UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

## VOLUME 109—PART 18

DECEMBER 4, 1963, TO DECEMBER 12, 1963
(PAGES 23189 TO 24450)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
R
v.109
pt.16

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE

### Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left to our own devices, we bow here in silence for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer.

As we lift our stewardship into Thy light, keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, and our spirits courageous as we are enmeshed in all the tangled tragedy of our ailing world. By Thy kindly light, as we follow it patiently and obediently, lead us and all men of good will to a realm where peace and concord shall reign, to a kingdom of human rights where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged, nor minds darkened by distorting lies which hide the light of truth.

We ask it in the name of the One who declared, "I am come to put at liberty those that are bound." Amen.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of morning business until 12:30 p.m.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 3, 1963, was dispensed with.

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George I. Cline, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

### KNOWLES AND CHINA GARDENS PROJECTS, MONTANA AND IDAHO

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should point out that the failure of the Simpson amendment to delete the Knowles Dam project would have compelled me to vote "nay" had I been present.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the minority views, appearing on page 330, of the report of the Committee on Public Works on Senate bill 3773, Calendar No. 2220, Report No. 2258, 87th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Minority Views on the Knowles Project and the China Gardens Project

The undersigned believe the testimony before the committee raised reasonable grounds for further consideration of the Knowles project and the China Gardens project. We believe the two projects should be deleted from this bill.

The Knowles project on the Flathead River in Montana was quite controversial with impressive testimony, as the printed hearings show, raising considerable doubt on the following points:

1. It is an economic detriment to the area.
2. It is not a feasible project.
3. It is not needed for flood control.
4. It would be detrimental to recreation and fish, wildlife and other conservation resources.
5. There are feasible alternative projects available.
6. Treaty rights of the Flathead Indians are jeopardized by the project.

The China Gardens project on the Snake River in Idaho and Oregon would also function as a regulating project for the High Mountain Sheep project upstream. The High Mountain Sheep project has been deferred. Therefore, it seems the China Gardens project should be deferred for further consideration.

A non-Federal entity that has a pending license application with the Federal Power Commission for High Mountain Sheep has committed itself, during hearings before the subcommittee, to undertake the construction of the China Gardens project if a license is issued to it for the High Mountain Sheep project. The question of license should be resolved within a year.

It is evident that no construction funds for China Gardens are to be voted and that none have been or will be requested in the current year.

The non-Federal entity has indicated no objection to Federal construction of China Gardens should a license for High Mountain Sheep be denied to it. Accordingly, nothing is lost by postponing action on China Gardens.

We see no justification for Federal construction of a project where a competent, resourceful, non-Federal body stands ready to build the same project and provide the same public benefits.

J. Caleb Boggs.
Jack Miller.
James B. Pearson.
Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.

### APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

#### NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, United States Code, section 393A, the Chair reappoints, for a term of 4 years, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

### COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-138, approved August 16, 1963, the Chair appoints the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1964, FOR CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (S. DOC. NO. 45)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964, in the amount of $210,000, for the Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army, which, with an accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, expressing sympathy on the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Louisville Council 2530, Knights of Columbia, of Louisville, Ohio, expressing condolences on the death of the late President John F. Kennedy; ordered to lie on the table.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 949. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736) (Rept. No. 676); and

S. 2213. A bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency (Rept. No. 677).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 692. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 678).

By Mr. WALTERS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 2218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 679).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1169. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (Rept. No. 742); and

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 681).

By Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. CHURCH), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1757. A bill to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation (Rept. No. 680).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel (Rept. No. 693);

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Pietro Maggio (Rept. No. 694);

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla (Rept. No. 695);

S. 1760. A bill for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III (Rept. No. 696);

S. 1781. A bill for the relief of Antonio Credenza (Rept. No. 697);

S. 1822. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anatasia (Rept. No. 698);

S. 1829. A bill for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes (Rept. No. 699);

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha (Rept. No. 700);

S. 1976. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez) (Rept. No. 701);

S. 2085. A bill for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors (Rept. No. 702);

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich (Rept. No. 703);

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang (Rept. No. 704);

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung (Rept. No. 705);

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski) (Rept. No. 706);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella (Rept. No. 707);

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling (Rept. No. 708);

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen (Rept. No. 709);

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy (Rept. No. 710);

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force (Rept. No. 711);

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto (Rept. No. 712);

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedman (Rept. No. 713);

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co. (Rept. No. 714);

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar (Rept. No. 715);

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett (Rept. No. 716);

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing (Rept. No. 717);

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parrett and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents (Rept. No. 718);

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden (Rept. No. 719);

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris (Rept. No. 720);

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin (Rept. No. 721);

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim (Rept. No. 722);

H.R. 5083. An act for the relief of John Stewart Murphy (Rept. No. 723);

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber (Rept. No. 724);

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux) (Rept. No. 725);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y. (Rept. No. 726);

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 727);

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin (Rept. No. 728);

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vinvenzina Ciavattini Restuccia (Rept. No. 729);

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa (Rept. No. 730);

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli (Rept. No. 731);

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 732);

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown (Rept. No. 733); and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz. (Rept. No. 734).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im) (Rept. No. 735);

S. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake (Rept. No. 736);

S. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim) (Rept. No. 737);

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ivanka Pekar (Rept. No. 738); and

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson (Rept. No. 739).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2084. A bill for the relief of Peitrina Del Frate (Rept. No. 740); and

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina) (Rept. No. 741).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week. (Rept. No. 682); and

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (Rept. No. 683).

By Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1319. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents (Rept. No. 684).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4766. An act for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co. (Rept. No. 685).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 743).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 776. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying (Rept. No. 686).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 579. A bill for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova (Rept. No. 687).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2242. A bill for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati) (Rept. No. 688).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2040. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 689); and

**H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy (Rept. No. 690).**

**By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:**

**S. 1832. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 691); and**

**H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc. (Rept. No. 692).**

## BILLS INTRODUCED

**Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:**

**By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MUNDT):**

**S. 2357. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.**

**(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)**

**By Mr. KEATING:**

**S. 2358. A bill to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation of the facts relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.**

**(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)**

**By Mr. DOUGLAS:**

**S. 2359. A bill for the relief of Roberto Biteranta Mejorada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.**

**By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:**

**S. 2360. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.**

**(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)**

**By Mr. HUMPHREY:**

**S. 2361. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.**

**(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)**

## RESOLUTION

### TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE EULOGIES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, DELIVERED IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL ON NOVEMBER 24, 1963

Mr. **HAYDEN** submitted a resolution (**S. Res. 230**), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

***Resolved,* That there be printed as a Senate document the eulogies to the late President John F. Kennedy delivered in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol on November 24, 1963, by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.**

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five hundred and forty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which one hundred and three thousand shall be for the use of the Senate and four hundred and forty-one thousand for the use of the House of Representatives.

## PROPOSED WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new wheat price support proposal. A companion bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

This bill would amend the present wheat certificate law providing a much simpler and more workable domestic parity program for wheat. Unless Congress enacts new wheat legislation, the present certificate program will have to be voted on again by wheat producers in a referendum early next year. Because of many complications and some undesirable features of the present law, it is highly unlikely that it would receive the necessary two-thirds vote in another referendum. This means that price supports would drop to about $1.30 a bushel. It would be utterly impossible for wheat farmers to survive this drastic drop in prices when costs of operation continue to rise year by year. The repercussions of a chaotic wheat price situation would have direct and adverse effects on the prices of most other commodities.

This new proposal would amend the present wheat certificate plan. The improvements proposed would make this a simpler and more workable program. It would be completely voluntary and would contain no marketing penalties. It would assure wheat produces 100 percent of parity for that portion of their crop consumed domestically and world prices for the balance.

Under this proposal the Secretary of Agriculture would determine each year the amount of wheat necessary to meet domestic and export requirements. This could not be less than 1 billion bushels. The Secretary would announce the acreage needed to meet the desired annual production goal. The national allotments and the State, county, and farm allotments would be arrived at in the same manner as allotments are now determined.

Using this formula the national allotment for next year would be about 50 million acres which, it is anticipated, would produce 1.2 billion bushels. If present export levels could be maintained or even increased, as now appears entirely possible, acreage allotments would be much higher. There would be a minimum support level, as provided under existing law, which the Secretary has announced as $1.30 a bushel. The farmer would receive, in addition to this, 100 percent of parity which is currently $2.51 a bushel for that portion of his wheat which is consumed in the United States or approximately 500 million bushels. This would give the farmer a blended price of about $1.80 a bushel for all of his wheat. If the domestic market price were higher than $1.30 a bushel, the farmers would, of course, receive a higher blended price.

In addition to the blended price of approximately $1.80 a bushel, farmers who complied with the program would receive diversion payments for acreage reduction as is now the case under present wheat and feed grain programs.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President of the United States could elect to make payments for wheat certificates through the CCC as similar payments are now being made for both the wheat and feed grain programs; or he could elect to make the program largely self-financing by requiring the domestic processors to purchase the wheat certificates as is the case now under the wheat certificate plan. One of the great savings would be in the elimination of most if not all Government storage payments. There would be very few price support loans taken out by farmers at this much lower price support level.

This bill would repeal wheat marketing quotas and marketing penalties. It would, however, leave in effect the provisions for acreage allotments. Farmers who complied with acreage allotments would be entitled to marketing certificates and price supports. Those who failed to comply with allotments would not get any benefits from the wheat program but would be able to raise all of the wheat they wanted to and sell it free of penalty for whatever it might bring on the open market.

With these and many other simplifications, the program would be a true domestic parity plan, more commonly known as the two-price system. The bill utilizes the mechanics of the present law in allocating marketing certificates. These certificates, however, would be restricted to that portion of the wheat crop needed for domestic food consumption. A major advantage of such a program would be that wheat exporters would not be required to purchase certificates and wheat could move freely into export channels without expensive export subsidies. Presently, there is no restriction on the sale of most farm commodities to Russia and Communist bloc countries. Only wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice—because of the particular type of price support and the export subsidy involved—have run into trouble. This program would eliminate such problems with wheat, as no export subsidies would be required. Most of the noncertificate wheat would be disposed of on the world market at world prices.

Mr. President, I send this wheat bill to the desk for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in full as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2357 ) to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program,

**introduced by Mr. Young of North Dakota (for himself and Senators Carlson and Mundt), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

Section 1. (a) Sections 332 and 333 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by sections 311 and 312 of Public Law 87–703, are amended to read as follows:

"PRODUCTION OBJECTIVE

"Sec. 332. (a) The production objective for wheat for any marketing year shall be an amount of wheat which the Secretary estimates (i) will be utilized during such marketing year for human consumption in the United States as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholly or partly of wheat, (ii) will be utilized during such marketing year in the United States for seed, (iii) will be exported either in the form of wheat or products thereof, and (iv) as the average amount which was utilized as livestock (including poultry) feed in the marketing years beginning in 1959 and 1960; less (A) an amount of wheat equal to the estimated imports of wheat into the United States during such marketing year and, (B) if the stocks of wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are determined by the Secretary to be excessive, an amount of wheat determined by the Secretary to be a desirable reduction in such marketing year in such stocks to achieve the policy of the Act: *Provided,* That if the Secretary determines that the total stocks of wheat in the Nation are insufficient to assure an adequate carryover for the next succeeding marketing year, the production objective otherwise determined shall be increased by the amount the Secretary determines to be necessary to assure an adequate carryover: And provided further, That the production objective for wheat for any marketing year shall be not less than one billion bushels.

"(b) If, after the proclamation of the national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat, the Secretary has reason to believe that, because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in the demand for wheat, the production objective should be increased, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether such action is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such action is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding and the amount of any such increase found by him to be necessary and thereupon such production objective shall be so increased. In case any production objective is increased under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for such increase by increasing acreage allotments established under this part of a uniform percentage.

"NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

"Sec. 333. Not later than April 15 of each calendar year the Secretary shall ascertain and proclaim the national acreage allotment for the crop of wheat produced in the next succeeding calendar year. The amount of the national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat shall be the number of acres which the Secretary determines on the basis of expected yields and expected underplantings of farm acreage allotments will, together with the expected production on the increases in acreage allotments for farms based upon small-farm base acreages pursuant to section 335, make available a supply of wheat equal to the production objective for wheat for such marketing year."

(b) Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting "prior to repeal of authority for marketing quotas" after the words "subsequent year" in the provisos in subsections (a) and (b), and after the words "subsequent years" in the proviso in subsection (c)(1) and in the second sentence of subsection (d).

(c) Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress is repealed, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the following provisions relating to wheat marketing quotas: (1) the sentence in section 334(i), as added by section 313(4) of Public Law 87–703, relating to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; (2) the words "and marketing quotas for the marketing year therefor" in the second sentence of section 334a; (3) the first and next to last sentences of section 335, as amended by section 315 of Public Law 87–703; (4) sections 336 and 338; (5) the two provisos in clause (3) of section 339(b); (6) "wheat," in section 372(a); and (7) the last two sentences of section 379c(b).

(d) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a), is amended—

(1) by striking from subsection (2) the following: "if marketing quotas are in effect for wheat";

(2) by striking all of subsection (4);

(3) by striking from subsection (5) the following: "if marketing quotas are in effect for the crop of wheat," and

(4) by striking from subsection (5) the last three sentences thereof.

(e) The following headings contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are amended as follows:

(1) The heading of subtitle B of title III is amended to read "SUBTITLE B—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS".

(2) The heading of part III of subtitle B of title III is amended to read "PART III—ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—WHEAT".

(3) The heading of section 335 is amended to read "MINIMUM ALLOTMENT".

### FULL PARITY FOR WHEAT FOR DOMESTIC FOOD CONSUMPTION

Sec. 2. (a) Section 107(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1445a), is amended to read as follows:

(1) price support for wheat accompanied by marketing certificates shall be at a level equal to full parity price therefor,".

(b) Section 379b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 379b. Beginning with the marketing year for the 1964 crop, a wheat marketing allocation program shall be in effect as provided in this subtitle. Whenever a wheat marketing allocation program is in effect for any marketing year the Secretary shall determine (1) the wheat marketing allocation for such year which shall be the amount of wheat which in determining the production objective for such marketing year he estimated would be used during such year for human consumption in the United States, as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholly or partly of wheat, and (2) the national allocation percentage which shall be the percentage which the national marketing allocation is of the production objective. Each farm shall receive a wheat marketing allocation for such marketing year equal to the number of bushels obtained by multiplying the number of acres in the farm acreage allotment for wheat by the normal yield of wheat for the farm as determined by the Secretary, and multiplying the resulting number of bushels by the national allocation percentage. If a noncommercial wheat-producing area is established for any marketing year, farms in such area shall be given wheat marketing allocations which are determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the wheat marketing allocation given producers in the commercial wheat-producing area."

### CERTIFICATES FOR PRIOR CROP WHEAT IF CURRENT CROP UNDERPLANTED

Sec. 3. Section 379c (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending clause (ii) of the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "(ii) the amount of uncertificated wheat remaining on hand from prior crops".

### AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND REQUIREMENT FOR PURCHASE OF CERTIFICATES BY PROCESSORS

Sec. 4. (a) Section 379d (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) All persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products shall, prior to marketing any such product for human food in the United States, acquire marketing certificates equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat contained in such product. Marketing certificates shall be valid to cover only sales made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued, and after being once used to cover a sale of a food product shall be void and shall be disposed of in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions hereof, the Secretary may require marketing certificates issued for any marketing year to be acquired to cover sales made on or after the date during the calendar year in which wheat harvested in such calendar year begins to be marketed as determined by the Secretary even though such wheat is marketed prior to the beginning of the marketing year, and marketing certificates for such marketing year shall be valid to cover sales made on or after the date so determined by the Secretary. The requirements of this subsection may be suspended for any marketing year or other period by the President in whole or to such extent as he deems appropriate, if he determines that such suspension will result in the more effective regulation of commerce and the better effectuation of the purposes of this Act. In the event of such full or partial suspension, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall buy all marketing certificates offered to it in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 379e."

(b) Section 379d(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or export".

### REPEAL OF MONETARY PENALTIES FOR PRODUCTION ON DIVERTED ACRES

Sec. 5. Section 339(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The producers on any farm (except a new farm receiving an allotment from the reserve for new farms) on which any crop is produced on acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat shall, except to the extent otherwise prescribed by the Secretary, be ineligible to receive price support on wheat or wheat marketing certificates unless the crop is designated by the Secretary as one which is not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if it is permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, or as one the production of which will not substantially impair the purpose of the requirements of this section. The acreage required to be diverted from the production of wheat on the farm shall be an acreage of cropland equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor determined by dividing the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below fifty-five million acres by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment."

### EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 6. This Act shall be effective beginning with the 1964 crop of wheat. Subject to adjustment as provided by law, the production objective for the marketing year beginning in 1964 shall be in the same amount as the national marketing quota heretofore proclaimed, and the national, State, county, and farm acreage allotment for the 1964 crop of wheat shall be those heretofore proclaimed and apportioned, without further proclamation or apportionment. The support levels specified in section 107(1) and 107(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by this Act, shall be applicable to the 1964 crop of wheat, notwithstanding the disapproval of marketing quotas for that crop prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a brief technical explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### EXPLANATION OF BILL

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

1. repeal existing provisions for marketing quotas;

2. provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption;

3. permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted;

4. permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation; and

5. repeal the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat.

Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the allotment and its apportionment among States, counties, and farms would be as provided by existing law. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the world price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1964 crop, the acreage allotments for 1964 being those heretofore apportioned.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas. That is its sole purpose.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota; the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law; and the national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as under existing law. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) deals with the provisions in sections 334 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the existing law for preservation of acreage history where the marketing excess is stored to avoid payment of marketing penalties. Subsection (b) makes purely technical amendments to give recognition to the fact that under the bill there will be no marketing penalties after 1963. History would continue to be preserved, however, where the marketing excess was stored in accordance with the existing provisions during the years 1959 through 1963.

Subsection (c) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively, with rice-marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice-marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (d) amends section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price support provisions for wheat, to eliminate references to marketing quotas. Section 107(2) now provides for the support level for noncertificate wheat "if marketing quotas are in effect." Subsection (d) makes section 107(2) applicable every year. Section 107(4) at present provides for the support level when marketing quotas are not in effect. The bill would repeal section 107(4), since a marketing certificate program would be in effect every year, and the support levels for certificate and noncertificate wheat are intended to be governed by sections 107(1) and 107(2) every year. Subsection (d) also amends section 107(5) which now defines "cooperator" differently when marketing quotas are in effect and when they are not in effect. Under the bill there would be only one definition of "cooperator," and various provisions of section 107(5) relating to marketing quotas would be deleted.

Subsection (e) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

Section 2 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

Subsection (a) increases the support level for certificate wheat to full parity (from the 65 to 90 percent of parity now provided for).

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided).

Section 3 would permit marketing certificates to be issued for uncertificated wheat on hand from prior crops, where the normal yield of the planted acreage is less than the farm wheat marketing allocation. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Section 4 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

Section 5 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage.

Section 6 would make the bill effective with the 1964 crop. The allotments heretofore established for the 1964 crop would be effective without further action, and the support levels provided by the bill would be applicable, notwithstanding the results of the quota referendum heretofore held.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota—who in my opinion is one of the outstanding experts not only on wheat but also on farm problems in general throughout the Nation—was good enough, about 10 days ago, to give me an advance copy of the bill which he is now introducing.

Unfortunately, because of the circumstances which occurred, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill, but I wish to assure the Senator that I will read his remarks with great interest and with great respect, as always, because I believe he realizes the difficulties which confront us in the wheat-growing regions and is likely to come up with a sensible proposal to help meet the situation which will confront the wheat ranchers next year.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I greatly appreciate the comments of our distinguished majority leader. He, of course, has long had great interest in agriculture and has always been sympathetic to the programs for wheat and to the needs of all farmers. I wish we had more friends like him in Congress.

## QUICK ACTION ASKED ON SUBPENA POWERS FOR PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL COMMISSION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to confer powers of subpena and other compulsory process upon the Commission recently appointed by President Johnson to investigate the facts relating to the assassination of President Kennedy.

This bill is modeled after the statute which granted similar subpena powers to the special Commission appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster. The

Commission which President Johnson appointed last week will exercise an identical function—that is, to ascertain and make public the true facts of a tragic event of great national importance—and it is essential to its task that it be authorized to compel the production of live testimony and documentary evidence—as I am sure they will find and will request. Because, in my judgment, the Commission should embark upon and complete its assignment at the earliest possible time, I am introducing this bill now, in the hope that it can be acted upon with dispatch, both in the Senate and the House, before the end of the present session. Hopefully, it can be done this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2358) to authorize the Commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation of the facts relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SOIL MAPS AND SUBURBS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen and improve the program of the Soil Conservation Service.

The purpose of the bill is to aid the planning of new suburban growth on what is now rural farmland.

In New Jersey alone, the population will by 1970 have increased by 25 percent to about 7.6 million, which will mean an explosion of new suburban development on what is now rural land.

But at the present time, new suburban development is all too often undertaken without any real knowledge of the soil.

A detailed knowledge of land capabilities has long been a basic requirement for scientific farming. Partially in recognition of this national need for standardized and reliable soil data, Congress many years ago created the Soil Conservation Service within the Department of Agriculture.

Since that time, the SCS has drawn up soil maps of over 20 percent of the acreage in the continental United States, thereby supplying the American farmer with invaluable information concerning the nature of his land.

As Federal programs go, this has not been an expensive effort. Last year, the SCS spent about $17 million on soil mapping activities throughout the country. But the value of soil maps, both through the savings achieved and the opportunities made manifest, has been incalculable.

Although the program was originally undertaken as a purely agricultural venture, many important urban uses for soil maps have been discovered in recent years. By a slight reorientation we can bring the skills and techniques developed in the service of our farming community to bear upon an important cluster of problems confronting our cities and suburbs.

The quest of millions of suburban Americans for a better life, for more pleasant physical surroundings and a more satisfying community environment, is much too well known a phenomenon to require further commentary.

What is not always recognized, however, are the kinds of problems that arise as new suburban developments spring up on land that was previously used for agricultural purposes or not used at all.

Just as the farmer has always known that land is far more than empty space to be occupied and used, the suburbanite in America has learned in recent years that the type, grade and structure of the soil beneath his feet must be taken into account in the formulation of his plans for the future. For the nature of the soil, in many ways not readily apparent, determines the capacity of the land.

Consequently, planning for the development of land in rapidly urbanizing areas would be enormously aided by the availability of soils data. Once completed, a soil map for a region is available for multiple uses by a wide variety of public and private agencies.

Health officials, for example, in many new suburbs are vitally interested in the kind of soil on which new housing developments are erected.

Thousands of new homes are going up every year on land which is miles from main sewer and water lines. As a result, the homeowner must depend on septic tanks for sanitary disposal.

Some kinds of soils, however, are just not suitable for septic systems, and some require larger disposal fields than others. But if this is not known prior to construction, serious sanitation problems will result.

All of which can spell tragedy for the homeowner who sees his dreams of gracious living in a pleasant environment blasted and financial disaster for the developer.

I could cite endless examples of this kind of thing in just my own home State of New Jersey. A recent instance in Bergen County is illustrative.

Individual septic tanks were installed for each of the 50 new homes in a development. But since the soil was already saturated from adjoining seepage, over half the homes immediately had drainage problems, both with their septic tanks and their lawns.

The upshot of the resulting litigation between the borough and the contractor is that it will cost each homeowner between $2,000 and $3,000 to have public sewage installed.

If soil maps were available, unfortunate incidents like this might have been avoided.

Nor is public health the only field in which a knowledge of soils would be extremely helpful. Low-lying lands that have sufficient natural drainage in their wild state often become subject to flooding when developed. Foundation bases for buildings, streets, and highways are affected by soil conditions which in turn determine construction costs. In sum, almost every phase of developing a new community must be done in reference to soils data.

If community leaders, planning commissions, zoning boards, education officials, real estate developers, and others are to make enlightened decisions, they must have at least a basic knowledge about the soils they have to deal with. And the Soil Conservation Service is especially qualified to supply it.

In some communities steps have already been taken. The city of San Antonio, Tex., for example, has realized the value of a soil survey.

San Antonio's city manager, Jack Shelby, has said:

> No official, department, bureau, or agency in San Antonio is now proposing construction without the soil survey as one of their basic tools.

But, unfortunately, San Antonio is not a representative case. Hundreds of other cities and towns that could make equally good use of soil maps do not have access to them.

The reason is quite simple. The Soil Conservation Service has very limited resources and the brunt of its efforts are still oriented toward agricultural needs.

In my own home State of New Jersey, the Service has only eight soil scientists working, and it will take them 15 years to complete mapping the State. Just five more scientists would speed this up more than proportionately, enabling all of the critical areas to be done in 5 years.

This bill would authorize the Soil Conservation Service to take steps to meet these critical needs before time has run out, and it would certainly help to repay States like New Jersey in some measure for all the money they have paid to support the subsidy programs of the Agriculture Department.

I think it is important to say that the Soil Conservation Service has done a fine job under difficult and confusing circumstances. Wherever possible it has been receptive to urban requests for its skills. But the present law leaves it unclear how much authority it has to undertake these projects on a large scale.

The bill would make clear that the Service does in fact have this power.

In view of the magnitude of the problem and the relatively slight cost of setting existing machinery in motion to solve it, I earnestly hope the Senate will give serious and favorable consideration to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2360) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## USE OF CAPITOL COLUMNS AT NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early in July of this year I announced that it was my intention to introduce legislation authorizing the use of the historic east front columns of the Capitol in the creation of an open-air pavilion at the National Arboretum.

Today I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the Arboretum. I am hopeful that Senators will give careful consideration to this legislation, for it offers an unusual opportunity for proper disposal of the historic columns in an esthetic and inspring setting.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this project will provide to the average citizen—the native of Washington, D.C., or the visitor to the Nation's Capital—a spot of striking beauty throughout the year.

We have been fortunate in obtaining the services and creative energies of one of America's truly outstanding architects—Edward Durrell Stone.

Mr. Stone has conceived in his plan full utilization of the elements necessary for a meaningful memorial to our historic traditions and also the future enjoyment in a natural setting for generations to come.

Such a project would provide impetus for the millions of visitors who travel to Washington yearly to enjoy and admire one of our newest and least publicized attractions—the National Arboretum.

Mr. Stone's plan envisions utilization of the 24 columns into an open air pavilion. A 4-tiered arc would be rimmed by the columns, 17 in the first, and 7 alternated in the second row. They would be reflected in an oval pond centered by a cascading fountain.

Mr. President, this bill would provide a breathtaking entrance to our National Arboretum, which borders the west bank of the Anacostia River at M Street and Maryland Avenue NE.

I doubt whether many of our citizens know about the 410 scenic acres whose higher hills overlook the Capitol and the Washington Monument to the south. In the east, the hills break in sudden drops to the Anacostia River.

It is altogether fitting that the project I am proposing will enhance this beautiful, natural setting with a living, vital, and inspiring witness to man's creative energies that can be enjoyed and appreciated by all people.

This project will not be encased in stark, cold slabs of stone. Rather, it will be a living memorial to the early traditions of a struggling democracy fought out in the halls these columns upheld.

Mr. President, I am indebted to those people who are actively supporting this project and to Mr. Stone, who has willingly given his services in the advancement of this new, bold utilization of our historic Capitol columns.

There have been other ideas put forth in the utilization of these columns. But I earnestly ask that my colleagues give their careful consideration to this project and join me in providing to the American people a living memorial that offers a refreshing, inspiring, and relaxing respite from a world of tensions, frustrations, and discord.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill authorizing the use of the Capitol columns at the National Arboretum be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2361) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That jurisdiction and control over the columns removed from the east central portico of the Capitol in 1959 are hereby transferred from the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary is authorized and directed to utilize such columns in an architecturally appropriate manner in the National Arboretum.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed in the aggregate $880,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

## AMENDMENT TO GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK BILL (AMENDMENT NO. 340)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to the bill, S. 2296, to create the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas. This substitute was prepared in the Department of Interior and accurately describes the exact area intended to be included in the proposed park as well as other provisions for its creation and administration. I approve of the Interior Department bill and introduce this substitute so that action may be expedited.

This proposal for creating a national park in the rugged Guadalupe Mountains of Texas is meeting with great favor in Texas, and approval by the National Parks Advisory Board was widely hailed. I ask unanimous consent to have printed after my remarks two editorials which illustrate this support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the many people who have worked so hard on this proposal to bring it to the stage it is today: The many fine public servants in the National Park Service, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall; Representative at Large Joe Pool, of Texas; and Mr. J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene, Tex., owner of this area, who has worked for years to conserve the area in such a natural state that it is today worthy of national park status.

Exhibit 1

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Nov. 9, 1963]

### The Guadalupes

Two sizable steps have just been taken toward the creation of a national park in the rugged and scenic Guadalupe Mountains of extreme west Texas.

The advisory board of the National Park Service has recommended the park's creation and Senator Ralph Yarborough, of Texas, has introduced a bill to establish it. A similar bill already had been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Joe Pool.

Congressional approval would insure that the great region encompassed by the proposal would be preserved for the public in its present wild and beautiful condition. Creation of the park would provide an outdoors recreation area for generations yet to come. The action of the Park Service's Advisory Board is gratifying, and Senator Yarborough deserves commendation for moving the project into the Senate without delay.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times, Nov. 9, 1963]

### Guadalupe Park Proposal

Not the least hidden resources of this State are the mountains in the western part—the foothills of the Rockies and in some instances just as scenic.

Right now, the Guadalupe Peak-McKittrick Canyon area is the subject of interest because an advisory committee for the National Park Service has recommendend it as a national recreation area. Senator Ralph Yarborough has introduced a bill in the National Congress to create a national park in the Guadalupe Mountains.

A 72,000-acre playground there compares with the size of some of the ranches in the area and it wouldn't be a big park in comparison with the Big Bend, for instance. But it has as great scenic value, and it would tie in with the planned approach to link tourist attractions over a wide area. This would provide another point of interest between the historic site at Fort Davis and the border playground on the Rio Grande.

Creation of the park would well double tourist interest in this part of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, OR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of November 26, 1963, the names of Mr. Allott, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Young of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2331) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President, the Vice President, or the Chief Justice of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators) on November 26, 1963.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONVENTION WITH MEXICO FOR SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold 2 days of public hearings, December 12 and 13, on the Convention with Mexico for Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal—Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session. Executive branch witnesses will be heard on December 12 and public witnesses on December 13. Both meetings will begin at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

All individuals or organizations desiring to appear should get in touch with the committee clerk.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE BILL 1912

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing will be held in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m. on Thursday, December 12, 1963.

The hearing will be on S. 1912, a bill proposed by the administration and introduced by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by request, to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and on H.R. 7381, the administration measure which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in an amended form.

Those wishing to testify on this legislation may arrange to do so by calling Capitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

## MARGARET SANGER, A RESPECTED PROPHET IN HER OWN TIME

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Parade magazine of December 1, 1963, contained an article describing the crusade Margaret Sanger initiated 51 years ago when she advocated birth control.

The story is entitled "Margaret Sanger 50 Years of Crusading." Author Lloyd Shearer has chosen his words well. The tribute to this remarkable women is long overdue. I commend Parade for bringing this article to the attention of its many readers.

Today, Margaret Sanger has the rare opportunity to watch her countrymen and those of other lands discuss publicly the dilemma she recognized half a century earlier. Fifty years, of course, is barely a wink in the age of our planet, so I shall not be unseemingly critical of the reluctance then to discuss the population problem. Happily, today we can discuss it without being jailed or threatened.

Author Shearer describes Mrs. Sanger as "a respected prophet in her own time" in many eyes. He is correct. Her life has been a profile in courage. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Parade article appear at the close of my remarks.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Is it respectable and responsible to discuss birth control or the population problems which confront the world? Of course.

The American Assembly of Columbia University discussed the population dilemma at its 23d session at Arden House in Harriman, N.Y., last May. Participants came from throughout the land. Their recommendations were positive. It is pertinent to observe the conclusion:

> The vast majority of the people of the world, including a large proportion of the people of the United States, do not yet recognize the full implications of present population trends. The 23d American assembly cannot emphasize too strongly that time is running out for the formulation and implementation of world and national population policy.
>
> To continue to ignore world and U.S. population problems is to ignore the welfare and security of all peoples. We must not remain complacent in the face of a major threat to world peace and survival.

Implementing these words, the George Washington University American Forum on "The Population Dilemma" was held November 14–17 at Airlie House, in Warrenton, Va. Its participants came from many parts of the eastern United States. They represented numerous professions and interests. Many had vast knowledge of the population problem. Many frankly admitted they did not know, and said they had accepted the invitation to participate so they could learn.

The final report of the George Washington University American Assembly on "The Population Dilemma" should please Margaret Sanger. Consider the first sentence:

> The condition of mankind is such that there have never been so many hungry people on this globe.

And the second paragraph:

> The relationship of the earth's population to its natural resources and its man-made institutions, is a crucial matter if mankind is not to abandon the future to the brutal laws of nature and chance. The impact of accelerating population growth on peace and well-being presents a clear and present danger.

The report is a 1963 testimonial to the courageous struggle Margaret Sanger made earlier this century. In two of its recommendations the assembly suggested that there be:

> Wide dissemination of information about birth control at low or no cost for those who desire it, with full recognition that the right to decide what steps to take and methods to use belongs to the individual, and should not be abridged by local law or restriction.

And the assembly recommended:

> That medically approved methods of birth control, including effective contraceptive devices, be made available at low or no cost to all those who request them, and that they be provided at public expense by public health clinics and health centers.

I want to report that in another recommendation the assembly endorsed Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, introduced earlier this year by my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], of which I am a cosponsor. It relates to the population dilemma.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE POPULATION DILEMMA

(NOTE.—The George Washington University American Assembly final report on the "Population Dilemma," as adopted by the participants in plenary session, Sunday, November 17, 1963. This report does not include everything that was discussed, nor does it reflect ideas presented in only one of the four panels. It is not the practice of the American Assembly for participants to affix their signatures, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

The condition of mankind is such that there have never been so many hungry people on this globe. A continuing high birth rate and a falling death rate have created an acceleration in the rate of population growth. The process has reached a point at which no authoritative prediction of population warrants indifference or apathy.

The relationship of the earth's population to its natural resources and its man-made institutions, is a crucial matter if mankind is not to abandon the future to the brutal laws of nature and chance. The impact of accelerating population growth on peace and well-being presents a clear and present danger.

This George Washington University American Assembly believes that—

(a) Man's present inability to deal with the basic needs of nearly two-thirds of the world's population suggests that a dampening of the rate of world population growth is imperative. The estimated present rate of worldwide population increase is approximately 2 percent per year. We believe that this rate should be reduced by at least a half.

(b) Efforts to deal with problems of economic development without regard for the rate of population growth are absurd and wasteful. Present concepts of economic growth, particularly as applied to less developed areas of the world, indicate the desirability of considering the impact of population growth on economic development. At the best these two forces may cancel each other. At the worst the planes of living will be lowered.

(c) Present efforts to study and understand the consequences of accelerating population growth, although far from adequate, are indicative of a growing worldwide concern. Present support for the concept of planning family size and responsibly controlling births comes from divergent sources that are surprisingly close in their analysis of the problem. In method of population limitation, the disagreement is still wide. The problem involves, for many people, moral issues and deep personal convictions. It requires and demands cooperation and good will.

(d) The world has achieved a phenomenal improvement in death control; the next step must be the achievement of a corresponding improvement in birth control.

(e) Family size is fundamentally a matter of personal choice by parents. Such choice ought to be based on knowledge of the consequences to the family and to society, and with knowledge of the means of effective family planning. Since reliance on voluntary self-regulation may permit those who are uninformed, irresponsible or indifferent to continue to procreate at an

**undesirable rate, strong efforts must be made to encourage everyone to deal responsibly with this problem.**

### I. POPULATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

**The consequences of the present population explosion are destructive to the achievement of rising expectations in the low income countries. Where the present gap between hope and reality is broadest, it is possible that the introduction of modern techniques of health care and sanitation can so suddenly transform the ratio of births to deaths that the prospect of raising the standard of living gives way in face of a tidal wave of people in need of food, housing, education, and other necessities of life.**

**This assembly does not believe that efforts at population control are the exclusive answer to these problems. The complexities of sound economic and social development and reform go beyond population size, but cannot go far without serious consideration of this essential factor. Economic measures—liberalization of international trade, investment, and access to and development of natural resources—may be an effective means of raising world income per capita and reducing income disparities. These economic results are desirable in mitigating international frictions.**

**The days of mass migration in search of a better life are over. Migration will not be adequate in face of the probable rate of world population growth, although it may reduce pressures temporarily in a given local area. Basic solutions must be found elsewhere.**

**Our concern for the impact of burgeoning population on world affairs leads us to recommend:**

**1. The expansion of the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies in making effective information regarding the techniques of birth control widely available for those who request it.**

**2. Increased support be given to the collection of improved population and other demographic statistics; to continuing analysis and projection of these data; to analysis of the interrelationship between demographic and socio-economic variables; and to the dissemination of this information.**

**3. That U.S. aid will be most effective in those cases in which the recipient countries have developed effective and comprehensive plans which include attention to population problems as well as to fiscal, monetary, natural resource, public administration, industrial development, and other questions of importance to the development of the country. It is our position that U.S. aid should also be directed to help low per capita income countries to develop effective and comprehensive plans related to population control.**

**4. That those agencies, public and private, giving assistance to countries in the planning of development should take particular care to call attention to the implications of the population growth of such countries.**

**5. The population explosion is not only a concern of governments and international political organizations, but also of the international, nongovernmental scientific community. We recommend that these groups undertake research and disseminate information about population problems, birth control, and the nature of the reproductive process.**

**6. Since most advocates of birth regulation stress the privacy of the decisions that must be made to achieve responsible parenthood, and since the motivation of the individual is involved in any voluntary program of birth control, we urge the great religious and other private organizations to take leadership in motivating people to accept the basic concept of responsible family planning. The influence of many of these private international organizations transcends national** boundaries and rises above the exigencies of rapid political change and economic fluctuation. Some of these deal directly and intimately with the individual and his conscience, where the personal decisions must be made in the area of voluntary population regulation.

### II. POPULATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS

This assembly is aware that there are current national problems which are related to the rapid population growth of recent years. We are equally aware that every responsible demographic authority predicts a substantial expansion of our national population without regard to our success in finding solutions for current problems of urban congestion, transportation, air pollution, educational facilities and personnel, and depletion of water, timber, and other resources. We have unused productive capacity; we have not approached the maximum population which our resources can maintain. But optimism without regard to the present facts of population growth and the widely disseminated projections of population could lead us to the very position we wish to avoid—one which sees social and economic progress retarded by excessive and badly distributed population growth. We also feel that there is no economic justification for the oversimplified idea that population growth automatically creates new markets which in turn support a growing labor force.

Our concern for the impact of burgeoning population on our social, cultural, economic, and political institutions leads us to recommend:

1. Immediate and extensive efforts be made to inform the people of this country of the projections of population growth and of the enormous problems inherent therein. This should be undertaken by the political, educational, civic, and religious leaders at all levels, as well as by the media of mass communication. Moreover, our political leadership should encourage, through the United Nations, a stepped-up program of awakening world leadership to this problem.

2. Increased and intensified research and investigation of the impact on our society of population trends; such research and investigation to be supported by both public and private financial grants. This problem, we believe, should be assigned a high priority.

3. Increased and intensified research and investigation of the biological and medical aspects of human reproduction in order that a variety of techniques and procedures to control reproduction may be developed.

4. Efforts to promote responsible parenthood require more information about the role of social and cultural factors as they relate to family size. This assembly urges the expansion of applied research in the social and behavioral sciences to provide more information in this field.

5. Wide dissemination of information about birth control at low or no cost for those who desire it, with full recognition that the right to decide what steps to take and methods to use belongs to the individual, and should not be abridged by local law or restriction. Such laws and restrictions, now seldom rigorously enforced, should be replaced by the concept of individual responsibility.

6. That medically approved methods of birth control, including effective contraceptive devices, be made available at low or no cost to all those who request them, and that they be provided at public expense by public health clinics and health centers.

7. Honoring the requests of fertile individuals for sterilization when there is no violation of the patient's or the physician's moral convictions.

8. That revision of present policy and programs related to family and child welfare which seek to minimize unwanted and rejected offspring be carefully examined lest efforts to deal with irresponsible parents lead to harm to innocent children.

9. The appointment of a Presidential Commission on Population as suggested by Senators CLARK and GRUENING in Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and the substantially increased programs of research within the NIH as called for in the same resolution.

10. Continued efforts to accelerate economic growth, broaden employment opportunities, and revise and expand vocational training programs, together with assurances that these will be available to all segments of the population without prejudicial discrimination.

11. Comprehensive programs of natural resource conservation which become increasingly important as population growth trends become realities.

12. The introduction of information concerning responsible family planning into the programs of schools and religious organizations, and particularly into the media of mass communication. The subject should receive attention in publicly supported adult education programs and local social agencies.

13. All the above suggestions for short- and long-range national and international action demand qualified professional personnel beyond our present supply. Educational facilities must be expanded in all these fields and efforts made to attract qualified people to the professions needed.

These recommendations, if put into effect widely, will have their own side effects with which society will have to deal. This assembly recognizes that some of our recommendations may create new problems. We feel that study and research, experiment and action, are very much the order of the day.

The first steps are underway, supported by a changed attitude on the part of responsible churchmen of virtually all major faiths, a new courage on the part of some political leaders, a real breakthrough in effectiveness by agencies which have been privately organized to deal with the problems of population growth—of which the Planned Parenthood Federation and the Population Council are outstanding examples. The great foundations have declared their interest and already devoted extensive funds to population problems.

This George Washington University American Assembly believes that the facts justify not panic, but confident action.

The choices here are hard ones. Population growth almost inevitably leads to multiplication of state controls, even in our free society. Yet control of population increases also involves some state action in a field of rights peculiarly private. For a free society there is here a true dilemma.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, 41 years ago Mrs. Sanger asked that I comment on the birth-control problem in her publication "The Birth Control Review." In that particular issue of July 1922, Mrs. Sanger asked:

> Would not the legal dissemination of scientific birth control information through the medium of clinics by the medical profession be the most logical method of checking the problem of overpopulation?

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my response to that question and to three others asked by Mrs. Sanger be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### BIRTH CONTROL: IS IT MORAL?

(Dr. ERNEST GRUENING'S answers to Mrs. Sanger's four questions)

1. "Is not overpopulation a menace to the peace of the world?"

Answer. A great menace. There are altogether too many people in the world. Quality, not quantity, should be the desideratum. If men and women are really superior to beasts, it is in their ability not to breed like rabbits or to spawn like jellyfish and turn their offspring into the ruthless jungle existence of tooth and claw, but to bring wanted, carefully nurtured, loved children into the world endowed with all the strength and fineness and potentiality for a happy existence which the planning and devotion of thinking beings can encompass. The overpopulation of the world has already borne the bitter fruit of war. Germany's congested multitudes were taught to believe that they were surrounded by enemies, that the open spaces of the world had been preempted and that Germany had to expand forcibly in order not to perish., However false this assumption, the fact remains that the Germans believed it, and it was a potent factor in producing the catastrophe of 1914–18. Japan's problems are similar—her overcrowding and inability to overflow into other lands underlies the present tense Far Eastern situation. Overpopulation is responsible for the fierce economic struggle all over the world. The changed conditions in the United States in the last 20 years, the repressions of the present day, the development of class consciousness and the intensification of the industrial conflict are merely manifestations of the patent fact that our country has at last filled up and has become overpopulated. Unemployment, an acute symptom of this condition, means nothing less from an economic standpoint than that there are too many people for our present system to support. A still graver symptom are the famines which regularly afflict sections of the earth, notably China, which we then belatedly and ineffectively try to relieve by feeble palliative measures.

2. "Would not the legal dissemination of scientific birth control information through the medium of clinics by the medical profession be the most logical method of checking the problem of overpopulation?"

Answer. It would. It is essentially the duty of the medical profession to accept full responsibility for the therapeutic phases of this problem. The new spirit in medicine demands that diseases be prevented wherever possible. The old adage is particularly applicable to matters of health that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

3. "Would knowledge of birth control change the moral attitude of men and women toward the marriage bond or lower the moral standards of the youth of the country?"

Answer. Neither. On the contrary insofar as it would tend to eliminate for all time the crime of abortion, its effect would be distinctly moral.

4. "Do you believe that knowledge which enables parents to limit their families will make for human happiness and raise the moral, social and intellectual standards of the population?"

Answer. I believe that no single reform capable of such immediate and widespread application would so greatly add to the happiness of the human race. There are no panaceas, but birth control properly established would go further to eliminate poverty, sickness, insanity, crime, with all that these scourges imply, than any other remedy proposed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the world owes much to Margaret Sanger and to others who are pioneers in the birth-control field. The world likewise owes much to the men who have made possible the American Assembly university forums established in 1950 by Dwight David Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University. The American Assembly is a national, nonpartisan, educational institution, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. Its assemblies are designed to illuminate issues of U.S. policy.

And we owe much to our late President, who did not let his personal beliefs interfere with the common good. Under his direction, our Government took important steps nationally and internationally in the unknown, unexplored, and controversial field of human fertility.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's pioneering and his work for all men in this area must not be wasted.

Here in the Nation's Capital, Georgetown University has taken an active, positive lead in studying the population problem.

Last July, the Georgetown University population study center opened officially. The center will benefit all mankind as it explores the population problem and as it works toward the perfection of the rhythm system. Its director is Dr. Benedict J. Duffy. A pioneer in the population field, the late Dr. Donald J. O'Connor, good friend of Dr. Duffy and of mine, first brought the need of such a center to the attention of the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, president of Georgetown University, several years ago.

Dr. O'Connor was an economist of established reputation. Don O'Connor did not falter in his quest for a reasonable answer to the population problem which he had seen illustrated in Puerto Rico which would be acceptable to all, including the members of his own Catholic Church. His death delayed establishment of the center, but today his dream is being realized.

The progressive role of the Catholic Church as it relates to the world's population problem is heartening. I am pleased to report that I have received and accepted an invitation to speak at a session of the Institute of Social Ethics at Georgetown University when a course in population will be held June 17 through July 21, 1964. The institute is sponsoring an interdisciplinary course on the moral and social effects of the population problem. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter signed by the Reverend Francis X. Quinn, S.J., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
*Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.*

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: From June 17 to July 21 the Institute of Social Ethics at Georgetown University will sponsor an interdisciplinary course on the moral and social effects of the population problem.

By assembling demographers, sociologists, economists and clergy, educators and men in professional life, we will attempt to pinpoint some of the problems posed by the accelerating rate of population growth. The topics treated will include world population growth, world resources and technology, the current status of fertility control, birth control and public policy, family size, rhythm and the "pill."

We would like you to participate. Can you be with us on July 1 and discuss "Population Growth and the American Economy." We will be glad to have you as our guest at the University. We would appreciate any suggestions.

Hopefully,
Rev. FRANCIS X. QUINN, S.J.,
*Institute of Social Ethics.*

P.S.—I may be reached at Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

---

EXHIBIT 1

### MARGARET SANGER—FIFTY YEARS OF CRUSADING

(By Lloyd Shearer)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—Here, in a small, secluded sanitarium aptly called House by the Side of the Road, one of the world's most controversial women is approaching the end of her life's journey.

Her name: Margaret Sanger. Her achievement: Founding the birth control movement in America.

This year, on September 14, Margaret Sanger reached the age of 85. Her birthday passed relatively unnoticed, except by close friends and her two sons, Stuart and Grant. Both are physicians, one an internist in Tucson, the other a surgeon in New York.

Bedridden for the past 3 years with a heart weakened by recurring occlusions and a bloodstream that manufactures too many white blood corpuscles, this little, strong-willed woman, no larger than a minute, still retains the spirit which drove her to found a movement which many people consider one of the most important in the world.

#### FATHER'S OPPOSITION

"Fifty years ago," Margaret Sanger told me as her son Stuart and I sat with her recently in her sanitarium room, "I realized what was coming—the population explosion we hear so much about today, women having more and more babies until there's neither food nor room for them on earth. And I tried to do something about it. Now I have thousands of people all over the world aware of that problem and its only possible solution—family limitation and planned parenthood. But 50 years ago"—she breathed deeply and tossed her head—"what opposition I had: the law, the police, the government, even my own father. He was the most broad-minded Irishman I ever knew—Michael Higgins was his name. But he kept saying, 'Margaret. Get out of it. Get out of it. The kind of nursing you're doing, the kind of project you're involved in—that's no life for a girl.' "

In 1912, after she had been married 12 years to Architect William Sanger and had borne two sons and a daughter, Margaret Sanger from Corning, N.Y., 1 of 11 children, a feminist if ever there was one and a graduate nurse, wrote a series of articles for the New York Call entitled, "What Every Girl Should Know." In simple, understandable language she described the problems of puberty and adolescence, the cause and prevention of social disease, the parts and functions of the female anatomy.

These articles outraged a ruthless, fanatical intolerant named Anthony Comstock, who in 1873 had managed to push through Congress a censorship law bearing his name. It authorized him, as a special agent of the Post Office Department, to open any letter, package, pamphlet or book going through the mails and to rule personally on what was indecent or obscene.

According to Comstock, anything dealing with contraception or venereal disease was indecent, so that druggists, doctors, hospital administrators and scientists were afraid to use the mails to receive or dispense such information. They feared prosecution and imprisonment.

Comstock was a detestable man with a twisted mind. One time he ordered two of his female decoys to write a kindhearted midwestern doctor, begging the physician for contraceptive information on the grounds that they were married to insane husbands. When the good doctor replied to the women, telling them what they might do, Comstock had him arrested and sent to Leavenworth for 10 years.

Comstock tried to do the same to Margaret Sanger. In 1913 this wisp of a woman was indicted by the U.S. Government on nine counts with a possible prison sentence of 45 years because she had insisted over and over again: "No woman can call herself free who does not own and control her body. No woman can call herself free until she can choose consciously whether she will or will not be a mother."

What inspired Margaret Sanger to write her articles and to found the birth control movement was the misery, the poverty, the degradation which met her eyes when, in the first decades of this century, she labored as a nurse on New York City's East Side.

"I can still see them," she says, closing her eyes and recalling the past, "those poor, weak, wasted, frail women, pregnant year after year like so many automatic breeding machines. Those poor women, crying, pleading, begging, 'Please tell me, Mrs. Sanger. You know the secret of not having babies. Please tell me. If I have another baby, I'm going to die.'

"You can't imagine what it was like," she continues, "what these hopeless women would do to prevent their continued pregnancies. They were poor. Their husbands couldn't support the families they already had. They sent their children out into the labor market at 7, 8, and 9 years.

"These pitiful women went to local abortionists, to butchers in many cases, and after illegal operations they bled to death. Others turned to drinking turpentine mixed with sugar, mustard mixed with teas. They threw themselves down flights of stairs to incur miscarriages. It was horrible, horrible—and all because there was no one, no person, no agency to tell them about contraception.

### "I KNEW I WAS RIGHT"

"Seeing all this misery year after year, this needless death, and realizing that there was no one, no man on the scene, no doctor, no nurse, no social worker who would help them, I resolved that women should have some knowledge of their own bodies, some knowledge of contraception, that they should be rescued from their sex servitude. You ask me how I could face all the persecution, the martyrdom, the opposition. I'll tell you how. I knew I was right. It was as simple as that. I knew I was right."

Before Margaret Sanger went on trial for violating the Comstock Law, a powerful New York corporation lawyer, Samuel Untermeyer, undertook to defend her. "Listen," he told her one day, "I've spoken to the district attorney. All he wants you to do is not to break the law. You send me a letter with such a promise, and you won't go to jail."

Margaret Sanger jumped to her feet. "I'm not worried about jail. That has nothing to do with it. The question is whether I have done something obscene. If I have not, I cannot plead guilty."

"But the law," Untermeyer insisted, "says that to disseminate information on birth control is obscene."

"Then," said Margaret Sanger, "the law is wrong, and the law will have to change, not I."

Margaret Sanger went to jail for 30 days, but her imprisonment aroused the conscience of the Nation's womanhood. Women from every station in society rallied to her side in such numbers that they made possible the founding of planned parenthood clinics throughout the Nation. In 1937 the American Medical Association voted to give birth control its recognition and support, and the Federal courts ruled that it was neither illegal nor obscene for contraceptive materials to be sent through the mails. Margaret Sanger had succeeded in changing the law.

Like that of many women who fiercely dedicate their lives to career or cause, Margaret Sanger's private life suffered in the process. While she was in England studying with Havelock Ellis and while researching birth control on the continent, her husband was imprisoned for distributing her series of articles. When she returned to New York, her only daughter, Peggy, to whom she was deeply attached, came down with pneumonia and died. Her two sons, sent off to boarding schools, saw less of their crusading mother than they might have under other circumstances. Eventually Margaret Sanger and her husband were divorced. In 1922 she was married again, this time to J. Noah H. Slee, president of the 3-in-1 Oil Co. He died in 1943, leaving her with many fond memories of their work together and a picturesque home in Tucson.

Constitutionally incapable of rest or retirement, Margaret Sanger organized in 1948 the Cheltenham Congress on World Population and Resources. Delegates came from 15 countries. Mrs. Sanger graphically pointed out that death rates, because of discoveries in medicine, were going down and birth rates were going up. She prophesied that unless population growth was controlled, it would neutralize any economic or social gains. Frequently, she said, it would lead to war. She emphasized that the growing population explosion was a problem the world could not shunt aside.

Invited to speak in Japan and India, she lectured so convincingly and with such incontrovertible expertise that both countries came out in favor of birth control and instituted programs for planned parenthood. Today, Margaret Sanger's prophesies have come true. The world rate of population growth has doubled since 1945 and is increasing steadily. In 35 years the population of the United States will reach 300 million, and the world population of 3 billion will double to 6 billion. In the last 3 years the population of the world has increased by 185 million—or as many people as there are in the United States today.

### RATE OF GROWTH

The earth's land space is fixed and inexpandable. Population grows geometrically: 2–4–8–16–32, etc. Since World War II, the world population has been increasing at 2 percent. This means that the total population will double every 34.6 years. Birth rates are highest in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, on which continents live roughly two-thirds of the world's population. Unless the birth rate is controlled, the earth will not have enough resources—water, fuel, food, and wildlife—to support humanity.

Margaret Sanger's movement was for years a source of controversy. Many sincere people opposed the dissemination of birth control information, both in this country and abroad. But nowadays all major churches recognize that the problem of population explosion must be met. As the Reverend John A. O'Brien, research professor of Theology at Notre Dame, points out: "Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are in agreement over the objectives of family planning, but disagree over the methods to be used." One church approves the rhythm method and abstinence, another condones "the use of the gifts of science for conscientious family limitation." A third approves the use of medical contraception only by the wife, for health reasons.

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in 1951, explicitly approved the rhythm system for Roman Catholics as a means of spacing children. He also called upon science to perfect the system so that it might be made more sure and reliable.

Fifty years ago Margaret Sanger told the world: "The greatest issue is to raise the question of birth control out of the gutter of obscenity * * * and get it into the light of intelligence and human understanding."

Today, with two-thirds of the world rapidly approaching its biological bursting point, she is happy to note the changing tide of international opinion, the respectability and importance given family limitation. It is a source of deep satisfaction to her that the administration in Washington now is willing to give birth control information to those oversea nations who request it, that currently the population explosion is recognized by statesmen everywhere as second in importance only to the problem of preventing nuclear war.

"But we still have lots to do," Mrs. Sanger warns. "I believe no girl should get married and start bearing children before she's 18. One of the big troubles in China, with 730 million people, and India, with 461 million, is that girls there are married off at 12 and 13 and bear on the average of 6 to 8 children. Married people must contribute to the continuation of the human race, but they are entitled to some freedom of choice in the matter."

"At this moment," she states, "one-third of the world's people have a freedom of choice, but over 2 billion do not, simply because they don't know that it's possible to limit births. We've got to get the message through to these people, or in a hundred years humanity will drown in the ocean of overpopulation."

"I think that here in this country," she avers, "an ideal age for a girl to marry is 21."

Margaret Sanger, still irrepressibly pedagogic at 85, has spent most of her life battling segments of the state, the church, the schools, the press, and society. She has fearlessly faced imprisonment, condemnation, and ostracism. To many persons, both her name and her views are still objectionable. But in the eyes of many she has lived to become a respected prophet in her own time.

---

## DAVID LAWRENCE EDITORIAL ON PRAYER

**Mr. SIMPSON.** Mr. President, Americans continuing to ponder the legality of public prayer, in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions, were heartened somewhat by official statements uttered in observance of Thanksgiving.

The distinguished writer and philosopher, David Lawrence, has commented on this confusion regarding public prayer in an editorial published in the December 2d issue of the Washington Star:

> The American people have been puzzled as to whether anyone in the Government of the United States may * * * ask people to pray to God—

Said Mr. Lawrence.

> It was therefore, rather significant to note the frequent references to prayers to God which have been made in public speeches these last few days.

In his column, the writer quoted extensively from a Thanksgiving Proclamation prepared by President Kennedy, as well as from President Johnson's November 27 address delivered before the joint session of Congress. Both statements were replete with reference to God and deity and our obeisance to the omnipotent power which controls the destiny of all of us.

Even the Supreme Court's Chief Justice implored God to "protect our Nation in this hour of crisis," in commenting on the assassination of President Kennedy.

Writer Lawrence concluded, and I certainly concur in his observance, "that these numerous references to prayer and to the deity are bound to be regarded by many people as proof that to mention God or to refer in public speeches to prayer is not to be construed as 'an establishment of religion' in a sense in which the Constitution uses the phrase."

Let us pray to God that such is the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this most heartwarming and scholarly article printed in the RECORD at this point, with my remarks. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the broad cross section of the American public which daily receives the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### TRAGEDY AND PUBLIC PRAYERS—NEED SEEN TO IMBUE SCHOOLCHILDREN MORE DEEPLY WITH THE GOLDEN RULE

(By David Lawrence)

For several months now, the American people have been puzzled as to whether anyone in the Government of the United States may, on a formal or official occasion, ask people to pray to God. In fact, ever since the Supreme Court's decision which ruled that public school teachers could not be directed by State or local governmental authorities to use a particular prayer in the classroom, there has been a question as to what mention of the Supreme Being would be permissible in official functions.

It is known, of course, that atheists have been insisting that there should be no semblance of religious worship in the public schools, but many citizens who do believe in God have assumed that the Supreme Court sooner or later would clarify its position and permit voluntary prayers in public schools.

It was, therefore, rather significant to note the frequent references to prayers to God which have been made in public speeches these last few days.

In the address, for instance, which President Lyndon Johnson delivered before the joint session of Congress on November 27, he said:

"On this Thanksgiving eve, as we gather together to ask the Lord's blessing and give Him our thanks, let us unite in those familiar and cherished words: 'America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.'"

In the Thanksgiving proclamation which had been issued on November 4 to the American people, the late President Kennedy said:

"Over three centuries ago our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts far from home in a lonely wilderness set aside a time for Thanksgiving. On the appointed day, they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the laws which bound them together and for the faith which united them under their God.

"So, too, when the Colonies achieved their independence, our first President in the first year of his first administration proclaimed November 26, 1789, as 'a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God' and called upon the people of the new Republic to 'beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions * * * to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue * * * and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.'

* * * * *

"On that day (November 28) let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and all nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

On Thanksgiving Day, President Johnson spoke over radio and television to the American people. He referred to Mr. Kennedy's proclamation and said:

"Tonight, on this Thanksgiving, I come before you to ask your help, to ask your strength, to ask your prayers that God may guard this Republic and guide my every labor.

* * * * *

"On this Thanksgiving Day, as we gather in the warmth of our families, in the mutual love and respect which we have for one another, and as we bow our heads in submission to divine providence, let us also thank God for the years that He gave us inspiration through His servant, John F. Kennedy.

"Let us today renew our dedication to the ideals that are American. Let us pray for His divine wisdom in banishing from our land any injustice or intolerance or oppression to any of our fellow Americans, whatever their opinions, whatever the color of their skins—for God made all of us, not some of us, in His image. All of us, not just some of us, are His children.

"And, finally, to you as your President, I ask that you remember your country and remember me each day in your prayers, and I pledge to you the best within me to work for a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind."

These numerous references to prayer and to the Deity, coming as they do from the highest official in the Government of the United States, are bound to be regarded by many people as proof that to mention God or to refer in public speeches to prayer is not to be construed as "an establishment of religion" in the sense in which the Constitution uses the phrase. Indeed, there are many citizens who feel that while prayers of any kind can, of course, be said in the home or in churches or in public meetings, the recent trend which would banish any religious exercises in the public schools can only, in the long run, mean that opportunities will be missed to teach public school students the foundations of morality and good behavior.

Chief Justice Warren, in his comment on the assassination of President Kennedy, declared it was "a result of the hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our Nation by bigots." And he said in conclusion, "May God protect our Nation in this hour of crisis."

But while people generally will wish to see hatred and bigotry eliminated from community life, they will also recognize that such a utopian mood will not come about unless schoolchildren, as well as grownups, are more deeply imbued with the golden rule mentioned in the Bible and the spirit of conciliation which is so necessary to solve the troublous problems of a free republic.

## STATE DEPARTMENT CONFIRMS KEATING REPORT ON FRENCH AND BRITISH ACTIVITY IN CUBA

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, several months ago I asked the Department of State for a report on the activity of French firms in Cuba. Informally, my office was informed that the Department of State had "no evidence" of French activity in Cuba. In order to be of assistance to them and make the information I had available to other Government sources, I supplied the Department with the name and address of the firm and asked what confirmation the Department had of these activities. Now, over 2 months later, the Department of State confirms my original statement, first made September 10, and offers some additional information as to French and British activities in Cuba.

In the light of continued Cuban terrorist activities, particularly in Venezuela, and in the light of continuing Castroite efforts to destroy the political stability of Latin America, I believe these reports will be of interest to the American people. There seems little doubt that the people of Latin America, when presented with a free and rational choice, will not choose communism. But the aim of Castro and those who are influenced and encouraged by his example is to deprive the people of that choice and to drive them by violence and deceit into the arms of communism, just as the Cuban people were driven. It should be a matter of serious concern—and I believe it is—to the United States when our allies contribute, in any way at all, to the economic potential of the Castro regime.

I believe it is increasingly important for the United States and also those Latin American countries directly affected to make their views known to other free world nations. It is increasingly important to tighten the boycott and isolation of Cuba and to discourage our allies, above all, from sales or activities that could strengthen Castro's position and prolong his rule in Cuba.

French willingness to sell equipment that can chemically process waste sugarcane into yeast should be a disturbing consideration, not only in the United States, but also throughout Latin America, where Castro continues, directly and indirectly, to menace economic progress and stable political development.

What is more, I am also reliably informed that another French company, in addition to those referred to earlier by me and now by the Department of State, is also active in Cuba, the Compania European Importacion & Exportacion and that French construction firms which had previously participated in tunnel-building activities are also looking for additional construction work in Cuba.

Moreover, the latest shipping reports released by the Maritime Administration show that, on an average, through 1963 more than one ship per day arrived in Cuba registered under the flag of free world nations. The number ranged from 12 in January to 45 in July. The current figure is just about one free world ship daily.

In my view, it is strongly in the interest of the United States and the whole hemisphere to have accurate and up-to-date reports on the activities of other free world nations in Cuba. The diplomatic tendency to conceal or to play down such moves only strengthens Castro's hand, as he tries, on the one hand to undermine free nations and on the other hand, to get all he can from them. What is needed is a full and forceful account of the dealings between Castro's regime and other governments and businesses and determined pressure once again from our own Government to cut down still further free world trade and shipping with Cuba and to make it even more difficult than it is today for Castro to win recruits and foment violence in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks, the text of this correspondence.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963.

Hon. FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
*Assistant Secretary of State,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DUTTON: Several usually reliable reports have come to my attention indicating the interest of French firms in establishing sugar-waste processing plants in Cuba, an interest which I understand has not been discouraged by the French Government.

I should appreciate a full report on this matter and any other information that may be available on the extent of current West European economic activity in Cuba.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

---

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
*Secretary of State,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand from conversations with officials in the Department that as of now you have no evidence of any French firm that is planning to construct a sugar-waste processing plant in Cuba.

My information is that the name of the French firm is Societé Pour Equipement des Industries Chemique, 14 Rue La Boetie, Paris VIII ieme (S.P.E.I. Chim.). I am informed that this firm is planning to sell the equipment for the factory but as yet does not have plans to operate it themselves. I would appreciate your looking specifically into this report.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, November 27, 1963.*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letters of September 10 and 24 regarding the interest of French firms in establishing sugar waste processing plants in Cuba. I refer also to my letter of September 26 promising you further information on this subject. I regret the delay which this investigation has caused.

We understand that the Societé Pour l'Equipment des Industries Chimiques (Speichim) will supply a yeast plant to Cuba under a contract negotiated in early 1962. A representative of this company is now in Cuba discussing with Cuba officials financial matters relating to construction of the plant. This transaction reportedly does not need the approval of the French Government since it is of a nonstrategic nature. We understand that no credit was granted Speichim by the French Government.

In addition to equipment for the yeast plant reported above, two French firms contracted in 1961 to supply plant equipment: Carbonization Entreprise et Ceramique is reportedly supplying $228,000 worth of equipment for a gas plant at Puentes Grandes, Marianao, and the Compagnie Generale d'Entreprise Electrique has supplied a turbogenerator for a powerplant in Matanzas Province, in a reportedly cash transaction.

One British firm, James Mackie & Sons of Northern Ireland, sold $2,500,000 worth of equipment in 1961, to establish a kenaf bag plant at Santa Clara, under a contract that was signed in 1958.

We remain keenly interested in the question of the extent of Western European commerce with Cuba. The matter has been kept under review by the Department and remains a basis for continuing discussions with our allies at all diplomatic levels.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
*Assistant Secretary.*

## IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a recent speech to the American Friends of the Hebrew University, David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, outlined the kind of scientific advances we can expect in the years to come. Paying well-deserved tribute to Prof. Milton Handler of Columbia Law School, one of our most distinguished scholars and practitioners in the field of antitrust law, and the latest recipient of the Scopus Award of the American Friends of the Hebrew University, Mr. Sarnoff dramatically depicted a future of challenge and opportunity. From the days of his arrival in the United States to the present, Mr. Sarnoff has been alert to the new horizons opening before us, and even more, he has himself contributed time and again to the opening of those horizons, and to the progress of science bringing new gains to the entire human race.

Mr. President, no one is better qualified to speculate on and explore the potentialities of science than David Sarnoff, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of his illuminating and exciting address to the American Friends of the Hebrew University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE UPON SOCIETY

(Speech by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, to the American Friends of the Hebrew University, New York City, December 1, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, Professor Handler, ladies and gentlemen, few occasions are as rich in meaning as the one which brings us together tonight, and I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to a distinguished American and to the cause which commands his devoted support.

I first met Milton Handler about a quarter of a century ago when he was a young professor of law at Columbia University and I was managing the enterprise that still employs me. Milton, at least, has come a long way since then. He has become one of the Nation's outstanding legal scholars and practitioners, and an expert in antitrust law. Even as layman I have had some acquaintance—at the receiving end—with this branch of the law. While it is a complex subject for lawyers to teach, it can sometimes be even more complicated for laymen to understand. Milton Handler performs a vital task in his dedication to clarifying the basic principles of these laws, so necessary to the preservation of our competitive system and our cherished free economy.

Beyond his legal and scholastic attainments, Professor Handler has distinguished himself through his devotion to a vision—a vision of Hebrew University as an educational beacon in the ancient lands of the Levant, illuminating new paths of understanding for Israel, for her neighbors and indeed for all of the civilized world. I congratulate him most heartily on being this year's recipient of the Scopus Award of the American Friends of the Hebrew University and your organization on its wise choice.

Today, under the capable guidance of a distinguished diplomat, statesman, scholar, and my good friend, Eliahu Elath, Hebrew University is effectively fulfilling its mission. It is truly becoming, as Chaim Weizmann hoped it would, Israel's "spiritual dreadnaught." And it is both fortunate and deserving in the support it is receiving across the world, as exemplified by this occasion.

The rising generation that you are helping to educate faces vast new dimensions of change, stimulated by advances in science and technology on a scale and at a pace exceeding all previous experience. The world of your lifetime and mine is being changed politically, economically, socially, technically, even geographically, by epoch-making scientific breakthroughs. There is not a man alive today who is unaffected by the new scientific discoveries and their applications.

All of us, of course, have had countless foreshadowings of the changes to come. I remember arriving here, in the year 1900, as a boy of nine and my astonishment at the marvels I saw for the first time in my life. At the port of Libau, in Latvia, enroute to Liverpool, I beheld a ship, an unbelievable mass of smoke and steel moving on the water. And then in Liverpool there was another wonder to gape at—a trolley car that moved without horses.

It took one unending month to sail from Libau to Montreal. Perhaps I should explain that this voyage was in the steerage of a commercial vessel and not a leisurely cruise on a private yacht. When my family landed in America, there were further marvels to behold—the horseless carriage, the phonograph, the telephone and the electric light. While early models of these new wonders could be seen, they were not yet in general use. There were virtually no automobiles on the streets, and no subways underground; no electric refrigerators and air-conditioners in the homes; no movies and of course no talkies.

Marconi had not yet flashed his first wireless telegraph signal across the Atlantic and wireless transmission of the human voice was only a fantastic dream. Radio broadcasting was still 20 years, and television 40 years, in the future. The Wright brothers and their flying machine had not yet appeared in the skies.

In the intervening years, the wonders of my childhood have paled into the commonplace as the impact of science upon society has become progressively more pronounced. Now, we talk by telephone to friends or business associates at opposite sides of the world. We breakfast in London, dine in New York, and retire in Los Angeles. We hear and see on a television screen astronauts in global orbit. The world shares through television the happiness of the inauguration of the President of the United States; and it also shares through television the sadness of the funeral of that same beloved and martyred President.

In recent decades the products of the research laboratory and drawing board have poured forth at a bewildering pace. There has in fact been more progress in discovery and development of scientific knowledge and in modification of our environment since the beginning of the present century, than in all the prior millenia of recorded history.

Even at that—and this is a fact not fully appreciated—we are only at the bottom rung of scientific achievement. There are many more scientists and physicists alive and at work today than the total number of those who lived in all the years of the past. The concerted application of their brainpower holds the promise of breakthroughs to new concepts and higher human levels. These opportunities are so great that Barbara Ward, the British writer, recently suggested that "only now is neolithic society being left behind."

What we have done in the past half century is to delineate the major areas of scientific conquest and to sketch their potentialities. Their fullest development is still to come.

It is likely that before the present century ends we will have the means to eliminate hunger. This will come not only through the extension of advanced agricultural techniques already available in the West—it is also probable that two major new sources of food will have been added. One is in the seas where the yield of food could be greatly increased through better knowledge of marine biology. The other is in the creation of synthetic foods, possibly at a cost low enough to eliminate all scarcity.

The essential nutrients man requires are basically chemicals whose formulas are well known and most of them can be synthesized in the laboratory. Eventually we can expect a flow of manmade foods that will compete in price, palatability, and nutritive value with the products of the farm. In addition to chemical and biological developments, it is well within the realm of the possible that germination and growth of foods may be accelerated by electronic means.

Man has always been the victim of disease and untimely death. Already medical science has extended average American life expectancy beyond the biblical threescore years and ten. In the not-too-distant future, birthdays celebrating the first 100 years will no longer rate press headlines.

One of the tiniest particles in the universe—the electron—has become a mighty weapon in the arsenal of medicine. An electronic device imbedded under the skin and known as the pacemaker, is now used to regulate the human heartbeat. By the end of this century, ultraminiature electronic devices implanted in the body will regulate human organs whose functions have become impaired—the lungs, kidneys, heart—or replace them entirely. The concept of electronic spare parts for the human machine will thus be realized. Already we have practical evidence of this possibility in the successful use of the artificial kidney.

People who die today because of the temporary impairment of some vital organ will be kept alive over extended periods by electronic and mechanical instruments until more permanent recovery is possible. Individuals who have lost an arm or leg will have their functions restored through electronic substitutes.

Our children and grandchildren will see electronics replacing defective nerve circuits, and even taking over some routine functions of the brain canceled out by strokes. Blindness, deafness, dumbness are disabilities that science will greatly reduce and ultimately eliminate. We will learn how to use electronics to serve as eyes, ears, and tongues for the afflicted. The body's own electricity can generate sufficient current to operate many of these devices indefinitely.

One of the most promising electronic medical potentials for the future is represented by lasers. These devices produce light beams so powerful and so concentrated as to illuminate an area on the moon only 2 miles in diameter; and so intense as to burn through a diamond at temperatures far hotter than the surface of the sun. Yet these pencil-thin beams are sufficiently delicate to cauterize a tumor out of the eye and to reconnect a detached retina. Recently, a medical electronics team also demonstrated their prospective value in arresting skin cancer.

By the end of the century we will very likely see laser beams within needle-thin tubes inserted into the body to perform clean, swift microsurgery on internal malignancies and other abnormalities. Indeed, with the electronic techniques in being or on the horizon, today's surgery will probably seem as antiquated 40 years from now as was the old practice of trying to cure disease by leeches.

Science is learning how life's hereditary patterns are transferred from generation to generation. In the nucleic structure of the living cell is the genetic code which determines those qualities and characteristics that pass from parent to child. Before the present century comes to a close, it seems likely that we will be able to decipher this code and thereby to alter many hereditary traits, to eliminate human diseases and defects, even to amend the behavior of cancer cells and so achieve its ultimate cure.

In the field of energy and power, man has historically been handicapped. This has been true even with the addition of coal, oil, and gas. But, this too will change, now that the secrets of the atom are being unlocked. One pound of uranium the size of a golf ball has the energy equivalent of 3 million pounds of coal, and the world's nuclear resources are far greater than coal, gas, and petroleum combined.

We will learn how to use atomic energy to blast harbors; to unfreeze icebound ports; to create reservoirs beneath the world's deserts to trap and hold water; and to provide low-cost power to desalinize the ocean's waters. Electric powerplants will be nuclear, and atomic energy will be a major power source, particularly in the developing areas of the world.

Suitcase-size atomic generators, similar to the one lofted into space this past September, will operate remote installations for years without refueling. Fuel cells, converting energy directly to electricity, will light, heat and cool our homes and operate the household appliances.

Atomic energy will power moving vehicles and revolutionize our present modes of transportation on land, sea, and in the air. The great cities of the world will be only a few hours apart, and many within commuting distance. Though the very words nuclear missiles today mean destruction, nuclear carriers will one day be used to transport mail and freight all over the world.

There is, finally, the universe around us. Manned interplanetary exploration will, in time, become an accomplished fact. If life exists on other planets, we may find solutions for some of the problems that persist on mother earth.

Around earth itself will be a network of weather satellites scanning the atmospheric sheath. Linked to computer systems, they will predict with increasing accuracy next season's floods and droughts, extremes of heat and excesses of cold. In shorter terms they will note any turbulence of sky and seas—typhoons, tornadoes, hurricanes—in ample time to be diverted or dissipated before they reach dangerous intensity. Indeed, the control and correction of weather is not outside the bounds of possibility.

In the field of communications, too, we are just at the beginning of most promising developments. Our grandchildren's world will be one in which it will be possible to communicate with anyone, anywhere, at any time, by voice, sight, or written message, separately or as a combination of all three.

Manned satellites weighing up to 150 tons and hovering over fixed points on earth will serve as switchboards in space to route telephone, radio and television, and other information, from country to country, continent to continent, and from earth to space vehicles and the planets beyond. Participants will sit in their homes or offices, in full sight and hearing of each other through small desk instruments and a color TV screen on the wall.

Within the next 10 to 20 years, it is more than probable that satellite television will be able to transmit on a worldwide basis, directly to the home, without the need of intermediate ground stations. This holds enormous significance for people everywhere in entertainment, information, and education. Audiences of a billion people may be watching the same program at the same time, with automatic language translators providing instant comprehension of the program's content.

"Ultimate" is a hazardous word to use in describing the future of any branch of science. If it has any application in the science of communications, it will probably arrive when an individual carrying a vest pocket transmitter-receiver will connect by radio with a nearby switchboard and be able to see and speak via satellite with any similarly equipped individual anywhere on this or other planets.

Ultrahigh and microwave radio frequencies, and the laser beams I mentioned earlier, can provide the billions of channels necessary for such personal communications. Private frequencies will then be assigned in much the same manner that an individual today receives his personal telephone number.

The developments I have mentioned—and others sure to emerge in the years ahead—are not merely further technological advances. They are so fundamental that they will alter the very structure of society and compel each of us to readjust some of our traditional concepts.

For example: We can expect that in time, science and technology will make it possible for our people to produce in 2 to 4 hours a day, what is necessary to supply our own needs.

However, beyond these, there will be other growing needs: to expand world trade; to adjust to the inevitable growth of automation, at home and abroad; to occupy the additional leisure hours usefully. These are problems that will challenge our imagination and command our best efforts.

But, these problems need not dismay us. On the contrary, they should be regarded as God-given opportunities for further progress that can add meaning, grace, and dignity to life for all mankind.

Since man's earliest groupings by family and clan, a basic cause of conflict has been lack of knowledge—an ignorance of strange people and strange things and the fears that it breeds. In primitive tongues, the word "stranger" was synonymous with "enemy." Other causes were disparity of resources and greed for their possession—haves against have-nots; neighbor coveting neighbor's goods. Today, the gifts of abundance inherent in science and technology, if used wisely, can bring relief and new hope to the have-not countries which have known only hunger, poverty, disease, and despair. It can thus remove one of the major causes of human friction and war.

I do not suggest that scientific maturity will suddenly transform mankind. Technological progress will inevitably create new problems, and the scientist alone cannot be expected to provide all the solutions. To adapt the words of Clemenceau that "war is much too serious a matter to be left to the generals," science is much too serious a matter to be left to the scientists. It involves the critical questions of disarmament and controls, peace or war; the size and purpose of the national budget; the sources of our livelihood and our manner of living; indeed the destiny of our civilization.

Not to recognize the basic forces of science and their titanic impact upon society, is to invite comparison with Aristotle's response when he was asked how much educated men were superior to the uneducated. "As much," he said, "as the living are to the dead."

At the meeting of the board of governors of Hebrew University in Jerusalem last year, Abba Eban, now Israel's distinguished Deputy Prime Minister, pleaded for "inventiveness and innovation in the search for the complete man, who is not humanistically illiterate, and a humanist for whom scientific truth is not a closed world." I join my plea to Minister Eban's.

Modern man—especially the would-be leader in society—has to be a culturally integrated individual, familiar with the sciences as well as the humanities. There cannot be two isolated cultures for the simple reason that there is only one society in which to live.

The statesman should have a better understanding of the sciences in order better to comprehend the problems that confront him across the conference table—problems that will become increasingly technological in nature.

The lawyer has need of education in the sciences because they have become a force in the lives of both government and citizen, forging new relationships between them. Lawmakers and the courts that interpret and apply the laws, likewise have need for an understanding of the scientific forces shaping our world.

Artists and musicians will find in science new dimensions of space, sound, and theme.

Science is also a proper study for the theologian, for religious revelation must be interpreted in the light of enormously broadened perspectives.

The ordinary citizen must know at least something of science if he is to serve himself and his country effectively, and not find himself an alien in a changed world.

I would propose that scientific and cultural education begin with the earliest school years and extend without interruption through college and into the professional schools. Specifically, courses in the social sciences and humanities should be related to the physical sciences. It seems to me highly desirable that science itself should be studied as a social phenomenon because of the great impact it has upon society.

In some areas, the process of scientific integration already is well underway. We see it at various levels of government, where the scientist has become as familiar a figure as the economist and the military specialist.

It would have been highly improbable 45 years ago to find a scientist by the side of Woodrow Wilson or Lloyd George. Yet in World War II, Prime Minister Churchill turned constantly to Lord Cherwell for scientific advice, and only a few weeks ago, Lord Hailsham, Minister of Science, was a prominent candidate for Prime Minister of Great Britain.

President Franklin Roosevelt had such distinguished scientific consultants as James B. Conant, Vannevar Bush, and Karl Compton. President Eisenhower created a post of Special Presidential Assistant for Science and Technology, and our late and distinguished President Kennedy wisely continued to man that post.

I have no more than suggested the possible shape of some of the things to come. Of this we can be certain: scientific realities of tomorrow will surpass our vision of today. The great challenge before all of us, is to make sure that the new knowledge and new instrumentalities shall be used constructively and not destructively. The powers of science and technology are neither good nor evil in themselves. Their capacity for good or evil lies in the use we make of them.

The crux of man's dilemma as he faces the future of change is this: While rapidly learning how to master nature, he is not making comparable progress in learning how to master himself.

Forty years ago Justice Louis Brandeis wrote: "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold." Forty years from now, if our children and grandchildren are to reap the benefits of science, we of this generation must reasonably evaluate the new forces at our disposal, boldly implement them, and guide them wisely.

The Proverbs tell us: "Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting, get understanding." In the context of the multiple revolutions promised by science, these words have never seemed more valid and more pertinent.

And in the indispensable search for wisdom the great universities of the world will play a crucial role. The Hebrew University assuredly is in this select company of institutions. Whether in the humanities or in the sciences, it draws upon an ethical heritage in which virtue is the central good, and peace with justice the highest virtue. That is why I consider it a high privilege to take part in the enterprise that has brought us here tonight, heightened by the personal satisfaction of seeing my friend Milton Handler honored as he so richly deserves.

## FEDERAL AID TO FEDERALLY IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the grave problem which confronts a very substantial number of Kansas school districts as a result of the failure of the Congress to approve legislation extending Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 providing Federal aid for federally impacted school districts.

The Senate will recall that the extension of Federal impacted aid for school districts is currently included in the vocational education bill, H.R. 4955, now in conference committee. Agreement on this bill does not appear imminent. Another version of extension of this Federal program is currently tied up in the House Rules Committee with no immediate prospects for House action.

Kansas schools face a unique and difficult problem because of the delay in the extension of Public Law 874 in particular. Our local governments, including our school districts, operate under what is known as a "cash basis law." This law, which was passed in 1933, prohibits a governmental jurisdiction from spending money which has not been budgeted and from creating an indebtedness in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury.

Some 177 Kansas school districts have budgeted over $6 million in Federal impacted aid for their 1963–64 school year. Their funds on hand from other sources are reaching a low point and in a number of cases will soon be exhausted. Their school operations are in danger of having to be severely restricted. Other State and local funds will be forthcoming next year, but this does not relieve the immediate problem which has been created by the failure to receive impacted aid on its normal schedule.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point several communications from Kansas school districts and one from the Kansas State Superintendent of Public Instruction setting forth both the statewide and the local problems created by the delay in action on Public Law 874.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
*Topeka, Kans., November 26, 1963.*
The Honorable JAMES B. PEARSON,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PEARSON: In behalf of the State of Kansas, I want to commend you for assisting in sponsorship of the Tower-Pearson bill S. 2304, providing for a 3-year extension of the impacted areas assistance program.

We are especially anxious in Kansas for the extension of Public Law 874, as amended, for the following reasons:

1. The Kansas Legislature in 1933 passed a cash basis law for all municipalities (G.S. 1963 supp., 10–1101—10–1122), a portion of 10–1114 states, "it shall be unlawful after May 1, 1933, for any member of any governing body of any municipality to knowingly vote for or in any manner aid or promote the passage or adoption of any order, motion, ordinance, resolution, legislation or other act of said governing body, creating an indebtedness in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury of such municipality at the time for such purpose, or to knowingly vote for the drawing of any order, warrant or check, or other evidence of such indebtedness on the treasury of said municipality, in payment of such indebtedness, in excess of the amount of funds actually on hand in the treasury at the time for such purpose."

2. The 177 Kansas public schools, which last year filed applications for financial assistance for current expenditures for public schools in areas affected by Federal activities under Public Law 874 (81st Cong.), as amended, are under the Kansas cash basis law and many of these school districts have estimated the Federal funds as a portion of their budget. Unless this law is extended in the near future, a number of school districts such as Leavenworth, Junction City, Salina, Wichita, Derby, Washburn Rural High School, and Pauline Common School District will be facing financial shortages in the operational funds.

3. It has been estimated in Kansas, based on the application, filed by the federally affected schools, that their entitlements for the school year 1962–63 will be $6,173,421.43.

Unless Public Law 874 is extended in the near future and money appropriated to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens, some of these schools will of necessity need to change their program and thus shortchange the students attending those schools.

Sincerely yours,
ADEL F. THROCKMORTON,
*State Superintendent of Public Instruction.*

---

SALINA, KANS.,
*November 23, 1963.*
Senator JAMES PEARSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

The Salina Board of Education strongly endorses Senate bill 2304 which we understand provides for an extension of House bill 874 for 3 years. As you well know Kansas operates under the cash basis law. In the budget for the present school year 1963–64 the Salina School District anticipated receiving $450,000 for operating expenses under the provisions of Public Law 874. Unless these funds are forthcoming as anticipated the Salina School District will face a critical financial situation. We are certain that many other federally impacted school districts will face similar critical financial positions unless this important legislation is enacted before many more days. We appreciate very much the assistance of you and Senator CARLSON in this tremendously important legislation.

KENNETH RYAN,
*President, Board of Education.*
W. M. OSTENBERG,
*Superintendent of Schools.*

---

JUNCTION CITY SCHOOLS,
*Junction City, Kans., November 27, 1963.*
Senator JAMES PEARSON,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR PEARSON: The copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 14, 1963, showing your remarks concerning S. 2304 has reached my office.

You have stated expertly the budget and cash problems which our school and Kansas Federal impact schools face because of the delay in extension of Public Law 874 and delay in appropriations thereto.

We do so appreciate your taking this step. We trust that enactment of this bill can come quickly.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD DEEVER,
*Superintendent of Schools.*

---

JUNCTION CITY, KANS.,
*November 23, 1963.*
Senator JAMES PEARSON,
*Washington, D.C.:*

We appreciate your support of S. 2302. Our budget is crippled due the uncertainty of the Federal impact revenue. We will soon be at the desperation point for cash on hand. Although we have survived the low cash plight to this date we are in a severe condition budgetwise until passage of the extension of Public Law 874.

HAROLD DEEVERS,
*Superintendent of Schools.*

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would urge that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare proceed with consideration of the impacted aid legislation in order that the Senate might act on it immediately. Last week, a number of Members of the Senate joined in the sponsoring of S. 2304, which would serve this purpose. While I joined in cosponsoring this bill, I am not wedded to it specifically if the committee desires to use some other vehicle. I would simply urge that some action be taken as quickly as possible.

## CUBA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to join in the plea made yesterday to the emergency meeting of the Organization of American States in the name of President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela calling for more drastic action on Cuba than has heretofore been taken in the Western Hemisphere. This is the act which people who have my point of view have been waiting for—in short, collective action by the nations of the Western Hemisphere with respect to Cuba in essential self-defense, which the events in Venezuela have shown are completely justified against Premier Castro and the Communist regime in Cuba.

I hope that Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Mexico—the countries which continue to maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba—may now see clearly that they are out of step with the demands of security and with the position of the overwhelming majority of the nations in the Organization of American States.

Let us remember that the Organization of American States may act, under the respective treaties to which the United States is a party and to which all the Latin American countries are parties, by authority of 75 percent of its membership; and may take any action, including a military and naval blockade, in terms of securing the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

I have urged before, and I urge again, that President Johnson give consideration to throwing the United States behind this policy. Though we like to see the other countries in the Americas carry the ball, I believe this is a case in which we know quite well that if any action such as President Betancourt recommends is to be taken it will depend heavily on us.

I believe that the Soviet Union, which has heretofore made threats with respect to similar action on Cuba, will understand the meaning of self-defense and security, if the facts prove it necessary—and they are clearly indicated, for Castro has been engaged in actually seeking to subvert by force the nations of the Americas.

So for the first time, the door is open for collective American action, which is the way it can and should be done, fully in the tradition of the Americas and of the American system.

My colleague [Mr. KEATING] spoke on this subject today. It is a subject in which he has taken an outstanding and distinguished leadership. What has ensued in this situation now bears out a great deal of what has been debated, discussed, and proposed to our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for people of a liberal point of view in international affairs, like myself, the door is now open to collective American action with respect to the threat of Cuba to the security of Americans. I hope our President and our Nation will keep the door open, will go through it, and fully support what President Betancourt has asked; and that the other nations of the Americas will finally rally in terms of their own security and interest to the need for this type of action. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the report by Henry Raymont entitled "OAS To Examine Caracas Charges Against Havana," which appeared in the New York Times, December 4.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

### OAS TO EXAMINE CARACAS CHARGES AGAINST HAVANA—INQUIRY ON ACCUSATION THAT CUBA FOMENTS TERRORISM IS VOTED BY 16 TO 0—BETANCOURT ASKS CURB—HEMISPHERE ACTION AGAINST SUBVERSION FAVORED AT EMERGENCY MEETING

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—The Organization of American States voted today to investigate charges that Cuba had smuggled arms into Venezuela to foster terrorism as part of a campaign to subvert democracy in Latin America.

The Organization's council, at an emergency session, decided by a 16-to-0 vote, with one abstention, to set in motion the machinery of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance to deal with the Venezuelan accusation.

Under the pact, known as the Rio Treaty, a country guilty of aggressive intervention in the affairs of a member state can be subjected to far-ranging collective sanctions, including the use of armed force.

#### FEAR OF EAST-WEST CONFLICT

Although the immediate issue was alleged Cuban arms shipments to Venezuelan terrorists, several delegates served notice during the 2-hour meeting that they wanted firm action against the broader threat of subversion instigated by the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

[In Caracas, President Romulo Betancourt called for a partial air and naval blockade of Cuba to prevent arms exports.]

Mexico, indicating that inter-American measures against Cuba at this time might set off a new East-West confrontation and imperil world peace, cast the lone abstaining vote.

Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, which like Mexico still have diplomatic relations with Cuba, voted in favor of considering the charges after stressing that they were not passing judgment on the merits. Bolivia and Haiti were absent.

As a first step after voting to invoke the treaty, the Council met as an organ of consultation on behalf of the Western Hemisphere's foreign ministers.

In this capacity, it designated an inter-American commission to study Venezuela's evidence. The vote on the commission again was 16 in favor, with Mexico abstaining.

Brazil voted in favor of the inquiry after demanding assurances that Cuba be given an opportunity to present her case.

The Cuban Government, although it has openly praised the Venezuelan terrorists, denied having shipped arms to them. In a communique issued last night, Cuba's Foreign Minister, Ral Roa, charged that the arms cache, discovered some weeks ago on a Venezulean beach, had been placed there by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Ilmar Penna Marinho, of Brazil, emphasizing the gravity of the Venezuelan charges, suggested that the factfinding commission be admitted to Cuba as well as Venezuela.

The proposal caused considerable surprise since the Castro regime has rejected every attempt at international inspection either by the United Nations or by the Organization of American States which excluded Cuba because of her Communist ties in January 1962.

Some diplomats here believed that an outright Cuban refusal to cooperate in the inquiry would make it easier for Brazil to justify for home consumption severing her ties with the Castro regime should such action be requested by the inter-American body.

Enrique Tejera, the Venezuelan delegate, suggested that diplomatic and economic sanctions would be the least his Government would demand if the investigation confirmed the evidence of Cuban intervention.

### IMPARTIAL INQUIRY URGED

Tapping his desk with a pencil to emphasize his words and speaking in a slow, grave voice, he declared:

"We want the Commission to carry out an impartial, unhurried investigation. We agree with Brazil that the other party must be heard. But once all the evidence is in, Venezuela will demand a clear and heavy judgment, for it is no longer possible to allow a member of the system of nations to conspire against juridical institutions and to plot criminal acts of violence."

Mr. Tejera displayed 21 photographs he said were taken of the weapons. He also offered laboratory evidence of partly erased Cuban Army markings.

The envoy repeated his Government's charges that 3 tons of arms were found on an abandoned beach on Paraguana Peninsula, in northern Venezuela. Repeatedly he likened the cache to the terrorist methods used by the late Dominican dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, that led to precedent-setting sanctions against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

Ward P. Allen, the acting U.S. representative, told the Council that his Government's technicians had verified the Cuban origin of the arms found in Venezuela.

He warned that the Castro regime could be expected to increase its subversive efforts as it faced increasing difficulties at home. But he suggested that only on the basis of the inter-American inquiry could the Council decide "whether additional steps should be taken" to increase the hemisphere's vigilance against Cuba.

### USE OF FORCE DOUBTED

Other North Americans discouraged speculation about any imminent use of force against the Cuban regime. They conveyed the impression that President Johnson would hardly welcome another world crisis over Cuba at the outset of his administration.

The U.S. officials were also cool to Venezuelan suggestions that military measures should be contemplated. Their feeling, shared by most Latin American delegates, was that the factfinding committee should complete its investigation before such steps were considered.

The Mexican delegate, in a brief statement, urged the Council to be mindful that "the principal mission of every regional organism is the contribution to the maintenance of peace."

A report tonight that President Betancourt had proposed a sea and air blockade came as a surprise to OAS delegates. They believed that, despite today's show of unity, the Council would vote against the measure if it came up before the investigating Commission completed its mission.

The Commission, appointed immediately after the meeting by the new Chairman, Juan Bautista de la Valle of Peru, will be made up of Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, the United States, and Uruguay.

The Commission is expected to leave for Venezuela this week.

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

### Blockade of 1962 Recalled

Caracas, Venezuela, December 3.—President Betancourt said today that he would seek a partial naval and air blockade of Cuba to prevent the export of arms to Latin America.

This was the strongest of the measures the Venezuelan President said he was asking of the hemisphere meeting in Washington.

He compared his proposal, which would involve the participation of members of the Organization of American States, to the blockade laid around Cuba in October 1962, to force the dismantling of the Soviet missile bases.

Mr. Betancourt, who spoke quietly and with apparent weariness, said foreign correspondents here for the election Sunday had overemphasized terrorism.

In response to a question he denied that the government had political prisoners. There are 200 to 400 Communist activists in preventive detention, a constitutional procedure, he said.

There are also "perhaps 100 terrorists caught with bombs and self-confessed slayers of policemen and military rebels serving sentences in jail," he added.

"You cannot speak of political prisoners here," he said.

President Betancourt said he lamented the kidnaping of Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the U.S. military mission. He said that the police were searching for him. Colonel Chenault was kidnaped 6 days ago by leftists terrorists.

---

## REVISED PROCEDURES FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STATE OF HAWAII

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 655, S. 2275.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2275) to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) (i) whenever after August 21, 1964, any of the public lands and other public property as defined in section 5(g) of Public Law 86–3 (73 Stat. 4, 6), or any lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions, which are the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(c) or become the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(d) of Public Law 86–3, except the lands administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and (ii) whenever any of the lands of the United States on Sand Island, including the reef lands in connection therewith, in the city and county of Honolulu, are determined to be surplus property by the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") with the concurrence of the head of the department or agency exercising administration or control over such lands and property, they shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii by the Administrator subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) Such lands and property shall be conveyed without monetary consideration, but subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe: *Provided,* That, as a condition precedent to the conveyance of such lands, the Administrator shall require payment by the State of Hawaii of the estimated fair market value, as determined by the Administrator, of any buildings, structures, and other improvements erected and made on such lands after they were set aside. In the event that the State of Hawaii does not agree to any payment prescribed by the Administrator, he may remove, relocate, and otherwise dispose of any such buildings, structures, and other improvements under other applicable laws, or if the Administrator determines that they cannot be removed without substantial damage to them or the lands containing them, he may dispose of them and the lands involved under other applicable laws, but, in such cases he shall pay to the State of Hawaii that portion of any proceeds from such disposal which he estimates to be equal to the value of the lands involved. Nothing in this section shall prevent the disposal by the Administrator under other applicable laws of the lands subject to conveyance to the State of Hawaii under this section if the State of Hawaii so chooses.

Sec. 2. Any lands, property, improvements, and proceeds conveyed or paid to the State of Hawaii under section 1 of this Act shall be considered a part of public trust established by section 5(f) of Public Law 86–3, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of that trust.

**Mr. INOUYE.** Mr. President, the Senate action today augurs well for the economic future of the State of Hawaii.

The speedy action testifies to the able arguments presented by the State administration, the democratic delegation to Congress, and administration representatives from the Federal Bureau of the Budget.

I thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], with whom I worked closely, and the Public Lands Subcommittee of which he is chairman, for this most expeditious handling of the bill.

I know that I speak for Governor Burns and Representatives Matsunaga and Gill when I express my deepest thanks to Dr. Harold Seidman and Mr. Howard Schnoor of the Bureau of the Budget. These two provided expert technical counsel which materially aided our cause in the Senate hearings.

All of the people of the State of Hawaii should feel extremely grateful for the timely Senate passage, which eventually will mean widened economic opportunities for all with the development of Sand Island and the continued return of surplus ceded land so crucially needed in the islands.

---

## PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LAST SPEECHES IN TEXAS, NOVEMBER 21 AND 22, 1963

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, on the last journey into Texas by the late President of the United States, the beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a series of five major addresses were planned by President Kennedy. Two brief, unscheduled addresses were also delivered.

The first address was delivered at dedication ceremonies for the Aerospace Medical Health Center at San Antonio, Tex., on Thursday afternoon, November 21. The second address was made in Houston later Thursday, in the early evening before the League of United Latin American Citizens at the Rice Hotel. It was brief and had not been on the original schedule. The third address was also in Houston at a testimonial banquet for Representative Albert Thomas at the Coliseum Thursday night, November 21. The great appreciation banquet was in honor of Representative Albert Thomas for his 27 years of effective service in the U.S. Congress.

On Friday morning, November 22, the President made another short, unscheduled address to a large crowd in an open square in front of the Texas Hotel at Fort Worth, followed by his main address at a breakfast in Fort Worth sponsored by the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. All of these five speeches were attended by thousands.

The speech that President Kennedy had prepared for delivery for Friday noon, November 22, at the vast Trade Mart in Dallas was undelivered, as the assassin's bullets snuffed out the President's life while the President's automobile in which he was traveling with Mrs. Kennedy was about 4 minutes away in time from the Trade Mart. The Dallas meeting was sponsored by three nonpartisan groups.

The only political meeting as such that President Kennedy was to address in Texas was a banquet sponsored by the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee, to have been held Friday night, November 22, in my home city of Austin, the State capital. A great welcome awaited President Kennedy in Austin, a welcome denied the people of Texas as well as President and Mrs. Kennedy, by the heartless acts of a murderous assassin.

Mr. President, it was my honor and privilege to travel to Texas with the President and Mrs. Kennedy on the Presidential jet on November 21 and 22 and to travel in all the motorcades. The Vice President—now President—and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson traveled on another jet, but took part in all of the meetings and motorcades.

At San Antonio, President and Mrs. Kennedy went by motorcade from the International Airport to the School of Aerospace Medicine, through the heart of San Antonio, and then on to Kelly Field by motorcade, a total distance of about 22 miles.

President Kennedy was seen by more people than ever received any other parade for a person in San Antonio. At Houston, the motorcade went from the International Airport to the Rice Hotel. Thursday night, on arrival at Carswell Air Force Base, President and Mrs. Kennedy again led an open motorcade the 15 miles to downtown Fort Worth. Though this was about 11 o'clock at night, many thousands of people met the President's plane at Carswell, many thousands more lined the roads and streets the 15 miles to Fort Worth. Thousands more stood outside the Texas Hotel at Fort Worth or jammed the corridors and main lobby to see the President.

On Friday morning, the 22d, many additional thousands came out to line the streets and roads to cheer the President and Mrs. Kennedy on their 15-mile motorcade route back to Carswell Air Force Base. At Dallas at noon, hundreds of thousands of friendly people massed in dense throngs on every street to show their love and affection for the President and Mrs. Kennedy. The President had passed through all the downtown tall building area and passed the last high-rise building on the parade route, only to be cut down from behind by rifle fire by an assassin lurking in a dark corner of the fifth floor of the last high-rise building.

Mr. President, in the six motorcade rides in four Texas cities on November 21 and 22, President Kennedy had been seen by more than 10 percent of the entire population of the State. It was a warm, friendly enthusiastic greeting. I rode in each of those motorcades. I saw the people exulting, cheering, waving, calling to the beloved and esteemed President. More people in Texas had seen President Kennedy in these 2 days than had ever seen any one man on a similar visit to Texas before. President and Mrs. Kennedy had traveled more than 65 miles in open motorcade in Texas.

Mr. President, because of the governmental messages they carry, and the historic interest in these last speeches by President Kennedy, I ask unanimous consent that the series of seven speeches by President Kennedy including both Fort Worth speeches, and the speeches prepared but undelivered at Dallas and Austin be inserted at this point in the Record, in the following order:

First. Remarks of the President at dedication ceremonies, Aerospace Medical Center, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., November 21, 1963—as actually delivered. Remarks of the President at same ceremony as prepared for delivery.

Second. Remarks of the President before the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Rice Hotel, Houston, Tex., November 21, 1963.

Third. Remarks of the President at testimonial dinner for Congressman Albert Thomas, the Coliseum, Houston, Tex., November 21, 1963.

Fourth. Remarks of the President before a citizens rally in front of the Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Fifth. Remarks of the President before the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Sixth. Remarks by the President as prepared for delivery to the Dallas Citizens Council, the Dallas Assembly, and the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, Trade Mart, Dallas, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Seventh. Remarks of the President as prepared for delivery to the Texas Democratic State Committee, the Municipal Auditorium, Austin, Tex., November 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Remarks of the President at Dedication Ceremonies, Aerospace Medical Health Center, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., November 21, 1963 (as Actually Delivered)

Mr. Secretary, Governor, Mr. Vice President, Senator, Members of the Congress, members of the military, ladies and gentlemen, for more than 3 years I have spoken about the New Frontier. This is not a partisan term, and it is not the exclusive property of Republicans or Democrats. It refers, instead, to this Nation's place in history, to the fact that we do stand on the edge of a great new era, with both crisis and opportunity, an era to be characterized by achievement and by challenge. It is an era which calls for action and for the best efforts of all those who would test the unknown, and the uncertain in phases of human endeavor. It is the time for pathfinders and pioneers.

I have come to Texas today to salute an outstanding group of pioneers, the men who man the Brooks Air Force Base School of Aerospace Medicine and the Aerospace Medical Center. It is fitting that San Antonio should be the site of this center and this school as we gather to dedicate this complex of buildings. For this city has long been the home of the pioneers in the air. It was here that Sidney Brooks, whose memory we honor today, was born and raised. It was here that Charles Lindbergh and Claire Chennault, and a host of others, who, in World War I and World War II and Korea, and even today, have helped demonstrate American mastery of the skies, trained at Kelly Field and Randolph Field, which form a major part of aviation history. And in the New Frontier of outer space, while headlines may be made by others in other places, history is being made every day by the men and women of the Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no history.

Many Americans make the mistake of assuming that space research has no values here on earth. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as the wartime development of radar gave us the transistor, and all that it made possible, so research in space medicine holds the promise of substantial benefit for those of us who are earthbound, for our effort in space is not as some have suggested, a competitor for the natural resources that we need to develop the earth. It is a working partner and a coproducer of these resources. And nothing makes this clearer than the fact that medicine in space is going to make our lives healthier and happier here on earth.

I give you three examples: First, medical space research may open up new understanding of man's relation to his environment. Examples of the astronaut's physical, and mental, and emotional reactions teach us more about the differences between normal and abnormal—about the causes and effects of disorientation—in metabolism which could result in extending the lifespan. When you study effects on our astronauts of exhaust gases which can contaminate their environment, you seek ways to alter these gases so as to reduce their toxity, you are working on problems similar to those we face in our great urban centers which themselves are being corrupted by gases and which must be clear. And second, medical space research may revolutionize the technology and the techniques of modern medicine. Whatever new devices are created, for example, to monitor our astronauts, to measure their heart activity, their breathing, their brain waves, their eye motion, at great distances, and under difficult conditions, will also represent a major advance in general medical instrumentation. Heart patients may even be able to wear a light monitor which will sound a warning if their activity exceeds certain limits. An instrument recently developed to record automatically the impact of acceleration upon an astronaut's eyes will also be of help to small children who are suffering miserably from eye defects, but are unable to describe their impairment. And also by the use of instruments similar to those used in Project Mercury, this Nation's private as well as public nursing services are being improved, enabling one nurse now to give more critically ill patients greater attention than they ever could in the past.

And third, medical space research may lead to new safeguards against hazards common to many environments. Specifically, our astronauts will need fundamentally new devices to protect them from the ill effects of radiation which can have a profound influence upon medicine and man's relations to our present environment.

Here at this Center we have the laboratories, the talent, the resources to give new impetus to vital research in the life centers. I am not suggesting that the entire space program is justified alone by what is done in medicine. The space program stands on its own as a contribution to national strength. And last Saturday at Cape Canaveral I saw our new Saturn C-1 rocket booster, which, with its payload, when it rises in December of this year, will be, for the first time, the largest booster in the world, carrying into space the largest payload that any country in the world has ever sent into space. That is what I consider.

I think the United States should be a leader. A country as rich, and powerful as this which bears so many burdens and responsibilities, which has so many opportunities, should be second to none. And in December, while I do not regard our mastery of space as anywhere near complete, while I recognize that there are still areas where we are behind, at least in one area, the size of the booster, this year I hope the United States will be ahead. And I am for it. We have a long way to go. Many weeks and months and years of long, tedious work lies ahead. There wil be setbacks and frustrations, disappointments. There will be, as there always are, pressures in this country to do less in this area as in so many others, and temptations to do something else that is perhaps easier. But this research here must go on. This space effort must go on. The conquest of space must and will go ahead. That much we know. That much we can say with confidence and conviction.

Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them. This Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they will be overcome; whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all those who labor in the space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with safety and speed, and we shall then explore the wonders on the other side. Thank you.

---

### Remarks of the President at Dedication Ceremonies, Aerospace Medical Health Center, Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., November 21, 1963 (as Prepared for Delivery)

For more than 3 years, I have spoken to the American people in terms of the New Frontier. That is not a partisan term. It is not the exclusive property of either Democrats or Republicans. It refers instead to this Nation's position in history today—to the fact that we stand on the edge of a great new era, filled with both crises and opportunities, an era to be characterized by both grim challenges and historic achievements. It is an age which calls for doing and daring, and for the best efforts of all who are willing to explore the unknown and test the uncertain, in every phase of human endeavor. It is a time for pathfinders and pioneers.

I have come to Texas today to salute an outstanding group of pioneers—the men who man the Brooks Air Force Base School of Aerospace Medicine and the Aerospace Medical Center. The trails which they blaze and the paths which they open hold the key to man's success in the environment above—the key to further progress in aerial flight and to further exploration of space.

It is fitting that San Antonio should be the site of this Center and school, at which we gather today to dedicate this complex of buildings. For this city has long been the home of the pioneers of areonautics. It was here that Aviator Sidney Brooks, in whose memory this base was named, was born and raised. It was here that Charles Lindbergh and Claire Chennault and so many other heroes of pioneer aviation received their early training.

The tales and memories of Kelly Field and Randolph Field form a major part of aviation history. And in the new frontier of outer space—while more headlines may be made by other men in other areas—history is being made every day by the unsung heroes of this Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no headlines.

But too many Americans make the mistake of assuming that space research has no values here on earth. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just as the wartime development of radar gave us the transistor and all the products it made possible, so research in space medicine holds the promise of substantial benefits for those of us who are earthbound. For our effort in space is not, as some have suggested, a competitor for the national resources needed to improve our living standards. It is instead a working partner and coproducer of those resources. And nothing illustrates this point better than the fact that almost every field of medicine may profit in some way from aerospace medical research. Permit me to cite three examples, familiar to all of you but not fully realized by all Americans.

First, medical space research may open new avenues of understanding of man's relation to his environment. Examinations of the astronauts' physical, mental and emotional reactions can teach us more about the differences between normal and abnormal—about the causes and effects of disorientation—about changes in metabolism which could result in extending the life span. When you study the effects on our astronauts of toxic gases which can contaminate their environment, and seek ways to alter these gases to reduce their toxity, you are working on problems similar to those we face in the pollution of the air in our urban centers. Already air pollution is contaminating 7,300 communities in the Nation, in which lives 60 percent of our population—and aeromedical research into atmospheric conditions offers some hope of assistance in our efforts to control this menace.

Second, medical space research may revolutionize the technology and techniques of modern medicine. Whatever new devices are created, for example, to monitor our astronauts—to measure their heart activity, their breathing, their brain waves and their eye motion, at great distances and under different or difficult circumstances—will also represent a major advance in general medical instrumentation. Physical examinations under conditions of stress and activity will then be possible, permitting an earlier detection of danger signals. Heart patients may even be able to wear a light monitor that will sound a warning if their activity exceeds certain limits. An instrument recently developed to record automatically the impact of acceleration upon an astronaut's eyes will also be of help to small children who are suffering miserably from eye defects but are unable to describe their impairment. Also, by the use of instruments similar to those used in Project Mercury, this Nation's private as well as public nursing services are being improved, enabling one nurse now to give more and better attention to critically ill patients than several nurses could formerly do in the absence of these instruments.

Third, medical space research may lead to new safeguards against hazards common to many environments. Specifically our astronauts will need fundamentally new devices to protect them from the ill effects of radiation. Those devices will be equally available here on earth—not, we hope, for purposes of civil defense but for safeguarding the increasing use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Also, new sterilization techniques—developed to prevent the contamination of other planets by men traveling from our infected and infested earth—may be used here on earth to protect our food from botulisms.

These are but a few examples of the benefits we can hope to obtain through this one vital part of space research. Albert Einstein once said that the life sciences must keep pace with the physical sciences, or else all mankind is in jeopardy. And here at this Center we have the laboratories, the talent, and the resources to give impetus to vital research in the life sciences. For the formidable engineering and medical task of launching and sustaining a man in space provides a useful and commanding focus for the development and coordination of the most advanced concepts of both engineering and medical research; and I believe that the new information and techniques to be produced will provide enormous benefits for us all.

I do not say that we know with any precision how and where space medicine will contribute to medicine here at home. It is the nature of scientific research and exploration that we cannot know—any more than we could have known that research related to radar would eventually lead to the transistor. But what we do know is that fundamental research has always led to new and vital applications—that our whole modern technological society was formed from such unpredictable applications—and that we have every reason to believe that space research, including medical research, will continue that unbroken pattern.

Nor am I suggesting that the entire space program is justified as a means of advancing medical research. The space program stands on its own as a part of our national strength. But I am confident—and the history of scientific endeavor justifies this confidence—that as a valuable byproduct this effort in space medicine will benefit in scores of ways our everyday lives here on earth.

Space medicine is still an infant science—but no other frontier of medicine is more exciting. In determining the need and role of various human parts, their creation and their possible substitution, you shall be probing the origins of life itself. And thus both the ancient past and the distant future—both the beginning and the end of this world and others—may be viewed under the microscopic eye of this and similar schools.

Let us not be carried away with the grandeur of our vision. Many weeks and months and years of long, hard tedious work lie ahead. There will be setbacks and frustrations and disappointments. There will be pressures for our country to do less and temptations to do something else. But this research must and will go on. The conquest of space must and will go ahead. That much we know. That much we can say with confidence and conviction.

Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside; and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high to climb, too doubtful to try, too difficult to permit their journey to continue, they took off their caps and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them.

My friends, this Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space—and we have no choice but to follow it. Whatever the difficulties, they must be overcome. Whatever the hazards, they must be guarded against. With the vital help of this Aerospace Medical Center, with the help of all who labor in this space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with both safety and speed—and we shall then explore all the wonders and treasures that lie on the other side.

### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS, THE RICE HOTEL, HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen, my wife and I are very proud to come to this meeting. This organization has done a good deal for this State and for our country, and I am particularly glad that it emphasizes not only the opportunity for all Americans, a chance to develop their talents, education for boys and girls, so that they can pursue those talents to the very end of their ability, but also because you remind Americans of the very important links that we have with our sister republics in this hemisphere.

One of the things which I have taken the greatest interest in has been attempting to pursue an example which was long neglected, and that was the one set by President Franklin Roosevelt to emphasize that the United States is not only good neighbors, which we were in the 1930's, but also friends and associates in a great effort to build in this hemisphere an alliance for progress, an effort to prove that this hemisphere, from top to bottom, and all of the countries, whether they be Latin or North American, there is a common commitment to freedom, to equality of opportunity, a chance for all to prove that prosperity can be the handmaiden of freedom, and to show to the world a very bright star here in this country and, indeed, in the entire hemisphere. So I am glad to be here today.

In order that my words will be even clearer, I am going to ask my wife to say a few words to you also.

### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR CONGRESSMAN ALBERT THOMAS, THE COLISEUM, HOUSTON, TEX.

Congressman and Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Congressman Casey and the congressional delegation of Texas, ladies and gentlemen, when I came to the House of Representatives in 1947 as a fairly young Congressman from Massachusetts, I heard the old saying that you spend the first 6 months in the House of Representatives wondering how you got there, and the next 6 months wondering how everybody else got there.

I spent the first 6 months as expected, but I must say that I never wondered how Congressman THOMAS got there. It has always been clear to me. When I read the report that Congressman THOMAS was thinking of resigning, I called him up on the phone and asked him to stay as long as I stayed. I didn't know how long that would be, but I wanted him to stay because I thought that he not only represented this district with distinction, but also he served the United States.

The Presidency has been called a good many names, and Presidents have been also, but no President can do anything without the help of friends, and I must say in the 3 years that I have been in this office, the 3 years really since I was here in Houston that night in this hall, I don't know anyone who has been a greater help in trying to get the job done, not just for Houston and not just for Texas, but for the entire United States than ALBERT THOMAS, and I am glad to be with his friends here tonight. He may not be so well-known outside of this district in Texas and Washington, but I can tell you that when he rises to speak in the House of Representatives they listen, so do some Senators, and so do we down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

He has one of the longest records of seniority in the Senate, in the House one of the shortest biographies. He has been consistently loyal to his party, but he has always stayed above partisan rancor. His record serves his constituents, but it serves the United States. He has helped steer this country to its present eminence in space. Next month when the United States of America fires the largest booster in the history of the world into space for the first time giving us the lead, fires the largest payroll—payload—into space giving us the lead. It will be the largest payroll, too. And who should know that better than Houston. We put a little of it right in here.

But in any case, the United States next month will have a leadership in space which it wouldn't have without ALBERT THOMAS. And so will this city. He has been a stickler for efficiency in Government, but he has also been for progress and growth.

He is 65 years of age this month, but has a young man's interest in the future and a young man's hope for his country, for he has lived with change and he has sought to channel its force instead of combating it. He understands, as any Texan does, the meaning and importance of growth, for he has served one of the fastest growing countries and States and cities in the Nation. And those who oppose progress should look at Houston and look at Texas.

When he went to the U.S. Congress in 1936, some 27 years ago this month, this city had less than 200,000 people. But ALBERT THOMAS had a vision of a modern Houston which now has a million people, and is growing stronger every day. He was not satisfied, nor the people of this city, with a channel which carried less than 30 million tons a year. He foresaw that this city, despite the fact that it is located 50 miles from the sea—and I come from a city that is on the sea—yet this city today ships second to the city of New York around the world. And that is in part because of ALBERT THOMAS. And he and you were not content with an airport serving a handful of passengers and an industry of less than 300 planes carrying passengers of less than a half billion revenue miles. He foresaw that that industry would provide 6 times as many planes, employ 19 times as many people, and serve more than 33 billion passenger miles a year. Here in Houston the number of passengers who go through your great International Airport have quadrupled in the last 15 years. This city has looked forward with hope and commitment, and those who say "No" in Houston or in Texas or in the United States are on the wrong side in 1963.

Finally when Congressman THOMAS went to the House of Representatives in 1936 he did not confine his sight to a Texas of less than 6 million people, a Texas doing less than $500 million of manufacturing, a Texas in which 37 percent of its population lived on the farm. By 1963, that population had dropped to 7 percent, the population of this State exceeds 10 million, the value of your manufacturing has climbed to $6 million, and Texas today is 1 of the 10 most highly industrialized States in the Union.

Many of the products and employers of this State and city were wholly unknown when ALBERT THOMAS went to the House—electronic machinery, sophisticated instruments, and preparations for the exploration of space. But those are the industries which helped this State reach its highest peak of prosperity in 1962, except for 1 year—1963. In Texas and the Nation, change has been the law of life. Growth has meant new opportunities for this State. Progress has meant new achievements. And men such as ALBERT THOMAS, who recognize the value of growth and progress, have enabled this city and this State to rise with the tides of change instead of being swept aside and left behind.

There were in 1936, as there are today, those who are opposed to growth and change, who prefer to defy them, who look back instead of forward. But ALBERT THOMAS and those who work with him did not heed that view in the midthirties, and this city, this State, and this country are glad that they did not. And we dare not look back now, if 27 years from now, in the year 1990 a new generation of Americans is to say that we, too, looked forward.

In 1990, for example, this Nation will need three times as much electric power as it has today, four times as much water, and that is why we are developing the Canadian River and the San Angelo, and the Columbus Bend, and other Texas river projects, and seeking at Freeport to find an economical way to get fresh water from salt, and building antipollution plants throughout this State and Nation, in a new and expanded program. In 1990 the need for national and State parks and recreation areas will triple, reaching a total very nearly the size of Indiana. That is why we are creating Padre Island Seashore, and adding refuge.

In 1990 your sons, daughters, grandsons, and grandchildren will be applying to the colleges of this State in a number three times what they do today. Our airports will serve five times as many passenger miles. We will need housing for a hundred million more people, and many times more doctors and engineers, and technicians, than we are presently producing. That is why we are trying to do more in these areas, as in the thirties, ALBERT THOMAS and Franklin Roosevelt and others did those things which make it possible for not only Texas but the entire United States to prosper and grow, as we do in the 1960's.

In 1990 the age of space will be entering its second phase, and our hopes in it to preserve the peace, to make sure that in this great new sea, as on earth, the United States is second to none. And that is why I salute ALBERT THOMAS and those Texans who you sent to Washington in his time and since then, who recognize the needs and the trends today in the 1960's so that when some meet here in 1990 they will look back on what we did and say that we made the right and wise decisions. "Your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions," the Bible tells us; and "where there is no vision, the people perish."

ALBERT THOMAS is old enough to dream dreams, and old enough to see visions. He sees an America of the future, in the lifetime of us all; with 300 million people living in this country with a $2 trillion economy which will happen in this century. Even more important, he sees an America, as do we all, strong in science and in space, in health and in learning, in the respect of its neighbors and all nations, an America that is both powerful and peaceful, with a people that are both prosperous and just. With that vision, we shall not perish, and we cannot fail.

Behind the Speaker's desk in the House of Representatives there are words from a great speech by a great citizen of my State, Senator Daniel Webster. It says, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its industry, develop its resources, and see whether we also in our time and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Albert Thomas didn't need to read those words. He has performed something worthy to be remembered.

Thank you.

---

### Remarks of the President Before a Citizens' Rally in Front of the Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. Vice President, Jim Wright, Governor, Senator Yarborough, Mr. Buck, ladies and gentlemen, there are no faint hearts in Fort Worth, and I appreciate your being here this morning. Mrs. Kennedy is organizing herself. It takes longer, but, of course, she looks better than we do when she does it. But we appreciate your welcome.

This city has been a great Western city, the defense of the West, cattle, oil and all the rest. It has believed in strength in this city and strength in this State, and strength in this country.

What we are trying to do in this country and what we are trying to do around the world I believe is quite simple, and that is to build a military structure which will defend the vital interests of the United States; and in that great cause, Fort Worth, as it did in World War II, as it did in developing the best bomber system in the world, the B–58; and as it will now do in developing the best fighter system in the world, the TFX, Fort Worth will play its proper part. And that is why we have placed so much emphasis in the last 3 years in building a defense system second to none, until now the United States is stronger than it has ever been in its history. And, secondly, we believe that the new environment, space, the new sea, is also an area where the United States should be second to none.

And this State of Texas and the United States is now engaged in the most concentrated effort in history to provide leadership in this area as it must here on earth. And this is our second great effort. And in December—next month—the United States will fire the largest booster in the history of the world, putting us ahead of the Soviet Union in that area for the first time in our history.

And, thirdly, for the United States to fulfill its obligations around the world requires that the United States move forward economically, that the people of this country participate in rising prosperity. And it is a fact that in 1962, and the first 6 months of 1963, the economy of the United States grew not only faster than nearly every Western country, which had not been true in the fifties, but also grew faster than the Soviet Union, itself. That is the kind of strength the United States needs, economically, in space, militarily.

And in the final analysis, that strength depends upon the willingness of the citizens of the United States to assume burdens of citizenship.

I know one place where they are, here in this rain, in Fort Worth, in Texas, in the United States. We are going forward.

Thank you.

---

### Remarks of the President Before the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Texas Hotel, Fort Worth, Tex. (as Actually Delivered)

I know now why everyone in Texas, Fort Worth, is so thin, having gotten up and down about nine times. This is what you do every morning.

Mr. Buck, Mr. Vice President, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Jim Wright, members of the congressional delegation, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Attorney General, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago, I introduced myself in Paris by saying that I was the man who had accompanied Mrs. Kennedy to Paris. I am getting somewhat that same sensation as I travel around Texas. Nobody wonders what Lyndon and I wear.

I am glad to be here in Jim Wright's city. About 35 years ago, a Congressman from California who had just been elected received a letter from an irate constituent which said: "During the campaign you promised to have the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested. You have been in office 1 month and you haven't done so." Well, no one in Fort Worth has been that unreasonable, but in some ways he has had the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested and here in Fort Worth he has contributed to its growth.

He speaks for Fort Worth and he speaks for the country, and I don't know any city that is better represented in the Congress of the United States than Fort Worth.

And if there are any Democrats here this morning, I am sure you wouldn't hold that against him.

Three years ago last September I came here, with the Vice President, and spoke at Burke Burnett Park, and I called in that speech for a national security policy and a national security system which was second to none, a position which said not first but, if, when and how, but first. That city responded to that call as it has through its history. And we have been putting that pledge into practice ever since.

I want to say a word about that pledge here in Fort Worth, which understands national defense, and its importance to the security of the United States. During the days of the Indian War, this city was a fort. During the days of World War I, even before the United States got into the war, Royal Canadian Air Force pilots were training here. During the days of World War II, the great Liberator bombers, and which my brother flew with his copilot from this city, were produced here.

The first nonstop flight around the world took off and returned here, in a plane built in factories here. The first truly intercontinental bomber, the B–36, was produced here. The B–58, which is the finest weapons system in the world today, which has demonstrated most recently in flying from Tokyo to London, with an average speed of nearly 1,000 miles per hour, is a Fort Worth product.

The Iroquois helicopter from Fort Worth is a mainstay in our fight against the guerrillas in South Vietnam. The transportation of crews between our missile sites is done in planes produced here in Fort Worth. So wherever the confrontation may occur, and in the last 3 years it has occurred on at least three occasions, Laos, Berlin, and Cuba, and it will again—wherever it occurs, the products of Fort Worth and the men of Fort Worth provide us with a sense of security.

And in the not too distant future a new Fort Worth product, and I am glad that there was a table separating Mr. Hicks and myself—a new Fort Worth product, the TFX. Tactical fighter experimental—nobody knows what those words mean, but that is what they mean, tactical fighter experimental—will serve the forces of freedom and will be the No. 1 airplane in the world today.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the long and hard fought competition to win the TFX contract, but very little discussion about what this plane will do. It will be the first operational aircraft ever produced that can literally spread its wings through the air. It will thus give us a single plane capable of carrying out missions of speed as well as distance, able to fly very far in one form or very fast in another. It can take off from rugged, short airstrips, enormously increasing the Air Force's ability to participate in limited wars. The same basic plane will serve the Navy's carriers, saving the taxpayers at least $1 billion in costs if they built separate planes for the Navy and the Air Force.

The Government of Australia, by purchasing $125 million of TFX planes before they are even off the drawing boards, has already testified to the merit of this plane, and at the same time it is confident in the ability of Fort Worth to meet its schedule. In all these ways, the success of our national defense depends upon this city in the Western United States, 10,000 miles from Vietnam, 5,000 or 6,000 miles from Berlin, thousands of miles from trouble spots in Latin America and Africa or the Middle East. And yet Fort Worth and what it does and what it produces participates in all these historic events. Texas, as a whole, and Fort Worth bear particular responsibility for this national defense effort, for military procurement in this State totals nearly $1¼ million, fifth highest among all the States of the Union. There are more military personnel on active duty in this State than any in the Nation, save one—and it is not Massachusetts—any in the Nation save one, with a combined military-civilian defense payroll of well over a billion dollars. I don't recite these for my partisan purpose. They are the result of American determination to be second to none, and as a result of the effort which this country has made in the last 3 years we are second to none.

In the past 3 years we have increased the defense budget of the United States by over 20 percent; increased the program of acquisition for Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by over 60 percent; added 5 combat-ready divisions to the Army of the United States, and 5 tactical fighter wings to the Air Force of the United States; increased our strategic airlift capability by 75 percent; and increased our special counterinsurgency forces which are engaged now in South Vietnam by 600 percent. I hope those who want a stronger America and place it on some signs will also place those figures next to it.

This is not an easy effort. This requires sacrifice by the people of the United States. But this is a very dangerous and uncertain world. As I said earlier, on three occasions in the last 3 years the United States has had a direct confrontation. No one can say when it will come again. No one expects that our life will be easy, certainly not in this decade and perhaps not in this century. But we should realize what a burden and responsibility the people of the United States have borne for so many years. Here a country which lived in isolation, divided and protected by the Atlantic and the Pacific, uninterested in the struggles of the world around it, here in the short space of 18 years after the Second World War, we put ourselves, by our own will and by necessity, into defense of alliances with countries all around the globe. Without the United States, South Vietnam would collapse overnight. Without the United States, the SEATO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States, the CENTO alliance would collapse overnight. Without the United States, there would be no NATO. And gradually Europe would drift into neutralism and indifference. Without the efforts of the United States in the Alliance for Progress, the Communist advance onto the mainland of South America would long ago have taken place.

So this country, which desires only to be free, which desires to be secure, which desired to live at peace for 18 years under three different administrations has borne more than its share of the burden, has stood watch for more than its number of years. I don't think we are fatigued or tired. We would like to live as we once lived. But history will not permit it. The Communist balance of power is still strong. The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. We are still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think we will continue to do as we have done in our past, our duty, and the people of Texas will be in the lead.

So I am glad to come to this State which has played such a significant role in so many efforts in this century, and to say that here in Fort Worth you people will be playing a major role in the maintenance of the security of the United States for the next 10 years. I am confident, as I look to the future, that our chances for security, our chances for peace, are better than they have been in the past. And the reason is because we are stronger. And with that strength is a determination to not only maintain the peace, but also the vital interests of the United States. To that great cause, Texas and the United States are committed.

Thank you.

---

### Remarks by the President to the Dallas Citizens Council, the Dallas Assembly, and the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, at the Trade Mart, Dallas, Tex., November 22, 1963

I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other. The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from MIT to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking Graduate Research Center.

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness. At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained. There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, not belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be of no help.

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

#### I

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems, that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year—increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program—increased by more than 75 percent our Minuteman purchase program—increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces. Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

#### II

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat-ready Army divisions—increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern Army weapons and equipment—increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion and modernization program—increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft—increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons—and increased the strength of the Marines. As last month's Operation Big Lift—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft—and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

#### III

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice. Our assistance to these nations can be painful, risky, and costly—as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million Allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign aid program—and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc—nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own Chiefs of Staff think needed in the common interest. Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the $50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the $4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign aid program is not growing in size—it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses—but we have undertaken to correct them—and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs. Dollar for dollar, in or out of government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much-abused foreign aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

### IV

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our Information Agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent—increased Spanish language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin America from 1 to 9 hours a day—increased sevenfold to more than 3.5 million copies the number of American books being translated and published for Latin American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive—but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only an America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defenses of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our oversea competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some $11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass $600 billion, for a record rise of over $100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens: I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific, and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of "peace on earth, good will toward men." That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: "except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

---

### Remarks of the President to the Texas Democratic State Committee, the Municipal Auditorium, Austin, Tex., November 22, 1963

One hundred and eighteen years ago last March, President John Tyler signed the joint resolution of Congress providing statehood for Texas. And 118 years ago next month, President James Polk declared that Texas was a part of the Union. Both Tyler and Polk were Democratic Presidents. And from that day to this, Texas and the Democratic Party have been linked in an indestructible alliance—an alliance for the promotion of prosperity, growth, and greatness for Texas and for America.

Next year that alliance will sweep this State and Nation.

The historic bonds which link Texas and the Democratic Party are no temporary union of convenience. They are deeply embedded in the history and purpose of this State and party. For the Democratic Party is not a collection of diverse interests brought together only to win elections. We are united instead by a common history and heritage—by a respect for the deeds of the past and a recognition of the needs of the future. Never satisfied with today, we have always staked our fortunes on tomorrow. That is the kind of State which Texas has always been—that is the kind of vision and vitality which Texans have always possessed—and that is the reason why Texas will always be basically Democratic.

For 118 years, Texas and the Democratic Party have contributed to each other's success. This State's rise to prosperity and wealth came primarily from the policies and programs of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. These policies were shaped and enacted with the help of such men as the late Sam Rayburn and a host of other key Congressmen—by the former Texas Congressman and Senator who serves now as my strong right arm, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson—by your present U.S. Senator, RALPH YARBOROUGH—and by an overwhelming proportion of Democratic leadership at the State and county level, led by your distinguished Governor, John Connally.

It was the policies and programs of the Democratic Party which helped bring income to your farmers, industries to your cities, employment to your workers, and the promotion and preservation of your natural resources. No one who remembers the days of 5-cent cotton and 30-cent oil will forget the ties between the success of this State and the success of our party.

Three years ago this fall I toured this State with Lyndon Johnson, Sam Rayburn, and Ralph Yarborough as your party's candidate for President. We pledged to increase America's strength against its enemies, its prestige among its friends, and the opportunities it offered to its citizens. Those pledges have been fulfilled. The words spoken in Texas have been transformed into action in Washington, and we have America moving again.

Here in Austin, I pledged in 1960 to restore world confidence in the vitality and energy of American society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have won the respect of allies and adversaries alike through our determined stand on behalf of freedom around the world, from West Berlin to southeast Asia—through our resistance to Communist intervention in the Congo and Communist missiles in Cuba—and through our initiative in obtaining the nuclear test ban treaty which can stop the pollution of our atmosphere and start us on the path to peace. In San Jose and Mexico City, in Bonn and West Berlin, in Rome and County Cork, I saw and heard and felt a new appreciation for an America on the move—an America which has shown that it cares about the needy of its own and other lands, an America which has shown that freedom is the way to the future, an America which is known to be first in the effort for peace as well as preparedness.

In Amarillo, I pledged in 1960 that the businessmen of this State and Nation—particularly the small businessman who is the backbone of our economy—would move ahead as our economy moved ahead. That pledge has been fulfilled. Business profits—having risen 43 percent in 2½ years—now stand at a record high; and businessmen all over America are grateful for liberalized depreciation for the investment tax credit, and for our programs to increase their markets at home as well as abroad. We have proposed a massive tax reduction, with particular benefits for small business. We have stepped up the activities of the Small Business Administration, making available in the last 3 years almost $50 million to more than 1,000 Texas firms, and doubling their opportunity to share in Federal procurement contracts. Our party believes that what's good for the American people is good for American business—and the last 3 years have proven the validity of that proposition.

In Grand Prairie, I pledged in 1960 that this country would no longer tolerate the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized nation in the world. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. In less than 3 years our national output will shortly have risen by a record $100 billion—industrial production is up 22 percent—personal income is up 16 percent. And the Wall Street Journal pointed out a short time ago that the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits. Here in Texas—where 3 years ago, at the very time I was speaking, real per capita personal income was actually declining as the industrial recession spread to this State—more than 200,000 new jobs have been created—unemployment has declined—and personal income rose last year to an alltime high. This growth must go on. Those not sharing in this prosperity must be helped. And that is why we have an accelerated public works program, an area redevelopment program, and a manpower training program—to keep this and other States moving ahead. And that is why we need a tax cut of $11 billion, as an assurance of future growth and insurance against an early recession. No period of economic recovery in the peacetime history of this Nation has been characterized by both the length and strength of our present expansion—and we intend to keep it going.

In Dallas, I pledged in 1960 to step up the development of both our natural and our human resources. That pledge has been fulfilled. The policy of "no new starts" has been reversed. The Canadian River project will provide water for 11 Texas cities. The San Angelo project will irrigate some 10,000 acres. We have launched 10 new watershed projects in Texas, completed 7 others and laid plans for 6 more. A new national park, a new wildlife preserve, and other navigation, reclamation and natural resource projects are all underway in this State. At the same time we have sought to develop the human resources of Texas and all the Nation—granting loans to 17,500 Texas college students—making more than $17 million available to 249 school districts—and expanding or providing rural library service to 600,000 Texas readers. And if this Congress passes, as now seems likely, pending bills to build college classrooms, increase student loans, build medical schools, provide more community libraries, and assist in the creation of graduate centers, then this Congress will have done more for the cause of education than has been done by any Congress in modern history. Civilization, it was once said, is a race between education and catastrophe—and we intend to win that race for education.

In Wichita Falls, I pledged in 1960 to increase farm income and reduce the burden of farm surpluses. That pledge has been fulfilled. Net farm income today is almost a billion dollars higher than in 1960. In Texas, net income per farm consistently averaged below the $4,000 mark under the Benson regime—it is now well above it. And we have raised this income while reducing grain surpluses by 1 billion bushels. We have, at the same time, tackled the problem of the entire rural economy—extending more than twice as much credit to Texas farmers under the Farmers Home Administration—and making more than $100 million in REA loans. We have not solved all the problems of American agriculture—but we have offered hope and a helping hand in place of Mr. Benson's indifference.

In San Antonio, I pledged in 1960 that a new administration would strive to secure for every American his full constitutional rights. That pledge has been and is being fulfilled. We have not yet secured the objectives desired or the legislation required. But we have, in the last 3 years, by working through voluntary leadership as well as legal action, opened more new doors to members of minority groups—doors to transportation, voting, education, employment, and place of public accommodation—than had been opened in any 3-year or 30-year period in this century. There is no noncontroversial way to fulfill our constitutional pledge to establish justice and promote domestic tranquillity—but we intend to fulfill those obligations because they are right.

In Houston, I pledged in 1960 that we would set before the American people the unfinished business of our society. That pledge has been fulfilled. We have undertaken the first full-scale revision of our tax laws in 10 years. We have launched a bold new attack on mental illness, emphasizing treatment in the patient's own home community instead of some vast custodial institution. We have initiated a full-scale attack on mental retardation, emphasizing prevention instead of abandonment. We have revised our public welfare programs, emphasizing family rehabilitation instead of humiliation. And we have proposed a comprehensive realinement of our national transportation policy, emphasizing equal competition instead of regulation. Our agenda is still long—but this country is moving again.

In El Paso, I pledged in 1960 that we would give the highest and earliest priority to the reestablishment of good relations with the people of Latin America. We are working to fulfill that pledge. An area long neglected has not solved all its problems. The Communist foothold which had already been established has not yet been eliminated. But the trend of Communist expansion has been reversed. The name of Fidel Castro is no longer feared or cheered by substantial numbers in every country—and contrary to the prevailing predictions of 3 years ago, not another inch of Latin American territory has fallen prey to Communist control. Meanwhile, the work of reform and reconciliation goes on. I can testify from my trips to Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica that American officials are no longer booed and spat upon south of the border. Historic fences and friendships are being maintained. Latin America, once the forgotten stepchild of our aid programs, now receives more economic assistance per capita than any other area of the world. In short, the United States is once more identified with the needs and aspirations of the people to the south—and we intend to meet those needs and aspirations.

In Texarkana, I pledged in 1960 that our country would no longer engage in a lagging space effort. That pledge has been fulfilled. We are not yet first in every field of space endeavor—but we have regained worldwide respect for our scientists, our industry, our education, and our free initiative.

In the last 3 years, we have increased our annual space effort to a greater level than the combined total of all space activities undertaken in the 1950's. We have launched into earth orbit more than four times as many space vehicles as had been launched in the previous 3 years. We have focused our wide-ranging efforts around a landing on the moon in this decade. We have put valuable weather and communications satellites into actual operation. We will fire this December the most powerful rocket ever developed anywhere in the world. And we have made it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in outer space. Texas will play a major role in this effort. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston will be the cornerstone of our lunar landing project, with a billion dollars already allocated to that Center this year. Even though space is an infant industry, more than 3,000 people are already employed in space activities here in Texas—more than $100 million of space contracts are now being worked on in this State—and more than 50 space related firms have announced the opening of Texas offices. This is still a daring and dangerous frontier; and there are those who would prefer to turn back or to take a more timid stance. But Texans have stood their ground on embattled frontiers before—and I know you will help us see this battle through.

In Fort Worth, I pledged in 1960 to build a national defense which was second to none—a position, I said, which is not "first, but," not "first, if," not "first, when" but first—period. That pledge has been fulfilled. In the past 3 years we have increased our defense budget by over 20 percent; increased the program for acquisition of Polaris submarines from 24 to 41; increased our Minuteman missile purchase program by more than 75 percent; doubled the number of strategic bombers and missiles on alert; doubled the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; increased the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe by 60 percent; added 5 combat-ready divisions and 5 tactical fighter wings to our Armed Forces; increased our strategic airlife capabilities by 75 percent; and increased our special counterinsurgency forces by 600 percent. We can truly say today, with pride in our voices and peace in our hearts, that the defensive forces of the United States are, without a doubt, the most powerful and resourceful forces anywhere in the world.

Finally, I said in Lubbock in 1960, as I said in every other speech in this State, that if Lyndon Johnson and I were elected, we would get this country moving again. That pledge has been fulfilled. In nearly every field of national activity, this country is moving again—and Texas is moving with it. From public works to public health, wherever Government programs operate, the past 3 years have seen a new burst of action and progress— in Texas and all over America. We have stepped up the fight against crime and slums and poverty in our cities, against the pollution of our streams, against unemployment in our industry, and against waste in the Federal Government. We have built hospitals and clinics and nursing homes. We have launched a broad new attack on mental illness and mental retardation. We have initiated the training of more physicians and dentists. We have provided four times as much housing for our elderly citizens—and we have increased benefits for those on social security.

Almost everywhere we look, the story is the same. In Latin America, in Africa, in Asia—in the councils of the world and in the jungles of far-off nations—there is now renewed confidence in our country and our convictions.

For this country is moving and it must not stop. It cannot stop. For this is a time for courage and a time of challenge. Neither conformity nor complacency will do. Neither the fanatics nor the fainthearted are needed. And our duty as a party is not to our party alone, but to the Nation, and, indeed, to all mankind. Our duty is not merely the preservation of political power but the preservation of peace and freedom.

So let us not be petty when our cause is so great. Let us not quarrel amongst ourselves when our Nation's future is at stake. Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause—united in our heritage of the past and our hopes for the future—and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance.

## A NEW PRESIDENT IS SWORN IN AT A TIME OF STRESS AND TRAGEDY, BY A WOMAN, JUDGE SARAH HUGHES

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, the Honorable Sarah T. Hughes has written a brief and poignant description of the ceremony in which Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as President of the United States.

The article was published in the November 29, 1963, edition of the Texas Observer by Editor and General Manager Ronnie Dugger.

Judge Hughes received a recess appointment as U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas from the late beloved President John F. Kennedy on

October 17, 1961. Her appointment was confirmed by the U.S. Senate, and she was sworn in March 21, 1962.

Because of the historical significance of this article by Judge Hughes, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### The President Is Sworn In

(By Sarah T. Hughes, U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas)

It was 2:15, Friday, November 22. I had just reached home from the Trade Mart, where a large and enthusiastic crowd had gathered to see and hear President John F. Kennedy. We waited in vain, for he had been assassinated as he was leaving the downtown area of Dallas.

Numbed and hardly realizing what had happened, I drove home. There was no reason to go to court. In the face of the tragedy that had befallen us, all else seemed of little consequence.

I phoned the court to tell the clerk where I was. Her response was that Barefoot Sanders, U.S. attorney, wanted to speak to me. Immediately I heard his familiar voice, "The Vice President wants you to swear him in as President. Can you do it? How soon can you get to the airport?" Of course, I could, and I could be there in 10 minutes.

I got in my car and started toward the airport. Now there was another job to be done—a new President who had to carry on, and he must qualify for the office as quickly as possible. He had much to do, and I must think of him, and do the job that had been assigned to me.

There was no time to find the oath administered to a President, but the essentials of every oath are the same. You have to swear to perform the duties of the Office of President of the United States, and to preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States. I was not afraid. I could do it without a formal oath.

Police blocked the entrance to the location of the plane, but there was no difficulty. They knew me, and I told them I was there to swear in the Vice President as President. One of the motorcycle officers went to the plane to confirm my statement and then escorted me to the plane.

It was a beautiful sight, the presidential plane, long and sleek, a blue and two white stripes running the length of the plane, with the words, "the United States of America," on the blue stripe. It seemed to exemplify the strength and courage of our country.

I was escorted up the ramp by the chief of police to the front door, where one of the Vice President's aids and the Secret Service met me. I was trying to explain that I did not have the Presidential oath but could give it anyway when someone handed me a copy.

In the second compartment were several Texas Congressmen, vice presidential aids, Secret Service men, and the Vice President and Mrs. Johnson. Mr. and Mrs. Johnson have been my friends for many years, but on such an occasion there did not seem to be anything to say. I embraced them both, for that was the best way to give expression to my feeling of grief for them, and for all of us.

By that time a Bible that was on the plane had been thrust into my hands. It was a small volume, with soft leather backs. I thought someone said it was a Catholic Bible. I do not know, but I would like to think it was, and that President Kennedy had been reading it on this, his last trip.

The Vice President said Mrs. Kennedy wanted to be present for the ceremony, and in a very few minutes she appeared. Her face showed her grief, but she was composed and calm. She, too, exemplified the courage this country needs to carry on. The Vice President leaned toward her and told her I was a U.S. judge appointed by her husband. My acknowledgment was, "I loved him very much."

The Vice President asked Mrs. Johnson to stand on his right, Mrs. Kennedy on his left, and with his hand on the Bible, slowly and reverently repeated the oath after me: "I do solemnly swear that I will perform the duties of President of the United States to the best of my ability and defend, protect, and preserve the Constitution of the United States." That was all to the oath I had in my hand, but I added, "So help me God," and he said it after me. It seemed that that needed to be said.

He gently kissed Mrs. Kennedy and leaned over and kissed his wife on the cheek.

Here was a man with the ability and determination for the task ahead. Great as are the responsibilities of the office, I felt he could carry on. I told him so, and that we were behind him, and he would have our sympathy and our help.

As I left the plane I heard him give the order to take off, "Now let's get ready and go." I drove away with my thoughts on this man, upon whom so much now depended.

---

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, much has been said and written in memory of and in tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy, in the sad and overcast days since his death. One of the most moving tributes I have read was delivered by Daniel F. Foley, national commander of the American Legion, at a joint Legion and Auxiliary memorial service held in Minneapolis on November 23. Commander Foley pointed out that "President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat," and pledged the American Legion to a continuing and active role in the struggle for justice and freedom as the best memorial to our late President.

I ask unanimous consent that Commander Foley's remarks be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Remarks by Daniel F. Foley, American Legion National Commander, at a Joint Legion and Auxiliary Fall Conference Memorial Service in Behalf of President John F. Kennedy Delivered at the Pick-Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., November 23, 1963.

National President Mrs. Johnson, my fellow Americans, for some time, I have looked forward to this conference, for the wanderer yearns for home. To be home with members of my own department, where the Legion spirit is deep and where the Legion heart beats strongly.

But today we are sad. The heart of America is sad. The soul of freedom aches. Our President has died—a martyr for the cause of justice and of freedom, not just here in the United States, but throughout the world.

It is the character of the true American to love justice and to jealously regard the highest rights of man as a creature of God.

The sincere, determined efforts of President Kennedy to promote justice among men everywhere will speak well for him before the tribunal of divine justice.

It is the inborn desire of all men to be free, and throughout all of our history brave men and women of great courage have and do defend the cause of freedom. Defenders of the cause of freedom daily lay their lives on the line that freedom may endure.

President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat, and all men of good will are crushed by this tragic event.

But again the great character of the American people, their deep love of God and loyalty to country will spring forth in all its fullness, for all the world to see, in this time of crisis.

Let no one think for a fleeting moment that this Nation will be divided in this hour of challenge.

Whatever differences of a political nature or disagreement on issues that may exist are quickly set aside as all Americans rush to accept the challenge these tragic circumstances have thrust upon our Nation.

One of the hallmarks of a free society under constitutional government is its continuity. What dictatorship can face the people of the world and say it speaks from the freely expressed will of the people?

But here in this Nation, which has now seen eight Presidents die in office, some at the hands of the assassin, such as Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley and now John Kennedy, the Government of the United States continues on—confident and courageous are its people—dedicated and sincere its leaders.

It is this desire to perpetuate freedom that has inspired the American Legion in its many years of fruitful service. We pledge ourselves to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, maintain law and order, to promote peace and good will on earth, to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy. Devotion to these principles characterizes the service which John Kennedy has left to all the ages, for his life work was filled wtih courage, compassion for others, a deep sense of justice and a love of freedom, as God willed it when He created man.

Into the stream of challenge, created at this hour, the American Legion, a powerful force for good, may well face its most crucial hour—its most difficult test.

We believe it to be the responsibility of every American to be an active participant in the affairs of the present, in a responsible manner. Every man who would enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in a free society must discharge the accompanying duties and responsibilities of citizenship. It is the total business of our life's work to be always consistent with the ideals of freedom, which encompasses a love of God—love of country—regard for the rights of others, and a renewed realization of our great responsibility to preserve for our children and our children's children down through the ages an America forever strong and forever free.

The Legion has the great challenge now, if it is to contribute significantly in these moving times, to hold its head high in service to the high cause of freedom, set an example for others to follow in all our actions, in all our utterances and so conduct ourselves in all of our posts across the length and breadth of the land, that our people will always see our work at its best and our ideals at their loftiest.

By so doing, we show reverence to the memory of our dearly loved President, who has fallen, and give hope and encouragement to our new President, who now assumes the awesome responsibility of leadership.

In this hour, so sad to us all, in this hour which challenges us so, we say for all men to hear:

Though the forces of evil, lawlessness, and hatred may beat with all their fury upon the breasts of liberty—

This Nation will endure strong in justice.

This Nation will prosper rich in compassion.

This Nation will stand down through the corridors of time secure in freedom.

---

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that the time on the Ellender motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1703 will begin to run at 12:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be 30 minutes of discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether provision was made for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No provision was made for a quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I have another matter for the morning hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. KEATING. Is the Senator from Minnesota seeking recognition? I have already been recognized in the morning hour.

---

### "THAT WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS"—TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as all of us know, the tragedy of November 22 caused all of our radio and television networks to stay on the air to bring us uninterrupted news of the events as they happened, and also public reaction from people here and around the world. I have expressed appreciation to all of the networks for doing this. Helpless as we were before the damnable history, they helped us handle our emotions by living them with all other humans.

One of the most unusual reactions from elsewhere in the world was produced on the British Broadcasting Corp. program "That Was the Week That Was." The video tape of its production in Britain on November 23 was flown here for showing on Sunday evening, November 24.

The program was remarkable for many reasons. This show has been known chiefly for its biting satire and bitter wit on public affairs and figures. On this Saturday night, it scrapped that format and did a program on the United States and the tragedy that befell us. It was a show of reverence and respect.

This we might have anticipated from the British, nevertheless we are deeply appreciative. Our feelings however were far more deeply touched by the character and quality of this program.

It carried a truly tremendous feeling under a superb, just short of staccato control. It had penetrating critical power and mordant analysis with such skillfully understated warmth of restraint that made its feeling a piercing and authentic one.

We did not do this for ourselves. We could not at that time. Perhaps these young Britons were in a position to be more objective. But that is not sufficient explanation for me for the excellence of quality and felicity of what they did. "Art" said the philosopher Santayana "is the trick of arresting the immediate." This program did indeed "arrest the immediate" in all its ugly hardness, but also in its searing tragedy, and in its depth of meaning in history, hope, and duty.

We have apparently been studied deeply—far more than from Friday evening to Saturday night, the time it took to write and produce the program.

It is humbling to know what our friends think and hope. I wish to thank the British Broadcasting Corp. and through them the individuals who wrote and produced the program. I ask unanimous consent to have the BBC copyright transcript printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcription was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TRANSCRIPTION OF "THAT WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS"—TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(First transmitted by the BBC November 23, 1963)

DAVID FROST. The reason why the shock was so great, why when one heard the news last night one felt suddenly so empty was because it was the most unexpected piece of news one could possibly imagine. It was the least likely thing to happen in the whole world. If anyone else had died—Sir Winston Churchill, De Gaulle, Khrushchev—it would have been something that somehow we could have understood and even perhaps accepted. But that Kennedy should go, well, we just didn't believe in assassination anymore, not in the civilized world anyway.

ROY KINNEAR. When Kennedy was elected 3 years ago, it was as if we'd all been given some gigantic miraculous present. Suddenly over there in Washington was this amazing man who seemed so utterly right for the job in every way that we took him completely for granted. Whenever we thought about the world we had that warm image at the back of our minds of a man who would keep everything on the rails. Now suddenly that present has been taken away from us when we thought we had still 5 more years before we need start worrying again.

DAVID KERNAN. It's funny how people used to talk about Eisenhower as a father figure. Kennedy was far more of a father figure and much more than Ike ever, ever was.

AL MANCINI. One just cannot believe that that rich, happy, talented family could have so much bad luck. Brother Joe was killed in the war, Sister Rosemary born a mental defective and Sister Kathleen died in an air crash.

When Jack Kennedy visited Europe this year after his visit to Ireland, he came to Britain and he flew to Chatsworth in Derbyshire to visit his sister's grave. Well, when he got there, there were more than 200 security officers all around this little churchyard and right next to her, her husband was buried also who died in the war. And there were hundreds of other policemen guarding hundreds of yards of ground in this little churchyard and about 20 feet away from the grave there was a team of medical men with blood plasma just in case anything would happen. Well, it didn't happen in that little churchyard, but in a city like Dallas, thousands of people crowding the streets, it happened. And there wasn't anything that anybody could do about it.

KENNETH COPE. When the news came through just before 8 o'clock last Friday night, more than a thousand people all over London caught buses or tube trains, took taxis, drove or walked to the American Embassy in Grosvenor Square. They had to do something. In Berlin, Mayor Willy Brandt asked people to put lighted candles in their darkened windows. Within minutes they were flickering out all over the city. In Moscow at 5 past 8 the radio broke into its programs to announce the news. It was followed by solemn organ music. In London viewers reacted with equal hostility to being treated to a half hour of comedy or being deprived of 20 minutes of soap operas.

WILLIAM RUSHTON. When Kennedy was picked to be the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1960, Norman Mailer wrote a piece about him in Esquire called "A Superman Comes to Supermart." At that time, of course, the general opinion was that Kennedy was too perfect, too good to be true, a sort of public relations officer's ideal American: the film star image, the beautiful wife, the great speeches with easy quotations from Burke and Shakespeare, the ice-cold efficiency, respect for the facts. But there was the homely, all-American humanity of the man when he went out on his family boating picnics. His wife was down one end of the boat eating the pâté de foie gras, he was sitting quite happily in the bow of the boat knocking back the peanut butter sandwiches.

LANCE PERCIVAL. But once Kennedy was in office, the dream came true. Behind the rocking chair and the cultural evenings at the White House and Caroline's pony and the parties in Bobby's swimming pool, behind the trappings of the image, was the first Western politician to make politics a respectable profession for 30 years, to make it once again the highest of the professions and not just a fabric of fraud and sham. When most statesmen die they have to be explained away with words like "integrity" and "cunning" and "courage," but Kennedy did not need such apologies. He was simply and superlatively a man of his age, who understood his age, who put all his own energy and the best brains of his country into solving its problems and who ended up in more cases than not by doing the right thing at the right time because he'd gone about it in the right way.

DAVID FROST. Few people would have thought at the beginning of this year that by its end we would have lost the leader of the opposition in Britain, Pope John in Rome and the President of the United States. We have been very aware of death this year. Even here in this studio we have lost someone we still miss, but with the murder of John Kennedy, death has become immediate to people all over the world for the first time. Because of the stature of the man and the nature of a shrinking world, people everywhere feel they've lost someone they'll miss. Yesterday 1 man died, today in America 60 lost their lives in a fire. Yet somehow it is the one that matters. Even in death, it seems, we're not equal. Death is not the great leveler. Death reveals the eminent.

MILLICENT MARTIN (song):

"A young man rode with his head held high,
under the Texas sun,
And no-one guessed that a man so blessed
would perish by the gun.
Lord, would perish by the gun.

A shot rang out like a sudden shout, and
heaven held its breath,
For the dreams of a multitude of men rode
with him to his death.
Lord, rode with him to his death.

Yes, the heart of the world weighs heavy
with the helplessness of tears,
For the man cut down in a Texas town in
the summer of his years.

And we who stay must not ever lose the
victories that he won,
For wherever men look to freedom then his
soul goes riding on.
Lord, his soul goes riding on."

**David Frost.** There has been today one ominous hint of future developments. Already the assassination which seems at the moment, at any rate, to have been the action of an individual, is being made subject to the first manipulations of various groups and sections of opinion for their own ends. In America and even here, they have already begun to show their hand. It would be good to hope that the death of a great man will not become a pawn in a power struggle of one sort or another. But it would, alas, be naive.

**Robert Lang.** There are two men in the world for the first time since the world began in whose hands there lies the possibility of bringing all life on this globe to an end and making its charred remains uninhabitable to the end of time. One of those men looks out on the loneliest view in the world, the view from the White House windows in the middle of our bitter and war-torn century. And, yet, how little true it is that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It would be closer to the truth to say that such power transforms, elevates, even purifies its holder. At the assumption of so terrible a burden, even as it marks out its bearer as a man forever apart, at the same time it gives him the strength to live it. In what manner this man, whose identity is less important than his office, has come by degrees, to bear the burden of hundreds of millions who know nothing of him is no longer important even if it could be determined.

What matters now is that we recognize what we have done. The loneliness of power is a universally accepted truth. There remains the recognition of the loneliness of absolute power, the responsibility for all life and death, a responsibility hitherto reserved only to God—in a sense so terribly real that it transcends paradox. Mankind has, by a conscious decision, appointed for itself a God-substitute and the blasphemy of the appointment by men of one man to live and die for us all is rooted in the ultimate blasphemy of the world that it made it necessary.

And so, once again, we are reminded that no man is an island, and the bell that tolls in Dallas, tolls for us all. Not only because of our inextricable interdependence. Not only because it shows that although it may be expedient that one man should die for the people, it is neither wise nor just. Not only because it teaches us all, though we cannot sluff off our responsibilities by putting them all onto one elected scapegoat. But above all because, as the bell tolls, it reminds us, in the hideous emphasis it places upon the reality of power, of the frailty of the body in which that power must ultimately rest, and in doing so prompts us to remember with Montaigne that sit we ever so high on a stool, yet sit we but upon our own tails.

**Dame Sybil Thorndike.** "To Jackie"

"Yesterday the sun was shot out of your sky,
Jackie, why, Jackie.
A man who was able and hopeful and gay
Was called abruptly from this world's day
His journey done, his song half sung, why,
Jackie, why.

What can we say to you, we who all pray
with you, widow and mother,
We who know well the peace loving world
lost a friend and a brother.
His sun is set, but we don't forget you, our
sister,
Yours the hard part, may God give you good
heart, little sister."

**Bernard Levin.** Amid the echoes of what was, with the exception of the one that killed the Archduke Ferdinand at Sarajevo, the loudest shot the world has ever heard, one bitterly ironic coincidence has gone unnoticed. A few hours before he died, President Kennedy had taken time out of his crowded program to look in on the birthday celebrations in Dallas of John Nance Garner. Garner, who was 95 yesterday, was Roosevelt's first Vice President and is by far the senior of the surviving former holders of that office. And when at the 1960 Democrat convention in Los Angeles, Lyndon Johnson, defeated by Kennedy for the Presidential nomination, was offered the vice presidency, he hesitated. To help him make up his mind he telephoned his fellow Texan, Garner, who had held the post all those years before, to ask whether he would advise acceptance. "No," said Garner, he would not. And in a typically Texan phrase added: "Lyndon, the vice presidency isn't worth a pitcher of warm spit." Nevertheless, Johnson accepted Kennedy's offer. And in consequence became yesterday evening the 35th President of the United States. The succession was immediate. In the world of today neither grief nor shock can be permitted to create an interregnum in the citadels of power. The President is dead, long live the President. And such is the pace at which the modern world moves that even before the mourning is over, indeed, before it has begun, we must begin to think not of the past but of the future.

What, then can be read of the future with President Johnson? For the time has long since gone by when the responsibility of the President of the United States was confined to the people of that country alone.

I believe that this now global responsibility has fallen into good hands. The contrasts between President Johnson and his predecessors are more obvious than important. Johnson, unlike Kennedy, is not an intellectual, but then neither was Truman. Johnson is provincial where Kennedy was metropolitan, but his years as leader of the Senate gave him a knowledge, understanding and control of the realities of power in politics, almost as sophisticated as that of Roosevelt. Johnson, in the inevitable isolation of the vice presidency, had had no direct power to exercise, yet Kennedy, unlike Roosevelt, took his deputy fully into his confidence, and shared with him the results of his decisions, if not their making.

Johnson's health is suspect, so was Roosevelt's, so was Eisenhower's, and so, indeed, was Kennedy's own.

And President Johnson will bring to the awful responsibility of his office qualities and a record that offer promise that he will be more than merely the best available shadow of the light that failed.

Though a southerner, his record on the color question, the rock on which America's future must either be built or sink, is one of the best in the Democratic Party. It was he who steered through Congress the only successful civil rights legislation of recent years. And during the 1960 election he and his wife faced physical violence in his home State for his liberal stand.

The other major domestic political achievement of his career—though, too, the impossibility of considering its effect only on the United States is apparent—was the planning and execution of the strategy that finally destroyed Senator McCarthy. There is every reason to believe that the assumption of supreme office will only confirm in President Johnson and his policies the beliefs that informed these actions and attitudes.

Abroad he will be chiefly remembered for his dash to Berlin during the crisis of the building of the wall. He was then much criticized for his extrovert behavior. But no part of that criticism came from the Berliners, who correctly saw in his visit a symbol of America's determination to stand firm in the face of any threat to freedom. Nor on the other hand is there any reason to fear that the thaw in the frozen attitudes of East-West relations will be seriously endangered, let alone reversed by President Johnson's accession. His incomparable political shrewdness, the clarity and firmness of the lines which President Kennedy had drawn on the charts and policy into the future, the team of younger men that he has inherited—these will combine to insure continuity in those aspects of American policy which are of such direct concern to us all. And the ambassadorial mission he undertook for the then fledgling President a few weeks after Kennedy had been elected, took him through Western Europe, including Britain, and wherever he went he made a good impression which will stand him in good stead now. And it is significant that that mission was carried out in the company of so liberal and devotedly internationalist an American figure as Senator Fulbright.

Nobody tonight can wish more fervently than President Johnson himself that this dreadful opportunity had not fallen upon him. But since it has, we, citizens of the alliance he now leads, have the right to hope for much from his leadership and a duty to wish him well with all our hearts. I think those hopes and wishes will not be disappointed.

A poet once hymned an earlier, narrower moment of crisis in the life of the United States. How much more bitterly relevant are Longfellow's words today:

"Sail on, oh Ship of State.
Sail on, oh Union strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging on thy fate."

**David Frost.** The tragedy of John Kennedy's death is not that the liberal movements of history that he led will cease, it is that their focus may become blurred and that the gathering momentum may be lost.

That is the aftermath of Dallas, November 22.

It is a time for private thoughts.

## AMBASSADOR ROWAN A SUCCESS IN FINLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since last May 17, Mr. Carl Rowan has been our Ambassador in Finland. The people of Finland have been taken by storm, as it were, by the total diplomacy of our new Ambassador's approach. He gets around in all levels of society in all parts of the country and undertaking everything that may be a part of aiding a broad understanding of what America stands for.

Mr. Rowan has been solidly successful and has been, with his family, taken to the hearts of the Finnish people with genuine warmth.

Finnish-American relations have been and continue to be good. Mr. Rowan has solidified them further with his frankness about America, denying no difficulties with our racial problems at home, while emphasizing the progress we do make, and overall drawing a balanced picture. His accent upon public relations, built upon honesty and forthrightness in all matters, has given impact to his unequivocal presentation of the U.S. position on matters vis-a-vis Russia.

Finland is in a difficult position in relationship to Russia. Finland might be cautious or hope a foreign ambassador would be. They have found Mr. Rowan refreshing and welcome. In short, his brand of diplomacy is of a high order and most effective.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record a recent New York Times magazine article on Ambassador Rowan for the benefit of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Our Man in Finland

(By Werner Wiskari)

Helsinki.—Carl T. Rowan is a 38-year-old New Frontiersman who, for the last 6 months, has been the U.S. Ambassador here. When he flew into town last May 17, he began a whirlwind round of what might be called total diplomacy, carrying the message of America to as many Finns as he could reach in the shortest possible time.

Helsinki has been used to a more traditional diplomatic approach, and Mr. Rowan promptly broke all the traditions, taking the capital by storm. But he would have taken Helsinki by storm in any case. For Carl Rowan happens to be a Negro. In fact, the news of his appointment had set all Finland buzzing, not because of any racial prejudice, for none is evident, but because of a curiosity about a race rarely seen here. And so the press informed the nation on the Rowans' arrival that the Ambassador and his sons are "chocolate brown" and that his wife is considerably lighter.

But it was soon apparent that the Finns felt that, color aside, this Ambassador was definitely out of the ordinary.

He went on a constant round of speeches, travel, receptions, bull sessions, bowling, golfing, and taking the steam with university students and others in the sauna. Mr. Rowan is convinced that, as a space age envoy, he should undertake anything that might help provide a broader understanding of America and what it stands for.

The usual career ambassador in Helsinki quietly settles into diplomatic routine after the striped-pants procedure of presenting credentials and paying ceremonial calls upon fellow diplomats and Finnish officials. But Mr. Rowan's traditions are not from the world of diplomacy. He was catapulted into his ambassadorship after 13 years as a newsman and 2 as a State Department custodian of press relations as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Hurtling into diplomacy with all the furious energy of a Kennedy election campaign, the fledgling Ambassador crammed five major speeches into his first 6 weeks along with three forays into the Finnish hinterland to pay official visits to southwestern and northern cities.

From the outset newspapers and magazines featured pictures of the Ambassador, of his wife, Vivien; sons, 11-year-old Carl Jr. and 10-year-old Geoffrey, and miniature greyhound, Gomez. Many of the pictures were of diplomatic activity Finns had never seen before. His Excellency was shown, for example, walking atop an iron fence with his boys or hunting through a neighbor's backyard for a baseball while the lady of the house hung up the wash.

A popular magazine, after his first week here, ran a feature article headlined "The Most Colorful Ambassador in Helsinki"—a headline that caused Mr. Rowan to toss his head back in laughter. At the end of his first month, however, he was happy to note that his whirlwind brand of diplomacy was beginning to be reported without reference to his race.

But, he says, even in that first month, when Finnish newspapers almost invariably described him as "dark skinned," he only rarely had any consciousness here of being a Negro. The few times that he did were when he listened to Voice of America or BBC broadcasts on race riots in the United States or when he had to discuss them at news conferences. He won admiration for declaring that he was not ashamed to speak of the riots even though they were a "national disgrace." He stressed that the Negroes of America had made great progress in the last two decades and that they now had more Government support than ever before.

At the same time, Finnish newsmen who had the opportunity to participate in a bull session with him were flabbergasted by his willingness to tell stories at his own expense about his experiences as a Negro in the United States. One that caused special astonishment was an account of mowing the lawn of the house he had while he was with the State Department in Washington. A white woman driving a big car pulled up to hail him as "boy" and ask how much he charged. His only pay for mowing the lawn, he replied, was the privilege of sleeping with the lady of the house.

Mr. Rowan surprised Helsinki in other ways as well. He does not give the impression in closeup of an aggressive personality likely to make a fast-paced debut as an ambassador. Heavy set, he seems to move almost languidly, speaking with a slow drawl bearing the stamp of his native Tennessee. He seems much older than his 38 years; he says he grew old at an early age.

He was in his late teens before he set out from his red-clay hometown of McMinnville, Tenn., where he had romped barefoot along streets filled with sharp stones. (These days he sometimes looks speculatively at his two sons, about the best dressed boys in Helsinki, and wonders if they will ever amount to anything, for they have never had to go barefoot.)

He left McMinnville with 77 cents in his pocket, carrying his clothes in a cardboard box. His road led first to a summer job in a Nashville hospital, then to a Negro college and, it being wartime, on to a U.S. Navy officer training school as one of the first Negroes to be admitted under what was then a new policy. He was the only Negro in a class of 337, he says, "and that ages you fast."

But World War II, in which 19-year-old Ensign Rowan served as a communications officer on two vessels in the Atlantic, turned out to be his "big break." "It got me out of the race situation," for it led to his move north. He went on to win his bachelor's degree from Oberlin College in Ohio, his master's from the University of Minnesota and a job with the Minneapolis Tribune, on which he achieved acclaim for his reporting on the Negro in the South and on social conditions in India and other Asian countries. His articles became the bases for three books. He received honorary doctorates from Simpson College in Iowa and Hamline University in Minnesota.

Attracting the attention of President Kennedy, he was appointed to the State Department in February 1961. Named Ambassador early this year, he came to Helsinki determined to judge for himself whether there was justification for the suspicions, often encountered in Washington, about Finnish relations with the neighboring Soviet Union.

He was not content to let the usual circle of business and uppercrust Finns and some other selected leaders dominate embassy functions. In a bid to talk to as many Finns as possible, he is struggling to gain something of a conversational ability in the exceedingly difficult Finnish language, since most people in this farmer-dominated northern country speak only Finnish.

He said in an interview that he had nothing against "the elite." He and his wife like "culture and good cognac as well as the next people," he declared. But he thinks that the revolutionary changes that the world has undergone in the last two decades have "also changed the requirement of diplomacy," making it necessary for the space-age ambassador to reach "the masses" in a great variety of ways.

"It is just as much an ambassador's job to go bowling, golfing, or to a track meet," he said, "as it is to go to the endless number of teas and diplomatic receptions."

Finns in general appear to be impressed and pleased with Ambassador Rowan and his accent on public relations. One official has already compared him with John Moors Cabot, now U.S. Ambassador to Poland, who has been highly popular wherever he has served because of his insistence on meeting and discussing America and its ideals with as many people as he could manage—here in the early fifties and subsequently in Sweden, Colombia, and Brazil.

Mr. Rowan has also made a deep impression here with his speeches, which he writes himself. Aware though he is of Finland's delicate position between East and West, he deems it his duty, nevertheless, to express his country's views without equivocation. And so in a speech in which he decried the Soviet-led "assault on the United Nations," he suggested that it had been mounted because of clear evidence that the "uncommitted peoples, these new members of the U.N., have, by and large, exactly the same goals as do the people of the United States and the rest of the free world."

Such remarks would scarcely seem extraordinary in the United States. But to many Finns, accustomed to the increasingly careful Finnish pronouncements of recent years, they appeared a bit startling, though welcome.

What does Mr. Rowan hope to accomplish here? He has no "grand strategy." But already his pattern of diplomacy is clear.

His is a mission largely to the Finnish "masses." But he also wants to get on such a casual basis with Finnish Government leaders that he can telephone for an appointment just to chat and not only when he has official business to transmit.

The Ambassador apparently can take partial credit for one of the most significant public relations triumphs the United States has ever scored in Finland: the outpouring of pro-American sentiment by the unexpectedly large and enthusiastic crowds that greeted Vice President Johnson during his September visit.

Before leaving Washington for Helsinki, Mr. Rowan had pressed hard for more attention to Finland by high level Americans going abroad. The Johnson visit was said to be an indirect result of this.

In general, besides trying "to enhance, if possible, the already excellent" Finnish-American relations, Mr. Rowan wants to be "aware, and make Washington aware, of any way in which the United States can act to assist the Finns in achieving their fundamental goal" of maintaining their independence.

"This," he said, "may mean doing nothing."

But for a man with a record of vigorous action "doing nothing" appears unlikely.

## HYPOCRISY AND ANTI-SEMITISM—ACTIVITIES OF ARON VERGELIS

Mr. **KEATING**. I believe the American people should be alterted to the activities under the cultural exchange program of Aron Vergelis.

Mr. President, among the cultural exchange visitors from the Soviet Union who have been touring the United States was a man sent obviously for the purpose of denying and obscuring the extent of anti-Semitic activities within the Soviet Union. Aron Vergelis, editor of a Yiddish publication in the Soviet Union, has tried to present himself in the United States as a spokesman for the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. Yet it is evident that his purpose is not to give Americans the full truth, not to explain the new trend of persecution and discrimination which fall to the lot of the Jewish people within the Soviet Union, and above all not to serve as a genuine link between the Jews in the Soviet Union and their coreligionists in the free world.

In one statement after another, Mr. Vergelis has tried to deny the obvious facts of discrimination, the closing of synagogues in the Soviet Union, the denial of a Yiddish language press or a cultural rights comparable to those of nationality groups within the Soviet Union. Vergelis has even insisted that "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and that those who discuss it are only trying to interfere and block peaceful relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I wish that the words of Mr. Vergelis were true and that the rights of Jews and other religious groups in the Soviet Union did receive the respect which is their due. It is, however, only too well documented that Jewish persons in the Soviet Union are being made scapegoats for economic failure of all kinds. Because of a sympathetic and often sentimental tie with the State of Israel, Soviet Jews are often considered disloyal citizens. They dare not give the true story of the discriminations they meet. But it is clear to those who have looked at the mounting evidence that the religious and cultural rights of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union are gravely threatened. In their continuing battle against all religion, the Soviet Communists have recently exerted special pressures against members of the Jewish faith and have denied to them the human rights which we in the United States regard as basic principles of government and ethics.

Mr. President, the American people are not deceived by the words of Aron Vergelis. Neither are we seeking to increase tensions between the two countries merely because as citizens of a free nation we see and recognize the facts. But certainly it would be a useful step in the easing of tensions and in the recognition of mutual interests if the Soviet Union would move to correct the injustices that are so clearly evident to the entire world and to insure for all its citizens the rights which it so proudly boasts of before other countries. That would be a step forward, a step that would be welcomed by all free peoples throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, in the RECORD the text of an article and editorial which appeared in the Jewish press on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jewish Press, Nov. 29, 1963]

### ARON VERGELIS

Aron Vergelis has come to America. Who, you will ask, is Aron Vergelis? If you were to ask the gentleman himself he would modestly say that he is merely a Russian writer here, together with 15 other such worthies, on a 3-week tour of these United States. The man's modesty, however, does not tell the entire picture.

For Aron Vergelis is a famous man these days, a celebrity at least. Because of Aron Vergelis 18 top Jewish leaders met in hasty conclave feverishly to discuss what to do about him. Because of Aron Vergelis, the International Airport at New York was filled with reporters waiting for the Soviet jet that brought him here to land.

But, you impatiently ask, why? Who is this Aron Vergelis? It is a simple question but one which, unfortunately, does not have a simple answer. We could say that Vergelis is a writer, a Soviet journalist, the editor of the only Yiddish magazine in Russia today. It would hardly be the whole story.

We would have to say that Aron Vergelis is a "moser" (an informer) who has been sent here by the Soviet Government to brand all the stories about Soviet Jewish persecution as a "fistful of lies invented by the capitalist ruling circles as part of their cold war strategy." We would have to say that he is sent here to confuse the issues in the minds of the Jewish peoples. We would have to quote you from one or two of his remarks upon arriving.

Thus, upon being asked why such minute groups as the Gypsies and Yakuts have complete cultural autonomy while the Jews have not, Vergelis quite logically said: "The Jews are already integrated; they are satisfied with a general Jewish culture." Upon being read a quotation from a Soviet journal that read: "What is a Jew's secular god? Money. Money, that is the jealous god of Israel before whom there is no other god," Vergelis coolly replied: "I read it and it does not bother me in the least. It is not the kind of Judaism I believe in that is being described in those articles."

And so, while the yeshivas in Russia are still closed and the synagogues diminish in number; while the physical well-being of the people is threatened and the spiritual life is being destroyed, Vergelis comes to deny it all.

Who—or what—is Aron Vergelis? We leave it to you, dear readers, to tell us.

---

### MOSCOW EDITOR SAYS NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

NEW YORK.—Aron Vergelis, editor of the Sovietish Heimland published in Moscow, and Robert Rozhdestvensky, a prominent Soviet poet, asserted here this week with great heat that there was no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the latter insisting "a Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union" and those in this country who say so are interested only in "interfering with the relaxation of tensions" between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Vergelis and the Russian poet were members of a three-man group of Russians who held a press conference at the headquarters of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. Most of the questions directed at the group, which was headed by another well-known Russian writer, Boris Polovoi, concerned the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

Both Mr. Vergelis and Rozhedestvensky avoided direct answers in regard to closures of synagogues by Soviet authorities and denial to the Jews of the Soviet Union cultural rights. However, Mr. Vergelis did produce for the television cameras and other photographers a large colorful poster announcing in Russian a performance by Yiddish artists and said that there are more Jewish theatrical performances in the Soviet Union than there are in the United States. Challenged about the high percentage of Jews given the death sentence for alleged economic crimes in the Soviet Union, Mr. Vergelis said that the victims were sentenced merely as criminals and that no anti-Semitism was involved.

---

## AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—HOUSE AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now resume the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1703, the Mexican laborer bill.

The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to concur in the House amendment, upon which 30 minutes of debate is permitted, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has requested a quorum call. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that my request be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be modified accordingly.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I speak briefly in support of the motion made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. His motion would call for the adoption by the Senate of the bill as passed by the House, which would extend the operation of the Mexican labor act, or the bracero act, for 1 year only, from December 31, 1963, to December 31, 1964.

The Senate, by a single vote margin, adopted the McCarthy amendment, which was the amendment omitted by the House in the passage of its bill.

The House had the same subject before it—that is, the McCarthy amendment—and it disposed of it in this way: The House Agriculture Committee rejected the McCarthy amendment by a vote of 28 to 4. When the McCarthy amendment was considered on the floor of the House, it was rejected by a division vote of 79 to 131.

The bill as passed by the House calls for an extension of 1 year only, without the McCarthy amendment.

Statements were made on the floor of the House to the effect that 1 year would be the limit of the extension to be expected by those who are using Mexican braceros for the production and harvesting of their perishable crops.

I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee stated yesterday on the Senate floor that, so far as he and his committee are concerned, their commitment is to an extension of 1 year, and not beyond that time.

Without laboring the question, let me make two points. First, this program is one requested by the Mexican Government itself. I served in the Senate committee when this solution was arrived at. The Mexican Government wanted it done this way because it said that under the old program Mexican laborers moved, too frequently, from communities which had no problem of unemployment. The Mexican Government wanted to have the right to select the laborers who would come to this country from areas of unemployment, therefore to have charge of the selection and handling of their people.

That purpose was accomplished under this program. It was not accomplished under the former program. It will not be accomplished by the program which will be left on the books after this program ceases to exist.

As I have stated, therefore, first, the Mexican Government wanted this program. It gives the Mexican Government an opportunity to send laborers from areas where acute unemployment exists in their own country, and to know that their people will be fairly treated.

Secondly, we must consider the need for these laborers in our country. Despite the fact that the number of such laborers has greatly decreased in the last year about 200,000 of them came into areas producing perishable fruit and commodities, and some other commodities, but mostly perishable commodities, to help, in the main, in the cultivation and harvesting of highly seasonal and perishable crops, which must be harvested at the time they mature.

We are now in the middle of a harvesting year and a production year, depending on the area in which these laborers are employed, because they are employed from Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, just outside Mexico, up through Colorado, Arkansas, and Michigan, where last year some seven or eight thousand were employed in harvesting the pickle crop.

I do not think it is fair even to think about eliminating this program and eliminating the possibility of the use of 200,000 laborers by those who have to depend upon obtaining laborers when they need them, when the crops are ready to be handled, and when they are doing that at this very moment in part of the area represented by the Senators from Arizona—and I see present the distinguished senior Senator [Mr. Hayden]—and by the Senators from California, who are interested in this program, and by the Senators from Texas, who are vitally interested in this program.

Mr. President, in my own State we do not use these particular laborers. We use, at times, laborers from the offshore islands under an entirely different arrangement, under which we pay much more than is paid in the case of Mexican laborers.

It would be very burdensome and difficult for the thousands of affected farmers to solve the problem in such a short time. Passage of the bill with the McCarthy amendment added to it would not solve the problem. I strongly support the pending motion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I spoke at some length on this subject matter last night, and today I wish to make only two or three points, and to offer those points for the consideration of Senators.

First of all, I appreciate the position of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], who opposes the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

I am sure he does so in all sincerity. However, I say to him and to other Senators who are in his position that the senior Senator from Colorado would not presume to judge the conditions in Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, or any State other than my own. I hope that they will accord to those of us who are involved in this matter the same courtesy and the same consideration.

The main issue, so far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, is whether the Senate will accept the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, or whether it will adopt the amendment which was in the Senate bill originally.

First of all, this is only a simple 1-year extension; and it would be a physical impossibility for the Secretary of Labor, within the 1-year extension, to put into effect the workmen's compensation provision, which must come under State laws, and implement the other conditions and provisions of the McCarthy amendment, before the expiration of the Act.

Therefore, in effect, the Senate would be indulging in an exercise in futility if it did not accept the motion made by the Senator from Louisiana.

The question has been repeatedly raised: What kind of program is this?

I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that three main conditions must be met by the Secretary of Labor—not by the farmer in the field, not by the hometown, not by the State—but by the Secretary of Labor, before braceros may be imported.

The first condition is that it must be found by the Secretary that there are not sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I request that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The second qualification that must be met is that the Secretary of Labor must determine that employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and the working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

The third qualification is that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Mr. President, there are many articles which I should like to include in the Record. However, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be printed in the Record an article entitled "Bracero Program Is Vital Part of State's Agricultural Economy," published in the Centennial State Farm Bureau News; excerpts from the testimony of Robert M. Sayre before the House Agriculture Committee; and questions and answers concerning the Mexican national program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Centennial State Farm Bureau News, July-August 1963]

### BRACERO PROGRAM IS VITAL PART OF STATE'S AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

The importance of Public Law 78 to the sugarbeet, lettuce and vegetable segments of Colorado's agricultural industry was emphasized by both producers and processors at a meeting with four members of the State's congressional delegation in Denver on June 21.

At a meeting arranged by Farm Bureau with Senators Allott and Dominick and Representatives Brotzman and Chenoweth, both growers and processors outlined the need for continuation of the Mexican bracero program.

The situation was summed up in a very few words by George Bensheid of the Arkansas Valley when he told the Senators and Representatives that without this source of labor the vegetable industry in Colorado "has had it."

Unless Congress acts to reverse the vote cast in the House of Representatives late in May, Public Law 78 will expire at the end of this year. The proposed extension of the law was defeated on May 29, described by Representative Chenoweth as a very bad day to try to get serious consideration of the proposed legislation to extend the program.

Being the day before a holiday, many of the Members of the House were absent. The total vote on the measure was 158 to 174.

Chenoweth pointed out that all but one member of Colorado's delegation in the House worked hard to save the law in the House.

All areas of Colorado were represented at the meeting with the Congressmen. In order to make best use of the time available, those attending the meeting selected spokesmen for the various interests represented.

Roy Inouye, member of the Colorado Farm Bureau board of directors and chairman of the organization's labor committee, chaired the meeting. He pointed out that the meeting had been called to give both growers and processors and the elected officials an opportunity to discuss the labor problem and the possibilities of reviving the program.

Spokesmen selected were Richard Blake, sugarbeet growers; Fred Holmes, sugar processors; Wayne Escheman, lettuce growers and shippers; Paul Hoshiko, vegetable growers; and George Benshied, vegetable processors.

All spokesmen for the various interests agreed that loss of the program would result in a damaging blow to the economy of both the agricultural industry in this country, and the general economy of Mexico.

The bracero program provides Mexico with its third largest source of dollar income.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT commented in his remarks to the growers and processors that he believes that $1 paid to a Mexican worker does more good than $5 paid in foreign aid. Representative CHENOWETH put an even higher value on the program.

Wayne Escheman, in discussing the value of the bracero program in the lettuce production and shipping industry, pointed out that Colorado meets all the requirements for building a strong industry except an adequate supply of hand labor. He pointed out that domestic labor is not available to do the fieldwork which is now being done by the imported labor.

Richard Blake stated that the sugarbeet industry was shocked by the action of the House. The entire industry needs the program.

Without the bracero program, acreage of sugarbeets will have to be reduced. There is not enough mechanization, as yet, to meet production requirements.

Fred Holmes of the Great Western Sugar Co. told the Congressmen that the industry used to be able to recruit 18,000 domestic workers for fieldwork. Now, the recruitment program supplies only about 4,000 domestic workers.

Paul Hoshiko, vegetable grower in Weld County, brought out several points which concurred with later discussion of the values of the program in people-to-people and international relations. Hoshiko reported that he still corresponds with workers from Mexico who worked for him as long as 5 years ago.

In discussing the program, many points were brought out in reference to why the program has been and is successful and needed. Principal opposition to the program has come from organized labor and organizations which have a completely erroneous picture of the program and the way in which it is operated.

Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK reported on the action they are taking in the Senate to try to get at least a 1-year extension of the program. Senator ALLOTT has introduced a bill calling for such an extension.

---

### QUOTATIONS FROM ROBERT M. SAYRE'S TESTIMONY, HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON S. 1703, MARCH 27, 28, 29, 1963

The second international consideration I should mention is the importance of the program to the economy of Mexico.

Remittances home from the braceros, estimated at least $100 and possibly twice this amount, not only have often substantially supported their families and relatives, but have contributed notably to cover the Mexican deficit in its trade and in repaying its loans. The Bank of Mexico estimated these remittances at $37 million in 1962.

The program also provides an important source of temporary employment for many thousands of Mexican workers. When it is recognized that the annual per capita income in many areas from which the Mexican workers come is approximately $100 it can readily be seen how important this supplemental income can be to the Mexican worker. This temporary program has thus fulfilled mutually satisfactory objectives: American farmers have been able to obtain temporary agricultural laborers and Mexican workers have been able to earn a fair income under labor conditions satisfactory to both governments.

I would also want to note that the sudden loss of the dollar income of Mexican workers would be a serious blow to their family income and constitute a significant loss of foreign exchange to Mexico.

The Department of State urges that the contribution to the economies of both countries be kept in mind in considering the continuance of this program.

The Department of State concurs with the Department of Agriculture that Public Law 78, as amended, should be extended at least a year beyond the present date of expiration.

---

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING THE MEXICAN NATIONAL PROGRAM

1. Who are the agricultural workers who come in under Public Law 78 who are frequently defined as braceros?

Answer. They are Mexican agricultural workers who enter the United States under the agricultural agreement that exists between the two nations and who have been certified by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor as being needed for the culture and harvesting of crops within the United States because of a lack of qualified U.S. workers.

2. What work are they permitted to perform?

Answer. The braceros are certified only for specific agricultural labor jobs for which American domestic workers are not available as determined by the Secretary of Labor. They can only be used in temporary or seasonal employment. They cannot operate power driven, self-propelling, harvesting, planting or cultivating machinery except in specific cases found necessary by the Secretary of Labor.

3. What safeguards are imposed in Public Law 78 to protect domestic agricultural workers?

Answer. Public Law 78 and the United States-Mexican Migrant Labor Agreement govern the importation of Mexican farmhands (braceros) as supplementary labor:

(a) The Secretary of Labor has complete authority to deny the employment of Mexican workers if qualified domestic workers are available.

(b) The Secretary of Labor has complete authority to remove Mexican workers from employment if qualified domestics become available.

(c) Wages paid Mexican workers cannot be less than wages paid domestics for similar work.

4. Does the Mexican labor contribute to the Nation's unemployment?

Answer. No. All domestic farmworkers' jobs are protected. Under Public Law 78 supplemental workers cannot be contracted until all available domestic workers have been employed. Certification for the employment of supplemental Mexican national workers must be obtained from the State employment service, as well as the U.S. Department of Labor.

5. Does the use of foreign labor depress wages?

Answer. No, because Public Law 78 has a provision for the Secretary of Labor to determine whether or not the importation of such Mexican national workers under Public Law 78 has an adverse effect upon American domestic agricultural workers. Before foreign agricultural workers can be brought into any area, growers must agree to pay them the prevailing wage rate being paid to domestic agricultural workers in the area or such higher rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to avoid adversely affecting rates paid domestic workers. These rates are determined by periodic wage surveys based only on earnings of domestic workers.

6. Will unemployed American industrial workers perform agricultural stoop labor?

Answer. Experience dictates that the answer is "No." State unemployment insurance laws do not require unemployment insurance recipients to accept employment in an activity foreign to their usual type of work. In addition, such employees are reluctant to jeopardize their chances for skilled work by accepting unskilled agricultural jobs. Skilled industrial workers feel that it is beneath their dignity to accept stoop agricultural jobs. Even a high rate of unemployment in industrial areas will not produce workers for farmwork.

7. Does the importation of Mexican nationals contribute to the growth of large farms to the detriment of small farms?

Answer. No. The only small farmers who require supplemental Mexican national contract workers when domestic workers are not available are those who produce the type of crops that require large numbers of stoop farm laborers. These small farmers are assisted immeasurably in the culture and harvest of their crops by banding together in associations for the purpose of hiring domestic workers and, if needed, Mexican national workers. In many cases small farmers do not have a large enough operation to maintain either a domestic or a Mexican national crew. In either case, whether he is large or small, he is not permitted to have Mexican national workers except for temporary or seasonal use. The timing of the cultural practices or harvest of perishable crops is just as important to the small farmer as it is to the large farmer. If labor is not immediately available when needed, either can lose his entire crop.

8. Is Public Law 78 a hidden subsidy to users?

Answer. No. The recruitment costs to the grower for obtaining Mexican national laborers is greater than the costs of obtaining domestic labor. The charge is made that 1 percent of the farmers use this supplemental stoop labor. This is true, but the 1 percent who use this supplemental labor are those who produce the crops requiring the greatest amount of hand labor. For example, every spear of asparagus, every head of lettuce, every head of cauliflower, every shoot of broccoli, every tomato, cucumber, stalk of celery, every strawberry must be harvested by hand, and it is because of these highly specialized crops grown on 1 percent of American farms that it is necessary to use supplemental labor. Again it is pointed out that American domestic workers do not make themselves available for this type of work.

9. Will the termination of Public Law 78 have an adverse effect on availability of agricultural commodities to the consumer?

Answer. It is obvious that there will be an adverse effect on the consumer since curtailed production will force prices upward so that both fresh and processed fruits and vegetables will become luxury items. Farmers will not plant what cannot be harvested. These highly perishable crops must have hand and eye selection for quality. They do not lend themselves to mechanization at this time or in the foreseeable future, although efforts are being made to develop mechanical harvesting.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I urge my friend from Minnesota to give those who are involved in this program and whose States need this program an opportunity to phase out the program, because otherwise many individual farm families will suffer in the next year.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations on the comments which have been made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

I have not been advocating that the program be killed. What I have been seeking to do is to have the program for the importation of Mexican laborers continued when it is found that there is a need for such importation, and that we should establish for American migratory workers and our potential domestic farmworkers conditions similar to those that are offered to the imported Mexican laborers, who come to this country in competition with American farmworkers.

It is rather interesting to note the comment of the Senator from Colorado when he said that Senators who do not have the same specific problem in their own States should more or less disqualify themselves and not have any judgment or take any position or express any opinion with regard to this particular problem.

Mr. President, I can qualify in that respect, because migratory workers are used in Minnesota, in the production of sugarbeets and other crops. Over the years some Mexican nationals have also been employed in Minnesota including a few in 1962.

In the debate several months ago, I suggested that if there are any States which could not produce sugarbeets without the use of imported Mexican laborers, Minnesota would be very glad to take over their share of the sugarbeet production and produce the sugarbeets without the use of Mexican laborers and solely with the use of American domestic farmworkers.

Mr. President, I believe that every Senator has an obligation to look across State borders at problems in other States.

We are not limited to consideration of problems which exist only in our own States. After all, this is the Senate of the United States. We do not back off from a consideration of a problem which may exist in another State. All of us should have an opportunity to study problems that exist anywhere in the country and to make recommendations to the Senate.

I do not say that the importation of Mexican workers is unnecessary. All I say is that before we give the growers the right to import Mexican nationals, we owe something to our own domestic farmworkers, to at least establish some of the same standards for them that we establish for Mexican laborers.

In the testimony it was clearly shown by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture that since the program has been initiated, the hourly, daily, and even annual income of American migratory workers has gone down.

It can be said that other forces contributed to this decline, and that may be so, but the circumstantial evidence is very clear that the importation of Mexican laborers has had that effect. It is also clear that there is not a need for as many Mexican workers as are being brought into the country. They have had the effect of depressing wages and income.

All we request is that we establish reasonable, comparable conditions, and that these conditions be offered to American workers before certification for the importation of Mexican laborers is permitted.

The action we propose was approved by the Senate after prolonged debate. We are simply asking that our conferees have the opportunity to take our position to conference with the House of Representatives.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, suppose that the crops of some of the farmlands of America are ready for harvest; suppose that the farmers on those farmlands cannot obtain the assistance of their fellow citizens in the harvesting of the crops simply because there are none available? What does the Congress propose to do about it? Is it suggested now that we turn our back on the American farmer and say to him, "Let the crops perish; that is your problem, not ours"?

Congress is aware, and ought to be aware of the problem. That is the reason why Public Law 78 was passed. It provides, in part, that the Secretary of Labor must first determine that there are no qualified American citizens available for employment by the American farmer in the harvest of his crops before he can permit the Government of Mexico to send, temporarily or on a seasonal basis, Mexican citizens to help American farmers.

The last time the Senate debated this issue, I told the Senate that I had the honor to be a member of the American delegation to the Mexican-American Parliamentary Conference, which met last spring in Mexico. I was the reporter of the panel of Mexican Senators and Deputies, and American Representatives and Senators, who sat around the table to discuss this and other problems.

The delegates from both nations were unanimous in favor of continuing the program.

There is no better program of foreign assistance than this program with Mexico, in which our friends from below the border can come here temporarily and then go home with a greater opportunity of establishing themselves in their own country.

I hope that this program will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I propose to vote for the motion by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], but I wish to make clear my position on the bill.

I said a long time ago that I thought the bracero program should be phased down. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had introduced a bill which would have done so, but the bill did not receive favorable action. The need for some action in that direction is indicated.

So while I shall vote for the Ellender motion, I shall do so with the clear understanding that next year I hope to see some action directed toward phasing out the program, or at least toward phasing it down. Failing that, I may be persuaded to support some amendment along the line of the McCarthy amendment, with which I am in agreement in some respects.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senate will support its action taken at the time the McCarthy amendment to the so-called Mexican farm labor bill was adopted. One or two things ought to be noted before the vote.

As it went to the House, the Senate bill did not discriminate against Mexican workers. What was sought by the adoption of the McCarthy amendment was to provide for American laborers, American workers, conditions comparable to those that are provided in the agreement entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico for the contracting of Mexican farmworkers. This point should be made crystal clear, because there are those who say that we are attempting to do something that would be injurious to our good friends south of the border—the citizens of Mexico who come to the United States, work on our farms, and thereby earn capital for the improvement of their living conditions.

The Senate has sought to make certain that American workers will not be discriminated against. If the Senate adopted the House bill—that is, the amendment that is before the Senate—American workers would be discriminated against merely because they are American citizens. The Senate version provides that American workers must be offered comparable conditions in transportation, housing, workmen's compensation, work guarantees, and all other benefits that are now offered to the imported Mexican workers.

The House version, because it does not contain the McCarthy amendment, would continue to deny to American nationals certain important benefits which are extended to Mexican nationals. That situation cannot be justified. Under present law and under the House amendment, American workers could get all these benefits if they went to Mexico, took out Mexican citizenship, and then were imported back to the United States as braceros. But American workers could not obtain such benefits if they applied for jobs in this country as American citizens.

The situation means that an American law, passed by the U.S. Congress, makes it a handicap for one having American citizenship to be an American worker. Such conditions cannot be justified.

One further point: The agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States for the importation of Mexican workers also contains a prohibition against discrimination. I applaud that agreement; I salute it. For example, it contains a provision for complete equality of treatment in what are called public accommodations. The agreement between Mexico and the United States is a basic civil rights act. I applaud the agreement for achieving that purpose.

There is a prohibition against any discrimination. For example, the language of the agreement requires that the chief law-enforcement officer of the community in which Mexican workers are employed must require that no discriminatory acts be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality, and further states:

> In the event that the Mexican consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

In other words, the Mexican Government says, in effect, "If it is desired to have Mexicans employed in the United States, they must be given their full equal rights; there must be no discrimination. They shall have access to all places of public accommodation. They shall have access to every public facility in the United States without discrimination."

On that basis, the agreement is excellent. The McCarthy amendment does not alter that agreement; it supports it. The McCarthy amendment merely extends some of the same conditions to American workers.

I am hopeful that the Senate will support the action of the Senate and will not support what is considered to be discriminatory legislation passed by the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank my colleague for his statement. The Mexican Government could in no way be offended by what the Senate intended to do by adopting my amendment. The Mexican Government ought to be pleased. We are merely trying to secure for Americans the same standards of employment as we have provided for Mexicans when they come to this country. The Mexican Government ought to be pleased to know that we are trying to raise the standards for American workers to the level we have insisted should be provided for Mexican workers before they come to the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in support of the pending bill I would like to point out to my colleagues that the passage of the measure would not mean the displacement of one domestic farmworker by Mexican nationals. This program merely insures that farmers engaged in vegetable and similar agricultural production will have the supplemental labor force necessary to plant and harvest their crops next year. Most of the braceros are employed in areas where hot temperatures prevail. This factor, together with the arduous nature of the work, such as continual stooping, has made it impossible for these farmers to fill their necessary work forces from the domestic labor pool.

If Congress does not extend this program, many of our farmers will be forced to curtail production. This would raise the prices on the national market and would depress the agricultural economy in many parts of our country.

The present regulations under which the Secretary of Labor administers the program insures that no domestic farmworker is replaced by this "bracero labor" and that the wage standard paid for this type of work is not depressed.

Our farmers need at least this 1-year period in order to find a solution to their labor problem without curtailment of production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which shows the percentage of cotton harvested by machine in Texas and the average number of domestic agricultural seasonal hired workers in Texas. The table shows that the percentage of cotton harvested by machine in Texas has increased from 44 percent in 1959 to 78 percent in 1962; and it shows that the average number of domestic agricultural seasonal hired workers in Texas have decreased from 141,000 in 1959 to 127,000 in 1962.

I also submit, for printing in the RECORD, a memorandum of statistics on Texas agriculture in connection with the bracero bill; a memorandum of data on the Mexican farm labor program and its effects; and, finally, a table which is taken from page 13 of the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture report (No. 722) on this bill.

There being no objection, the tables and memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Percent of cotton harvested by machine in Texas.

| Year: | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| 1962 | 78 |
| 1961 | 64 |
| 1960 | 58 |
| 1959 | 44 |

2. Average number of domestic agriculture seasonal hired workers in Texas.

| Year: | *Number* |
|---|---|
| 1962 | 127,000 |
| 1961 | 133,000 |
| 1960 | 137,000 |
| 1959 | 141,000 |

Source: BES, Department of Labor, In-Season Farm Labor Report.

### MEMO TO SENATOR YARBOROUGH FROM ALLAN MANDEL RE STATISTICS ON TEXAS AGRICULTURE IN CONNECTION WITH BRACERO BILL

1. No 1963 figures are available on agricultural employmeint in Texas. Figures for agricultural employment, however, show a steady drop over the past 4 years.

Annual average agricultural employment for Texas:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 | 397,992 |
| 1960 | 383,891 |
| 1961 | 360,383 |
| 1962 | 343,100 |

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

2. Average annual total unemployment rate for Texas:

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| 1959 | 4.6 |
| 1960 | 5.1 |
| 1961 | 5.6 |
| 1962 | 4.8 |

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

3. Total number of Mexican workers contracted and recontracted in Texas, 1959–62:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 | 225,498 |
| 1960 | 140,308 |
| 1961 | 135,515 |
| 1962 | 36,289 |

Source: Minority views in Senate report on bracero bill.

4. Number of farms using bracero labor in Texas:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 | 22,310 |
| 1960 | not available |
| 1961 | 16,498 |
| 1962 | 13,092 |

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

5. Total number of farms in Texas:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1959 | 252,000 |
| 1960 | 240,000 |
| 1961 | 232,000 |
| 1962 | 224,000 |

Source: Department of Agriculture.

### DATA ON MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTS

(1) Peak employment of Mexican nationals in Texas totaled 136,200 in 1959. In 1962, a total number of 24,200 Mexican nationals were employed in the peak month. The total number of braceros employed in Texas in 1962 was 36,289; in 1961, 135,515.

(2) The extent of mechanization in Texas is illustrated by the fact that 35 percent of the 1958 crop was mechanically harvested in 1958 as opposed to 78 percent of the crop in 1962.

(3) A two-row cottonpicker cost about $18,000. It can do the work of 50 to 60 handpickers.

(4) The decline in employment of Mexican nationals has been matched by reduced number of domestic workers employed. This is because of mechanization. When a farmer mechanizes, he must go the complete route. This eliminates jobs for domestic workers as well as Mexican nationals.

(5) The peak employment of seasonal agricultural workers in Texas has fallen from 206,200 in 1959 to 180,400 in 1962.

(6) All farmers cannot afford to mechanize. The investment is too great for many. Land topography is also a controlling factor. Smaller farmers will continue to require supplemental labor. It is in their interest to have a supplemental labor program when domestic workers are not available.

(7) The Mexican labor program is important to the economy of Mexico. According to the Department of State remittances home from braceros are estimated to average at least $100 per worker and maybe twice this amount. The Bank of Mexico estimates these remittances at $37 million in 1962. The program offers an important source of temporary employment for Mexican workers.

*Man-months of Mexican labor, by States, 1959–62*

| State | Man-months | | | | Percent change, 1959–62 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | |
| U.S. total | 1,630,950 | 1,358,058 | 1,148,800 | 716,426 | −56 |
| Texas | 733,724 | 569,177 | 496,702 | 188,409 | −74 |
| California | 560,690 | 487,680 | 406,255 | 378,570 | −32 |
| Arizona | 110,608 | 104,078 | 86,810 | 61,666 | −44 |
| Arkansas | 84,689 | 78,436 | 52,988 | 18,664 | −78 |
| New Mexico | 81,368 | 60,362 | 46,783 | 17,888 | −78 |
| Michigan | 22,776 | 21,381 | 23,788 | 18,361 | −19 |
| Colorado | 15,747 | 16,112 | 19,192 | 19,690 | +25 |
| Montana | 3,257 | 3,376 | 3,122 | 2,644 | −19 |
| Nebraska | 2,733 | 2,712 | 2,474 | 2,715 | −1 |
| Wyoming | 1,816 | 1,852 | 2,423 | 2,010 | +11 |
| Georgia | 1,812 | 1,806 | 1,454 | 0 | −100 |
| Wisconsin | 1,496 | 1,531 | 1,340 | 1,327 | −11 |
| Utah | 1,837 | 1,804 | 1,276 | 1,850 | +1 |
| Tennessee | 2,474 | 2,283 | 1,060 | 330 | −87 |
| All others | 4,945 | 4,013 | 1,835 | 2,302 | −53 |

Source: Farm Labor Market Developments, February 1963, BES-USDL.

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, this program is being phased out because of the increasing mechanization of agriculture in Texas.

In the past I have voted for correction of abuses in the bracero program, for the employment of American labor. Under the emergency now existing I will vote for a 1-year extension of it, for this year only. This 1-year extension will provide an opportunity to phase out the bracero program; and that development is inevitable because the use of both bracero labor and domestic agricultural labor is declining, as the result of the increasing mechanization of agriculture. I agree with the chairman, when he states that he will not bring out a bracero bill another year. I vote for this 1-year extension to enable American farmers to adjust their labor supply, to search for domestic labor, and to lighten the disruption caused by a too sudden termination of the program.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

**Mr. McGEE.** Mr. President, I wish to point out that in our area, bracero labor is of very great importance because of the sugarbeet industry. We have found this type of labor most important in connection with the harvesting of the sugarbeet crop.

Therefore, with the understanding that the proposed 1-year extension of the program will be "the end of the line," I hope the Senate will concur in the proposed 1-year extension, which will make good sense and will provide the small sugarbeet farmers with the opportunity they need to employ this type of labor.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to concur in the proposed 1-year extension of the program—and only a 1-year extension.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Three minutes.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Record two telegrams which have come to me from Arizona. One of the telegrams is from Lawrence Anderson, of Arizona Vegetable Distributors. His telegram reads as follows:

Phoenix, Ariz.,
*November 20, 1963.*

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy,
*Senate Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

We are certainly opposed to any extension of Public Law 78 and we ask your help in defeating the passage of this bill. We have plenty of local labor which needs to work. We may have to pay higher wages but we should do this. This national bracero program has done nothing but give us overproduction in all forms of farming as the large farmers bring in such large amounts of labor it depresses all operations. We are small growers and this program is doing nothing but ruining all small growers. So we ask your help to defeat this program.

Lawrence Anderson.

The following telegram has been sent to me by Mr. A. W. Bodine, president of the Bodine Produce Co.:

Phoenix, Ariz.,
*November 15, 1963.*

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy,
*Senate Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

We would like to have your support in voting against any extension of Public Law 78. We are growers and shippers of fruits and vegetables farming over 3,000 acres in the Salt River Valley of Arizona. We have plenty of domestic labor available to do our work or they can be secured at slightly higher wages than we are now paying the Mexican nationals and it will certainly stabilize our fruit and vegetable growing operations. With the tremendous amount of labor in Arizona and California now in all districts it has caused our markets to become very demoralized and growers and shippers are facing losses of many thousands of dollars. We urge and request your support in this matter for an overwhelming defeat of Public Law 78. Thanks.

A. W. Bodine.

These two telegrams were sent to me by growers in Arizona.

I have also received the following telegram from Thomas L. Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, in San Francisco, Calif.:

San Francisco, Calif.,
*November 15, 1963.*

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Air mail specialing November 2 S. F. Examiner article on closing Dole Corp.'s Oakland cannery which employs 930 people during canning season. Of interest to Public Law 78 fight is Dole President Malcolm MacNaughton's reported statement: "Our Oakland plant was designed and equipped to process cling peaches, tomatoes, and tomato products. These products have been in chronic oversupply for several years, resulting in depressed prices and unprofitable operations at this plant."

Thomas L. Pitts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article referred to in Mr. Pitts' telegram.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Dole Shuts Cannery in Oakland

Dole Corp., subsidiary of Castle & Cooke, Inc., announced yesterday that it is permanently closing its 410,000-square-foot Oakland cannery, but will continue to use the warehouse adjacent to it as a distribution center for Dole products.

"Our Oakland plant was designed and equipped to process cling peaches, tomatoes and tomato products," said Malcolm MacNaughton, Dole president. "These products have been in chronic oversupply for several years, resulting in depressed prices and unprofitable operations at this plant.

The plant at 5733 San Leandro Boulevard, formerly F. M. Ball Co., was acquired by Dole in 1955. It normally employed 120 year-round personnel and up to 930 people during the canning season.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me. However, I have not received any further requests for time; therefore, I am ready to vote, and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** All remaining time has been yielded back or expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** Mr. President, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

**Mr. McCARTHY.** The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703. Is it correct that if the pending motion is rejected, it then will be in order for the Senate to request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two bodies to the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1703?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes; but the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**Mr. BREWSTER** (when his name was called). On this question, I have a live pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

**Mr. BEALL** (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

**Mr. PROUTY** (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and that of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.

Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
McGee
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Pearson
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—36

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Beall
Brewster
Carlson
Church
Engle
Hickenlooper
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mechem
Prouty
Smathers
Sparkman

So Mr. ELLENDER's motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1703 was agreed to.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was agreed to be reconsidered.

**Mr. HOLLAND.** Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. RIBICOFF.** Mr. President, my good friend and former colleague in the Cabinet of President Kennedy, Justice Arthur Goldberg, is an American of whom we can all be proud. His dedication to duty and high concepts of service have been fruitful both for his country and his fellow citizens. He recently presented a thoughtful and scholarly paper on the meaning of human rights and the denial of those rights to Jews in the Soviet Union. Justice Goldberg addressed the Jewish Theological Seminary of America's Louis Marshall Award dinner. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HUMAN RIGHTS

(Address by the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, at the Louis Marshall Award dinner of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, November 17, 1963)

I am deeply honored to have received an honorary degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary greatly respected as it justly is for profound scholarship and uncompromising devotion to Jewish learning.

As an outstanding rabbinical school, the seminary, in its teachings, demonstrates that fidelity to Judaism is also devotion to the moral heritage of our civilization. Jewish tradition instructs us to turn inward and to set the true value on our days and works; to find the purposes for which we spend the few years granted to us and to ask whether individual dignity and freedom prosper in our cause.

This seminary and its preeminent place among institutions of Jewish learning is testimonial to the belief shared by Jews throughout the centuries that man's mind and spirit will not relinquish the faith most precious to him, regardless of the torment and suffering through which he must pass.

The sacred text and commentaries which form the subject of the seminary's studies necessarily bring to mind man's ancient and continuing struggle for human rights—the rights of man.

In my service on the Supreme Court I often have occasion to reflect upon the origins of the human rights which are proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States. It would be a mistake to assume that they derive solely from English constitutional history—from Magna Carta or the English Bill of Rights or from John Locke's philosophy, although much is owed to English Barons and philsophers alike. The roots of our contemporary conceptions of human rights reach much deeper in time and thought.

Many commentators have noted the historical connection between our modern views of the rights of man and older natural law thinking which Western civilization inherited from Graeco-Roman culture.

When Lord Coke told King James that the King, though not under any man, is under "God and the law" he was merely paraphrasing Sophocles. For it was the great Greek dramatist in Antigone who had the heroine defy the king by appealing to a "higher law" than the positive law of the state: "Nor did I deem that thou, mortal man, couldst by a breath, annul and override the unwritten immutable laws of heaven; which were not born today or yesterday; they die not, and none knoweth whence they sprang."

But the sources of our Bill of Rights are more ancient even than the Greeks—they reach back to Biblical times and to Judaic-Christian teachings and tradition. The Old and New Testament teach that all men have rights—that every individual has rights because as a child of God he is endowed with human dignity.

The framers of our Constitution were men of varying degrees of property and of education but they shared one thing in common, in addition to patriotism, knowledge of the Holy Scriptures—a household book in colonial times when other books were often unavailable or lacking.

Our Court in its opinions reviewing our Nation's history has often had occasion, including a most recent one, to acknowledge the indebtedness our constitutional theory owes to religious teachings.

In the recent and much commented upon prayer decision (*Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203, 213) Mr. Justice Clark speaking for the Court said: "The fact that the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted in Him is clearly evidenced in their writings, from the Mayflower Compact to the Constitution itself."

Mr. Justice Black, also speaking for the Court, in *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 434 observed: "The history of man is inseparable from the history of religion. And * * * since the beginning of that history many people have devoutly believed that 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of'."

Mr. Justice Douglas for the Court in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313 gave specific recognition to the proposition that "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

And in the Prayer case I pointed out that: "Neither government nor this Court can or should ignore the significance of the fact that a vast portion of our people believe in and worship God and that many of our legal, political, and personal values derive historically from religious teachings."

The Torah teaches what our Bill of Rights recognizes that the history of man's struggle for freedom is in large degree a struggle against oppressive procedures. Both Scriptures and the U.S. Constitution afford the right, basic to a fair trial, to know the charge and to have an adequate opportunity to defend; the right to confront the accuser; the privilege against self-incrimination; protection against double jeopardy; the right to a speedy trial; the right to a trial by a fair and impartial judge; and numerous other procedural safeguards essential to due process of law.

It is commonly assumed that the presumption that a man is innocent until proven guilty is solely an Anglo-Saxon conception. In the ancient Jewish tradition, however, this presumption was so broadly applied that if, in a meeting of the Sanhedrin, no judge volunteered, at the outset, to say a good word for the accused; the case had to be laid over, to give the accused the benefit of reflective application of this great principle.

The noble concept, equal protection of the laws, symbolized by the inscription on the entrance to the Supreme Court building: "Equal Justice Under Law" was long foreshadowed in the famous passage from Leviticus 19: 15: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor."

And fair treatment of neighbors in Holy Scriptures included fair treatment of aliens as well as Jewish citizens.

It is no accident that communism, a materialistic philosophy, stands opposed both in theory and practice to the basic conception of the Bible and of our Constitution enthroning the human rights of individuals. As Professor Cranston has stated in his excellent book, "What Are Human Rights": "Marx regarded the notion of rights of man as a bourgeois illusion; he was opposed to the individualism which underlies the classic doctrine of rights—and by individualism he meant the belief that each particular human person is a unit of value and an end in himself. Marx believed in humanity, in the whole, collective mass of mankind, and he argued that this humanity would come into its own when men ceased to think and feel as individuals with separate inalienable rights."

I mention these differences between these conflicting ideologies not for historic or academic interest but because they have important significance in this very day, as I shall later point out. The patriarchs and sages and the Founding Fathers shared another important idea about the safeguarding of human rights. Both recognized that for the meaningful assertion of these rights, judicial machinery must be provided for their enforcement. From the earliest times, in Judaic tradition, the great rights of man though divinely proclaimed were not deemed self-executing ordinances. On the contrary they were Torah—"law" to be interpreted and adjudicated by the Sanhedrin and other courts.

The practice of judicial review is a very old and never challenged part of Jewish tradition. The great sages were at one with the great Chief Justice, John Marshall in decreeing that supreme law—in the case of the sages scriptures, in the case of Marshall, the Constitution—had to be interpreted and applied by courts to have true meaning and significance.

They both recognized that human rights to be safeguarded must be more than ethical preachments, they must be positive law—legally enforceable standards as well as moral ideals.

The age-long quest for universal adherence to end enforcement of human rights culminated in our times in the provisions of the charter of the United Nations which "reaffirmed faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person." Furthermore, by the charter all member states pledged themselves to take separate and common action for the recognition of these fundamental values.

The charter of the U.N. reflected the consciousness of mankind that the persecution, expulsion and extermination of millions of human beings, including the great body of European Jewry, during World War II exceeded any denial of human rights recorded in the previous history of civilization. This bitter experience awakened world opinion to the importance of extending international protection to the individual.

The United Nations at its meeting in May 1946 established the Commission on Human Rights charged with the responsibility of submitting to the General Assembly recommendations and reports regarding "An International Bill of Rights." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, of blessed memory, was elected Chairman of the Commission.

The Commission on Human Rights thereupon drafted that great document which properly takes its place in the annals of human liberty known as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The declaration is really in two parts. One deals with economic and social problems, the other with political and civil rights. It is the latter that I discuss tonight because of its relationship to my theme.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, like our Constitution and like the Bible, proclaims the dignity of the human person, and defines the rights of man as rights which belong to him simply because he is a man.

Regretfully, the universal declaration provides no means of enforcement. The Communist bloc countries in alliance, sadly enough, with our own and other Western countries objected to the setting up of international machinery for implementation on the untenable grounds that this "would tend to undermine the sovereignty and independence of states." Americans and the ancient Hebrews knew otherwise; they both knew, by historical experience, an unimplemented declaration of human rights amounts only to a manifesto, a statement of ideals and not binding law.

Our Government in 1953 went so far as to announce that it would not sign any treaty on human rights drafted by the United Nations to implement the declaration. This remained our position until 1961 when Mrs. Roosevelt returned to the U.N. and once again announced our support of a binding treaty regarding human rights.

The time is overdue for the adoption of such a treaty and for the establishment of an International Court of Human Rights to implement the essential civil rights of the universal declaration.

Some men of good will believe that world justice through the rule of law can be achieved only with the creation of a full-fledged super state in which all nations are merged—a super national organization that has political and military control over all of its units. My own view accepts Dean Roscoe Pound's premise that "all states need not be merged in a great world state, in which their personality is lost, in order that their conduct may be inquired into and ordered by authority of a world legal order."

I agree with my colleague Mr. Justice Brennan, who is one of the world's leaders in urging international protection for the great rights of man, that: "All that seems necessary is that the United Nations signatories ordain by a simple treaty statute a structure and scheme for securing international due process of the nature of the national due process familiar to every American: A prompt and speedy trial; legal assistance, including assistance for the indigent; prohibition of any kind of undue coercion or influence; freedom to conduct one's defense; the right to a public trial and written proceedings; the presumption of innocence and the burden upon the state to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; and security against cruel and unusual punishments. These standards of due process, and thus of effective justice, only words now in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have their counterparts in our own U.S. Constitution. The vital difference, however, is that our Nation has vitalized them for our people through a national forum and a national procedure for their enforcement."

The establishment of an International Court of Human Rights is not a new or impractical idea. Indeed a beginning has already been made in the creation in 1953 by the 15 countries of the Council of Europe of the European Court of Human Rights, and a Commission of Human Rights which may receive complaints from individuals or groups, or from member nations, of alleged violations of a wide range of human rights.

The absence of an International Court of Human Rights increases the obligation of all who believe in the dignity of man to protest the denial of human rights whenever or wherever it occurs.

The denial of human rights by the Soviet Union to Jews is properly a matter, therefore, of deep concern to all Americans of every religious persuasion.

The evidence of discrimination against Jews by the Government of the Soviet Union is overwhelming.

The 2½ million Jews of the Soviet Union, though classified by the Soviet Constitution and laws as a national group are deprived of their national culture and the means of expressing it. Every other Soviet nationality is permitted the use of its national language and is granted support for its cultural institutions. But the teaching of Hebrew, the biblical language, is banned in the Soviet Union; Yiddish, the tongue of 450,000 Soviet citizens, is discouraged; Jewish schools virtually prohibited and nonexistent; the once flourishing Yiddish theater scarcely tolerated and Jewish literature and publications sharply curtailed.

The religious freedom of Soviet Jews is severely limited—more so than any other religious group; increasingly synagogues are closed and private worship restricted; both Bible and prayer books are denied reprinting; other necessary religious articles made unavailable; the last Kosher butcher shop in Moscow closed down, the ancient Jewish cemetery in Kiev condemned; the state baking of matzoth discontinued; private baking discouraged by prosecutions; the training of Seminarians hampered and religious exchanges discouraged.

Jews are vilified in the Soviet press and other mass media which reflect hostility to the Jewish people as such.

Jewish emigration even for the limited purpose of reuniting families torn asunder by war and Nazi persecution is permitted only on the most insignificant scale.

There is increasing evidence of discrimination against Jews in employment and areas of public life.

Finally, there is also evidence that an undue proportion of Jews is being prosecuted and executed for economic crimes.

No law-abiding citizen of any nation and particularly no judge can urge that any person or group is immune from the equal application of any nation's laws. But when 60 percent of those executed in the Soviet Union for economic crimes are Jews who comprise only a little more than 1 percent of its population then the belief naturally is fostered that Jews are receiving unequal treatment under Soviet law. Particularly is this so, in the setting of other discriminations against the Jews both historical and current in old Russia and in the Soviet Union.

Discrimination against Soviet Jews is not solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union. It is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values. Soviet mistreatment of the Jews violates worldwide concepts of human rights and human dignity; transgresses the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union is a party and violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is morally binding upon all member states of the United Nations.

It is not a sufficient answer to reply, as Soviet officials are wont to do, that some of my best in-laws are Jewish. Nor is it an answer to assert that those charging discrimination are motivated by hostility to the Soviet people. The philosopher Bertrand Russell is a self-proclaimed friend of the Soviet Union and even he has found it necessary to write profound and serious letters to Mr. Khrushchev expressing deep concern about Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens in terms similar to those I have expressed this evening. In stating my views, I do so as an American citizen who supports the effort of our Government, with due regard for our own security as a nation, to seek ways for better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of our people the desire for an end to the cold war and for a just and lasting peace.

In appealing for an end to governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, I am mindful that as a nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great declaration of human rights. I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination.

But one need never apologize for speaking out for human rights of all peoples everywhere. For as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights asserts, "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

## REPORT ON RECENT UNESCO DEVELOPMENTS

**Mr. RIBICOFF.** Mr. President, our former colleague William Benton, who represented my State of Connecticut here in the Senate 1949-53, today represents the United States on the executive Board of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—with personal rank of Ambassador. Bill Benton was one of the founders of UNESCO, during his years as Assistant Secretary of State, immediately after World War II. In Chicago last month, at a conference sponsored by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, he made the first of what we can hope will be a series of reports about recent UNESCO developments. I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### REMARKS OF FORMER SENATOR
### WILLIAM BENTON

We seem to live today in the age of misunderstanding. I've just spent 3 weeks in Paris at a meeting of UNESCO's executive board which was largely dominated by misunderstandings. Indeed, may not the misunderstanding seem more acute than ever—if only because the capacity to communicate is greater than ever? We are living in a world of educational poverty in the midst of communications plenty.

Many of us who worked in the field of world affairs as the war ended were somewhat naively persuaded that Understanding with a capital "U" was the answer to many of mankind's ills. That belief guided us as we wrote UNESCO's charter. Many of us then indulged ourselves in the luxury of believing that when we conquered the misunderstandings in the world there would then be few tensions to be relaxed, few relations to be improved, and no need for such redundancies as "peaceful coexistence."

Yet today we live in an age in which a single misunderstanding might be the last misunderstanding. President Kennedy reminded us last week that 300 million people can die in an hour. So we have a new and necessary test ban agreement. We have a "hot line" telephone linking the White House and the Kremlin. We listen so carefully to Chairman Khrushchev that we scour each word for a hidden meaning. Indeed, we look up all the meanings listed under Mir in our Russian dictionaries whenever he mentions the word "peace." The Soviets even want UNESCO to be converted into a forum on disarmament. We worry. All the world worries.

As we worry tonight we can also remember that we have UNESCO—and we have Director General Rene Maheu who flew from Paris to be our guest in Chicago today.

On and off over the past 18 years I have been fortunate enough to be associated, in varying capacities, with this provocative organization. Ever since World War II UNESCO's friends have watched it work with plodding patience, even though often with little skill, to build what the great Chicagoan, Archibald MacLeish, described in the preamble to the UNESCO constitution as "the defenses of peace." Indeed, my association with UNESCO now covers the entire span of its existence, from sharing in its inception in wartime London, when I was Assistant Secretary of State responsible for the American delegation, through service in various roles to my present assignment as the U.S. member of the UNESCO executive board, the governing body which meets twice a year in Paris.

Over the years that have separated the wartime devastation of Europe from the instruments of horror that now wait beneath their concrete silos in Nebraska cornfields—and in Siberian cornfields—UNESCO has changed its immediate programs though not its fundamental goals. Today, the urgent needs of our times have transformed UNESCO's old priorities into a new challenge—how to use education, science, and culture to help the new nations lift themselves out of the privation, poverty, and ignorance of centuries.

UNESCO went into its first general conference, in 1946, with 24 member nations. Today it counts 113. But the change in its program since 1946-47 seems to me to be roughly a swing of 180°. I remember well the temper immediately on the heels of World War II. Our preoccupations at these early meetings were with the more developed countries, let us call them. How could we handle the defences of peace in men's minds so as to prevent a third world war? At that time we were not giving primary attention to the large areas of the world which were soon to achieve national independence—or even to those other areas which, independent politically, were economically and socially underdeveloped. They did not look like the countries in which future wars would generate.

UNESCO has now swung away from its early primary goal of intellectual cooperation among the more advanced countries—the goal to which the League of Nations' Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was dedicated. The entire structure of the United Nations, indeed, since the early 1950's has increasingly turned its attention to the problems of the less developed countries, or shall we call them hopefully, the developing countries. This shift in emphasis led in 1961 to the adoption by the U.N. General Assembly of a suggestion of President Kennedy. This was the now famous Resolution 1710, which declared the 1960's to be the "decade of development."

Yes, this is the accelerating trend of the last decade—to help the developing countries achieve economic and social progress. The goal is to narrow the existing gap and ultimately to eliminate it. I don't object to a phrase as strong as that.

In the early days of UNESCO, I used to hear the charge and suspicion that the United States was supporting UNESCO financially to further a program of "American cultural imperialism" and "dollar penetration." I am pleased to report that such fears and such talk have disappeared.

* * * * *

The gentleman whom I am pleased to introduce to you at this forum has been a stanch proponent of the preeminence of education as a bulwark against poverty and conflict. His sense of the challenge recalls the words of another famous French visitor to America, Alexis De Tocqueville. De Tocqueville said that "since the uses of intelligence represent the wellsprings of strength and prosperity, we should consider every new scientific development, every new bit of knowledge, every new idea as a nucleus of power placed within the grasp of the people." De Tocqueville and Maheu were the pioneers who saw the issue long before the current crop of economists who are suddenly proclaiming the importance of education as a tool in economic development.

Mr. Maheu is a rare phenomenon—a civil servant in a U.N. agency who has risen to the top and seized the helm. He rose to the eminent post he now holds because of three personal qualities: Intellectual capacity, energy, and the administrative ability to absorb vast quantities of detail and still keep his eye on the horizon. The document we have just been discussing in Paris, spelling out the UNESCO budget and program for 1964-65, is about as thick as the Chicago telephone book. He knows the numbers in it, including those that are unlisted. Literally thousands of projects must be followed through. Politicians must be dealt with (or circumvented). People, money, buildings must be found. He will find them.

"Little by little, I have merged my life with that of the Organization," Mr. Maheu has said.

Rene Maheu sees UNESCO's program as a two-pronged effort; the first, help to the developing nations; the second, what he has termed "a composite interdisciplinary reflection on contemporary man." (This latter shows his preoccupation with the essential philosophic and intellectual aspects of UNESCO.) One day, he hopes, these two currents will meet and blend. He says, "When that happens, there will be complete convergence and all parts of the program will be united and have the same meaning. And then, UNESCO's action will bear its true humanistic stamp."

Mr. Maheu's career is a blend of teaching, journalism, and diplomacy. Born at Saint Gaudens in the Pyrenees, he is familiar with the culture of Spain through firsthand experience. Before the war he served as professor of French literature and philosophy at the French Institute of Great Britain. From 1936 to 1939 he was cultural attaché at the French Embassy in London. Later he was head of the French mission working with the British Ministry of Information. He is indeed a great propagandist whether he likes the term or not.

A couple of weeks ago in Paris he called on the Executive Board to help him develop ideas for UNESCO that will move men's hearts and spirits. He called them ideas with resonance. I ask this Conference to join with him in the pursuit of ideas. As a matter of fact, Mr. Maheu, this Conference here in Chicago is such an idea and I congratulate the National Commission and the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations upon it. Last week I suggested to Mr. Maheu that UNESCO conduct an annual Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Conference on human rights to be attended by the world's great philosophers and scholars interested in this area which is causing us of the United States such "anguish"—to use the word of another Chicagoan, Governor Stevenson. This is the kind of idea to which Rene Maheu responds.

In 1946 he joined the infant UNESCO, as head of the Free Flow of Information Division. This was a division dear to the United States and UNESCO has never done enough with it. This is when I met him. Five years of his subsequent UNESCO experience was as the UNESCO representative to the United Nations in New York. Thus he knows us well. Or shall I say to this Chicago audience, that we can at least hope he knows New York well? After his New York service he was named UNESCO's Deputy Director General.

Emphasis on the priority of education, and on the dignity of the individual, has been with Rene Maheu all his life. He attributes much of his own attitude and his desire to advance social justice to his paternal grandparents, neither of whom could read or write. In his address accepting his present role, Mr. Maheu said: "It is from them that I acquired what I consider to form the essence of my character and convictions, above all else, the longing of the humble for learning; the people's quenchless thirst for social justice."

Mr. Maheu has learned enough from history to agree with the philosopher Henri Bergson that "there is no obstacle which cannot be dealt with by wills sufficiently keyed up if they deal with it in time." Like Bergson, he refuses to believe in "the fatality of history." But he has been acute enough to note that most of mankind must still be fatalities of history—instead of its beneficiaries—as long as most of mankind remains uneducated.

He has now had 17 years of close involvement with UNESCO in which to evolve his own equation for moving men to move mountains by starting with the alphabet.

Mr. Maheu is now urging that UNESCO's program give new priorities to science—to bring science and technology at once to a par with education. Few men so well as Rene Maheu realize that time may not be on UNESCO's side. He thinks that science is.

It is of course impossible to keep an accurate box score on the achievements of an organization such as UNESCO whose working materials are the minds of men and women. Where is an exact box score on the great universities of the city of Chicago? UNESCO can surely point with pride, like a great university, to its accomplishment in helping to infuse a group of widely scattered intellectuals—intellectuals of all races and conditions—with a sense of unity, dignity, and high purpose. However, for all its dedication to such goals, UNESCO's work now rests squarely on the soil of contemporary political reality. Sometimes it seems difficult for intellectuals to accept this necessity. I often hear that some of Mr. Maheu's associates don't accept it. But to build on any other foundation is to use bubbles for bricks and dreams for cornerstones. The present goal of UNESCO is realistically to use the instruments of education, science, and culture to help shape the developing new world.

To help achieve an understanding of this goal is the purpose of this conference in Chicago. Hasn't diplomacy always been too crucial to be left to diplomats? Increasingly it centers on the understanding that comes only through informed, thoughtful public opinion of the kind that develops here.

I hope I need not reassure our honored guest that those here, and the powerful groups they represent throughout the United States, are strong in their support of UNESCO's goals. The continuing support of his organization by the United States, both from a material and political view, is and has been strong and substantial. President Kennedy reaffirmed this support at the time of my appointment when he called on UNESCO to remedy what he called "the desperate lack of adequate and relevant educational resources in those countries of the world which are trying to engineer an escape from ancient poverty."

On behalf of the American people, Mr. Director General, the U.S. Commission for UNESCO and the University of Chicago, with which I have been associated for more than a quarter of a century, I bid you welcome to this rostrum and to this city. You will find a warm welcome here.

---

## A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 22, 1963, the Senate of the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University of North Carolina adopted a resolution expressing the deepest sympathy to the family of the late President John F. Kennedy and declaring support for his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### A Resolution of the University of North Carolina Concerning the Death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Whereas President John F. Kennedy has served this Nation with courage and dignity for 3 years in times of great foreign and domestic turmoil; and

Whereas the President exhibited great devotion and meticulous attention to his duties even up to his final hour, often in the face of acid criticism; and

Whereas he never faltered in his faith and belief in the dignity of all humanity and he proved his conviction by living a life of unceasing struggle against complacency and half-truths; and

Whereas he met an untimely death at the hands of a despicable and misguided assailant: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies meeting in joint session,* That we are deeply shocked and dismayed by the untimely passing of a great American and a noble human being. We express our deepest sympathy to the family of John F. Kennedy for their great loss and do hereby declare our united support and encouragement to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Respectfully submitted.

Leslie W. Bailey, Jr.

Passed by acclamation, November 22, 1963.

Hubert W. Hawkins, Jr.,
*President.*

## DREXEL INDUSTRIES, A MAGNIFICENT EXAMPLE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 7, 1963, the Newcomen Society of North America saluted Drexel Industries, Inc., and its president, Robert O. Huffman, at a dinner at the Hotel Charlotte in Charlotte, N.C. Drexel Industries, which has its home office at Drexel, N.C., constitutes one of the most famous furniture manufacturing organizations in the United States, and one of the finest examples of the free enterprise system to be found anywhere on the face of the earth.

Under the enlightened leadership of its president and directors, Drexel Industries has committed itself to the proposition that the interests of the stockholders and employees are identical. It manifests its commitment in this respect by dividing its profits among its stockholders and employees. In so doing, it points out to all American industries the surest way to industrial peace.

It was my happy privilege to introduce Robert O. Huffman at this dinner, and to hear him recount the history of this organization which has grown from a small beginning to one of the great furniture companies of the United States. This history should be made available to all who believe that the future welfare of our country depends upon the preservation of the free enterprise system.

As a consequence, I ask unanimous consent that my introduction of Mr. Huffman and Mr. Huffman's history of the genesis and development of Drexel Industries be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, such introduction and history were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Senator Ervin Pays Tribute

Robert O. Huffman has lived at Morganton in Burke County, N.C., all of his life. I have known him with affection and admiration at least as far back as the day in the second year of Teddy Roosevelt's administration when the Morganton graded schools opened their doors to Morganton's youth and admitted me to the first grade. Incidentally, Rob Huffman's father and my father were members of the board of trustees who organized these schools at that time.

Rob Huffman traces his ancestry to German and Scotch-Irish folk who settled among the beautiful hills of Burke County before the American Revolution and participated in that fight for freedom.

While winning his bachelor of arts degree at the University of North Carolina, Rob Huffman was chosen president of Phi Beta Kappa because of his intellectual accomplishments and was tapped for membership in the university's highest honor society, the Golden Fleece, because of his demonstrated leadership in many student activities. The esteem in which he was held by his classmates was attested by his selection as permanent president of his class, and the pride of his alma mater in his achievements after graduation was manifested by its bestowal upon him of its honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Rob Huffman's talents would have carried him to the top of any enterprise anywhere in the United States. Instead of succumbing to the temptation to go to what appeared to be at that time more inviting fields elsewhere, he returned to the place of his birth upon his graduation and joined his revered father, Samuel Huffman, in the management of the Drexel Knitting Mills Co., which was then a comparatively small plant engaged in the manufacture of hosiery.

Since that time, Rob Huffman has made contributions of great moment to American business and industry in these capacities: president of the Drexel Knitting Mills; president of the Huffman Hosiery Co.; treasurer, president, and chairman of the board of the Morganton Hosiery Co. and its predecessor the Morganton Full Fashion Hosiery Mills; director of the Huffman Knitting Mills and its predecessor, Huffman Full Fashion Hosiery Mills; president and chairman of the board of Drexel Enterprises and its predecessor, Drexel Furniture Co.; president of the Burke Farmers Cooperative Dairy; member of the advisory board of the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.; member of the executive committee of the Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Co.; director of the American Thread Co.; director of the First National Bank of Morganton; director of the Charlotte branch of Wachovia Bank & Trust Co.; and director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond. He has also rendered significant services to business and industry as a director of the National Association of Manufacturers, vice president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, president of the Southern Hosiery Manufacturers' Association, and director of the Southern Furniture Manufacturers' Association.

Despite the tremendous demands which these positions have made upon his time and energy, Rob Huffman has played a vital role in the civic, public, and religious life of his town, county, area, and State.

As a consequence, he can speak to all his neighbors, both near and far, words similar to those which Kipling spoke to the people of India:

"I have eaten your bread and salt,
I have drunk your water and wine,
The deaths ye died I have watched beside,
And the lives that ye led were mine.

"Was there aught that I did not share
In vigil or toil or ease—
One joy or woe that I did not know
Dear hearts across the seas?"

Rob Huffman has served with rare diligence as chairman of the board of deacons of the First Baptist Church of Morganton; mayor of Morganton; trustee of the Morganton graded schools; president of the Morganton Kiwanis Club; trustee of South Mountain Institute; chairman of the board of trustees of Mars Hill College; trustee of Grace Hospital at Morganton; chairman of the board of governors of the Drexel Foundation; and president of the Business Foundation of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

He has long been interested in Free Masonry, serving for a time as master of the Catawba Valley Lodge No. 217 at Morganton and holding membership as a 32d degree Scottish Rite Mason and Shriner. One of the most inspiring moments of my life was hearing him deliver a masonic lecture on the occasion of my being raised to the degree of Master Mason in Catawba Valley Lodge. He was chosen Morganton's Man of the Year in 1955. During the Second World War, Rob Huffman was called to Washington where he rendered valuable service to the war effort in various positions with the Office of Production Management, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration. He was recalled to further service of this nature with the Office of Price Stabilization during the Korean conflict.

Rob Huffman was happily married to Miss Pearl Trogdon and is the father of three charming girls.

The Swiss philosopher, Amiel, declared that "it is not what he has, or even what he does which expresses the worth of a man, but what he is."

I have told you something about what Rob Huffman has and something about what he does. I am sure, however, that what I have said does not reveal in adequate manner what he is.

Rob Huffman is a man in whom a strong and honest mind, a compassionate and courageous heart, and a simple faith in God and man are blended in harmonious proportions. These attributes are exemplified in everything he thinks, says, or does. As a consequence, he is a genial companion, a true friend, a lover of his fellow man, an exemplary citizen, a devoted churchman, a dedicated free enterpriser, an enlightened industrialist, a hard fighter for causes he believes just, and withal a man of many graces, much humility and a gentle spirit.

I deem it a high privilege to present him to you.

---

## Furniture Giant Grows From Small Beginning

(By Robert O. Huffman, president)

Since I am the only remaining official of Drexel who remembers the organization of that company, and who has been a witness to its affairs, the duty has devolved upon me to read this paper, giving in a most condensed form some of the highlights of the history of this company.

To a very real degree the growth of Drexel has, for 60 years, paralleled the growth of our country and its economy. Like all companies of similar age, Drexel has enjoyed the opportunities and shared in the setbacks and disappointments experienced by business generally.

It is difficult for the younger generation to realize how financially poor this small-town area of western North Carolina was in 1903, and how backward it was by modern standards. It was no easy task to find local subscribers who would obligate themselves to invest something like $33,000 in a new and completely strange manufacturing enterprise. Sixty years ago there was not a mile of good road in Burke County. Such roads as did exist were simply narrow strips of red clay. Any oldtimer here tonight can remember how gooey, slippery, and miry, red clay could be in the rainy season. In this rural section the era of the automobile was some 15 years away. The first gasoline I ever saw was bought from a drugstore.

As it happens, 60 years ago on this very day the organization meeting—the first meeting of the subscribing stockholders of Drexel Furniture Co.—was held at the home of Morganton's then only capitalist, Mr. A. M. Kistler. At this meeting, over which Mr. Kistler presided, a board of directors was chosen, and a manager was elected. The first directors consisted of Messrs. A. M. Kistler, W. C. Ervin, D. B. Mull, S. Huffman, P. W. Patton and J. D. Boger, all of Morganton. Mr. J. S. Abernathy was selected as secretary-treasurer and manager, and this new enterprise was launched.

Sixty years ago pleasures were rarer and simpler. The giant automated corporations of today, at least many of them, were at that time simply small, struggling companies, trying to find for themselves a place in the world. In those days, by force of necessity, rugged individualism characterized the the people of the Southern States, and nowhere was this more true than in Piedmont, N.C., lying at the foot of the great Blue Ridge, and of its offshoot, the South Mountains.

Perhaps one-third of the 620 square miles of Burke County, N.C., was still virgin forest. Even at that late date farmers were cutting down the original forests to clear land on which to scratch out an existence. Transportation was so impossible that many of these beautiful logs were simply piled up and burned, instead of being converted into lumber. It was natural that under such circumstances, with such an abundance of fine timber, that sawmills would be established at sites where it was practical to convey to market the lumber they produced.

In the middle nineties such a sawmill was erected by two businessmen from Morganton, who later became subscribing stockholders to Drexel Furniture Co. These were the late Samuel Huffman and his brother-in-law, D. B. Mull. This little business was established on a railway siding in the midst of a great primeval forest, at what is now known as Drexel, N.C.

A modest degree of prosperity was enjoyed, and other equipment was added from time to time until the point was reached where a general line of building material was produced. The ambition of the founders of this business led them to seek wider activities for the use of the local timber that was available and hence, the idea of a furniture factory for the little community of Drexel was advanced. Merchants, professional, and other businessmen of Morganton and surrounding area became parties to this venture, and a total of something slightly in excess of $30,000 was subscribed to make it possible.

There exists no record of the affairs of this Drexel Furniture Co. from the date of the organization meeting, November 7, 1903, until February 5, 1906, the latter reading:

"J. S. Abernathy resigned as secretary-treasurer on February 5, 1906. F. O. Huffman was elected to succeed Abernathy and took charge on that date."

The next record found in the minute book is a record of disaster, and yet, I cannot help but feel that this is perhaps indicative of something that has characterized Drexel from its beginning. The minutes of a directors' meeting on that date (December 7, 1906) read as follows:

"The meeting was called to order by Mr. A. M. Kistler, president, and steps were taken to look to the rebuilding of the plan which was destroyed by fire on December 7, 1906."

As a teenage boy I happened to be a witness to this meeting. The fire was still burning; the air was full of ashes and smoke; timbers were still falling, and with insurance of only $25,000 this board of directors made the momentous and courageous decision which was to affect the economy of the locality for future years.

The story of Drexel falls naturally into two chapters; first, the story of Drexel Furniture Co. alone, which began on November 7, 1903, and which ended in 1957 when the Morganton Furniture Co., of Morganton, and Heritage Furniture Co., of High Point and Mocksville, were acquired by an exchange of stock, the first such acquisition by the Drexel Furniture Co.

During the first chapter Drexel Furniture Co. enoyed considerable growth. The first balance sheet of record is for the year 1908, at which time the net worth of the company was shown to be $45,766.67. At the close of business on November 30, 1956 the net worth of Drexel Furniture Co. had grown to $13,231,847. Sales had grown from an estimated $150,000 per annum to nearly $29 million.

The first furniture made by Drexel was a bedroom suite of native oak, comprising a bureau, a washstand and a double bed, wholesaling at about $14.50. In the very nature of things it had to be of very simple design and construction. Employees experienced in the manufacture of furniture were almost impossible to obtain. Knowledgeable management was equally rare. It was inevitable that both management and the production force must together learn the intricacies of the manufacture and sale of furniture. Satisfactory sales arrangements were very difficult to secure. The new factories were almost completely in the hands of professional metropolitan sales agents, who designed, priced and sold their furniture.

As the years went by, the workers took on additional skills and management acquired a more complete knowledge with respect to the solution of the problems of management and selling. I can assure you that in the fields of both production and management, the accepted method of making progress was that of trial and error.

Yet, in spite of all the difficulties, and in spite of the lack of knowledge, which could be gained only by experience, this young company prospered steadily. By January 1911 it felt sufficiently prosperous to declare a small dividend. The financial statement for the year 1911 shows an accumulation of profits for the years 1908–11 of $50,071.70.

As the company improved its financial condition it also improved the character and design of its product. In the teens, it pioneered in the manufacture of "figured red gum" furniture, and this product became a very important factor in the furniture field.

It had also somewhat become of age in the area of marketing, and it was no longer so completely at the mercy of one sales agent. Cost systems had been added, which could serve as a proper guide for pricing the furniture. During the year 1915 we read from the minutes that the affairs of the concern were in good shape and the prospects bright. At the 1916 mid-year meeting a dividend of 2 percent per month was declared for the remainder of the year.

The ambitious and still young company was beginning to flex its muscles. In 1918 another 20,000 square feet was added to the one plant at Drexel, and in the same year the Blue Ridge Furniture Co. of Marion was purchased for cash from the owner who was preparing to go into service in World War I.

As of December 30, 1922 the company showed a net worth of $540,323, and in 1923 took two notable steps by declaring a 1,300 percent stock dividend, and by purchasing the plant of the Morganton Manufacturing and Trading Co. in Morganton, thereby entering that town for manufacturing purposes.

During this period of growth, when the principal emphasis was upon production, and the acquisition of facilities for such, the sales of the company had been consolidated to a high degree until a very large part of its total production was being sold to one very large wholesale house, which had a number of branches in strategic areas in the United States. The depression of the thirties found this customer to be in financial difficulties, and it was compelled to go out of business. This left Drexel with two problems: One, to collect the large sum of money due it from the bankrupt customer; and two, to find another outlet for its product. The force of necessity demanded a change of policy in marketing.

Other misfortunes struck the company at this same time. Our beloved president, Mr. A. M. Kistler, who had been president from December 7, 1906, died suddenly on July 5, 1931. Mr. S. R. Collett, longtime director of the company, was chosen to succeed Mr. Kistler in this capacity, and he served from September 3, 1931 to June 27, 1932, when his untimely death occurred. F. O. Huffman was elected president to succeed Mr. Collett.

It was during this period of the early thirties that Drexel suffered its only profitless year, sustaining a loss of some $4,200 for its operations in the year 1933. However, during this year important policies were being created which were greatly and favorably to affect the future of the company. The decision was made to offer the line principally to retail stores and through commission salesmen located in important marketing areas throughout the country. This was a very important step to take, and one which could not bear fruit very rapidly. However, in the light of subsequent years the wisdom of this plan had been demonstrated.

During this difficult period of the early thirties the astute management, finding its company with its principal customer out of business, and with a serious depression raging, realizing that drastic action was necessary if they were to make sales, brought out a bedroom suite of furniture at an extremely low price, and among other places showed it in a rented space in the Furniture Exposition Building in Jamestown, N.Y., which at that time was an important furniture center. The suite of furniture being quite attractive and priced at a ridiculously low figure, practically "stole the show" to such an extent indeed that the Furniture Exposition Building in Jamestown would no longer rent Drexel space for showing. The resourceful management, however, rented an empty store building in Jamestown and kept on selling.

Just in the midst of this period of development tragedy again struck. On May 12, 1935, President F. O. Huffman died in Chicago, making three presidents that Drexel had lost in 4 years. R. O. Huffman was, on June 1, 1935, selected as president of the company.

Mr. T. Henry Wilson, who had for a period of a couple of years been sales manager for Drexel, was elected vice president and general manager. Under his management the company made considerable progress in the character of its line and the expansion of its area of sales. It was during this period that Drexel inaugurated its program of advertising. The first piece of national advertising done by Drexel appeared in a nationally distributed homefurnishings magazine in April 1937. This advertising program has grown by leaps and bounds and is now a very important element in Drexel's marketing effort.

On November 30, 1944, Mr. Wilson and other members of the organization resigned, in order to start their own manufacturing business, and President R. O. Huffman assumed active management of the company. A new organization was set up at the time. Mr. Burton R. Tuxford, one of Drexel's outstanding salesmen was called in to headquarters to act as sales manager. Mr. G. Maurice Hill was brought in to assume charge of production, and Mr. Robert L. Connelly, for several years an accountant with Drexel, was put in charge of finances, and the company continued its growth by increasing its output, diversifying its styling and expanding its sales.

During the 11 years following, sales grew from slightly more than $7 million to slightly less than $29 million. Profits went from $230,700 to $1,800,000. During this period Mr. Tuxford resigned and was succeeded as vice president for marketing by Mr. David J. Brunn.

In January 1951 Drexel purchased for cash all of the outstanding stock of Table Rock Furniture Co. of Morganton. This old and respected company was incorporated in 1925 principally by local stockholders. Mr. N. O. Pitts served continuously as president of Table Rock from its organization to its sale to Drexel. This plant has become an important manufacturing facility for Drexel Furniture Co.

This period to which I refer as the growth period ended with the year 1956. During this period Drexel had grown from within itself. The next period, beginning with 1957 and continuing to the present, I refer to as the expansion period, since during this period three fine companies were acquired by an exchange of stock.

During 1957 Heritage Furniture Co. of High Point, and Mocksville, was acquired by an exchange of stock. This company was established in 1937 by Mr. Elliott S. Wood of High Point for the purpose of manufacturing upholstered furniture for national distribution, and showed a most remarkable growth and success through the years. In 1947 this fine company built a new plant in Mocksville for occasional tables.

At the same time of the acquisition of the Heritage Furniture Co. the Morganton Furniture Co. of Morganton was acquired also by an exchange of stock. This excellent company was only a couple of years younger than Drexel, having been established in 1905. The first superintendent of this plant was Mr. A. C. Chaffee, who moved to Morganton at that time. Mr. Chaffee's affiliation with this company, first as superintendent, then as one of the principal owners and general manager, as president, and finally as chairman of the board, continued through the years until its acquisition by Drexel. Mr. Chaffee was recognized as the dean of the western North Carolina furniture industry, and served on the board of Drexel Furniture Co. from 1957 until his death in 1962.

At the time of these acquisitions the Heritage organization was given the responsibility for the operation of the Morganton Furniture Co. plant, which manufactures bedroom and dining room furniture. This enables Heritage to offer a complete line of bedroom and dining room furniture. The Heritage brand name is recognized as one of the finest names in furniture. The name Morganton through the years has enjoyed a most enviable reputation for the quality of its product.

In January 1961 this expansion was continued by the acquisition, through exchange of stock of the Southern Desk Co., an old and well established company with headquarters at Hickory, which manufactures church, school, library and domitory furniture. This splendid company was established in 1908 by the late George F. Ivey of Hickory, and has shown continuous and steady growth since that time. In 1952 Mr. George F. Ivey died and his son, Mr. Leon S. Ivey succeeded him as president. A new plant, recognized as a model of efficiency, has been built at Hildebran for this company. We are expecting great results from our affiliation with this company.

After the acquisition of these three companies the decision was made to set up a new form of organization, in order to provide a more effective means of coordinating the activities of each company. Therefore, in 1960 the decision was made to merge all of these newly acquired companies into Drexel Furniture Co.; then change the name of the corporation to Drexel Enterprises, Inc., and to operate the companies as divisions of the corporation.

The result is that there are now three such divisions, operating under the corporate board; the Drexel Furniture Co. Division, the Heritage-Morganton Furniture Co. Division, and the Southern Desk Co. Division.

Under this plan of organization each division enjoys a high degree of autonomy, subject only to the general over-all policy determinations of the corporate board. Each division has its own president and complement of officers, its own board of directors, its own sales organization, and is held responsible for its own performance.

Currently, Mr. G. Maurice Hill is president of Drexel Furniture Co., Mr. Charles S. Shaughnessy of the Heritage-Morganton Division and Mr. Leon S. Ivey of the Southern Desk Co. Division.

Any business that has been in successful operation for 60 years must invariably develop certain philosophies. Drexel Enterprises is no exception. There are a number of areas within the operations of this company where very definite philosophies may be observed.

The first of these is that every person who works for Drexel is considered to be an important individual. Some have much greater abilities than others; some have much greater responsibility than others, but it is, nevertheless, definitely our thought that each employee is within himself an individual, and is an important person in the operations of the company.

This philosophy just naturally develops another one, and that is that everyone who works for Drexel should share in the profits, if any, of the division in which he works. Each division is a profit center of its own, and every employee may expect to share in the profits of his division on the basis of a simple formula. In addition to this, each division has a full complement of fringe benefits. There is a uniform pension plan, wholly paid for by the divisions. Hospitalization, major medical, group insurance, and other benefits are offered on a contributing plan.

Several years ago our then chairman of the board (now honorary chairman), Mr. A. L. Harwood, Jr., in making a talk to a group of Drexel employees, established a set of high principles which we earnestly undertake to live up to; that is, that Drexel must be a good neighbor, a good citizen, and a good employer.

We like to believe that wherever we have plants there is ample evidence that we are making a serious effort to live up to these high principles.

So tonight I am able to say to you that the little company, which 60 years ago started out in such insignificant fashion, has now become one of the great furniture companies of America, operating some 15 plants, and doing an annual volume approaching $60 million. There are those who will tell you that the name "Drexel" is the best known name in furniture in this country.

As I look back over the years, I try to analyze the things that have been responsible for the growth of this company. Of course, there are many elements which have contributed to this. Not an unimportant one is just plain good luck, but I do, in my heart, feel that the greatest factor in the growth and development of this company has been the complete dedication of those who, through the years, have been responsible for what has happened. In all my life I have not witnessed any greater selflessness than that which has been demonstrated by the great rank and file of Drexel officials and employees. It is this which has given Drexel its personality and which has furnished the driving force necessary for accomplishing what has been done.

This high morale of the organization, the loyalty of its customers, which include the finest stores in America, the pride of our workers in the company and its product, and a devotion to teamwork form an unbeatable set of circumstances. We have a word for this esprit de corps at Drexel * * * we call it Drexelitis. As long as this characterizes the spirit of Drexel people, there should be no fear for its future.

As I look back over the past 60 years of observing the history and participating in the affairs of Drexel I can recall many happenings in which Drexel might take just pride but in all this period of time I recall no honor so distinguished as that which is being conferred tonight by Newcomen.

I know that I can speak for all Drexel in expressing deep appreciation and great gratitude for this splendid event, and our thanks to you, our neighbors and friends, who have contributed so much to this occasion by your presence.

## OMAHA LATVIAN SOCIETY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY OBSERVANCE

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, on November 16, it was my pleasure to meet with the Omaha Latvian Society in observance of the 45th anniversary of the declaration of Latvian independence.

It was both a moving and inspiring experience, as these sincere and earnest people recalled the 22 years of independence, cultural, social, and economic progress before their beloved ancestral country fell, along with the other Baltic States, under the Communist yoke.

The president of the Omaha Latvian Society, Mr. Arveds Vinovskis, spoke briefly on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an extract of his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### THE LATVIAN PEOPLE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

Forty-five years ago a new independent state was born—the Republic of Latvia. After centuries of foreign domination and servitude, after bitter fights and direct assistance of the United States, Great Britain, and France, Latvia regained its freedom.

During the 22-year period that followed the achievement of independence, cultural as well as economic life in Latvia progressed at a rate seldom surpassed.

In its international relations Latvia adopted a strictly neutral attitude, favoring neither its powerful neighbor to the west, nor its equally powerful neighbor to the east, desiring only to be left alone to enjoy the fruits of its restored freedom.

But the peaceful and happy days lasted not long. The outbreak of World War II was a tragedy for the Baltic States. In October 1939 Latvia and the other Baltic countries—Estonia and Lithuania—were forced to sign a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union, granting of military bases within the territories of the Baltic States.

In his speech at the state dinner given after the signing of the pact, Stalin gave his Bolshevik word of honor that the Soviet Union would adhere to its promises and obligations as specified in the accords just concluded.

It took the people of the Baltic countries 8 months to learn the value of solemnly signed and sealed Soviet obligations, voluntarily offered, and strengthened with Stalin's personal word of honor, though they were.

In June 1940 the Soviet Red Army invaded Latvia. Since that time land, industry, commerce and banking were nationalized. All economic life was disrupted, the people terrorized and pauperized. Farmers were forced into collectivized farming after Soviet pattern. Religious freedom disappeared with other liberties. More than 100,000 people were deported to Siberia, and tens of thousands were killed.

Today, on Latvia's Independence Day, the free world accuses the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against Latvia.

Today the Latvian people in the free world pledge to intensify their joint organized activity for freedom and liberty for all.

ARVEDS VINOVSKIS,
*President, Omaha Latvian Society.*

## MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

**Mr. TALMADGE.** Mr. President, on November 24, on the eve of the late President John F. Kennedy's funeral, Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor of Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta, delivered a heart-warming television message dedicated to the memory of our slain President.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wesberry's message be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### MESSAGE DELIVERED BY DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY, PASTOR, MORNINGSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA, IN MEMORIAL SERVICE ON EVE OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S FUNERAL, SUNDAY NIGHT, NOVEMBER 24, 1963.

The heart of our great Nation has been broken by a deep sorrow. The body of our great President, John F. Kennedy, lies in state under the dome of our Nation's Capitol. Multiplied thousands of people have already passed in review and will, and tomorrow, the day of President Kennedy's funeral, has been declared a day of national mourning.

How quickly and shockingly momentous world events take place. Little did any of us think that we would come to this Thanksgiving Sunday bowed in grief over the untimely and tragic death of our brilliant and gifted leader. Full of life and completely dedicated to the service of the Nation and to the freedom and peace of the entire world, the President of the United States was cruelly and brutally shot and killed by an assassin in Dallas, Tex., last Friday, and now the assassin is dead.

It is as unbelievable as it is shocking—and yet we know it is true. How hard it is for us to believe that such a thing could happen in so-called Christian America. We find it so difficult to believe that we are living in a land where such a thing as burning churches, bombing a synagogue or church, and murdering a President could happen. To think that he who gave his life so freely and who carried within his office the greatest power on earth could have his life snuffed out in such an atrocious way.

This sadly reminds us that the awful sins that helped to crucify the Lord of glory on Calvary over 1900 years ago still lurk in the human heart, and there are yet evil forces that would tear down and destroy everything for which Christ stands and upon which America was built.

President Kennedy commanded the respect, love and admiration of the world. His was a great faith—a true profile of courage. His sacrificial death has a sobering effect upon our Nation and our world. America can never be the same after such a tragic, staggering blow. Whatever comfort there may be in it, God is great enough to make the wrath of man to praise him—out of evil good can come. As great as President Kennedy was in life, he is many times greater in death. This is a better world today because of his life and death and America has been brought closer to God.

Senator WAYNE MORSE was right when he said just before the Senate was recessed Friday: "If ever there was an hour when Americans should pray, this is the hour." This sort of thing humbles us all and causes us to hear again God say, "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." Only time will reveal Mr. Kennedy's contribution to the unity of our world, of the nations, of religious denominations, to brotherhood, justice and peace.

The universe is full of vicarious suffering. One thing lays down its life for another. This is true in the vegetable world as well as the animal world. Everything is bought with a price. Men lay down their lives sometimes in single heroic acts of martydom, sometimes by years of patient, self-denying service—the physician, the school teacher, the engineer, the statesman. Only God knows the price many pay to serve—mothers and fathers, husbands and wives.

Oh, what a price they pay as they suffer and sacrifices for the well-being of their children. This is the nature of atonement, and in every corner of the world it is spelled out like a dim and broken inscription on the fragments of human life. Everywhere this vicarious principle is at work. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

We find this at the very summit of all being. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." We do not expect our great Creator to ignore this vicarious principle with which He has filled the world. He, too, suffers and sacrifices for his children. The throne of God is one of self-sacrificing love. "The Lamb is in the midst of the throne" is a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." There is the blood of the Cross. There is a voice saying, "Father, forgive them."

Father Damien, at the age of 18, joined the Society of the Sacred Heart. When he finished training he asked to go as a missionary to the Hawaiian Islands. Deeply moved by the sad condition of lepers on the Island of Molakai he went to live among and minister to them. "No matter," he said to those who opposed his going, "it is the call of God and of human need, and I am going." He lived with those unhappy people the rest of his life, contracted the dread disease and died from it, disfigured almost beyond recognition, after 26 years of devoted service. Like his Master, whose spirit he had caught, he gave himself for lepers through long years of faithful and loving ministry. So it has been with many others, such as, David Livington, giving his life to Africa; Wilfred Grenfell, of Labrador; Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and now John F. Kennedy.

Nothing short of this experience of earnest service and unflinching sacrifice for the triumph of God's will can interpret to us today the meaning of the sacrifice of Christ on His cross.

Every man or woman who has ever tried to do these things in any measure knows only too well that there can be no salvation either from sin or from the misery sin entails on guilty and innocent alike save by the vicarious sacrifice of some brave, generous servant of righteousness and benefactor of his fellows. This great doctrine of vicarious suffering is self-evident to every man who ever fought entrenched and powerful evil or sought to rescue the wicked from wickedness. To those who know nothing of giving themselves for others this doctrine, like all deeper spiritual truths, remains an unintelligible and impenetrable mystery.

The first man I talked to after the tragic news that our President had been shot said, "I feel guilty myself, as if I had a part in it." Don't we all? For we are all responsible citizens or should be.

This is not the only crisis our Nation ever faced. There have been many others. It was a sad day in America over a hundred years ago when a troubled minister wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and suggested that the recognition of our undying faith should be printed in some form on the coins of our Nation. "This," he wrote, "would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism. This would place us openly under the Divine protection we have personally claimed. From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters."

Upon receipt of this eloquent plea the Treasurer wrote the Director of the Mint in Philadelphia saying, "No nation can be strong except in the strength of God, or safe except in his defense. The trust of our people should be declared in our national coins."

The Director of the Mint ordered that a motto be prepared expressing in fewest words this national recognition. Several mottoes were tried, but in 1864 there first appeared on a U.S. coin, a 2-cent piece, the words, "In God We Trust." These immortal words symbolize the faith and righteousness that exalts a nation, and have a ring of timelessness as though they had been given to our Founding Fathers upon tablets of stone.

Blind indeed are they who would pull this standard down. It must be maintained at all costs. The ancient landmarks for which we are most grateful, and for which our Nation stands and which have made America great, must never be removed: The Bible, church, home, Christian schools, the Lord's day, Sabbath, prayer.

No people ever suffered greater hardships than our pilgrim fathers. Of 102 immigrants who landed on that bleak, rocky, storm-tossed shore of Cape Cod in the winter of 1620, almost half of them died during the first year. They built seven times more graves than they did homes. Only God knows what they suffered during that cold, hard winter. There was sickness, hunger, depression, death, bitterness, sorrow, loneliness, and separation from native land. But of all that history records regarding them, there is nothing written more indelibly than their faith in Almighty God.

For many this may seem like a midnight hour, but let us, like the Psalmist say, "At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto thee because of Thy righteous judgments." And remember, as long as our trust is really in God, all things work together for good—and as He has blessed our Nation in times past, so will He go with us as we face the future, for it is He who says, "Be strong and of good courage, fear not, nor be afraid of them: for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; He will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." Deuteronomy 31: 8.

## WALLS OF FUTILITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 2 entitled "Walls of Futility."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 2, 1963]

### WALLS OF FUTILITY

Some time ago David McDonald of the United Steelworkers joined with steel industry spokesmen to ask for Government protection from foreign steel imports. More recently the AFL-CIO convention passed a stiff resolution indicating that unions in general are beginning to think more and more in terms of import curbs.

It's certainly understandable that people who feel their jobs threatened by imports might fail to appreciate the argument favoring free trade. Still, as past experience well demonstrates, protectionism is futile and self-defeating.

Certainly it is not in the workers' interest. They are also consumers and taxpayers, and when a domestic industry is shielded from foreign competitors, American citizens pay for this "privilege" either through higher prices (the result of tariffs) or more taxes (the result of subsidies) or both. And if, as is likely, the excluded foreigners create higher import barriers of their own, the retaliation hurts other American industries; a great many U.S. jobs depend on exports. All of this applies to Mr. McDonald's steelworkers as well as other workers.

Even the protected industry and its workers ultimately suffer from protectionism. One example is the American shipping industry, where unions along with management support protectionist policies that include both subsidies and protective laws. As a result, the American shipping industry has become so sluggishly dependent on this treatment over the years that it has had to forfeit the flourishing world market to its vigorous foreign rivals, at the expense of thousands of jobs for American seamen and other workers in the maritime industries.

But the worst effect of protectionism and the one most injurious to employment is that it relieves the industry of responsibility for meeting competitive conditions as they really are. The result is that it looks to Government and not its own energies for solutions to every market crisis. A weak and dependent industry can be neither a guarantee of existing jobs nor a creator of new ones.

If union leaders are really in earnest in their effort to improve employment opportunities, they should first address themselves to the labor costs that have been making American industry less able to compete. This would be far more fruitful than a futile attempt to build protective walls that don't really protect.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the editorial very eloquently underscores my own long-held views on foreign trade policy. Protectionism in any form—whether in the guise of unduly restrictive buy American-type legislation, tight quotas on residual fuel oil, a more restrictive antidumping law, or especially costly marketing requirements of imported goods—is against the best interests of the United States.

We are about to embark on some very difficult trade negotiations, the first under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The atmosphere of these negotiations has already been clouded, controversy and suspicion have been provoked, by ill-timed restrictive actions on the part of the EEC—European Common Market—and there are grave doubts as to the likelihood of any worthwhile accomplishments coming out of the forthcoming talks in the foreseeable future. Further restrictive steps on our own part at this time would further endanger these crucial talks.

Restrictions on steel imports proposed by the Steelworkers and the steel industry are not in their own best interest either. Restrictions on our part in turn engender restrictions abroad which would inevitably damage our exports, jobs, the economy, and the balance of payments of the United States.

I am particularly impressed by the editorial's argument that:

> The worst effect of protectionism and the one most injurious to employment is that it relieves the industry of responsibility for meeting competitive conditions as they really are.

The strengthening of the competitive capability and performance of our own economy is the best solution to import competition as well as the meaningful expansion of exports. This means an early enactment of a substantial tax cut, the maintenance of price and wage stability at home, and the reduction of the cost of production through automation with just provision for the workers concerned.

## DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am chairman, has recently held hearings on ocean freight rates and their effects on the balance of payments. Government officials, shippers, and private economists have informed the committee that substantial disparities exist between outbound and inbound ocean freight rates. It costs more to send American products to Europe or Japan than it costs to send European or Japanese products to this country. There is an extensive list of such rate disparities.

Representatives of the American steamship industry recently told the committee that these disparities were insignificant and did not affect the movement of commerce for, in most cases where the disparities existed and where the outbound rate was higher than the inbound rate, these rates were usually "paper rates" under which commerce did not move. Moreover, it was said that many disparities exist in the opposite direction, that is, it costs more to ship commerce inbound from Europe and Japan than it costs to ship American products to Europe or Japan. But, again, they said that such disparities were insignificant because these also were paper differentials.

Mr. President, I am not sure that these disparities exist for the reasons stated by the steamship industry. It is my opinion that many of these disparities are real and not paper disparities, and tend to act as a barrier to American exports.

The Federal Maritime Commission has recently taken a courageous step and ordered the major steamship conferences—the associations of lines which establish ocean freight rates—to reduce their outbound rates to the inbound levels on 45 potential export commodities or justify to the Commission why these disparities exist.

If the disparities are paper disparities and do not affect the movement of commodities, the steamship lines and conferences should not object to their elimination. Apparently this is not their intention, judging from recent newspaper articles which indicate that the steamship industry, particularly the foreign lines, intend to strongly resist the Commission's order. This would indicate that either the American lines are not telling the Joint Economic Committee the whole story when they argue that most rate disparities are not significant, or the American lines cannot influence the steamship conferences which are predominantly controlled by foreign-flag operators.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record various newspaper articles which indicate that there is a serious battle shaping up between the Maritime Commission and the steamship conferences.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record two Washington Post articles which commend the Commission for its action and question whether the United States should continue to allow steamship conferences to exist by exempting them from our antitrust laws.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 4, 1963]

### Regulating Ocean Rates

The Federal Maritime Commission has made a beginning in what hopefully will be a successful effort to narrow the ocean shipping rate differentials that exist between inbound and outbound traffic.

Last June Senator Paul H. Douglas, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, called attention to ocean shipping rates paid on inbound cargoes of steel products which were very much lower than those paid on outbound shipments. Subsequent hearings before his committee revealed a pattern of discriminatory ratemaking practices that inhibit the growth of American exports, thus contributing to our balance-of-payments difficulties.

The Federal Maritime Commission has now directed eight outbound shipping conferences—the cartels in which rates are set—to eliminate the inbound-outbound disparities on some 45 commodities or file justifications for their existence. This is the boldest effort which the Commission has made to date in fulfilling its regulatory responsibilities. But if substantial progress is to be made in eliminating the transport-cost impediments to export growth, a frontal attack will have to be made upon the shipping conference system.

Under the Shipping Act of 1916, American carriers are permitted to join conferences or international cartels of ship operators which set rates and pool revenues. And since it is the policy of the Maritime Administration, now in the Department of Commerce, to withhold subsidies from companies which do not adhere to conference rules, the cartels are in fact bolstered by the coercive power of the Federal Government.

The conferences, which attempt to regulate competition among their members, engage in discriminatory practices which raise shipping rates above their competitive level. There is a dual rate system under which shippers who agree to use only conference liners for some minimum length of time are given lower rates. And in some conferences loyal shippers are rewarded with deferred rebates. Both practices are calculated to tie shippers to conference lines and divert business from the nonconference competitors.

Since ships in the traffic which is outbound from the United States are more fully utilized than those on the inbound runs, there should be a normal inbound-outbound rate differential. But it is magnified by the stronger cartel discipline in the outbound shipping conferences.

The Maritime Commission may be able to narrow these differentials by efforts to regulate the conferences in the manner of public utilities. However, success in such an endeavor involves the policing of hundreds of individual conferences and cooperation of their foreign members. These difficulties raise the question of whether it would not be better to forbid American participation in the shipping cartels, thus relying on the unfettered forces of the marketplace.

---

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1963]

### What To Do About Shipping Conferences

(By Harvey H. Segal)

"People in the same trade," wrote Adam Smith, "seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

And if the good Dr. Smith had been able to observe the activities of the world steamship operators over the past century, his tart statement would have been even less circumspect.

Ever since the later 1860's—and perhaps even before—efforts have been made to regulate competition in ocean shipping through the establishment of conferences in which operators agree to play the game in a gentlemanly fashion by fixing commodity rates on various routes.

At the present time there are scores of shipping conferences or international cartels operating openly with the support of national governments. In the Shipping Act of 1916 and subsequent amendments, Congress authorized American shipowners to participate in conferences. And their power has been bolstered by the policy of the Maritime Administration which withholds subsidies from lines that do not abide by conference agreements.

The market power of the conferences is far from absolute because of competition from nonconference lines and tramp ships. But they have over the years perfected discriminatory devices in order to retain a large share of the market.

There is a system of dual rates which provides lower rates for shippers who agree to use only conference lines for some minimum period of time. Certain conferences offer deferred rebates to loyal customers, and the Celler committee in 1958 uncovered evidence of secret rebates in times of excess capacity or overtonnage. In addition, many conferences have pooling agreements under which the total earnings on a particular route are shared among the members.

Shipping conferences came back into the news when Senator Paul H. Douglas and his colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee revealed that the balance-of-payments problems are being aggravated by the wide disparities between inbound and outbound rates established in the shipping conferences. Douglas' attack led to a shakeup in the Federal Maritime Commission, the agency charged with regulating rates, in which Adm. John Harllee replaced Thomas E. Stakem as chairman.

The Commission has now taken its first significant step in an effort to regulate rates by calling upon eight outbound conferences to correct the alleged disparities on some 45 commodities or provide a justification for their persistence. While welcome, this belated action raises some serious questions about the ability of a U.S. Government agency to perform a regulatory function within the framework of the international shipping cartels.

In the memorandum on ocean freight rates for steel products which Senator Douglas released last June, there are enormous disparities between inbound and outbound rates, far greater than might be justified on economic grounds. However, subsequent testimony before the JEC indicates that ships on the outbound routes are more fully utilized than those on inbound runs, and this fact supports the presumption that some disparities between inbound and outbound rates would persist in the absence of shipping conferences.

But while surprisingly little is known about the conference ratemaking process, it is fair to assume that they have magnified the differentials. Because of higher capacity utilization, discipline in the outbound conferences is stronger, and it is quite likely that they have pegged certain commodity rates at levels which work to both their disadvantage and that of the public at large.

It has been proposed that the Maritime Commission pursue the well-established principles that guide the regulation of domestic utilities and eliminate discriminatory practices which conflict with the national interests. But this hopeful view overlooks several important factors. The rates charged by an electric power utility with an exclusive area franchise can be regulated without difficulty. But the shipping conference is a ratemaking body with an international membership of individual carriers, an organization that may be coerced but never controlled by the agency of a single national government.

Moreover, the conferences, like all international cartels, are inherently unstable. When markets are slack and there is considerable overtonnage, discipline breaks down and individual members make "sweetheart" deals with shippers in order to fend off nonconference competition. In fact, one witness at the JEC hearings, the head of a chemical exporting company, remarked that the only factor that makes the dual-rate system tolerable is the existence of nonconference competition.

If the Maritime Commission is ever to control ocean freight rates, it will have somehow to strengthen the power of the conferences which constitute the only base upon which a regulatory structure can be built. But even if that could be accomplished, the cost would be very high. Ocean freight rates under a weak conference system are already higher than they would be in a free market; and effective regulation might mean an even higher and more rigid rate structure.

The alternative is a policy which would forbid American carriers from participating in the cartels. It might at first result in a greater instability of rates, but free markets offer a solution in an area where the traditional regulatory concepts have little chance of success.

---

[From the Journal of Commerce, Nov. 29, 1963]

### SHIPPING GROUPS PONDER RATE ORDER COURT FIGHT

(By George Panitz)

A serious battle between the steamship industry and the Federal Maritime Commission appears imminent in the wake of a controversial order by the regulatory agency that ship conferences equalize inbound and outbound cargo rates or justify the continuing rate disparity.

Spokesmen for many of the eight U.S. based ocean freight conferences directed to take such action by December 15 voiced bitter denunciations of the FMC move and hinted that a court challenge of the agency's power may definitely be in the offing.

#### BOTH EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

The eight shipping conferences control the outbound rates of American exports to western Europe and the Far East. Eight other ocean freight conferences located abroad and acting similarly on shipments imported to the United States have also been directed to file rate data with the FMC on a selected list of products in the country's foreign commerce, some of these dating back almost 4 years.

However, the order to reduce rates on export commodities applies only to those conferences with headquarters in the United States.

As of Wednesday, only two of the 16 shipping conferences involved had been served with section 21 orders—that part of the FMC authority applying to production of information by steamship companies. They were the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference and the Continental North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference.

Officials of ship line members of the two freight groups declined comment on the FMC action. However, they reflected utter dismay at the agency move while indicating that counteraction is being studied.

Other industry spokesmen termed the FMC order as "stupid" and one official charged that the conferences are being harassed because of pressure from Congress.

#### TWO SENATORS

This was a reference to the activities of Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE in goading the ship regulatory agency to act against conferences in rate matters presumably because it could aid American exports to better compete in foreign markets.

Senator DOUGLAS, from Illinois, and Senator PROXMIRE, from Wisconsin, have persistently charged that conference rate disparities on the same types of cargo items made in the United States and in foreign lands are hurting American trade expansion plans. Only last week and in the face of steamship industry testimony contradicting this stand, Senator PROXMIRE introduced new legislation calling for rate equalization or an explanation by ship lines why a level tariff cannot be issued.

While industry reaction to the FMC order was generally unofficial it was, nevertheless, extremely heated indicating the strong undercurrent of resentment that is affecting the steamship companies. Some conference officials said that they would withhold comment until receipt of the FMC order.

#### WON'T MEET DEADLINE

It became clear, however, that the industry would not meet the December 15 deadline set by the FMC Chairman Adm. John Harllee. Industry spokesmen noted that in addition to possible legal action, delays in complying would probably result from the mass of detail involved in the sweeping order.

In the case of the two North Atlantic-Europe conferences, the FMC has ordered a reduction in the rates of the eastbound conference, to a level of that in the westbound conference on more than a score of products. Included are fruit juices, radios, plywood, electronic data processing computers, hand tools, iron or steel castings and forgings, pipe, finished steel goods, costume jewelry, copper sheets, brass tubing, zinc and lead ingots, unboxed automobiles and trucks, potash, nitrogen and phosphate fertilizers, batteries, printing presses and motorcycles.

However, this is only a partial list of the products that the FMC says should be moved at equal rates to and from the United States.

#### SPOKESMEN COMMENT

The over-reaching nature of the FMC order and the wide number of commodities involved prompted one steamship industry leader to voice disbelief that the agency would even think of taking such action. "This is ratemaking in its most inequitable form," he charged, "Are they (FMC) now going to come in and upset the rate structures that have been built up with approval of shippers for decades?"

Another conference official, whose member lines have had difficult problems with nonconference line competition asked why the FMC has not gone after the independents. "The independents have different rates on their inbound and outbound trades, what about them?"

Still another industry spokesman offering strong support of the conference ratemaking system suggested that the latest FMC move could prove to be "the end of the honeymoon" with the shipping agency that was formed under new legislation in 1961. "We have been bending over backwards to work with the Commission but this has brought nothing but deep resentment," he added.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 29, 1963]

### MARITIME COMMISSION ORDERS OCEAN SHIPPING RATE CHANGE

(By John P. MacKenzie)

The Federal Maritime Commission has made its boldest move to date in its venture into the regulation of ocean shipping rates.

In an action certain to raise storms of protest in the shipping industry, the Commission told 16 major ratesetting conferences of ocean shipping lines to correct "alleged disparities" in rates or give a good reason for not doing so.

The "disparities" listed by the Commission involved about 45 commodities which cost more to export than to import. Congress and the administration have charged that the rate structure—and Commission inaction—have frustrated the U.S. trade expansion program.

The Commission chose the commodities carefully. Ranging from books to sewing machines and canned vegetables, the goods appeared to be selected more for their export potential than for their economic impact on shipping lines.

#### MAY BE FIRST STEP

Since the goods chosen for corrective action do not constitute much of the shipping lines business, the industry must decide whether the rate structure is worth fighting for in prolonged hearings.

If the industry complies with the Commission directive to bring the inbound and outbound rates into line, there is no guarantee that the Commission will not start regulating other, more sensitive commodities.

The Commission directive calls on the conferences, which represent perhaps 100 shipping companies, to correct the disparities by December 15 or file justification for them by December 31.

Although the Commission has the power to amend the rate structure by canceling the conferences exemption from antitrust laws, it has never exercised the power. Until recent prodding by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress and the late President Kennedy, the Commission had declined even to threaten regulation.

#### INVESTIGATIONS STARTED

Last summer, at the height of congressional irritation over the shipping structure, President Kennedy named Commissioner John Harllee as Maritime Chairman. Harllee pledged to move "more vigorously" to implement national export policy.

In a burst of activity, Harllee started one staff investigation into shipping rates for steel, initiated another which headed off a rate increase contemplated by a major Atlantic shipping group, and began studying an export-inhibiting surcharge on shipments from the west coast to Manila.

Joint Committee Chairman PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who spearheaded the congressional inquiry and encouraged President Kennedy's shakeup at Maritime, praised the Commission's move. "If properly followed up," he said, there could be major progress in the battle to redress the U.S. deficit in international payments.

In another response to Capitol Hill criticism, the Commission announced it would hold an open session with a group of lawyers and newsmen to discuss the "free flow of information" in the agency.

Charges that the maritime agencies "are the most secretive in Washington" were made in recent hearings before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

---

[From the Journal of Commerce, Dec. 2, 1963]

### STEEL FREIGHT RATE STUDY SCOPE WIDENS

(By Barbara Spector)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—The Federal Maritime Commission's iron and steel freight rate investigation is turning up facts and figures which conceivably may well lead to similar investigations on the disparity between import and export rates in trades between the United States and Latin America, India and Pakistan.

Ninety percent of the current investigation (docket No. 114), which is limited to the trades between the United States and Europe, Britain, Japan, the Philippines and Australia, informed commission sources told the Journal of Commerce.

Generally, the Commission investigators have found that in the European trade, the Common Market has expanded production facilities rapidly and has possibly outstripped the U.S. ability to market their iron and steel commodities in Europe—except for specialty items." One Commission source put it rather succinctly, "generally there would be no sales of U.S. iron and steel products even if freight rates from the United States were zero."

### DOUGLAS HEARINGS

The Commission investigation, initiated by ex-Chairman Thomas Stakem, results from hearings by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. Senator DOUGLAS has stated that higher export rates from the United States than import rates on similar products moving in the same trades are hurting our balance-of-payments posture. The investigation is aimed at determining just where the disparities lie in the iron and steel industries.

This presently is the only docketed Commission investigation dealing with the disparity between inbound and outbound freight rates.

It is now expected that hearings will begin on January 14 in New York City. Importers and exporters are expected to testify on their ability or inability to make foreign sales as such opportunities relate to freight rates. Importers will be questioned on their ability to make sales here as such sales relate to very low inbound freight rates.

In February similar testimony will be taken in San Francisco. Gulf importers and exporters will be given an opportunity to testify either in New York or a special session may be called in that area. At the conclusion of testimony taking, the hearings will probably resume in Washington so that conference and steamship industry executives, and perhaps iron and steel industry leaders, will have an opportunity to testify.

### RELUCTANT DRAGON

According to informed FMC sources the steel industry, which in the beginning played the reluctant dragon, has become very helpful. U.S. steel companies engaged in the export field at first refused to supply the FMC with the information originally requested. However, these same companies are reportedly now being most cooperative and have submitted to the FMC different information which the Commission regards as more useful to the investigation than the original material sought.

Commission sources indicate that the information from the iron and steel companies will help broaden their investigation to cover why there are rate differentials in the same inbound and outbound trades—and not just to show that they do exist.

The steel companies have handed over to the FMC their correspondence relating to the disagreements with conferences over outbound freight rates, it was learned. The exporters have gotten action on at least half of their complaints, and the Commission will endeavor to show what percentage of half of the complaints were acted upon in a way to satisfy the exporters.

The steel company responses to FMC queries lead the Commission to suspect that rate practices to the Far East from the United States reflect preferential differential treatment for Japan.

### DECLINING MARKET

For instance, in the New York to Far East trade, covered by the Far East Conference, there is a declining U.S. iron and steel market and rates had to be reduced by the conference.

The conference reduced the rates to Hong Kong and Australia, but not to Japan and the Philippines. This backs up FMC thinking that these rates embody a preferential treatment for Japan and the Philippines which keeps those rates high to keep U.S. steel out. In that same trade, it was learned, it was cheaper to ship iron and steel commodities to Korea than to Japan, even though a ship had to stop at Japan before stopping at Korea.

The Far East Conference is made up of four American carriers, nine Japanese, four European and two Philippine flags.

The other conference in that trade, but from the U.S. Pacific coast, the Pacific westbound freight conference is made up of 10 Japanese, 7 American carriers, 4 European and 2 Philippine flags.

### COMMISSION PLANS

The Commission plans to concentrate its hearing time on 4 or 5 of the 10 largest steel companies because they each represent entirely different modes of doing business abroad. It was learned that one of the companies works out of steel mills it has built abroad.

Another area of investigation will be the effect of low import freight rates on the European's ability to capture a good share of the market generally reserved for U.S. production.

The investigators will explore the corporate tieup between Japan's leading shipowners and leading steel producers.

They will also cover the influence British steel producers exercise over British shipowners to raise European inbound rates to a level bound to limit U.S. imports.

The FMC is also expected to explore "the fantastic increase in U.S. imports of Australian steel products in the last 7 or 8 years." FMC wants to know how this came about. This is expected to involve the level of each rate involved.

---

### FEDERAL ORDER AROUSES SHIPPERS: COURT FIGHT SEEN ON RATES

(By Robert S. Burns)

The Federal Maritime Commission's order to steamship conferences to justify or end alleged disparities between export and import freight rates has aroused confusion and resentment along shipping row.

Foreign-based conferences that regulate rates on imports have refused similar orders and have had their refusal backed by the courts. Conferences located in the United States, which set export rates, do not intend to obey the latest order without a fight.

American lines, most of whom are Government subsidized, must comply. One line reported that the job of gathering all the information requested by the Commission would cost at least $20,000.

Inbound conferences have until December 15 to comply with the Commission's request to justify differences in export and import rates. Outbound conferences and some of their member companies have until December 31 to supply information for a rate study being undertaken by the agency.

It is fully expected that the conferences and lines will ask and get an extension of these deadlines. The Commission's action was taken to comply with an order from the Congressional Joint Economic Committee to do something about the alleged disparity in rates by January 10.

The committee is investigating charges that rates on American exports are higher than on similar imports. Last week American shipowners told the committee that most export rates were lower or equal to similar import rates and that in any event the higher export rates did not place American manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage.

It was pointed out that the difference in average profit a revenue ton outbound versus inbound does not exceed 68 cents and probably is less than 50 cents on the adjusted scale.

A typical reaction to the Commission's action was given yesterday. "We are damned upset over the whole situation. It has almost reached the point of harassment," one industry leader said.

"The industry is up in arms * * * this goes well beyond any right the Commission has under the law," another said.

---

## WORLD CONFERENCE ON OCEANOGRAPHY

**Mr. INOUYE.** Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my Senate colleagues to an excellent suggestion made recently by Representative BOB WILSON of California.

Representative WILSON has asked the Congress to call a World Conference on Oceanography to be convened in the United States in 1965.

As the good Representative pointed out, the undetectable approaches to our shores which lie under water constitute one of our greatest perils of enemy surprise attack. And so the subject of national defense would be high on the conference agenda.

But we all know that scientists have only begun to ripple the surface of the vast oceans of the globe in their search for untold treasures.

We know the oceans yield food but we take but a fraction of the food because we have yet to learn the necessary processing techniques. We know the oceans cover enormous mineral wealth, oil and other natural resources.

We know the oceans may some day be a prime source of energy. Each year we have managed to lower the cost of converting salt to fresh water. Some day we may eliminate the world's deserts and convert them into rich, productive farmlands.

To sum up, each of us acknowledges the importance of oceanography and its virtually limitless potentials. A world conference on this subject could not help but prove to be beneficial to the United States and all mankind.

Since my House colleague suggested the conference be held, I can only second his motion—with one slight amendment. I propose Hawaii as an ideal conference site.

Hawaii, surrounded by the Pacific Ocean, is ideally suited as a conference site. The city and county of Honolulu is just now completing a modern civic auditorium complex which would make an ideal location for the Conference.

I am certain the faculty of the University of Hawaii's Geophysics Institute would be happy to act as Conference hosts.

In conclusion I hope that my Senate colleagues will give their wholehearted support to the proposal that a World Conference on Oceanography be held in the United States in 1965, preferably, of course, in Hawaii.

---

## DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 648, Senate bill 1111, be laid down and made the pending business.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 1111, to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to S. 1111 may be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as so amended, be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, S. 1111, implements the report of one of the finest select committees ever created by this body—the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The committee was authorized by Senate resolution 48 of the 86th Congress and was composed of members of the Public Works, Commerce, Agriculture and Forestry, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. The late Senator Robert S. Kerr was its chairman. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL of California, the distinguished minority whip, was vice chairman. Serving on it were Dennis Chavez, chairman of the Public Works Committee; Senator Allen Ellender, the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee; Warren Magnuson, chairman of the Commerce Committee; Senator Henry Jackson, the present chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and such distinguished minority Senators as Senator Milton Young of North Dakota, Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas, Francis Case of South Dakota, and Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. It was a blue-ribbon group, from both sides of the aisle.

Hearings were held the length and breadth of the Nation under the guidance of the chairman, Senator Kerr. The committee studied firsthand in a great majority of States the water problems of each individual area.

While the hearings were being held, experts on water and water-related resources in the Government and private life prepared for the committee a series of 32 studies published as committee prints. An outstanding authority on water problems has described these prints as the finest collection of material on the Nation's water resources ever brought into 6 inches of shelf space—it would take books covering 1000 feet of shelving to find the same material anywhere else, and much of it could not be found elsewhere.

On January 30, 1961, the committee filed its report and recommendations with the Senate. They had found that six types of water problems confront the various areas of the Nation: supply, distribution, natural quality, pollution, variability, and floods.

The committee found that five major regions in the Nation will have inadequate water supply in 1980 to meet anticipated increases in population and economic activity even with full development. They are:

First. South Pacific.

Second. Colorado River basin.

Third. Great Basin—Utah, Nevada, California.

Fourth. Upper Rio Grande-Pecos.

Fifth. Upper Missouri River basin.

By the year 2000, the committee foresaw supply shortages also in the Upper Arkansas-Red River basins, the western Great Lakes States, and the Louisiana-Texas western gulf area.

Other major areas of the Nation, the committee found, would have adequate usable water only if they invest billions of dollars in pollution control, recycling, storage reservoirs to level out variable seasonal flows, and establish more efficient management practices.

The whole great industrial area of the United States from Boston south to Norfolk, Va., and then sweeping west in a great band to Kansas City and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was found to be in the latter category—facing shortages of usable water unless they spend billions to conserve and manage it right.

The Senate select committee made five major recommendations. Shortened, they were:

First. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins in the United States.

Second. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning. A minimum of $5 million should be made available annually for matching by States.

Third. The Federal Government should undertake a coordinated scientific research program on water.

Fourth. The Federal Government should prepare biennially an assessment of the water supply-demand outlook for each of the water resources regions of the United States.

Fifth. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use.

The U.S. Senate has acted to implement the third recommendation by the passage of S. 2, the Water Resources Research Act, now under active consideration by the House committee.

President John F. Kennedy on July 13, 1961, transmitted to Congress the original river basin planning bill, which became S. 2246 of the 87th Congress. Its objectives—to provide for development of comprehensive river basin plans, biennial assessments of regional water needs and supplies, aid to the States, and encouragement of more efficient water development, management, and use—were the same as the objectives in the pending bill, as was much of the language.

Title I of President Kennedy's bill provided for a Federal Water Resources Council, giving it responsibility for the biennial water surveys, stimulation of river basin planning, and administration of aid to the States.

Title II of President Kennedy's bill provided for the establishment of river basin planning commissions, including representatives of the States, whose members would all, however, be appointed by the President.

Title III of the President's bill provided for $5 million in aid to States each year for 10 years for water resources planning, as proposed in bills then pending in Congress by Senator Kerr, chairman of the select committee, and myself.

In August 1961, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee held joint hearings on President Kennedy's bill. There was a good deal of opposition to it from the States represented by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems and from water organizations. They wanted the bill amended to declare that the States had primary interest in water, to provide that planning could not be undertaken in a basin unless two-thirds of the States requested it, and that the Commission would have a voting arrangement in which the States would pretty much dominate the decisions. The President's bill gave the Federal Government all of the final authorities.

In 1962, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held a further hearing to receive the detailed views of the State governments as they had been gathered by the Interstate Conference on Water Problems. The conference submitted an extensively revised version of the bill which was not acceptable to some of us on the committee. But we felt that with patience and diplomacy on both sides, an acceptable bill might be worked out.

I regarded this as an extremely important project. I did not want to see the reports and the work of the Senate select committee entombed in the Archives and forgotten as a dozen major water reports had been filed and forgotten in the past.

This country has been struggling since 1908 to do something about river basin planning—a span of 55 years. On February 3, 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission recommended "prompt and vigorous action by the States and Federal Government to this comprehensive plan for all the Nation's river basins." There have been repeated efforts in the past half century to bring about that river basin plan. They have succeeded in getting the job done in less basins than there are fingers on one hand.

Because of the increasing urgency of our water problems, committee members and staff have spent weeks and months negotiating with representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water

Problems and the various water organizations on an acceptable bill.

In these negotiations, agreement was first reached that the bill would be kept entirely out of the Federal versus State water rights controversy and that it would be drafted so it would not adversely affect any existing agencies operating in the water resources field.

Section 3 of S. 1111 is a statement and a proposed enactment of these basic understandings and purposes. It needs to be read carefully and understood, for it puts aside many of the controversial side issues which have in the past unnecessarily delayed the water planning job. Section 3 reads as follows:

> SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;
>
> (b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

During one of the hearings on this bill, I made the statement that the longstanding water rights controversy between the Federal Government and the States had never prevented the construction of a project. I challenged one witness to name any project which had been forestalled by the rights issue. He named two, but it proved that he was mistaken on both of them.

It was, and is, my belief that if we will set the water engineers and experts from the Federal Government and the States down around a table to come up with the very best possible plan for the use of the water of a river basin, they will get the job done without any extensive debate on rights. They deal in facts. The costs and benefits of alternative projects and programs are measurable. They will study those alternatives, compare them, and select the alternatives which are best for the basin involved.

Time after time the engineers have been able to recommend projects which all of the participants in some of our major water rights battles come in and support and then go back home and start scolding each other about water rights again.

We can plan. We can prepare for the development of our water resources which will be urgently needed in the next 10, 20, and 30 years, if we will just suspend bureaucratic arguments long enough to set up a planning machinery which will allow the engineers and the water experts to get together.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has recommended the passage of S. 1111, has another bill before it, S. 1275, which deals with the State and Federal water rights issue. We are going to hold hearings on it and see if we can take at least a short step toward settlement of that dispute. I am not sure whether we will be able to or not. But that dispute can be dealt with separately and does not need to impede the passage of S. 1111 to get the planning job done.

Mr. President, S. 1111, before the Senate today, still seeks to achieve the same purposes as President Kennedy's bill which is the implementation of recommendations 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

Title I of S. 1111 establishes a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, including the five major agencies which have responsibilities for water resources planning now.

The title charges this Council with performing one of the important jobs recommended by the Select Committee on Water Resources, a biennial assessment of water supply and demand in the various regions of the Nation.

This is a considerably more important function than many realize. Experience shows that it sometimes takes 20 years and longer to bring major water resources facilities from the planning stage to completion. After all the planning is done, after all the blueprints for a dam have been completed and Congress has actually authorized the first money to start work on a dam, it sometimes takes 5 to 7 years just to construct the access roads, excavate, drill foundations, bore water tunnels, and finally erect the structure that will impound a river's waters.

It is too late to start the planning and construction of a dam after a water shortage is upon a city. It must be done years in advance. It is consequently essential that we know years in advance when demand is going to exceed the supply under different stages of development.

A second major function of the Council—and a very important one in some major areas—is to assess the effect that the individual river basin plans will have on other regions in the Nation.

The Mississippi River basin has been treated for Federal water planning and development purposes as six different basins in the past. It has been treated as a Lower Mississippi River basin, the Tennessee, the Ohio, the Upper Mississippi River basin, the Missouri basin, and the Arkansas-Red-White River basin.

Water management in the Tennessee Valley affects water flows in the lower Mississippi below Cairo, Ill., as does water management in the Ohio. Irrigation in Montana and North Dakota affects the amount of water flowing past Vicksburg, Miss. It is necessary that there be a Federal agency making certain that in instances like the Mississippi basin that the plan for one of the six segments does not adversely affect others.

A second example of interbasin relationships which must be watched is interbasin exchange of water. Some of these are intrastate, as in California, where it is planned to divert water from humid northern California areas to arid southern California. Some instances are interstate, such as diversions from the Colorado River to the Missouri and Arkansas River basins.

A third major task of the Water Resources Council has already been undertaken on an ad hoc basis. We needed a new statement of Federal principles, standards, and policies to provide Federal water agencies with a common guide for justification and planning of water projects. President Kennedy asked the four Cabinet members in the proposed Council to meet on an ad hoc basis and prepare such principles and standards, to replace the old and unpopular standards in Budget Circular No. 97. This job has been successfully accomplished. S. 1111 directs the new Council to keep this work current, to develop common cost allocation practices, and to encourage voluntary coordination of the Federal Government's water planning and development activities.

Title II of the bill is where the principal debate has occurred. It provides the pattern for the Federal-State river basin planning commission.

Under S. 1111 the Federal Government and the States will each appoint and pay their own representatives in any commission. The Federal and State people will meet as representatives of autonomous units of government. The commissions will be truly Federal-State, not Federal commissions, to which the President has appointed people intended to represent the viewpoint of the different States. The Federal Government and the States will share in the budget.

Since preparation of the best plan for the development of the water and related land resources of a river basin requires a determination of the best alternatives based on the facts involved, and it is not a political question which can be settled by voting—no provision is made for voting in the commissions. In instances where the engineers and experts finally disagree on what is the best plan, then the commissions will report to the President and the Governors, and through them to the legislative bodies, on the alternatives. Congress ultimately has to authorize the projects. It will not be unusual if we have to judge occasionally between alternative projects. It will be unusual to judge between alternatives where the engineering facts and the anticipated results of the alternatives have been clearly defined and we know the exact nature of the choice we are making.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on which three distinguished members of this body serve with distinction—Senators ERVIN, MUNDT, and MUSKIE—has approved this new type of commission with some enthusiasm.

The Commission includes representatives of the executive branch of the

Federal Government, Senators, Representatives, Governors, State legislators, mayors, county officials, and private citizens.

The members of the Commission, without any dissents, agreed to a report on this bill which said—and I quote their report:

> We believe the concept of Federal-State cooperation in river basin planning and development, as proposed in the bill, is not only desirable but consistent with sound principles of intergovernmental relations in our Federal system. Success of the proposed program of course would depend on the way in which both levels of government react to their responsibilities. By having an active role in the planning process, the States would have an added incentive to undertake developmental and construction projects contained in the plans developed by basin commissions * * *.
>
> Insofar as we are aware, the proposed Federal-State structure for river basin commissions would establish a novel pattern for furthering intergovernmental cooperation, but one of major advantage to our Federal system in that it is adaptable to changing times and circumstances.

I must confess that I am a little bit proud of the fact that in the preparation of this bill there has developed an agency pattern which this great Commission has described as something new and novel, which can be of major advantage in furthering intergovernmental cooperation within our Federal system.

My pride in it is partly based on the source of that comment. The Advisory Commission is not a partisan body, but a bipartisan commission of outstanding practitioners of the art of government at every so-called level within our system.

It includes, besides our three distinguished Senate members, Governors John Anderson, of Kansas, and Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho, Mayors Richard Batterton, of Denver, Raymond Tucker, of St. Louis, Neal Blaisdell, of Hawaii, and Arthur Naftalin, of Minneapolis. The Chairman of the Commission is an outstanding political scientist and administrator, the Honorable Frank Bane.

Title III of the measure before us, Mr. President, is the minimum program of aid to States for water resources planning proposed in the select committee recommendation No. 5. It authorizes the appropriation of $5 million each year for 10 years, to be apportioned out to the States on a matching basis, to develop State water plans, including both intrastate and interstate water resources, their own independent planning, and planning which may be done by title II commissions, interstate compact commission, or other interstate water planning agencies with which the State works.

The formula for the distribution of the State aid funds is a rather complex one, based on population, land area, need for water resources planning, and financial need.

On the average, States can get up to 50 percent matching to pay the cost of developing State water plans. Individual States will be eligible to more or less than 50 percent matching depending on their average per capita income. If their average per capita income is more than the U.S. average, the ratio matching will be less than 50 percent. If their per capita income is low, and they have less than average Americans to spend, then they will get more than 50 percent matching. The Federal matching is never to be more than two-thirds or less than one-third, except in instances where the States adopt some elaborate scheme where even one-third of the cost exceeds their share of the $5 million under the population area need allotment. A State cannot get more than its allotment under the population area need distribution originally made.

I am advised that this same formula is working well in the Pollution Control Act, from which it was taken.

Title IV of the bill has several housekeeping provisions. One authorizes necessary appropriations. Others authorize rulemaking, delegation of some functions by the Council members, borrowing of personnel for planning from established agencies, where it is agreeable to the employing agency, and provision of employee benefit programs.

During committee consideration of the bill, we have adopted several amendments to make it satisfactory to the executive agencies. We adopted one to make it clearer that the measure does not displace, supersede, or limit existing interstate compact commissions and like established agencies.

As the report on the bill states, the only disagreement with the executive branch remaining, of which we are aware, is an authorizing provision which would allow the Civil Service Commission to extend Federal employee benefit programs to commission employees, on a contract basis.

We want the planning commissions to have the very finest water resources planning personnel. We do not want loss of Federal employee benefits to be a deterrent to working for a commission. We would like to see them become an attraction.

In any event, we do not require the Civil Service Commission to contract to provide such benefit programs, we just authorize them to, and then provide a little persuasion toward that end in the report on the bill.

This river basin planning bill has more widespread support than anyone could have conceived possible when the measure was first proposed.

President Dwight Eisenhower's Budget Director sent a river basin planning bill up to Congress on January 16, 1961. It did not even get introduced in Congress until President Kennedy, in July 1961, used the Eisenhower bill as the model for title II of his bill.

Our committee did not have a handful of witnesses in favor of title II in President Kennedy's bill in the first series of hearings. As revised, we have not had a handful of opposition.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems, to which all 50 States belong, endorses it heartily, as does the Council of State Governments, its parent organization.

The National Reclamation Association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the National Association of Soil Conservation District Officials and organizations which have not been in the same room together for years tell us this bill is all right.

Besides their endorsement through the Council of State Governments and Interstate Conference, the officials of 33 States have independently sent in messages of approval, 6 more liked it with certain amendments, and only 3 saw fit to oppose.

Mr. President, I believe we have an opportunity to take a step forward toward this Nation's 55-year-old goal of river basin planning by the enactment of S. 1111.

I hope that the Senate will pass it with a big majority as a recommendation to the House of Representatives to do likewise.

Mr. President, I wish to compliment the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who has been engaged in the study of this bill over a long period of time.

The Senator from Colorado will offer certain amendments. I appreciate the way in which the Senator has worked on the amendments. He has not suddenly flashed them on the Senate, so as to require Senators to consider them suddenly. Over a long period of time he has discussed the principles involved. So far as we can, we shall try to meet the objections and requests of the Senator from Colorado, who has done an extremely outstanding job in this particular field. He has done an outstanding job in many other fields, but this is one field in which I have seen his work, and I appreciate the contribution he has made.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **ANDERSON**. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico for his kind remarks. I always enjoy working with him on any matter which pertains to water, because he is quite knowledgeable in this field.

I am a little embarrassed to find it necessary to offer amendments under these circumstances, although the Senator has been entirely gracious about it. The Senator knows and understands that at the time of both markup sessions on the bill in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I was compelled to attend other committee meetings, and it was not possible for me to attend the sessions on the markup of the bill or to present my amendments, although the Senator and I have discussed many times the general nature of my ideas about the bill.

At this time I merely wish to express my appreciation to the Senator. I believe other Senators would like to ask him some questions. I will yield at this time, so that they may do so, before I make my statement.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, I understand the situation which the

Senator from Colorado faced. He was busily engaged in work on appropriation bills, and in particular one bill with respect to which he was the ranking member of the subcommittee. His presence was absolutely required.

We discussed what we should do—whether we should call off all our hearings and wait until the Senator was free. There is no way of knowing when a Senator will be free these days, with all the responsibilities Senators have.

I therefore suggested to the Senator from Colorado that the bill be reported, with full rights reserved to him to present amendments at a later date if he wished to do so.

The Senator was represented at all hearings by members of his own staff. I appreciate the fact that they have been hardworking and careful. I understood completely the situation in which the Senator from Colorado found himself.

I appreciate the fact that he let us go ahead, complete the hearings, and mark up the bill, without his presence, since his presence was required elsewhere.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that title 3 of the bill provides for an annual authorization of $5 million for 10 years. If these authorizations are fully funded, this could be a $50 million program. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that in the committee report there are certain references made that relate the amount to be granted to each State for study from this $5 million to per capita income. It is provided that it shall vary between one-third and two-third grants, depending on the State's need and its per capita income. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Water flows in unusual ways. It does not always flow through States that have the greatest resources to take care of the problem. I can imagine that the State of New York, for example, which has had an abundant budget surplus, certainly in recent years, could take care of many of these costs; whereas there are many States that are hard pressed to take care of their regular running expenses and must find new sources of revenue. It is preeminently for those States that there is a need for this legislation.

We had long conferences with State officials and with Governors on this subject. It was requested that a formula be placed in the bill which makes it possible to take care of the needs of States which may not have a great supply of money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Procedures for payment of funds are described on page 8 of the committee report. I presume those procedures are spelled out on pages 21, 22, and 23 of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. It starts at the bottom of page 20. Those procedures are all spelled out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 1 of the committee report is contained a list of areas of the country, such as South Pacific, Colorado River basin, Great Basin, and so forth, that are in dire need. They are five areas which by 1980 will have a very substantial water shortage.

Following that list is a list of two or three other areas which will have a serious shortage by the year 2000.

The question that occurs to me is that in some parts of the country there may be initiative and urgent pressure to get these funds for studies, in view of the fact that the bill provides guidelines that are fairly general, and, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, flexible.

I am concerned about the possibility that in other areas, such as the State of Wisconsin—there is mention of the Great Lakes States—there may be a water shortage later. I wonder if people in those States may later be foreclosed because other States had made efforts earlier to get the funds.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is provision in the bill or in the committee report for protection of States which may not be as eager or as alert as other States are.

A few years ago if anyone had suggested that there would be a shortage of water for the city of New York, he would have been laughed off the course, because there were ample reservoirs in and around the city to make sure it would have an adequate supply of water for a long time.

Then came the vogue for swimming pools and other uses for water, and now New York finds itself short of water. It is not a critical shortage of water yet, as it is in other areas, but by the year 2000 it may be.

The provisions of this bill are related to areas that need planning. There will be a time when States which have not done so will require planning, and there will be money available for them. It is the responsibility of a careful administrator to see to it the funds are available for programs that come along now and to be prepared to meet others that may come along later. If certain areas are not now distressed, they may be by the year 2000.

A great many water experts testified before the select committee established under the leadership of the late Senator Kerr and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. It was surprising the calculations they made about the water needs within a few years. People who never worried about the possibility that their States might be short of water realized that they might be critically short of water. That is why, for example, the Atomic Energy Commission is working with the Department of the Interior on a large atomic plan which will not only develop electricity at reasonable rates, but which will develop ways of making used water potable, and also to obtain an unlimited amount of water from the sea for use.

We are doing that because the flow in the Colorado River is far lower than we thought it would be. That may be the experience of other river basins. Therefore, it is necessary to plan long in advance if water is to be made available. Every thought was given to the problem of the States. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] asked many questions concerning his State and others. I think thorough consideration was given to the possibility that there may be a need at a subsequent time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What protections are there to assure that only one, two, three, four, or five States will not get virtually all of this money, as the Senator has said there are? This is a field where there has been a great need for making substantial and expansive studies of this kind.

On page 20 of the bill there is reference to use of the funds. I do not see any limitation as to the amount of funds one State can get.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are these limitations. This money is available on this basis. Some States may get more funds than others, if there is no other demand for the money temporarily. We have to depend on the honesty and integrity of the administrator to take care of that problem. For instance, the Department of Agriculture had to consider acts of Congress for retirement of land. There were limitations on how those lands could pass out of cultivation. Some States did not use up the money at all. Other States needed a great deal more.

We must depend on the administrator to administer the program in a sensible way. If one State did not use any of the money and later wanted it, the administrator would put it back into the program. I think that is the only safe rule to follow.

I do not see how we could require Congress to look into all the details. We would have to depend on the integrity of the administrator. The procedures are set out in the report. I think that is as far as we can go. All we can do is state what the expectations of the water shortage are for the year 2000 or the year 1980. If the Colorado River basin finishes its planning and its work is completed by 1980, then the money could be transferred to the Great Lakes States, for example, for the next 20 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does it mean that the administrator would make a commitment of $5 million each year, or that he would not make a commitment over many years, so that if certain States made applications in 1965 or 1966, for example, other States would not be foreclosed if they decided to come under the program in 1967, for example?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is this the first time the Federal Government has engaged in this kind of program, where it has made grants of this size for study of water resources?

Mr. ANDERSON. The housing authority does it. I also want to say that back in the days of the WPA there were grants given to States on the theory that States should have a shelf full of projects available which might be utilized if we had a depression.

I would not want to say this is the first time it has been done. I only say to the Senator that in the deliberations of the committee we felt this was a field that was pretty well ignored at this time. The water problem is developing very rapidly, and the thing to be done was to pass this bill now and make sure that there was future planning for taking care of this problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the first time for water resources. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I would have to——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The WPA was established to take care of various projects. There might have been some incidental water studies, but not any really significant amount such as in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not of this comprehensive type. I was a part of the WPA, and I had responsibility for all the 11 Western States. The work on the Grand Coulee Dam started as a WPA project. Therefore, it had some of these aspects. However, this is the first time that this kind of comprehensive approach has been made by legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I first inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico has completed his presentation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is not a late hour in this legislative day, but it is a late hour in this legislative session. I regret very much that it is not possible to have a greater number of Senators in attendance for the consideration of the pending bill.

In my opinion, the bill would affect the lives of more people in the United States, their economics and their resources, than any other bill that this Congress will consider this year. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico has this in mind and realizes it as well as I do.

The reason why the bill will affect the lives of people, their economics and their resources, is that it deals drastically, and almost dramatically, with their water resources. To those of us who, like the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I, live in the West, dealing with water is not a new thing. We fight to conserve it. We fight to obtain it. We fight to get the best beneficial use out of it. There are many interstate compacts which have been beat out on the anvil, just as a piece of brass is beaten out on the anvil, to obtain those agreements.

This is a new situation, particularly to the people of the Midwest. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] asked a few questions a few moments ago. The situation is new for the people of the East and of the South. They have never been in the position in which water is literally a lifeblood.

The growth of New Mexico—and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico does not mind my saying this—depends upon how well it serves its water uses as much as on any other dozen factors.

The same thing is true in my State and in every other reclamation State.

It is hard to put this in context with sufficient weight for the people of the Midwest, the East, and the South because they have never faced these problems. They think essentially of water in terms of something that is obtained by the turning of a tap.

In the great arid and semiarid areas of the West, that is not true. It is the subject of constant litigation and constant attention. It is one which we place at the top priority of the things we must watch and attend to assiduously.

With respect to the pending bill, I said in the beginning that I wish it were possible for every Senator to be present. I know it is not. I know that Senators must eat. I know that Senators must attend committee meetings, which are in progress throughout the Capitol. We are doing our best to try to wind up this session. Believe me, Mr. President, when I say that what we do here today on the pending bill will eventually affect the water rights and the water uses of every State in the Union. As the years go by and the pressures build up in the Midwest, the East, and the South, and accelerate and come into the foreground, to that extent the economics and the lives of those States will be affected.

After consultation with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I prepared a series of amendments, which I propose to the pending bill. I believe those amendments would improve it. I must be completely frank in saying that I do not believe that those amendments would make it a good bill. I know that the Senator from New Mexico realizes my position. What we needed in this country many years ago was the establishment of a department of government under a Cabinet head, in the form of a department of natural resources.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico, as I recall—and he often alludes to it both as a matter of humor and with respect to some experiences he had—was the Secretary of Agriculture under President Truman. He is aware, as I am aware, that with the proliferation of interest in resources throughout the various departments of government, the amalgamation of natural resources department under one Cabinet member, which in my opinion and in the opinion of many others would be the proper way to do it, is for all practical purposes an impossibility.

I do not know how the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior could ever be amalgamated, particularly with respect to the Bureau of Public Lands, the Park Service, and the Forest Service, into one department. I am sure no one else knows. It is all so set in the pattern of this country, and the interests are so vested, that the result is a situation of inertia which seems to be impossible to change.

Therefore, what the pending bill does is to offer an alternative to what is not within the bounds of practical reality. It is an attempt to set up a means of dealing with the situation.

I wish to refer very briefly to several points in the bill, and then I shall get to the amendments, which should not take too long a time to consider.

Title I of the bill would establish a Water Resources Council, which is referred to in the bill as the Council. It is to be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from what page he is reading?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am reading from page 3 of the bill, line 7 and subsequently.

I believe the reason for the selection of these particular agencies is apparent from the functions they perform. I shall not try to explain that section further, unless it is desired that I should do so.

What concerns me is that ultimately the bill, even in spite of the amendments I propose to offer, would vest within the Council such great powers over the planning, use, and development of water that we who have been reared in the tradition and the law of States rights and State control of water are fearful of it.

I must say this because the rebuttal could be made to that statement that many interests in this country, waterwise, have looked at the bill, studied it, and now approve of it.

I am not attempting to chastise my good friends of the National Reclamation Association, who, after examining the original bill in 1961, opposed certain phases of it. The present bill is a rewriting of the earlier bill, in an attempt to eliminate some of the objections. But I am somewhat surprised that my good friends in the National Reclamation Association, which has in its membership many outstanding, able water lawyers and others who are knowledgeable in the water field, cannot see the potential dangers in the bill. I do not believe that I am seeing an Indian behind every bush.

By the bill, the Council would be given the authority to—

> (a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to keep the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and
>
> (b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation * * *.

It then gives to the Council certain other powers with respect to the expenditure of funds, planning, and so forth, as might be expected from such a bill.

On page 7, title 2 provides for the establishment of river basin commissions. The subjugation, if I may call it that, of river basin commissions to the Council, which would be an all-Federal agency, is, I believe, the feature of the bill that concerns me the most. The bill defines how the commissions shall be organized, and I shall discuss that provision later, when I offer my amendments. Incidentally, the chairman of each commission would be appointed by the President and would have considerable powers under the bill.

Then provision is made for the organization of the commissions and the duties of the commissions to:

> Engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2.

The commissions shall:

> Submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress.

The commissions shall:

> Submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States, a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such Commission was established.

With these preliminary remarks, I have merely tried to lay the foundation for the broad, general program, which is that because of our history, we are really dealing in an antiquated way with the problem of resources.

I am sure that many persons would desire an entirely different approach than that provided in the bill, if that were possible. I realize that it is not possible. So what I shall try to do, through the amendments which I shall offer, is to bring this proposal into line and attempt to make the bill as compatible as possible with the ideas and theories of the water rights laws that most Western States have.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield? There is one matter I should like to have made clear before I attend a conference on the foreign aid bill.

On page 18, under title 2, section 207 (a) provides:

> Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States.

It appears from the way the bill is written that some States could bring other States into a commission setup, whether the other States wanted to come into the arrangement or not. I want to make certain that the commission could not assess a State if the legislature of that State was opposed to such action.

I recall that a few years ago the West Virginia Legislature declined to make an appropriation for some works in the lower Ohio Valley of which the State did not approve. The Supreme Court decided that West Virginia was liable for the assessment made by the Ohio River Compact Commission. The difference in that case was this: West Virginia had voluntarily joined in the Compact Commission.

But in the bill before us, are we saying—and I am thinking in terms of my own State—that if four, or three, New England States decided that they wanted to establish a commission, could they then assess the State of Vermont for a part of the costs of that commission whether or not Vermont had voluntarily become a member?

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the author of the bill, without losing my right to the floor, because I believe he can best express the intent of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** I assure the Senator from Vermont that the State of Vermont could not be assessed. If four New England States should form such an organization, there would be no power whatever to make the State of Vermont, under this provision, pay a portion of the expense.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Is there not some provision in the bill by which States in a river system could organize a commission and bring other States into the same system, States which perhaps did not care to come into the commission?

**Mr. ANDERSON.** They could not be dragged in.

**Mr. AIKEN.** They could not be dragged in?

**Mr. ANDERSON.** That is correct.

**Mr. AIKEN.** I refer to page 21 of the bill, section 303:

> The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

Does that language mean that one State could submit a program which might affect a river system which extends into other States, and would the council then be required to approve the program submitted by that one State, so long as the program met the certain criteria established by the council?

**Mr. ANDERSON.** This provision is only for the purpose of putting up participating money for States to plan for waters in their own State, or interstate waters insofar as they affect their State. Another State could not step in and say that the State of Vermont must accept a project they have planned. Each State has to stay within its own limits. The council could step in, but not individual States.

**Mr. AIKEN.** I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his assurances regarding limitations on the authority of certain States to assess other States.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Before the Senator from Vermont thanks the Senator from New Mexico too much, and goes to his committee meeting, I should say to him that I have been very much concerned about the operation of section 207.

If it is made very clear that the statement of the Senator from New Mexico is correct, the Senator from Vermont may be assured in his position. But if not, I should say that the language as written cannot be susceptible of any other interpretation than the one which the Senator from Vermont does not want. I read from page 18, line 6:

> SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States.

If we give the Commission the power to determine the proportion of the expense to be borne by the Federal Government and the proportion to be borne by each of the States, in the absence of a clear legislative record here that it is not intended that this be a legal obligation, I submit that probably it would be a legal one.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Let me say to the able Senator from Colorado, who constantly shows us in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he is a good lawyer, that I am not trying to get into an argument with him about the correct interpretation of law. But Delaware is a member of the larger compact, and has refused to pay all of its assessments, and there is no way to collect the rest from Delaware.

**Mr. AIKEN.** And there is also the West Virginia case.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Yes; as the Senator from Vermont says, there is also the West Virginia case.

However, I have referred to the refusal of Delaware to pay, and I have said there is no way to force Delaware. I am very certain that is correct, for over and over again the interpretation has been made in our discussions that that is the way the situation would be. I would hope we would have sufficient legislative history, by means of this exchange, in order to make sure that that is the way it will be. A State cannot be obligated for sums it does not agree to.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Yes.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Then let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, and also to the Senator from Vermont, that it is now agreed that the legislative history of this matter is that section 207 could never constitute a legal basis for a claim against a State.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Or against the Federal Government.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Well, against some State, but not on the basis outlined.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** But the States that would be included would only be included of their own volition.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** However, unless a State came in of its own accord, it could not be assessed. If a State comes in of its own accord, it can be subject to an assessment.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** And if under this paragraph a State has come in of its own volition, rather than by virtue of the fact that a majority of the States worked out such an arrangement and, as a result, the remaining States were brought in, it would be subject to the assessment. In other words, a State which came in of its own volition would be subject to the assessment; but a State which did not come in of its own volition could not be bound by such an assessment.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** I believe the Senator from Colorado said that if a State came in voluntarily, it would be bound by the assessment.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Yes. But if a State did not come in voluntarily, it would not be bound.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** I agree with the Senator from Colorado, and I think the legislative history should be clearly set forth at this point.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the point I wished to have brought out, because in the case of *West Virginia* v. *Simms*, 95 L. Ed. 713, West Virginia came in voluntarily.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the two cases need to be examined simultaneously. West Virginia came in voluntarily, and therefore has had to pay. Delaware did not agree to its assessment and therefore would not have to pay.

Mr. AIKEN. West Virginia came in under the compact.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the Ohio River Sanitation Compact.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the Senator from Ohio was the Governor of his State at the time when this matter arose and West Virginia refused to pay its part.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont whether his question has been answered.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. However, I have a further question to ask.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, Mr. President, on this question will the Senator from Colorado yield, to permit me to make a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, to permit him to make a comment on this subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been stated that only the States which voluntarily join in the program will become liable for the expenses incurred in the operation of the regional council. Section 207 states, however, that each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expenses which shall be borne by the Federal Government and by each of the States.

I am somewhat fearful that this language is quite mandatory, and that any discussions of the nature of the one we are having now, even though made with the best and most honest of intentions, could not change the meaning of clear and unequivocal language. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado comment on that point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be very happy to do so, because I raised this question. If we could lay this matter aside for a few minutes, however, I think the insertion of one or two words—and in that connection we would be thankful for the Senator's help—might clear up this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the wording will be made so clear that it cannot possibly be misinterpreted at a later date, because I am in favor of the proposed legislation as a whole.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question the right or the responsibility of the commission to fix the assessments against the various States; I only point out that if a State has not agreed to accept the arrangement, it does not have to pay the assessment. That point has been clearly established. If a State wishes to pay the assessment, it can do so.

However, the question asked by the Senator from Vermont was whether the assessment could be enforced against Vermont. I say that it is clear, under the Delaware case, that it could not be enforced against Vermont, for if a State does not enter into the arrangement, it does not have to accept the assessment; and Delaware has not agreed to the assessment, and therefore does not have to accept the assessment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator's statement is valuable for the record; it shows that the statements we have previously made do not destroy the power of the commission, under section 207, to determine the proportionate share of the expenses which shall be borne by the Federal Government and the proportionate share which shall be borne by each of the States; but unless a State is a member of the commission on a voluntary basis, there would be no means of enforcement of the assessment, and it would not constitute a legal liability.

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as I am concerned, I should like to have the matter rest in the way the Senator from Colorado has put it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. This clarification should be quite helpful. Of course, there is no certain way to prevent some persons from misinterpreting any act of Congress. Misinterpretations have been made before; and no doubt they will be made again.

I wish to refer to another point: As I understand, if a majority of the States in a region or in an area—and, incidentally, what is the difference between a region and an area? Has that question been brought up yet?

Mr. ALLOTT. Not yet.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the able Senator from Colorado will propose that the word "region" be changed to the word "area." In that way, the wording will be the same; and I shall accept his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am thinking in terms of New England, where there are six States. As I understand this measure, three of them could establish a commission and could require the other three States to become members—inasmuch as it is clear that half of the States in an area can set up a river basin planning commission. But I also understand that it is impossible to get out of the commission without the consent of the majority of the States involved. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Again, I am not trying to hedge on an answer; I only say that the Senator from Colorado has proposed an amendment which will put it on the basis of half of the States, instead of a majority of the States; and we are prepared to accept his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Therefore, I think the correct answer would be that if half vote to go out, the other half would be permitted to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Could half of the States go out by themselves? For instance, in the last 2 or 3 years there has been a perfectly preposterous proposal to establish a compact in New England and to bring in the six New England States. It has not been enacted into law as yet. Nevertheless, the legislatures of four States accepted it—the legislatures of the three southern States and New Hampshire. Maine and Vermont never did accept it. Under the proposed legislation we are considering today—which is a very great improvement over the proposed New England compact—it would still appear to be possible for four New England States to set up a commission, and the other two would become part of the commission, even though they could not be legally assessed or required to pay toward the cost of something they did not want to get into, in the first place.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it is fair to say that four States can set up a commission, but each State is autonomous. They could not drag in Maine and Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. They could not?

Mr. ANDERSON. They could not. There is no authority to take in those two States. Even though an attempt might be made to set up a project on a six-State basis, if only four States agree to setting it up, those four would be the only ones in the plan—unless the others come in.

Mr. AIKEN. Vermont is a party to several regional compacts, which operate amicably and effectively. However, we do not wish to take a chance on getting dragged into something which would clearly be to our detriment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from Vermont has raised a question I was going to ask and which I will try to develop a little further. There is considerable apprehension in the State of Wyoming. As the Senator from New Mexico recognizes, the State of Wyoming might be involved in four major river basin projects, and a couple of less proportion. We are in the Columbia River Valley, the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, and in the Snake River compact. With Utah we are in the Bear River compact.

What would happen if the State of Wyoming chose to go along on a project in one particular area but not the three others? Would we be involved in all of them?

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope I am correct in saying to the Senator that the States that set up projects in areas which the State of Wyoming might not express a desire to join could go ahead with their own work and do their own planning. The State of Wyoming could not be forced into those other commissions. For example, if Wyoming decided to stay only with the Colorado River Basin, that is the only project to which the State would make a contribution and the only one to which the State would be bound.

Mr. SIMPSON. What about the Federal contribution to the State of Wyoming with respect to the one it chose to join?

Mr. ANDERSON. If that is what the State expressed a desire to do, that would be it. States have been determined in the assertion of their own rights. That is why the language is different from that contained in the bill S. 2246. We have had to recognize that the States do have strong feelings. They may wish to join the State of New Mexico in the Colorado River compact but not in the Pecos River compact. Therefore, after much discussion, I am quite sure I am correct in saying that the State of Wyoming could join whatever commission it wished to join, and would be regarded as responsible for assessments in that particular area and in that particular area alone.

Mr. ALLOTT. To clear up this point for the legislative record, and in response to the question of the Senator from Wyoming, if we assume that the State of Wyoming is involved in four separate basins—perhaps it is five—then it could be a member of four basin commissions or it could be a member of one basin commission, as it chooses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Whichever it desires.

Mr. ALLOTT. Whichever it desires.

Mr. SIMPSON. I have a question which either the Senator from Colorado or the Senator from New Mexico may wish to answer: What is the situation with respect to river basin compacts under the purview of this enactment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I would be happy to answer that question if it meets with the approval of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Colorado answer that question.

Mr. ALLOTT. The bill is clear. I shall read into the RECORD page 2, section 3, subsection (a) and subsection (b) of the bill, so that the answer may be clear:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed—
>
> (a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;
>
> (b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

It is my understanding—and I am sure it is the absolute intent of the author of the bill—that nothing in the bill can, in any way or in any manner, modify any present existing State law with respect to water, or can modify any existing compact or agreement between the States with regard to water.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator from New Mexico concur in that understanding?

Mr. ANDERSON. I concur completely with what the Senator from Colorado has said. This language has been picked up and repeated in the report. Immediately ahead of it appears the following language:

> Avoid any attempt to adjudicate or affect State and Federal authorities over water and related land resources, or to displace any established agencies, or in any way alter existing interstate and State-Federal arrangements or compacts, such as the Colorado River compact with its upper and lower Colorado Basin divisions.

We went out of our way to be sure to be understood, in exactly the way the Senator from Colorado has stated it.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Colorado. I wonder if I may now intrude some questions—not objections, but questions—with respect to the State of Wyoming because we are involved in so many of these compacts it is vital to us, as I know it is also to the State of Colorado and other Western States such as Idaho and Montana.

I have not been able to check my objections to the bill. If the Senators from Colorado and New Mexico will indulge me and try to answer a question, perhaps they could give me the benefit of their experience.

I raise the following question first of all:

> One of the most important of these revisions would be a provision that wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which Congress has given its consent, each such subbasin shall be treated as a separate river basin for the purposes of this act.

That is on page 99 of the hearings. The Senator from Colorado has adequately answered that question. Reading further:

> This suggested change to S. 1111 would provide better planning coordination on those particular river basins which encompass different regions where the physical, economic, and social conditions of the upper basin States may be vastly different from those of the lower basin States.

Then I raised the question of national resources:

> The procedure by which a river basin commission is established could be strengthened by making provisions by which a majority of the States in a given river basin would have to be in concurrence on the establishment of such a commission.

Is that taken care of in the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. To answer the question of the Senator from Wyoming, we are really operating backwards at this moment. An amendment will be offered which will contain the language which was read by the Senator from Wyoming, or similar language for the same purpose, as suggested by the Governor of Wyoming and by the Senator from Wyoming, as well as by Governor Love of Colorado and others. I shall offer that amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The language I read a moment ago from the report specifically pointed to the Colorado River compact, and then pointed to the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basin to show that we had a subbasin. We are not going to disturb that situation either. That is why I am prepared to accept the amendment which the Senator from Colorado will offer. We fully concur that the protections for the subbasins should remain.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know that the Senator from New Mexico is desirous to have the legislative history disclose these points.

I have one additional question which gives us considerable concern. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado could tell me if he will propose an amendment with respect to the following language:

> Other aspects which are of great concern are the procedures by which the State's financial assistance allotment will be computed under title III. It appears that the Council will determine the need for comprehensive planning and the need for financial assistance of any particular State and further, if a State's program does not meet the approval of the Council the Council can discontinue any further payments until such time as the State's program is carried out in accordance with the Council's wishes.

That language appears to place the States under the direct control of the Federal Government or risk the loss of any financial assistance under the act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I can only give my own impression. I do not have an amendment to that particular part of the bill. I did not have time to prepare an amendment or to have a study made of an amendment which would take care of this. However, the bill will go to the House.

My own point of view agrees with that of the Senator from Wyoming. That is probably one of the weak places of the bill, from my standpoint.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank my friend. The point I wish to bring to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming is found on page 21, under "State Programs."

Mr. SIMPSON. In the report?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the bill itself. That is section 303, wherein it is provided:

> The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

and then there are set forth the qualifications. I believe it is the intention to say that the Council cannot capriciously toss these things aside.

Mr. SIMPSON. If the Senator will pardon an interjection, that is the section which disturbs us, because it seems to be contrary to what the Senator just stated. It seems to give the total authority to the Council.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is difficult to assume that if a State turned in a plan it would not be a comprehensive plan with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources. If the plan covered those things, it would automatically mean the State would get its share of the money. If there were turned in some program which would not do that, the Senator from Wyoming and I would not wish it paid for, anyway.

We tried to say that the discretion of the Council to turn them down, would be tied to the requirement on the States to do certain things. We believe those things are reasonable.

The Council of State Governments has examined this language carefully and is completely satisfied with this language. They believe it does exactly that.

Mr. SIMPSON. I know the Council of State Governments has. It was the statement of the Council of State Governments with which we took issue.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sorry; I did not recognize that.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that we tried. We carried this language to them. We tried to make sure that every State official examined it and was satisfied with it. We now have language they have been satisfied with. I believe it is satisfactory.

Even though it does seem to say that the Council may hold back money, it cannot do so if a State puts up a program as set forth from line 20 on page 21 over to the top of page 23. These are the types of programs which the Senator from Wyoming would support if he were chief executive of his State again. This is exactly what we want the States to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from New Mexico has done a thorough and exhaustive job, of which he is so capable, on this particular measure. I am not taking issue with the work of the committee. When the Senator from New Mexico tells me something I believe it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to have me yield at the moment, I should like to proceed to a consideration of the amendments. I believe they can be dealt with rapidly.

I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for immediate consideration. The amendment pertains to page 6, line 19, and page 16, line 7, of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 19, after the word "by" it is proposed to insert the following: "a majority of".

On page 16, line 7, after the word "by" it is proposed to insert the following: "a majority of."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have heard the arguments made that under the financial aid provisions of the bill States could be compelled to abandon their own views and to conform to what the Federal Government suggests. I direct the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] to page 21, to section 303, which provides:

> The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—
>
> (1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination.

It tells what the State must do.

On page 23, under section 304, it is provided:

> Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—
>
> (a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or
>
> (b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure.

My query is: Does not this language, giving the Council the control over the purse strings, give to the Council the positive and absolute power to compel compliance by the State with the Council views on what should be done? I should like to ask both Senators that question.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will reply to the distinguished Senator; and I know the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will wish to reply also.

When I discussed this matter previously, I believe the Senator had not yet come to the Chamber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is, in my opinion, one of the great weaknesses of the bill. The Council is composed, as the Senator knows, of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, the Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

All those individuals are Presidential appointees, whose nominations are subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The powers of which the Senator spoke are listed on page 23, and it is absolutely correct to state that they are to be given to the Council. They are extensive. They could amount to a choke leash, if the Council were arbitrary enough to exercise the powers in an arbitrary manner.

I know the Senator from New Mexico will say, "We must presume that those people are going to be reasonable." I suppose we must make such an assumption.

There is one attempt made to lay out guidelines for the action of the Council, which the Senator read, and which of course is particularly subsection 1 of section 303, which states that—

> The States must provide for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination—

The Senator left out, in my opinion, the most important part of the paragraph: "with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields."

This last phrase, in my opinion, is the real guide that is to benefit the council. The council must approve a State program if it meets these guidelines. The only trouble is that we cannot bring a council into court if we think it has abused its discretion.

The Senator has very well put his finger on a sensitive part of the bill.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], because he may have a different view.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I went into the Department of Agriculture I discovered that the Extension Service had much power over great groups. An extension director who wanted to do so could have made it tough on any individual State extension service. But a hundred years of experience in the Department of Agriculture shows that under administration of the Morrill Act it has not done so. Once in a while a director got out of hand and he was fired; but the States and the land grant colleges did not get into trouble.

The relationship to the States and to the land grant colleges has been extremely good, although there is power given if the land grant colleges do not do the things they are supposed to do, to withhold funds.

The purpose of this language is that, for example, if we started with development of the Pecos River, joining with the State of Texas, and funds were granted for that purpose, and then we decided to develop the Mimbres River, that would be in violation of what we said we were going to do. This language would stop that. It would be an example of the State not doing what it said it was going to do. Funds cannot be wasted by a State on a frivolous program.

I recognize the difficulty of guaranteeing the integrity of an official. It is difficult to make such a guarantee. But, generally speaking, with this particular language, the administrator must put up the money, and he must make sure that the State does what it said it would do. I am not sure whether the Federal Government could be sued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Looking at section 305, which deals with the Federal share, it reads:

> The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States. * * *

I shall not read on. Does the provision for imposing a share of cost deal with the cost of a project to develop the water resources, or the cost of making plans?

Mr. ANDERSON. Planning only.

Mr. ALLOTT. It has to do with the State's planning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I does not deal with the project?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we could not justify it on that basis.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While the experience of the Senator from New Mexico with the Department of Agriculture may be comforting, I had experiences with respect to a situation in aid to the handicapped, under the Federal aid program, under which 87 of the 88 counties in the State complied. One county, Harrison County, said, "We will not let the U.S. Government tell us how we shall employ our personnel to administer the program." I begged Harrison County to comply. It asserted its sovereignty and independence, and refused to do it. The bureaucrats said the county was going to comply or the State of Ohio would lose all of the money to which it was entitled.

When Governor Davey, now deceased, was the head of our State, Ohio had several million dollars taken from it for failure to comply with some picayune and arbitrary provision that was asserted. That is the other side of the picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad that did not happen in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, do the amendments now pending refer to page 6 of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. They refer to page 6 and page 16, do they not?

Mr. ALLOTT. Page 6 and page 16.

I refer, first of all, to page 6, line 19. The question here is the power to administer oaths and whether or not this power shall be exercised. The amendment requires here, and in the same situation with respect to the Commission, on page 16, the insertion of the words "a majority of them." It means that a majority of the council and a majority of the Commission must endow the power to administer oaths and determine that the taking of testimony under oath is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in behalf of the committee, I am glad to accept the amendments. I ask the Chair to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of amendments and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 20, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 8, line 11, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 8, line 16, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 9, line 4, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 10, line 8, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 10, line 18, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 11, line 1, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

On page 13, line 12, to strike the word "region,", and insert in lieu thereof the word "area,".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado amending the bill in eight particulars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 2, beginning with the word "Whenever", strike all through line 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a Commission be established, the Council may upon a finding of need recommend to the President that such planning as is otherwise authorized by law proceed."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment. I thank the Senator from Colorado again for his tolerance and willingness to arrive at an adjustment. He wished to strike out additional language, but agreed not to do so when it was pointed out that some of the language might be desirable to retain.

The amendment as now proposed is satisfactory to the committee, and I am glad to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 10, after the word "or", strike "agreement of", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not less than one-half".

Mr. ALLOTT. The purpose of the amendment is to deal with the several matters which were discussed by several Senators, or were the subject of inquiry by several Senators, with respect to the ability of States to terminate the Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 16, strike the word "recorded.", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "set forth in the record.".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about this particular amendment, to establish some legislative history with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

It is my understanding and comprehension of the bill that there will not be any votes in the ordinary consideration of matters before the Commission. To this end, this language has been placed in the bill, in subparagraph (d) on page 12:

> In the work of the Commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views.

Then, at the end of the same paragraph, it is provided:

> The position of the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the vice chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be recorded.

My question related to the word "recorded."

I do not know whether "recorded" puts this provision in the category of requiring a vote or not. The word is indefinite. Perhaps its meaning should be made clear.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. I had a different view. I thought "recorded" might mean that the result was put into a transcriber and forgotten. But when it is "set forth in the RECORD," I understand it. I am therefore happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would have been prepared to leave the bill as it was if the Senator's version had been accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 11, after the word "portion", it is proposed to insert the word "thereof".

On page 13, line 15, after the word "portion", it is proposed to insert the word "thereof"; after the word "revision", insert the word "thereof".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 16, line 25, after the word "shall", it is proposed to insert the following: ", in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof,".

In page 17, line 5, beginning with the word "In", it is proposed to strike all through line 8.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this amendment merely seeks to clear up and define some of the housekeeping duties of the Commission. I believe it would clarify the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the amendment is better. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 24, line 5, it is proposed to strike the figure "66⅔", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "50".

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the share which Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would obtain of the Federal Government's contribution. In view of the large amount of money that the Federal Government spends to support both of those areas, I have suggested that the sum of 50 percent be inserted in lieu of 66⅔ percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee is prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 25, line 23, it is proposed to strike the period, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed $7,500,000 for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years thereafter."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment because, as I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, I do not believe in open-end authorizations. The amendment merely places a limitation of $7,500,000 upon the expenditures of each of the first 3 fiscal years.

Mr. ANDERSON. It does not, however, mean that we are saying there shall be no more appropriations at the end of that time, but leaves the question open to congressional review at that time?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. The statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct; but the bill as it was written provided for an open-end authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk for immediate consideration an amendment pertaining to page 8, line 1. I call the particular attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 8, line 1, it is proposed to strike the period and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That for the purposes of this Act wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an Act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, each subbasin shall be treated as a separate basin."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the amendment is offered to allay the fears of many persons, including myself, as to the extent to which the Commissions could include other places and vast areas of land. It relates also to the colloquy which was conducted earlier with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and other Senators.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, throughout the colloquy, I have been saying that this is what the bill means. Therefore, I certainly would be in no position to oppose the amendment. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico concerning one further amendment which I have prepared in the alternative. My feelings are not too strong about either proposal, but I do prefer one. The amendment relates to page 10, line 6, the membership of the commissions.

As the bill is now constructed, the President could appoint an almost indefinite number of members to each basin commission. It is not necessary to explain this in detail as it will become evident by reading the bill. The amendment I propose to offer reads as follows: At the end of line 6, strike the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That the total Federal membership so appointed shall not exceed the State membership as hereinafter appointed."

Mr. AIKEN. Including the chairman?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will add "including the chairman."

I also have an amendment which reads: "shall not equal or exceed."

I prefer the one I first read. I should like to have the reaction of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall have to say to my friend from Colorado that I would not be in favor of that amendment. I shall tell him why. The amendment presumes there would be a vote. There would not be a vote. I do not want to have anything in the bill that would indicate there might be a vote.

A river compact might be entered into by only 2 States. Therefore, that project would be limited to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Interior. I should like to be certain that representatives of the Federal Power Commission and various other groups concerned were present.

I hope the Senator will not press the amendment, because I think it would do what we do not want to have done. I think it would establish two classes of voters, Federal on one side, and State on the other. This would result in a shift in position that neither of us would like when we were finished with the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I concur in the view that there shall not be voting. I do not think it is necessary to draw this proposal out in this way; but I suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that in the case of a given river compact, several departments could be involved; for example, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and perhaps also the Federal Power Commission. Even, in some instances, the Interstate Commerce Commission might be involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare might be concerned.

In almost any instance, there could be an overwhelming majority of persons who represented solely the executive branch of the Government.

Frankly, I am aware of the problem that the Senator from New Mexico stated; that in a two-State or a three-State compact, there might not be the representation that was desired. For example, in the case of a two-State compact it might also be a necessity to have the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and perhaps the Federal Power Commission represented. At the same time, if there were a compact among two, three, or four States, I can readily conceive that the number of departments of Government that might have an interest, or that could be defined by the President to have an interest, in the particular basin could be composed of five, six, or eight persons.

Therefore, even if no vote were cast by the representatives of the Federal agencies, their presence there could overawe and dominate in connection with the activities of the commission.

Perhaps the Senator has in mind a better way to handle this matter. Both of us realize that this measure must be dealt with by the House of Representatives, which will work its own will on it. However, I do not believe we should overlook this point, and I do not think the State governments which have examined it should have overlooked the possibility of complete dominance by the Federal Government members of the commission. I am frank to state that I do not know how to work out the matter other than in this way.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that although the commissions have a certain number of members who represent Federal Government agencies, they do not determine, by vote, the course to be taken.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the very point I make.

Mr. AIKEN. Furthermore, because of the necessity for cooperation, it would be necessary for the representatives of the Federal Government and the representatives of the States—whether 2 States or 10 States are involved; perhaps there would not be 10, but there might be—to agree. I believe the situation would be different if only two States were involved and if a number of Federal Government agencies were represented on the commission, and if the decisions to be arrived at were reached by majority vote. Frankly, I had not thought before of this problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. This is the point the Senator from New Mexico has made in regard to a voting situation. I am frank to state that if there were a two-State or a three-State compact and if five or six Federal Government agencies were represented on the commission, the Federal Government representatives could dominate the commission, merely because of their numbers; at least, there would be that tendency, in connection with the necessity to arrive at a consensus. This is one point about which I am very much concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize the Senator's concern; and I, too, am concerned. However, in the Missouri River Valley there are 10 States and only 6 or 7 Federal agencies, but those representative States would not be able to dominate the Commission. In other areas, the preponderance of numbers may be opposite, but it makes no difference. There is no vote. These Federal Government agencies supposedly will help the States and will advise with them.

In dealing with water pollution, the Federal Government agency which deals with water pollution will not try to dominate; instead, it will try to help the States.

So I hope the Senator from Colorado will not press for the adoption of his amendment, because all along it has been agreed that the agencies of the Federal Government would not dominate, but would only try to be helpful to the States.

If there is doubt on that point, I am sure the House will try to eliminate it and to clarify the situation. However, I feel sure that the debate we have had today on this point, including the participation in it by the Senator from Wyoming, shows that the agencies of the Federal Government will not dominate, but, instead, will only try to help the States in their consideration of what to do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find myself in an embarrassing situation, in that I have drawn up these proposals in alternative form, but I now find that neither the Senator from New Mexico nor his legislative assistant has seen them. I am very sorry about that.

Mr. ANDERSON. But of course I have not accused the Senator from Colorado of anything in that connection.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand; but I wished to have copies of these submitted to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, in view of the legislative history we have made in regard to this matter and in view of the fact that I have stated clearly that I think a problem exists in this connection, and that I believe this matter should be dealt with by the House, I shall not press for the adoption of either of these amendments, but shall simply permit the RECORD to remain as it is now.

I do not know whether there are other amendments to be offered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield briefly, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This measure is to be known as the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963. After the studies have been made and the plans have been evolved, is it contemplated that in the future the Federal Government may enter the field of expending funds to provide facilities, including conduits and other equipment, for the provision of the water, as contemplated in the plan?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be glad to attempt to answer the question, or I am quite willing to defer to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator. The Federal Government is in the field; and by this measure it is merely proposed that in the future an attempt shall be made to plan these matters carefully, rather than to rush haphazardly into them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the planning council and the planning commissions under the bill have authority to recommend the type of projects to be developed in order to provide the water that will be needed?

Mr. ANDERSON. They would pass on the suggestions made by the groups in the field; but the U.S. Congress will deal with that question when it reaches it. This measure will not in any way diminish the power of Congress to decide whether it will or will not build a conduit or a dam or similar structures. We merely provide in this bill that planning shall be made for the future, rather than to proceed only on a year-by-year basis. This measure is in no way a guarantee of Federal Government financing of any description in the future, and that matter has no part in this bill. So I am glad the Senator from Ohio has raised the question, which had not occurred to me.

However, the approval of projects in the future is in no way a part of this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had in mind the point that it is recommended that Ohio join a regional operation for the construction of a conduit from Lake Erie into the interior, to carry water. It is possible that if such a plan is evolved, the Federal Government might step in, in the future, to help finance it. However, I think that point needs no answer.

Mr. ALLOTT. This bill does not contemplate such action. The question of whether the Federal Government might help finance such projects is an entirely independent matter, and is entirely aside from this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the planning might be a concern under this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, will this measure constitute a "nose of the camel under the tent," so that in the future that would be the objective?

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to repeat the statement made a moment ago by the Senator from New Mexico. Under the Department of the Interior, there are reclamation projects; and under the Corps of Army Engineers there are docks, flood-control works, and so forth—many of them on the Great Lakes. These projects are for the benefit of the people of the United States. However, this measure would not in any way change that picture.

If the Senator from Ohio will examine page 2 of the bill, he will find there the answer to his question. I read section 2:

> STATEMENT OF POLICY
>
> SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

The key to that paragraph lies in the words "shall be planned."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe we should make clear two other points of legislative history, and then I believe we will be through with the bill.

I refer to page 6, subparagraph (c). The clause is repeated at other places in the bill. Subparagraph (c) reads as follows:

> (c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

The same phrase is used later in the bill with respect to the Commission, except that the word "shall" is used rather than the words "may be made."

I raise the question now because I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to what the words "to the extent permitted by law" referred. I asked him specifically whether or not the language would result in an invocation of the executive privilege of the Federal Government. I have discussed the question with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He agrees that it would not. I say that it would not. The only purpose that the language could be used for would be to preserve security.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct.

I call attention to the use of the word "shall." The States asked for that. They wanted to make their material available. But there are certain areas of the country in which there might be placed a military installation or an installation of some similar nature. The project might be operated by a mining company that did not care to make all of its records public. We thought that those considerations should be noted. But the provision is not intended to invite the use of executive privilege.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that if any Senator thought that the legislative history should be otherwise, he would say so now. I presume that what the Senator has said is correct.

On page 8, in subparagraph (b) of subparagraph (1), appears the following language:

> (1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate,

> and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

A legislative history should be made on the question to show that the word "coordination" does not mean control of local and State plans. It merely means "coordination." Perhaps I am only emphasizing the point, for we ought to know the meaning of English words. However, that is not always true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator. I agree with his understanding of the meaning of the word "coordination." It means that the Commission would take the local plan which the locality has the right to propose and see that the larger plan properly accommodates the local plan. That is what is meant by "coordination," and nothing else.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I address myself to the Senator from New Mexico.

I refer to page 8(b)(3). The language of that subparagraph provides that—

> (b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—
>
> (3) Recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning and construction of projects.

That language holds great value. I should like to state my views on the question to the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Colorado. I have served on the Committee on Public Works, which, as Senators know, authorizes the Corps of Engineers projects. One of the problems is the question of priorities. The Corps of Engineers undertakes surveys. At times projects which are not as valuable to a river basin in terms of the conservation of water or flood control as others precede in development those which should be undertaken first.

I believe that the provision to which I have referred offers an opportunity to correct that situation. A commission would be working in the basin itself, and that commission would be able at least to give its advice to the Congress in relation to priorities in that river basin. At least the Congress could consider that advice. From my experience as a member of the Committee on Public Works I do not believe that there is any source to which we can now look for the establishment of such priorities on even a Corps of Engineers project.

Mr. ANDERSON. One of the reasons why the committee was established in the first place on the motion of the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was that we were trying our very best to establish priorities. I know that the Senator from Montana had in mind that we should start a system of priorities. The Public Works Committee was adequately represented by Senator Kerr, who was an eloquent spokesman for the proposal, and by the then chairman of the committee, Senator Chavez. Many members of the committee were present. They stressed the very point which the Senator from Kentucky has now made; namely, that many times projects are given top priority which should not have been given first consideration. The language merely suggests that it might be desirable to set up the priorities to see what they are like. The Congress would then have the right to do what it would wish to do. At least we would know what the priorities ought to be.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad that the point was developed. We are all aware of the fact that when public works authorization bills come before the Senate, some question their value. Perhaps at times Senators have reason for doing so. I include even those Senators who have served as members of the committee. We know that the Corps of Engineers has performed these duties and performed them well. But it is not required by the Congress to establish priorities. We establish the priorities upon the basis of the best information that we have.

The proposed language offers some reasons for a more orderly development of the priorities in a river basin. I am glad to see that provision.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, particularly in view of the budget situation in our country at the present time. If the Chief Executive of our country, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Members of the Congress—I do not leave us out—would make up their minds about a reasonable system and basis of priorities for the things our country needs and would consider them in a logical order, I believe the budget of our country could be reduced by about 25 percent a year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment and a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico.

Recently the Senate passed the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and establish a Federal Water Pollution Administration. The Senator from Iowa happens to be a member of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

I detect a possible overlapping or perhaps even a conflict with the bill which is now pending insofar as water pollution activities might be concerned.

For example, the bill points out that the various river basin commissions serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate and local plans and for the development of water and related land resources.

Technically that language could conflict with the provision in the Water Pollution Control Act, which we have passed, and in which we have provided that the Water Pollution Control Administration, operating in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will do that very thing insofar as water pollution activities are concerned.

On page 9 of the bill which is pending, it is also provided that the commissions would foster and undertake studies of water problems in the various regions. This would perhaps technically conflict with the duties of the Water Pollution Control Administrator of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for which we have provided.

I should like to establish a bit of legislative history, so that it will be clear that there is nothing in the bill intended to overlap or duplicate, or conflict with the duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of the Water Pollution Control Administrator which are provided for in S. 649.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the question of the Senator from Iowa. I say to the Senator that that is exactly why the language is in the bill. We expect that this will coordinate plans. We expect that the water pollution control groups will develop their own plans. This group will not do the planning. After the water pollution control groups have developed their plans, somebody will coordinate them with the Department of the Interior, which may be developing a dam in the area for the irrigation of the area or for the development of water power. Whatever else may be done by the Army Corps of Engineers, or by anyone else, it should be coordinated with what has wisely been written into the bill for the preparation of water pollution control programs.

That is exactly what is intended. We wish to make sure that there will not be a conflicting interest, but instead a coordinating interest. That is what the Senator from Colorado well established a short while ago. "Coordination" has meaning and purpose. We mean that they shall coordinate the plans for the development of water with the plans made for water pollution control projects, plans made for flood control projects, and all other plans the Government has to avoid duplication and overlap. We do not wish to have one agency going in one direction and another agency going in another direction, with no regard for each other.

I am glad the Senator from Iowa has raised this point. He has stated precisely what we hope to accomplish.

Mr. MILLER. There is no intention to have the commissions to be established under the bill duplicate the work of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and in particular of the Water Pollution Control Administrator, for which we have provided in S. 649, recently passed

Mr. ANDERSON. For the sake of the record, I am happy to say there is no such intention at all.

Mr. MILLER. I did not believe there was any such intention, but I think it is wise that we have built a legislative history.

Mr. ANDERSON. I quite agree. I only wish I could think of all of these things myself, but I cannot. I therefore appreciate it when some other Senator brings up a point, as the Senator from Iowa has done.

**Mr. SIMPSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

**Mr. SIMPSON.** I have listened to the colloquy with respect to the bill and with respect to the amendments to the bill which have been agreed to. I still have considerable misgivings about future prospects under the measure. Though I am eager to try to find a way to persuade myself to vote in favor of the bill, I am worried about the context and worried about the possibilities for taking away water rights of the West and putting them under the supervision of a Federal agency, without too much being said by the States themselves.

I wish to make my position crystal clear to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New Mexico. I shall vote against the measure, even as amended.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico. It has taken us some 2½ hours to dispose of these matters. Without his understanding cooperation, I am sure it would have taken us the same number of days to accomplish the same things.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I yield to the Senator from Montana.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** It has been many months since I have seen a bill as thoroughly explained as this bill has been, with as many questions raised as were raised in regard to this bill, and with the record made as clear as the record on this proposal has been made.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and all other Senators who have participated in this debate, whether they vote for or against the bill, are entitled to our thanks, because the discussion has been clearcut and well set out, so far as the intent and the congressional interpretations are concerned. It has been an excellent presentation.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana. I merely wish to say, since there will not be a record vote, I shall vote against the bill, so as to preserve my position with respect to the bill when it comes back from conference.

I am ready for a vote on the bill.

**Mr. DODD.** Mr. President, I rise in support of the legislation before us today which would attempt to bring about the best possible development of the land and water resources of this Nation by the establishment of a Water Resources Council and River Basin Commissions.

I feel that legislation of this type is an excellent first step in the direction of conservation and intelligent planning to save the remaining natural resources of our Nation.

Mr. President, while I support this legislation I do so with the knowledge that it has little application to my State of Connecticut or to the New England area.

Though small in size the six New England States do not represent merely a single river basin area but rather a complex of several river basins not necessarily interrelated.

Because of this I and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, COTTON, SALTONSTALL and PELL cosponsored S. 1434 calling for a New England water and related land resources compact in an effort to create machinery which would consider the whole of New England as an interdependent geographical unit for the purpose of properly developing and managing our remaining natural land and water resources.

Similar legislation in the 87th Congress passed the House but affirmative action was not secured in the Senate and for this reason we have introduced S. 1434 in the 88th Congress.

In view of the interest and support for legislation involving the conservation of our natural resources expressed here today I hope it will be possible for early action to take place on S. 1434 particularly in view of the fact that four New England States, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island by action of their legislatures have already ratified the northeast compact and agreed to participate in it and are only awaiting congressional approval to put the compact into effect.

Mr. President, I again want to express my support of S. 1111 and hope that my colleagues who have expressed such concern and interest over the conservation of our land and water resources will also support S. 1434 when it is considered on the floor of the Senate.

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, and all the other cosponsors of S. 1111, for the good work they and the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have done on the most important nonhuman natural resource, next to the land itself.

Too often we have approached the water problem piecemeal, but the sponsors of this legislation have considered six types of the water problems that confront the Nation; namely, supply, distribution, natural quality, pollution variability, and floods.

One facet of supply has been attacked by the desalinization projects. In the summer of 1961 Secretary of Interior Udall spoke at the dedication of the Freeport, Tex., desalinization plant, as President John F. Kennedy pressed a button in the White House that turned into the water mains of the city of Freeport, fresh sweet water from the Gulf of Mexico, from which the salt had been removed in the Freeport plant.

The bill before the Senate provides for Federal-State cooperation, and for scientific research, and for comprehensive water development and management for major river basins in the United States.

In pushing this legislation, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is carrying forward the conservation program so well supported in the 87th Congress, and by the Senate in this 88th Congress. Let us hope the other House will pass this bill, and the water research bill previously passed by the Senate this session. This precious commodity of water must be saved, conserved, purified, and properly distributed for our growing population and our developing technology.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (S. 1111) was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

*Short title*

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act".

*Statement of policy*

SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

*Effect on existing laws*

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

### TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(a) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(b) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oats when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

### TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

#### *Creation of commissions*

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the area, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this Act wherever a river basin has been divided into subbasins by an Act of Congress or by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, each subbasin shall be treated as a separate basin. Such concurrences shall be in writing.

Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a Commission be established, the Council may upon a finding of need recommend to the President that such planning as is otherwise authorized by law proceed.

(b) Each such commission for an area, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its area, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related resources: *Provided,* That the plan may include alternatives and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its area, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

#### MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSIONS

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and cordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or employee;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State, which lies wholly or partially within the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

(d) One member appointed by an interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

#### ORGANIZATION OF COMMISSIONS

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the Council or agreement of not less than one-half of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided,* That studies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided,* That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consesus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided,* That at any time the Commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the Chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the Vice Chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be set forth in the record.

#### *Duties of the commissions*

SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent

**to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;**

**(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion thereof or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion thereof or revision thereof to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion or revision to report its view, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion or revision; and**

**(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.**

***Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions***

**SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—**

**(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;**

**(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;**

**(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;**

**(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;**

**(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;**

**(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel;**

**(7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and**

**(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.**

**(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.**

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall, in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof, be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission.

*Compensation of commission members*

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall determine the proportionate share of its expense which shall be borne by the Federal Government and each of the States. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

### TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

*Allotments*

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

*State programs*

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local

agencies having responsibilities in such affected fields;

(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

### *Review*

Sec. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

### *Federal share*

Sec. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 50 per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(b) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the suceeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

### *Payments*

Sec. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

### *Definition*

Sec. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

## TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

### *Authorization of appropriations*

Sec. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III not to exceed $7,500,000 for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

### *Rules and regulations*

Sec. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

### *Delegation of functions*

Sec. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

### *Utilization of personnel*

Sec. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

### *Employee benefits*

Sec. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a)(6) of this Act.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say again what I have been trying to say throughout the afternoon. I greatly appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Colorado. The character of the amendments he has produced shows the care with which he has done his homework and the zeal he has put into the endeavor. I pay tribute to him for a fine job, well done.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico.

## CONGRESS MUST ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me three editorials from this morning's Washington Post that are of such high caliber that I shall ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record in connection with these very brief remarks.

The first is an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Congress Must Act." All I want to say is "Amen" to every sentence of the editorial. I think the Washington Post has "laid it on the line" for the Congress.

I applaud and congratulate the editor. I think he has outlined the course of action Congress should follow when he says, in the last two sentences, speaking of the people:

> They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Congress Must Act

Congress, on the very eve of the holiday season, faces a legislative chore sufficient to engage it for weeks of a normal session and for months of a session proceeding at the speed with which it has moved this year.

Civil rights, the tax bill and the appropriation bills are on the top of its pile of work, but there is a lot more unfinished business. Congressmen, like the rest of us, relish a holiday interlude. But the country is entitled to say to Senators and Representatives who protest at continued unremitting toil: "You asked for work when you hired out." That they did, and the work they hired out to do has not been completed.

If Congress takes a customary adjournment with so many of its tasks unfinished there will be a ghost at every Christmas board, as well as a turkey. Or to use a more current metaphor, there will be two turkeys—the one the Congressmen are eating and the one that represents the session they have just quit.

The work that the Congress came here to do is unfinished. The people have a right to ask Congressmen to finish it. An administration does not have the right to insist that Congress approve everything for which it asks. It does have a right to ask that Congress dispose of the program one way or another. The public too has a right to expect that Congress will vote on the matters before it; a right to demand that it permit the administration program to come to a decision.

Congressmen, individually, may feel it is unjust to blame them. No doubt the session has been wearing—perhaps more wearing than when the legislative machinery moves more swiftly. They may say that it is not their fault, but the fault of the rules and the system. But the House makes its own rules. The Senate makes its rules. If the rules preclude expeditious action, why hasn't each body changed its rules? It is to be hoped that next session Congress will at last take a look at the structural defects that have made it one of the most lethargic legislative establishments in the history of democratic government. Now, Congress will have to finish this session's work with the rules as they are. Whatever the defects of the rules, they can still act if Senators and Representatives are sufficiently determined to act. The time has come to end what amounts to a congressional sit-down strike.

The session should proceed on an emergency schedule. Absences in either Chamber should not be allowed lightly. The whole legislative program should be pressed on a crisis basis. There should be no thought of a long holiday recess or adjournment. Private citizens, so far behind in their personal endeavors, would content themselves with a rest on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day and then get on with their work. They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

## A WORD FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. MORSE. Next, Mr. President, I refer to an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "A Word for Washington." The editorial points out the longstanding position of the President of the United States as a great friend of the District of Columbia and a longtime supporter of the right of self-government.

I want to give the brief testimony that as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the present President of the United States, when he was majority leader of the Senate and when he was Vice President presiding over the Senate, never failed to give me full and complete cooperation on any District of Columbia matter that I put to him when he found my case meritorious; and I was careful not to present any case that was not meritorious.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A WORD FOR WASHINGTON

As President Johnson observed, the United States both deserves and requires a National Capital that reflects the country's standards of civic beauty and decency. Overcrowded schools, disheveled welfare programs and patchwork city planning makes an unhappy contrast with the shining marble monuments and the aspirations that they symbolize. Mr. Johnson has reassured this city that he shares its concerns.

He has asked Mr. Horsky, his adviser for National Capital affairs, to remain at the White House. Two programs of immense importance to the city's future, the development of an urban transit system and the campaign against juvenile delinquency, are both being managed from outside the structure of the municipal government, and both have obvious implications for the parallel national programs. The case for a special presidential adviser continues to be valid. The White House is continually forced willy-nilly to intervene in city affairs, and one prefers that intervention to be knowledgeable and consistent.

Above all, President Johnson has recognized that Washington remains destitute of the first and basic civil right: the right to self-government. At a time of rising hope for home rule, the President's brief and direct statement offers new encouragement to his neighbors.

## WIRETAPPING

**Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I congratulate the editor of the Washington Post for the editorial entitled "Sanctuary."** It is one of the most succinct, concise, devastating statements in opposition to wiretapping that I have read in recent years. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read it. I hope every Member of the Senate will read it prior to further consideration of the so-called omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia. I hope Senators will also read it when they give consideration to why the senior Senator from Oregon, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, has undertaken a study of policies of the Metropolitan Police force.

I congratulate the editor of the Washington Post for what I consider to be his unanswerable argument in opposition to wiretapping.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SANCTUARY

Suppose you went into a phone booth to call your boss and convey some business confidence to him; suppose you called your wife to explain why you would be late for dinner and got into a quarrel with her; suppose you called to make a date with a girl. And suppose you happened to pick a phone booth where the Internal Revenue Service had installed a listening device with which to overhear and record all that you said.

Apparently the Internal Revenue Service does just this on occasion. Its agents did it last spring in the case of a woman they suspected of participating in the operation of a lottery. They listened to what she said by means of a "bug" installed in the phone booth from which she made a call and then had Metropolitan Police officers arrest her as she came out of the booth. How many other callers who happened to use that phone booth were overheard remains unknown.

General Sessions Court Judge Harry L. Walker, before whom the woman was tried the other day, ruled that the eavesdropped conversation was not admissible as evidence against her. We think that the public welfare is protected by this ruling. If police work is made somewhat more difficult by preserving the privacy of telephone booths, communication between free and law-abiding citizens is made much easier. It is worth something to the community, of course, to have lottery operators detected and prosecuted; but it is worth much more to be confident when one enters a public phone booth that he can talk in private.

The police seem to understand very little about privacy and to care less; but it is of the essence of a free society that they be made to respect it.

## NEW VOICES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a news article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post reporting on the great speech delivered by LeRoy Collins, former Governor of the State of Florida, in Columbia, S.C. The heading of the story reads: "Rout Forces of Hate, Collins Urges South."

If anyone has any doubt about the fact that new voices are being heard in the South—and I have made that observation for some time past now—he need only read this news article relating to this great speech delivered by former Governor Collins.

I have written for the complete speech, and I shall discuss it at a later time.

I read an excerpt from this news article:

> "How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?
>
> "All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners."
>
> Collins said it was obvious that desegregation was inevitable but that too many southern politicians hoodwink the people by pretending it is not.
>
> " 'That all men are created equal' is not an empty cliche," he said. "It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment.
>
> "It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.
>
> "It may be thwarted—it may be delayed but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right."

What a great southerner. What a great American. What a refreshing new voice to be heard in the South. I congratulate Governor Collins.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### ROUT FORCES OF HATE, COLLINS URGES SOUTH

(By Robert E. Baker)

LeRoy Collins appealed to southerners last night to rise up and defeat the forces of hate and bigotry in their midst.

"It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry," Collins said in an address to the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce in Columbia, S.C.

Collins had been invited to address the businessmen as president of the National Association of Broadcasters. But the 54-year-old former Governor of Florida told them he had been brooding over his Southland, especially since the assassination of President Kennedy.

In his speech, released in Washington, Collins said too many southerners have remained silent and allowed extremists to speak for the South.

"And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?" asked Collins.

"How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

"All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners."

Collins said it was obvious that desegregation was inevitable but that too many southern politicians hoodwink the people by pretending it is not.

"'That all men are created equal' is not an empty cliche," he said. "It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment.

"It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

"It may be thwarted—it may be delayed but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right."

Collins said that President Kennedy was a heroic person who thought in terms of generations and of what America must be for the children of today and tomorrow.

"I say to you tonight," Collins said, "that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet."

### SELF HELP

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Self Help, an Iowa organization born of the desire to improve the lot of people in underdeveloped countries, was the subject of an article by Associated Press Writer Carol Johnson in the November 20 editions of the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette. Miss Johnson sums up the reasoning behind this organization's founding in the lead paragraph, and I quote:

> One man's strong belief in Christian good works and the principles of capitalism is the foundation of an organization devoted to helping people in the world's developing nations improve their standards of living.

The article goes on to detail how Self Help reconditions used farm machinery for shipment to areas where the need exists. Its helping hand now stretches into 32 countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

As I have remarked before, the end result of this program is that machinery is purchased by the recipient, thus giving him a sense of responsibility and purpose, a stakehold in his future as a capitalist, with the incentive to produce which such a status provides.

This is private enterprise in action on the foreign aid front, and it shows what can be done if one has the determination to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Self Help in 32 Countries," be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Self Help in 32 Countries

(By Carol Johnson)

(Editor's Note.—In a world rapidly becoming overpopulated and with people arising to demand self-government as independent nations, the problem of food is acute in some countries. To help alleviate some of these agricultural ills, an organization, Self Help, Inc., has been started in Iowa, one of the richest farm areas in the world.)

Waverly.—One man's strong belief in Christian good works and the principles of capitalism is the foundation of an organization devoted to helping people in the world's developing nations improve their standards of living.

Called Self Help, Inc., the organization reconditions used farm machinery and other equipment, largely obsolete by American standards, for shipment to areas where it is needed. Such equipment now is located in 32 countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

The project began when Vern Schield, 60, farmer and industrialist in this community, observed in travels to 69 foreign countries the recurring problem of agricultural underproduction and a resulting lack of sufficient food for the population.

"Some of the most productive soils and climates of the world produce almost nothing," Schield said. "The work is all done by hand and the crops are poorly tended. Farmers need power equipment that will increase each man's productivity."

Schield saw an answer to the problem in the used equipment he had seen on Iowa farms—such as old tractors, hand corn shellers, and treadle sewing machines which were obsolete in America but potentially useful in other nations.

Schield gathers used machinery and rebuilds it at his Schield Bantam Manufacturing Co.

At this point Schield's belief in private enterprise comes into play. The rebuilt equipment is not given away, but is sold at low cost.

"Give a man a tractor or even so much as a hammer, and he won't take care of it," Schield said. "But if he pays for it—no matter how little—then he has a stake in it."

Self Help works this way. Missionaries, schools, foundations, organizations such as the Peace Corps and individuals let Self Help know what equipment is needed. Self Help collects the needed items either through donations or purchase, rebuilds them and ships them.

The only charge to people getting the equipment is the original cost of the equipment to Self Help plus the rebuilding costs. The missions or organizations which place the orders usually pay for shipping.

The money paid to Self Help for the equipment goes into a revolving fund for more purchases and repairs.

Since Schield started Self Help in 1950, financing has been a major problem. In many years he provided up to $10,000 of his own money for the program in addition to establishing it in the Bantam plant.

Self Help was incorporated in 1959. Its executive director, John William Baccarini, said the organization has been receiving more help in the form of donations of equipment and funds from individuals, firms and foundations.

Another source of help for the organization comes from 80 to 90 Future Farmers of America chapters in Iowa and Minnesota which gather and rebuild equipment in their vocational education classes.

Self Help now sends a carload of machinery abroad on an average of every 30 to 45 days. Baccarini estimated sales of a quarter of a million dollars' worth of equipment in the last 15 months. The machinery was sold at one-fifth to one-third its actual value, he said.

Baccarini emphasized that Self Help doesn't compete with commercial manufacturers to sell equipment in developing nations.

Self Help operates only in those areas where people are too poor to buy new American-made machinery. New American products are in most cases too expensive and advanced, and in many cases too big, for use in foreign countries.

Self Help has developed a special compact tractor at a sales price of $675 for use on these smaller farms.

Other items rebuilt and shipped by Self Help range from windmills to typewriters and washing machines.

Schield retired this year and sold his Bantam Co. But he remains active in the Self Help program and recently visited Peace Corps projects in Central America.

### IDIOT'S BROOD

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a very able editorial appearing in Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., of Washington, D.C., on November 29, 1963, entitled "Idiot's Brood."

The editorial deals with the philosophy advanced first by Gunnar Myrdal, to utilize Federal power to enforce the integration of the races.

I should like to read a short excerpt from the editorial, as follows:

> Forced integration of the races was never contemplated by the U.S. Constitution and as far as human history is concerned never was countenanced by even the most tyrannical power.
>
> It would seem that abstract thinking on this problem compounds idiocy the way the philosophical storms swept the medieval monasteries.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in its entirety may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Idiot's Brood

It cannot have failed to reach many Americans over the past 10 years that we are playing fast and loose with the future of this country by making a political football out of public education.

It seems to us that we have strayed far from fundamentals of human behavior by our actions on the matter from the very beginning. First, we have Jim McGranery, an interim Attorney General, throwing the Brown case into an avid, social-minded Supreme Court, for the settlement of the integration issue. To prove the point, the writings of Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish leftist, were used as text for the education of the Court.

Myrdal fled to the United States when the German pincers embraced Norway and Finland. No one knew when they would close, and Myrdal was the top friend of Stalin in Sweden. Being a pink, Myrdal got a glorious reception in Washington and got a fine job writing about the Negro problem until the danger at home was passed.

At least one of his staff during that period is high in administration circles at present. The integration decision was a foregone conclusion once the case was presented and from that moment on the public schools of the Nation were in a state of harassment and peril. The children became political pawns in the deadly, cold-blooded game of power politics.

If an adult nation cannot handle its education problems without airborne and armored troops, a private SS Korps of U.S. marshals and a continuous conflict between the central authority and the States, then this Nation is ripe for seizure of power from within and without and the last stand of the individual is gone.

Forced integration of the races was never contemplated by the U.S. Constitution and as far as human history is concerned never was countenanced by even the most tyrannical power.

It would seem that abstract thinking on this problem compounds idocy the way the philosophical storms swept the medieval monasteries. If the monks were guiding the thinking today, they would be in a vast controversy as to whether the color of a man's soul is white, black, yellow or brown. The fact that no man has ever seen a soul would make no difference. The fact that integration is unnatural to man, makes no difference to those engaged in the current political struggle.

What, now, happens to the pathetic and innocent victims of this barbaric struggle? What of the schoolboy and schoolgirl of today, who with dawning intellect sees himself or herself tyrannized over by an insane society?

What must be the wonderment of those who are trucked across cities to meet integration standards? Is this child, thrust by cowardly politicians into a van, forced into contact with an alien race, going to turn out to be a good citizen?

What standards prevail? Does the integrated class slow down to the pace of the slowest child or does it leave in its wake the wails and tears of the slow when the standard is that of the quick?

Where is the damage done? It undeniably is done to the old established neighborhood school, the bedrock of modern education. When children from one neighborhood are flung upon another, it is an unkind and unsettling experience. This is advancement, visiting this upon children, too young to defend themselves? No matter which way the matter works, the children suffer. They are subjected to alien influences at an age just beyond the cradle, an age when wisdom, guidance and circumspection should be the rule.

The use of children in picket lines and demonstrations has long been a weapon of the Communists. It is out of place on the streets of a free country. Likewise the use of children and the schools is a despicable weapon of politics.

## WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR LIBERALIZING CHILD CARE TAX DEDUCTION

**Mrs. NEUBERGER.** Mr. President, I am indeed pleased by the widespread support that has developed throughout the Nation for my amendment to the pending tax bill to liberalize the child care tax deduction.

On December 6 I will have the opportunity of testifying in support of my amendment before the Senate Finance Committee. My amendment carries out the recommendations made last January by President Kennedy in his tax message, as well as the recommendations of the President's Commission on the Status of Women on which I served.

The child care tax deduction contains a totally inadequate $4,500 income ceiling for the combined income of husband and wife which was adopted as part of the 1954 Tax Code. Under the terms of my amendment this income ceiling would be increased to $7,000 per year as well as providing a deduction of $1,000 where there are three or more eligible children.

I am indeed pleased by the support contained in an editorial dated November 20, 1963, in the Columbia, S.C., newspaper, the State. Mr. President, as this editorial points out, there is presently a tax discrimination against the womenfolk and it should be corrected. The editorial further states:

> Here is a true instance of denial of equal rights—and one which directly affects working women of all ages and all races in all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial entitled "Unfair Tax Laws."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### UNFAIR TAX LAWS

Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, liberal widow of the late liberal Senator from Oregon, generally is too far out in left field for our political tastes—but we give her full support on one point:

She contends that working mothers should be allowed tax deductions for housekeepers.

There is, in the Internal Revenue Code, a provision for "child care" deductions for working mothers who must work yet who must also see that their children are tended during the workday. But there are limitations on this type of deduction, and the deductions close out completely at a given point of earnings.

In short this child care deduction is provided only as a help for the family; not as a reasoned and equitable tax provision.

Income tax laws, so far as we know, do not spell out the philosophy of tax deductions. But it would seem reasonable to conclude that deductions are intended to allow a measure of relief for taxpayers who incur necessary expenses in the business of earning a living.

And since earning a living involves earning enough to pay taxes, it would seem that the Government should be willing to play fair in the matter of deductions. But even without reference to fair play, it is simply good business for the Government to encourage the earning of good wages in order that those wages might produce tax revenues.

The woman who stays at home, whether by choice or by necessity, may be performing a useful function as housewife and homemaker but she is contributing nothing in the way of taxes.

If she goes to work, voluntarily or involuntarily, she not only becomes a breadwinner but a taxpayer. Furthermore, she becomes an employer herself by paying a cook, maid, or babysitter to mind the house or tend the children. It is here that she is penalized, for our tax laws make meager provision for her deducting the expenses she incurs in order to become a taxpaying worker.

This is a tax discrimination against the womenfolk, and it should be removed. Here is a true instance of denial of equal rights—and one which directly affects working women of all ages and all races in all parts of the country.

## ECONOMIC CONVERSION LEGISLATION

**Mr. McGOVERN.** Mr. President, the distinguished editors of the Washington Post have again called attention to the desirability of planning for possible shifts in our economy due to changes in the Defense Establishment. It is quite clear that at a time when we are investing 10 percent of our gross national product in defense spending that we need to plan carefully for shifts, stretchouts, or reductions in our defense contracts. There is also a need to plan for the day when communities may be losing part or all of their defense installations.

Toward that end I have introduced legislation to provide for such planning on the local, State, and Federal level. Our colleague from Michigan, the distinguished Senator HART, has introduced related legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post on this subject in the issue of December 2, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DEFENSE DISLOCATIONS

Senator McGOVERN is espousing simple prudence in urging Congress to create a National Economic Conversion Commission. The purpose of the Commission would be to cushion the dislocation caused by reductions or shifts in defense spending. These reductions and shifts are occurring all the time and are not contingent on reaching a disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union. Technology and defense are always in a process of evolution, and Congress has an obligation to consider the impact of these changes on the American economy.

Mr. McGOVERN and the nine other Senators supporting his bill would have the Conversion Commission supervise the creation of operating conversion committees in all plants where 25 percent or more of the work involves defense contracts. The need for an approach like this does not have to be labored; every Member of Congress is familiar with the desperate protests that come from the constituency whenever the end of a defense contract is even rumored.

One solution to the problem would be simply to keep the industries going on a make-work basis; indeed, this is one argument for giving Government support to the construction of supersonic transport aircraft. But as Mr. McGOVERN and others have pointed out, the make-work solution ignores the very real problem of distortions in the economy caused by concentration of research in the Government sector.

Senator HART, in a proposal paralleling Mr. McGOVERN's, suggests the formation of a Commission on the Application of Technology to Community and Manpower Needs. The name is self-descriptive; Senator HART would have the Government encourage the exploration of ways of using our technological skills on such troublesome problems as urban transportation or air pollution. Both proposals are an attempt to meet a continuing problem; both warrant serious consideration.

## REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 462, H.R. 82, which is to be made the pending business.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

**The LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 82) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the need—and there is a real need for H.R. 82—arises out of application of section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

The bill now before the Senate was carefully considered by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was reported, and was passed by the House. It has been carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Commerce, and has been reported for the second time. It is before the Senate now in the form suggested last fall by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], when a companion bill was under discussion at that time.

Mr. President, it was the judgment of Congress more than 20 years ago that the executive branch of Government should be given power or authority to allocate ships for building in yards which might not necessarily have submitted the lowest bids. For many years that section was not employed, probably because during all that time the Government had the ships that were being built under subsidy arrangements constructed for its own account in various yards throughout the country.

This system was altered in 1954, and thereafter the ships were built for the account of the private operators.

Six ships were allocated, since the law became effective in 1938, to yards other than those which had submitted the lowest bids.

For example, two vessels were allocated for Moore-McCormack Lines and two for the American Export Lines. East coast shipyards had submitted the lowest bids. In the judgment of the Maritime Administration, it was necessary to have those ships built on the west coast, in order that there might be maintained a viable and functioning shipbuilding industry.

Because of this, the two companies were subjected to additional costs. Inspection staffs had to be taken across the country, and the ships, when completed, had to be delivered to their home ports. The total amount under consideration in that respect was about one-half million dollars.

Two ships were allocated for the account of the American President Lines. In those cases, a saving was effected insofar as the American President Lines was concerned. The bill now before the Senate provides that the Government shall, in respect of future allocations, if there are any, reimburse the owner-operator if he is subjected to additional costs by reason of having ships built at a point distant from his home port.

The bill also provides that if a saving is effected, it shall be paid to the Federal Government.

It should be remembered that all of this is not for the benefit of the owner-operator in any case; it is for the benefit of the U.S. Government, so that for national defense purposes there will be a shipbuilding industry on all coasts, where it is needed.

The allocation provision is one method by which Congress sought to insure that this would be a fact.

It seems to me, after careful consideration of the bill—and I was the acting chairman of the subcommittee when this matter was considered last year and again this year—that the bill does nothing more than provide equity and justice. We must remember at all times that in respect to vessels which are built under a construction subsidy, the American company which is going to come into possession of any particular vessel is not the gainer; it can go abroad and buy that ship at any time for half the price at which it could be built here. The subsidy is not for that company's benefit, but is a means of keeping the American shipbuilding industry in existence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Can the Senator give us the names of those ships, the years in which they were constructed, and also the construction cost and the amount of the subsidy paid in each case?

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the Senator wish the names of the ships?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; so the ships can be identified.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not seem to have that information at hand. The two ships that were allocated to the American Export Lines were allocated to the National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego, Calif.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What year was that?

Mr. BARTLETT. That was in 1958, I believe. Delivery was made in 1961. The ships could be readily identified from the records of the Maritime Administration. I see that we have the names of the two ships. The first of the two allocated ships to be delivered was the *American Agent*. This ship left San Diego on January 9, 1961, and proceeded to Portland, Oreg.

The second was the *Export Aid*.

The ships allocated for Moore-McCormack are not listed here by names. Two ships were allocated for the American President Lines. They are not named either.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In what years were they constructed? Does the Senator have the amount of the construction cost and the amount of the subsidy which the Government has already paid on those ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. That was between 1958 and 1961. That was when they were delivered. I will obtain that information shortly for the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The two ships for the American Export Lines were ordered in 1958 and delivered in 1961. When were the Moore-McCormack ships contracted for and delivered?

Mr. BARTLETT. My information is that the allocations were made in the same year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How about the American President Lines ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. The ships for the American President Lines were allocated to the Bethlehem Steel Co. at San Francisco, and the date of the allocation is not noted. The period was roughly the same for these six ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the bill, as I understand, the American Export Lines would collect $150,000 for one ship, and $120,000 for the other ship. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. American Export would be reimbursed in the amount of $270,000. Moore-McCormack would be reimbursed approximately in the amount of $260,000. American President Lines would pay back to the Government in the neighborhood of $41,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Has the President Lines agreed to pay this money back?

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand so. Whether they do or not, the law, if the bill is enacted into law, would not be applicable unless this arrangement were made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But can a law be passed at the end of 1963 that would retroactively impose an obligation upon the American President Lines for $41,000? It is now 5 years later. Can we retroactively pass a law that would impose an obligation on this company as of 5 years earlier? If the company did not agree what could be done about it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Section 2 of H.R. 82 reads:

> SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective with respect to any contract entered into under the provisions of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and the Secretary of Commerce shall, with the consent of the other parties thereto, modify any such contract entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this Act to the extent authorized by the amendment made by this Act, except that the Secretary shall not agree to any such modification which would result in a payment by the United States unless, within one year after enactment of this Act, provision has been made for payment to the Secretary of an amount equal to the total of any amounts which would be due the United States under such contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act if all such contracts were modified in accordance with the amendment made by this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does that mean that neither American Export Lines nor Moore-McCormack Lines could collect any refund until after American President Lines has paid back the obligation? Or would American Export Lines and Moore-McCormack be allowed to pay $41,000 for them into the Federal Treasury and automatically collect in return $530,000?

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Would they be permitted to do what?

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Could Moore-McCormack Lines and American Export Lines pay the $41,000 if American President Lines refused to do so and thereby establish eligibility for their own refunds? My question is on the assumption that the American President Lines objected. The first section of section 2 provides:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, with the consent of the other parties thereto.

American President Lines apparently entered into this contract in 1958. Under the law it does not owe the money now. Yet under this bill it is proposed to permit the Secretary of Commerce to collect the money if the parties agree. I would not agree to it, and neither would the Senator from Alaska, if the proposal were not a law 5 years ago.

What I want to know is: Are the payments to American Export and Moore-McCormack contingent upon American President Lines as a contracting party, paying its own $41,000; or could the other two companies, which have a $530,000 stake in the program, pay the $40,000 and have $390,000 left?

**Mr. COTTON.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska allow me to amplify that point?

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Yes.

**Mr. COTTON.** I would add to the question asked by the Senator from Delaware: Is it not true that the bill was drawn—at least, the members of the committee from both sides of the aisle so considered it—to provide that unless the parties, both those that were to receive from the Government and those that were to pay to the Government, voluntarily complied, those who were to receive would not receive anything until those who were paid, paid? It would not in any sense be retroactive, and no action would be taken prior to the date of enactment.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Precisely so. Whatever the Senator from New Hampshire might say in response to the inquiry made by the Senator from Delaware—and it is a logical one—the fact is that the question will be academic, as I understand, because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] proposes to offer an amendment to cover this very point.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I am glad to hear that. I would certainly support such an amendment, because it sees to me that without it there would be no provision which would make the action mandatory. As I read the language, it clearly provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall modify the contracts retroactively only with the consent of the parties involved.

Section 2 provides that the payments shall be contingent only upon the fact that repayment has been made to the Treasury for an amount equal to the amount that was due from the American President Lines. As it is written it is not clear who must pay.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** The Senator's interpretation is absolutely correct. The committee so phrased the language, and it was inserted in the bill and adopted, to provide that the United States would be certain to be made whole before any money would be paid out by the United States.

**Mr. COTTON.** I should like to interpolate further that if the bill had been phrased in any other way than to provide for agreement of all parties, it would have been unconstitutional, because we could not force some one to pay, as the Senator from Delaware has so well expressed it. So, again, it all boils down to a simple proposition. Personally, I think a good way to have handled the situation would have been not to make it retroactive at all, but to have all parties agree that those who owed should pay, and that those who suffered could receive, provided the procedure worked both ways and that it was so provided in the bill.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** That is absolutely correct. Speaking about retroactivity, the fact is that two companies, Moore-McCormack and American Export, protested vigorously, and violently, and pronounced themselves as being shocked when the allocations were made. They did not want the ships to be built at ports farthest from their home ports. They wanted them to be built where the lowest bids were submitted. But they had nothing to do with that. The Government said that it would build the ships on the west coast. The law had been in effect for about 20 years. Allocation had never before been performed. It was now.

I submit that these companies, if they are to be treated fairly—this construction was done for national defense purposes—should be permitted to be reimbursed.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. To make the record clear, I agree that to have awarded the contract to the west coast since the lower bid was from the east coast was wrong. But that is not the point we are debating today. The fact that the contracts were awarded to the west coast at prices higher than the lowest bid did not cost these companies any more money; it only cost the taxpayers more.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Oh, no.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Just a moment. The taxpayers paid the subsidy on the ships when they were built on the west coast. Yes, the taxpayers paid the difference between the construction costs of the ships in American shipyards and what the costs would have been in foreign shipyards. When the ships were built on the west coast at a higher price than the price on the east coast, the taxpayers paid this higher cost.

It is true that from their standpoint the companies would rather have had the ships built on the east coast. The bill before us deals only with the extra cost of moving the ships from the west coast to the east coast. But I point out that had the ships been built in foreign shipyards the companies would have had to pay the transportation costs of moving the ships from Tokyo or from Europe. But I am not too much concerned with the fact that they had to pay for bringing them from the west coast. That is why I asked to have the record show what the total construction cost of the ships was, what the amount of the subsidy was, and how much the shipping company paid.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** That information will be available for the Senator in a moment. Research is being pursued vigorously at the moment.

The Senator was correct so far as he went, but he did not go far enough in his statement. He apparently assumed that the total cost of the vessels was paid for by construction subsidies. It was not, of course.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. No; I referred only to the differential in cost between the cost of building the ships in an American yard and the cost of building them in foreign shipyards. Construction subsidy covers only the difference.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** But the private companies, Moore-McCormack and American Export, were subjected to additional costs by reason of the allocations, just as the taxpayers were. The total added cost to American Export Lines amounted to $270,000; for Moore-McCormack it was $260,000. I cannot tell the Senator now what the added cost to the taxpayers was because I do not know the exact amount of the construction subsidy; but I hope to have that information soon.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. This bill only covers the $270,000 cost of transferring the ships from the west coast to the east coast, where they were to be used. The point I first made was that the difference in the contract price as between the east coast and the west coast was paid in its entirety by the taxpayers, because the point from which to figure the subsidy was, first, what it would have cost to build the ships in a foreign shipyard.

The second is, what it cost to build the ship in an American yard. The taxpayers pay the differential.

When a ship was built in a west coast shipyard, the costs were higher than for construction in an east coast yard; and accordingly the taxpayers paid the entire amount of the extra cost.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Yes; and when the case is narrowed to those terms, I agree with the Senator from Delaware. However, I know he will agree with me that that has nothing to do with the interest of the private company for which the ship is being built; it is confined exclusively to national-defense considerations.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Perhaps it has nothing to do with this bill, but I emphasized that point because the Senator from Alaska said the cost of construction on the west coast would be greater than the cost of construction on the east coast. I merely emphasize that that is not at all an argument in support of this bill.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** The company had to pay the inspection costs, which were higher for the owner-operator, of course, by reason of the allocations.

**Mr. WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Those factors were taken into consideration in connection with the construction. If the company had had the ship built in a foreign yard it would have had similar extra costs. I am not using that as an argument against the bill, but I point out that we should not shed tears for the shipowner because the ship was built in a west coast yard—after all, the company got the ship on the same basis as if it had been built in a foreign yard. The taxpayers were the ones who paid more.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. I have already noted that the shipping companies expressed their protest, but under the law they could do no more than protest. They are required by law to build replacement ships, and they are required by law to have them built in the yards designated by the Secretary of Commerce. They have no choice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are required to do that by law only so long as they wish to receive the operational subsidy. If they choose to disregard the construction subsidy and the operational subsidy they can build and can operate the ships 100 percent as they see fit. It is only when they wish to have the U.S. taxpayers pay half of the construction costs and half of the operation costs that the companies face these requirements. They say they want to operate on the basis of the American free enterprise system, but they also want the Government to underwrite the costs. If they receive the construction subsidy and thereafter receive the operational subsidy these requirements go into effect.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and this applies to practically every company under the construction subsidy, for without the operational subsidy they could not operate, and they would have to go out of business. Only this morning we were told, in connection with a bill introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio, that the operating costs for American flag ships are three to five times higher than those for foreign flag ships.

In that connection, I read from the report, as follows:

> Furthermore, they have no control over the allocation, and no control over the added costs which result. The shipyard allocation is made for national defense reasons, but it does not add to the value of their ships, or confer any direct benefit on them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What point does the Senator from Alaska make in that connection?

Mr. BARTLETT. The point I am seeking to make—although apparently I did not succeed in making this clear—is that the allocations are beyond the control of the company or companies for which the ship or ships are intended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why should they not be? If the Federal Government is, first, going to pay the difference in the cost of building the ship in an American yard as compared to the construction cost in a foreign yard, why should not the Government decide in which yard the ship should be built?

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the cost would be added.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sure the cost of the construction in a U.S. yard would be twice the cost of construction in a yard in Tokyo, Japan, but the taxpayers are paying this difference.

Furthermore, let me ask whether interest is to be paid on this refund.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is to be a flat payment, without interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Without interest?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; no payment of interest is contemplated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the bill provide that no interest will be paid?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; but I cannot imagine that the Secretary of the Treasury would pay interest, when there is no specific authority to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So there can be a question of whether the Federal Government also owes the interest. If we state that retroactively we owe them the $530,000 I am not sure whether that will be with or without interest unless the bill specifies that it will be without interest.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to offer an amendment to that effect, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that the Senator from Ohio has an amendment. Later it can be spelled out in the bill that there will be no payment of interest. I will prepare such an amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not think there is even a possibility that interest would be paid. I see no necessity for the inclusion of such an amendment, although I would not have any objection to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether the estimated cost of $150,000 for extra inspection and $120,000 for delivery costs of the two ships of the American Export Lines will be the only additional costs to the taxpayers.

Mr. BARTLETT. These are the costs to the company.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but now it is requested that these be paid from the Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

I also wish to ask about the 6-percent differential in connection with the construction of the ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been a construction differential of almost 50 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there is a 6-percent construction differential as between construction in a west coast yard and construction in an east coast yard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Those were national defense allocations.

Mr. ELLENDER. So for the two ships constructed for the American Export Lines, the total cost to the taxpayers will be $270,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. For the one company.

Mr. ELLENDER. And for the two ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the two ships for the Moore-McCormack Lines, I notice from the report that the costs are estimated at $140,000 for inspection services and $120,000 for delivery purposes, or a total of $260,000. Are those the only additional costs on those two ships?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And as for the two other ships—those for the American President Lines—it is estimated that there was a saving of $41,000; and I understand that amount will be deducted from the entire sum asked for by means of this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the entire cost for those six ships will be around $500,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of giving a little of the historical background, let me point out that on page 37 of the hearings is set forth a letter written by the American Export Lines, Inc.; and on page 38 there appears a letter written to the Federal Maritime Board by Frazer A. Bailey, who was representing the ship operators.

It is very interesting that in the letter of January 7, 1958, the American Export Lines, Inc., protested the building of these ships on a coast opposite to its situs because, it said, the cost of moving the ship would be greater to itself.

It did complain in the letter of January 7, but subsequently, on February 13, 1958, the following letter was written to the Federal Maritime Board:

> GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to your allocation under section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, we are today executing a contract with the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., of San Diego, Calif., for the construction of two cargo vessels. Two additional cargo vessels are being contracted for with New York Shipbuilding Corp., which submitted the lowest responsive bids in response to our invitation.
>
> We understand that the basic objective is that, where an allocation is directed by the Federal Maritime Board with the approval of the President, all extra costs instant thereto should be borne in full by the Government. In the contract which we are executing today, we believe it is known and understood that the following items are not to be so paid for by the Government:
>
> (a) extra costs of delivery of vessels from the allocated builder's yards over costs of delivery which would otherwise be incurred, and
>
> (b) extra costs instant to inspection for the account of export at the second builder's yards located on the Pacific coast.
>
> We further understand that the Federal Maritime Board and the Comptroller General would agree to the equity of including in the present contract a provision for reimbursing us in full for these extra costs, but for the fact that it is not specifically authorized by existing law.
>
> For that reason we are writing this letter to withdraw our request of January 7, 1958, for a reimbursement clause in our construction-differential subsidy agreement, pending passage of authorizing legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad the Senator read from that letter because it is naturally a powerful argument for the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is powerful and yet it is also negative, because this complaint in effect said, "We will go ahead with the existing law. We will not object to your granting this contract to the nonlow bidder, but we still feel that in equity we are entitled to reimbursement."

Mr. BARTLETT. They wish to do what the Senator from Ohio and I would do, perhaps, in similar circumstances. We are dealing with people who have power, so we are not going to write a fancy letter. We would say, "If this has to be done we acquiesce—though certainly not gladly—but we depend upon your fairness and your sense of justice. We depend upon Uncle Sam to deal fairly with his citizens." That is what we are trying to do now. Six years or more after this letter was written the House acted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The mystifying thing, regarding the correspondence, however, is that all the correspondence on this item, both in the Maritime Commission and in the company, is gone except for these two letters. I cannot understand that method of doing business, and why these two letters were available and no other letters.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. BARTLETT. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us say there is some equity to this claim, but in a substantial degree it is in the form of a special relief bill. It is not so labeled. There is no legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay the proposed $530,000, less $41,000.

I filed minority views on the measure, and they are set forth on page 13 of the report.

I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record. They show my views on this item. At a later time I may discuss it in detail.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Minority Views of Mr. Lausche

As a result of my longstanding objection to bills providing for retroactive payments by the Government, I must record my opposition to this measure, H.R. 82. Stated as a general principle, I believe it unjustified for a private person or company to take willing action under the existing and known statutory ground rules and then, when a loss occurs, seek to have the Government provide reimbursement.

When the ship operators made applications for subsidies they knew of the existing law under which the then Maritime Board might award the contract to a shipbuilder who was not the low bidder. They knew that a possibility existed that an applicant carrier on the waters of the Pacific might find himself in the position that the low bidder for the building of a ship was on the east coast and the higher bidder on the west coast, and that the Maritime agency, in the interest of national defense, might make the award to the west coast company.

In this illustration the ship operator of the Pacific would, of course, be benefited because it would not be necessary for him to move the ship after it was constructed from the east to the west coast.

The converse of this situation, of course, could have occurred under which the ship operator would have suffered a loss—the award for the construction having been made to a shipbuilder whose situs of business was on the coast of the United States directly opposite to the home situs of the ship operator. In this latter situation there would have been an additional cost imposed upon the shipowner.

The existence of these possible situations was known to the applicants for subsidy at the time the applications were filed. It simply does not come with good grace to ask for a modification of the law after the application was filed and the agreement made.

Any other course represents an unwarranted drain on the Treasury (particularly at this time when the deficit is likely to exceed $9 billion) and a form of Federal paternalism contemplated neither in equity, morality, nor the Constitution.

In the case of the legislation at hand, a retroactive payment would be made to subsidized ship operators for the additional costs of subsidized vessel construction when the award had been granted to a shipyard other than the low bidder. This is an old story in the merchant marine. A less than exhaustive review of the last few years reveals retroactive provisions on legislation passed to increase the ceiling on construction subsidy and on a bill to permit larger sums to be paid on traded-in vessels. This is an industry that has successfully converted itself into a ward of the Congress.

Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid. Once the web of subsidy is started, there can be no end to the efforts of the beneficiaries to make sure there is a symmetrical dole at great and continuing cost to the public. H.R. 82 is no exception. Under existing maritime subsidy laws a vessel costing $10 million to build can, and usually does, receive a subsidy of $5.5 million with the remaining $4.5 million paid by the operator. Should national defense reasons indicate that the ship be built in a yard other than the low bidder, the Secretary of Commerce may allocate the contract to the needy yard and the Government pays the difference between the cost of the ship in the low-bid shipyard and the one actually receiving the award. However, this allocation may be to a yard more distant than the low-bid yard thus increasing somewhat the costs of inspection and movement to the eventual owner. Such additional costs approximate $125,000 on each of four ships that were in fact allocated; a sum that might well be made up if the carriers resorted to their usual commercial function by obtaining cargo for at least that portion of the return voyage necessary to get the ship back on berth. Instead, in this case before the Senate it was found easier to seek legislation authorizing retroactive subsidies. Where does the Government's beneficence end and the subsidized company's obligation begin? Is there not some point where men and their entities learn to make the best of their present circumstances rather than rush to the Federal Government for a handout that can be ill afforded? If the logic of H.R. 82 is to prevail, is not legislation in order to pay pre-FHA homebuilders the difference between their present interest rate and that possible under FHA?

Events during the course of the committee consideration of this bill well illustrate the reasoning that leads to a never-ending subsidy. The Department of Commerce recommended that the bill contain a retroactive provision requiring that an operator who saves from an allocation return to the Treasury the benefits of that action. One company did in fact achieve a savings through a favorable allocation, an event that made the latter recommendation of the Department totally unacceptable to it. The sum involved was roughly $41,000. For almost two sessions of Congress the industry fought for a bill retroactively paying to operators $500,000 but not requiring the payment of $41,000 to the Government. The underlying rationale of this posture must be either: (a) equity is a one-way street or (b) the industry can only impress Congress with its needs if it is united. Finally, when no action became likely, the side to gain $500,000 was able to convince the company that had saved $41,000 that a $459,000 net gain for the industry was worth a reevaluation of position. Accordingly, the committee was notified that that source of opposition was withdrawn.

And, in the final analysis, the industry was able to divert attention to how much rather than meeting the question why. Totally overlooked has been the fact that the operator entered a contract for a vessel to be constructed with full knowledge of all subsidy provisions including that provision (sec. 502(f)) authorizing the Secretary to allocate the construction award. Since the Secretary has the dual responsibility to foster a strong, economically healthy merchant marine as well as preserve shipbuilding, it must be assumed that his decision, and the statutory provisions supporting it, did not contemplate any such increment to the subsidy program as would be added by this bill.

I will cast my vote against H.R. 82.

Frank J. Lausche.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should now like to convey to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the information that he desires.

First, the two ships allocated for Moore-McCormack were the *Mormac Cape* and the *Mormac Glen*, the total cost being $23,750,000. The amount of the subsidy was $11,630,000.

The two ships allocated for American Export Lines were the *Export Agent* and the *Export Aide*. The total cost was $23,760,000, and the amount of the subsidy was $11,590,000.

For the American President Lines there were built the *President Lincoln* and the *President Tyler*. The aggregate cost for those two ships was $32,960,000, and the subsidy involved was $16,800,000.

All of those ships were allocated for 1958 and all were delivered in 1961.

I believe that is the information the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] desired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, speaking for the minority on the committee, I completely endorse the position stated by the Senator from Alaska who is also a member of the committee.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct an unforeseen inequity to shipowners which results when the Government, for national defense purposes, assigns the construction of a new ship to a shipyard which was not the low bidder.

The background can be stated briefly. The basic policy of the Merchant Marine Act requires that ships built with a construction subsidy should be built by the lowest responsible bidder, and this bill would not change that policy, nor would it have any effect on it. However, the law permits an exception to the low bid policy. In cases where the Secretary of Commerce determines that certain shipyards need to be encouraged, he may assign, or allocate, the construction of a vessel to a shipyard which was not the lowest bidder. This exception has its roots in the national defense needs of the Nation. Defense considerations require that the Nation have effective and adequate shipyard capacity on all our seacoasts, Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf. The Secretary of Commerce was given the authority to allocate vessel construction in order to assure that adequate shipyard capacity was maintained in all these essential areas.

The need for the bill arises because recent experiences with the allocation of vessel construction have disclosed that it places unexpected and unfair burdens on the vessel owners, who, after all, are not really parties to the decision as to where the ship will be built. These added burdens have involved the expenses of maintaining additional inspection teams at distant shipyards and the cost of transporting the finished ship from the shipyard back to its home port.

The bill will authorize the Government to reimburse the vessel owner for these additional expenses—expenses, I emphasize, which do not bring any benefits to the shipowner, but which were incurred solely as a result of a policy decision by the Federal Government in the interests of our national defense.

The bill has been carefully considered and revised by the Committee to make it perfectly clear that only the net increase in costs will be reimbursed, and to assure that the Federal Government is the beneficiary of any savings if the allocation results in reduced costs to the shipowner.

Mr. President, in my view, those who are damaged by the policy acts of the Federal Government are entitled, as a matter of simple justice, to some reimbursement for their added expenses. That is all this bill would do, and I believe it should be enacted.

I add a comment; and it should not be considered in any way a criticism of my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], for whom I have the most profound admiration and with whom I stand 9 times out of 10 on the floor of the Senate. In his separate views, written with his usual clarity and grasp of the situation, the Senator inadvertently, in my opinion, at one point said something a little unfair and unjust to the ship companies involved. He commented on the fact—which, on its face, if it does not deserve would at least attract comment—that originally the companies which had been damaged were seeking their compensation and were not seeking the kind of retroactive measures which would cause the Government to be reimbursed for cases when the companies had been the beneficiaries.

That is a rather natural situation. Those of us who have been involved in business transactions know that company A, as a matter of common decency in fair competition, would not go before a congressional committee to advocate forcing company B to pay something to the Government. We could hardly expect them to do more than present their own case.

For that reason I believe we should not draw any inference that there has been anything more than plain, simple seeking of justice by these companies.

The important fact about the bill is that the procedure has been followed for a long time, and for future benefits the bill should be passed. I am not discussing the need for maintaining a subsidy for shipyards. I am not at all sure that the way to correct the situation would not be to enforce the "low bidder" policy, and not permit anyone to say, "We are going to build a ship in some particular shipyard for the sake of a subsidy to the shipyard."

That is the policy. That is written into the law. That is not before the Senate and not before the Congress today.

The parts of the bill which would be retroactive are so designed that the ship companies would not receive payments for the past unless those who owed the Government paid their share. That is to be reinforced by an amendment which I understand will become a part of the bill, to be offered by my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio.

It would be a pity if the bill did not get on the statute books, for benefits in the future. The procedure has continued long enough. In my opinion, it would be only fairplay to pass the bill.

As the ranking minority member of the committee, I reinforce everything my friend the Senator from Alaska has said.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire. My recollection is that the Senator sat faithfully through the long hearings, in both years during which the bill was considered. I could not agree with him more completely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I shall describe its contents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 3, line 18, beginning with "provision" strike out all through the end of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (1) all such modifications of contracts entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act which would result in a payment to the United States have been agreed to, and (2) each applicant agreeing to such a modification has executed and filed with the Secretary an affidavit that he has not and will not receive any payment of any kind for agreeing to such modification or as reimbursement of such payment to the United States. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, before I enter into a discussion of the amendment, I wish to point out the reasons why I believe the bill ought not to be passed.

In 1958, when the construction of ships was under consideration, there existed a law which provided for a subsidy and giving the Government the right to assign the building of the ships where it determined proper, if circumstances were such that the interests of the country warranted granting the construction to a company which was not the low bidder, the granting of the contract being made on the basis that it was necessary to keep a shipbuilding company alive on the east coast, the west coast, or the gulf coast.

When the ships were awarded for construction, the owners of the ships knew exactly what the law provided. They knew a possibility existed that the award of a contract would be made in one instance so as to benefit financially the operator and in another instance so as to damage the operator.

Having in mind that situation, the operators went along with the law and received the subsidies described by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

While I am on that subject, I wish to state that the subsidy to the Moore-McCormack Lines was $11,630,000; to the American Export Lines, $11,590,000; and to the American President Lines, $16.8 million.

Now I read from my minority views:

> As a result of my longstanding objection to bills providing for retroactive payments by the Government, I must record my opposition to this measure, H.R. 82.

Since coming to the Senate, I have seen retroactive bills passed on a number of occasions, always to the damage of the Government, never to its benefit. This will be the first time the Federal Government has received the benefit of a retroactive bill. Even in this bill, the Government will receive only $41,000, while it pays out $530,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does he agree with me that the principle is more important than the money involved here?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think my principle is. Retroactive laws are never good, and they are especially not good when applied to the Federal Government always to its damage, but never to its benefit. That is the reason why I express my opposition to the measure.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I cannot refrain from warning the Senator that we are to have a tax bill that will be retroactive. The retroactivity involved in this bill is a mere drop in the bucket compared to what will be involved retroactively in the tax bill. I wondered how the Senator felt about the principle as it would apply to the tax bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The same principle is involved. The retroactivity will apply, not to the benefit of the Government, but to the benefit of others. There will be no retroactive phase in the tax bill that will impose a burden on the taxpayer to pay to the Federal Government.

So I think the situation, again, is that retroactive laws are always passed to put a burden on the Government, and never to its benefit.

I continue to read from my minority views:

> When the ship operators made applications for subsidies they knew of the existing law under which the then Maritime Board might award the contract to a shipbuilder who was

> not the low bidder. They knew that a possibility existed that an applicant carrier on the waters of the Pacific might find himself in the position that the low bidder for the building of a ship was on the east coast and the higher bidder on the west coast, and that the maritime agency, in the interest of national defense, might make the award to the west coast company.
>
> In this illustration the ship operator of the Pacific would, of course, be benefited because it would not be necessary for him to move the ship after it was constructed from the east to the west coast.
>
> The converse of this situation, of course, could have occurred under which the ship operator would have suffered a loss—the award for the construction having been made to a shipbuilder whose situs of business was on the coast of the United States directly opposite to the home situs of the ship operator. In this latter situation there would have been an additional cost imposed upon the shipowner.
>
> The existence of these possible situations was known to the applicants for subsidy at the time the applications were filed. It simply does not come with good grace to ask for a modification of the law after the application was filed and the agreement made.
>
> Any other course represents an unwarranted drain on the Treasury (particularly at this time when the deficit is likely to exceed $9 billion) and a form of Federal paternalism contemplated neither in equity, morality, nor the Constitution.
>
> In the case of the legislation at hand, a retroactive payment would be made to subsidized ship operators for the additional costs of subsidized vessel construction when the award had been granted to a shipyard other than the low bidder. This is an old story in the merchant marine. A less than exhaustive review of the last few years reveals retroactive provisions on legislation passed to increase the ceiling on construction subsidy and on a bill to permit larger sums to be paid on traded-in vessels. This is an industry that has successfully converted itself into a ward of the Congress.

The two bills I have mentioned were passed and made retroactive. In both of them benefits were provided retroactively to the industry. The bills that were passed were, of course, also made prospective; but the retroactive feature is the principal part of which I complain.

Reading further from my minority views:

> Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] made some mention of that.

> Perhaps the fault really lies in the original decision to provide Government aid. Once the web of subsidy is started, there can be no end to the efforts of the beneficiaries to make sure there is a symmetrical dole at great and continuing cost to the public. H.R. 82 is no exception. Under existing maritime subsidy laws a vessel costing $10 million to build can, and usually does, receive a subsidy of $5.5 million with the remaining $4.5 million paid by the operator.

I may want to correct this statement somewhat, because the subsidy goes to the shipyard, and not the operator; but it is a cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the Senator has made an incorrect assumption, which may or may not be important. I point out that the subsidies are not uniformly at the rate of 55 percent. That is the ceiling which may be paid. My understanding is that more vessels are constructed with a less than 50 percent subsidy than with a subsidy in excess of 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator has mentioned that fact, because it brings to my mind another thought. When the subsidy law was enacted in 1936, it was contemplated and expected that in the course of time the differential in costs between building ships in foreign countries and in the United States would be eliminated. It was anticipated that the time would come when our shipbuilding yards would be able to compete with foreign yards.

In 1936 the maximum subsidy was designated to be not more than 50 percent of the cost of the ship. I believe in 1961 we were notified that the differential was not reduced, but was aggravated. So in 1961 a new law was enacted, making the maximum payment not 50 percent, but 55 percent.

Strangely, at the hearings it was stated that this differential in all probability would grow worse as time went on.

Getting back to my minority views, on page 13:

> Should national defense reasons indicate that the ship be built in a yard other than the low bidder, the Secretary of Commerce may allocate the contract to the needy yard and the Government pays the difference between the cost of the ship in the low-bid shipyard and the one actually receiving the award. However, this allocation may be to a yard more distant than the low-bid yard thus increasing somewhat the costs of inspection and movement to the eventual owner. Such additional costs approximate $125,000 on each of four ships that were in fact allocated; a sum that might well be made up if the carriers resorted to their usual commercial function by obtaining cargo for at least that portion of the return voyage necessary to get the ship back on berth.

I have, in substance, related my reasons why the bill should not be passed. If it is to be passed, I ask that an amendment to it be adopted. Three ship companies are involved. One is to be paid $270,000 retroactively, and the other is to be paid $260,000 retroactively. That makes a total of $530,000. One company, the American President Lines, is to pay back $41,000. The Senator from New Hampshire has made the statement that the $41,000 cannot constitutionally be demanded. In other words, we cannot make a law retroactively requiring a party to pay back to the Government something that it did not owe under the original contract. The bill now provides that the $530,000 shall not be paid until the $41,000 is paid back to the Government. My amendment contemplates requiring the two recipients, the one of $270,000 and the other of $260,000, and also the third company, which is to pay to the Government $41,000, to file affidavits to the effect that no understanding has been reached and no payments have been made by the recipients, or are to be paid by the recipients, to the one that is to pay $41,000 to the Government. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the Senator from Ohio to accept the amendment. I should like to say, however, that in many ways I regret that the amendment has been offered, and that the Senator from Ohio felt it necessary to offer it, because it implies the likelihood of conniving and doubledealing and the entering into practices that I do not believe responsible American businessmen would ever engage in. I can understand the American Export Line and the Moore-McCormack Line using their persuasive powers to induce the American President Line to pay the $41,000 to the Government, and it would be surprising to me if they did not do so; but I cannot imagine their going any further and saying, for example, to American President Line, "If you pay the $41,000, when we get our $530,000 from the Government, between us we will see that you will be made whole."

I do not believe that American businessmen would for a moment dream of operating in this manner. However, if the Senator from Ohio feels it essential to add this amendment to the bill, well and good, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would not have offered the amendment if it were not for the fact that for the past several years the company which is to pay back $41,000 has specifically declared that it would not pay it. The objection to passing the original bill was that in the instances where we lose, we pay; in the instances where we ought to gain, we do not get back the money. Within the last year there has been a change in attitude; and, to make sure, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The distinguished Senator from Alaska, who has the task of guiding the bill on the floor of the Senate and representing the majority of the committee, has agreed to accept the amendment. I am not disposed to object. It is essential that the bill be passed, and I am not disposed to object in any way. I am willing to agree that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be accepted, so far as I am concerned, representing the minority of the committee.

I commend the Senator from Ohio for the vigilance that he so characteristically always exercises in looking after the Government's interests.

However, before I agree to accept the amendment, I believe the record should be set straight. I hold no brief for any steamship company, and I hold no brief for the Committee on American Steamship Lines, which represents the industry. However, the tone of the debate would indicate that there was something dishonorable or sub rosa in the whole transaction, and this I could almost say, I resent, not only on the part of the members of the committee, but also on the part of the companies and their associations who have appeared before us.

I wish to repeat something I said a few minutes ago. If the distinguished Senator from Ohio or the distinguished Senator from Alaska or the distinguished Senator from Delaware happened to be the president of the Moore-McCormack Lines—and I doubt whether any of us would ever be offered that position—and if we appeared before the committee, does anyone think that we would come before the committee, representing our stockholders, and say, "We have been unjustly put to costs, and deprived of certain sums of money, and we hope that this committee will reimburse us; at the same time, we want you to collect from our competitor, the American President Lines, what they got from Congress"?

We know that no representative of a steamship company will come before a committee urging Congress to collect what some other steamship line should pay. That is our job. It is a job that we should try to do, and it is a job that the Senator from Ohio is making sure will be done.

I believe the bill is perfectly sound. If the proposed amendment would make it any more ironclad, I will go along with the Senator from Ohio. I want to see the Government get whatever it should get. I am not worried about who pays it or what the circumstances are or what is paid. If the Senator from Ohio feels that the amendment should be adopted, I respect his judgment and integrity so much I will agree to accept it.

From the very start, there has been no "monkey business," as we say in New Hampshire.

Mr. BARTLETT. And in Alaska.

Mr. COTTON. There has been nothing sub rosa, nothing dishonorable; there has been no desire to enable anyone to get something for nothing.

If the bill were not made retroactive, I am not at all sure that the ship lines involved could not proceed by having a bill of their own introduced by the Committee on the Judiciary, because they have been subjected to expense through no fault of their own by a policy of the Government.

So long as the Record clearly shows that there is no reflection either on the steamship lines that appeared before our committee or on the committee itself, I am perfectly willing to join with the distinguished Senator from Alaska and accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARTLETT. For my part, I could not and would not regard the amendment as any reflection. I agree completely with what the Senator from New Hampshire has said.

I do not wish to take further time of the Senate unnecessarily; but I say to the Senator from Ohio, who remarked that this is always a one-way street—that the Government pays out, while the companies receive—that in 1947 or 1948 some ships were built under the construction subsidy program. In 1955 the companies were called in and told that they had received too much money. Late in the 1950's the companies agreed to reimburse the Government. So it is not always a one-way street.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the appropriate place, it is proposed to insert:

> *Provided further,* That no interest shall be paid on any refund authorized under this Act.

Mr. BARTLETT. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

Mr. BARTLETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. COTTON. I object.

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill (H.R. 82) was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. COTTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 502, Senate bill 927.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, to strike out "February 1, 1962," and insert "the date of enactment."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 927, I could do no better—no matter how detailed a statement I might make—than to refer to the explanation of the bill which is incorporated in the committee report. I refer to the report by the majority of the committee—even though there have been printed, in connection with the committee report, certain minority views.

The basic purpose of the bill is to allow U.S. citizens who own vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidy funds the same rights in respect to war risk coverage of these vessels as now are available not only to American owners, but also to foreign owners of such vessels.

The more I have considered the bill, the more it has seemed to me that a strange hodgepodge had developed over the years, and in some cases and in certain instances it does not make for logical treatment. Indeed, it does not seem to me to make good sense.

I could speak at great length about the merits of the bill. However, I think I shall concentrate upon one example which, to my mind, illustrates in the way that nothing else does the inequities which prevail under existing law.

Consider the passenger liner SS *America*. In the existing circumstances, the Maritime Administration makes it mandatory for the United States Lines, the owner-operator of that ship, to carry insurance in the amount of $6,400,000; but the war risk insurance laws provide that if war were to come, but prior to the Government's requisitioning of the ship for either title or for use, the insurance figure would drop to $4,556,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield, or does he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I discussed this bill with the Senator when it was taken up by the Senate on a previous occasion. However, final action was not then taken on the bill; and it is now being considered by the Senate again.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I was previously misinformed about the bill. In substance, the bill would give the owner of a subsidized vessel which had to be replaced the amount of his insurance, to be applied toward the cost of construction of a new vessel. But if the vessel were not to be replaced, the owner of the subsidized vessel would not receive anything more than the depreciated value of the vessel when it went down. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. BARTLETT. The fact is that any insurance payments which are made must go into a vessel replacement fund, and cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so understand. If the ship were not to be replaced—in other words, if the owner did not wish to have a new ship built, to replace the one he had lost—he would not be paid the full value of his war risk insurance, but he would be paid only his share of the depreciated value of the ship. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us assume that the SS *America* sinks tomorrow. Then there would go into the vessel replacement fund, to be used for no other purpose, the amount of $6.4 million.

Let us assume, on the other hand, that an emergency has arisen, and that the insurance is whittled down, prior to requisitions for use or title, to $4,556,000. That amount would go into the replacement fund.

The third situation—and it is the third situation that has led me to believe that the bill is justifiable in every way—involves a vessel, say the SS *America*, to be precise in this instance, which is requisitioned by the Government for use under war conditions. In that event the insurance would drop to $437,000; although today the Maritime Administration insists that commercial insurance in the amount of more than $6 million be carried. Whatever the situation might be, the money that is derived from the insurance fund would go into a vessel replacement "kitty" as it were, which must be used for the one purpose only of building of another vessel to replace it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Using the last example of the SS *America*, suppose we assume its owner had a certain amount of insurance on her and did not wish to replace her. Then what would he be entitled to get? When I objected before my point was—and I understand I was wrong—that he would not get more than he had invested in the ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. If his decision should be to go out of business for example, my understanding is that he could withdraw that money. But all the taxes normally applicable would be levied against that amount.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the Senator is correct in that understanding. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator then explain to me his understanding?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding is that if the shipowner does not wish to replace the ship, he cannot get the full amount of the war risk insurance, but he can get his share of the depreciated value of the vessel.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not believe the Senator is correct in that assumption.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not want him to get more than he had in the ship if he decided not to replace it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am positive about that. The money would go into a fund and would be segregated for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If he did not replace it.

Mr. BARTLETT. That decision would come much later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I give an answer to that question?

This is a statement made by Mr. Gulick of the U.S. Department of Commerce, on S. 937, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

> So as to provide that the valuation for Government war risk insurance purposes of American-flag ships that have been built with the aid of construction differential subsidy shall be the current domestic market value of the vessels without considering that the owners in return for the subsidy have agreed that, if the vessels are requisitioned in time of war or national emergency, the requisition price shall be not more than the owner's depreciated acquisition costs.

That language means that there are two different rights of insurance—first, the nonsubsidized ship, and second, the subsidized ship. The nonsubsidized ship is allowed to buy war risk insurance in an amount equal to the market value of the ship. The subsidized shipowner can buy war risk insurance only in an amount not in excess of the market value but equal to the book value; that is, the depreciated value.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe that statement is subject to a slight correction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I be permitted to finish my statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator permit me to finish my statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. Excuse me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The subsidized shipowners desire to be placed in the same category as the nonsubsidized. When shipowners now accept the subsidy, they are bound to turn the ship over in case of war or emergency and to be paid the book value. On that basis the Government has said to those shipowners that all they should be entitled to by way of insurance is not the market value, but the book value.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but that is not a correct statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what the Department of Commerce has said on the subject.

### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—ORDER TO CONVENE AT NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XII, there be a time limitation on the pending measure; that the Senate convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow; that there be a 30-minute period for routine morning business; that there be at least 2 hours of debate on the pending measure; and that the vote come not later than 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, the time to be divided between the Senator——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Suppose the morning hour runs until 1 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said "at least 2 hours of debate." As a part of the agreement, I ask that the time be divided between the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

### Unanimous-Consent Agreement

*Ordered*, That effective on Thursday, December 5, after the hour of 12:30 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill S. 927, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], with the vote on final passage coming not later than 2:30 p.m.

*Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

*Provided further*, That the Senate shall convene at 12 noon and the time from 12 noon until 12:30 may be used for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question which has not been answered to my satisfaction. What the Senator from Ohio has spoken of relates to subsidized vessels taken over by the Government and then lost. As I understand, the money received from the war risk insurance would go into a pot to build a new vessel. The owner of half of that vessel would not receive any cash.

If the owner desired to build a new ship, the money would be available.

However, assuming that he would not wish to build a new ship, what would the owner receive from the war risk insurance? Would he receive the depreciated value of the vessel at the time it was sunk? Would he get the fair market value of the vessel at the time it was sunk, or what would he receive? I do not wish him to get more than he would have in the vessel.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to answer the question in two parts. Admittedly, I was less than completely explanatory when the Senator first propounded the question. I might as well be frank in stating that I did not have the correct answer, although I thought I did.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The question is very complicated. I do not blame the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is a bit technical. My understanding at the moment—and I propose to do further research on this subject before tomorrow—is that insurance money of this nature would go into the replacement fund and could not be used for any other purpose whatsoever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator's understanding is the same as mine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would go into a "pot." If they wish to build a new ship, the shipyard would get its share and the owner would get his share of the value of the ship which was sunk, toward the cost of the new ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. This would be his contribution, and then the Government would make the usual construction subsidy contribution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Up to the depreciated value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator previously asked: Would the owner be entitled to the market value or to the depreciated value?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am interested in ships. I wish to help in any way I can. I wish to make sure that the owner of a ship, if he does not want a replacement, will not get from war risk insurance more than he put into the vessel originally.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is proper. Under the existing law he would get the depreciated value of the ship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the proposed law he would be entitled to the market value of the ship. That would be a great difference.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with a part of what the Senator from Ohio said, but not all.

Let us consider again the case of the *America*. That provides a ready means for identification of the entire subject.

In the first instance there is the situation as of today, in which the Maritime Administration compels the owner-operators of the United States Lines to insure the vessel commercially for $6.4 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Government would have half of the $6.4 million, if it were a 50-50 subsidy?

Mr. BARTLETT. No. This would all be for the benefit of the owner-operator.

Let us suppose an emergency should arise. The Maritime Administration would say, "We want your ship. We need it for war purposes. Prior to our requisitioning the ship, for use or for title, your insurance must be calculated upon two factors; the domestic value of the *America*, minus the amount represented by the subsidy that was paid in the construction of the *America*."

The two figures add up, in this instance, to $4,456,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the market value?

Mr. BARTLETT. Minus the subsidy percentage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Minus what the Government has in it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Let us consider a third situation. Let us assume that a war is in progress. Let us assume the Government has requisitioned the *America* for use.

Then the war risk insurance would drop to $437,000, which represents—and this is where I dissent from the opinion expressed by the Senator from Ohio—the residual or scrap value of the *America*.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read what Mr. Gulick says on this subject. He is the authority.

> Mr. GULICK. We would like to answer some of the arguments industry made last year on behalf of an identical bill. One of these arguments is that we require commercial marine hull insurance on the *America* in the amount of $6,400,000, but that the *America* is eligible for Government war risk insurance only at the amount of about $450,000, and that these values are disproportionate. We think these different values reflect different conditions with regard to the probability of war and, therefore, with respect to the probability of the requisitioning of the ship at the $450,000 price.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Four million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Four hundred and fifty thousand dollars. It has been depreciated to $450,000, and the owner wants this depreciated ship, with the value of $450,000, to be insured by war risk insurance at $6.4 million. That is why every branch of the Government is against the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the owners want to pay the premiums to buy that insurance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. They want to pay the premium; but if war should be with us the danger of the ship being sunk would be far greater than now, in time of peace.

Mr. BARTLETT. They cannot buy war risk insurance now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read further from Mr. Gulick's testimony:

> Commercial war risk insurance is terminated upon the outbreak of war—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The *America* has an insurance policy. The moment a war occurred, the policy would be ended—

> outbreak of war between the powers mentioned and it excludes loss resulting from an event that occurs within 90 days of the outbreak of war which leads to war.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What would the nonsubsidized vessel get?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The nonsubsidized vessel is entitled to insurance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To war risk insurance?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; at its market value. The subsidized vessel can be insured under existing law only at its book value. The reason why it can be insured only at its book value is that the Government is allowed to take it over at the book value. If the Government is allowed to take it over at the book value, why should the insurance be at the market value?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If this bill were passed the company would be financially better off if the ship were sunk than it would be if the ship were returned to the company after the war.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it they would have a ship worth $450,000, and if the ship were sunk they would get $6.4 million. Would that not be an inducement to have the ship sunk en route?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator say that again? Under what circumstances would they get $6.4 million?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The ship could be taken over under the law, could it not, for $450,000? If the Government should decide to take the ship from the company during time of war, is that not what it would pay?

Mr. BARTLETT. It would be chartered, under arrangements to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought the Senator said it would be taken over for $450,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Could they not requisition it for the depreciated value?

Mr. BARTLETT. That would be the amount of war risk insurance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking of what it could be taken over for by the Government in time of war.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that; no.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me quote again what Mr. Gulick says:

> We think these different values reflect different conditions with regard to the probability of war and, therefore, with respect to the probability of the requisitioning of the ship at the $450,000 price.

That is a quotation, word for word.

Mr. BARTLETT. What does he mean, in the forepart of the statement? I find difficulty in understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What he means is that under the agreement when the subsidy was granted, the grantee agreed that in time of war the Government could take over the ship at its book value, as distinguished from its market value.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But a nonsubsidized vessel would be taken over at market value?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if an unsubsidized vessel were sunk, the owner would get the market value?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And not the book value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a subsidized vessel were sunk under present law, the company would get merely the book value, and not the market value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will inform the Senator from Massachusetts that the Federal Government has two routes open to it in the requisitioning process. It can—and almost always does in such circumstances—requisition for use. If it prefers, however, it has a right to requisition for title.

Then the ship becomes the property of the Federal Government. But that does not so often happen, I am informed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It happened that many ships were taken over in the last war. I have a report compiled by the Interstate Commerce Committee under date of April 1951 which gives a list of all the ships that were requisitioned during the war along with the price at which the ships were later sold back to the companies. After the war the Government sold them back to the subsidized shipowners at a depreciated formula, about which they did not complain. Some were sold after the war for as low a price as $17,000 a piece, net. That was the valuation placed on the ships when we sold them back. The *Deltargentino* and the *del Brasil* were sold to the American-South African Lines after the war at a net price of $17,000 each. The construction cost of each of those two ships was over $3 million.

In my opinion the shipping companies are already adequately protected. It is about time we began to think about the taxpayers.

Besides, this bill is opposed by every agency of the Government on the basis that it is unfair to the taxpayers in general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Alaska still has the floor. I should like to ask him the question to which I still have not received the answer. The Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Alaska all say that if the subsidized ship is sunk it means the war risk insurance goes into a pot to replace the ship at its fair market value, and that money is a part of the owner's contribution to the new subsidized ship. What would happen, assuming that the owner did not want to buy a new ship or replace the old ship?

This bill may be a fair bill if the owner does not get more than he originally put into it, provided he does not want to build a new ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was informed a few moments ago by the Maritime Administration, in response to an inquiry, that there is no provision—none which has ever been exercised, at any rate—whereby the money from such a fund was used for other than replacement purposes.

It is a very interesting question, and a very important one. I propose tomorrow to have a more explanatory and, I hope, more useful answer for the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate that. I think it would be desirable in fairness to the consideration of this bill. I have always supported merchant marine bills, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BARTLETT. And very vigorously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There ought to be an amendment in the bill, if necessary, providing that an owner who does not want to replace the ship will not get more than he originally had put into the ship.

Mr. BARTLETT. In line with what the Senator has been saying, it is the intention of the committee that those funds shall be used for replacement purposes; that they shall not serve to constitute a bonanza for anyone.

At the present time we are engaged in the biggest vessel replacement program in the history of the country. This country is building upward of 300 ships, at a cost to the companies of $2 billion, and with a further contribution by the way of subsidy which will come from the Federal Government.

I, no more than the Senator from Massachusetts, would want to create a situation whereby a man who owns and operates a vessel today could run away, figuratively speaking, with a large sum of money to which he would not otherwise be entitled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, if an unsubsidized owner is allowed to obtain the fair market value during wartime if his ship is sunk, under war risk insurance, why should a subsidized vessel owner, in which he has 50 percent and the Government has 50 percent, be permitted to get only the book value, rather than market value? Why should one get the fair market value and the other get only the book value?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think they should be treated alike.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wonder what the Senator from Ohio thinks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposal in the bill does not contemplate treatment alike.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Why not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Because the Senator from Massachusetts has just pointed out that he normally has about 50 percent of the cost of the ship invested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. While the nonsubsidized owner has 100 percent invested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. This bill contemplates putting them on the same basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator mean 100 percent?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I read from page 7 of the hearings:

> The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 also makes it possible, by Government aid, for American owners themselves to acquire ships which are the product of American labor. Without such aid the ships could not have been acquired. For this support of the owners by the Government, the Government gets certain ownership rights. They are three, and they run with title to the ships by law.
>
> They are: One, the right to control disposition. The construction-differential subsidy ship can be sold only to a company which will document the ship under the U.S. flag for the first 25 years of its life.
>
> Two, the right to control the use of the ship. The CDS ship must not only be operated in foreign trade, it may not be operated in domestic commerce, except within the limits provided in section 506 of the act. If it is so operated within those limits, a fixed percentage of the CDS is forfeited.
>
> Three—

And this is the important one—

> the right to reacquire the ship by requisition. The Government retains the right to regain ownership at a fixed price. These ownership rights affect the ship's value for war risk insurance purposes and may not be ignored. There is a fundamental difference between commercial war risk insurance and Government war risk insurance.
>
> However, both must serve recognized insurance principles. Not only must the Government war risk insurance be based on a value which takes into account burdens on title and use which reduce that value, but it must be recognized also that the Government is a self-insurer of its contribution which made it possible for the ship to be constructed in the first place.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to reply to that.

The assumption made by the Senator from Ohio is that huge benefits flow as a consequence of Government financial assistance to the company which becomes the owner of the vessel. I submit that that is not the case. He is required to build domestically. He does so under a construction subsidy. Thereafter he is forced to place the ship on routes approved by the Maritime Board——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think he is compelled to sell only to ones that are approved.

Mr. BARTLETT. He is compelled to hire American seamen. Why does he do all these things?

He does it in order that Americans may be given employment on these vessels, in order that the shipbuilding yards under the American flag may be kept, if not in a prosperous condition, at least in a tolerable one.

What is being done is being done for the benefit of the Nation.

It might be his choice—and I understand that it could be—to go abroad and have the vessel built in Japan, for example, or in West Germany, and then to hire cheap foreign labor and staff the vessel with the cheap foreign labor; and then to take his chance in the world market, including the carriage of U.S. traffic.

However, he is not permitted to do these things. He is not permitted to do them because Congress has held that it would not be in the national interest for him to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it is the desire of Senators to recess for the evening, but I wish to make one point. I believe that the owner of a subsidized vessel, if he does not wish to replace the vessel—and I understand that the money goes into a pot, and he would get a vessel to the extent of the market value of the vessel if it were sunk—or even if he wishes to replace the vessel, he should not be entitled to more than he actually put into the vessel when it was originally built, and that is the fair market value. If those provisions are in the bill, it seems to me that the bill is protective. If such provisions were not in the bill, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, the owner of a subsidized vessel would receive the whole 100 percent.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let me comment on that statement for a moment. Suppose the owner of a subsidized vessel has a ship that cost him $10 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a subsidized ship. That means $5 million apiece.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not a $10 million ship, however. It is roughly a $5 million ship on the world market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wish to get down to the proposal that rightly concerns the Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to read briefly from a letter written to me by Mr. J. D. Durand, of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, under date of April 30, 1963. It appears in the hearings at pages 35 and 36 of April 1.

I shall read a portion of the letter. I do not propose to read all of it, in order to save time. Mr. Durand writes:

> DEAR SIR: A question has arisen whether, under S. 927, it would be possible for a steamship company to receive in war risk insurance more than that company had paid for a lost vessel, and, if this is not the case, whether the total of insurance proceeds and accrued depreciation on the lost ship might amount to more than the cost of the vessel to the owner.
>
> After review of this subject we have concluded that it is practically impossible for a situation to arise in which war risk insurance proceeds from a lost ship would amount to more than the owner's cost of the ship. The only possibility, and it is remote, under which this could happen would be the case of the loss of a new ship, the market value of which, because of inflation, exceeded the owner's cost. For this to occur the annual rate of inflation would have to exceed the owner's annual rate of depreciation, of 4 or 5 percent. Even in this remote instance, however, the insurance recovered would not exceed the cost, to the owner, of a replacement ship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be possible to add an amendment to the bill providing that in no case shall the owner of a subsidized vessel, with war risk insurance, receive more than he had originally put into the ship?

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall be glad to take up this point with the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the unsubsidized owner in control of the SS *America*, which has been used as an illustration, who put up the full sum, would be entitled to insurance amounting to $6,400,000. The depreciated value of the ship, according to this illustration, was $450,000. In building the ship, the subsidized owner put up 50 percent of $6.4 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He would be putting up $3.2 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The rights given to the subsidized owner, under the suggestion made by the Senator from Massachusetts, would be far in excess of the rights given to the unsubsidized owner.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment could provide that the owner of a subsidized vessel which was lost in the war, and on which war risk insurance was carried, could not receive more than 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not wish to concur in the Senator's suggestion, but there is logic and strength in what the Senator has said. Of course that would mean a change in the whole subsidy law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for asking his very searching and useful questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that an amendment could be devised which would clarify these subjects, which, from an outsider's point of view—that of one who does not serve on the committee—are not very clear.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the Senator will make note of the letter from which I have read, which appears at pages 35 and 36 of the hearings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on November 28, 1963, the Philadelphia Inquirer published an excellent editorial entitled "The New President Speaks." The editorial points out that "the Presidency of the United States is in strong hands, it was demonstrated on Wednesday in Lyndon B. Johnson's first address to the Congress since his succession to that high office."

The Inquirer refers to our new President as "a humble and patriotic American, suddenly loaded down with awesome responsibilities. Lyndon Johnson asked Congress for its help in the days ahead. He should receive that help—and that of all Americans."

I join in the sentiment expressed by the Inquirer and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE NEW PRESIDENT SPEAKS

If proof were needed that the Presidency of the United States is in strong hands, it was demonstrated on Wednesday in Lyndon B. Johnson's first address to the Congress since his succession to that high office.

He spoke solemnly, unsmilingly, to a somber Senate and House, still numbed by the tragic ordeals of the past 5 days. His speech was low keyed, in keeping with the occasion.

But it was forceful and direct, and it reflected the strength of the speaker's convictions and his determination to take hold of the burdens thrust upon him to the best of his ability.

He made it clear where the Government stands; he left no doubts in anyone's mind as to the course that he will follow. His position, his policies, his commitments will be those of the murdered John F. Kennedy; where his predecessor said on his inauguration: "Let us make a beginning," President Johnson says to the American people: "Let us continue."

Many persons have been anxiously awaiting the position the new President would take on the two controversial issues that are left overs from the Kennedy administration, civil rights and tax reduction; and the bills concerning each that are among the unfinished business of the present Congress.

Mr. Johnson made it clear what he wants done: both the civil rights legislation and the bill calling for income tax reduction should be enacted into law quickly.

"No memorial oration could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory," he told Congress, "than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought." And again: "No act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the earliest passage of the tax bill for which he fought."

On world affairs, the President was equally explicit. The United States will maintain military strength second to none in the world and will, at the same time, be unceasing in the search for peace. This Nation will keep its commitments "from South Vietnam to West Berlin." It will support the United Nations and keep its alliances strong.

And he flung this challenge to the foes of America and of freedom: "Those who test our courage will find it strong. Those who seek our friendship will find it honorable."

Lyndon Johnson came before Congress with a heavy heart, just as he had sorrowfully taken the oath of office as President minutes after John F. Kennedy died from an assassin's bullet. He appeared to make the deepest impression upon his hearers when he called earnestly for "an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence" in the land.

A humble and patriotic American, suddenly loaded down with awesome responsibilities, Lyndon Johnson asked Congress for its help in the days ahead. He should receive that help—and that of all Americans.

## TALMADGE-HUMPHREY COTTON BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment this evening on proposed agricultural legislation which will be proceeding through the channels of Congress. I refer particularly to the cotton bill now being debated in the other body.

There is no disagreement as to the fact that the domestic textile industry is in trouble and that new cotton legislation is badly needed. The need for this legislation is revealed by the following:

First. Increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and CCC investment in cotton.

Second. The decreasing share of cotton in the utilization of the various fibers.

Third. Increasing Government costs.

Fourth. The decreasing share of world production of cotton by U.S. producers.

It was in response to these facts that I joined with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] in introducing the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. I am pleased at the increasing editorial support this bill is receiving. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks two editorials from the Washington Post which deal with the cotton dilemma.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill would enable the cotton industry to get back on its feet and reduce U.S. Government outlays. It would eliminate acreage controls and instead assign to each farmer a domestic allotment in terms of pounds or bales of cotton. Instead of a steady reduction in utilization, we would get expansion. Instead of heavy Government costs for storage and export, we would get utilization through the free market system. Instead of the "trickling down" of money to the producer, we would appropriate funds directly to the man who takes the risks and makes the whole industry possible.

It may seem rather peculiar to some Senators and to some citizens that a Senator from Minnesota should be interested in cotton as a product and in cotton production and cotton processing. I served for 8 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. During that time I was called upon to vote on cotton legislation and to listen to the testimony of cotton producers, representatives of the Cotton Council, and representatives of textile processors. I became familiar with some of the difficult problems that cotton producers face, and the problems the textile industry itself faces. Therefore, I sought to be of some help.

I found in the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] one of the most knowledgeable and best informed individuals in the Nation so far as agricultural policy is concerned, as it relates specifically to cotton. The Senator from Georgia developed a cotton program—the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. I joined him in sponsoring that program in the Senate. I consider this to be progressive and effective legislation. It is legislation designed to aid the cotton producer and, above all, to permit the American textile manufacturer to compete in world markets.

It is time we stopped the use of acreage controls and quotas and regulations and compliance checks on the cotton farmer. It is time we made it possible for the efficiency of the private trader to move this commodity to the ultimate consumer. Then, and only then, will we be able to substitute "growthmanship" for "shrinkmanship," because what is happening now is that our cotton markets are shrinking while they ought to be growing.

The Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill would eliminate confusion and do away with hidden subsidies, and would again enable U.S. cotton to compete in foreign markets.

I am opposed to the cotton bill that is being considered by the other body. I am opposed to it because I do not think it would do the job that needs to be done; that is, to aid the cotton producer, on the one hand, and also to help the textile industry meet foreign competition, on the other hand.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and me would be much more efficient in its operation and less costly, and would provide direct assistance to cotton producers and the textile manufacturer, because it would permit the textile manufacturer to buy cotton at a reasonable price and thus enable him to compete in world markets at world prices.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his interest in the cotton problem. While the cottongrowers of my State are divided as between the two measures, I am not now speaking on the bill. However, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator. His State does not produce cotton, but the subject is worthy of every leader, as he is a leader, on the national level.

When the American Colonies were first founded, after a few years tobacco became the main export crop. It remained the main export crop of the Colonies for 200 years, until some years after independence. But with the invention of the cotton gin, cotton became the major agricultural export. For a hundred years it brought in more money than any other export from this country.

The decline in the export of cotton has been a weakening factor in our whole economy and in our whole export trade. So it is a very fine thing that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has studied this problem which means so much to the overall American economy.

In my State, the value of the oil and gas produced is about five times the value of the cotton produced. However, far more people earn their living from producing cotton than the producers of oil and gas, because oil and gas move largely beyond the State.

Of all the families who earn their living in my State, far more earn it on the side of cotton. Cotton brings into my State about $800 million a year, out of a total of $1.5 billion in field crops. It accounts for more than half the value of all field crops. It is a very important commodity, grown from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, with a great growth of cotton taking place in Arizona, New Mexico, and California, as well. It is a crop that means much in the enlargement of our exports. I think it is well worth the time of the distinguished majority whip to discuss it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas, particularly for his vast information about this important crop and the manner in which it affects the economy of his State and also of the national economy.

My interest is derived from the fact that I know that cotton is one of our major commodities. For a long time it was one of our major export crops.

I also know that the American textile industry is fighting for its life against foreign competition. On the one hand, we export American cotton and make available an export subsidy, so that our foreign competitors are able to obtain American cotton cheaper than our domestic producers.

On the other hand, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill would provide a production payment to cotton producers, which would permit them to make a good living. This payment will be the difference between the world price and what would be judged to be a reasonable and fair domestic price for the producers; and in the marketplace the American manufacturers could purchase American cotton at the world market price, so that our textile plants could compete with foreign production, using American cotton. Thereby our farmers could produce at a price which would be augmented by a payment to permit a family to make a decent living out of the production of cotton.

I realize that this measure is an innovation. I refer to it now only because in the morning press I noted a statement to the effect that the House is considering this problem and is considering a "compromise" cotton bill. I believe that when that bill comes to us from the other body, we should amend it by substituting the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. Otherwise, our producers will be in great trouble.

The administration finds itself in a sense supporting both these bills. I think the administration should decide which of the two it really wants. If the Bureau of the Budget considers both of these bills, I believe it will want the Talmadge-Humphrey bill; and if the Department of Agriculture will decide which of these bills will better serve the producers, I am sure the Department will favor the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. Furthermore, I am confident that the textile industry will find the Talmadge-Humphrey bill much the more desirable of the two.

I read now from an article, written by William M. Blair, and published today in the New York Times:

> The opening of debate brought the unusual situation of Mr. COOLEY telling the House that the cotton bill, known as the Cooley bill, was not what he favored. He said that he favored a compensatory payment system, but that he knew direct payments would not be authorized by Congress.
>
> Compensatory, or direct, payments would be the difference between the market price for cotton and a predetermined Federal support price. These payments would go direct to cotton producers.

Mr. President, most of those with whom I have talked say the Talmadge-Humphrey bill is the one which should be enacted. The farmers, the economists, the textile manufacturers, and the Members of Congress are saying that. However, word goes throughout the land that Congress will not pass it. I think it is time to stop playing games with agricultural legislation. What we want in such legislation is, first, to protect the free enterprise, agricultural, family farm economy of this country. That can be done through a compensatory payment system. Second, we want U.S. agriculture to be able to compete in foreign markets. However, that is not possible with artificially high prices. Therefore, we have to have a program which permits the free market price to be the price that is effective in world markets, and provides a domestic market price that will provide a decent standard of living to our farm producers, made available by the establishment of a direct payment to producers. Under the Talmadge-Humphrey bill, that payment will be the difference between the world price and what would be judged to be a reasonable and fair domestic price for the producers.

Mr. President, I find the cotton bill which is being considered by the other body much less desirable than the Talmadge-Humphrey bill. The cotton bill now being considered by the other body would be unnecessarily expensive, would be most difficult to police, and would be fraught with all sorts of possibilities of abuse. That bill retains all of the old control mechanisms, and even adds a few new ones.

On the other hand, the Talmadge-Humphrey bill is designed to simplify the application of effective price supports for domestic producers and to intensify U.S. exports at competitive prices in the world trade.

Mr. President, I stand with the farmers, and I stand alongside the textile manufacturers. The textile workers need a cotton program which will give them equity and a chance to sell and to compete, with a profit. The Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill stands foursquare with the cotton producers, and provides the very best program possible for the cotton textile manufacturers.

It is essential that further analysis be made of the problem in connection with cotton legislation. We need reasoned judgment based upon facts, not emotion.

Some may say I have broken with the administration on cotton legislation. But I have not done so, Mr. President. I am attempting to use the great forum of the U.S. Senate to obtain a hearing for the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill, because it makes sense to every taxpayer, it is good for every producer, and it will permit our textile manufacturers to do business without a lot of Federal gimmicks, tricks, and gadgets, which are what the present cotton legislation is filled with, with the result that no one quite understands what it is all about.

Certainly it is time for us to take a good look at all of this agricultural legislation. We should begin with the cotton legislation. I have long been interested in agricultural policy. This year, I introduced a wheat bill which, I am proud to say, is cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], who now is the Presiding Officer of the Senate. That bill will help our wheat producers, will save our soil, will provide incentive payments for compliance, and will encourage farmers to grow, on the diverted acres, crops which now are in short supply. I am happy that we are receiving much support for that bill from the farm organizations.

I shall also submit to the Senate a proposal for a blue ribbon commission to examine the entire agricultural policy of the United States, so that we can take a good look at what we have accumulated through the years and where we should be going as a great agricultural and industrial Nation, in the years ahead.

Furthermore, one of these days I want to look into what the Commodity Credit Corporation is doing. It is getting too large, with too many assets, with too many personnel, and with too many farflung operations. So we need to examine it carefully. It has a very important and significant role to play, and I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as indicating that I am opposed to the Commodity Credit Corporation, for I do not know what the American farmers would do without the Commodity Credit Corporation. In that connection, I wish to repeat a statement I made on this floor 5 years ago. I said then, and I repeat now, that the Commodity Credit Corporation was established to supplement farm income, to aid the farm producer, to supplement the normal channels of trade, and not to supplant the normal channels of trade. At times I have had disturbing evidence that the mandate of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter has not always been followed.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was not organized to do the business of the cooperatives. It was not set up to do the business of the grain trade and the merchants in food and fiber. It was set up to help, not to take over. It was set up to make the marketplace more orderly, not more disorderly. It was set up to help improve the price structure for the farm producer, not to lower it. It was set up to withhold commodities from the market at times, not to dump them. Congress should see to it that the Commodity Credit Corporation operates within the framework under which it was designed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times by Mr. William M. Blair, a portion of which I quoted earlier, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOUSE TOLD JOHNSON BACKS SUBSIDY FOR TEXTILE MILLS ON COTTON PURCHASES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, December 2.—Congress was told today that President Johnson would give "100-percent support" to a bill to aid the cotton industry.

President Johnson's assurances, his first on a farm bill, signaled a major administration effort to push the measure through Congress. The measure had been accepted as a compromise by President Kennedy.

As a result of Mr. Johnson's support, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman began a new lobbying drive on Capitol Hill to gather votes.

He began patrolling Congress and holding conferences off the House floor. On previous occasions, the Secretary's actions have brought howls of "arm-twisting tactics" from Republicans and other opponents of his farm policies.

HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, Democratic chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, gave President Johnson's assurances as the House began debate on the measure. It would provide a subsidy to enable domestic textile manufacturers to buy U.S. cotton at the same price as foreign mills.

The bill would enable domestic mills to purchase cotton at a discount of 8½ cents a pound. This is the difference between the world price of 24 cents a pound, which foreign mills pay under an export subsidy, and the domestic price support of 32.47 cents a pound now paid by domestic manufacturers.

Cotton brokers would be able to sell cotton at the lower price and then be repaid in kind by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government price-support agency that controls surplus farm products acquired under the Federal price-support system.

The cotton bill is, in effect, a test for President Johnson, although the measure was not drafted under his sponsorship. That the administration attaches more than passing importance to the measure is seen in the role of JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, and now next in line by law for the Presidency.

In effect, Mr. MCCORMACK is floor manager for the bill, a role nominally filled by Mr. COOLEY. Mr. MCCORMACK is working closely with Secretary Freeman.

The opening of debate brought the unusual situation of Mr. COOLEY telling the House that the cotton bill, known as the Cooley bill, was not what he favored. He said that he favored a compensatory payment system, but that he knew direct payments would not be authorized by Congress.

Compensatory, or direct, payments would be the difference between the market price for cotton and a predetermined Federal support price. These payments would go direct to cotton producers.

The bill would run for 3 years, with the domestic price support for cotton eventually reduced to 29 cents a pound.

---

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 2, 1963]

### THE COTTON DILEMMA: I

The House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity to revise the Federal cotton-price support program which has worked perversely in discriminating against American textile manufacturers and in exacerbating the surplus problem by encouraging the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton. The gross costs of controlling cotton production, buying up surpluses, storing them, and subsidizing exports are now running at a rate of about $1 billion a year. Congress can adopt an alternative program which would sharply reduce the costs to the taxpayers and at the same time eliminate contradictions and perversities which are responsible for the failure of the present program. But unless a political deadlock can be broken, positive action during this session is unlikely.

To understand the cotton dilemma, one must review features of the existing price support and export subsidy programs.

Domestic cotton prices are now being supported at a level of nearly 32½ cents a pound through acreage allotments and the purchases of surplus stocks by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Secretary of Agriculture estimates domestic consumption and export needs and translates them into acreage requirements. The national acreage allotment is then apportioned to States, counties, and individual farms on a formula which is based upon historical production. Each farm has a marketing quota; last year, after the farmers approved the quotas in a national referendum, the national allotment was set at 16.2 million acres.

Cotton has long been identified with the Southeastern States, but this popular image was long ago shattered. The Southeastern States where cotton culture originated now account for only 13 percent of the total production and the Delta States 32 percent. More than half the cotton produced—52 percent—now comes from the West and Southwest. This geographic shift has created a sharp disparity of political interests. Cotton can be produced at much lower costs in the West and Southwest than in the older Southeast and Delta areas and this fact is reflected in regional attitudes toward acreage controls and price supports.

The pegging of domestic cotton prices at high levels afforded protection to the farmers, but it made it impossible for American cotton to maintain its traditional position in the world markets. Since 1956 exporters have been able to obtain domestic cotton at the world price for shipment abroad.

But in establishing a two-price system, a dilemma was created. Domestic cotton mills now pay $42.50 more per bale than their competitors in Japan and Hong Kong, and despite the protection afforded by the tariff and import quotas, they are at a clear disadvantage. Last year an effort was made to raise the tariff, but the Tariff Commission in rejecting that plea very properly ascribed the difficulties of the cotton textile industry to the inequities of the two-price system.

In addition to raising the cost of raw materials, the two-price system has accelerated the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton, thus adding to cotton surpluses and increasing the difficulties of the depressed cotton textile industry.

Although there are formidable difficulties, the cotton dilemma can be resolved through a measure which will be discussed in a subsequent editorial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 3, 1963]

### THE COTTON DILEMMA: II

In dealing with the cotton dilemma, Congress is confronted with three choices. It can fail to act and thereby perpetuate a system which will impose an increasingly heavy burden on the taxpayer and continue to place American textile mills at a competitive disadvantage. It can adopt a bill sponsored by Representative **HAROLD D. COOLEY** which would compound the difficulties by adding a producers' subsidy to those already granted to exporters. Or it may make a sharp break with the unsuccessful past by adopting the forward-looking program proposed by Senators **HERMAN E. TALMADGE** and **HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**.

The objection to the Cooley bill is that it would increase the cost of the cotton programs without attacking the roots of the problem. Under its provisions "payments in kind" would be made to the cotton mill operators in order to eliminate the artificially created differential between the cost of cotton in this country and on the world market. Virtually nothing would be done to eliminate the cotton surpluses which are induced by the high support price and gains in productivity. The CCC now has more than 8 million bales of surplus cotton, and under the Cooley bill this stock might rise beyond the peak level of 1956–57. In addition, the producers' subsidy, running between 5 and 8½ cents a pound, would add at the very least $222 million to the cost of the program.

COOLEY's bill would be greatly improved by the incorporation of an amendment offered by Representative **CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE** which provides for a stepwise reduction of the price support levels from 32.47 to about 29 cents per pound. But the complexities of the triple-subsidy system would remain, and the poor, small-scale farmers of the Southeast would bear the brunt of a painful process of adjustment.

Senator TALMADGE's bill provides for a more radical and humane solution. It would dismantle the double subsidy system and take the Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton. In place of the price-supporting purchases by the CCC, the Talmadge proposal provides for income subsidies to farmers which are equal to the difference between the world cotton price and a percentage of the domestic parity price. The income subsidies would vary inversely with output thus providing the greatest assistance to the poorer farmers. Payments on the first 15 bales would be based on 80 to 90 percent of parity—or the difference between the world price and parity prices of between 32 and 36 cents a pound—and the payments would be scaled down to 70 percent of parity for production in excess of 30 bales.

TALMADGE's plan, which incorporates a national acreage allotment, would lighten the taxpayers' burden and at the same time result in lower cotton prices to both producers and consumers. It would increase cotton consumption and very probably slow down the incursions which synthetic fibers have been making into the cotton markets.

While the efficient cotton farmers of the West and Southwest would welcome a program in which they were free to produce more cotton, they will probably join the producers in other parts of the country in opposition to any plan which substitutes income subsidies for price supports. They fear the income support program can be more easily curtailed than one which manipulates prices. But this may prove to be a shortsighted view. In the committee hearings, Senator TALMADGE warned that: "With the political influence of the farmer steadily declining and the public becoming more conscious of the high cost of maintaining the present cotton program, it is imperative that we find a solution to the cotton situation and at the same time hold the costs within reasonable limits."

The Talmadge bill offers a reasonable hope for a permanent resolution of the cotton dilemma. Mr. COOLEY's bill, with the McIntire amendment, would immediately right an undoubted wrong to a major American industry and deal more justly with the textile manufacturers but at the cost of adding one subsidy to another. Congress ought to join the principles of these measures together in such a way as to accomplish an early relief to the textile industry and a gradual shift from price supports to benefit payments. Stopgap subsidies could then be paid to the domestic textile manufacturers at a diminishing scale. These subsidies could be phased out while benefit payments to growers were phased in, gradually abandoning the two-price system and replacing it with the Talmadge plan, under which neither price supports nor textile subsidies would be required.

(At this point Mr. MCGOVERN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

## THE VENEZUELAN ELECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my comments tonight on a subject that is very close to the heart of the President of the United States and, indeed, to our beloved and late President Kennedy. I only wish that President Kennedy could have been with us to cheer the election results in Venezuela, because no man in our time has done more to encourage democratic institutions and the practice of democracy in Latin America—and, indeed, throughout the world—than the late great and beloved President Kennedy.

There is good news from Venezuela. Despite continuous violent harassment by Communists and Castroite leftist groups, the Venezuelan elections were held on schedule on December 1 and resulted in a resounding triumph for democratic forces in Venezuela. The election represents a smashing victory for President Betancourt's democratic coalition and for the new leader of Betancourt's Accion Democratica Party, Raul Leoni, who will now succeed President Betancourt in the Presidency. President-elect Leoni's victory is assurance that Venezuela will continue the same enlightened progressive domestic policy and pro-Western foreign policy that has characterized the Betancourt government.

I find the election results encouraging, too, in that they revealed that the Social Christian Party, headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, has now become the second strongest political party in the country. That is, a responsible and democratic political party. Indeed, the Social Christian Party, which has been the junior partner in the Betancourt coalition government, scored the most impressive gains in the election, winning 23 percent of the total vote cast.

Mr. President, it has been my real privilege to know Dr. Caldera, as I have had the privilege of meeting the new President-elect, President Leoni. These are fine and good men, dedicated to the cause of democratic ideals.

The election revealed that in a wealthy, rapidly developing country like Venezuela, the two strongest political parties are precisely those two parties whose programs and objectives are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

I cannot understand why there have not been more comments in the Senate about what has happened in Venezuela. I was pleased to hear the comments of the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING]. Other Senators may have spoken on the subject. When I think of all the complaints about the foreign aid program and the Alliance for Progress, I wonder why the Senate Chamber did not ring with cheers of success of the Alliance for Progress in Venezuela—a key country and a vital bastion of democracy in this hemisphere. Why did not more Senators rise and say that the Alliance for Progress has had a victory? Freedom has had a victory. No country has been more besieged and harassed by the forces of communism, terrorism, and Castroism than has Venezuela. Yet that country has come through. The leaders of liberal, progressive politics have gained a victory. The reactionaries were rebuked. The Communists were rebuked. The terrorists have been rebuked. The freedom-loving people have gained a victory.

The two victorious parties in this election represent the two principal reform-minded, non-Communist groups in Latin America, the Democratic left group in the Caribbean, and the Christian Democratic group in South America. These parties represent the hope of democracy in Latin America. President-elect Leoni is a member of that movement, the Democratic left, which has provided the principal leadership in the last decade for progressive constitutional forces in Latin America. It is this movement that has come forth with astute leaders like Betancourt, Jose Figueres, and Daniel Oduber in Costa Rica, and Luis Muñoz-Marín and Teodoro Moscoso in Puerto Rico.

These are people whom we know. They represent the real progressive democratic leadership in this hemisphere.

The Social Christian—COPEI—headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, is typical of the Christian Democratic Parties, which, although a minor force in Latin America up until recently, are now rapidly growing in strength and are destined to play a major role in the political life of such countries as Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, and Peru in the next decade.

In fact, the Christian Democratic Party may actually save Chile from electing a pro-Communist government. I believe it will. I am convinced that the forces of progressive democracy will win in the coming elections in Chile.

With the continued cooperation between Accion Democratica and COPEI—those two parties—that has characterized the Betancourt government in the past 2 years, Venezuela will be governed by a progressive government friendly to the United States, which will enjoy the firm backing, too, of the U.S. Government.

From the events of the past week, it is clear that the new Venezuelan Government will need the support of its friends in this hemisphere to repel external attacks originating in Cuba. The evidence is clear and indisputable that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. The evidence has been presented to the OAS Council, which voted 16 to 2 to investigate the charges of interference by Cuba in the internal affairs of Venezuela.

I wish my position on this subject to be crystal clear. Our national policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba and Venezuela. We can no longer condone Cuba being an arsenal for terrorism, revolution and chaos. It is about time, instead of merely worrying about governments of friendly countries being able to stay in power and resist violence, that we choke off the source of that violence.

We have stated before that we will not permit the Castro regime to subvert the democratic governments of its neighbors through armed aggression, whether covert or open. We have repeatedly stated this as our policy. Today we have a clear, carefully documented case of arms shipments into Venezuela. The Venezuelan Government has presented convincing photographic evidence of the smuggled arms shipments.

What is our response to the situation? I believe we should mean what we have been saying. We should take all steps necessary to prevent further arms shipments from Cuba into Venezuela. And I mean all the steps—whatever steps are required in terms of naval operations, or any form of activity to stop these arms from crossing over into the Caribbean areas and Latin America.

Mere words alone will be of little avail. The new administration headed by President Johnson should serve notice on the Soviet Union that we do not intend to see friendly governments like that in Venezuela subverted by terrorists armed from Cuba.

We ought to make that clear so that there can be do doubt as to our position. If action is needed to convince the Cubans that we mean business, then action should be the order of the day. Either we defend our friends in Latin America against armed subversion, or we may as well forget about a peaceful, democratic revolution in Latin American countries through the Alliance for Progress.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance. We should provide it—now.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance in the OAS. We should provide it.

I suggest that we energetically, wholeheartedly, and determinedly support the position of the Venezuelan Government in the Organization of American States.

I submit that we should let the whole world know we believe enough in free democratic government to protect the rights of people to enjoy the privileges of such governments.

It is one thing to talk about the invasion of Cuba. That, within itself, is fraught with many dangers. It is yet another thing to tell the Cubans and the Russians that we do not intend to permit them to invade, overtly or covertly, Central or South America. The sooner we make it crystal clear that we mean business, by whatever means is required, the better off we shall be, because other elections will be held in the months ahead.

Only 12 months ago I was in this area. I remember going to visit the trade union in Caracas. I was supposed to be there at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I canceled my appointment due to a call which came from the American Embassy.

At 4 o'clock that afternoon a car went by the headquarters of the labor organization—the free democratic labor organization—and spewed machinegun fire over the building. I missed being there by 5 minutes. That did not make the headlines in the United States, but I know for whom those bullets were intended. A car moved down the streets of Caracas and sprayed the building with machinegun fire, from terrorists telling us we should go home.

I was warned that I should not go into the slums of Caracas. I was told I would be harassed, and might even be molested. I was also told that others who had gone there recently had had their cars fired upon. It did not seem to me that that was any time to back away, so we went. Fortunately, there was no violence.

If we are to support free democratic governments—if the Congress is to frown upon coups by military cliques—if we are to stand up and argue about foreign aid and all the limitations and mistakes of foreign aid, I suggest, when there is a victory for freedom in an election such as that in Venezuela, that we ought to cheer it, salute it, commend it, and extend the hand of congratulation and good fellowship.

There ought to be voices raised here in the Senate commending the people of Venezuela, who turned out in an overwhelming mass of support. Ninety-five percent of the eligible adult population voted. I ask Senators to compare that with statistics on elections in the United States. If 60 percent of the population, or 65 percent of the population, votes, it is a so-called election day miracle.

Ninety-five percent of the eligible voters of Venezuela—and they have universal suffrage—went to the polls, even though the Communists and the Castroites had threatened them with death.

At every polling box soldiers were to be stationed to protect the lives of the voters. A free election was carried out. There were opposing parties. The sanctity of the ballot was protected and preserved.

What do I hear in Washington? We had 4 weeks of debate, of griping, of arguing about the mistakes of foreign aid, about the weaknesses of the Alliance for Progress, about the fact that we were not doing well, about the fact that countries were turning their backs upon us.

Venezuela is only a few hours away, by modern jet airplane, from Cuba. Venezuela stands at the head of the Caribbean. It is a country in which this Nation has placed its faith and trust. Our former beloved and late President John Kennedy placed his trust in the country. He went there to visit.

Before President Kennedy left for Texas—on that fateful trip—the last words he said to one of his assistants at the White House was, "I worry over the safety of President Betancourt."

Yes, our beloved President Kennedy worried over the physical safety of the President of Venezuela. The President of Venezuela lives. Our President died.

In our suffering, our agony, our pain, and our grief, we might at least salute a friend of our late and beloved President who triumphed. Democracy won. Freedom won.

Also, we ought to let Castro and all his kind know that their terroristic campaign will be beaten down. We ought to tell Mr. Khrushchev to call off that bewhiskered little friend of his and put him back where he belongs, in cold storage—either that, or the United States, in cooperation with its neighbors, under the Rio pact and under the Act of Bogotá, will move to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent further intervention by armed subversion in the Latin American Republics.

I feel better, Mr. President. At least I have raised my voice in the Senate for freedom tonight. I have spoken for a people who are brave; a people who are determined to make democracy work. Their political leaders are willing to lay their lives on the line for freedom. Their political parties have carried on in the tradition of democratic governments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain editorials and articles relating to the substance of my remarks on Venezuela, President Betancourt, President-elect Leoni, and Dr. Rafael Caldera printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1963]

### VICTORY IN VENEZUELA

Democracy is a novel experience in Venezuela, where President Romulo Betancourt became the first popularly elected Chief Executive only 5 years ago. Yet in defiance of Communist terrorists inspired by Cuba's Castro, Venezuelan voters turned out in record numbers to assure the succession of a new candidate. Dr. Raul Leoni, the choice of President Betancourt, seems most likely to emerge the winner, but the real victory belongs to the Venezuelan people.

While Dr. Leoni did not gain an absolute majority and will have to form a coalition government, it is clear that the voters want an orderly and peaceful succession. This is the real significance of the immense turnout. The electorate has spoken out against revolution or military rule. It has no desire to embrace Castro's violent solutions, and it has refused to be cowed. The vote for democracy is a vote for a peaceful transformation of Venezuela's economic and social system along the lines of the Alliance for Progress.

Communist harassment and the constant threat of civil war prevented President Betancourt from carrying out his program of reforms. He had all he could do to establish and maintain constitutionalism and the preservation of personal liberties. Venezuela is fortunate in possessing its rich resources of oil, but the country must broaden and extend its economic base if it is to assure a higher standard of living for all its people.

This is the most challenging task facing the new Government. The defeat of the terrorists is not yet final. Encouraged by Castro, they may resort to even more violent tactics in an effort to frustrate and paralyze its efforts. But the resistance of terrorism displayed in the election suggests that peace can be won in Venezuela with the help of the United States and the other members of the Organization of American States. Peace is essential if the victory of the Venezuelan people is to be a lasting one.

---

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1963]

### The Social Christians

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—The future of Venezuela may depend not so much on the army and police flushing out Communist terrorists as on a little-publicized crusade by liberal Catholics to wean the nation's youth away from communism.

Copei, Venezuela's Social Christian Party and junior partner in President Romulo Betancourt's coalition government, is challenging Communist domination of the country's students, and with considerable success. The Social Christians have won control of the state universities at Maracaibo and Valencia and are running a close second to Communists at Caracas Central University, the staging center for the anti-Nixon riots in 1958.

Nor is the clash between communism and liberal Catholicism limited to Venezuela. Throughout Latin America, Social Christians comprise the one anti-Communist force that talks the heady, idealistic language of youth.

The college student, who has exerted disproportionate influence in Latin politics for a long time, is now the focal point of the hemisphere's subversive movements. Moscow and Havana have failed to subvert labor, peasants, or even slum dwellers. They rely on the student.

This reliance has become absolute in Venezuela, where one of every four college students is pro-Communist. Furthermore, these young men and women form the core of terrorist units and often spend their vacations fighting as guerrillas in the hills. These youthful bombthrowers include the very Venezuelans who ought to be the country's future leaders.

The son of one anti-Communist state governor is a Communist guerrilla in the Falcon Mountains. The daughter of one of President Betancourt's personal associates is a Communist terrorist in Caracas. The list goes on and on.

Special factors encourage the gravitation of Venezuelan youth toward communism. The 1952–58 dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez concentrated on persecuting its democratic opposition—but let Communists run wild. As a result, they thoroughly infiltrated the faculties of universities and normal schools. The madcap provisional government that followed Perez Jimenez's fall compounded the damage by granting Central University an autonomy that makes it a sanctuary for subversives.

Even without this assistance, however, the Communists would be doing well enough with young Venezuelans. Latin America's middle class young intellectuals are tormented by the poverty and social injustice they see everywhere. They want an easy answer. The Communists give it to them.

Certainly, these students derive little inspiration from Betancourt's Accion Democratica (AD) Party. AD's magnificent political machine probably will push a lackluster candidate to victory in the December 1 election to succeed Betancourt (who is barred by the constitution from another term). But AD would run poorly in a poll of students.

Founded a generation ago as a revolutionary Marxist party, AD has dropped most of its socialist trappings. When it expelled its pro-Communists in 1960, most of AD's youth went with them. It is today an unexciting, mildly liberal party of older men, who prefer ornate offices in Miraflores Palace to launching crusades.

Not so the Social Christians. True, they cannot match the Communists and offer students the thrill of swaggering off to battle with a submachine gun. But they do offer social revolutionary doctrine to transform Venezuelan society. The Copei Party, organized in 1946 as a conservative clerical party, is well left of center today. Its youth is particularly suspicious of private enterprise, specifically American business imperialism.

Naturally enough, then, not all anti-Communists here are overjoyed with the rise of the Social Christians. Parish priests imported from Spain and conservative members of the Catholic hierarchy are appalled. American businessmen (plus some staffers from the U.S. Embassy) would much prefer the emergence of a middle-class party supporting private enterprise, but that kind of party would be anathema to Venezuelan youth.

And no matter how much the radicalism of the Social Christians here may annoy Washington, they can be counted on to take a hard line against communism. That's no small assurance in Latin America today.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

### OAS To Examine Caracas Charges Against Havana—Inquiry on Accusation That Cuba Foments Terrorism Is Voted by 16 to 0—Betancourt Asks Curb—Hemisphere Action Against Subversion Favored at Emergency Meeting

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, December 3.—The Organization of American States voted today to investigate charges that Cuba had smuggled arms into Venezuela to foster terrorism as part of a campaign to subvert democracy in Latin America.

The Organization's Council, at an emergency session, decided by a 16-to-0 vote, with 1 abstention, to set in motion the machinery of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance to deal with the Venezuelan accusation.

Under the pact, known as the Rio Treaty, a country guilty of aggressive intervention in the affairs of a member state can be subjected to far-ranging collective sanctions, including the use of armed force.

#### FEAR OF EAST-WEST CONFLICT

Although the immediate issue was alleged Cuban arms shipments to Venezuelan terrorists, several delegates served notice during the 2-hour meeting that they wanted firm action against the broader threat of subversion instigated by the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

(In Caracas, President Romulo Betancourt called for a partial air and naval blockade of Cuba to prevent arms exports.)

Mexico, indicating that inter-American measures against Cuba at this time might set off a new East-West confrontation and imperil world peace, cast the lone abstaining vote.

Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay, which like Mexico still have diplomatic relations with Cuba, voted in favor of considering the charges after stressing that they were not passing judgment on the merits. Bolivia and Haiti were absent.

As a first step after voting to invoke the treaty, the Council met as an organ of consultation on behalf of the Western Hemisphere's foreign ministers. In this capacity, it designated an inter-American Commission to study Venezuela's evidence. The vote on the Commission again was 16 in favor, with Mexico abstaining.

Brazil voted in favor of the inquiry after demanding assurances that Cuba be given an opportunity to present her case.

The Cuban Government, although it has openly praised the Venezuelan terrorists, denied having shipped arms to them. In a communique issued last night, Cuba's Foreign Minister, Ral Roa, charged that the arms cache, discovered some weeks ago on a Venezuelan beach, had been placed there by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Ilmar Penna Marinho of Brazil, emphasizing the gravity of the Venezuelan charges, suggested that the factfinding Commission be admitted to Cuba as well as Venezuela.

The proposal caused considerable surprise since the Castro regime has rejected every attempt at international inspection, either by the United Nations or by the Organization of American States, which excluded Cuba because of her Communist ties in January 1962.

Some diplomats here believed that an outright Cuban refusal to cooperate in the inquiry would make it easier for Brazil to justify for home consumption severing her ties with the Castro regime should such action be requested by the inter-American body.

Enrique Tejera, the Venezuelan delegate, suggested that diplomatic and economic sanctions would be the least his Government would demand if the investigation confirmed the evidence of Cuban intervention.

#### IMPARTIAL INQUIRY URGED

Tapping his desk with a pencil to emphasize his words and speaking in a slow, grave voice, he declared:

"We want the Commission to carry out an impartial, unhurried investigation. We agree with Brazil that the other party must be heard. But once all the evidence is in, Venezuela will demand a clear and heavy judgment, for it is no longer possible to allow a member of the system of nations to conspire against juridical institutions and to plot criminal acts of violence."

Mr. Tejera displayed 21 photographs he said were taken of the weapons. He also offered laboratory evidence of partly erased Cuban Army markings.

The envoy repeated his Government's charges that 3 tons of arms were found on an abandoned beach on Paraguana Peninsula, in northern Venezuela. Repeatedly he likened the cache to the terrorist methods used by the late Dominican dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, that led to precedent-setting sanctions against the Dominican Republic in 1960.

Ward P. Allen, the acting U.S. representative, told the Council that his Government's technicians had verified the Cuban origin of the arms found in Venezuela.

He warned that the Castro regime could be expected to increase its subversive efforts as it faced increasing difficulties at home. But he suggested that only on the basis of the inter-American inquiry could the Council decide whether additional steps should be taken to increase the hemisphere's vigilance against Cuba.

#### USE OF FORCE DOUBTED

Other North Americans discouraged speculation about any imminent use of force against the Cuban regime. They conveyed the impression that President Johnson would hardly welcome another world crisis over Cuba at the outset of his administration.

The U.S. officials were also cool to Venezuelan suggestions that military measures should be contemplated. Their feeling, shared by most Latin American delegates, was that the factfinding committee should complete its investigation before such steps were considered.

The Mexican delegate, in a brief statement, urged the Council to be mindful that "the principal mission of every regional organism is the contribution to the maintenance of peace."

A report tonight that President Betancourt had proposed a sea-and-air blockade came as a surprise to OAS delegates. They believed that, despite today's show of unity, the Council would vote against the measure if it came up before the investigating Commission completed its mission.

The Commission, appointed immediately after the meeting by the new chairman, Juan Bautista de la Valle of Peru, will be made up of Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, the United States, and Uruguay.

The Commission is expected to leave for Venezuela this week.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 4, 1963]

### THE 1962 BLOCKADE RECALLED

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, December 3.—President Betancourt said today that he would seek a partial naval and air blockade of Cuba to prevent the export of arms to Latin America.

This was the strongest of the measures the Venezuelan President said he was asking of the hemisphere meeting in Washington.

He compared his proposal, which would involve the participation of members of the Organization of American States, to the blockade laid around Cuba in October 1962, to force the dismantling of the Soviet missile bases.

Mr. Betancourt, who spoke quietly and with apparent weariness, said foreign correspondents here for the election Sunday had overemphasized terrorism.

In response to a question he denied that the Government had political prisoners. There are 200 to 400 Communist activists in preventive detention, a constitutional procedure, he said.

There are also, "perhaps 100 terrorists caught with bombs and self-confessed slayers of policemen and military rebels serving sentences in jail," he added.

"You cannot speak of political prisoners here," he said.

President Betancourt said he lamented the kidnaping of Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the United States military mission. He said that the police were in searching for him. Colonel Chenault was kidnaped 6 days ago by leftist terrorists.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1963]

### RETICENT VENEZUELAN—RAUL LEONI

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, December 1.—The expected victor in today's presidential election, Dr. Raul Leoni, is a stocky, reticent man who moves slowly and with a certain self-absorption.

He has spent his life organizing the Democratic Action Party, and, when it was shattered, reorganizing it. In fact, it was only with today's election that the party came into its own. For party stalwarts, winning under Romulo Betancourt raises the question whether credit belongs to the party itself or to Mr. Betancourt, a man with a fiery personality.

Mr. Leoni, who is deliberately undramatic in manner and firmly entrenched in party councils, has been half hidden from public view. Today's election demonstrates that party organization rather than personality can win votes here.

Venezuelans who dislike Democratic Action—the upper classes, the professionals, the university students—find in Mr. Leoni the very qualities they find in the party. They consider him a hack and they consider the Democratic Action Party to be composed of hacks who use patronage and coercion to stay in power.

#### LEADERS RIDICULED

Domingo Alberto Rangel, who is in jail on terrorism charges, was once a top figure in Democratic Action, but left it. He was thinking particularly of Raul Leoni when, in a widely quoted phrase, he described the party leaders as "the tired oxen."

Dr. Leoni is not capable of such phrases, and on a platform he tends to mumble. But in private he has a diffident warmth and solidity that even his enemies recognize. He can sit through endless argumentative meetings and come out with what he wants.

Those who are close to him know, too, that he is a sensitive man. In an interview a few days ago, after some almost mechanical pronouncements about policy, he described the events that first turned him toward politics.

When he came to Caracas at the age of 14 from the backlands region where he was born, he saw his first carnival. He noticed that the boisterous processions kept circling a low, circular building. It was the rotunda where the dictator, Juan Vicente Gomez, kept his political prisoners.

#### STRUCK BY THE CRUELTY

The dictator would arrange for the carnival crowds to parade around the rotunda. Inside, the prisoners could hear the singing, shouting and laughing of the celebrating men and women outside.

"This was the cruelest thing I could imagine," Dr. Leoni said.

The future politician was born in Upata in the Guayana region on April 26, 1905. He attended the Central University of Caracas, where he became president of the student association.

In 1928 the association joined young army officers in an unsuccessful coup against the Gomez dictatorship. By that time a number of the future leaders of Venezuela—Mr. Betancourt, Dr. Jovito Villalba, Dr. Leoni and others—were working together.

The conspirators fled to Colombia, where Dr. Leoni and Mr. Betancourt ran a fruit stand for a while. After Mr. Gomez died, the group returned, only to be expelled again. When Isaias Medina became President they were allowed to come back.

Mr. Betancourt and Dr. Leoni then organized a political party that eventually became Democratic Action. In this effort Mr. Betancourt was the campaigner and speaker, Dr. Leoni the behind-the-scenes organizer.

Democratic Action and a group of young officers ousted President Medina in 1945, charging that he planned to rig the elections. Dr. Leoni became Minister of Labor. Democratic Action's solid control of organized labor is the result.

Dr. Leoni fled again when Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez took over in 1948 and went to work for the International Labor Organization. When the dictator fell, he returned and organized the campaign that made Mr. Betancourt President in 1959. Dr. Leoni was promptly elected president of the party.

During his last exile Dr. Leoni married Menca Fernandez, a woman of notable political astuteness on whom he has depended considerably for help and advice. They have five children.

---

### PRIVATE PEACE CORPS AIDING LATIN AMERICA

(By Ernest A. Lotito)

Americans, generally speaking, are good organizers. They learn the art early as Cub Scouts and Brownies and practice it for the rest of their lives in the family, the PTA and on the church picnic.

Latin Americans are a different breed. "It's because they have never had a tradition of local responsibility," says Joseph H. Blatchford. "They evolved under the patron system of always looking to somebody above you to get things for you."

The 29-year-old Blatchford's mission is to instill the organizing spirit in the have-nots of Venezuela so that they will start doing things for themselves. The tool: A private Peace Corps known as ACCION (Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations), of which Blatchford is the founder and director.

Blatchford is a graduate of UCLA and the University of California Law School in Berkeley. He toured 30 Latin American cities with seven other collegians in 1958–59. He played tennis (he once played at Wimbledon), and the others played jazz.

It was then that the germ for ACCION was born, an idea that grew while he was at law school and culminated in his leaving for Venezuela the day after graduation.

"The organization has been working since 1961," said Blatchford, who was in town yesterday to drum up recruits and money. "We send men and women into an area to organize the people, to make a community of them.

"The goal is to get the average man to participate in his fate," he added. "We serve as the catalyst; they provide the manpower. We get funds wherever we can—from American companies here and in Venezuela, from local governments there."

An example of ACCION's accomplishments is a civic center built in the small town of Maracaibo.

"A volunteer called the townspeople together, and after several meetings they decided they wanted a civic center of their own," Blatchford explained. "Once they built it, other things followed. They graded roads, put in waterlines, and even set up a milk distribution center."

Stimulated by ACCION volunteers, Venezuelans are doing similar things all over the country. In Valencia, it is a school; in the Tuy Valley, a series of rebuilt homes; in Puerto LaCruz, a community center.

Volunteers are mainly Americans who enlist for 18 months and live with the people. They are paid enough to cover expenses.

Blatchford and ACCION are planning to branch out into other Latin American countries. He is looking for people who can organize and get things going.

Interested? Write ACCION, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

---

### VICTORY IN VENEZUELA

It is a tribute to the courage of the Venezuelans, and to their resolve to uphold democratic processes, that such large numbers of them—about 96 percent of all the eligible voters—took part in Sunday's elections. They did so despite a Communist-directed months-long campaign of vicious bombings, murders, and other forms of terrorism designed to frighten them into staying away from the polls.

This violence, including last-minute threats to gun down anybody lining up to cast a ballot, has been the work of a Red-led underground organization that calls itself the Armed Forces for National Liberation (FANL). The organization, which is equipped with large quantities of weapons smuggled in from Fidel Castro's Cuba, can be counted upon to continue with its abominable activities in the weeks and months ahead. But in view of how the Venezuelan voters have defied it—almost contemptuously, with nose-thumbing mockery—it is likely to undergo a progressive decline in strength.

The election results are promising in that respect. Raul Leoni, his chief lieutenant, apparently has been chosen by a big plurality to succeed President Betancourt, who was debarred by Venezuela's constitution from running for a second 5-year term. Unless some untoward event intervenes, Mr. Betancourt, when his tenure expires next March, will be a man of very special distinction: The first freely elected Chief Executive in his country's history to serve out a full term and turn over his office to a freely elected successor. And Mr. Leoni, with the FALN thus having suffered a major defeat in its attempt to wreck constitutional government, may be expected to intensify Mr. Betancourt's efforts to smash the terrorists completely.

This must surely be one of the prime objectives of the prospective new government. Another must be an unremitting drive to seal off Castro's Kremlin-supported tyranny. Mr. Betancourt already has taken a long step in that direction by calling upon the Organization of American States to unite in preventing Communist Cuba from committing further acts of aggression in the hemisphere. The Venezuelans have in effect voted overwhelmingly for such action, and most public opinion south of the Rio Grande is in the same sort of mood: It is anti-Red, and it would like nothing better than to see an end put to Havana's exports of hate, subversion, and terroristic aggression.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, December 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4, 1963:

### Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

*To be senior surgeon*

Walter F. Edmundson

*To be surgeons*

Maurice E. Snyder
Joseph H. Roe, Jr.

*To be senior assistant surgeons*

John T. Potts, Jr.
James D. MacLowry
John L. Overby
Joseph F. Piffat
Arthur T. Gronner
Norman J. Knorr
Matthew P. Dumont
Herschel M. Schwartz
Norbert J. McNamara
Denny W. Walters

*To be senior assistant dental surgeons*

Stephen L. Bissell
Donald P. Lecklitner
John H. Reiber
Donald F. Stoick

*To be senior assistant sanitary engineer*

Santo A. Furfari

*To be assistant sanitary engineers*

Gerald E. Siefken
Paul B. Smith
Clarence C. Oster
Guntis Ozolins
Jack R. Farmer
Elmer G. Cleveland

*To be junior assistant sanitary engineers*

Darwin R. Wright
Wayne A. Blackard

*To be scientist*

Ibrahim J. Hindawi

*To be sanitarian*

Kenneth L. Pool

*To be senior assistant sanitarians*

John E. Regnier
Litsey L. Zellner
Michael B. Musachio
James M. Cox

*To be assistant sanitarian*

James F. Lawler

*To be veterinary officer*

James F. Wright

*To be senior assistant health services officer*

Victor R. Stoeffler

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rabbi Harold P. Smith, Congregation Agudath Achim of South Shore, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, emerging as we now do from the darkened valley of irretrievable loss, and rising, as we now do, from the throes of crushing adversity, we come to Thee for Thy divine blessings and guidance; for the restoration of spirit which can come only from Thy divine light.

Immersed though we be in somber thoughtfulness, we nevertheless see ample reason for gratitude and consolation in the demonstrated capacity of our great and glorious Republic to carry on, in our saddest and darkest hours, with strength and determination, with peacefulness and orderliness, with respectful relegation of party differences—all characteristic only of free world democracies.

We continue to pray, as we always shall, for the soul of our fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We pray also, from the very depths of our being, for the welfare of our newly risen leader, Lyndon B. Johnson. Bless him, we pray Thee, with long life, good health, and Thy divinely replenished resources, that he might continue, as he has started, with honor, vigor, and courage, to meet the weighty burdens and overwhelming responsibilities which have so suddenly been thrust upon him.

We ask, also, Thy benign blessings upon the Speaker of the House and upon all our esteemed legislators whose awesome responsibilities in these epochal times of unpredictable events call upon them to make decisions which affect the permanent destiny not only of their own countrymen, but of all mankind.

May they honor the deep trust we have placed in them by finding, this day, new vistas of insight which Thou alone canst supply; that they might shed a new and alleviating light upon the crucial issues which oft divide us one from another in these critical times when unity and good will are so vitally needed for survival.

Help us, O Lord, help us; that we in these blessed United States of America, shall indeed be united States, and that all of us shall approach and solve our problems with love and understanding, in a united state. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak., and

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McNamara, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Fong to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1565. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber;

S. 1931. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians;

S. 1968. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; and

S. 2279. An act to authorize the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be allowed to conduct its hearings during general debate for the rest of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## DISCHARGE PETITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next I shall file, under the rules of the House, a discharge petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 574 entitled "A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill." It is hoped that a goodly number of the Members of the House will sign that petition promptly so that we can get the bill on its way and passed and enacted into law. I know of no better monument to the memory of the late lamented John Fitzgerald Kennedy than to pass the civil rights bill.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## THE LATE CAPTAIN MICHAEL D. GROVES

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning for another sad task as a result of the assassination of our beloved President. I rise to announce the death, unfortunately, yesterday of Capt. Michael D. Groves, the commanding officer of the Honor Guard Company of the 1st Battalion, 3d Infantry—Old Guard—Fort Myer, Va., who was in charge of the military arrangements at the funeral of the President. From the time President Kennedy's body reached Washington, D.C., Captain Groves worked day and night to handle these arrangements and he directed the military honors for the President's funeral. Unfortunately, Captain Groves overtaxed himself and died yesterday evening at supper, as a result of acute cardiac congestion, at the age of 27.

He was responsible for the training and supervision of the body bearers, death watch, rifle firing party and caisson escort for President Kennedy's funeral in Arlington Cemetery.

Born in Detroit, Mich., his legal residence was Ann Arbor, Mich. Captain Groves is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Donald W. Groves who live in Cleveland Heights, Ohio; his wife, Mary Frances, and a daughter, Kelly Ann, age 3.

This is another tragic incident that has flowed from this recent assault on the Government of the United States. It is a sad occasion on which we wish to console his family and send our sincere sympathy in their bereavement. Captain Groves has died in the service of our country in a job well done.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 217]

Adair
Ashley
Becker
Bromwell
Cameron
Clausen, Don H.
Dawson
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Gill
Glenn
Hall
Hébert
Jensen
Kelly
Keogh
Latta
Long, La.
McFall
McLoskey
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Milliken
Morton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
St. Onge
Shelley
Sheppard
Trimble
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 398 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 6196, with Mr. Rooney of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] had 49 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] had 37 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the Dean of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 6196 is indispensable to the security of the Nation; vital to the future of our textile industry, and urgently necessary to the cotton growers of the Nation. If the textile industry and our cotton farmers are to survive, H.R. 6196 must be enacted.

Briefly, this is what the bill does:

First. It equalizes the cost of U.S. cotton between domestic and foreign mills.

Second. It authorizes $10 million a year on special research to cut growing costs.

Third. It moves maximum supports to 30 cents in 1964, 29½ cents in 1965, and 29 cents thereafter.

Fourth. It approves 10-percent higher supports—up to 32.47 cents—on the first 15 bales raised.

Fifth. It provides that if allotments on the 1964–66 crops exceed 17 million acres, half the excess would be divided among base allotments—the other half would go to farmers who want to overplant by 20 percent, selling the overplanted production at world prices.

The textile and apparel industries play a leading role in the economy of our Nation. One out of every eight manufacturing employees in the United States works in this industrial complex.

Additional thousands of employees are involved in the raising of cotton and other related activities. This industry clothes every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Its products are found in every room, in every home, and in every office of this land.

It has been frequently said that the textile industry, supplying over 10,000 separate items in support of our World War II effort, ranked second only to steel as an essential war industry.

When a condition develops that adversely affects such a vital segment of our economy, something positive must be done. Bad times have fallen upon this agricultural-industrial complex. It is so bad that its very future is endangered.

The causes for these difficulties and the circumstances surrounding them are several, but unquestionably the principal one is a direct result of acts of the Congress and Government policies resulting therefrom.

During the depression, the cotton farmers of America, along with all other major agriculture groups, needed and received Government help. The first step taken by the Government was to establish price supports.

The second step taken by the Government on their behalf was to eliminate foreign competition. Barriers against the importation of foreign-grown raw cotton into the United States were established, with the insignificant exception of less than 1 day's mill supply annually.

Price supports rose progressively so that in time they exceeded the free world market price of raw cotton. In other words, the assistance which our Government gave our cotton farmers in the form of price supports priced U.S. raw cotton out of the world market and resulted in drastic cuts in the export sale of American-grown raw cotton.

For 150 years, raw cotton constituted America's largest agricultural commodity sold overseas; it was responsible for our largest balance-of-payments exchange. In pricing cotton out of the world market by excessive price supports, our Government created a major economic threat to the United States.

Congress recognized this threat and in 1956, with the expressed intention of recapturing America's traditional position in the sale of world cotton, we enacted a statute directing the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize the exportation of domestically grown raw cotton so that it might be sold at the world price in the international marketplace.

These three actions by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government:

First, establishing price supports for domestically grown cotton.

Second, prohibiting the importation of foreign-grown cotton into the United States.

Third, subsidizing exported raw cotton—when combined with the overall agricultural programs of the Government protected and stabilized our cotton growing economy.

For these steps our Government is to be commended. These same three actions, however, when coupled with the reduction, to the point of near abolition, of U.S. tariffs on foreign cotton textiles entering this country, have had a drastic and nearly chaotic effect upon the domestic textile industry. Foreign textiles have been allowed to flood the U.S. markets.

The import situation is only half the story, however, so far as the bad effects of this Government-created condition in which our domestic industry finds itself.

Another effect of the noncompetitive price of cotton is that since the end of 1960 other fibers have had an increase in consumption equal to 2,652,000 bales of cotton in annual rate while cotton has had a decline of 52,000 bales.

If cotton had no competitive loss in the market throughout this period it would have received 55 percent of this increase. Cotton consumption in the first quarter of 1963, instead of being down from the last quarter of 1960 would have been 1½ million bales higher. In other words, cotton has suffered a competitive loss of 1½ million bales in a little over 2 years.

To know these facts and to permit the situation to continue uncorrected is unthinkable.

The U.S. Government requires domestic mills to pay $42.50 a bale more for domestically grown cotton than this same cotton is offered to foreign mills. This results in what is referred to as two-price cotton—the high price American mills have to pay for cotton and the lower price at which foreign mills may buy the same cotton.

When U.S.-grown raw cotton is sold to foreigners for $42.50 a bale less than Americans must pay for the same cotton, our domestic industry is at a terrific raw product cost disadvantage.

And, since foreign mills pay their labor 75 to 90 percent less in wages than do American mills, this gives foreign mills a labor cost advantage in addition to the raw product cost advantage they have over our domestic mills. Other production costs in foreign lands are also much lower than in this country.

Clearly it can be seen that the plight of the domestic textile industry is U.S. Government imposed. This condition has prevailed since 1956. The situation the industry finds itself in today is not caused by inefficiency, business ineptness, or the inability to survive in the free and competitive environment of doing business in the United States.

Today's effort to remedy this affliction to the domestic textile industry is not the first that has been made.

In 1955 the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for action under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act to impose quotas on imports of cotton textiles at 150 percent of the 1953–54 average of such imports. The petition was turned down by the Department of Agriculture in February 1956.

In 1956, an amendment to the farm bill (H.R. 12) to impose import quotas on foreign cotton textiles was offered by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia; it was defeated by a vote of 33 to 57. During the same session we saw the Senate reject two proposed amendments, in favor of import quotas, to the foreign aid bill. A fourth amendment, offered by Senator YOUNG of North Dakota, to limit imports of surplus agricultural commodities and their products not covered by a section 22 quota was narrowly beaten by a vote of 43 to 45. Another amendment applicable only to cotton textiles was offered by Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina; it too was turned down by a vote of 36 to 52. The only measure to aid our domestic industry that was passed by that session of the Congress was the inclusion of section 204 in the Agricultural Act of 1956. Section 204 authorizes the President to negotiate with foreign countries to limit imports.

Negotiations aimed at limiting imports from Japan which at that time accounted for the largest volume of cotton textiles imported into the United States began in 1956. In 1957 the negotiators agreed upon a 5-year plan for voluntary control of Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States. Since this agreement applied solely to Japan, when the Japanese restrained their shipments other textile exporting nations increased theirs.

In 1959, the domestic cotton growing industry asked the Secretary of Agriculture to seek a Tariff Commission hearing under section 22 to obtain relief from imports. The President asked that the case be limited to the effect of imports on the cotton export program. The Tariff Commission rejected the recommendations.

While these efforts were taking place cotton textile imports were climbing from 135 million square yard equivalents in 1952 to more than 1 billion square yard equivalents in 1962. Since 1955, despite a population increase of approximately 20 million, there has been a loss of nearly 200,000 jobs in the textile-apparel industries and consumption of domestic raw cotton and cotton products has failed to expand with the population.

It was against this background and with the knowledge of these conditions that President Kennedy took office in January 1961. He recognized the problem and its seriousness to our Government and our people, and he resolved to do something about it. He immediately appointed a five-man Cabinet Textile Committee, composed of the Secretaries of State, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, and the Treasury, to inquire into the situation and to recommend to him what should be done. As a result of the committee's inquiries, President Kennedy on May 2, 1961, announced his seven point program for the assistance to the textile industry.

That very same month industry initiated action in the Office of Emergency Planning under the national security clause of the Trade Agreements Act. They presented the most detailed and extensive case ever filed with this office. The evidence was designed to establish the fact that the cotton textile industry is both essential to national defense and jeopardized by imports. Under the authority of the national security clause, the President may impose import controls to protect an industry if the above criteria are met. The record in the case was closed in October 1961. No decision has thus far been announced.

There were those of us in Congress who had observed for many months these deteriorating conditions developing in the agricultural-textile economy. I called together some of my colleagues who are most directly affected by this situation so that we might confer with and advise with the late President on ways to alleviate the situation. One hundred and twenty-seven Members of the House responded and we have met over the past 2½ years. Representatives of this group upon several occasions discussed the matter with our late President.

There has been, I believe, general acceptance and support of President Kennedy's seven-point program. One of these seven points deals with the abolition of two-price cotton. That is the major purpose of H.R. 6196.

Prior to developing the reasons why the enactment of this bill is necessary to the Nation as a whole, and to the cotton, textile, and apparel industries in particular, I wish to take just a moment to report upon some of the other points of President Kennedy's program which will put into proper context the absolute necessity of the enactment of H.R. 6196, a bill which will not injure this highly complex and interrelated program, but will, instead, preserve this critical segment of our economy from further internal erosion and unfair external competition.

Our late President recognized that an unrealistic and inequitable tax depreciation schedule was imposed upon the textile industry. He directed the Department of the Treasury to study the situation to take corrective action. This was done. As a result, I am happy to report that intensified modernization and purchase of new and replacement equipment are taking place, thus further perfecting one of this Nation's most efficient and advanced industries.

The contribution to be made to the industry by intensified research was also recognized by President Kennedy, and in accordance with his wishes the Congress made initial funds available for this purpose. Encouraging reports have been received from competent experts in the Department of Agriculture and the cotton-growing industry that with increased research into the costs of growing cotton over the next 5 to 10 years a reduction in costs may be anticipated of 10 cents per pound.

In November 1961 the Department of Agriculture, for a second time, in accordance with the fourth point of the program, sought Tariff Commission action to limit imports under section 22. President Kennedy widened the scope of this investigation by extending it to cover the effect of imports on all U.S. cotton programs. In spite of these measures by the executive branch the Tariff Commission in September 1962 once more ruled against relief for the domestic textile industry.

A 19-nation, 1-year cotton textile arrangement was negotiated in 1961, and a 23-nation, 5-year arrangement was negotiated in 1962. Both of these arrangements sought to control the flow of cotton textiles into the United States, but satisfactory enforcement of the arrangements by the United States has been rendered extremely difficult because of the raw cotton costs advantage enjoyed by foreign mills. The windfall profits which accrue to foreign manufacturers and domestic importers are such that they encourage every conceivable device for circumventing the terms of the arrangements. The advantage two-price cotton gives foreign mills, at the expense of U.S. mills, was aptly described by President Kennedy as "the unique burden" borne by the domestic textile industry.

Developments of this present legislation to remove the inequity of the Government-established two-price cotton program began at the direction of President Kennedy in late 1962, following the adverse decision of the Tariff Commission.

It is evident that H.R. 6196 came into being against a background of complex and involved political and economic conditions which have developed over a period of several years. Two-price cotton was created by the Government; two-price cotton must be abolished by the Government. The passage of H.R. 6196 will do just that.

The ultimate success of our late President's entire seven point program will be greatly enhanced by the passage of this legislation.

This bill was not casually arrived at. It is the product of extensive hearings involving every interest in the vast agricultural-industrial cotton complex. A sincere effort, and I submit a successful one, has been achieved to strike a delicate balance between the various and sometimes diverse elements of this industry, without doing violence to any. It is, I think, a tribute to the very fundamental nature of the American industrial and governmental system to recognize the successful coordination of individual interests in H.R. 6196 for the purpose of breathing new life into a great and vital industry.

I urge that the bill with the committee approved McIntire amendment be passed. It is the considered judgment of the industry, the Department of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committee of of this body that this legislation should be enacted in the form in which it has been presented to us. Such a delicate balance has been struck between all the diverse interests involved that to tamper with its present form will unquestionably seriously jeopardize the entire legislation. I encourage your support of H.R. 6196 with the belief that it is the best, if not the only, workable solution to abolish an injustice imposed by Government upon this indispensible segment of our domestic economy. I thank you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my good friend and colleague for many years, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in support of the bill H.R. 9196. I am hopeful that the Cooley bill will pass the House today because it maybe the last chance the many textile firms of this country have to live.

You who may be removed from the textile communities do not realize the hardship that has been imposed upon this industry in recent years. Only a month ago a large textile factory in my district closed, and I understand another one is threatened.

Mr. Chairman, these closings mean hundreds of people are going to be thrown out of work, hundreds of good, honest working men and women who only want a fair chance to earn an honest living. They are deprived of that opportunity because of intolerable conditions imposed by our Government.

These industries are not only forced to pay 8 cents a pound more for their cotton than the industries of Japan and European or other Asiatic countries, but they are also forced to compete with the cheap wages paid abroad which are very much less than in this country.

Why are we forced to do this? It is due in large measure to our foreign policy which demands that we make these sacrifices. I am hoping that we may be able to solve this problem and remove these artificial conditions.

But, if we are forced to pay this extra amount for our cotton, the burden should not fall entirely upon the people who work in the textile industry. It is an expense for the whole country and they should share in the expense.

I do not like a lot of policies in these various farm bills. Some of them have been very obnoxious to me. But we are faced today with one fact, and that is if we do not pass this bill the chance of survival of the textile industry is very limited. In view of that fact I make this plea on behalf of thousands of people who are employed in my district and whom I want to keep working. I believe it is good for the workers and I believe it will give American private enterprise a chance to flourish.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in support of this bill. It is the last chance of the textile industry to get a little justice from this Congress. I do not think anyone is so hardhearted or sectional minded that they would want to destroy the oldest industry in America. I live within a stone's throw of the place where the textile industry started. I know from the old citizens that it started in the city of Pawtucket, R.I., just across the river. The first textile mill was formed immediately after the Revolutionary War. The people of the country at that time knew they had to have this type of industry, and they have made continued efforts in its behalf.

The prompt passage of this bill will be hailed with joy by the thousands of people who work in the textile industry.

The textile industry was needed in the early days of our Republic. It is an absolute necessity both in peace and war. We must not sacrifice it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, there is virtual unanimity on two facts about the current cotton situation: First, that cotton is in serious economic trouble, and second, that something must be done to prevent further inroads by competing fibers into its markets. The disagreement and the controversy is centered on the question of how to solve a critical situation.

At the outset, let me say that I intend to vote for H.R. 6196 if the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Maine is adopted. I am doing so in full recognition of the fact that the bill provides temporary additional cost to save the cotton industry.

It would serve no purpose for me to repeat the numerous facts which all add up to one thing—American cotton is in deep trouble. Most of its current problems stem from the fact that its price is too high to permit it to compete for markets. That its price is too high is the direct result of poor and unwise administration of existing cotton legislation by the current Secretary of Agriculture. To permit the present cotton program to continue as it is now being administered, would cost, in my judgment, far more than the cost of the program embodied in the legislation now under discussion.

H.R. 6196, if amended as proposed by the gentleman from Maine, offers the only practical and possible method for solving the cotton problem. It points the way toward a cotton program that permits the industry to realize its full potential and exist without dependence on Federal subsidy.

If we accept the fact that cotton's markets will not wait and that immediate action must be taken to prevent further loss of markets and contraction of the industry, there are virtually no alter-

**natives to the proposed bill. I doubt that anyone seriously entertains the thought that price supports can be immediately lowered to a level that would allow American cotton to meet its competition at the "world price." Such a step would ruin the vast majority of cotton farmers across the entire belt. And the resulting economic consequences would be felt far beyond the farm level.**

**Likewise, elimination of the export subsidy would not solve the problem. Without the export subsidy, American cotton would be virtually eliminated from foreign markets. When we consider that cotton earns about $750 million yearly in foreign exchange, we realize that the national interest militates against such a move.**

**H.R. 6196 is aimed at improving the economic well-being of the entire industry. But if there is any one branch that stands to benefit the most from the long-run effects of the legislation, it is the producer segment.**

**Under the existing cotton program, as it is being administered, farmers face a dreary prospect. They are directly confronted with sharply declining markets, and swelling surpluses. If these conditions are allowed to continue, a further reduction in the statutory minimum cotton acreage allotment is almost inevitable.**

**On the other hand, H.R. 6196, with the amendment of the gentleman from Maine, offers a real opportunity for farmers to produce for an expanding market and actually increase their income from farming.**

**The gentleman's amendment requires a reduction in price supports from the existing level of 32.47 to 29 cents by 1966. It puts a ceiling on the level of price supports. At the same time, H.R. 6196 directs the Secretary of Agriculture, beginning with the 1965 crop year, to lower price supports to reflect reductions in costs of producing cotton. It also directs that a special cotton research program be instituted to reduce production costs.**

**This is the only sound solution to the present cotton problem. Costs must be cut if cotton is to compete for its markets without a Federal subsidy and without sacrifice of farm income. The benefits that will flow to farmers from such a program are clear.**

**The only question is: Can costs be lowered? The answer, I believe, is "Yes," and here is the crux of the matter.**

**A real potential does exist for much faster progress in cotton technology, especially in lowering the cost of production. Currently an interesting case in point is the boll weevil, which has long stood as the symbol of cost and trouble for much of the Cotton Belt. This is a highly specialized insect which feeds on virtually nothing but the cotton plant and is found mainly in North America. Yet only in the past several years has a research effort of realistic scope been launched against the boll weevil. Already several highly promising leads have been developed, raising hopes that this insect can be brought under much better and cheaper control, possibly even eradicated. There are many comparable** opportunities, but the total research effort on cotton is a small one for the vast complexity of problems which exist. Documented testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture shows that adequate research could open the way to an average cost reduction of 11 cents a pound in the next 5 or 10 years. Should this effort be successful, the hand of the Federal Government could be taken off the American farmers back. This must be our ultimate objective.

Cotton production costs must come down, so that prices can come down. Then we can have market expansion, not market contraction. If we assume a static market and try to squeeze all we can from it by the supply-management technique of high price and low production, we will wind up with little or no market.

All the land, labor, and capital now employed in producing and handling cotton stands in serious jeopardy of losing its employment. And this is not the threat, sometimes found in food and feed, that one farm enterprise will be displaced by another. It is the threat that U.S. cotton will be displaced on its home market by industrially produced fibers and in the export market by these together with foreign cotton. In other words, we must contemplate the threat of a large net reduction in the markets served by American agriculture.

On the other hand, there is a great possibility of expansion in the markets for U.S. cotton, representing a net increase in the total output required of our agricultural system.

Of course, there are other competitive factors besides price in the contest for fiber markets. Quality and promotion are the most obvious of these. But on the current competitive scene the role of price is especially crucial.

Over the past 3 years cotton has lost about a sixth of its domestic market to competing fibers. It is clear that this shift was caused largely by a Government-supported rise in the market price of cotton, following and accompanying reductions in the prices of rayon and other manmade fibers. The shift is continuing, with no end in sight.

In exports, it is more difficult to measure the fundamental market changes which reflect real shifts in the competitive position of U.S. cotton. So many temporary factors obscure the basic trend. But at least this much is evident: A few years ago the trend was strongly upward, but today there certainly is no upward trend. There is much reason to fear that it is downward. Meantime the export market for U.S. cotton, even as it now stands, depends vitally upon a subsidy which causes a two-price system, making cotton available much cheaper to foreign than to domestic manufacturers and thus stimulating a tremendous expansion in imports of cotton products.

Our present export price for cotton may or may not be low enough to sustain a healthy continuation of this export market in future years. This is not as yet certain. But quite certainly this export price is part of a two-price system which is itself the target of ever-rising criticism and is unlikely to be tenable, politically or economically, beyond a limited time.

Thus the market for cotton, domestic and foreign, is in critical condition because of the domestic price level. It must be lowered, and the costs underlying it must be lowered.

I deplore the fact that even temporary and modest additional spending is required to provide the time needed for this industry to get on the road to the long-term goal. That it is needed is due to the unsound administration of the current cotton legislation.

But the fact remains that there is a compelling need to eliminate the two-price cotton system. Prices must come down quickly, but costs can only come down more slowly. To bridge the difference in timing, is the reason for a temporary Government program. There is little point in making the effort needed to reduce costs if our markets are to be irrevocably lost in the meantime. But likewise there is little point in further Government subsidy if it merely prolongs the agony of a dying industry or—even worse—if it carries us permanently into deeper dependence upon handouts from Washington. Either the cost-cutting effort or the temporary subsidy would be rather futile by itself.

Fortunately, the legislation, particularly with the McIntire amendment appended, provides the means by which not only the new but also the present Federal subsidies can be eliminated. On balance the good features of the legislation outweigh the bad. If we can move in the direction of freeing the cotton industry from dependence on the Government, we will have done it a great service. This legislation is aimed at that goal.

Let us be honest about this bill. The only alternative to it is a continuation of the incompetence of current agricultural programs which are destroying the freedom and opportunity of millions of American citizens.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I commend my colleague from Tennessee on his views and his statements. I join with him in support of this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. BROCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress of the United States, many times in my 30 years of legislative life I have been in the position of standing on the floor and fighting for a cause that I knew beforehand was lost. I have that feeling today. It has been said that a speech never changes a vote, but persuasion does. I am afraid the speeches have been too few and the persuasion has been too much.

We have finally reached that stage where we have to make a decision on a far-reaching piece of legislation, one that I believe will kick open Pandora's box for many years to come in the most serious type of legislative demand ever made upon a legislative body in the history of this United States.

Never in our history have we been asked to subsidize profitmaking, profit-taking, and profit-corporate enterprise except in times of duress, emergency, and expansion where expansion was needed for the common welfare.

This legislation for the first time proposes that 35 mill operators in these United States will receive in cash—will receive 75 percent of a total of $350 million. Do not be fooled by the phrase "payments in kind" because when a textile mill has to buy its cotton, it either pays for it in cash or pays for it with a certificate of payment in kind from the Government. It cannot operate without cotton and cannot operate without any other ingredient in its product. Therefore, if it gets the ingredient by certificate, it is in lieu of cash and the certificate is cash.

While not underestimating the cost one way or another of this legislation, I believe the decision goes to a principle far and beyond any that has ever been propounded or expounded on this floor.

We all know about the domestic cost differential between foreign cotton purchases. But the same group that is demanding the passage of this legislation demanded the foreign export to help the cotton farmer in the United States grow cotton for cotton export and the taxpayers in every other section of the United States have paid a subsidy of $500 to $750 million a year—every year in order that we could keep our cottongrowers operating.

I want to say here and now that from the beginning of time agriculture has always had to be subsidized in one form or another. And I subscribe to that principle. I believe that agriculture has to be subsidized in one form or another. But I do not believe that this Congress can step from the necessity of subsidizing the cotton or the wheat or the dairy industry and then move over into subsidizing the processors, producers, and profit takers.

That is what we are doing. They are using strong and compelling arguments. They are saying that 45 mills have been liquidated in the past 5 years due to foreign competition. Who amongst all of us did not know a year ago that foreign competition was a disastrous, dangerous, and catastrophic thing in the economics of this Nation? If you did not know, it was because you did not listen, because I tried for hours, for days, and for weeks, talking in most cases to an empty hall, to warn you about the very danger that is contained in a foreign trade movement which has behind it the most unrealistic philosophy of trade ever conceived in the minds of any legislative body. The increase in imports has been from 100,000 bales in 1954 to 645,000 bales in 1962. They knew that, and they imposed that sickness upon themselves by their vote for the so-called will-o'-the-wisp of free trade.

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Congress, believe me, I have voted and I will vote again to support the cotton farmer, but in this instance the cotton farmer will be hurt. You are taking from the cotton farmers' share of the subsidy and you are going to give it to the mill operator. Any person in this Congress who has never read the story of cotton mills and their operations in this country had better read it before they vote today. I was told that the textile workers are for this bill and therefore I ought to be for it. I have a great deal of respect for the textile workers. In 30 years of legislative work it has always been my aim to vote for and to work for the lesser peoples and the little peoples of this Nation. I have yet ever to have had to apologize for any vote I have cast for any piece of legislation when it relates to the welfare of the farmer or to the welfare of the worker.

The textile workers were against my stand on trade last year, but here they have in their own letter a statement coming from their own president saying that the increased imports because of our trade policy are the reason for the Marland mill shutting down, throwing 453 workers out of work.

I want to tell you I am very, very, very appreciative of the fact that this is the first time in the history of my legislative career that the Farmers Union, and the Farm Bureau have gotten together in opposition to a piece of legislation on the floor of the Congress. And I want to tell you, that is no easy marriage.

Yesterday I heard a Member of this Congress talk about how the cotton workers wanted to stay in the economy. Believe me, my people want to stay in the economy. I have here a labor market letter received this morning from my district. Let me read one line. "A loss of 6,500 more jobs in this district caused the total employment to drop to an alltime low." And why were they out of work? Because subsidized oil killed off the coal mines; because plastics took the place of glass. And the cotton industry is in trouble today because synthetics are taking the place of the natural fiber, cotton.

This legislation is a war chest, and I say this for the record and I defy any Member of this Congress to prove differently. I can prove it by the record that was made before the very committee that brought this bill out. This legislation provides a war chest of $350 million to the cotton textile mills to fight the synthetic textile mills in America.

In our own report to this House, in a statement made by Mr. Hickman Price, the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, he plainly and bluntly said:

> Indeed, the issue here is whether the use of cotton is to dwindle as a result of our own self-imposed action, or whether the use of cotton is not only to be maintained, but to be increased.

The American farmer, in good times and in bad, has been the basic customer who is with us in peace and war. That customer now needs the only customer he has, the textile mills. Is that industry to continue to be discriminated against by allowing the test tubes and the chemical engineers to develop competition? Because, if you are anxious about the foreign competition, the result could easily have been achieved by creating an 8½-cent-a-pound cotton content component duty against imports. Only 8 percent of the textiles in the United States are imported and 92 percent are domestic. It would cost exactly $27 million to equalize the cost of domestic cotton textiles to the American people with foreign textiles.

Why do we say that 6 million bales of cotton being exported at a subsidy of $42.50 are to be equalized by paying $42.50 on 8½ million bales of cotton?

We finally have arrived at that point where a decision is to be made on a very important question. While not underestimating the costs one way or the other on this legislation, I believe the decision goes more to a principle and a philosophy than it does directly to the dollars involved. We all admit that the present system of Government price supports for cotton create an inequity between American cotton users and foreign cotton users when they are thrown into trade conflict.

On one hand the domestic price is supported at 32½ cents a pound while at the same time the Government enables foreign mills to obtain American cotton at 24 cents a pound. This is roughly a 25-percent advantage given to foreign mills.

In dollars and cents it amounts to $42.50 a 500-pound bale. Sponsors of this legislation are using the politically important argument that this inequity has led to a tremendous increase in cotton products. They say that the increase has been from 100,000 bales in 1954 to 645,000 bales in 1962. They go on to say that skyrocketing imports have contributed to the decline of the domestic industry. Employment has declined from 246,800 workers in 1958 to 223,400 in 1962. In August 1963, it was down to 216,000 production workers. Forty-five mills have been liquidated in the past 5 years wiping out 20,000 jobs.

These are very strong and compelling arguments, however, they deserve more than a passing inquiry. And so, I would like to say in the words of an old political leader—let us look at the record: From 1947 to 1961 industrial production in the United States increased by 50 percent while textile production declined by 2 percent. During the same period, textile employment decreased from 1,325,000 to about 940,000. You can see that while production dropped 2 percent, employment dropped 25 percent.

Most of this was due, of course, to technical advancement, automation, and manmade fibers in the industry. The entire importation of cotton goods amounted to 8 percent of the domestic cotton used by our mills last year. It can be said that the proponents of this legislation are claiming that 8 percent of the domestic market supplied by foreign imports has disrupted the entire market so that U.S. mills, according to page 5 of the committee report is as follows and I quote:

> The economic structure of the American cotton industry now is in jeopardy.

In spite of this, the Tariff Commission has found, again quoting from the committee report, the Tariff Commission has denied a request for relief through an import fee that would equalize the cost of raw cotton in foreign domestic goods. Let us examine just what this legislation really does. It will pay a subsidy direct to textile mills based on today's cotton prices and the last year's consumption of 8½ million bales of cotton of approximately $350 million.

The proposal of our late, lamented President to assess 8½ cents per pound on imported cotton content in manufactured products would have been assessed as against approximately 650,000 bales of cotton in cotton content amounting to approximately $27 million.

The real loss to the American economy, dollarwise, is the loss of $42.50 on every bale of cotton exported from the United States, which according to the latest figures, is estimated at 6 million bales which means that American taxpayers fail to collect from foreign cotton mills a sum of $255 million.

The passage of this act will not alter this fact, nor will it change this phase of the cotton subsidy program. We will still lose $42.50 on every bale of cotton we export, but this bill will add an additional loss of approximately $350 million to the taxpayers by equalizing the so-called world price to the domestic price.

If this is done for cotton, it necessarily follows that it can, and perhaps should be done for the flour mills, the peanut candymakers, the users of feed grains, and all other subsidized products that flow in the world trade at prices lower than the U.S. support price subsidy.

It is interesting to note that while the impact of imports, and I believe every Member of this Congress knows how I feel about unfair, low-priced imports, I repeat—the impact of the cotton imports, while only 8 percent of our total cotton textile production—nevertheless, according to the sponsors of this act, are responsible for the loss of 45 mills, and 20,000 jobs in 5 years.

Anybody that knows the cotton content of textile fabrics and the finished products sold in the marketplace must realize that while the cotton content is one factor that determines the selling price of a product, it is by no means the major or determining factor, and so we must look elsewhere for relief for the cotton industry since the wages, taxes, necessary and essential services—such as power, heat, transportation are all components of cost, and in each of these areas the differential between the import and the domestic product is much greater and more of a factor than the cotton cost.

Whether we like it, whether we want to admit it, the simple economic facts of life are such that the promise held out to the textile workers to the consumer and to the cottongrowers that all their troubles will be over if they pass this textile mill owner subsidy legislation is but an empty promise and we will be right back where we started with a lot less money in our Treasury if we pass this legislation.

I have not the time to deal in the statistical figures that prove beyond a doubt this is unsound legislation that will not even approach the goal it is intended to reach. Namely, a competitive level with foreign products. We pay at the present time a subsidy of $25 million on exported cotton and we also, using the same figures, are paying a subsidy on domestic cotton of $350 million. Under the terms of this act we would pay an additional amount from $320 to $350 million depending on the success of the reduction in the price program which would make approximately $900 million in total subsidy for the cotton industry.

This would be equal to, and above the total amount of the value of the cotton exports from the United States. In simple, plain language this House of Representatives is today asked to vote to add to an already burdensome program of subsidy, a sum that would make the total of the subsidy out of the pockets of the taxpayers greater than the value of the entire cotton shipment from the United States.

This is some of the reward that we reap from an unsound trade policy which is responsible in the first instance for the two-price system.

No matter how much we add to the subsidy program the American cotton mills will never compete on a price basis with foreign cotton mills in foreign markets or in our domestic market. Once we have admitted this then we must look for a solution, or better still, let us look and see if there is some other reason for the great push on this legislation.

If the sponsors of this legislation wanted to equalize the import cotton cost in order to make American cotton goods competitive—as the proponents claim that we would—then the simple procedure would be to pass legislation charging a customs of 8½ cents a pound on all imported cotton content. This would not have cost the taxpayers a red cent; would have given us $27 million-odd to put into the Treasury to help meet the domestic subsidy program and would have absolutely equalized the cost of the cotton content between imported and domestic cotton goods.

I find it hard to believe that this solution was discarded for the cumbersome, costly, and exorbitant program offered in H.R. 6196.

In searching for an answer to this provocative situation I read very carefully the committee report and on pages 7 and 8 I find the following excerpts from the speech of Mr. Hickman Price, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and a man whom I remember well as one of the prime promoters of the free trade philosophy, the seven-point textile agreement and the Trade Expansion Act. This is what he had to say:

> We, in the Department of Commerce who are so keenly aware of the difficulties of our domestic textile industry in its struggle against competition, hope that the Congress will consider this legislative proposal favorably and enact it at an early date.
>
> But the issues before the Congress, in considering the proposed legislation is, if I may suggest it, more far-reaching than that merely of the correction of a monstrous inequity. The stake here is the long-term survival of cotton itself as an industrial commodity. The American cotton farmer in good times and in bad times has one basic customer who is with us in peace and in war. That customer is our own domestic cotton textile industry. If the industry continues to be discriminated against as it now is by a very much higher cost of its raw material than its foreign competition, it is inevitable that in the long run, with all the technology now available in today's world, that great customer will progressively switch to other fibers in the manufacture of fabric and apparel. If it is the policy of the United States to substitute the products of test tubes and chemical engineering for the American cotton farmer, then let us continue on precisely the same road that we are now on, because that is where we are going. If, on the other hand, the Congress says that the economy of this Nation should be a balanced one, including a prosperous cotton sector of our agricultural life, then make it possible for cotton's largest customer to continue the use of the basic staple and to increase it.
>
> Indeed, the issue here is whether the use of cotton is to dwindle as a result of our own self-imposed action, or whether the use of cotton is not only to be maintained, but to be increased.

I cannot help but note that for the first time we see a new element introduced into the argument for the passage of this legislation and while the import problem as we admitted before, is one to be considered, it appears that the Commerce Department spokesman has finally admitted that this legislation is aimed at equalizing competitive prices of cotton and manmade fibers. In plain words, that while $27 million would be sufficient to equalize the cost with imported cotton goods, the American taxpayer is going to be charged approximately $350 million to put cotton in a competitive equality with test tubes and chemical engineering.

As Mr. Price says, to balance the economy and to eliminate what he calls the declining of the uses of cotton as a result of our own self-imposed action, meaning of course, that the subsidy program has increased the price of cotton to where it is no competition with synthetic fibers.

Now, if this is the purpose of the legislation, then we ought to discuss that and make a decision as to whether Congress is willing to set up industrial subsidies in order that steel can compete with aluminum and glass can compete with plastics and coal can compete with fuel oil and gas.

Are we entering a new phase of Government spending unwilling. I am sure, unwillingly, except for those few who—like Mr. Price—have stated it in plain language, that this legislation is intended to save the cotton industry from the disastrous affects of synthetic fiber competition.

I have no stated position on this phase of this legislation, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to pass this legislation without knowing exactly what can be the results of its passage. If this is a bill to help the cotton industry fight the chemical industry, it ought to be so stated. The facts and figures in the case strongly tend to corroborate this belief since the disparagement between the amount of extra subsidy paid directly to cotton mill owners cannot be justified solely on the impact of cotton imports.

The truth of the matter is that the remedy insofar as the import impact is concerned is simple, and requires no new legislation. If we pass this bill today, we are setting aside the findings and the opinion handed down by the Tariff Commission and we are declaring that the importation of cotton textiles is destructive to the cotton industry.

Personally, I lean toward that belief, but this legislation does not prove it.

Getting to that part of the report which tends to show the great advantages to the taxpayer who will be called upon to dig into his pocket to pay millions of dollars to textile mill operators, we find that the proponents of this legislation have put out information which has caused at least one large union in America to send out a fact sheet stating that the passage of this legislation will save the consumers $500 million a year and will create some 35,000 jobs for textile workers.

I will say this, as a personal belief and opinion, that the millions of dollars given to the textile mills will not be reflected in any 2 for 1 savings for the taxpayer who is, after all, the consumer. Second, unless there is a greatly expanded use of textiles of all kinds, jobs created—if any—in the cotton mills will be lost to the textile workers in the synthetic textile mills.

Again, in searching for the logic or reasoning behind such an assumption that by charging the taxpayers $1, we will return to him $2 in savings.

I find on page 7 of the same report, and I quote the following language from Mr. Price, statements which I have difficulty in equating to simple arithmetic, let alone the science of trade economics:

> We not only believe that this reduction will be passed on to the consumer, but we believe that because of the necessary distributive markups which are added as a percent on costs, the reduction will be magnified through the distribution channels. Such cumulative markups in the textile and apparel industries range between 100 and 135 percent.
>
> Utilizing the more conservative markup of 100 percent, and using an annual raw cotton consumption figure of 4.5 billion pounds, each cent of reduction in cost would amount to $45 million, thus magnified to a $90 million saving to the consumer. And this could be higher than $100 million per penny of reduction annually.
>
> This would, of course, not occur overnight because of the variable inventory lag. It may run, for example, from 3 to 8 months, in the case of cotton apparel.
>
> The intolerable inequity imposed on our domestic mills by the difference in cost of raw materials must be done away with, and the costs of payments, whatever they may be, to remove the inequity will find their way into the profits of the American taxpayer as, also, the American consumer. And I doubt that he would shirk the payment of $1 to correct this obvious unfairness in order to receive $2 back in his own purse.

I have difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in trying to equate a $90 million savings to a 0.01-cent reduction in the cost of cotton. Since the textile mills would not be able to pass on to the consumer this reduced purchase price, since the plea is made that the mills cannot sustain their present price structure without this subsidy—and when you realize that the domestic mills sell 92 percent of the cotton content products in the United States—it is hardly conceivable that the mills will pass on to the taxpayer that amount of money doubled that he is paid in taxes as a subsidy.

If this were economically true, and sound, then, Mr. Chairman, why do not we pay a subsidy of a billion dollars and the taxpayer then would save $2 billion in the purchase of cotton goods.

The only way that a subsidy can be used to reduce cost to the consumer at the marketplace is when the subsidy is absorbed by the National Treasury. This, I am sure, will be the ultimate results on any added subsidies passed by this Congress today, or any other time.

It might be interesting to know also, Mr. Chairman, that this subsidy plan will actually give more to the textile mills of the United States than they have been able to earn in any of the last 5 years. This is covered in an address by James E. Robison of Indianhead Mills, entitled "King Cotton's Ransom," which I recommend to be read by every Member of Congress before he votes on this legislation. For purposes of bringing this matter to your attention, let me give you the figures that will demonstrate the point I have just made.

In 1957 the cotton industry used 8,496 million bales of cotton. They paid a premium through subsidy of 38.4 cents a pound, or a total of $326 million. They show a profit on total textile mill products for that year of $306 million.

Skipping then to 1961, and I assure you that the figures are relatively the same, fluctuating with the subsidy payment and total consumption—by taking the figures of 1961—the industry consumed 8,200,000 bales bearing a subsidy of $30 a bale, amounting to $246 million, and made a profit of $261 million. Taking the figures of 1962 estimated at 8,750,000 bales at 42.5 cents, subsidy payment would amount to $371 million. Using the ratio between profit and subsidy on past performance, we will find ourselves in a position of giving textile mill operators a payment in kind, equal to their earned profit for all textile mill products within 10 percent either way.

This means further, Mr. Chairman, that when the textile mills make their next purchases and payment in kind, certificates will buy $371 million worth of cotton out of the surplus, adding that much surplus to the new crop. This is especially so since this legislation will allow increased acreage planting to flow into world trade at world trade prices without subsidy.

Are we to believe that with cotton surpluses already in our warehouses that we can sell more cotton and, in doing so, will we find ourselves faced with another appeal in a few years for an added subsidy for foreign shipments?

The claim of jobs needs a little more study before this Congress can accept a figure pulled out of the air. To say that this industry will increase employment by even one employee cannot be proven by the record because the total textile employment in the United States, including synthetics—as well as cotton textiles—is 940,000 with an industry producing within 2 percent of its 1947 figures when they employed 1,325,000.

When we realize that we will be taking employees from the synthetic plants, it is hard to believe that we will increase production in the cotton textile mills to provide jobs claimed by the sponsors of this act. The opposite may very well be true in that a combination of this windfall of 300-odd millions of dollars, plus the windfall given into industry under the expansion incentive plan, allowing tax credits for modernization and automation of plant facility may very well bring about a lessening of job opportunities in this industry.

I would gamble my reputation as a political prophet, and say to this House that if this legislation is passed as it is now written, it will go down in history as one of the most ill-conceived, ill-considered spending programs ever to pass the Congress. This, I believe, and I repeat as I did on this floor when the trade bill was before us. I said then, that I did not believe the trade bill would create job opportunities in the United States, that it would not create a balance of payments, and it would not increase our exports in any significant amount unless they were subsidized. In closing, I said I pray I am wrong, but I believe I am right—and today I say to you again, I pray I am wrong, but believe I am right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bad bill, one of the worst in my memory as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a Member of the House of Representatives. Basically this is a mill subsidy bill and nothing else. The legislative history so discloses.

The American Farm Bureau is definitely against this bill. The Farm Bureau says in a recent letter addressed to Members of Congress as follows:

> On behalf of the producers we earnestly recommend that you vote against this legislation. It will not solve the problems of cotton.

Here is a letter dated December 3, 1963, received from the Farmers Union. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> Farmers Union respectfully urges your active opposition to H.R. 6196. The enactment of this cotton mill subsidy bill is not in the best interests of farmers nor of taxpayers.

This is the first triple subsidy bill in agricultural history as far as I know. It includes a subsidy for the producers, an export subsidy and now it is proposed to add a mill subsidy. Those of you who have talked about economy in Government—and a lot of you have, although you do not always vote that way. Here is an opportunity for you to stand back of our new President who said the other day that he wants to reduce Federal expenditures. I commend him for it.

This bill is going to cost over $635 million more than the present cotton program over a 3-year period. How can anyone conscientiously vote for this costly bill when we are trying to cut down Federal expenditures? You are going to have a chance to go on record on a rollcall vote, and we will see who is for economy when the votes are counted.

This bill also contains back-door spending to which most of us have been opposed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would encompass and adopt the oft repudiated Brannan plan of production payments or compensatory payments which we have fought against long and hard throughout the years. Here it is again for another trial run. It is a bad proposal. The worst part of the bill is really the precedent that we will be setting if we adopt the Brannan plan. I hope you fully realize just what you are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am more concerned about the precedent involved than anything else. Have we gotten to the point where we are going to bail out and subsidize every industry that gets into trouble?

I sympathize with the cotton mills of this country. I know the problems involved. However, the chickens are just coming home to roost; that is all. Those of you who so valiantly supported the Trade Agreements Act, well know what it is doing now to American industry. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and a lot of industries have already gone out of business. Those of you from the cotton belt who have gone all out for foreign aid are beginning to realize that something has happened to the cotton industry as a result of foreign aid. We have spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to teach people overseas how to plant more and better cotton with American taxpayer money. You are in trouble, and it is now proposed to bail out the mills, this will not solve the problem and we will be again confronted with the same problem after 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we accept the Brannan plan in this bill, I want to predict right now that we will have the dairy industry asking for the same kind of relief. The dairy industry is in trouble in this country. Why not bail them out in the same way when they are in trouble?

What are you going to say to the dairy farmers, what are you going to say to the cheese manufacturers, the butter manufacturers when they also ask for help?

Just now those of us from the cattle-feeding areas of this country are hearing from our farmers about the importation of beef from foreign countries which is really reaching great proportions, and the administration is not doing anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, in order to be fair to all industries we will have to take care of all of them and not discriminate as it is proposed to do in this bill. One of the cotton mills, believe it or not, is going to get approximately $20 million, even with the so-called McIntire amendment. They are going to be the real beneficiaries. The cotton farmer is not going to get much out of this. The consumer certainly is not. The cotton mills will get the gravy.

Mr. Chairman, a former Speaker of the House, John Nance Garner, once said, "Don't tell me what a bill says, tell me what it does."

The bill before the House today does this:

First. It increases the cost of the present cotton program by at least $635 million over the next 3 years for a yearly average of $212 million more than the present program.

Second. It adds new and expensive subsidies to "persons other than producers" in order to reduce the cost of cotton to U.S. textile mills.

Third. It authorizes these payments to be made in kind—that is, in surplus cotton. The Congress will not have control over the total amount of these payments or over the amount paid to any one recipient after this bill becomes law. This bill is both an authorization and an expenditure piece of legislation.

Fourth. It discriminates against areas of efficient cotton production—particularly in our Western States.

Fifth. It establishes a dangerous precedent for other commodities.

Sixth. It continues and expands Government domination over the cotton industry.

PRESENT PROBLEM SERIOUS

Mr. Chairman, I take a position in opposition to this bill because it is bad legislation, not because a serious problem does not exist. I believe that every member of the Committee on Agriculture recognizes that the cotton industry is in trouble at present.

The income of cotton farmers will be down this year for the reason that the Secretary of Agriculture has cut the national cotton acreage allotment from 18.1 million acres to 16.2 million acres without changing the level of support in dollars and cents.

Taxpayers' costs under the present program are heavy—some $612 million in the 1962–63 marketing year—and the August 1, 1964, carryover of all cotton is now expected to be nearly 12 million bales. The taxpayers of this country have over $1.6 billion tied up in surplus cotton.

The American textile industry is faced with a real dilemma. Foreign textile competition enjoys a price for its raw cotton at least 8½ cents below that available to American textile firms, and imported textile products have caused widespread hardship in the textile industry. The U.S. Tariff Commission has failed to grant relief to the industry, and the long-term agreement on textiles made in Geneva, Switzerland, has not been fully implemented by our Government.

In spite of our heavy export subsidy program, U.S. exports of cotton have dropped very sharply in 1962–63 and ran nearly 1.3 million bales behind last year.

Cotton as a fiber is rapidly losing its dominant place as king of the textile industry. Twenty-four years ago when the Government first became involved in the production control program on cotton, this commodity represented 81.6 percent of all fiber use. Last year, 1962, cotton held only 59.8 percent of total fiber use.

Because of dwindling cotton markets and the intense pressure on textile manufacturers to utilize automated equipment, many thousands of textile workers have lost their jobs. As the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America said in its January 1963 policy statement:

> The American people are paying three penalties for the outmoded cotton price-support program. First, they have to foot the bill for the Federal payments to cotton farmers in support of the inflated price of cotton. Second, they are taxed to provide subsidies amounting to $200 million a year to exporters of cotton products. Finally, they have to pay at least $600 million a year more for domestically produced cotton products than would be necessary in the absence of high support prices.

This bill seeks to solve the present problems of cotton by turning to the Federal Treasury for a new subsidy—a subsidy for the domestic textile industry to offset the effect of the other two subsidies in the cotton marketing structure. It will be, I believe, the first triple subsidy farm program ever enacted.

COST

Many times in the past when the House has debated farm legislation, there has been a great deal of argument about the cost of the pending bill. This time we can all agree, I believe, that the program will cost taxpayers more than the present program.

The proponents of H.R. 6196 say it will cost $118 million more in the first year, $88 million more in the second year, and $44 million more in the third year.

I contend the actual cost will average at least $212 million more during each of the next 3 years.

The reason for the difference in my estimate is that the proponents of H.R. 6196 do not assign any cash value to 950,000 bales of Government-owned cotton to be used as payment in kind. This cotton is now held in the inventories of CCC.

I feel in all fairness that this cotton has a real value—a value of at least 24 cents a pound, which is the present world price of cotton.

In addition, the bill proposes to make payments on cotton now held in private inventories. This payment could be and probably would be 8½ cents a pound. If it were not that much, there would still be two-price cotton which supposedly is to be eliminated by this legislation.

COST OF THE COOLEY COTTON BILL, H.R. 6196

The Cooley cotton bill, H.R. 6196, proposes to add new and expensive subsidies to the cotton program.

Everyone concerned with this legislation, both opponents and proponents, agree that the cost to taxpayers will increase under the bill. The question is, "How much?" According to estimates prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the total additional cost would be $635.9 million during the next 3 years.

In May 1963, Department of Agriculture witnesses appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to testify on cotton legislation. In its testimony the Department estimated that the cost of the cotton program with the Cooley bill would be $779.4 million in 1964, or an increased cost of $228 million over and above the cost of the program under present law.

The Department's estimate was based on a 6-cent trade incentive payment the same as what would be provided under the McIntire amendment.

The table showing the Department's estimate presented to the Senate committee appears at page 42 of House Report No. 366 on H.R. 6196.

On October 14, 1963, the Department of Agriculture published a new estimate of the cost of the Cooley bill which assumes the adoption of the McIntire amendment. A copy of that table is attached.

You will note that this table shows an increased cost of $118.2 million in the first year, an increase of $87.9 million in the second year, and an increase of $44.3 million in the third year.

Please note that the table shows the additional cost of the trade incentive payments—$283.5 million in the first year, $259.9 million in the second year, and $236.2 million in the third year—being offset by the domestic value of 950,000 bales of cotton during each year—29.25 cents per pound times 950,000 bales—thereby leaving a "net cost" of the trade incentive payments of $144.6 million in the first year, $123.3 million in the second year, and $102 million in the third year.

This table also shows a "reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures" of 950,000 bales each year. Stated another way, this means that in addition to the added cash costs of H.R. 6196, the value of 950,000 bales is added to the cost of the present program. Some proponents of the bill argue that these 950,000 bales of cotton have no value. Some opponents have said these 950,000 bales should be valued at $162.50 each, the cost at which taxpayers acquired them under the price support program—32½ cents per pound times 500 pounds per bale.

It is certainly fair to value this cotton at the world price of $120 per bale—24 cents per pound times 500 pounds per bale—because the Commodity Credit Corporation can always sell at the world price. It is not fiscally rational to assume no value whatsoever for this cotton.

Based on a valuation of $120 per bale reflecting the world price of 24 cents per pound, the value of these 950,000 bales becomes $114 million annually—$120 times 950,000. Therefore, the USDA table which shows a direct additional cash cost of $118.2 million in the first year, shows also an additional cost of $114 million representing the value of the 950,000 bales.

This, of course, means a total additional cost of $232.2 mllion in the first year.

The latest estimate of USDA showing additional costs of $232.2 million in 1964, therefore, is comparable with that agency's estimate in May which showed an additional cost of $228 million in 1964.

For the 3-year period, therefore, the additional costs of H.R. 6196 would be as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| 1st year: | |
| Additional cash cost | 118.2 |
| Value of 950,000 bales | 114.0 |
| Additional cost | 232.2 |
| 2d year: | |
| Additional cash cost | 87.9 |
| Value of 950,000 bales | 114.0 |
| Additional cost | 201.9 |
| 3d year: | |
| Additional cash cost | 44.3 |
| Value of 950,000 bales | 114.0 |
| Additional cost | 158.3 |
| 3-year total: Additional cost during the 3-year period, 1964–66 | 592.4 |

You will note that the Department's table does not include the one-time transition expenditure. The bill provides for "trade incentive" payments on all cotton in private inventories on the date of its enactment into law. The latest report shows private stocks at 1,023,000 bales. At the full subsidy rate of 8½ cents per pound, this payment would be $43,477,500. It could, of course, be lower if the Secretary set a smaller subsidy rate.

*Grand total of additional cost*

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| 3-year additional costs during 1964–66 | 592.4 |
| Additional cost in 1963 | 43.5 |
| Total additional cost of H.R. 6193, as amended | 635.9 |

SUMMARY

As seen from the figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, the total additional cost of this bill as amended by the McIntire amendment would be at least $635.9 million for the next 3 years or an average of approximately $212 million per year.

The reason for this additional cost is simple. The bill with its proposed amendment would add a third subsidy to the present double subsidy structure for cotton. Under present law, U.S. cotton farmers are guaranteed prices 8½ cents a pound above world prices. Cotton exports are subsidized at 8½ cents. This bill proposes to subsidize the domestic textile industry to offset the effect of the other two subsidies.

*Cotton: Comparison of major items of estimated expenditures under current legislation and H.R. 6196, based on assumptions listed below*

| Item | Current legislation, subsequent year | H.R. 6196 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1st year | 2d year | 3d year |
| Support price: | *Cents* | *Cents* | *Cents* | *Cents* |
| Middling 1 inch | 32.47 | 30.00 | 29.50 | 29.00 |
| Average of crop | 31.72 | 29.25 | 28.75 | 28.25 |
| Export subsidy rate | 8.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 |
| Trade incentive rate | | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 |
| Increased support on 1st 15 bales of cotton | | 2.47 | 2.95 | 2.90 |
| Estimated expenditures: | *Million dollars* | *Million dollars* | *Million dollars* | *Million dollars* |
| Export subsidy on 5,000,000 bales | 212.5 | 150.0 | 137.5 | 125.0 |
| Cotton products payments | 17.0 | | | |
| Public Law 480 (excluding export subsidy), 1,500,000 bales | 180.0 | 180.0 | 180.0 | 180.0 |
| Carrying charges, interest, etc | 82.8 | 74.2 | 65.7 | 57.1 |
| Increased support on 1st 15 bales of cotton (5,000,000 bales) | | 61.7 | 73.7 | 72.5 |
| Trade incentive payment: | | | | |
| Gross amount (9,450,000 bales and payment rate) | | (283.5) | (259.9) | (236.2) |
| Less amount of payment-in-kind paid from CCC stocks with no offsetting expenditure (based on 950,000 bales times average support price) | | (138.9) | (136.6) | (134.2) |
| Net amount of trade incentive expenditure | | 144.6 | 123.3 | 102.0 |
| Total of estimated expenditures | 492.3 | 610.5 | 580.2 | 536.6 |
| Net additional expenditures added by H.R. 6196, as amended | | 118.2 | 87.9 | 44.3 |
| Reduction in CCC stocks in addition to cash expenditures | | *Bales*<br>950,000 | *Bales*<br>950,000 | *Bales*<br>950,000 |

NOTE.—The data for H.R. 6196 does not include the 1-time transition expenditures that would be incurred under this bill.

Assumptions:
1. Minimum allotment, 16,200,000 acres.
2. Harvested acres same as in 1963.
3. Yield per harvested acre, 460 pounds (5-year average of 1959-63 yields; 1959, 461; 1960, 446; 1961, 438; 1962 457; 1963, 500 (estimated)).
4. Domestic consumption:
   Under current legislation, 8,600,000 bales (same as estimated for 1963).
   Under H.R. 6196, 9,550,000 bales (950,000 bales increase because of reduced price); 100,000 bales will be from imports and city crop with no PIK payment.
5. Exports, 5,000,000 bales.

NOT IN INTEREST OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

This bill is not in the interest of the American textile industry. I recognize, of course, that there is a great deal of interest and concern within the textile industry about the present serious problem and consequently, some in the industry are supporting this bill. The legislative history has already been made in our committee that these payments, which are called trade incentive payments, under the bill will be made to textile companies. As pointed out by Dr. Walter Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress, a number of textile companies in this country use more than 400,000 bales of cotton a year. I draw your attention to the

**fact that a textile company using 500,000 bales in a year and receiving these "trade incentive" payments, would realize at least a $15 million subsidy from the Federal Government each year.**

**I also draw your attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], a member of the Cotton Subcommittee, and the letter you received from the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], a member of the full Committee on Agriculture. Both of these Members have documented the effect of this legislation on individual textile companies.**

I sincerely believe that the American textile industry should not be placed in a position of relying on direct Government subsidy for its economic survival.

### BACK-DOOR SPENDING

**This bill is, of course, financed by the device known as back-door spending. The Secretary under the terms of the bill would set price supports and make "simultaneous purchase and sale" payments to farmers and "trade incentive" payments to cotton processors, and then the following year come to the Congress with the request to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the losses incurred in such an operation. The Committee on Appropriations would have no control in advance over either the total amount of the payments or over the size of individual payments.**

### EFFICIENT GROWERS HURT

**This bill discriminates against the production of cotton in the more efficient areas of the Nation such as the Mississippi Delta area, west Texas, and the Far West. The hearings on this legislation showed clearly that many farmers in these areas would be willing to accept a lower price for cotton in return for an expanded acreage. The overplant provisions of this legislation would not even begin to come into operation until the national allotment reached 17 million acres.**

**When we recall that the present allotment is 16.2 million acres and there will be a surplus of nearly 12 million bales on August 1, 1964, it is obvious that it is going to be quite a long time, probably 2 or 3 years, before these growers could even hope for a chance to produce more cotton at lower prices. Western members of this House will, I predict, be very sadly disappointed if they support this bill in the hope of acquiring increased acreage for their cotton farmers.**

### BAD PRECEDENT

**When we look at this bill in the cold light of day, Mr. Chairman, we see it simply as a processor subsidy. How many other farm commodities are there that could not use and will not hesitate to ask for similar treatment?**

**Some segments of the dairy industry are already seeking to establish a 10-cent processor subsidy on butter. If cotton processors receive these subsidies in cotton, how then will Congress be able to refuse wheat processors who ask for payments in wheat, a commodity even more in surplus than cotton? There will be no end to such demands if this bill is enacted into law.**

### GOVERNMENT CONTROL EXPANDED

**In 1958 a Democratic Congress passed and a Republican President signed the Agricultural Act of 1958. The spirit of that statute was to lower cotton price supports to meet man-made fiber competition, to expand cotton acreage, to maintain farm income, to gradually eliminate the advantages of foreign textile manufacturers, and to lower Government costs and involvement in the cotton industry.**

Secretary Freeman has chosen not to follow the spirit of that law, and in exercising his discretionary authority, raised price supports on cotton in 1961 and has held them there since.

In 1958 the textile industry was prominent in its support of the Agricultural Act of 1958. This legislation before us today, however, would undo all that has been done before to realistically meet the problems of the cotton industry.

It would bring the Federal Government even further into the cotton marketing and processing structure. For example, about one-third of the cotton crop will be covered under the "simultaneous purchase and sale" provision dealing with the first 15 bales of production of each farmer. Can you imagine the paperwork on this single provision which would directly involve each and every cotton grower in this Nation? And commonsense dictates that the Government will have to supervise carefully the millions of dollars worth of "trade incentive" payments made to cotton processors, thus bringing the Department of Agriculture still further into the daily commerce of this great industry.

### WILL CONSUMERS BENEFIT?

Consumers will not benefit from this bill. I realize that an argument is made that by cutting the cost of cotton to the mills by 8½ cents that taxpayers would save $500 million in cotton products. While this point will be debated at length, I would like to make just two brief observations about such a claim.

First. It is entirely inconsistent with the earlier position of proponents of this bill who have told the House for years that an increase in the support prices will not adversely affect consumers.

Second. If a cut in cotton cost to the mills will now save consumers money, then Secretary Freemans' action 2 years ago in raising the cost of cotton to the mills must have cost consumers millions of dollars.

### THE ALTERNATIVE

There is really only one alternative to this bill for Members of the House who seek to realistically meet the serious problems of cotton. That alternative is to enact legislation which would require the Secretary to follow the spirit of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

At the appropriate time in this debate I intend to offer an amendment to this bill which would set lower price supports for cotton starting in 1964 while authorizing an intensive research program designed to cut production costs.

### SUMMARY

Yes, the problems facing the cotton industry are serious and something should be done to meet the current intolerable situation. We should not, however, turn to this exceedingly expensive and unwise proposal for a remedy. We should instead make the law that we now have work as it was intended to do when it was enacted 5 years ago.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], who addressed the House a moment ago, seems to be a little disturbed over the welfare and happiness of the glassworkers, but he is little concerned with the welfare of the cotton industry of this Nation.

I want to repeat again, there are about 10 million people in this Nation who are interested in the legislation that is now before us.

He mentioned the fact that the AFL-CIO was opposed to this legislation. I challenge the accuracy of that statement, because I know that the AFL-CIO is in favor of the legislation. I know we have in North Carolina more textile workers than in any other State of the Union. He is also in error in his statement regarding organized labor being in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have been misquoted, and I want the Reporter to read back what I said with reference to the AFL-CIO.

Mr. COOLEY. If I misquoted the gentleman I will give him an opportunity to correct my statement, and I yield to him now.

Mr. DENT. I said the Farmers' Union is opposed to this legislation. The Farmers' Union.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not know they were an offspring of the AFL-CIO. I am sure the gentleman is in error.

Mr. DENT. It seems from the way we are acting that a lot of Congressmen do not know a lot about a lot of things. I said the textile workers were for the legislation and opposed to my stand, and those in the gallery will substantiate that.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is speaking to the gallery, that is all right.

Mr. DENT. You are too.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Just to clear this matter up for the record, I quote the following concluding sentence of a letter I received from Mr. William Pollock, general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, under date of November 11, 1963, as follows:

> Because of its importance—

Speaking of the Cooley bill—

> **not only to textile workers, but to the consumer and the national interest in general, we earnestly urge you to vote in favor of this legislation.**

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is an answer to the situation that the textile union is in.

Since they favor the bill, I hope the House will understand that the bill is important to those who work in the textile mills of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I trust that my position as second man from the bottom on the Committee on Agriculture will be secure after I make this statement today.

I should like to point out that I oppose this legislation. I think it is an inordinately poor bill. I think that many of the things respecting the policy of the bill have not been fully brought to light since we have had a chance to study this bill in the last 5 months since it was reported by our committee.

I should like to point out very briefly the extremism in which the cotton industry is. If you will look at the chart, it starts in 1940 and ends in 1963, with the marking for next year extrapolated. It shows the cash receipts of the cotton farmers for cotton seed and cotton starting down at the $700 million level back in 1940. The green line is the line you are looking at, to the $2.7 billion level at the present time. As you can see, this is the highest earnings they have ever had in their history, save and except for the inordinate marketing conditions during the Korean war.

If you look further at the number of farmers sharing this income, there were 1,600,000 allotments in 1940 and we now have some 700,000 farmers sharing this income at the present time. We have half the number of farmers sharing four or five times the income.

What has happened to the utilization? This is the red line. If you ignore the plateau where the line is, that is the Korean war again, ignoring the inordinate marketing conditions of the two peaks which led to the 1958 act, which corresponds with variations in the market conditions in cotton, you will see that projected for next year we are going to use in the cotton industry 13.8 million bales of cotton. This is a good average. It is more than we used in a lot of years prior to these inordinate conditions we have just passed. I do not think that points out that we have to spend $300 million at the present time to beef up this industry.

We all believe in the Department of Agriculture in their extrapolations as to the health of this industry. If you look at the November issue that the Department of Agriculture put out on the cotton situation, they state here very simply that though our exports this year are 3.5 million bales, if the Cooley bill does not pass and if nothing happens the projections are that we are going to export 5 million bales of cotton next year.

They state that we are using in this market year 8.2 million bales domestically. If nothing happens and we do not pass the Cooley bill we are going to have 8.8 million bales of cotton utilized domestically next year. This does not demonstrate to me that the cotton producers are in extremis. They are in better condition than they have ever been in the history of the industry.

Whom are we trying to help? Our friends in organized labor say we have to keep these jobs and beef up the industry. If you look at the statistics with respect to industrial organizations, the thing we have been fighting not only in the cotton industry but in the petroleum industry and in the food machinery industry is technological unemployment.

This is the monster we are after. There are fewer cotton spindles today because there are bigger spindles working faster with less people on them than we have ever had.

Now what you want to do is to give Burlington Mills $28 million so that they can buy some new spindles and put more guys out of work and confound and compound your problem and this is exactly what you are doing.

As a practical matter this bill should not be on the public calendar today. It ought to be on the private calendar because, really, this is a private bill.

I sent to you a long, complicated chart—I sent that to every Member. I had heard that 35 mills were going to get the bulk of this subsidy after the bill passed out of committee. So then I got the Department of Commerce to give me the 35 leading mills of the country. I asked the Department of Agriculture what was the utilization of those 35 mills. They said they did not have this figure and that you have to get it from the Department of the Census. So we ask the Bureau of the Census to give you the figures. They say, "We cannot give that to you because it is secret information but we can give it to you by fours."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, they say, "We can give it to you by fours—the four greatest producers in the United States and then the next greatest four producers." This puts a burden on any kind of student who is really trying to find out what is going on in this industry. You have to extrapolate and interpolate this industry utilization to get the utilization of the number of bales by the individual 35 large mills.

Now then I find that the largest mill in the country, Burlington Mills, had a net operating income in 1951 of $35 million.

In 1960 they had a net operating income of $105 million.

It went down in 1961 to $90 million—which led to the drive for this legislation.

But then this last year they had a net income of $124,500,000. I checked Standard & Poor's Index for the first three-quarters of this year and I find their net profit this year is going to be the greatest profit in the history of this particular business.

They utilized last year 660,000 bales of cotton.

They are going to receive by this bill in its current form $28 million—which by the way was 80 percent of what Burlington made in 1951.

The next largest firm—Stevens—are going to get $16.2 million.

You might as well name these people right here in this legislation as to exactly what they are going to get.

I think this is the first time in history that we have a situation in an agriculture subsidization bill where we do not let the natural market forces play their hand.

Here $205 million are going to 70 percent of the mills that operate 70 percent of the business throughout the country.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman give us any guarantee that this $28 million which would be authorized for payment to Burlington Mills would be translated into a bigger payroll for the textile workers?

Mr. LEGGETT. That is another thing. When you give $28 million to this one firm, which by the way if you look at the U.S. News & World Report, which I do look at sometimes, you will find that textile industry stocks have gone up 30 percent since the Democratic administration came into office. They are at the top end of the spectrum. They are not at the bottom end of the spectrum. If you want to help this industry, and there are probably some who need some help, it is not at this level as, perhaps, the gentleman from Illinois has inferred. There is a close correlation between the price of raw cotton and the price of gray goods, but there is extremely little correlation in spite of the fact that there are some little tips that correspond to the raw cotton price conditions. There is little correlation between the retail price of cotton and the raw material prices.

No matter how much correlation you have had at the gray cloth line that has nothing to do at all with the utilization. Utilization is established by the consumer demand—that is the ultimate consumer. By this piece of legislation, you are just throwing this money up in the air and if any of it gets down to the consumer level, it may help and it may not.

I think we are making a gross error in passing this kind of bill. I think we are digging the grave not only of the cotton industry and the cotton people, but the grave of practically every farm commodity. This will occur when the American public understands just exactly what we are doing here today and when they understand that this whole issue is because of an increased import of processed cotton cloth of about 200,000 bales. That is what we are talking about. The two-price cotton. In the last 2 years we have had a 200,000-bale increase of processed cotton cloth imports. We have had an $8.8 million domestic utilization. This processed cotton cloth has to come back here from Japan and be reprocessed in our domestic mills to be cut up into material. This is semiprocessed goods that comes back into our country. When that cotton was exported we gave them 8.5 cents a pound and because of that we have to give everybody in the United States 8.5 cents for the next 3 years for every pound of cotton they process, plus the fact that it will cost us $30 million also to buy their inventory, because we have to make this perfectly equitable. If you want to make it perfectly equitable, what we ought to do is go back 5 years and figure out how much these people lost since the act of 1958 and really make it equitable and give them a subsidization right back to scratch.

I do not think this is a good bill. Rather, it is a poor bill, and it is just unfortunate that we get ourselves into these situations.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the fine leadership of the chairman of our Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD D. COOLEY. I regret dissenting on a major piece of legislation which contains the hopes of many of our small cotton farmers throughout the Nation.

The test of good farm legislation is simply whether we are buying the best possible net farm income for the most reasonable Federal cost. Unfortunately, as far as I am concerned, I cannot justify the expenditures in cotton for the benefits derived to society and, moreover, I see no real reason other than tradition, which I would like to break with, for giving cotton more favorable consideration than we give to poultry producers and some others.

My figures indicate that in the last 10 years we have expended the following amounts in the cotton program considering Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—purchases, the raw cotton export subsidy at 8½ cents per pound, the export subsidy on processed manufactured cotton goods, CCC storage and carrying charges, and Public Law 480 sales.

[In millions of dollars]

| Fiscal year | CCC loss on cotton sales | Cotton export subsidy | Public Law 480 (food for peace) | Carrying charges on CCC stocks | Total costs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1955 | (0.8) | | 11.2 | | 10.4 |
| 1956 | 66.3 | | 91.9 | | 158.2 |
| 1957 | 420.4 | 14.2 | 300.0 | | 734.6 |
| 1958 | 279.5 | 15.5 | 194.8 | | 489.8 |
| 1959 | 101.4 | 22.0 | 153.9 | | 277.3 |
| 1960 | 212.0 | 253.1 | 121.4 | | 586.5 |
| 1961 | 162.6 | 191.9 | 223.8 | | 579.3 |
| 1962 [1] | 137.9 | 227.0 | 153.6 | 26.8 | 545.3 |
| 1963 | 195.5 | 165.7 | 204.0 | 46.8 | 612.0 |

[1] Pre-1962 costs based on losses realized by sales but fail to accrue approximately $50 per bale losses on 3,000,000 bales, including storage, totaling about $150,000,000. Post-1962 figures calculate losses to CCC on acquisition.

GET RID OF TWO-PRICE COTTON?

We are advised now by the cotton producers and the mills that they must now have even more favorable special treatment if the cotton industry is to survive. We are told we must get rid of two-price cotton; that the favorable consideration given to foreign importers is destroying our local markets. The per capita utilization of cotton, it is said, is going down every year.

The facts simply do not bear out the implications from these allegations.

While it is true that per capita use of cotton has gone down from 30.9 to 22.2 pounds per person in the past 12 years, what the cotton proponents do not say is that all fiber use in the United States has declined in the same period from 42.2 to 35.7 pounds per person. Lighter cotton fabrics and lighter synthetics are doing the job.

Also unspecified are the wool and rayon statistics showing reduced utilization of the former, 4.2 to 2.2 pounds per person, and of the latter, 8.9 to 6.1 pounds per person per year.

The allegation that the foreign export preferential treatment is ruining the local cotton market is likewise unfounded. The simple facts are these: The United States produced an average of 14 million bales of cotton per year for 15 years prior to World War II; production went down during the war and has maintained the 14-million-bale yearly average figure since. With modern technology acreages have been steadily reduced to keep this production figure. It should be here noted that when farmer producers deliver the same number of bales on less acres that costs go down and net profits go up. Domestic mill consumption utilized from 6 to 9 million bales per year prior to World War II. Production went up during the war and has maintained a yearly utilization of about 8.5 million bales since that time. An increased population with a constant utilization results in the lower per capita utilization. The Department of Agriculture projects that an 8.2 million 1962–63 utilization will naturally expand to 8.8-million-bale use in 1963–64.

EXPORTS OF RAW COTTON DWINDLING

Exports of raw cotton varied from 6 to 10 million bales before the war, were fractional during the war. Since the war exports varied from 6 million bales in 1960 to 2.8 million bales in 1958 when the 1958 cotton program was enacted, resulting in a utilization of 7.3 million bales in 1959, 6.8 million bales in 1960, 4.9 million bales in 1961, and 3.5 million bales in fiscal 1962–63. Here again the Department of Agriculture in its November bulletin projects a 5-million-bale, natural-export cyclical expansion.

The plain facts are that the United States is a residual world producer and regardless of the export subsidy world markets cannot be maintained if foreign production continues to increase. The foreign cotton is going to be sold first. Free world utilization has risen in the past 10 years, but there has been a greater increase in free world foreign production, particularly in Mexico. The point is that we need to keep the export subsidy to keep our diminishing share of the world market which buys and sells 25 percent below the U.S. market.

EXPORT SUBSIDY—LITTLE EFFECT ON LOCAL MARKETS

Does this export benefit deteriorate the American domestic market? I think not.

Respecting our exports of processed cotton goods, we have a further subsidy that has been costing us about $17 million yearly. Our quantities exported of processed cotton are in fair shape and have remained relatively constant the last 10 years.

In 1930 we exported 375,000 bales.

In 1940 we exported 374,000 bales.

In 1950 we exported 538,000 bales.

In 1961 after we built up the foreign mill capacity by Marshall plan aid, we dropped to 498,000 bales.

In 1962 we exported 459,300 bales—1963 exports are lagging behind 1962 due only to a shipping strike last January 1963.

Conclusion: The foreign processed cotton goods market has not been substantially eroded. As a practical matter we should increase the export subsidy, if anything, if we are to keep our foreign markets. This is indicated by the following article from the United States-Japan Trade Council Bulletin.

> U.S. cottongrowers suffered considerably in 1962 from the production cutback in the Japanese cotton textile industry, which is one of the largest in the world and is the largest foreign buyer of American cotton. Between 1961 and 1962, Japanese production of cotton yarn and fabrics fell 12 and 9 percent respectively. Japanese textile mills reduced purchases of raw cotton from abroad and drew heavily from their inventory, which had increased to a high level in 1961 as the result of import liberalization and speculative buying. Japan's total raw cotton imports fell from the record level of 796 million metric tons in 1961 to 602 million metric tons in 1962, a decline of 24 percent.
>
> Because the price of cotton remained relatively high while prices elsewhere throughout the world weakened, the inventory reduction in Japan cost the United States most heavily. U.S. raw cotton exports to Japan dropped from the record 1961 high of 1.7 million running bales to only 846,000 bales in 1962, a 50-percent drop. As a result, the U.S. share in this largest foreign market for cotton slipped from 51 to 32 percent. Mexico, the second largest source of Japan's cotton supply, increased its shipments to 30 percent of the market. Most other source countries of Latin America and the Near East increased their sales to Japan.
>
> U.S. sales to Japan of mohair decreased by 63 percent; while, interestingly, U.S. exports of cotton and woolen apparel and related items nearly doubled and those of manmade fiber products rose from $2.5 to $3 million between 1961 and 1962.

IMPORTS ARE NO PROBLEM

A quota has always limited and allowed only nominal importation of raw foreign cotton. Thus raw cotton imports cannot affect local markets.

Imported processed cotton goods is allegedly the culprit that is destroying the local cotton market. Again the statistics do not substantiate this conclusion.

Imported cotton goods have expanded only at the following rates:

| | Bales |
|---|---|
| Less than 100,000 bales per year before 1954: | |
| 1954 | 101,000 |
| 1955 | 181,000 |
| 1956 | 225,000 |
| 1957 | 199,000 |
| 1958 | 233,000 |
| 1959 | 360,000 |
| 1960 | 525,000 |
| 1961 | 393,000 |
| 1962 | 645,500 |

Conclusion: Our exported cotton processed goods are comparable to our imports of those goods.

Forty percent of current cotton imports are in the form of cotton cloth and assumedly would be processed at domestic mills, thus allowing for an equalization of even this competition.

It seems highly unrealistic to conclude that a 400,000-bale increase since 1957 in cotton processed cloth could destroy or seriously threaten a domestic market of 8,500,000 bales.

The purpose of the domestic subsidy allegedly is to allow domestic mills to meet foreign competition—if we are just to meet competition this should have no effect on demand and thus utilization of cotton.

Since September of 1963 a new bilateral agreement was executed through the Tariff Commission with Japan limiting imports of cotton to substantially the current figure.

Respecting competition of foreign and domestic cottons, the Tariff Commission stated in T.C. 69 as follows:

### FINDING OF THE COMMISSION

On the basis of the investigation, including the hearings, the Commission (Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton dissenting) finds that articles or materials wholly or in part of cotton are not being, and are not practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the programs or operations undertaken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with respect to cotton or products thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from cotton or products thereof with respect to which such programs or operations are being undertaken. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that a fee equivalent to the per pound subsidy rate on the cotton content of imported articles and materials wholly or in part of cotton or any other restriction on imports for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is not necessary.

The proposed fee is popularly, though inaccurately, referred to as an equalization fee, on the theory that it measures the difference in the cost of raw cotton to domestic mills and to foreign mills that market some of their output in the United States. As shown in the body of the report, there is great variation in the cost of cotton to mills throughout the world. The application of such an equalization fee would therefore not equalize costs of raw cotton to mills in the United States with those in foreign countries.

No evidence was made available to the Commission in the course of its investigation that imports of articles containing cotton were adversely affecting the operation of any specific program of the Department of Agriculture for cotton or cotton products. On the contrary, it was found that the rising level of imports of articles containing cotton contributed to the success of several of those programs, notably, the export-subsidy program for raw cotton and the domestic price-support program. But for the expanding U.S. market for such imports, the tendency would have been for U.S. exports of raw cotton to be smaller or lower priced, or the export-subsidy or price-support programs to be more costly to carry out, or some combination of these.

The view that a restriction of imports of articles containing cotton would bring about an increase in domestic mill consumption of U.S. cotton equal, or nearly equal, to the cotton content of the excluded imports rests, in our opinion, on a mischievous denial of the most commonplace workings of the market.

In referring to the ratio of the cotton content of imported cotton articles to exports of raw cotton, the USDA stated in its brief that "we have simply swapped one bale for another." In each of the calendar years 1959–61, however, the cotton content of U.S. imports amounted to less than 10 percent of U.S. exports of raw cotton. In 1960, the peak year to date for imports of cotton articles and also the year when exports of raw cotton—amounting to 7.5 million running bales were larger than in any preceding year since 1933, the cotton content of imported cotton articles was almost 7 percent of the exports of raw cotton.

Whereas average annual consumption of raw cotton in 1953–61 was 28 percent above that in 1935–39, the corresponding increase for all fibers was 57 percent. Thus, it becomes apparent that cotton has not benefited as greatly as other fibers from the enlarged total market for textiles resulting from the increased population and the expanded incomes since World War II. On a weight basis cotton's share of annual U.S. mill consumption of all fibers declined from 80 percent in the years immediately preceding World War II to 63 percent in 1961. Inasmuch as the yardage of fabrics produced from a pound of manmade fiber is, on the average, about 50 percent greater than the yardage of similar types produced from a pound of cotton, cotton's share of the market for the total output of U.S. textile mills (measured in yards) declined to an even greater extent than that indicated above.

Since 1946 there has been a substantial expansion in the combined annual consumption of the three principal groups of textile fibers—cotton, manmade fibers, and wool. The raw-cotton equivalent of aggregate annual consumption of manmade fibers and wool, added to the annual mill consumption of raw cotton, increased from 12.8 million bales in 1946 to 15.3 million bales in 1960. Thus, while the total market for these fibers has obviously expanded, the relative importance of cotton in that market has declined. The principal explanation for that decline in an expanding market for textile fibers is that manmade fibers have enjoyed a phenomenal increase in usage during the postwar years. In terms of actual weight, consumption of manmade fibers in 1960 was nearly double that in 1946; when expressed in terms of raw-cotton equivalents, the increase was even more spectacular, as indicated by the following tabulation:

| | 1946 | 1960 |
|---|---|---|
| Actual weight (million pounds) | 954.3 | 1,878.1 |
| Raw-cotton equivalent: | | |
| Million pounds | 1,295.1 | 2,824.5 |
| Million bales | 2.7 | 5.9 |

During the 15-year period 1946–60, the raw-cotton equivalent of aggregate U.S. consumption of manmade fibers was approximately 68 million bales. The sum of the increments of annual consumption of manmade fibers in the period 1947–60 over consumption thereof in 1946 is 27 million bales of raw-cotton equivalent. Part of the increase in consumption of manmade fibers resulted from new or expanded markets for such materials, some of which were not suitable outlets for natural fibers primarily because of their physical characteristics. At least a third of the increase in the consumption of manmade fibers, however, probably represented a direct replacement of cotton. In the manufacture of tire cord alone, where manmade fibers have replaced cotton almost entirely, cottongrowers have lost an outlet for more than 7 million bales during the period since World War II.

In addition to the quantity of cotton displaced by manmade fibers, there has been displacement by other competing materials, such as paper and plastic. Although the aggregate displacement by these materials cannot be exactly determined, the total is known to be very large, as is indicated in the subsequent discussion of industrial uses of cotton.

### MARKET SHIFTS FOR COTTON

Reduction in industrial outlets for cotton: The heaviest market losses for cotton since World War II have occurred in industrial uses, owing in large part to competition from manmade fibers, plastics and paper. Immediately before the war, more than a third of the consumption of cotton in the United States was accounted for by industrial end uses. By 1960, less than a fifth of the total went into such uses. The heaviest losses were sustained in the tire cord and bag markets. In 1960 the production of cotton tire cord required only 70,000 bales of cotton. Cotton accounted for only 4 percent of all fibers used in tire cord in that year. Before World War II, the bag market used some 500,000 bales of cotton annually. This market shifted largely to paper and plastic; in recent years it has consumed only about 150,000 bales of cotton annually. The use of cotton also declined in the manufacture of electrical insulation, hoses, laundry and drycleaning supplies, and machinery belts.

Increased use of cotton in apparel: Total gains for cotton in the apparel market have exceeded the losses in industrial uses. Since the end of World War II, wearing apparel has accounted for a steadily increasing share of all cotton consumed—rising from 36 percent in 1947 to 53 percent in 1960. In terms of absolute quantities, the increase from 1947 to 1960 in the annual consumption of raw cotton by the apparel manufacturers was 1.7 million bales (63 percent). Not only has there been an increase in the quantity of cotton required for producing wearing apparel, but cotton provided a larger share of all textile fibers consumed in this end use in 1960 than in 1947—cotton's share being 62 percent in 1960, compared with 56 percent in 1947.

### WOOL AND OTHER FIBERS HAVE PROBLEMS

Other goods besides cotton have had problems over the past 12 years. The export-import figures on wool and manmade fibers are as follows:

WOOL

[In pounds]

| | Exports | Imports |
|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 7,535,000 | 63,804,000 |
| 1962 | 4,543,000 | 127,458,000 |

MANMADE FIBERS

| | Exports | Imports |
|---|---|---|
| 1950 | 81,385,000 | 4,348,000 |
| 1962 | 118,954,000 | 23,491,000 |

Conclusion: Where in 1950 we had a 239-million-pound balance of trade on the export side, today we have merely a 23-million-pound export balance.

### ARE MANMADE FIBERS CAUSING COTTON PROBLEMS?

The alternative ground is given as support for the domestic subsidy that regardless of the foreign competition we must have the subsidy to meet domestic competition in rayon and manmade fibers.

Since 1950 cotton, wool, rayon, and manmade fibers, domestic mill consumption figures have varied as follows:

| | Cotton | | Wool | | Rayon | | Manmade fibers | | Total consumption (million pounds) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Million pounds | Percent | Million pounds | Percent | Million pounds | Percent | Million pounds | Percent | |
| 1950 | 4,464.0 | 67.1 | 691 | 10.5 | 1,305 | 19.8 | 136 | 2 | 6,596 |
| 1962 | 4,278.0 | 59.8 | 568 | 7.9 | 1,238 | 17.3 | 1,074 | 15 | 7,159 |
| 1963 (estimated) | 4.4 | | | | | | | | |

Conclusion: While cotton consumption has gone down slightly, so also has wool and rayon, and next year we will produce the average in cotton.

At least 60 percent of increased consumption of manmade fibers created new markets. The 12-year increase of 563 million pounds is largely as a result of new markets created by manmade fibers, though admittedly some cotton markets have been taken.

### SURPLUS PROBLEM

Respecting the surplus of cotton on hand there is no problem. In 1961 we had the smallest CCC stock in 10 years. The current supply is not the largest and can be depleted by pricing cotton supports in line with demand.

### COSTS OF PROPOSED COTTON PROGRAM

The proposal is to reduce the support price for production over 15 bales over a series of years and pay a domestic subsidy arbitrarily to local mills to allegedly make them competitive.

Projected annual costs and savings are as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Export subsidy (payments in kind, CCC stocks to exporters) | 150.0 |
| Public Law 480 (exports in kind valued at $161 per bale) | 180.0 |
| Storage charge (carrying and storage charges on 7,500,000 bales held by CCC) | 74.2 |
| Domestic subsidy (payments in kind, cotton valued at $120 a bale allegedly to make 8.5 million bales in domestic cotton competitive with 400,000 bales of processed imported cloth) | 292.5 |
| 10 percent premium on first 15 bales (payment of full support price of 32.7 cents per pound on 1st 15 bales to all producers) | 68.0 |
| Payment on cotton in inventory | 30.0 |
| Estimated 1st-year cost | 794.7 |

I have projected on the appended chart which has been mailed to each Member the exact projection of how 34 mills will cut up a $205 million pie in a shotgun effort to beef up this industry.

The largest firm, Burlington Mills, will receive $28 million based on that firm's average cotton consumption over the past few years. This handout is 80 percent of that firm's operating income in 1951. Other absurd results are charted showing a 370 percent increase in one firm's income. This chart was prepared with the assistance of statistics from the Library of Congress, Department of Commerce, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of the Census, and a number of private organizations, including the cotton industry itself.

The Democrats have long stood for priming the pump at the bottom. The theory of the pending bill, I believe, is alien to our philosophy. Should the mill subsidy provision be included in the final version of the bill, I would ask you to consider seriously defeating this legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would merely comment that the Agriculture Committee has worked diligently on the subject legislation, but due to the inexperience of some of us and pressure of representing our constituents on others of us, I do not in good faith believe that we have the best bill for this subject matter.

There is a need to do something for the cotton industry. My calculations based on State university cost reports for each cotton State and census data indicate that comparing cotton in the Carolinas and Georgia as opposed to Arizona and California is like comparing bicycles to Cadillacs. In one area cotton presents a social problem with 150,000 small producers in a single State accounting for the bulk of the production netting each less than $1,000 per year; in the other States due to better growing conditions, larger acreages, irrigation and mechanization, a few thousand producers account for 85 percent of the production and net in excess of $50,000 per year each.

The need to subsidize the former is patent; the actuality of subsidizing the latter is scandalous. Cotton is produced in the Western States every day below 20 cents per pound.

If we are to maintain our worldwide markets to any degree we are going to have to move in a direction which recognizes competitiveness and allows that competitiveness to expand having due regard for the technologically displaced. Herein lies the deadlock of our system respecting the cotton commodity.

In summary it can be concluded as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, CHARLES WELTNER, showed the other day in his fine exposition that the cotton producer industry was never healthier. The chart attached shows the mills were never in better condition, consumers are not complaining and neither are our international competitors.

We have developed an export subsidy to protect a high support price. A domestic subsidy would appear to confound the matter in that we are seeking to protect us from ourselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to attempt to answer in 2 minutes the speech you have just heard which is entirely erroneous, because the record will show that the Textile Manufacturers of America came before our committee and stated emphatically that they did not want any part of a subsidy paid to them. The farmers took the same position. So in that situation we authorize in this bill the Secretary of Agriculture to make such payments as may be necessary to eliminate this inequity. That is the record. Yet he comes here with a statement that the mills are going to pick up millions and millions and millions of dollars. That is just not true.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. All the mills are seeking is the right to buy cotton at the same price as their foreign competitors. Is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what is involved here.

I want to ask a question—Do you know of any industry in America that has borne on its back this unique burden which by law has been forced on the textile industry of this country—$42.50 a bale? Cotton sells in Hong Kong and Pakistan and Portugal, and anywhere else in the world for $42.50 a bale less than our own mills can buy it for. The present Secretary of Commerce said in a speech at Charlotte, N.C., some months ago that it was the silliest thing any government ever did on this earth.

I agree with that statement, and our committee agrees with it, and I hope the Congress will agree with it. How on earth can you go home and say by Federal law you impose this burden on an American industry, which is a unique burden? You talk to me about coal miners and glass workers and other people in depressed areas. There are 10 million people interested in this bill, and yet somebody comes in here crying and bleeding their hearts out about the coal miners and glass workers in an effort to bring about its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is not right that foreign buyers should be permitted to continue purchasing American cotton on the world market 8½ cents per pound cheaper than American manufacturers can buy the same cotton on the domestic market and then sell the finished products on the American market in competition with the American textile industry. This bill would improve the competitive position of domestic cotton mills against imports and cheap foreign cotton goods. It would make American cotton available to domestic mills at world cotton prices.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of cotton products have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, to 234,000 bales in 1958, to 526,000 bales in 1960, and approximately 672,000 bales in 1962. This upward trend in the main has occurred since 1956 when the two-price cotton system was created.

Since the advent of two-price cotton in 1956 active cotton spindles have dropped 9.1 percent. Textile employment has declined 176,000 workers. Mill consumption of cotton has declined and imports of cotton textiles continue an upward surge.

The textile industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by imports from low-wage countries. The American cotton farmer is being hurt by this decline in the textile industry on which he must depend. A bale of cotton has little value until it is processed. The export market is uncertain so the strength of our Nation's cotton production industry must depend on a healthy American textile industry. The two-price cotton system is not only weakening the textile industry but is hurting the American cotton farmer.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams from textile and garment manufacturers in my congressional district pointing out the necessity of early action to eliminate the two-price cotton system. We cannot afford to delay, with textile employment shrinking, and the number of cotton spindles being constantly reduced. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer unemployment and shorter hours while their foreign competitors are supplying so much of the American market.

All who have spoken on this bill have agreed that an inequity exists which should be corrected. There is disagreement as to the best method of correction. Those who have objected so forcefully to the legislation in speeches during the last hour have admitted that a wrong exists which should be corrected, but they have offered no solution to the problem.

I was among those who appeared before the Tariff Commission seeking a solution by an offset import fee but it was denied by a three-to-two decision. Our textile mills do not want a subsidy. They are just requesting the right to purchase American cotton at the same price that their foreign competitors are paying.

The late President Kennedy characterized the two-price cotton system as "a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future."

Enactment of H.R. 6196 would improve the competitive position of American-produced cotton goods, would reduce Government stocks of cotton, would save cotton goods consumers some $500 million per year and would thus increase cotton consumption.

This bill is important because it deals with the livelihood of millions of American citizens and with the future of our textile plants, their management and employees. It is important because it corrects an inequity that should be corrected. I believe that the equity of this legislation should appeal to every Member of this House.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Is it possible to repeal that unjust law which is now on the statutes and which has caused this problem?

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be possible to repeal it but I am firmly convinced that it will not be repealed. The only opportunity we will have to correct this inequity is to pass this bill during this session of Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The textile industry has tried to eliminate this inequity. They have spent tens of thousands of dollars presenting their cases to the Tariff Commission. There were two outstanding cases, one under the Eisenhower administration and one under this administration. They went to the Emergency Planning Board and received no relief there. This is the only way they can secure any relief.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the last analysis, who has control over this matter, the Tariff Commission or the Congress?

Mr. COOLEY. The Tariff Commission under existing law has control over the problems involved. The Tariff Commission exercises that responsibility at the request of the President.

Mr. KYL. Do they not derive their authority from the Congress, from congressional acts?

Mr. COOLEY. Ah, yes; if you want to go back, we could abolish the Tariff Commission or probably put some law on the books. But this is the law that we have decided is best for all concerned; that is, to make our domestic industry competitive with foreign industry and with domestic synthetic textiles.

Mr. KYL. One other related question, if I may. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture today can make the adjustments in subsidies?

Mr. COOLEY. He will under this bill make adjustments as are necessary to eliminate the inequity.

Mr. KYL. The question is, can he do it without this legislation? Does he have this authority today?

Mr. COOLEY. To adjust this?

Mr. KYL. The subsidy level, price supports.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes; he can adjust price supports.

Mr. KYL. Without this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. Price supports have been fixed on cotton at 32.47 cents a pound. That is not competitive with the world market price of cotton which is produced at 24 or 25 cents a pound. It cannot compete with synthetic fibers which sell at a price substantially below that.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gray). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 218]

Adair
Ashley
Becker
Brademas
Bromwell
Celler
Collier
Dawson
Fallon
Gibbons
Gill
Griffin
Hall
Hébert
Kelly
Keogh
Latta
Long, La.
McLoskey
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Milliken
Morrison
Morton
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Trimble

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. Albert] having assumed the Chair, Mr. Rooney of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6196, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 390 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to two or three communications which I hold in my hand and which I will insert in the Record at the proper time when we return to the House. One is from the United Textile Workers of America, from Cranston, R.I., in favor of this bill. Another is from the Textile Workers Union of America from Lewiston, Maine. It ends up:

> We plead with you to use your great influence to secure the passage of H.R. 6196 known as the one-price cotton bill in order to relieve the insecurity of many thousands of American cotton textile workers.

I have here another communication dated November 11, 1963, a two-page letter, of which I will read only one paragraph at this time. It concludes this way:

> We in the Textile Workers Union of America are most anxious to see the Cooley bill enacted. We regard these payments as essential to remove the competitive disadvantage suffered by the domestic industry. On the basis of past experience with cotton price reductions, it is evident that competition will force the price level for cotton textiles to be lowered. This, in turn, should result in a $500 million savings to consumers and lead to the expanded use of American-made cotton products. In addition, it should not only relieve the threat to existing cotton textile employment, but should create some 35,000 additional jobs for cotton textile workers.

I shall at the proper time insert the full text of these documents in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]:

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I am not unmindful of some of the opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a large part of the cotton industry and the cotton textile industry in particular finds itself, as has been admitted here over and over again, between two Government programs which are making its situation very bad from the standpoint of foreign competition. These are, of course, the trade policy of the United States and the cotton price support program. The result of these two programs is that for the average pound of cotton the American miller has to pay roughly 8½ cents more than competing mills overseas. He is thereby placed at a competitive disadvantage not only with respect to the world market but also with respect to the American market.

Most Members have admitted this in their speeches, even those opposing the bill, but many Members have suggested other remedies.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa with whom I served on the Committee on Agriculture for many, many years, and others, have criticized this bill on other grounds. As a matter of practical legislative fact every Member who has been around here a long time knows that we will either have to take this bill or we shall not get anything. That is the truth of the matter. We are not considering other forms of bills which Members think might be better.

The gentleman from Iowa knows also that some of the amendments which are going to be proposed, or substitutes which might be proposed in lieu of this bill, would be more objectionable to him than is this bill itself. That would certainly be true I say, knowing the gentleman, if a complete Brannan-type bill were substituted for this bill and the farmers were given a direct subsidy. The gentleman knows that this is true.

So, if we start out trying to satisfy one group by amendment there will be nothing more certain than that ultimately we will not do anything, even though the situation cries out for remedy. This is a chance for remedy and I urge the Members of this House not to start voting for amendments, except the amendment of the gentleman from Maine. His amendment is one that has been cleared with the committee. It is a desirable amendment because it attacks directly one of the two Government programs which I mentioned in the beginning as having given rise to this difficulty, namely, the support program.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about the extent of the subsidy. But there is nothing in this bill to show or indicate that any mill will be given $1. All the mill will be given is the right to bid on American-grown cotton at the same or comparable price at which its foreign competitor can bid on that cotton.

Mr. Chairman, that is the essence of this bill.

Now, there has been a lot said about the amount of the so-called subsidy. Well, I think we ought to recall again the practical situation. As of next August 1, the Government carryover will probably reach 12 million bales. We have no possible outlet for that cotton under existing law. It cannot be sold abroad without a subsidy. It cannot all be sold abroad even with a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, this talk about the cost of this bill, when we consider the payment in kind, is really out of line with the facts. What are we going to do with this cotton? What are we going to do at the end of the next season when the amount of cotton in the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation will probably reach 12 or 13 million bales?

Mr. Chairman, this proposal gives us a way to handle this problem with a minimum of cash outlay. It gives us a chance to do equity to the cotton textile industry of this country. It gives us an opportunity to move in before the cotton farmers of this country, by reason of the laws which we have passed, often with their support, are completely driven out of business, and one of the largest, most important industries in the United States comes to an end.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BELCHER. I think the gentleman probably left the wrong impression here. The cotton mill buys the cotton at the American price which will be as much as 32.47, will it not?

Mr. ALBERT. The cotton mill will not necessarily do that. It could be the handlers. This statement that this subsidy is going to be paid to the mills is simply not correct.

Mr. BELCHER. No; the mill first buys the cotton in the marketplace and then the mill will be given the cotton at this price.

Mr. ALBERT. It may be the mill or it may be somebody else.

Mr. BELCHER. The mill will be given a subsidy in cotton to take up the difference between the cotton price here in the United States and the world price.

Mr. ALBERT. The point which I am trying to make, as I understand it, is that the so-called subsidy can be given to anybody except the producer. If I am wrong about that, the end result is the same in any event.

Mr. BELCHER. If the gentleman will yield further, the end result is the same but, still, this bill will only help the mill. The farmer does not get a dime out of it.

Mr. ALBERT. No. The only thing the farmer gets out of this is the salvation of the cotton farmer. The only thing the miller gets out of this is the right to buy cotton grown on American farms at the same price as someone 10,000 miles away can buy it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it was not by design that I was put up here to follow my colleagues from Oklahoma. This came about purely by accident. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], said he stood in the House today fighting for a lost cause. I am glad the gentleman has joined me, because, Mr. Chairman, I do not recall ever standing in the well on an agricultural bill that I was not fighting for a lost cause. I am glad to have a colleague on the Democratic side who has also had the experience of fighting for a lost cause.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture of this House apparently can bring more embarrassing bills to the floor of the House than any legislative committee of the House. They never bring a bill here that does not put a whole group of you gentlemen over on that side right square on the spot. You will recall my statement concerning the wheat bill last year. You will recall at that time I told you that there was nobody in America who wanted the wheat bill except the Secretary of Agriculture. You Members were put on the spot to support your administration and vote for the wheat bill. I did not ask anybody to vote according to my viewpoint. I simply would like to have you have the facts. That is all I did in connection with the wheat bill.

I told you at that time the taxpayers did not want the bill, the consumers did not want the bill, and I told you the wheat raisers did not want the bill. I do not think there is any doubt that the taxpayers wanted to pay that subsidy and the consumers of your district were not shouting over the increased cost. The only thing I could have been mistaken about was the fact I was wrong concerning the wheat farmer. When the referendum was put out to the wheat farmer and the Secretary of Agriculture went out to sell the farmer on the idea that this was a good bill, they shouted "No" just like you gentlemen over there shout "No" when we offer an amendment. That was the kind of "no" that was indicated. The wheat farmer did not want it, the consumer did not want it, and the taxpayers did not want it.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said about correcting an inequity. This inequity was brought on by the Committee on Agriculture. We brought a bill to the floor providing for an export subsidy. We brought a bill to the floor that gave the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set price supports, and while this cotton industry was in serious condition just a few months ago the Secretary increased the export subsidy by 2.4 cents a pound, and this is the same administration that is here today asking you to vote $600 million of your taxpayers' money—for what? To pay for the damage which the last bill we passed caused.

It just occurs to me it is not sensible to create a situation that causes damage, then come back because you loyal Democrats were loyal enough to support your party in creating that damage, and ask you to go back to your taxpayers for $600 million more to pay for the resulting damage.

Why not just stop the cause of the damage? That is a very simple thing to do. We hear that there is no way to get that done. We can reduce price supports and stop this inequity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not former Secretary Benson and former President Eisenhower approve this plan?

Mr. BELCHER. I do not know who recommended it. I may say to the gentleman I did not follow Eisenhower in everything.

**Mr. COOLEY.** I did not know how the gentleman feels about that.

**Mr. BELCHER.** The gentleman now addressing the House did not recommend it. That is the only man I can speak for. It was your bill, not my bill. You created the inequity you are asking us to correct.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Did not Benson recommend it?

**Mr. BELCHER.** I do not recall that. If Mr. Benson caused this damage there is no reason for us to remove the cause of the damage.

**Mr. McINTIRE.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. BELCHER.** I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

**Mr. McINTIRE.** On the point the gentleman is making as to the level of price support, would the gentleman agree with me that the amendment I propose to offer goes directly to this particular point?

**Mr. BELCHER.** I would say that the McIntire amendment does attempt to correct some of the inequity, and does to the extent of about $2 or $3 per hundred. It does attempt to correct the inequity brought about. But now this is the situation with which we are confronted.

The Japanese mills are the principal exporters of cotton products into the United States. I have a lot of respect for the Japanese nation. I think they are great allies. I had a lot of respect for the Japanese nation, and all of us did, prior to World War II. We gathered up every pound of scrap iron we could find in this country and sent it to Japan, and Japan shot it back at us.

We are now subsidizing Japan with our cotton. We are sending our cotton over there and subsidizing it at 8.5 cents a pound. Do you know what Japan is doing? It is shooting it right back at us just as they shot the scrap iron back at us in World War II. The only thing is today they do not kill anybody, they merely put American workers out of work.

That can be corrected by the Tariff Commission. That can be corrected by this House of Representatives. But apparently the only remedy we are ever able to offer is to spend more money. This Committee on Agriculture every time it has come to the floor has provided for additional Government expenditures, never to reduce Government expenditures.

We are now asking for $600 million to correct a bill which we passed last year. Next year we are going to be back here and we are going to say the bill we passed last year was bad, it was not good, and now we want to correct the inequity which the last bill created.

I want to say one thing in closing to you very loyal liberals on that side. I admire you. You are liberal. You are generous. Year after year you have voted against the best interests of your constituencies for farm programs and farm expenses. You are good, loyal Democrats, and I admire you for that. But being a loyal Democrat in the wheat bill did not help the Democratic Party. Being a loyal Democrat today is not going to help the Democratic Party. Some day, I do not know when, you are going to get an opponent against you and you will have to explain why you voted $600 million of the taxpayers' money. What for? To correct another bill that you voted for that created the damage of $600 million. Maybe you have a good explanation for that, I do not know, but I believe you are in the same spot I was in for 8 years. The gentleman from North Carolina just pointed out to me something about what Mr. Benson did. Of course, Mr. Benson embarrassed me at times. I was not able to follow Mr. Benson all the time because the people in my district sometimes did not believe in Mr. Benson's program. But I tell you one thing, and I plead guilty, I am sure I am not as loyal a Republican as you are loyal Democrats, because when it came to a proposition of whether I voted for the constituents in my district or Mr. Benson or Mr. Eisenhower, some way or other, I strung along with the people of my district. If you are loyal enough to come down here and vote $600 million out of the pockets of your own taxpayers here, just to be loyal Democrats, I admire you, I respect you for your loyalty, but I do have to admit I am going to doubt your political judgment a little bit. Loyalty is a wonderful thing, but it makes a whole lot of difference what that loyalty is to. Is your loyalty to the administration or to the people that year after year send you down here to represent your constituencies?

If there is a single, solitary Member on the Democratic side or on the Republican side of the aisle who does not have a textile mill in his district who is going to get a part of this subsidy, you are not representing the best interests of your people if you vote for this bill. You are taxing your people to send the money somewhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

**Mr. HOEVEN.** Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher].

**Mr. BELCHER.** Mr. Chairman, just yesterday we heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] say that he hoped we could approach this bill from a nonpartisan, unselfish position. Well, now, I can understand why the gentleman can do that very easily. In the first place, he has two-thirds of the Members on his side so that nonpartisanship would be fine. In the second place, his district is going to get one of the biggest subsidies in the United States. Gentlemen, I can readily understand why he can be completely unselfish. I think all the rest of us could be unselfish, but unselfishness alone is not going to pass this bill. If this bill is approached from a nonpartisan angle, as the gentleman from Texas wants, you have not got a chance on earth to pass this bill. If the Democrats are not held in line through partisan loyalty, you have not got a chance. There is not a single Democrat over there whose district does not get part of this subsidy can possibly approach this thing from a nonpartisan angle and vote for it. That is the only excuse you have. Maybe in your district you have the excuse that you are doing what the administration wants you to do, and that is all you need to do when you explain your actions to your constituents. But, ladies and gentlemen, when I go back to my district—and it just so happens that the big majority in my district are Democrats—I just cannot go back to them and say, Well, I followed the Republican administration and whatever they told us to do I did. I have to go back and explain to them why I vote the way I do. I have to be in a position to defend the merits of the legislation that I vote for or vote against. It must be nice to be in a position where all you need to do is to go back to the people and say, I was just doing what my administration asked me to do and I was just doing what the Secretary of Agriculture asked me to do. But that would be no excuse for me. If I followed that policy, gentlemen, I would not be on the floor of this House here today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not telling you how to vote on this bill. Vote your own sentiments.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Grant].

**Mr. GRANT.** Mr. Chairman, I want to be helpful to all segments of the cotton industry, to the farmer, the textile worker, the textile operator, and last but not least, the consuming public.

The cotton industry is in a plight, not because of any one individual group, but mainly by reason of the encroachment of synthetic fibers. The textile mills have in the main turned to synthetic fibers because of their having to pay a higher price for the cotton consumed by the mills than that paid by foreign competitors. This is known as a two-price system because the foreign mills who use our cotton are subsidized to the extent of approximately 8½ cents a pound or $42.50 a bale. When this cotton is made into a finished product it is exported back to this country and then enters competitive trade with the products made by the domestic mills who have to charge a higher price and are thus penalized to the extent of the amount that the foreign mills are subsidized.

The bill before us with the McIntire amendment seeks to place most of the burden on the farmer. The farmers realize that in order for them to grow and sell cotton that they must of necessity find a cheaper way to produce cotton; however, the McIntire amendment drops the support price too much We should have a one-price system and in order to carry this out some contribution must be made by all segments of the industry and because this amendment does not equitably distribute the burden it should be amended.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, the future economy of our Nation is at stake here today. This cotton bill, which we now consider, has not had the publicity of some of the other legislation before us this session, but it is of the utmost importance to millions of Americans. What we do with this cotton bill today will be reflected in the earnings of textile workers and cotton farmers and, yes, even our Government in the years ahead.

Perhaps all of you here today are not from textile manufacturing areas and are not aware of the size and scope of the American textile industry. Few of us thought of its importance to the Nation this morning when we donned a cotton shirt or cotton socks. The cotton industry is among the largest manufacturing industries in the United States. One of every eight persons employed in manufacturing works in cotton textiles. The more than 2 million workers are employed in more than 8,000 plants of all types scattered through 43 States from Maine to Texas.

This is only part of the picture, however. There are thousands of farmers who grow cotton. There are other thousands who depend for some or all of their income on processing and marketing cotton and furnishing materials and supplies to the raw cotton industry. And, after the weavers, doffers, and dyers have turned the raw product into cloth and that has been turned by cutters and seamers into finished products, it provides jobs of other thousands of salesmen and deliverymen.

The American textile industry provides millions of American families with livelihoods. The payroll for workers in the textile manufacturing and apparel industry this year will reach an estimated $3.5 billion. This, in turn, helps to keep the wheels of progress turning in other industries throughout the country. And, governments also are large beneficiaries of the American textile industry. The textile mill products industry annually pays around $320 million in Federal income taxes alone. State and local governments are other beneficiaries.

The textile industry accounts for a significant portion of our national income. In 1958, the manufacturing groups comprising the textile industry accounted for about $9.1 billion of the $104.1 billion of the national income originating in all manufacturing activity in the United States. This was about 8.7 percent of the national income originating in the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy. In addition, the textile industry is essential to the national security. Of vital importance in peacetime, it has proved indispensable in time of emergency.

So important, so vital to all Americans, and, yet, right now the economic structure of the American cotton industry is in jeopardy. Despite attempts to supply some relief, there is a continuing flood of low-priced textiles coming in from abroad which is displacing the goods produced by our own workers and is demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry. The advantage to the foreign mills is that they can buy American produced cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than American mills can buy this same American cotton. This two-price cotton system is killing our textile industry.

Since 1946, imports have increased at an average annual rate of 22 percent. In recent years, cotton textile imports have continued to reach new record highs despite duties on such imports and agreements with governments of other countries to restrict their shipments to the United States. In 1956, some 450 million square yard equivalents were imported into this country. This figure has reached 1 billion square yard equivalents in 1960, and last year, in 1962, some 1.2 billion square yard equivalents were imported. And, the imports are running a little higher thus far this year.

What does this mean for the American textile industry? Of course, it can mean only one thing. Despite the increase in population, less American-produced cotton goods is being used. The population of the United States has jumped from 168 million in 1956 to 187 million in 1962. During this same period, American mills production dropped from just over 10 million linear yards in 1956 to just over 9 million linear yards last year. This has been keenly felt by textile workers. In 1950, there were 1.2 million persons employed in the textile mills products industry. In 1955, this was down to just over 1 million persons, and, in September of this year, the number of persons employed was down to 886,000.

This then is the serious situation which today confronts the cotton textile industry. For Congress to ignore this situation could well mean the eventual ruin of this industry, with all the grievous implications for those who work in and with the industry. What would the United States do if its gigantic textile industry were suddenly more seriously impaired? Where would all the textiles workers go to look for jobs? What could the farmers grow in place of cotton? What would happen to the modern mills, to the business districts and shopping centers that have grown with the industry? In other words, can the United States afford a weak and crippled cotton industry?

Such a situation must not be allowed to come to pass. This deterioration of the American textile industry must be stopped. This is the object of the cotton bill before us today. Perhaps this is not a perfect bill, but it at least eliminates a gross inequity foisted upon one segment of our economy by the Government. The two-price cotton system, so unfair and so unnecessary, would be terminated.

This cotton bill is necessary legislation. Under it the producers will be protected, the cotton textile industry will be given a fair chance to prosper and expand, the livelihoods of millions of persons associated with cotton will be protected, and consumers will be doubly repaid for their tax investment. Seldom has a single piece of legislation benefited so many. I hope it will pass.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] such time as he may require.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill before the House today, not because I think it is the answer we are seeking to the cotton problem, but because I think it is better than nothing.

This bill might help a little in bringing down the price of cotton textiles to the American consumer. It might make it possible for our cotton textile industry to compete better in the domestic and world markets.

Hopefully, this bill might protect the remaining jobs in the American textile industry for workers who are faced with the threat of losing their jobs because of the unfair competition of foreign mills.

But this bill does not go anywhere near solving the dilemma of the cotton textile industry that has seen American fiber losing out on the world markets and our mills closing down in the face of cheap textile imports.

This bill does not go anywhere near providing a solution to the problem of mounting cotton surpluses piling up in the storage warehouses at the expense of the taxpayers.

There is pending in the other body, Mr. Chairman, a bill that I believe goes much further than this bill toward meeting our cotton problems.

I refer to a bill authored by the junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. TALMADGE, and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY.

The bill to which I refer is designed to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of the consumers, and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

The Talmadge bill, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to be admirably suited to accomplish its avowed purposes, and I think it is far better than the proposal before us today.

The bill before us might do some good, but mainly it would pile another subsidy on top of a subsidy, at greater cost to the taxpayers and would not go to the heart of the problems of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the Talmadge bill not only would not require an additional subsidy to the mills, as this one does, it would eliminate altogether the necessity for the costly export subsidy which has helped put our mills in such a dilemma.

The Talmadge bill would free the cotton farmer from acreage controls. It would give the small cotton farmer adequate price support to maintain a fair and adequate income. It would permit the large cotton producer to grow as much cotton as he likes and sell it on the world market. It would restore American cotton to a competitive position in the world.

And most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the Talmadge bill would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, handling, and storing cotton.

I say we need the Talmadge bill, Mr. Chairman, and the best way and the quickest way to get it is to pass this bill before us and quickly send it to the Senate so that we can begin promptly to work out a compromise version of the two proposals. The time to act is now.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the State of Oklahoma, 180,000 people live wholly or in very substantial part upon incomes earned directly from cotton. These include 79,000 people living on cotton farms and 66,000 others whose breadwinners are seasonal workers on cotton farms. The remaining 35,000 consist of people whose income earners work in gins or for apparel manufacturers, plus cotton's pro rata share of those living on incomes from farm supply stores, merchandising operations, and so forth.

This by no means tells the whole story because statistics are not available on the many people working in oil mills and cotton warehouses; and there is no way to compute the number of employees concerned with cotton in banks, insurance agencies, department stores, motor freight lines, and many other fields.

The average annual cash receipts from cotton and cottonseed by Oklahoma farmers during calendar years 1960 through 1962 was $58.5 million. About three-quarters of the cotton raised in Oklahoma is in my district. This makes cotton the second most important crop next to wheat. It provides nearly a fourth as much cash income as all other crops combined, and a sixth as much as all meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs combined.

The total payroll of all manufacturing establishments in the State of Oklahoma was $470 million in 1961, the latest year reported. In that year, farmers' receipts from cotton and cottonseed alone were $59 million, or one-eighth as much as all wages and salaries of all industrial employees.

Thus the inevitable conclusion: If the cotton economy is crushed, Oklahoma will lose one of its big income producers, which will have a depressing effect on the State's whole economic structure. If cotton survives and goes forward, it will provide a stimulant to the industry and commerce of the State as a whole.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6196. When the so-called trade bill was before us for consideration I stated that if the great expounded principles of that bill did not work in practice we would be forced to subsidize our industries to compete with world trade in order to offset the lower wage scales of the foreign countries. Today we have reached that point. New York City has long had one of the largest textile industries, but unemployment in this industry has continually increased in a large part due to the lower cost of imported finished cotton products—possibly due to other nations buying cotton at the lower price and their paying lower wages.

I do not believe in subsidizing, but today, because of existing subsidization in the production of cotton and in foreign exports, we must also consider our own home manufacturers. The possible solution and end to this spending will come when subsidization is stopped at the source—that is to stop paying for nonproduction and permit the market to regulate its own production by supply and demand.

This legislation, I believe, will also be an aid to consumers for there can possibly be a reduction in the cost of the finished product, based on the lower cost of the raw material. Though this amount may be very small, the greater benefit will come in increased domestic employment in this industry, thus giving more people buying power which will aid and add to our economy. Thus, what is spent as a subsidy to industry under this legislation will, in a great measure, be returned to the Government in taxes.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have continually worked for, spoken for, and voted for a reduction in Federal Government control and regulation of our free enterprise system. I still believe in the thinking and reasoning of Thomas Jefferson when he said, "That government is best which governs least, providing every American with the opportunity to manage his own affairs."

In order to maintain and preserve a healthy, dynamic agricultural industry in our country today, I believe we must work toward a free-market-controlled economy for our farmers and relieve them from oppressive Federal controls and regulation. Former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson made, and was making, some tremendous strides in this direction during his office tenure.

Basically, the present cotton problem has been created by the failure of Secretary Freeman to carry out the philosophy of the Agricultural Act of 1958. Under this act, cotton prices, through a series of steps, would be adjusted to a realistic and competitive level. Because of this legislation, there was a substantial improvement in the cotton situation during the 1959 and 1960 marketing years. If Secretary Freeman had stayed with this act and the program set forth, he could, and should, have strengthened the competitive position of cotton by reducing the support price in 1961 and 1962. Apparently, it was politically more expedient to raise the support price; and thus came a tremendous increase in surplus cotton in storage, a reduction in the national cotton allotment, a serious reduction in both exports and the domestic consumption of cotton, and an increase in the export subsidy from 6 to 8½ cents per pound.

We need to move toward freeing the agriculture market from these conditions—toward a supply and demand market. Mr. Freeman and his advisers have not indicated a willingness to take the necessary steps to do this; in fact, they have gone the other way. The Congress must take action to get back to the basic philosophy of the 1958 Agricultural Act.

H.R. 6196, the Cooley bill, does not provide the best solution that will answer the problems, but it does, in my opinion, take some desirable steps by reducing the price support by the McIntire amendment from 32.47 cents per pound to 30 cents the first year, 29.50 cents the second year, and 29 cents the third year; and this is mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture who has demonstrated that he does not intend to lower support unless he is forced to do so by the Congress.

A particularly objectionable provision of this bill is the 10 percent additional premium support, with a maximum of 32.47 cents per pound for the first 15 bales produced—thus, in some instances, a sustaining subsidy for inefficient operations. However, it has been pointed out, most of the smaller farms, 30 acres or less, have been declining in number very rapidly even under the 32.47-cent support.

There are many acceptable and objectionable features to this bill. After careful study of this problem and weighing all the facts, in my considered judgment, the good slightly outweighs the bad in H.R. 6196, and I am therefore inclined to support its passage. It does not present an ideal solution of this problem, but it will probably be the only possible step we might have the opportunity to take to help cushion or stem the rapidly deteriorating condition of our very vitally important cotton industry.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, while I am not in favor of some of the subsidization measures provided by this bill, I feel very strongly that it is the only present prospect and opportunity for saving the cotton textile industry in the Nation.

It should not require much argument to demonstrate the plight of this once great industry. Attacked on all sides by unsound and unwise economic policies of this Government, victimized by the incredible two-price cotton system, the one-way-street trade programs flooding the market with cheap goods, cutthroat, unfair competition from foreign nations and all points of the compass, harried by production differentials pricing its products out of many major markets, the cotton textile industry is on the financial and economic ropes. The cotton industry itself is under an unprecedented threat.

Unless prompt relief and encouragement is forthcoming in this bill, the future of the cotton textile business, North, South, East, and West, wherever it exists in this country, not to speak of the great cotton-producing industry, will be in greatest jeopardy.

For these reasons, and because I believe that the interests of our consumers, our American economy, the cotton textile and related industries and the very many workers employed in these industries whose livelihood for themselves and their families is definitely at stake, I believe the Congress should pass this bill in the national interest.

I will support the amendments designed to improve the bill and will vote for its passage. And I earnestly hope it will help to relieve the very distressing conditions existing in the cotton textile and related industries.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, in further amplification of my remarks this date I include at this point in the RECORD a statistical analysis of the exact effect of the pending legislation on the 34 leading mills of the United States.

*Plain facts on cotton mill subsidy*

[Dollars in millions]

| | 1951 sales | 1960 sales | 1961 sales | 1962 sales | 1962 sales | | 1962 net income | | 1963 sales | | 1963 net income | | Operating income | | | | Cotton consumption (estimated bales) | Share in $292,000,000 subsidy [1] | Comparison increase in 1951 or 1960 operating income by subsidy (percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 6 mos. | 9 mos. | 6 mos. | 9 mos. | 6 mos. | 9 mos. | 6 mos. | 9 mos. | 1951 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | | | |
| Burlington Mills | $310 | $913 | $866 | $1,010 | ------ | $754 | ------ | $28 | ------ | $814 | ------ | $31 | $35 | $105 | $90 | $124½ | 660,000 | $28.0 | 80 |
| J. P. Stevens | 349½ | 513 | 495½ | 585 | [2] $143 | ------ | [2] $4 | ------ | [2] $145 | ------ | [2] $3 | ------ | 49½ | 49½ | 40½ | 56 | 384,000 | 16.2 | 33 |
| United Merchants & Manufacturers | 215 | 468 | 471 | 502½ | (3) | ------ | ------ | [4] 10 | ------ | (3) | ------ | 6 | 31½ | 36 | 29 | 39½ | 330,000 | 14.0 | 45 |
| M. Lowenstein & Sons | 144½ | 253 | 261½ | 270 | 74 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 71 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 13½ | 18 | 12½ | 14½ | 178,000 | 7.6 | 57 |
| Cannon Mills | 199 | 203 | 218 | 231 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | [5] 20½ | 26 | 28 | 31 | 274,000 | 11.6 | 57 |
| Cone Mills Corp | 154 | 188 | 214 | 220 | 122 | ------ | 3 | ------ | 115 | ------ | 2 | ------ | 26 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 268,000 | 11.3 | [6] 44 |
| Spring Cotton Mills | (3) | 187 | 188 | 197.6 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | 14.4 | 234,000 | 9.9 | (7) |
| Dan River Mills | 112 | 163 | 157 | 173½ | 91 | ------ | ------ | ------ | 85 | ------ | 3 | ------ | [8] 15 | [8] 20 | [8] 18 | [8] 19½ | 197,177 | 8.4 | 56 |
| West Point Manufacturing Co | 137 | 157 | 145 | 173 | ------ | 131 | ------ | 5 | ------ | 131 | ------ | 5 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 17½ | 209,000 | 8.7 | [6] 43 |
| Kendall Corp | 97 | 112 | 124 | 134 | [9] 62 | ------ | [10] 2 | ------ | [9] 63 | ------ | 2 | ------ | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 159,000 | 6.8 | 56 |
| Beaunit Mills | 96 | 124 | 109 | 121 | [11] 31 | ------ | [11] 2 | ------ | [11] 33 | ------ | [11] 1 | ------ | 24 | 20 | 13 | 17 | 143,000 | 6.2 | [6] 26 |
| Indian Head Mills (1952) | 13 | 82 | 102 | 152 | 74 | ------ | 2 | ------ | 73 | ------ | 1 | ------ | (3) | 36 | 6½ | 10 | 176,881 | 7.5 | 270 |
| Erwin Mills, Inc. (1952) | 61 | 64 | 68 | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 115,000 | 4.9 | ------ |
| Pepperell Manufacturing Co | 88 | 100 | 91 | 102 | (12) | ------ | (12) | ------ | (12) | ------ | (12) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 154,091 | 6.2 | ------ |
| Riegel Bros | 58 | 91 | 86 | 87 | ------ | [13] 63 | ------ | [13] 2 | ------ | [13] 61 | ------ | [13] 2 | (3) | 8 | 6 | 8 | 133,000 | 5.7 | 73 |
| Graniteville Co | 57 | 62 | 68 | 74 | 38 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 41 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 6 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 111,000 | 4.7 | 78 |
| Bibb Manufacturing Co | (3) | 80 | 74 | 85 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | 8 | 7 | 7 | 131,000 | 5.5 | 68 |
| Reeves Manufacturing Co | 67 | 72 | 66 | 77 | ------ | 55 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 59 | ------ | 1 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 114,000 | 4.8 | [6] 60 |
| Collins Aikman | 58 | 65 | 65 | 90 | [14] 26 | ------ | [14] 1 | ------ | [14] 27 | ------ | [14] 1 | ------ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 133,000 | 5.8 | 115 |
| Avondale Mills | [15] 48 | 61 | 56 | 66 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | [16] 1 | ------ | (3) | 6 | 7 | 7 | 98,149 | 4.2 | 70 |
| Fulton Industries | (3) | 52 | 52 | 49 | 24 | ------ | .93 | ------ | 24 | ------ | [17] .66 | ------ | (3) | (3) | 2 | 2 | 87,000 | 3.7 | 185 |
| Berkshire Hathaway | 61 | 63 | 48 | 53 | ------ | 41 | ------ | [10] 2 | ------ | 38 | ------ | [17] .712 | (3) | (3) | 2 | [17] .114 | 94,000 | 4.0 | 200 |
| Belding-Heminway | 20 | 40 | 44 | 49 | 25 | ------ | .575 | ------ | 25 | ------ | .465 | ------ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 87,000 | 3.7 | 370 |
| Thomaston Mills, Inc. | 42 | 41 | 38 | 42 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 75,106 | 3.2 | 46 |
| Duplan Corp | 31 | 31 | 37 | 43 | ------ | 34 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 35 | ------ | .784 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 72,000 | 3.1 | 110 |
| Mount Vernon Mills, Inc | 63 | 37 | 37 | 43 | 21 | ------ | ------ | ------ | 22 | ------ | ------ | ------ | 11 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 72,000 | 3.1 | [6] 28 |
| Bates Manufacturing Co | 60 | 36 | 36 | 38 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | 2 | 2 | 72,000 | 3.1 | 155 |
| Fabrex Corp.[3] | (3) | 39 | 36 | (3) | ------ | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 72,000 | 3.1 | ------ |
| United Elastic Corp | 26 | 30 | 32 | 35 | 18 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 19 | ------ | 1 | ------ | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 64,500 | 2.8 | 47 |
| Textiles, Inc | 30 | 29 | 28 | 32 | [18] 16 | ------ | [18] .705 | ------ | [18] 16 | ------ | [18] .568 | ------ | (3) | 4 | 3 | 4 | 64,500 | 2.8 | 70 |
| Monarch Mills | (3) | (3) | [19] 21 | (3) | (3) | ------ | [20] .63 | ------ | (3) | ------ | [20] .42 | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | (21) | 64,500 | 2.8 | ------ |
| Standard Coosa-Thatcher | 26 | 26 | 23 | 27 | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 64,500 | 2.8 | ------ |
| Wyandotte Worsted | 31 | 24 | 22 | ------ | 10 | ------ | .85 | ------ | 9 | ------ | [17] .48 | ------ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 64,500 | 2.8 | 140 |
| Stonecutter Mills | (3) | (3) | [19] 13 | (3) | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | ------ | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | 64,500 | 2.8 | ------ |
| Total | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | ------ | [22] 205.0 | ------ |

[1] $42.50 per bale.
[2] 13 weeks; month ending in May of each year.
[3] Not available.
[4] Includes $588,000, or 10 cents a share net capital gains.
[5] 1952.
[6] Companies experienced reduced income, 1951–63.
[7] 1962, 396,000 bales, 16.8 percent increase.
[8] Includes gross income from commission selling operations; 1961, $2,017,523; 1962, $2,164,712.
[9] 24 weeks ending June 15, 1962, and June 16, 1962.
[10] After $229,000 (11 cents a share) charge due to devaluation of Canadian dollar.
[11] Quarter ended June 30.
[12] Year ending June 30.
[13] 40 weeks ended July 7, 1962, and July 6, 1963.
[14] Quarter ended June 2, 1962, and June 1, 1963.
[15] 8 months.
[16] 28 weeks ended Mar. 10, 1963.
[17] Deficit.
[18] 6 months ended March.
[19] Total assets; sales not available.
[20] Canadian dollars.
[21] Merged Dec. 31, 1962, with other companies, including Pacolet Manufacturing Co.
[22] 70 percent of parity.

Sources: Standard & Poor's Corp. records; Moody's Industrials; Daily News Record, Jan. 25, 1962, p. 22, Daily News Record, May 14, 1963.

**Mr. LINDSAY.** Mr. Chairman, first I wish to state my strong support for the McIntire amendment to H.R. 6196. The amendment will force a gradual reduction in cotton price supports from the present 32.47 cents per pound to 29 cents over the life of the bill. The amendment compels these reductions; the Secretary of Agriculture has no choice in the matter.

With the McIntire amendment the bill, it seems to me, is worthy of support. It is fair and reasonable. I do not see how one can justify two-price cotton and low tariff rates at the same time without making some adjustments. I strongly supported the Trade Expansion Act. I believe in reciprocally low tariffs. I also believe in Americans selling cotton abroad in international markets. This means that we must sell overseas at the world market price. The world market price is 8½ cents per pound below the U.S. domestic price. The United States must sell abroad at this price in order to compete. This same cotton then comes back into the United States in manufactured goods form. What is the answer? Do we end international selling of raw cotton? Of course not. The Government already owns over 8.2 million bales of cotton. This is almost six times the amount owned in 1961. By 1964 it may increase to 10 million bales. The Government investment in this cotton will be $1.6 billion and the storage costs will approximate $83 million annually. We must sell as much as we can and we must stay in world competition. The choice then is to lower the price support for cotton, which this bill does by the McIntire amendment, and to make surplus cotton available to manufacturers at a price which will enable them to stay within the range of competition of foreign manufacturers. Foreign buyers of American cotton still will manufacture more cheaply than we can, but at least American manufacturers will not be prejudiced before they begin. The American consumer will be able to buy domestic cotton-made goods at cheaper prices. It is estimated that 35,000 jobs can be saved. In the past 5 years 45 cotton mills have been liquidated, wiping out approximately 20,000 jobs. How long can this continue? Most assuredly it will continue indefinitely unless some adjustment is made.

I would like to see larger cuts in the cotton price support than that provided by the McIntire amendment, but my distinguished friend from Maine, who is committed to the gradual elimination of the whole price support system, went as far as the practicalities indicated he could go in his amendment. On balance, then, I will support this bill.

**Mr. ALGER.** Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the minority members of the Agriculture Committee and to join with them in opposition to this bill.

I would like to make it clear that I share the concern for the serious problems facing the cotton industry. Cotton plays a most important part in the economy of Dallas, the district I have the honor to represent. I agree that a vigorous and prosperous cotton industry is vital. This bill does not assure such a result, rather, in my opinion, it merely postpones the day when the cotton industry is liquidated unless we take proper measures to create a climate in which it may be restored to health.

The weakness of this bill is that it does not move cotton closer to a free market and less Government controls, but actually imposes a triple subsidy program for cotton, as pointed out in the minority report. This bill proposes, in addition to the subsidies for producers and exporters, a third subsidy for the mills. This is wrong and can result only in higher prices to consumers while providing no solution to the problem the cotton industry faces.

The way out of the dilemma faced by cotton is clearly outlined in the minority report on page 40 which is summed up as follows:

> It is therefore our general recommendation that the Secretary of Agriculture be required by law to follow the mandate and the authority which he has failed to use under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Agricultural Act of 1949, both of which were amended by the Agricultural Act of 1958. We propose that these acts be amended to effect an orderly transition over a period of years toward lower price supports for cotton which would allow increased markets and the development and reestablishment of a one-price cotton system while lowering Government costs, maintaining farm income, and recapturing cotton's historic preeminence as the king of textiles.

This is the goal of all of us truly interested in maintaining the cotton industry and this bill makes the attainment of such a goal almost impossible. Finally, there is only one proper solution to the problems of cotton and all of agriculture, ultimately we must get the Government out of the farm business.

**Mr. POAGE.** Mr. Chairman, there seems to still be some lingering misunderstanding among some of the Members of the House as to how the Department of Agriculture would administer the provisions relating to changes in the support price of cotton as changes in the costs and efficiency of cotton production develop.

Section 3 of the bill requires that the Department make a determination as to how much change there is in the cost of growing cotton. It has been argued that it is not possible to measure accurately the cost of growing cotton. Let me emphasize that this bill requires only that the change in the cost of growing cotton be measured. There is no question but that it would be extremely difficult to get general agreement on the exact number of cents per pound it costs to produce cotton. But there is general agreement that the change in the cost from year to year can be measured with a very high degree of accuracy. The Department of Agriculture has done considerable work on this subject. In November 1962, a report on this work was published. It is entitled, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production." Two charts from this report are contained on page 287 of the hearings. This is the method we would expect the Department of Agriculture to use to measure the changes in costs.

I have also heard it said there is some doubt about how the Department would apply this cost reduction provision to the price support level. This also has been worked out by the Department. An index of the average cost of growing cotton would be determined for a period of about 3 years ending in the latest year for which data is available. Three years is suggested in order to eliminate as much as possible the effects of weather. Another such average, ending 1 year earlier, would then be determined. The comparison of these two averages will reflect the change in the cost of growing cotton.

Under leave to extend, I will include in my remarks at this point a description of just how this calculation would be made This is what the Department says it will do should H.R. 6196 be enacted:

### Proposed Method of Administering Section 3 of H.R. 6196, as Approved

The Department's publication, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production," dated November 1962, contains the basic procedure and some of the data which would be used in administering section 3 of the bill. However, some additional data would need to be obtained in order to analyze and make available estimates of sufficient accuracy for this purpose.

In establishing a statistical series for measuring changes in the cost of producing cotton, it is intended that it will reflect not only those costs arising directly from the production of cotton such as labor, machinery, materials, ginning, and other contract services, but also a reasonable allowance for general farm overhead costs including a return to land. In the matter of establishing a return to land, however, it is expected that to the extent feasible account will be taken of, and appropriate adjustments made for, the many factors that have contributed to an artificial inflation in prices of farmland so that the return to land reflects only its value for agricultural uses.

It should also be pointed out that the Committee intends that changes in production costs from any cause be recognized in administering this section. It is not intended that reductions in price support be predicated only on reductions in production costs realized through the special cotton research program provided in section 3 of the bill.

The Department's publication measures the changes in costs of production for each year. In order to minimize the effects of weather on the cost in any particular year, an average of a few years should be used. The average should be kept as short as possible in order to bring changes in costs to bear on the price support within a reasonable time. But there must be sufficient lag to permit the data to be collected and the cost change determination made.

It is suggested, therefore, that for 1965, the average cost index during the 3 years ending in 1963 be divided by the average index during the 3 years ending in 1962. The result (but not more than 1.00) would be multiplied by the 1964 price support level to determine the level for 1965.

Each year thereafter, the 3-year averages would be advanced by 1 year.

An exception to the above would be made in the event costs go up, and then start down again. No reduction in the price support would be made as costs are coming back down until the previous lowest level is reached. From that point on the price support would again begin to be lowered as costs go down in the manner described above.

This provision is fair to the farmers in that it assures them that their price support will not be reduced unless the cost of growing cotton is reduced. With the kind of a research program contemplated by the bill, production costs can be reduced substantially. As the lower costs of production are reflected in lower price support, the overall expenditures for the cotton program will be reduced.

I think there is a good chance that by 1966, we can expect expenditures to be even less than they are under the present program. Over a period of say 8 to 10 years, it is highly possible, even probable, that costs can be reduced to the point where virtually all of the Government expenditures will be eliminated. To me this is one of the most important features of the bill. It removes from the political arena the establishment of the level of price support for cotton and puts it on a basis which is sound—both to the Government and to the farmer.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time remaining on this side.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, as we come to the end of this long debate, I want to impress upon the House just a few facts and figures. My dear friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], made a speech that was something of a tirade. He seems to think this House is not aware of certain things that have happened.

The fact is that for 20 long years under Democratic administrations, and I know that my colleague is very, very partisan, we operated a cotton program so successfully and so well that when we turned it over to the Eisenhower administration in 1953 we did not show a loss of a single dime nor of a single dollar but had a net profit of $268 million in the cotton program over a 20-year period.

When it got into the hands of unfriendly administrators, within a few short months that profit had been lost. Now we have lost up to date through the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton $1,858 million—almost $2 billion. Yet the gentleman from Oklahoma comes here to oppose us when we are trying to do something about the losses and to minimize the costs and gives you a figure which is misleading. He says that this program costs $600 million. That is the total cost. He does not point out what the cost will be if you do not pass this bill. The additional cost for the first year is only $118 million. The second year it goes down to $87 million, and the third year $44 million, but during those 3 years it is estimated by experts that we will save the consumers of America $500 million and save the jobs of textile workers.

Let me go now to wheat. Our colleague had a lot to say about wheat, and that is the principal crop in his district. Do you know what their losses have amounted to on wheat to date? Under the 20 years that we ran the program for wheat we lost only $76 million.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. No. I am sorry. I cannot. But I will give you some information I do not think you know. Losses on wheat in the 20 years prior to 1953 were $76 million, which amounts to nothing compared to the subsequent losses we have incurred to date on wheat, his principal commodity, which amount to $10,931 million. And I challenge you to deny the accuracy of those figures. It is all right to lose on wheat, but you cannot lose on cotton. I have voted for wheat legislation, and you griped and growled about the last program we gave you. You went out to the country and told everybody to vote down this program. You said, "We will get you another." You have not gotten another wheat program. The wheat farmers rejected it. And I am willing to abide by their decision. Whenever the cotton farmers and the rice farmers and the peanut farmers and the tobacco farmers reject our programs I have no complaint to make. But I do have a complaint to make when fallacious statements and erroneous statements are made here in the last minutes of this debate in an effort to lead the Members to vote against this bill.

I can tell you this is the last clear chance to save the cotton industry of this country. This is the vote that you will cast. That is how important it is. I am pleading not only for the cotton farmers. We have about 230,000 textile workers in my State—more textile workers than any State in the Nation—more textile spindles than any State in the Nation.

This is a bill that will bring relief to everybody in the textile industry from Boston to Houston or Boston to Austin or whatever you want to say—from Ocracoke in North Carolina to the Golden Gate of California.

So I think this bill should be enacted and you should not be frightened or intimidated by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher] because he does not want to vote it out. He has a perfect right to believe so.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. BELCHER. If you did not yield to me, you need not ever ask me to yield on the floor, whether I was for your case or not, because I have never, since I have been a Member of this Congress, refused to yield to you. When you give me some information I do not know, that will be a novel experience. But I will say to the gentleman I admit those wheat losses. Every single one of those bills was passed by your committee and it was your support that cost that money.

Mr. COOLEY. And signed by your President and recommended by your Secretary of Agriculture and voted for by you.

Mr. BELCHER. I voted against the bill that you passed that cost $8 billion. Your committee brought these bills up and not I.

Mr. COOLEY. No. It was your administration that weakened the program so much and accumulated these losses which are now constituting a great and intolerable burden on the taxpayers of this Nation.

I ask you to give careful consideration to the implications involved in this legislation. I have resolutions and letters here that will go into the Record from Rhode Island and up in Maine and all over this country where the people are begging for this legislation. Yet we see it wrapped up here in partisan politics.

I am inserting certain letters and resolutions at this point in the Record:

Textile Workers Union of America,
*New York, N.Y., July 30, 1963.*

Hon. Harold Cooley,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Cooley: I have read with a good deal of interest an article in the Daily News Record of July 24 which indirectly quotes you as saying that the Textile Workers Union of America can be of help in rallying support for one-price cotton legislation.

Specifically, the article says: "Mr. Cooley is known to believe that the Textile Workers Union may be able to muster help from other segments of organized labor to work for the bill on behalf of textile mill workers."

My purpose in writing is to assure you that, as in the past, we will do all we possibly can to promote the passage of legislation which eliminates the inequities of the present two-price cotton system. We shall, of course, use all of our influence and persuasive powers to convince "big city" Congressmen of the pressing need for such legislation.

As for any attempt to enlist the rest of organized labor behind this legislation, I feel I must warn you and all other interested parties that this is no small or routine task.

It is very difficult, indeed, to arouse any sympathy on the part of other segments of labor, and the public in general, for a low-wage, nonunion industry, such as textiles, which fanatically resists the efforts of its workers to organize and improve their working and living standards.

It is hard to sell the proposition that an industry which will not even sit down with the representatives of its workers to discuss joint efforts to promote beneficial legislation deserves any consideration of this sort.

However, because textile workers have a stake in eliminating the inequities of the two-price cotton system, we shall make a vigorous attempt to mobilize support. But these are the facts of life we have to face, and they do not make this task an easy one.

Sincerely,

William Pollock,
*General President.*

---

Textile Workers Union of America,
*New York, N.Y., November 11, 1963.*

Hon. Harold Cooley,
*Old House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Cooley: Over the years, the Textile Workers Union of America has devoted a good deal of its energy to enlisting the aid of the Government in developing remedies to help restore the economic health of the textile industry. We have pursued this course not only in the interests of nearly 1 million American workers who depend upon it for their livelihood, but also because this industry is essential to the Nation's welfare.

Textile imports have always been a threat to our industry because the emerging, underdeveloped, low-wage nations always turn to this commodity in their efforts to industrialize quickly and to secure dollar-exchange for international trade.

To compound the difficulties which stem from this practice, our own Government makes it possible for foreign manufacturers to purchase raw cotton from the United States at 8½ cents a pounds (or 25 percent) less than domestic manufacturers are compelled to pay for the same cotton.

In turn, these foreign manufacturers, who already enjoy the advantage of low wages, convert the raw cotton into consumer goods and ship them into the same markets upon which our own industry depends. The result has been a drastic shrinkage in the jobs of American textile workers and a continuing threat of further shrinkage.

As a result of this unfair competition, imports of cotton products have skyrocketed. In 1962, they were equivalent to 645,000 bales of raw cotton. This amount is 64 percent greater than in 1961 and four times as great as the annual average of the last decade. Moreover, they continue to increase.

This vast influx of imports has seriously aggravated the unemployment problems of cotton textile workers. Employment in broadwoven fabric mills declined from 246,800 production workers in 1958 to 216,700 in August of 1963. In this 5-year process, 45 cotton mills have been liquidated and approximately 20,000 jobs have been wiped out.

What prompts this letter is the fact that, at long last, a remedy for this situation is about to be considered by the House of Representatives. The Cooley one-price cotton bill (H.R. 6196) will shortly be before you. This legislation would eliminate the two-price cotton system which has been depressing the domestic textile industry. It would enable domestic manufacturers to purchase raw cotton at the same price that foreign buyers pay.

This would be accomplished by gradually reducing the support price from 32½ to 29 cents a pound and, by making payments to the mills (in the form of cotton from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation) to make up the difference between the support price and the 24-cent world price of cotton.

We in the Textile Workers Union of America are most anxious to see the Cooley bill enacted. We regard these payments as essential to remove the competitive disadvantage suffered by the domestic industry. On the basis of past experience with cotton price reductions, it is evident that competition will force the price level for cotton textiles to be lowered. This, in turn, should result in a $500 million savings to consumers and lead to the expanded use of American-made cotton products. In addition, it should not only relieve the threat to existing cotton textile employment, but should create some 35,000 additional jobs for cotton textile workers.

The Kennedy administration is supporting the Cooley bill and the Speaker of the House has agreed to bring it to the floor shortly after November 11, 1963. Because of its importance not only to textile workers, but to consumer and national interests in general, we earnestly urge you to vote in favor of this legislation.

Sincerely,

William Pollock,
*General President.*

---

Lewiston Joint Board, Textile
Workers Union of America,
*Lewiston, Maine, October 28, 1963.*

The Honorable Harold Cooley,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Cooley: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the delegates to the Lewiston joint board of the Textile Workers Union of America at a meeting held on Sunday, October 27, 1963.

The joint board represents approximately 4,000 textile workers in Maine at the present time.

Only a few years ago, we represented over 8,000 workers. The decrease has been due principally to competition caused by increased imports of cotton products.

We plead with you to use your great influence to secure the passage of H.R. 6196 known as the one-price cotton bill in order to relieve the insecurity of many thousands of American cotton textile workers.

Very truly yours,

DENIS A. BLAIS,
*Manager.*

Whereas the cotton textile workers and manufacturers in this country have been burdened for many years with unfair competition from foreign made products; and

Whereas the action of our own Government in permitting foreign manufacturers to purchase American-grown raw cotton at prices substantially lower than those prevailing for American mills; and

Whereas the combination of low foreign wages and lower priced cotton has resulted in greatly increased imports of cotton-made products with a corresponding decrease in employment in the American cotton textile industry: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Lewiston joint board of the Textile Workers Union of America, representing workers in the areas of Lewiston-Auburn, Augusta, Waterville-Winslow and Old Town, in the State of Maine, urgently request the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 6196, known as the one-price cotton bill now pending in the House of Representatives; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and members of the Maine congressional delegation.

Unanimously adopted October 27, 1963.

---

UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
CRANSTON, R.I., *September 8,1963.*

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO ECONOMIC HARDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN TEXTILE WORKER

Whereas it is a matter of record that the economic plight of the American textile worker has become so acute, each week thousands are forced on relief rolls because their employers are compelled to shut down their plants, or are forced out of business due to unfair foreign competition; and

Whereas it is also a matter of record that the price differential of 8½ cents per pound of cotton allowed foreign competitors is economically unsound, and eventually will cause more textile mills to close their doors, thereby making a graveyard of an industry which was once the backbone of the Nation: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That Local 2459, United Textile Workers of America, Cranston, R.I., respectfully memorializes Congress to pass remedial legislation to end price differential discrimination against the American textile industry, and give to the American textile worker the inalienable right to work at his chosen trade; be it further

*Resolved,* That our international president, George Baldanzi, be consulted on the propriety of a peaceful march to Washington, D.C., by members of our international union, for the purpose of presenting our petition to the Members of Congress, and to provide documentary proof that legislative inactivity is causing irreparable harm to thousands of textile workers in the United States; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution, and supporting data, be forwarded to our delegates to Congress from Rhode Island, to John H. Chafee, Governor of Rhode Island, and to President John F. Kennedy.

This resolution was passed at a regular meeting, Sunday, September 8, 1963.

JAMES LENEHAN,
*President.*

---

EXCERPTS, PROVIDENCE SUNDAY JOURNAL BUSINESS WEEKLY, AUGUST 25, 1963

The two-price system centers around an export subsidy program established in 1956.

Foreign competitors buy American grown cotton 8.5 cents cheaper, or the equivalent of $42.50 for each 500-pound bale.

American Textile Manufacturers Institute report on imports of cotton products including grey goods and yarn.

| | *Square yards* |
|---|---|
| 1955 | 363,487,000 |
| 1962 | 1,165,878,000 |

At the moment, there are three bills in Congress. Two are in the Senate, Cooley bill in the House. Apparently, the Cooley bill has the best chance of passage.

Berkshire Hathaway operated four textile plants, and a finishing plant in 1961. Now only one plant remains.

Cotton inventories are exceedingly low, business is being done on a hand to mouth basis, because Congress is not saying whether it will grant relief or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 348. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1967, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of enactment of this section available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided,* That beginning August 1, 1964, payments shall be made to persons other than producers in an amount as will make upland cotton produced in the United States available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 13, insert the word "such".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 2, line 12, substitute a period for the colon and add closing quotation marks; then strike the remainder of line 12 and all of lines 13 through 17.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be necessary to take even 5 minutes to explain this amendment. All it does is to insure that we will not go further than making a payment which will eliminate the inequity. That is supposed to be the purpose of this bill. The first part of this section takes care of that by giving the benefits to the mills of any inequities that exist because of the export payment. The proviso beginning on line 12, however, says:

That beginning August 1, 1964—

The Secretary can go further than remove the inequities and make the payment exactly what the foreign payment is. It is not necessary in the opinion of many of us and in the opinion of the Department to do this. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy, who appeared for the Department of Agriculture before our committee said that it might take 5 cents, it might take 6 cents, it might be as low as 4 cents, to remove that inequity. The difference is because of the transportation cost, handling, and insurance and other relevant items like that. So by adopting this amendment you would be merely providing what the proponents of this bill say that they want. You would be prohibiting the possibility of a windfall to anyone.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, would ruin the pending bill. It would take the heart out of the bill. I think the author of the amendment is well aware of the fact that no provision in this bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make an 8½-cent-a-pound payment to anybody. The payment to be made is the same that is necessary to eliminate the inequity, whatever it happens to amount to. If under the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE], the price of cotton comes down to 29 cents a pound over a 3-year period, naturally the payment would come down.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a brief question?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me why they would put a proviso in here to the effect that beginning August 1 there would be different rules followed than would be followed upon enactment of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows exactly why.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, I do not.

Mr. COOLEY. I will tell the gentleman if the gentleman will just listen.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will listen.

Mr. COOLEY. We promised to eliminate this inequity. At that time when the promise was made the inequity was 8½ cents per pound. Everyone in the industry came before our committee and supported my original bill. My original bill contemplated the elimination of the inequity in toto. Then, when the administration people came before our committee they told you and told me that because of the budgetary situation they could not go the full 8½ cents per pound in 1963, but would try to reach it in 1964. I think the Under Secretary said under the budget they might be able to go as much as 5 cents a pound.

When that word came out all of the people in the industry just left Washington and went home. I think they were heartbroken and upset.

Then we finally got them together again in Washington and the officials convinced the industry that they could take less than full and complete elimination of the inequity in the first year under this legislation.

So, that is the reason we put this date in the bill.

In August of 1964 we are proposing to go all the way to eliminate this injustice.

If there is an injustice and if there is an inequity, it should be eliminated in toto and not partially. That is the reason it is in there and I thought, certainly, that the gentleman from Missouri knew that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the first part of the section there say that in order to make such payments as will eliminate the inequities—it does not place any restriction upon it, does it?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right exactly.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why have they not suggested that instead of coming down here and saying it has to be the exact amount, when the Under Secretary in all of his testimony did not say this. The only people who said it took a full 8½-cent reduction were the mill people. I do not blame them for saying it.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But, I think they got a little greedy.

Mr. COOLEY. The Department officials admitted it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, the Department officials never did admit that. The gentleman cannot show me a place in the hearings where they admitted it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there anything in here that calls for 8½ cents? If there is, show it to me. It is not in here.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If it were not in that proviso, you would not object to taking it out.

Mr. COOLEY. It is not in there. The language says whatever it takes to eliminate the inequity. That is what we want to do and that is all we want to do.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question, in order to clarify the amendment that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has offered here.

As I understand it, with the striking of this language, beginning on line 12, the Secretary could decide to pay only—and let us say—a 2-cent subsidy to the mill if he wanted to, rather than be required to bring the price to the mill down to the world market price; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. If he wanted to break faith with the intent and purpose of the law, of course, he could do that. But I have no reason to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would issue any such order.

Mr. QUIE. When the Secretary of Agriculture, or someone who represented him, appeared before our committee, he indicated that the disparity or the difference between these prices was not 8½ cents, because there is some transportation cost involved.

Mr. COOLEY. Why there was some talk about transportation costs. If the Secretary finds a disparity of 8½ cents, there is nothing to require him to pay 8½ cents. If he is right, it might be something substantially less than 8½ cents.

The point is the inequity. I do not believe in trying to partially eliminate inequity. I think we should go all the way and be fair to this industry which is so vital to the welfare of the people of our country.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, even with the language in the proviso which the Jones amendment would strike, the Department of Agriculture could consider transportation. Say transportation was 1 cent, then he could make the payment 7.5 cents instead of 8.5 cents?

Mr. COOLEY. He has all the flexibility in the world, it seems to me. He must look to the intent and purpose of the law, and that is to eliminate inequities, and I think the gentleman will recall that because of the budget situation they could not go all the way.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, if we agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, there is a likelihood in 1964 the Department would not go all the way either?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the gentleman's amendment seems to me to be a rather important point. Although I am not sure I understand what the bill's objective is, in one place it says the objective is to eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users. I am not sure what that means, but I suppose it means to equalize the cost of cotton at the mills, both foreign and domestic. The bill says "eliminate inequities." It does not say that the Department would be authorized to make a lesser payment immediately upon the enactment of this act simply because of a limited budget. It says the Secretary is required to eliminate the inequity.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is the difference between us. The gentleman from Missouri I think understands that to eliminate inequity we must have this subsidy.

Mr. HARDY. Let us get away from the 8.5 cents, or any specific amount. Let us talk about what an inequity is. I do not know whether it is 8.5 cents or what it is you have been talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. Eight and one-half cents is not mentioned in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are misquoting me. I did not say it required 8.5 cents to remove the inequity.

Mr. HARDY. I did not mean to promote an argument between my two friends. This thing has me a little bit confused, too, because there is nothing in the bill about "cents." It says "to eliminate inequities." I do not understand how under the language of the bill the Secretary could make a payment of less than the amount required to eliminate the inequity as of the effective date of the bill.

Frankly, I think I have to agree with the gentleman from Missouri. As I read the language in the proviso, its meaning differs substantially from the earlier language in the section. In one case it says "difference in the cost of cotton between foreign and domestic users." Under the proviso it says "the price at which such cotton is made available for export." So in the proviso the Department would be required to take into consideration the cost of transportation and any other incidental expenses. Frankly, I think the proviso ought to be stricken if you are going to promote equity.

Mr. COOLEY. In the proviso the language is "at a price that is not in excess of the price at which cotton is made available for export."

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the whole thing does make sense. That is, if there is an inequity it should be eliminated. We do not tie the Secretary's hands.

Mr. HARDY. That is not what you are saying in this language, as I read it. You are saying in this language that the American competitor is going to have an advantage because he is going to get his cotton at the mill cheaper than the foreign importer can because the foreign importer has to pay handling and storage and transportation costs. In the proviso you relate it to price for export.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not related to price. It is related to an inequity in price.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot read inequity in the last part of the proviso to save my life. The proviso relates to price and it proposes to equalize the price of cotton to mills in the United States with the export price of cotton to which still must be added transportation and other costs before it reaches foreign mills.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. It seems to me clear that the proviso puts the domestic mill in a very much better position than his foreign competitor.

Mr. HARDY. That is it exactly.

Mr. MEADER. This adds transportation costs, insurance, and all the other costs.

Mr. HARDY. That is my point. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri ought to be adopted.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion in committee, if I recall properly and I am sure I do, the purpose of this language was the Department testimony that it could not make an 8.5-cent payment to remove the so-called price inequity between the export cotton and the domestically consumed cotton. It testified the inequity was somewhat less. You could determine it was 5, 5.5, or 4.5 cents. But the proviso that this would strike would insure that if the McIntire amendment is adopted and the price support of cotton is reduced you would carry the gage relating what the transportation cost is, you would not continue the payment, if it were 5 cents of 15 cents after August 1, 1964, regardless of what the inequity was. So it does bring about a higher payment after August 1, 1964 than it does before, in relationship to the 1963 crop.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri what his definition would be in relation to equity under the amendment which he proposed. I think for the legislative record it would be very helpful if the gentleman would say what he thinks of in terms of equity that would be attempted under the legislation if his amendment were adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the wording in the bill, the part that I do not strike, gives an adequate definition. It says here very plainly:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1967, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than producers—

Of course, the mills may not get it.

> in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton.

In the hearings, when Under Secretary Murphy was before our committee he was raked over the coals quite a bit. We were trying to pin him down to a point. He indicated that the payment might be different in different areas due to the difference in the cost of transportation, due to the cost of handling, insurance, and all the other factors that go into it. We discussed that in the committee and we finally wrote the language and said we were going to leave it up to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide what the equity was. That is what he still does and would still do if my amendment is adopted. Unless my amendment is adopted, we get into paying the exact figure. The reason I say the exact figure is that the differential between the domestic mills and the foreign mills should not be the same, because the difference in transportation costs and other relevant factors would be ignored.

According to the American Cotton Association, it cost 35 cents to get cotton from Memphis to Bremen by the Gulf ports as against 35.12 to get it from Memphis to a Carolina mill. It depends on where the cotton is going as to the amount of subsidy that mill should collect at that time.

That is what the Secretary would do. That is what he would be permitted to do under this bill, if my amendment is adopted. But if my amendment is not adopted, then we are going to say that this payment to the domestic mill has to be the same as the payment to the foreign mill. I say that would provide a windfall.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Missouri said that during the hearings there was a discussion of such an amendment in the committee. The gentleman never offered such an amendment in the committee. Now he comes here and offers this amendment and confuses the issue. You know the clear purpose and intent of this bill is to eliminate the inequities. Here we are making legislative history and if the amendment before us is adopted all we will be saying is that the purpose of it is not to give our domestic mill any advantage. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the chairman will admit that we had considerable discussion. There were amendments offered in committee at the time this was under discussion.

Mr. COOLEY. But it was not your amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It was not my amendment, no. But I have supported a lot of amendments on the floor that I did not offer. As a matter of fact, I offer very few amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. But no amendment with the same purport and intent as your amendment was offered in committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There were amendments with the same purport offered—yes, I beg to differ with the chairman. I am not trying to confuse the issue. I am trying to bring the issue out and make it clear.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I think the point has been thoroughly discussed. I think the objective we have in mind is that there shall be equity, and I feel that the language that is in the bill makes this intention very clearly.

I want to say I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. If the purpose is equity based upon the cost to both the domestic and foreign consumer, then I can vote for the bill because the rule of thumb on exports into the United States as contained in the hearings and the information that we got in hearings that I held for 2 years at the instance of the House of Representatives is that approximately 25 percent of the American purchase price is added.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this. I would be happy to vote for this bill, if the purpose is to really create equity between the American purchase price of cotton and the foreign purchase price. Because if they purchase at $139.50 the rule of thumb is that 25 percent of the American purchase price is added for insurance and transportation. That will mean that the added price to the $139.50 would be $35 making it $164.50, which is the cost of a bale of cotton, let us say, to the Japanese. That is if they charge the rates of transportation provided under the international rate board schedules. But since the Japanese own and control their own transportation, I can guarantee you that they will increase the price of their transportation so that it will equalize the cost at the figure of $172. As this now stands, if we accept the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri, the total available amount that can be retained or claimed by American industry and American textile mills will be $7.50 a bale instead of $42.50 a bale.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. As I understand it, the gentleman is saying that with the proviso eliminated, the bill would provide for equity whereas with the proviso included in the bill, it would go further than that and might involve a windfall.

Mr. DENT. Yes, and it would go further. I say that the gentleman is right in that assumption.

Furthermore, you must remember that the entire cotton content imported into the United States is less than 8 percent of the American consumption of cotton content products or textiles. Therefore, if it is only 8 percent of the total U.S. consumption, how can you justify giving a so-called equity of $42.50 on 8 million bales to American textile maker? The impact upon his production and sales in American is 8 percent of his total sales.

Now, I am not one who believes in imports. If I thought this bill would close the door to imports, I would be the first to vote for it, and every person here knows that. But it will not, because the cotton content of a shirt is less than 4 ounces of cotton. So the cotton content makes no difference when you are paying $2.15 an hour average wage in South Carolina and are paying 15 cents as an average wage in Hong Kong and Japan. The question of equity here has to be based on four factors. I would vote for a bill that would undertake setting up a factor of wages, a factor of raw material, a factor of taxes, and a factor of services where the costs are mandated by law. If you do that, you put your industry in competition not only here but all over the world. Until you do that, do not do it this way, piecemeal, because the cotton States will suffer the most. Those of us who are your friends are telling you frankly this is unsound. It will hurt you when you have to come back to the House within a year or so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We are told—whether accurately or not I do not know—that if this inequity is eliminated and our mills are authorized and able to purchase cotton at the same price as foreign mills purchase cotton then we will substantially increase the use of cotton here at home. That will benefit the cotton farmer and it will benefit the cotton textile man and it will benefit everybody including the consumer. All of this will bring down the price to the consumer to the extent of about $500 million a year. That is what the record shows.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I respect you and respect what you are trying to do, but let me tell you something. While all other commodities in the United States increased in volume from 1947 to 1962 by 50 percent in production and use, the textiles in the United States diminished by 2 percent. The textile industry is the victim of its own advancement as well as the advancement of manmade fibers. When they started to product shrinkproof materials and started to Sanforize cotton and make cotton so that it lasted longer and a housewife could buy a cotton dress for a dollar and throw it into a washing machine instead of having five dresses that she had to scrub and scrub away on and scrub them into the sewers, that is what caused the decline in textiles. This is a national decline. There is an increase in the foreign countries because they do not have washing machines and they do not have detergents and other washing materials and do not have our processes for making cotton so durable.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment would have the effect of tightening up on the possible abuse of the direct payments to mills under the provisions of this bill. The latest quotation I have seen on the price of Middling inch upland U.S. cotton at London, for example, was somewhere around 27 cents a pound and not the 24 cents a pound price at which I presume the differential payment or trade incentive payment could be computed under the definition which appears in lines 12 to 17, page 2, of this bill.

I just discussed the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie], who spoke a few minutes earlier. I believe I speak for him in stating that he is definitely in support of the Jones amendment, and I join him in urging my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the high privilege of being a member of the Committee on Agriculture, but I have followed this problem very closely for a great many years. There is not a bale of cotton produced in my district, and there is not a textile mill located in any of the areas that I represent, but I have worked for many years on our trade agreements program and I have been one who has recognized this inequity which exists as a result of the laws enacted by the Congress. As a matter of fact, I headed a subcommittee which went to Japan about 4 or 5 years ago. We met with the Japanese textile industry for about a week. We discussed these problems in the friendliest fashion possible. A year or so ago when we considered the passage of the new Trade Agreements Act, the cotton textile people came before us and pointed out what was obviously an inequity. They then went to the Tariff Commission and filed a complaint there, and the Tariff Commission said that there was an inequity but that it was created by law and could not be solved by a tariff.

Obviously there is an inequity. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] had to say. The textile industry is a great variety of industries. It is not limited to cotton. The synthetic fiber industry is fast moving into the textile industry. The synthetic trade is moving ahead of the normal cotton fiber phase of the industry, which is falling behind, as everybody knows.

Mr. Chairman, I am the last person on earth to say that this is a perfect bill. I know that all of the bills that come before this body lack perfection, as everybody else knows. But I do know that a sincere effort has been made to perfect a bill. I do know that this bill has one primary objective and only one primary objective and that is to correct the inequity, namely: the price differential that an American mill has to pay as compared to someone operating a mill in England or in Tokyo or in Hong Kong.

Mr. Chairman, I am a great admirer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I listened to his remarks here earlier today with great interest. He and I usually have been on different sides of the export-import trade question. The only exception I would take to what he had to say was in connection with support for this bill. I know that the labor people in the textile industry are supporting the bill because they are fast losing their jobs.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana. I think this amendment should be defeated. This bill was carefully considered by the committee. It represents a majority viewpoint of the members of the committee who carefully considered it over many days and many weeks. I think it would be a mistake to start amending it now in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. I notice it has been bandied around here that I, for some reason or other, intimated that there has not been a loss of jobs and that unions are not for this legislation. Certainly they are for it. They were for the trade bill. But that does not mean that I have to follow exactly everything that any union labor leader wants or what every farmer wants, or anybody else wants. I do want to say that in the publication of October 26, 1961, from the press of Indianhead Mills, Inc., Mr. James E. Robison—a person whom I do not know—takes exception to the gentleman's remarks when the gentleman suggested that the textile industry has been increasing. From 1947 to 1961 industrial production in the United States increased 50 percent while textile production declined by 2 percent. Employment was 1,325,000 in the textile industry in 1947 and employment now is 940,000.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed?

Mr. DENT. Yes, you may.

Mr. BOGGS. The facts are that the textile industry employs a great many people in New England, and in the southeastern part of the United States. There is not a single person in my congressional district who is employed in the textile industry.

What this bill is designed to do, if it has any merit at all, is to correct the differential that exists. One does not have to be an economist to understand this problem. An American mill goes out to buy a bale of cotton and that American mill has got to pay *x* number of cents for that bale of cotton more than does the Japanese mill.

The gentleman made some point a moment ago in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] that we should not take into account shipping costs and all the other things that go into the movement of cotton. But, if we did not look at this thing on an overall basis, then we would have to go into the whole competitive situation between the American cotton industry and, let us say, the Hong Kong cotton industry. As all of us know, the wage differential, the fringe benefits and all of the rest of these items are quite different in Hong Kong as compared to the situation in Massachusetts, North Carolina, or Georgia, or some other place in the United States.

As I understand the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones], what he seeks to do is to strike out the language on page 2, beginning at line 12 which, in effect, says in modifying the definition of "inequity," that it should not be in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export.

If we strike that out, what it really means is that there will be no requirement to equalize this inequity.

I say, Mr. Chairman, if there be an inequity—and there is one—and if we are going to legislate in the field, let us face up to it realistically and recognize the inequity and try to do something about it.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, one other point: This cotton is paid in kind, cotton in storage costing the taxpayers money to store it.

The idea that these payments are made out of the Treasury of the United States is just not so.

I say, in conclusion, that this is a long way from a perfect bill. But it is a step in the right direction. By the time this bill has been passed by the other body and has been perfected in conference between the two bodies, I think we will have taken a step in preserving the great American textile industry, and I think we should do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that some of those who go over to Japan to frequently would talk to the Japanese about some of the facts of life in this country. They should be told that we cannot forever absorb their imports at the cost of jobs for American workers and damage to our industries.

Mr. Chairman, I recall, after World War II, how this country moved into Japan. We gave the Japanese modern equipment. We sent technicians to teach them how to use this modern knitting and textile equipment. We loaned them some $1.8 billion. About a year and a half ago that loan was settled and we got back somewhere around $470 million in full payment for a billion-800-and-some-odd-million-dollar handout.

There is only one way that we are ever going to cure situations of this kind, not only for the cotton people but for the raw materials producers and processors of this country, and that is to somehow or other get out of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] who has just addressed you is a member, a tariff that represents the differential in the costs of production as between foreign producers and American producers.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a chicken war with the European Common Market. It has not yet been settled, and we are on the way to taking another shellacking from the Common Market nations.

A blue ribbon U.S. Commission was established and it reported there was $46 million worth of damage to American producers by virtue of the loss of the poultry market because the Common Market virtually tripled its tariff on our frozen poultry.

Incidentally, Arkansas, the home State of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is one of the largest poultry producing States in the United States. Then U.S. and foreign negotiators got busy and the other day we were told the $46 million damage has been reduced to $26 million. Somehow or other, overnight, the damage to American producers shrunk to $26 million.

This is but one example, Mr. Chairman, of how we are getting whipped all over the world. In South America they expropriate our property, the American-owned telephone company in Brazil, for instance. Sure, the Brazilian Government is going to pay for it, and pay more than the telephone company was worth. But how are they going to pay for it? With the dollars we dump in through various forms of foreign aid. They expropriate American investments, then we give them a soft loan that will never be paid, or we give them foreign aid in outright dollar grants. In other words, they use our tax dollars to pay for their larceny.

How long are we going to continue with this fleecing of American taxpayers for such purposes?

This bill is but another device for victimizing the American people for the benefit of a few. American textile manufacturers, according to the sponsors of this bill, are being damaged by foreign textile imports. So the answer is easy, as this bill provides—simply raid the U.S. Treasury and compensate the textile corporations for the damage they allegedly sustain.

Well, what do you propose to do for all others—farmers, processors, manufacturers, and labor—who are also hurt by the importation of low-cost foreign products? How many billions will it take to compensate all those who are being damaged on the same basis?

In the debate yesterday, it was stated that President Johnson supports this legislation. He is also being touted in the newspapers these days as being an advocate of frugality and economy. If it is frugality and economy to advocate spending an additional $600 million on the cotton program, with a substantial part of this money going as a windfall to the textile corporations, then I do not know the meaning of the words frugality and economy.

We are witnessing an attempt to put the raw materials producers on a world price level. The only sane answer is to get back immediately to tariffs—tariff schedules that represent the differential in the costs of production of foreign and domestic products.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to stand in the well today, coming as I do from New England, and speak against this bill. However, I feel I have no alternative. As a Member of the House for some 5 years, and having taken the well of the House on many, many occasions against subsidies and the principle of subsidies, I cannot see how I can, in good conscience, vote for a triple subsidy in this bill. We must vote with our conscience, whether it affects our own backyard or not. We must rise above politics.

In questioning the tone and intent of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I am questioning mainly the serious and continuing problems of subsidies which go against the grain of the American democratic system.

And yet many of my colleagues, who are concerned with the increased spending on countless issues, are saying that this is not a subsidy program, and that it is a sensible solution to a serious problem.

We cannot fool anyone in this country, Mr. Chairman, with this program, a so-called panacea to abolish two-price cotton which will increase the agriculture expenditures in this one commodity from the $500 million level to the $775 million, at a subsidy cost of $283 million a year.

It is quite possible, as the gentlemen from California [Mr. Leggett], who serves on the Committee on Agriculture said in a letter to his colleagues, to "oppose this measure not because I am not interested in a healthy cotton industry, but because I wish to see this industry expand and prosper in a healthy way."

First, Mr. Chairman, how ridiculous can this problem of subsidies become? Here we see the evolution of a three-barreled subsidy to, first, the farmer, second, the importer and, third, the manufacturer.

Instead of pouring money into a situation that will not improve at the termination of this act, this Congress has had the time and the talent to look into the serious problem and arrive at a better solution than this.

Instead, by injecting a philosophy of supply management, so odious to the American farmer, the Congress would, by the passage of this bill, continue to damage the laws of supply and demand and by doing so, damage agriculture more than the natural and terrifying forces of nature ever could.

We are, in effect, admitting that the subsidy program has been a failure and we are attempting to correct that failure by still another error in judgment.

This reminds me of the old golf pro in Massachusetts who guaranteed that he could cure anyone's slice, which he did. Everyone began to hook.

And like the damaging hook, Mr. Chairman, this bill is out of bounds.

One of the strangest features, it seems to me, is the kind of handout it provides to an area of our country that has been responsible for pilfering many of our textile industries in New England.

All of these things considered, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that Congress will pride itself on the passage of this legislation at a time when we should be considering issues of a national and world importance.

At a time when we should be national, we are being sectional. At a time when we should be united, we are splitting ourselves apart on a piece of legislation that, upon deep reflection, rips through our free competitive system. It should not be supported by anyone who has any concern for the tightening of our fiscal system at a time when spending is getting out of hand.

Mr. Chairman, a colleague from New England said yesterday he could not understand for the life of him why anyone from New England could not vote for this bill. I bleed for the textile industry; however, it was not two-price cotton that came in and stole the textile industry from New England. It was the South. It was the cheap labor in the South, the sweatshop conditions, the tax inducements, and the lack of fringe benefits. These were the causes that took our textile industries from New England to "greener pastures" in the South. Now you want us to bail out the South so that they can finish the job and take what remaining industries we now have—but not with my vote.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 102, noes 90.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. ABERNETHY as tellers.

The committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 122.

So the amendment was agreed to.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEVEN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute to H.R. 6196 offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' at the beginning of the first paragraph and adding the following:

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10 million annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

"'(c) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103(a), shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton. The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton; *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop'."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether or not the document just read is offered as a substitute for the first section or as a substitute for the whole bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). It is offered as a substitute for the entire bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. COOLEY. That the bill has not been read and a substitute is not in order to the bill until it has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is attempting to offer it at this time for the reason that if the first section is stricken he may take subsequent action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is offering it at this time and if the first section is stricken he may subsequently move to strike out the remaining sections as they are read.

The gentleman from Iowa may move to strike out section 1 at this point and insert new language. If that motion is adopted he then may move as the remaining sections are read to strike them from the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit, while I do not disagree with the statement of the Chairman, I am looking at the situation as it is. Previously I requested unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, but objection was made to that request. Then we adopted the Jones amendment on page 2, line 12. The rest of the bill has not been read and I say the gentleman is out of order in offering a substitute until we finish reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Technically the gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Iowa may offer an amendment at this time to strike out section 1.

Mr. COOLEY. But he has not offered an amendment to that effect. I am not talking about what he may do hereafter, but up to this time he has made no such offer, and therefore my point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair at this time is indicating what the gentleman from Iowa should do.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. He has indicated that three times, but he has not done it yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] will be required to change the language presently offered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do I understand that it is not in order to offer a substitute to the bill as such until the entire bill has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is not so. The gentleman must first move to strike out section 1 of the bill and insert the language he has offered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will it also be necessary to move to strike all of the succeeding sections?

The CHAIRMAN. It will, if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is responding to a parliamentary inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. COOLEY. May we ask what the parliamentary inquiry is?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is inquiring as to how he should proceed.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Chair that the gentleman is proceeding according to information which he had received.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa could offer his amendment at the conclusion of the reading of the entire bill as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman be recognized for that purpose at the proper time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Then I shall defer action until that time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my request that the remainder of the bill be considered as having been read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill follows:

SEC. 2. Section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section also shall be applicable to payments provided for under section 348 of this title."

SEC. 3. Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. In carrying out this special research program, the Secretary is authorized to utilize not to exceed $10,000,000 annually of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

"(b) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

SEC. 4. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 per centum of the current loan rate for such cotton under section 103(a) plus reasonable carrying charges:"

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(b) For the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops of cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may provide to cooperators price support on not to exceed fifteen bales (standard five hundred pounds gross weight) of the production from their allotments at a level up to 10 per centum in excess of the basic level of price support established under subsection (a) hereof but not in excess of the level of price support for the 1963 crop.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to keep cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, if the level of price support to cooperators for the 1964, 1965, or 1966 crop is increased under subsection (b), price support for cotton at the level established under subsection (b) shall be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (b) and sale of such cotton at the support price therefor under subsection (a) or similar operations, including loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of the amount for which the cotton would be redeemable if the loan thereon had been made at the support price for such cotton under subsection (a)."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEVEN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN: Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' at the beginning of the first paragraph and adding the following:

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.

"'(c) In establishing the level of price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton beginning with the 1965 crop of such cotton, the Secretary, notwithstanding the provisions of section 103(a), shall make such reductions in the price support level as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton. The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton: *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop.'"

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The reading of the amendment was not very clear. But permit me to ask a question: Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment or substitute to eliminate the whole bill, except the research provisions, and then to insert the McIntire amendment?

Mr. HOEVEN. Exactly. This incorporates the McIntire amendment and the research section of the bill before us and eliminates everything else.

Mr. COOLEY. Everything else. All right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it was said on this floor a while ago that this was the last chance to enact cotton legislation. I do not think there is ever a last chance. My substitute gives you a chance to do something about it. Several people from the Cotton Belt have confided in me, that the answer to their problem is the reduction of price supports for cotton. I wish they would practice what they preach by supporting my substitute.

My substitute would amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to change the operation of the cotton price support law.

It is identical to the price support language of the bill with the amendment which may be offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] if my substitute fails. It is also identical to the language on research contained in the committee amendment to the bill.

The effect of the substitute would be to delete from the bill all provisions dealing with payments, including both trade incentive payments to cotton processors and simultaneous purchase and sale payments on the first 15 bales. It would also delete from the bill provisions dealing with CCC release prices and overplanting of allotments at the world price.

The purpose of my substitute is to require the Secretary to make adjustments in cotton price supports starting in 1964. It would set a maximum support price of 30 cents a pound in 1964, 29½ cents a pound in 1965, and 29 cents a pound in 1966. Thereafter supports would be related to production cost research.

It would achieve these results:

First. It would cut the cost of the present cotton program substantially. Since the current support price is 32½ cents, it would save taxpayers 2½ cents a pound in the first year, 3 cents a pound in the second year, and 3½ cents a pound in the third year on every pound of cotton acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program.

According to the Department of Agriculture, CCC took title to 4,744,000 bales of the 1962 cotton crop on August 1, 1963. On August 1, 1962, CCC took title to 3,246,000 bales from the 1961 crop. For the last 2 years, therefore, CCC has taken title to an average of about 4 million bales.

Assuming a drop of 2½ cents a pound or $12.50 per bale next year under my substitute along with a drop of 3 cents a pound or $15 a bale the following year and a drop of 3½ cents a pound or $17.50 a bale in the third year, we can forecast substantial savings to taxpayers.

Based on a 4 million bale takeover by CCC, taxpayers would save $50 million the first year, $60 million the second year, and $70 million the third year below the cost of the present program under my substitute.

It would also cut the present cost of the export subsidy. At a 5 million bale export level, this alone would amount to a $62.5 million savings next year, $75 million the following year, and $87.5 million during the third year.

Second. It would eliminate the proposed "trade incentive" payments which the Department of Agriculture assigns a gross cost of $283.5 million next year, $259.9 million the second year, and $236.2 million the third year under H.R. 6196 as reported to the House.

Third. It would eliminate the "simultaneous purchase and sale" provisions of the bill which the Department of Agriculture estimates would be $61.7 million the first year, $73.7 million the second year, and $72.5 million the third year.

Fourth. It would make cotton available to mills at 2½ cents a pound cheaper next year than at present, 3 cents a pound cheaper the following year, and 3½ cents a pound cheaper the third year. While it would not eliminate completely the present two-price structure for cotton, it would make a long step toward that goal.

Fifth. It would relate future cuts in cotton price supports to the results of an intensified research effort. My substitute authorizes the annual expenditure of $10 million per year for this purpose.

Sixth. It does not change the Secretary's authority under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase cotton acreage as expansion in the use of cotton occurs.

Seventh. It protects the income of cotton farmers by gradually lowering price supports rather than by dropping them abruptly. Even though the support price would be lower, the individual farmer would be growing more cotton in the future, thus maintaining his income.

Eighth. It also would be in the interest of consumers of cotton who would be able to purchase cotton goods made from raw cotton costing the textile mills from 2½ to 3½ cents a pound less.

Ninth. It would begin to close the competitive gap between cotton and manmade fibers. This gap must ultimately be closed or at least substantially narrowed someday if cotton is ever going to be economically justified as a source for fabrics.

My substitute, Mr. Chairman, is, of course, not the total answer to every segment of the cotton industry. But, I submit, neither is H.R. 6196 as reported to the House. My substitute, however, represents a balancing of the equities between the public treasury, the income of cotton farmers, the welfare of the textile industry, the competitive realities of manmade fibers and the interest of consumers.

It is in accord with the spirit of the Agricultural Act of 1958 which passed this House with bipartisan support and I sincerely urge its adoption today as a realistic alternative to either doing nothing or adopting the committee bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we set aside this day of debate for the purpose of considering methods of equalizing the inequity which has so long existed between the American mills and the foreign mills.

I am delighted that the ranking minority member of our committee is pleased with my handiwork, because his research section is a word-for-word copy of the section I offered and put into the bill in committee. I am delighted he approves of it. Still, I regret that he should have overlooked entirely or he has deliberately abandoned every effort to bring about an equalization on behalf of the American mills.

Of course you have had no opportunity to read his so-called substitute amendment, but he simply strikes out a large part of the bill and keeps the research section that I have put in the bill, and adds the McIntire amendment which the committee has agreed to accept and that is all there is in it. The research section I think is good, and I am committed to the support of the McIntire amendment, as are a great many Members of the House. But we did not come here to pass a research bill, much as we need research. We have not worked a year and more simply to bring to you an amendment to lower the support price on cotton. I want every one of you from the South to understand that this substitute would lower the support price on cotton, lower it by some 3.5 cents without any compensating increase in your market.

I think that if we can increase our markets, if we can expand the uses of cotton, it is perfectly logical to say that we may be able to take a somewhat less price for it, because if you are able to sell 100 bales of cotton instead of 50 you can afford to sell it at something less. But the Hoeven substitute does not offer you one single new outlet for cotton, not one bale increase in the consumption of cotton, but it does lower the price your farmers would get—not 2 or 3 percent but close to 15 percent.

I ask my friends from industry how many of you could stand a cut in wages of 15 percent? That is what the Hoeven amendment does to the cotton farmer.

What does it do to the cotton worker in the mills? It takes his job away from him because it does not make cotton available at a price which will enable American cotton to compete with either foreign textiles or domestic synthetics. Every cent we lower the price to the mills must, under this Hoeven substitute, come out of the farmer. Every penny by which this substitute would reduce costs to the mills must come out of the farmer's hide.

What does it do for the consumer? The committee has brought you a bill which the Secretary of Commerce has said will effect a saving to the consumer of at least $2 for every $1 we spend. But this substitute offers you no such opportunity. It offers nothing to the farmer but still lower prices. It offers nothing to the mills but what it takes out of the hide of the farmer. It offers nothing to the consumer except the infinitesimal drop which might come out of the farmers' already inadequate income.

Should we consider here at this late hour something that was not suggested in the committee, something that has not been considered by industry, producers, or consumers, something on which hearings have not been held, or should we consider the legislation which the committee has worked on for a full year?

There have been few pieces of legislation which have come before this House which have had more full consideration than this has. I urge the Members of the House, regardless of your interest, whether it be that of the farmer, the mill man, mill worker, or the consumer, to defeat this substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, in a moment a chart will be brought into the Chamber which will set forth the value of payments to mills that are authorized in the bill now before us.

There has been some discussion today as to whether this really is a mill subsidy bill.

The question is—Who would get the payments?

Here are some typical answers and I invite your attention to this chart.

Burlington Mills, for example, would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $16,500,000 a year.

Stevens Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $13,500,000 a year.

Springs Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $11,250,000 a year.

Dan River Mills would be authorized to receive $9 million a year.

West Point Mills would be authorized to receive payments worth up to $7 million a year.

And, of course, other mills would be represented by the same typical figures, based on their use of cotton—the mills that would get the payments. You can say that they do not get a subsidy, but they certainly get these multimillion-dollar payments.

The Hoeven substitute would get rid of this nonsense. It would take it completely out of the bill. It would also eliminate this nonsense of simultaneous purchase and resale of cotton, a premium to the farmer himself. That too does not belong in this legislation.

The Hoeven substitute would get the cotton program back on the right track—the same track built by the Agricultural Act of 1958. An act which intended a gradual reduction of price supports, accompanied by an increase in acreage limits as demand for the lower priced cotton rose.

The act of 1958 reached a final vote in the other body on July 25, 1958. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date the name of U.S. Senator Johnson of Texas—now the President of the United States—is listed as voting "yea."

At that time he was majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

The then Senator Johnson helped to steer this legislation to final passage.

The Agricultural Act of 1958, containing the cotton program, was cited by the Senator from Texas as one of the "most important achievements" of the 85th Congress.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 15, page 19453, the then Senator from Texas was quoted as saying:

> I believe this Congress rose to great heights.

I am placing in the RECORD some of of our most important achievements. On page 19493 of the same date, the gentleman enumerated these achievements, including a detailed review of the Agricultural Act of 1958.

The President of the United States is thus on record in behalf of the approach to the farm problem set forth in the Hoeven substitute. In his message to a joint session of the Congress just last week, the President urged "thrift and frugality."

The Hoeven substitute is an example of thrift and frugality, and no doubt that is one of the reasons for President Johnson's support of the Agricultural Act of 1958 when he was in the other body. The bill before us is not an example of "thrift and frugality." It is an example of waste and lavish spending.

We can all give President Johnson a resounding vote of confidence by supporting the Hoeven substitute, because we thus endorse and reestablish the same approach to the cotton problem President Johnson then advocated as a U.S. Senator and majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Using these charts and interpreting the charts, does it not actually mean that these domestic mills have been paying that many more million dollars than the foreign mills have been paying for the same kind of cotton?

Mr. FINDLEY. No, not at all, due to shipping. In fact, the latest quotation, as I have mentioned earlier today, on the Middling inch upland U.S. cotton in the London market, the same basic item we are talking about today—the latest quotation I have seen—is over 27 cents a pound. The bill before us now would authorize up to 8.5 cents, which is partly taken care of by the simultaneous purchase and resale gimmick and partly by the trade incentive gimmick.

Mr. COOLEY. You are not using 27 cents but are only using about 24 cents.

Mr. FINDLEY. If you will repeat your question, I will come back to it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not that chart indicate clearly the burden being borne by the domestic industry and the number of millions of dollars listed on that chart.

Mr. FINDLEY. It does not accurately set forth the burden.

Mr. COOLEY. What does that chart mean, then, if it does not show that?

**Mr. FINDLEY.** It represents the big payments, the subsidies, the multimillion-dollar payments that textile mills will get under this bill.

**Mr. JONAS.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I thought the figures on this chart reflect the true situation, I would not support this bill myself. I think the chart is misleading and that the so-called subsidies to domestic mills will not occur. My colleague from North Carolina pointed out the actual situation when he said these so-called subsidies more accurately reflect the degree of discrimination against domestic mills since the two-price system began.

What the chart fails to show is that we are currently subsidizing foreign cotton mills to the extent of from $150 to $200 million a year. Instead of subsidizing domestic mills, this bill simply makes it possible for our own mills to receive the same kind of treatment we give their competition abroad.

May I bring this debate back to proper perspective. The substitute offered by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], does not even touch the serious problem involved here. It would not take one bale of cotton out of storage. It only applies to future crops.

My friends, you must remember that this Government owns today, stored in warehouses around the country, nearly 10 million bales of cotton, for which the American taxpayers paid $1.5 billion. Now what are you going to do with that cotton if this bill does not pass and if you do not make it possible for the American mills to begin using some of it at the world price ? You cannot eat it.

It is one agricultural commodity that is not edible. That $1.5 billion worth of cotton is not worth 5 cents unless some cotton mill spins it into cloth or yarn. The only customers for this cotton are the cotton mills at home and abroad. In the sale of this cotton, are you going to continue to discriminate against the domestic American mills upon whose successful operation 10 million American citizens depend for a livelihood? Are you going to continue to subsidize foreign competitors for our mills? If you do that with 10 million bales, do you know what the subsidy will be? Nearly a half of a billion dollars in export subsidy, which will further put out of balance the competitive situation between our mills and foreign mills.

There are only three alternatives. There are only three ways in which we can get rid of this 10 million bales of cotton. We can continue to export it with the current subsidy of $42.50 a bale and thereby perpetuate the discrimination which now exists and which this bill would undertake to try to correct. I call your attention to the fact that we are in a declining trend with regard to exports, anyway, even with the heavy 8.5-cent subsidy. Last May the Department of Agriculture testified before the committee that up to that time in this marketing year only 3,059,333 bales had been registered for export as against more than 4,350,000 during the preceding year. So our cotton exports declined more than a million bales in just 1 year—even with the heavy subsidy. Even if we can push our annual exports up to 5 million bales again, we will be paying out $212 million a year for the sole benefit of foreign competitors of our cotton mills who furnish employment to our own citizens. This is an actual subsidy to foreigners but the opponents of this bill never refer to that.

Second, we can give some of it away under the aid program, or sell it abroad under Public Law 480 for unredeemable currencies. Or we can make some of it available to our own mills at the price we sell it abroad, and I do not call that a subsidy but simple justice to a domestic industry and to millions of American citizens who make their living from it.

**Mr. HAGEN of California.** Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this substitute amendment, and I wish to address myself to my Democratic colleagues. I think if this amendment carries we might well predict that we can write off the South as a voting area for any Democratic presidential candidate we might have, because this amendment knocks the price support for cotton down to 29 cents without any compensating feature.

The bill that we have written recognized the realities of cotton production in the South. They have some inefficient producers. They have some very small producers. Although our bill basically provides for a reduction of price supports it eases the blow with respect to those who produce 15 bales or less and has certain political values, believe me, to the Democratic Party. We in California could well accept the Hoeven amendment. In fact, a great majority of my farmers would be perfectly willing to abolish all price supports. I want to say that it ill behooves anyone to get up here who supports high price supports on rice, high price supports on wheat, on corn, on dairy products and complain about the price support levels on cotton and the equalization payment feature of this bill, because, believe me, it is not the most expensive farm program that we have. But it is an extremely valuable farm program. Cotton annually earns about $750 million in foreign exchange to help in the balance-of-payments problem. It supports a vast manufacturing industry which relates directly to such cities as New York, Boston, Los Angeles, and other areas all over the United States. It supports machinery, fertilizer, and many other industries all over the United States. It is not just the welfare of the cotton growers that is involved here or the welfare of a few spinning mills in the South. It is the welfare of a much broader industry which is represented in almost all of the areas of the country and specifically in the New England States and in the garment centers around the country.

This is a very delicate mechanism that the committee has put together. It recognizes some of the political realities in the cotton situation as well as the economic realities.

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

**Mr. HAGEN of California.** Certainly.

**Mr. ALBERT.** Of course, the Hoeven amendment would really cut the heart out of this bill, so far as the inequity which the present law has created is concerned. But the bill as we now have it before us will do everything the Hoeven amendment seeks to do and also cure the inequity.

**Mr. HAGEN of California.** The distinguished gentleman is correct. In other words, what the Hoeven amendment would do is reduce the price support to the farmer without any of the other necessary provisions of the Cooley bill. The mills would receive some advantage, but not enough advantage to eliminate or to substantially diminish the inequity which they suffer now in competition with foreign mills. So this is a rather perfect device that we have put together here.

We in California would like to see some special proviso in there to correct inequities which we feel exist in the cotton law. But we realize the political reality of the situation and we cannot get them except for the rather limited overplant privilege contained in it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of the Members to vote against this substitute amendment and not upset this delicate compromise which is contained in this bill and which has been arrived at after a year of deliberation.

I want to say that as far as the timing of this legislation is concerned I am not an illiberal Democrat. This bill was read for floor action and it was scheduled for such action before our late great President died, President Kennedy. It has been kicking around the House of Representatives since July.

Mr. Chairman, its immediate passage is a matter of urgency because the mills do not know what the price of cotton is going to be and there has been a lot of uncertainty in the cotton trade because of the failure to act on this legislation.

**Mr. SHORT.** Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have very much cotton acreage in my State. So my interest in this bill is a little bit remote, perhaps, but it is very deep because I happen to represent one of the most agricultural States in the Nation. I am also a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I would like to be a part of enacting some farm legislation that will finally, at long last, make sense and get to the root of the real farm problem.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Iowa has offered would make a reasonably good bill out of a bill that, in my opinion, is nothing more or less than bad legislation. I say that the bill before us is bad legislation because it provides for an expensive means of continuing a program of cotton price supports which has been responsible for getting the cotton industry into the trouble about which we have heard so much these last 2 days.

Mr. Chairman, little has been said during the debate so far to identify the fact that the reason for the trouble is that the Secretary of Agriculture has insisted upon maintaining a price-support level that is a few cents per pound above the cost of synthetics and above the world price of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to adjust this inequity. I have not heard anyone deny that on this floor during this debate.

Now, I am a farmer. I have a sympathy for farmers. But I have little faith in the ability of Congress to improve the economic lot of farmers. We have been trying for some 30 years and yet we find today that agriculture, partially at least, according to the statistics, is a depressed portion of our economy. The important part of this picture of adversity for agriculture is that it is the small farmer who is still experiencing adversity.

It is too often overlooked that the benefits for our farm program accrue to the larger farmers rather than the small. A price support that is a limited benefit to a little farmer is a windfall to the bigger one. We should keep this in mind: that 39 percent of the farmers of America produce 89 percent of the total agricultural production of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to start recognizing some distinction in size of farm operations if we are ever going to really get to the root of the farm problem, and I would be the last to deny that there was not one.

The Cooley bill makes a gesture at recognizing the small farmer. The fact that this bill provides special attention for the first 15 bales has not been identified here, but it is the first 15 bales of the cotton of every farmer, big or small, that they produce. If we want to get to the root of this problem of the small farmer, then apply this special consideration to the first 15 bales of the farmer who does not produce more than 15 bales of cotton.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may not be popular with farmers. I suppose the words I am saying now are not going to be popular in my district, either, because they are going to be interpreted that I am in favor of lower price supports. I think the time has come when we have to recognize the simple fact that we have to have our agricultural commodities move at prices that would permit them to move, in world trade, and in our domestic trade.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am sure the gentleman will recall that when I addressed the committee awhile ago, I read parts of a letter from the Farmers' Union stating that they were opposed to this bill. The Farmers' Union has always been in favor of high price supports and apparently they now realize that high supports did not solve the cotton problem. Of course, they also have other valid objections to this bad bill.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of that fact. I reiterate here that the two largest farm organizations in America are opposed to this bill. The Farm Bureau has opposed the bill and the Farmers' Union has written to all Members of Congress on yesterday stating they are opposed to the passage of this bill. I do not know how you can make it any clearer that the farmers are not in favor of this legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the debate on the bill that is before us, I was tempted many times to take the floor today and point out some other factors that I did not think were being stressed fully. I have not yet done so, however, I hope to do so now. At this time I point out a number of reasons why I think the Congress should turn down the present substitute bill which would reduce income to the cotton farmer about $15 to $20 per bale. I asked for the additional time so that I might review with you some of the background in connection with the necessity for agricultural programs and some of the reasons for some of the things which have been discussed, all of which lead to the need for us to do something in connection with cotton and cotton production. As much as many would like to do so, we know if we are to continue to produce cotton, we must see it is used.

At the outset, the original farm legislation provided supports so as to maintain the purchasing power of those engaged in agriculture, recognizing that was the greatest market that the industry of America had. We had then and now have minimum wage laws; we have the bargaining power of labor unions, the right of industry to mark up. In the great depression the drop in purchasing power of American agriculture, in my opinion, was the beginning of the depression in that they did not have the purchasing power to buy what industry produced. We know what this country went through at that time. Every State and nearly every person was "broke." Then it was that the Congress provided price supports for various and sundry farm commodities, all to provide a fair purchasing power. There was a difference in the law in the case of perishable commodities, since an oversupply of perishable commodities would decay or rot and not be in the way of next year's crop; and storable commodities, such as a bale of cotton, which will keep for 50 years and be in its original condition.

I would like for some of my friends who have spoken here today to realize that they too have price supports. Those in the beef cattle business say they get no subsidy, that they do not have any price support. May I say, you certainly do. You have the best kind, because yours is in the form of price supports on grains and feed.

The next best price system I am aware of is that for perishable commodities, where more than 50 percent of the 30 percent of import duties, the so-called section 32 funds, are set aside to buy up the surplus in order to balance supply and demand; then the producer gets his price at the marketplace. All these programs are based on the necessity of maintaining a proper balance between agriculture, industry and labor, by maintaining the greatest customer of industry, which is agriculture.

The original cotton law provided for a processing tax which was levied on users of synthetics as well as cotton, with the proceeds then used to maintain farm purchasing power and income. However, the Supreme Court held that law unconstitutional on the ground you could not levy a tax for a special group.

If that law had been reenacted so as to provide that such tax be paid into the Treasury and used as a justification for appropriation, as in our sugar program, I believe it would have been held constitutional.

However, when the law failed, and when the new laws were written, the synthetics manufacturers were left out from under the provisions of the law. Then cotton had price supports but there were no price supports on synthetics; synthetics manufacturers have been able to undercut cotton prices, and cotton's share of the domestic textile market has constantly gone down. Many cotton producers believe the Cooley bill will help to regain a greater percentage of the domestic market.

As to this, time will tell. Certainly we need to follow the course of this measure to be sure it does what its title says—I quote: "A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton to maintain income of cotton producers, and so forth." We hope research will do the job, though I know it is slow.

May I point out again that always our Government surpluses could be sold in the world market for whatever price it would bring. For many years our Government held U.S. cotton off world markets while building up foreign production. None of that is required by law. The payment of a subsidy is not required. The law authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell anything in the world it has for anything in the world it will bring. What we have is losses, but mechanically we have at times used the subsidy approach.

Many of my colleagues from the sugar-producing area think they have no interest in price supports. May I say you do, for you have a processing tax that is levied and you divide it among the sugar producers. The wool producers think they have no interest in this matter. To you I say you have a real Brannan plan; but may I say, you are dependent upon the support of Congress to keep the program. Another major reason we are in this predicament is that under section 22 of the basic law, the Agricultural Act, it was provided that the Government could prohibit the import of any foreign commodities, or finished goods, or tax them if such imports jeopardized our domestic farm program. Under the policy followed by our Government for the last few years, under both parties, the right of keeping these goods out has not been fully exercised; and imports of cotton goods have greatly increased. Whatever the reasons, section 22 has not been fully used and all these goods are coming back into this country.

To tell you another thing which has not been stressed here, I want you to know that Congress has been more fair than might appear. Congress, through the Department of Agriculture, has paid the domestic mills money to the point where that part of the cotton the domestic mills exported in world trade has been bought at the world price. Do not tell me it has not. It has and is.

These are some of the reasons the Cooley bill is before you. The cotton people, as a group, have come up with the idea that sooner or later they have to be competitive with synthetic fibers, or they cannot maintain the use of American cotton—which is essential if we are to produce cotton. Also, they know they have to live in an economy where we have high costs. The Cooley bill hopes to give help until such time as research can lower the cost of production, cotton can attain a competitive position with the synthetic fiber, and save the Government lots of money.

The Hoeven substitute, which I oppose, would simply reduce the farmer's price—right now $15 or $20 a bale, leave the farmer with all of his costs, reduce his income, and give no help while efforts are made to reduce costs.

The Hoeven bill would wreck the economy of the Cotton Belt and seriously hurt the national economy.

So I say again, the American producer is trying to cooperate, trying through research to get where he can produce cotton cheaper, trying by research to get his cost of production down to where he can compete with synthetics pricewise. He says he will go along with the proposed Cooley bill, if you will go along with the provisions to help out with this adjustment during the period when he tries, through research, to reduce costs. I hope they are right, though again, I know research results are slow to come.

I do recognize that we are up against the Hoeven amendment of cutting prices to farmers $15 to $20 per bale if we don't do something. So far as the Cooley bill is concerned, I have a number of reservations, as I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] does. However, when the producers take this upon themselves it is time this Congress helped them and not come in here as the gentleman from Iowa would do, and whack $20 a bale out of farm income in a period when it is as hard as can be just to meet the cost of production.

Again I say, there are no "holier than thou's" in the field of agriculture. There are price supports in every direction you can imagine. There are price supports on perishables. There are price supports on beef. And there are price supports on all the rest of these commodities, all made necessary by other laws.

But here, for once, you have a group that recognizes its problems and says, If you help us over a period of 4 or 5 years, we will try to work our problems out so we can compete and keep cotton from going into the hands of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann], a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, when we were holding these hearings on January 30, 1963, I suggested to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings], that we should include pertinent information in the record. The discussion yesterday and today has proven that this information should have been included in the record and not try to sweep it under the rug.

My questions were: What will the 10 largest producers receive under this program?

What will the 10 largest handlers receive under this program?

What will the 10 largest mills receive under this program?

The chairman asked me to defer, and through the kindness of the chairmen, the subcommittee chairman and the committee chairman, all through the hearings in permitting my many questions of the witnesses, I deferred. I am from Nebraska, ladies and gentlemen, and I knew little about cotton as of December 13, 1962, I knew little about cotton legislation except that I wore and what I might purchase—at that time I suggested to the gentlemen on the committee, I would be glad to help in the cotton problem if you will bear with me, I needed to know many things.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman Gathings, very kindly gave me this freedom and I asked the questions. And I appreciate the kindness of the committee chairmen; every question I asked was answered but this one.

The question was, What will these people receive if this type of bill is passed?

Further than that, the discussion between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], vice chairman of the committee, and Mr. Murphy, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, was on the points discussed here today. What is the rate inequity? How are you going to satisfy the inequity? We spent the whole morning on that one subject. How are you going to handle this inequity?

We never decided it in the committee. It was taken out of the bill because we could not decide it in the committee.

I withdrew my questions on these subjects but they have come back to haunt you today.

I withdrew my questions at the request of the subcommittee chairman after I said, "Agriculture has a public relations problem to consider. I just do not want to see it injured."

My point was, if that information on amounts had been in the Record, you would not have had the problem you have had in the last 2 days.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings] said:

> I think you are doing more to injure the program in the questions you have asked there than anything conceivable.

In deference to my chairman, I said:

> I withdraw my question.

I say it was a mistake not to include it in the hearings. You would not have had all this fight today. Everyone who came before the committee said: "We do not want this subsidy."

The producers did not want it. The handlers did not want it. The mills did not want it.

Then just who wants it?

The National Cotton Advisory Committee was far from unanimous in their recommendation of this legislation. So, if the producers do not want it and the handlers do not want it and the mills do not want it, what are we fighting about? Right now we are fighting to force the poor Secretary of Agriculture to make a determination that the committee would not decide.

I would like to show you a little newspaper. This is the China Mail, established 1845. This is the late final edition of Thursday, November 15, 1962. This is in the record of the hearings on page 60. Now, this is in the record, too. The gentleman from South Carolina came before our committee, and I asked him if he agreed with the gentleman from North Carolina, where the front page headline says, "Now that the textile dispute has been settled you can look forward to a great expansion of exports to the United States."

This was Secretary Hodges' message of hope for Hong Kong.

> Hong Kong can look forward to a great expansion of her exports to the United States now that the textile dispute has been settled, Mr. Luther M. Hodges, the American Secretary of Commerce, said before his departure today.
>
> He said that the United States is an extremely favorable market for the Colony and there is no ill feeling against "made in Hong Kong" products.
>
> His advice for Hong Kong manufacturers was to devote more effort and money to research.
>
> He said industries here should not limit themselves to any particular products or market.
>
> He described the bustle and activity he saw in Hong Kong as "fantastic."
>
> The mental attitude of the people in Hong Kong is excellent, he said. He believed that people in Hong Kong generally wanted free trade.
>
> He said the textile dispute between Hong Kong and the United States created some misunderstanding in both countries.
>
> But this, he said, had been cleared up and future trading patterns would follow orderly arrangements under the long-term Geneva agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

**Mr. BEERMANN.** Now look at your hole card. Those of you who voted for the Trade Expansion Act. I know this bill is fulfilling a promise to help you out, but you are getting doublecrossed by your own Secretary of Commerce.

On page 103 of the hearings a gentleman testified before the committee and he said, "cotton is being punished for a crime it did not commit. The crime is simply being overpriced."

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you the Hoeven substitute gets about as close to the bill that the Committee on Agriculture was close to agreement on before the Secretary of Agriculture announced the support price for this year. When he announced that support price it threw cotton legislation into a cocked hat in the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask you to support the Hoeven substitute and let us get on with the business of helping the people in cotton out of their dilemma.

I yield back the balance of my time.

**Mr. POAGE.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we agree on a limitation of time. This thing could go on way into the night unless we do. We will be about an hour or two speaking on this amendment at the rate at which they are now rising. I ask unanimous consent that we agree to close debate on this amendment at 4 o'clock.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

**Mr. HOSMER.** Mr. Chairman, I object.

**Mr. POAGE.** Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close at 4 o'clock.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The motion was agreed to.

**Mr. SNYDER.** Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the gentleman to propose that all debate on this amendment close at 4 o'clock, and I understood the Chair to say "this amendment and all amendments thereto."

**The CHAIRMAN.** That is correct.

**Mr. SNYDER.** Which is it?

**The CHAIRMAN.** "And all amendments thereto" is the way the Chair put it: "This amendment and all amendments thereto" is the way the Chair put the question.

**Mr. SNYDER.** Then, a further parliamentary inquiry. In the event this amendment would pass, would this preclude any further amendments to the bill?

**The CHAIRMAN.** It would not.

**Mr. HALLECK.** Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The gentleman will state it.

**Mr. HALLECK.** Mr. Chairman, I understood the Chairman to say that if the substitute were adopted there could be still further amendments. I am inquiring whether or not under the rules of the House if the substitute were adopted the Committee would not immediately rise.

**The CHAIRMAN.** There could be further amendments only in the event the substitute were voted down.

**Mr. HALLECK.** I thank the Chairman.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

**Mr. KYL.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

**The CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Mr. Chairman, no one would deny that, as the result of Federal programs, an inequity is borne by the textile mills of the United States. The Hoeven substitute would ease this inequity to the tune of 3½ cents a pound on cotton which would bring things far better into line than they are today, and get us on the right track.

Concerning my source of information for my mill subsidy chart, I have in my hand letters from each of the mills involved stating how much is used by each. The figures on the chart are computed on the basis of payments authorized as a result of the McIntire amendment, which would vary between 5 and 6 cents a pound over a 3-year period. The figures are computed carefully and they are accurate. They have been on the public record for over a month without any challenge. They authorize multimillion-dollar payments to textile mills.

Can anyone give me a guarantee that even one dime of these multimillion-dollar payments will be translated into the form of lower prices for the consumer? He cannot give such a guarantee. Can anyone give me a guarantee that even one dime of these multimillion-dollar payments will be translated into the form of bigger payrolls and higher payrolls and higher wages for the employees of the textile mills? Of course not.

Are you prepared to make the same sort of multimillion-dollar payments to the manmade fiber industry? After all, the pepole who make dacron, nylon, rayon, are American citizens, too. If you vote for this bill you are voting to require those American citizens as taxpayers to help finance their own competition. Is this your idea of justice? I do not see how anyone in good conscience could vote for a bill which would retain the multimillion-dollar subsidies or payments that are set forth accurately on this chart.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] for 1½ minutes.

**Mr. QUIE.** Mr. Chairman, before we agree to support this bill or oppose the Hoeven amendment, I think the Members of the House ought to consider what would happen if every other commodity that was in the same plight as cotton received the same kind of treatment as proposed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is pretty well agreed that this will mean something like $600 million over a 3-year period additional cost to the taxpayers if this cotton bill goes through. Let us just consider two other commodities that are in the same plight, wheat and butter. If wheat received the same kind of treatment, at least another $300 million a year would have to be added to the taxpayers' expense, or $900 million in a period of 3 years.

If butter received the same kind of treatment, with a 15-cent-a-pound reduction in price, this will mean $360 million a year, or $1,080 million in the 3-year period, making a grand total for just three commodities, then, rather than just cotton, of $2.6 billion at the end of 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to bring equity to American agriculture, and equity is what we are talking about, look at what it is going to cost us. Think of this before you support this kind of a program, because we set precedents here. If we give it to cotton, think what it will mean to the dairy farmer, because the dairy interests are represented all over the country rather than just a small part of the country as is the case with cotton.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] for 1½ minutes.

**Mr. HOSMER.** Mr. Chairman, the shaky structure of cotton subsidies should be razed rather than reconstructed as attempted by the kind of illogical and inadequate patchwork bill we have before us at this time.

This bill is not going to be of any help with respect to imports, because the cost of cotton is such a small fraction of the reimported textiles' cost in relation to the cheap labor overseas, that nothing is going to be changed pricewise of sufficient significance to have any effect upon the export-import problem.

But let us assume for a moment that the contrary would be true. Even under that assumption the bill is going to be of no help to reduce the cotton stockpile because exports will be reduced in direct proportion to increases in domestic consumption. Moreover, it is going to be of no help to the general economy because whatever increased use of cotton, if any, is going to come out of the chemical fiber producers of America and hurt that sector of the American economy in direct proportion to any help it gives the natural fiber sector.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, with reference to these mills which are listed over here on the chart, over which there have been considerable tears shed for their financial prospects, I just took a look at the Wall Street Journal file maintained outside the Chamber in the Speaker's lobby, and the first on the list is Burlington Industries. Its stock during this year has risen from 25⅞ on the New York Stock Exchange to 42, a rise of 62 percent.

Stevens stock has experienced a 23-percent rise in price on the stock exchange. Dan River Mills has had a 27-percent jump. I could not find the other two mills listed.

Mr. Chairman, the brutal truth is that we have too much cotton in this country because too many people are growing too much of it.

They are growing too much because the domestic price levels are artificially high, which incidentally keeps U.S. cotton blocked from natural access to world markets.

The further brutal truth is that these artificial price levels are maintained because legislation passed by this Congress makes it possible and because the Secretary of Agriculture lacks the political courage to reduce support levels, which he has the power to do.

The cotton mess will plague us, drain the Federal Treasury and pile up the national debt until this Congress has the courage and wisdom to drop this artificial, illogical, and fallacious business of crop props.

As a starter I urge passage of the Hoeven amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. **GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. **HOEVEN.** Mr. Chairman, all I want to do is to sum up the situation. From the standpoint of economy in Government this bill will cost $635 million more than the present cotton program over the period of 3 years.

Those who are talking about economy in Government should take heed. This bill also provides for back-door spending to which a lot of us have been opposed.

This bill would embrace the so-called Brannan plan of production payments. This would establish a dangerous precedent which is going to haunt you when other segments of agriculture demand similar relief. You will likely be confronted by similar requests from the dairy industry, from the cattle feeders of this country, and from other segments in our agricultural economy. Once we have opened the door, we are going to have to afford similar relief to everyone of our agricultural industries that gets into trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee will review the objections as I see them, and that you will then vote for my substitute. It simply eliminates all of the controversial sections of the bill; lowers the price support over a 3-year period to 30 cents the first year, 29½ cents the second year and 29 cents the third year and provides for a comprehensive research for cotton. If you really want to do something for the cotton industry you will vote for my substitute.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. **WATSON.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. **McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ABERNETHY.** I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. **McCORMACK.** Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment would have a very disadvantageous effect on a very important segment of American industry, an industry that everyone knows is entitled to equity and justice, and as everyone knows is placed in a very disadvantageous position by reason of the international situation where people abroad can buy cotton at 8.5 cents less than it is sold to American industry. If ever there was a cause for justice, it is this bill. The pending amendment would cut its heart out so far as justice is concerned, and I hope the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be defeated.

Mr. **ABERNETHY.** Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished Speaker for his remarks. He most accurately stated the situation and it is along the same line that I intended to address my remarks. Our distinguished Speaker has stated the situation so much better than I could and I trust the Members will heed his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would not be here if it were not for the inequities, the existence of which no one has challenged. This bill has not been brought to the floor because of the research provision which it contains. This is merely an incidental amendment added to the bill. That is one section of Mr. HOEVEN's substitute. Neither was this measure brought here because of the McIntire amendment, the substance of which is the second provision in the Hoeven substitute. This is another incidental item. Neither of these incidental items deal with the problem which brought the bill out of committee and to this body.

The bill is here because of certain inequities, the existence of which no one has challenged. The Hoeven amendment just puts us up to the issue a bit sooner and, to my judgment, a bit too early. If you want to vote down the bill without even hearing any more of its merits, if you feel you have had enough, and the time has come to vote the bill down, then the thing for you to do is to vote for the Hoeven substitute because it completely eliminates the provision of the bill which inspired the hearings and brought this issue to the floor of the House. The situation is just that simple.

I hope this Committee and all Members present who are interested in having the issues fully debated will afford the members of our committee that opportunity. As of the moment that is all we ask. Then if you feel the bill has merit you can vote it up. If you do not feel it has merit, you can vote it down. I hope you will vote down the Hoeven amendment because to vote it up means the end of the bill and the perpetuation of the inequity which the bill is designed to correct.

I respectfully ask you to vote down the Hoeven amendment and accord us the privilege of discussing the issues and the merits in an orderly fashion.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. **BALDWIN.** Mr. Chairman, I represent 450,000 cotton users and consumers. They are entitled to have their views heard. The implication of the arguments against the Hoeven substitute is that the only way to correct the existing inequity is to establish a third subsidy in the field of cotton.

There is another way to correct this inequity. That is to lower cotton price supports until they are no higher than the world price and the cost of transportation to the mills overseas who are buying our cotton. If we lower price supports to where they are equivalent to the world price plus the freight rate overseas, then we would eliminate the inequity that now exists. If we take this course to eliminate the inequity we are not putting a new inequity on the U.S. taxpayers. For this reason the Hoeven substitute has merit, and should be adopted.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

(By unanimous consent Mr. McINTIRE yielded his time to Mr. BROCK.)

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. **BROCK.** Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of us on this side, at least, would object to the principle sought in the Hoeven amendment. I think what we now must do, though, is to look at the real impact of this amendment if adopted by this House. I do not see how we can adopt it for one simple reason.

You talk about a basic problem. The basic problem is the price support which forces a false price on American cotton and requires the American manufacturer to pay 8.5 cents a pound more than any other manufacturer. It is not only 8.5 cents a pound more than the Japanese manufacturer but 8.5 cents a pound more than the manufacturer of a competing fabric, of synthetics such as rayon and nylon. This is the problem. The problem is not with imports but with synthetics, which have tripled the impact of cotton imports.

The effect of this amendment would be simply to say we are going to reduce the support price, but what happens while that reduction is going on? You eliminate your cotton market by changing your machines over to synthetics. When you get through with reducing the support prices you have solved your problem, yes, but how? By eliminating the market for cotton. That is the end result of the Hoeven amendment. This is the problem we face if we adopt this substitute proposal. I do not think it is proper or workable. I think it is going to result in the elimination of thousands of jobs in American industry. I do not think we can afford that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that there is bipartisan recognition of the seriousness of the problem confronting the cotton economy and that both sides of the aisle see the need for legislation. I deeply regret, however, that there is disagreement over the extent of the action the situation demands. While the substitute being offered here would deal with part of the problem, it is inadequate. Certainly, I oppose this substitute and I urge that the integrity of the original proposal with the amendment to lower price supports progressively be adopted.

Too much time has gone by already. If this substitute is accepted, it will be an admission that there is still more time available to deal adequately with the problem. In my opinion, this is not the case. I only wish it were.

The equalization features are the very heart of this bill, and they represent the only sound hope of putting American cotton back on its feet.

As I have said before, markets, and only markets, are the key to this whole question. It will not do any good to reduce price supports over the long term, or reduce growing costs by the research program, if the markets for cotton textiles have been wiped out in the meantime. What good will it do to initiate a program for lowering raw cotton prices over a 3-year period unless we insure that there will be cotton textile markets left for farmers to sell to? We have got to provide a way now for cotton prices to be competitive.

The equalization features of this bill are the answer. If we continue to force American mills to pay more for cotton than their foreign competitors, American cotton products will continue to be priced out of the American market.

Gradually lowering price supports over 3 years, and gradually lowering production costs with a research program, while a step in right direction, simply will not give the help needed. We have got to get back these markets for cotton textiles. And we have got to get them back now. Three years more of the present situation, and the American cotton industry will just be something for historians to use as an illustration of the Federal Government's power to destroy.

Over the past 2 years, cotton has suffered a direct competitive loss to other fibers in the amount of 20 percent. Also over the past 2 years, imports of cotton in the form of textiles have increased 56 percent. Over the past 5 years, thousands of textile jobs have been wiped out. This ought to be warning enough to all that the approach taken in this substitute is not enough.

Now, some might say that this is too bad, but that it really is not the Federal Government's job to help cotton out of its problem. Well, gentlemen, I say that it is the Federal Government's job to help cotton out, because it was the Federal Government that got cotton into this mess in the first place.

Statistics indicate a fantastic loss in markets over just the past 2 years. So far this year, indications are that market losses are going to be even greater during 1963. If we wait more years, as this substitute suggests, it is simply going to be too late.

In this debate, much has been said about the inroads of synthetic fibers. Today the price squeeze the cotton textile industry suffers has caused it to turn to synthetics on a massive scale. This is a fact of business life. The synthetics are cheaper. However, they are not available. Production capacity cannot fill the orders for synthetics. Certainly, the synthetic fiber industry is watching closely what we do today. If we do not act to assure a market for cotton in our domestic mills now, the course synthetics manufacturers will take is obvious. Plant expansion can be expected immediately to fill the orders which capacity operations now cannot fill.

There is no mystery about this. There has been too much talk here about "windfalls" to the cotton mills. The plain fact is that price competition is going to prevail. If cotton mills are denied cotton at competitive prices now, those strong, wealthy enough to survive, will look to synthetics. Others will seek out foreign supplies of yarns. Can there be any doubt that the declining market for cotton will be aggravated? Is there any doubt what economic damage will result in a vast section of this country? Is there any doubt that emergency relief measures costing far more than the additional cost of this bill may have to be considered here?

It is obvious that the cotton surpluses we are piling up now cannot be sold without expanded markets. If we could dispose of them, the opposition to using these surpluses to expand those markets might be valid. But the facts are otherwise.

Cotton surpluses have increased over the past 2 years from 1.5 to 8.2 million bales and exports have dropped from 6.6 to 3.4 million bales. We obviously cannot sell surplus cotton on the world market as fast as the CCC is acquiring it, and we are losing our market at home because of the support price. Well, how are we ever going to get rid of this cotton? The answer is—to create markets for it. How do we create markets for it? By making it competitive. And how do we make it competitive? By making it available to our mills at a competitive price. And how do we make it available to our domestic mills at a competitive price? Only by rejecting this substitute.

I do not want to see "too little and too late" carved as the epitaph on the tombstone of the cotton economy. I urge that this substitute be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POAGE yielded his time to Mr. COOLEY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some question about the standing of the AFL–CIO on this legislation. Here is a telegram I have received from William Pollock, general president, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO:

> Have just been informed that there is some doubt that the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, favors H.R. 6196, the Cooley cotton bill. This is to inform you that as general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, we are 100 percent for this bill with the McIntire amendment.

In concluding the debate on this amendment, I want to give the House some figures. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] sounded off here in very eloquent fashion about this bill. He hopes that we will lose sight of the fact that his commodities, wheat, and dairy products, have resulted in losses as follows: On wheat the taxpayers of America have lost $10,931 million. Last year out of every dollar received by the wheatgrowers the taxpayers paid 75 cents. Dairy products cost $3,351 million. For the two of them, you and your producers have cost the taxpayers $14,282 million. I want to repeat that when the cotton program was taken over by the Eisenhower administration we had a profit of $268 million. Now we have substantial losses. We lost substantially last year.

We are told this bill is going to cost $600 million. That is not true. The cotton program is going to cost a substantial amount of money whether we pass this bill or not. But in 1964 it will only cost $118 million more. Furthermore, we are told it will save for consumers $500 million a year.

The next year it will only cost $87.9 million.

The next year it will only cost $44.3 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, on this vote I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed Mr. HOEVEN and Mr. ABERNETHY as tellers.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 184.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 3, line 3, after the period, strike out the sentence down to and including line 6 and insert: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, after line 3 insert:

"SEC. 6. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

" '(1) The following new sections are added to the Act:

" 'SEC. 349. If the national acreage allotment established under section 344(a) for the years 1964, 1965, or 1966 exceeds 17 million acres (exclusive of the national acreage reserve established under section 344(b)), the amount of such acreage allotment in excess of 17 million acres shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this part, be allotted as follows: One-half of such excess shall be allotted pursuant to the provisions of section 344. The remaining half of such excess shall, subject to the provisions of this section and section 350, be allotted by the Secretary as export market acreage directly to farms eligible to receive allotments under the provisions of section 350 to the extent that he determines that such allotments will not increase the carryover of cotton at the beginning of the marketing year for the next succeeding crop above the carryover on the same date one year earlier, except that no farm may receive an allotment of export market acreage in excess of 20 per centum of the acreage allotment for the farm established under the provisions of section 344. Any acreage available for allotment as export market acreage which the Secretary determines will not be used shall be allotted pursuant to the provisions of section 344. Any acreage allotted to a farm as export market acreage and planted to cotton shall be in addition to the county or State acreage allotments and shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Notice of the maximum export acreage for a farm shall be included in the notices of farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The provisions of this section shall not apply to extra long staple cotton.

" 'SEC. 350. The producers on any farm on which there is export market acreage or the purchasers of cotton produced thereon shall, under regulations issued by the Secretary, furnish a bond or other undertaking prescribed by the Secretary providing for the exportation, without benefit of any Government cotton export subsidy and within such period of time as the Secretary may specify, of a quantity of cotton equal to the actual production of the export market acreage as determined pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary. The bond or other undertaking given pursuant to this section shall provide that, upon failure to comply with the terms and conditions thereof, the person furnishing such bond or other undertaking shall be liable for liquidated damages in an amount which the Secretary determines and specifies in such undertaking will approximate the export subsidy on such quantity of cotton. The Secretary may, in lieu of the furnishing of a bond or other undertaking, provide for the payment of an amount equal to that which would be payable as liquidated damages under such bond or other undertaking. If such bond or other undertaking is not furnished, or if payment in lieu thereof is not made as provided herein, at such time and in the manner required by regulations of the Secretary, or if the acreage planted to cotton on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of section 344 by more than the maximum export market acreage, the farm acreage allotment shall be the acreage so established under section 344. Amounts collected by the Secretary under this section shall be remitted to the Commodity Credit Corporation and used by the Corporation to defray costs of encouraging export sales of cotton under section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended.

" '(2) Section 376 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This section also shall be applicable to liquidated damages provided for pursuant to section 350 of this title." ' "

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 5, lines 7 to 25, and page 6, lines 1 to 10:

"Amend section 349 in subsection (1) of section 6 of the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 349. If the national acreage allotment established under section 344(a) of the Act for the years 1964, 1965, or 1966 exceeds sixteen million acres (exclusive of the national acreage reserve established under section 344(b) of the Act), the amount of such acreage allotment in excess of sixteen million acres shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this part, be allotted as follows: The first five hundred thousand acres of such excess shall, subject to the provisions of this section and section 350 of the Act, be allotted by the Secretary as export market acreage directly to farms eligible to receive allotments under the provisions of section 344 of the Act; any remaining acreage in excess of sixteen million, five hundred thousand acres of the national acreage allotment shall be allotted one-half pursuant to the provisions of section 344 of the Act and one-half shall be allotted as export market acreage in the same manner as the first five hundred thousand acres of export market acreage: *Provided*, That no farm may receive an allotment of export market acreage in excess of the per centum prescribed by the Secretary for the crop year of the acreage allotment for the farm established under the provisions of section 344 of the Act. In allocating export market acreage, the Secretary shall estimate the amount which would be planted on farms and establish a percentage, hereinafter referred to as the maximum export market acreage (not exceeding the per centum prescribed by the Secretary under the proviso in the preceding sentence), of the farm acreage allotment established under section 344 of the Act reasonably expected to result in planting of an acreage equal to the export market acreage available for the crop year. Any acreage allotted to a farm as export market acreage and planted to cotton shall be in addition to the county and State acreage allotments and shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments. Notice of the maximum export acreage for each farm shall be included in the notices of farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas issued pursuant to section 362 of the Act. The provisions of this section shall not apply to extra long staple cotton."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In reality is not the gentleman's language offered as a substitute for the committee amendment?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is offered as a substitute for a part of the committee amendment and therefore it had to be offered as an amendment to the entire committee amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the gentleman will yield further, what part of the committee amendment does the gentleman leave in?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We are leaving in section 350. I cannot yield any further. I have to have time in which to explain my amendment, and I can explain it to the members of the Committee very briefly.

The committee in its consideration of this bill recognized that there were many cotton producers throughout the United States in many States who wanted to produce additional acres badly enough that they were willing to produce it without any subsidy. In other words, the export acres which are provided for in the amendment—the committee amendment—in section 349, the export acres mean that the farmer who grows those export acres would pay the Government 8½ cents a pound, or the total amount of any export subsidy for the privilege of growing cotton.

However, under this bill—this committee amendment—the export acres could not go into effect until the national cotton allotment reached 17 million acres.

Under the present law there is a limitation that the national allotment cannot go below 16 million acres.

Last year every cotton producer in America was supposed to receive an 11-percent reduction in acres. With the 11-percent reduction in acres, we are producing this year one-half million bales more of cotton than we produced last year.

Under the provisions of the present law we will produce on 16 million acres of national allotment next year.

Now, the effect of this amendment that I have offered is merely this, and the members of the Committee can understand it this way: Under my amendment we will not produce on the 1 million acres of cotton between the 16 million acres national allotment and a 17-million-acre national allotment, cotton that would be subsidized.

Under the committee amendment there would be a million acres of cotton which would be produced before the free or export acres could go into effect. That would cost the Government over $50 million in paying the subsidy on the cotton that would be produced on the million acres, between the minimum of 16 now and the 17 provided in this bill.

The only thing that this amendment of mine does is to permit the export acres to be grown without any cost to the Government. It does not add to the national allotment. It will not be used in figuring the future State, county or farm acreage allotment. It will only go to those people who say, "We can produce cotton at the world price, we are anxious to do it, and we are willing to pay 8.5 cents a pound to do it."

I would have preferred that it had gone in before this, but in compliance with the present law, the 16-million-acre minimum would be maintained, and the export acres would go into effect only when it was decided by the Secretary that 16 million acres could not produce the cotton needed.

There are many States that would take advantage of these export acres. Under the committee amendment during the 3 years that this bill will be in effect the committee amendment would be of no effect whatsoever because there is no one and I defy anyone on this floor to say there is any possibility at any time during the next 3 years we will have a national allotment of 17 million acres.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I merely wish to state that I offered this amendment in committee and it lost by a very close vote. I am heartily in favor of the gentleman's amendment, and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does agree it would save the Government at least $50 million?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I may say that I considered offering a lot of other amendments, but I am giving you an opportunity here to vote to save at least $50 million. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. At least there will be some saving of money, as the gentleman from Missouri indicated, $50 million. That will be helpful.

The chairman of the Agriculture Committee indicated that the dairy program and the wheat program cost money during the last few years. During this administration the cotton program cost money. The cotton program cost $545 million in 1961, $612 million in 1962, and for this year, 1963, according to the estimate of the Department of Agriculture, $550 million.

What should we do? Cut back the cost of the program? That might be a good idea. There is nothing in this bill that suggests it, and with the McIntire amendment the cost of this bill will increase the cost of the cotton program next year to $779.4 million. That is an increased cost—contrary to any sound program or unsound program offered in this Congress.

Will the chairman of the committee want to add to the cost of the dairy program for these last few years, and the wheat program for the last 3 years, to give them an identical program with the one proposed here for cotton, and paying a direct payment to the processor to bring their raw material price down to the world market price? You will find a fantastic increase in the cost to the taxpayers if you bring this equity into every commodity. So we come to this amendment which will surely save some money and permit the part of the country where they can produce cotton at the world price to do so.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I think the House ought to have all the facts about this amendment, particularly the background and the consideration which it had in committee. I do not mean my colleague from Missouri has concealed anything; probably he did not have time to cover the situation entirely. The situation needs some review and I shall give it to you.

The only reason this bill is before the House of Representatives is because of the inequity which we have heard repeated over and over today and yesterday. But for no other reason is this bill before us. The distribution of acreage and the subject of price support has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with the immediate problem.

As my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] indicated earlier today, we frequently have a very difficult time getting together in the Committee on Agriculture. The people down in my State where I represent a lot of the little 10-, 15-, and 20-acre cotton farmers, most of whom are poor people, had a special amendment, too. Like the pending amendment, it did not have a thing in the world to do with this inequity nor did it contribute anything to its solution. The people in Missouri had amendments to help their particular situation, some of which our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has presented today, the pending amendment being one of them. But none of these amendments contribute to a solution of the overall problem. Our friends in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, in fact all sections of the Cotton Belt had amendments they wanted to tack on. And mind you none of them had a thing to do with the problem of the inequity.

Everybody wanted something special, and they wanted to tack them on as riders to a bill that was designed to help everybody from one coast to the other, the mills, the trade, and the farmers of the Carolinas, Missouri, Louisiana, Arizona, and California, each and every other State in the Cotton Belt. It had become evident that because of these special and sectional amendments we would never get a bill. We were stalled on dead center.

On our side of the aisle all of us finally agreed to stand aside on our special gadgets and to waive amendments, that is, all except my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who has offered the pending amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not agree to waive amendments.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said the gentleman did not. He was the only one who did not.

Somebody asked yesterday, Why has this bill been so long getting here? This is one of the reasons. It was snagged in the committee for months and months all because so many members wanted to use it to get a little something special. Numerous members wanted a special coach on a train that was being run to help everyone. This brought about an impasse. So the bill remained locked in committee. Finally, as I say, everyone agreed to give up on special amendments, except our colleague from Missouri, with the hope that we could get the bill out, pass it and bring needed benefits to every segment of the cotton industry as well as the consumers.

And by the way, if these people who are so anxious to save money—I do not believe the amendment will save $50 million or 50 cents. It will not save anything. It will just bring about the production of some cotton that will replace other cotton, with the latter being forced into Government stocks. And incidentally, if my colleague's Missouri farmers wish to produce some cotton under a waiver of price supports there is nothing to prevent them from doing so now. They do not have to take supports.

In any event, we finally all agreed on a compromise on the provision wanted by the gentleman from Missouri and other members, that is, all agreed but the gentleman from Missouri. We drafted the compromise amendment and put it in the bill. The compromise was made known to the gentleman from Missouri. As I say, we put it in the bill and we have heard no more about this issue since until today. Everything has been quiet since the bill was reported out months ago. We had hoped and thought differences had been compromised enough to get this sorely needed legislation out, on the floor and passed.

Until about 2 years ago cotton farmers were allotted better than 18 million acres of cotton. The acreage was divided on a historical basis among all the States between the Carolinas and California, all in accordance with a fair formula written into the law. The yields were so high that acreage had to be cut. So the national allotment was dropped to 16 million acres, the statutory minimum. Every State allotment was proportionately reduced.

Operating for 2 years at a bare minimum, and suffering from the cuts in acreage, we were all looking forward to the day, and still look forward to same, when we would return to the 18-million-acre national allotment. We are looking forward to the time when our farmers, large and small, particularly the small ones, could plant their normal cotton acreages.

All of us have made our contributions to reducing the surplus by reducing our acreage. When and if the surplus is reduced then all of us should, in my judgment, share in the fruits thereof, that is, larger acreages for each farm, with every farm being treated alike in the increased allotments.

If we do get back to the normal plantings under an 18-million-acre allotment, then I think every farmer should share in it, share and share alike. That is not what the amendment of my friends is designed to do. Nobody will challenge that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will challenge it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Just a minute. I did not yield. So as matters rocked on we finally worked out a compromise in committee on the Jones amendment. We agreed that acreage up to 17 million would be allotted in the normal way, and the next million above that if the national allotment went that high would be divided 50-50 between those who wanted to produce cotton under the price support program and those who wanted to produce under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

If you are unable to follow this explanation, then to put it simply, we all agreed to meet the sponsor of the pending amendment halfway. Rather than stymie the bill, hold it in committee and do serious injury to the entire cotton industry, we agreed to this compromise.

We had been standing firm that this rather unusual proposal would not become operative until we returned to the old national allotment from which we had been cut. Our friend from Missouri was insisting that we begin with the first increased acre above the present 16-million-acre minimum. Our compromise met him halfway. How much fairer can one be?

Take a look at page 5. There you will find where we inserted the 17 million acres as the beginning point for the idea proposed by our colleague from Missouri. Instead of demanding that we wait until we reached the point of a return to the old national allotment of 18 million acres, which prevailed for so long, we said we will start at 17 million acres, we will go halfway with you.

That is all we ask you to do in urging you to vote down the Jones amendment. Let us compromise our differences, let each side go halfway. That is what the bill provides. What could be more fair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones]. My recollection is that a few years back we had a provision in the cotton legislation for an A and B program. This has some similarity in that it would provide for additional expansion of acreage, with the so-called export acreage and an equalization payment for the privilege of that export acreage?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would be similar to it except it goes much further because this way they are paying 8½ cents a pound for growing it and there is only a differential, I think, of some less than 4 cents a pound in the A and B program.

Mr. McINTIRE. Could the gentleman give us for the record some figures as to what the participation was in the A and B program?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you mean nationally?

Mr. McINTIRE. In your particular area. Was it quite substantial?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In some States it was. In our State I think something like 40 percent participated and took advantage of growing cotton at a cheaper price—yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. And the figures which you use as to the possible saving of $50 million was calculated on full participation?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No, the calculation was made because any production on a million acres of cotton at the present yield will produce cotton where the subsidy would amount to $50 million. That would be saved under this amendment.

Mr. McINTIRE. In the use of the term "export acreage" from a practical standpoint, this cotton would not necessarily be set aside physically for export; would it?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would not be set aside physically for export, but the payment would be made. It would be set aside as far as the processor is concerned and he would be paid 8½ cents a pound for it—yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri and I live right close together. Some of my constituents live in Arkansas and work land in Missouri, and some of his folks live in Missouri and work land in Arkansas. These are the very people who want an increased acreage. I would like an increased acreage for my people. It does not make any difference, as a matter of fact, how the vote goes on this Jones amendment because of the fact the Secretary of Agriculture is not going to go above 16,310,000 acres in the national acreage allotment until such time as this cotton moves into various channels, domestic and export, in much larger quantities than it has been moving.

But, in any event, just as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy] stated, it was a compromise because the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from California wanted to start at 16 million acres and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy] wanted to make the figure 18 million acres. Seventeen million acres was written into the bill as a starting point. When the national allotment exceeded that number of acres then the export acreage provision would go into effect.

But I want to say this to you. We grew 15,300,000 bales of cotton in the current year, as has been estimated. The estimated disappearance is 13.8.

We have grown 1.5 million more bales of cotton in the current year than we can dispose of. This is no time now to talk about an increased cotton acreage allotment for anyone.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not trying to say we are going to get any increase until we meet the disappearance? I feel myself we will not get it unless we have the disappearance.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. And whether your amendment is agreed to or not it makes very little difference, because until we move more cotton into the channels of trade the gentleman's amendment would not operate. I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and stand on what I said before.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few brief observations in the limited time I have at my disposal. First I want to agree with what has been said to the effect that this amendment was worked out in the committee with one compromise after the other being made. We composed our differences and agreed on this provision. The Gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] had his day in court, so to speak, in the committee. He was heard at great length, and the committee rejected his proposal.

To sum up I want to say the minimum of 16 million acres is now in the law. On that allotted number of acres we added this year to our surplus amount of cotton somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million bales. Now, every bale of cotton produced under the Jones theory and his program, even though they pay 8.5 cents or whatever it is as a penalty or premium to grow it—every bale of it will displace another bale of American cotton in foreign markets of the world. There is no way to get around it. How inconsistent can we be? Here we have a program on the one hand controlling production, at great cost, and then we come along on the other hand and permit his constituents to grow cotton and put it into Liverpool and all other ports of the world and take the place of some other bale of cotton grown here under the program of controls.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are not telling this House here that this amendment of mine would add 1 bale?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course it would.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would not add an acre to it.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the purpose for proposing it, then? You want to grow it for world markets. You say you can go ahead and grow it at world prices and sell it in the world markets and make a profit, but this is an inconsistent proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jones) there were—ayes 53, noes 112.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'INTIRE

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McIntire: On page 3, line 19, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following: "The level of price support for the 1964 crop of upland cotton shall be the national average support price which reflects 30 cents per pound for Middling inch. For 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton: *Provided*, That the maximum level of price support shall be the national average support price which reflects for Middling inch 29½ cents per pound for the 1965 crop and 29 cents per pound for the 1966 crop."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, the basic purpose of the amendment is to move in the direction of lower price supports for upland cotton.

The amendment in its present form would make three important changes in the upland cotton price support law:

### AMENDMENT IN NEXT CONGRESS

First. It would permanently repeal the Secretary's present discretionary authority to set upland cotton price supports from 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Second. It would establish a statutory ceiling on the level of price supports for the production in excess of 15 bales on upland cotton for the 1964, 1965, and 1966 crops. For the 1967 and subsequent crops during which trade incentive payments and the 15-bale provisions would not apply, a statutory ceiling would continue in effect unless changed by subsequent legislative action.

Third. Beginning with the 1965 crop, price supports could be lowered below the statutory ceilings under a cost of production formula reflecting the research efforts of the Department of Agriculture.

### 1. REPEAL OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY

First it would permanently repeal the Secretary's discretionary authority to set price supports at a level from 65 to 90 percent of parity. Although other provisions of H.R. 6196 would be temporary in nature—such as the "trade incentive payments" and the "simultaneous purchase and sale provision"—and would be authorized only through the 1966 crop, the price support provisions of the bill as amended by my amendment would be permanent law.

Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is the present statutory authority for cotton price supports. It provides as follows:

### PRICE SUPPORT FOR 1961 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS (COTTON)

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, price support to cooperators for each crop of upland cotton, beginning with the 1961 crop, for which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas shall be at such level not more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor nor less than the minimum level prescribed below as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act. For the 1961 crop the minimum level shall be 70 per centum of the parity price therefor, and for each subsequent crop the minimum level shall be 65 per centum of the parity price therefor. Price support in the case of noncooperators and in case marketing quotas are disapproved shall be as provided in section 101(d) (3) and (5). (7 U.S.C. 1444.)

Accordingly the Secretary has set the 1963 level of price support for the key grade Middling 1-inch cotton at 32.47 cents or 79 percent of parity.

Section 3 of H.R. 6196 states that the Secretary "notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, shall make reductions in price support levels as will reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

The amendment goes on to state that for 1965 and subsequent years, the level of price support shall be "the level in effect for the preceding crop adjusted as provided in this section to reflect reductions in the costs of producing cotton."

### 2. STATUTORY CEILING

Under the amendment the statutory ceiling for the "balance of the crop"—that is, the cotton produced in excess of 15 bales—would be as follows:

[Middling 1-inch, cents per pound]

| | |
|---|---|
| 1964 | 30 |
| 1965 | 29½ |
| 1966 | 29 |

For the 1967 and subsequent crops the statutory ceiling would be the lower of 29 cents or the level in effect for the 1966 crop.

The level of support is, of course, the key to both the cost of the program and the income of producers.

By lowering the level of support to 30 cents in 1964, the cost of acquiring surplus cotton and the export subsidy are both reduced by 2.47 cents. This saving would be offset by the cost of the trade incentive payments and the "bonus" payment made to 15-bale producers through the "simultaneous purchase and sale" device.

The Secretary could, under the bill, make these small grower payments at a level up to 10 percent above the support on the balance of the crop. In 1964 this could not exceed 2.47 cents—10 percent of 30 cents but not in excess of 1963 level of support; in 1965, 2.95 cents—10 percent of 29.5 cents; and in 1966, 2.9 cents—10 percent of 29 cents.

Under the bill the trade incentive payments would be equal to the export subsidy. Since the market structure is assumed to be 30 cents the export subsidy and the trade-incentive payment would be 6 cents—30 cents minus the assumed "world price" of 24 cents. In 1965 it would be 5½ cents—29½ cents minus 24 cents—and in 1966 it would be 5 cents—29 cents minus 24 cents.

For each 1-cent-per-pound reduction in level of price support cost of support will be reduced $45 million per year.

### 3. PRODUCTION COST RESEARCH

A separate provision of the bill, as well as the general authority of the Department, authorizes the establishment of a cotton research effort aimed at reducing production costs. Through extensive research by the Department, it is hoped that cotton production costs can be reduced, particularly in the area of insect damage—that is, the cotton boll weevil.

Under data now compiled by the Department it is hoped that if and when these research efforts begin to be effective the Secretary will accordingly reduce the level of support below the statutory ceilings.

### WHAT THE AMENDMENT DOES NOT DO

The amendment materially modifies the Secretary's discretion in setting upland price supports, trade incentive payments, small farm "simultaneous purchase and sale" payments, and export subsidies. It does not, however, delete any of these provisions from the bill.

The amendment would reduce the cost of the bill as reported by the committee if the Secretary were to exercise his discretion to set the levels of support at the maximum range. It is generally conceded, however, that the new program would be more expensive than the program in effect for the 1963 crop, although the amount is subject to argument.

The amendment deals only with price supports. It therefore makes no changes in the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions incorporated in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

In summary, this amendment would materially change the operation of the upland cotton price support law by replacing the present discretionary authority of the Secretary to set price supports under the parity formula with a new method under which statutory ceilings which would be lower than the present level of support could be further reduced in the event of future effective production cost research.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the membership of the House that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] proposed this amendment in committee. It was thoroughly considered and discussed.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine was adopted by the committee, and I, chairman of the committee, was directed by the committee to accept the McIntire amendment when it was offered by the gentleman from Maine, the author of the amendment.

I here and now announce to the membership of the House that pursuant to the direction of the House Committee on Agriculture I accept the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

I believe in high price supports, and high prices for agricultural commodities. In the past, when producers of such commodities have been willing to make necessary adjustments in production to bring production in line with reasonable consumer demands adjustment programs have been successful and have been accepted by producers, and I do not favor, and never have favored, high price supports with unlimited production of any agricultural commodity. I repeat that I am in favor of high price supports, I am in favor of adjustment programs, and I believe that producers should be willing to reduce production in an effort to bring supply in line with demand. I know that the McIntire amendment provides for a gradual reduction in price supports. Regardless of my own views, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, by direction of my committee, I must accept the gentleman's amendment.

After all, we must be realistic. We must realize that the cotton industry of America is in great and grave danger.

We must realize that American-grown cotton is competing with foreign-grown cotton.

American-grown cotton is competing with manmade fibers. And above all, we must understand that unless American cotton is made competitive with foreign-grown cotton and with manmade fibers, the cotton industry of America will suffer.

No industry in America has been burdened with such a burden as has been borne by the cotton industry of America.

This inequity between our domestic mills and foreign mills is unwarranted and intolerable.

All the evidence before our committee indicates that if American cotton is made more competitive with foreign-grown cotton and with manmade fibers our markets for cotton at home and abroad will be expanded and the cotton farmers of our country and every segment of the cotton industry will be benefited.

There are two magic words in all the languages of this earth—food, and raiment. In America we have an abundance of both food and fiber. Our warehouses are bulging. The cost of storage is great and unbearable: The pending bill provides for a payment "in kind" rather than in cash.

I know that the gentleman from Maine is a very sincere man. I know that he understands the problems involved in the proposals now under consideration.

So, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I accept the McIntire amendment.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said pro and con on the merits of this legislation. The fact is that the cotton manufacturer is paying a substantial part of this price for Federal policies—both domestic and foreign—for which he has no responsibility.

The editorial from the December 1 edition of the New Bedford Standard-Times which I will now read sheds light on several factors which have been misunderstood and I commend it to the attention of the House. I particularly commend that portion of the editorial dealing with the so-called McIntire amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this editorial is entitled "Fair Play for Cotton"—it could perhaps be referred to as fair play for the cotton manufacturer, the worker in the textile industry, and the allied industries using the goods they jointly produce. It will benefit, too, the consumers who will buy the finished products from American looms and the American garment industry.

### Fairplay for Cotton

> The U.S. House of Representatives is scheduled to act Tuesday on the so-called cotton subsidy bill. In so doing, it has an opportunity to correct a discriminatory situation that now penalizes American management and labor.
>
> The price of cotton since the 1930's has been Government-supported at artificially high levels. Since 1939, domestic mills have been unable to import foreign cotton in excess of 30,000 bales annually. This is less than 1 day's supply.
>
> Thus, U.S. mills cannot buy in the world market, but must purchase American cotton.
>
> Since 1956, however, U.S. cotton has been exported under a subsidy equal to the difference between our high Government-supported domestic price and the world price.
>
> Foreign mills, therefore, can purchase U.S. cotton at the world price, which is below the support price established by the Government for U.S. mills.
>
> At present, the difference between the world price and the Government support prices is 8½ cents a pound. This means foreign mills can buy U.S. cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper than U.S. mills can purchase it.
>
> What effect does this have?
>
> In 1955, the year before the export subsidy was enacted, the United States imported 300 million square yards of cotton goods. The figure now is 1,200 million square yards, and increases progressively each year.
>
> This is not entirely due to the lower price at which foreign mills may purchase their raw material, yet 8½ cents a pound—a 25-percent differential—is a substantial advantage. Without even figuring cheaper labor costs, it means that foreign mills can produce cotton goods competing with those of the United States at from 2 to 5 cents a yard cheaper.
>
> The pending bill would remove this inequity imposed by Government policies, by making cotton available to U.S. mills at the same price at which foreign producers can buy it.
>
> How would this be done?
>
> By utilizing the huge stockpile of cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, through payment in kind, rather than payment in cash. U.S. mills would pay to cotton distributors the world price; that is, the American support price less 8½ cents a pound. The distributor would get the difference between the support price and the world price in free cotton shipped to him by the CCC.
>
> Thus, this is not a subsidy to mills, but to the cotton market, just as is done with wheat and other items. The cotton distributor already receives this subsidy when he sells abroad; the pending bill simply expands an existing subsidy provision to include domestic, as well as foreign buyers.
>
> This legislation would do no more than give U.S. mills the same break as foreign mills. It would allow us to be competitive at least to the extent of raw material which, frankly, in terms of realistic economics, we should get cheaper than our foreign competition, because we grow it here.
>
> Representative McIntire, Republican, of Maine, has an amendment to this bill which ought to be passed, too. It provides for gradual reduction of the cotton support price. This is constructive; instead of continuing to pay an unrealistically high subsidy, the Government should gradually reduce the support price to the world price level. A provision in the bill for $10 million, to aid research aimed at growing cotton cheaper, might help in this direction.
>
> It is encouraging to learn that President Johnson looks with favor on this legislation, and the House ought to pass it, in the name of fairness to American business and American jobs.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I congratulate the gentleman on his usual scholarly approach. But I want to ask this question with respect to his amendment. These cost figures with reference to this bill that have been propagated in the sum of $661 million are inaccurate; is that not correct?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would agree with that. These figures which have been tossed around bear examination, because as far as cash outlay is concerned, this bill with the amendment that I am proposing in the first year would cost $118 million, the second year it would cost about $88 million, and the third year it would cost about $44 million. So, for the 3 years, if you put these figures together, would cost a total of those amounts.

But let me be fair and say that in making those statements I am not including the value or the cost of cotton which is to be used in payment in kind.

Mr. HAGEN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, also, is there not a possibility that once you get the price support down to the 29-cent figure, it would never go any higher in succeeding years? Perhaps that is a requirement of your amendment?

Mr. McINTIRE. It is a requirement of the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the evidence before our committee clearly indicate, if this amendment is adopted and this bill is enacted, that the result will be a saving to the consumers of America of approximately one-half billion dollars?

Mr. McINTIRE. This figure was used in the committee, and I have no basis for denying its accuracy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota would yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would this preclude a further amendment to the bill, debate on a further amendment to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No; this only applies to the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, many of the Members of the House have been opposed to the bill, as reported by the committee, but with the McIntire amendment they favor the bill.

I just want to point out to the Members of the House what the McIntire amendment does in relation to what the bill provided when it came out of the committee.

As the bill came out of the committee, the Secretary can set the price support at 29½ cents a pound for cotton and pay the subsidy on the first 15 bales. Seventy percent of the farmers that produce cotton in this country produce 15 bales of cotton or less. I understand that 94 percent of the farmers in North Carolina produce 15 bales or less.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture can set the price support at one-half cent below the McIntire amendment for next year and still do the same thing as the bill provides, keep the 32½ cents for the first 15 bales that are produced and then bring the price support down for the rest of the production to 29½ cents.

The McIntire amendment sets it at a half cent higher the first year than the bill already provides that the Secretary can do. It is also the same price that the Secretary can set it at in the second year, and in the third year he is required to set it at 29 cents with the McIntire amendment, half a cent less than the bill provided. So, that is it. You are paying one-half cent less the third year. I do not think that this saves much money at all.

I have no doubt but what the Secretary of Agriculture would set the price support at a low level as long as the little farmer could receive the 32½ cents on his first 15 bales, because of the philosophy which he has espoused for a long time. This is taken for granted that he would set support at the levels I have indicated.

So, I would expect that would happen. So this is really no savings, except one-half cent the third year.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Might it not be said, however, that this amendment which I propose does take the authority for setting the price support level out of the hands of the Secretary and vest it in the Congress in this legislation?

Mr. QUIE. That is right, the Congress under your amendment requires the Secretary to do by law what the bill previously gave him authority to do.

Mr. McINTIRE. Does it not meet the problem which the cotton industry has been confronted with? That is, it has been the decision of the Secretary to put price support levels up to 32.7. This does, in fact, set the direction of price supports more in a lowering scale. I think the gentleman will agree that is very constructive as far as the total problem is concerned.

Mr. QUIE. As with any commodity, if you give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make direct payments on any commodity to the farmers, he is going to set the loan level as low as he can and use the payments to the farmers to keep the supports at same rate. This has not solved anything.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Did the gentleman support the Hoeven substitute?

Mr. QUIE. The Hoeven substitute did not have the payment to the producer of the first 15 bales.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I understand that, but a part of the main thrust was to compel the Secretary to lower price supports, and that is what the McIntire amendment does.

Mr. QUIE. We have a little different situation. The Hoeven substitute compels them to comply with what 1958 intended to be the case. Under the bill now before us the Secretary would do the same thing that the McIntire amendment proposes. He would set it at a half cent lower the first year and half a cent higher the third year.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I am intrigued by the statement that the consumers would gain $500 million. We would be spending $250 million on the program, and the consumer would get $750 million back. Following that theory, if we provided enough money by the taxpayers the mills would get the cotton free and the consumers would gain a billion dollars. Why do we not go all the way and give them the cotton?

Mr. QUIE. Perhaps we could pay them to take the cotton and save the consumers $2 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to raise a question about the McIntire amendment, although the remarks of the preceding speaker may answer the question. My question is, and it is directed to the gentleman from Maine, does not section 5(b) remain in the bill H.R. 6196, regardless of your amendment?

Mr. McINTIRE. It does, indeed.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Does not that section provide that the Secretary of Agriculture himself may set price supports at a level 10 percent above the price supports in your amendment on 15-bale acreage?

Mr. McINTIRE. It does. My amendment does affect the price level on the 15-bale provision in the second and third year of the bill.

Mr. RYAN of New York. As I have calculated the effect of the McIntire amendment on the 15-bale producer, in 1964 there would be no change in the present price support level.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN of New York. In 1965 there would be a reduction in the present price support level of two-tenths of 1 cent, and in 1966 there would be a reduction of one-half cent. And the present price support for 1963 is 32.47.

Mr. McINTIRE. That is approximately correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: Page 2, line 5, strike out "persons other than".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "including" and insert "and shall also make to handlers and users".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment I offered in the agriculture committee. At one time this amendment carried by a vote of 19 to 16 in the committee. Then the next time it came up for reconsideration, it was rejected on a vote of 19 to 15.

What this amendment provides is that the direct payment shall go to the producers. We have heard talk for these 2 days as to who gets the direct payment. I think it ought to go to the producer, so it will be simple and clear as to who is receiving it. Right now there is really a triple subsidy. The farmer gets a price support up to 32.5 cents, the exporter gets 8.5 cents, and now you propose another subsidy for the textile mills.

If we would let the loan level be at the world market price, then let the Secretary of Agriculture give a payment to the farmer in addition to that to bring the price up to the support level, at the McIntire amendment's level of 30 cents, 29.5 cents, and 29 cents, then we would see what kind of agricultural program we have before us. It would be the least expensive way of operating the program and would be of benefit to the people who are supposed to be helped by an agricultural program, the farmers. The marketplace would be able to compete competatively. The mills would have assurance then. We would be able to solve something then. This would solve something, because the mills would have assurance that the loan level, the approximate price they have to pay, would be at the world market level, and we could adjust in the years to come the amount of payment we thought the farmer ought to have. So I think this will make the bill a much more workable program than it is at the present time.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Mr. Chairman, yesterday I inquired of the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if he could clarify what language was stricken from existing law by section 3, lines 22 and 23 on page 2 of the bill. The question was not clearly answered. As I understand the effect of the Ramseyer rule, as it applies to pages 24 and 25 of the committee report, the bracketed language strikes out the basic legislation on which the current feed grains program is based and would also reinstate the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to impose acreage controls in the feed grains area. This is of great concern to anyone who has feed grains in his district. We are entitled to know exactly what the legislative effect of this section is, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina or to anyone who can clarify this question. I am referring to section 105, which appears at the bottom of page 25 of the committee report, and which was subsequently amended four times.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN], a member of the committee.

**Mr. BEERMANN.** Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] so that this item can be cleared up.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. FINDLEY.** I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, the language stricken out was section 104, an obsolete or dead law so to speak which was not needed. The referendum referred to was held in 1958.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** The language includes section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which is part of section 104, as printed on the bottom of page 25. That is my point. Is section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 stricken from the law? If so, then feed grains are in a terrible predicament. We should know what the situation is.

**Mr. COOLEY.** That is not the purpose of it at all.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Is that the effect of it whether it is the purpose of it or not?

**Mr. COOLEY.** No, that is not the effect of it; but if you feel that it is, we can make a clarifying amendment at the appropriate time.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Does the gentleman state that section 105 is not actually stricken from the law by this Ramseyer rule on this bill?

**Mr. COOLEY.** No; it was not stricken.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** If it is not stricken from the statutes, then the Ramseyer rule clearly shows it in brackets as being stricken and thus the Members are misinformed.

**Mr. COOLEY.** The Ramseyer might be incorrect as far as that provision is concerned.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

**Mr. KYL.** Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this for one moment with the chairman of the full committee in order to bring it quickly to a resolution.

Mr. Chairman, may we have the assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina that if this legislation does violence to the feed grain provisions, this matter would be taken care of in the conference, if the bill is passed?

**Mr. COOLEY.** Yes, sir; I assure the gentleman that will be done.

**Mr. KYL.** There certainly is no intention either overt or otherwise to do any violence to the feed grain provisions?

**Mr. COOLEY.** None whatever.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. KYL.** I yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. FINDLEY.** That creates more uncertainty. If this language does not belong in here under the Ramseyer rule then I wonder if there are many more bones there in the barnyard. Maybe we ought to delay further consideration of this bill. This is legislation of vital importance. It involves the entire feed grain price support program.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. KYL.** I yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. COOLEY.** What you say as to the language in the report under the Ramseyer rule has no effect on this bill.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is apparently admitting now what he would not admit yesterday, that this bill does strike the acreage allotment and feed grain provisions from the law. He says at the appropriate time he will correct this. There is no more appropriate time than right now to rectify the mistake that has been made in this bill.

**Mr. COOLEY.** The gentleman is certainly too good a parliamentarian to make that sort of assertion on the floor of the House. The Ramseyer rule is not the law.

**Mr. GROSS.** I did not say that it was.

**Mr. COOLEY.** We cannot put something in a report under the Ramseyer rule that would strike out what is in the law.

**Mr. GROSS.** Just a minute. Turn to the bill, section 3, where it says:

> Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows.

Then follows an amendment which repeals the law. If that is not true, why did you put in brackets in the report on pages 25 and 26, showing repeal of the acreage allotment and feed grain provisions?

**Mr. COOLEY.** If there is any doubt about it, I will draft an amendment to clear it up. If there is any doubt about it, I will make an effort to clear it up before it comes back to the House.

**Mr. GROSS.** This is the time to do it and not in conference.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Will you prepare the amendment?

**Mr. GROSS.** No, I will not prepare it.

**Mr. COOLEY.** You do not want to prepare anything.

**Mr. GROSS.** You repealed this law, not I.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Who did?

**Mr. GROSS.** You did. You prepared the bill, and you are in charge of it here on the House floor.

**Mr. COOLEY.** If you want to present an amendment, all right. If you do not, all right.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

**Mr. NELSEN.** Mr. Chairman, in the debate yesterday I am sure that all of us who were not on the committee were completely confused, and obviously today in the debate it would appear members of the committee do not fully understand what is in the bill. But after the debate of yesterday, Mr. COOLEY's answer to Mr. GROSS' question relative to the possibility that sections of the feed grain bill was repealed was this. I am quoting Mr. COOLEY. "All right. If we have done that, it certainly can be corrected when we start to read the bill."

Now, I am confused, Mr. COOLEY, and I do believe that we should have a satisfactory answer.

**Mr. COOLEY.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. NELSEN.** I will yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. COOLEY.** To clear it up I will offer an amendment at the proper time and see if we can clear it up.

**Mr. NELSEN.** I thank the gentleman.

**Mr. GATHINGS.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

**The CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

**Mr. GATHINGS.** Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6196 provides that payments to eliminate the inequities of the so-called two-price system shall be made to persons other than producers. It is now proposed that these payments be made to producers.

The question of how these payments will be made in order to effectuate the purposes of the bill has been the subject of intensive study and discussion by many groups during the past 12 months. I favor the language of the bill which vests in the Secretary of Agriculture authority to determine the terms, conditions, and procedures for issuing the certificates. It is likely that the payment rate for the period beginning with enactment of the bill and ending July 31, 1964, would be different from the rate in effect beginning August 1, 1964. Also, it is uncertain which would be the most practical means of making payments on inventories of raw cotton on hand at the time the bill is enacted. The Department of Agriculture has had many years of experience in administering a wide variety of programs involving payments. Under some of these programs the payment has necessarily been made direct to the farmer. But in others, where the payment is related to movement of the commodity through normal trade channels to the ultimate consumer, the procedures have designated a particular seg-

**ment of the trade as the control point for the preparation of records, furnishing of reports, and issuance of payments.**

**As a general proposition I believe it is more economical and efficient for the Department to carry out a program by dealing directly with several hundred—or even several thousand—persons and firms in the channels of trade than to be required by law to issue payments to producers. In the case of cotton we have over 700,000 farms with allotments, and even if the producers on these farms were to receive PIK certificates covering payments it would undoubtedly be necessary for certain substantiating reports to be obtained from the trade.**

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 57, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: Page 3, line 19, insert the following:

"TITLE I—PRICE SUPPORT

"(c) Effective with the 1964 crops, section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 105. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1964 crops, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye at 90 per centum of the average price received by farmers during the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, adjusted to offset the effect on such price of any abnormal quantities of low grade wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye marketed during any of such years: *Provided*, That in the event that a special agricultural conservation program is in effect for such designated grains as provided in subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Secretary shall establish the level of support for such grains at not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor.

"'(b) In the event that the special agricultural conservation program for the designated grains is in effect, the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye that the producers of such crops participate in and comply with such special agricultural conservation program as provided in subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

"'(c) If the producers on the farm elect to participate in the special agricultural conservation program, price support shall be made available only if such producers divert from the production of the designated grains in accordance with the provisions of such program an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide. In the event that the special agricultural conservation program is not in effect, the Secretary shall make price support available to producers of the designated grains as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

"'(d) Beginning with the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, any wheat stored in order to postpone or avoid payment of a wheat marketing quota penalty under sections (3) and (6) of the Act of May 26, 1941 (Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended), prior to its repeal by the Feed Grain and Wheat Act of 1963 shall not be eligible for price support.'

"(d) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"(e) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by striking the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of any marketing year for which a special agricultural conservation program is not in effect for wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye (as provided by subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended), the Corporation shall not sell any such designated grains for unrestricted use at less than 115 per centum above the current support price for such designated grains plus reasonable carrying charges.'; and

"(2) by striking the semicolon after the words 'deterioration and spoilage' in clause (D) and inserting the following: 'except if the supply of any designated grain (as defined in section 301(a)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) is not in excess of a normal supply (as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the Corporation shall forthwith replenish its stocks by the purchase of a quantity of the commodity equal to the amount of such commodity so sold;'.

"(f) Subtitle D of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SUBTITLE D—SPECIAL AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

"'SEC. 379. (a) If the Secretary finds that during any year the total supply of designated grains will, in the absence of a special agricultural conservation program, be in excess of a 'normal supply' as defined in section 301(b)(10)(A) of this Act, he shall formulate and carry out a special agricultural conservation program, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of designated grains to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1959, 1960, and 1961 to designated soil conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount.

"'(b) The Secretary may permit such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, canary seed, and flax, when such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which would otherwise be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses and no price support shall be made available for the production of any such crop on such diverted acreage.

"'(c) The Secretary shall not permit such diverted acreage to be grazed.

"'(d) The Secretary shall require the producer to take appropriate measures to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents.

"'(e) The acreage eligible for payments in kind under such special agricultural conservation program shall be an acreage equal to the greater of forty acres or 20 per centum of the farm designated grain base. The Secretary shall, at the option of the producer, make an additional payment in kind for the diversion of not to exceed an additional 30 per centum of the designated grain base on the farm. The rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary on the 20 per centum reduction in the designated grain base on the farm shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre. The rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary on the additional 30 per centum reduction in the designated grain base on the farm shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre.

"'(f) The Secretary shall permit producers to divert for periods of from three to five years up to 50 per centum of the farm acreage of designated grains and in such event the rate of payment in kind to be made by the Secretary shall not exceed 60 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the designated grains on the farm based on its adjusted yield per acre: *Provided*, That the same acres on the farm shall be identified and diverted each year during the period provided by this subsection.

"'(g) The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage and yields as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, type of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. The base period for the purpose of determining the adjusted average yield in the case of payments with respect to the 1964 crops shall be the four-year period 1959–1962, and in the case of payments with respect to any subsequent crop shall be the most recent five-year period determined by the Secretary to be representative for which statistics are available.

"'(h) To the extent that a producer proves the actual acreages and yields for the farm for the 1959, 1960, and 1961 crop years, such acreages and yields shall be used in making determinations.

"'(i) The Secretary may make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments in kind to producers in advance of determination of performance.

"'(j) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"'SEC. 380. Only payments in kind shall be made and such payments in kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for the designated grains which shall not be valued at nor sold for unrestricted use for less than the support price plus reasonable carrying charges and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates at such time and in such manner as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of this Act. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within thirty days of the date of its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning thirty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate.

"'SEC. 381. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the event of a national emergency or a serious drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may place such limits on the extent that producers may participate in the special agricultural conservation program authorized by this Act as he determines necessary or he may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this Act.

" 'SEC. 382. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle D.'

"(g) Effective with the 1964 crops of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, and rye, sections 321 through 339 of parts II and III of subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are repealed and parts IV, V, and VI of subtitle B are redesignated as parts II, III, and IV, respectively.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this section shall apply to the 1964 and subsequent crops of wheat, corn, grain, sorghum, barley, oats, and rye.

"(i) Section 301(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections as follows:

" '(10) The term "designated feed grains" means wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and barley and, at the discretion of the Secretary, oats and rye.

" '(11) The term "designated grain base" means an acreage on the farm equal to the total of the following acreages:

" '(a) The average acreage planted to corn, grain sorghum, barley (and oats and rye if so designated by the Secretary), on the farm in the crop years 1959 and 1960 and the farm feed grain base established for the farm in the crop year 1961; and

" '(b) The highest wheat acreage allotment on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, or 1961, as established in such years by part III of subtitle B of title III of this Act prior to its repeal by this section; and

" '(c) The average acreage of wheat planted on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961 in the case of farms on which wheat was planted under the fifteen-acre farm marketing quota exemption as provided by section 7 of the Act of May 26, 1941, as amended (Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress), prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962: *Provided,* That in computing such acreage the Secretary shall not also include the farm acreage allotment; and

" '(d) The average acreage of wheat planted on the farm in the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961 under the thirty-acre wheat-for-feed exemption as provided by section 335(f) of this Act prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.'

"(j) Section 301(b)(10)(A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(10)(A) "Normal supply" in the case of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, rye, rice, and peanuts for any marketing year shall be (i) the estimated domestic consumption of the commodity for the marketing year ending immediately prior to the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (ii) the estimated exports of the commodity for the marketing year for which normal supply is being determined, plus (iii) an allowance for carryover. The allowance for carryover shall be the following percentage of the sum of the consumption and exports used in computing normal supply: 15 per centum in the case of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, rye, and peanuts; and 10 per centum in the case of rice. In determining normal supply the Secretary shall make such adjustments for current trends in consumption and for unusual conditions as he may deem necessary.' "

Mr. DOLE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this is the amendment which deals with the new program for feed grains and wheat and so forth?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. DOLE. Will you reserve your point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves his point of order.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, the bill applies to wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, and at the discretion of the Secretary, oats and rye.

Its main features are: If the Secretary should find that there will be a supply of these designated grains in excess of a "normal supply," he would put into effect a special agricultural conservation program based on these four principles:

First. It would be voluntary. Price support and diversion payments would be available only to participants in the program.

Second. It would require land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. A minimum 20 percent would be required with an optional and additional 30 percent reduction allowed.

Third. It would use only payment in kind for making diversion payments. The Secretary could, however, advance the producer cash in anticipation of the sale of grain, but there would be no direct payments as provided under the 1963 feed grain program.

Fourth. It would be based on a market economy. The CCC release price for surplus grain in inventory could not be less than 105 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. When the supply of grain is back to a normal supply this release price would be 115 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges and CCC would be required to make equivalent market purchases for grain which has been sold as being out of condition. The release price for grain used to redeem payment-in-kind certificates would be at the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. Other major provisions include:

First. Time: Applicable to 1964 and subsequent crops.

Second. Support price: 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Third. Base period: 1959-61.

Fourth. Diversion rates: Up to 50 percent of normal production times county support rate of first 20 percent reduction; also up to 50 percent on next 30 percent reduction.

Fifth. Longer term retirement: Up to 50 percent diversion payment for acreage diverted for periods of from 3 to 5 years.

Sixth. Advance payments: Up to 50 percent at signup time.

Seventh. Diverted acres: Control weeds and pests. Allow oilseed crops at up to one-half regular diversion rates.

Eighth. Small farms: Allow retirement of entire farm base if less than 40 acres.

After the present surplus of wheat and feed grains had been reduced to a "normal supply," price supports on wheat and feed grains would be set on the designated grains at 90 percent of the previous 3-year market average. If another surplus should develop, the special agricultural conservation program would go back into effect until the surplus was again reduced. All acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the designated grains would be repealed. There would be no referendum since this would be a voluntary program.

*Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat-milo farm*

Assume: 50 acres wheat.
25 bushel yield.
$1.62 price support (per bushel).[1]
50 acres milo.
40 bushel yield.
$1.10 price support (per bushel).
Total base: 100 acres total base.
20 percent diversion required.

20 acres (acreage required to be diverted).
80 acres (can be devoted to either wheat or feed grains as farmer chooses—assume 40 acres of wheat and 40 acres of milo are produced).

Calculation:

40 acres wheat
×25 bushel yield
200
80
1,000
×$1.62
2,000
6,000
1,000
$1,620.00

40 acres milo
×40 bushel yield
1,600
×$1.10
1,600
1,600
$1,760.00
$1,620 wheat
1,760 milo
$3,380 gross

*Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat-milo farm*—Continued

```
                         DIVERSION—20 ACRES
     10 acres wheat                              10 acres milo
    ×25 bushel yield                            ×40 bushel yield
    ───                                         ───
    250 bushels.                                400 bushels.
   ×.50 percent payment in kind rate           ×.50 percent payment in kind rate
   ────                                        ────
    125 bushels                                 200 bushels
 ×$1.62                                      ×$1.10
 ──────                                      ──────
    250                                     $220.00
   750
  125
 ──────
$202.50

$202.50 wheat                        Total: $3,380.00 gross
 220.00 milo                                   422.50 diversion
 ──────                                     ─────────
$422.50 diversion payment                   $3,802.50 gross benefits
```

[1] Minimum support price under H.R. 6547.

*Example of H.R. 6547 on a wheat farm—gross benefits*

```
Assume: 100 acres wheat.
        25 bushel yield.
        $1.62 price support (per bushel).[1]
Calculation:
       100 acres total base
      ×.20 percent diversion required
      ────
        20 acres (acreage required to be diverted)
        80 acres                                          20 acres
       ×25 bushels per acre                              ×25 bushels per acre
       ───                                               ───
       400                                               100
      160                                                40
      ────                                               ───
     2,000 bushels                                       500 bushels
    ×$1.62                                              ×.50 percent payment in kind rate
    ──────                                              ────
     4,000                                               250
   12,000                                             ×$1.62
  2,000                                               ──────
  ─────────                                              500
 $3,240.00 gross                                      1,500
    405.00 payment in kind                           250
 ─────────                                          ──────
 $3,645.00 gross benefits                           $405.00 payment in kind
```

[1] Minimum support price under H.R. 6547.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite for the consideration of the chair rule XVI, clause 7 of the Rules of the House wherein the following is found:

> No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of cotton legislation designed to eliminate an inequity which is referred to in the bill and in the report. It is not a feed grains bill. It is not a piece of wheat legislation. It is not a type of amendment which could be anticipated. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, it falls under rule XVI, clause 7, which would hold it to be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard?

Mr. DOLE. I do, Mr. Chairman. I understand, of course, that under the rules of the House an amendment must be germane to the pending legislation and that perhaps the bill before us is well coated with "Johnson's wax," but my amendment would add "Polish". Ordinarily, coming from a wheat area I also understand you cannot amend a cotton bill with wheat legislation. That is ordinarily the case.

I would point out also that ordinarily cotton bills do not repeal feed grain laws. Yesterday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], raised a point of order against the bill and he was overruled on the ground that it did not repeal a number of laws dealing with feed grains. The point of order was overruled by the Chair thus leaving rather clear implications as far as I was concerned, that there was, at least by inference, a repeal. On this basis I asked the highest authority present, the Speaker of the House, if at the proper time I could offer an amendment, a proper amendment, if it would be proper to offer such an amendment on this basis. And on page 23038 the Speaker indicated that it would be proper, at the proper time, for me to offer an amendment.

The cotton bill does contain provisions dealing with feed grains. We all agree on that, although some very reluctantly. The rule of germaneness which would ordinarily be a procedural block to a grain amendment to a cotton bill no longer applies. My amendment is to the same section of the bill which purportedly repeals these feed grain laws. My amendment is to section 3 of the bill which repeals section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. It simply adds some new language on feed grains to take the place of that which is repealed.

Since my amendment contains a definition of feed grains similar to that which is included in the feed grain law which is repealed by H.R. 6196, I see no basis for an objection to it on procedural grounds.

The amendment is similar to the provisions of H.R. 6547, which 20 Members introduced on May 23 this year. It combines wheat and corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum into a single feed grain program.

And, on this basis and the endorsement of the Speaker as of yesterday, I have my case.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, today America is standing in a fork in the road of farm legislation. Down one road is the maze of a controlled economy in which an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy, through subsidy and regulation, substitutes or tries to substitute its will for market factors and for free choice. Down the other road, while not always a smooth one, the route still offers agriculture a position as a dominant and vital factor in a private enterprise system, encouraged and helped by Government where necessary to overcome some specific problem or maladjustment, but free to move without unnecessary constraint to perform better its key part in our national life.

We have experienced this comparison in the handling of different crops during recent years. Those free from interference have prospered. We have seen, likewise, future implications by comparing the progress of American farming with farming under other systems of government. The Communist grain shortages have brought this home to all of us most vividly in recent months. In the May wheat referendum we saw the overwhelming conviction of the farm community on the issues involved and the importance of the choice of which road to follow. While this choice is vital to continued progress at home and to enjoyment by farmers of a fair share of our wealth, we should also reflect that the strength of our economy and our productive capacity may be the crucial factor in what remains a cold war but could still become a hot one. The choice made for agriculture can and should be an inspiration and a guideline for the proper direction of other lines of our national endeavor, the direction of freedom.

Coming from the State in which, in the wheat referendum more votes were cast in opposition than in any other State, I must point out that we in the Congress are still refusing to face up to the expressed desire of American farmers for a voluntary wheat program that is market related and takes a fair and sensible approach on land retirement. Therefore, I urge the Congress to face up to its responsibilities, both to the wheat farmers as well as to the country as a whole, and to enact meaningful legislation without further delay.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, in the Dole amendment now pending before the House we have an opportunity to do now for the nearly 2 million wheat farmers of this Nation what has been promised will be done in early 1964. If the Chair rules this amendment germane, and I believe it is, we can today approve a 1964 wheat and feed grains program which would be voluntary and would retain land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. The proposal, offered by Mr. Dole, would provide price support and diversion payments only to those who retire acreage from production.

My colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole], who represents the largest wheat-growing district in the United States, and who is a member of Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, has been a leader in the effort to secure a voluntary wheat program since the Nation's farmers rejected compulsory and mandatory control plans advocated by the administration earlier this year.

I concur with his findings, and those of the senior Member of the Kansas delegation the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery] who yesterday wisely pointed out that we cannot turn our heads from 2 million wheat farmers while we rush emergency legislation to assist 850,000 cotton farmers.

Mr. Chairman, in my conversations with wheatgrowers in my congressional district I have found there is concern and deep interest in a voluntary wheat program for 1964. It is my understanding that the Wheat Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, under the leadership of the very able gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell], has been holding hearings and executive sessions on the problem quite regularly. We have heard that there is consideration of bringing a voluntary program which would be effective for the 1964 wheat crop to the floor early next year.

The time is getting late. Legislation passed at this time would allow the participation of most farmers who desire to join the program. The substance of the amendment has been before the Committee on Agriculture and the House of Representatives since its introduction as a comprehensive wheat and feed grain bill by a number of our colleagues after the rejection of the administration's compulsory program last May 22.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the consideration and adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish it would be possible to bring a wheat bill out on the floor for the House to consider. Wheat farmers need a new law for next year. The Dole amendment would give them the same as the feed grain farmers presently have. They are not asking for an increase in Government cost to give wheat processors what the cotton mills will receive, only the same as the feed grain farmers.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, no longer should the people of America refer to the "sacred cow." If they wish to make reference to something sacred they should refer to the "cotton cow" or "sacred cotton."

For 2 days we have been witnessing another example of what can happen to an agricultural commodity raised in the South.

There is no question but that the cotton textile industry is in distress because of the price differential between what the domestic textile producer must pay for domestic cotton and what the foreign textile producer can buy identical cotton for from CCC stocks.

Just what is so sacred about cotton that the support price should not be permitted to drop by 2 or 3 cents or possibly 4 cents so that domestic mills would be in a more competitive position? Just why is the cotton producer so much more sacred than the wheat producer for instance?

In 1962 Congress passed a so-called wheat support bill which was so un-American in its provisions and conditions that the wheat farmer rejected it in a referendum. This was early in the spring of 1963 and yet neither of the Agriculture Committees of the House or Senate has taken any action to provide any legislative relief to the wheat farmer of America. His price will drop to possibly $1 or $1.25 per bushel. Apparently this is all right in the eyes of the Democrat-controlled Agriculture Committees. But rather than to see the producers of "king cotton" take any reduction in production price, the committee comes in stampeding the Congress for a brandnew subsidy program. This subsidy program opens a brandnew field for subsidizing any industry injured by imports. Now the taxpayer is to subsidize the industrial production of cotton goods. I ask, Mr. Chairman, why cotton is given preferred treatment. I know the answer as does every Member of this House.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

Wheatgrowers in the State of Washington, as in other wheat-producing States, recognized that in voting "no" in the wheat referendum last May, that they were forced to accept an unsatisfactory alternative. This is why so many wheat farmers in my district wanted assurances from me before the referendum that there would be efforts in Congress to get enacted a voluntary wheat program this year. I assured them that I would make such an effort, and 2 days after the May 21 referendum I joined many of my colleagues from wheat States in introducing a voluntary wheat and feed grains program. I was pleased that hearings were scheduled by the Agriculture Committee. My farmers are concerned, however, that nothing further has been done with regard to wheat legislation this year.

I, too, am concerned, Mr. Chairman.

The Washington Association of Wheat Growers held their 1963 State convention on November 11 and 12 in Spokane, Wash., and I think my colleagues will be interested to know that this association, after carefully considering a number of major bills pending in Congress at this time which seek to deal with the wheat situation, passed a resolution stating that a national program is necessary to keep production of wheat within present markets and to stabilize farm income. The wheatgrowers favor a voluntary program, and so state this in their resolution.

State wheatgrowers associations have been meeting in wheat-producing States, as have other farmer organizations and I am informed that most associations feel that a national program is necessary.

Certainly our farmers have spoken out against compulsory programs, Mr. Chairman, but this does not mean that they want the rug pulled out from under them. Wheat farmers, like all Americans, want to be free from Government domination. They want to run their own businesses. They want freedom of choice. They want and need a voluntary wheat program.

For these reasons I fully support the effort being made at this time to pursue a remedial and voluntary wheat program.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Short] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole].

If it is not possible for the House to take action on Mr. Dole's amendment it is at least appropriate that the subject of wheat legislation be discussed here today. Much has been said about the importance of the cotton industry to our economy. Even more could be said about the importance of wheat to not only our economy but to the very survival of our society. Bread is often referred to as the staff of life and it is unquestionably true that without wheat we would be hard put to feed our people. We use about 550 million bushels of wheat each year to feed the American people. We have exported more than that much wheat during each of the last several years and this year we will approach 800 million bushels, not counting the possibility of selling wheat to Communist Russia.

The wheat and feed grain program which Mr. DOLE's amendment would authorize is one which in my opinion deserves favorable consideration. I am one of those who introduced this legislation in the House. I did so because being a farmer I thought I knew what many farmers wanted in a wheat program. They wanted, if possible, a voluntary program such as they had in the feed grain program which was strenuously supported by this administration. This is probably the most important feature of this proposed program. In simplest terms, it would add wheat to the present voluntary feed grain program. Anyone not wanting to participate in a Federal price support program would not be required to do so. He would be able to raise all the wheat he wanted to, but he would not be eligible for price support or land retirement payments. He could sell his wheat for whatever price he could secure on the market. He would not be limited to selling his wheat for export as in some of the voluntary programs that have been proposed.

When wheat farmers rejected the administration's certificate wheat plan in last May's referendum, they were not voting for no wheat program. They were rejecting a plan that seemed entirely too complicated and restrictive and hoping that Congress would give them a program that was fair and equitable. I believe our proposal is sound and would fulfill the obligation that Congress has to give the farmer something real instead of just hope.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that Mr. DOLE's amendment would be of benefit to the farmer. This cotton bill we are considering today will do nothing to help the cotton farmer, but from all the evidence presented here it would mean millions to the processing industry.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, we can with great justification assume that we have reached another milestone on the long, winding road of Government programs for agriculture. It becomes increasingly clear that we here in the Congress, along with leaders of all farm organizations must apply the utmost of our commonsense, knowledge, and ability to the framing of a farm program which will be effective and acceptable in the following respects: First, it must maintain or improve the possibility of increasing farm income; second, it must reduce the Government's role in the management of the affairs of our Nation's farmers and decrease the costs to the taxpayers; third, it must be basically voluntary in its application; fourth, it must apply to total wheat and feed grains production in order to avoid transfer of problems in one area to another and get at the problem of reducing surpluses; fifth, it should work toward restoring the normal grain trade to its proper place in the farm market economy; and sixth, it should not be a temporary or crash program which would be subject to radical changes from one crop year to another—it should be given the chance to prove itself.

Let me say that we have come a long way on that road in our bungling attempts to make adjustments for the tremendous increases in the productive capacity of our country's farmers. The trouble is that there have been too many detours, and all too often we have been on a road which would have led us to we know not where.

Looking back over the years we recall that in 1947 CLINTON ANDERSON, now U.S. Senator from New Mexico, became Secretary of Agriculture. He advocated a badly needed, long-range farm plan based on flexible supports—if a short supply in a commodity exists, raise supports to encourage production. When surpluses mount, drop supports, but always with a floor to protect the farmer. President Truman supported Mr. ANDERSON, and Secretary Brannan did, too, for a time when he took over the Department.

A year later, in 1948, both political parties stood for flexible supports, but by the spring of 1949, Secretary Brannan scuttled the idea in favor of his own infamous plan, and what chance could there possibly be for agreement on anything except to let the mistakes continue and the surpluses mount.

By 1952 the Republicans stuck with flexible supports and the Democrats campaigned for high rigid supports and through the next 8 years the battle was fought and refought to the utter confusion of everyone, and with a surplus problem that became increasingly a headache.

The Kennedy administration next moved in on the scene. They then proposed the Agricultural Act of 1961, known as the "omnibus farm bill," which attempted first to take over the functions of Congress, and second to obtain authority to place into operation the Cochrane theory of supply management over every one of the 256 agricultural commodities produced in America. The Congress was wiser than the controllers. It refused to give this authority. The proponents by the application of their concept would destroy the U.S. marketing system by placing controls over every segment of the marketing system, and thereby destroy the free market.

In the meantime the so-called emergency feed grain bill had been passed and I might say that this program has possibilities, the theory being that land would have to be retired in order to balance supply and demand, but now we find that those who were the strongest advocates of high supports and full parity for the farmer are administering agricultural programs with the farmers of the Nation struggling with a parity ratio of 77 percent for the first 6 months of 1963. This, I might comment, is the lowest parity figure since 1939.

Further examination of the history of farm legislation reveals that the Congress has been dealing with many separate commodities, many times attempting to legislate in one commodity only to have a problem break out in another. It is no great secret that the natural wheat-growing areas were asked to cut back in production while the door was opened for 15-acre producers to eventually produce more than the total annual surplus. Attempts have been made to cut back on the production of corn, while opening the door for grain sorghums. It is not so long ago that an attempt was made to permit the growing of barley on idle wheatland, and more recently a bill has been reported to permit the grazing of soil bank land.

So in reviewing the entire legislative conduct it becomes increasingly clear that there is a lack of across-the-board consideration and it is obvious that in our attempt to legislate by commodities we fail to recognize a basic need and that is to consider the total acres producing crops of all kinds and attempt to design legislation to encourage full participation in a land retirement program. This approach is necessary if we are to hope for adequate participation and to eventually bring supply and demand into proper proportion.

The bill that I introduced earlier in this session seeks to meet these qualifications, and I feel that there is a desperate need at this time to enact legislation, especially because of the situation that will develop in the area of wheat production. Statements have been made to the effect that the wheat farmer has indicated he wants no program, this judgment having been reached because of the wheat referendum vote. I do not believe that that is a proper interpretation to place on this action on the part of the farmer. In my judgment the farmer was saying, We do not want this type of a program, and I believe that they look to the Congress to come up with a more acceptable plan. I also am of the opinion that the proposal submitted by myself and others would be acceptable and would be endorsed by the wheat farmers of America.

I have further reasons for concern as to the wheat producers. While my district is largely a feed grain area, it is my opinion that if wheat prices are driven down, we will face still further competition in the feed grain areas which, of course, will result in cheaper feed and cheaper livestock. Already prices are distressing according to recent reports indicating that net farm income in the

Midwest is down as much as 15 percent—Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963. The Department of Agriculture reports farm income—excluding Government payment—in 1960 at $11.1 billion; in 1961 at $11.1 billion; in 1962 at $11 billion; and in 1963, an estimated $10.5 billion. The farm parity ratio has stood at 77 percent for the past 3 months and that figure for the month of November is the lowest since 1933.

The bill that I have introduced is very simple in its application. It is entirely a voluntary program which requires not less than 20 percent land retirement and permits up to 50 percent. One feature that in my judgment will be attractive to the family livestock farmer is the provision in my bill that the farmer who takes grain as payment-in-kind, instead of cash, will receive a more liberal treatment. This is a means of encouraging the small farmer to participate, and in their instance usually feed grown is fed on the farm and needed on the farm. This approach will keep many bushels of grain out of storage and out of government ownership.

Questions may be asked to cost, but regardless of what approach is made in the field of agriculture, it will be costly. But it is my hope and the hope of many farmers that little by little the staggering surplus can be drawn down and we can again get agriculture to working in a more normal fashion. It is also our hope that we may establish better world markets in areas where food is a scarce commodity. This must be done by greater activity among farm organizations and people in the grain trade as well as the Government through Public Law 480.

I believe that the wheat growers of the United States deserve a better program than the one which will go into effect in 1964.

First. The present program will cause an extremely sharp reduction in wheat growers' income;

Second. If the present program is not radically altered, we are bound to be witness to a sharp expansion in wheat acreage accompanied by low price. These sharply low prices will make the wheat competitive with feed grains in the feed market; and

Third. An excess of feed supplies would ultimately drive down the prices of livestock and livestock products.

It should be noted that in the Midwestern States, between two-thirds and 80 percent of the farm income is derived from sales of livestock. I do not intend to stand idly by and watch the price structure for livestock and livestock products go into a nose dive.

It does not make sense to me to force the wheat grower to deplete his soil by overcropping in wheat in order to meet his expenses when at the same time this will cause irreparable damage to farmers clear across the conutry. Wheat growers and other farmers deserve better of their Government. It is for these reasons that I am strongly in favor of a voluntary wheat program which makes economic sense.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] desire to be heard further?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas, No. 1, we did not repeal the section to which the gentleman refers, the section dealing with feed grains. If we did, it does not include any reference of any kind or character to wheat.

Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas deals with wheat. It could have dealt with hummingbird eggs or most anything else. If it had, it would not be germane to this bill, and since the gentleman includes an item which is not repealed or which is not referred to in this bill, therefore, his amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further?

Mr. DOLE. I do, Mr. Chairman, briefly.

I might say, first of all, in response to the gentleman from Mississippi that our bill defines wheat as a feed grain. Therefore, that objection is taken care of.

Also, from the present feed grain law I read the following:

> The average acreage of wheat produced on the farm during the crop years 1959, 1960, and 1961, pursuant to the exemption provided in section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, prior to its repeal by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, in excess of the small farm base acreage for wheat established under section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall be considered as an acreage for the farm, and the rate of payment for diverting such wheat shall be an amount determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in relation to the rates of payment for diverting feed grains.

In other words, we are talking about wheat in the present feed grain law, and the fact the previous "wheat for feed" exemption can be used in determining your feed grain base.

Mr. Chairman, I think on this basis it is completely germane, and I trust the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The Chair is ready to rule.

First, permit the Chair to refer to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] when he refers to a statement of the Speaker.

The Chair would assume that the Speaker referred to an amendment which would be a proper amendment and in line with the rules of the House, and not just any amendment.

Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] has had a point of order made against it by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] on the ground that it is not germane to the pending bill.

This is a situation where we have a bill referring to one commodity, cotton, and the gentleman's amendment would refer to other commodities. Clearly the gentleman's amendment is not germane because one individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition, even though the two may belong to the same class.

Therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to learn that the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], is going to ask for a rollcall on the amendment which was adopted in the House on a teller vote. That amendment, as all of you know, was one designed to knock out the proviso which would prohibit the possibility of a windfall to anyone through the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the members of the committee should know upon what they are going to be voting.

The first part of this section gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make such payments as will eliminate the inequities. That is as far as we say we want to go. The proviso does not take into consideration inequities—it does not mention anything about inequities. It merely says that he shall make a payment at a price which is not in excess of the price that cotton is made available for export.

In other words, if they are paying an 8½-cent-a-pound export, then he would pay the mills 8½ cents per pound, not taking into account the fact that they do not have the same transportation costs, other handling charges and other expenses, that are involved in export shipments.

If you vote against this amendment, you will vote for a windfall for the mills that are trying to take advantage of this cotton legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to speak on this bill. I do not come from a cotton-producing area nor do I have the experience in this body or on this committee to speak with the authority of the senior Members. But in my district we have lots of people who wear shirts and who pay taxes. And my instincts tell me that this bill is not the answer to the cotton problem for the Nation as a whole nor, indeed for the cotton-producing areas. My judgment on this is borne out of what study I have done and, more important, by my conversations with other Members more learned than I.

I know that cotton is an important industry and that the whole country is affected by its health or sickness and I do not approach this problem in a provincial manner. With the arguments that the present situation is intolerable I am in agreement. But not as intolerable as the one we will be in if the bill passes. And a bad situation does not call for a bad solution but rather for a bill to which we can all repair as offering hope for a permanent solution, and one which, perhaps, can be applied to other commodities.

I cannot let this debate close without reference to a bill pending in this Congress which, in my opinion, does this and which, in any event comes closer to solving the difficulties in the cotton industry than does this one. I refer to the Talmadge bill. In committee I offered this as a substitute for the Cooley bill. I did not expect the motion to carry but I wanted to make a record because I think the Congress will come to the Talmadge bill, or something like it, in due time. And so many Members of this Congress and of the industry have told me privately that they agree that I am almost inclined to believe I am right. They all add that it would not pass. But this I cannot understand if they are all for it.

The proponents of the Cooley bill argue that it is needed to do away with the two-price system under which, they argue, our mills are at a disadvantage with foreign producers of cotton cloth. I assume this is so. But I cannot agree that the solution is to add a subsidy to a subsidy to a subsidy. And it is hard for me to see how the ruggedly individualistic free enterprise school of industrialists and agriculturalists can say it is. It seems to be simple commonsense to eliminate the problem caused by the export subsidy by eliminating that subsidy rather than compounding the error by adding another subsidy. This is the approach of the Talmadge bill and it seems to me highly preferable.

This year we have a bumper crop. Some 1.5 million bales will be added to our carryover. A combination of weather and improved technology have increased the yield per acre beyond any previous high. Reducing the support price will only encourage more production per acre in an effort to hold up farm income and in an absence of increased acreage.

Has not the time come when production quotas should be made on units of production—bales or bushels—rather than on acres if we are to continue with high price supports. This is what the Talmadge bill does. The present proposal, on the other hand, continues the acreage allotment system and even has a provision for an extra allotment for "export" of up to 20 percent of the base under certain conditions. It seems to me this compounds rather than solves the problem.

Mr. Chairman, there are many more ramifications of these two bills. Time and my knowledge limit my discussion. There are improvements which I would like to see in the Talmadge bill. It seems to me that enough has been said to show the advantages of the Talmadge bill over the present proposal, however, and I would be satisfied if the Congress can go at least this far. I am prepared to support it and I hope that the Senate will give it the consideration that I think it deserves.

**Mr. WELTNER.** Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

**Mr. WELTNER.** Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that two-price cotton is an evil, nor that the elimination of two-price cotton should be a compelling order of business of this House. At one point, I felt that this bill might be the best means of ending two-price cotton that Congress might have before it in this session. Frankly, I had planned to vote for it, notwithstanding its serious defects. My reasoning at that point was that the bill might be amended in the other body by the substitution of a Senate bill generally known as the Talmadge plan.

Now, it was on that basis that I had considered supporting this bill.

In recent weeks, however, it has become more and more apparent that this bill, while ending two-price cotton, would create new evils equally as bad, if not worse. First, there is the matter of cost. Even the most conservative estimate shows this bill to carry a price tag of a quarter of a billion dollars more than the present program. That is a conservative estimate, and in all likelihood, cost will run $300 million during the first year.

Second, the deficiencies and inequities of the present cotton support system will in no way be eliminated or remedied by this bill. Therefore, we will continue a price support program which heaps millions of dollars upon large growers, and provides the small southeastern farmer the sum of about $5 a month. We will continue the 8½ cents per pound consumer subsidy for each pound produced in the United States. We will continue the embargo on foreign imports, along with the export subsidy and the nonrecourse loan program of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third, in an effort to extricate ourselves from the dilemma created by the producers' subsidy, we are adding a mill subsidy. Subsidies are basically wrong. Two wrongs do not make a right, nor do two subsidies set this situation aright.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a cursory examination of the distribution of this proposed subsidy shows that six mills in America will receive almost a third of the benefit of this program. The largest mills, will receive the most. For instance, Burlington Mills, based upon its cotton consumption of 660,000 bales, is slated to receive the benefit of $28 million under this bill—almost 10 percent of the entire program. The attached table bears this out.

This bill is wrong. It is wrong for our Nation to obligate the huge sums required to carry it out. It is wrong for the taxpayer and consumer, who must pay this staggering new burden. It is wrong for textile mills to be the beneficiary of a new public dole. And it is wrong for the small farmer, whose unhappy circumstance is perpetuated by the strictures of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as much as I would like to see the end of two-price cotton, I cannot support this bill. It is a new spending program at a time when the tax cut demands stringent economy. It is a subsidy heaped upon existing subsidies. It is true that if any cotton bill is sent to the other body it might be amended by substitution of the Talmadge Plan. But that is the responsibility of another body, not this one. It seems poor policy for me to legislate in this House on the faint hope of substitution by the other House.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill when there has been pending in the Congress for several years a sound, economical and just plan for ending two-price cotton; for taking the Government out of the business of buying, selling, shipping, and storing cotton; for ending the vast disparities and inequities in the present cotton support system; and for returning to the cotton grower greater freedom of movement and opportunity for growth.

Mr. Chairman, everyone says that this bill has its defects; even the advocates of this bill acknowledge its many defects. Even they will readily admit that this is a poor solution. Yet they say it is the only cotton bill that can pass. I do not understand this reasoning. There is a better bill, whose superiority in acknowled not only by many Members, but by key figures in the administration, and in the industry. The Talmadge plan is vastly superior to this bill, and almost everyone admits it. If that be the case, then why not reject this bill and vote for a sound and simple solution to America's cotton dilemma?

| Major cotton mills | Main plants | Sales | Operating profit |  | Cotton consumed | Benefits derived from Cooley bill |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Amount | Percent of sales |  | Amount | Percent of all subsidy |
|  |  | *Millions* | *Millions* |  | *Bales* | *Millions* |  |
| Burlington | North Carolina | $1,010 | $125 | 12.4 | 660,000 | $28.0 | 9.6 |
| J. P. Stevens | South Carolina | 585 | 56 | 9.6 | 384,000 | 16.3 | 5.6 |
| United M & M | North Carolina | 502 | 40 | 8.0 | 330,000 | 14.0 | 4.8 |
| Deering-Milliken (est.) | South Carolina | 500 | 53 | 10.5 | 329,000 | 14.0 | 4.8 |
| Cannon | North Carolina | 231 | 31 | 13.4 | 274,000 | 11.6 | 4.0 |
| Cone | do | 220 | 14 | 6.4 | 268,000 | 11.3 | 3.9 |
| Total (6 mills) |  | 3,048 | 319 | 10.5 | 2,245,000 | 95.2 | 32.7 |
| U.S. total |  |  |  |  |  | 292.0 | 100.0 |

Sources: As to cotton mills, Moody's and Standard & Poor's.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, what a dark day this will be in the history of American agriculture if the House passes the bill now before us. The bill has been properly identified this afternoon as being nothing but a subsidy to industry under the guise of an agricultural bill. Yet we do not have the time or the opportunity to give a minute of consideration to the problem that presently confronts agriculture now with a parity price that is the lowest now since 1939, with net income down, and with further reductions coming. The proposition before us leads agriculture blindly down a road that is going to lead to his ruin. May I say to the House if we want to ruin all existing agricultural programs, and those coming, this is the best way in the world to do it. Imagine, a $16 million subsidy annually to one concern. Suppose for one single minute, if you will, there was a farm operation that was big enough to command that kind of subsidy. What a howl would go up in this House. Still today we are about to provide more than $600 million in subsidy to industry while we further reduce farm income. Only after reducing price supports on cotton can this bill be passed. Many of us have been begging and doing everything possible to direct some attention and favorable action on wheat legislation. Wheat farmers face a most difficult situation, it seems however that the only attention coming their way is when they are told how to vote. Where is the New Frontier in regard to farmers today, I have heard nothing but objection from the other side to everything in their behalf today. In the interest of farm families throughout the Nation I recommend defeat of the bill before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COOLEY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cooley: Page 2, line 23, strike out "to read as follows" and insert "by adding the following new subsection"; and

On page 2, line 24, strike out "(a)" and insert "(c)"; and

On page 3, line 14, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and that it should be considered on a parallel with the amendment just ruled on.

Mr. COOLEY. I have offered it because the gentleman says he wants it. If the gentleman does not want it I can withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of this amendment is to correct the technical references. That is the only purpose of it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I do this reluctantly because I did ask assurance of the chairman of the committee that this matter would be taken care of. But I do not want to make any exception to the rule. This is not germane. I do not want to have any part of that procedure.

Mr. COOLEY. It is germane, and I should like to have it adopted. It can go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] is germane, and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Does this deal with the feed grain provisions of the existing law?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It merely clarifies the matter in the report.

Mr. GROSS. What is the material in the report that is cured, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for the gentleman from North Carolina to answer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I introduced the amendment as the result of a complaint that came from that side of the aisle. If there is no ambiguity and you do not want it clarified, vote against the amendment. I think we should take the amendment because it is a clarification of something that appeared in the report and should be a part of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, would it now be in order to reconsider by unanimous consent the amendment I previously offered?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to reconsider is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

The amendment was agreed to.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRANT

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Grant].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Grant: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title 2 thereof the following new section:

" 'Sec. 213. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, is directed to make payments, in cash or in kind, to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts as will make such cotton available for domestic use at prices not in excess of the prices at which cotton on comparable quality is made available for export, including such payments as are necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of the enactment of this Act available for consumption at the level of prices established hereunder.'

"Sec. 2. Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a special cotton research program designed to reduce the cost of producing upland cotton in the United States at the earliest practicable date. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate with respect to the results of such research.' "

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute in an effort to be helpful. This matter of setting up a one-price system for cotton is something that the House Agriculture Committee has worked upon for a long time. Over a year ago, it became quite apparent to those of us who are interested in cotton that if the cotton farmer was to stay in business that it would be necessary that cotton sold domestically be made competitive with that sold to foreign markets.

With this in view, a meeting was held last fall in Memphis, Tenn., and since the opening of Congress in January this year, the committee has diligently and carefully considered every phase of this problem.

We realized that competitively priced synthetic fibers are taking the domestic cotton away from our own textile mills. There is no justification for the mills in this country having to pay approximately $42.50 more per bale for cotton than those in foreign lands.

For several years those interested in this problem have waited patiently for the Tariff Commission to grant some relief; however, after exhaustive hearings which were attended by many Members of Congress and other interested parties, the Tariff Commission refused to grant this much-needed relief. Therefore, it became necessary for some legislative action to be taken.

H.R. 2000, a bill introduced by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, was a simple bill which came nearer than any of those since proposed in solving the problem in that it handled the matter of the equalization of this two-price system by giving the Commodity Credit Corporation the authority to make direct payments to persons other than the producers of cotton in such amounts as will make cotton available for domestic use at prices not in excess of the price at which cotton of comparable quality is made available for export, including such payments as are necessary to make raw cotton in inventory on the date of the enactment of this act available for consumption at the level of prices established hereunder.

I am offering this substitute, first, because I want to save the cotton industry from self-destruction and, secondly, it is equitable in that any subsidy payments made will fall upon all segments of the industry and the consuming public in the same manner as the subsidy now paid upon exports.

I realize that over the coming years that cotton must be made more competitive with synthetic fibers, and for this reason, I have included in this substitute the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to expend such amounts, not to exceed $10 million as will be necessary for the Secretary to carry out this special research program. Research upon this special problem will, I am sure, provide much-needed information which will be useful to the farmers—not only in increasing the amount of cotton grown per acre but will at the same time lower the cost of producing it by the elimination of pests, such as the cotton worm, boll weevil, and other cotton-destroying insects.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I hate to add to your burden at this late hour, but there is one thing that has been a burden to me and that is the question of whether anything is being done with reference to the discriminatory practice of storing this cotton. As I understand it, and if my information is wrong, I wish you would correct me, there is a differential where reconcentrated cotton is stored for 30 cents a bale and less while other Government-owned cotton may be stored even in the same warehouse running from 46 cents to 51 cents because it is not subject to competitive bidding.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not touch the question of storage rates in one way or the other.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that. What I want to know is if you are doing anything about it.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not do anything about it.

Mr. CASEY. Is the committee doing anything about this discrimination which, as I understand it, would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars because this cotton is not subject to competitive bidding.

Mr. POAGE. This particular matter has been referred to the oversight subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture. Frankly, I do not know what arrangements they have made as to further hearings on the matter, but it is presently before that subcommittee.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly hope they get some action on it.

Mr. Chairman, I take it from the answer received from the gentleman, that he is aware of a discrimination in the placement of cotton in storage.

I sincerely trust that the Agriculture Committee or a subcommittee thereof will immediately dig into this matter.

From the limited information I have, the Department of Agriculture procedures are costing the taxpayers of this country approximately $2 million per month more than it should for the storage of Government-owned cotton alone.

Competitive bidding would eliminate this practice which has in my opinion unjustly enriched some warehousemen.

The storage of cotton under loan should also be thoroughly gone into as it appears that the storage of this cotton is costing more than is reasonable in some instances.

I reach this conclusion and I am sure others of this House would, when you see reconcentrated cotton being stored for 30 cents per bale per month in the same warehouse continuing loan and other Government-owned cotton being stored at a cost of 46 to 51 cents per bale per month.

I respectfully hope the committee will give immediate attention to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, before action on this bill is concluded, I would like to make some further remarks in regard to this bill, and the problems confronting cotton farmers.

Mr. Chairman, people who are familiar with the cotton situation generally agree that new legislation or at least a new course of action is urgently required if the cotton industry is to avoid drastic readjustments and sharp downward acreage allotments.

Having said this, I want to point out that cotton programs have for many years contributed in a big way to the stability and success of the cotton industry. Most cotton farmers have been fairly well satisfied and many have prospered. This is definitely true of the cotton farmers in the district which I represent in Congress.

I firmly believe that if the cotton farmers in the district which I represent were convinced that they could continue indefinitely with the present program, and that includes the present acreage and price supports, they would much prefer the present program. They realize that the present program has its inequities and imperfections but I believe that they had rather continue with it indefinitely if they knew they could retain in future years the present acreage allotments and supports. In other words, if they knew they could, they had rather hold on to the program which they have, rather than take a chance on a new program which they fear may be far less satisfactory from their standpoint than the present program. I have the same fear which the farmer has in this respect. If I knew we could hold on indefinitely to the present program, I would much prefer it to taking the gamble on a new program which in my opinion will probably not be as satisfactory from the standpoint of the cotton farmer as the present program.

In the light of what I have just said, the natural question is, If the cotton farmers generally speaking like what they have, why are so many of them advocating a change? The reason is they just simply do not believe the present program can be continued indefinitely. They think, and in my opinion correctly so, that if the present program is continued a drastic additional reduction in cotton acreage will result.

The cotton carryover on August 1, 1960, was 7.5 million bales. The carryover on August 1, 1963, was 11.2 million bales, and the estimated carryover on August 1, 1964, is 12.9 million bales.

The alltime high carryover of cotton was 14.5 million bales on August 1, 1956. This shockingly high figure was largely responsible for the inauguration of the cotton export subsidy program under which we now pay an export subsidy of 8½ cents per pound on every pound of cotton exported, approximately $42.50 per bale.

Probably the major reason why a change in the cotton program is unavoidable is the fact that the consumption of cotton by American mills is not keeping pace with population growth, and the proportion of cotton used in relation to synthetic fibers in the production of textiles is on the downgrade, having taken a sharp downward turn within the last 2 or 3 years.

With this downward trend of cotton consumption by U.S. mills, relative to synthetics, it is inevitable that under the present programs surplus stocks of cotton will continue to mount. If this continues to happen a sharp reduction of acreage allotments to the farmer is inevitable. This is a major worry of the cotton farmer and the friends of the cotton farmer.

The major purpose of any cotton legislation should be to increase the consumption of American cotton by U.S. mills and bring about an increase in cotton acreage allotments to farmers.

After the debate on this bill is concluded today there will, no doubt, be a motion made to recommit it—send it back to the Committee on Agriculture. In my judgment the bill is far from satisfactory, but I doubt the wisdom of sending it back to the Committee on Agriculture.

I believe the better procedure would be to pass the bill for the purpose of sending it to the Senate for consideration. After the measure has been considered by the Senate committee and the Senate itself, the House will have an opportunity to act on the revised version of the bill. In the light of the facts as they exist at that time and in the light of the provisions of the final version of the bill, the House can determine whether or not such bill, as finally revised and amended, should be passed or defeated.

I realize that there will be a variety of views as to just what action should be taken today, but I believe the course which I have suggested is the best thing to do at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, in recent years this Congress has passed many bad measures of farm legislation. In fact, the agricultural economy of the Nation has been living under a crazy quilt of Government subsidies and controls which have afforded no solution to the problem of the American farmer; and, in fact, it has only compounded the burden upon many farmers and certainly the American taxpayer.

But the bill we have been debating these past 2 days tops them all in legislative irresponsibility. Indeed, we find ourselves faced with a bill that will add a subsidy to a subsidy to a subsidy. We subsidize cotton on the world market to be competitive, then subsidize the cottongrower; then seek to subsidize the textile industry in an agricultural bill.

One cannot help but wonder what the American taxpayer must think when he looks at this picture in perspective. Good judgment would certainly dictate that this Congress, knowing that this bill will not provide a solution to the plight of either the cotton or textile industry in this country, defeat the measure before us and write legislation which is directed to a more permanent solution to the problem rather than take the courses of political expediency which merely places a greater burden on the American taxpayer and consumer.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

**Mr. BELCHER.** Mr. Chairman, in the interest of getting this legislation out of the way, I yield back the balance of my time.

**The CHAIRMAN.** If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 464, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

**The SPEAKER.** Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the passage of the bill.

**Mr. HOEVEN.** Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

**The SPEAKER.** Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

**Mr. HOEVEN.** I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

**The SPEAKER.** The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOEVEN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6196, to the Committee on Agriculture.

The previous question was ordered.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion to recommit.

**Mr. HOEVEN.** Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 224, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—179

Abbitt
Abele
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Downing
Duncan
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gary
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Halleck
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hechler
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Powell
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—224

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baker
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brock
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
St. Onge
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Farbstein
Thompson, N.J.

NOT VOTING—29

Adair
Ashley
Auchincloss
Becker
Bolling
Bromwell
Fallon
Gibbons
Gill
Hall
Hanna
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Long, La.
McLoskey
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Milliken
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Shelley
Sheppard
Staggers
Trimble
White

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Bromwell for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. McLoskey for, with Mr. White against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Gill with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Fallon.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Staggers.

**Mr. CANNON** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

**Mr. CASEY** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

**Mr. FARBSTEIN.** Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]. If he were present, he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

**Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.** Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

If he were here, he would have voted "nay." I, therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **HOEVEN**. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 182, answered "present" 7, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

**YEAS—216**

**Abernethy**
**Addabbo**
**Albert**
**Andrews, Ala.**
**Ashmore**
**Baker**
**Barrett**
**Bass**
**Bates**
**Blatnik**
**Boggs**
**Boland**
**Bonner**
**Brock**
**Brooks**
**Brown, Calif.**
**Broyhill, N.C.**
**Broyhill, Va.**
**Buckley**
**Burke**
**Burkhalter**
**Burleson**
**Byrne, Pa.**
**Cannon**
**Carey**
**Celler**
**Chelf**
**Colmer**
**Cooley**
**Corman**
**Daddario**
**Daniels**
**Davis, Ga.**
**Davis, Tenn.**
**Dawson**
**Delaney**
**Denton**
**Diggs**
**Dingell**
**Donohue**
**Dorn**
**Dowdy**
**Dulski**
**Dwyer**
**Edmondson**
**Edwards**
**Elliott**
**Everett**
**Evins**
**Fascell**
**Finnegan**
**Flood**
**Flynt**
**Foreman**
**Forrester**
**Fountain**
**Fraser**
**Friedel**
**Fulton, Tenn.**
**Fuqua**
**Gallagher**
**Garmatz**
**Gathings**
**Giaimo**
**Gilbert**
**Glenn**
**Gonzalez**
**Grabowski**
**Grant**
**Gray**
**Green, Pa.**
**Griffiths**
**Hagan, Ga.**
**Hagen, Calif.**
**Halpern**
**Hansen**
**Harris**
**Hawkins**
**Hays**
**Healey**
**Hébert**
**Hemphill**
**Henderson**
**Holifield**
**Holland**
**Huddleston**
**Jarman**
**Joelson**
**Johnson, Wis.**
**Jonas**
**Jones, Ala.**
**Karsten**
**Keith**
**Kilburn**
**Kilgore**
**King, Calif.**
**King, N.Y.**
**Kirwan**
**Kluczynski**
**Kornegay**
**Landrum**
**Lankford**
**Lennon**
**Lesinski**
**Libonati**
**Lindsay**
**Lipscomb**
**Long, Md.**
**McDowell**
**McFall**
**McIntire**
**McMillan**
**Macdonald**
**Madden**
**Mahon**
**Martin, Calif.**
**Martin, Mass.**
**Matthews**
**Miller, Calif.**
**Miller, N.Y.**
**Mills**
**Minish**
**Monagan**
**Montoya**
**Morgan**
**Morris**
**Morrison**
**Morse**
**Moss**
**Multer**
**Murphy, Ill.**
**Murphy, N.Y.**
**Murray**
**Natcher**
**Nedzi**
**Nix**
**O'Brien, N.Y.**
**O'Hara, Ill.**
**O'Hara, Mich.**
**Olsen, Mont.**
**O'Neill**
**Osmers**
**Patman**
**Patten**
**Pepper**
**Perkins**
**Philbin**
**Pilcher**
**Pirnie**
**Poage**
**Poff**
**Pool**
**Price**
**Purcell**
**Quillen**
**Rains**
**Randall**
**Reuss**
**Rhodes, Ariz.**
**Rhodes, Pa.**
**Rivers, S.C.**
**Roberts, Ala.**
**Roberts, Tex.**
**Rogers, Colo.**
**Rogers, Tex.**
**Rooney, N.Y.**
**Rooney, Pa.**
**Roosevelt**
**Rosenthal**
**Rostenkowski**
**Roush**
**St Germain**
**St. Onge**
**Scott**
**Secrest**
**Selden**
**Sibal**
**Sickles**
**Sikes**
**Siler**
**Sisk**
**Slack**
**Staebler**
**Steed**
**Stephens**
**Stratton**
**Stubblefield**
**Sullivan**
**Taylor**
**Thomas**
**Thompson, Tex.**
**Thornberry**
**Toll**
**Tuck**
**Tupper**
**Udall**
**Ullman**
**Utt**
**Van Pelt**
**Vinson**
**Wallhauser**
**Watson**
**Watts**
**Whitener**
**Whitten**
**Wickersham**
**Widnall**
**Williams**
**Willis**
**Wilson, Bob**
**Wilson, Charles H.**
**Winstead**
**Wright**
**Wyman**
**Young**
**Zablocki**

**NAYS—182**

**Abbitt**
**Abele**
**Alger**
**Anderson**
**Andrews, N. Dak.**
**Arends**
**Ashbrook**
**Avery**
**Ayres**
**Baldwin**
**Baring**
**Barry**
**Battin**
**Beckworth**
**Beermann**
**Belcher**
**Bell**
**Bennett, Fla.**
**Bennett, Mich.**
**Berry**
**Betts**
**Bolton, Frances P.**
**Bolton, Oliver P.**
**Bow**
**Brademas**
**Bray**
**Broomfield**
**Brotzman**
**Brown, Ohio**
**Bruce**
**Burton**
**Byrnes, Wis.**
**Cahill**
**Cameron**
**Casey**
**Cederberg**
**Chamberlain**
**Chenoweth**
**Clancy**
**Clark**
**Clausen, Don H.**
**Clawson, Del**
**Cleveland**
**Cohelan**
**Collier**
**Corbett**
**Cramer**
**Cunningham**
**Curtin**
**Curtis**
**Dague**
**Dent**
**Derounian**
**Derwinski**
**Devine**
**Dole**
**Downing**
**Ellsworth**
**Feighan**
**Findley**
**Fino**
**Fisher**
**Fogarty**
**Ford**
**Frelinghuysen**
**Fulton, Pa.**
**Gary**
**Goodell**
**Goodling**
**Green, Oreg.**
**Griffin**
**Gross**
**Grover**
**Gubser**
**Gurney**
**Haley**
**Halleck**
**Harding**
**Harrison**
**Harsha**
**Harvey, Ind.**
**Harvey, Mich.**
**Hechler**
**Hoeven**
**Hoffman**
**Horan**
**Horton**
**Hosmer**
**Hull**
**Hutchinson**
**Ichord**
**Jennings**
**Jensen**
**Johansen**
**Johnson, Calif.**
**Johnson, Pa.**
**Jones, Mo.**
**Karth**
**Kastenmeier**
**Knox**
**Kunkel**
**Kyl**
**Laird**
**Langen**
**Latta**
**Leggett**
**Lloyd**
**McClory**
**McCulloch**
**McDade**
**MacGregor**
**Marsh**
**Martin, Nebr.**
**Mathias**
**May**
**Meader**
**Michel**
**Minshall**
**Moore**
**Moorhead**
**Morton**
**Mosher**
**Nelsen**
**Norblad**
**Olson, Minn.**
**Ostertag**
**Pelly**
**Pike**
**Pillion**
**Powell**
**Pucinski**
**Quie**
**Reid, Ill.**
**Reid, N.Y.**
**Reifel**
**Rich**
**Riehlman**
**Robison**
**Rogers, Fla.**
**Roudebush**
**Roybal**
**Rumsfeld**
**Ryan, Mich.**
**Ryan, N.Y.**
**St. George**
**Saylor**
**Schadeberg**
**Schenck**
**Schneebeli**
**Schweiker**
**Schwengel**
**Senner**
**Shipley**
**Short**
**Shriver**
**Skubitz**
**Smith, Calif.**
**Smith, Iowa**
**Smith, Va.**
**Snyder**
**Springer**
**Stafford**
**Stinson**
**Taft**
**Talcott**
**Teague, Calif.**
**Teague, Tex.**
**Thompson, La.**
**Thomson, Wis.**
**Tollefson**
**Tuten**
**Van Deerlin**
**Vanik**
**Waggonner**
**Weaver**
**Weltner**
**Westland**
**Whalley**
**Wharton**
**Wilson, Ind.**
**Wydler**
**Younger**

**ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7**

**Aspinall**
**Conte**
**Duncan**
**Farbstein**
**Hardy**
**Herlong**
**Thompson, N.J.**

**NOT VOTING—29**

**Adair**
**Ashley**
**Auchincloss**
**Becker**
**Bolling**
**Bromwell**
**Fallon**
**Gibbons**
**Gill**
**Hall**
**Hanna**
**Kee**
**Kelly**
**Keogh**
**Long, La.**
**McLoskey**
**Mailliard**
**Matsunaga**
**Milliken**
**O'Brien, Ill.**
**O'Konski**
**Passman**
**Rivers, Alaska**
**Rodino**
**Shelley**
**Sheppard**
**Staggers**
**Trimble**
**White**

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Conte against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Gill for, with Mr. Duncan against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Bromwell against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. McLoskey against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Gibbons against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Adair.

Mr. White with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Kelly.

Mr. **FARBSTEIN**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **THOMPSON** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **HERLONG**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **HARDY**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **DUNCAN**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **COOLEY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

## A FIRM EXPERIENCED HAND

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy was growing in stature and by the end of a second term he would have been considered as one of a handful of great Presidents. This was the appraisal of President Kennedy made by Malcolm S. Forbes, publisher and editor in chief of Forbes, a national financial magazine.

Mr. Forbes pays tribute to the late President in an article appearing in the December 1, 1963, issue of Forbes.

In the same article Mr. Forbes pays tribute to Lyndon Johnson, saying—

> No unelected—and few elected—Presidents have come into office with better preparation for the job.

Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks Mr. Forbes' article:

### A FIRM EXPERIENCED HAND

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Three and a half years ago I worked hard for the election of Richard Nixon to the Presidency, and as a delegate to the GOP convention happily voted for his nomination. During the Democratic convention I rooted for Lyndon B. Johnson in the conviction expressed often to friends that, "If a Democrat should win, he'd be the best one." Kennedy? Too young, too inexperienced. Attractive, eager, but not mature enough.

At lunch with two friends 48 hours before President Kennedy's death, we discussed at length how glad we were that he was President; that in foreign affairs, American objectives, hopes, and ideals had been made clear and had been kept clear; that the President had displayed firmness without resorting to shallow and explosive brinksmanship. We commented on how no Republican President probably would have dared to ask for the tax reduction so necessary to our maximum economic expansion.

We rounded out the conversation by concluding that Kennedy would undoubtedly be reelected and that by the end of his second term he would be considered as one of the handful of great Presidents.

In 36 months there are few specific legislative milestones on which historians can peg an evaluation of President Kennedy's administration but his greatness as a man is firmly established. With wit and wisdom and calmness he met world crises, and continually concerned himself with measures that would benefit the human lot. The TV program "Conversation With the President," showed his conception of the job and his remarkable grasp of the problems of our time.

On these pages Forbes in past months has on several occasions supported his actions and proposals.

The man is now beyond support, but some of the measures and the need of them remain.

What now? What about Lyndon Johnson?

I can recollect no unelected—and few elected Presidents who have come into office with better preparation for the job. In the three most immediate problems facing the country President Johnson had unusual responsibilities under John Kennedy.

He was knee deep in defense problems, particularly in matters of space.

In the field of civil rights he headed the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In connection with foreign relations he has in recent months acquired firsthand familiarity with most of our allies and friends abroad.

Before this exposure to national responsibility on the Executive level he, in title and in fact, led the legislative branch as majority leader of the Senate. Virtually every important legislative measure during President Eisenhower's last 6 years achieved passage primarily because of Johnson's help. His support of foreign aid and trade, of NATO and the UN, social security and expanded civil rights is a matter of record, both in words and deeds.

In one very significant area Johnson's skill exceeds that of the late President—how to get things through Congress.

President Johnson displays one attitude strikingly similar to President Eisenhower's: An almost-fervent belief in the free enterprise system. Anybody tempted to sell securities because of uncertainty about the new administration should listen to a replay of the Texas TV station's interview with the President and Mrs. Johnson at the LBJ Ranch, recorded a few weeks ago. No Republican, no conservative, no business leader, no Vermont Yankee ever gave greater or more continuous expression of conviction about free enterprise and the American way of economic life than the new President of the United States.

In our profound misfortune we are fortunate that the new hand at the helm is an experienced, firm one. President Johnson knows unusually well the process of governing and the problems facing the Government. He knows unusually well men in government and particularly the men now in his government.

In despairing over the still-unbelievable deed of assassination, we certainly need not despair over our country's present leadership and future prospects.

## PRESIDENT NKRUMAH IN RADIO MESSAGE HONORS MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

**Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

**Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.** Mr. Speaker, "Man of His Century" was the tribute to President John F. Kennedy in a memorial radio address by President Nkrumah to the people of Ghana. I am extending my remarks to include President Nkrumah's radio message, honoring the memory of our martyred President:

### PRESIDENT NKRUMAH IN RADIO MESSAGE HONORS MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

It is with deep sorrow that I speak to you today and pay tribute to the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, a great world statesman, and a relentless fighter for equality and human dignity.

The whole world has been shocked and bewildered at President Kennedy's tragic death by assassination in the prime of his life. In spite of his brief term of office, President Kennedy has made an indelible mark on the history of our time. He will be remembered as a distinguished champion for peace and the rights of man. His inspiration, his tremendous courage, his integrity and the warmth of his feeling for his fellow men will be a beacon to those who share his convictions and aspiration.

John Kennedy's achievements in international affairs have been remarkable. We in Africa will remember him above all for his uncompromising stand against racial and religious bigotry, intolerance, and injustice. His courage and steadfastness in pursuing the objectives of racial equality in his own country will always remain as his greatest contribution to the struggle against racialism and racial arrogance.

* * * * *

President Kennedy was a remarkable man and a man of his century. Born to wealth, he was yet deeply sensitive to the problems and hopes of the common man and of the underprivileged. This aspect of his character was reflected both in his domestic and international policies.

His ideas on economic aid, social welfare, and world peace were far in advance of large sections of influential opinion in his own country. As the youngest President ever of the United States, he was truly a representative of our century—a century of expanding opportunities for all the elimination of poverty, ignorance, and disease, and the establishment of a new order of truth, equality, and social justice.

With a true sense of history John Kennedy carried on in a most dramatic manner what Abraham Lincoln began 100 years ago; like Lincoln he was prevented from carrying his endeavors to the great heights he had set for himself by an assassin's bullet. As a man endowed with great human warmth, his relationship with people was always friendly and sincere. I was privileged to meet President Kennedy and his wife in Washington in 1961 not long after he became President of the United States. In fact, I think I am right in saying that I was the first Head of State to whom he granted audience immediately after he had been sworn in as the President of the United States. I was deeply impressed by his wisdom and sincerity.

His presence, his sense of understanding and appreciation of the grave issues confronting our world, and his genuine interest in the solution of the problems confronting developing countries made me regard him even then as a man from whom the world could expect great things, as a man who could become one of the most important leaders of our time. It really takes a man like John Kennedy to say, and I quote from his writings: "A man does what he must in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressure and that is the basis of all human morality." We in Africa can have no more appropriate epitaph to John Kennedy's memory than his own words spoken in his inaugural address: "Whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice that we shall ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward with history, the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

To his dear wife and children, I send deepest condolence on my own behalf and on behalf of the people of Ghana.

## NEW WHEAT PLAN

**Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

**Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota.** Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Senators MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, and FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, in introducing legislation to amend the present wheat law. This is, of course, extremely important to North Dakota, which derives more of its income from the sale of wheat than any other State in the Nation.

The present law has far too many complications, as was pointed out by the farmers who refused to go along with it in the wheat referendum. The plan we are suggesting would amend the present law to make it voluntary. There would be no referendum. The act would be far easier to administer than any of the wheat plans that have been promoted by the Department of Agriculture. Actually, our bill is closely akin to the principles of the old McNary-Haugen farm law.

I believe sincerely that both taxes and Government expenditures must be cut. Other wheat legislation before Congress could cost the taxpayers up to $2 billion annually. Our program would be self-supporting if the President chose to have processors acquire the marketing certificates.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau and the National Grange have both from time to time favored a two-price approach to solving our wheat problem. This over a period of years has been attractive to me because the American farmer certainly deserves full parity for that wheat which he produces to be consumed in America. After all, for the machinery he buys, the fertilizers he uses and all the other costs of his production, he is paying American prices.

At the same time, no farmer can expect the taxpayers to continually subsidize him for producing grain that is neither needed nor consumed. And, too, the American farmer under this approach would be free to plant as much wheat as he desired, and this freedom of opportunity is something that the farmers of our country have wanted for a long time.

I think this act would be good for North Dakota and the Nation for a number of reasons, which I shall summarize:

First. It preserves the cherished American tradition of freedom of choice. Those farmers wanting no program at all could stay out. Those who feel they need price supports could participate.

Second. It provides full parity for that wheat produced for domestic consumption.

Third. It is a much less complicated program and can be administered with a minimum of cost to the taxpayer and a minimum of interference with the farmer.

Fourth. There would be an interchangeability feature by which a farmer could substitute his feed grain acres for wheat and vice versa.

Fifth. It would allow freer export of American wheat, giving us the opportunity of using our God-given abundance as a positive weapon for peace in the world.

And lastly, the price for wheat would be set in the marketplace, with the result that we in North Dakota would get more for our quality wheat.

The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, would determine each year what amount of wheat we need to meet both domestic and export requirements. The amount set could be not less than 1 billion bushels. Each year the Secretary would announce what acreage was needed to meet the necessary annual production goal. The State, county, and farm allotments would be determined with the national allotment in the same manner as allotments are now determined.

The national allotment for next year using this formula which would require the production of approximately 1.2 billion bushels would be about 50 million acres.

It now appears entirely possible that present export levels could be maintained or even increased. In the event of an increase, of course, acreage allotments would be somewhat higher. A minimum export level would be set by the Secretary as provided under existing law which the Secretary has announced at $1.30 per bushel. The individual farmer would receive, however, 100 percent of parity, which is currently $2.51 per bushel, for that portion of his wheat consumed in the United States—approximately 500 million bushels. This would give a blended price of about $1.80 per bushel to the participating farmer for all of his wheat.

The market price would be set entirely by the demand for that particular type of wheat sold, and if the farmer were raising wheat which has always commanded a premium, or if expected heavy exports materialize, the farmer would of course receive a higher blended price.

Besides the assured blended price of at least $1.80 a bushel, farmers complying with the program who reduced their acreage would receive diversion payments the same as we have had under wheat and feed grain programs for several years.

The President of the United States would have discretionary authority under the provisions of this bill to make wheat-certificate payments directly through the Commodity Credit Corporation as is done under the present wheat and feed grain program. Or he could elect, by requiring the domestic processors to purchase the wheat certificates as is presently required under the wheat-certificate law, to make the program largely self-financing.

The elimination of most, if not all, Government storage payments would be another great saving. The repeal of wheat marketing quotas and marketing penalties would be a part of this new wheat price support proposal. Provisions for acreage allotments, however, would remain in effect. If and when the acreage allotments were required by the Secretary of Agriculture, those farmers complying would be entitled to marketing certificates which would provide their price support. Those failing to comply with allotments would be able to raise all the wheat they want to and sell it free of penalties on the open market but would not get any benefits of the wheat program. This choice might well be elected by many farmers who feel they do not need price supports.

The program would be a true domestic parity plan which has been known more commonly as the two-price plan. The bill would utilize the mechanics of the present law to allocate marketing certificates which would be restricted to that portion of the wheat crop needed for domestic food consumption.

The major advantage, of course, of such program would be that wheat exporters would not be required to purchase certificates, making foreign sales of wheat much more possible and much more feasible.

This allowing of a wheat export of American wheat would give us the opportunity to use our food as a positive weapon for peace in the world.

I would like to include the following explanation of the bill from technical counsel:

### EXPLANATION OF BILL

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill provides for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program. It would—

(1) Repeal existing provisions for margeting quotas.

(2) Provide full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

(3) Permit certificates to be issued for wheat held over from a prior crop where the current crop is underplanted.

(4) Permit the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates, in which case all certificates would be redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation.

(5) Repeal the provision for montary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Under the bill acreage allotments would be proclaimed every year. The amount of the allotment and its apportionment among States, counties, and farms would be as provided by existing law. Marketing certificates would be utilized as under existing law, except that they would be restricted to the portion of the crop needed for domestic food consumption, and the support level for certificate wheat would be full parity, instead of 65 to 90 percent of parity. The remainder of the crop would be supported at the level now provided for noncertificate wheat, and certificates would not be required for export wheat. The President would determine, in accordance with the objectives of the act, whether processors would be required to obtain certificates for wheat processed for domestic consumption, or whether the wheat for domestic consumption should move at the world price, with the certificate issued to producers being redeemed by Commodity Credit Corporation. The bill would be applicable to the 1964 crop, the acreage allotments for 1964 being those heretofore apportioned.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Section 1 repeals the existing provisions for wheat marketing quotas. That is its sole purpose.

Subsection (a) provides that, instead of proclaiming marketing quotas when the supply would otherwise be excessive, the Secretary shall determine a production objective each year and proclaim a national acreage allotment designed to achieve it. The formula for determining the production objective would be the same as the present formula for determining the amount of the marketing quota; the national acreage allotment would be the same as under existing law; and the national acreage allotment would be apportioned to States, counties, and farms as under existing law. Acreage allotments could be increased as under existing law, but the existing provision for termination is deleted.

Subsection (b) deals with the provisions in sections 334 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the existing law for preservation of acreage history where the marketing excess is stored to avoid payment of marketing penalties. Subsection (b) makes purely technical amendments to give recognition to the fact that under the bill there will be no marketing penalties after 1963. History would continue to be preserved, however, where the marketing excess was stored in accordance with the existing provisions during the years 1959 through 1963.

Subsection (c) repeals Public Law 74, 77th Congress, which deals with wheat marketing penalties; and amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by striking out section 336 which deals with the marketing quota referendum, section 338 which deals with transfers of farm marketing quotas, and provisions in various other sections which have no meaning in the absence of marketing quotas. Paragraphs (8) and (9) of Public Law 74, which deal, respectively with rice marketing penalties and support for the 1941 through 1946 crops are obsolete, and their repeal merely strikes out ineffective provisions. Rice marketing penalty rates are now established by section 356 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (d) amends section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the price support provisions for wheat, to eliminate references to marketing quotas. Section 107(2) now provides for the support level for noncertificate wheat "if marketing quotas are in effect." Subsection (d) makes section 107 (2) applicable every year. Section 107(4) at present provides for the support level when marketing quotas are not in effect. The bill would repeal section 107(4), since a marketing certificate program would be in effect every year, and the support levels for certificate and noncertificate wheat are intended to be governed by sections 107(1) and 107(2) every year. Subsection (d) also amends section 107(5) which now defines "cooperator" differently when marketing quotas are in effect and when they are not in effect. Under the bill there would be only one definition of "cooperator," and various provisions of section 107(5) relating to marketing quotas would be deleted.

Subsection (e) makes changes in headings in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required by the deletion of quota provisions.

Section 2 provides price support at full parity for wheat for domestic food consumption.

Subsection (a) increases the support level for certificate wheat to full parity (from the 65 to 90 percent of parity now provided for).

Subsection (b) limits the quantity of marketing certificates issued to producers to the quantity of wheat estimated to be needed for domestic food consumption (instead of including such portion of the estimated exports as may be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture as is now provided).

Section 3 would permit marketing certificates to be issued for uncertificated wheat on hand from prior crops, where the normal yield of the planted acreage is less than the farm wheat marketing allocation. The farm wheat marketing allocation is the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment multiplied by the national allocation percentage. Under existing law marketing certificates are to be issued for the farm wheat marketing allocation, but not more than the normal yield of the planted acreage, plus the amount of wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty which is released because of underplanting the allotment. Since the bill repeals marketing quotas, there no longer would be any wheat stored to avoid penalty. The bill would permit certificates to be issued for any wheat stored from a previous crop to make up the amount of the farm wheat marketing allocation.

Section 4 would authorize the President to suspend the requirement that processors acquire marketing certificates to cover the amount of wheat processed by them for domestic food consumption. This section also repeals the requirement that exporters acquire marketing certificates for wheat exported by them, since it is the purpose of the bill that the noncertificate wheat move freely into export. The President might suspend the requirement that processors acquire certificates either in whole or in part. If he determined, for instance, that the regulation of commerce would be better served by requiring the processors to acquire certificates for a part of the wheat processed by them, he could so provide. The suspension might be for an entire marketing year or a shorter or longer period, as determined by the President.

Section 5 repeals the provision for monetary penalties for producing crops on acreage required to be diverted from wheat. Producers would continue, however, to be subject to loss of eligibility for wheat price support and marketing certificates, if they produced crops on such acreage.

Section 6 would make the bill effective with the 1964 crop. The allotments heretofore established for the 1964 crop would be effective without further action, and the support levels provided by the bill would be applicable, notwithstanding the results of the quota referendum heretofore held.

## SUBPENA POWERS FOR PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill the terms of which, by attaching legislative connotations to the investigation of the late President's tragic murder, will provide the power to subpena witnesses and to take testimony under oath subject to the penalties of perjury. Such an authority is indispensable to an adequate investigation, which has far-reaching ramifications as we all know.

Even our great FBI does not have the power to compel testimony under oath. This is a fact too few are aware of. In the discharge of its heavy responsibilities to find and present all the relevant facts surrounding this awful crime, the American people are entitled to the assurance that the report of the Commission shall be based upon sworn testimony. This is particularly important as we reflect on the fact that the alleged murderer Oswald was an admitted Marxist and had sought citizenship in Communist Russia.

For more than 10 years I have urged repeatedly that affiliation with Marxism, and Marxism-Leninism as one variation, raises the most serious questions of loyalty to the United States and hence of security in this Nation. Paul Sweezy testified before me in years past that he was a Marxist. Yet the U.S. Supreme Court held the State Legislative Investigating Committee could not inquire concerning his activities at our State university. I believed then and continue to believe that such a fact, without more—and there was much more—raised many relevant questions of material concern ot the safety and security of the State of New Hampshire and to the United States. There have been others in America who have been and are Marxists—too many others in this great, free land.

It is interesting to note that now the Chief Justice of the United States heads a fact-finding Commission that is bound to be concerned with the question of whether Oswald acted on his own or at the behest of others, or in concert with others. It is indisputable that Communist affiliations of this alleged killer are material, whether Castro or Comintern inspired.

It is not unreasonable to anticipate that in the process of this immensely important investigation the distinguished Chief Justice and his outstanding colleagues on the Commission will encounter and of necessity have to resolve some of the great problems of relevancy and pertinency involved in the implacable enmity that is the Communist conspiracy to destroy America. Unfortunately, this has often been glossed over by some of the judiciary in applying judicial precepts to efforts of State legislatures and the Congress to keep posted on Communist activities in the United States.

This is a new and important role for our Chief Justice. Let us hope that the decisions of the high court will not prove to be roadblocks as the Commission seeks to establish all the facts surrounding this despicable crime.

## OUR MARTYRED PRESIDENT—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic assassination of President Kennedy has dealt a heavy and tragic blow to the people of the whole country, as well as to the people of my own district.

Expressive of that sentiment in my own area of upstate New York, Mr. Speaker, is an eloquent tribute paid to our late beloved President by the Reverend Edward O'Heron, assistant pastor of St. Mary's Church in Cortland, N.Y., which I now include in the form in which it appeared in the Cortland Standard of November 25, 1963.

### FATHER O'HERON'S EULOGY TO PRESIDENT

Because a eulogy of the late President delivered several times in the past 2 days by the Reverend Edward O'Heron of St. Mary's Church has been so well received, the assistant pastor was asked this morning to repeat his words at the solemn high requiem mass held at the church.

Following is his tribute to John F. Kennedy:

"Speech is always inadequate to describe the thoughts and feelings of a human being. During these sorrowful hours since the news flashed of our national tragedy in Dallas, speech is never so inadequate as it is at this time. In a way it seems almost sacrilegious to say anything. It seems that there is nothing to be done and nothing to be said except to be quiet—and to reflect—and to pray.

"At the same time, however, as human beings we are compelled to speak. We are creatures of body as well as soul. Whenever we feel deeply, whenever we love deeply, whenever we mourn deeply, our nature demands that we express ourselves, even though it be ever so inadequate."

"In the opening words of the Gospel of St. John we read the following words, 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' Today we Americans can well apply those words of the evangelist to the President whose death we now mourn. 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' In recent months we have lost two men sent from God whose names were John, the one a Pope and now a President. In some ways they were so different from each other, the one the son of a millionaire, the other the son of a peasant sharecropper. Yet at the same time they were so much alike, so dedicated to the needs of others, so sensitive to the sufferings of others.

"We will leave it to the world's orators the task of eulogizing John F. Kennedy as Chief Executive or politician or supreme

**commander. We will leave it to the historians to assess his place in history. Today we wish only to speak of John F. Kennedy as a member of the family, a member of your family, a member of my family. Just how much a part of your family he was is seen by the fact that if you had been informed on Friday afternoon of the sudden death of one of your own blood relatives, your sorrow could hardly be any deeper or any more heartfelt than it is right now at the death of President Kennedy. One concise sentence from the news wire service summed it all up with the words, 'Everyone's bright young brother has been killed.'**

**"This is perhaps the greatest lesson we can learn from the life of John F. Kennedy. He has shown us that in spite of our political differences, in spite of our religious differences, we are in fact members of the same human family, we are brothers with the same Father in heaven.'**

**"On Friday morning at a breakfast talk in Fort Worth, Tex., John F. Kennedy had this to say, 'This is a very dangerous and uncertain world—We would like to live as we once lived but history will not permit it.' He went on to say, 'No one expects that our life will be easy—certainly not in this decade and perhaps not in this century.' John F. Kennedy was right. Our life will not be easy. As we realize today how much poorer we are without him, let us also not forget to be grateful for the fact that we are so much richer for having had him with us. How he took our narrow, self-centered attitude toward life and toward other people, and broadened our vision to encompass every human being on the face of the earth. How well he has given us the lesson and the challenge of the service of God not merely through prayers but the service of God through the service of men. Perhaps it all comes down to this. As we mourn the death of a great American, a member of our family, and pray for his soul, let us not forget to include prayers of gratitude, gratitude that for us Americans in the 1960's there was a man sent from God whose name was John. May the God who he served so well give eternal peace to his valiant soul."**

## AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

**Mr. RYAN** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. RYAN** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn that on November 26, 1963, the Board of Education of the City of New York adopted a resolution which endorsed and recommended to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives approval of my bill, H.R. 8198. I would like to bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included at this point:

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—H.R. 8198, 88TH CONGRESS, RE AID TO LINGUISTICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

*Resolved*, That the board of education endorses and recommends to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives the approval of the proposed amendment to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H.R. 8198, 88th Cong.), dated August 21, 1963, permitting the use of funds appropriated under title III of said act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for use in teaching the English language to students whose primary language is not English.

EXPLANATION

The board of education has approved the establishment of experimental language laboratories in schools at the elementary and secondary levels, with costs to be met in part through grants available under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for foreign language instruction.

The proposed amendment would permit the use of funds received under title III to be extended to the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment or for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in providing education in the English language for students whose primary language is not English.

In the language category, the original bill limited assistance to foreign language instruction. The amendment will permit the use of Federal funds granted under title III of the National Defense Education Act to be used for linguistically handicapped children in any modern language.

It is expected that a particular benefit will be derived by non-English-speaking children through improvement of techniques in English language instruction.

## THE TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT ON CIVIL RIGHTS IS NOW

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday a discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, to the floor of the House will be filed. Because of the obstructionism of the Committee on Rules this procedure will be followed. It is my hope that the required 218 signatures will be obtained promptly so that the House will be able to debate and vote on this vital legislation this year. As I understand the parliamentary situation, December 23 will be the first date the bill could be brought to the floor under the discharge procedure.

Mr. Speaker, December 23 is a date which may conflict with the plans of the Members for a Christmas recess. However, I believe that the enactment of civil rights legislation this year is so essential that the House should remain in session until that unfinished business is completed. There could be no more fitting memorial to our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

One week ago, President Johnson challenged the Congress to act:

> We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law.

The Washington Post, in an editorial published today, puts its finger on the obligation of the Congress to the Nation to complete the business before us. I hope that each of my colleagues will read and seriously consider this editorial of December 4, 1963, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS MUST ACT

Congress, on the very eve of the holiday season, faces a legislative chore sufficient to engage it for weeks of a normal session and for months of a session proceeding at the speed with which it has moved this year.

Civil rights, the tax bill, and the appropriation bills are on the top of its pile of work, but there is a lot more unfinished business. Congressmen, like the rest of us, relish a holiday interlude. But the country is entitled to say to Senators and Representatives who protest at continued unremitting toil: "You asked for work when you hired out." That they did, and the work they hired out to do has not been completed.

If Congress takes a customary adjournment with so many of its tasks unfinished there will be a ghost at every Christmas board, as well as a turkey. Or to use a more current metaphor, there will be two turkeys—the one the Congressmen are eating and the one that represents the session they have just quit.

The work that the Congress came here to do is unfinished. The people have a right to ask Congressmen to finish it. An administration does not have the right to insist that Congress approve everything for which it asks. It does have a right to ask that Congress dispose of the program one way or another. The public, too, has a right to expect that Congress will vote on the matters before it; a right to demand that it permit the administration program to come to a decision.

Congressmen, individually, may feel it is unjust to blame them. No doubt the session has been wearing—perhaps more wearing than when the legislative machinery moves more swiftly. They may say that it is not their fault, but the fault of the rules and the system. But the House makes its own rules. The Senate makes its rules. If the rules preclude expeditious action, why hasn't each body changed its rules? It is to be hoped that next session Congress will at last take a look at the structural defects that have made it one of the most lethargic legislative establishments in the history of democratic government. Now, Congress will have to finish this session's work with the rules as they are. Whatever the defects of the rules, they can still act if Senators and Representatives are sufficiently determined to act. The time has come to end what amounts to a congressional sitdown strike.

The session should proceed on an emergency schedule. Absences in either Chamber should not be allowed lightly. The whole legislative program should be pressed on a crisis basis. There should be no thought of a long holiday recess or adjournment. Private citizens, so far behind in their personal endeavors, would content themselves with a rest on Christmas Eve and Christmas Day and then get on with their work. They have a right to ask their Representatives and Senators to do as they would do in the conduct of their private affairs. The work of the Nation is not less important.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader if he can give us any information as to the legislative program for the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we hope to announce the legislative program for next week on tomorrow. The House will meet during the balance of the week, that is tomorrow, Friday, and Saturday, because the leadership has been notified that objection would be made to going over.

But there will be no legislative business for the balance of the week except such as might be called up under unanimous-consent request.

There will be no conference reports as was previously indicated.

On tomorrow, as previously announced, we of course will have tributes to the memory of our late President.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Can the distinguished majority leader tell us if it is anticipated there will be any business at all tomorrow other than the eulogies to the late President?

Mr. ALBERT. There may be a unanimous-consent request to send bills to conference. Beyond that I know of nothing. There will be no legislative program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Will there be an attempt to get unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Normally that request would be made.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to advise the gentleman I will object to any unanmious-consent request for that purpose. As I understand it, the Committee on the Judiciary has a bill that they want considered on the floor of the House and that Calendar Wednesday is available to them for that purpose.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, when any Member notifies me that he will object, I would respect that notice and would not make the request.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is very courteous and I am making such notification.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, I would respect it.

---

## COEXISTENCE—IS IT POSSIBLE?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the feasibility of coexistence with the Soviet Union is a major debate facing the Nation. Despite the preponderance of evidence dramatizing complete failure of the coexistence theory, the State Department is charging ahead with frantic efforts to appease and coexist with the morally evil philosophy of communism.

I include with my remarks an article which appeared in the Hairenik Weekly of Thursday, November 28, entitled "Coexistence—Is It Possible?" written by Ruben Chudlarian.

Mr. Chudlarian is a noted expert in this field, a former member of the faculty of Central Asia University, and came to the United States from the U.S.S.R. as a political refugee. He is the author of a number of works, among which are "Americans Built Communism," "U.S.S.R.-Prison Nations," for which he received the All-American Conference Award in 1959; "Khrushchev's Call," for which he was awarded the George Washington Medal in 1961, and others.

### COEXISTENCE—IS IT POSSIBLE?

(By Ruben Chudlarian)

Is coexistence possible between communism and capitalism? This is the most discussed problem of our day. It is also the least understood.

The writings of Marx and Lenin assure us that the scholarly Mao Tse-tung is correct in his contention that the founders of the Communist philosophy excluded the possibility of the coexistence of capitalism and communism; his assertion therefore that "Khrushchev is a traitor to Communist ideology," is just. But misinterpretation of the meaning of coexistence leads to serious errors. To understand its real intention let us lay open to the attention of the world Khrushchev's ideological cerebrations.

Reporting to the Plenum of Central Committee CPSU (see Pravda, June 19, 1963), Khrushchev asserted: "There cannot be any thought of coexistence between two ideologies: Communist and capitalist * * * the ideological war will continue until capitalism perishes from the world." He went on to say, "Our party considers coexistence as the right way which leads to the victory of communism over capitalism."

Now then, turning our attention to the program of the CPSU, accepted at the 22d Congress, we read that "by 1980 * * * people will live under communism," and that "the state is bound to wither away." It is obvious however that the government in Russia cannot be liquidated while it is beleagured by states with other systems. To meet this, the program says, "To insure that the state will wither away completely it is necessary to make a final settlement between capitalism and communism in the world arena in favor of communism." It is evident that Khrushchev, the creator of this program, believes that the "final settlement," another term of "coexistence" will assist him to achieve his goal.

There is another cause that worries the party. As long as democratic countries continue to exist, there will remain the opportunity for people to get rid of a way of life—communism—to which it is difficult for human nature to become accustomed. The only way to wrest the hope of freedom from the people and force them to submit to the Communist way of life is to destroy the agent of unrest—the democratic world.

From this brief observation the logical conclusion is that the building of communism can be realized only after the destruction of Western democracy, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung agree in this regard; therefore, both of these leaders, one of orthodox Marxism, the other of the "modernized" version are our enemies. The difference between them is that while Mao Tse-tung openly announces his aims, Khrushchev's method calculated to destroy world independence is crafty. The latter's political activities are the reflection of a personality immune to all decency. Khrushchev demonstrated this when he denounced Stalin, whose close associate he had been, and declared that he himself had played no part in the murder of millions of people.

As the savage he is, he pulverized the bones of Hungarian women and children under Russian tanks, and then blandly declared that the Hungarian working class had been responsible for suppressing what he termed "two counterrevolutionary uprisings."

With unsurpassed cynicism he threw up the Berlin wall, declaring it a step "to defend the freedom of East Berlin working people from American imperialists."

With typical sneakiness, calculating that he would force the United States to its knees before him, he installed his missiles in Cuba. One can enumerate dozens of such ignoble deeds on the part of the chairman of the U.S.S.R. and the general secretary of CPSU, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev.

Taking into account Khrushchev's methods and philosophies in prosecution of state business, sober-thinking Americans are at a loss to explain how our statesmen dare risk a nuclear ban agreement with such a person and, generally, with Communists, who for 45 years have subscribed to Lenin's point of view that "It is naivete to take a treaty with a bourgeoisie government seriously." (Dr. Kim et al., Istoryia, SSSR—Epokha Sotsializma, Moscow, 1958, p. 116.)

But understanding permeates us when we examine deeply the motivations which often guide our statesmen. In a cover story, couched in high-powered language, Time (see Aug. 2, 1963) pictured the "great deeds" of a certain U.S. diplomat. In reading this masterpiece of huckstering, one imagines him a veritable star in the firmaments of statesmanship. But if Mr. Luce, the editor-in-chief, had put to himself the question, "What has democracy gained from that diplomat's activities, this same individual who for long years has been working in the field of creating correct relations between the United States and the Communist empire?" Mr. Luce might receive this answer:

Thanks to the diplomacy of the this diplomat, one-third of humanity is groaning under the dictatorial weight of the Communist parties; and if such stars should continue to contribute to the cause of democracy, we can be certain that the remaining two-thirds of mankind, still free, will in the next decades join their brethren in Communist captivity.

Remarkable indeed are Khrushchev's sayings about such opinions. He points out that "Americans * * * the world gendarmes of imperialism, have lately performed the role of gendarmery in psychological warfare." He sneers, "The gentlemen from Washington imagine that they can shatter our belief in the Communist cause." He cited a well written poem (see elsewhere) concerning this matter. And the party plenum laughed and applauded him at length. "Some rotten ideologists," he continued, "have invented a theory of hybridization; that means the fusion of communism with capitalism by moderation of the first and the modernization of the second." (Apparently he referred to Walter Lippmann's pet theory.)

What are the ways of coexistence with which Khrushchev shall inevitably destroy capitalism? There is no need to enumerate the many devices Communists use for such a purpose. Everybody knows about them. However, lately, he has been using his tools so shrewdly as to fool even the venerable old men in the Vatican. He sends his son-in-law to the Pope to show that he is not the enemy of Christianity. (We advise the clergy who preach that Christianity can exist with communism to read the opinion of the party about it in Izvestia, June 2, 1963.)

> By this maneuver, Khrushchev helped the Communists to gain a considerable victory in the recent Italian elections. He proved at the same time that through the policy of coexistence, everything can be achieved.
>
> Let us consider what consequences will follow on the so-called nuclear test ban treaty, lauded as a "turning point in the history of mankind." (This may be correct but the question is: Is this a turning point toward world slavery or freedom?)
>
> 1. This treaty leads to the disunity of the Western World, already shaky because of economic conflicts among nations of the European Common Market and others.
>
> 2. France's refusal to accept this treaty creates a situation whereby the United States and England and their ally Soviet Union now must consider France as some sort of enemy of humanity.
>
> 3. With some reason, West Germans are suspicious of the sincerity of our Government. The fact that East Germany has signed this treaty means that the United States has acknowledge her de facto. This is contrary to the interests of Bonn.
>
> 4. Our friendship with the Soviets will strangulate the struggle of the Russian intelligentsia against the Party dictatorship, a struggle inspired by Western psychological warfare against Communist ideology. (Intellectuals who raise their voices against the Party are called in Communist jargon "kulak supporters of American capitalism.") This movement is one of the mightiest forces Khrushchev fears. A study of the text of his speech, as it appeared in the March 14, 1963, issue of Pravda shows, that Khrushchev approached the problem of the Soviet intellectual strata with a gingerly nervousness of precedental proportions. His vexation with the Russian intelligentsia can be compared with Tsar Alexander III who was considered as "a triumphant pig threatening to eat the moon." So too Khrushchev.
>
> 5. With this treaty we simply augmented Khrushchev's prestige in the Communist camp as well in the world arena. (Reason prompts us to support neither Khrushchev nor Mao Tse-tung, to let them gorge on each other. Such a scene would heap increasing discredit on the Marxist ideology.)
>
> 6. The hypocritical friendship of the two forces will tend to slacken the watchfulness of our industrialists. They will increase their trade with Soviets and with it increase its potentials, thus accelerating Moscow's economic offensive. It can be foreseen that in a few years the world trade in oil will be the first victim; the steel industry will follow, and so on.
>
> 7. Whereas we will carry out honestly our end of the treaty, there is no guarantee that Khrushchev will do the same. It is misleading to feel that we can control Russia's actions. If our intelligence service is so poorly organized that the Government has little correct information as to what is going on in Cuba, what then of our intelligence of Russia? Her spaciousness alone (United States of America, 3 million square miles: U.S.S.R., 8.6 million square miles) allows her to conduct every kind of secret operation, particularly in the North Siberian and in the Arctic Ocean regions.
>
> In addition to these and other circumstances that will follow from this treaty, it must be strongly emphasized that we gave a considerable boost to the cause of International Communist movement from our actions in this regard. That the negotiation and the treaty was signed in the capital of Soviet Union led the wide masses of people all over the world to believe as Izvestia (see July 29, 1963) said, that the Communist Party proved that it strives for peace, that it is on guard for the welfare of mankind, and that Soviet Union has become so strong as to force the "American imperialists to give up their savage longing for war."
>
> The Kremlin, the site of the early tyrant-tsars who tormented the unhappy moujik, and in our days of "enlightened" civilization, of the Communist tyrants who have murdered about 12 million persons: the Kremlin, the most terrible place on earth, now is shining brighter than the sun, now a more important shrine than Jerusalem and Mecca.
>
> Khrushchev can be proud that he has realized his nation's "historical mission" that Russia has the duty of "saving civilization from the decadent West."
>
> For years the international Communist movement has been cultivating in the peoples' minds the idea that Washington is the den of capitalist obscurity. They have achieved their aim. By heightening the importance of the Kremlin, we have downgraded our Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the historical and unchallenged logic of this article, I hope that the true sentiments of the American public will be considered by the State Department planners, and that a policy of ultimate victory in the cold war rather than surrender through coexistence will be adopted. I urge the Members of Congress, representing as they do all citizens of our great land, to use our collective influence to halt the dangerous and self-defeating foreign policy course now being charted.

## COVER-UP ON OSWALD?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am more than ever convinced that any investigation of the assassination of John F. Kennedy must center upon the State Department's role in bringing defector Lee Harvey Oswald back to the United States. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 812 for this purpose.

Why was Oswald in Minsk? Was it because there is a Soviet espionage school there? How did his wife, apparently the daughter of a Red army intelligence colonel, happen to be in Minsk? What has the girl in the Embassy in Moscow who interrogated Oswald for hours, really have to say about this?

In introducing this report of suppression of news from the Washington Post of Sunday, December 1, I must warn about our being diverted by false issues and attempts to cover up the facts. The public does not want a whitewash or a phony witch hunt. The Washington Post article follows:

> ### Diplomat Is Silenced on Oswald
>
> Tokyo, November 30.—The American consul who handled the case of Lee Oswald when the accused Presidential assassin tried to renounce his U.S. citizenship in Moscow in 1959, says he has been ordered by the State Department not to discuss the case.
>
> Richard Snyder, now First Secretary in the U.S. Embassy here, said the order was based on the fact that Oswald's case was now under judicial investigation and, therefore, it would not be appropriate to say anything.
>
> Snyder did indicate, however, that Oswald never formally renounced his U.S. citizenship.
>
> Oswald is reported to have complained to American correspondents in the fall of 1959 in Moscow, where he was living at the time, that Snyder had tried to talk him out of renouncing his American citizenship.

## COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when one single telephone call can cancel a sole source procurement and convert it into a procurement where American industry is given a chance to work the cost-reducing magic of competitive purchasing, all is not peaches and cream with the military purchasing agents of our country.

Yet, this is exactly what has happened in the case I shall detail for you today. The Army said it had to buy 141 pulse transformers from only one bidder because it had no plans, specifications, or drawings.

After a simple telephone call from me, the Army found drawings in the Navy, secured them, and now plans to buy the item competitively. What kind of testimony is this to the efficiency of our military procurement people?

I think it actually demonstrates how superficial is the work being done in procurement sections. It shows just how inadequate and inefficient is the coordination of our military services.

Mr. Speaker, how many hundreds of cases such as this are there that I, with my small staff and limited time, am unable to uncover? How much money is being wasted each day on just such purchases with such flimsy justifications?

This latest case came to my attention on July 30, 1963, when I saw a bid document for these pulse transformers among the 50-odd documents received from the Small Business Administration that day.

The document explained that the Army proposed to buy, from one source with no competition, 14 of these pulse transformers. Its reason was "no drawings available."

This aroused my interest and I telephoned Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, then head of the Army's Electronics Materiel Agency, in Philadelphia, Pa. I said to him that he might find drawings had been purchased several times and should exist. This was based on informal information available to me from industry.

General Stanwix-Hay said he would look into the matter. On August 7, 1963, he reported that the transformer had been bought on at least three previous occasions without competitive bidding.

He also wrote me:

> As a result of your inquiry, the Navy was queried as to the availability of drawings. An affirmative response was achieved, and drawings are being obtained to determine their adequacy for competitive procurement.

Later, on October 25, 1963, I received another report, this time from Brig. Gen. Wesley Franklin, the new commander at Philadelphia. He informed me that Navy drawings had been secured August 22 and that subsequent events proved adequate technical data does exist and has been secured from Navy by Army.

General Franklin concluded his report to me thus:

> It was determined that a sole source procurement was not appropriate. Consequently, the RFP (request for proposal) was cancelled and these requirements are planned to be procured on a competitive solicitation.

When that competitive procurement takes place, Mr. Speaker, it is my prediction the price will fall by at least 50 percent or more and the taxpayers will have won another victory.

The outcome of this case is simply more evidence that the right hand of military procurement does not know what the left hand is doing. This is just one small transaction. There are hundreds, maybe thousands more just like it.

These reports prove conclusively that only superficial attention was given this matter by the Army. But for quick action, the taxpayer would have been the loser. This is typical of the way in which some procurement people take the line of least resistance and the easy way out, in order to make their jobs easier. They may have succeeded in the past, but now they are being exposed; and, as a result, more and more competitive procurements are being conducted by the military.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the kind of work my study has turned up over a continuing period. This is why I continue to fight for competitive procurement, for full disclosure of information and for more efficiency in the expenditure of the tax dollar.

Is it any wonder, in the light of what has been exposed, that the Defense Department tried to shut off my source of information—the bid sets that I pick up every day at SBA?

Mr. Speaker, what is needed in military purchasing at all levels is harder and more efficient work. Every avenue must be exhausted before competitive bidding is ruled out.

We are winning battle after battle, but progress is still too slow. Although the military is slowly admitting its mistakes and correcting them, a complete revamping is needed from top to bottom to really get the job done.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## SHEVCHENKO A MONUMENT TO WORLD FREEDOM

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the late President Kennedy was a man of varied literary and scholarly interests, as well as a leader in the cause of world freedom. When he saw the power of the word giving eloquent and immortal expression to the coviction of world freedom, he perceived an everlasting greatness which he himself was quick to honor. This he did in the case of the Ukrainian poet laureate and national hero, Taras Shevchenko, when in 1961 he joined with others to say:

> We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

### EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER TARAS SHEVCHENKO 1814–61

When Shevchenko's monument to world freedom will be unveiled in our Capital next May, it will also be a monumental tribute to all Americans who, like the late President, have with knowledge and perception understood the universal symbol of Shevchenko for world freedom. Indeed, the statue will honor the understanding and vision of our late President.

It was my privilege to join with other Members in the 86th Congress in support of the legislation authorizing the erection of a statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko. For those in our country who still were unfamiliar with East European history, we in that Congress made possible the publication of a documentary biography of Shevchenko. The House of Representatives Document No. 445, titled "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–61," sets forth both the paramount reasons for the statue and the highlights of Shevchenko's universal significance as reflected in his works and life. The foreword of the booklet, written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, explains these reasons clearly and forthrightly, and I append this foreword to my remarks at this point:

### FOREWORD

There is a rapidly growing interest on the part of Americans in the affairs and history of Eastern Europe. The conditions and challenges of our times demand and intensify this necessary interest. Needless to say, it is in our own national interest to cultivate and broaden this intellectual concern so that the products of our knowledge and understanding may be wisely and pragmatically applied toward our survival as an independent and free nation.

As this thriving interest expands and deepens, new names and new places will emerge within the compass of our knowledge. Those who fought for freedom and those who perpetuated tyranny and despotism will be ordered accordingly in our minds. In this inevitable process the name of Shevchenko and the place of Ukraine sooner or later will be understood and appreciated by Americans generally. This is particularly true because the two are inseparably bound with man's persistent struggle for expanded freedom, the struggle which is crucial for us.

One of the chief reasons for this documentary biography of one of the most outstanding freedom fighters in Eastern Europe, within the tyranny-ridden Russian Empire itself, is, of course, to facilitate and abet this mounting American interest in the invincible forces at work in the imperial successor to that Empire, the present Soviet Union. Another reason is the fact that 1961 marks the Shevchenko Centennial, the hundredth anniversary of the death of this immortal East European freedom fighter. Free and honest men will celebrate the year in informed memory of the enduring works of Shevchenko in the service of freedom: Totalitarians in Moscow's present farflung empire will distort these works in a futile endeavor to claim this historic figure as one of theirs.

Concretely, why should every thinking American know the significance of this centennial, the historic meaning of Shevchenko, and the fundamental importance of his Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.? Clearly, there are six basic reasons justifying the necessity of such knowledge:

1. For quite a number of years now, we have been told—and rightly so—that we should understand other peoples and other nations in our own interest as well as in the interest of truth itself. In response to this sound urging, this brochure is an open invitation to learning about another nation and its personification. The prime motivation behind it has no relation to any sentimental attachment to a figure that existed a hundred years ago; rather, it is a live and intelligent recognition of his perennial spirit in the present and for the future. This is not just a literary memorial of things accomplished in the past but, more so, an important means to utilize in our day the work and the symbolic value of an immortal so that victory over the dark forces of Russia's imperialist totalitarianism may be assured. The man is buried on the bank of the Dnieper near the town of Kaniv, but as the English author, W. R. Morfill, puts it, "The tomb of the poet is the object of special reverence among his countrymen, the Mecca of the Ukrainian patriots."

2. The observance of the Shevchenko Centennial by free men everywhere goes beyond the person of this champion of liberty. Shevchenko has a symbolic and inspirational value not for just a few people but actually for over 40 million and countless more. As concerns his native Ukraine alone, we are dealing in essence with a nation of over 40 million, which happens to be the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain and the second largest nation within th U.S.S.R. itself. Subtract this captive non-Russian nation from the U.S.S.R. and Moscow's economic, military, political and cultural claims, largely built upon imperial piracy, become heavily deflated.

One need only delve into the record of the anti-Communist and anti-imperialist Russian resistance on the part of the Ukrainian nation from 1918 to present date in order to grasp the full meaning of Shevchenko. This record is readily accessible even in the archives of our own Government, the reports of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression and also of the House Un-American Activities Committee and others. Indeed, our memorials bear a much broader significance. They impinge with striking effect upon the hearts, the minds, and souls of millions of people. Thus, in the incessant cold war it is vitally important for us, in favor of our own American interests, to symbolize in every respect our friendship and spiritual affinity with the large Ukrainian nation. As early as 1877, Charles Dickens well perceived the power of Shevchenko and his writings when he observed that Ukrainians "worship the memory of Shevchenko."

3. A further observation which deserves equal emphasis is the fact that Shevchenko is not only a national figure of a given people but is also a luminous personality in the whole course of contemporary East European history. Beyond peradventure of doubt, his role forms a prominent chapter in the fight of humanity for freedom. His works dwell not only on the oppression of the Ukrainian people but also on the enslavement of every other nation raped by the Russian masters, which means the Poles, Lithuanians, Georgians, and many other non-Russian peoples. He strongly protested the denial of civil rights to the Jews in the Russian Empire of the white czars, and fought persistently and courageously for the freedom of nations and the liberties of individuals. As the contents of this brochure disclose, his solid stature in world literature is also a point of fact not to be overlooked. A contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, he, too, dedicated his life to the emancipation of nations and men from the bondage of Russian imperialism and totalitarian tyranny.

4. Our great tradition and all that it uniquely entails has rubbed off on many nations and innumerable people throughout the world. Shevchenko is a crystal-clear example of this irresistible process. His works make explicit reference to Washington, and the ideals, progress, and just laws of our Nation, founded ultimately upon the moral and political principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, constitute a powerful source of inspiration and hope to Shevchenko and his Ukraine.

5. There can be no doubt that despite the genius of freedom thought found in Shevchenko's writings, Moscow will, through its formidable propaganda organs, pollute and distort his contributions to humanity in the course of the centennial. The Russian totalitarians have had to reckon with the immense popularity of the bard among the Ukrainians and other peoples. Their attempts to degrade him as a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist" have seriously backfired. Spuriously, they characterize him as a "revolutionary democrat" who fought against Russian tsarism but not against Russian imperialism and colonialism in behalf of the independence of Ukraine and other subjugated non-Russian nations in the former white empire. In brief, reading Shevchenko will convince any objective person that he belongs to us, not to tyrannical Moscow, past or present.

6. Finally, it will be recalled that in July 1959, Congress passed an extremely significant measure, namely the Captive Nations Week Resolution. For the first time our Government recognized the essential fact that there are even more numerous captive nations within the U.S.S.R. than exist in so-called satellite Europe. Shevchenko's Ukraine is one of them, the largest in all of captive Europe. It is evident that this document is genuinely in the spirit and intent of that resolution, which is now Public Law 86–90.

There is a good deal of foolishness in our thinking about the Soviet Union. Our lingering misconceptions and myths about this uneasy empire structure only contribute to the success of Moscow's worldwide propaganda of deceit and lies. We consistently give vent to the impression that the Soviet Union is a gigantic monolith, flexing its military, economic, and political muscles. The overriding fact is that it is the very opposite of a monolith or a "nation." Actually the existence of the majority captive non-Russian nations within the so-called state of the U.S.S.R. shows it to be an unsteady empire and a prison house of nations, capable of crumbling under a real test of comparative strength. For us, their existence is as great—if not more so—a deterrent against the outbreak of a hot global war as the strength of our composite military posture.

The U.S. celebration of the Shevchenko Centennial will demonstrate to Moscow that we are perfectly aware of and sympathize profoundly with the freedom aspirations of the Ukrainian people and other captive nations in the present Red Russian Empire. It will also show that we proudly take Shevchenko as our own and view with repugnance Moscow's brazen exploitation of his name and his works. For truly he was in the vanguard of national and individual freedom in Eastern Europe, the striking antithesis of traditional Russian totalitarianism. Our memorial to him plainly symbolizes the spirit of Washington which Shevchenko called and died for in all of captive Europe and Asia. This unforgettable figure lived 100 years ago, but by his words, soul, and thought he is with us today in the fight for world freedom and the liberation of the numerous subjugated nations under the yoke of imperialist and colonial Moscow.

In this noble spirit, the essays in this document furnish many rich insights into the nature of the hero and the challenges of his times which substantially were no different from those facing us today. Words are inadequate to express fully our popular gratitude for the efforts and clear foresight of the Honorables Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; John Lesinski, of Michigan; Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan; John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating, of New York; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, and many others who advanced the idea of appropriately observing the Shevchenko Centennial. Their unstinting aid and the superb assistance offered by the members and staff of the Senate Rules Committee, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, and Senator Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, will long be remembered. This biographical document would not have been possible without the special efforts of the prominent and distinguished Representative of Michigan, the Honorable John Lesinski. The magnificent cooperation of the membership and staff of the House Administration Committee in the preparation of this document draws our everlasting thanks.

Moreover, the solid contributions provided by the several testimonies on Shevchenko in March 1960 have laid a firm groundwork of understanding for the centennial. The testimonies are available for reading purposes in the offices of the House Administration Committee. They were prepared and submitted by Representative Bentley, Senator Javits, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Mr. Dmytro Halychyn, president of the Ukrainian National Association, Mr. George Wolynetz, Jr., national commander of the Ukrainian American Veterans, and Mr. Mykola Lebed, president of the Prolog Research and Publishing Association.

Lev E. Dobriansky,
*Georgetown University.*

### INEXCUSABLE IGNORANCE

Mr. Speaker, in light of all that has been written and said about Shevchenko, it is inexcusable for anyone who has an interest in this highly important project to display ignorance of his stature as a universal poet, as an early freedom fighter in the Russian Empire, a firm adversary of all forms of oppression and, above all, a living spirit of freedom and independence for the captive non-Russian nations in and outside the Soviet Union. Recently, contradictory editorials in the Washington Post have unfortunately put on such a display, and a member of the National Capital Planning Commission has overstepped himself in his attempt to use these false editorial opinions for a reconsideration of the Shevchenko site.

The reaction to the smear campaign has been swift and heavy. A voluminous amount of letters sent to the Post have not been published. However, I should like to join my colleagues in offering two examples of this reaction. One is a pungent letter written and sent by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, to Mrs. James H. Rowe, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. The other is a letter published in the November 19, 1963, issue of the Evening Star, which praises that paper's writer, Robert J. Lewis, for his fair and excellent article "The Status of a Statue," November 10. I include both as part of my remarks:

November 18, 1963.

Dear Mrs. Rowe: One of our Washington newspapers gave space recently to some belated protests against the erection of the Shevchenko statue.

This sort of thing, as you well know, is nothing new. There is scarcely a monument now gracing this memorial city but what, before its accomplishment, was the target of some critic.

Certainly no person who has the historic background of knowledge to realize the notable significance for the free world of the Shevchenko statue will have any doubt as to the appropriateness of this likeness of a freedom lover and a tyrant hater to be raised in this land of the free. It is no wonder the project has thrilled millions of patriotic hearts in America.

It is as ridiculous for the Kremlin masters of deceit to claim Shevchenko as one of them as it would be to profane history by saying that Washington was an ally of Benedict Arnold in his perfidy, or for it to be represented 100 years from now that the gangster, Valachi, was really a member of an organization to enforce the Ten Commandments. For the Moscow conspiracy against decency to reach back and unblushingly tell the world that if Shevchenko lived and wrote today he would be the mouthpiece of the butchers of Budapest, and of the horrors poured out on Shevchenko's own country, the Ukraine, is to insult the intelligence of both the free world and those fettered behind the Iron Curtain.

The Ukraine is enslaved now even more than it was under the czarist autocracy. It was the ruthless Soviet revolutionaries who stopped the ringing of jubilant bells in the Ukraine as they were pealing out the emancipation for which Shevchenko fought and wrote. For Khrushchev, whose hands drip with Ukrainian blood, to claim any kinship with this noble patriot is enough to make angels weep at such blatant hypocrisy. Nothing arouses this dictator more than the resolve of America to keep before the conscience of the world the Red regime's crimes of genocide, deportation, and liquidation. Shevchenko's voice cries out against the present Russian colonialism. They can't explain his calling those who degrade their fellows "a cursed crew" and asking "when shall we get another Washington?"

This monument will be reared in the one nation which stands with its massive might against world domination of the slave system—it will be a rainbow of hope to all the captive peoples now yearning to breathe free. No more effective blow against the mobilized forces of evil vowing to bury us can possibly be made than the erection of this statue.

I am enclosing my article of some time ago, "Wanted—Another Washington," from the Washington Star.

I feel sure the membership of the National Capital Planning Commission is so high grade that any falsely based criticism will not affect the decision it has already wisely made regarding the Shevchenko statue.

With every good wish, I am,

Yours cordially,

FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS.

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 19, 1963]

### STATUS OF A STATUE

How refreshing to have read Robert J. Lewis' very fine article, "The Status of a Statue." In it, Mr. Lewis ably demonstrated his insight of the symbolism of the Shevchenko movement and its impact on Americans, if we wish to continue to sustain our image as a beacon of hope to all freedom-seeking and freedom-loving people, and the consequences if we do not.

The present smear campaign and brazenness in disputing the integrity and decisions of two Presidents, Congress, and Government officials, the extraordinary intolerance recently demonstrated by a few bigots, certainly displays an absolutely antonymous concept of the justice for which we stand.

Most assuredly, the statue of Taras Shevchenko would give Washington, in the words of Mr. Lewis, "cause to rejoice that human brotherhood and understanding once again have affirmed the cause of freedom." The decision is ours; the decision is American.

VERA A. DOWHAN.

### A GIFT TO KHRUSHCHEV?

Mr. Speaker, unless some in our midst are intent upon giving Khrushchev a valuable gift by dishonoring Shevchenko and all his works in behalf of freedom, the forthcoming statue will not only honor the man but also stand as concrete evidence of our American resolve to work with all captive nations for the common cause of world freedom. The statue will be an enduring symbol of universal brotherhood toward freedom for all. For the enlightenment of those who would offer Khrushchev the valuable cold war gift, I submit at the conclusion of my remarks a very illuminating article titled "Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet of Freedom," which was written by Pauline Bentley and published in the UNESCO Courier, July-August 1961—one among countless informative articles on the poet of world freedom:

### TARAS SHEVCHENKO: UKRAINE'S POET OF FREEDOM

(By Pauline Bentley)

A 100 years ago a poet who was one of the world's great champions of freedom died in St. Petersburg. This year, his centenary is being celebrated not only in his own land, Ukraine, but throughout the Soviet Union, and in many great cities of the world including the American Capital, Washington, where a statue is to be raised in his commemoration. This man's name is Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and patriot who not only established his country's literature high among world letters, but who actually lived his poetry. A torchbearer of liberty, his whole life mirrored the sufferings of his oppressed country and the unconquerable, indomitable will of its people to freedom.

The vast territory of Ukraine with its population of 40 million stretches from Poland and Czechoslovakia to the Black and Azov Seas, and is the second largest nation within the U.S.S.R. Of it Voltaire wrote "L'Ukraine a toujours aspiré à être libre," for its history is one of endless invasion and national effort to throw off oppression. Its literature goes back to the 10th century but at that time it mostly made use of an artificial language based on the ceremonial Church Slavonic; only in 1789 (the year of the French Revolution) did the Ukrainian writer Kotlyarevsky introduce the spoken language in literature and so lay a foundation for Shevchenko to elaborate on.

Taras Shevchenko was born in a village near the banks of the Dnieper in 1814; he was born a serf, a scrap of humanity without rights or privileges, belonging entirely to the local landlords. It is perhaps difficult to imagine what harsh misery the enslaved poverty of serfdom meant to the Ukrainian peasant at this time, but the waves of change which had brought American independence and the French Revolution, which had washed away the old autocratic orders in Europe and North America, had rippled to stagnation before reaching the East.

In 1814 Ukraine was still a feudal land under czarist tyranny. The fertile beauty of the countryside of Taras' childhood stood in cruel contrast to the living conditions of his people but both these aspects of the life around him affected him deeply; from one he learned a passionate patriotism, a love of his country which was to remain undimmed by exile or absence, and from the other he learned a hatred of tyranny, of oppression and injustice which inspires his poetry with the divine fire of liberty.

"O dear and quiet land
O my Ukraine
Why do they plunder thee?
Why has death come to hut and lea?

"Break your chains and live as brothers.
In a foreign country
Do not seek and do not search for
What is nonexistent.

"In your home, you'll find your justice
And your strength and freedom.
The world has only one Ukraine
Dniepro cannot be found elsewhere."

As a boy Taras showed early a vivid imagination and a passion for drawing. When he was left an orphan at the age of 12, he sought a teacher and from a brutal drunken clerk did learn to read and write though this man's harshness finally drove him elsewhere. He quickly exhausted the meager local sources of learning open to him and after a disconsolate spell of village cattle-minding, he was summoned to work as scullion in the manorial kitchens. From there he attended the young master, Pavel Vasilyevitch Engelhardt, who took him as part of his retinue on his travels.

A new world opened up before Taras; he wonderingly absorbed all he could of this unaccustomed grandeur, and secretly studied the art treasures housed round him. One night in the Engelhardt establishment at Wilno, the master returned late to find Taras absorbed in copying a print by candlelight. He had the boy flogged next day for his temerity but was so impressed by the quality of the copy that he decided to allow Taras to study with the Wilno painter, Rustem, and later, on moving to St. Petersburg, apprenticed Taras to the painter Shirayev, a harsh and cruel master who turned his pupils into drudges.

Taras had little leisure, but in the white nights of the early summer he would go to the Summer Gardens of St. Petersburg to sketch the ancient statues there for his own pleasure. It is on such an occasion that he is said to have met a fellow Ukrainian, Ivan Soshenko, who was studying at the Imperial Academy of Arts.

Soshenko introduced Taras to his friends, to the Imperial Academy circle and the famous painter Bryulov, who at once decided that Taras must study at the academy too. As a serf, Taras was ineligible to do this. Engelhardt proved unwilling to part with his talented protege and finally only agreed to sell him his freedom for the almost prohibitive price of 2,500 silver rubles.

To raise this sum, Taras' new friends rallied round; Bryulov interested the celebrated poet Zhukhovsky who commissioned a Bryulov portrait of himself and had it auctioned by private lottery. On April 22, 1838 (a year after the death of Pushkin) Engelhardt received his 2,500 rubles; Taras Shevchenko became a free man for the first time in his life.

From the grime of Shirayev's garret he was transported to the enchanted halls of the academy where his work won him acclaim and whence he graduated honorably in 1845. He made many friends in the open-hearted Bryulov circle, including the actor Shchepkin, and he began thirstily to fill the gaps in his education, absorbing all he could of literature and the arts, but underneath all his sophisticated activities he could not forget Ukraine, the sufferings of his people or the family he had left there unable to share his freedom.

There arose in him a new passion, to express all his homesickness and love for his country in Ukrainian verse. Years later he wrote of this period spent in Bryulov's studio in these words. "And what did I do in that holy of holies? It is strange to think of it. I occupied myself with writing Ukrainian verses * * *. I cherished in my heart my blind Kobzar and my bloodthirsty Haydamaky as in the shadows of the wild steppes I saw pass before me the shades of our good hetmen.

"Before me stretched the steppe, studded with burial mounds. Before me lay my fair, my unhappy Ukraine in all its chaste loveliness. And I mused, lost in thought; I could not tear my inner eye from that enchanting beauty. It was a vocation, that was all."

It was a vocation. In 1840 an enthusiastic Ukrainian merchant found Shevchenko's verses while sitting for his portrait in the artist's studio and immediately published them at his own expense. Shevchenko called the little book "Kobzar," after the name of the old Ukrainian wandering folkbards. Keeping to the traditional folksong form and within the romantic current of the day, he idealizes the stern and bitter conflicts which the Kozaks of old had waged for independence, glorifying the Kobzars who alone had kept alive the memory of Ukraine's heroic age.

"Kobzar" marks an epoch and the beginning of a new Ukrainian literature; it throws a bridge between its ancient treasures, the later work of Kotlyarevsky, and modern literature. For the first time a major poet emerges to pour out his heart in his native tongue and express the sufferings of his people and their past. And because he lived so deeply in their thoughts and feelings, they accepted his poems as their own songs and composed music to them: Today his works are in almost every Ukrainian home and are sung throughout Russia.

But his poetry is more than just folksong; it has the magic simplicity and melody of pure verse. "Owls are calling/ sleeps the forest/ stars are shining brightly * * *." "Like the sea the field whitened/ by the driving snowflakes. * * *" Countless country images reflect the poet's mastery of his art. Together with this evocative lyricism, his poems are permeated with his innate humanism.

No one knew better than he the harshness of the peasant way of life. In the theme for instance of the village girl transgressing the moral code, he poignantly and repeatedly makes a plea for compassion and tolerance. In his long epic poem "The Haydamaky," which came out in 1841 and recalled the 1768 revolt of the Ukrainians against their Polish overlords, he writes "Why should people destroy each other? * * * Only see, they are the same kind of people, they could live, they could be friends."

In 1843 he gave way to his intolerable longing and returned home to Ukraine; he was welcomed everywhere as a national poet, portrait commissions flowed in, all doors were open before him, but the terrible sufferings he saw among the peasants on his travels throughout the country brought about a sharp change in his work. His idealization of the Kozak epoch gave place to stinging castigation of the enslavement, despotism and tyranny he saw everywhere exercised on behalf of the Czar Nicholas I. He became openly rebellious to every institution, whether religious or civil, which seemed to tolerate such terror, cruelty and injustice as were suffered by the Ukrainian serf. He began a series of poems which from a literary standpoint are considered his most perfect. Politically they were dynamite; they could not possibly be published in the Russia of that time and their circulation even in a private album which Shevchenko called "Three Years" figured greatly in his arrest in 1847.

Among these poems, "The Great Grave" recounts in mystical terms the immortal freedom-loving spirit; "The Dream," written in a form of fantastic satire, contains an acid attack upon the Imperial family in which the poet ridicules the Court and likens the Empress to a dried mushroom; the whole poem is one of his bitterest attacks against tyranny.

"The people's loud cries and their laughs are not heard—
They strip the patched clothing from off of the beggars
They strip with the hides—for the poor must find shoes
For youthful young princes. They pummel the widow
To pay her poll taxes; they fetter her son
Her son, her one son, the only child that she has;
Her hope—and they send him away to the army
But for a while—yet in filth and in mud
The boy is soon bloated—from hunger he dies,
His mother is reaping the wheat at forced labour."

In another poem, "The Caucasus," Shevchenko celebrates the struggle of the mountain people for their freedom. He sent this poem to Paris to the Polish revolutionary and poet, Adam Mickiewicz, a follower of Mazzini, and it shows his widening interest in the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but everywhere.

"And our human spirit dies not
And our freedom dies not.
It is for us to keep on weeping
With bloody sweat and bitter tear.
And mix each day with our daily bread
Truth will rise and so will freedom.
And meanwhile the streams are flowing
Streams of blood are flowing."

At about this time appears the poem "The Feeble Minded" (Jurodyvyj) in which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, wrote:

"When shall we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law
And receive we will some day."

In Kiev during this period he found sympathetic friends among a group of young Pan-Slavic revolutionaries called the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius; their revolutionary ideals for peasant enlightenment and emancipation encouraged him to write "The Heretic," a poem honoring the Czech reformer Jan Huss and glorifying him not so much as a great scholar but as a representative of the common people.

"Seer you caught the glimpse of freedom,
Freedom and of truth,
And the Slav wide-scattered family,
Sunk in dark and slavery,
You collected all together."

The existence of this society was betrayed to the authorities in February 1847 and they acted swiftly and savagely suppressed it. By April Shevchenko and his friends were arrested and sent to St. Petersburg. In prison there the poet produced a number of verses in which he expressed his concern for the future of his country and the fate of his people. His main indictments were the "outrageous and to the highest degree insolent" poems and the "Three Years" album confiscated at his arrest.

On May 30 he was sentenced to serve as an ordinary soldier in the bare Orenburg steppe, "a broad, unlocked prison." On his sentence file papers Tsar Nicholas I wrote in his own hand, "under the strictest supervision with a prohibtion of writing and sketching."

Shevchenko had been free for only 9 years; now he was back in a bondage more terrible than before, torn away from Ukraine and condemned to live among rough and brutalizing soldiery in the remotest area of eastern Russia. At first sympathetic officers allowed him clandestinely to draw and write,

"Am I to live in this sad plight,
Still many years, forever wasting.
But I am looking, while my heart's flying,
To a dark garden in Ukraine."

When the St. Petersburg authorities got to know of this, the Czar's instructions were carried out to the letter. Shevchenko was sent to a still wilder place, the fortress of Novopetrovsk on the Caspian Sea. Of this place he wrote, "Sand and stones; if only there were one blade of grass, only a tree, but nothing." The endless drill, the absolute deprivation of any creative work or interests wore him away. "There is nothing more bitter than to recall freedom in captivity," he wrote at this time, but even though his health was affected, his spirit remained unbroken and he was able to note in his diary, "all this unspeakable grief, every kind of degradation and harshness passed as if without touching me. * * * Not a single aspect of the inner me was changed."

He was to languish nearly 7 years in Novopetrovsk since, even after the death of Nicholas I. Imperial feelings were still tender from the "dried mushroom" episode. The new Czar Alexander did not include Shevchenko in his general amnesty, and not until 2 years more had passed did friends finally secure his release, when he returned to St. Petersburg to enjoy great moral and political prestige.

One of his first compositions after being freed was "The Neophytes," a daring comparison of the czar with Nero, for Shevchenko had returned from exile with his hatred of czarism equaled only by his hatred of slavery—for him these two evils were related and he never counted the cost in fighting them.

No other European literature has a comparable protest against serfdom and there is no other poet of genius sprung from the serfs who has shown up the ugliness of serfdom with such powerful effect as Shevchenko. He contributed much to the abolition of serfdom by influencing liberal public opinion which played a large part in inducing Alexander to initiate liberal reforms.

He interested himself in etching at the academy, becoming an academician in 1860, and achieving work which caused other artists to call him the "Russian Rembrandt." A Negro actor, Aldridge, came to the city and played Othello there: Shevchenko had always been deeply influenced by Shakespeare; he was much moved by Aldridge's performance and the two men became friends. And he continued to write, raising the flaming banner of his verse in the same causes of justice and liberty as before. Although he risked immediate retaliation, he did not hesitate to sign a statement defending the civil rights of the Jews which where in question, and he consorted openly with the leading radicals of the day including Chernyshevsky who spoke up for a new edition of "Kobzar," which was allowed to be published in 1860 provided none of the post exile poems were included in it.

But despite his valiant spirit, Shevchenko returned broken in body and weary from his exile. Personal unhappiness and loneliness weighed heavily upon him and his last poems, including "Mary" in which he deliberately changes the sacred story to that of an ordinary peasant woman, have more austere, often Biblical, sources: They carry a message emphasizing mankind's need for truth and love and brotherhood.

Against the day of peasant emancipation he wrote a primer for use in schools, but his very last poem is a swansong and a testament of faith that he will in another world—"on Phlegethon, or on the Styx in heaven, or on Dniepro, that mighty river * * *" find a happiness which this life denied him and which, toward the end, he most pathetically sought.

He died on March 10, 1861, and was buried as he had asked:

"In a lofty tomb
Out upon the steppes unbounded
In my own dear Ukraine;
So that I can see before me
The wide stretching meadows
And Dniepro, its banks so lofty,
And can hear it roaring."

His grave lies near the small town of Kanev where in 1939 a memorial was raised to him which has been called "an object of special reverence among his countrymen, the Mecca of all Ukrainian patriots." So it is, but this poet of Ukraine, who took his language as it had been developed, and by the power of his genius ensconced it in modern literature, this apostle of liberty, enemy of all oppression, Taras Shevchenko, goes beyond the narrow limits of one country. He is a poet of humanity; his message of brotherhood and love, truth and justice, and above all, of freedom, is worldwide in scope, universal in significance. Other poets have sung his song, other poets are perhaps better known, but none by the pure identification of his life with his inspiration deserves greater homage or recognition.

(Note.—Taras Shevchenko's first fame came as a painter, especially for his portraits. But his fame today rests with the poetry in which he captured the heart, soul, and image of his native Ukraine. As early as 1860, translations of his poems appeared in Poland, and only a little later Czech and Bulgarian translations also appeared. In 1870, Georg Obrist translated his poems into German and 6 years later they were published in French. By 1903 his works were translated into English. In the past 50 years, Shevchenko's poems have been translated 400 times into 41 languages, numbering 12 million copies. In the poet's native language, for Ukrainians around the world, his works have been published 245 times in almost 7 million copies.)

---

## SALVATION ARMY SERVES POLICE AND GUARDSMEN AT U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Ernest W. Holz, most able divisional commander of the Salvation Army's National Capital Division, rendered a very fine service at the U.S. Capitol on the night of November 24–25, which I wish to bring to the attention of the House today. The need for immediate action was imperative. It is noteworthy that Bridgadier Holz, as usual, worked tirelessly and unceasingly when his services were needed for mankind. Personally, I would like to commend him for the outstanding job he is doing in the Nation's Capital, as divisional commander of the Salvation Army.

Answering a call from the U.S. Capitol Police on Sunday evening, November 24, when it was decided to keep the rotunda open so that hundreds of thousands of citizens lined up might pay respects to their beloved late President, 30 Salvation Army officers, under the direction of Brig. Ernest Holz, divisional commander, provided food and hot coffee throughout the long, cold night to the hundreds of police and guardsmen on duty.

Over 300 gallons of coffee, 325 dozen doughnuts, 1,200 sandwiches, and 20 gallons of hot soup were served to about 4,500 persons.

For most of the police and guardsmen, who had been on duty from 20 to 36 hours, it was the only source of food and refreshment. Many have stated that they could not have made it through without the help of the Salvation Army.

Assisting the local Salvation Army division were three completely equipped mobile canteens from the Salvation Army headquarters in Philadelphia, Pa., who responded to the request of Brigadier Holz and immediately dispatched the units, which arrived at the Capitol shortly after midnight.

Salvation Army personnel remained on duty until Monday morning when the President's casket was removed for the funeral journey to the cathedral.

NOVEMBER 27, 1963.

Brig. ERNEST W. HOLZ,
*Divisional Commander, Salvation Army,*
*National Capital Division,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR BRIGADIER HOLZ: The assassination of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and the subsequent plans and arrangements in connection with the funeral caused a number of emergency situations in the Metropolitan Police Department whereby officials and men were called upon to serve for extended continuous periods of time, even as much as 36 hours. Such a situation occurred at the U.S. Capitol on the night of Sunday, November 24, and continued through the morning of the 25th, when members of the force were on duty to handle the large mass of citizens who came to pay their last respects to the deceased lying in state in the Rotunda.

The night was cold; the men had been on duty for more than a full tour and in need of nourishment; due to the nature of the occasion and the day, business establishments were closed; and we were faced with the possibility of losing some of our much needed manpower due to illness because we were unable to provide warm food and drink for the men's consumption. It was at this time that your local unit arrived with hot coffee and doughnuts and from the reports I have received personally from my men it was a most welcome sight. Recognizing that the local unit was not sufficient for the occasion, one of your foresighted and efficient deputies placed a call, I understand, to you for additional equipment. Arriving on the scene at approximately midnight three of your emergency disaster units from Philadelphia commenced dispensing hot soup, sandwiches, coffee and doughnuts, through the early morning hours until their mission was accomplished.

I cannot be too high in my praise of the Salvation Army and its personnel for the outstanding assistance rendered on this occasion. You have made a multitude of friends within this department and among the general public by your considerate and much needed action in this emergency. Please convey my deep appreciation, and that of all officials and men on duty in the vicinity of the Capitol, to each member of your fine organization who devoted his time and energy for that purpose.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
*Chief of Police.*

P.S.—In a TV interview on WTOP "News Night" program, Tuesday, the 26th, I had publicly expressed my appreciation to the Salvation Army, but when the program was shown that part was deleted.

---

NATIONAL POLICE OFFICERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D.C.*

THE SALVATION ARMY,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR FRIENDS: The Washington police officers were completely shocked and grieved with sorrow of the sad news of the violent and unexpected death of our great late President, John F. Kennedy. Our routine duties in all types of emergency are clear and our superior officers decisions are swift and we were faced with long and arduous duties in connection with the funeral arrangements. We were mourning, cold, hungry, and tired after or rather during the millions of other mourners' visit to our town to witness this historic and sad occasion.

But almost as a bright light from the darkness appeared the symbol of the Salvation Army, and with them they brought warmth and spirit to the many downhearted policemen and people in the cold air. This indeed was a great act and deed of mercy, as the officers mostly were working on their day off and had not eaten a good hot meal for many hours. Your sacrifices were certainly to the very highest human aspects.

As representative of this great organization of police officers throughout the United States, I thank you in their name. For me personally I would like to say that I have fulfilled my pledge to the United Givers Fund for many years, because I know that services such as yours is needed very much by mankind.

May God bless you and keep you forever.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL V. BROWN,
*State Vice President.*

## LET'S VOTE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my support to the discharge petition that will bring the President's civil rights bill before the floor of this House.

I do not attack the committee structure of this honorable House, neither do I wish to criticize any committee chairman or Member of this body. On the contrary, I have continuously defended my colleagues throughout this entire session when unwarranted or misinformed critical comment has been made by the press or by individuals.

However, it will soon be Christmas 1963. For many months now we have waited for a civil rights bill to reach the floor. We are still waiting. The House Judiciary Committee spent 6 months of this year in studying the merits of the Presidential recommendations. That committee did approve a bill and did make a number of changes in the original request.

Surely, the majority of the Members are ready to cast their votes on this subject. I believe the time has come for the House to work its will. Either the civil rights bill is to be passed or it is to be defeated. The choice must be made if possible before the next session begins.

The President of the United States addressed this House on November 27 last. He said in part:

> This is no time for delay. It is a time for action. * * * We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes; it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in the books of law.

I support the call for action so eloquently expressed by the President. I intend to sign the civil rights discharge petition at the first available opportunity. I urge all my colleagues to join me in this attempt to have the House work its will at the very earliest moment. Let us decide this matter in 1963.

## THE INDIGO DYE INDUSTRY VANISHES FROM THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, last year in the course of debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 I voiced regret that several amendments did not find their way into the final bill. While I supported the trade legislation and voted for the bill in the House, I did so with the expectation that constructive and necessary amendments would be made to the bill in the other body.

I particularly cited the need for qualified industrial advisers to serve as consultants to our negotiators during the bargaining sessions. While the bill specifically provides that opportunity shall be given to interested persons to present their views, all of such activity is expected to take place prior to the time of actual negotiations.

We all know, however, that in a subject as complex as this, it is impossible to anticipate every matter with might arise and that judgments will have to be made on the spot. The question is whether those judgments will be naive or informed.

During last year's discussions I said:

> All of us recognize that there is within the framework of this bill a potential for great damage to domestic industry. Most of us are concerned lest the negotiators for other countries be better qualified and more

**knowledgeable than our own. Certainly detailed knowledge of the industry in question, particularly when it is one of great complexity, is essential.**

**A recent occurrence within my own district only serves to reinforce this conviction. The largest employer in Salem County is the Du Pont Co., with the company's largest plant, the Chambers Works, located at Deepwater, N.J. This plant, one of the earliest organic chemical plants in this country, dates from World War I when European sources of dyes and other compounds were cut off by blockade of transoceanic shipping.**

**This fall, Du Pont announced that an increase on low-priced foreign imports had forced it out of the indigo dye business. Indigo was not only one of the first, but also the largest volume dye manufactured at Chambers Works. Incidentally, the closing of this facility leaves American textile mills with only one domestic manufacturer of indigo dye.**

**Commenting on the closing in a New York speech, William M. Roth, deputy special representative for trade negotiations, noted that the company announcement stated that personnel will be absorbed into other plant operations. This, he said, indicated that the chemical industry was strong enough to weather the impact of tariff reductions.**

**Gentlemen, whether or not the industry can withstand the impact, these jobs are gone and future jobseekers will not be employed at the indigo unit. Moreover, I am told that over half the people at Chambers Works are engaged in the production of dyes and dye intermediates. If many other dyes go the way of indigo, it will obviously be impossible to take up the job slack in other operations at the plant.**

**The impact of the Trade Expansion Act and the negotiations under it have yet to be felt. Now that the administration has made it clear that essentially all domestic industry is listed for 50 percent tariff reductions, it is almost certain that some industries will cease to exist, with resulting unemployment and attendant problems.**

**Certainly, before such situations develop, the minimum that should be done is to see that the effect on U.S. industries of tariff reductions by the United States and tariff concessions obtained from foreign countries is fully understood in the light of the realities of the business world.**

**It is for this reason, lest the indigo shutdown become a harbinger of the dislocations to come, that I again strongly urge the President to appoint and utilize qualified advisers from industry, both before and during negotiations.**

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

**By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:**

**Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Monday, December 16.**

**Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, December 10.**

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. MORSE), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BEERMANN to include an article in the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOEVEN to include certain tables and extraneous matter in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. LEGGETT (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) to revise and extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD during general debate today in Committee of the Whole and to include therein extraneous matter and certain tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORSE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT in 10 instances.

Mr. GRABOWSKI.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1565. An act to amend the Act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1931. An act to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2279. An act to authorize the transfer of the Piegan Unit of the Blackfeet Irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards;

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land;

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing;

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; and

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 5, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1408. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1409. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 16th report on operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8507. A bill for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8937. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8999. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 931. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8970. A bill to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7457, a bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 996). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier; with amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORSE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1384. A bill for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas; with amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup; with amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1521. A bill for the relief of Josip Luzic; with amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo; with amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1211. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1403. A bill for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Frank Mramor; without amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2818. A bill for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne; with amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5500. A bill for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann; with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin; with amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5858. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5941. A bill for the relief of Julian A. Erskine; without amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6092. A bill for the relief of Alexander Haytko; without amendment (Rept. No 984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6876. A bill for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7788. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8085. A bill for the relief of Roy W. Ficken; with amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8323. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8392. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8828. A bill for the relief of John T. Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8849. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8878. A bill for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; without amendment (Rept. No. 993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8930. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8931. A bill for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 9344. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9345. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak., and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9346. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9347. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9348. A bill to prohibit certain shipments of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce by a licensed manufacturer or dealer, and to prohibit the transmission of firearms in the U.S. mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9349. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 9350. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Missouri River between Bismarck, N. Dak., and Mobridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 9351. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9352. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide for the performance by the Federal Housing Administration of certain additional functions with respect to housing loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9353. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 9354. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States, of any Member of the Congress of the United States, and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9355. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 835. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 836. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution authorizing the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to sell its publications in the rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution authorizing the commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 839. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 840. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 841. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 9356. A bill for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pompeyo B. Montemayor and Mrs. Angeles P. Montemayor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose N. Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9359. A bill for the relief of Michele Guzzo, Concepcion Guzzo, Fabia Guzzo, and Miguel Guzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9360. A bill for the relief of Cyriac J. Thengumthiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 9361. A bill for the relief of Kathryn Choi Ast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.J. Res. 842. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

447. The SPEAKER presented a petition of G. T. Apthorp, city manager, East Cleveland City Commission, East Cleveland, Ohio, to enact civil rights legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A Hundred-Billion Budget for Fiscal Year 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed beyond words when I read in the Washington Post this morning that President Johnson is expected to send a budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1965 of over $100 billion and that the President plans a deficit for fiscal year 1965 of $8½ billion, and at a time when our Federal debt is crowding $310 billion, or $7,000 for each American family, on an average, or their children or their grandchildren to pay, somehow, some way, some day or else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and as one who has never played politics with any issue which affects the lives and pocketbooks of all our people, I recently had high hopes for a balanced budget in fiscal year 1965, which begins July 1 next, but irrespective of the newspaper report above mentioned, I shall, along with the economy minded Members of our committee and of Congress, work constantly and I hope effectively for a balanced budget for fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter. To be worthy of our place we can, we will, we must do no less, and without partisan politics, fear, or favor.

Mr. Speaker, that is my pledge to the American people, and I am quite certain I speak for all the conservative Members of Congress, as well as a great majority of our already overburdened American taxpayers.

## A Resolution To Give the Presidential Commission the Power To Compel Testimony Under Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I feel strongly that investigation of the facts attendant upon the tragic assassination of President Kennedy should adhere to the highest requirements of probity, I have today introduced a House joint resolution that would give the Presidential Commission the power to compel testimony under oath. It would also require that the results of the investigation, together with recommendations for legislation, if any, should be reported to Congress.

The far-reaching ramifications of this horrible crime committed we believe by an admitted Marxist with a record of residence within the Soviet Union can have serious effect upon both our internal security procedures and our foreign policies. The American people are entitled to have the Commission's report based upon sworn testimony that was given subject to the penalties of perjury. It is too important a matter to be left in the realm of rumor, conjecture, or hearsay.

A copy of the House joint resolution I have proposed is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 838

Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of records

*Resolved,* That the Commission established pursuant to Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out its duties under such Executive Order, to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States including any commonwealth or possession thereof, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission may deem necessary and advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman may authorize any member of the Commission or its staff to conduct on its behalf any part of the investigation herein provided for and in such event and for such purposes any member so authorized shall have all of the powers herein granted to the Commission.

For the purposes of this resolution the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places during the First or Second Sessions of the 88th Congress, recesses and adjourned periods, and to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistance as may be required.

The Commission shall report not later than the first day of the First Session of the 89th Congress to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The expenses of this investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

## Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, made a very effective address last week before the Washington Urban League's Equal Opportunity Day Committee's 1963 Observance.

He took this occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program for Washington, D.C. In view of the interest of the Congress in this subject, I am certain my colleagues will find his remarks particularly meaningful and timely.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the text of the Secretary's speech, as follows:

Address by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz at the Washington Urban League's Equal Opportunity Day Committee's 1963 Observance, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963

Sitting last evening at my desk at home, beneath a picture of the original author of Equal Opportunity Day, I found myself repeating his grandly simple reminder that "all men are created equal"—and then looking up and asking "Are they?"

In what meaningful sense are all men created equal?

Lincoln spoke directly to the error that had developed in a nation's thinking: that in the act of creation itself there was an intended distinction which was marked by the color put in children's skins. Until that false notion was corrected nothing could be accomplished.

Today, too long a century later, that earlier ignorance has been substantially overcome. If there is not yet unanimity in the Nation there is nevertheless a clear consensus that accords with our conscience. Americans are agreed now that life was not designed in the pattern of discrimination.

Yet we gather here today with the consciousness that there is much more to it than this—and that what lies ahead requires something beyond the recognition of a divine equity.

It is as though in this historic 100th year, we had climbed a mountain called discrimination, only to find on approaching the summit that what lies ahead is another mountain called disadvantage.

If the error in men's minds a century ago warranted the reminder that "all men are created equal," the necessity today is that we face squarely the limitations within which this is true.

For the fact is that each child brings with him very different gifts from God.

The fact is that with his first breath a child's endowment becomes principally whatever portion of advantage or disadvantage the circumstances of his environment confer upon him.

In the century ahead, the requirement upon America is that it be dedicated to the proposition that men will correct the inequalities which men have created, that the inequities children inherit will be lifted from them.

So I speak today of equal opportunity that includes much more than freedom from denial of opportunity when the chance comes. If equal opportunity is to mean anything it must include the right to be ready.

I realize that my thinking today is particularly of equal opportunity in the field of employment. This is partly because of the nature of my own responsibilities, and partly because I think the equal right to work is perhaps closest to the surface—if not the heart—of a great many of today's long-overdue current demands. Perhaps this is because equality in employment presents some of the hardest problems which lie ahead.

I mention only a few of the key factors here.

There will be loss, not gain, from any person's demanding or receiving a job for which he is not qualified.

Honest and sincere men reach different conclusions about whether previous discrimination warrants preference now—to "even things up." My own strongly held view is that such preference could be justified only on an assumption that this is a matter of competition between two sides. It isn't, and there is great importance in avoiding and eliminating any mistaken grouping along color lines. The victims of preference would be individual human beings, and more likely than not today, persons who are themselves opposed to discrimination.

To think in terms of quotas is again to think in terms of two groups, which is the thing to be avoided. I believe strongly in the necessity of a Federal fair employment practices act, but surely such a law must be written in terms of the absolute of equality, with no exceptions of any kind.

To believe in equality of opportunity except as it increases competition for one's own job is selfish hypocrisy. Discrimination is no less ugly for its being inspired by self-interest, entirely unrelated to racial prejudice.

Nor can it be questioned that more than equality is not only justified but is required so far as preparation for opportunity is concerned. There is no unfair hurting of someone else if preference in education is accorded those who have been previously disadvantaged. Here there is only the necessary compensation for the ravages of a century of unfairness.

I take this appropriate occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program for Washington, D.C., which may become a model of what can be done to break this cycle of unemployability.

Within a month, a new MDTA experimental demonstration project will get underway, sponsored by the National Institute for Labor Education, acting for the AFL–CIO and the Department of Labor. The project will give 100 Washington youngsters a chance to upgrade their skills so that they may become apprentice carpenters.

It is expected that the majority of the trainees will be out of school, out of work, Negro youths ranging in age from 17 to 21. None of these youngsters would be able to qualify as apprentices without the type of training they will receive in this program. Many of them will not have completed any kind of high school program, nor will they have had a close association with the building trades through family or friends.

The value of the project is that it will preserve the standards of apprenticeship training, while opening the doors to new opportunities for youngsters who otherwise would be facing the blind alley of the unskilled.

Surely the single most critical front in the current battle for meaningful equal opportunity is the education of the presently disadvantaged minority group youth. I suggest that this minority can be best described not in racial terms at all but in terms of all disadvantaged youth. We who are here today hate the bigotry of racial prejudice with all that is in us, especially when it is inflicted on a child. But the hurt to a child is no less when he is denied a fair chance for any reason beyond his control. Racial discrimination is no worse in its effect than the discrimination which results from poverty, from chronic unemployment, from growing up in a slum or in a broken family.

It is not enough today to be against discrimination. That's easy now. If we are to be true to ourselves we will buckle down to the job of preparing the next generation to seize opportunities they do not (because they cannot) know they have. They were not created equal, or they lost their birthright the moment they drew their first breath.

We have effectively opposed the folly of discrimination. Now we must stop the fallout of disadvantage. We must get through to these boys and girls that there is opportunity beyond what they have seen at home.

If we believe what we say, we will put our best schools in the slums, not in the suburbs.

If we believe what we say, we will make a flat commitment to all American boys and girls that they will receive all the education they are willing to use, right on through college.

If we believe what we say, we will adopt the education program President Kennedy has presented to the Congress, the vocational education program, the Youth Employment Act, and the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Equal opportunity will not come merely by preventing the denial of opportunity to those disadvantaged by reason of race or previous condition of environment. That's like trying to get rid of dandelions by cutting off the tops. Equal opportunity will come only by digging out the roots of inequality, by giving those who are least ready for opportunity the preparation they need. "It is here," it has been said, "that 'more than equality' makes sense; and today anything less makes no sense at all."

"A nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." What Lincoln was saying, of course, was that what fault there is, what inequality, is not of God's making, but of man's, and that it is man's to correct.

---

## Jack F. Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that today under unanimous consent I am able to extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Jack F. Mills who has been named executive director of the Republican National Congressional Committee, effective January 1, 1964.

Over the years Mr. Mills has provided valuable assistance to many of my colleagues. He has been a good friend, and a credit to all of us in public service.

I know my colleagues who have worked with Jack will agree that his reputation and character over the years is truly a record of which we can all be proud. He has served his Nation in commendable fashion.

May I take this opportunity to introduce Jack Mills to my colleagues who have not yet had the opportunity to meet him.

Jack was born in Milwaukee, Wis., September 14, 1920. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Annette (Christy) Mills, he is married to Anna Lenor Butke and the father of four children. He has been an executive in industry and earlier in life was the assistant golf professional at the Milwaukee Country Club.

Since coming to Washington he has shown initiative and ambition, and has helped shape the image of public service of which we are all proud.

## Why Businessmen Make Good Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following from Nation's Business, issue of November 1963:

The business community has a vital stake in improving government at all levels, and there is much that businessmen can contribute.

This is the opinion of Representative HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, a Williamsport, Pa., businessman who has been in Congress since 1960. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, a Republican, was first elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Alvin R. Bush. He was reelected in the general election of 1960 and again in 1962. He is a member of the influential Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI is a businessman of 30 years' experience. He is a commission distributor for the Gulf Oil Corp., owner of an automobile dealership and part owner of another Gulf distributorship in a nearby community and two wholesale-retail tire outlets. An Army captain during World War II, he served as commanding officer of a high-explosives plant at Kingsport, Tenn.

An active interest in civic affairs led Mr. SCHNEEBELI into politics. He served as president and campaign chairman for the Community Chest and was campaign committee chairman for YWCA and Williamsport Hospital fund drives. He also was appointed to the school board.

Then he was persuaded by the directors of the Williamsport Chamber of Commerce to act as coordinator of its first political action course. The course was in progress when Representative Bush died, and a number of the city's leading citizens prevailed upon Mr. SCHNEEBELI to run for the vacant seat. He won the special election in April 1960, and in the two general elections since, increased his winning margin from 4,200 to 40,000.

In this interview with Nation's Business, Representative SCHNEEBELI tells why he believes more businessmen should run for public office, what qualities they have that are useful in solving Government problems, and explains how he has put his own business experience to use in the House of Representatives.

"Question. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, have you found your business background helpful in Congress?

"Answer. It is a terrific asset, particularly in the committee on which I serve, the taxation committee. I feel that I can do a pretty good job because, being a taxpayer of some consequence, I am allergic to high taxes. On the other hand, having to meet a payroll, I recognize the fact that we should raise the money to pay our expenses. So I have an interest in both ends of the problem, and I think my business background, together with my education in business administration at Dartmouth, helps me grasp a lot of the intricate problems of the Ways and Means Committee.

"There is much to learn, and I am still very much in the learning process. There is much that I don't know, but I am an eager student and try to keep an inquiring mind.

"Question. What qualities and abilities does the average businessman have that are useful when brought to bear on problems of government?

"Answer. First of all, government should be operated as close to a profit and loss basis as business. The experience of a businessman in trying to balance a budget and show a profit is an important counterbalance to those people in Congress who don't seem to have much concern in this area, who feel that all social programs are justified regardless of cost. We have a little more realistic approach—a business cannot succeed unless it shows some sort of profit or surplus.

"Secondly, I think businessmen tend to deliberate a little more on the broad reactions to and results of a decision. Where we have used our own money in business we have been circumspect as to what the final answer is going to be. We are a little broader in our outlook, I think, in determining all angles to a problem.

"A businessman also brings into politics certain characteristics of ethics and morality. Certainly in local business you must have these qualities or you are not likely to be successful.

"I think that experience in handling labor, finance, management, sales promotion, and all the various aspects of business gives us a little deeper appreciation of the many problems that go into a decision here in Washington.

"Question. Do you feel it is important that more businessmen run for public office?

"Answer. We are witnessing a gradual decrease in the number of people in politics who are simply political professionals. In their place, more and more, I believe we will find business and professional people and others with experience outside the field of politics alone. This is a healthy trend and one which is essential if we are to have sound government in the years ahead.

"Since government is getting into the affairs of business so deeply in so many areas, it certainly should be a matter of concern that government would be sympathetic to and appreciate business problems. And who knows better what the business problems are than a businessman?

"I think the professional politician gradually is going out, and I think that people in the professional and business world are gradually recognizing their responsibilities in this area. The trend is from restricted activity—accepting civic responsibility in local affairs and philanthropic drives—to a more active participation in politics on all levels.

"They recognize the problem and they are doing something about it.

"Question. Businessmen feel they have a vital stake in taking part?

"Answer. Very much. All we have to do is think about the tax bill, for example. If we can reduce the taxes of business by 10 percent, we will have accomplished something very beneficial to the whole Nation.

"Question. What active roles other than elective office can businessmen take in politics?

"Answer. Well, they can serve in several capacities. They can serve on a finance committee of a political party, which is very important. They can serve on the executive committees of district and county organizations. They can serve as committee people and ward workers. They can lend their interest and presence and active participation in politics in many areas—as a candidate, in financing the party, and as an active worker.

"Question. Has holding public office been a rewarding experience?

"Answer. It has been very enriching in broadening my appreciation and concept of our many national problems and it has been very challenging. I often meet with the heads of large corporations. As Congressmen, we meet with people of this type continually. We get to know their thinking. We probably are in an area of higher executive influence and contact than were we to stay home in business.

"The problems we have to cope with here in Washington prepare us for handling big business problems. If we have any basis for advancement, it would be furthered by the contacts we make in this type of work.

"Question. So the experience is valuable for the businessman who enters politics?

"Answer. There is greater personal development than if you were to stay with a single corporation, because you have access to many more people with divergent ideas. This is much better preparation for handling a big corporate job.

"It gives you a concept of problems on a national scale and you are thinking of things in a broader sense, which is also becoming more and more a top corporate problem.

"Question. How does being a political decisionmaker in Congress differ from being a business decisionmaker?

"Answer. First of all, the business decision in my case is local, limited or personal, while in Congress it is more impersonal, of national consequence generally, probably more philosophical, and on a much broader scale, with much deeper implications all around. The problems here are deeper and more disturbing.

"I usually sleep much better with my business problems than I do with my congressional problems.

"Question. Does it require a different approach to get things done in Congress than in running your own business?

"Answer. Yes. In Congress you tend to take an academic approach to problems in trying to grasp their broad significance. Secondly, in trying to decide your stand on an issue it is almost like being judge or jury. Thirdly, there are political aspects of party policy and loyalties which have some importance. Your business problems are a lot more immediate, limited, and specific.

"In Government you are dealing with the public bank account. You are very concerned with doing the right thing. The problems are always new and usually more difficult to delineate specifically and solve.

"Question. Have you found that compromise is a more important part of accomplishing something in Congress than in business?

"Answer. Yes. In business it is usually yes or no. But in Congress there are so many aspects. Take this tax program. There were 35 or 40 different areas in which changes were recommended or made. Well, you might be able to subscribe to 80 percent of them, but the only way you get 80 percent of them is to accept 20 percent you don't like. In business you would be more apt to take the 80 percent and discard the 20 percent. We don't have that choice here.

"Question. Do you think that most companies are doing enough to encourage their executives to take part in politics?

"Answer. I don't know that most companies are. Many companies do a very effective job. Some of the larger companies I know should do more.

"One of the largest companies, A.T. & T., is doing a marvelous job. Another large national corporation is doing virtually nothing, and I have told the chairman of its board that I think it is unfortunate his company doesn't get into this area more. So much of their future is tied up in what happens in Washington that it behooves them to see that the representatives who are down here are not unsympathetic to the fact that business helped to create a lot of what is good in America.

"I believe there is a strong trend toward big business encouraging political participation at all levels, and this is good for the country.

"Question. Do most corporations support their executives once they get into politics?

"Answer. Corporations which encourage their employees to get into politics certainly should and do support them because they recognize their responsibility in creating this interest.

"Gulf Oil, for example, with which I am affiliated, has a salaried employee from Scranton, Pa., who happens to be Democrat and who recently was elected to the State assembly. So Gulf does not necessarily just reflect the Republican viewpoint, because their other man in politics from Pennsylvania is a Democrat.

"Gulf Oil was one of the original leaders in urging businessmen to get into politics. Much of this spadework was done by Archie Gray, former executive vice president.

"Since my election, there have been no pressures or political overtures from Gulf or any of my other business connections. As a matter of fact, in committee I voted in favor of the two tax provisions regarding additional taxation of oil companies, which were contrary to the interest of the major oil companies.

"Question. What is the best way for a businessman to get started in politics?

"Answer. He should create in the public mind the knowledge that he is interested in public service. He can do this by working with community projects and by not limiting himself to his business alone. Being a good community worker is probably the best background.

"Question. How did you set up your political organization?

"Answer. At the outset, I capitalized on my knowledge of organizing people with a common objective. I had a meeting each Monday of the first 2 months with people whose opinion I valued and people who had some practical experience in politics.

"In the first 2 months I went around to the other seven counties, visiting newspaper editors, county chairmen, people interested in politics, radio stations, and so forth. I wanted to let people see and know who HERM SCHNEEBELI was. They had no idea, since I was new at this work.

"Then I got to the practical matter of going around to Republican political meetings being organized for our special election.

"Suddenly the special election became a big national issue because it preceded the 1960 presidential election. Political pundits were looking for straws in the wind, and I guess I was one of the straws. The Republicans were determined they weren't going to lose this seat, which they had held for years, despite the fact they had a businessman who had never run for politics and had to be sold as a candidate. And the Democrats, realizing they had a pretty good proposition, began pouring in an awful lot of money. It was pretty rough going for an amateur.

"Question. How big was your winning margin?

"Answer. In the special election I won by 4,200 votes. The following November I ran against the same person and won by 20,000. In 1962, I won by 40,000.

"I attribute this increase to, first of all, hard work in Congress; and secondly, sales promotion work which I had learned in business. I became aggressive and advised the people that I was their Congressman in order to help them, and asked what their problems were and what their views were. They liked this approach, which was learned through business experience.

"Question. Since your election have you retained your business interests?

"Answer. Yes. I go home about every other weekend and I spend about 5 or 6 hours a month on my personal business. I think that it is just as well that quite a few Congressmen have an independent income so they aren't beholden to the office and can express an independent view at times.

"I am not a professional politician in that respect, and I think this independent income is an asset to me in making an independent, impersonal decision.

"Question. Do you hope to stay in Congress or do you eventually plan to go back to full-time business?

"Answer. From what I have seen down here I think one of the most difficult problems is for some people to realize when their term of contribution and worthwhile service is ended.

"Although there aren't too many instances of this type, there are a few people who tend to stay too long, and I hope I don't get in the same sort of situation. But it is difficult to be too self-critical in trying to arrive at a proper appraisal of when our service is declining."

## Address of Hon. John S. Monagan on Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, water pollution control and abatement is a matter of great concern to the people of Chicago, and the address this week of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], was an event of importance.

I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Congressman MONAGAN's speech before the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, delivered in Chicago on December 3, 1963:

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems of water pollution control and abatement. As you know, your association testified earlier this year before the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, on which I serve, at its water pollution control hearings in Washington. Your association made a significant contribution to the subcommittee's record. I hope that my remarks here today will be as useful to you as your association's testimony has been to our subcommittee.

The water crisis of the century is not the shortage of water itself, but the shortage of usable, clean water.

Water pollution has become the Nation's single most desperate natural resources problem. Almost all of our major streams and rivers and lakes are suffering increasing pollution. This pollution jeopardizes our water supplies, menaces the public health, destroys aquatic life, and disgraces our environment. It is a direct result of rapid growth in population and ruban living, plus the unprecedented technological advances of industry in the past two decades.

The impact which the increasing population and the growing urbanization of our country have on our clean water supply can easily be understood in terms of a few figures.

In the 63 years since 1900, the Nation's population increased from 76 to 180 million; new towns and cities sprang up where only farms or wildernesses existed; villages of 3,000 or 4,000 expanded to 50,000 and more; cities of 100,000 are approaching or have exceeded a million in population.

In 1900 the Nation's urban population was 30 million. It has grown beyond 125 million in the sixties. By the year 2000, the urban population of the United States may exceed 300 million.

Water pollution control problems caused by the increases in population are already urgent. In the remaining 36 years of this century they will become overwhelming unless a basis for dealing with them is laid today.

The sources of pollution in our Nation's rivers and streams are almost innumerable. Untreated wastes are still being dumped into rivers and streams in many parts of the country. Oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines, and many other substances, including new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, radioactive wastes, and a number of other items that we could mention, are ruining our waters.

Water demands are increasing every day. Vast quantities of water are required to produce 1 ton of synthetic rubber, or a ton of high-grade paper, or a ton of cold-rolled steel.

New or developing industries will, within the next few years, more than double the demand for good quality water. We will have to reuse our waters as they pass from the land to the sea, and unless we take bold and concerted action to meet this expanding demand for reusable water, the United States will, within the next generation, face economic retardation and a resulting impairment of our national strength to an almost unprecedented degree.

The control of water pollution thus involves the health and economic destiny of our entire Nation. We have an equally great responsibility to maintain clean waters for recreation, propagation of fish and wildlife, and preservation of the esthetic beauty of our country.

It was for these reasons that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, established the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives to make an extensive and intensive inquiry to appraise how effectively Government agencies and others are dealing with the problems of our Nation's increasing water pollution and to determine what can be done to improve the techniques for preventing or controlling the rising pollution levels of so many of our Nation's rivers, streams, and other surface waters.

The Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee has held extensive hearings in Washington, as well as in different regions of the country, including New England, the Middle Atlantic area, the Midwest, and the Pacific Northwest, and this week in Texas. I assure you that the Congress is deeply concerned about the problems of water pollution.

During these intensive hearings, almost 200 witnesses submitted information. Government and industry representatives, as well as other interested citizens, testified.

While reflecting substantial achievements of State and Federal officials, the testimony before our subcommittee has revealed the rapidly growing backlog of needs that must be met to carry out successfully a national water quality control program.

Under the Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1961, much more must be done. New projects are required—to keep pace with population growth—in the field of municipal waste collection and treatment. In addition, the testimony before our subcommittee revealed that there are 15 million Americans today who are not served by any sewers or treatment works. The method of sewage treatment employed today is the same in principle as that used by the Egyptians 2,000 years ago. That is not progress.

Both municipal and industrial wastes have presented pollution problems for some time. The newest pollution problem comes from the fast growing companies producing synthetics and chemicals which find their way into watercourses. These chemicals include pesticides, radioactive materials, detergents, and fertilizers. Testimony showed that many of these chemicals do not respond to biological treatment and that they persist in streams for a long time. They are increasingly troublesome sources of pollution with far reaching and still unpredictable effects on our rivers and streams. Some of the wastes carry both immediate health hazards and long-term genetic hazards which have not yet been adequately appraised.

These newer pollution problems, as well as the growing backlog of conventional problems of treating municipal and industrial waste, indicate the compelling need for major new efforts in the reduction and prevention of water pollution. Recently enacted Federal legislation is pointed in the right direction. Yet we are faced with the inescapable fact of the deterioration of water quality, a fact which clearly demonstrates the need for new preventive efforts.

These efforts must be made by the States and local agencies by enforcing antipollution laws which are available to them and by strengthening those which are shown to be inadequate. In addition to the preventive efforts required through the enforcement of antipollution laws, there is a great need for more sewage treatment works to handle effluent from cities, industries, and farms, and for the development of new methods to treat chemical, pesticide, and radioactive wastes.

Though much remains to be learned about many of these problems, water pollution control cannot wait upon the development of all the answers. Our present state of knowledge in many fields is sufficient for the imposition and vigorous enforcement of controls to safeguard the public health and welfare, and to provide for the quality and quantity of water which our rapidly expanding population and economy require.

Among the new pollutants are the hard detergents which are found in most soaps and cleaning solutions. They have been a serious nuisance in a number of streams where the foaming has been excessive. The companies manufacturing detergents have assured us that the chemical formula of their products is going to be revised so that they will be degradable and susceptible to treatment in our treatment plants. This is something that must be done. Legislation is pending in Congress, as we know, to forbid the manufacture and sale of so-called hard detergents. I think that the work of our subcommittee is going to encourage progress in this area.

I must admit that at times during the hearings it sounded as though we were making no progress at all in pollution abatement. Water pollution seemed to be as bad as it was 50 years ago. At that time we were losing lives from waterborne typhoid; now we are losing lives from waterborne hepatitis.

Perhaps one of the most encouraging parts of the hearings was to learn of the great amount of research that is being done at all government levels, and by industry and other private concerns. I think that this accelerated research and development work now taking place will do great things for the overall pollution abatement program.

The responsibility for research and for the management of water pollution falls on all water users, as well as on local, State, interstate, and Federal agencies. The simple reason for this is that streamflow does not recognize political boundaries. So from the beginning we have recognized that streams may transcend local areas and become a national concern. The problem of pollution is so enormous that it is big enough to give everyone a share in its solution.

Water pollution is expensive. It costs the individual, the businessman, the community, and the Nation. No one escapes the economic loss brought about by the pollution of our most valuable resource.

Some of these losses or damages are evidenced by the additional costs which must be met, such as construction, operation, and maintenance of water treatment facilities.

But the bulk of the costs of pollution cannot be directly tabulated.

How is the impairment to health measured in dollars? Or the loss of recreational facilities, depreciated property values, or the failure of industry to expand?

While these indirect consequences of pollution cannot be expressed in precise dollar terms, they are nevertheless real and constitute a critical barrier to the fulfillment of local and national economic goals.

Pollution control measures combat these adverse conditions and produce economic benefits associated with the improved water quality. These benefits are often not apparent to the public, however, because they constitute insurance for future use of water as well as for immediate use.

The taxpayer must realize that while it costs money to prevent or combat water pollution, the return is great in attracting thriving and expanding industry and producing healthful community water conditions.

Water pollution is not new and the problem has become more serious for three primary reasons: (1) rapidly expanding industry, (2) growing and shifting population, and (3) use of more water per person. The problem of water pollution is more acute in some areas than in others, and is especially severe in some areas. It is the key part of the whole complex problem of wise water use.

We are not running out of water, but now and in the future we will have to use our streams more wisely to meet our growing needs.

Although significant progress has been made in managing water pollution, we are not keeping up with growth and demand and we need, therefore, to step up study, research, and all other efforts if we are to head off a very real water supply crisis.

In stepping up these efforts, there are responsibilities facing all of us as water users. We need to work as effectively as we can at the individual and industrial level, and through the most effective agencies we can use at the local, State, interstate, and Federal levels.

Most important of all, the different classes of water users, including industry, must cooperate to guarantee that the needs for the differing and sometimes conflicting uses of water are met in a safe and equitable manner.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that unless a basis is laid now for dealing with the water pollution problems of the next 30-odd years, these problems would be absolutely overwhelming by the year 2000. A good first step toward meeting the challenge of the year 2000, occurred on October 16, when the Senate passed a bill (S. 649) introduced by Senator MUSKIE to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The bill would accomplish, in brief, the following purposes:

1. It would express the national policy "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and * * * for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

2. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer comprehensive programs, interstate cooperation, enforcement measures to abate pollution, establishment of water quality standards, and pollution by Federal installations.

3. It would provide for an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary of that Department to supervise and direct the administration of that Department's functions related to water pollution.

4. It would authorize appropriation of $20 million annually for 4 years research and development grants, up to 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of demonstration projects for separating combined sewer systems;

5. It would increase the individual dollar ceiling limitations of Federal grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities;

6. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the grant for construction of waste treatment works if the project is certified as conforming with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area;

7. It would authorize enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person is prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution and action of Federal, State, or local authorities;

8. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after public hearing and consultation with all interested parties, to prepare and to encourage the development of regulations establishing standards of water quality for interstate waters;

9. It would provide that waste water discharges by Federal installations shall be controlled under permits issued by the Secretary of HEW.

10. It would establish a procedure to evaluate progress in the development of decomposable detergents which will not cause or contribute to the pollution of surface and underground waters, to develop standards of decomposability for such detergents, and to authorize the promulgation of such standards at such time as detergents conforming to the proposed standards of decomposability are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents.

11. It would establish audit procedures concerning expenditure of construction grants.

12. It would state the authority of the Secretary of Labor over labor standards governing construction of federally aided waste treatment facilities.

The Muskie bill, as well as a companion bill which I introduced earlier in the House of Representatives (H.R. 9007), are now pending before the House Public Works Committee, and hearings on these bills will be held this week, beginning tomorrow, December 4.

I do not take the position that our water resources cannot survive without the enactment of each of the provisions in these bills. I have been a legislator far too long to believe that the Nation, or its natural resources, will stand or fall on the enactment, or failure of enactment, of a particular provision. But I do believe that taken altogether the provisions of these bills represent a most important and worthwhile effort to meet our water resources problems before it is too late.

Achieving cleanliness in our streams will entail the making of judgments and the weighing of competing factors of economics and the less tangible benefits of recreational, esthetic, and wildlife values. The lines which must be drawn will vary from area to area, from stream to stream, from basin to basin, and will depend on the varying judgments of many people. There will undoubtedly be disagreements between those who believe in utilizing the full assimilating capacities of the streams, and those who believe that streams are more important for fishing, boating, and swimming. There will be differences between those who believe that water pollution control is solely the job of the locality, the State, or the region, and those who believe that the Federal Government must take an increasingly vigorous role in the control and reduction of pollution.

Our subcommittee recognizes these many problems and differing attitudes. We are examining all the available facts, opinions and recommendations on this subject from every part of the country. We are using them to stimulate action in many quarters. From our findings and recommendations will undoubtedly evolve legislation, executive action, research, and new points of view.

The hearings and investigations by our subcommittee are not yet complete. I am convinced, however, that the subcommittee has already created a heightened awareness on the part of Government officials responsible for the Federal water pollution control program. It has sharpened administrative practices and stimulated more imaginative and creative policies.

For example, when our hearings disclosed how little has been done to control water pollution caused by drainage of acid waters from both existing and abandoned coal mine works, the Secretary of the Interior gave personal emphasis to create an intensified effort within the Interior Department on that subject. Similarly, as a result of our subcommittee's inquiry, many Federal agencies are now scrutinizing their own waste discharge practices and much progress is being made to reduce or abate their pollutional effects. Various agencies are also examining their statutory authority with respect to water pollution control, and I anticipate that various bills will be introduced to eliminate deficiencies in the existing law on this subject.

The subcommittee's hearings have also served another significant purpose which, I feel, is all too often neglected—that of educating the public. The great number of newspaper reports and articles appearing in professional and trade publications regarding the subcommittee's hearings leave no doubt that we, along with other groups, have made a deep impression on the public conscience. Where before there was apathy, there are now the stirrings of widespread citizen concern over the preservation of our water resources. In a democratic society such as ours, that is the all-important beginning of a solution to a problem.

The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators has secured for itself, by virtue of its constant and diligent efforts, a vanguard position in the crusade to preserve the Nation's water resources. Please accept my congratulations for the work you are doing. We Members of Congress are happy to be associated with you in this great enterprise. I know we will succeed.

---

## Congressman William L. St. Onge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome back to our body a good friend and respected colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Never has the Second Congressional District of our State been so well represented as by my worthy associate who has been sorely missed during his absence from this Chamber. I join my fellow Congressmen in greeting our compatriot and know that he will bravely join us in the fight to enact the policies formulated by President Kennedy and now embraced by President Johnson which will insure the continued growth of our Nation.

---

## Ships That Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter in answer to a letter from Mr. Baldwin of the Lumber Institute.

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

The tone of your letter and the attached agenda plus the NAHB attacks on H.R. 2513 shows pretty much how the so-called export trade increase and dollar balances have deteriorated since a few of us stood up against the misnamed Trade Expansion Act in 1962.

All of the propaganda to the contrary the most telling statistics can be read in the waterline of the outgoing ships from the lumber terminals in Dundalk, Baltimore, Md.

While in session I live below Annapolis on the Chesapeake Bay. I see the ships coming into our ports loaded to the waterline, I see them going out floating high, wide, and easy.

When they are low in the water they're on an outward voyage you can bet it's foreign aid, military vehicles or wheat and other Public Law 480 shipments.

What doesn't seem to phase the sophomoric economists, the unwitting victims of the hard sell artists of the international trade profiteers is that when imports squeeze the domestic market it results in depressed prices, lowered profits for expansion and investment, static labor wages and automated unemployment.

We talk about percentages of domestic market when measuring imports with little or no consideration given to the spread of the imports. For instance if the lumber imports are 70 percent of U.S. market and probably a lot more when one checks into all types, forms and prices containing lumber products are counted, it doesn't mean that the loss of business is spread evenly over all U.S. lumber producers. It can hit one producer harder than another. In fact, it can and has put the regional or marginal producer out of business and bids to put the average producer on the shelf in a few short years.

You ask what I think can be done. It's beyond what I think, it's now a problem of reversing millions of pages of propaganda and endorsement of unsound economic trade policies.

This can only be done if all the industries affected would courageously and unselfishly do what the industrial trade profiteers have done, join together all their efforts and awaken to the fact that one by one they have no power or effect upon Congress or the press, or the people, or the President.

Let's be realistic. No U.S. industry can survive in a free-trade world so long as we have fixed costs of production based upon raw materials, labor, taxes, and services in the United States which are for all practical purposes mandated by Government with local, State and Federal tax agencies, union contracts and protection for unions under our Constitution, antitrust and antiunemployment laws.

No sane person would advocate wiping out the systems of check and balance contained in the above mentioned and other laws of our Nation and yet the very same persons who scream to high heaven if we ever attempted to cut out social security, unemployment compensation, etc., are in the forefront demanding so-called free trade with nations whose basic costs of production are in no more reasonable or measurable terms comparable to ours.

I've been to Europe and Asia, Hong Kong to Japan. I've seen their production facilities, their costs of labor and their government commissions for export products. I've seen the most modern plants in the world being run by 7-, 15-, and 25-cent-an-hour labor.

The problem isn't one of labor alone anymore than it's one for the lumber industry alone.

As you note more than a hundred Members of Congress signed a petition in behalf of the lumber industry. More than 200 signed a petition to help save the shoe industry.

Individuals and regional groups comprising a sizable majority of both Houses of Congress have at one time or another signed petitions or introduced legislation seeking quotas for this or that product or industry. Many others have dropped antidumping bills into the hopper.

It's strange but true, Congress is made up of in the main of protectionists—protectionists for their individual district's products but collectively the Congress is for so-called free trade.

Why is this the case? The answer can be oversimplified by saying that they are looking after their own skins locally and yet nationally they are make-believe statesmen.

This is true, but it isn't the whole reason for the paradoxical position of being for and against a subject matter at one and the same time.

Basically all of us are both protectionists and freetraders. We want protection for what we sell and we want bargains for what we buy. Few of us seem to grasp the full picture. When any one worker is displaced by unsound trade practices and policies, every other worker loses.

When any one industry suffers all others suffer. Only recently have some of the more able newsmen started to cut out the chaff from the wheat and are telling the truth about the import-export trade policies and their effect upon our National economy.

One such newsman, Jack Anderson, writing in the syndicated news column "Washington Merry-Go-Round" slapped the fake figures and false picture painted about the steel industry. You will note that he covers the fact that U.S. oversea investments have created the overexpansion in steel production and we are just starting to see the results of free trade between unlike economics in a given world surplus product.

We've seen this in cotton, wheat, peanuts and other agricultural products. We are entering the final stage of the cotton fiasco when Congress votes on an additional $300 million subsidy for cotton, this time we pay it to the textile mills.

Shades of free trade seem to be forming a shroud around the U.S. free enterprise system. The formula for cotton, subsidy out of the U.S. treasury for cottongrowers, payments to cotton warehousers, purchases by U.S. Government, resell to foreign textile mills for $42.50 less than domestic mills, floods of cotton textile hit U.S. market, U.S. textile mills lose income, workers lose jobs, Government proposes $42.50 gift (credit on purchases) to U.S. mills to save U.S. industry.

The cost of subsidy on cotton from and to textiles will be greater in dollar value than the entire cotton export dollar collected by U.S. Government.

This then is the order of doing business in any line of U.S. product thrown into the profit-seeking calendar of international trade.

When we finally realize that free trade is only sound in iron competitive items and job protection is as important to a democracy as military defense, we will come up with a formula for world trade that will more closely resemble fair and equitable trade between competing economics.

We should never tariff goods we do not produce whether manufactured, mined or farmed. No other nation should, unless its customs are revenue measures and not protective measures.

Before putting before you exerpts from Jack Anderson's story on steel let me remind you that glass, rubber, cheese, mushrooms, in fact anything from soup to nuts is on the list in the hands of Christian Herter and in the forthcoming Kennedy round of GATT meetings we may set the stage for the embalment of free enterprise, individually owned and operated U.S. industrial complex.

The story on steel follows:

"STEEL AID ABROAD BOOMERANGS

"(By Jack Anderson)

"More details can now be told about the foreign aid fiasco in steel—how American generosity has built up foreign steel industries, putting dozens of our own mills out of production and thousands of workers out of work.

"By unofficial count, 179 foreign steel plants have received American loans or grants since World War II. This aid has enabled them to install machines and adopt techniques more modern than our own.

"Thus the U.S. steel industry through its tax payments not only has helped to finance its foreign competitors but has obligingly provided them with better equipment.

"No wonder the American share of the world's steel output has dropped from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent today. U.S. steel products have been pushed out of two-thirds of their former markets, causing a sharp production slump.

"Foreign mills built at American expense are now turning out wire and rod so cheaply, for instance, that imports have captured 30 percent of the U.S. market. Even steelplate, the bread and butter of the industry, is beginning to roll in from abroad.

"STEEL FRANKENSTEIN

"Typical example: With the best of intentions, Uncle Sam helped to rebuild Japan's war-wrecked steel industry until it is now taking customers away from U.S. mills.

"From 1955 until 1960, 10 great Japanese steelworks received foreign aid grants amounting to $155,300,000. Nine more mills were granted Export-Import Bank loans totaling $121,100,000.

"The Yawata Iron & Steel Co. for example, received a $5,300,000 grant in 1955, a $26 million loan in 1957, another $20 million grant in 1959, and still another $26 million loan in 1962. Its blast furnaces are now producing more steel than most American mills.

"Even as French President Charles de Gaulle was tightening the screws on American products, Uncle Sam doled out four separate loans totaling $6,556,000 to France's giant Union Sud du Nord steel works in 1960–61. A smaller $66,000 grant went to Miferma, another French steel company.

"Dictator Franco got $59,513,000 in grants for nine Spanish steel plants, the largest an $18 million grant for the Altos-Hornos Viscaya works in 1961. The Empresa NAC Siderurgica mills received several American grants, the latest a $6,600,000 payment last year.

"In Latin America, Mexico and Argentina received the most U.S. aid. Altogether 22 Mexican steel plants collected $90,780,236 from Uncle Sam, then promptly began shipping steel plate across the border to U.S. customers. Another 22 Argentine plants received $88,580,560 in U.S. handouts.

"STEEL FOR REDS

"The only Communist country whose steel production got a U.S. boost was Yugoslavia. Uncle Sam granted the Yugoslavs $15 million to purchase a U.S. steel mill in 1961. Earlier, Yugoslavia's Niksic Iron Works was given $5,610,000 in American counterpart funds.

"The largest single grant was arranged in 1959 by Tom Dewey, the two-time GOP presidential candidate, for Turkey's Eregli Steel Mill. Amount, $129,600,000.

"The loan was granted, incidentally, while Vance Brand was the Government's development loan chief. He promptly retired from the loan fund to become a high-paid consultant, and later a director of Koppers, the company that did the engineering on the Turkish steel plant.

"Even our prosperous northern neighbor, Canada, once received a $5,700,000 Export-Import loan to aid her steel industry.

"Around the world, foreign steel mills have been subsidized by the American taxpayers. Unhappily, the American desire to better the world has reached the point that we are in danger of crippling the goose that lays the golden eggs."

I know this is more than you bargained for but I can't let up in what I believe to be the most dangerous situation, economically, this Nation found itself in our generation.

We cannot blend the exact science of economics, the inexact science of world diplomacy and the will of the wisp of commercial world trade without disaster.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
*Member of Congress.*

---

## Twentieth Anniversary of International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. HALE BOGGS**
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, December 4, 1963*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was just over 22 years ago that our country entered the bloodiest war in the history of mankind. As my colleagues in the House and Senate know, this terrible war marked the beginning of the end for isolationism in America; that is, the isolationism as it was known in the two decades and more after World War I. In the 1920's we returned to what was mistakenly called normalcy, only to be devastated in the 1930's by the great depression. In the first decade, we were concerned with satisfying our pleasures; in the second, with easing our pain. Then came the cold, sobering effects of 1939; World War II had begun. With the clandestine attack on Pearl Harbor 2 years later, the United States was in that war.

We Americans always have loved peace; in the midst of every war, the leaders of our country and all our people have dreamed, have worked, have planned for the day when the guns are again silent. In the midst of World War II, 20 years ago this month, I had the great privilege to join with 13 other business and civic leaders in my city of New Orleans in establishing an organization designed to foster peace and good will among all men, and to flourish in peacetime, and not in war.

The real driving force behind the founding of International House was the late Rudolf S. Hecht, then chairman of the board of the Mississippi Shipping Co. Early in 1943 I had the honor of working closely with Mr. Hecht to prepare a brochure that projected the idea of establishing this unique organization, the first of its kind in the United States, or anywhere in the world for that matter. We traveled to Washington several times to consult with Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his aids about this organization to promote international trade. Despite the press of his heavy wartime duties, Mr. Hull was most helpful, and was enthusiastic about the idea.

My wife, Lindy, really broke the logjam on finishing the brochure in time to launch our initial drive for support and funds for establishing International House. And it was Lindy who provided this great institution with its motto, "Dedicated to world peace, trade, and understanding," which is inscribed in large letters on the outside wall of International House's building on Gravier Street in New Orleans.

Some two dozen other cities in our country have followed the successful pattern of New Orleans' International House, and organized similar institutions themselves.

It was December 28, 1943, when the articles of incorporation for International House were signed in New Orleans, and a unique and farsighted plan for peacetime was born. The establishment of this progressive organization was a big factor in assuring there would be no return to "isolationism" in my part of the country. Its purpose was, and is, to develop and promote trade and commerce between the people of the whole Mississippi Valley and those of the nations of the world, particularly the countries in our own hemisphere. In the two decades since its founding, International House has served as the great catalyst for the benefit of the port of New Orleans, and business and industry throughout the Mississippi Valley. Its success has been phenomenal, and this success has been showered on all who have worked through International House.

Trade has always been the very life's blood of New Orleans, since its founding in 1718. The old saying that "the proof is in the pudding" was never more true when applied to International House's greatest contribution to my city—its efforts to provide the tremendous increase in the past two decades in the volume of imports and exports handled by the port of New Orleans. In 1962, according to the U.S. Corps of Engineers, a total of 71,570,000 tons of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce passed through the port. In 1962 the dollar value of the foreign cargo alone was $1,667 million. Furthermore, since World War II, New Orleans reestablished itself as America's No. 1 grain port; last year, the port handled 189,049,000 bushels. All of these factor add up to explain why New Orleans is today, and has continued to be, in most postwar years the Nation's No. 2 port next to New York City. And the fine work of the officers and staff of International House has helped the port of New Orleans to enjoy this great development and prosperity.

I had the honor and privilege to be the first executive secretary of International House. In November 1943 the completed plans for establishing this now world-famous organization were announced, and the next month, its articles of incorporation were signed. The 13 distinguished citizens of New Orleans who joined in forming International House were: William G. Zetzmann, who served as its first president; Wilmer Hayward, George H. Terriberry, Leonard K. Nicholson, E. O. Jewell, Charles Denechaud, Sr., Salvador D'Antoni, A. B. Paterson, George E. Schneider, Eddie F. Lebreton, Theodore Brent, W. P. Flower, and Salon B. Turman. Unfortunately for my community, most of these men have gone to their reward, but their good works live after them and are a daily reminder of their vision and their dedication. Those of us founders who live on are devoted to their memory and their sacrifice, and we are proud to salute them on this memorable anniversary. The founders who are continuing today to serve International House and the city of New Orleans are Mr. Solon B. Turman, chairman of the board of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Mr. E. O. Jewell, Mr. Eddie F. Lebreton, Mr. George E. Schneider, president, New Orleans Traffic Transportation Bureau, and myself.

International House first opened the doors of its present home on Gravier Street in June 1945, and today this splendid organization has almost 2,500 members from New Orleans, the Mississippi Valley, and around the world. In its membership, International House boasts the leading business, civic, and professional leaders of many communities, who represent all forms of transportation and every kind of business and industry engaged in trade and commerce.

International House is a nonprofit organization supported by its 2,500 members, and is a fine example of the fruits of energetic and imaginative men working together under our free enterprise system. It is literally an "international clubhouse" which, you might say, sells nothing itself. That is, it sells no physical products. But it does sell, or promote, friendship and good will, trade and commerce, throughout the world.

What was it that prompted this group of leaders in New Orleans to envision such an organization and work toward its establishment during World War II? The most immediate reason was their determination to maintain New Orleans as the Nation's second port in the postwar era. The fact is that during the war our port was enjoying a great boom, as were so many other ports in America. Our businesses and industries, especially those geared to the war effort, also were thriving. In 1943 the port of New Orleans handled a total of $657 million in combined imports and exports. What would happen to this boom when the war ended? How could we maintain New Orleans position in trade and commerce in the competitive postwar years?

By the establishment of an organization like International House.

Through the spring and summer of 1943 our idea for an international clubhouse to foster trade and commerce between the Mississippi Valley and the nations of the world advanced toward reality. By the time the articles of incorporation were signed in December, a total of more than $500,000 had been raised to help establish International House. This institution has made New Orleans, more than it ever was before, a truly international, cosmopolitan city. Our port has continued to reign as America's second port. Scores of businesses and industries in Louisiana and other States drained by the waters of the Mississippi and its tributaries have realized the benefits of the constructive work of International House. All of this has been done through the basic concept, in the words of Paul Fabry, the managing director of International House, that "friends always do business easier than strangers, and strangers can, and do, become friends through understanding and trade."

The men who have served as president of International House since early 1944 comprise a "Who's Who" of the business, civic, and professional leaders of New Orleans. The first president of International House was, most fittingly, one of the founders—the late William G. Zetzmann, president of Zetz 7-Up Bottling Co., who served from early 1944 to June 1947.

In chronological order, the other presidents were: A. E. Hegewisch, president of the Hegewisch Corp., who served from June 1947 to June 1949; Lloyd J. Cobb, New Orleans attorney, June 1949 to May 1951; Robert E. Elliott, now senior vice president of the National American Bank, May 1951 to July 1953; C. C. (Bud) Walther, president of Walther Bros. Co., July 1953 to December 1954; Richard G. Jones, executive vice president and general manager of the Jackson Brewing Co., December 1954 to December 1956; Joseph M. Rault, New Orleans attorney, 1957; Richard W. Freeman, president, Louisiana Coca-Cola Bottling Co., 1958; George S. Dinwiddie, chairman of the board, New Orleans Public Service Inc., 1959; Capt. Neville Levy, president of Equitable Equipment Co., 1960; Maurice F. Barr, vice president, Gulf Paramount Theatres, Inc., 1961; Dr. Alton Ochsner, internationally famous surgeon and president of the Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation, 1962.

The president this year has been Lawrence A. Molony, a prominent New Orleans attorney. He is to be succeeded in 1964 by Henry Zac Carter, president of the Avondale Shipyards near New Orleans.

By their service in leading International House to ever greater success, these leaders have given the New Orleans area more than they can ever be repaid in dollars and cents.

In naming the presidents of International House, I cannot forget to pay tribute to the full-time managing directors who have served International House so well through the years. Mr. Stanton Robbins was the first managing director of the organization in 1945 and 1946. Then for 15 years, Charles Nutter, a noted reporter for the Associated Press for many, many years, served at the helm and was instrumental in building International House into the great organization it is today.

In the period 1946–61, Charlie Nutter made a magnificent contribution to the development and growth of International House and to the achievement of its goals not only in our community but also in other communities in the Mississippi Valley. Late in 1961 Charlie Nutter left International House, and today he publishes and directs the operations of several weekly newspapers in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

Early in 1962 Paul Fabry assumed the directorship of International House, and he is carrying on in the same fine manner as did Charlie Nutter.

A list of the many projects International House has executed successfully is innumerable, but I would like to cite the most prominent ones over the past 20 years.

Some of the leading projects of International House are:

First. The annual trade and cultural missions of International House members to nations all over the world.

Second. The annual Pan-American press seminars which bring together leading editors of America with those of all media in Latin America. This year the second such seminar brought to New Orleans 40 participants from 17 countries.

Third. Scholarships to deserving Latin American students for attendance at American colleges and universities: These are provided through the Cordell Hull Foundation.

Fourth. Two-way tourist promotion between New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley, and the nations of Latin America particularly, although travel to and from Europe and Asia also is promoted. International House members often guide VIP's through New Orleans and the Deep South.

Fifth. Special programs for foreign students who are attending universities in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Sixth. Periodic publications and directories to complement the cultural and trade works of the various Government departments and agencies.

Seventh. Special exhibits for foreign artists in this country and exhibits of our art abroad.

Eighth. Various educational television programs.

Probably the most publicized and most successful work that International House does to promote trade and commerce through New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley is through its many trade and cultural missions to countries over the globe. Thus far, International House has sponsored 47 of these missions. Their purpose is to spread the name of New Orleans and its port, to cite the advantages of engaging in trade and commerce through the port and with the businesses and industries of my city and in the Mississippi Valley. Most of these missions have been to the nations of Central and South America, but there have been several to Western Europe, and one to the Soviet Union and the bloc countries and one to the Far East.

Among the mission trips this year, a very fruitful one was the jointly sponsored trip to the five countries of Central America and Panama. The medical school of Louisiana State University joined with International House in sponsoring a 13-day tour of Central America. The result was the establishment of another IH project to provide free medicines and drugs to charitable, nonprofit medical groups operating in the poverty stricken areas of Central America. The LSU Medical School is cooperating in this humanitarian project, and the major pharmaceutical companies are donating the drugs and medicines.

And this summer, 31 civic, business, and professional leaders from the New Orleans area participated in the organization's 47th mission, which took them to three Common Market countries and to member nations of the rival free trade asociation. In these countries of free Europe, the IH members met with representatives of the chambers of commerce, the various port authorities, export and other trade associations, and the officials of different cities and towns.

In the coming year, International House is planning five trade and cultural missions: A tour of Central America by Louisiana lawyers to meet attorneys in those countries; a tour of South America to foster further cultural exchange and trade relations between the New Orleans area and Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Venezuela; an around-the-world trip in 25 days to further the goals of IH throughout the globe; a mission to the Mediterranean area to expand cultural exchanges and promote business through New Orleans from rapidly developing countries in the Near East, and a small mission to several islands in the Caribbean to explore new opportunities for promoting trade and commerce.

Furthermore, a recent trip this year to San Salvador by IH's director of its international relations department resulted in a decision by the tourism ministers of five Central American nations to establish in America a joint tourist promotion department in 1964. The tourism ministers had invited the IH official to meet with them for their own discussions on forming a regional tourist promotion department; the outgrowth was the ministers' pledge to establish in our country a joint tourist department in addition to their own regional one in Central America.

One of the finest humanitarian projects which International House has engaged in all its years was the formation, with the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, of an East Pakistan relief committee to raise money and clothing for the distressed people of that country who were victims of a severe cyclone. The committee sent $15,000 worth of clothing and other goods, plus a check for $7,000 to aid the citizens of East Pakistan.

A very worthy and continuing program sponsored by International House is the foreign language instruction it provides at very low cost to New Orleans citizens.

International House offers regular courses in Spanish, French, English, German, and also this year added two classes in Italian. More than 200 students have consistently attended these classes in recent years.

One of the splendid services which International House provides to American businessmen and those of other nations is through its Thomas F. Cunningham Reference Library. This specialized library on world trade matters was established with the founding of International House, and today its multilingual staff members answers questions of all kinds from all over the world. In effect, the Thomas F. Cunningham Library serves as an international information service on world trade and enjoys a worldwide reputation. Its shelves now hold more than 11,000 volumes; they include trade directories from all over the world; reference books from many, many nations; statistical sources such as publications from the United Nations, reports of central banks of various countries, the publications of foreign governments, particularly from Latin America, and others. The library's periodical files date back 20 years, and tdoay it subscribes to or receives some 450 current periodicals from all parts of the globe. Some of its old periodicals cannot be found in any other library in the New Orleans area, and thus the IH library is a well spring not only for the businessman, but also for the student and the scholar.

The cornerstone of the daily operations of International House is its world trade development department, whose principal job is to bring buyers and sellers together from the four corners of the earth. Over the years the world trade department has established over 350,000 contacts between U.S. businessmen and those of many other countries. The department has comprehensive records of these contacts in its files, and also has extensive files on trade information by country and by commodity. A twice-monthly bulletin relating new opportunities in importing and exporting all kinds of products is published by the department. The work of the world trade department is enhanced through its close contact with American and foreign chambers of commerce, U.S. Government Foreign Service posts, foreign government representatives living in the United States and trade promotional organizations around the world. The department also studies the results of other American city missions to foreign countries for the purpose of trade, travel, and cultural promotion, and participates in many annual international trade conferences.

This year the world trade department published the third edition of International House's "Directory of Importers in the Midcontinent Area of the United States." This directory is of great use to foreign trade commissions; U.S. commercial offices here and abroad; transportation lines and many other groups engaging in foreign trade.

Another vital department of IH is the international relations department, which serves as guide and host to both government officials and private citizens from around the world when they visit New Orleans. This department also directs International House's student exchange program, through which hundreds of students have received scholarships and other forms of financial assistance. International House administers the Cordell Hull Foundation, which is a nonprofit corporation to aid needy and worthy students from Central and South America to obtain a college education in America through special loans. The foreign language program is operated by the international relations department, as is the planning for the various trade and cultural missions taken by IH members each year.

The publicity department of International House, in addition to originating articles and information relating to international affairs, trade, shipping, and the advantages of the port of New Orleans, also publishes Noticias, a weekly Spanish newsletter for Latin American newspapers, and Trade Winds, IH's official log.

International House also has a monthly half-hour television show entitled "VIP" which is telecast over WYES-TV, the educational TV station in New Orleans. IH has helped to make several documentary movies on the Alliance for Progress program too.

With the great emphasis now placed on the vital Alliance for Progress program, which was initiated and pushed by the late President John Kennedy, it is most fitting that International House celebrate its 20th anniversary by hearing from the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Moscoso is to be the principal speaker at the anniversary celebration in New Orleans December 12, and I know he will give a most interesting and important address on his program and its progress. We have seen some positive results from this great program, but we all know that we are late in Latin America, and that the road of obstacles there will be long and difficult. Our country must contend with the unceasing efforts of Communist agents, from Castro's Cuba and elsewhere, to overthrow existing governments. The problems in Latin America are still very acute and are a long way from being solved, and the Alliance for Progress has been launched by our country to give the less fortunate citizens of our hemisphere an opportunity to better their standard of living and to enjoy the fruits of a democratic system of government.

For so many reasons, the success of the Alliance for Progress is vital to the future growth and development of my city of New Orleans, its port, its businesses and industries, and to the whole economy of the Mississippi Valley. As I have pointed out, International House has been a great catalyst in this growth, and the future of IH is intertwined with that of New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley.

On this 20th anniversary of the founding of International House, in which I am proud to have played a small part, I am pleased to salute the new officers of IH and its dedicated staff members, and to congratulate them and wish for them and for International House 20 times 20 more years of increasing success and prosperity.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

O God of grace and mercy, the sudden passing of John F. Kennedy, after a brief life among us of less than half a century, and a tenure of office of only a little less than 3 years, has given clear and glorious contemporary witness and meaning to these words of sacred Scripture.

Today the Members of the House of Representatives have assembled to render tributes of praise and love to the memory of Thy servant, our President, whose mortal body has been laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery, but whose spirit dwells in the Father's house of many mansions, leaving us to dream how wonderfully beautiful that heavenly home must be since he is there. We believe that at this very hour he is laboring and serving with all his strength and enthusiasm in the spacious and limitless fields of eternity.

As we go up and down the courts of memory and think of that brilliant and dedicated young man, whom millions in this and many other countries so dearly loved and admired, we are calling to mind especially the creative and significant part he had in history's greatest cause and challenge, the establishment of peace on earth and good will among men.

There was enshrined in his soul a deep passion for the welfare of mankind and for all the members of the human family, who are finding the struggle of life so difficult and its burdens so heavy.

By spoken and written word, by arduous toil and travel, he continually bore testimony that this was the vision which stirred his imagination and for whose fulfillment he longed and labored.

The contribution that he has made toward attaining that goal of universal peace and brotherhood will perhaps never be rightly and fully appraised by this and future generations for now we see through a glass darkly and know only in part, but someday we shall see and know the good that passed on from his life into the life of multitudes of others and how much more beautiful the world was made by his presence.

Grant unto the members of his bereaved family who were bound to him by the ties of faith and love, the consolations of Thy grace and the assurance that Thou hast crowned his life with the diadem of Thy praise and bestowed upon him Thy benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter unto the joy of thy Lord."

In the name of the Christ, our Saviour and the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 82. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 20, 1963:

H.R. 2073. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain submerged lands to the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; and

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

On November 26, 1963:

H.R. 8969. An act to provide for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On November 29, 1963:

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On December 2, 1963:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1111. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; and

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1, Public Law 88–138, approved October 16, 1963, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LONG] was appointed as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

The message also announced that pursuant to title 44, United States Code, section 393A, Mr. SALTONSTALL was reappointed, for a term of 4 years, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 8747, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1964, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6518, THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 6518, the Clean Air Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

### SENDING TO CONFERENCE H.R. 8667, RIVER BASINS ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Jones of Alabama, Cramer, and Baldwin.

## PROJECTS AND PROGRESS OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 179)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of July 1 through December 31, 1962.

This report reveals the significant accomplishments that are beginning to flow from our broadly based space effort. In cooperation with other agencies and through its own increasing competence, NASA is making a major contribution to a maturing national space program.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *December 5, 1963.*

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to insert their remarks in the Congressional Record today and include therewith extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **CAREY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 221]

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Ashbrook
Ashley
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Brooks
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Celler
Chamberlain
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gill
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Henderson
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Knox
Lankford
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Montoya
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Schwengel
Scott
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Snyder
Stinson
Stubblefield
Taft
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Whalley
White
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Vinson). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may address the House today in eulogy to our late beloved President may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all other Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the body of the Record, and that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the Record.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman modify his request so that Members may also include in the body pertinent extraneous matter as well as editorials?

Mr. **McCORMACK**. I include that in my request.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, it can be said that the American people and the Government of the United States—both—have just passed through one of the most tragic events of our history. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, around noon on Friday, November 22, 1963, was cut down by the bullets of an assassin in one of the great cities of the country that he loved and that loved him. Here was the 35th President of the United States at a high moment of his eminence, and in the middle of the last year of what would have been his first administration, receiving the adoration and the praise of his fellow citizens. The assassin was morally blind, as blind as the bullets from his weapon, to the central fact that perhaps no leader of his people on this conflict-ridden planet since the end of World War II, and precious few before, had so completely captured the imagination of his fellow Americans, and of mankind, as this young, vigorously alive, brilliantly statesmanlike champion of world peace.

The impact of a tragedy so monumental, and the high drama of the violence and the ruthlessness that surrounded it, made the whole world reel as if from a blow that had been struck at the collective brow of mankind and caught it viciously and squarely between the eyes. Not alone the unexpectedness of this calamity but the unending repercussions in the hearts of 190-odd million of his fellow Americans, and among the peoples and in the capitals of every nation in the world, produced a momentary paralysis of comprehension hitherto unknown to the psychology of mass bereavement. This President, who was the enemy of no man, suddenly called forth, by the rude ferocity of his sudden death, a flood of feeling and a depth of understanding from one end of the earth to the other, that is without parallel in the annals of time. Above all, it elicited from the American people a new dimension in the quality of their character as a free nation. It called forth from them, on a superb note of dignity, a collective and a massive grandeur in their bereavement that will remain for all time one of the great phenomena of history.

It was as if the people, by the dignity of their response to the peril of the moment, strove to match in their conduct the splendid heroism exemplified in the life of their young President. This feeling of appreciation, of sympathy, of the need for abjuring panic and avoiding an almost pardonable hysteria of despair while feeling the intensest emotion of bereavement, covered the whole spectrum of American life. The political party in opposition, the leaders of practically all the factions of American political thought—except the most rabid and the most hate-loving—responded with a degree of decency that attested to the great place John Fitzgerald Kennedy had won for himself in the minds and hearts of those who opposed him as well as those who followed faithfully what I believe was his high order of domestic and foreign statesmanship.

The American people admire courage and expect it in their leaders. This President demonstrated it—not only physically, dramatically, and actually in violent combat for his country—but intellectually and politically, in the White House, before the country, and in confrontation with the greatest nuclear power in the world, second only to our own, at the very brink of nuclear devastation.

The American people admire boldness in their leaders. This President demonstrated it again and again in his speeches, in his policies, in his negotiations with the great and the minor powers. One has but to review the list of notables who came from the far countries to attend his funeral to realize the faith he had won among the leaders of the world for the integrity of his aspirations for world peace and prosperity and the respect and prestige he had gained for his country in the great capitals of the earth. Many came personally who could have sent delegates carrying with them the highest credentials in a genuine and a sincere display of condolence. All mourned the loss of a relatively young man who had proved himself a patriot passionately loving his own country, of course, but a statesman also who was concerned about the welfare and the future of all mankind.

This is no place, and the hour is too melancholy, for a review in detail. But suffice it to say that here, in the coffin now laid to rest on the soft hillside facing the Potomac, is the courage of the President who stopped the Kremlin dead in its tracks when it sought to threaten American freedom with missiles in the weak and helpless island of Cuba.

And here is the statesmanship and the courage of the President whose vision was without hate and without pique and without personal arrogance, or rancor, and who gave to mankind the greatest gift it has known since nuclear physics came into being—the gift of the nuclear test ban treaty. Much may still depend on the honor or the duplicity of the Kremlin. But through this treaty, without lessening our own strength and without committing more than we are asking the other side to commit, a step has been taken to lift the imminent threat and the unspeakable burden of war and the destruction of the earth. Is it not a tribute to statesmanship of the highest nobility and skill and the most profound integrity that the President who could compel the Soviet Union one day to withdraw its arms from Cuba, could the next day persuade it to come to terms on a matter basically affecting the status of the world's power structure?

This is the hero of the 20th century who has just been taken from us.

In every crisis that John Fitzgerald Kennedy spoke, in every crisis that John Fitzgerald Kennedy acted, he was the President extraordinary.

There rang in his words and breathed in his language the traditions of this country, and the precepts and disciplines of the Constitution which he knew as devotedly and as studiously, as a preacher of the gospel knows his Bible. When he acted in the Cuban crisis that led to the withdrawal of Soviet missiles, both his language and what his journalistic eulogists call his style had the firmness that meant business, and the reasonableness that made Soviet withdrawal possible under terms that gave the greatest possible promise of a nonviolent solution. This is what the historians of the future will put down as statesmanship. We may never know what an immense gratitude the whole of mankind owes to this brilliant young diplomat-statesman for thus, at one stroke, preserving the freedom of the West, and achieving his fixed determination to get Soviet nuclear weapons out of Cuba. All this without the firing of a shot.

Courage. There was an abundance of courage—the cool and thoughtful courage that our people admired—when in 1961 President Kennedy made plain to the Kremlin and to the whole world precisely what our position was on the matter of the East Berlin wall. The threat hung in the air that with this piece of evil demarkation standing like a prison menace between East and West Berlin, the Soviets were prepared to block access to West Berlin and the Allies in spite of long-established guarantees. At the most acute point of this menace, President Kennedy assigned Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson to the scene of the crisis. He backed him up with a formidable display of American military might in the Berlin strategic area. With the presence of the Vice President in Berlin and the evidence of military readiness, the whole of the free world on the other side of the Atlantic breathed more easily. The Kremlin was made to understand the situation in all its reality, and again President Kennedy won his point. And again the process was the process of considered statesmanship and anything but headlong, precipitate or unthoughtout action.

The goal was peace—but peace with honor—and that goal, the Kennedy goal, was achieved.

President Kennedy worked with the materials at hand and with marvelous success. He had the habit of success and the design for victory from the time he came to this House as a fledgling Representative from Massachusetts in the 80th Congress in 1946, to the moment when he was felled by the assassin's bullet. He was a success at Harvard, receiving his B.S. degree cum laude. He was a notable and a dramatic success as a PT commander in World War II. His fondness and his respect for American journalism can be traced to his own tour of duty as a newspaper correspondent, and to his authorship of such works as "Why England Slept" and "Profiles in Courage," which won him the Pulitzer Prize. He was outstanding—as I personally observed—in the 80th Congress, the 81st and the 82d, and even more markedly an outstanding success as a Senator from the time of his election to the Senate from Massachusetts in 1952, to the time of his election to the Presidency in 1960.

It is no reflection on any of his predecessors to describe President Kennedy as one of the best informed, most knowledgeable, and therefore one of the most accurately articulate Presidents in the history of our country. This was a President who had taken hold of his education and whose education had taken hold of him to the immense benefit of his countrymen and to the enhancement of the prestige of the White House for all time. His state papers and his speeches, which lend themselves to quotation more easily and more effectively than the utterances of any President since Lincoln, are examples of superior literary workmanship and a school of eloquence that can lift the heart, the dignity, the patriotism, and the distinction of a whole people. We have had strong Presidents and colorful Presidents and Presidents whom we loved as war heroes. But not until John Fitzgerald Kennedy have we had a President who belonged so wholly and so absolutely to the 20th century. He exemplified in himself, by his very breath and image, the very soul of American youth, American vitality, American courage, and American learning and tradition. Here was an American President who expressed in his every word and gesture, the inner essence of this—the freest society of all time. This was a President, who, it seemed to me, looked the way the President of a busy and an active democracy ought to look. He spoke as a President who is the head of a nation to which all mankind looks as the last great hope of earth, ought to speak.

As he will be remembered for his masterful leadership in the field of foreign affairs, our late beloved President will also be remembered for his outstanding leadership in the field of domestic affairs. His progressive recommendations to strengthen America on the domestic level, many of which have been enacted into law, and others in the legislative process of final enactment, are also a monument to his leadership.

But more than any President of our time, he fought for equal rights for all our citizens. He fought for those rights because he so deeply believed in them. There was a deep, abiding devotion to God and God's morality behind the legal social justice for which he fought. John Kennedy never thought of the brotherhood of man without relating it to the fatherhood of God, from which all virtue springs. Here was his inner strength.

There remains one note about which I can only speak falteringly, and this is the personal one. Back in Massachusetts and here in the House, both as a friend of the family and as a friend of the President, I felt a kinship born of frequent contact and intimate discussion. This is a President whom I knew as a lad in his father's house. It is God's will that I stand to speak as a mourner at his passing. For I saw in this President a future of peace and prosperity for our country and for the whole of the free world. To see such a prospect for the human race struck down in his prime, at the very gate of massive accomplishments, brings me personally as a friend, and as a citizen, to the very edge of desolation.

What buoys us all up in this moment is the structure of our Government and the quality and the resources of our leadership. This, too, was influenced by the President who so brought the Vice President into his confidence and his activities that the transition is being effected with results that have already made the whole world feel reassured. The enemies of a free society could get no comfort out of the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The strength, the vigor, the decision, and the capacity already displayed by Lyndon Johnson, have electrified our own people and the world and lifted us all out of the deep doldrums of bereavement and despair. What President Johnson is giving us is not only transition but continuity, and continuity is what mankind is looking for and what this Nation wants.

I hope I will be forgiven if I find it impossible to quit this moment of grief without a word of tribute to as remarkable an example of human courage and deportment as this Nation has probably ever witnessed. We, as a people have seen so much and been brought so close to the dreadful drama of November 22, can never forget our admiration for Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of the President. I know of no way to lessen her agony. She is the living proof that as John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a success in war and in peace, in politics and in statesmanship, so he was a success as a husband and a father. The modern communication media helped the whole world to see a quality in human character that must restore respect for human nature in the most pessimistic among us. This young woman proved herself a patrician capable of a display of grace under pressure beyond anything our world has seen in its time.

And I might say, looking through the pages of history, I cannot find therein any lady who underwent the terrible experience that Mrs. Kennedy endured—riding with her loved husband—chatting—joy—happiness—love—then the sudden bullet. And then embracing her husband in her bosom in his dying moments.

It is because of all this that I say the American people and their Government have just passed through one of the most tragic, and in the majestic bearing of Mrs. Kennedy, one of the finest hours in our history.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 22, for the fourth time in the history of this Republic, our Chief Executive had been struck down by an assassin's bullet. On that day of darkest tragedy the most beloved man of this generation bowed his head for the last time and said "goodby."

On Monday, as the autumn evening descended over the slopes of Arlington, taps sounded the final solemnity to the President's funeral pageant attended by a sea of mourners—plain and royal, ordinary and exalted, a grieved family and thousands of heart-heavy citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the death of the President and these tributes have moved me to an emotion I cannot express. For the first time in my life have I felt such grief. For the first time have I begun to comprehend the shock and sorrow of the generation that lived through the martyrdom of Abraham Lincoln.

Our hearts and prayers go out to the wonderful family of our late beloved President, to Mrs. Kennedy whose courage and devotion have inspired the world, to the children, to the father, mother, brothers and sisters, and other relatives of our departed leader. May the love of God, which passeth all understanding sustain them in their sorrow.

The life and deeds of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will forever illuminate the pages of American history. This son of the 20th century, who was destined to live less than two thirds of the allotted span, was also destined to compress into his short years one of the most remarkable records in all the annals of time.

The rhythm of his life astounded us. He moved with the pace of one who had so much to do, so little time in which to do it. Never stopping even to catch his second wind, he hastened to meet responsibility after responsibility. Already having taken time out to fight a war and to recover from the wounds of battle, he came to the House of Representatives in 1947, the youngest Member of this body. In 1953 he was the youngest Member of the U.S. Senate. In 1960 he was the youngest man ever elected President of the United States, and, less than 2 weeks ago, he became the youngest President ever to die in or out of office.

When he came to serve in the House of Representatives he was—as has been said many times in thousands of words—a hard working, dedicated, brilliant, and articulate young man. But these were not the qualities that set him apart—not his youth, his elegance of form and manner, not his matchless zest for life, his vast intelligence nor even the simple goodness of a Christian gentleman. No, Mr. Speaker, it was not any one of these qualities, impressive though they all were, which set John Kennedy apart. It was rather that they should all come to dwell in one man.

John Kennedy was a man of tough mind and tender heart, of great passion and iron self-discipline. A man for work and a man for play. A man for joy and a man for suffering. A man for the heads of state and a man for little children. A man for the old and ill, a man for the youthful and strong.

Such was the man mourned the length and breadth of land and sea—behind whose funeral caisson united representatives of most of the world to walk together in grandly silent tribute.

John Kennedy stirred peoples long quiescent and despairing to rise and demand a place in the community of free men.

In his own country he called his people to join with him in preparing for a new era in time.

For John Kennedy felt in his deepest soul that we were entering a new epoch in the history of man.

He believed literally that the world stood at the bar of the universe—that we had collided head on with immeasurable distance and yet-to-be-fathomed mysteries of a new frontier.

He believed that this event demanded a fuller implementation of our traditional concepts and goals and a fuller development of the potentialities and opportunities of all men.

In his inaugural address in 1961 he bid us join him in a "celebration of freedom." For John Kennedy, the "celebration of freedom," its fulfillment and its extension, was the be-all, end-all of his life. To him freedom could not be circumscribed or limited. It belonged to the humblest man in the most distant corner of the globe.

John Kennedy was not a man who limited freedom by fences and boundaries, justice by color or name, peace by politics or geography.

He has written his personal translation of democratic government into the hundreds of programs he devised and pressed—national and international, economic and social, scientific and military, educational and cultural.

One year ago in his State of the Union message he reported that we had made "steady progress in building a world of order in Berlin, in Laos, in the Congo, in Cuba" and that "at home, too" we had made "good progress in handling our economic problems and heading off a recession." "But," he continued, "we cannot be satisfied to rest here. This is the side of the hill, not the top."

During his brief sojourn in the White House, President Kennedy stamped an indelible imprint on every phase of American public life. As one who knew the horrors of war, he waged an unrelenting battle for world peace on every front. The Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, the test ban treaty—all testify to his grasp of world problems in this generation and loom as monuments to the far-seeing constructive quality of his statesmanship.

His leadership in the cause of world peace was recognized worldwide. At his death, the shock of a world crying for peace was expressed by 83-year-old Irish playright, Sean O'Casey, who wrote a friend in New York City:

> What a terrible thing has happened to us all. To you there, to us here, to all everywhere.
>
> Peace, who was becoming bright eyed, now sits in the shadow of death; her handsome companion has been killed as he walked by her very side. Her gallant boy is dead.

A devotee of the principle of religious freedom and of the separation of church and state, John Kennedy did more than any man in our time to erase the blot of religious bigotry from our land.

A firm believer in the ideals expressed in the Declaration of Independence, he has done more than any American since Abraham Lincoln to give them substance. Calling upon the moral resources of this country, he made it the mission of this generation to remove the last vestiges of slavery.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave America and the world a rallying point to rededicate themselves to liberty when dedication seems to have faltered—to be courageous in the pursuit of justice when courage seemed to have waned—to be hopeful of peace when peace had become fragmented. In his youth and strength, his love and courage, he gave all that mortal man can give—all in the cause of freedom and justice.

The challenge of the death of President Kennedy was expressed in his own state-of-the-Union message when he said:

> Now the time has come * * * to translate the renewal of our national strength into the achievement of our national purpose.

On November 22, John F. Kennedy passed the torch to us. President Johnson has dedicated his administration to the unfinished task. In the fulfillment of our responsibilities in this day and this generation, this House, under God, can do no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think my reaction to the first report I received that the late President John F. Kennedy had been shot was shared by virtually every American citizen: A total disbelief that the news was true.

Even as we stand here today in tribute to the 35th President of these United States, there is to me a strange quality of unreality about the events which have transpired since that awful day in our national history, Friday, November 22, 1963.

But the assassination of President Kennedy was real—tragically real—and we as a nation are stunned by the sad truth—that this was no nightmare to be forgotten with the dawn.

We, as a great people, are bereaved, and the people of the world share our loss.

I recall a conversation I had with a newspaper friend a few days after the death of our late President.

In attempting to assess the deep shock and sorrow of every man, woman, and child capable of understanding what had happened, he said something like this:

> I think every President carries in his being a little piece of every one of us. And when a terrible thing like this happens to him a part of us is somehow lost, too.

This seems to me an expressive way of describing how Americans feel about the death of John F. Kennedy.

Certainly, in a relatively short time, President Kennedy had identified himself with Americans in all walks of life, and they with him.

There was no question of his great love for America, her heritage and her traditions.

And there was never any question about his unwavering faith in America's future.

As a nation we are immeasurably poorer at his loss.

The John F. Kennedy I knew, first as a Member of this House of Representatives, later as a Member of the other body, and finally as our President, had all the attributes we generally associate with success in the field of public service.

His war record established his courage and his devotion to his country and his fellow men.

His record in the Congress of the United States established his high intelligence, his energy and his sense of purpose.

Beyond that, I found him to be a young man of much personal charm and graciousness, whose ascendency to the highest office in our land did not, so far as I ever knew, affect his genius for being most thoughtful of others, be they of high or low stature.

The achievement of becoming the youngest President in the history of our Republic is perhaps the greatest testimonial to John F. Kennedy's determination to serve his country to the ultimate of his capacities—capacities which were considerable.

He and I differed on matters of political philosophy. We did not agree on what might be the best means to serve the best ends.

But as combatants in this great arena, neither of us, to my knowledge, ever ascribed to the other a dishonesty of conviction or of purpose.

It is not for any of us to question the wisdom of a Higher Power who has taken from our company a devout servant.

But we all sorrow that he is gone, with heartfelt compassion for the fine family he leaves to mourn.

Who can say that his work was unfinished?

Perhaps the ideals of peace, freedom, and good will among men for which he labored will be pursued henceforth with even greater diligence by all men everywhere, to the end that John F. Kennedy, like the innumerable other Americans who have served valiantly, shall not have died without cause.

This the way of history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as we gather here in this, the highest theater in the world, to commune together in grief and in remembrance, so many scenes come back to my mind from the years in which I knew, loved, and trusted this magnificent leader of mankind.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven—the first glimpse of a tall, gangling, boyish, smiling broth of a boy, sent by his neighbors to the Nation's Capital to speak and work in their behalf.

He was a young man, his body wracked with pain from a war wound that never went away, who on sight was a warm, relaxed, buoyant new friend—a friend who trusted and was trusted in return.

I came in time to know his father and his grandfather. I treasure the picture that hangs in my office of the President's grandfather, well known to our colleagues here from the great State of Massachusetts. I remember the occasion in 1947 when he asked me to go to Boston to talk to the Clover Club. I spent a great deal of time preparing a serious speech, but when I arrived there I realized I should not be serious. And I have had hanging in my office ever since a picture of the President taken in that year of 1947, a gangling boy standing next to his Irish grandfather, "Honey Fitz," and inscribed thereon in the handwriting of the President:

> To my dear friend, HALE BOGGS, in memory of the night we were both in Clover.

I remember so many other things. I came to know his father and his mother. I remember her coming to my city of New Orleans in 1960 when the President was seeking the Presidency. She met there with a group of ladies from my hometown and my home State of Louisiana—friends of mind and friends of my wife. Her charm, her courage, and her knowledge of our country which she and her husband had translated and transmitted to her great son, charmed and captivated all the ladies of my town, despite the fact that they had been reared in what we value and prize as our southern tradition, and she, of course, had been reared in the New England-Irish tradition.

So many things have happened. A lovely wife that all of us loved and who has been described as one who brought majesty to our country during the last few years. There is one who said she came to Washington as a beautiful girl, but leaves official life as a beautiful spirit.

I remember one day after one of our White House breakfasts the President brought in Caroline and, in the tradition of little girls, she had been taught to curtsy. She curtsied to Mr. MCCORMACK, she curtsied to Mr. ALBERT, and to Senator MANSFIELD, and to Senator HUMPHREY, and to Senator SMATHERS. I think even to me. But she did not curtsy to the then Vice President, now President, Johnson. He said:

> Why, Caroline, didn't you curtsy to me?

And in little-girl fashion, she said:

> I forgot.

The real reason was that she considered the Vice President a member of the family. She, too, had this magnificent quality of grace that the President gave to all with whom he was associated.

There are so many memories, memories of the man that come fleeting back to me. Many of you served here with him, and knew him when he served in the other body, and watched him as President. We remember his fight to go to the U.S. Senate against odds which were considered difficult at that time, but which he overcame through hard work and quiet confidence in his own ability.

We remember the wide range of efforts, covering the whole panorama of American life, which he undertook as a Senator. I served with him as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and there I became aware of his fabulous knowledge of the economy of this country and of the world.

Will you forget that day in Chicago in 1956 when he barely missed the call to national leadership, a defeat which he accepted with the grace, with the composure which characterized his life. Or can any of you ever forget the excitement of Los Angeles, when this man was nominated to the Presidency, and with determination he called out to all of us to get moving forward?

Or can any of you forget some of his TV performances? I remember Mr. Sam Rayburn's muttering to some of us, and I quote almost his exact words:

> My God, the things that boy knows.

Imbedded in our memories like an etching, I am sure, in that day in January 1961, when a young President, his hair waving in the blizzard wind, called the Nation to action as he himself entered his last battle. And only last October a year ago when the world trembled on the verge of the ultimate holocaust, our valiant leader, alone in the world's most awful loneliness, became a giant as he turned the corner of peace with a courage and a patience and a calmness and a determination unequaled in our time.

So many, many things to remember this man for. Unruffled and unhurried, he always had time to hear another's problems. Witty and urbane, he was also warm, thoughtful, and eternally considerate to his fellow man. Burdened by problems heavier than any one man should ever be called on to carry, his faith in his country and in its future never faltered. A giant himself, he made all men taller. He gave us back a sense of purpose.

A few weeks ago, I think at his very last press conference, he was asked to appraise his job, and this is what he said:

> Well, I find the work rewarding. Whether I am going to stay and what my intentions are and all of the rest, it seems to me, is still a good many months away. But as far as the job of President goes, it is rewarding, and I have given before this group the definition of happiness of the Greeks, and I will define it again. It is full use of your powers along lines of excellence. I find, therefore, the Presidency provides some happiness.

That was his quote.

Yes, there was excellence, Mr. Speaker, but there was also humanity and love. And how the Nation responded in life and in death.

Will any of you forget the Sunday just a little more than a week ago when we gathered in the rotunda of this great, historic building and listened to the words of Senator MANSFIELD, the Chief Justice, and our distinguished Speaker, and watched that bereaved, majestic lady and those lovely children pay their own tributes?

And can you forget the people who came from everywhere and how they stood through the cold of the night and how they were still there when they took him away the next morning? I found it hard to believe that they would stay there through the sunset and would still be there after the rising of the sun.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, so many memories, so many personal memories. I remember so many things that he did for all of you. Some of you would come to me from time to time, and I was honored when you did, and you would ask me some simple thing, and there was never a time that this man did not understand, whether it meant autographing a picture, signing a book, writing a letter, sending a greeting, or shaking hands with a constituent, whatever it may have been, he was never too busy to respond to the demands of our people.

Again I remember that Cuban crisis. I see sitting here that great statesman from the State of Georgia, and I remember coming from one of those meetings with Admiral Vinson, and his remarks about the steely calmness of this man who was directing the destiny of all of mankind. I think that when history is written that act will figure as one of the decisive acts in all the history of mankind because that could very well have been the decision that prevented a holocaust which could have destroyed all of mankind.

To add just a personal note. Just a few weeks ago my mother was visiting in Washington. My mother, my wife and her mother went to the White House about the time of our Tuesday breakfast. I asked the President if he would greet them—I thought for just a moment. But in typical fashion, he personally called them into his office.

It was a beautiful fall day and we looked out on the famous rose garden and on the fall flowers that were blooming there. The President turned to my wife and said:

> Lindy, how long do the chrysanthemums bloom in the fall in Washington?

Then he looked acrosss and pointed to the magnolias and he told us about Andrew Jackson planting them. Yes, his interests even encompassed the trees and the plants in that garden.

Then he took us into the Cabinet Room and he explained to those ladies so dear to me, about the table that had been designed by Jesse Jones so that all who were seated at it could sit as close as possible to the President to hear what was going on. I became concerned about the amount of time he was taking—but he summoned Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln, and God bless her, and asked for a photographer. So I have that prized possession for my mother and my wife's mother and my wife and myself.

Then finally our last breakfast was on November 20. We talked about many things, including the feuding among Texas Democrats. He said that would create interest and would bring a lot of people out. That remark so truly reflected the temperament of the man. He always looked at the optimistic side of every problem. It was so typical of him. Then he said—I think I shall always remember this because it was the last thing he ever said to me:

> Things always look so much better away from Washington.

As I recalled that meeting and the people who sat there, I thought of the thousands and thousands of people all over the world who loved this man. But I thought, none loved him more than the members of his own staff whom he took to these meetings year in and year out—Larry O'Brien, Kenny O'Donnell, Ted Sorenson and Pierre Salinger—and that list is anything but inclusive or exclusive.

How do you define such a man, Mr. Speaker? No one can, really. Because he means something different to every person. I think what he best symbolized was an understanding of people and of his country and of the world in which we live. He knew, as he said so many times, that we had to move ahead. He knew that as a static society we would perish. He grew as a Congressman. He grew as a Senator. He grew as a President.

He had the capacity for growth, just as he knew that our country had the capacity for growth.

He faced awful problems—a growing population, overflowing cities, automation, unemployment, racial tensions at home, the threat of nuclear war, civil strife, and revolutions abroad. He described it all in his last news conference as "an untidy world."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is gone, but his spirit, his courage, his inspiration will live with every American as long as there is an America and as long as there is an American.

Another great American, also felled by an assassin's bullet, told us in his time what those who come along must do, and I quote:

> It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, now, when our grief is unsolaced and our loss seems unbearable, let us really move ahead, remembering what he taught us by his example: To die for one's country is the supreme sacrifice, but let us now here assembled remember that if we live in our country, well and wisely and actively, we die for it, too.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy did both.

Mr. Speaker, I include an address made on Monday, December 2, before the National Women's Democratic Club, here in Washington by Mrs. Hale Boggs, former president of the club and Mrs. Boggs was selected to deliver this eulogy for the club.

It follows in full:

### EULOGY REMARKS ON THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, BEFORE THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, DECEMBER 3, 1963

(By Mrs. Hale Boggs)

A week ago today (it seems an eternity), on a sunny slope in Arlington Cemetery, where L'Enfant once looked across the Potomac to envision the Federal City, where Robert E. Lee paced making his agonizing decision, at a spot he had called the prettiest place on this earth, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, naval hero, Congressman and Senator from Massachusetts, 35th President of the United States, before the greatest assemblage of world dignitaries ever gathered to honor an American statesman, was laid to rest among our honored dead. Then Cardinal Cushing, his life-long spiritual adviser, committed "our dear Jack" to the company of the angels; American boys from the various branches of our military forces lovingly and expertly folded the flag that had draped their precious burden; his valiant widow lighted a torch and with the assistance of his two brothers, in whom he placed so much affection and confidence, ignited an everlasting flame.

President Kennedy would have approved every word and every motion because they were most appropriate in the affectionate mourning of the man and in the honor due the leader of the free world. For he was always personal in his interest and always pertinent to the occasion, whether he greeted a group of youngsters as "fellow members of the CYO" or admitted that he was "the man who had accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris," or whether he inquired about the hospitalized child of a White House staff worker, or declared, while looking calmly down the nuclear gun barrel during the Cuban crisis, that the United States wished for peace, but was prepared for war.

It was this very pertinence that identified him with his times. He tapped the great resources of learning available in a free society, and used to intelligent advantage the computers and the opinion polls, the helicopters and jet planes of a modern technological nation. President Kennedy had a style that was perfect for our times—an understated elegance, a sparkling wit, an enduring charm, an amazingly absorbtive mind and a retentive memory on a wide variety of subjects, and most of all, a joyful love of life and a real love for the most challenging job in the world.

He understood the world in which we live: The constant threat of nuclear carnage; the ideological struggles all over the globe; the bursting desire of peoples everywhere to be free; and he also understood perfectly America's role in this world. He knew that our military and economic strength must be maintained but that it must be matched by moral restraint and high national purpose. He knew that we must at last reassure the rights of every American; else we could not have self-respect, nor could we expect the emulation of our system by other nations. He knew that we must move America forward, and his identity with the young will assure our destiny in the future. His influence on the young caused a general reawakening of an interest in politics; and more importantly, he opened up to them new and effective channels of service through the Peace Corps, through an accelerated summer Government employment program, through the various areas of relieving the human needs of the old, the infirm, the school dropouts, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, and through encouraging participation in music, the sciences, and the arts.

Among the hundreds of messages that have poured into my husband's office perhaps the most enchanting was from a young Algerian professor who felt that John Kennedy was "a modern American chevalier with a beautiful lady for an ornament." And true knight he was—dedicated to God devoted to the service of his country, faithful son, courtly husband, affectionate father, loyal and generous friend, who was willing to give his life that right might prevail.

In weak imitation of his splendid style, I feel that no tribute from this club to President Kennedy's memory would be appropriate without expressing the personal appreciation of its members to Mrs. Kennedy, one of our two honorary presidents. Her stoic composure and unfailing grace gave to American women everywhere a renewal of the strength and the pride they sorely needed in an hour of sorrow and dismay. And she assuaged the grief of a nation by following the suggestions of Isaiah, one of President Kennedy's favorite Biblical references, who said:

"Give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

We now place with Caroline our collective hand in hers to comfort her, and with little John we salute our departed leader, and bid adieu to our beloved friend.

Mr. Speaker, I now include text of the eulogy by Richard Cardinal Cushing; an article by Theodore H. White; and an article by James Reston in the New York Times for November 23, 1963.

They follow:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 25, 1963]

### THE TRANSCRIPT OF CUSHING'S EULOGY

(NOTE.—Following is the text of Richard Cardinal Cushing's eulogy of President Kennedy on a nationally televised mass from Boston as recorded by the New York Times through the facilities of WOR radio.)

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

My dearly beloved, friends in Christ, and guests:

A shocked and stricken world stands helpless before the fact of death, that death brought to us through a tragically successful assault upon the life of the President of the United States.

Our earliest disbelief has slowly given way to unprecedented sorrow as millions all over the earth join us in lamenting a silence that can never again be broken and the absence of a smile that can never again be seen.

For those of us who knew the President as friend as well as statesman, words mock our attempts to express the anguish of our hearts.

It was my privilege to have been associated with John F. Kennedy from the earliest days of his public life, and even prior to that time, my privilege to have watched him mature with ever-expanding responsibility, to have known some of the warmth of his hearty friendship, to see tested under pain and loss the steely strength of his character.

I have been with him in joy and in sorrow, in decision and in crisis, among friends and with strangers and I know of no one who has combined in more noble perfection the qualities of greatness that marked his cool, calculating intelligence and his big, brave bountiful heart.

#### TRIBUTE AS WORLD LEADER

Now all of a sudden, he has been taken from us and I dare say we shall never see his like again.

Many there are who will appropriately pay tribute to the President as a world figure, a tribute due him for his skill in political life and his devotion to public service.

Many others will measure the wide interests of his mind, the swiftness of his resolution, the power of his persuasion, the efficiency of his action, and the courage of his conviction.

For me, however, it is more fitting and proper to recall him during these days of mourning as husband and father, surrounded by his young and beloved family.

Although the demands of his exalted position carried him often on long journeys and filled even his days at home with endless labors, how often he would make time to share with his little son and sweet daughter whatever time would be his own.

What a precious treasure it is now and will be forever in the memories of two fatherless children. Who among us can forget those childish ways which from time to time enhance the elegance of the Executive Mansion with the touching scenes of a happy family life?

Charming Caroline stealing the publicity, jovial John-John on all fours ascending the stairs of an airplane to greet his daddy and a loving mother, like all mothers, joyfully watching the two children of her flesh and blood, mindful always of three others in the nurseries of the Kingdom of Heaven.

At the side of the President in understanding devotion and affection behold his gracious and beautiful Jacqueline. True always to the obligations of her role as mother, she has given new dimensions to the trying demands of being America's First Lady.

The pride in her husband which he so eminently justified, was plainly reciprocated in his pride of her. The bonds of love that made them one in marriage became like hoops of steel binding them together.

From wherever men may look out from eternity to see the workings of our world, Jack Kennedy must beam with new pride in that valiant woman who shared his life, especially to the moment of its early and bitter end.

It will never be forgotten by her for her clothes are now stained with the blood of her assassinated husband.

These days of sorrow must be difficult for her—more difficult than for any others. A Divine Providence has blessed her as few such women in history by allowing her hero husband to have the dying comfort of her arms.

When men speak of this sad hour in times to come, they will ever recall how well her frail beauty matched in courage the stalwart warrior who was her husband. We who had so many reasons for holding her person in a most profound respect must now find an even wider claim for the nobility of her spirit.

One cannot think, my dearly beloved, especially one such as myself, of the late President without thinking also of the legacy of public service which was bequeathed to him by his name and his family.

#### FAMILY DEDICATION

For several generations in a variety of tasks, this republic on one level or another has been enriched by the blood that was so wantonly shed on Friday last. Jack Kennedy fulfilled in the highest office available to him the long dedication of his family.

It is a consolation for us all to know that his tragic death does not spell the end of this public service but commits to new responsibilities the energies and the abilities of one of the truly great families of America.

What comfort can I extend to their heavy hearts today—mother, father, sisters, brothers—what beyond the knowledge that they have given history a youthful Lincoln, who in his time and in his sacrifice, had made more sturdy the hopes of this Nation and its people.

The late President was even in death a young man—and he was proud of his youth. We can never forget the words with which he began his short term as President of the United States:

"Let the word go forth," he said, "from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage."

No words could describe better the man himself who spoke, one whose youth supplied an almost boundless energy, despite illness and physical handicap, whose record in war touched heroic proportions, whose service in Congress was positive and progressive.

It was against this personal background that he continued by saying:

"Let every nation know * * * that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty. This much we pledge and more."

All that the young President promised in these words, he delivered before his assassination. He has written in unforgettable language his own epitaph.

#### A FULLY HUMAN LIFE

Two days ago, he was the leader of the free world, full of youth, vigor, and promise, his was a role of action, full of conflict, excitement, pressure, and change; his was a fully human life, one in which he lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow, loved, and was loved.

Now in the inscrutable ways of God, he has been summoned to an eternal life beyond all striving, where everywhere is peace.

All of us who knew personally and loved Jack Kennedy—his youth, his drive, his ideals, his heart, generosity, and his hopes—mourn now more for ourselves and each other than for him.

We will miss him; he only waits for us in another place. He speaks to us today from there in the words of Paul to Timothy:

"As for me, my blood has already flown in sacrifice. I have fought the good fight; I redeemed the pledge; I look forward to the prize that awaits me, the prize I have earned. The Lord whose award never goes amiss will grant it to me—to me, yes, and to all those who have learned to welcome His coming."

John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, has fought the good fight for the God-giving rights of his fellow man and for a world where peace and freedom shall prevail.

He has finished the race at home and in foreign lands alerting all men to the dangers and the hopes of the future, pledging aid in every form to those who attempted to misinterpret his words, to misunderstand his country, to become discouraged and to abandon themselves to false prophets.

He has fulfilled unto death a privilege he made on the day of his inauguration—a privilege in the form of a pledge—"I shall not shrink from my responsibilities."

Far more would he have accomplished for America and the world if it were not for his assassination here in the land that he loved and for which he dedicated and gave his life.

May his noble soul rest in peace. May his memory be perpetuated in our hearts as a symbol of love for God, country, and all mankind, the foundation upon which a new world must be built if our civilization is to survive.

Eternal peace grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him.

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 4, 1963]

## FOR ONE SHINING MOMENT THERE WAS CAMELOT

(By Theodore H. White)

(NOTE.—The following is from the current issue of Life magazine where it appears under the title, "For President Kennedy, an Epilogue.")

HYANNIS PORT.—She remembers how hot the sun was in Dallas, and the crowds—greater and wilder than the crowds in Mexico or in Vienna. The sun was blinding, streaming down; yet she could not put on sunglasses for she had to wave to the crowd.

And up ahead she remembers seeing a tunnel around a turn and thinking that there would be a moment of coolness under the tunnel. There was the sound of the motorcycles, as always in a parade, and the occasional backfire of a motorcycle. The sound of the shot came, at that moment, like the sound of a backfire and she remembers Connally saying, "No, no, no, no, no."

She remembers the roses. Three times that day in Texas they had been greeted with the bouquets of yellow roses of Texas. Only, in Dallas they had given her red roses. She remembers thinking, how funny—red roses for me; and then the car was full of blood and red roses.

Much later, accompanying the body from the Dallas hospital to the airport, she was alone with Clint Hill—the first Secret Service man to come to their rescue—and with Dr. Burkley, the White House physician. Burkley gave her two roses that had slipped under the President's shirt when he fell, his head in her lap.

All thru the night they tried to separate him from her, to sedate her, and take care of her—and she would not let them. She wanted to be with him. She remembered that Jack had said of his father, when his father suffered the stroke, that he could not live like that. Don't let that happen to me, he had said, when I have to go.

### AN ANNIVERSARY REMEMBRANCE

Now, in her hand she was holding a gold St. Christopher's Medal.

She had given him a St. Christopher's Medal when they were married; but when Patrick died this summer, they had wanted to put something in the coffin with Patrick that was from them both; and so he had put in the St. Christopher's Medal.

Then he had asked her to give him a new one to mark their 10th wedding anniversary, a month after Patrick's death.

He was carrying it when he died and she had found it. But it belonged to him—so she could not put that in the coffin with him. She wanted to give him something that was hers, something that she loved. So she had slipped off her wedding ring and put it on his finger. When she came out of the room in the hospital in Dallas, she asked: "Do you think it was right? Now I have nothing left." And Kenny O'Donnel said, "You leave it where it is."

That was at 1:30 p.m. in Texas.

But then, at Bethesda Hospital in Maryland, at 3 a.m. the next morning, Kenny slipped into the chamber where the body lay and brought her back the ring, which, as she talked now, she twisted.

On her little finger was the other ring: A slim, gold circlet with green emerald clips—the one he had given her in memory of Patrick.

There was a thought, too, that was always with her.

"When Jack quoted something, it was usually classical," she said, "but I'm so ashamed of myself—all I keep thinking of is this line from a musical comedy.

"At night, before we'd go to sleep, Jack liked to play some records; and the song he loved most came at the very end of this record. The lines he loved to hear were: 'Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot.'"

She wanted to make sure that the point came clear and went on: "There'll be great Presidents again—and the Johnsons are wonderful, they've been wonderful to me—but there'll never be another Camelot again.

"Once, the more I read of history the more bitter I got. For a while I thought history was something that bitter old men wrote. But then I realized history made Jack what he was. You must think of him as this little boy, sick so much of the time, reading in bed, reading history, reading the knights of the round table, reading Marlborough. For Jack, history was full of heroes. And if it made him this way—if it made him see the heroes—maybe other little boys will see. Men are such a combination of good and bad. Jack had this hero idea of history, the idealistic view."

But she came back to the idea that transfixed her:

"Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot—and it will never be that way again."

### LEST THEY FORGET

As for herself? She was horrified by the stories that she might live abroad. "I'm never going to live in Europe. I'm not going to 'travel extensively abroad.' That's a desecreation. I'm going to live in the places I lived with Jack. In Georgetown, and with the Kennedys at the Cape. They're my family. I'm going to bring up my children. I want John to grow up to be a good boy."

As for the President's memorial, at first she remembered that, in every speech in their last days in Texas, he had spoken of how in December this Nation would lift the largest rocket booster yet into the sky, making us first in space. So she had wanted something of his there when it went up—perhaps only his initials painted on a tiny corner of the great Saturn, where no one need even notice it. But now Americans will seek the moon from Cape Kennedy. The new name, born of her frail hope, came as a surprise.

The only thing she knew she must have for him was the eternal flame over his grave at Arlington.

"Whenever you drive across the bridge from Washington into Virginia," she said, "you see the Lee Mansion on the side of the hill in the distance. When Caroline was very little, the mansion was one of the first things she learned to recognize. Now at night you can see his flame beneath the mansion for miles away."

She said it is time the people paid attention to the new President and the new First Lady. But she does not want them to forget John F. Kennedy or read of him only in dusty or bitter histories:

For one brief shining moment there was Camelot.

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

## WHY AMERICA WEEPS—KENNEDY VICTIM OF VIOLENT STREAK HE SOUGHT TO CURB IN THE NATION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—America wept tonight, not alone for its dead young President, but for itself. The grief was general, for somehow the worst in the Nation had prevailed over the best. The indictment extended beyond the assassin, for something in the Nation itself, some strain of madness and violence, had destroyed the highest symbol of law and order.

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, now 71 and, by the peculiarities of our politics, next in line for the Presidency, expressed this sense of national dismay and self-criticism: "My God! My God! What are we coming to?"

The irony of the President's death is that his short administration was devoted almost entirely to various attempts to curb this very streak of violence in the American character.

When the historians get around to assessing his 3 years in office, it is very likely that they will be impressed with just this: His efforts to restrain those who wanted to be more violent in the cold war overseas and those who wanted to be more violent in the racial war at home.

He was in Texas today trying to pacify the violent politics of that State. He was in Florida last week trying to pacify the businessmen and appealing to them to believe that he was not antibusiness. And from the beginning to the end of his administration, he was trying to damp down the violence of the extremists on the right.

It was his fate, however, to reach the White House in a period of violent change, when all nations and institutions found themselves uprooted from the past. His central theme was the necessity of adjusting to change and this brought him into conflict with those who opposed change.

Thus, while his personal instinct was to avoid violent conflict, to compromise and mediate and pacify, his programs for taxation, for racial equality, for medical care, for Cuba, all raised sharp divisions with the country. And even where his policies of adjustment had their greatest success—in relations with the Soviet Union—he was bitterly condemned.

The President somehow always seemed to be suspended between two worlds—between his ideal conception of what a President should be, what the office called for, and a kind of despairing realization of the practical limits upon his power.

He came into office convinced of the truth of Theodore Roosevelt's view of the President's duties—"the President is bound to be as big a man as he can."

And his inaugural—"now the trumpet summons us again"—stirred an echo of Wilson in 1913 when the latter said: "We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried at our hearts."

This is what the President set out to do. And from his reading, from his intellectual approach to the office, it seemed, if not easy, at least possible.

But the young man who came to office with an assurance vicariously imparted from reading Richard Neustadt's "Presidential Power" soon discovered the two truths which all dwellers on that lonely eminence have quickly learned.

The first was that the powers of the President are not only limited but hard to bring to bear. The second was that the decisions—as he himself so often said—"are not easy."

### QUOTED MORLEY

Since he was never one to hide his feelings, he often betrayed the mood brought on by contemplating the magnitude of the job and its disappointments. He grew fond of quoting Lord Morley's dictum—"Politics is one long second-best, where the choice often lies between two blunders."

Did he have a premonition of tragedy—that he who had set out to temper the contrary violences of our national life would be their victim?

Last June, when the civil rights were at their height and passions were flaring, he spoke to a group of representatives of national organizations. He tolled off the problems that beset him on every side and then to the astonishment of everyone there, suddenly concluded his talk by pulling from his pocket a scrap of paper and reading the famous speech of Blanche of Spain in Shakespeare's "King John":

"The sun's o'ercast with blood: Fair day, adieu.  
Which is the side that I must go withal?  
I am with both; each army hath a hand,  
And in their rage, I having hold of both,  
They whirl asunder, and dismember me."

There is, however, consolation in the fact that while he was not given time to finish anything or even to realize his own potentialities, he has not left the Nation in a state of crisis or danger, either in its domestic or foreign affairs.

### WORLD MORE TOLERABLE

A reasonable balance of power has been established on all continents. The state of truce in Korea, the Formosa Strait, Vietnam, and Berlin is, if anything, more tolerable than when he came to office.

Europe and Latin America were increasingly dubious of his leadership at the end, but their capacity to indulge in independent courses of action outside the alliance was largely due to the fact that he had managed to reach a somewhat better adjustment of relations with the Soviet Union.

Thus, President Johnson is not confronted immediately by having to take any urgent new decisions. The passage of power from one man to another is more difficult in other countries, and Britain, Germany, Italy, India and several other allies are so preoccupied by that task at the moment that drastic new policy initiatives overseas are scarcely possible in the foreseeable future.

At home, his tasks lie in the Congress, where he is widely regarded as the most skillful man of his generation. This city is in a state of shock tonight and everywhere, including Capitol Hill, men are of a mind to compose their differences and do what they can to help the new President.

Accordingly, the assumption that there will be no major agreements on taxes or civil rights this year will probably have to be revived. It is, of course, too early to tell. But it is typical and perhaps significant that the new President's first act was to greet the congressional leaders of both parties when he arrived in Washington and to meet with them at once in the White House.

Today's events were so tragic and so brutal that even this city, which lives on the brutal diet of politics, could not bear to think much about the political consequences of the assassination.

Yet it is clear that the entire outlook has changed for both parties, and the unexpected death of President Kennedy has forced Washington to meditate a little more on the wild element of chance in our national life.

This was quietly in the back of many minds tonight, mainly because President Johnson has sustained a severe heart attack, and the constitutional line of succession places directly back of him, first Speaker McCormack, and then the President pro tempore of the Senate, 86-year-old Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

Again this note of self-criticism and conscience has touched the Capital. Despite the severe illness of President Eisenhower just a few years ago, nothing was done by the Congress to deal with the problem of Presidential disability.

For an all too brief hour today, it was not clear again what would have happened if the young President, instead of being mortally wounded, had lingered for a long time between life and death, strong enough to survive but too weak to govern.

These, however, were fleeting thoughts, important but irritating for the moment. The center of the mind was on the dead President, on his wife, who has now lost both a son and a husband within a few months, and on his family which, despite all its triumphs, has sustained so many personal tragedies since the last war.

He was, even to his political enemies, a wonderfully attractive human being, and it is significant that, unlike many Presidents in the past, the people who liked and respected him best, were those who knew him the best.

He was a rationalist and an intellectual, who proved in the 1960 campaign and in last year's crisis over Cuba that he was at his best when the going was tough. No doubt he would have been reelected, as most one-term President's are, and the subtle dualism of his character would have had a longer chance to realize his dream.

But he is gone now at 46, younger than when most Presidents have started on the great adventure. In his book, "Profiles in Courage," all his heroes faced the hard choice either of giving in to public opinion or of defying it and becoming martyrs.

He had hoped to avoid this bitter dilemma, but he ended as a martyr anyway, and the Nation is sad tonight, both about him and about itself.

There is one final tragedy about today: Kennedy had a sense of history, but he also had an administrative technique that made the gathering of history extremely difficult. He hated organized meetings of the Cabinet or the National Security Council, and therefore he chose to decide policy after private meetings, usually with a single person.

The result of this is that the true history of his administration really cannot be written now that he is gone.

He had a joke about this. When he was asked what he was going to do when he retired, he always replied that he had a problem. It was, he said, that he would have to race two other members of his staff, McGeorge Bundy and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., to the press.

Unfortunately, however, he was the only man in the White House who really knew what went on there during his administration, and now he is gone.

**The SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

**Mr. ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, there are no words by which we can fully express the shock and deep sense of loss felt throughout the world with the assassination of John F. Kennedy—the beloved President of all of us. Even at this hour, as he rests in peace in the national burial ground of our country's fallen warriors for the cause of freedom, we can hardly believe that such a monstrous act would be committed. We keep asking ourselves: Why? Why? For what purpose?

In a brief moment there was taken from us not only the head of a great nation, not only a world leader. There was taken from us a young man whose life was filled with meaning and purpose. There was taken from us a man, endowed by the Maker of all men everywhere, with the rare qualities of intellect and personality that encourage and inspire men everywhere.

He has not lived and died in vain. His words and deeds live after him to encourage and inspire us in our unfinished task.

The untimely death of our President has brought us to an immediate realization of his greatness. It has also brought us to a fuller realization of the greatness of our system of government and our people. In a quiet, somber, orderly manner we have proceeded with the affairs of state under a new President. And this is how our late President would have it.

I extend my personal sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and the family.

**The SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

**Mr. VINSON.** Mr. Speaker, a little over 3 years ago a young man with spring in his step, determination in his eyes, firmness in his voice, an overwhelming sense of humanity in his heart, and a burning desire to lead the United States of America to even greater heights, spoke at Warm Springs, Ga.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was seeking the office of the Presidency of the United States. On that day, which I remember so well, he said:

> I do not run for the Presidency under any expectation that life will be easy for the next President of the United States or easy for the citizens of the United States.
>
> To be a citizen of this country is to live with great responsibility and great burdens. The United States must be true to itself, it must meet its own responsibility. It must build great strength in this country because it alone defends freedom all around the globe.

The American people listened to this youthful-looking man who possessed the vigor that so characterizes our Nation; they expressed their trust and confidence in John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and they elected him the 35th President of the United States.

In his first appearance before the Congress we can all recall his fateful and prophetic words:

> Before my term is ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers.

Eight months later he stood before the United Nations General Assembly to eulogize the late Dag Hammarskjold. He said:

> His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our

> agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone, but the quest for peace lies before us.

These words spoken by President Kennedy are words that describe the greatest goal John Fitzgerald Kennedy sought for this Nation.

Just 2 months ago he said:

> Let us complete what we have started, for as the Scriptures tell us, "no man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God."

There is no person in America who denies the sincerity of purpose of John F. Kennedy. No person doubts his dedication to the cause of freedom; his love for his fellow man; his goals for the betterment of America; his understanding of the problems of his fellow citizens; and his objective of a better life for freemen everywhere.

In addressing the Congress in May of 1961, President Kennedy, recognizing the challenge of the future as no man before him, said:

> The great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe—Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East—the lands of the rising peoples. Their revolution, the greatest in human history, is one of peace and hope, for freedom and equality, for order and independence. They seek an end to injustice, tyranny, and exploitation. More than end, they seek a beginning—a jungle road to bring a doctor when a child is ill—a schoolhouse to unlock the mysteries of knowledge—seed and fertilizer, jobs and food, a chance to live and be more than just alive.

This was the vision of John F. Kennedy for the future of the world. This epitomizes his incomparable sense of humaneness for his fellow man.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy became President of the United States in a time of peril, and soon he faced the challenge of Cuba, the problem of South Vietnam, the tinderbox of India, the wall of Berlin, the ambitions of the Soviet Union, and the poverty of parts of the free world that might have opened their arms to communism in a move of desperation.

He knew that this Nation was the leader of the free world, and was the single focal point for the universal goal of world peace and freedom.

He knew that this goal could not be achieved by a nation that rested on its laurels; he knew that the burden of responsibility placed upon our shoulders by the events of this century required, in fact, demanded, an ever forward moving America.

He knew that our economy had to expand, and he also knew that traditional barriers among nations had to be eliminated.

He was an American, through and through, who responded to the challenge of our time as no man before him.

All of us who knew John F. Kennedy, watched him grow in stature, and in leadership, as he assumed the reins of Government and led the Nation in its goal of peace, prosperity, and progress.

The Nation can be grateful that he was permitted to be one of us so that he could leave his imprint—an imprint so indelible and so impressive, that his name now joins that small select group of very great Americans to whom this Nation owes an everlasting debt.

John F. Kennedy is no longer with us; he was cut down by an assassin's bullet; his wisdom; his humanity; his ambition for America; his thoughtfulness; his quiet humor; his dignity; his vigor; his foresight; his leadership are gone. But no one can deny that the good he has done for the Nation, and the world, will live on forever.

No one could look upon the hundreds of thousands of faces that waited to view his bier in the rotunda of the Capitol and question the love and affection which the American people held for him.

He was a man who could stand with kings, but talk and walk with the people of this Nation from every street of life.

The strong and the mighty; the weak, and the unimportant understood him, loved him, respected him, and mourn his death.

Probably no man in the history of the world has ever achieved such universal greatness in such a short period of time.

John F. Kennedy leaves behind a courageous, but sorrowing wife and family. But in her sorrow, Mrs. Kennedy displayed a courage that has inspired every citizen of this Nation. Her grief was shared by millions of people throughout the world. But the manner in which she met the shock of her husband's assassination and the mournful days that followed will be remembered, admired, and respected in the years ahead.

Mrs. Kennedy has become a symbol of courage to which every American can point with pride while sharing, with deep conviction, her sorrow.

John F. Kennedy also leaves behind goals yet unattained, but he has set the course for the Nation for generations yet unborn.

The American people are headed on that course and though there are shoals in the channels of progress in the years ahead, there is no question that we will one day enter the harbor of universal peace and world understanding. When that happens, the master of our destiny in that respect here on this earth will have been John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in all our history nothing has so shocked the Nation and the world as the tragic death of our beloved leader.

When the annals of these critical days are written, he will rank as one of the greatest in that long line of distinguished men who have occupied the office of the Presidency down to this or any future time.

But had John F. Kennedy never been President, he still would have been one of the outstanding men of his time.

Every war has produced heroes, and the legendary stories of heroic accomplishments have come down to us from every battlefield. Lieutenant Kennedy's remarkable salvage of every man of his command when survival seemed hopeless, after PT boat No. 109 had been lost by enemy action, is one of the all but incredible achievements of the war. And he carried to the end the disabilities incurred in that historic disaster.

He was a most uncommon man—a man of engaging presence and magnetic personality. It was said of him that he walked like a prince and talked like a scholar. He was indeed a scholarly man. In addition to other notable academic honors, both during and after his undergraduate days, he wrote a book at that early age, "Why England Slept," of such unusual merit that it was in demand throughout Europe and America. His "Profiles in Courage" was awarded the Pulitzer Prize. And, of course, his "Strategy of Peace" is found in every library in America and Western Europe.

Among the leaders of the world, among all the executives of state, kings, presidents, and premiers, who today direct the affairs of nations, he was outstanding, not only in position and prestige and power, but in the realization of great ideals and aspirations in national and international precepts and policies.

The devotion and majestic dignity of Mrs. Kennedy at the most tragic crisis of her life, in the greatest bereavement that could befall her, add lustre and laurel to the family and the Nation on this terrible occasion. To her and the children we extend our deepest sympathy. Our hearts go out to them.

But the man who struck him down did even a greater disservice to our form of government. The strength of democracy depends on the acquiescence of those who in a campaign have differed from the verdict of the voting majority. President Kennedy, above all others was a notable example in that respect. When at the Chicago Convention in 1956 he lost by the narrowest possible margin—it could not have been closer—the nomination for the Vice-Presidency of the United States, he accepted it smilingly, without evidence of regret or disappointment, and cooperated in that campaign as heartily as if he had himself been on the ticket.

This untoward act of force and violence has served to disturb the long-established custom by which, after every election, however bitterly contested, we conform and concur, regardless of any previous convictions we may have had or statements we may have made, in the decision of the majority. This is the soul and essence of democracy and democratic government.

It is a relief to know that this unspeakable crime was the individual act of one twisted and disordered mind and that no party or faction or group or organization prompted or promoted it. It was insanity. It was not American.

The Nation still lives. And he still lives—in the hearts and memory of the people—in the enhanced stability of the Government to which in his brief administration he gave such added impetus, and for which he died.

It is for us who are left behind to close ranks, to present a united front and "to continue," as he admonished, in the development and achievement of loyal and patriotic citizenship.

He died as he would have preferred to die—in the press of strenuous events—in the harness and with his face to the front—on the crest of recovery from threatened recession—and in the hour of his greatest fame and acclaim. Skoal.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues of the House in paying our small tribute to President John F. Kennedy. I know that other speakers will extoll President Kennedy's great leadership, his eminence in our chosen field and his well deserved stature as a world figure, indeed his position as the world's most powerful man. Since I know that his place in history has been so solidly carved out that he will join that historical group of legendary leaders of our country, I will not dwell on that aspect of his life. I do know that my generation has lost its leader and his like will not be seen again in our day.

I would, therefore, like to pay tribute not to President Kennedy, but to Jack Kennedy, the man. I have known Jack Kennedy intimately for over 28 years. As my college roommate, war companion, as an usher at his wedding, as a godfather to my oldest son, as one who sat with him in Los Angeles at the news of his selection as our party's leader, and as one who walked that terrible distance from the White House to St. Matthew's Church, and as a total and complete friend, I think that I am somewhat qualified to discuss the sort of man that our President was. I have seen him grow and mature physically, mentally, and morally. I have been blessed by a sharing of his joyous moments, his sorrows, his triumphs, his hard times and through a melding of all these, I have come to know and understand the best person I have ever known. Many people now just remember Jack Kennedy at the pinnacle, but I can remember the hard, difficult, arduous and sometimes tragic road that took him to that pinnacle. I have shared with him the grievous loss of members of his beloved family: Joseph Patrick Kennedy, Jr., his equally beloved sister, Kathleen, the loss of his youngest son, and have seen out of these experiences the forging of a man of indomitable strength, willpower, and serenity.

I suppose I am now engaged in a matter of which Jack Kennedy would not approve, namely, publicly displaying emotion and an expression of love, which is so closely felt and held in my heart. His was a nature that was so hardily forged that he would not, and perhaps could not, reveal to the world the depth, warmth, and serenity of his emotions. For Jack Kennedy was, among other things, a Spartan, even though he was Irish to the core. The pain of body which he knew and endured so well was never reflected in any of his words. But I believe that his insight into the needs and hurtful emotional pains of other people had been woven into his fiber from the cruel experiences he suffered, both during World War II and at the time of his excruciatingly painful back trouble and operation. The concealing of his emotions was not a purposeful thing, but an ultimate expression of his belief in the rationality of life. He understood better than most of us that with good, some bad always follows, and that pleasure often is the companion of pain. I know it was the pleasure of many of you to have served either with or under Jack Kennedy and I know that pleasure is one of the chief reasons for the terrible pain that many of us feel on this melancholy day.

I am very proud that Jack is the godfather of my oldest boy, one of the newest generation, for I feel confident that Jack's life, his dedication to the principles in which he so firmly believed, by which he lived and, perhaps, for which he died, will be a challenging inspiration for those of the generation to follow us. A devoted husband, father, son, and brother, his love was returned doubly by those he loved and I am sure it must be of some solace to all his family to know that we and the Nation mourn him so deeply and so personally. Their loss is our loss, our loss is the country's loss. Life will, of course, go on, but life will never be the same for me or for many millions of our people. It always seemed to me that being President was just one of the things that Jack Kennedy could have done. The qualities that distinguished this man from all others, the grace, the brilliance, the fortitude, the understanding and compassion which he brought to this high office, would have made him a brilliant man in any field he chose. But his qualities will not be forgotten, nor will they, in my judgment, ever be duplicated again.

In the same way that the eternal light shines from the ground near his grave, in the same way will life and the love which he kindled in our hearts and minds glow on forever. As is said in our shared religion, may he rest in peace, may perpetual life shine upon him, and may God have mercy on his soul.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is not given to every generation to have a political leader of the quality of John F. Kennedy. For those of us who knew his firm handshake, his ready smile, his keen wit and his youthful wisdom as he campaigned across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the loss is particularly acute. He was a loyal friend, an honest and honorable opponent and a dedicated public servant.

John F. Kennedy had an ability to stand outside himself and survey the sweep of American history. He knew how to build upon the greatness of the past and how to profit from the errors of those who came before. He was able to operate within the realities of today without losing sight of the vision of tomorrow. But perhaps most important of all he truly understood the 20th century. He spoke of a new generation of Americans "born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today." This new generation was not to be defined in terms of age but in terms of an understanding of the inexorable development of human events.

Western civilization has faced its most severe challenges in this century. The best of its virtues is reflected in the drive for independence by the emerging nations of the world; the worst of its vices in World War II. President Kennedy understood the modern world. Although he recognized the challenge to freedom posed by the Soviet bloc, he also knew that there must be room for diversity in a world so vulnerable to annihilation. He knew that we can defend freedom without sacrificing internal liberty or world peace, and that we must serve the cause of democracy at home before we can represent it abroad.

We who stand in the House today to pay tribute to our fallen President cannot help but reflect on the mortality of man, the continuity of nations, and the responsibility of public service. We cannot put aside our grief and return to our usual tasks—our tasks are his and they are those of the Nation. We cannot achieve the goals of equality, justice, and peace solely by the way we live as private individuals—we are charged with the attainment of the supreme goals of a great nation.

There are no words to express our grief—each of us has sustained a loss which cannot be expressed here, or in any other place, except in our own hearts. We can best honor John F. Kennedy by dedicating ourselves to the pursuit of excellence, to the nobility of ideal, majesty of purpose, and to the highest standard of integrity in public service.

We are bereaved, but not bereft. For it is in our power to help achieve the high ideals of this Republic—by the way we conduct ourselves in this Chamber.

To Mrs. Kennedy and his children we extend our deepest sympathy, our admiration for their courage and strength in the face of tragedy and our pledge to work in peace for the attainment of the high aims of the American experiment in which John F. Kennedy believed, and for which he gave his life.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MACDONALD, was recognized to lead off the tributes of the Massachusetts delegation to our late, beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

No one in this House knew President Kennedy better than the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MACDONALD. No one could have offered a more personal and moving testimonial.

Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was my friend as well as my leader. I traveled with him to many places in this country and to some nations across the Atlantic Ocean. I was privileged to share with him private moments of relaxation and reflection, as well as public occasions of controversy and triumph.

He was a friend to the people of my district long before he became President. They knew him as their Senator and advocate who had shaken their hands, attended their functions, worshiped with them and always listened sympathetically at their problems.

Our personal loss is great, but it is insignificant compared to what the Nation and the world lost when this dynamic life was cut short, so soon, by so brutal an act.

John F. Kennedy did not shrink from the burdens of the Presidency. He welcomed them as an opportunity to make America mean more to its people and to the world. The programs he advocated for education, medical care, civil rights, and economic strength will be an inspiration until the day they become law and a source of strength to the country from then on. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, the nuclear test ban—all of which he originated and fought for—have alined our Nation with the hopes and aspirations of people throughout the globe.

Mr. Speaker, America lived under the leadership of John F. Kennedy for only 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days. It was not a long period, as time is measured, but it will shine out in the history of our Republic as long as men have the capacity to admire courage, to desire progress, and to perceive greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I cherished John F. Kennedy in intimate affection. I honored him as a political associate and ally. I took pride in him as a glorious contribution of my great Commonwealth, Massachusetts, to the Nation. I deeply mourn the loss of my friend. I bewail the loss of his magnificent abilities to the public life of America. But my heart, heavy as it is, rejoices in the fact that Massachusetts has been privileged to contribute such a hero to the United States. His patriotism embraced every inch of American soil and every single American citizen. His loyalty was not limited to the land and people of Massachusetts, nor to those who shared the Irish origins in which he took a just and honorable pride. He loved his country with a deep and abiding passion and constantly his great talents, his keen intellect, his persuasive voice, and his physical strength were all used to the fullest to make our Nation and the world a better place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to Jacqueline Kennedy. At no time within the memory of man, has such a burden of grief blanketed a wife and mother. And never has anyone stood so erect, so majestic in such anguished hours. She has set an example and inspiration that can never be surpassed.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Kennedy family has given this Nation an example of devotion, dedication, and decency. Our Nation is the richer for it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I express to this House the gratitude of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the moving and magnificent expressions that have echoed this Chamber today—and the days of the past 2 weeks. The people of Massachusetts are grateful for the honors and tributes that the world, this Nation, and this city have heaped upon its most famous and most beloved son.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include in the RECORD at this point one of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's greatest state papers—his inaugural address. I further ask that a communication of John Kenneth Galbraith be included. It is one of the finest pieces on President Kennedy and penned by one who knew him intimately and under varying circumstances.

### THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Vice President Johnson, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens:

We observe today not a victory of a party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first Revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required, not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister Republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist freemen and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support, to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective; to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak, and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request; that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleased by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course, both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew, remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms, and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in a new endeavor; creating not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, north and south, east and west, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A Communication

(By John Kenneth Galbraith, professor of economics at Harvard University and former Ambassador to India)

In these last few hours hundreds, thousands of men have tried to write about John F. Kennedy. This is not wholly a ritual of the modern newspaper, one of the final rites of the great. Millions of people on this dark and sombre weekend want to read of, and then to reflect, on this man who was so profoundly a part of their lives. This wish the papers are seeking to serve.

My justification for this brief word is not that of a friend but of a writer who knew the President a trifle better than most of those who must tell of him in these days.

No one knew the President well. In a sense no one could for it is part of the character of a leader that he cannot be known. The rest of us can indulge our moments when we open the shutters to our soul. We are granted also our moments of despair—the despair, indeed, that we felt on Friday when that incredible flash came in from Dallas. But a Kennedy or a Roosevelt can never turn the palms of his hands outward to the world and say: "Oh God. What do we do now?" That armor which insures confidence in power and certainty in command may never be removed even for a moment. No one ever knew John F. Kennedy as other men are known.

But he carried his armor lightly and with grace and, one sometimes thought, with the knowledge that having it without escape, at least it need not be a barrier before his friends and associates. He surprised even friends with the easy candor with which he spoke of touchy problems, half-formed plans, or personal political dangers. Without malice or pettiness he contemplated the strengths and weaknesses of high officials and influential politicians. He was constantly and richly amused by the vanities of men in high places. He freely discussed ideas the mention of which would make most men shudder. Last summer during the visit of President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan of India, in a social moment before a formal dinner, mention was made of some woman politician. He turned and asked me why there had been so few women politicians of importance—whether women were poorly adapted to the political art. Here surely was a politically ticklish subject; women are half the voting population and might not react well to wonder at their political shortcomings. I struggled to come up with examples—the first Elizabeth, Mrs. F.D.R., one or two others. The President admitted of the exceptions but good humoredly returned to the rule. He knew he could discuss an interesting point without anyone proceeding to argue that he was against the 19th amendment.

"The political campaign won't tire me," he said in the spring of 1960, "for I have an advantage. I can be myself." He had learned one of the hardest lessons of life which is that we all have far more liberty than we use. And he knew beyond this, that others because they admired it would respect the informality with which he passed through life. No President ever said so much to so many friends and acquaintances and so rarely had to disavow or explain.

John F. Kennedy was much interested in writing. This, I think, provides one small clue to understanding. Good writing requires a sense of economy and of style and the absence of vanity which allows a man to divorce his writing at least a little from himself. A writer can be interesting when he is speaking to others; he is rarely if ever interesting, when he is speaking to himself except to himself.

Mr. Kennedy hated verbosity. Though he rejoiced in politics he hated the wordiness of the political craft. He never, at least in his adult life, opened his mouth without having something to say. Never even in conversation did he speak for the pleasure of hearing his own words and phrases. Many of us have a diminished interest in the words of others. Mr. Kennedy was the rare case of the man who applied the rules with equal rigor against himself.

The Kennedy style, though it involved detachment from self, involved no self-deprecation. In the early years when he was enlisting followers, he did not offer a program for universal salvation. He was suspicious of all resonant formulas from whatever source—he rightly regarded some of the liturgy of American liberalism as corrupt. It is trundled out at election time as once were the candidate's trains, urged in a torrent of words and then put away for 4 years. His case again had the merit of candor. He said, essentially, I am a man worth following, you can count on me to be honestly better at the art of government than any other possible contender, and, an important detail, I know how to get elected.

That he was qualified in the art of government there will never be any question. His style called for unremitting good taste and good manners. It called also for a profound commitment to information and reason. He did not think that man had beeen civilized as an afterthought; he believed it was for a purpose. Perhaps there are natural men, those who have the original gift of art and insight. Mr. Kennedy without being so rude as to say so would believe such pretension to be an excuse for laziness. His reliance was on what men had learned and had come to know. What Mr. Kennedy had come know about the art and substance of American Government was prodigious. I first knew Jack Kennedy 25 years ago when I was a comparatively young tutor and he was an undergraduate in Winthrop House at Harvard. He was gay, charming, irreverent, goodlooking and far from diligent. What no one knew at the time was that he had the priceless notion that education never stops. Some of us who later worked with him on economic issues—farm policy, interest rates, Federal Reserve policy, the control of inflation, other arcane or technical matters—used to say that we had observed three stages in his career in the House and more particularly in the Senate: The first was when he called up to ask how we thought he should vote; the second was when he telephoned to ask 15 or 20 quick questions as to what lay behind the particular action or measure; the third was when he did not call at all or inquired as to why, as he had gleaned from an article or a letter to the Times, we seemed to be acting on some misinformation. My colleague, Prof. Carl Kaysen, who has worked in the White House these last years, has said that when asked who is the most knowledgeable of the President's advisers he always felt obliged to remind his questioner that none was half so well-informed as the President himself.

Mr. Kennedy knew that knowledge was power; no one, of course, will ever imagine that this was his sole reliance. Knowledge without character is worthless—or worse.

Departments and individuals, in approaching the President, invariably emphasize the the matters which impress them most. Mr. Kennedy knew how to make the appropriate discounts without anyone quite realizing they were being made. He had a natural sense for all of the variables in a problem; he would not be carried away by anyone.

Like all men of deep intelligence, he respected the intelligence of others. That was why he did not talk down to the American people; it was why he was contemptuous of the arm-waving circus posturing of the American politician which so many American newspapermen so much admire right up to the moment of final defeat.

The President faced a speaker with his wide gray-blue eyes and total concentration. So also a paper or an article. And, so far as one could tell, once it was his it was his forever. This, of course, was not all.

Knowledge is power. But knowledge without character and wisdom is nothing, or worse. These the President also had, and also the highly practical capacity to see when part of an argument, being advanced by a department, bureau, or zealot, was being presented as the whole. But I come back to the group of issues, the breadth of information and the power of concentration. Perhaps these come naturally. I suspect, in fact, that few men in history have ever combined natural ability with such powers of mental self-discipline.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Members of the congressional delegation from Massachusetts be included in the Record following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record following the remarks of the Massachusetts delegation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here today to pay tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we pay tribute to a continuing force among us. For the finest thing that we can say about the late President is that, in a very genuine sense, he is with us here today on the floor of the House where his admirable career had its beginning and where he gave his state of the Union addresses.

These addresses, Mr. Speaker, were model surveys of plans, programs, and policies of a vigorous young man who lived actively the life of the mind and one who attempted to fuse the ideal with the real into programs that were part and parcel of the great American tradition. Few people agreed with all of his ideas, but many people were to agree with most of them.

It will be the place of history to record how successful his brief tenure as Chief Executive of our land was and how meaningful many of his programs will become with the passage of time.

We can already say with certainty, for example, that the dream of the Peace

Corps has become a reality. We do not know, on the other hand, whether the Alliance for Progress will develop into the kind of a program and demonstrate the great potential that it has. And on and on—these and other judgments will be made by the ultimately objective hand of history.

We can remember him now as one who believed in the career of politics and equated the word "politics" with good government.

This was true of the young John Kennedy at Choate and later at Harvard, and during his graduate work at the London School of Economics. Soon after his commendable career in the U.S. Navy, he was to go into the rough and tumble politics of the Boston area, an area that has been called an advanced school of political science.

The young man obviously was a man of destiny, and his election to this body from the 11th Congressional District in Massachusetts was the beginning of one of the distinguished careers in the history of American public life.

Few of us would have thought that such an amazing career would have been possible, but John Kennedy demonstrated that is was. And we can remember him with a great deal of pride for innumerable things and incidents.

It seems incredible to me that just a short while ago I had a wide-ranging discussion with him during the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College in Massachusetts. He had come there to pay tribute to the poet whom he loved, and after the ceremony, we talked about legislation and he expressed intimate detail of issues which confronted the Nation, issues which were, in a real sense, his own plans for the extension of American social progress and progress around the world—the free world in which he had become the indisputed leader.

All of us have our own private prayer for the late President and for the surviving members of his family.

As a recent issue of Commonweal magazine so profoundly stated:

> The loss of a President is more than the loss of its most important officeholder and the symbol of its law and order, as stunning as that is in itself. It is also the loss of a man—in this case—with a peculiarly apt set of talents and convictions for our time.

The editorial goes on to state, quite basically, that he was a man of our time, who understood the problems of our time. While we may have had different interpretations of how certain policies could have been executed, he stood squarely in line with those whose view of the world was broad, and not narrow.

It was one of peace, and not hate. It was also one of hope, and in summing up, I would like to quote from a statement made by Mark Van Doren, in Cornwall, Conn., just over the borders of the Berkshires where John Kennedy loved to visit.

Mark Van Doren, the distinguished poet and writer said, at the conclusion of his public statement:

> The oneness of the world is what we are now feeling; and fearing, if we doubt that it can soon enough be good, at least within the limits of mankind's capacity.
>
> But there are fears and fears, noble and ignoble; and the noblest fear is that which each of us can have lest he himself fall short of being as sensible, as reasonable, as steadfast, and as loving as he can. It is not for others to be these things to the limit of possibility. It is for ourselves, each one of us, whoever, whatever, and wherever he may be.
>
> Goodness—

Van Doren said, and we all must agree—

> begins at home. If it is not there, it may be nowhere. The clearest sign that it is there, the unmistakable sign, is our fear that we ourselves have not been all that we could be. This is a noble fear, another name for which, when hope and faith come with it, is humility. Hope and faith, and not despair, upon which fear can feed until it fills the world. Hope and faith, the final cure of fear; along with knowledge—all of which we can possess—and charity: the rarest, the most difficult, and still therefore the greatest of these.

My deepest sympathies go out to the wife and family of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several days have elapsed since the tragic assassination of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, yet it still seems impossible to believe that death has taken from us one of the great leaders of our time.

Jack Kennedy was a young and vital man. I have known two generations of his family before him and watched him grow to manhood in my home State of Massachusetts.

His maternal grandfather, John F. Fitzgerald, was once mayor of Boston, and I knew him well. His father, Joseph P. Kennedy, is known to all of us for his contributions to the public service. When I served as Speaker of the House in 1953, I had the honor to appoint him to the Hoover Commission. The Fitzgerald and Kennedy families have lived and loved politics for many generations.

Our late President was introduced to public service in the House of Representatitves at the statehouse in Boston. When he returned from naval service after World War II, he visited our House Chamber with his Grandfather Fitzgerald. And State Senator Leslie B. Cutler from my district escorted him to the rostrum for an introduction. There began a remarkable career—Congressman, U.S. Senator, President.

In 1946, as Speaker, I was privileged to administer the oath of office to two youthful Congressmen, President Kennedy and Richard Nixon.

Although the late President and I were faithful to different political parties, we shared a common love of Massachusetts and our country. We worked together for many programs we believed to be for the common good.

The world and all of us will miss his dynamic leadership, his ability to keep his eye on great goals, his genius at keeping the peace in troubled times, his dedication to equal rights for all Americans.

Massachusetts had a special love for this man. His support transcended party lines. His remarkable wife and his fine children deserve our heartfelt grief.

But the best expression of our sorrow is renewed dedication to the goals of his eventful life. The eternal flame that now glows on the hillside in Arlington must not only be a glimmer of physical warmth, but a beacon of hope to a world locked in the throes of change.

His name will be remembered by future generations because it has been affixed now to our launching site in Florida. It must be remembered also for the great contributions that the late President and his wife have made to cultural activities and the fine arts. I had the privilege of joining this week in filing legislation to name our National Cultural Center in his honor.

This Kennedy Center will be an appropriate memorial. Future generations that visit Washington will not only remember the vigor with which this young man pursued political goals, but they will remember now that Robert Frost read poetry at his inauguration, that artists and writers were his close friends and frequent visitors at the White House, that the White House itself was transformed into a place of beauty and artistic achievement during his residency there.

He was ever a strong champion for the improvement of arts, science, and our cultural life.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my sorrow at his passing and my deep sympathy for his family in their bereavement.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 22, 1963, the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought shock and grief to both great and humble people throughout the world.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, of which I am honored to be a native, and Representative from, lost a son in whom its pride had constantly increased. From that day in 1943, during the Second World War when a young Navy lieutenant commanding a PT boat performed a heroic rescue, until that unhappy day when his life was extinguished, the Nation was nobly served by John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In 1946, at the age of 29, he was elected a Representative from Massachusetts to the U.S. Congress. After serving three successful terms in the House of Representatives, he was elected, in 1952, to the U.S. Senate. In the short span of 8 years he was elevated to the country's highest position, and became the 35th President of the United States.

The entire Nation lost a leader, who was in the midst of his task of exploring new frontiers and fulfilling his pledges to carry America forward. Under the leadership of President Kennedy, new force was given to the search for ways to expand an economy which had already outdistanced any other system in providing high living standards for its peoples. New recognition was brought to certain national problems which had received relatively little attention, such as the problem of mental retardation. Most important, new progress was made in conquering the greatest single domestic problem of the United States, the problem of insuring equal opportunity for all.

Such problems as these, many of which had long been the subject of despair, received vigorous thrusts forward toward solution under the administration of President Kennedy. Now there is a void in the hearts of people throughout the land because this beloved man, who had accomplished so much, and who held the promise of accomplishing still more, is gone. As much as any one man could be, he was the indispensable man of our times.

The sadness and mourning at the death of President Kennedy is not confined to the United States, as the free world has lost a chief proponent of its goal of liberty for all. Under his leadership the determination to defend freedom from every threat, the determination to maintain the strength necessary to defend freedom was proved at many outposts around the world and decisively in Cuba. Freedom was also given an unforgettable push forward by President Kennedy when he implemented such programs as the Alliance for Progress, designed to correct some of the basic conditions which have been inimical to freedom. Now, there is aching in the hearts of freedom-loving people throughout the world because this distinguished leader is gone.

President Kennedy's energy, dedication, and sacrifice for his country will long be remembered as a glowing tribute to what one man so young, so vital and so rich in spirit could accomplish in the short time that he was allowed to be our Chief Executive.

We, who knew him closely, will always remember him for his championship of equal rights, wisdom, warm humor, high judgment and deep love for his country and people.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy has brought unspeakable shock and deepest grief to people all over the world and it is with heavy heart that I join my colleagues in the House today in this solemn ceremony to mark the life, works, service, and principles of a very great American whom I was privileged to call my friend for many years, going back to his service in the House after World War II, his distinguished service as U.S. Senator from Massachusetts and later as President and world leader.

The focal point of the sad events of the weekend before last was centered here in this majestic Capitol where the President's body lay in state. The unprecedented funeral ceremonies were thronged by the largest crowds in the history of our Capital City and in the rotunda on Sunday night, I saw vividly the great and silent grief of thousands upon thousands who came to pass by his bier.

That night to make the short trip from the rotunda to my hotel, it was necessary for me to travel in the opposite direction almost to the District of Columbia Stadium, almost 25 or 30 blocks from the Capitol, before I could find a detour that would bring me to my destination.

Along the streets the people were massed four and five deep in a long winding trail of 3 or more miles in a long wait that would take them the whole night through in bitter cold before they could pass in review in a matter of a few seconds in a last personal tribute to their fallen leader.

Washington has never seen anything like this, nor will it see anything like it again. The magic of television could not capture this great silent mass of solemn people, thousands upon thousands in number, waiting the night for this last mark of respect and devotion to a great American. This had to be seen and, of all the stirring and moving events of those sad days, I have impressed upon my memory the vast sorrowful multitude waiting silently in the night to pay their last respects to our beloved President.

I was among those Members of the House designated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, to represent this body at the solemn funeral services at St. Matthew's Cathedral, which was thronged with the heads of state and distinguished leaders from the great powers of the world, high Federal and State officials and close friends of the President. As elsewhere in the Nation, a cloud of sorrow hung over the many mourners, great and little, and it was clear that all Americans had been stunned, shocked, and moved by deepest sorrow into a personal, collective grief.

Thus, a great Nation mourned its stricken leader and a sorrowing people openly expressed its profound bereavement as the Nation and the world paid an unforgettable tribute to a great leader who had left an indelible impress upon history.

The inspiration of President Kennedy's courageous, stirring leadership will live through the years to strengthen and sustain our great Nation and time will enrich the greatness of this outstanding American, who shall always be remembered for his vision, his courage and his dedication to freedom, peace, and the cause of humanity.

It seems but yesterday that he was sitting here with us, an esteemed colleague and dear comrade. We saw him—vital and dynamic, touched by the spark of destiny, moving inexorably to greatness, to the other body and to the White House.

Just a few days ago, we saw and talked with him as he conducted the great office of President, honored leader of our great Nation, recognized everywhere as the most articulate spokesman and courageous leader of the free world.

How impressive was his magnetic personality, how appealing his alert mind; how appreciated the lightning of his ready wit; how admired his lofty ideals, his intrepid courage, the sweep of his altruism and concern for all those unable to speak for themselves; how inspiring his battle for social justice, for equality of right and opportunity, for the cause of the poor and the oppressed, his determined struggle for peace and order and a world organized on the rule of law, his firm resolve to preserve the integrity and security of our Nation and the free world, to uphold the basic moral and ethical principles of the American way of life and Western civilization in the God-fearing values and traditions of our forebears and our Constitution.

Now he is gone, though we who loved him and the whole world that hailed him hardly can believe or accept it. He is gone—gone to that land "from whose bourn no traveler returns" to the heavenly reward of eternal life with his Creator.

No longer will the smiling, handsome face of this revered Galahad of the 20th century appear before us in real life. No longer will his confident voice and stirring, noble words move and inspire us in the stuggle for human betterment and peace. No longer will his message of hope, faith, and aspirations for suffering humanity be publicly expressed to bring solace and renewed devotion to the cause of freedom and justice for all.

But his spirit lives on in human hearts, in our hearts. It will never die. More vibrant in death than in life, it will be the rallying call for the forces of enlightenment and progress, the light of reason and advancement, delivering men and women from the shackles of ignorance, fear, and doubt, and guiding humankind to new pathways of understanding, cooperation and brotherhood under the fatherhood of God.

The name and contributions of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go down the long, unbroken channels of history like a great, gleaming beacon light casting its warming light of toleration and justice over the Nation and the world and showing us, and unnumbered generations yet to come, the way to plenty, prosperity, amity and peace.

Out of the pathos and sorrow of this sad hour, out of the inutterable personal grief we who were his friends so poignantly feel, out of the disbelief of the world that this great shining standard bearer of lofty human causes has gone from us, let us all lift up our hearts in faith and submission to the will of our Divine Master.

Let us pray for our great, good and dear friend and his bereaved wife and family. To them, suffering as they are under the heavy burden of personal sorrow and irreparable loss, let our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy go out to all members of this afflicted family—his devoted wife who has borne her grief with dignity and majesty; the young daughter and son, yet unaware of the true measure of their loss; his great, distinguished father and devoted, loving mother sorrowing for the son who brought the immortality of history to their name; his esteemed, distinguished brothers, his able partners in his memorable tasks; his gracious, beloved sisters who were also proud, valuable members of his team, and all members of his family whose loss is so shocking and so profound.

Let us join as a proud, united and dedicated band of believers and achievers in carrying forward the torch of inspiration which has fallen to us from his failing hand.

Let us go foward for his great cause—for justice, for freedom and peace for our own Nation and the world. Thus we can best honor the blessed memory of the great John F. Kennedy.

In the touching words of the contemporary Massachusetts poet, Mr. Anthony Cama:

How splendid glows his torch; how haloed
is his cross.
He is not gone. He is with us to stay.
He is the dream of battles faith has won.

His indomitable spirit, lofty ideals and great achievements will always be with us, our country and the world.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is sorrowful with deepest grief for the loss of a dear friend and honored leader.

May the good Lord, whose understanding and love consoles and strengthen us, bring him rest, peace and happiness in his eternal home.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with diffidence that I rise at this time. Words are certainly meaningless tools of expression when one tries to fumble for the proper phrase to convey deep sentiment. What can one do at a time like this expect to pray for the assistance of the Lord for the soul of John F. Kennedy and pray for the strengthening of our country, and offer prayers that will bring solace to the members of the bereaved Kennedy family.

Like all of you, I mourn the passing of a dear friend, a friend whom I have known since the first day he entered into the public life of this Nation.

It is less that 2 weeks ago that this great Nation of ours was rent by remorse and silence. In the deltas and the cane breaks, in the prairies of the West. In the tenements of the East, the Nation was shocked and silenced.

To be with silence is to be with God—for in the hearts and minds and on the lips of men there were fervent prayers for the soul of our departed President.

Yet during these trying hours, I cannot help but think of the words of the poet, Robert Frost, a great favorite of our President John F. Kennedy. Robert Frost on his 80th birthday made this statement:

> Despite our fears and worries, and they are very real to all of us, life continues—it goes on.

And as we watched on television and as we watched in person, one could not help but think that the transition of Government is really cruel to a certain degree—but life continues and the Government continues. But that is the way John Kennedy would have wanted it. That is one of the reasons why this Nation of ours is as great as it is and it is because of this stability of Government in this time of remorse that we have been able to continue on.

When I think of John Kennedy, I knew him so well—the philosophy and creed by which he lived: "Thou shalt love they neighbor," "I am my brother's keeper." He truly lived by the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." "No one saves us but ourselves; no one can and no one may. We ourselves must walk the path; teachers merely show the way." He has been a great teacher to the Nation, to the world.

I am reminded of the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi, which truly Jack Kennedy lived by.

> Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred let me show love. Where there is injury, pardon. Where there is doubt, faith. Where there is despair, hope. Where there is darknes, light. Where there is sadness, joy.
>
> O Divine Master, grant that I may not seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved as to love, for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to Eternal Life.

I cannot refrain from expressing that the President was blessed with a wonderful wife, Jacqueline, and a marvelous family. May God's blessings be upon them.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it was the greatest drama of the century, perhaps of many centuries—a tragedy—that unfolded before him; but no one, not quite three, could understand. He was only a little tot standing at hand salute and he was too young to know.

An emperor, a chancellor, presidents, queens, prince of state and church, a mourning world was the cast. No one, not Aeschylus, nor Sophocles, nor Euripides, nor Shakespeare, nor Dumas, nor Beaumarchais had ever attempted to rival this. This list of characters was too rare to be assembled together in such quick fashion—and as mere bystanders—in any work of fiction. Only in reality, where they could be recognized as living figures of history, could their presence be believed—at least by us. But this little fellow—he was too young to know.

Never so widely throughout the world was the word so quickly spread, nor the sorrow so profoundly felt. Pictures have now come back to us from distant lands, where, although this man never learned their tongue, he somehow captured their heart. Someday this little fellow will glean from this a real sense of pride—but today, he is just too young to know.

Only those of us who have long witnessed the uncertainties and tragedies of life could accept the reality of this procession which had shaken the world. You and I accepted it, not as a fact that could be readily understood, but rather as a matter of blind faith that we neither questioned nor clearly perceived. The deed had been done, but why? He is too young to know.

This is not the first time, nor shall it be the last, when the Commander in Chief will fall when his life is far from spent. Philip of Macedon, Julius Caesar, Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley, as heads of government, had fallen before. The price of leadership is great and uncertain. The price of freedom is never paid. Another downpayment on liberty has been made. Someday, this little boy will understand as we understand. But, Mr. Speaker, do we really understand? Do we really understand?

Our former President was a master of verse and an advocate of the arts. His expressions were graphic and destined to be found among the treasures of world literature. Robert Frost was one of his great favorites. Both the man and his poems were a highlight of President Kennedy's inauguration in 1961.

Perhaps Frost would be more widely acclaimed; perhaps his words would have lasting fame if he had lived and his pen would write and capture the pathos of this dreadful experience. However, he could not have more keenly felt the loss, nor fashioned a more heartfelt phrase than came from the lips and pens of the average American. Among those who turned to verse to pay a tribute deeply felt and richly deserved was Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., in his poem entitled "A Martyr for Humanity" which, in part, follows:

As truly as this Nation is his birth,
As truly as this Nation is his bed;
The stars are weeping on the anguished
earth—
"Our President is dead."

Drop gently, tears and sorrow, great our loss,
Let every heartache clasp its hands and
pray.
How splendid glows his torch; how haloed is
his cross.
He is not gone. He is with us to stay.

He is the dream of battles faith has won,
A father's love, a husband's treasured part,
America is proud of such a humble son,
His noble service; his devoted heart.

As truly as this Nation loved his mirth,
As truly as he lived and died and bled,
The world is weeping; mourns the sobbing
earth—
"Our President is dead."

A light has gone out, but a greater light has lit the world.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, 13 fateful days ago, about this hour, a torrential wave of anguish suddenly swelled up in the street of an American metropolis. With the lightning speed of electronic sound its floodwaters of strickening grief rolled out and into every hamlet of the Nation; overflowing our shores it spread its shocking, sickening sorrow among the peoples and the princes, and even the dictators, of every country in the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, was untimely dead.

The composite boundlessness of this unique man's coordinated capacity of intellect, courage, vision, personality, faith, humaneness, culture and character discourages and dismisses any unending inventory of his separate virtues and talents.

He could astound the most learned with the eagle swiftness of his perception and the scholarly details of his knowledge.

He could warmly share a homely anecdote with the untutored.

For the honor of mankind he dared the arrogance of tyranny to thunder open the earth for the perishment of all upon it, while he patiently pointed toward the path of understanding to prevent it.

He could forgo the tempting machinations of expedient accomplishment to self-effacingly strengthen the foundations of the free government he was dedicated to preserve.

He could uplift the wholesome laughter of assembly on a celebrating day. He could bow down his worshiping head in lonely, suppliant prayer on a night of fearful danger and decision.

He could fling forth the challenge of cooperating effort to rid the world of "tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself," while he cursed in condemnation the dark powers that harass and hinder this blessed happening.

He understood the need to encourage the culturing influence of the poet while he rigidly repelled the debasing barbarity of the tyrant.

His wit was tempered, his humor was warm, and his infectious smile of tolerance reflected the clean breath of the freedom he so valiantly protected for the sake of all on earth.

The sudden passing of this great spirit erupted the spontaneous recognition of personal nobility his presence had delayed. He walked with even step among the humble and moved with towering stature above the mighty.

He was a leader of men and a servant of God and this poor world will not soon see his like again.

The extent of the universal tragedy that has befallen us cannot yet be fully realized but, as emphasized in the December 7, last, issue of the America magazine, it is perhaps best prophesied in this briefly pertinent passage from the third act of Shakespeare's "Hamlet":

> The cease of majesty dies not alone, but like a gulf doth draw
> What's near it with it. It is a massy wheel
> Fixed on the summit of the highest mount,
> To whose huge spokes ten thousand lesser things
> Are mortised and adjoined; which, when it falls,
> Each small annexment, petty consequence,
> Attends the boisterous ruin.

This attendant ruin need not and must not be. Let the word go out, from this Chamber and through these walls that echoed to his tread, that we shall not stop, we shall not be weary, we shall not rest, we shall not relax, until the fullest measure of each of his aims "to assure the survival and success of liberty" here and everywhere has been indelibly inscrolled upon the brightest pages of all our legislative history.

Looking toward the eternal flame that marks his tomb let us solemly pledge ourselves to the unswerving and unshrinking welcome of this united responsibility because by our common action we can insure that the glow from that flame will everlastingly "light the world" to new horizons of tolerance and decency, of progress and peace.

Only in this manner can we prove to all who come after that this generation was worthy of the life of President John F. Kennedy and guiltless of the shame of his barbarous death.

And now, in custom, what feeble words can we or have we to say to, or of, the partner of his glory.

"She walked in beauty" beside her fallen warrior and the splendor of her stride portrayed for all the world to see the majestic grandeur of "woman," God's fairest creature.

The inspiring observance of a troubled daughter's comforting little hand, and the solemn salute of a small but stalwart son, in accord with noble heritage, vaulted the watching world to heights of compassion hitherto unparalleled.

Mr. Speaker, I entered this Congress on the same day as John F. Kennedy and was privileged to work closely with him throughout these near 17 years past. I, with others of like privilege, have suffered a deep personal loss beyond belabored expression.

I join with all my colleagues here in extending heartfelt sympathy to our late and beloved President's widow, Mrs. Jacqueline B. Kennedy, his daughter, Caroline, his son, John, Jr., his parents, his brothers and sisters. We prayerfully ask Divine Providence to grant them the extraordinary grace of faithful understanding and resignation to the holy will that designed the destiny of this sacrifice of husband, father, son and brother.

From boyish wartime decorated skipper of a small boat to the seasoned peacetime commander in chief of the Ship of State, within 20 short years, he has now been hastily summoned as aide to the Almighty, to be, no doubt, from the parapets of heaven, the continuing guardian of the land he served under the Lord he loved.

May the great soul and spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy rest in peace until we meet again in the House of Resurrection presided over by the Eternal Father of us all.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely wish to join in heartfelt tribute to a great American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Nation, indeed the whole world, was stunned by the cruel and senseless crime of November 22. Those of us from Massachusetts and particularly in my district at Cape Cod, which the late President in many ways considered his home, have felt the added personal grief that comes from the loss of a good friend and neighbor.

The loss, of course, extends far beyond the bounds of our personal sorrow. America and the free world has lost an able leader. His unique personal prestige outside of America will be missed, as will his intellectual, keenly professional approach to the awesome responsibilities of the high office he held. John Kennedy conveyed a sense of excitement that quickened the tempo of political life everywhere.

It will be a long while before we fully recover from the tragedy that has befallen us. We pray to God, however, that in the end we will be stronger fortified with the strength we found in an hour of crisis and in the rich legacy of courage and dedication left us by a martyred President.

We must take this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the high principles of human dignity, of liberty and to the continuing cause of peace and good will that were guiding beacons in the purposeful life of John Kennedy—that will be the finest tribute we could pay his memory.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the moving tributes which have been paid during the past 2 weeks and during this meeting today to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy who was taken from us under such tragic circumstances reflect the deep feeling of all our people over this sad event.

When a Nation loses a courageous leader, there is always a deep sense of shock and loss, and a keen feeling of sadness. When the event occurs under sudden, unexpected, and tragic circumstances, the shock, the loss, and the sadness are all the greater.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy proved his courage in war, in peace, through periods of serious sickness, and under the harsh, unyielding, and continuous pressures of the most important and difficult job in the world today.

I will not undertake to try to find the words today to frame all the thoughts which come to my mind. Others have eloquently spoken of his attributes of statesmanship, his moral firmness under the most trying of pressures in foreign affairs, and of the qualities of his leadership during the past 3 years.

I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was privileged to meet often with our late President over matters falling within the sphere of the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman. Because of the nature of the problems which came to our Committee on Ways and Means, I counseled with John Fitzgerald Kennedy over many aspects of these particular legislative issues. During these many meetings, in the discussions he always kept foremost the public interest to be served by the legislation under consideration. In addition he always evidenced a very keen insight into the details of the legislation and how the public interest could best be served, not only by the broad objectives but also by the details.

I have a deep sense of personal loss. I join in the expressions of sadness which have been here given, and I again extend my deepest feeling of sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her children. They can take solace from the knowledge that John Fitzgerald Kennedy as the 35th President of the United States left a heritage of courage and leadership which will properly be accorded a high place by those who in the future record the accomplishments of our great Nation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on the sloping hillside in Arlington Cemetery, just a short pace down and in front of historical Lee Mansion, now lies in eternal peace our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. There glows the eternal flame as symbolic of the light of lasting peace on this earth to which he had so dedicated, his life.

As we reflect this terrible, awful tragedy which profoundly shocked the Nation and the world and stunned and numbed the conscience of the American people, our hearts go out for Mrs. Kennedy, Caroline, and John, Jr., as well as the entire family. They have our sympathy in the deep sorrow they bare. Our prayers are for them that they will be sustained as they and the Nation mourn the loss of this loved one, our leader, our President.

Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of a national tragedy, realization is followed by concern. It is to the everlasting credit of our country and our leaders that concern rarely gives way to consternation and panic. It is a fitting tribute to our late President that the citizens of the United States in their sorrow and indignation set about the solemn task of paying their last respects with dignity and effected the transition of Government leadership with firm dedication to established principles.

Never in recent years have we been bound so closely together as a nation as we were during the awful weekend beginning on November 22.

On the day following the death of John F. Kennedy, I addressed a letter to my constituents that expressed some of what we all felt—the tragedy, the loss—the anger. But on that morning another feeling was born—the feeling of determination that is now so evident.

On this day of reflection and tribute I would like to include my thoughts on that Saturday morning as the Nation picked itself up and continued.

> SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1963.
>
> It is dark and dreary in Washington today. The weather reflects the gloom that has settled over the Nation's Capital. The whole world mourns the sudden death of President Kennedy at the hands of an assassin in Dallas. The despicable and incredible act has shocked the Nation beyond description.
>
> Throughout the Capital astonishment was followed by a dull sort of paralysis. Radios and television sets suddenly appeared and each one attracted a small somber group. Routine work was forgotten. Special editions of Washington papers were delivered and disappeared in minutes from the newsstands. Throughout the day nothing penetrated the deep melancholy that gripped the Capital. Churches remained open all night. In the Catholic churches every available candle was lit. Aimless groups and individuals gathered near the White House, stayed a while and wandered away. Today many offices normally busy are closed and many normally closed are working, as everyone seeks his own way of meeting the emotional impact of yesterday's tragedy.
>
> Last night the body of the late President rested in the naval hospital at Bethesda and today lies in repose in the East Room of the White House where the family, the Cabinet and the Congress will pay their respects. This afternoon I will join the others passing through the East Room in tribute and admiration for the man and the office held. I have been asked by Speaker McCORMACK to be one of those representing the House of Representatives attending the funeral and paying final respects to the President.
>
> The body will lie in state in the Capitol Sunday and Monday morning until 10 when it will be removed to St. Matthew's Cathedral for the solemn pontificial requiem Mass at noon.
>
> I knew President Kennedy from our service in the House of Representatives for 6 years. I knew him as a Senator. I have known him as a President. Through the long association I admired him as a Member of Congress in the House and Senate, as President of the United States, and as a friend.
>
> "If ever there was a time to pray, it is now, for our President, and for our country."
>
> This prayer echoes throughout the country in expression of the deep sorrow of our people and sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy and the family. It expresses an even deeper faith of our people in our sustaining belief in God and the future of our country.
>
> It is in the midst of these dark moments in the life of our country that Vice President Lyndon Johnson has taken office as the 36th President of the United States. Our prayers are with President Johnson as he is so suddenly and unexpectedly catapulted into the vast responsibilities of a great, strong, progressive, dynamic, and powerful country.
>
> Regardless of the political differences that exist in the country he deserves the wholehearted and unanimous support of the people of America in his effort to guide the ship of state through the turbulent waters to a more calm and peaceful sea.
>
> When this tragedy flashed throughout the country it was immediately assumed that it was the handiwork of someone associated with the segment of our people who had sharp political differences. The assumption proved to be erroneous. Apparently the dastardly act was committed by one who had attempted to defect and spent 3 years in Russia and who was an admitted leader in the pro-Castro Communist-supported regime in Cuba.
>
> This tragedy should be a reminder to all of us that even though we have our political differences, which become sharp and deeply imbedded in the minds of our people, our enemy—the real threat to our future is in the Communist philosophy of those committed to our destruction.
>
> There have been dark moments in the life of our Nation before. Our people as a nation have met and overcome crisis after crisis. I have no doubt that we will emerge from this one as a stronger nation with even greater determination for the future wellbeing and security of our people—and a better understanding among the nations and peoples of the world.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad indeed to express our sentiments on this day of mourning for our late, lamented President, John F. Kennedy. Words cannot describe our personal grief and the sorrow of the Nation, if not of the world, at his passing.

Here was a young man of greatest promise struck down at the height of his career. He was a man who could walk with kings, but not lose the common touch. His credo was for the forgotten man. Indeed, his philosophy was well summed up in a paragraph taken from his immemorial inaugural address:

> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

He was a man that wanted peace—not peace at any price, but peace with honor. He proposed that both sides, meaning the Soviet side and our own, should unite and explore problems that confront both, instead of belaboring those problems and thus divide and widen the breach between us.

He realized that he could not make effective in the short space of his tenure of office the gigantic plan he had for us and for the world, and he said:

> All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

He was meek, but only in the sense that "the meek shall inherit the earth."

If stark tragedy had not directed the fatal bullet that felled him, there is no telling to what further pinnacles of achievement he would still have risen.

He had an uncanny sense of history that unerringly guided him in his daily tasks.

He was kind and benign.

He had a grace of manner. Indeed, he could charm a bird out of a tree.

Latterly, I had occasion frequently to be with him at the White House in conference with Members of the House. The purpose of these meetings was to solidify support for the civil rights bill. Our late President, anxious that all Americans should have the same rights, sought to convert some Members. He never threatened, raised his voice or hectored. He sought in quiet, firm tones, to win over. He accepted refusal to join with him in stoic manner. His modesty, demeanor, infinite patience, keen persuasion did however, cause numerous Members to come over to his side.

He was possessed of a self-deprecatory sense of humor. We recall that when he went to Europe with his dear wife Jacqueline and both were acclaimed, he said he was the man that accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Europe.

At Denver, Colo., he was guest of honor at a $100 plate fundraising dinner for the Democratic campaign chest. He said he was touched with the reception given him and added that those present were more "touched" than he. His delicate trend of humor always stood him in good stead.

He knew the frustrations of the office of the President, but also knew its victories and the victories compensated for the many disappointments. He often quoted Lord Morely, who, in effect said, "politics is one long second best, where the choice often lies between two blunders".

John F. Kennedy has not died in vain. His words will ever be emblazoned upon the tablets of history. The record of his deeds will glow with time. We are the better for his passing through our midst.

We extend to his dear wife and children and the members of his family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Speaker, at the suggestion of our leadership, on November 25, 1963, it was my high but most painful, most sorrowful, privilege to present to this House the official resolutions on the death of our late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

With a heart still overflowing with grief, I again join our colleagues in this further tribute to a great and a good man.

I first met John F. Kennedy immediately after I became a Member of the 80th Congress.

I was quickly drawn to him as a man. The world will long remember him for his great intellect, his keen wit, his fine manner, his good deeds, his many kindnesses.

I will best remember him for his love—a love born of deep respect for his family, his fellow man, for all humanity, love of, not for, authority, and of the dignity, the rights, and the privileges of others.

I am a better man because of the opportunity to have known him and to have worked beside him and for him.

My coreligionists have for centuries uttered a special prayer for those who have fallen in battle, from which I recite:

> And the work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness, quietness, and confidence forever.

We close the Kaddish, our prayer for the dead thusly:

> May the Father of Peace send peace to all who mourn, and comfort all the bereaved among us.

Impressed, as all of us were, by the magnificent stallion which followed the President's caisson in the funeral procession, my good friend, Rabbi Louis I. Newman, has written a poem, eloquently expressing a feeling for the symbolism of that riderless horse. Permit me, Mr. Speaker to repeat it here:

THE RIDERLESS HORSE

(By Louis I. Newman, Nov. 25, 1963)

A horse dark of hue wears a blanket of black;
Its saddle is empty; its guiding reins slack;
Its footsteps move sidewise; the touch at its head
Is strange to a creature so lovingly bred.

A sword in a scabbard is strapped to its side,
A sign its commander has made his last ride;
His stirrups and boots are turned backward, to tell
A soldier has fallen. Brave martyr, sleep well!

A horse walks alone, 'mid the music of grief,
Bewailing the loss of a gallant young chief,
Shot down in the battle, his arrows unsped,
His mission unfinished, his message unsaid.

Oh, mourn for the leader so heartlessly slain,
Whose voice could command, yet so wisely restrain!
Oh, mourn for the steed, of its master bereft,
That looks for its friend to the right and the left.

Our Nation is trembling, a riderless steed,
That yearns for a hand that can halt and can lead.
Oh, symbol of majesty, honor, and pride,
How long shall we weep, now our chieftain has died?

Alas for the warrior who lies in his tomb,
Alas for the horse in its vestment of gloom!
But hail to the horseman who mounts to his place,
The saddle refilled for the challenging race!
And when this great charger is freed from its bonds,
Behold how it leaps and with ardor responds!
Oh, thus may our country, still bowed under pain,
Courageously take up its burden again.

Let us say together: May the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy be for a blessing forever.

**Mr. GIAIMO.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

**Mr. GIAIMO.** Mr. Speaker, the hearts and minds of men have suffered a grievous blow. From among us has gone a truly great man. The ability to be great is given to few men, but it was given in abundance to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and through him, to his country.

In the days of numbing shock and sorrow which followed his death, I am sure that each of us searched his mind for adequate words, for personal consolation, for courage. He was our leader, all could say. He was our friend, many could say. He is gone—no one can bring himself to say.

It is inconceivable, unforgivable, that it happened. And it hurts almost too much for words.

For days, people throughout the world stood with the faraway looks and tears in their eyes which spoke silently but eloquently of their deep sorrow, their anger and their ineffable anguish. People would stop me on the street and say "I'm so sorry. I remember when I saw him." It was never necessary to ask them whom they meant.

In our agonizing attempts to regain perspective, we took our memories of this man and mourned him with deep personal grief. There were many memories for many people. There are the memories of the man who sold him apples on the road to New Haven—the first time, in 1960, because a brilliant young candidate for the Presidency needed a quick snack; the second time, in 1962, because a brilliant young President remembered that the man was waiting for him. That man will always remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy. And so will the men whose hands he shook; the women whose smiles he returned; the children whose heads he patted. I will remember how good it was to be his friend and his follower. My daughter will remember that he often stopped to ask how she was. All of us have our intensely personal memories of this brief glimpse of greatness—the cherished mementos to last a lifetime.

From the flood of memories and tears, it is the little things about the man that we remember first and most poignantly—the smile, the witty remark, the unfailing thoughtfulness, the power to inspire the minds, hearts and love of people.

Now we also remember the towering principles for which he stood. We remember his unswerving dedication to efforts to assure the rights of all men to live in dignity and freedom. We remember that he had the courage to be strong; the conviction of purpose to reason. We remember that he gave to this country an image of poise, graciousness, maturity, and culture. We remember that he had absolutely no doubt that the future can and will belong to those who plan and plan well, to those who dedicate the present to the welfare of posterity.

There is so little that can be said that has not been said. The country has lost a matchless leader; the cause of freedom, its most ardent advocate; the future of man, its most determined champion. It is incomprehensible that this man, with his flawless sense of history, his unique ability to comprehend and command, should not be permitted to continue the work he so brilliantly began.

Because there seems to be no sane reason for this tragedy, we are determined that there will be living results. We are not a nation that accepts such a needless loss. We cannot just accept the fact that he is gone. We must not.

If we must search for blame—and it is inherent in us that we must—let us all share it. Let each of us who has ever known a complacent moment bear the blame. Let each of us who ignored the fury of hate and extremism bear the blame. And let each of us who thought more of self than the rights and future of others bear the blame.

There was dignity, warmth, purpose, and principle in the man we mourn. We as a nation must adopt these qualities as our own or else we will bear the opprobrium that history could say he was too good for us. If we do not perpetuate the principles for which he lived and died, if we do not strive to meet the goals he set for us, we do ourselves and this magnificent man's memory a disgraceful disservice.

If his brave and gracious widow can derive any consolation, it must lie in the fact that millions mourn with her and promise that the memory of John Kennedy will live in the hearts, minds, and actions of man everywhere.

What of his monuments? Thucydides said:

> To famous men all the earth is a sepulcher. Their virtues shall be testified not only by the inscription on stone at home but in all lands wheresoever in the unwritten record of the mind, which far beyond any monument will remain with all men everlastingly.

This is, in truth and in perpetuity, John Fitzgerald Kennedy's monument.

To the country he led and loved, let us swear to continue his principles and to meet his goals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. ST. ONGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

**Mr. ST. ONGE.** Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this sad tribute to our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose passing was so tragic and untimely. His death is a terrible blow to the American people and to freedom-loving people everywhere. Although nearly 2 weeks have gone by since he was brutally torn from our midst, I still cannot bring myself to the realization that our country and the world have suffered this most horrible loss.

I believe that the needless and incredible death of President Kennedy may well prove to be the most shameful and dastardly act in our Nation's history during the 20th century, just as the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was the most shameful and dastardly act of the 19th century. The death of President Kennedy will leave a great void and a gaping wound in the hearts of men of good will all over the world.

In assessing the enormity of this crime of the century, the noted columnist Walter Lippmann wrote as follows:

> The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge of the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community can we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We have lost much more than the life of one individual and the services of a most able leader. We have sustained great loss of faith, reason, and inner peace. We have lost much of heart, courage, and noble values which we inherited from our forebears. It will take many years to recoup these losses.

In his short life of only 46 years, our martyred President has shown us the true meaning of courage and patriotism. He has given us a new sense of purpose and a new inspiration. He has given us new ideals and new goals. We must strive to attain these goals, to fulfill these ideals, and to continue to seek inspiration from the examples he set for all mankind—even though he is no longer with us in body, but only in spirit. The strength of his indomitable spirit will surely strengthen us all in the years ahead.

In the speech he never delivered in Dallas, President Kennedy had in the text of his address which was issued later the following observation:

> In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every problem.

These words are both a legacy and a warning we must never forget. It is a legacy that we must hold high the lights of learning and reason, which have made our Nation great. It is a warning that we must stamp out the hatred and the bigotry of the left and the right, the evil forces which seek to rend our Nation asunder and to bring it down in ashes. John F. Kennedy clearly foresaw this danger and he warned his countrymen. Those who hated Kennedy cut him down before he was able to warn the Nation of their evil schemes.

In this hour of national bereavement, let us rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which John F. Kennedy labored so hard—the building of a world of peace and freedom, a world of brotherhood and genuine understanding, a world of morality and loving kindness for all mankind. I pray that God, in his infinite wisdom, will guide us to this kind of a world.

To the courageous widow of our martyred President, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, to her young children deprived so untimely of their loving father, and to the members of the Kennedy family, we express our deepest sympathy. We pray that God will give them the strength to bear this great bereavement, which all of us share with them. May they be consoled by the fact that his memory will always live in the hearts of the American people and his name will always occupy a glorious place of honor in the history of our Nation.

And now let us resume the task of building our Nation. For as President Kennedy said in his famous inaugural address nearly 3 years ago:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love.

This is what John F. Kennedy wants us to do.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we meet today, in the House of Representatives, where John Fitzgerald Kennedy once served, to pay tribute to the memory of our martyred 35th President. In the tragic days that followed his violent death at the hands of an assassin, our press, our clergy, and the people have eulogized him many times over. It remains for us, his partners in Government, to contemplate the lessons which his life and works have bequeathed to the Nation.

To those of us from New England, who knew him well as a neighbor, his ties were especially close. He had attended Choate School in Connecticut, and he visited us often in public life. He had attracted the fervent admiration of our people even before running for the Presidency and winning the campaign as our Chief Executive.

His early career had given him an apprenticeship for affairs of state. With education at Harvard, Stanford, and London, he had acquired scholarship. As the Ambassador's son in London, he had observed the movement of great tides of history. He made a perceptive study of the reactions of people in a democracy to the threat of fascism, a study which he documented in an analysis of why England slept as war approached. He served his Nation in the South Pacific and the mark of his character was, perhaps, best exemplified in the dramatic adventure that befell him there.

He had come to the helm of state in 1960, tested in the crucible of war and warmed by the comradeship of conflict. He had been born while the United States was engaged in one world war and he, like the generation of young Americans who gave him their loyal support, had known well the gathering storms of the Second World War and the persistent, bleeding struggle of the subsequent years. He was of that generation. He became its leader. With their help he assumed with confidence and coolness the mantle of leadership for the world's most powerful nation.

He had concern and compassion for all Americans. He devised and fought for a program which would build a better country, a stronger United States. He made progress, but his most difficult task was to get America to look to its hopes, rather than its fears. The doubts, uncertainty, and inertia that marked the Nation whose direction he had assumed were reflected in the razor-thin margin of his victory and that, in turn, was reflected in the obstacles and barriers that were waiting along his path.

He ignited the spirit of the younger men of his own generation who saw the possibilities as he outlined them. He drew to him a staff of exceptional merit, whose loyalties could be dedicated to the common peace. In his messages of cogent and comprehensive reasoning, it was the work of many men who contributed to the sense of urgency and motion, but this staffwork was the lengthened shadow of one man.

These messages, which came to the 87th Congress at a furious pace, set forth the problems and the solutions that he recommended. Out of them were hammered programs to strengthen our social security and minimum wage laws, to rebuild areas particularly hard hit by chronic unemployment, to encourage world trade and world peace, to support education, to control water pollution.

In each of these successes, and in others that he himself would not attain, our democratic system reflected both its strengths and its weaknesses. For our Constitution does not permit the Executive to dominate the process of Government. Instead it requires that each proposal undergo the thoughtful and considered scrutiny of the Congress, and be subject to the best suggestions that may be made. This process may be twisted and tortured into delay, and there were those who fought each and every proposal, some on principle, some for politics.

It was here, too, that the conflict between the new generation and the old was most apparent. The Congress is the product of tradition, and great reliance is placed on seniority. Age often confers wisdom and experience, and such seniority has merit. Yet younger members chafe at the deliberate pace which seniors prefer, especially in the full sense of the importance of the goals toward which we must move.

On several occasions recently, I have seen references to programs in which President Kennedy was reported to have told associates that it would be well to get at it, since this or that specific program might well be the only memorial they would leave. This, too, I think, reflects the spirit and vigor of the generation tempered in war, for those who knew command and responsibility at a young age understood that time is one resource which may not be hoarded or reserved. Once foreseen or anticipated, an objective deserves attack and conquest. When John Hersey wrote his memorable account of John Kennedy's survival in World War II, he began his report with the words:

> Our men in the South Pacific fight nature, when they are pitted against her, with a greater fierceness than they could ever expend on a human enemy.

It was the dedication of our late President, with his apparently inexhaustible energy, to the fight for a better country, that we must celebrate today. We must pledge ourselves to an unrelenting attack upon the forces of war, disease, ignorance and the imperfect.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the architect of a better and greater United States. He envisioned the world as it must be, as it ought to be, within the limitations of the best information we have available to us today. These are the precepts of imagination and possibility which must be taught to our young and which, through President Kennedy's particular attention to the youth of our Nation, are bound to have an ever-widening impact. For years and decades to come, men will be reaching into the store of his plans and programs for inspiration.

We must do all we can to record and pass on the lessons which his work embodied. I was disturbed to read in a recent article by James Reston that much may be lost to history because of the informal way in which the late President conducted affairs of the greatest moment requiring rapid reflexes and response. I would hope that some of the personal recollections of our leaders may enter the RECORD today. The memories of our distinguished Speaker, who observed the late President's public career throughout his lifetime, or of the esteemed gentleman from Georgia, who walked with the President in the rose garden, deserve to be recorded. President Johnson should be encouraged to find the resources in the Executive Office, perhaps through the use of Dr. Schlesinger, or Mr. Holborn, to assemble a broader record, through interviews and the collection of documents, to cast a greater light upon such a man.

In my capacity as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I was particularly impressed with the late President's understanding of the possibilities of science and the importance of the space program. He had delegated direction of the latter program to his most important aid, the Vice President, but he did not lose sight of the goals for which we worked. In one of his last public appearances, he discussed this question at the dedication of the Aerospace Medical Health Center at Brooks Air Force Base in Texas.

He told, to illustrate his point, an Irish story of Frank O'Connor, who had learned as a boy to face the challenge of a wall that seemed too high, too doubtful, by scaling his cap over the wall so that he had no choice but to follow it. And so, President Kennedy said, we have tossed our cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it.

The work which President Kennedy charted will be carried out in years to come. The John F. Kennedy Space Flight Center will be the scene of many successful efforts. Let me say that I am not thoroughly convinced that he would have wanted the cape on which this flight center is located to be named after him as well. His sense of history would have respected the traditional name which has earned such wide recognition across the world through our space successes. It would be more fitting if we named only the Center and then looked out and determined that the point on which our first astronaut lands on the moon would assume the name of Kennedy. And yet that too can be done.

I have mentioned the President's awareness of the uses of science. He had gathered the resources of the executive research establishment to help identify the problems we face and to decide upon solutions. He was not one who thought we could undiscover the atom; he worked unceasingly to find out how we could make use of these resources to improve our way of life. He had warned and emphasized that recent scientific advances have not only made international cooperation desirable, but they have made it essential.

President Kennedy's term of office was tragically short. One landmark may stand high to historians who review this work in later time. For John F. Kennedy worked vigorously for peace, and for a better understanding among peoples of the world. He was resolute in defense of American principles, but he coaxed and led on the way to peace. Just a few short months ago, at his urging, the Senate approved our part in a ban on nuclear tests—tests which had threatened to poison the atmosphere and despoil the world in which our children are to live. This was a step intended to free mankind from the dangers and fears of radioactive fallout.

His service in the White House changed him, as it must all men who assume those formidable responsibilities. He acquired a new and greater sense of the power of the office. Yet he never lost the grace and wit that had characterized his life. He faced the calumny and hatred heaped upon him by a tiny minority with steadiness and integrity. I recall with a sense of repugnance, the hysterical campaign of mail and telegrams that reached us in the Congress at the close of a long session 2 years ago crying that Congress should remain in session to prevent his seizure of tyrannical power. I have only pity for these little minds. Perhaps the martyrdom of our President will serve to wipe out that shame by forcing these people and all our people to a better understanding of what the United States must mean. President Johnson, in his appeal to the Congress, has set these medicines to work, and we all hope for a more reasoned approach to the political efforts of our leaders seeking to bring about a better nation.

I have heard many people wonder why John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was born to wealth and a comfortable life, would have sought the position of President, why he entered politics and engaged in the tiresome, rugged engagements that mark the political scene. Perhaps he said it best himself in the speech at Boston on November 7, 1960, when he asserted that.

> I run for the Presidency of the United States because it is the center of action, and in a free society the chief responsibility of the President is to set before the American people the unfinished public business of the country.

And he had no illusions, for he warned that on the shoulders of the President elected in 1960 would rest burdens heavier than had rested on the shoulders of any President since the time of Lincoln. These explanations should be received with particular understanding among us here, who have also moved toward the center of action in behalf of our people and our country.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose memory we honor today, assumed the responsibilities of power with a full understanding of their nature. He was a member of a generation that has earned recognition in its own right, regardless of race, religion or color, among Americans. He was sometimes described as a Brahmin of Boston, out of respect to his attainments and to the Yankee traditions among which he flourished, but it was his achievement as one of the new breed, born of a tradition of immigrants who have made their mark in this land of opportunity that stands foremost as a mark to those who follow.

He was of a new generation, toughened by war, but compassionate for the people; decisive in action, but flexible in studying the courses which were open to him. His cultural attainments and his interests in the arts were, with those of his gallant lady, to set standards which this Nation must strive to emulate. Above all, he was a man, enthusiastic about the delights of physical sports, aware of the sensibilities of others.

He has left a legacy of personal devotion to the greatest good of our country and of our people. Given the continued progress of our youth in the lessons he has taught, his kind will pass this way again, and in that we may take the greatest comfort.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a furtive assassin has brutally murdered John F. Kennedy and we meet today to honor our late President.

Our friend, our leader, the gay warrior and dauntless standard bearer is:

> dead ere his prime
> young Lycidus, and hath not left his peer.

Others may celebrate his political victories, his legislative achievements or his diplomatic triumphs. I shall mention none of these. Instead, I shall testify to the style and quality of the man.

He was indeed "a parfit, gentil Knight", a Lancelot in the modern world of politics. In the midst of partisan strife or internecine feuding he maintained serenely his concept of the ideal executive. Recognizing the need to give hard knocks and to press an adversary without flinching, he nevertheless retained a grace, a cleanliness and a style that we shall not soon see again.

He brought gusto and zest to the job of being President. With his lovely wife he swept out the corners and opened the windows and spread a new light around the Presidency. He lent to it a unique bravura and surrounded it with a romantic quality that was pervasive—yet, almost intangible.

We people on the pavement looked at him
For he was a gentleman from sole to crown,
Clean favored, and imperially slim.

And he was always quietly arrayed
And he was always human when he talked;
But still he fluttered pulses when he said,
"Good morning", and he glittered when he
walked.

In the spell which he wove was something of the poetry, the imagination and the creativeness which came to him through his Celtic forebears.

His loss is a tragic one, indeed, both for us his friends and for our country. Yet may we not find solace in knowing that he will to us and to history always be young and bright and fair?

He gave to the Nation the incomparable gifts of freshness, of vigor, of idealism and of faith. How much better to remember always the youthful profusion of this endowment which he lavished upon us.

Never will he "swell the rout of lads that wore their honors out, runners whom renown outran and the name died before the man."

Like the John Keats of Shelley's "Adonais":

He has outsoared the shadow of our night
Envy and calumny and hate and pain,
And that unrest which men miscall delight,
Can touch him not and torture not again;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
He is secure, and now can never mourn
A heart grown cold, a head grown gray in
vain.

**Mr. GIAIMO.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

**Mr. SIBAL.** Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy was one of the most remarkable men ever to serve in public life in this country. The world will never be the same because he lived.

President Kennedy was a rare combination of physical vitality, limitless personal courage, a creative intellect, a restless, probing imagination, and ardent patriotism. He was an activist who sought to use the Government as a refined instrument for the people's good.

He was impatient at the thought of unused talent and national capacity and insistently and constantly pressed his fellow citizens to make the most of their vast personal and national resources.

He could not bear to see suffering go unattended nor injustice go unavenged. He dared to experiment.

He filled the Nation's Capital and the chambers of government with youth and laughter as well as with a sense of high purpose. He graced the arts with his educated patronage and stimulated the Nation's sense of beauty.

To the world, he gave an image of America's youth and energy.

As he lies now in the silence which comes to us all, I think there is truth to the old Greek saying, "Those whom the Gods love, die young."

**Mr. GIAIMO.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

**Mr. GRABOWSKI.** Mr. Speaker, the mortal man, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has left us.

Our Nation and the world are in mourning. All mankind is poorer because of his death.

This man who was our President lives on, not only in the immortality God offers us, but in all those whom he touched.

The values for which John Fitzgerald Kennedy spoke and fought are still with us. They live in both his words and remembered deeds. They live in all American hearts and minds and in the hearts and minds of all the peoples of the world.

In grief we are united with all humanity, we join to mourn the tragic loss of a dedicated, noble man.

By his notable achievements during an unexpectedly brief term of office, John Fitzgerald Kennedy left a profound mark on the course of human affairs. His efforts were directed toward the noblest of man's dreams; justice, freedom, equality, and the brotherhood of man.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy came to office to face domestic problems, world political upheavals, the great ideological struggle and the problem of human destiny. He faced them boldly.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy said that he wanted to be known not only as the President who prevented war—but who won the peace. He had expressed a bold thought and held a bold hope. He faced a situation, that in this nuclear age, had made the choice quite clear. It was, simply, to strive and work in every possible way for world peace and not to continue toward the stockpiling of nuclear weapons and world frustrations and hatreds.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy knew that we could not have an overnight cessation of antagonisms and hostilities. But he knew, that for the sake of future generations, we would have to make a start, a beginning.

He followed his dream, and because he did, we have begun what may be a long journey, a hazardous journey. But, we have started, and because of this the world may be a better place for future generations.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of his age, an eloquent spokesman for our era, who was concerned with history and our posterity.

There are many programs he requested which we must now act upon and, as President Johnson has said, now is the time for action. The torch has been passed to us and we will try to carry it as bravely as our lamented President did.

If we have learned a lesson from this tragic event every American must now join together. We must, all who love this country, all who seek justice and implore mercy, unite to erase the hatred that clouds men's minds. We must cease making accusations, false and malicious, which lead men to violence. If this can be achieved our beloved President will not have died in vain.

If not, if we continue to be divided by hate groups, if we cannot disagree yet live harmoniously, then we have learned nothing from our crushing loss.

Let us move forward to achieve the Nation and world John Fitzgerald Kennedy envisioned and is now unable to share with us.

Let us never forget our heroic President standing bareheaded and unafraid, requesting, at his inauguration:

> That we ask not what our country could do for us—but what we could do for our country.

Let us face the future as he did, unafraid and with faith in ourselves and in our Nation.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

**Mr. MAHON.** Mr. Speaker, there are several of us in the House at this time who accompanied the late President John F. Kennedy on the last trip of his life and were with him when the tragic shots rang out that took his life.

On this trip President Kennedy was relaxed and cordial, he was elegant and charming in his manner. He was a picture of confidence and poise. He was good humored, humble, and patient. He was magnificent in his public utterances. The throngs who saw him were pleased and inspired by his presence. In his every action he reflected credit upon the great office which he held.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to speak at length—I had great admiration and respect for the President and I simply want humbly to join with others here in paying tribute to the memory of one I was privileged to call my friend, the late President of the United States.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

**Mr. BALDWIN.** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of my district, and of my own family, I would like to express my deepest sorrow at the tragic event which brought to such a sudden and untimely end the life of President John F. Kennedy. The citizens of our Nation had elected him to serve as our leader, our President. He was a loyal, dedicated American. The assassination of the President was a blow not only to his family but to our entire Nation. His loss is a grievous one. It is a shocking thing that the person responsible for this terrible act was unwilling to allow our Nation to function as a democracy. The citizens of my district and my family join with me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her two children at this tragic time. May our Creator give them strength to meet the future as He gave them strength during the 3 days preceding the funeral of the President. Their courage and moral strength during those 3 days was an inspiration for our whole Nation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

These are immortal words of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, who fell to the senseless marksmanship of a psychopath on that ugly, infamous day of November 22, 1963.

These words and many more splendid words were uttered during his inaugural address on January 21, 1961, when he was sworn in as the youngest President of this great country.

Many of us here served with Jack Kennedy when he was a Member of this House. Many of us, older than he, remember him as an eager, restless, young man who was going places. I am sure that none knew at that time of the heights he would achieve. But with an indomitable will, a sense of destiny, and a never failing good humor he went on to the Senate—and from that vigorous battleground to the campaign that led him to the highest office in the land.

Mr. Speaker, the genius of our political system has somehow made all our Presidents great. Relatively mediocre men have—with history thrust into their hands—met the challenge. In every case our Nation has moved forward in greater or less degree. But John F. Kennedy knew where he was going from the beginning.

Over the span of my years on Capitol Hill—which exceeds by a little bit that of our great new President—I have often recognized the ingredients of greatness. Some are born with them. Some acquire them.

The tousled haired young man from Massachusetts who attended his duties in the House from November 1946 to November 1952, when he went to the Senate, was a man of patriotism—in action.

Yes, there are many of us who knew him; many of us who somehow felt his dynamic influence. But, many of us did not appreciate, in the fullest sense, those qualities until he burst upon the world stage as President of the United States—and became, through his own personal powers, a new and vital force for the advancement of this Nation—and the world.

This Nation—and the world—mourns the wasteful death of John F. Kennedy, who dwelt with us so brilliantly for much too short a time. The lost years of his normal promise are things we will long ponder.

What would they have meant had he been given a full chance to show his mettle?

His record, the words, the philosophies, which he left behind set examples and goals by which to live and to aspire.

On this sad requiem day, as in all the long days since the 22d of November, let us thank God that John Fitzgerald Kennedy came this way.

And let us thank God, too, that the American ideal contains the firm, strong thread to keep our system going forward under a vigorous, able person like Lyndon Johnson, on whom the mantle falls. President Johnson has received the torch to carry the flame of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all the other Members of this body in expressing my deepest sympathy and admiration to that great and noble young woman, Jacqueline Kennedy, who was the source of so much inspiration to her husband—as she has been to all of us since his untimely death.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of President John F. Kennedy has inscribed a sad and tragic chapter in the history of our great Nation.

Our beloved President was a source of strength, inspiration, and hope for our people and for countless millions of others in many distant lands. The full measure of our loss is indescribable, for his lifework embodied the spirit of heroism, dedication, brilliant and confident leadership, and unselfish devotion to the highest American ideals. It is little wonder that the shocking news of his death struck our people a blow that can be compared only with the shock of Pearl Harbor.

The stature of John F. Kennedy loomed large on the world stage. During the course of a short 2 years and 10 months as our President, the quality of his leadership made of him a giant among giants. In all the things that he did, his abiding confidence in the noble cause he led was matched by an uncommon inner confidence in his abilities to meet and resolve the many challenges confronting our Nation and the free world community. And these attributes of true greatness shone through the daily test and trial of his leadership like a bright silver lining in an overcast sky. The course of his journey through life was charted by the steady and certain guidance of Divine Providence on which he depended and which he constantly sought.

John F. Kennedy was an unyielding champion of peace with freedom and justice for all men and all nations.

John F. Kennedy was a tireless fighter for human rights, equal dignity, and equal opportunity for all the people of our Nation.

John F. Kennedy was an implacable foe of poverty, disease, illiteracy, injustice, and all forms of tyranny.

John F. Kennedy was blessed by his Maker with many rare talents and he happily turned those talents to a life of labor for the benefit of his fellowmen.

These immortal lines of personal dedication, spoken by our late President in closing his inaugural address, resound today as a clear trumpet's call to this generation of Americans:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessings and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Our country has lost one of its most noble souls and gifted citizens. Our memory of him as the architect of an heroic age in an era of uncertainty and fear will never die. May his noble soul find peace and comfort in eternal rest.

I join the people of our saddened land in expressing condolences to Mrs. Kennedy and her dear children and to all the members of the Kennedy family in this hour of national mourning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, in the gracious words of our late and beloved friend and President, John F. Kennedy, "thank you, thank you so very much" for your recognition of me so that I might say a few words of eulogy with respect to our fallen and martyred leader.

Among the many very real and beautiful talents that President Kennedy possessed, such as honor, integrity, courage, intelligence, wit, humor, dedication, loyalty, ability, youth, and many, many others—he had a genuine love and respect for his fellowman. In my opinion he had more consideration for others than any man I have ever known in any office high or low. If you will please pardon the personal reference, let me give you an example. The President and I were personal friends. Our friendship dates back to when we served together as young Members in this House. I was elected in 1944 and he came to Washington in 1946. Whenever I had a birthday he would send me a letter of congratulations. Each time he did so his staff would write the salutation "Dear Congressman CHELF" and invariably the President in his own handwriting would cross out the "Dear Congressman" and write in "Dear FRANK." He was not only considerate but a kind and generous person as well. For instance, when my dear brother, Henry Lee Chelf, passed away, a personal letter of condolence came to me from the President. Truly it was one of the sweetest, most considerate acts of kindness ever done me. His greatness was his deep humility.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak for hours on this great and good man, but I know that President Kennedy is now sitting in a special room, looking out at all of us from a special window, from a special rocking chair fashioned of love, immortality, and eternity—yes, he sits in God's own presence and in God's own mansion. Why? Because President John Fitzgerald Kennedy "let his light so shine that men might see his good works and glorify our Father, which art in heaven."

Our beloved President lived an exemplary life, one of moderation, courage, of kindness, of gentleness, one that was free of hate, malice, and bigotry. He read and loved the Bible and I am sure that he has said to Almighty God many times these words from the book of books:

> Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight O Lord my strength and my redeemer.

It is no wonder that all the world was stunned by his sudden tragic death.

We are all better men, better women, better legislators and we are a better country because John Fitzgerald Kennedy passed our way and served approximately "a thousand days" as our President. And thank Thee, dear God, for his selection of Lyndon B. Johnson as his running mate. Bless him and guide him now and always.

To all members of his family, and most especially his stoic, gallant, magnificent widow and his lovely, wonderful, well-mannered children, Caroline and John, Jr., I extend my deepest sympathy. "May their leaf never wither and whatsoever they do—may it prosper."

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the heart of our Nation is heavy today. A great American is dead and a grateful nation bows in solemn tribute. The death of our President, John F. Kennedy, is too tragic for words.

Into a world darkened by ideological struggle and actual conflict, his clarity of vision, intellectual honesty and indomitable courage brought a clear shaft of light and hope. In these times when many of the problems confronting this country and the world seem almost incapable of solution, we can ill afford to lose a man with the experience, ability, integrity and statesmanship of our late President. He had no peer in his knowledge of public affairs. His honesty and fairness were proverbial. It was these qualities which led to his rise to power and to a position which commanded the confidence of millions of Americans.

The passing of this great American is a great loss to this Nation and to the free world. To his grieving family we can offer only the comfort that John F. Kennedy won an assured place in history and a permanent resting place in the hearts of all good men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of sadness at the untimely loss of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that I this afternoon join my colleagues in these eulogies. Really, I cannot find the words to adequately express the reaction I had when I first heard the tragic news on that fateful afternoon of November 22, 1963. The feeling of utter helplessness I had then, overcomes me again today in trying to find words to properly express the sadness I have suffered in the passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The moving tributes from my distinguished colleagues certainly indicate the high esteem, admiration and respect that was felt for President Kennedy and there is little that one can say which would not be repetitious. The most fitting tribute we as a nation could give to our late President would be for each and every citizen to strive to bring to an end the hatred which incites destruction and death, for President Kennedy's dream was to have a peaceful world in which his children and ours could live. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, whose life was a great inspiration to President Kennedy:

> Let him have the marble monument along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty, unselfishly, for all men.

I am indeed proud to be able to say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of the finest friends I have had in my lifetime. I first came to know him when he became a Member of this body in January 1947. I worked closely with him on a number of matters, including his legislation to separate airmail pay from subsidy moneys for the airlines. He helped me in connection with the erection of the beautiful statue in honor of Comdr. John Barry, the father of the American Navy, unveiled in September 1956 at Crescent Quay, Wexford, Ireland. It was this statue on which President Kennedy placed a wreath last June. At his invitation, I had the privilege to meet with him for a few days at his father's home in Palm Beach at Christmastime in 1960 following his election to the Presidency of the United States. I also had the great privilege of being one of the Members of this House invited to attend his wedding at Newport, R.I., in 1953.

During those hectic days following November 22 when our country was grasping for something of which it could be proud, we found that something in the strength, endurance and devotion of Mrs. John F. Kennedy. My heartfelt sympathy and prayers are with her, Caroline and John-John, and the entire Kennedy family in their great loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the flag of our country and the hearts of our people continue to fly at half-mast because of the death of John F. Kennedy, the late President of the United States.

I join with my colleagues in mourning his passing and in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory and to his life of dedicated service to our country.

I was shocked and saddened, as all the world was shocked and saddened, to learn of his untimely passing—to know of this most terrible tragedy which took the life of the young, brilliant 35th President of the United States.

In his passing the cause of freedom has suffered an irreparable loss.

A truly great hero and champion has fallen in our midst.

Reflecting in the afterglow following this tragic event, it is well that we consider the moral implications of conditions in the world which produced such a national tragedy.

The country may well fasten the blame on a single individual and attribute to him a diseased and depraved mind. History may possibly label this era as an era of hate and suspicion and an age which produced an unhealthy climate filled with the venom of hate in which the assassination of the President was but a single expression.

Perhaps the death of John F. Kennedy will signal the beginning of the end of the hate period in America and in the hearts of men everywhere. If such a condition would occur, then the President's life would have been given for a most noble purpose unparalleled and unequaled in time.

In the year that John F. Kennedy first ran for Congress from Massachusetts, I also ran for Congress—from Tennessee—and after the election in 1946 we came together as classmates in 1947 to the 80th Congress. It was my privilege to work with "Jack" Kennedy and to come to know him as a warm and personable friend.

In our freshman class he was elected president of the Young Democrats of the 80th Congress and was early marked as a man of destiny.

My esteem and respect for him continued to grow and increase over the years. Our friendship continued through his terms of service in the House and in the Senate and during his years in the White House.

Born of wealth he might have chosen a life of relative ease—a life with few problems and many comforts. Instead he chose a career of public service—predicated upon the choice of the electorate—and a life filled with service to the cause of democracy and our country.

He brought to this life of service a great intellect, dedication, and immense courage.

He was taken from us in the prime of life while at the height of service but his 46 years were filled with accomplishments and with rich contributions to his country—the America which he loved with intense devotion.

America and the free world have lost a great leader, and I have lost a personal friend.

I am proud to have known John F. Kennedy.

I am proud to have walked in the Halls of Congress and to have served with him.

John F. Kennedy the man is dead—but, John F. Kennedy the patriot will live forever.

The principles for which he lived and died will continue to shine forth as a perpetual monument to this great and good man. His place in history as a dynamic, forceful, and foresighted President is assured. His brilliance and eloquence will serve as a continual reminder to Americans of the ideals and goals to which our country can aspire. I believe these goals are best summed up in the words of the late President himself when he said in his inaugural address:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

As the Nation observes the official period of mourning for our late President, I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the other members of his family in their bereavement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 22, a devastating blow was struck at every one of us.

On that day, and for days thereafter, there were stunned, unbelieving looks on the faces of the people: crowds in the street, mourners in the President's funeral procession; wherever you looked you saw shock and incredulity.

The bullet of the assassin had come like a wind of hurricane force out of clear skies, to strike down our wise and beloved leader, and to endanger our Ship of State in the difficult navigation of the waters of national and international affairs.

We are all shaken, not only by the sudden tragic loss of a courageous and vital President, but by the realization of how powerless our precautions of police and other guards have proved against the spite and ingenuity of a viciously twisted mind. This silly little man, cocksure in his own warped and opinionated ideas, has taken the life of one of the leading human beings of the world, and deprived the people and nations of the world of a great man's inspiring strength and energy and guiding wisdom in the good fight for peace, justice, and human dignity.

Tragically, the rule of law in our country has been grossly violated, first by the brutal assassination itself, second by the shooting down in cold blood of the policeman trying to apprehend the suspected assassin, and third by the murder of the handcuffed suspect himself.

But in noble contrast to this breakdown of order and justice, in these sudden and violent events, we see the entire Nation, and the vast majority of the nations of the world, joining in a dignfied, orderly, and impressive series of actions. In the honors paid to the slain President, in solemn processions and in lying in state, in the religious rites of his church, in the presence of high officials and heads of state of many countries at his funeral, we see recognition both of the intrinsic value of the man and of the dignity of his office. No assassin's bullet could reach or damage either that value or that dignity.

In Mrs. Kennedy's behavior we see the utmost love for her husband combined with a noble concern for the welfare of our country, and a touching courtesy toward all who came to mourn her husband's death. Our hearts and prayers were with her during those long hours of terrible anguish, and our love and sympathy will always be with her and her children in all the days ahead. Our grief and our profound sympathy go out to all the bereaved members of the Kennedy family, who set an unforgettable example for us all of the strength, warmth, and beauty of a close and loving American family.

In these sad and turbulent events we see, too, our Ship of State surviving the sudden shock, and once more breasting the waves, as a new captain, experienced and conscientious, takes the wheel. In this reaction to the tragic event, we find a great consolation. Our party differences, our conflicts of opinion about various governmental measures taken or under consideration, give way for the time to our basic loyalty to the American democratic system of government. The transition from one administration to another has been marked, not by any conflict or irregularity, but by an ease and good will springing from our universal devotion to constitutional principles and the democratic process. Leaders of both parties have affirmed their unhesitating loyalty to our new President, the line of succession is known and accepted, and the necessary steps have been taken to prepare for any such transition in the future.

The people of America today send up fervent prayers to God that our new captain be given the strength and wisdom he will need to carry on the great task that has so suddenly become his responsibility. In our prayers, we recall with mournful gratitude the great sacrifice made by our late captain, President John F. Kennedy, in his constant and strenuous efforts to keep our Ship of State on a smooth and steadfast course.

John F. Kennedy was a Democrat, and a great one. I am a Republican, but proud to recognize, in this standard-bearer of the rival party, a sincere and stalwart American. I can say in all honesty that he lived up to the great American tradition of bipartisanship, whenever matters of great importance to our Nation were involved, and put the interests of America above any personal, regional, or partisan considerations. His love and his shining courage were at the service of his country, as much when he served in the Presidency as when he served in the Navy.

John F. Kennedy was a practical idealist, a great statesman, and a brilliant world leader. This is not at all to say that he was not a politician, or that he was not a man devoted to his political party. He had a conviction of the rightness of a certain body of principles that he associated with that party, had developed personal and professional associations, and knew how to work in and with that party toward the attainment of national goals. He was a politician in the best sense of the word, and proud of it. He respected the two-party system, as I know every Member of this body does, and realized that as long as we have two thriving, competing, potent parties, this Nation and its liberties will be safe. His words and his actions made plain that he realized that politics is the science of government, and that good politics means good government. Partisan politics, for him, did not transcend, but served, the ideals of freedom, justice, brotherhood, and the dignity of man.

From the very first moments of his Presidency, John F. Kennedy made of his youth a banner and a rallying cry. He took pride in being the first President born in this century, and issued a ringing call to the young people of America to join him in a vigorous, active response to the new challenges of today's world. Characteristic of this attitude of infectious courage were the words from his inaugural address that immediately preceded his well-known and often repeated peroration:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

We must not forget that preceding this call to duty, and underlying it, was John F. Kennedy's bold and clear-eyed vision of the dangers and difficulties that face America in the world of today.

> In the long history of the world—

He said—

> only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

President Kennedy brought to his office courage, vigor, high ideals, intelligence, and the charm and elasticity of youth. He brought into his administration young men with new ideas, and explosive energy. A spirit of hope and energy and activity emanated from the man, pervading not only his immediate surroundings, but the whole Nation. Young people were inspired by his example and exhortations to undertake their own tasks, to form their own decisions, to assume their rightful share of responsibility for America and for the world. And everywhere in the world was felt the impact of John F. Kennedy's character and personality. Men and women, great and small, recognized his qualities of essential goodness and trustworthiness, felt an affection for him and an identification with him, and responded to the appeal of his nature.

As we participate, in the time ahead, with our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in the Government of our great country, we know that the waters will not always be tranquil. We shall continue to face difficulties and dangers abroad, and varied troubles at home. Of course we shall not always be in agreement on what measures are best for surmounting these difficulties and dangers, and for dealing with our domestic troubles. But as President Johnson takes command, in these difficult times, we pledge to him our respect for his person and for the dignity of his office, and our loyalty to him as the visible symbol of the majesty of our Nation. The prayers of all Americans go up to God that he may be granted strength and wisdom as he leads us in the days ahead.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. **HOLIFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time in our 188 years of national existence, a President of the United States has been slain by an assassin's bullet. Four Presidents, each of whom were elected by a majority of our citizens to lead us in times of peace or war, have been struck down by four murderers. Four individuals at four different times took upon themselves the awesome responsibility of making the personal decision to destroy the highest official in our structure of Government.

We have elected men to the high offices of President and Vice President 47 times. Lyndon Baines Johnson is our 36th President. He is the fourth Vice President to succeed to the Presidency because the President was assassinated. Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, William McKinley, and now John Fitzgerald Kennedy comprise the list of assassinated Presidents of the United States.

There have been several attempts on the lives of other Presidents, attempts which fortunately were not successful.

My remarks today will not be directed toward praise alone of John F. Kennedy. Any praise which I might give would be inadequate to express my appreciation for his contribution in ideas, in high ideals, and quality of dedication to country.

Neither could I express my grief, the grief of my family, and the grief of my constituents at this tragic loss. This grief is augmented by the tears of millions throughout our country and the world.

It is beyond my poor talents to express the sympathy which all of us extend to his courageous wife in this time of deep sorrow. To the President's family we extend also our heartfelt sympathy.

Today I wish to go beyond the words of praise and sympathy which express the deep emotions we all possess.

I wish to direct my words toward analysis of the basic foundations and superstructure of a society which can at one and the same time produce a beloved citizen such as our former President and at the same time produce an individual who, given the opportunities and freedoms of our society, will nevertheless spurn those opportunities and freedoms, and destroy with an assassin's bullet our President.

I adopt this procedure because no tears or words of praise which I might give will wash away our grief nor will my poor words ennoble his character or memory. Perhaps it is better that we turn away from our sorrow and face the problems and opportunities which we have, and try to correct society's defects for the benefit of the people our President served and loved.

How do we explain, in this country with its great belief in government by majority election of public servants, the assassination of our President, this throwback to the age of violence when national leaders were assassinated almost as an ordinary procedure?

We can only explain these sporadic acts of violence as the result of the fact that men have not reached the goal of self-control as individuals or as nations. Murder, hate, violence, and evil still lurk in the background of the mind. Its repression from overt act or expression depends on the degree of stability and nobility of the human mind.

In our society, we have moved too slowly in the field of understanding the social sciences. We have moved too slowly in the treatment of mental diseases and mental retardation.

We have moved too slowly in eradicating from our country the slums and cesspools of ignorance, poverty, and disease which breed twisted minds that are unable and unwilling to face the pressures of our time. As long as we refuse to face the problem areas in our society with realism and with the determination to improve those defective areas, just that long will we be faced with the results of our indifference.

Total protection, from deliberately planned assassination of high public officials, probably can never be obtained in any kind of society. Such protection in a free society is much more difficult for many reasons. Most of our public officials are men of substantial personal courage. They resent and refuse to live behind bulletproof shields. They accept the risk of death in an environment of freedom rather than accept the restrictions for security which could be imposed on their daily lives for greater personal protection.

With this realization in mind, however, we should take all reasonable precautions which are endurable to protect the lives of our President and other high officials from danger. I am sure the President's security people will strengthen, wherever possible, their protective care of the President and his personal and official family.

There is an obligation of society—of each citizen—which can and should be discharged. The collective obligation of society can be strengthened by eradicating ignorance of the mind by education. It can eliminate the slum environment which breeds poverty and sickness of body and mind. The cost of correction of these areas of neglect and limitation of opportunity can never, never equal the cost of crime, sickness and unemployment, the cost of which we now must pay. The tempo of society's collective action must be increased.

The basic responsibility for improvement of our social environment rests upon the individual citizen.

In the final summation of the value of a society, we must always turn to its component units, that is, the individual citizen must be informed. The citizen must participate in government.

The citizen must assume the responsibilities of expending time and dollars in collective and personal efforts to improve the society in which we must live. The responsibilities of the citizen in a free society are many. They are many because our society becomes daily more complex. Time and space does not permit the enumeration or evaluation of a good citizen's responsibilities.

At this time I comment on a grave and growing factor in American political life.

A representative constitutional type of government such as ours, is, in my opinion, the most rewarding type of government yet devised. It offers more individual opportunity. It offers a better and wider base of economic rewards. More important, it provides greater individual freedoms and liberties.

If these statements are true, and I believe their verity cannot be challenged, then we must as citizens understand the political philosophy which supports our basic structure of government.

Basically our structure of Federal Government is divided into three parts, executive, legislative, and judicial. The executive and legislative parts are directly under the control of the citizens. The citizens elect their policymaking officials. Every 2, 4, and 6 years, the voting citizens select and elect their President, Senators, and Representatives. The judicial part of our Government, under our Constitution, has its personnel selected by the President and approved by the Senate. Therefore, its basic existence stems from the citizens' choice of a President and their Senators.

The citizens' choice of Federal representatives, President and Vice President is in turn based on the principle of majority choice. It is equally important that the minority accept the majority's choices. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this basic principle of our form of government. Unless we accept it and live by it, our form of government cannot long endure. It has provided the basic procedure of transition from President to President, from U.S. Senator to succeeding Senator and from U.S. Representative to succeeding U.S. Representative. These transitions have occurred without strife, violence, or armed conflict between groups of citizens. Even when elections have been very close, as in the 1960 presidential election when less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the votes gave John F. Kennedy the majority over Richard M. Nixon, the principle held steadfast. The people accepted the principle of majority selection and election.

Transition from Republican party control passed quietly to the control of the Democratic party. The quiet acceptance of the minority—by such a narrow margin—was a proof of the maturity of the citizen electorate and a testimonial to our constitutional strength.

From the executive and legislative sections of the Federal Government let us turn to the judicial section, the Supreme Court and its subordinate Federal courts. Here again we find the principle of majority decision at the highest level of our judicial system, the Supreme Court of the United States.

The actions of the executive and legislative branches of government must be in harmony with the Constitution of the United States. The citizen has the ultimate right of appeal against those actions to the Supreme Court if a constitutional controversy is actually involved.

The Supreme Court cannot legislate. It can and must interpret the existing law in relation to our basic constitution. While the interpretation frequently gives final meaning to legislated enactments, it need not be the final determination of legislative purpose and intent. The Congress can always enact new laws for the purpose of changing the Supreme Court's decisions. As long as the new law is in harmony with the Constitution, it can and does clarify, modify, or nullify existing law. When the Supreme Court is again confronted with a similar or different problem, it must take into consideration the new action of the Congress.

I have made this very brief exposition of some of the basic principles of our structure of constitutional Federal Government for an important purpose. I have sought to lay a foundation of understanding and appreciation for the structure of government per se. I believe that our national destiny depends on the preservation of our basic structure of constitutional government, such as I have described.

Unless the structure is preserved—unless its procedures are safeguarded—unless its laws and decisions are respected, our Government will be destroyed.

There is abroad in our land forces which seek to destroy the confidence of our citizens in the integrity and efficacy of our traditional structure of government—in the efficacy and values of its procedures and in the integrity of its elected and appointed officials.

At this point, I want to clearly state that there is a distinct difference between the criticism of a law enacted by the Congress and a criticism of Congress as an institution of constitutional government.

There is a clear difference between the criticism of a Supreme Court decision or a difference in belief as to the validity of a Supreme Court interpretation of a law, and the vicious, intemperate criticism of the Supreme Court as a constitutional body.

There is a sharp difference between the criticism of any official act of an elected or appointed official of government and a vicious, intemperate and usually unfounded attack on the character and integrity of a particular official in government.

I will go even further and say that I would not curtail the right of any person or communication media from criticizing any elected or appointed official of government for any personal offense against the laws or moral standards of our society. It is necessary that the right of criticism be zealously guarded for the protection of our basic institutions and liberties. But those who use the freedom of press and word also bear a responsibility for the preservation of truth and justice. A public official can be destroyed by the spreading of innuendoes, snide stories, and unfounded rumors. Those who use these dangerous methods strike a blow at the integrity and the character of men who represent, in the public mind at least, the personification of government.

If these indefensible tactics persist, it will become more and more difficult to obtain the services of responsible men for public service in Government.

Neither do I believe that criticism should be prohibited against any public servant for an official vote, act, or decision. But, I say let that criticism be based on the merits which are involved in the case and not based on a vicious attack against the motives, integrity, or patriotism of the person who made such vote, act, or decision.

There are too many people today who seek simple answers to complicated national and international problems. They seek and accept the simple answer—the vicious statement—the character-assassinating explanation.

These people seek their kind for comfort and mutual encouragement. They organize in action groups of the Communist and extreme left. They organize in the hate groups of the extreme right.

Whether left or right, they are impatient with constitutional procedures and functions of orderly government. They seek not only to discredit a President, a Senator, or a Representative by character assassination and personal defamation—they seek to destroy confidence in the structure of government. They offer vague and untried substitutes for orderly and proven methods of evolutionary change.

These extremists of the left and right go much further than logical argument and explanation of position. They forsake the calm appeal to reason and the sane methods of persuasion. They adopt the tactics of the fanatic. They adopt the tactics of the Communist cell or the Nazi storm troopers. They disrupt civic meetings and organizations with violence of word and deed. These extremists operate their printing presses and mimeograph machines night and day, spewing out their vicious poison into the homes of our citizens.

These are the hate groups, frequently hiding behind innocent front names of various kinds. They purloin decent words such as "Christian," "peace," "American," "constitution," "freedom," and "liberty" and embody them in their titles of organization, for the purpose of recruiting the simple or unwary.

Their doctrine is the doctrine of hate—hate of the President, hate of the Congress, hate of the Supreme Court, hate of the United Nations, hate of the Jews, hate of the Catholics, hate of all religion, hate of liberals, hate of conservatives, hate, hate, hate.

This river of hate—this ocean of venom—is threatening the basic structures of our Nation. The strong mind, the well balanced and informed mind, can evaluate its evil and reject it.

The indifferent mind can close its ears and turn carelessly away.

The simple mind or the unbalanced mind too often accepts it and becomes a victim to its poison.

These are the minds that twist and writhe under the stimulus of hate until only destructive action can give them relief from their emotional torment.

In this Nation as in every nation under the sun, we have our share of weak minds, simple minds, unbalanced and twisted minds. These people are sick people in mind if not in body. The solution for their care or cure is neither simple nor cheap. They will be with us in the future as in the past.

These twisted minds cannot control the stimulus of hate. They cannot cope with the vicious lies and denunciations against public officials, public policies, and public institutions. Lee Harvey Oswald's mind was twisted by hate. He hated our institutions. The fact that he subscribed to the doctrine of the extreme left is no more pertinent than had he subscribed to the doctrine of the extreme right. The pertinent point is that his mind was twisted with hate. His act of violence against the President was embedded in his hate for our institutions and our public officials.

Lee Harvey Oswald was the end result of subversive beliefs and the doctrines of hate. His deed of violence was the evil fruit from the tree of hate.

Let all of those who spread the doctrine of hate take note. The seeds they plant today will inevitably produce the evil fruit of hate and violence tomorrow, or some future tomorrow.

President Lyndon Johnson, in his first address to the joint session of Congress on Wednesday, November 27, 1963, said:

> The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. So let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our national bloodstream.

Along with every other loyal citizen, I know we can say, "Amen." I know that we too can "highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we are met in simple tribute to John F. Kennedy. All America sits here too—expressing, I believe, a sense of personal loss.

Throughout the world these past days, people from all walks of life have mourned too.

Here in the House we join in extending our deepest condolences to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the family. From her grace, courage, and fortitude we take fresh inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, as a young President, John F. Kennedy truly articulated the dreams of America and inspired young men and women to new dimensions of service in the cause of peace. His hopeful and courageous approach to the future will long live in the hearts of the people.

Who can forget his call to a new generation of Americans—"ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Who can forget his injunction "to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors" in exploring the stars, conquering the deserts, eradicating disease, tapping the ocean depths, and encouraging the arts and commerce.

Who can forget his recognition of the great truth that our "revolutionary beliefs"—including the rights of man "come not from the generosity of the State but from the hand of God."

Now that he has passed—but with us still—let us remember his imperatives:

First. That "our strength as well as our convictions have imposed upon this Nation the role of leader in freedom's cause."

Second. That "continued Federal legislative inaction—on civil rights—will continue, if not increase, racial strife—causing the leadership of both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence."

Third. That in building the peace—"together we shall save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames" and that "it is our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved."

Finally, do not his words before the Massachusetts Legislative bear relevance to each of us here in the Congress:

> Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date

the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the State—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: Were we truly men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in this hour of stark tragedy for our country, may we stand as one man back of our President and our Government. May Almighty God guide and sustain President Lyndon Johnson.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

**Mr. JONES** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as we are gathered here today to pay tribute to the memory of a young courageous hero, my prayer to God is that he has not died in vain. I have neither the words nor the eloquence of speech to express the feelings that I have experienced since hearing the first report, that came over the radio to which I was listening at the time, that our President had been shot. "Who" and "why?" were the first questions to enter my mind. Incredulous, I reasoned, that here in the United States, an assassin's bullet would be the means of extinguishing the life of the President of the United States. But as the minutes and hours passed, with the news bulletins of the rapidly developing events of the day, I began reminding myself of the increasing evidences of hatred, bigotry, distrust, and lack of respect for constituted authority which apparently has been growing in this country for sometime. It was then that I began to reluctantly admit to myself that such a tragedy was possible. Was this God's way of shocking this Nation into a realization of the responsibilities of each of us as individual members of what had been presumed to be an enlightened and intelligent society? Was it His way of reminding us that we as a Nation had so far departed from the ways of decency, that we were approaching a moral degeneration that would eventually and inevitably result in the decline and fall of the United States of America, the last hope for millions of people who were being forced to live not only in a world of turmoil, but under conditions that prevented them from enjoying the peace, the freedom and the many advantages of life that were synonymous with the United States? In the almost 2 weeks that have passed since that tragic day, including the traditional Thanksgiving season, we have come to realize that despite the great loss which this world has suffered, we still have many things about which we can be thankful. The uninterrupted transition which has occurred in the President's office has demonstrated to the world that our system of Government is sound and stable, and to me at least it has demonstrated that the Founding Fathers who originally established this Government and drafted the original Constitution, were acting under the guiding eye of a benevolent Creator. Our prayers, during the past few days have been for our new Commander in Chief, that God may continue to give him the wisdom, the understanding, the courage and the strength, to lead this Nation in the direction that He would have us go; that we may continue to be an inspiration to other nations, less fortunate, to convince them, through our actions and our deeds, and not through force or compulsion, that our way is one that they may safely follow. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, our prayers are for the widow and the children of our late departed friend and leader. Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has demonstrated to the world that she is a tower of strength, a most remarkable woman by any standard. Nothing that we can say or do here today can assuage her grief, and none of us can fully understand the agony and torture that she has borne during these trying days, or even the days ahead, but I know it is the hope and prayer of all of us that during the days and years to come she will have every reason to believe, and that her children as they grow into maturity, will realize that the sacrifice which this husband and father made, has left its imprint upon all posterity, and that President John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die in vain. May his soul rest in peace, and may God's richest blessing be upon his family and all those he loved.

Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an editorial, written by Jack Stapleton, Jr., publisher of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, of Kennett, Mo., which appeared in that publication on Monday, November 25, 1963.

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was laid to rest today.

And his life has become a part of the heritage of America, to be told and retold down through the ages of this Nation and of the world.

A sobbing Nation today paid its last formal tribute to John F. Kennedy, but in the days and years ahead, there will be many more tributes paid to the 35th President of the United States of America.

Although the events of the last few days hang like a nightmare over the minds of Americans, there is enough reality in the events since Friday to make us realize there has indeed been a tragic death in the American community, that a void has been left in the Nation's leadership, that a man with a great vision for world peace and brotherhood has lost his life in the cause of freedom and human dignity.

Even if we cannot understand the reasons for them, Americans everywhere have begun to realize the significance of the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. There is a new President in the land, and by virtue of his experience, his devotion and his dedication to public life, Americans somehow feel that Lyndon B. Johnson will be a great President in his own right.

One of the reasons for this sense of security in the new President is the record of the one he succeeds. From the office of the Presidency, John F. Kennedy had assumed the leadership of not only these 50 States but of the entire free world. This mantle of leadership came not only because he was the Chief Executive of the United States of America, but because he displayed those qualities of determination, intelligence, fortitude, and bravery for which mankind grasps and so often fails to achieve.

As elaborate and grandiose as all of the formal eulogies were, they were echoed time and time again by every American who has often wept silent or open tears since the assassination last Friday. For it was with the average citizen that one could find the perfect tribute, the heartfelt sorrow of his death. As one Washington woman said as she stood across from the White House last Friday night, sobbing quietly, "He belonged to all of us, he belonged to all of us." A man standing beside her turned and replied, "Yes, we know that now."

In a real sense, the death of John F. Kennedy is a martyrdom which gives promise of returning America to an emotional stability which has been too long lacking in this nation of ours. For in America, where civilization has reached a zenith in so many areas of life, we have too often forgotten that the cause of freedom demands the best in us, and the best from us, if we are to measure up to our responsibilities as citizens.

Like a cancer has grown the hate, the grumbling, awful hate which blackens men's hearts with violence, both in word and deed. The strident cry of the alarmist, the racist, the hatemonger, the extremes of both sides have too often turned American against American. A breeding of suspicion has been cast over the land until it has festered for so long that hate and discontent have become a part and parcel of the American community as much as affluence and progress.

The admonition, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" has been a mockery in American life for too long; the struggle for mankind's freedom around the globe has come second, nay third or fourth, in too many lives, in too many minds, in too many hearts.

When this hate is exposed, as it was Friday in all of its stark terror, America can too often see itself mirrored in the actions of a madman. And the awful consequences of this hatred, this contempt for others, this lack of Godliness in our lives is then held up for America to see.

By the grace of God, may we see before it is too late and all of mankind stands before judgment.

It is too early to judge critically the administration of the 35th President. Proper reflection, intelligent analysis, free of emotion, will be required to make a proper appraisal. But to every American, the dedication of John F. Kennedy to the cause of human freedom around the world is inescapable. During his relatively short tenure, he led this Nation through some of its most trying times. His record of leadership in this single, most-important phase of his office has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. The direct confrontation, for the first time in the world's nuclear age, between the free world and the Communist world is of such major importance that it may well mark the most significant date of the 1960's. That direct confrontation with a nuclear power that seeks our destruction was of such awesome proportions that many Americans still cannot grasp its full meaning. It was the 35th President of the United States who, as only he could do, ordered and directed that confrontation. And in all of the events of reality of last April, the awful truth of mankind's destiny stood fully in focus. For this moment, John F. Kennedy may well have been divinely created by his God.

Blessed be the poor in spirit—blessed be those who weep this day for John F. Kennedy.

Blessed are they that mourn—may they understand the cause for which he died and embrace it forever in their hearts.

Blessed are the meek—may the qualities of our fallen President be a part of our minds, our bodies and our souls, now and always.

Blessed are they which hunger and thirst after righteousness—may they lead us through a period of hate to the land of peace and forgiveness.

Blessed are the merciful—may the quality forever be America's.

Blessed are the pure in heart—for they shall be divinely ordained to carry the banner of peace and love.

Blessed are the peacemakers—and may we as mankind emulate them from this day on.

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake—for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

God bless John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Harris). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of President Kennedy is a tragedy for our Nation and for the cause of human freedom throughout the world. As no one else in our time he was able to awaken in the hearts of our people an awareness of the tasks we must perform before America's ideals can become a reality for all men.

He called our attention to the unfinished business of our society; he spoke of the long twilight struggle for the freedom of man; he asked that we consider what we can do—and should do—for our country. During the brief time he spent in the White House, he devoted himself with rare courage and energy to the attainment of the promise of America—both for our people and for those of other lands.

I knew President Kennedy as a leader and a friend. We met in 1948 when I entered Congress. Later it was my privilege to assist him in the Wisconsin primary and in the presidential campaign, on his road to the White House. We met frequently in the past 3 years, most recently upon my return in mid-October from the factfinding trip to southeast Asia. At that meeting, as before, I was impressed with the youthful vigor, clear thinking, and historical perspective of President Kennedy. As Cardinal Cushing said in eulogy of him: "We shall not see his like again."

In President Kennedy's death, we have lost a friend, a good man and a great leader. Let us pray that with his passing we shall not also lose the will which he awakened within us, the will to follow the course which he had set for us. For if that should occur, then President Kennedy's death will go down as one of the most tragic events in our Nation's history.

I am confident, however, that our people will rally from this stunning blow to once again move forward under the able leadership of President Lyndon Johnson. In our journey we have as our beacon the symbolic eternal light that flickers by the grave in Arlington Cemetery where lie the mortal remains of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

As we mourn his loss, let us rededicate ourselves to the ideals and principles for which he fought. May God have mercy upon his soul and the United States of America which he served so well.

To Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the children, and the Kennedy family go our sincere prayers that the good Lord may assist them in their great trial and sorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, no public figure has ever captured the hearts, the confidence, and the support of the people it is my privilege to represent in the Congress like John F. Kennedy. We in eastern Kentucky felt very close to him—close enough that some of the pain, anguish, and complete sense of loss being felt in the hearts of the late President's family now grips our own hearts.

When I was first elected to Congress and assumed duties on January 3, 1949, one of the first individuals that I met was the Honorable John F. Kennedy, Congressman from the State of Massachusetts. Like myself, he was assigned to the Committee on Education and Labor on which he had served in the preceding Congress. During the 81st Congress we had many controversial subjects before the committee. Of the present committee membership only the chairman and I, out of 31 Members on both sides of the aisle, were members of the committee at that time. Some of the most controversial pieces of legislation in the House of Representatives were considered by our committee in those years, particularly the minimum wage legislation, Federal aid to education, Federal Employment Practices Act, and amendments to the so-called Taft-Hartley Act that had been enacted in the previous Congress. During the years 1949–50 our committee was presided over by the gentleman from Michigan, John Lesinski. Many night sessions were held because the hearings were conducted by the full committee; in other words, the chairman did not assign any of this controversial legislation to subcommittees but decided the full committee should hear all the witnesses on minimum wage legislation and changes suggested in the Taft-Hartley Act. I shall always treasure the warm working relationship I have had with that fine statesman since those days of the 81st Congress in 1949.

His 46 years of vibrant activity is an enduring message conveying again to all who will listen that even a tragically short life can be rich and full.

The late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will go down in the annals of history as truly a man of the people—a man who not only espoused freedom for all men but also was greatly concerned about the lack of economic opportunities and substandard living conditions in many areas of our country. He turned the eyes of the Nation to the Appalachian region where automation and economic changes in the coal and other industries has extracted its toll of human discomfort—high unemployment—low family incomes. The people of the Appalachian area have felt that John F. Kennedy was truly their President.

Mr. Speaker, evidencing the regard that eastern Kentuckians had for our late President are many expressions of the people as carried in the newspapers serving the eastern Kentucky area which I would like to have inserted in the Record following my remarks.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the family.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### John F. Kennedy—1917–63

President Kennedy is dead, in the 46th year of his life and the third of his presidency. A stunned and grieving Nation cannot, at once, assess the reasons why.

John Kennedy came upon the national scene in a time of change. The face of our world was altering all around us, the temper of our Nation was changing in ways not always understandable. The greatest gift he brought us was the gallantry with which he met that spirit of change, the earnestness with which he sought the ways of peace abroad and at home.

The makeshifts and compromises of the postwar era were falling apart when he became President. He had to chart new lines, to watch for new currents, to make us aware of aspirations still unmet and wrongs neglected too long.

At home and abroad the obstacles to progress were dismaying in their magnitude. But to a man of intelligence and humanity the sicknesses which beset our body politic, the rancors that divide Americans into glaring, hostile camps were evils to be overcome at all costs, even, as it turned out, at the cost of life itself.

The years and the energies of John Kennedy's presidency were dedicated to an effort to bind up the wounds of his world and his time, to heal the divisions that separate man from man. He sought an easing of tensions within the world community, the creation of an atmosphere in which East and West could grope their way toward understanding and an avoidance of nuclear holocaust. He sought within his Nation a middle ground on which labor and management could meet for the economic welfare of both. And he sought to touch within the hearts of men a charity and a decency that would permit man to live with his fellow man.

He was a strong man, impetuous and given to the occasional outbursts of temper that mark strong men. His feeling for the right phrase, his articulateness and the saving note of wry gaiety which saved his occasional rhetoric from any pomposity have been matched in our time only by Franklin Roosevelt.

Underlying this surface grace and humanity of utterance was an intellectual courage, a moral toughness that made him respected in his own country and by the world at large. His words were heeded even by those who disagreed with them. His willingness to take desperate risks for peace impressed men who had earlier questioned the force of our will for peace. The epitaph history will write must take account of these facts and the progress he had made, as it will note the sacrifice demanded of him in the end.

Stunned by his death, the Nation must now face the awesome questions that such a calamity poses. Shall we continue to try to heal the wounds of the world? Are we capable of the tolerance and patience and intellect that the search for peace demands? Can we honor the concepts of dignity and decency and brotherhood on which our Nation was founded? Or shall we be sacrificed, as our President has been sacrificed, on the altar of man's refusal to live with man?

Of the new President, taking office under circumstances so tragic, one may say the Nation is fortunate that his experience is wide, his goals are those for which President Kennedy fought and that he has the courage to walk the high and lonely path his predecessor has marked out. May God be with him.

---

[From the Louisa (Ky.) Big Sandy News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A Beloved President Laid to Rest; His Successor To Carry On by the Help of God

Residents of Louisa and Lawrence County joined a shocked nation and world in mourning the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th and youngest President of the United States, who was felled by an assassin's bullet Friday, November 22, while on a speaking tour of Texas and died, a short time after the

**ambush shooting, in Parkland Hospital, Dallas.**

**The news of the tragedy here and elsewhere was met with disbelief at first, but when it became a reality the stunned citizens joined a stunned nation and his family in mourning his untimely death which deprives the Nation of one of its greatest leaders.**

**Texas Gov. John B. Connally, who was also shot as he sat side by side with the late President in the open car, is reported to be recovering from his wounds.**

**These heads of governments were reportedly slain and wounded by Lee Harvey Oswald, a former marine whose records show he was twice court-martialed while in the service and received an undesirable discharge so he could accept citizenship in the Soviet Union. Oswald died 48 hours later from bullet wounds inflicted by Jack Ruby, an operator of two striptease joints in Dallas. He is now in custody, charged with murder.**

**The 24-year-old Oswald, a native of New Orleans, La., a self-styled Russian and a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, married a Russian girl. He was the father of two small children.**

**Many beautiful and touching tributes from across the Nation and around the world were paid the late President. Many have praised Mrs. Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family for the courage they displayed in their trying hours. Perhaps one of the most touching scenes was when John, Jr., a 3-year-old, saluted a farewell to his daddy, thus becoming the brave soldier his father would have wanted him to be.**

**As a means of expressing their loyalty, devotion, and grief, some churches have conducted memorial services, church bells have tolled and on Monday, the day declared by the new President Lyndon B. Johnson, as a day of mourning, was observed here by closing business places, city, county offices and city and county schools. Heads of city and county governments, Lawrence County Bar Association, ministerial association, parent-teacher organization, superintendent of schools, both political parties, Democrat and Republican, were invited by the News to express their sympathies and views and all have responded. Their expressions are incorporated in this story.**

### EULOGIES

#### LAWRENCE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

**Being aware that no statement, by it, could hope to add any vital significance to the private and public condolences offered to the bereaved family of our assassinated President, and that words cannot adequately express our feelings of the loss of this great intellect from the leadership of our Nation and the world. Nevertheless, we believe such a baseless atrocity against law and order should be an occasion for every citizen to cry out in shame for the sins of omission which would generate such wanton destruction.**

**It is inconceivable that any citizen should be so ignorant of our system of "government under law," or believe that an objective for good or evil, could be achieved by taking the life of our President or any other public officer, or that such hatred could be generated against the one holding an office as to create a desire in any mind, no matter how depraved, to remove him by an assassin's bullet.**

**In mourning the loss of our leader, we should each be rededicated to the faith of our Founding Fathers that this Nation, under God, shall grow under law into a country of freedom and justice for all.**

**C. F. SEE, Jr.,**
***Secretary,***
***Lawrence County Bar Association.***

#### LAWRENCE COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN

**Like millions of other Americans, I cannot express in words the shock of the late** President's death and the way it was brought about.

I believe history will record the name of John F. Kennedy alongside those of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, for his dedicated service to his country, and his efforts toward world peace and equal rights for all men.

Mr. Kennedy and his young family were the image of America itself. This young couple, highly trained, very capable and willing, were eager to meet each responsibility of their high calling. John F. Kennedy will be missed throughout the world.

JOHN B. PATTON,
*Chairman, Lawrence County Democrat Party.*

#### LOUISA MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION

The Word of God says, "Thou shalt not kill." The murder of the late President John F. Kennedy was a violation of God's Word. The breaking of God's law is sin and sin always results in hurt, damage, misery, sorrow, and loss. The murder of our Chief Executive served to amplify and magnify the results of sin until our Nation and the entire world have seen these results. We have viewed them with horror and disbelief. They have brought an ache to our hearts, a lump to our throats, and tears to our eyes. We have genuinely mourned the loss of our President.

May the awfulness of this act of murder be etched into our minds and hearts. It has cost us the life of a talented, brilliant, and energetic young leader. May President Kennedy's tragic death shock us into the realization that our Nation cannot afford the wages of sin. His death is symbolic of a moral decay which is eating away at the very moral fiber of our Nation. Our sin is sapping our true strength. His death is symbolic of our losses.

Let us turn to God through Jesus Christ. It is only here that we find the spiritual powers for living above sin. May we come to fear sin with all of our hearts and to dread its wages. May we come to love God and realize that He is able to save us from sin. Let us as individuals submit ourselves to the will of God through Jesus Christ. Only then will we be able to bring our beloved Nation under the will of God that we might truly serve Him. May God have mercy upon us as a nation for our sinfulness.

W. L. STRATTON,
*President, Louisa Ministerial Association.*

#### LAWRENCE COUNTY JUDGE

Lawrence County Judge J. J. Jordan said, "This is the most deplorable thing that has ever happened to this Nation and the world. It is unbelievable that this could occur in a free country. I know the rich and poor, State and county, will miss John F. Kennedy as he has done so much in 1962–63 for the depressed area of eastern Kentucky by appropriating money for building roads and bridges in Lawrence County which would have been impossible for the county to have financed. Myself and the fiscal court deeply feel this loss."

#### LAWRENCE COUNTY REPUBLICAN CHAIRMAN

Roy Potter, chairman of the Lawrence County Republican Executive Committee said, "I am deeply disturbed by this unforgettable tragedy. It is almost unbelievable that this terrible thing could happen in our freedom-loving country.

"My heartfelt sympathy goes to the entire Kennedy family in their bereavement."

#### CITY OF LOUISA

We extend our deepest sympathy on behalf of all the citizens of Louisa, Ky., to President Kennedy's family and the Nation, and to pray for the guidance and direction of our new President Lyndon B. Johnson, and that we may have peace and good will among all nations.

CLAUDE T. WILSON,
*Mayor, City of Louisa.*

#### LOUISA PTA

Mrs. Andrew York, president, said: "Members of the Louisa Elementary Parent-Teachers' Association join the Nation in expressing sympathy to all the members of the Kennedy family, in the passing of our late President, Mr. John F. Kennedy, and pledge their full support and prayers to their new President, Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson. Let us remember that the American way of life is the only one capable of insuring peace and security. The battle for human rights is being borne by our children and youth."

She continued: "There has never been a time in the history of the parent-teachers' association when it was so important that every member give urgent attention to the vital issues of human relation programs, as in the coming year."

"A good man never dies—
In worthy deed and prayer,
And helpful hands and honest eyes,
If smiles and tears be there;
Who lives for you and me—
Lives for the world he tries
To help—he lives eternally,
A good man never dies."
—JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY.

#### LAWRENCE COUNTY SCHOOLS

The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy left the free world stunned beyond words. The greatest leader of the free world, of this generation, is lost to civilization because his assassin was not taught the principles of democracy by his parents, his church, his school, or the other organizations with which he came in contact during his short life.

We, as American citizens, should render the man who replaces him as President of these United States the benefit of our prayers and our undivided support until that office is reaffirmed as the symbol of the security of the free world.

W. A. CHEEK,
*Superintendent, Lawrence County Schools.*

President Kennedy's death could not have come at a more crucial time in our Nation, but, in the words of the late James A. Garfield (an assassinated President in 1881), "Fellow citizens, God reigns and the Government in Washington still lives."

Following the ceremonies at St. Matthew's Cathedral, Monday, by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, an old friend of the Kennedy family, the late President now rests in beautiful Arlington Cemetery near the resting place of another great President, Abraham Lincoln, who succumbed to a bullet fired by another assassin, John Wilkes Booth, on April 14, 1865.

The funeral ceremonies were attended by representatives of governments around the Nation and from most of the countries of the world. Over his resting place will burn an eternal flame, lit by his widow, assisted by two of his brothers, Robert and Ted.

---

[From the Hazard (Ky.) Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A TIME TO EVERY PURPOSE—A TIME TO MOURN, A TIME TO GIVE THANKS

"To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven * * * a time to be born, a time to die * * * a time to kill, and a time to heal * * * a time to weep, and a time to laugh * * * a time to love, and a time to hate * * * a time of war, and a time of peace"—Ecclesiastes 3.

The season is Thanksgiving, a time of joyful praise to the Lord for His bountiful goodness, but now a time of mourning for the dead man who loved these words from the Holy Bible.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy had "his purpose * * * his time to live, and his time to die." We who mourn cannot understand why this man's talents were taken from this earth, and in such tragic manner, shot down from ambush by a little man dissatisfied with his own world and others. A horrendous deed that leaves not only this Nation but the world in a state of shock and disbelief that such a thing can take place in America, the land of the free, man's last, best hope on earth.

Violence of this nature is a thing abhorred by true Americans. Therefore the second violent act just 48 hours later, which claimed the life of the accused killer was almost as repugnant to us as the President's assassination. It was simply more violence, an act which sealed the man's lips forever before justice could be meted through our courts. It profited nothing. Violence never does.

As we ponder over John Kennedy's being plucked from our midst in the very flower of his life, our "whys" are too many to be answered, as they always are. The inexplicable divine plan is never revealed except in God's own time. Therefore, it behooves each of us to respect this man's memory for his contributions to humanity, and for the example he set as a man of faith and character.

So let us mourn, and rightly so, but let us also learn from his greatness of spirit. Let us acquire some of his tolerance and understanding for our fellow men, regardless of their race, creed, or color. This was the great task to which he bent his vitalities. It's what John Kennedy would have wanted for tribute.

The torch has been passed to other hands. Another leader, President Lyndon B. Johnson, quickly assumed the reins of government. His experience points to his ability to carry on with full measure of success. We trust every American will do his small part to assist, in the city, on the farm, or the small town such as ours.

So on this Thanksgiving Day, we can find much for which to be thankful. Not the least of our blessings is the American system of government, which never faltered while paying the highest tribute to our leader.

We join the world in paying tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who gave his life to his country. On Thanksgiving Day, let us rejoice in his good works, his portion on this earth, and pray God's blessing on the man who is now President.

It is the season for giving thanks.

---

[From the Hazard (Ky.) Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

### DEATH OF A PRESIDENT

A shot rang out through the crowd that day.
It took the life of our President away,
An assassin's mind was poisoned it seems
Against our country's future, hopes and dreams.
The world was shocked, grief-stricken and stunned,
And with all our prayers, nothing could be done.
This too was a shot heard 'round the world—
For in no time the news was hurled
Across the sea to many a land
Where people who heard couldn't understand
Why in America, the land of the free,
Such a thing that happened, they couldn't see.
Our loss is great, but we still must go
On and on and let our faith grow
For in America, the land of the brave
Our red, white and blue is still free to wave.
And our Government by the people has not perished
And thanks be to God, we've still this to be cherished.

—IDA LEE HANSEL.

Composed November 23, 1963.

---

[From the Hazard (Ky.) Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

### COMPARISON OF TWO PRESIDENTS

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

Through the assassination and death of our 35th President, I have heard and read various comparisons between President Kennedy and our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. From two books I have both well worn with age, called "Heart Throbs" and written around the turn of the century, I find the following on the death and assassination of Lincoln:

#### GARFIELD ON THE DEATH OF LINCOLN

"There are times in the history of men and nations when they stand so near the veil that separates mortals and immortals, time from eternity, and men from their God that they can almost hear the breathings and feel the pulsations of the heart of the Infinite. Through such a time has this Nation passed. When 250,000 brave spirits passed from the field of honor through that thin veil to the presence of God, and when at last its parting folds admitted the martyred President to the company of the dead heroes of the Republic, the Nation stood so near the veil that the whispers of God were heard by the children of men. Awe stricken by His voice, the American people knelt in tearful reverence and made a solemn covenant with God and each other that this Nation should be saved from its enemies; that all its glories should be restored. It remains for us, consecrated by that great event, and under that covenant with God, to keep the faith, to go forward in the great work until it shall be completed. Following the lead of that great man, and obeying the high behests of God, let us remember:

"He has sounded forth His trumpet that shall never call retreat;
"He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat;
"Be swift, my soul, to answer Him; be jubilant, my feet,
"For God is marching on.

"And his closing statement in his New York speech was:

"God reigns, and the Government at Washington still lives.

—"JAMES A. GARFIELD."

The above seemed so true today on the assassination and death of our late President, I am moved to submit same to your paper to be published if you see fit.

MRS. IDA LEE HANSEL,
*Hazard, Ky.*

---

[From the Maysville (Ky.) Daily Independent, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE UNFORGETTABLE MAN

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now immortal.

As an assassin's bullet sped the President of the United States to stand in judgment before Almighty God, tears mingled with our prayers for the loss of this earthly leader. On this dread day of November 22, 1963, time stopped before he could fulfill the hope of greatness every American knew he had. Countless millions prayed for his soul:

"Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him."

John Kennedy is the only President who ever shook our hand or allowed us to break bread with him. We, who are nobody, had been asked for our advice and left his presence humbled as if we too were another Atlas weighted down by the burden of a world too heavy to support.

Yes, John Kennedy was the Mr. President by whose side we walked into the state dining room to eat food that might have been ambrosia. He was Mr. President who went up in the elevator with us to show, on an impulse of course, the bedroom of another great hero, Abraham Lincoln. With love, John Kennedy touched this sacred memento or some other symbol dear to him and to Jacqueline. Thinking back now to that day, there seems now a prescience of tragedy we shall never forget.

We need more than tired, defaced words in this time of sorrow to try to capture the essence which was John Kennedy.

None of us shall be able to do it. For who can say with sureness what was the spirit of a man who knows now that there is no greater love than to lay down his life for another?

John Kennedy was like that. Despite all the frailties of man, and he had his share of them, he already had proved in his short 46 years his invincibility to death. Already familiar with personal pain and the heartbreak of the loss of a son, and, yes, familiar too with the bitter taste of failure of some of his dreams, Jack Kennedy had experienced a long preparation for yesterday's tragedy. Now in his final trial he has proved his indestructibility.

If in dying, the magnificence of his vision can yet be executed by the peoples of these United States, he shall not have died in vain. If his death brings us the wisdom of which we have such a terrible need, he shall yet live.

We loved him. So did you.

---

[From the Morehead (Ky.) News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### THE PUBLISHER'S PEN: APPROPRIATELY WE DEVOTE THIS COLUMN TO JOHN KENNEDY

Morehead, and this area, like the rest of the United States and most of the civilized world, was at a standstill in shock and near unbelief from Friday afternoon through the weekend as an assassin's bullet removed a great and courageous leader from this earth.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was, in our book, the greatest President of all, even though many of his programs are unfinished. Perhaps our evaluation, and grief, is deeper because he was the only President that we knew personally.

While he was a candidate for the Presidency—the Democratic nominee—it was our privilege to spend 4 days with his public relations corps, many of whom are now on the White House staff.

Later, we attended a dinner for about 20 newsmen in the White House. The place cards had each individual's name engraved in gold (protocol for state dinners) and we were only one seat removed from the President. Our friend, and colleague, J. T. Norris Sr., publisher of the Ashland Daily Independent, sat next to President Kennedy.

We recall our one question during that 2-hour forum. It was: "Mr. President, we recently heard a speaker who was a member of, and official representative of the Strategic Air Command, say that our greatest danger was Russia destroying our nuclear bases before we could get our planes off the ground, and he further indicated that we were not keeping enough of these planes, fully loaded with nuclear bombs in the air 24 hours a day. Could, or would you, comment on this?"

The President answered: "First, let me say that Mr. Khrushchev and I are agreed that in the event of nuclear war that society and humanity as we know it will be destroyed. Specifically, answering your question—I will say that we do have sufficient planes in the air for the SAC to retaliate and destroy Russia, or any aggressor. We would destroy each other."

A week later we read in the newspapers that SAC had more than doubled, perhaps trebled, the number of planes in the air at all times. Of course, this had already been ordered by the President before our question.

Last year we traveled with the White House press on a mission much like the one at Dallas where a little punk fired that fatal and historic shot from a mail-order rifle. We were included in one press pool that rode in the same plane that took Mr. Kennedy to Texas and returned with his body.

We could write columns about the security measures taken by the Secret Service that we saw firsthand to protect the President. It was evident that the greatest concern was vulnerability of Mr. Kennedy when riding in an open car. We heard it mentioned several times that the mountains of western Pennsylvania through which the President was traveling at the time were one of the real danger spots, that a sniper could be hidden on a mountain side, or toss explosives from a steep cliff.

Concern of the Secret Service reached a climax at Washington, Pa., where about 30,000 had gathered. The platform was unusually high. The Washington Hotel, just across the street, was cleared of all but the first floor and we heard members of the Secret Service say after the speech finished, "We're glad that one is over."

The White House press corps, including Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, went out of their way to entertain and advise us, probably because we were a country editor among big-name writers.

We have preserved the White House and White House press memos for our grandchildren. Where else, in all the world, could a rural, grassroots editor of a weekly newspaper be accorded such red carpet treatment, including a personal Christmas card last year from John Fitzgerald and Jacqueline Kennedy.

### MOURNERS

A report is on the desk that church attendance in Morehead, and perhaps all this area, may have reached an alltime high Sunday as people gathered in houses of the Lord to mourn the passing of President Kennedy and pray for our new leader, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

### MEDITATION

Also at hand, and to the credit of a great nation, is that business in the Nation's bars and liquor stores fell off 50 percent, or more, over the weekend. Most people prayed and meditated instead of trying to drown their deep sorrow.

### MUST HAVE HURT

Casting back, we recall that Glenn W. Lane, Democratic county chairman, was the first outspoken and effective ally of Mr. Kennedy in Rowan County. Mr. Lane sold himself at the 1956 National Convention in Chicago when Mr. Kennedy barely lost the nomination for Vice President.

### FOND MEMORY

The January 1961 inauguration of President Kennedy witnessed a blizzard at the Nation's Capital. Somehow, two choice inaugural platform tickets were obtained for Mr. and Mrs. Lester Hogge, deans of the considerable delegation from Rowan County and eastern Kentucky. After the inauguration Mr. Hogge said: "That was the greatest speech (Kennedy's) ever delivered. * * * He will go down in history as one of the great Presidents of all time."

### UNTIMELY?

Many think the assassination almost ruined the founders' day program marking the 40th anniversary of Morehead State College. President Adron Doran announced the death of the President shortly after the program started at the fieldhouse. Almost in unison, the 3,500 present gasped and said "Oh, no." But at every founders' day in the years to come, people will recall the simultaneous events in 1963.

### APPROPRIATE

Gov. Bert Combs had handed news media the text of his founders' day speech containing high praise for MSC, its president, regents, and progress. He discarded the speech, said a few words, and then appropriately asked the college chaplain, Dr. Gabriel Banks, to lead the assemblage in the Lord's Prayer.

### POSITION OF POWER

One of the closest friends and allies of President Lyndon Baines Johnson is Kentucky's former Governor and former U.S. Senator Earle C. Clements. It is certain that Clements, presently legislative chairman of the Maritime Union, will have a powerful voice at Washington and will confer often with the President on domestic policies as he has through the years. It is probable that Kennedy's death will result in realinements of the Ned Breathitt administration and Democratic policy in Kentucky.

### PROCLAMATIONS

It is rare that we observe proclamations requesting all business places to close. We had two within 3 days. County Judge W. C. Flannery and Mayor Eldon T. Evans issued a proclamation for business to halt from 2 until 4 o'clock Friday in observance of MSC Founders Day. Mayor Evans signed a proclamation Sunday requesting the same thing from noon until 2 o'clock Monday during the funeral and burial of President Kennedy.

### UNUSUAL

Our youngest granddaughter is 3 years old. During her brief life the United States has had three presidents—Dwight D. Eisenhower, John Fitzgerald Kennedy and now Lyndon Baines Johnson. In the event President Johnson does not succeed himself she will have seen four different presidents when still 4 years of age.

### COMMUNICATIONS

The assassination of President Kennedy will also go down in history as the finest coverage by newspapers, television, and radio of any event. Many Americans did not learn of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln for 2 or 3 days. The reports then were so confused that waves of rumors and misinformation spread that the Government in Washington had been overthrown.

### IN CONCLUSION

History may record that President Kennedy, a Roman Catholic, did more than any other man to effect an understanding between all religions and all churches in the world.

### THANKSGIVING

Despite this great tragedy which could change the course of the world or could lead to the end of modern civilization we have much to be grateful for on this Thanksgiving Day. As one local minister put it in his sermon Sunday we have more to be thankful for than any people on this earth. On behalf of the staff, and personnel, of the Morehead News we wish you a bountiful Thanksgiving and a strengthening of family ties.

---

[From the Prestonsburg (Ky.), Floyd County Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### THIS TRAGEDY POSES MANY QUESTIONS

What shall we say now, almost a week after the tragic event occurred?

Mere words, with all their shades and tones, have been employed by others, and they are inadequate. Our addendum to the great lay of grief would be equaly inadequate. Those intangibles of the human spirit cry out for expression but so often are inexpressible.

Then let us turn to facts, which in themselves are sad enough.

The President of the United States has been stricken down by cowardly attack engendered of hatred. The Governor of the State of Texas lives but not because the gunman who sought the deaths of the two men willed it so. Less than 48 hours later, the man accused of the President's assassination has himself been gunned down at a time when he was as defenseless as was his victim.

Is there something basically wrong with a country which has lost four of its 35 Presidents to guns in the hands of murderers and where attempts have been made on the lives of at least two other Presidents, one former President and one candidate for the Presidency. This question is asked in the purview of history which shows that in all the centuries-long annals of England not a King or Prime Minister has ever been subjected even to attack.

It is true that the mentally deranged have figured in some Presidential assassinations, but England has its deranged, too.

Is "gun law" still a basic idea of American justice? Can it be that, for all our progress and industrial genius, there remains in the deep recesses of darkened minds the idea that the gun is needed as the arbiter of differences, political or personal? Or that, as in the slaying of the accused killer of President Kennedy, gun-justice satisfies the needs of society? Are the orderly processes of government fit only for the scrap heap if they do not suit our individual tastes?

These senseless murders pose many questions which will intrigue sociologists, psychologists, and students of government as well as the ordinary citizen. They may never be fully answered, and we do not attempt all the answers, much less to pontificate.

What causes one man to take the life of another? Except for those who engage in mortal combat as members of a country's armed forces, either sudden anger or dark, brooding hate must be considered the motivation for such violation of the person of another and of the laws of the land. Then whence came the hatred which cost John F. Kennedy his life?

Remember that rightwingers hate as violently as the left. Remember the tensions of the times—the passions arising because of divergent ideologies, the class hatreds as well as the racial, the swirling and apparently endless conflict involving so many and composed of so many evil ingredients.

Veritable "hate campaigns" are waged. Presidents are the special targets of secret and public abuse. Unstable minds and characters are inflamed to action.

And political campaigns have deteriorated into their own particular brand of "hate campaign." In Kentucky, for instance, the intelligence of the voter is flouted, the real issues of political campaigns have been tossed aside, and character assassination has become a familiar and disgusting tactic. Many astute political observers have become convinced that the collective mind of the electorate has become so conditioned that a calm appeal to reason is helpless in the face of a demogogic appeal to the emotions.

Politicians, the old pros of politics, can remain more or less detached and if affected emotionally only in superficial degree by such donnybrooks. But to many of unstable character and emotions the "hate campaign" remains after the real campaign has ended.

Then again one wonders how truly Christian is so-called Christian America. One wonders if all of us, including the millions of citizens who are shocked by wanton murder or other violence, do not share some of the guilt. How far does our Christianity extend? The passive absence of hatred leaves a void unless there is the active presence of love.

Dallas, Tex., has its problems. It cannot shed the blood-red stigma of murder with which it has been stained. But "it can happen here," or in any other part of this country.

For there is no protection for President or the lowliest against the heart which fills itself, or has been loaded with, the venom of hate. We cannot preach hatred in one breath and turn it off as we would a faucet. The true Christian principle which recognizes every human being as equal in the sight of God, regardless of his color, his politics, his intellect, his ideals or even his acts, is the only hope that the genus homo will ever escape the rule of fang and claw.

---

[From the West Liberty (Ky.) Licking Valley Courier, Nov. 27, 1963]

### IS IT FATE? IS IT THE TURNING POINT IN WORLD HISTORY? WILL AMERICA MEASURE UP?

In 3½ days of a fateful weekend Americans experienced nearly the full gamut of human emotions—from stunning shock to despicable shame, with noble grandeur in between.

It was Friday afternoon when the first flash came, "President Kennedy Has Been Shot."

From this first shock that stunned our complacent belief that "it can't happen in America," through Sunday when his handcuffed assassin was so despicably murdered in the Dallas police court station with cameras picturing it all to the world, through the solemn funeral mass and burial in Arlington as crowned monarchs and potentates from most of the nations of the globe bowed with Americans in respect—most Americans were glued to their television.

And, seeing it all, nearly the full gamut of human emotions, they experienced the deep pathos of tragedy, marveled at the magic majesty of Jacqueline Kennedy, shed a tear as she and Caroline kissed the flag on the bier, and another when John, Jr., 3, saluted as they bore his father's coffin to the caisson, felt the grandeur that is America as the funeral procession moved across the Potomac to Arlington, Lincoln's tomb in the distance.

Never in history have so many millions been drawn directly, through modern communication media, into the vortex of such saddening and sobering dimensions.

It has left a soberer citizenry—and provoked a lot of needed soul searching.

Our failure to fight back at hatemongering that has sickened our society; our complacency, and our attachment to the fast buck and equating comfort with freedom—these have bred a false way of American life.

But, as the wounded Governor Connally said—John Kennedy in death may accomplish what he could not in life. He had revived again the ideals of the human race, freedom for all men.

Belatedly, Americans are just now realizing he was a Spartan warrior placing the full power of the strongest government on earth on the side of the common man. One of the ironic facts of our time is that the rest of the world knew, especially since the Cuban missile crisis, Kennedy to be a strong, resolute and wise leader.

Americans in large part had been blinded by hatemongering, so slyly spread that it perplexed our citizenry, fanned little prejudices into hatreds. This was gnawing at our Nation's vitals, consuming our Union which alone is a democracy's strength.

Other nations divined Kennedy's greatness; so did Americans of good will, except those perplexed and blinded by hate and intolerance.

Else why did the heads of most nations of the globe make pilgrimages to Washington to honor the fallen leader? And why did more than 250,000 from over the Nation file past his bier under the Capitol dome, the line growing longer through a wintery night? And why the hundreds of thousands who lined the streets to watch his coffin pass? And why the half million who visited his grave in 1 day? And why does this steady stream continue past his resting place in Arlington?

It may have been fate. It may have been the will of the gods that kept Lt. John Kennedy alive during the 5-day ordeal in the South Pacific when a Jap destroyer shot his PT boat in two and he saved his crewmen in heroic manner. A divine will that kept him alive for a nobler mission.

For in a postwar troubled era he brought stability between nations threatening a holocaust of nuclear war, and he raised again the hopes of the human race for freedom for all men.

But some in their greed for power dissented. Knowing that emotion, not reason, rules the race, they spread hate, the hate that is easily distilled against one who sought civil liberties for citizens whose skin was unlike theirs, and whose religion was different. This hate was consuming our democracy.

Did it take assassination to awaken a people to the sickness that is consuming our Union?

No other event, not even Pearl Harbor, has so absorbed the emotions of America.

Is it fate? Is it that America is to have another chance if—if her citizenry can be awakened by a shock back to their senses of common decency and the ideals of human freedom that spawned our democracy?

The world is waiting, and watching, and weighing. This may be the pivot time in world history. Will Americans measure up to their destiny?

Call it good luck—or the favor of the gods, as you will. America was blessed with a calm and wise second in command.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson upon becoming President has steadied a wavering world in a midnight of tragedy and doubt—and has asked "the help, the strength, the prayers" of his people as well as God's guidance.

And to dispel the sickness of a people that kill their Lincolns and their Kennedys, he has asked the people of America to "banish the rancor from our words and the malice from our hearts," and thus rid the Nation of "the burden of hate and prejudice we have borne too long."

The shock of John F. Kennedy's assassination may mark the turning point in world history, if—if Americans measure up.

---

[From the Licking Valley (Ky.) Courier, Nov. 27, 1963]

### TO HONOR HIM WHOM HATRED FELLED

Much has been said in the wake of President Kennedy's shocking death about banishing hatred and rancor from this land. No one to our knowledge has expressed it more eloquently than the president of Indiana University, Elvis J. Stahr.

"I would suggest," he told an overflow audience at memorial services in the Indiana University auditorium Monday, "that we shall best honor the memory of (John F. Kennedy) from this day forth if we strive, as he did, each as best he can, to eliminate bigotry and hatred and prejudice and intolerance from our minds and hearts, to uphold freedom and free institutions in our own land and for people everywhere."

Such words, unfortunately, cannot be expected to penetrate minds encased in utter fanaticism. But they should give pause to those whom Chief Justice Earl Warren had in mind, standing beside Mr. Kennedy's flag-draped casket in the rotunda of the Nation's Capitol, he said: "Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?"

---

[From the Licking Valley (Ky.) Courier, Nov. 27, 1963]

### FIRST TO REASSURE THE NEW PRESIDENT—TWO NOBLE AMERICANS

With the Nation stunned sorrowing and the free world quavering at loss of its most stalwart leader, orderly and reassuring transfer of the American helm to Vice President Johnson was of prime need in a troubled world. As soon as he returned to Washington, the new President Lyndon B. Johnson went to the White House. And the first two telephone calls he received were from former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. They assured Johnson they had confidence in him and would do whatever they could to help him in the transitional period, and were leaving immediately to be at his side. Two noble Americans, Eisenhower and Truman. Patriotic Americans and worthy leaders—leaders chosen by the American two-party system that helped make the Nation great, not by hate groups that have done so much to spread discord and engender disunion.

---

[From the Sandy Hook (Ky.) Elliott County News, Nov. 26, 1963]

### MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR PRESIDENT ATTENDED BY MANY IN SANDY HOOK

The Sandy Hook Methodist Church was the scene for an impressive and beautiful memorial service for President Kennedy held at 10 a.m. Monday, November 25, was well attended.

Rev. James Medley spoke the memorial tribute and ended with the prayer from the ritual for the President of these United States, after which the congregation stood and joined in the singing of the national anthem with the church organ.

Reverend Medley's text and excerpts from his tribute follows:

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Psalms 33:12.

"Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted." Matthew 5: 4.

There is much in the ethic of Jesus that is paradoxical. Few reasoning people see in mourning the source of blessedness. This morning, I want to help in reaching an understanding of this paradox as we study it in the context of the Sermon on the Mount and apply it in the context of the sudden and tragic passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of these United States of America.

Having presented the foundation stone of Christian experience in the statement, "Blessed are the poor in Spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of God," Jesus grants insight for growth in that kingdom.

The tragedy of sin can only be viewed properly in retrospect. Those who are blinded by sin unforgiven cannot see it in true perspective.

Blessed happiness can be the part of all who admit sinfulness and place personal faith in the Christ.

Blessed are they that mourn as we do for John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Our mourning brings us to the point where we know that as a nation we cannot express ourselves except in prayer. Some prayers will be orderly. Some prayers will be marked by the hysteria of grief. We shall be comforted in the fact that God hears both. The Holy One of Israel is aware of our dilemma and cares for us. This care is a reality for each personal faither in Christ. We pray that it might become the corporate experience of our Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy committed himself to the role of making peace. He seemed to have incorporated in his personal being the salient features of men with profiles of courage. Underprivileged men the world around are indebted to him for his efforts to bring freedom from want and peace of mind that comes to those who need never look with envy upon a favored America.

His stability of character has added much to the possibility of establishing peace among races and religions in our Nation.

His personal bearing of integrity has added much to the area of peace now enjoyed between labor and management.

His passing makes us the recipients of a fresh determination to make this world the peaceful kingdom of our Lord and our Christ.

I think it entirely proper and practical for us to reaffirm our faith in the historical gospel of the Sermon on the Mount and to pray earnestly for the 36th President of these United States of America, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

---

[From the Maysville (Ky.) Daily Independent, Nov. 23, 1963]

### All Mourn—Dastardly Act, Says Stunned Community

The work-a-day world of Maysville died yesterday with the assassination of President Kennedy. Business was at a standstill as townspeople lived through the half-hour agony that preceded the moment he was shot and the awful numbness that followed the word he had died.

What had seemed important a moment before, no longer had any significance. The streets of the city became almost deserted as people went home to pray and to follow on television every terrible related fact.

Mayor T. T. McDonald at once directed the flag on Market Street and at city hall to be flown at half mast. County Judge John P. Loyd did likewise.

Soon after the confirmation of the President's death, the bells at St. Patrick Church began to toll. At 6 p.m. the Episcopal of the Nativity tolled its dirge of sorrow. Civic leaders were as one in their expressions of sorrow.

The Right Revered Monsignor Leo B. Casey termed the assassination a senseless, despicable act and a tragic one. He said the world had lost a great leader and an apostle of peace.

No sooner had word of the tragedy spread like wildfire through the countryside, than the children at St. Patrick school went to St. Patrick Church. There led by Father Casey and the Reverend Robert Wendeln and the children recited the Rosary and prayers for the dead.

At St. Rose of Lima Church in Mayslick, where 40 hours devotions are being held, the church was filled with a multitude of prayerful citizens offering petitions to God for the repose of the President's soul. The bell there also tolled.

The Reverend Robert Peck, of the Church of the Nativity, said a mass of requiem would be said Sunday and that public prayers would be offered Sunday afternoon.

The Reverend T. Howard Kinston, of the First Baptist Church, in expressing his shock and sympathy, said he felt it must be the act of some insane person and not representative of the citizens of the country.

The Reverend James Rucker, of the First Presbyterian Church, expressed sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy and the President's family as he said that he felt "a personal responsibility that we can let matters get to such a stage."

Superintendent of City Schools Earle Jones said, "It made me sick down deep in my heart that in a civilized country such a terrible thing could happen" and that he hoped it would be the last.

Circuit Judge John A. Bresta, who was in Augusta when apprised of the tragedy, termed it "a barbaric thing" and that it gave him a sense of "numbness and disbelief." He quoted the president of the U.N. that all of us should pause and look to our country and at the democratic process." He added his prayers for the family and the success of President Johnson.

Mayor McDonald and Judge Boyd said they would proclaim public days of mourning to conform with what will be done at the national level.

Doctors, lawyers, merchants, and chiefs—the common man so to speak that each represents—went about in a daze after the tragedy. For a little while, it was as if hope had died in a senseless world. Poignant were the words of sympathy uttered for Jacqueline Kennedy. To everyone it seemed that a beloved friend was gone.

The public meeting of sanitation district No. 1 for interested citizens was also canceled. "No one felt like talking," Chris Kilgus, chairman of the board of commissioners, said.

---

[From the Pike County (Ky.) Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Gloom Pervades Land When Kennedy Killed—President's Death Stops Area Meeting — Colonel Cochran Reviews Flood Control Problems; Stream Snagging Viewed

The incredulity, shock, and deep sorrow with which word of the assassination of President Kennedy was received here last Friday afternoon was typical of the emotions experienced in every nook and corner of America and in almost every country of the world.

An almost palpable gloom settled over the land. Beginning with the first announcement that the President and Governor Connally of Texas had been shot in Dallas, Tex., millions sat as if transfixed before television sets. Wherever others went or gathered here, there was one topic of conversation.

Official Frankfort reacted as did the ordinary citizen. The State flag atop the Capitol was lowered to half-mast. Governor Combs, at Morehead at the time for a Founder's Day address at Morehead State College, discarded his prepared speech to speak movingly of the martyred President and the gravity of the hour for the Nation.

At Pikeville, where many Floyd Countians were attending a hearing conducted by the U.S. Corps of Engineers on flood control on the Big Sandy and its tributaries, word of the tragedy abrubtly ended the meeting before testimony was introduced.

On Sunday churches over the land joined in expressions of grief and in prayers for the Kennedy family, the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and for the Nation. In Prestonsburg a lone blast of the fire department siren was the signal at 11:15 a.m. to worshippers at the various churches to unite in 2 minutes of silent prayer.

Then, Sunday afternoon, came the second shockwave when television viewers saw murder committed before their very eyes as Lee Harvey Oswald, prime suspect in the President's assassination was gunned down in the Dallas police station by a nightclub operator.

Monday, the day of national mourning proclaimed by President Johnson, saw businesses closed here, streets as deserted as they will be, Christmas morning. Doors of local churches, however, remained open as an invitation to any who wished to enter for prayer or meditation.

So, in brief, have the days passed. And still the tragedy, the strange chain of violence which in one Texas city saw a President slain, a Governor wounded and, finally, a prisoner shot down, continues its hold on the minds of millions.

---

[From the Paintsville (Ky.) Herald, Nov. 27, 1963]

### A Nation Is Warned by the Unspoken Words of an Assassinated President

The triple tragedy in Dallas and the slaying of our President have shocked the world and brought grief and sorrow to the people of the United States. Death is natural even for one so young, but these three deeds of smoldering resentment and madness, are ominous and threatening, and strongly suggestive that all is not well with us. Our citizens turn guiltily to look within their own hearts for the causes.

Only last week one of the Nation's leading newspapers carried separate articles on the rapid increase of crime in the State of Texas and the lack of efficiency on the part of law enforcement officials in Dallas. One writer pointed to the loose Texas State law on acquiring firearms. But Texas with its high crime rate is not alone among the States. J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI has repeatedly warned of the Nation's increasing lawlessness and juvenile delinquency, attended by the unconcern, lack of cooperation with police officials and the general apathy of the people.

We believe the bullets in the gun of the accused Lee Oswald were molded by our society and that his sick mind and soul were creations of this society. The 24-year-old Oswald who enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps at the age of 17 appeared frank and open in his deep resentment and his contempt for the system that made him as he was.

This youthful, accused assassin of President Kennedy and alleged slayer of a Dallas law official was not unlike the Billie Sol Estes and hundreds of others in top circles of business and government from the grassroots to Washington who operate under the cloak of hypocrisy and deceit until the sands run out in their sordid hourglass.

The frank disdain, the youthfulness of Oswald, his apparent lack of remorse cause us with a sense of guilt to turn and look within ourselves for the answer to the Oswalds in our midst.

We must weed out in our small hamlets, our rural areas, and our crowded cities over this Nation, the seeds of violence, the greed and hatred of the innocent. Even in our small communities there are vile and despicable deeds by elected officials and civic leaders, carefully carried out under the protection of the law or the secretive darkness. And here in these small communities are the same hate and resentment that pulled the trigger of the assassin's gun in Dallas last Friday. The same hatred took the life of a policeman to leave a widow and three young children; it took the life of an accused assassin without benefit of trial. The same hatred is in our midst.

The late President Kennedy in his speech prepared for Dallas citizens, stopped by death before its delivery, concluded with spiritual truths handed down through the centuries. Taken from Psalms, these words carry a warning and a prophetic message to the American people: "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." The President was warning as did that inspired writer more than 2,000 years ago, that if we keep the faith, if we let the Lord keep our beloved country, our defenses will not be in vain.

President Kennedy is gone but this was his parting message. May it be inscribed in the hearts and souls of every citizen of this blessed land.

The crime of Lee Oswald is shared with every individual who makes up our society. If the death of President Kennedy serves to awaken us to a nationwide soul searching, and a revival of righteousness, then he will not have died in vain.

[From the Journal Enquirer, Grayson, Ky., Nov. 28, 1963]

### History Pauses To Mourn—Carter Countians Pause With Nation To Pay Tribute to Slain President Kennedy

When a television program is interrupted, and the word "bulletin" is flashed on the screen, a cerain amount of anxiety exists.

Probably the anxiety will never be as high again, however, as it was last Friday afternoon when newsmen confirmed that President John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, had been assassinated as he was riding in a motorcade through the outskirts of Dallas, Tex.

As was the case throughout the nation—and, in deed, the world—the news was received with shock and disbelief.

In Grayson the word came about 1:45 p.m., shortly following the lunch hour. Little was accomplished for the remainder of that day.

At Prichard High School in Grayson—and other schools in the county—the news stunned students and faculty alike. Some students broke into tears. Radios were pressed into service to obtain details.

Carter County schools were dismissed on Monday, day of the former President's funeral.

Along the business districts of Grayson and Olive Hill, people gathered to tell those who had not heard. "Isn't it terrible" was the expression used over and over. After first reports were ended and it was announced the President was dead, a wave of stunning shock prevailed. Throughout Carter County communities, area residents gathered in stores and various neighborhood places to join their thoughts concerning the President's assassination.

Regular church services throughout Carter County on Sunday included prayers for the Kennedy family and for the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Special memorial services were held Monday in Carter County.

In Grayson, the Bagby Memorial Methodist Church was jammed with businessmen and residents who gathered to pay tribute in a special community service.

Most business houses were closed from 9:30 until noon.

Participating in Monday's service were host minister K. R. Dillon; Jay D. Cooper, minister of the First Church of Christ; William Scott, minister of the Church of the Nazarene; Melvin Hester, minister of the Bayless Memorial Presbyterian Church; and J.C. Stephens, minister of the First Baptist Church.

Dillon, in bringing the memorial devotion, urged Americans to take another look at their lives. He asked that citizens draw strength from the tragedy by stamping out hatred in individual lives. He also called on the nation to pray for President Johnson as he assumes the responsibility of leading the free world.

---

[From the Bath County (Ky.) News Outlook, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A Shame To Share

Twenty years ago, the late Ernie Pyle so poignantly described his feelings upon seeing his American footsoldier buddies brought down out of the Italian hills, their lifeless bodies draped across the backs of burros.

Wrote the immortal war correspondent:

"It makes you feel ashamed to be alive."

That is the same feeling that struck us Friday upon hearing the news of the Nation's great tragedy, the coldblooded murder of our President, John F. Kennedy. It made us feel ashamed to be Americans.

In a crisis like this, we are not Republicans, Democrats, segregationists, conservatives, liberals—we are all Americans. We share equally in the grief and shame of this despicable act. Even though we live in a country where we have learned to expect the most unusual, nothing in our lifetime has touched us so deeply or shocked us so greatly.

Friday, November 22, 1963, will go down in history as the day of infamy in our generation, even overshadowing the nightmare havoc of Pearl Harbor 23 years ago. It is a day that marks a terrible blot on our country's rich and prideful history. It is a day we will have to live with, as badly as we would like to erase it from the calendar. It is a day to make all Americans realize their need for strong patriotism, a strong desire for unity and an even stronger faith in God.

The reaction of the people of Hometown, Owingsville, Ky., U.S.A., must have been almost universal. The flag at the post office was quietly lowered to halfstaff, business came to a near standstill, sober-faced people gathered in small clusters, listening to the latest news and talking in whispered tones. There were tears, heads shaken in bewilderment and disbelief. The shroud of sadness loomed like a blanket of fog over a country not easily moved by emotion.

That a twist of fate should permit the demented mind of one bad apple to snuff out the young life of a great American statesman in his prime is a great mystery to most of us. It takes faith in the divine providence to accept this as having some meaningful purpose known only to our Maker.

But by our apathy toward extremists, hatepeddlers and Communists we have contributed toward this end and must share the blame and shame of this day of infamy. Let us hope President Kennedy's death will not have been in vain. If it makes us more vigilant, more cognizant of the dangers that beset our national security and freedoms, more tolerant of each other in our political convictions, more affirmed in our Christian way of life and more dedicated to making this world a place of peace and understanding, then his passage will have a meaning.

We believe it has a meaning for all of to see and follow.

---

[From the Bath County (Ky.) News Outlook, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Letter of Sympathy to President's Widow

The sentiments of Owingsville were expressed by Owingsville Mayor Robert W. Gilmore in the following letter to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy:

November 25, 1963.

Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy,
*White House,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

We the citizens of Owingsville, Ky., join with the rest of the world in our expression of sympathy. Your personal loss in a husband and father, we know seems unbearable. The citizens of this Nation shall always remember him as a great leader.

Words such as these will come to you from kings and queens, leaders of great nations eloquently expressed by great statesmen. Perhaps this message will be from the smallest city of the group but even though small, there will be none more sincere and genuine than this message from the heart of our people. We think of ourselves as "The little town with a big heart." And at an hour such as this we extend it all to you.

Robert W. Gilmore,
*Mayor.*

---

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Daily Independent, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Deep Sorrow and a Sense of Guilt

The nation is joined as one today in sorrow. Prayers arise from the hearts of Americans of every race, creed and type of political belief. They implore merciful comfort for the wife and family of the murdered John F. Kennedy. They ask that strength and inspiration be given President Johnson as he assumes his new responsibilities. They seek the aid and blessing of Almighty God for our Nation, as a great leader is lost.

In all of these we join. Many times during the past 24 hours the words of Walt Whitman, wrung from him in anguish on the death of Lincoln, have been recited, beginning "O Captain, my Captain our fearful trip is done."

With all of this there arises in our hearts a vague sense of individual guilt. How could we, a free, self-governing people, have permitted conditions to exist which made possible such diabolicly-planning assassination of our President? Three times before presidents have been brutally murdered. On several other occasions attempts upon the life of a Chief Executive have narrowly failed.

In our anxiety to permit freedom of thought and opinion to every man, have we not permitted small but powerful groups to exist in our midst, which recognize no law nor orderly processes of change provided by our system? The relatively few thousands of these agents of destruction live among us and labor with the deadly intent of destroying the liberties of 190 million people.

We need more realistic recognition of this menace. What happened in Dallas on Friday could happen again. Not only our Chief Executive could be destroyed, but our vital defenses could be made useless with relative ease by these agents and saboteurs of our enemies. If we would protect our liberties we must tighten our security methods within our country. We have been warned of this by J. Edgar Hoover and others many times. If any good can arise from the tragic murder of our President, perhaps it will be a sadly needed strengthening of our internal security safeguards.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore [Mr. Harris]. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass].

Mr. **BASS**. Mr. Speaker, while campaigning for John F. Kennedy for President in 1960, I described him in this manner:

> A man with the intellectual level of Thomas Jefferson, the courage of Andrew Jackson, the dedication to purpose of Woodrow Wilson, the vision and leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, and the fortitude and decisiveness of Harry Truman.

Now I know I was right. He can now be described as a composite of greatness.

I liked him as a man. Loved him as an American. Enjoyed him as a friend. Admired as a leader. Supported him as a President.

An assassin's bullet has taken Jack Kennedy but his influence will live for generations.

I will miss him greatly.

May his family be consoled in the memory of his great works.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell].

Mr. **FASCELL**. Mr. Speaker, "The world is very different now." President John Fitzgerald Kennedy spoke thus in realistic and prophetic appraisal on January 20, 1961.

Our great American, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is now gone, and, Mr. Speaker, the entire world is indeed very different as a result of the events of Friday, November 22, 1963.

In that short space of time John Fitzgerald Kennedy set for himself and all

Americans great goals for a better America and a better world. He was a man of indomitable courage and keen and far-sighted historical vision. He set for himself, for all Americans, and for all peoples challenges sufficient to call forth the best in every man, woman, and child—a clean-cut and hard blast of the horn for unity, peace, and action.

Sparks of action—electricity of purpose—these are the benchmarks of a man who dedicated his life to work for his beloved country.

All this—

He said—

> will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

And, Mr. Speaker, begin he did. The leader chose the road, charted its course and asked his people to join him and join him they did, not only Americans, Mr. Speaker, but people in all parts of the world joined. They sparkled with new enthusiasm, they looked upward with new hope and spirit. For they saw in this young, fearless, idealistic yet realistic leader, the crusader, the New Frontier, the new hope for all mankind.

I am proud that history will record that this great American did so many great things, accomplished so much for so many people in so short a period of time.

But, Mr. Speaker, all this is cut short.

What years of dangerous wartime service could not do, an assassin's bullet did in a split second.

My wife, children, and I who knew him personally, grieve with millions or Americans and for some of these I am honored to speak in these hallowed halls today. But with a great outpouring the likes of which the world has never seen, Americans and others have spoken eloquently for themselves.

### His Chair Is Still

(By Donna Davis, Miami)

The rocking chair sits empty now,
No stalwart frame to hold;
No vigorous movement to allow
A point, a plan unfold.
A strong young warrior poised there
In earnest motion without cease,
Fighting for freedom everywhere
Dreaming of a world at peace;
The rocker there was not to rest
Nor rest on laurels won
But rather ready for the test—
Chart the course of state to run.
I do not think his chair is still
But speaks of courage so sublime
His acts live on and history will
Tell nobly of this man—this time.

### John F. Kennedy

(By Judy D. Cooper, Miami)

You were the greatest of them all Mr. Kennedy
You were the greatest of them all I know.
You helped us out so very much and there was such a short time to go
You helped to bring us from the bottom to the middle, and then almost to the top
You did or tried to do the things you said you would
And just by that I know you could
Because you tried the way you should.

### All the World Knows Why

(By John L. Perry, Miami)

She didn't cry
She didn't sigh
She only lost her smile
But all the world
Was praying
She'd regain it in a while
For she'd lost one
The world would mourn
For wanting all men free
I'm writing this for Jackie
So all the world knows why
When Jackie smiles
Her face just tells
Her heart another lie.

### He Followed to Infinity

(By Jean Quinn, Miami)

He stood so tall, with sadness all around,
The beat of the drums, the only sound,
This sailor with face so sad and strong,
Took his place where he belonged
His name to me, is unknown,
I only remember, the pride that was shown,
As he followed the caisson, his step never lagged
For he proudly carried his President's flag.

### Long May He Live

(By Madelynne Cooper, Miami)

Our leader has fallen, and long may he live,
He'd not question why, but for us to forgive,
This world will be a better place, for it has been honored by his touch,
Oh dear Mr. President, we all loved you so much!
God bless America, long may our flag wave,
For here in this country is a marked grave,
Of a man who asked little and gave so much,
The world will be better, having been graced by his touch.

### Love Or Hate

(By Albert L. Citero, Miami)

The falling tears of a mourning world,
Were caused by hate, its wrath unfurled,
First, the President, then the law,
Next the assassin, hate killed them all.
If love had only replaced the hate;
Oh God, please teach us before it's too late.

### A Prayer for a President

(By Mrs. George A. Pikari, Miami)

He was a man we all did love,
He sought his guidance from above,
In his views he shone a light.
Some say that he was wrong
But he did what he thought was right.

A great man, a family man,
And both in such a way,
That he will be remembered,
Forever and a day.

Bow your head and say your prayer,
For your President JFK,
For by his death his goal was reached,
He showed us all our need for Peace!

### Dolor

(By J. Carlton Barnette, Miami)

Daybreak again!
Another day to live through,
Passing the hours somehow,
Until the inscrutable shades of night
Bring blessed sleep.

Life holds no peace for me,
My eyes no gladness see,
Where once was happiness, my heart
Is saddened now and filled with nought
But deepest grief,
Our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy,
Is dead,
Struck down by a cowardly assassin's bullet.
May he rest in peace.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Our Sorrow Is the World's: John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Wherever the somber sound of voice or the grave face of type reached yesterday, people recoiled in horror and in shock.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead of an assassin's cowardly bullets. In the freest land in the world death had come by sneak attack to the people's Chief Magistrate.

No one can say at this writing what was the motive of the killer. It is hard not to take account, however, of the climate of hate in which men struggle to govern.

We differed with Mr. Kennedy on many occasions. Where these differences were noted, the President offered game and gay rebuttal.

A gentleman always, and ever a scholar, he lent dignity (spiced with a certain boyish humility) to the greatest office in the gift of the people. One might quarrel with his policies but never with his encyclopedic knowledge of government.

The Nation's sorrow is the world's, also.

Under this President the United States had been moving in the direction of peace with freedom.

Like his predecessors, he was conscious of America's role of leadership thrust upon it by the fortunes of war (which he shed blood to help win) and the circumstances of unrivaled prosperity.

What more can one say as a young man is struck down in his prime in an act of such suddenness that the country is left reeling?

May God be with the 35th President of the United States.

And may He be with his successor, upon whom the nearly intolerable burden falls, Lyndon B. Johnson.

[From the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., Nov. 24, 1963]

### When the Word Came

A President is shot and the world seems to slow down to await word of the human body's battle for survival.

The word comes. The President is dead.

The world seems to stop momentarily.

Even after the waiting and the announcement of the worst there still is a state of disbelief—or of not wanting to believe.

Then slowly but surely the realization sets in, damply in many instances.

Heads are bowed in prayer and flags are lowered in mourning.

The talk, as it has been from the first announcement, is subdued, but gradually the voices return to normal.

You think about it. Your heart goes out to the family. You wonder about the Government.

But there's work to do, and you know that the man in his midforties who almost made the supreme sacrifice for his country in World War II but survived that to become one of our most knowledgeable and energetic Commander in Chief would want, even in death, the business of the country and the millions of people who make it up to continue.

After the shock you realize there's the future to look to. The President had often reminded us of that.

So for a moment you look ahead. One of the first things you see is Thanksgiving Day.

And you wonder perhaps how his family will find much to be thankful for in this Thanksgiving Week.

But even they must find some thankfulness in the prayers and sympathies the people of the world over are offering. And they must be thankful that one of their own has been able to achieve so much and do so many things in such a few years.

And the country?

Whether you agreed with the President or not on many things there is the knowledge that he was a man who acted on facts as he knew and understood them, and he made every effort to get all the facts all the time.

Perhaps one of the things we can be most thankful for is the fact that he chose his biggest competitor for nomination to the office to be his Vice President. That person of course now is our President.

This Thanksgiving Week will be a week of mourning for John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

But it will also be a week of giving thanks for our system of government that insures an orderly continuation of the business of this Nation.

---

[From the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., Nov. 28, 1963]

### INDIGNATION WILL FADE, BUT WE CAN MAKE A VOW

What is it that causes a mind to slip over the brink to the point that the body which houses it will viciously attack and kill a little girl, or from a hiding place shoot to death a President of his country?

If we knew the answer to such questions perhaps tragic events of recent days could have been avoided.

But we don't know, and the shock and indignation of the two recent crimes that have touched us closer and deeper than usual gradually will fade for most of us as we go about the business that must go on if life is to be worthwhile.

But as the shock and indignation are dulled, it is appropriate that we vow to ourselves to practice more the spirit of brotherhood—to love when hate momentarily seems in order; to forgive when we are tempted to take vengeance; to give when we are tempted to take; to be courageous in moving ahead when a step backward seems easier.

---

[From the Jewish Floridian, Nov. 29, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TRAGIC PASSING

We mourn the tragic passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Nation has lost an outstanding leader: a young and vigorous man; an intellectual, who brought a breath of fresh air to the erstwhile distant formalities of the White House; an author, whose knowledge of history helped set the course for our future as a people; a President, whose years belied his capability, and whose easy manner disguised his courage.

Our 35th President of the United States is gone. The Nation laid him to rest in Arlington on Monday. It is difficult to believe that he has passed. And yet, the presence of President Lyndon Baines Johnson in the White House today tells us it is a fact—that the unbelievably tragic circumstances of last weekend were no fantastic piece of fiction, or even a page torn from the distant American history book of yesterday or tomorrow.

Saddened as we are by his death, we give thanks that the Nation is now in the hands of President Kennedy's capable successor. A man with a devoted record of service to his country, running over the course of many decades, Mr. Johnson comes to the President's office well steeped both in the demands and the intricacies of the position he has taken over.

The Nation, grieved, is now a nation solidly behind President Johnson, sorrowful in the memories of its youthful leader assassinated so brutally and so purposelessly, but assured that the United States of America can successfully withstand tragedies even as profound as this.

---

[From the Miami Times, Nov. 30, 1963]

### THE NATION MOURNS

The assassination of our dear beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy's on November 22 in Dallas, Tex., coming so unexpectedly, struck the Nation—nay the whole world, a stunning blow.

The dastardly deed was committed by Lee Harvey Oswald at 12:30 last Friday.

As ye editor entered the Times' office shortly after 1 o'clock he observed quietness. Everybody's eyes were centered on the television. What's wrong? he inquired. Came the sad reply: "President Kennedy has been shot. He is dead."

It was undoubtedly one of the sad moments of ye editor's life. He glanced at the figures on the press. Checked, they showed but 6,400 copies of the Times printed. A change of makeup was ordered for the first page, and not long after newsboys who were waiting were on the streets announcing the sad intelligence—President Kennedy is dead.

The man who committed this hideous crime was arrested, but he too fell a victim of an assassin's bullet. He was shot Sunday by Jack Ruby, a barroom owner, as Ruby got through a crowd of newsmen in the basement of the Dallas police station.

This was unfortunate. Far better would it have been if Ruby had allowed the culprit to be brought to justice.

The FBI and other authorities are investigating. It is hoped that they may be able to find sufficient evidence to unravel what was really behind the assassination of President Kennedy and perhaps, Oswald.

The body of the President was taken to Washington, where funeral services were held on Monday and the mortal remains placed in Arlington National Cemetery.

Special services were held in churches throughout the Nation. In Washington the services were at St. Matthew's Cathedral While the body was at the White House and Capitol thousands upon thousands went and paid their respects to the President.

Millions saw the funeral cortege on television and heard the high terms in which bishops and others spoke of President Kennedy.

During the funeral service ye editor was practically glued to his chair looking at television, as he is certain many others were.

Heads of Government from most countries attended this funeral and later were received and thanked by Mrs. Kennedy.

During the ordeal Mrs. Kennedy has proved herself to be an extraordinary person. Her calmness under such trial could be an example worthy of emulation.

May God continue to bless her and her children.

There has been so much said over television and radio, so much written and printed in our daily newspapers that this humble scribe finds little left to say. However he will say that little.

President Kennedy was a champion for the underprivileged. His fight for human and civil rights has been emblazoned upon the hearts of millions, never to be forgotten.

President Kennedy was a man among great men; a President among great Presidents; and a Christian among Christians.

May he rest in peace and light perpetual shine upon him.

---

[From the Voice, weekly publication of the Diocese of Miami covering the 16 counties of south Florida, Nov. 29, 1963]

### BISHOP CARROLL MOURNS KENNEDY

(The following statement was issued by Bishop Coleman F. Carroll from Vatican City, where he is attending the second session of the Second Ecumenical Council.)

VATICAN CITY.—I am deeply shocked by the news of the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy, as indeed are all Americans and citizens of other nations.

We grieve for our country which has lost a courageous, able and tireless leader, and for the world which has looked to him for leadership and courage in the never ending struggle for peace and freedom. Our hearts go out to his bereaved wife and to his family. We beg God to console and strengthen them in their severe trial.

We Catholics in south Florida who considered him a neighbor and fellow parishioner have added reason to feel keenly his untimely death.

I am sure it is the prayer of all Americans that God may grant John Fitzgerald Kennedy a full measure of peace and a fitting reward for a life characterized by total dedication to duty and fidelity to his God and country.

With this unexpected crisis in government the burden of leadership has been placed on the shoulders of Lyndon Johnson. He will stand in need in these critical days not only of the vast and varied experience of his public life but of divine guidance and assistance.

We pledge President Johnson the full support of our prayers that God may give him the wisdom and courage for the attainment of peace and the recognition of the rights of all men.

COLEMAN F. CARROLL,
*Bishop of Miami.*

---

[From the Miami News, Nov. 30, 1963]

### FLORIDA PAPERS SAID:

A cross-section of editorial comment on President Kennedy's assassination from daily newspapers in Florida:

Gainesville Sun: "Mr. Kennedy's greatness was hewn from the same rock as that of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. * * * When struck down in Dallas, Practical Politician Kennedy was rebuilding fences which Idealist Kennedy had knocked down."

Clearwater Sun: "It is incomprehensible that this could happen in America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the stronghold of democracy, a nation to which the entire free world has looked, and received leadership in time of deepest tragedy."

Ocala Star-Banner: "We have taken issue with President Kennedy on a great many of his programs. But in our country, political differences are not necessarily personal differences. * * * Even when we disagreed with him we couldn't help sympathizing with him because of his impossible position."

St. Augustine Record: "The shots that were fired at President Kennedy should be a warning that our country has enemies from within—Communists, pro-Castro supporters and the like who seek to destroy or enslave our Nation."

Lakeland Ledger: "The terrible thing that happened * * * surely has moved the American people to more serious reflection as to the basic importance of showing proper respect for the high office of the Presidency."

Orlando Sentinel: "The bullet which struck the young President was felt by each of us, and a part of us was lost when he died."

Palm Beach Post-Times: "A sense of outrage pervades this community where John F. Kennedy was a friend and neighbor in addition to being President of the United States. His murder seems a personal thing."

St. Petersburg Times: "* * * Since 2:39 p.m., Friday, November 22, our destiny as a nation, and much of the destiny of the free world has been in the hands of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Fortunately * * * the Presidency has fallen into capable hands."

Sarasota Herald-Tribune: "A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet in death he gave of himself to us."

Pompano Sun-Sentinel: "Perhaps the fact that so many of us have had the chance to see violence in action will serve to cool the blood and ease tensions which have strained our Nation. Let us pray that this may be."

Tampa Tribune: "How could it happen? It could happen because in a free society it is not possible to search out and quarantine every festering mind which may develop a murderous resentment against the President or the national policy he represents."

Daytona Beach Morning Journal: "The good people of the Nation must begin anew on our task—the task of driving out the hatred and fear and scorn that can become trigger happy."

Jacksonville Times-Union: "Bullets prove only who lives, not who is right, and this attack does great disservice to the cause of those honest men and women who have sought to change the policies of this Government by lawful means."

Fort Lauderdale News: "That President Kennedy had his quota of political opponents goes without saying. * * * But how anybody could let their personal or political beliefs drive them to the point of cold-bloodedly murdering the President of our Nation is neither understandable, rational, nor excusable in any sense of the words."

Key West Citizen: "The greatest memorial that the world could erect to our late President would be one of a lasting peace and understanding among the peoples and nations of the earth."

Hollywood Sun Tattler: "There is no easy way to forget. * * * The Nation can but seek to evidence the same type of courage which characterized the President it mourns."

---

[From the Hialeah-Miami Spring (Fla.) Home News, Nov. 27-29, 1963]

### Black Friday: A Day of National Shame

Not since the night that John Wilkes Booth pulled the trigger in Ford Theater, has the world's mightiest nation been as close to prostrate as it appeared to be last Friday afternoon.

His visit to the Miami area only 4 days earlier still fresh in the minds of Dade Countians, President John F. Kennedy lay dead in Texas.

Countless citizens of our generation remembered the stun and shock of December 7, 1941, but the numbness that set in following last Friday's announcement of President Kennedy's assassination sent all reeling.

Senseless, needless, an utter waste of valued human life were just a few of the first reactions that came to a dazed public.

Then, as the first shock wave wore off and a partial emotional balance was restored, memories poured forth.

The man chosen by the electorate to be the symbol of democracy and of a free society became victim of an assassin's bullet in his own country where, by all sane and logical reckoning, he should have enjoyed the fullest measure of safety.

That the assassin met a similar fate offers no consolation to a mourning Nation. An "eye for an eye" cannot return the President to his Nation, nor can it bring back a devoted father and loving husband.

But the black deed is done, and the world repaid it Monday with probably the highest tribute ever tendered any leader in any time.

Now, in deepest mourning and emotionally drained, we must set aside our humiliation, bury our remorse and resume President Kennedy's dedicated purpose of showing the way to the free world.

We must also rally around the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, to give him the support he so urgently needs in this hour of great crisis.

---

### The World Family Came To Mourn

From the far corners of the globe they came.

From 53 countries they traveled to the United States on their melancholy mission.

Kings, presidents, prime ministers, foreign ministers, defense ministers—they came here not for political advantage or financial gain—but to pay final homage to the American President.

They came to our Nation's Capital for the solemn services at which the assassinated President was to be laid to rest—the shocked-haired young American whose soaring ideals had won their admiration and whose firm courage had exacted their deep respect.

Such a coming together of the world's mighty leaders had never happened before. Such a concourse of the world's top governing men in one place—at one time—for one purpose—had never been witnessed in all history. And it might never be again.

The leaders, who came from all the continents, were joined by a bond, a bond of sorrow over the loss of the beloved U.S. President, the man who had dedicated himself to preserving human freedom and world peace.

The powerful leaders came from lands where various shades of political philosophy prevailed. Yet they walked in the funeral cortege from the White House to the cathedral, as simple human beings, in sympathy and grief for a suddenly bereaved family and a suddenly bereaved nation.

Like many another, we yearn to believe that from the grotesque and awful tragedy the Kennedy family and our Nation suffered last week—a tragedy of such magnitude that the mind is stunned and the emotions numbed—some droplets of good will come.

Like millions of others, we yearn to believe that the untimely death of this remarkable person and magnetic leader has not been in vain.

We long to believe this, to ease the pain and sense of futility that clutches us at the thought of the mindless atrocity that has been perpetrated.

We want to believe this because John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as we conceived him, would be happy to have it so.

Thus we harbor the hope that in the unplanned meeting of the world's heads of state at the bier of our assassinated President, the start of a rapport was lighted.

If each leader of state saw in the other, a simple human being groping toward a better life for his people, perhaps he can now regard him more kindly. If each leader of state saw in the other not the sinister, formless "enemy" but a vulnerable man as himself—perhaps his fears of him will diminish. If each leader of state saw the lines of worry and weariness lining the face of the other—perhaps his resentments will give way to sympathy. The common knowledge that the others are all human clay, all subject to the Great Leveler, can conceivably be the basis for the easing of hostilities and an eventual building of peace for mankind.

We would like to believe that such a spark was lighted at the somber and highly moving ceremonies at which John F. Kennedy was laid to rest.

We would like to see it as a translation into human terms of the eternal torch that burns at his Arlington grave.

---

[From broadcasts over WTVJ-TV, Miami, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Four Days of Tragedy: A Summation

With this program, we are nearing the end of nearly 4 continuous days of reporting by television what most certainly is one of the most dramatic and important events in history—the assassination of our 35th President.

Never before has such a tragic moment of existence been shared by so many. The momentous series of events etched forever in the minds of millions of Americans never to be forgotten, and the events should not be forgotten.

First, on Friday, we listened anxiously for reports from Parkland Memorial Hospital where the President struggled vainly for life. Then came news of his death and the dramatic flight to Washington on Air Force 1 with the newly sworn President, Lyndon Johnson, on board with Jacqueline Kennedy and the late President's body.

Television transmitted the arrival at Andrews Air Force Base. Then the dignitaries of the world poured in—General de Gaulle, Lord Home, and others. We saw their arrivals. Then yesterday, at the lunch hour, came the incident which more than any other pointed up the ability of television to transmit to millions the scene of action. In this case, the basement of the Dallas City jail and the unexpected killing of Lee Harvey Oswald. A burlesque club owner, of all people, putting a climax to the story—a story which all along had really been unbelievable.

At about the same hour, TV cameras in Washington showed us the cortege moving from the White House to the Capitol. We watched as Mrs. Kennedy stood in the White House portico holding the hands of Caroline and John, Jr. Then the casket was carried up the Capitol steps. In the Rotunda, another moment which brought tears to the millions watching—Mrs. Kennedy moved forward to kiss the flag of her beloved country—the Nation for which her husband gave his life, truly in the line of duty.

Through the day and night we saw thousands of citizens file past the bier—paying last respects. Those of us watching at home did the same.

Then came the final coverage still fresh in our minds—the funeral mass; young John, Jr., outside the church saluting his father's casket; the long trip to Arlington; the Lincoln Memorial, hovering in the background, giving a sense of history to the proceedings; the playing of the dirge; the flyover of Air Force jets; the final volley of shots; playing of taps, and the folding of the American flag. It was over.

At the State Department we saw the new President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, as he began his new duties by greeting the largest number of royalty, heads of state, and government leaders ever assembled in this country.

At the moment this Nation and its people continue their headlong rush into history.

I would just like to leave this thought: That because of television and what we have been able to see firsthand since Friday, all of us will be prepared to move ahead with a new sense of purpose. We have a better understanding of our role as individuals and as citizens of this great country.

---

### President Kennedy: His Accomplishments Live

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

And so, almost 100 years ago to the day, Abraham Lincoln, himself to be assassinated, turned from the tragedy of death to the future and the molding of a great nation.

It does seem appropriate to pause, however quickly, to reflect on what our young President began and what we must continue and complete.

As President Kennedy so poetically expressed his first day in office, that this is a new generation of Americans born in this century, so we must recall not only his classic words but his deeds.

His steadfast efforts toward world peace and human rights; a Peace Corps, that now sustains thousands of idealistic but realistic Americans in a hundred lands—taking with them the zeal and sincerity of purpose that accomplishes more than all the words in the language or all the promises in the mind.

The Alliance for Progress, a firm, steady hand of help extended to the nations of Latin America, to assist them in their efforts to become strong and independent partners in freedom.

> The first President to make a governmental study of juvenile delinquency to try to assess the reasons and causes for it.
>
> The first to address an administration's attention to the cause of women in America—their progress, their opportunity.
>
> The President who finally brought to fruition the dream of men since the atom was turned into a weapon—the nuclear test ban. The abrupt halting of a headlong weapons rush that seemed inevitably turned to war. But perhaps what John Kennedy brought to the highest office in the Nation was a new sense of youth and vitality. For the first time in most Americans' recollection, the young, prosperous, and most free nation in the world was in the hands of an equally young, dynamic, and thoughtful man.
>
> Not perfect, to be sure, our young President, but from his most eloquent moving inaugural address to his last in Dallas, he was always the figure of what made America great—the zest of life, the course of purpose and, maybe the most important, the use of new ideas.
>
> John Kennedy brought to the Government of America a quality not usual in its workings but sorely lacking. He turned the minds of men to more than just politics and vote getting.
>
> From the universities and corporations of America there was the move to put the best man in the right place in government, regardless of political payment or due.
>
> And before we close this partial list of his accomplishments, a word concerning our First Lady and mother—his wife, Jacqueline.
>
> Surely one of his greatest accomplishment shall be numbered that she was his wife. For millions of Americans who themselves have fallen into grief, her courage and pure spirit will never be forgotten. Truly tonight, and always in memory, she leads her Nation in spirit and soul.
>
> But what to do of this fallen hero—our dead President?
>
> To mourn him too much is to detract from the work he began. He surely would be the first to call short this sorrow. We then must anticipate his spirit of purpose and devote ourselves to keeping alive that new sense of being which he lived and died.

Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy dedicated his life to us. He did all for his country, but that is not all. Mrs. Kennedy and her children dedicated their life to him and through him to all Americans. We must forever be inspired by her courage, determination, and dedication to the ideals and responsibilities of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the man, the husband, the father, and the President of the United States. No woman more completely joined with her husband and stands now at his side in history.

Mr. Speaker, it is for us not to forget. The eyes of courage are upon us. All mankind and history wait and listen.

Mr. Speaker, he began—it is for us to carry on. There is work yet to be done.

Fortunately, immortal words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will forever stir Americans to action. Who will ever forget?

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

Will we pick up and carry forward the baton of these moving words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Friday, January 20, 1961:

> We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first Revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.
>
> Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.
>
> This much we pledge—and more.

With God's help let us resolve here today that we will.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, greater love hath no man than this, that he is willing to lay down his life for his friends.

With these words in mind, I rise today with a deep and sorrowful heart to join my colleagues in tribute to the greatest leader I have ever known, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Like a giant oak tree that has stood as a landmark giving refuge from the heat of the day and providing a special character of a total environment, a great man served his nation. Just as the complete worth of a magnificent tree is seldom fully appreciated until the ravages of time take their toll so it is with this great man, John F. Kennedy.

Now that my dear friend and leader is dead, his role in leading this Nation and truly improving all of our lives is more crystal clear today than ever before. His was a life filled with deep devotion to mankind, blessed with imagination and depth of insight which was complete with a courage that never faltered.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a true leader of a great people. He believed a responsibility was a sacred privilege and that life had true purpose and personal significance only when devoted to the welfare of all men.

Mr. Speaker, for him there was no room for the defeatist, no room for the weary, the despondent, the retreater or the sinner. John Fitzgerald Kennedy faced life possessing firmness without harshness.

He faced life with vision, without daydreaming; confidence without brashness; courage stripped of vanity.

Now that the great oak tree has fallen, let us recognize as never before the debt every person in this Nation owes to this great man.

We of southern Illinois can look throughout the hillsides and see progress in agriculture; we can see the mark of this man for all time to come. Possibly we can honor him best by resolving to fight hard to be worthy of the mantle of leadership he has now passed on to us.

I would like to dedicate the following short poem to his memory:

> John Fitzgerald Kennedy,
> His life is a beautiful memory,
> His absence a silent grief,
> He sleeps in God's beautiful garden,
> In sunshine of perfect peace.

To his courageous wife and loving family I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy and that of my constituents and my family and to thank them for sending this great man our way.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it was a glorious spring in 1960 in West Virginia. The laurel-decked hillsides sparkled. When the early morning fog had lifted from the mountaintop airports, planeloads of news commentators, political experts, and curious visitors debarked and headed for the hills and hollows. This was political primary time in West Virginia, the primary which started John F. Kennedy on the road to the White House.

West Virginia, the 35th State in the Union, made John F. Kennedy the 35th President of the United States. It was on this battleground on the 10th day of May 1960, that the future President scored a smashing victory which buried the so-called religious issue.

### MOUNTAINEERS ARE ALWAYS FREE

The strong affection between West Virginia and President Kennedy was not due to the primary alone, even though the intensive weeks in April and May 1960, enabled both the candidate and the people to get to know each other intimately. In West Virginia, President Kennedy recognized a State which received its birth of freedom in the turbulence of the Civil War, and where the spirit of freedom and self-help burned bright in the breasts of its mountaineers. He saw that God blessed our State with rugged mountains, and he put black diamonds in them all. In West Virginia, President Kennedy saw an unfulfilled potential. He worked tirelessly as President of the United States to help all of God's children realize their potential, in West Virginia, in West Berlin, and all over the world.

Whether he was dealing with one person, with a group, with a community, with a State, or with any nation or the peoples of the world, the mainspring of President Kennedy's philosophy was how to help them realize their most noble capabilities.

### A BUILDER FOR HUMANITY

Here was a man who knew more about our Nation's past than any occupant of the White House, yet keyed his every action to what it would mean for the future. That is why the closest thing to his heart was the youth of the world. He was a builder for humanity's future. His interest in and concern for young people extended across the board. Since he was perhaps the most completely educated man of this generation, he had a deep and personal understanding of the importance of education. He looked on education as an essential of national strength in the future, and as a source of personal fulfillment for the human beings of the Nation. He worked to perfect vocational education, job training, youth employment, and measures to reduce juvenile delinquency. He worked for young people to live in a better world in the future.

Cynics have termed people like this "do-gooders." The implication is usually left that such dreamers will sap the initiative of free men by spoon-feeding them. One only had to watch the interaction of young people with President Kennedy to realize that this could never happen with him. He invited, challenged, and demanded of the young people of America and the world more than any other leader of modern times, and they responded and will continue to respond.

Have you seen the hordes of young people who stood in line, hour upon hour in the cold, to pay their last respects to the President? Have you seen the radiant enthusiasm on the faces of the young people with whom he has talked?

I remember Ravenswood, W. Va., on a Sunday in the spring of 1960, when a woman's club reception was augmented by an eager group of high school students. I remember every Monday morning during the summers of 1961, 1962, and 1963, standing with a group of West Virginia high school students at Andrews Air Force Base, and to watch their inspired looks as the President waved at them or sometimes would stop to speak with them, as he returned from a weekend at his beloved Hyannis Port.

### THE INSPIRATION TO YOUNG PEOPLE

President Kennedy awakened in young Americans an interest in and awareness of their Government, the necessity to participate, and the nature and value of our Nation's ideals. Like Theodore Roosevelt, he quickened the appreciation and understanding which young people hold for the Nation's noblest virtues. His presence kindled a flame of eagerness to learn, as he did, and for young people to dedicate their lives to purposeful activity, as he did.

It was with a group of my students from Princeton University that I first met this man some 15 years ago. He was serving his first term in the House of Representatives, after a surprising primary victory over eight opponents in the Boston area. His office was delightfully disorganized. By studiously refusing to enter except through the door to his private office, his staff could rarely discover whether or not he was in. Just as his secretary was announcing that Congressman Kennedy was not in, he appeared at his office door bearing a tray from which he was just finishing lunch. "I can save lots of time this way," he announced. On numerous occasions, I have watched him since, "saving time," almost as though he realized he must work fast to fulfill God's purpose on earth.

The interview almost fell flat on its face, because this man had a wonderfully mischievous sense of humor. Our class was studying "Legislatures," and before we could get the first question out, the Congressman asked: "What kind of a group is this?" I answered rather quickly: "This is a group in 'Legislatures'." He shook his head sadly and responded: "Now, that is very unusual. In all my years in school, I never heard of a group in legislatures." He engaged in very light banter and needling for a few minutes, apparently to establish whether the professor was a stuffed shirt, and then suddenly turned the conversation in a way which made the students feel they had the most important teacher in the business. Those who were fortunate enough to know this man best can appreciate both of these wonderfully human qualities—his quick and delicious sense of humor, always tempered by a sensitive consideration for the feelings of others.

As I looked at this very thin, sophomoric-looking legislator, his face slightly yellowed by the atabrine he took for wartime malaria, I wondered just what motivated him to get into politics when his father's millions could have launched him on any on a dozen other careers. I paused at the doorway to ask, as my students were leaving. He glanced out of the window in a preoccupied, imperturbable way, and answered casually: "Oh, I guess it's a sort of an obligation."

With John F. Kennedy, life was a dedicated obligation, and he always talked about it with deliberate understatement.

### THE MEANING OF SACRIFICE

One of our West Virginia tributes to President Kennedy was penned by the editor of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, who has summed up the late President's life in terms of the single word "sacrifice." Under unanimous consent, I include the article by Harry Hoffman, editor of the Charleston Gazette, at this point in the RECORD.

### LESSONS FOR PUBLIC IN KENNEDY'S LIFE

(By Harry Hoffmann)

John F. Kennedy in his brief, brilliant, and tragic career in public life, constructed a legacy that provides for this generation and for posterity lessons to be learned by people in all walks of life and in all nations.

In the millions of words that have been written around the world since that black Friday in Dallas, Tex., this seemingly has been all but overlooked except in what the individual may deduce on his own in reading of the purpose and achievements of the young man from Boston.

Did not the course which John Kennedy set for himself teach us all something about our responsibilities to our Government, to our fellow citizens, to the world?

Here was a man born to wealth. He could have led a carefree life, irresponsive to the needs of other people and safe from the calumny and abuse that, in the American tradition, seems to be a burden of those who offer themselves in public service.

He could have gravitated from seashore to mountain resort, from one continent to the next, from one social funfest to the other—all without worrying about where the next dollar was coming from to buy whatever he may have desired.

He could, in what too often has become the tradition of those born to wealth accumulated by a father or a grandfather, have led a wasteful life of fun and frivolity.

Instead, he chose to make something of his life—not for himself but for others. So it was that, when an old back injury made him ineligible for enlistment in the armed services in World War II, he committed himself to demanding exercises to strengthen his back so that he would be acceptable.

And, after the experience that brought him so close to death in the South Pacific, he resisted what might be the normal temptation to adopt the easy life provided by inherited wealth and chose to offer himself in the public service—first in the House of Representatives, then in the Senate, and finally in the excruciating burdens of the Presidency.

He well knew the price of his decision for, in the preface of his book, "Profiles in Courage," he included this quotation from Edmund Burke:

"He well knows what snares are spread about his path, from personal animosity * * * and possibly from popular delusion * * *. He is traduced and abused for his supposed motives. He will remember that obloquy is a necessary ingredient in the composition of true glory * * * that calumny and abuse are essential parts of triumph."

John Kennedy, putting aside the safe and happy life that wealth could provide, was willing to risk the hazards of public life and high office. In so doing, he and his family experienced the slander and the abuse he had anticipated—and in the final analysis, by choosing a purposeful life instead of a wasteful one, he sacrificed his life to the cause.

This was the key to his life and to his success—sacrifice. He not only accepted it; he welcomed it, even when the position to which he was born gave him every reason to avoid it.

For this, much of the credit must go to his parents and to the upbringing they provided. They had the means of avoiding sacrifice and giving their children whatever they wanted.

Instead, they taught them that there was a purpose in life, and they had to compete with each other and with the world, that they had to fight for a position of their own and for what was right, that they had to know living was something more than a selfish pleasure.

In this sense, Joseph and Rose Kennedy, the parents of the martyred President, are the real heroes in the saga and the tragedy of John Kennedy—and thus a lesson is provided for parents everywhere: Don't safeguard your children from sacrifice, but attune them for sacrifice.

John Kennedy, the man and the President, had other qualities to provide lessons for this generation and those of the future. He had physical courage, as demonstrated by his wartime service * * * and moral courage, as exemplified by his decision in the Cuban crisis and his stand on civil rights.

In the first instance he was willing to avoid an excuse, and instead went out of his way to jeopardize his life to serve his country; in the second, after the success of his decision on Cuba, he was so determined not to damage the future world prospect by any humiliation of Khrushchev that he completely failed to bring home to the American people the magnitude of the victory which he had won. He was also ready to give up votes to further the cause of racial equality.

What is the first lesson to be learned by the people of West Virginia—the people of the State he made such an effort to help—from the life John Kennedy chose for himself?

The answer might be in the single word, "sacrifice," or in a willingness to avoid an easier life and stand for public service. But the question may well be answered through another question:

How long has it been since you have taken the trouble even to vote in an election? Or, better still, when have you made the effort to learn the respective qualifications of the candidates before voting?

For those who have wondered why this man of moral strength and judgment and courage should be taken from us at a time when his qualities could best serve the world, the answer may be in the lessons he leaves for us by his decisions and service in life.

A quotation from his "Profiles in Courage" of 1955 seems proper to point up the lessons of his life and his chosen course of living it:

"The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less than a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality."

This is the true purpose of politics. Can there be any better lesson than that to gain from the life of John F. Kennedy? And what will be our fate if we fail to take heed?

Mr. Speaker, I also include a column by Bill Wild in the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch for December 2, 1963, in the Record:

### Reflections on a Moment in History

(By Bill Wild)

A week ago John Fitzgerald Kennedy, an exciting, challenging President, went to his grave, a martyred hero's plot, in Arlington National Cemetery. The deed which put him there and the national reaction stripped the English vocabulary bare of words and terms which would be properly expressive. Larger than life as President, his shadow looms larger still. Historians are already looking forward to the coming battle between "facts" and the inevitable "myths."

Huntington is among the relatively few (many, but still relatively few) places in the Nation which got a closeup of J.F.K. in the heat of close-up battle action before he moved behind the barriers which inevitably come to surround persons of enormous prominence. We would like to recall a moment or two of that time almost 3 years and 7 months ago at the start of the West Virginia primary battle which was to "make" Kennedy.

Huntington was a Nixon town. It had earlier eagerly received the GOP hopeful. Now moving in this April 1960, was the still-new Kennedy State organization, more effective than it knew, full of self-doubts, attractive to amateurs and idealists, despised by many "regulars." Now the candidate comes into view in this account:

"A trifle ill at ease at the gates of the H. K. Porter Co. steel plant as he greeted workers, Senator Kennedy leaped to the top of his car just a block away to bring cheers and laughter to a throng of Marshall students."

A crew of still-doubtful out-of-town newsmen accompanied him, gathered "background" from local yokels and found confirmation for their dispatches to the Nation that the campaign in West Virginia was going to be a close thing for this youthful, and Catholic, upstart.

A press conference at the Hotel Prichard preceded a reception for the candidate. Whatever might have been newsworthy comment was lost in the din. Out-of-town reporters asked about West Virginia. West Virginia reporters asked about Quemoy and Matsu. One hard-of-hearing reporter took copious notes on things no one else could hear. A worried young county organization functionary named David Fox, Jr., asked that the conference conclude so the reception could go on, thereby grievously insulting a New York Times man who considered it his privilege, as senior among those present, to declare the little gathering at an end. Subsequent events developed this impression printed a few days later:

"Senator Kennedy brings to campaigning a different kind of tirelessness * * * than does Minnesota's Senator Humphrey * * * Senator Humphrey, an energetic political hummingbird always nervously on the move, is up against a different kind of bird. Kennedy is a robin, head cocked to one side, eyes carefully appraising the ground ahead, then, jump-jump-jump moving in quickly to strike hard."

During the reception a lifelong Republican was instrumental in seeing to it that the late Col. George S. Wallace, watching from the sidelines with his chin resting on the great cane he carried, was properly and formally introduced to the young candidate.

A brief speech established the picture which was to become familiar later from the television debates.

"The man should be watched in action as he ponders questions shot at him, lets his head drop * * * as his eyes seem to be trying to pick the words out of the air, and then, generally looking his questioner full-on, answers rapidly and almost never with hesitation. His hands * * * are used sparingly to emphasize only the most important points or strongest of feelings. Generally, the right hand does the gesturing and either impales the air or chops it to bits. The left hides a good deal in a great flannel pocket, emerging * * * only in moments of gravest crisis, usually something Republican."

Even then there were indications that this man could put together a powerful party organization beyond the scope of a more articulate liberal such as Senator Humphrey. There was this evaluation:

"Kennedy has the more formidable philosophy in that it is more realistic; it is flexible enough to fit well into several regional Democratic patterns. It carries the assurance that compromise, while perhaps distasteful, is still not impossible."

A powerful image of idealism was emerging even then. The candidate was described as "someone who could be voted least likely ever to be found in a smoke-filled room, who makes the words 'let the people pick the candidates' sound like a crusade."

The reception was over and one of those curious opportunities for a reporter arose which occurs maybe once a decade. Everyone streamed from the Prichard ballroom doors except the young candidate, a reporter, and two eager Democratic admirers, Mr. and Mrs. Robert K. Emerson. There was perhaps 5 minutes of three-cornered conversation during which the reporter fervently hoped that, against all odds, he could corner the candidate alone. The Emersons, after all, two votes, won out. The interlude was brief for, in a short time, the organization streamed back again seeking its hero and the future President was swept away, to history.

Mr. Speaker, I include a column written by H. R. Pinckard in the November 24, 1963, issue of the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Advertiser in the Record.

(By H. R. Pinckard)

I will always remember John Kennedy as I saw him last April at a White House reception for the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

It wasn't a formal reception. Mrs. Kennedy was not in Washington and the President had not been scheduled for a "set" appearance. The guests trooped through the White House on a tour most of us had made several times on previous trips to Washington—the women pausing to examine paintings, furniture and china, as women will, and their escorts nervously trying to urge them on, as men will.

Most of the throng eventually congregated in a large and almost barren room at the rear of the White House. This room was on the first floor and just outside the windows could be seen tools and wheelbarrows that gardeners had abandoned at the 5 o'clock quitting time.

On a long table at one end of the room was the usual assortment of hors d'oeuvres—cheese and crackers, shrimp on toothpicks, olives and pickles. There were two kinds of punch, white and purple. The waiters pointed to them, saying "This one is, this one isn't."

The chattering in the big, barren room finally reached the point where it exceeded the sound barrier and I decided I had had enough of it. My luck was good, for as I approached the big entrance hall near the main door of the White House, I saw Mr. Kennedy just entering.

The Marine Corps orchestra was playing in the main hall and the President paused to listen and to smile cordially at some young girls who were gathered around the musicians.

In that incredibly quick way that throngs collect around a celebrity, the President was almost instantly surrounded, but I managed to work my way to his side.

"I'm from West Virginia," I said. "I remember shaking your hand as you stood on the corner of Tenth Street and Fourth Avenue in Huntington. You were with Brother Bob and you were running hard to win the West Virginia primary."

Mr. Kennedy smiled and shook hands warmly. "I'll always remember West Virginia with the kindest recollections," he said. "That was where I started * * *. How are things out there?"

Well, what do you tell a President at a time like that? I said things were fine with us in Huntington, though perhaps not so good in the coal fields and in some other areas of distress.

In a moment he was literally swept away as the guests from other parts of the White House discovered their host and descended upon him.

I watched him as this flood of humanity rolled in from all sides, breaking only slightly to avoid doing the President physical damage.

He seemed so young, so boyish, so modestly surprised at this acclaim—which must, of course, have been an almost daily occurrence. Yet he had a kind of inner serenity and outward poise that couldn't be shaken. He was always the master of the situation, never its victim. He invariably—perhaps instinctively—said the right thing, made the right gesture, seemed always to be glad to shake a hand, return a smile, answer a question, respond to a conversational sally.

I have seen many people struggle with admiring crowds—Presidents, generals, movie stars, champions of this and that. But none had this man's aplomb, his keen attentiveness to the individuals that make up a clamorous crowd, his way of showing that this was a sustaining and appreciated part of his life and his mammoth job—not a boring interlude to be endured and made the best of.

Many thought, some said, that it was hard to believe that this handsome young man had taken the measure of Nikita Khrushchev in the Cuban crisis—just 6 months before.

It was a natural observation. But the longer you watched those blue eyes and that firm jaw (now busy in amiable chatter) the more you realized that even in friendliness they did not yield all of the inner man. Those eyes could turn cold and that chin could be stubborn and resolute.

Perhaps this was the afterthought. But I am sure that many in that gathering gained the same impression. And even as I did, they must have had that sick-stomach feeling when they learned, on Friday, that he was dead.

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser for November 23, 1963, in the Record.

### Nation Mourns President's Death

The news of the shooting of President Kennedy in Dallas, Tex., struck every community of the Nation with stunning force yesterday and echoed throughout the world with a shocking sense of personal grief and anxiety over his condition.

The scenes of people crowding about wire service machines in the newsroom of the Huntington Publishing Co. and about radios and television sets in homes and stores here were reenacted in thousands of towns and cities.

There was deep shock beneath the tension of veteran newsmen accustomed to handling stories of tragedy and disaster that tear the heart. Dispatches from Dallas said sobs were heard in the corps of correspondents assigned to the presidential party.

During the long moments of suspense while crowds waited for news from the hospital, there were words of hope and then cause for deepening anxiety as two priests arrived, presumably to administer last rites of the Catholic church.

At last the word came that the President was dead.

In fleeting thoughts during their tension people had already been considering the possible consequences upon the lives not only of officials but of millions of people in this country and around the earth.

In this hour of shock and grief even those with the most complete information will be unable to say what course events will take in the delicate balance of international affairs.

No doubt President Johnson will continue the general line of domestic and foreign policy laid down during the years of President Kennedy.

But for the present, thoughts will dwell upon the personal aspect of the tragedy of the attractive and highly popular young President's being shot down beside his wife in a moment of triumph and acclaim.

The "Oh, no!" that she cried in anguish and the picture of her cradling him in her arms will remain for life with all those who read the accounts.

People of West Virginia felt a particularly heavy sense of loss because they had seen so much of the young candidate during his primary and presidential campaigns in 1960.

He appeared at Huntington several times, talked with many people personally and addressed gatherings attended by those of both parties.

One reason he won the primary campaign was that he was able to communicate to the people his sincere sympathy for those suffering through the years of chronic heavy unemployment.

His impressive victory in the primary effectively cleared the way for his nomination, and he never lost an opportunity to express his gratitude to the people for their support.

Even before his inauguration he began to fufill the promise he had made of economic assistance by appointing a task force headed by Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, with Senators Robert C. Byrd and Jennings Randolph, of this State, as consultants to formulate a program of aid.

The group presented its recommendations on January 1, and as one result of the study, the bill for creating the Area Redevlopment Administration was the first offered when the Senate convened.

Under this agency and other programs initiated during the Kennedy administration millions of dollars have come to the State not just in emergency relief but for permanent improvements establishing a sounder base for the economy.

The humane action to aid the people of West Virginia was typical of the various phases of domestic policy designed to stimulate economic growth and create new jobs.

Among the most important measures now pending before Congress are those for reducing taxes, extending civil rights to all classes, providing medical care of the aged, and granting much-needed aid to public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Kennedy's eloquent and forceful appeals for such measures will assure him a notable place in American history not only as a humanitarian but as a man of clear vision who recognized the vital needs of people in an increasingly complex social and economic order.

In the field of international relations, also, the young President charted a course that will give him towering stature among those who throughout history have stood resolutely for freedom against the encroachments of tyranny.

His ultimatum forcing Premier Khrushchev to remove his ballistic missiles from Cuba will be remembered as an achievement cracking the monolithic unity of the Soviet Union and widening the ideological breach in the Communist empire.

The tense days during the eye-to-eye confrontation while the fate of the human race trembled in the balance will live among the most critical in modern times.

The calm courage of the young President, along with the solid support of the people of the United States and the free world, helped open the way for the later nuclear test ban treaty and for perhaps further accommodations between East and West.

On the basis of these achievements, President Kennedy's place in history will be that of a strong man of far vision whose assassination at the early age of 46 was a heavy loss to the people of the world as well as those of the United States.

The shocking tragedy underscores the view expressed on this page today by Walter Lippmann that representative democracy is failing to solve the complex problems of nations in this perplexing age.

There has been entirely too much fanaticism in the political arena. Extremists of both right and left have gained a hearing far beyond the justification of their mental processes.

No doubt President Kennedy is a victim of the crackbrained hatred generated in the boiling cauldron of radicalism or mental confusion, just as the assassinated Presidents before him have been.

There is no way to eliminate such dangerous people, but those of sounder minds and more temperate judgment can avoid inciting them to violence by keeping their own good sense in control of their emotions.

There is particular need in this hour of national sorrow and world crisis for people to lay aside the animosities that have divided the Nation as well as both parties and to concentrate on the public welfare.

Differences on means of meeting problems will always exist but there should be no thought of reaching a solution through violence. This should be constantly on the minds of political candidates and orators during the heat of the national campaign just getting underway.

Meanwhile the Nation is fortunate that President Johnson has had wide experience in the problems of government during his years as majority leader of the Senate and as Vice President.

He will be able to take over with a sure hand and continue the business with only the interruption that the national tragedy imposes.

No doubt he will benefit from the popular unity that a crisis always brings to an intelligent free people and perhaps will be able to bridge the coming days of transition more easily because all good citizens will move closer together from the sobering shock that violence has caused them.

### THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the fact that President Kennedy always turned his eyes toward the future. Nothing better illustrates this than his great vision and imaginative grasp of this Nation's space program. He was determined that America to remain preeminent among nations must master space and sail on this new ocean. He refused to be deterred by his shortsighted critics who failed to recognize the bold progress which the challenge of outer space could provide. History will record the courage and the foresight which President Kennedy showed in mobilizing the Nation's resources to make America first in space.

It would take pages to set forth the many different interests and activities of President Kennedy, and the fields in which he lent leadership. His interests and knowledge was as wide as Jefferson's. He brought a realization to cur minds that we as individuals should work together regardless of race, color, or religious faith. To the many people who criticized him for "going too far" in the field of human rights, he calmly replied that his stand would probably lose votes, but he clearly indicated that this was a matter of moral principle.

### A COMPASSIONATE HEART

This great man with a compassionate heart worked tirelessly to ease the burdens of the aged through a program of medical care, and to launch a new program to combat mental retardation. It was in West Virginia that stark poverty moved him very deply. "Imagine," he said to one of his assistants one night, "just imagine kids who never drank milk." Two weeks to the day before his tragic death, he made some informal remarks before the Protestant Council of the city of New York, as the council conferred on President Kennedy its first annual "Family of Man" citation for his support of human rights. President Kennedy chose as his text this theme: "Our Obligation to the Family of Man." He referred to a newspaper article which he had read on poverty in the Appalachians, and mentioned "schools which were without windows, sometimes with occasional teachers, counties without resources to distribute the surplus food we make available."

It was this compassionate heart of the great President which was illustrated in his very first official act after taking the oath of office: The Presidential order that additional emergency food relief be sent to West Virginia and other areas of need. In quick succession, a whole series of additional measures were taken to help West Virginia and other areas with high rates of unemployment. He launched the area redevelopment program. Under this program, Huntington, W. Va., my hometown, became the first place for the administration to undertake a retraining program for the unemployed. West Virginia now has about 40 such retraining projects underway or completed. New employment was created through industrial and commercial loans, and public facilities loans. When ARA took hold perhaps too slowly, President Kennedy a little over a year ago launched the highly successful accelerated public works program, which has enabled communities across the Nation to build new streets, water and sewer systems, public libraries and other buildings, hospitals and health facilities. To West Virginia, this program has provided a tremendous shot in the arm, as about $40 million has been awarded in matching funds for some 275 projects which have provided work for the unemployed and have made these communities better places to live, as well as more attractive for new industry.

During the 1960 campaign, John F. Kennedy many times referred to the fact that the State of West Virginia had contributed more volunteers in proportion to population during the Korean war than any other State, and that West Virginia also suffered more casualties than any other State in the Union in proportion to its population. Senator Kennedy then referred to the fact that per capita West Virginia stood near the bottom of the list in the per capita amount of prime military contracts awarded.

I recall one occasion when Senator Kennedy was due to address a breakfast in Huntington, attended by his brother Robert. Although Robert arrived on time, Senator Kennedy's plane was late. In the period of time while the audience was waiting, one of his Huntington campaign supporters picked up an issue of U.S. News & World Report and started to read off the small amounts of defense contracts awarded to West Virginia in comparison with other States. When he came to the State of Massachusetts, this Huntington supporter read off a rather substantial figure, and paused with slight embarrassment, only to have Robert Kennedy interrupt with this comment:

> That proves that Massachusetts has had excellent representation in the Senate.

After John F. Kennedy was elected President, the entire picture was changed. West Virginia now stands 26th in the Nation instead of close to the bottom in per capita prime military contracts. And great plants like the Food Machinery Corp. in South Charleston, manufacturing armored personnel carriers and other vehicles for the Army, are providing employment for thousands of West Virginians.

### THE FIRST LADY OF THE WORLD

Mr. Speaker, many volumes will be written about the wonderful woman who served as First Lady of the Land, and by her qualities Jacqueline Kennedy has earned the title of "First Lady of the World." I recall the first time that I met Mrs. Kennedy at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1956, at the time when her husband, as a U.S. Senator, came within an eyelash of being nominated as the candidate for Vice President of the United States. At the time, what deeply impressed me was the detached serenity and deep principle of this woman of talent and intelligence, whose conversation was so refreshingly different in an atmosphere of highly competitive presidential politics. Her comments were never cynical, but she seemed to be able to put everything into grand perspective, and to glorify what to surface observers looked like a mad scramble for delegates. Then I remember January 2, 1960. The cameras and the floodlights were set up in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. A still-shy and slightly diffident looking young U.S. Senator walked into the room, and his hands shook as he read a prepared statement to announce what was no secret: That John F. Kennedy was throwing his hat into the presidential ring. I looked around the room to see who had come to witness the launching of Senator Kennedy's campaign for the presidential nomination. Only one other Member of the House of the Representatives was there, Representative Edward Boland, of Massachusetts, who asked me: "Does this mean that you are publicly supporting Senator Kennedy?" At that stage I was just an observer and a fence-sitter, and I told Eddie: "No, I am just here to watch a great campaigner in action, but I can tell you this: he has lots of friends and supporters in West Virginia." Then I glanced around and saw a beautiful lady dressed in a red coat, calmly sitting by herself in the front row. Nobody was with Jacqueline Kennedy, nobody from the press came up to interview her, few people seemed to recognize the woman who a year later would become the First Lady. I sat down quietly beside her and introduced myself again. Once more, she conveyed that wonderful spirit of quiet confidence which gives strength to men to work for their goals and ideals. I came away with the impression that, in any campaign, she would not provide the ordinary type of handshaking and small talk but would really contribute something new. I started to imagine the role she might play in West Virginia, or perhaps in the White House itself. I did not dream that she would go down in history as the First Lady with the deepest understanding of the history of the White House, and the First Lady who with her illustrious husband brought a new culture and stimulus to the arts, music, and literature.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include a column from the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Advertiser of December 1, 1963, written by Bill Belanger:

> "Real courage instead of being a man with a gun in your hand is when you know you're licked before you begin, but you begin anyway and see it through no matter what. You rarely win. But sometimes you do."
>
> I was reading this paragraph in Harper Lee's "To Kill a Mockingbird" and trying to forget about what had happened. I was trying to realize that television commentators had not slipped when they were saying "President Johnson" instead of President Kennedy. And then it came through in the crazy mixed up way that everything comes to my mixed up brain; Harper Lee's paragraph about real courage was the kind that the late President Kennedy had.
>
> I'd admired him, not so much for his bravery in a PT boat fighting in the war, but for standing against the crowd who ridiculed him for trying to help them. I admired him because he took a dirty word—in our land—like "culture," and another dirty word "intellectual" and made them not merely fashionable but sought after in the true meaning.
>
> For years we Americans have written ourselves off as a crass class of people, historically too young to have intellectual roots, or a culture of our own. Anyone who dared to like art and good music had better be prepared to defend himself, to show he wasn't a sissy. Some Presidents have paid lipservice to cultural affairs by donning boiled shirts for one opera a season or an art exhibit. But the impression they wanted to give was they were too much "he" men to really like such stuff.
>
> But Mr. Kennedy made no pretenses. He liked art and music and I suppose what really endeared him to me was that he even went with his wife to the ballet. No red-blooded American can get away with that? I guess it took a Kennedy to do it.
>
> He apparently agreed with Bacon's ideal of the "whole man"; he advocated physical fitness programs so that we could be even more mentally alert to use our opportunities for education.
>
> The making of the "whole man" which has long been carried out by the Great Books of the Western World reading program is now filtering down for younger readers. A set called "Gateway to the Great Books" has been published by Encyclopaedia Brittannica, edited by Robert M. Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler, father of the Great Books idea.
>
> In 10 volumes it has the great writings selected by the GBWW editors. It serves as bridge to the Great Books, being a complement to them, having some of the same writers but not their same writings. There are contributors like Ernest Hemingway, Joseph Conrad, Thomas Mann, George Bernard Shaw, Ibsen, and Eve Curie. There is a graded reading plan too. And the editors assure the reading can be enjoyed by most 16- and 14-year-olds.
>
> But that is not the real value of the set.
>
> It is worth every penny of the $69.50 just for the introductory essay on reading written by Robert Hutchins. From it you will learn—and don't think you can't learn—the difference between knowledge as facts and knowledge as inquiry. He makes the point beautifully that the greatest enjoyment, greatest fun in life is learning. He implies the means of getting an education in the true sense is more enjoyable than the end.
>
> Hutchins shows literally how Xenophon and Prescott are better than any western and no more difficult to read. The curse of education today, he shows, is the need for group study with its consequent demand for adjustment. The fast learner is bored waiting for the slow to catch up so they both can go on. The slow learner is bored by frustration.
>
> Plans like "machine education" which are really not machines but a plan to permit individual progress through self-teaching are only partly the answer.
>
> A practical education is not one that aims to transmit information but one that leads to understanding, he concludes. And while we agree with him we must admit the idea has been expressed before—in the Bible:
>
> "The man that findeth wisdom is the man that findeth understanding."

### MEMORIES OF THE WEST VIRGINIA CAMPAIGN

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the thoughts which flash across my mind in an unorganized fashion, I cherish many memories of John F. Kennedy in West Virginia. There was the April day when his plane landed in Parkersburg, W. Va., and the able director of his West Virginia campaign, Robert P. McDonough of Parkersburg, squeezed me into the front seat of his station wagon next to Senator Kennedy as he rode to an early-morning reception at the Elks Club. It takes a lot of effort for a man under such heavy pressure to be graceful so early in the morning, but I was amazed at his knowledge of West Virginia, his quick absorption of facts, and once again the breadth of his interests. I paid a man a few dollars to drive my convertible from Parkersburg to Charleston so I could fly with the candidate's plane and pick up their motorcade from Charleston to Huntington. The first thing which struck me when we got on the plane was the difference between this candidate and other presidential candidates with whom I had traveled in the past. The first thing he did was to pick up a map of West Virginia, and to start asking questions and making casual comments which revealed his deep understanding, not only of the politics, but the economics, culture, and history of the State.

"Tell me about Mingo and the Indians," he said as he put his finger on Williamson, and then he proceeded to tell us all more than the combined knowledge of the staff and correspondents on the plane. His alert finger ran across to Logan County—a machine-controlled county where John F. Kennedy engineered one of the great surprises of the primary by pulling a 3 to 2 victory out of the primary fire. He mused, half to himself, "The Iroquois Confederacy produced great characters like Cornplanter and Sequoia and, last but not least, Logan." Then, without any apparent reason, he glanced out of the plane and quoted this sentence: "Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one." I still do not know who or what he was quoting, but months later, while glancing through Morison and Commager's "Growth of the American Republic," I found both of these references which his insatiable mind had retained.

### SMASHING THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

Debarking at the Kanawha Airport, the motorcade took a swift ride to Morris Harvey College where the young candidate addressed a student assembly. He asked for questions. A student with a strident voice, reading from a slip of paper, asked him rather provocatively whether his Catholic religion would interfere with his oath of office, and asked why he had declined to attend a Philadelphia fundraising dinner in 1950 for the Chapel of the Four Chaplains. The question did not sound like the type of question a student would formulate himself, nor was it posed with the courtesy which has come to be associated with most West Virginians. Many students were visibly embarrassed. I wondered, as I watched Senator Kennedy closely, just how he would handle such a question. He smiled ever so slightly and met the question head-on. He answered it so directly, so clearly, so completely and so forcefully that the audience gave him a prolonged ovation which I am certain surprised even the candidate.

After a stiff luncheon for contributors in Charleston, the motorcade started driving along Route 60 to Huntington. I wanted very much to have Senator Kennedy visit Marshall College, but there were no definite plans, and everyone realized that the backward rule prohibiting candidates from visiting the campus would make it impossible for him to set foot within the gates of Marshall. On the spur of the moment, I telephoned a Marshall student, Bobby Nelson, and asked him if he would see if he could round up a few students to wait just outside the Marshall campus gates along about midafternoon. Nelson said he would try. Along the way between Charleston and Huntington, the candidate blithely yielded to local entreaties that he stop by a few farms and get photographed with some local politicos. The motorcade became completely disorganized. "First time in history anybody has been lost on Route 60 between Charleston and Huntington," grumbled a United Press reporter.

Hundreds of students swarmed along Third Avenue in Huntington, waiting for almost 2 hours for the satisfaction of seeing the young candidate. It was a completely unplanned, spontaneous tribute arranged without official announcement and spread by word of mouth. After a brief stop at the H. K. Porter Steel Co., Senator Kennedy saw the great wave of students at the Marshall gates and started walking toward them. They poured across Third Avenue, blocking traffic and swarmed around him. He cheerfully leaped up on the hood of an automobile to make this prophetic statement to 500 cheering students, "KEN HECHLER tells me that Marshall will soon be a university." After a few preliminary remarks, which rang out loud and clear despite the lack of a microphone, he asked for questions. Here he was at his best, stimulating and stirring, never preaching or talking down, but leaving each one of his listeners with part of himself—and above all, the inspiration to go out and learn more.

### WEST VIRGINIA MADE HIM PRESIDENT

Perhaps in this review of what John F. Kennedy stood for, and his relation with West Virginia, I place too much stress on the great primary campaign of 1960. But I agree with the assessment of Arthur Edson of the Associated Press, one of those who covered the West Virginia primary, who wrote after the Democratic Convention:

> If our political disputes are ever remembered as our battlefields are now, West Virginia will become a national shrine. For it was in West Virginia's beautiful mountains, in its thriving cities, in its impoverished coalfields that the decisive battle was fought that gave Senator John F. Kennedy the Democratic presidential nomination.

West Virginia will always be grateful to John F. Kennedy not only for the concrete accomplishments which he wrought in providing jobs for West Virginians, but more particularly in what President Kennedy stood for. Many, many times I stood on the edge of a spellbound crowd, watching this vigorous and high-principled man, who so often would end his talk with one of his favorite quotations from Robert Frost:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep
> But I have promises to keep
> And miles to go before I sleep—
> And miles to go before I sleep.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker—

> I weep for Adonais—he is dead.
> Oh, weep for Adonais. Though our tears
> Thaw not the frost which binds so dear a head.

The great Republic weeps and grieves for the loss of an inspiring and courageous leader. Courage in battle is a rare and important quality. That he had, but even more significant, he was a profile in political courage.

Back in 1932, Walter Lippmann described such courage in political leaders when he said:

> It is not necessary to talk softly to the people and to pamper them as if they were invalids. One has only to look back and see how the real leaders of men have talked to their people in a time of crisis to see how false it is to offer men mere optimism and reassurance.

By entitling his administration the "New Frontier," he offered us not "mere optimism and reassurance," but a challenge to look squarely at the problems which menace us, and then, with intellectual integrity and political courage, seek a solution to them.

He insisted upon excellence in every aspect of his administration, upon trained competence and upon idealism tempered by the need for effectiveness.

Never before have the American people seen such youthful flair as that which President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the White House. Unique among occupants of the White House the Kennedys had the courage to try and to succeed in inspiring the American people to seek new heights of intellectual and cultural understanding.

Cuba tested his political courage first in failure and then in success. After the Bay of Pigs he had the courage to assume full responsibility rather than to search for a scapegoat to absolve himself. In the October 1962 Cuba crisis he had the courage necessary to force Nikita Khrushchev to pull his nuclear missiles out of Cuba before the eyes of the world, but he was also so politically courageous that he did not push the Soviet leader into a corner. In the triumph of Cuba the same restraint that earlier had marked his acceptance of bitter defeat led directly to the successful negotiation of the nuclear test ban treaty. He honored his inaugural commitment: "Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate."

On the domestic scene, his political courage was equally magnificent. The summer of 1963 was a period of racial discontent. Though he was aware that his support of a strong civil rights program could tear apart his party and cost him his reelection, he moved courageously toward a program which he believed to be right.

A young man born in this century and tempered by war, he brought to the White House a wisdom far beyond his years. In 1960 his political wisdom, his political courage, his sense of history and his deep understanding of our constitutional form of government led him to request—nay, even demand—that his strongest opponent for the presidential nomination should receive the nomination for Vice President of the United States.

Today, in Lyndon Baines Johnson all Americans benefit from that political wisdom, from that political courage.

Despite his wisdom and despite—or possibly because of—his courage, he was destroyed by a movement of hatred.

Hatred, bigotry, intolerance, and fanaticism in any form were an anathema to this man of reason as they are to all who cherish constitutional freedom.

From him who did not shrink from his responsibility of defending freedom in its hour of maximum peril, let us take new energy, new devotion, new consecration to replace violence, hatred, and extremism with rational discussion, moderation, and understanding of all the traditions for which John Fitzgerald Kennedy and this Nation stand.

America has lost a hero but, unto eternity, America will always remember the light which his life and his Presidency gave to us—

> Say: "With me died Adonais; till the future dares forget the past, his fate and fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

**Mr. ROUSH.** Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak on this most solemn occasion, I am aware that I speak not only my own sentiments but that I give expression to the feelings and sentiments of the people I represent for at this moment, and on this occasion, we feel with one heart and we express that feeling with one voice. What we say is accompanied with a prayer and cry unto God. The Psalmist said:

> Hear my cry O God; attend unto my prayer
> From the end of the earth will I cry unto
> Thee
> When my heart is overwhelmed; lead me
> To the rock that is higher than I.

At this moment, etched in my memory—as they will be forever—are feelings, sights and sounds which have attended these dark and tragic days. There was that shock of the terrible news, "The President is dead"; there was that moment when I walked into the East Room of the White House where President Kennedy rested in death as did President Lincoln 99 years ago; there were those acts, sights and sounds which said so much and can never be forgotten; there was that expression of love as a young widow pressed her wedding ring unto the cold cold hand of her beloved; there was the night long shuffling of feet, hundreds of feet, thousands of feet, which was the whisper of the American people saying farewell to their President as they filed by the black velvet draped catafalque in the rotunda of the Capitol; there was the riderless horse following the slow-moving caisson bearing the body of his fallen captain; there were the tears rolling down the cheeks of men, women and children; there was the little girl who, while thousands watched, walked slowly and alone onto Pennsylvania Avenue and spread her flowers in the path of the funeral cortege of her President "cuz I love him"; there was the sound of the muffled drums as they beat out the cadence to which the great of the world marched up that hill and into Arlington Cemetery, John F. Kennedy's final resting place; there was the sound of taps which echoed throughout the world as we bade farewell for the last time to our fallen leader.

In the tears rolling down the cheek of the little colored boy, in the prancing, impatient, proud and riderless horse, and in the salute of the great men of the world we saw in death what John F. Kennedy symbolized in life.

John F. Kennedy brought to America a new compassion for the lot of our fellow man, a new respect for the rights of all men and a new hope for the brotherhood and dignity of man. He aroused in us a sense of urgency. He expressed and exemplified an idealism which was American through and through. His vitality and enthusiasm were inspirations which have made their mark on us all, for friend and foe alike have hastened to associate themselves with this new generation to which the torch has been passed. To those who love freedom in this world his message came through loud and clear that "we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Now he has been taken from us but his idealism, his work and his dream for America and, yes, for the world, is left for us to continue. This he would want us to do. This we pledge to do for he was our friend and gave so much. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

All, all the people of the world were his friends.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

**Mr. OLSEN** of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues and pay high tribute to my beloved friend and leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I learned to know him first, as did most Americans, in 1956, at the Chicago convention of our Democratic Party. I was attracted by his radiant personality—emitting both youth and wisdom—and I sought him out. Thereafter, Mr. Kennedy came to Montana. We became more closely and personally acquainted. Finally, while I was making my first run for Congress, I personally led the campaign to win Montana's 1960 State Democratic Convention endorsement and Montana's Democratic delegation to the National Convention for Mr. Kennedy for President. I mourn his loss as a close and dear friend—but I think all men of good will mourn, whether they personally knew him or not. Taken in a temporary triumph of madness and violence, all men of good will are hurt and offended and mourn the more.

Mr. Kennedy loved his fellow man. Therefore, he dreamed great and practical dreams. Because he loved, he knew the needs of people, and because he knew, he championed their cause—the needs of the poor, the sick, the aged, the young he cared for; and he encouraged the rich and able too. Because he lived, more people have a better standard of living, the country is stronger and healthier and happier. More people have homes. The health of many is better cared for. More people eat better, and are better clothed and sheltered and schooled. He did work for every facet of our lives. He made our defenses of our country stronger and still had time to work for peace in the world.

His words of 1 week before his assassination I will remember well: "Marshal Lyautey, the great French marshal, went out to his gardener and asked him to plant a tree. The gardener said, 'Why plant it? It won't flower for a hundred years.' 'In that case,' the marshal said, 'plant it this afternoon.'" Mr. Kennedy said "That is what we have to do."

So in Montana, as everywhere, he inspired all of us to do the practical things of today and at the same time do what must be done for 100 years from now. Yes, and he said, "For a thousand years from now." His last visit to Montana, he advised us again of our need for natural resource development—of the land, the crops, the forest, and the great rivers. He thought we should clean the water, and keep it clean; and clean the air and keep it clean. Daring dreams, but oh so practical. We miss him, and we thank God's grace that he passed our way, in our time. He inspires all of us to continue devoted service to all of mankind.

Mrs. Olsen, my children, my mother, all my loved ones join the prayers of everyone for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, for his devoted widow Jacqueline, and for his children and his loved ones.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

**Mr. RANDALL.** Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy with grief and mourning for our President fallen by an assassin's bullet. From the hour the news flashed, the shock almost defied expression. The dominant reaction, repeated over and over again, was one of disbelief. Our inner mind kept telling us the news just couldn't be true but then, when we saw the flag-draped coffin of our former President, we knew it was not a nightmare or a bad dream, as we had preferred to think, but that our loss was real.

Not only is it a real loss but a great loss. For some, it was a personal loss, but for all of us collectively, it was a great national loss. The entire free world suffered in the brief span of a few seconds. What a senseless waste of experience and talent was tossed away so suddenly. A truly great national asset was forever lost in those few short seconds.

Our great leader is gone but everyone of us will have the pleasant privilege to look back on a man whom we knew had a great heart and a great mind. He was a man of warmth, poise, high motives, and great courage. As proof of his courage and vibrant spirit, he ruled against riding in the bubble-top limousine or armored car. This vibrant personality loved people from all walks of life and wanted to be near and close to them. It is for this very reason the American people will never forget the image of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I think one of the greatest tributes made to the late President came from German Chancellor Erhard who said, "Whenever we picture him in the mind's eye, we feel a breath of wind over our heads and against our cheeks."

No leader of modern times ever received the spontaneous outpouring of respect and affection shown our fallen

President. Over 250,000 people stood in line, throughout the night, to pass through the rotunda in respect to their national hero. The following day 1 million people lined the streets of Washington with bowed heads as the caisson passed through the city streets from the Capitol to the cathedral and then to Arlington Cemetery.

As we look back upon the life of our great leader, we realize that he was an idealist to the extent that he sought a nation and a world of justice, dignity, and peace. We are also mindful he was a realist knowing these goals could not be realized in his administration or perhaps in our lifetimes. But somehow, someway, he thought we should start toward this better world.

John Kennedy was struck down in the summertime of his life. In an instant one killer deprived us of a great statesman and then another robbed us of the proper course of justice of which this country has been so proud.

But John Kennedy would not have us look back but instead look ahead, because he looked ahead. All of his speeches were filled with hope for America's future. One of the most significant things we should observe in eulogy of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is to take a look not only at his friends but at the enemies he made. He was a man who liked to be liked, but he was willing to court dislike and disfavor; to be a resolute leader of what he thought was right. The enemies he made were bigots of race, class, and religion. These who hated him tell us much of what kind of man was John F. Kennedy.

Perhaps never has a nation lived a chapter of its history as that of the 72 hours from noon Friday, November 22, until just after noon Monday, November 25. Historians in the future will appraise this period but, for the time being, all of us were taught by these 72 hours that we all had a more remarkable President than we ever realized or understood. We learned, too, how much the rest of the world respected him, which was proved by the extraordinary appearance of 220 foreign leaders at his funeral.

Finally, as we look back, we have the lesson of the courage and dignity of Jacqueline Kennedy in her ordeal. Not to be omitted is the gallant example of the tiny children and in particular the small boy when, on the steps of St. Matthews Cathedral, he stood erect and gave a salute to his father, that stirred millions.

Those of us who had the personal privilege to talk with him on occasions will cherish these pleasant memories the rest of our lives. Those who knew him will silently repeat the words of Richard Cardinal Cushing uttered at the Cathedral when he said "May the angels, dear Jack, lead you to Paradise." Millions of words have been said and written, but all of us will repeat, again and again, along with Cardinal Cushing, as he turned away from the grave at Arlington, the simple words "He was a wonderful man."

Mrs. Kennedy and her dear little ones, we individually, along with the Nation, extend our heartfelt condolences. Our deepest sympathy goes out to them. May God sustain them in their hour of sorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker—

> The testimonies were vast that when the news came that he had been killed, that he was dead, that he had gone from them and would never speak again—there was shock, they were stunned, there was nothing to say, they could sit silent and weep.
>
> The tears came—and nothing to say.
>
> When they said "It is terrible" or "God help us" or "It is too bad" or "Good God, how sad" it was not as though they were talking to others but rather as though they were moaning to themselves and knowing very well no words were any use.
>
> Thousands and thousands would remember as long as they lived the exact place where they had been standing or seated or lying down when the news came to them, recalling precisely in details and particulars where they were and what doing when the dread news arrived.

Those are the words of Carl Sandburg, describing what occurred throughout the land in the aftermath of the Black Friday, April 14, 1865, when Abraham Lincoln was shot. He might as well have been speaking of that other Black Friday, November 22, 1963, when John F. Kennedy was taken from us.

On November 22, 1963, America was shocked, stunned, silent, and in tears. An American President had been murdered, a sacrilege against the people. A buoyant, vibrant, and creative spirit, the President of all Americans, had been struck down, his work unfinished.

Abraham Lincoln and John Fitzgerald Kennedy embodied the best hope of mankind that reason, tolerance and human decency would prevail. When unreason, intolerance, and violence took their lives, doubt was cast upon that hope, and Americans grieved for themselves and all mankind.

The grief at the death of President Kennedy will be with us, as Adlai Stevenson said, until the day of ours. But mourning is not enough. We must move forward with strong and active faith in advancing the goals he set at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidency of John F. Kennedy ended, almost before it began, in grievious tragedy. What heights of accomplishment he might have reached in the future years will now be forever unknown to us. He is now like those whom Laurence Binyon laments in his poem, "For the Fallen":

> They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old:
> Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun and in the morning
> We will remember them.

The full measure of the greatness of John F. Kennedy lies today in the hands of the people of our Nation. He is to be measured by the rightness and magnitude of the goals that he set for his administration and for the American people beyond the span of any one man's executive leadership. But he is to be measured in the final analysis not only by these goals, but by how nearly the United States in response to his challenge approaches to the accomplishment of these goals.

In his eloquent inaugural address, now grown familiar to our ears and deeply treasured in our hearts, John F. Kennedy told us:

> All this will not be finished in the first one hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first one thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

This call to action was followed by a statement to which the recent tragedy has given pathos and added urgency:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

John F. Kennedy summoned us to meet the challenges of our time. He knew that the sixties demanded new ideas, new approaches, and new leadership. He did not shrink from this responsibility—he welcomed it.

John F. Kennedy never underestimated the ideological challenge we face in the world, but he knew also that it could not be met with inflexible dogma. In his American University speech on June 10, 1963, he called for purposeful perseverance toward peace. This policy led to the nuclear test ban treaty, which may well be remembered as the monument to his administration.

President Kennedy's administration was marked by the civil rights revolution. He recognized that 100 years after Abraham Lincoln, emancipation was not a fact, and he urged Congress to act. And act we must, not only in tribute to John F. Kennedy, but to keep faith with the American people and the ideals of our first revolution.

Let us honor the immortal spirit of John F. Kennedy by continuing along the road he charted. Let us be strengthened in our aspirations for human dignity and freedom by his dedication to the goal of full equality for all of us and his firm resolve to put us on the path to peace.

When he took office on that beautiful and exhilarating day in January 1961, President Kennedy said:

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans.

Let the word go forth today that the torch is still burning. We of the Kennedy generation have accepted it and will carry it forward toward that New Frontier of equal rights, peace, and social justice for which he lived and died.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is paradoxical perhaps that the cataclysmic termination of the life of the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, has presumptively been caused in the Dallas heartland of much of the extremely conservative right by a young man apparently dedicated to the radical left. Many have been quick to indict and convict those of the right and left in a supposed natural effort to attach some blame for this most spectacular example of man's inhumanity to man.

There has been admittedly over the past series of months of this session a crescendo of indictments of American foreign and domestic policy by many persons who can charitably be labeled as intolerants. The loyalty to the Constitution of many public elected officials including myself has been doubted. The President himself has been accused of vacillation to the Soviets and being too soft on our Latin Communists to the south. It was ironic therefore that the President's presumed assassin should apparently be motivated by the fact that the President was not sympathetic to these alien interests.

I would caution the country, even with the preliminary showing that has been made, to be cautious in indictment and only include therein the offenders where probable cause indicates their culpability. Perhaps this issue has been laid to rest. Surely patriotic Americans will have died in vain if we forsake our democratic institutions including presumption of innocence and the requirement that guilt be proven to a moral certainty and beyond a reasonable doubt in a stampeding effort to vindicate a wrong. To say the least, it seems unrealistic to presume a teetering dictator to the south planned this assassination of the fine late President who has only been accused of being too reasonable.

Neither should this crime against the people of America affect the rights of a free people to express themselves. Rightly, our Supreme Court has determined that the rights under the Bill of Rights and particularly free speech, should not be abridged unless a clear and present danger is presented to life, limb or national security.

There are those who might suggest that this tragedy is in some way related to extremism and, for this reason, both the right and left should be cautioned. This tragedy, I believe, is related only to insanity which could find solace perhaps among either faction of our national parties.

Let us not martyr John Kennedy for any one of his particular causes. Our late President need not be martyred because he gave so much during his lifetime and tenure of leadership. The causes which he espoused stand alone without the ghostly support of our late President, and certainly if these causes do not so stand, John Kennedy would be the first to modify his position.

I think that for many of us, the last few days have produced an end-of-the-world atmosphere as great as mortal man will ever realize. The President's wife and family have the solace of knowing that all segments of the Nation join them in grief and sorrow.

The President, a friend of people in life, perhaps will only truly be appreciated in death. His cause in life was the cause of people—fundamental rights of people which some have unfortunately interpreted as opposing the rights of property. The President acknowledged last week that there was in fact a deadlock in our system on the civil rights issue that had sterilized the Congress. He stated that however dark it looks now, "Westward look, the land is bright" and he hoped that America truly would be brighter by next summer. It is hoped by many that this mortal man should not have died in vain, that in some way this sacrifice of the very best that this country can produce might somehow anneal some of the wounds which have arisen in the moral fabric of the United States of America.

We are fortunate indeed to have had a President in truth and fact as Vice President who has stepped forward according to law to fill the legal void created. With cooperative help of all Americans he will be successful.

The void in our hearts, however, perhaps will never be replaced. John F. Kennedy stood for more than a program for people; he stood as a living symbolic image of a day-to-day considerate, compassionate response to the requirements of a country both domestically and internationally.

Time, of course, stands still for no man and no one understood this better than the late President. Even now, we must continue to chart the course of a free America.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 weeks since we were shocked by the horrible assassination of John F. Kennedy. He would be happy to know that in these 2 weeks his death brought out the "goodness" in America. In a sense, because of newspapers, television, and radio, every American attended his funeral services. He would have seen the entire Nation turn to prayer—millions of our men wept openly and were not ashamed. The American people filled every church and synagogue over and over again.

The whole world was shown that the American people have great respect for the office of the Presidency, our Congress, and our Supreme Court. Our democratic processes were tested—this great Government continued on in orderly fashion, supported by a united people. There was no doubt we showed the high morals we possess—time and time again we went over every word he uttered that inspired us. The people in my district of New Jersey loved John F. Kennedy. As their Representative I pledge to work here in Congress that we should leave a fitting memorial for our late President.

He wanted peace and freedom for all the people of the world and to that end he established the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and urged foreign aid. He supported the United Nations and asked support for our space programs. He knew we needed these programs in order to live in peace and freedom. He promised we would try to wipe out unemployment; he advocated care for the aged; he desired to raise the standard of living for all Americans and to this end he asked for the $11 billion tax cut so the economy of this country could function freely and create employment.

He urged this Nation, as no other man in our time since Abraham Lincoln, to solve our racial problem and he sought the passage of civil rights legislation so all Americans could be first-class citizens. We here in Congress should provide a real memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy by carrying out his program.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was the evening of Monday, November 18, 1963, when the President, John F. Kennedy, returned to the White House from a day in Florida inspired by the warmth of hands and hearts he had received from the people of Tampa and Miami. I was the last to shake his hand as he left the helicopter and thanked me for a page advertisement which Mrs. Pepper and I had inserted in the paper that day to welcome him to Miami. He strolled rapidly toward the south entrance pausing only warmly to return the greetings of his faithful dogs and entered. The master of the house was home again and happy.

And then came Friday—a day which, too, will live in infamy—and he was struck down on the streets of a great city in his own land. The bullet pierced the brain from which had come the wit and wisdom which had challenged the admiration of the world and had become a lasting part of the literature and the lore of the race. Without a sound he fell into the arms of that fairest of ladies, Grecian goddess, with Spartan spirit, who in tragic minutes was changed from laughing and loving wife to mourning widow.

A short time before he had stood majestic in his figure, like noble Lancelot, tall and strong and unafraid, symbol and champion of the eternal Camelot, chiefest knight of all the round table of the world, dedicated to the service of God and good. And then suddenly, too young to die, he was dead. The voice which had charmed millions was now forever silent and the hand which had turned miracles was forever stilled. He survived war to be killed in peace by an enemy of his country.

We who contemplate those who thought or wrought this heinous deed asked the question, as does humanity, as history forever shall, as Pilate asked of those who clamored for the death of Jesus, "what have you to say against this man?" And rolling over the hills and valleys and oceans of time, ever following the sun, as long as men shall tell tales of foul deeds and epic eras comes the answer: he revered God and he worshiped Him; he believed in the Bible and he lived by it; he loved the Constitution and he upheld it; and in his heart he had compassion for his fellow man.

For these things did he who fired the fatal shot, each who wished him dead; and each who rejoiced in his death, kill him.

We of all faiths can forgive if we cannot forget. And we, too, can pray and pray do we now with all our hearts that somehow God's mysterious chemistry has made it possible for the tears which have fallen from the eyes of the millions who have mourned his passing to wash away the stains of hate from the hearts embittered toward him.

And may the memory of that undaunted but anguished widow and of his half-orphaned children—little John gallantly saluting his dead father on his third birthday, and brave beautiful little Caroline comforting her grieving mother at the funeral service—may these moving memories somehow soften the hearts of those who turned only harsh hands and raucous words against him; and may his sacrifice purify and cleanse and make more contrite the heart of this great Nation.

And, may this land he loved be better because he lived in it and led it and died for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we take our leave of our brave leader and noble friend in the words of the sorrowing Horatio to the fallen Hamlet:

> Good night, sweet prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER].

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy lifted the horizons of his countrymen and of people all over the world. He demonstrated that economic growth could be quickened. He brought a renewed sense of public responsibility and public trust. He brought warmth, sympathy, and a sense of urgency into the improvement of human relations. He brought balance and strength to the problem of world understanding. In all of these areas and many others, he stirred the conscience, raised the expectations, and evoked the energy to strive toward excellence—national excellence, personal excellence.

He was particularly the spokesman of the younger generations throughout the world. To them, the world's flaws have not been glossed over and shortcomings remain glaring anomalies. To them, his call to get on with the task of meeting the problems and improving the circumstances of our time will be heeded for generations to come.

I am told that when the news that there would be a flame lit on his grave reached people in a number of foreign lands, the streets immediately filled with people who had lighted torches. For millions of people, perhaps hundreds of millions, John Kennedy lighted a torch. The penumbra of those flames will spread through time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the murder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was more than the trespass of one man against another. It was more than a crime against a wife and children. It was more even than a blow against all humanity.

It was an act which struck at the Constitution of the United States itself—that Constitution which established our great Republic and provided the manner in which we choose our Chief Magistrates, and the manner in which from time to time we may replace them.

It was an act medieval in its horror. The assassination of a head of state is outlawed and outlived as a means of terminating temporal power.

When I first heard the news of President Kennedy's assassination, I was attending the President's Appalachian Regional Conference in Hagerstown. The speaker on that occasion was to have been Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. As soon as I had been advised that President Kennedy had been wounded I told Secretary Roosevelt the sad news. We made an announcement to the group gathered there for lunch and we both immediately felt that we should get to a place where we could follow events and be of service in any way possible.

It was all too soon that the announcement was made—the President had died. This unbelievable fact, even more unbelievable because of the vitality and youth of the President, was hard for the country to absorb as a reality. On the following day, Mrs. Mathias and I joined our colleagues at the White House to pay our respects. We were met at the door by one of President Kennedy's naval aides and with slow ceremony escorted through the state rooms of the White House into the East Room where the coffin lay in state.

In the very presence of death it was impossible not to accept the reality of death. What had been so unbelievable to the news became, unfortunately and sadly, fully believable.

By the ceremonies which began at this point, our Republic was not only expressing its sorrow at the passing of a great citizen, but it was expressing its profound shock and its indignation that this crime should have taken place—a crime which violates the organic and fundamental moral law of God and man.

The next act in the sad drama occurred on the following day when the President's body was moved from the White House to the Capitol. On Sunday the entire Congress gathered solemnly in the rotunda under the great dome. There, in muted light, surrounded by the pictures of the great events which represent more than three centuries of American history, we waited together for the unfolding of yet another chapter in the history of America. You will all remember that as we waited we could hear through the stone walls of the Capitol the drums and music of the funeral cortege approaching Capitol Hill. When the great bronze doors opened, the casket was brought in to rest upon the Lincoln catafalque. No human heart within that great hall could be untouched and unmoved when Mrs. Kennedy, following the coffin of her husband and clasping the hands of her children, came forward to bid farewell with dignity, with grace, and with beauty.

On the following day the Congress again gathered in the rotunda accompanied by members of the Cabinet, former Presidents, and many of those who had taken great parts in the life of this Nation. We gathered in complete quiet. The eloquent men, the great orators of the Congress, all stood silent with heads bowed and centered in attention and emotion on the casket carrying the body of the 35th President of the United States. As the pallbearers bore the casket from the rotunda every soul in that assemblage was wrenched by the human suffering of Mrs. Kennedy and of her children—that suffering which she subdued because the wife of a President is not even allowed the privilege of an expression of her grief, but must uphold the traditions of the office to which her husband had been called.

In the afternoon, Congress went to Arlington National Cemetery to bid farewell to John F. Kennedy. I was struck by the fact that the Members of Congress gathered on the grass under an ancient oak tree, gnarled, almost leafless—standing on the hill below the home of George Washington Parke Custis in that sunny afternoon as if they were gathering in a country churchyard. There was a simplicity about the fact that these Senators and Representatives—Members of the greatest legislative body in the world—stood there, bareheaded for the most part, waiting for the body of the Chief Magistrate of this Republic to be borne to its final resting place.

It was a simplicity reminiscent of the early federal period of our Nation when the patriots—Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, and all the rest lived their lives in simple grandeur.

From the hillside we saw the funeral cortege coming across Memorial Bridge. And what a procession—representing the peoples of the world—President de Gaulle, Prince Philip, Prime Minister Home, King Baudouin, Emperor Haile Selassie, all these—come to salute a great man and a great nation. The day seemed in tune with the event. As we stood by the grave at Arlington the sun moved over our heads and touched the top of the trees. The shadow lengthened and it was, indeed, a time for farewell.

How rightly typical of a Republic—what a scene to emphasize the dignity of man—there, not separated by position, rank or favor, the leaders of the nations gathered as one family to pay a last tribute. It was a moving testimonial to the office of the Presidency, to its 35th occupant and to the Nation over which he presided.

I believe that the greatest monument that any President can ever have reared to his memory is that the Constitution passes intact from his hands to his successor's, and, I believe, the greatest act of memoriam any citizen can render is to resolve anew that the life and work and greatness of the Republic shall continue.

This is the monument that every American can help to build. This is the monument that will endure and will commemorate the life of dedication which is required of and freely given by a President of the United States.

In this city we have reared great marble temples to our national leaders of the past. One of the greatest is to Abraham Lincoln, a memorial which inspires me anew every day I pass it.

Yet Abraham Lincoln is known to millions throughout the world who have never and will never see the Lincoln Memorial. It is the principles of freedom and democracy, that he proclaimed and supported, and the Constitution and the Republic that he supported which make his name a household word in all nations of the world.

But all Americans since Lincoln's day have helped to build this monument. By our respect for freedom and self-government we have helped to rear this monument.

Just so, I propose that all Americans take part in erecting a similar monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. By the care with which we continue the institutions he held dear, we shall preserve his memory in a medium more lasting than stone.

The struggle for the maintenance of freedom was a historic task of John F. Kennedy. Freedom may well be lost, if Americans ever slack in this constant and unremitting contest. To recognize the gifts that freedom confers, and to observe the discipline that freedom imposes is the duty of every American, but it is also a contribution to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is truly difficult for me to express my feelings about the tragic assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. When it was finally announced that the President had died, I was filled with heartbreak and grief. The days which have since passed have done little to dull the pain of that tragic hour.

In life, President Kennedy gave of himself to his utmost, with great courage, devotion, total dedication born of deep conviction. With greatest determination he worked to give full freedom to all the people of our country and to build up our domestic strength to support the tremendous requirements necessary to sustain us in world leadership. He dedicated himself to seeking peace, freedom, and the blessings of a good life for our own people and the people of the world.

John F. Kennedy and I came to Congress together 17 years ago; I came to know him well and his gracious wife Jackie, whose courage and fortitude during these dark hours was perhaps the greatest tribute to his memory. The mark this man made upon our world is exhibited no more poignantly than in the expression of personal grief felt by so many in so many lands.

A most striking element of the death of our President was the discovery that on God's earth there were events which transcended the struggle which preoccupy us in our daily lives. Certainly it gave us pause to ask, "Can we look into our own hearts and say that we are doing all that we can for our beloved country?"

As we make the pilgrimage to the grave where is lit the eternal flame, there burns within us the memory of a great man. But beyond a memory there will be hope—hope for a world which will carry on in his spirit his basic humanity, his kinship with the peoples of the world—hope and confidence in the enduring greatness of America.

Truly, it can be said that greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends and for his country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks a most moving editorial by Miss Veda Ponikvar, editor of the Tribune-Press in my hometown of Chisholm, Minn.

### HE, TOO, BELONGS TO THE AGES

The voice of our captain has been stilled.

Our Nation grieves in shocked disbelief at the swift and tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The world mourns with the crying skies, and the sad dirge of the winter wind.

On the streets of the world, men, women, and children of every color and creed stand together weeping unashamedly, yet in remorse that, in a civilized generation of humanity, such infamous action as the assassin's bullet could even come to pass.

Each crucial period in the history of mankind has given rise to men of kaleidoscopic leadership, and a vision that magnetizes and rebuilds the finest in human ingenuity. The various eras have had their outstanding leaders and great Presidents, but, without a doubt, historians will write of perhaps the greatest, John Kennedy. The world's problems were his problems and, in the loneliness of his trusted office, he approached each challenge with a courage and forthrightness that is not given to many men to enjoy or endure.

Millions of people believe in peace. But few pursued it with such vigor and keen analysis as did the President. He worked for this cause with a firmness that commanded the respect of friend and foe. The entire world was his threshold, and his deep belief in freedom convinced him that only by working together, as people of good will, oblivious to color of skin, greed, and hatred could we achieve the ultimate in man's dream.

In his three dynamic and historic years of the Presidency, the Chief Executive exemplified the beacon in the lighthouse, sharing his brilliant knowledge, his radiating kindness, and his humble goodness with the peoples of the world. His love for the United States was a masterpiece of patriotism. His piece of tapestry was the globe of nations and illimitable space. He wove the threads into a chapter of profound human leadership that has no peer. All those who love freedom, must be free; the starving must be fed; the uneducated, educated; the misguided, directed; those blind to justice made to see the righteousness of justice for all; and those steeped in hatreds and prejudices, mellowed in the understanding for the dignity of man.

The Divine Master must know that the piece of tapestry on earth has not been completed, and yet, in this unfinished work remains a challenge of unequaled significance. Our Nation—yes, the world—has lost a leader, a molder of good crucibles, a husband and father who exemplified the highest ideals of family life, and an American patriot who will stand with the musketed soldiers at Valley Forge; with the men of the Blue and Gray in the war of emancipation just a hundred years ago; with the hopeful khaki-clad armies of World War I; and the patriotic dream-filled youth of World War II. We stand today, with heads bowed, knowing that we must complete the task. This world cannot long exist, half slave and half free; two-thirds starving and one-third fed; two-thirds uneducated and one-third educated. Man was meant to be free, to live as a brother, and to share in the riches of the good earth. This, President Kennedy believed, and this, we must all believe.

Our fears must be assuaged by the inner candle glow of knowledge that death is not the end * * * it is only a long sleep. The sun has set for America's most indefatigable President. He now belongs to the ages, and has left for all mankind a blueprint for peace.

We have work to do. We must not—we cannot—fail.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial by my very good friend, Marty McGowan, editor of the Appleton Press, Appleton, Minn.

### PRAYER FOR THE NATION AND ITS FALLEN LEADER

All Americans today feel saddened and ashamed. They are saddened because they have lost their President. They are ashamed that one among them would be so savage as to kill the President. They are further ashamed because the suspected assassin was murdered before he could be given a trial.

There is grief for the family of the President, the young widow bereft of her husband so early in life, and the two children who have lost their father.

The Nation is also the loser. Its great leader has been taken from the scene at such a young age, even before he completed his first term, and before his full potential could be realized. The question of what would happen to this young man after he had completed what were expected to be 8 years in the White House at an early age was answered by a sniper's bullet Friday.

The feeling of shame comes that there are still those in this Nation who would stoop to violence on their President. This is a nation having the highest standard of living with the most culture. Such things are not supposed to happen here; they are only for unstable South and Central American nations or those of Asia.

It may never be known the real reasons for the assassination but the crime must be attributed to a deranged mentality, as is usually the case with such killings. In a polygot nation of 130 million there are bound to be a few crackpots.

The Press was not among the most ardent admirers of President Kennedy either before or after his election because of what this paper considered his failure to understand the great problems of the vast agricultural Midwest. This inability would be understandable in a man with no financial worries raised in an eastern manufacturing State.

Yet the press did have the utmost admiration for the work of President Kennedy in other fields. He excelled in foreign relations where an innovation was the Peace Corps, which put the work of peace on a personal basis. That it was succeeding is manifestly evident. He also kept the cold war cool when the peace of the world was threatened with missiles in Cuba.

President Kennedy also excelled in civil rights. His efforts were long overdue but these same efforts were pushed with the vigor that characterized all his work and with a disregard for the political consequences.

For his work in these two fields alone will President Kennedy be most remembered. These efforts will also put him in the category of great Presidents.

Born to wealth, President Kennedy could have loafed through life and made no contributions for the betterment of his fellow man. Had he done so, he might be alive today.

But instead he offered himself and his labors to a lifetime of service. Nearly killed once in the wartime defense of his country, he was saved then only to be cut down later after greater service in the highest office the Nation can bestow on one of its citizens. He died Friday on another field of battle.

There will be little joy in the United States on this Thanksgiving Day. Yet there are still some small consolations to be found for which to be thankful.

This Nation has the system of government that can survive such a wrenching to its roots. It has another man well trained to step in and fill the breech. He has taken over and the Nation moves on.

The Nation can give thanks for this today as it also utters another prayer in memory of it fallen leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deeply wounded heart that I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I speak here today in behalf of all the people of the 11th Congressional District on Chicago's northwest side, who join me in acknowledging the great loss our Nation has suffered in the death of President Kennedy.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had the unique capacity to understand the problems of all people; and for this reason he was respected by all people regardless of their political views, their religious beliefs, or their racial background.

His untimely death has been mourned by all, and so today I extend condolences to his survivors not only for Mrs. Pucinski and myself, but in behalf of every single person residing in my congressional district.

The Washington Post, shortly after the tragic death of President Kennedy, in an article entitled "A Promise of Power Wisely Used," stated that:

> President Kennedy gave our Nation an exhilarating vision of political dignity.

There will be many epitaphs written in his behalf and I think this epitaph certainly belongs in the forefront.

The Post stated:

> However he had to zig and zag, the goal he sought was peace, and his methods were those of reason. Those who admired him never doubted his earnestness, though they were sometimes impatient with his caution.
>
> He now belongs to history, and his confidence that time would soon bear him out, bringing the country to where the land was bright, remains imponderable. So does his buoyant faith in reason.
>
> For the most savage irony is that this apostle of enlightenment, this advocate of rational discourse, was cut down by the very fanaticism that as President he sought to contain.
>
> He paid with his life in a cause that remains in doubt. The last page of his biography must be written with what Vergil called the tears of things.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps another meaningful epitaph that belongs to John F. Kennedy is that he dared to dream.

He dared to dream of a world aglow with peace; he dared to dream of a world prospering from the blessings of freedom; he dared to dream of an America, strong, prosperous, free, educated, caring for its aged, opening new opportunities for its youth.

He sought an America where every citizen could develop his own full talents without discrimination because of his race, his age, the color of his skin, or because of his religious beliefs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy left us a legacy—a legacy based on intellectual courage and honesty; a legacy which summons all Americans to his courage in carrying out his magnificent dream for a greater America.

President Kennedy wrote his own "Profile in Courage."

Even though there were those, yes, here in this very Congress, and in his own political party, who admonished him that he was moving too swiftly; that he was working with strokes too broad for the canvas to carry; that he was too impatient with the normal pace of our democratic process; that he should curtail his awe-inspiring program for America.

President Kennedy insisted on moving forward because he had promised America a New Frontier. He himself said his program would not be completed in "the first 100 day or even the first 1,000 day," but he asked us to begin.

He urged and got from Congress, at least from the House so far, a historic tax revision program which gives new meaning to capitalism and the free institutions it represents.

He fought without compromise for civil rights legislation and admittedly risked his own political future in an almost spiritual belief that democracy cannot survive if all of our citizens are not free to seek equal opportunities.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, he had the courage to propose a concept for understanding in world relations, even with our most bitter enemies, in those areas where America's own security was not diminished.

President Kennedy has already built his own monument when he successfully worked through Congress the controvsial nuclear test ban treaty; the Peace Corps, and the Disarmament Agency, which for the first time gives our Nation a systematic approach in the search for peace.

But man perhaps is incapable of envisioning the full glory that awaited America had President Kennedy been able to carry out his entire inspiring program. Imagine what great opportunities await our Nation with enactment of his program of medical care for our aged; the youth opportunities bill; amendments to the Manpower Retraining Act; the mass transit program; improved conditions in our educational institutes both at the secondary and higher education level; the President's program for aid to the mentally ill; his efforts to improve labor-management relations; his magnificent desire to help mankind explore the mysteries of the moon and the rest of the universe.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has already built his monument to a greater glory for our Republic.

Civilization will never be able to fully understand the monstrous attack upon this President by a hate-filled individual who took his life. The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial written moments after the President's death, analyzed this particular aspect of this tragedy in words much more eloquent than I could hope to compose. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I request the Sun-Times editorial titled "America Weeps" and written by that newspaper's chief editorial writer, Robert E. Kennedy, be included at the conclusion of my own remarks.

The most unfinished business that faces our Nation today in the wake of this great tragedy is to make sure that hate never again becomes so much a part of our national fabric as to lead to another Lee Oswald.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy we cannot help but to also pay tribute to his gallant and heroic wife, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. In the depth of her tragedy, Mrs. Kennedy, through her stature and her majestic behavior, has given all of us as Americans the strength we needed in our moment of greatest dispair.

The spirit of President Kennedy lives on both in his wife and wonderful children. It also lives on in a grateful nation. We as a nation are so much the richer today that both President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy have touched all of our lives albeit much too briefly.

May our late President rest in peace and may his wife and his children be to all of us a constant reminder of his noble character.

Our Nation can offer a profound prayer of thanksgiving to the Almighty that in the wake of this great tragedy with the death of President Kennedy, we have been blessed with a worthy successor in President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire article which I referred to earlier in my remarks and which appeared in the November 24 issue of the Washington Post written by Mr. Karl E. Meyer follow the Chicago Sun-Times editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### AMERICA WEEPS

(By Robert E. Kennedy)

President Kennedy lies dead, a martyr in the cause of democratic government.

His countrymen weep in sorrow and in anger.

The immensity of the crime can hardly be grasped in these hours of confusion that inevitably have followed the assassination of the Chief of the most powerful nation in the world.

The Nation goes ahead with a new leader. Vice President Johnson has assumed the heavy burden of the Presidency and the policies of the Nation will undergo no imminent change. But inevitably the assassination will change the course of history, not only in the Nation but in the world.

And it should change the temper of our times. At the moment the motive that lurked in the twisted mind of the killer is not, of course, known.

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as the bombing of houses of worship, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

All of these acts of violence are the work of persons who, fundamentally, do not believe in a democratic government operating under a rule of law.

The preachers and whisperers of hate and disunity, who undermine confidence in our Government and our public officials by irresponsible attacks on their sanity and loyalty, plant the motives in the heads of those who pull the triggers and toss the bombs.

Those who impugn the motives of our national leaders, who defy the courts, distort the operations of the United Nations or advocate a change in our form of government might not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the eyes that lined up Mr. Kennedy's head in the crosshairs of a rifle sight yesterday.

The awful loss that hate visited upon the Nation and the world should inspire all Americans to join together in this hour of shock and mourning in a reexamination of the national conscience.

The right of dissent, the exercise of free speech, the criticism of the President and other public officials high and low, must not corrode into sullen rebellion that breeds violence. All Americans, those who agree with their Government's policies and those who disagree, must stand together on this fundamental and demonstrate this unity by action as well as words. The purveyors of hate must acknowledge the danger they create.

When we speak of the purveyors of hate we obviously are not speaking of the President's regular political opposition, those persons in his own party and in the Republican Party who had disagreed with many of his views and policies and who also grieve for Mr. Kennedy. We are speaking of the extremists, left and right, who go beyond the pale in their opposition and criticism.

The Nation owes a great debt to Mr. Kennedy, who gave his life in the service of his country as surely as a soldier on the frontline. And to Mrs. Kennedy and the President's family the American people offer their hearts. The personal tragedy of an assassination seldom has been as heartbreakingly evident as in the scene that followed the shooting; Mrs. Kennedy holding the President's head in her lap and weeping "Oh, no."

No, it should never have happened in America. That it did must weigh heavily on America's conscience. And if it brings a reawakening and a real change in the temper of our times Mr. Kennedy will not have died in vain. This is a prayer in which all Americans can join.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 24, 1963]

## A PROMISE OF POWER WISELY USED: JOHN F. KENNEDY GAVE US AN EXHILARATING VISION OF POLITICAL DIGNITY

(By Karl E. Meyer)

He came in with a snowstorm and the symbolism was flawlessly right on Inauguration Day, January 20, 1961. There was no premonition of tragedy, but rather a sense of rebirth in a Capital mantled in beauty as the oldest President yielded office to the youngest man ever elected Chief Executive of the United States.

It was much more than a change of administration. It was also a change of generations, a change of outlook—and, most immediately apparent, a change of style. When John Fitzgerald Kennedy became 35th President of the United States, he appeared to fulfill Robert Frost's augury that an age of poetry and power was commencing in Washington.

But the poetry is now husted, and the promise of power wisely used is now an unfinished chapter of a history entitled, "Let Us Begin." We are left with memories of a singular and gifted man, memories that sustain us, following a tragedy as unspeakable as it was incomprehensible. None of us suspected that in retrospect the inaugural show would seem a shroud.

Every President is a bundle of men—the chief of state, who admonishes us to be better than we are; the taskmaster of a bureaucracy; the champion of a party and, not least, in this case the father of a family whose every trivial habit was watched and copied by the Nation. More than most, President Kennedy made of these fragments of official functions a harmonious whole.

This swiftly became apparent during the first hundred days. If he did not give us a New Deal, he did provide an exhilarating vision of the dignity of political life. In every aspect of government—small and large—he insisted on trained competence, on grace and integrity, on idealism tempered with a shrewd awareness of the possible. If the substance of his program did not differ dramatically from his predecessor's, it surely contrasted in style.

### A STANDARD OF ARTICULATENESS

The most obvious element of that style was articulateness. The clipped cadences of the inaugural address set the standard for his other great utterances as President. They also reflected the man, a man who could be ambiguous but who was seldom diffuse or banal.

"He brought an unsparing instinct for reality to bear on the platitudes and pieties of society," Mr. Kennedy once said of Robert Frost. The words applied to the President at his best.

Yet more fundamental than eloquence were Mr. Kennedy's sense of history, his courage, his temperance, his belief in reason—and all of these were laced with a potent dram of wit. The President did not excel at slapstick or sarcasm; his weapon was irony, which he used like a rapier, and sometimes so deftly that the victim only slowly became aware that his head had been figuratively separated from his neck.

His favorite foil was the press, but, unlike some other great men, his sense of humor extended even to himself. He was never more memorably engaging than at the White House correspondents' banquet in May, 1962, at which he mockingly protested the rise in ticket prices for the dinner—this, after the press had parodied his own attack on big steel.

Only the other day, though it feels like a chasm of time, Mr. Kennedy deflated BARRY GOLDWATER by remarking that the Arizona Senator had spent a busy week in, among other things, selling the TVA and interfering in the Greek election. With his death, President Kennedy has left Washington not only a sadder but also a colder place.

The courage in office was untheatrical and was the more impressive for its understated quality. Though President Kennedy had his share of Irish temper, his nature was not choleric and his anger seldom soured into rancor. But when he felt personally betrayed, or when he believed that a deep principle was involved, he could display a spinal fortitude that belied his need for a rocking chair.

As a Presidential candidate, he made what was probably his greatest speech before an audience of Protestant clergymen. The subject was religious bigotry; his delivery blended passion and precision; the place, ironically, was Texas.

As President, his courage was twice tested by Cuba—first in failure, then in success. Perhaps the most morally impressive moment was his acceptance of full responsibility for the debacle at the Bay of Pigs—and his refusal to redeem a fiasco at the risk of American blood and a world war. And though the defeat cut cruelly and deeply into his self-esteem, he disdained making a ritual scapegoat of any adviser.

In what was at once his greatest and most perilous moment as Chief Executive, Mr. Kennedy forced Nikita Khrushchev to pull nuclear missile bases out of Cuba before the eyes of the world—but he did not push the Soviet leader into a corner. He honored his inaugural commitment: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." In triumph, he showed the same restraint that earlier had marked his acceptance of bitter defeat.

Domestically, the strength of his backbone was demonstrated during a summer of racial discontent. Though the President was aware that his support of a strong civil rights program could rend his party and cost him popularity, he accepted both risks with calm—with an almost awesome equanimity.

This detachment frequently drained the drama from his gestures and gave a misleading coldness to his Presidency. Yet that was an indispensable element of the Kennedy style—an abhorrence of posturing. As President, he placed more confidence in the verdict of history than in the clamor of the crowd. And the sense of history was perhaps the secret of his serenity.

President Kennedy was a prodigious reader who was steeped in the records of the past and absorbed by the literature of the present. His chief military aide, Brig. Gen. Chester V. (Ted) Clifton, was astonished to discover that Mr. Kennedy even glanced critically over the monthly list of books recommended to service officers and that he read, in galley proof, books like Barbara Tuchman's "Guns of August."

From his reading, the President acquired a sense of detachment about himself and about the limits of his power. To his liberal friends, this trait was at once exasperating and winning; to them, he sometimes appeared more a Hamlet than a Hotspur. Like Lincoln, he seemed to feel that he was as much controlled by events as controlling events. In death, his view has acquired a poignant authority.

His favorite biography was Lord David Cecil's "Melbourne," a book about the urbane Whig who was Queen Victoria's first Prime Minister. In both the flattering and unflattering sense, the choice disclosed something of Mr. Kennedy's definition of himself. For the Whig aristocracy, like the President's own family, blended moderate liberalism, an attitude of noblesse oblige, a conventional if broad-ranging interest in the arts and a coolness about excessive commitments.

Above all, the leaders like Melbourne who dominated British politics in the early 19th century were temperate men. They wanted to civilize power as much as to use it. They regarded noisy public dispute as a mark of political failure, not as a device for compelling consent.

### SYMPATHETIC POLITICIAN

In his relations with fellow politicians, as well as with the press, Mr. Kennedy showed a reluctance for turbulent combat. A gifted craftsman in politics himself, he understood the political problems of others.

When a President of Argentina campaigned for office on a platform calling for a cancellation of contracts with foreign oil producers, Mr. Kennedy's restrained reaction testified to his fraternal feeling for another elective official's need to keep a promise.

The same tolerance marked his relations with a Congress nominally dominated by his own party. He could be tough in private, but his voice was soft in public. Through all the vicissitudes of political life, he retained an abiding faith in the power of reason to affect the destiny of men. It was President Kennedy who saw to it that a "hot line" was installed in the White House to give reason a chance before mankind plunged over a brink.

His belief in human intelligence gave a glow to his style. More, perhaps, than any other President since Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Kennedy cherished not only learning but the learned. His ideal of Government seemed to be part academy, part precinct club. His mind was open to fresh ideas, and his official residence was open to anybody—from Nobel laureates to lowly subordinates—who could impart a ferment.

### THE CHILLING HEIGHTS

It may be that when he took the oath of office, John F. Kennedy was still the carefree playboy of hostile propaganda, though the evidence is to the contrary. Lincoln was also a more ambitious politician than a prophet of freedom when circumstances contrived to make him President on the eve of civil war.

But the heights chill as well as elevate, and before long Mr. Kennedy comprehended the responsibility in his hands. In two speeches—at the United Nations in 1961 and at American University only a few months ago—the President disclosed his troubled reflections about a world that modern weapons could turn into a flaming pyre.

In private discussions, the President tirelessly iterated his feeling that mankind walks a narrow ledge. However, he had to zig and zag, the goal he sought was peace, and his methods were those of reason. Those who admired him never doubted his earnestness, though they were sometimes impatient with his caution.

He now belongs to history, and his confidence that time would soon bear him out, bringing the country to where the land was bright, remains an imponderable. So does his buoyant faith in reason.

For the most savage irony is that this apostle of the enlightment, this advocate of rational discourse, was cut down by the very fanaticism that as President he sought to contain.

He paid with his life in a cause that remains in doubt. The last page of his biography must be written with what Vergil called the tears of things.

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Vice President Johnson, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens:

We observe today not a victory of a party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has aways been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in a new endeavor: creating not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BURKHALTER].

Mr. **BURKHALTER**. Mr. Speaker, Arlington National Cemetery was chosen as the last resting place for the mortal remains of our respected and revered President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The ever-present symbol of the always burning eternal flame, which was so eloquently chosen by his thoughtful and devoted wife, Jacqueline, shall serve in the ages ahead to remind all mankind and especially those in our democratic Nation of the ideals and ideas of true freedom and peace that the President espoused while he served as the elected Chief Official of this great free Republic.

His stay was so short but his works, deeds, and thoughts will endure forever where free men and women gather to work toward a world free of prejudices and hate and fear and where the word "peace" can have a daily meaning of strength and not be circumspect in its allegiances.

A path once trod is much easier to follow. President Kennedy in envisioning the new horizons to be explored in this 20th century world, whether they be on this planet or on the surface of others, in his ringing cry for the conquering of these new frontiers had the courage and wisdom to blaze the trail so those of us who followed could find it easier to attain these self-same pinnacles of human understanding and love for all mankind, whether or not we shared their particular native tongues or native customs.

President Kennedy has given us all a responsibility and another stone of American heritage to place in the building of a greater understanding in the edifice of our still unfinished shrine and fortress of a meaningful democracy.

Each of us in his own way can mix the mortar that will hold this heritage in place for time immemorial, but all ingredients of hate, intolerance and bigotry must be banished from this true mortar of liberty and equality to assure a firm, sound and binding medium for future generations of free Americans to build on with confidence.

Words are so meaningless unless backed by actions and deeds. I feel that Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy will find more solace and understanding, in the days ahead if she can see deeds and actions that are put into motion to finalize the dreams that our beloved President had hoped to achieve in his elected term of service to the people, country and ideals of this our land which he loved so well. May Caroline and John-John in their majority, know that the Nation as well as the world in which they exist is better because of the courage and convictions that their daddy had when they were his adorable, lovable, playmates in the Oval Room of the House that is home for all of our American dreams and achievements.

In this tragic moment of sorrow and grief Mrs. Burkhalter and I extend our prayers and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy and children and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Senator Edward Kennedy, Eunice Shriver, Jean Smith, Patricia Lawford and their families on the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, one so dear and close to each and every one of them.

Our democracy is a living thing, one of its greatest leaders, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has died in its service. May his supreme sacrifice be the birth of a new and better understanding amongst all of us. Time will prove it was not in vain.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, when the petals of a rose are crushed, a fragrance lingers in the atmosphere.

The life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy inspired and beautified our world. It was the finest and most perfectly formed rose in our garden. Now, so unspeakably crushed in the full flower of its beauty, its fragrance is all about us.

How unreal it seems. How beyond our capacity to fathom. How incongruous and paradoxical that in the cosmic fitness of things so premature and untimely an end to so great a life would come at such a time and in such a seemingly senseless way.

Ushered in on the falling flakes of a snowstorm on that bracing January day in 1961, 3 short years of his invigorating leadership of our Nation have come to a halt.

Yet as deathless as immortality are some of the things he said. His blithe and refreshing spirit will be with us for generations to renew our faith when we are tired, to rekindle our hopes when we would despair.

One hundred years from now, the children of this land will still recite and apply to their lives the timeless words of that inauguration address:

> My fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

So long as the fires of freedom burn on earth, free man still will find their inspiration renewed in the memory of his challenge:

> My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

So long as men hope and dream of peace, they may find direction anew in the words spoken in his fine hour in October of last year:

> Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in the hemisphere, and, we hope, around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved.

So long as there are men and women of compassion, they will find confirmation of their faith in his message to Congress in 1962 wherein he said:

> For we are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people.

And never will the Nation be able to forget his timely reminder:

> If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

John F. Kennedy was a far greater man than many ever fully realized. Not only was he our youngest President, but surely one of the most intellectually gifted.

Some of us had the rich privilege to know him as an extraordinarily fine human being. He was approachable and warm. You could talk to him and he would listen. He was a man of sparkling humor, capable of friendship and deeply loyal. He loved his country and believed earnestly in its future.

On Friday morning, November 22, which today seems an eternity ago, none could feel but that the Nation and this man who so perfectly symbolized it were in their finest hour.

On that morning, I had the privilege of walking with him through a clamorous hotel lobby and across the street to a waiting crowd, tumultuous with the joy of seeing their President. In that inimitable way in which he gave himself, we walked past the speaker's stand and directly to the people. It was his joy to go among them, to shake their hands, to feel the press of their hopes and aspirations.

There were accompanying him that morning a little group who never will forget the warmth of his personality and the depth of his humanity. Raymond E. Buck, president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, State Senator Don Kennard, Mrs. David O. Belew, Jr., the State executive committeewoman, Texas Gov. John B. Connally, and President Kennedy's devoted friend and capable fellow laborer, our then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The President was relaxed, in the high spirits of his characteristic good humor, vibrant and outgoing at his very best, a President sharing himself with his people.

As he talked, another crowd awaited at a breakfast. But he could not bring himself to leave, so hungry were the people assembled in a drizzling rain to hear him and to clasp to themselves forever the imprint of his personality.

Almost whimsically, I thought of the words of that last stanza of his favorite poem:

> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Everywhere he went the throng crowded about. The people sensed that this was, in solemn truth more profound than the mere utterance of words, their President.

Never has there been a man more loyal to the hopes and dreams of his people. Never has there been one more able to articulate the finer essence of their spirit. Time will not tarnish nor age decay the ever-fresh example of this man, plucked off in the full flower of his youth.

America will never be so young again, but when we are old we still can remember the words that he spoke and the deeds that he did.

So helpless do we feel to comfort or give solace to those who loved him most—his incredibly brave young widow and their children. She has represented us nobly in this moment of our tragic trial when all the world looked on and saw her unflinching courage in the face of adversity so stark as to beggar description.

But John F. Kennedy would not have us to look back. His faith was in the future. His hope was in tomorrow. And all of our tomorrows will have more than a little bit of him.

We cannot linger in the paths of our reflections, and he would not have us do so. There is work to be done, and a torch to be lifted from his hands and carried on into all the tomorrows that stretch beyond the horizon. Tempted though we are to linger longer in the moment, we hear again his words as he quoted Robert Frost:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Can we from this untterable tragedy find light for the way? Can there emerge from this circumstance which defies mortal understanding a beacon to lead us? Perhaps from this traumatic shock the Nation may learn a new tolerance. Lest his life shall have been in vain, may we find in this a new sense of unity and a new dedication to the national purpose.

May the bitter, howling winds of divisiveness and the occasional gusts of hate be stilled among us. May we in this hour and tomorrow and tomorrow be able to repeat again the prayer murmured by Aristophanes among the ruins of the Greek temples devastated by the Peloponnesian wars:

> From the murmur and subtlety of suspicion
> With which we vex one another
> Give us rest;
> Make a new beginning
> And mingle again the kindred of the nations
> In the alchemy of love;
> And with some finer essence of forbearance
> Temper our minds.

The Scriptures tell us "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, who gave strength to his people and drew strength from them, who exposed himself to the Nation at such unrestrained sacrifice of his own comfort and repose, has laid down his life for the Nation he loved.

May we seek to be worthy of so grand a sacrifice.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, we will long remember the terrible sense of shock and sorrow as well as that of deep personal loss which we felt on learning of the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The sense of sudden shock will fade in time, but that of personal bereavement will stay with us.

The spontaneous expressions of tribute and condolences of countless Americans as well as people in other lands have been a vivid demonstration of the measure of esteem and affection that President Kennedy inspired. Our hearts, and those of people of good will everywhere, go out to our widowed First Lady, her little children, and the others of the Kennedy family, in their grief. We share their deep sense of loss.

History will assess the impact of President Kennedy as going far beyond the comparatively 3 short years he served as Chief Executive. His leadership was composed of a great and rare blend of courageous dedication to high principles, depth of understanding, wisdom, and kindness of heart. To know him was to admire, respect, and like him.

The world is truly enriched by the example given us by our late President. He was a most remarkable man in many ways. His tremendous energy, his quickness of mind and his determination enabled him to overcome at various times opposition, illness, and adversity. He demonstrated an abiding interest in his fellow men. His endeavors in their behalf never faltered.

President Kennedy's firmness with the Soviet during the Cuban crisis may well have been the turning point in the long and difficult struggle to preserve the peace. All his foreign policy reflected his determination to achieve his best in efforts to build world conditions in which our democracy could survive as a nation of free and independent people. His domestic policies were reflected in his proposals for legislation designed to improve the business climate and create improved and increased opportunity for employment. He was also a stanch advocate of physical fitness, stressing health-building exercise for the young, and urging adequate care for the aged.

Yes, while the world is poorer for his loss, it is still enriched by the impress of his character and personality upon our civilization. The mantle of destiny had been placed on his shoulders and he wore it with a gracious dignity and wisdom. I am proud to have been his friend, to have served with him in the Congress and under him as our President. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, already enshrined in the hearts of his fellow men, will be recorded by history as brightening the pages of our time.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and distressed to learn of the tragic passing of our beloved President the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is rather difficult to realize at this late date that such a tragedy could happen in the United States. We are supposed to be one of the leading civilized countries in the world and it is generally understood among all people that we can and should be able to disagree on about every problem confronting our country and our personal affairs without being disagreeable.

I had the distinct honor of serving as chairman of the House District Committee during the time our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was serving as a member of the District Committee. Congressman Kennedy as I addressed him at that time was one of our most active Members and was very cooperative with me as chairman of the Committee at all times.

I was able to work with President Kennedy after he was elected to serve as our President and on several occasions he personally called and asked me to come to the White House and discuss problems confronting the District of Columbia and other problems confronting the country with him when no one was in the room with me except the President. I never repeated to anyone any of the conversations that we had since he had requested a private conversation with me.

I had explicit confidence in our late President and think that he will go down in history as one of the most brilliant men who ever served as President of the United States.

We did not always agree on certain proposals pending before the Congress and I did not always agree with some of his policies and I am certain he did not always agree with my policies and votes; however, this did not lessen my great respect for John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a man and as our President.

President Kennedy was a gentleman under all circumstances and no one could ever point their finger at any discrepancy of any type that he participated in during his long public service.

We all fully realize that President Kennedy could not handle all the problems confronting this country and our foreign relations with other countries without some assistance. I am certain that if it had been humanly possible for him to handle all the affairs on the homefront and the problems overseas we would have a better country to live in at the present time.

The world was shocked over the tragedy and as long as we have mentally deranged people and people who are not stable roaming the streets and byways of this country it will be dangerous for a President or in fact any person to travel without some protection. I have wondered on numerous occasions in previous years why the President of the United States was allowed to ride up and down Pennsylvania Avenue with the top down on his automobile when any "crackpot" could have shot him from the roof of any building on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I always disapproved of any President traveling over the United States in the individual States for the purpose of campaigning or making public appearances as a man in this position already has more responsibility and work at the White House than he can possibly bear or transact.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Kennedy and their two children, also to the President's distinguished father and mother, and his brothers and sisters.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are limited by the magnitude of my sorrow. This leader whom the world has lost came to us out of the mystic womb of time, fashioned out of superb intellect, sparkling wit, and an incomparable grace. A person of heroic stature chosen by destiny for high service to humanity. Only in the crucial moments of mankind's life is it given the rest of us to walk, talk, and be inspired by a leader who is endowed with qualities that transcend those bestowed upon the rest of us. Only, it seems, in periods of a hundred years is the mold out of which mankind is fashioned, modified by God and a greater portion of the infinite injected into the soul of a finite being, so it was with John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Such leaders in sparing numbers have appeared on the world scene in times of our most crucial struggles. We of the 20th century have shared for a brief moment an image of greatness such as we will never see again—for now he is committed to the immortality of the ages.

Today, we see the worldwide consensus of his greatness. Today, we note that no barrier of race, creed, or nationality intrude upon the common suffering at this time of our fellowship in anguish. And, Mr. Speaker, although the progress of man as recorded in history is known to me; although I am aware of man's inhumanity to man; despite my knowledge of man's prediliction to look within himself for greatness, to close the doors of his mind and heart even when that which is his salvation is freely offered, I yet ask myself over and over again—why? Why? I can not find the answers. I do not know that I shall ever find them, but I do know that I must say to my colleagues and to men everywhere as has been said before: That the purveyors of hate and intolerance, the peddlers of bigotry, as well as those who wrap themselves in the mantle of indifference, are coconspirators in a deed so foul that it revolts the conscience of mankind. They have permitted, both actively and passively, men of incomparable evil to inject venom into the bloodstream and the nerve centers of some of our fellow countrymen. They have prostituted the faith they claim to possess and they have made a mockery of the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unseemly for me to proceed further, and it would be unthinkably cynical for me to live without hope for the future of our country. Let me, therefore, say in closing:

> The wicked are the chaff which the wind driveth away. Therefore, the wicked shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous; for the Lord regardeth the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked shall perish.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, more than any other President in history, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was an integral part of this body. He loved Washington. He loved the men and women who labor in these halls, and his love of his fellow man and his country seemed unending.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I think it highly probable that we—even we who knew him best—underrated his greatness. We were so close to him that we could not accurately estimate his great stature.

We were prone to think of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a dear friend and colleague who had been elected to the Presidency of the United States and was therefore the leader of 200 million Americans. We could not entirely grasp the fact that his leadership, and his responsibility, extended to the whole of humankind, to the free world and even to the world that is not free.

When we first learned the dreadful news of his assassination, we felt, primarily, a personal loss. Then we began to comprehend the national loss. But it took a little longer to grasp the fact that ordinary men and women in every walk of life, in every corner of the free world, were mourning him as fully and as personally as we were.

A Japanese farmer walks 18 miles, with his family and through the night, just to stand silently in prayer before the American Embassy in Tokyo. Bus drivers in Warsaw, when they hear the news, halt their vehicles and burst into tears. A hundred thousand students in West Berlin carry memorial torches through the night. Men and women in London on the streets break into uncontrollable sobs. In every capital of the world, grieving citizens line up before American embassies and consulates to sign a book so that the bereaved citizens of this country will know they share with us their great sorrow.

Never before in the history of man has the death of a leader caused a deeper or a more universal grief.

John Kennedy once said that a nation reveals itself by the men it honors. He was speaking of another when he said it, but the phrase applies with such poignant truth to himself. Without completely realizing it, Americans were enlarged and glorified because they had seen fit to honor John Fitzgerald Kennedy and to choose him as our leader.

We have often been blest with idealists and greatness in the White House, but John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the most articulate and the most dynamic magnificent idealist we have ever had as our President. He gave our national ideals vibrancy and vigor and he gave them meaning with his masterful leadership.

He believed passionately in peace and he believed passionately in freedom. And the glory of the man is that he saw no conflict between the two.

He believed in the potential of the individual.

He believed in the reality of hope.

He believed in thought. He believed in reason. Just because reason so often fails, he would not permit himself to entertain the belief that it never works.

He believed in laughter and he believed in life.

He believed in an obligation to generations yet unborn, to provide them with a good earth and a decent world.

Above all, he believed in God.

And, Mr. Speaker, he believed in all this so strongly and so completely that the rest of the civilized world—its leaders and its ordinary citizens—came to realize that the people of the United States shared these beliefs with their President. We, the American people, were indeed revealed by the man that we honored.

At the moment we feel that our tragedy is total. But, great as our sorrow is, it need not be total if we pledge ourselves to work for the accomplishment of what John Kennedy tried to do.

The ultimate tragedy of a great man is not represented by death. It is represented by the things he sought to bring to life. It is up to us, Mr. Speaker, and to the American people to complete the vast programs for the benefit of this great Nation and all mankind which John F. Kennedy had started. It is up to us, and to the American people, to give life to the ideals and to the purposes of the great man whose memory we cherish so dearly.

We mourn the death, with all our heart, of a great friend, a great President, a great world citizen. We extend, with all our heart, the hand of condolence to his bereaved widow and his children. May his spirit and his greatness live on forever.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has experienced a great tragedy in the horrible murder of its beloved leader, President John F. Kennedy. Like most of my colleagues here in the House, I knew him as a personal friend. This is true, in a very real sense, for all Americans, because he was truly interested in the welfare of us all.

Many suggestions have been appropriately made for memorials to his memory. Regardless of what may be done on those proposals, each of us can create for President Kennedy a memorial in our own hearts by channeling our thoughts to love and understanding among mankind, in our time and wherever we may be. By so living we may lessen the tensions and provide the solutions of many of our problems.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a former Member of this body.

No American is unmindful of the tragic loss which President Kennedy's death has brought to this Nation.

Yet those of us in this body also remember him as a former colleague.

When I first came here as a Member of the 82d Congress, John Kennedy was in his third term. As it turned out it was his last term in the House, for he thereafter successfully sought election to the Senate.

Those who knew him in those years know that he grew greatly in maturity and ability as he continued to move into greater responsibilities. Even in those years he was liked and respected.

When he entered the White House a decade later, although he was the youngest man to be elected to the Presidency, he possessed a maturity and an experience well beyond his years.

No one can adequately measure just what his contributions to America might have been had he lived a full span of years.

Instead this young and promising leader was cut down by a mad assassin, who had fed himself on the hatred and destructiveness of communism.

Lee Oswald's act is the complete antithesis of our free traditions, which are honored and preserved in this body, and which were exemplified by our late President.

In a free society we cannot always be safeguarded from a madman.

This was recognized and accepted by John F. Kennedy. This risk, as he knew, is part of the price of freedom.

We can greatly honor John F. Kennedy by continuing his fight against the forces of darkness, typified by his Marxist assassin, which still threaten the world with tyranny and slavery.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I know that I represent the feeling of all of those from my district and of Louisiana in expressing my heartfelt regrets at the loss of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The freshness of his approach to the manifold problems of this country and his constant vigilance in keeping the security of our people will be an inspiration forever to those who love America.

The greatness of our system of government and the fortitude of our people will insure the perpetuity of things for which President Kennedy devoted his tireless and enlightened efforts.

The memory of his dedication to duty and his love of country will certainly influence future generations to strive to follow in his footsteps of progress.

In speaking for the people whom it is my privilege to represent, I wish to extend my sincere sympathy to President Kennedy's bereaved family on the occasion of their irreparable loss which was so keenly shared by people throughout the world.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to add much to the moving words of tribute that have been paid here this afternoon. However, I am grateful for the honor of joining my colleagues in expressing my sense of loss and shock at the tragic passing of President John F. Kennedy.

He brought to Washington and the Nation a new appreciation for excellence—excellence in statesmanship, excellence in intellect, excellence in devoted service to his country and to free men everywhere. It was this pursuit of excellence that brought to Washington a brilliant and dedicated new generation of public servants—men who continue to serve. I extend my sympathy to his family and all those near and dear to him.

In closing I would just like to add that I will cherish throughout my lifetime the privilege of having had the honor to serve in this distinguished House of Representatives during a portion of President John F. Kennedy's administration.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and spoken about our late and beloved President Kennedy, and his short life was so full of accomplishments and great moments, that I feel incapable at a time like this to try to express my admiration for him, my deep sense of loss at his death, my sincere sympathy for his family, and my hope that the memory of him will live in people of good will everywhere throughout the ages.

It still seems almost impossible that he is gone from us. This young and vigorous man had risen to the pinnacle of his chosen career of public service. He gained the highest office in the land and the most important office in the world today in a shorter time than did any before him. He served in that post with honor and dignity. Born in a time of crisis, he served his Nation with a dedication few men possess.

His military career exemplified his courage and his love for his fellow man, as did his whole life. He almost gave his life in the Pacific to save his comrades. He was a hero who could have satisfied himself with having served his Nation with distinction. But this was not enough for John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Born to privilege, he was trained for service, service to his Nation and to all mankind. He served with a vigor seldom equalled. Throughout his career in the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and his 3 years as President of the United States, he gave his Nation all his energy and mental ability. No task was to difficult, no burden too great.

During their 3 years in the White House, President and Mrs. Kennedy enriched the cultural life of our Nation beyond measure. This was only a small part of their total effort, but their impact in this field will never be forgotten.

Even in death our beloved President continues to serve. That tragic event on the 22d day of November, just 13 days ago, has bound this Nation together in a unity we were not able to accomplish before. We hope and pray that it is a permanent unity, that we will not forget so soon as we are apt to do.

God grant that a new and permanent spirit may be born in us, that our President shall not have died in vain, "that there shall be a new birth of freedom in our Nation, so that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Our President was but a mortal man. But he was an extraordinary mortal. He had faults as all men do. But he had a love for people, a desire to serve, a dedication to ideals, and a brilliance to comprehend that was unique, and vital, and needed.

To those of us who had the pleasure of knowing him personally, his death is a more personal loss, perhaps. We knew him as a warm and understanding person. We will miss him.

For all Americans, and for freemen everywhere, we have not only lost a dedicated leader, we have lost a true friend. May he rest in peace.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, "For dust thou art, and into dust shalt thou return." This is a simple truth we all must face one day, and although we recognize it, we shut it from our minds until it touches someone near. It is then we experience the grief accompanying it. However, when these expected moments arrive the sorrow and grief we experience is relieved through tears that we shed. It is one of the mysteries of the mind that grants this relief. But as mysterious as the mind can be, in that it motivates our very actions, there are moments when all of its mysteries cannot produce the answer to an accepted fact—when it fails in its task to accept the reality that is placed before us.

The loss of someone near and dear is always a painful experience, but when the loss is unexpected and sudden, no mortal can understand it and they want so much not to accept it. It is a shock that dulls our senses. It leaves us in a state of limbo.

Thus it was on November 22, 1963. A shock wave rumbled that reached to the far corners of the world. It was a deep shock, so deep that a state of paralysis seemed to engulf everyone that it touched. It will go down in history as the day the world stood still. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Chief Executive of the United States had been assassinated.

When the news of his tragic death was announced, the world was stunned. Many wanted to cry, but the shock was so great that the tears would not form. We were numb.

What is the significance of the reaction that took place? Considering that in the history of mankind many tragedies have occurred where lives were lost through sickness, plague, war, and human error, one might feel that we have conditioned ourselves to this eventuality. Yet the modern world had never experienced the loss of a leader who was recognized as the "protector of peace." A man who was dedicated not only to serving his country, but to serving all mankind. One who chose to lead this life, for he had ideas and far-reaching vision to bring about a peaceful existence amongst humanity. His love for his fellow man has been recorded in his service record during World War II. Even then he was ready to sacrifice his life for his country. But it was not to be. Rather, he was to be spared to carry on in a more important role with far more reaching effects.

President Kennedy was groomed for his office. He had the experience of serving in both bodies of Congress and he made certain he was fully aware of our country's needs and position in the world.

In accepting the Presidency of the United States, he was more determined in his desire to improve conditions both here and abroad. For through a program of action, which he had carefully planned, the dream of peace and prosperity could one day be a reality. He became the hope of the oppressed, the poor, and the helpless. But more so, he became the hope of the future for all humanity.

Why then should this great man be taken from us in the prime of life? Many answers have been given to this question, but I wonder if there is not a real significant meaning to the one answer that could be the right one. The answer that this tragedy was put before us as a message from our Maker to return to His acknowledgment.

In recent years the world has grown to live in fear, greed, and hate. It has strayed from the everlasting teachings of faith, hope, and charity and our purpose in life on earth was being lost. We had to be awakened from this hypnotic state and returned to the path of righteousness.

It could very well be that the death of President Kennedy, before the eyes of thousands of our citizens, before the eyes of the world, was the message we were to receive. For as I have said, November 22, 1963, was the day the world stood still. But it only stood still with respect to the material things in life. It moved toward the spiritual things we were forgetting.

Never in the modern history of the world have so many stopped to take time to enter their houses of worship and silently pray for the repose of one human soul. Although their actions were in behalf of this man, I am sure a soul-searching took place.

If this be the answer to the question, "Why was this great leader taken from us"?, then I hope that this message will resolve ourselves to return to normalcy.

Although we have lost a great leader, his spirit will never die. His life is the everlasting light at his gravesite. Let us look to it as a symbol of guidance toward achieving the goals designed by the man for which it burns.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be missed but he will never be forgotten. He was a martyr for a cause—a cause for peace and love amongst mankind.

Let us carry on in his felt absence.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Republican I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to pay my own personal respects to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The reaction to his senseless assassination was one of national shock and yet one of national unity. There was a closing of the ranks following this great tragedy. I believe, as his spirit now looks down upon us mortals who remain here, that he approves.

John F. Kennedy loved this Nation passionately and held high hopes for its immediate future and ultimate destiny.

There are, of course, those of us who may differ with the ways and means of achieving this, but there is a union of determination to keep this Nation great—a fitting place for the land of the free to be and for the home of the brave to be located.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of everyone in my district, I join with my colleagues in eulogizing our late President, John F. Kennedy.

The Presidency of John F. Kennedy lasted only slightly more than 1,000 days, but it was a time of greatness for our United States. Now it is ended by an assassin's bullet, but the national purpose which he gave the Nation will live on.

In his campaign, President Kennedy pledged to face squarely the challenges of the 1960's. His domestic program and foreign policy show how successfully he kept his word. Never before in our history has a President accomplished so much for the Nation in so short a time.

Immediately on taking office, President Kennedy moved boldly to invigorate our sluggish economy through the new area redevelopment program, needed public works projects, and legislation for tax reduction and reform. As a result of these actions, the gross national product has been increased $100 billion in less than 3 years. For the past 34 months, there has been a steady upward trend in the economy.

President Kennedy believed the evils of segregation and discrimination have no place in our national life. He eradicated them from public housing through an Executive order, removed barriers to employment opportunities in government and private industry by enforcing a policy against prejudice with every means at his disposal, and proposed to Congress the most sweeping bill on civil rights in the Nation's history. President Kennedy gave top priority to this legislation because he believed the immoral practices of segregation and discrimination were preventing us from fulfilling the ideals of the Constitution and hampering us in our role as leader of the free world.

President Kennedy's foreign policy brought us a step nearer to lasting peace. In 1961, our conventional military forces were in a sad state of disrepute. This weak link in our armor was a threat to our security because it gave us no choice between nuclear holocaust and surrender. President Kennedy initiated the special forces program and today the soldiers of this unit are expertly assisting the South Vietnamese in their struggle against Communist insurgents. He also increased our nuclear arsenal to the point where we now have absolute superiority over any potential enemy. President Kennedy demonstrated that he would use our military might to combat threatened aggression in the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. This policy of seeking peace through strength was proved correct with the signing of the limited test ban treaty. It showed that the Soviets recognized overt aggression would avail them nothing and they should seek a detente. The Treaty of Moscow was the first positive stop toward a lasting peace in more than 10 years.

President Kennedy's contribution to the Nation should not be measured solely in terms of policies adopted or programs proposed. He brought an energy and drive to government which had been missing for many years. He gave Government service a dignity and respect long absent. He provided inspiration for those at every level of service.

John F. Kennedy was a brilliant and articulate President. His inaugural address, his speech at the U.N. on disarmament, his address at American University, and his remarks to the Nation this past June on civil rights will surely be ranked among the great orations of our time. President Kennedy had the power to uplift men's spirit and touch their most noble instincts. It was he who conceived the idea for the Peace Corps as a group of dedicated people working for human betterment around the world. This organization, which has been so successful, will be a lasting memorial to his Presidency and the ideals for which he fought.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough that we honor the accomplishments of President Kennedy. We have an obligation to him and to the entire Nation to learn an invaluable lesson from the tragic and frightening experiences of recent days.

The principles on which our open society is based, respect for law and order, rationality and freedom of ideas, have suffered an agonizing blow. The fabric of our society has been brutally torn by this monstrous assassination. We ask ourselves in shocked disbelief, How could such a thing happen in our country?

To answer this question we must look within ourselves, individually and collectively and identify those who are responsible for the low level to which our national life has sunk. Those extremists who have preached hatred, fear, and distrust must accept a large portion of the blame. By questioning the loyalty and dedication of our national leaders, they poisoned the minds of decent people across the country and so set the stage for the savage events which took place in Dallas. These extremists are guilty of subverting the most sacred principles of the Constitution. Surely now, all must realize that we must repudiate extremists of both the left and the right and unite behind men of reason and good will who can lead the country forward along the path set forth by President Kennedy.

The responsibility for this terrible deed extends beyond the disseminators of evil and divise propaganda. A measure of guilt must be borne by everyone who sat by and allowed a scurrilous remark against the President or the Chief Justice of the United States to go unchallenged, by each citizen who smugly neglected his duties to his fellow man and to his community, and by all those who failed to speak up and support the laws of the United States and the orders of the Federal courts when they were defied by local officials.

No one can completely escape blame for what has occurred. Thus it is incumbent on each of us to pledge to eliminate from our national life those forces which have led us to this dark time in our history. On his last trip to Texas, President Kennedy warned against those who spread passion and violence. He pleaded for reason and understanding.

In his inaugural address President Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." We have his answer. He died in the service of his country like the heroes of Gettysburg, the Aisne-Marne campaign, Iwo Jima and the battle for Seoul. Let us make sure he has not died in vain.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as the sun began to descend from its meridian on November 22, 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy's moments on this planet were quickly fleeting. His labors were nearing an end. His vision was about to be closed.

Suddenly, as from the ground yawning at his feet, Death, the phantom, with all the accouterments of his terror, leaped upon John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the youthful, vibrant, and dynamic 35th President of the United States.

At the turn of the road in Dallas, Tex., a transient glimpse of the violent agitation of sudden death was revealed to thousands of American lookers-on—a scene flashing in and out of their unbelieving eyes for the briefest instant, telling its own dreadful tale and sweeping it forever into the minds and hearts of a shuddering and mournful humanity.

His back at that moment was turned to us; not by sight could he any longer communicate with the waiting peril. But from the ominous crack of an assassin's fusillade, too truly had his ear been instructed that all was done as regarded any effort of his. Already in resignation, John Fitzgerald Kennedy had rested from his struggle. And perhaps in his heart he was whispering, "Father, which are in Heaven, do Thou finish above what I on earth have attempted."

The specter of death mixed itself already in John Fitzgerald Kennedy's early manhood with the heavenly sweetness of life. Yet, upon our beloved President, as upon other mortals scattered in the vast field of eternity, fell too powerfully and too early the vision of life.

A certain rabbin upon the text, "Your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams," inferred that young men are admitted nearer to God than old men, because vision is a clearer revelation than a dream. President Kennedy was a visionary—a man young in years but perhaps old in hours because he lost no time. In the conduct and manage of his actions, he did not embrace more than he could hold. Nor did he stir more than he could quiet, nor did he fly to the end without consideration of the means and the degrees.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed a rare and deep insight into the history of man and the world, without which there is no recognition of the understanding of the rapture of life. No marble, no gilded monuments of kings and princes shall outlive nor war's quick fire shall burn the living record of the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

When old age shall this generation waste,
Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe
Than ours, a friend to man.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, words are insufficient instruments to capture and convey the essence of a human being—especially when the human being is a man of the nature of John F. Kennedy.

We mourn the passing of a man of spirit, gallantry, wisdom, and verve. He made this Nation's Capital and many capitals throughout the world brighter and more stimulating in the time of his brief young life.

I am eager to eulogize John F. Kennedy in works rather than words. I am yearning to speak eloquently with the single syllable "aye" for equal opportunity, for expanded democracy, for new frontiers of economic security, for a peaceful world.

As our late President so often told us, the path is long and arduous. It is not for the bigoted, nor the cynical, nor the easily discouraged. But I am grateful to know that there are many of us who are willing to follow it. That is our best memorial to our vigorous young leader. If we do not tire, if we accomplish, we will be insuring the place of John F. Kennedy in the history of the country he served so well.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled here today to pay honor to a man, the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who exemplified the most noble qualities of American statesmanship and American citizenship.

John F. Kennedy was born to wealth and comfort, yet he dedicated his life to the poor and the uncomfortable of this Nation and the world. During the last World War he suffered enduring wounds in defense of the humanitarian principles which have sustained this Nation since its inception. In 1963, he gave his life for these same best standards of our American ideals.

All of us in this Chamber knew John Kennedy. Each of us has shared the shock and the sorrow produced by his death at the hands of an unprincipled coward. Every American, regardless of political persuasion, must surely feel a sense of personal loss, as we do here, at the passing of so vibrant, so courageous, and so duteous a leader as John F. Kennedy.

Like each of you, I have lived through some of the grandest and the saddest scenes of time. We each of us have shared human triumph and human despair. We have seen human strength contend against human weakness, and we have learned to appraise the different qualities of the human heart, the different things that are great and grand in this world.

I have traveled to and fro across my beloved Missouri countryside, marveling at the diversity of its topography and the immutable strength of its people. And I have always thought that was wonderful.

I have been at my home in rural Missouri and looked at the red maples in their torrid autumn dress, and listened to the birds and enjoyed the quiet and tranquillity, and I thought that was wonderful.

I have traveled this country over and much of this world over, from Atlantic to Pacific, with all the myriad scenes of grandeur. And I thought these were wonderful.

I have listened to oratory and music so magnificent that it appeared to me that "the human spirit seemed to be separated entirely from the gross things of this earth and it seemed to my spirit there was nothing but love and laughter and beauty and spirituality and holy things in this life," and I thought that was wonderful.

But the greatest and most wonderful thing I have ever seen in this life is a man who possesses a good and God-fearing character with a warm sympathy for the unprivileged, with an understanding of human rights, with an undivided love for his country, with intelligence and culture and wit, and with the courage to fight for his convictions even when in a position of ultimate responsibility and ultimate vulnerability.

On behalf of the citizens of northwest Missouri, on behalf of my family and myself, I extend heartfelt condolences to President Kennedy's courageous wife, his lovely children and his devoted family.

A great poet once wrote about such a man as John F. Kennedy:

Were a star quenched on high,
  For ages would its light,
Still traveling downward from the sky
  Shine on our mortal sight.

So when a great man dies,
  For years beyond our ken,
The light he leaves behind him lies
  Upon the paths of men.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I stood there on the hillside.

To my right and to my left I could see an almost endless sea of crosses.

Below was a small plot of ground, flowers covering an enclosure bordered by a white picket fence. A flame burned brightly at the head of the grave, at the foot a sad but proud guard of honor.

I had come to Arlington National Cemetery to join with the thousands of others who have formed an almost continuous line to pay their respects to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, in his final resting place.

I watched for a long while from the hillside, as a steady stream of Americans trudged up the embankment. It was quiet, it was reverent, it was sad—but in a sense, it was proud.

Proud of the man whose memory this silent march commemorated.

Gazing into the distance, I saw the Lincoln Memorial. I saw the Washington Memorial. I saw our Nation's Capitol. This Capitol represented to me the dynamic spirit of these United States, that men can live in peace and freedom, that they can live with a stable government of democracy tragically proven again in these past few days. The memorial to Washington reached skyward, symbolizing the unceasing spirit of freedom of the man who helped found this Nation on a dream. The Lincoln Memorial honors the man who preserved this Nation, who gave it a new birth of freedom, and who died as did John Fitzgerald Kennedy, serving the land he loved so well.

And just below me burned the flame.

I was deeply moved, as have all Americans at the events of these past few days. The youngest man in the history of our land to be burdened with the duties and responsibilities of the most powerful and important position man can bestow, had been struck down by a cowardly and dastardly deed.

I thought back over the years to a young man who had served his Nation so valiantly in time of war. Naval Lt. John F. Kennedy was willing to lay down his life for his beloved country in time of war. He was a hero in the American mold, and his story, and that of the men of PT-109 have become a part of the American tradition.

Looking at our Capitol through the slowly gathering haze, I could see in my mind's eye, a young man serving his Nation in the Congress of the United States, first in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate.

He was then called by America to lead this great Nation in the most trying and difficult times that man has ever known.

He called to us in his inaugural address for new resolve, for new dedication. He said:

> Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths and encourage the arts and commerce

He called for "a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

Destiny was not to allow him to serve out even his first term. I do not know why it had to happen, but I do know that we are all poorer because he has died, but knowing just as well that we are all richer because he lived.

I thought of his brave widow, who, for each of us bid him farewell and silently closed the coffin. Truly then did he, too, belong to the ages.

The band of gold which she placed on his still finger seems to me to be symbolic somehow for each of us. The circle has ever been a symbol of eternity, never ending, never ceasing, our faith in the eternal. And because of our faith in God, we know that this has been His will.

We grieve for his bereaved and gallant widow, his children, his family. Theirs is a sorrow that we all share. Their grief is our grief and we bear it with them.

Looking again from that hillside at the Lincoln Memorial, I thought of another American President who had given his life for his country. And the endless procession of white crosses I saw in the gathering dusk below, each also represented a life given for each of us in the defense of freedom, for the American way of life, for the eternal hope of tomorrow when all men will live in peace and brotherhood, blessed by our Heavenly Father.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is gone from us.

But his spirit should never be allowed to die.

His words will cry out through the ages:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what can you do for your country.

Our beloved President now lies in honored glory with the remains of thousands of American heroes, some known only to God, those who gave their lives for you and for me.

He died a hero, serving his Nation and its people.

As I descended the hillside to return to Washington, the silent line of mourners continued to press on toward the grave, silently to honor his memory and his sacrifice. A saddened and quiet multitude descended the hill, joining in a silent march from the grave.

Looking back at the flickering eternal flame, I felt that from this life, and death, America should gain a new measure of devotion and resolve. This flame, burning ever brightly, represents the true spirit of America, ever new, ever rekindled as the torch is passed to new generations, in the spirit that all men can someday live in a world of peace and prosperity.

Let us now pray for the man who has assumed the awesome responsibilities that only the President of these United States can bear.

Let us learn from this tragedy. Let us move bravely, as he would have done, to the future.

The spirit of John F. Kennedy can never die as long as America lives. For truly, it was and is the spirit of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Gordon W. Blackwell, the president of the Florida State University, Tallahasse, Fla., is one of America's most outstanding educators. At a memorial convocation in memory of our late President, John F. Kennedy, Dr. Blackwell made the following remarks, which I feel is a moving tribute to his life and work:

### Remarks at Memorial Convocation for John Fitzgerald Kennedy

(By President Gordon W. Blackwell, Florida State University, November 25, 1963)

The shocking, unbelievable events of the past 3 days must have special meaning for each of us. Each has his own interpretation; each, his own emotional reactions; each, his own thoughts on the import of all this.

For those of you who are away from the comforting mooring of home and family, it has doubtless been a particularly trying time.

Many well chosen words have been written and spoken in these days. Impressive and richly deserved tributes to our late respected leader have been made by many who are eminently capable of so serious a responsibility.

Now, as these tragic events reach their denouement, one wonders what more of significance can be said. Perhaps we can look beyond the confusion of the moment, the personally felt shock, the deep feeling of sympathy for the bereaved, the clear impression of Mrs. Kennedy's devotion and courage. And as we look beyond these fleeting, transitory emotions, perhaps we can see something which will give comfort and hope.

Certainly the opportunity to participate intimately in these tension-filled events through the miracle of instantaneous communication has left each of us emotionally drained. But perhaps also the experience has left us stronger, better persons.

We have had the intimate experience of corporate sharing of deep grief, not only with Americans but with all men who believe in human goodness and the dignity of man. The familiar words of John Donne have never been more poignant: "And, therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." Perhaps through this tolling we shall come to be less self-centered as individuals.

Especially have the young among us, I believe, experienced a renewed dedication to the principles upon which this country must stand if it is to remain the world's chief bulwark of freedom for the mind and the spirit. For John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as few other Presidents in American history, was identified with the vigor, the imagination, the excitement of the young at heart and the young in action. His familiar face was that of a young man. His courageous wife, the epitome of youthful beauty and creativity, typifies the cultured, well-educated woman. With their two lovely children, the image of the first family has been that of the ideal young American couple.

So Mr. Kennedy and his wife have had a profound meaning for young America. As the news of his death spread around this campus on Friday afternoon, students began to gather at the religious houses, and a few hours later crowded into the First Presbyterian Church for a memorial service. It was clear that these young people had been profoundly affected by the news of the President's death.

There can be no question but that the late President caught up the enthusiasm of the young with his warm personality, the brightness of his mind, and his love for sports and the out-of-doors. He carried them forward with the vigor of his thinking which matched his vibrant personality. He said to them, as to all of us: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." This question which he posed was no idle rhetoric, for he provided not only the inspiration but also some of the avenues by which many young Americans could find their own answers to the question. I think particularly of the Peace Corps, an instrumentality through which Mr. Kennedy brought into reality the proposition, advanced by William James three generations earlier, that for young people there should be a moral equivalent for war. Through the Peace Corps, self-sacrificing young Americans have moved into the far corners of the earth to represent their country on the front lines of ignorance and sickness and poverty.

But in an even larger measure President Kennedy helped to identify public service in government as a proper career ambition for youth, a career, like the other professions, deserving its fair share of the best talent and the best brains coming from our colleges and universities.

And so we mourn today America's youthful President, one of the youngest ever to hold the office, the one leader of modern times more than any other with whom young people could identify most closely, the one whose own life charted courses for them of both inspiration and action.

As an institution of learning, too, we respect and honor the qualities of his intellect, a mind that was well trained, quick to perceive, able to penetrate the complex problems that were his daily routine. He stood for the right of all to educational opportunity which would enable them to develop to the fullest their God-given talents. His leadership made brighter the prospects for strengthening higher education as a vital national resource.

Scholar, author, Pulitzer Prize winner—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in the short number of years in which he lived such a full life, helped to create a new respect for intelligence, for the disciplined mind. For this all colleges and universities are grateful.

As students and teachers we mourn this man who was both an interpreter of the American way of life and a warrior for American ideals. Against the background of war we saw his profile of heroism; against the background of international crises, we have seen him move with courage no less inspiring. Time and time again he desperately sought to bring to America and to the world an understanding of the larger meaning of the ideals for which he first risked his life in the service of his country.

And I believe it took no less courage for him to make decisions on the domestic issues which confronted him than it did to swim through the hostile waters to save the men in his command. Walter Lippmann observed some months ago that seldom in American history has a leader been so quick to perceive the true nature of major social changes. He faced issues squarely; he laid his political future on the line without hesitation as he attempted to lead the Nation through a most difficult stage in its domestic development. He took what he believed to be a sound middle course, one that was both legally and morally based, and, as a consequence, he was fiercely attacked from both the far left and the far right. At the end, it was only a question from which side the bullet had come.

As we ponder the kind of climate which is conducive to assassination and countermurder, we see anew the danger of extremists who preach fear, hatred, and bigotry without regard for law and order. The divisiveness which threatens our country can be laid directly to such extremists. Perhaps we have now been shocked into seeing these groups for what they really are.

The late President's violent death appears in one light as yet another incident where people who differ resort to violence rather than reason. Especially in a university do we have a responsibility to stand for the resolution of differences around the conference table, not on the streets, through negotiation, not the bomb or the sniper's bullet. But the opportunity of the conference table must be provided, and representatives of groups in conflict, no matter what the issue, must be willing to sit down to reason together. This is the civilized way, the intelligent way. This is the only way by which violence can be avoided.

In this memorial convocation, then, we pay homage to the memory of the youthful and martyred President who gave so much; who in his shortened life symbolized the values that we are charged with teaching and learning; who in his death has challenged the Nation to reexamine its ideals and how they shall be achieved.

The slaying of the President was an aggression against all freemen. In mourning this senseless and tragic death, let us reaffirm more boldly our belief in a purposeful life, in liberty and justice for all, and in the dignity and brotherhood of man. As students and as teachers of new generations, let us move with firm resolve to replace fanaticism with tolerance and prejudice with understanding, so that each of us may retrieve from these tragic days something of personal significance and lasting value that this community, this State, this Nation—yes; even this world will become truly a better place in which to live.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget that tragic and dark day of November 22 when, with you in the House restaurant here in the Capitol, I heard the dreadful news about the assassination of our 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It was, and still is, extremely difficult to believe that such a terrible thing can happen in the United States today. But happen it did and a great leader was taken from us.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born to wealth and could have chosen a career in any field, but he chose the most difficult one of all, that of public service. And he served boldly and courageously, both in war and in peace. He was a strong and fearless leader, both in war and in peace.

The entire world recognized his outstanding character and qualities and our loss was also their loss, mourned even by our enemies.

To his bereaved widow and family I extend my heartfelt condolences.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, human grief cannot be assuaged by human words. It is beyond anyone's power to dispel the shock and anguish suffered by the Nation, the intimate friends, the family, in the death of our late President.

We in the House of Representatives who were loyal opposition to some of his policies mourn in the loss of John F. Kennedy the departure of a brave and dauntless, and beloved, adversary.

His ideas delighted many, affronted others, astonished some, disappointed a few, challenged everybody. He crystallized important issues, cleared the field for honorable dispute; he gave the Congress and the American people a chance to make their own clear-cut decisions. He breathed new life into both great political parties. He drew the battlelines distinctly between Democratic and Republican philosophies and defended his own with vigor, imagination, skill, and courage.

The young and energetic man in the White House carried his convictions into the home of every citizen, stirring an interest, an excitement, an anticipation unparalleled in this generation. By throwing down the gauntlet to keen minds of every shade of opinion, he drew forth the finest efforts of men of all political faiths. He aroused millions of Americans, who had grown indifferent, to a new awareness of the Federal Government's impact upon their individual lives.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy enjoyed the clash of political controversy; he thrived on the sharp abrasive of partisan conflict. He knew, with his lively valuation of American history, that out of controversy and conflict have emerged the United States most noble achievements and most splendid triumphs.

In sincere tribute to his memory, let us keep aflame the torch of controversy among good and honest citizens. Let us honor him, as he did honor to other great Presidents of the past, by striving with intelligence and integrity, with unwavering devotion and calm patriotism, with the courage of our convictions, to maintain and preserve this most perfect of unions.

**Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.** Mr. Speaker, we all seek the exact phrases to express our great sorrow at the shameful loss of a President of the United States. While thinking about this, I received yesterday a letter from one of my constituents, Joyce Torrence Conley, of Crescent City, Calif. Mrs. Conley said that "out of their fullness of heart, people do many different things. The fullness in mine spills over into poetry." Indeed it does, Mr. Speaker, and in this time of sadness I take leave to use the words of Mrs. Conley to express my sentiments to this House:

### THE PEOPLE SPEAK

We, the Nation, mourn.
We mourn a gallant leader who is gone,
Shot down so brutally while in his prime.
We weep for him,
But even more we weep for loved ones left behind
And for ourselves, the Nation—
For the world.
The loss indeed is great.
We cannot estimate
Its implications;
Still we must accept and carry on.
We bow our heads in grief and pain.
We must, regrettably, bow, too, in shame,
For guilt is on us everyone—
Guilt that a Nation blessed so bountifully
Could foster such an act as has been done,
Guilt that, lethargic, we
Have shirked responsibility.
Our President is dead; we grieve.
And in our hearts we vow that he will be
Forever living in our memory—
That his example we will not forget—
That we, in facing duty, will learn devotion yet.
We make a pledge that his shed blood
Will somehow be a bridge to brotherhood.

### TO MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY

What is there of comfort
In words at times like these?
Alas! None that we know.
And yet we speak.
We, the people, speak that you may know
The deed that grieves you so
Grieves too the world.
Our hearts are rent
For you—your children—
For the life that's spent.
Nought that we can offer you can e'er replace
The missing voice—the missing face.
Nothing can we do save walk in pride
That this brave man gone from your side
Did walk in honor,
Did discharge his duty's harsh demand
With dignity and courage.
Let us pray his sacrifice this day
Will be an inspiration to us all
That we too may rise in honor
At each sound of duty's call.
First lady—Our Lady—
From this day forward you will ever be
First lady in our hearts.
Beyond all others you
Are all the name's significance imparts,
And we pay tribute to true majesty.
We know the burden of the public view,
And we—who loved him too—
Express our gratitude that you
Have shared with us in grief.
Your courage and your grace—
The sorrow in your face—
These rend our souls apart;
Alas, nought we can say
Can ease the awful sadness in your heart.
All we can do is vow your loss will not be vain
By striving, as did he,
To bring the world to brotherhood again.
Our Lady, forgive us in that we
Have made of you an ideal.
'Tis not an easy thing to be!
Pedestals are cold and barren homes
For those in occupancy.

### TO MRS. KENNEDY AND MRS. TIPPIT

I offer you, the lonely ones, my sympathy.
Your loved one was as dear to you as mine are dear to me.
Yet what is there that I can do or say
To help you in your anguish on this day?
I know that you do not expect me to pretend
The deed he did was less than shameful—wrong.
But wrongfulness still does not alter love that's strong;
So now you weep and bear the burden of his sin.

And I—I too must cry.
As parents weep when brothers war,
As Adam grieved for Abel—and for Cain,
So too must I.
Three sons—two honored—one dishonored—I have lost,
And still another yet may die.
God help us all.
God help us all.

—JOYCE TORRENCE CONLEY.

**Mr. WHALLEY.** Mr. Speaker, no words can express how shocked we were to learn of the unexpected death of our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The tragic event of November 22 caused sorrow throughout the world and each family in the United States felt they had lost a loved one, for the President belonged to us all.

President Kennedy was a man of intelligence and courage. He was a man of vision and unlimited energy. His great energy, intellect, and human qualities combined to mark him with the genius of leadership.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Kennedy and to all the family the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Whalley and myself.

**Mr. HARVEY of Michigan.** Mr. Speaker, I speak not only for myself but for all the citizens of Michigan's Eighth District as, in some small way, we, too, pay tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy, in this special session of the United States House of Representatives today.

The tragic death of our President sent our Nation and, for that matter, the entire world into a state of shock. The news of his passing was incredible, unbelievable. But as we must, our Nation has slowly but surely recoiled from the tragedy. All our people have demonstrated true Americanism in closing ranks behind President Lyndon B. Johnson in a critical period.

Literally thousands of words have been spoken and many more will be written in eulogy of our late President, and many more thousands will be heard and read in the days ahead, for all Americans will not soon forget the terrible tragedy of the assassination.

Because I am honored to represent Michigan's Eighth District, I believe it is most fitting that the sincere, heartfelt words of another citizen from there also be included in this tribute. I am taking the liberty of inserting a letter I received from a dear friend, Rev. Wilfred G. Sawyier, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Ionia, Mich. His letter, dated November 23, 1963, the day after the death of the President, read as follows:

> DEAR JIM: I thought you might be interested in the enclosed poem, written through unashamed tears last night. Our memorial services here express the shock and grief we all feel at this hour. We don't have to be of the same party to recognize greatness.
>
> Cordially,
>
> BILL.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Sawyier's letter and poem are among many, many letters received from residents of the Eighth District. His poem, I believe, represents the feelings of all people throughout our Nation and the world:

### ON THE DEATH OF OUR PRESIDENT

A man touched by greatness and thrust into
The middle of the splendor and agony of the world
Is dead.
Even saying it and repeating it hardly makes
It true. For didn't he just a yesterday
Walk the hallowed halls of our nations shrines,
Talk to great and small at the world's crossroads,
And kneel in humility before His God?

He really never ate the bread of hunger * * *
But compassion for the hungry moved him to action.
He could never be in the tormented skin of his darker brother
But he suffered and perhaps died—with his tears for them.
Thank God he never knew in this beloved land
The heavy hand of tyranny
But he agonized—and perhaps died—for the freedom of others and other lands.

He was no angelic being—just one of us.
The flaws were there for those, so willed, to pick at, and he did not need to fear the said unhappy circumstance, that "all men speak well" of him.
He had the shadow of death brush over him;
Once on the heroes sea and nameless other times.
He knew sorrow, as only the bereaved can know it.

Yet, through it all, he was a great man in a high place with a noble purpose.
He had said that "the cost of freedom is high."
And, for him it cost dear, for the free hand
That struck him down with demented anger,
Feared freedom.
Whether freedom for some within our land,
Or freedom for others in foreign shackles,
It matters not—
Their hope of freedom cost him his life.

The years, we pray, will treat him kindly;
But it really matters little!
For the Christian God he worshipped will treat him kindly;
Even as His love gave and sustained, it will continue his life.
And God will give strength to those who, bewildered, are left behind to grieve;
And the one who takes the helm of State!
God grant that each may deeply ask, not
"What can my country do for me?"
But, like him, "What can I do for my country?"
This will make more bearable the fact—
That though still a nightmare—
A man, touched by greatness and thrust into
The middle of the splendor and agony of the world,
Is dead!

—W. G. SAWYIER.

IONIA, MICH., *November 22, 1963.*

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these were the thoughts that came to me as Mrs. Poff and I stood before the catafalque in the great rotunda of the Capitol, the dimensions of which have ever struck awe in the hearts of Americans: The greatness of man is measured by many yardsticks. One is his fear of God; President Kennedy measured the full height. Another is his love of country; President Kennedy measured the full depth. Another is his devotion to his wife and children; President Kennedy measured the full scope. Another is the strength of his convictions; President Kennedy measured the full length. Another is the respect he holds for the convictions of those who disagree with him; President Kennedy measured the full breadth. In all these dimensions, President Kennedy measured up to greatness.

Not the least important of these yardsticks is the latter. The man who, while holding strong convictions of his own, can honor other men whose convictions are different is the man every man should strive to be.

The thoughts which came to me as we watched Mrs. Kennedy leave the graveside in Arlington National Cemetery I translated into a telegram addressed to her:

> All Americans are proud that, even in her most terrible travail, America's First Lady conducted herself as always as a great lady. Mrs. Poff and I beseech God's guidance and comfort on you and your children.

The thoughts which came to me as President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress were these:

America is one Nation under God—one people with one President. As patriotism is due America, loyalty is due America's President. In every way consistent with individual conscience, every citizen, both in and out of Government, must rally to President Johnson's leadership and must never be found guilty of opposition for opposition's sake. And yet, loyalty does not demand servility. Indeed, President Johnson would be the first to despise a sycophant. As one who recognizes that most questions have two sides, he welcomes opposition of the constructive variety. And as a former Member of both Houses of the Congress, he knows better than most that the compromises hammered out on the anvil of debate in the legislative halls by 535 men and women, all with different viewpoints and each representing a constituency different from all the rest, best promotes the long-range welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the millions of words which have been written about our recent national tragedy have never come close to describing the vivid individual feelings of every American. Each of us will wear the indelible imprint of our personal feelings within our own conscience—and it will never be erased.

The magnificent funeral, which for the first time brought Americans to the ceremonial maturity which distinguishes Europeans, was indeed a fitting tribute to President Kennedy as a man and to the Presidency. But in many ways the events of the days which followed the funeral and the manner in which the affairs of State have continued constitute an even greater tribute.

At the time of tragedy the business of Government could not stop and give way to national grief. As we paid last respects and left the East Room of the White House on that rainy Saturday of November 23 and walked past the playground of the Kennedy children, it was possible to see the heads of President Johnson's Cabinet at work over the elliptical table of the Cabinet Room. Somehow this starkly necessary job was not offensive to the somber ritual underway at the opposite end of the White House. To the contrary it seemed quite in keeping with the vitality and enthusiasm with which President Kennedy approached everything he did. It was the way he would have wanted it.

The transition from leadership by President Kennedy to that of Lyndon Johnson has been unbelievably smooth. Today we are a united people and in being such we continue to pay the highest possible tribute to our late President.

There will still be opposition to parts of his program. But opposition will not desecrate his memory. Mr. Kennedy thrived upon opposition and he loved it. The position he fought so hard to achieve would have held less meaning for him had it not been won for a hard price after a struggle against strong opposition. Regardless of how strongly he may have felt over parts of his program, I am sure he would not wish it to be legislated without honest and vigorous debate.

Today we are a more prideful people. Mrs. Kennedy's magnificent demeanor throughout her ordeal has served to buttress the pride of every woman and man's pride in woman. In recent weeks it seems that every American has taken stock of moral values and principles of Americanism. Latent patriotism has swelled into demonstrative pride in country. And the mere expression of that pride has stimulated Americans to greater things.

The country did not stop—it kept moving and is still moving.

And by keeping it moving we are truly paying the highest compliment and respect to President Kennedy. It is the way he would have wanted it.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate for the Members of this House of Representatives to assemble here, today, to express the grief of the people of this Nation.

It is the Members of this House who are so intimately associated with the emotions and the sensibilities of our people.

President Kennedy, himself, served with honor and distinction in this House. He earned the admiration and the profound respect of those who served with him in both the House and the Senate of this Congress.

We rise here, today, from all parts of this land representing a people united in common sorrow.

President Kennedy was truly great. He had a grandeur of spirit, a nobility of mind, a generosity of heart, and the courage of action. He sought to sublimate and to activate this Nation toward higher concepts. President Kennedy was, at all times, motivated by an urge to improve the lot of mankind.

President Kennedy's messages to this Congress had a common thread. They formed a pattern that sought a political, social, and economic betterment for all peoples of all nations.

As the first President of the Roman Catholic faith, he gave assurance that a Catholic citizen could serve this Nation in that high office with complete fidelity and devotion.

President Kennedy was a symbol of hope to the less fortunate peoples of the world. He fervently and sincerely sought a just peace between divided peoples, conflicting national interests, and antagonistic social systems.

President Kennedy bequeathed to this Nation a new destiny for greatness, new paths toward world peace.

Spiritually, President Kennedy lives on. He will continue to walk with this Nation toward the achievement of our peoples' aspirations for freedom, peace, justice, and equality.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 13th District of California, I join my colleagues in expressing our sorrow at the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We all extend deep symathy to members of his family.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I join with all Americans, and with men of good will everywhere, in expressing the shock and grief felt by the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We saw in the morning the joyousness and youthfulness of this young man, our

President, as he went to visit and to speak among his people in Texas. We saw in the night the melancholy procession of a coffin slowly carried to the White House, when he returned dead to all his people in the Capital of the Nation.

Two children lost a father in a way they cannot comprehend. A wife lost a husband in a depth of horror that is beyond comprehension. We lost a President, but in a way that we can indeed comprehend. His death has turned our eyes back upon ourselves, and I believe that all Americans have renewed most profoundly their dedication to the principles which have made this country the most noble experiment in the history of mankind.

If it is true that adversity builds character, as I believe it does, then this tragedy can become a living challenge to every one of us, to build the greatness of America in the future in our lives, as others have built the greatness of America in the past in their deaths.

We have seen his widow, steeped in grief, giving the entire world a new meaning to courage and dignity. These things we shall not forget.

The editorial writers of the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania have expressed their horror in far more literate language than I could hope to emulate. I, therefore, include in the body of the RECORD the editorials to which I have referred.

[From the Scranton Tribune]

### Our President Is Dead

The President of the United States is dead. He was assassinated by a fanatic.

The entire Nation and the free peoples of the world are in mourning.

The brutal, callous manner in which the life of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was snuffed out defies belief.

Shock mingled with outrage swept the Nation and spilled into the far corners of the planet. The acknowledged leader of the free world, gunned down in a great city of the greatest Nation of that free world. What a horrendous crime was perpetrated, what a dastardly blow to befall this Nation.

The vision of a vigorous man of 46, his body slumped in the arms of his wife and life draining away with each heartbeat, was almost too much to bear. Women, and strong men too, wept. It was as if his death had personally touched the lives of every American.

It was a sad hour for all of us, regardless of party affiliation, regardless of one's political beliefs, or creed, or color.

President Kennedy was the very epitome of the ideal American—a man with strength of character, firm resolve, and a dedication of purpose that was not lost on world leaders.

President Kennedy, in the very prime of life, the Executive head of a Government which has prided itself the world over as an orderly, representative Government of the people, by the people, for the people—the very words of another President shot to death by another fanatic—has, too, been assassinated.

We join all our fellow citizens in remorse, in regret, and in deep mourning for this terrible tragedy.

---

[From the Tunkhannock Republican and New Age, Nov. 28, 1963.]

### Thanksgiving Amid Grief

"The Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

These words, uttered by the sorely pressed Job, should be in the hearts and minds of all grieving Americans on this Thanksgiving Day. They express an abiding faith in God which we most urgently need in the face of the unspeakable tragedy of last Friday.

Mortal man should not attempt to question the methods of God. We should not ask of God why John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a young, vigorous man of immense courage, intelligence and dedication, should be so abruptly halted in the midst of his labors. We should not ask why his wife and children will be deprived of the husband and father they loved so deeply. We should not ask why God has allowed the striking down of this selfless man who was born to serve—who could have lived out his years in idleness and pleasure had he not been devoted to the cause of his fellow man.

Grieve him we shall, and the shocked disbelief on the faces of young and old, regardless of party affiliation, as the Nation waited in hushed silence for word from Parkland Hospital in Dallas; the unashamed sobbing which was heard as the death of John F. Kennedy was revealed, indicate that the Nation's grief will be long with it.

But even as we join in mourning this latest martyr to man's refusal to lift himself from the realm of the animals, we must face this Thanksgiving Day with hearts full of gratitude for his bounty to us.

It is easy to give thanks when all is going well. It is much more difficult to turn to the Lord in thanksgiving when grief and suffering are predominant.

But Job—who suffered far more than most men—could do it. So must we.

Aside from our material blessings, we must give thanks for hope and faith—that God has not turned away from us, that His will shall be done, and that this Nation, under God, shall continue—despite its terrible loss—to provide leadership for the free world and hold out hope for the downtrodden.

So even as we commit to God the soul of John F. Kennedy, we must, again, echo Job's words, "The Lord hath given, the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord."

---

[From the Towanda Daily Review, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Death Sad Blow to Whole World

Unbelievable as it seems, President John F. Kennedy is dead.

News that an assassin's bullet had cut him down while he was visting Dallas, Tex., Friday afternoon came like a thunderbolt out of the blue. It is hard to conceive of a tragedy which could have caused greater genuine grief throughout the world. First reaction was a stunned silence. Then many swallowed a "lump in the throat" and others gave way to tears.

Sadness was not confined to members of his own political party by any means. We frequently differ on political issues but that is what gives this Nation its strength; debate brings out the best for the good of all. No one knew this better than President John F. Kennedy and he always helped to give important questions a thorough airing. Above all, he was an American.

Our deepest sympathy goes out to the President's widow and his little children. Their grief is almost unbearable. When Mrs. Kennedy entered the hospital with her husband her clothes were bloodstained from the President's wounds. What a horrible experience for any woman, let alone the wife of the Chief Executive of the world's greatest nation. And our hearts go out, too, to little Caroline who is old enough to realize that her daddy has gone, never to return. The only solace of the family can be the knowledge that President Kennedy, youngest man ever elected to the Presidency, will go down in history as a great man.

The President had a great and abiding faith in the future of America and was determined to do his best to promote its best interests not only at home but everywhere around the globe. His stanch patriotism could never be questioned by even the most partisan politicians. He was forthright in giving his views and expected others to be the same. His word was as good as his bond and he had worldwide respect even in nations which opposed American ideologies. Complications throughout the world as the result of his untimely death may be far-reaching.

On the home front Lyndon B. Johnson, who succeeded to the Presidency yesterday, will face many serious problems which President Kennedy had tackled vigorously but which still are unsolved. One of these deals with civil rights and it is to be hoped that Mr. Johnson will be able to find a solution. If he can, nothing would be a more fitting memorial to the late President. He firmly believed in the brotherhood of man and that all men have inherent rights to a dignified, free existence.

As John F. Kennedy becomes a name in the history books, his existence on this mortal sphere at an end, his memory will linger on for years to come. Most of those now alive will never forget his tousled head, the famous Kennedy smile, the pointing finger as he spoke, and the accent that could not be mistaken anywhere.

Friday, November 22, 1963, will indeed go down as one of the blackest days in the annals of the United States, if not the entire world.

---

[From the Troy Gazette, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Astounded, Stunned

The booming noises persisted, and the instreaming sunlight of that Sunday morning made slumber no longer a joy.

Arising and dressing, the booming noises continued in no particular pattern, excepting to indicate some sort of a contest. Curious, a walk along the row of slumber-laden beach cottages to the Waikiki Beach, was taken.

It's the Navy on practice maneuvers and a gun battle. But, so close to shore? Then, as a youngster pointing toward Pearl Harbor, to his mother, saying: "There's another one," you got the idea quickly. Pearl Harbor was aflame, asmoke, exploding.

Turning on heel, steps were retraced more rapidly. Now, a radio announcement would pierce the otherwise still morning. All firemen report to stations immediately. All police * * *

At home again, a quick switch of the radio dial—then, "This is no false alarm, this is the McCoy * * * Pearl Harbor is being bombed. Repeat." Webley Edwards, of Honolulu radio station, was declaring over the radio.

The phone rang. The duty officer tersely stated: "Report for duty immediately." "Yes, sir."

That was Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Last Friday, November 22, 1963, some 22 years later, another stunning event occurred. The President had been shot.

Only, it was different now. Twenty-two years ago the shock was allayed by duties that occupied the mind and body. I was in military action.

Last Friday was different. You waited, after the first shocking, brief announcement was made. You waited, thoughts racing, for word that the President was not seriously wounded. Then, it came. "He is dead."

But, you still did not believe it. You wanted to know how it had occurred, where and when. And, who did it?

Subsequently, you caught bits of information, pieced them together as you listened to radio and television announcements. And then, you were stunned, numbed. And, you wondered: The President of the United States assassinated? And by an American? It was not possible. Then, you wondered, just how permanent, how sure are we.

The death of President Kennedy occurred in Dallas, Tex., at 1 p.m. It was 2 p.m. in Harrisburg when Governor Scranton interrupted the speaker to say: "The President has been shot three times, according to radio. Nothing further has arrived."

The Governor was at a luncheon held in the Penn-Harris Hotel, attended by over 90 editors and publishers of Pennsylvania newspapers. The occasion was an information meeting on the newly formed "100,000 Pennsylvanians for the Promotion of Economic Growth."

The program was underway. Luncheon tableware had been removed and the speakers had commenced their deliveries.

A telephone buzzed twice before the receiver was lifted. Soon one of the Governor's aids at the luncheon went to the phone. Finished, he approached the speaker's table at which sat some dozen dignitaries, including the Governor and his wife. The man from the Governor's office leaned over, head between the Governor and his wife. He whispered.

Mrs. Scanton raised her hand toward her face which showed "horror reaction." The Governor's face became graver.

The speaker continued. Only a handful in the large room knew what had happened. The phone rang again. This time, only one ring. Again, a trip to the Governor's side. He nodded, then arose and interrupted the speaker, to make the first announcement.

His second announcement, about a half hour later, came while he was delivering the main address on "100,000 Pennsylvanians." His aid stood beside him, awaiting a break in the Governor's speaking. It came, and he turned to his aid, listening, nodded, then finished the thought he had been developing. It completed, he stopped, and said:

"The President is dead. In view of the circumstances, I think we should terminate our session. Let us stand in silent prayer."

Each publisher and editor in that large room heard words of the speakers, but his mind was racing over events connected with the wounding of the President, and the consequences. The words of the speakers were like background radio sounds; they were there, but you did not hear exactly what was being said.

Those publishers and editors who could not leave for their own communities immediately, sought radio, or television outlets, to learn more details. Those who came by autos equipped with radio sets must have turned on these sets and listened as they drove homeward.

Those who traveled far, had a longer session of it, for there was practically nothing on the air except news about the assassination. And, you went to bed, late that night, absolutely dead-tired, shocked, and stunned as probably did millions of Americans and other peoples of the world who had heard the day's tragic news—CDA.

---

[From the Canton Independent, Nov. 28, 1963]

### GRIEF-STRICKEN AMERICA, FREE WORLD LOSE LEADER

A panorama of history swept around the world on Friday as the President of the United States was assassinated while visiting in Dallas, Tex. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our 35th President, was dead at 46 years of age, on his 1,000th day as President of this great Nation.

In less than 1 hour after his airplane landed at Dallas Love Field, the President and Texas' Gov. John Connally were shot and by 1 p.m., c.s.t., Friday, November 22, the President was dead. The Governor is recovering at Parkland Hospital, Dallas, following surgery.

Mrs. Kennedy accompanied her husband on the Texas tour, following a time of mourning from the loss of their infant son Patrick Bouvier. Her gracious manner was applauded by the Texans. In 1 short hour tragedy hit her home and the Nation.

The grief of Americans joined by the citizens of the world seems to have united peoples of all races, creeds and nationalities.

President Kennedy was a symbol of the younger generation. He was courage, champion of human rights, a man of peace and dedication, a leader of the New Frontier and Peace Corps.

Mrs. Kennedy, a shy, cultured woman, added much glamour to the White House and became a symbol of fashion as well as outstanding example as a wife and mother. Her interests in fine arts opened a new era in America's life and she endeavored to preserve early American heritage as well as restoration of the White House.

From the time of the fatal shooting of the President, she rested his wounded head in her lap, spent every hour with his body and marched behind his casket to the cathedral on Monday.

With our martyred President dead, the democracy Government swiftly moved and Judge Sarah Hughes swore Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson in as the new 36th President.

The circle of death continued as a Dallas patrolman gave his life in attempting to pick up a suspect, Lee H. Oswald, 24. Then on Sunday as Oswald was being moved from the city jail to the county jail, Jack Ruby took Oswald's life.

Sorrow of this week will be remembered for centuries to come. The heads of government from around the world sent delegates to share with Mrs. Kennedy, Caroline and John, as well as other members of the family, the loss of this great American, John F. Kennedy.

---

[From the Forest City News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IN MEMORIAM

As the news of the death of our President, by assassin's bullet, reached Forest City last Friday afternoon, it was received with a feeling of complete and utter disbelief by our citizenry. Up and down Main Street small groups of people gathered still unable to realize the full import of the tragedy. Unashamedly, tears of shock and grief, dotted the faces of a number of passersby. A lone flag, flying at half mast, at the corner of Main and Dundaff Streets lent a somber emphasis to the great tragedy which had befallen our country.

The shock was deepened by many thoughts. First, the youthful exuberance which had been introduced into our American way of life. Here, for the first time in many years, the White House in Washington had heard the scamper of little feet in the person of 3 year old John and 6 year old Caroline. In addition the flashing beauty of our First Lady, endowed our Government with a new life and feeling. Here was a closely knit family group, which in one fleeting second was torn apart and exposed to an agony not often experienced by anyone.

Secondly, our shock was compounded by thoughts that this heinous deed could happen at this time; the 20th century, 1963. Surely, things like this couldn't happen in our United States. Yes, it could happen to Abe Lincoln in 1865, to Garfield in 1881, and to McKinley in 1901, and it could happen in Vietnam, to the Diems, but it could never happen here. Well, it did happen here, and this is the 20th century. A crime such as this has no time, or no place. It can happen and it has.

A leader, a statesman, and a family man has been removed from our land. Mr. Kennedy always called himself a child of the times. Tempered by the depression and matured by war as we all of this century have been. We will never forget this horrifying deed and we can but hope that a higher purpose will be served through his sacrifice.

In the democratic tradition, a new man has stepped forward to assume the awesome duties of the Presidency. Lyndon B. Johnson, a man of vast experience in Government, has been thrust into a responsibility, which is completely incomprehensible to us, on a moment's notice. To fulfill these duties he will need the prayers and support of every man, woman, and child in this country. The days ahead may be difficult, but we can endure.

We can but join with the peoples of the world in our sincere and heartfelt grief and sympathy to the family and close associates of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that he may rest in peace after his difficult trial in life. He will be remembered always, by we who have lived in this era. Let this coming Thanksgiving Day bring a new meaning to our lives and a fresh understanding of the problems facing us and we can truly say that his death, "shall not have been in vain."

---

[From the Carbondale News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD—PRESIDENCY REMAINS

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 46, succumbed to an occupational hazard at 2 p.m., Friday, November 22, eastern standard time.

The lunacy of assassination proved to be a communicable disease and 48 hours later the primary suspect in the killing of the President himself was cut down by a one-man lynching party.

Three Presidents before Mr. Kennedy died of wounds inflicted by assassins, all succumbing to gunshot wounds.

Abraham Lincoln was shot in Washington by John Wilkes Booth April 14, 1965, and died April 15.

James A. Garfield was shot in Washington July 2, 1881, by Charles J. Guiteau and died September 19.

William McKinley was shot by Leon Czolgosz in Buffalo, N.Y., September 6, 1901, and died September 14.

An attempt on the life of Franklin Delano Roosevelt resulted in the death of Chicago's Mayor Anton Cermack.

An attempt on the life of Harry S. Truman failed.

Every President lives from day to day in the shadow of death at the hand of a fellowman.

Yet the striking down of Mr. Kennedy sent a numbing shock across the entire Nation.

It seemed inconceivable that such a vigorous young man should have ceased so abruptly to live, to have had his life's blood spattered upon his lovely young wife, to have taken such abrupt leave of two attractive young children, themselves personalities at an early age.

Our Thanksgiving editorial already had been written, set in type, and the page made ready for the press. In essence we said that the Nation had much to be thankful for, this Thanksgiving.

First reaction in the News office and shop was that events had made the Thanksgiving editorial inappropriate. But sober second thought said no, that despite the Nation's terrible loss we still should be thankful.

Thankful that our system of government provides an orderly succession of Chief Executives in event of death of the President in office.

Thankful that the new President is a man of strong character, broad experience in government, and thorough training for his succession.

We mourn our loss.
And we give thanks.

---

[From the Sayre Evening Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### AMERICANS STAND UNITED IN MOURNING FOR KENNEDY

Americans stand united today as seldom in the Nation's history, in mourning the death of assassinated John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and in horrified revulsion at the manner of his passing.

In life, President Kennedy was a highly controversial figure, capable of arousing both wild enthusiasm and sharp opposition. But in death, felled by an assassin's bullet, he was recognized only as the martyred President of all Americans, and the feeling of grief and loss was universal.

Americans of every walk in life from the mightiest to the lowliest, of every shade of opinion—political, religious, economic—of every race and of every national background, became as one in the feeling of shock and sadness.

It is impossible at this early moment to say with certainty what was the full impact upon the country of President Kennedy during his few short years in office. Only the passage of time will permit a historical objective assessment of his administration.

But it can be said with confidence that much of what he did will live on to affect the welfare of the Nation—and of the world—far into the future. The Alliance for Progress of which he was the chief architect will continue the effort of bringing all of the American nations closer together in cooperative effort. And it may be considered a certainty that the Peace Corps of which he was the father will remain an active effort over the coming years to show the true American image to the people of other lands.

President Kennedy will be remembered as a vigorous President, one not only willing but eager to fight for his beliefs and his ideals. He will be remembered as a man of deep and loyal devotion to the country he loved, and tireless in his efforts to advance its welfare and the welfare of its people.

What he might have accomplished had he lived to complete his term and perhaps serve an additional 4 years in the Presidency can now never be known. But every American is fully cognizant of the fact that his work was cut short by an assassin in complete negation of every tenet of the democracy on which this country is founded, and his death comes as a matter of personal loss to every last citizen of this land.

President Kennedy will be enshrined in memory as a martyred President, one who died in the service of his country just as truly as any man who has fallen in battle.

---

[From the Scranton Times]

### NATION MOURNS

In every home across the length and breadth of America there is today deep sorrow—a grief almost to the point of numbness. And around the world, wherever men cherish freedom and respect its champions, there is also sincere mourning and a sense of deep loss.

For the United States and the world have lost one of their great leaders. President John F. Kennedy fell victim to an assassin's bullet yesterday in Texas. The news of this tragedy and the realization of the heinous crime behind it shocked the Nation. Throughout the country, as newspapers and television and radio stations carried the fateful news to the people, strong men unashamedly wept and found a lump in their throats as they tried to talk. For John F. Kennedy was not just a lofty figure, aloof in his high station; he had won his way into the hearts of his countrymen of all classes, of all races, of all political parties in our great Nation.

Their sympathy went out immediately to his bereaved wife, the mother of his two children, and to the other members of the Kennedy family. Theirs is the deep personal loss; the President's death by cruel assassination in the prime of his manhood is the loss of all our people.

Americans have long revered their Presidents who made their way from humble origins—Lincoln and his log cabin birthplace, as an example—to the highest public office in the land.

But John F. Kennedy brought a new image to families of great wealth. He recognized the responsibilities which great wealth imposes. His father, who created the family fortune, had instilled that sense of responsibility in all his sons. John F. Kennedy saw his opportunity to fulfill it in the dedication of his life to public service through good government. His preparation for the Presidency included terms as a Congressman and a U.S. Senator.

In the cold war he assumed great burdens as he moved into the White House. He was the recognized spokesman of the free world, the symbol and the voice of human liberty. He was a seeker of peace but practical enough to know that the best defense is in armed strength. He kept America strong and sought to do the same for our allies. His negotiation of the test ban treaty with Soviet Russia was a mighty contribution to the cause of world peace.

It is a reflection of President Kennedy's high character, his great talents in government and his devotion to America's highest ideals that the religious issue which was so heated in the 1960 campaign no longer exists. He was the first Catholic to be elected to the Presidency, yet only a few short days ago in New York City he was honored by an award from one of the country's leading Protestant organizations.

With his background of wealth, John F. Kennedy was moved by concern for the common man. His legislative program was an expression of this concern. Medical care for the aged, public works projects to give jobs to the unemployed, measures to aid the physically handicapped and the mentally retarded were close to his heart, as he had shown.

That President Kennedy should die at the hands of an assassin is an ironical twist of fate considering the risks he endured as commander of a Navy PT boat in the Pacific area during World War II. He emerged from that conflict, with an injury that remained for life, as one of its outstanding heroes.

John F. Kennedy is dead and today Lyndon B. Johnson is President of the United States by succession. The prayers of every American will be for him as he takes over the crushing burdens of his high office; but he will find encouragement to meet his heavy task in the fruits of his long association with the man whom he succeeds and in the knowledge that the American people will pledge him their allegiance in every action for the welfare of the Nation.

Fortunately for the people of the United States, Lyndon Johnson is a man well versed in the art of government. His service as Vice President for the past 3 years, coupled with a vast knowledge of legislative and administrative affairs gained as majority leader of the Senate, makes him exceptionally well qualified to take over as the Nation's leader in this hour of emergency.

---

[From the Wayne Independent, Nov. 25, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE

The assassination of President Kennedy casts a somber shadow over the coming Thanksgiving holiday. As this community and the Nation mourn the death of its leader, heavy hearts may find it difficult to feel the true spirit of Thanksgiving.

Yet, in his Thanksgiving proclamation issued more than a week before his untimely death, the President asked the Nation to offer thanks to God, not only for material blessings, but for those of the mind and soul.

Concerning the former, he pointed out, "Today we are a nation of nearly 200 million souls, stretching from coast to coast, on into the Pacific and north toward the Arctic, a nation enjoying the fruits of an ever-expanding agriculture and industry and achieving standards of living unknown in previous history. We give our humble thanks for this."

But the President asked, too, that Amercans "be humbly grateful for inherited ideals." He continued, "Let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow beings throughout the world."

He went on to trace the establishment of Thanksgiving as a national holiday and pointed out that the country has made great strides in both its population and power. "Yet, as our power has grown," he added, "so has our peril." He asked that prayers be offered for guidance "to sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

This vital man has made an indelible impression upon the mind and heart of the Nation, in his short period in office—short in relation to other Presidents, only five of the other 33 men who were President having served for briefer periods. He seemed closer to the people of this area because thousands saw him personally at Milford less than 2 months before his untimely death.

The plea of this young President now dead, for prayers of guidance and thanksgiving rings out louder than before.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, words are not at my command to express the feelings of the people of our congressional district in the tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

His death is certainly a great loss to our district, our State, our Nation, and the world.

To best describe the feelings of our section, I quote from a letter that I received from a senior at the Martin branch of the University of Tennessee, which is located in our congressional district:

> What does one say to a friend and neighbor about the tragedy that has beset our Nation, and the world? When I first heard that Mr. Kennedy had been shot, I asked God to take away my breath and give it to him. It is not my place to question our Maker, but I just cannot understand why He would allow such an act.
>
> I did not agree with all of Mr. Kennedy's policies, but I highly respected his firm stand on his beliefs and convictions, for a man's worth is not measured by his size, color, or shape, but by his deeds and actions.
>
> I guess that's why I'm writing this way to you. For your actions and deeds are of the highest caliber.
>
> Our Nation has lost a great man. I feel that there is something I must do, but at the same time, there is a feeling of complete helplessness. I wish that my thoughts and feelings could be put into adequate words, of which there are none, to express the profoundness of this occasion. His death shall not have been in vain. It will serve as a reminder of the high ideals which were hammered and forged by our forefathers into the form of the greatest country and people the world has ever known. May God bless his soul, and, in the same instance, give us

> of earthly life new courage and assured guidance to continue to strive, to sweat, and, if necessary, to fight, for those beliefs we hold most dear.
>
> May his epitaph read, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country."

On November 23, I received a telegram from Mr. Shannon D. Faulkner, superintendent of the Tipton County schools, which also expressed our sentiments:

> The great tragedy which has befallen us by the death of our President gives cause for a period of mourning in the schools of Tipton County, Tenn. I hereby declare an interruption in the activities of Tipton County schools until Tuesday morning, November 26, and suggest that each student, parent, and teacher reflect on the implication of this grave hour in the history of our country. Although burdened by grief, we have the greatest confidence in President Lyndon B. Johnson and his ability to carry our country forward in the historic tradition of our Founding Fathers. May God help us all in this endeavor.

To Mrs. Kennedy and the family I want to express my deepest sympathy.

**Mr. KNOX.** Mr. Speaker, the shock and grief that swept our Nation at the untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy are still very much with us. The numbness has not completely worn off. The feeling still remains that the events subsequent to midday on November 22 are all part of some hideous nightmare. Through our modern communications media, nearly all our citizens were made witness to this strange and tragic drama. Throughout those terrible 4 days one could not help feeling, and desperately hoping, that when the weekend was over all would return to normal, and we would find that these things never really occurred. And yet they had.

It is too soon to adequately and completely analyze President Kennedy's stewardship. Only the passage of time will give us the perspective so vitally necessary for that task. Some impressions of Mr. Kennedy, as President, as politician, and as a man, remain with me. With each succeeding year, John Kennedy grew and matured despite the awful pressures and burdens of the Presidency. He brought devotion to duty, persistence, and imagination to the post that demands them most heavily. And whether one agreed with Mr. Kennedy or not, one respected him, for he was the President.

Even as one battled him, one found himself, grudgingly perhaps, admiring him. His sense of timing, his choice of phrases, and his intuition were unmatched.

But it is John F. Kennedy as a man that will be most sorely missed and it is in this sense that his death was most tragic. He was cut down in the prime of life, with many years of useful service to the Nation still ahead of him. His youth and vitality, his marvelous sense of humor, his warmth, intelligence, and casual dignity were reflected in being in his presence. His great courage was wonderfully reflected in that shown by his wife Jacqueline and the children in their days of trial and grief. The Presidency will carry on, and will be well filled by other men. There will be other great politicians and statesmen. But there will not be another John Kennedy.

His life taught much, but his death, tragic though it is, can teach more. It has pointed out, as perhaps no other event could, both the weaknesses and strength of our form of government. It was the very freedom he loved in this Nation that allowed him to be cut down. Yet it is the strength arising from that freedom that allows us to carry on. One is hard put to think of anywhere else on earth that the events of the recent past would not lead to civil strife or near panic which would rip other nations asunder. Perhaps we must pay this tragic price for our freedom. Yet John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not shirk from it, nor did any of his predecessors. Out of this tragedy we can draw hope, and from that moment of weakness, our Nation has drawn strength for the tasks which lie ahead. For John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it is our fervent prayer that he may rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, the people of our Nation have reacted in their own way at the tragic event of November 22. One of my constituents from Roger City, Mich., sent a poem to the editor of the Presque Isle County Advance which expresses the feeling of so many in the loss of President Kennedy. I insert into the RECORD at this point the poem written by Betty Wojtaszek:

### POEM BY BETTY WOJTASZEK

On that dreadful day in Dallas,
  In the fall of sixty-three,
Thousands gathered on the street,
  To cheer John Kennedy.

The motorcade moved slowly,
  On this last and fatal ride,
So all could see the President,
  And Jackie by his side.

Three shots rang out, so suddenly,
  A cause for great alarm,
"Oh, no," cried our First Lady,
  Her wounded husband in her arms.

The crowd was stunned and praying
  John Kennedy would live.
A man who helped our Nation,
  With all he had to give.

They waited sick with sorrow,
  That the news, they would not dread,
But their hopes died with these fatal words
  "Our President is dead."

Tears fell, by the millions,
  For this great and noble man,
The leader of our country,
  And for who our country stands.

He's gone, but not forgotten,
  And these words are all well meant,
We hope he'll hear them from above,
  God bless you, President.

**Mr. SIKES.** Mr. Speaker, the death of President John F. Kennedy was one of the great tragedies of modern times. I would not have thought it could happen here. The President's leadership in the fields of foreign affairs and national defense had contributed significantly to improved prospects for peace in the world and encouraged greater prosperity at home. There was a brighter hue in the world around us; strong promise of a better tomorrow. Then he was struck down.

The impact of this young man's leadership upon the world is best illustrated by the fact that 220 heads of state and high ranking officials came to Washington for his funeral. Very probably we in America failed to fully grasp the dynamic energy, the great enterprise, the powerful leadership given our Nation by President Kennedy.

In company with most of my colleagues, I differed with him on occasions. That is one of the treasured rights of a democracy. We can respect our leaders, we can admire them personally, we may even support them with enthusiasm, but we reserve the privilege to assert our own beliefs and those of our people at home when we feel it is right and proper to do so.

It is a tribute to John F. Kennedy that our country has reacted with courage and vigor to press forward following his death. The chaotic events which began with his assassination would have created panic in many parts of the world. For a few hours the people of this country were stunned. They could not grasp the significance of what had happened. But the firmness with which President Johnson took the helm of government and the smoothness of transition to the new administration were reflected in a tremendous outpouring of determination to go forward in the Kennedy tradition. This is in part a barometer of the Nation's resiliency to adversity, but it is also a tribute to the man who had led us upward and onward for 3 years. And, I am sure the world took note of this reflection of confidence by our own people in our own country.

Out of that stunning rush of events some things stand out—none with more dramatic clarity than the courage and devotion of Jackie Kennedy. If she had critics, they were silenced during those long grief-stricken hours from the time the assassin's bullet found its mark until the President's body was laid to rest, in Arlington. She is a great lady, and the Nation's pride in her is as great as the vast outpouring of sympathy it offered her.

John F. Kennedy was struck down needlessly, senselessly. His work is done, but his spirit and his leadership are our heritage. The life of our country goes on. Its work must go on. We shall have to stand and work more closely together as Americans to make up for the great loss the Nation has suffered.

**Mr. LLOYD.** Mr. Speaker, in September 1963, just a little more than two months before his death, John F. Kennedy came to my district, the Second District of Utah, and received a tumultuous welcome. He spoke to an overflow crowd of cheering citizens in the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City and was a breakfast guest of President and Mrs. David O. McKay of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormon. His visit was bathed in friendship and good will. On behalf of my district where he will be remembered so well, I join in these eulogies.

His handsome grace and expression, his concern for human beings, his talented mind, his patriotic devotion to America, his responsible projection of the United States in the leadership of the free world, the testimony which he gave to the principle of free men governing themselves, brought to this Nation a respect from legions of righteous men throughout the world. As a result, the ice of the cold war had shown signs of thaw, and a season of spring was developing in which men of diverse opinions were gaining confidence in finding peaceful solutions.

While knowing that fanatics walk the earth and may appear at any time at any place, he vigorously and joyfully battled for public office and public expression. He fanned into flames much dormant interest in democratic government and spurred participation in political action.

At his assassination his wife set a standard of bravery under the blows of indescribable shock, torment, and grief of lost love.

With my son, I viewed the miles long, wide line of mourners, waiting patiently through a cold night for the privilege of paying tribute at his bier and I sensed that John F. Kennedy had become nobly enshrined in the history of our Republic.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, we have said goodby to a brilliant young President. We mourn him here in the Congress as we try to resume our legislative work, but our hearts are heavy with sorrow.

We mourn John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a friend and as a former Member of this body. We mourn for his young widow and children, for his parents and other members of this close and affectionate family. And we mourn for our Nation that has lost a dedicated and courageous Chief Executive, and for the world that has lost a great humanitarian and leader for peace on earth.

Unafraid of responsibility and unremitting in the performance of his awesome tasks, he brought to the office of the Presidency, youth, vigor, and a forward look. He was a man of persuasive ability, he had political dignity, eloquence of speech, wit, and charm. He saw troubles ahead, but was calm and determined, and he had great faith in America. He had said just before his election as President: "We will need in the sixties a President who is willing and able to summon his national constituency to its finest hour, to alert the people of our dangers and our opportunities, to demand of them the sacrifices that will be needed." In John F. Kennedy we had such a President. His record of performance in the short time he was in the White House had brought our country a long way, but it was only the beginning for him; he was taken from us harshly and suddenly at the pinnacle of his leadership. His untimely death made me think immediately of the words of Poet Robert Frost, whom the President admired so much, and I believe this was one of his favorites of Mr. Frost's poems:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
> And I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Surely our young President, who had just begun to blaze the trail of the New Frontier, must have felt that he had miles to go before he slept.

John F. Kennedy was a warm and friendly person. He was a devoted husband and father, and a religious man. He forgave quickly and he bore no grudge or envy. It was my privilege to consider him a friend and to know him personally. He had asked me to the White House on several occasions in the past few years, sometimes on legislative matters and sometimes for social functions when my wife accompanied me. We had visited him in his home in Palm Beach. Last February when I was ill and hospitalized, his personal notes of good wishes and his beautiful bouquet of flowers brought me happiness. This was a man with tremendous responsibilities, daily burdened with work, problems, and decisions, who somehow found time to personally and warmly touch on the lives of so many. His telephone call to former Vice President John Nance Garner to wish him happiness on his birthday—only a matter of hours before the black hour of his death—was an example of the type of thoughtful, personal deed he so often performed.

A short time after my release from the hospital, he wrote to express thanks for my support of one of his proposals:

> Although you were far from well, you were present in the House on Wednesday to vote in support of the administration's position. * * * This is to express my personal appreciation and my admiration for your strong sense of loyalty and responsibility.

This from a man who had no equal when it came to loyalty and responsibility.

Our beloved late President was a champion for world peace; probably his greatest goal was harmony and understanding among the nations of the world, and among our own American people. He had said:

> However undramatic the pursuit of peace, that pursuit must go on. Peace and freedom do not come cheap. * * * Let us not be petty when our cause is so great * * * let us not quarrel among ourselves when our Nation's future is at stake * * * let us stand together with renewed confidence in our cause * * * and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance.

Though he was criticized by some, he was instrumental in bringing about the nuclear test ban treaty and he was hopeful it would prove a lasting and major deterrent to a destructive nuclear war. He had great hopes for the advancement of our space program and the peaceful use of atomic energy. In his inaugural address, he said:

> Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science, instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

He was determined to keep his promise to the people of West Berlin. He stood firm against Soviet Russia on the Cuban crisis. He saw his Peace Corps program acclaimed a successful contribution to humanity throughout the world. He sought approval of a civil rights program "to achieve equality we have talked about for a hundred years," and he asked Congress for education bills "that would bring the light of learning to every home and hamlet." He said:

> America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason. Liberty without learning is in peril, and learning without liberty is in vain.

He wanted a tax bill that would keep our national economy from faltering; and he had asked Congress for a foreign aid bill that "would make it clear that we do not intend to forfeit our responsibilities to this hemisphere or the world." He had repeatedly urged approval of medical care under social security for our aged citizens.

My respect and admiration for President John F. Kennedy was deep. His wonderful memory will live in my heart. I will remember him as "a profile in courage."

My family and I extend heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, to young Caroline and little John, and to other bereaved relatives. They have our prayers for the strength and comfort that only the Almighty can give.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the bereavement of the entire free world has been so intense that most of us still have difficulty in finding words adequately to express our sense of grief and loss occasioned by the tragic assassination of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy.

Seventeen years ago, almost to the day, when John F. Kennedy arrived in Washington for the first time, as a Representative-elect from Masachusetts, those of us who were serving in this body at that time were immediately attracted to him by the many facets of his outstanding character. Since then he has become known to the world; and the traits that first endeared him to his colleagues in this House brought him the highest honor the citizens of this country can bestow—the Presidency of the United States.

To say that John F. Kennedy was a good man seems insufficient, but when we recall that millions of people—upon recovering slightly from the horrendous shock of the news of the President's untimely death—blurted those words through their tears, we have some appreciation of the meaning of that phrase. That spontaneous tribute summed up in two words, which can rarely be so universally applied to a man, all those attributes of character that adorned John F. Kennedy and that he bore with such grace.

He was naturally good. As Aristotle observed many centuries ago, the goodness that comes by nature is bestowed by a divine agency on certain people who truly deserve to be called fortunate. We shall never again see John F. Kennedy, but the good that he has done in his lifetime will live on and touch the lives of generations yet to come.

The genius of President Kennedy was his ability to accomplish great things for his country and his people in the face of long odds. One attribute of his character which enabled him to turn back the slings and arrows aimed at defeating his objectives was a wit that he had inherited from a long line of Celtic forebears. It was the manifestation of his wit on many occasions that so endeared him to million of Americans.

The world today is the poorer for his passing, but it is immeasurably richer for his having been with us during these past years.

There is no need for me to enumerate the fine accomplishments of John F. Kennedy. Others have done that today and much of it is known without the retelling. I only want to stand here in reverence to the memory of a good man and express my own sense of bereavement.

To the wonderful family of President Kennedy, I extend my most heartfelt condolences. Their sorrow is shared by all of us. Perhaps never has any family in our history shared in the prayerful remembrances of so many million Americans. Their grief can be less unbearable in the knowledge that it is also the grief of all Americans.

Mr. **GREEN** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, rarely in the history of America has one man blazed his path of glory across the horizons of this Nation in so short a time and with such momentous impact as did John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was fashioned of the heroic stuff of which great Americans are made. Yet we who knew him best can testify before all the world that here was a man of gracious charm, broad intellect, and rare wisdom, a man with all the courage, faith, and compassion which real manhood forever requires.

And as if aware of the tragic limitations which destiny was to impose upon him, he swept with power and purpose out of the mists of relative political obscurity to burst upon the consciousness of the American people as few men before him have ever done, symbolizing in his vigor, his leadership, and his vision a new generation of Americans.

In many ways, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the living embodiment of the American dream. Born to wealth and prominence, he, nevertheless, became the champion of the poor and downtrodden. Of Irish immigrant ancestry, he fused within his own personality those characteristics for which Americans have become world famous, while giving voice and form to the yearnings of all his countrymen regardless of their backgrounds. As a young man in England, he witnessed firsthand the ravages upon the human spirit of tyranny and oppression, even as the first rumblings of war swept through Europe. Later, he went on to experience for himself the awful agonies of combat and its aftermath while fighting in the South Pacific.

In all of his formative years, it is difficult to find a time when John Kennedy was not testing himself, when he was not sharpening and perfecting his moral and intellectual capacities for that fateful moment when he would keep his long-appointed rendezvous with destiny as President of the United States. His entire life became a hymn of preparation for the brief but critical months of service he would undergo as leader of the country he loved so dearly and for which he finally gave every last ounce of devotion that there was in him to give.

Though he wrote two books, he considered himself no author. Though he was a decorated war hero, he was no militarist. Though he served with honor as a distinguished political figure, he was no politician. But, first and foremost, he was a great patriot. Above personal ambition, above party affiliation, above petty conceits, John F. Kennedy will forever be a challenge and an inspiration to all those patriots, present and future, who would take their place among history's honor roll of the brave and the good.

Though many men are called to serve their God and their country, a very few men in any generation are chosen to walk the solitary path to glory which he walked. His entire life was a noble overture to his sudden and tragic death.

No man so captured the imagination of his age as did John F. Kennedy. No man so mirrored the ideals and aspirations of the American people as did he. When John Kennedy died, people the world over felt hope within them die. When John Kennedy was struck down, men everywhere saw reason and sanity and understanding being struck down with the same brutal senselessness and violence.

But the ideals which were so much the immortal part of John F. Kennedy shall endure beyond the grave. The assassin's gun and the assassin's bullet has not been made which can destroy freedom's dream—a dream that is indelibly impressed upon the minds and hearts of men. The dream of freedom shall endure so long as man himself endures.

On January 2, 1961—nearly 3 years ago—John F. Kennedy said:

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans. * * * Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival of liberty.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has borne his burden. Now let us take up ours. With God as our shield, with freedom as our cause, let us labor to create a new and even greater America so that historians, in the years to come, will not find us unworthy of the sacrifice made by one of the noblest men of this or any other age.

Mr. **BROOMFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, to eulogize our former President, John F. Kennedy, is a task which simple words cannot master. The man, himself, was his own eulogy.

All of us look at the world and beyond in new dimensions and perspectives because of John F. Kennedy. His breadth of vision, his depth of intellect, and the height of his spirit will be remembered as long as there are men on this earth.

More than any other man, President Kennedy understood that civilization no longer has a choice between peace and war. There is only the choice between peace and annihilation.

President Kennedy was a hero in war. He knew the meaning of battlefield courage. But more important, and infinitely more difficult, he was a hero in peace in a continuing battle in which there are few if any discernible victories and many defeats.

Most important, President Kennedy saw. He had the vision and the imagination to see the future of our Nation in its broadest perspective. His vision was not a daydream like fantasy of little substance, but a solid, tangible pattern of peace, justice, opportunity, and freedom which showed the way to progress for millions in our Nation and the world.

He saw that, just as it is impossible for a man to exist in a vacuum, so is it impossible for a nation to exist alone in the world, divorced from friends, encircled by enemies, even if that nation is the richest and the freest the world has ever known.

John F. Kennedy died a hero in a battle which will continue for decades and possibly centuries. The battle is for freedom, for dignity, for the right of each of us to realize his full potential.

His horizon stretched far beyond the shores of our Nation and, indeed, beyond the reaches of this small planet on which we live.

Now it is up to us not to lose sight of the goals John F. Kennedy has set for us. He was truly a pathfinder on the dangerous road to peace.

Mr. **SLACK**. Mr. Speaker, many have been the tributes paid to the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and no words of mine could hope to match the hundreds of scholarly expressions which have come from all over the world to add lustre to his memory.

Yet, I must add these few words because the people of my State and my congressional district were privileged to know him under exacting conditions, and he walked among them on many occasions with smiling countenance and purposeful stride, en route to the White House.

In the fateful West Virginia primary campaign of 1960, they voted their confidence in him and provided the catalyst that changed a hazardous prospect into an ultimate victory. He came to them as a man with a purpose, seeking support and understanding for his objectives. He left with them an impression which will survive as long as there remains alive even one among the thousands who shook his hand.

They were impressed by his clear understanding of the vast national problems which confront us, by his compassion for those who have not shared in our material progress, and most of all they admired his courage, both physical and spiritual, present in quantity and combination not often granted to any leader in our Nation's history.

Throughout a strenuous campaign in which his entire future hung in the balance, it was remarked that he never spoke an unkind word. But he spoke often in praise of others, and whoever gained his support was proud of it, and carried those words of praise with him as a buffer against adversity.

Now his days have been numbered and he has passed on to a greater journey. Like Halley's Comet which crosses the heavens only once each 75 years, we may not expect to soon see his equal in human resources enter on this stage again.

But each of us knows from the career of this man that, as long as the citizenry of this Republic continues to bring forth such men, then like the fire which drives the comet on its trajectory through the universe, our national spirit is unquenchable, and we shall remain invincible.

**Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.** Mr. Speaker, although I am a relatively new Member of this legislative body, it was my great honor to have known and been associated with our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, for many years before my election to the Congress.

I first met him in 1956. I came to know him better in the years intervening.

In 1958, the President—then serving as a Senator from Massachusetts—came to Easton in Northampton County in my district to make a public appearance.

Then, as always, he impressed the people of my area in Pennsylvania as a man of enormous compassion and magnificent insight into the great difficulties confronting mankind in modern society.

In July of this past year, following the death of my great and esteemed predecessor, Congressman Francis E. Walter, I was selected to be the Democratic nominee to fill the vacancy in the Congress.

Throughout the campaign in July, I made it perfectly clear that I was strongly and unswervingly allied with the President's policies, in general, and with his desires for a strong civil rights measure and a tax cut to stimulate our economy, in particular.

I ran, during that campaign as a liberal Democrat—against the advice, I might add, of several persons within my district. I do not regret having done so—and I believe that the actions of my constituents in electing me to this seat by a 7,000-vote margin would indicate that they agreed with me in that respect.

I am convinced, today, as I was in 1960 at the Democratic National Convention, that my party nominated the two men best qualified—by experience, by temperament and by native intelligence—to serve all the people of this Nation as their highest officials. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind, now—if there ever was before—that Lyndon Baines Johnson and John Fitzgerald Kennedy were allied philosophically in the single struggle to make the American dream a reality.

But President Kennedy did not live. He was cut down by some quality of madness, some maniac's reasoning that none of us here in this room will ever fully understand.

Now the assassin is dead, killed by a man who must have lacked the same ability to reason and the same lack of faith in a free society.

Three men lie dead, restored to the earth of their origins, stilled in the ashes of eternity—one of them among the most humane and compassionate and intelligent men ever to walk the path of righteousness in this country, the second a man of delusion and disenchantment, bitterness, and blind bigotry, the third a brave police officer who was murdered in the line of duty.

We have put John Fitzgerald Kennedy's body to rest now in Arlington Cemetery. But his soul will not rest, his spirit walks the Halls of this Congress today and we must not let his memory rest and die away within us, within our minds and hearts. It is—and it must be—a bright flame burning at the center of our collective conscience, as Congressmen and as his countrymen.

To understand the meaning of John F. Kennedy's life we must understand, also, the lives and thoughts of those men who first set down the principles of this great Nation.

Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Patrick Henry, Adams—these were men who recognized the grandeur of America and the greatness of its challenge. They knew—as did Lincoln, as did the two Roosevelts and Woodrow Wilson—that the very nature of this Nation would be such that its business would never be truly finished, that each challenge, once met, would give way only to another challenge—and that it was America's eagerness to be challenged which set it apart, totally and triumphantly, from every other nation ever created on the face of the earth.

No man in our time so thoroughly understood the underlying meanings of this free society.

No man in our time was ever more willing to meet the challenges it conveyed upon him, and upon us, as our birthright.

No one gave more freely of himself, in life.

No one has left us a greater legacy, in death.

Less than 2 weeks have gone by since John F. Kennedy's earthly body was placed in a grave at Arlington. Less than 2 weeks have gone by since we watched, with the final flagging energy of a nation sapped of tears and mourning, as a great lady of youth and beauty stood beside that grave and said a last goodby.

Less than 2 weeks.

And yet the voices are already rising across the land, saying that it was a terrible, tragic thing—but, after all, none of us were really to blame.

Is that true? Is that really true?

Can we say, in good conscience, that there is no blame upon this Nation, that those who spoke with hate and malice and bigotry before can be absolved of guilt in this senseless, futile killing?

I pray that none of us here in this room believes that the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was an accident of fate.

That it was the work of insanity, we do not and will not deny.

But even the most insane deed is committed in the right climate of opinion. And the climate of opinion in a country is created by many forces, not just a few.

There will be many memorials to John F. Kennedy. Some of them will be just, lasting, and fitting tributes to a man who cared more deeply about this country than anything in his own life.

One of those memorials has already been proposed to this Congress and I am in full agreement with those who wish to see the National Cultural Center become the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center. No President in America's history believed more firmly that the strength of our country was founded upon its intellectual and esthetic development.

Less than 2 months before his death, President Kennedy flew to Milford, Pa., in Pike County, in my district. He went there at the beginning of a great nationwide tour in the interests of conservation. He went there to dedicate a research center commemorating the life and work of a great Pennsylvania Republican Governor, Gifford Pinchot, who was our State's first genuine conservationist.

But he went, also, to remind us that the majesty and grandeur of our natural surroundings must be preserved, that we must do all within our power to prevent the ravages of floodwaters such as those that laid waste to Pike and Monroe and Northampton Counties in Pennsylvania during Hurricane Diane in August of 1955.

He believed, with all his heart, in the continuing greatness of America, in its people and in the dream which made it possible.

He loved people, too—and it was a basic part of his personality to want to be with them wherever they were, in crowds, on the streets, or at the seashore. I remember that beautiful September 24 of this year when John F. Kennedy finished his formal talk at Milford and stepped down to shake hands with the hundreds of men and women who had come to hear him.

There were many young people there that day—just as there were here after his death. They came, I think, out of love for him, out of respect for him and the office he held—and out of understanding. For he was the first man in many years who could tell the youth of this country that America was still a young nation and make them believe.

It was the core of his being which spoke to all America when he talked of moving forward to meet the great, unfinished business of our country.

That is why he was so concerned with the development of Tocks Island Dam and national recreation area on the Delaware River in my district in Pennsylvania.

And that is why I am humbly hopeful that his family and the Members of the Congress may look with favor upon a proposal to give his name to this magnificent reservoir and recreation area. It will be the largest of its kind in eastern America. It will serve between 20 and 30 million people—approximately 11 to 15 percent of our total national population.

I can think of no more dignified or fitting means of keeping his memory alive in the minds of such a large segment of the American people.

Surely, it is obvious that John Fitzgerald Kennedy took with him in death the prayers and blessings of the vast majority of citizens in this country. He was loved in life by countless millions, not only here, but in other nations beyond our borders.

He is loved, in death, as few men have ever been.

He will be remembered, for his cause was the fulfillment of America.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in participating today in the eulogies to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I want first to point out that these remarks are in behalf of all who make their homes in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. The grief which accompanied the President's passing came to each household, each family, and indeed, each individual. These expressions today on the floor of the House of Representatives follow the many personal letters, newspaper editorials, and radio and television programs, all dedicated to the memory of President Kennedy and to his life and work.

An obvious explanation of the general outpouring of sorrow and sympathy is that the President was the leader of our Nation. The thought that anyone would presume to assassinate the head of our Nation is deplored and rejected by all. Our initial unbelief was soon followed by deep individual and personal grief. I doubt that the emotional impact which we experienced during the dark days following the President's assassination, will ever leave us.

President and Mrs. Kennedy and their children have endeared themselves to the Nation as a whole. On my several personal contacts with the late President, I found him to be a most friendly and warm individual, a person who expressed concern and interest in others. In addition, he was one who attracted the most friendly attitudes on the part of others. He was well liked—and assumed that others liked him—as they did.

These personal attributes of the President make his death the more tragic and more heartrending. That anyone would harbor feelings of hostility to the extent of wishing to inflict on him physical harm or violence was surely beyond his belief. The entire world has been stunned and shocked by the brutal slaying of our President.

The sorrow of this hour is assuaged by the knowledge that in the Spirit, life is eternal, and that however it may appear to mortal eyes, in the eyes of the Divine Power which governs us all—man is forever alive. As a spiritual man of God, John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, at this moment in history when the world reels in shock at the insensate, cruel, and brutal murder of our beloved President, it becomes a bounden duty to assess our role in this day and in this crisis.

As a nation and a people, joined by the peoples of the world, we pay fitting tribute to this man who gave unstintingly of his time, his mind, his energy and, indeed, his very life, to insure peace in this world and a better life for its people. This is as it should be.

But this is also a moment of truth and we cannot escape it. We must with all sincerity examine our hearts and our consciences. It is inescapable that we all share to some degree a collective responsibility for the continued reservoirs of hate and ignorance that can bring forth such a crime.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man. He was a man who dared to meet the challenges of our time. His name and his deeds will live as a magnificent monument to the determination of this Nation and our people to realize the immortal promise of the American dream—a free people and a free nation—devoted to the pursuits of peace and the betterment of mankind.

Now he has given his life to these ideals.

The American people will even now look to those within whose power it resides to erect a lasting memorial to this American whose memory will remain a beacon light along the paths of democracy.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I propose that we join, not as Democrats—not as Republicans—but as citizens of this great Republic, in enacting into law that program which will live as the greatest memorial to the ideals and hopes of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

In closing, I would like to recall the words of the Prophet Isaiah:

> And thine ear shall hear a word behind thee saying, this is the way, walk ye in it.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Second District of Colorado, which I represent, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing our sorrow over the tragic assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy and extend our sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, never in the history of our Nation has a death affected the lives of so many people as the untimely, senseless murder of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was indeed a man of courage, brilliant intellect, and a dynamic leader. His death brought shock and sorrow to all of us and plunged the entire Nation into deep mourning.

He had youth, charm, a zest for life, and leadership the White House has seldom known. He had courage in war and in peace and he had the wits to confound those at home or abroad who would despoil his beloved country.

Like Jefferson, he kept faith with the common man's ability to exercise his own freedom. His was an abiding conviction that all citizens have a right to equality.

During his short time as our leader, he achieved greatness. To each problem that was presented, he sought a solution. Each solution helped America retain her position in world affairs.

For the first time in the history of the world, the citizens of the bereaved Nation have been able to see the deep lines of grief etched upon the faces of the peoples of this and other nations and to hear, firsthand, their expressions of regard and concern.

It is highly significant that in this great tragedy even those who have disagreed with the President and his philosophy of government are as sincere in their grief as those who marched side by side with him as he stood at the helm of the great Nation.

The people of the United States and the world will forever mourn his untimely death. They will pay proper recognition to the contributions he has made to help mankind and maintain a free America.

I extend my sympathy to the family.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, after the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I wrote a letter to my constituents. This letter expresses my feelings then and expresses them now and I ask unanimous consent to place this letter at this point in the RECORD:

> This is not the usual newsletter. It is just a word to let you know of my participation with you in the shock and grief at the dastardly assassination of our President.
>
> Never has there been such an outpouring of sympathy, sorrow, and indignation in the Nation's Capital. At the White House everything was quiet and impressive. In the East Room that most of us have usually associated with gay occasions the great catafalque draped with the flag was in the middle of the room with the huge candles at the four corners and the guard of honor immobile, like statues, with their eyes fixed on the ground. Many of us knelt for a brief moment at the foot of the catafalque and prayed not only for our President, who had been taken in such a tragic manner, but for his bereft family. Mrs. Kennedy has been magnificent throughout and the heart of the Nation goes out to her. Owing to television and radio, we were all very close at the time and no one will ever forget Mrs. Kennedy's face as she stood near President Johnson on the plane as he took the oath of office or when she left the plane at Andrews Air Force Base and got into the ambulance that took the late President's body to Bethesda Naval Hospital. There is a saying in the hunt country that Mrs. Kennedy loves so well that: A thoroughbred never lets you down—she surely has proved herself true blue during these tragic days.
>
> And now the 35th President of the United States is left to the ages, and in the words of the poet:
>
> "The tumult and the shouting dies;  
> The captains and the host depart;  
> Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,  
> An humble and a contrite heart."
>
> Yes, certainly John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave the last full measure of devotion to our country and this will be remembered after much else will be forgotten.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, little can be added to that which has been so eloquently spoken here today. What is so deeply felt by millions of Americans and many millions more the world over requires but few words.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead.

"He cometh up, and is cut down, like a flower"—and the people lament.

We ask ourselves, what purpose, what reason serves this twist of fate? Why was one, whose superior capacity for leadership of and good will toward the brotherhood of man, taken so violently from us in the summer of his life by a loathsome assassin?

The guilt for this atrocity is borne in part by all of us, and well it should be. For we are not as far advanced from the uncivilized periods of this world as we should like to think. We must give pause in our thoughts on this date and earnestly hope and pray that from this great tragedy a lesson has been learned. A lesson that shall not be forgotten.

But no matter what new resolves for improvement emerge from this tragic experience, we have lost that which cannot be recovered. We have lost a great and good man, and one feels as did Horatio upon the death of Hamlet:

Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet Prince; and flights of
angels sing thee to thy rest.

**Mr. RUMSFELD.** Mr. Speaker, the people of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois share the profound shock and grief that our Nation and, indeed, the world has experienced as a result of the still unbelievable and terribly tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He commanded the respect and admiration of all who met him as a man of conviction who respected the convictions of others; a formidable politician and born competitor who did much to raise the level of respect for politics and politicians; a man of dedication, who faced his many difficult tasks with enthusiasim and a zest for living; a man devoted to his country.

As the Nation goes forward in these still troubled times, all of the fine qualities which he exemplified will help us fulfill the hopes and aspirations which all of us hold for our country and its people.

**Mr. CAMERON.** Mr. Speaker, my mail of November 26 brought the following letter, which I believe to be as eloquent a tribute to President Kennedy as has been written:

RONALD BROOKS CAMERON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: My family and I have been deeply disturbed by the death of President Kennedy.

It is difficult to put into words, but perhaps it is like our reaction to a breeze that moves through the forest; it rustles the leaves and stirs the surface of a pond; we feel its presence and grow accustomed to it. Then it stops, and we are impressed by the stillness. The presence of Mr. Kennedy was like a clean, fresh breeze that moved the leaves of our society and stirred the surface of its culture. That presence is gone, and I can only wonder at the stillness and express to you my support of his principles, and to encourage you in continuing your efforts to implement them.

Sincerely,
Mr. TERRY L. WORTHYLAKE.
WEST COUINA, CALIF.

**Mr. STAFFORD.** Mr. Speaker, I rise here today in behalf of the people of Vermont to pay tribute to our 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

No new words can be added to the thousands which have been expressed so eloquently by so many since that tragic event of November 22.

There does seem to be one more fitting tribute which should be made, however. As you know, President Kennedy and Vermont's beloved Poet Laureate, Robert Frost, shared life's greatest hopes.

Frost spoke of some of these at President Kennedy's inauguration here nearly 3 years ago. The President honored Frost publicly at later events. Both have now gone on.

In tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I should like to read the following verse written by his friend from Vermont, Robert Frost.

ESCAPIST—NEVER

He is no fugitive—escaped, escaping.
No one has seen him stumble looking back.
His fear is not behind him but beside him
On either hand to make his course perhaps
A crooked straightness yet no less a straightness.
He runs face forward. He is a pursuer.
He seeks a seeker who in his turn seeks
Another still, lost far into the distance.
Any who seek him seek in him the seeker.
His life is a pursuit of a pursuit forever.
It is the future that creates his present.
All is an interminable chain of longing.

**Mr. PELLY.** Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress did not have to be of the same political persuasion of a New Frontiersman to admire the warm personality and fine qualities of leadership of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

Future historians will assure Mr. Kennedy the place in history which he so richly deserves. But I venture to say that far beyond the memories of any of us who live today his name will be venerated as a great humanitarian and upholder of human rights.

For myself, I would express admiration on one count which I feel deserves special mention. Respect of a people for the highest public office—the Presidency—is evidenced by the universal grief of our people and the orderly transfer of authority from the slain President to his successor. This, I believe, is a vital prerequisite to preservation of freedom and democracy. So in paying my tribute to the life and accomplishments of John F. Kennedy, let me point up especially this particular aspect of his service. Our late President lent dignity to his high office and this in itself was an important contribution to our Republic. He brought the people, through his televised and personal appearances, close to the White House and gave them an understanding of national problems. His words reached the people and respect for the office of President has been sustained on a very high level.

Mr. Speaker, because of this, I was restrained when I disagreed with Mr. Kennedy. I freely debated issues where there were differences with his administration but I honored him and his views as did other members of my party. We differed in approach but never with objectives. He was for peace. We are for peace. He was for human dignity. We are for human dignity. He was for a better life for our citizens and mankind. We are for a better life for our citizens and mankind. He was for a strong America. We are for a strong America.

Only did we quarrel at times over the best means to achieve these common objectives.

Now with Lincoln and other noble leaders of the past, he belongs to the ages. The American people of all creeds, races, and political views have been drawn together by our sorrow. We remain drawn together seeking the same objectives to which Mr. Kennedy was dedicated. We are left by the tragic assassination a united people under God and in this time of grief each of us must rededicate ourselves to our beloved country. That is what John F. Kennedy would wish. That is the way it will be.

**Mr. WEAVER.** Mr. Speaker, the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will be remembered in history as a victim of the "cold war"—a victim of an assassin schooled in communism.

Through his youthfulness, vigor, leadership, his gracious wife, Jacqueline, and their two lovely children, the Presidency was given a new concept.

These assets along with a keen mind, an eloquent speaking technique, a pleasing appearance, and his theme of moving the United States forward, projected President Kennedy into the hearts of his countrymen. He became one of this Nation's most popular Presidents.

The shock of his death still remains in the minds of many. All of us who felt the effect of this horrendous act will never erase it from our memories.

Not everyone agreed with his policies; but the President in carrying out his responsibilities did so as a great American who had the best interests of the Nation at heart.

His quality of leadership that I admired most could be best illustrated in his firm handling of the Cuban crisis in which his bold moves saw the Soviet Union retreat from American strength and power.

Mrs. Weaver and I will never forget the sadness that filled our hearts as we expressed our personal sympathy and that of the people of the Erie, Crawford, and Mercer Counties at the White House, Capitol rotunda, and Arlington Cemetery. Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her children, Caroline and John, truly deserve the respect of this Nation for the dignity they displayed during this moment of personal grief, shared by the entire world. Mrs. Kennedy was truly a "profile in courage."

His death was a profound loss to the Pennsylvania 24th Congressional District. My sentiment and that of our people is reflected in the editorials appearing in the press in the Mercer-Crawford-Erie district.

Following are some of the writings:

[From the Erie Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

ODDS AND ENDS

(By Ed Mathews)

We didn't always agree with him.

We were like a great deal of other people.

We felt that he was politically activated on many of the things he did.

On the other hand we admired him.

We thought he was a great President.

We doubt if there will be another President like him.

We felt as though he was someone we knew on a personal level. We didn't but he had the overwhelming power to make you think you did.

We remember the last time we saw him. He spoke to the American Society of Newspaper Editors at their annual convention in Washington and when he finished he spoke to each and every member.

He was a politician, a good one.

He was a man who couldn't possibly have been beaten in 1964.

He was a symbol of what was the new fighting look in a young vigorous country.

He was a war hero who was lucky to survive.

He died as a man in the service of his country.

He died at the hands of the type of man he abhorred—the mixed-up type who thought other countries much better than his own.

He died on a political trip—which he enjoyed—to help Texas, the home of his successor.

When he died a little of each and every one of us died with him.

We were with a group of newspapermen attending a meeting to improve the economy of the State of Pennsylvania when the news first was announced. Gov. William Scranton was on the speaking platform and we happened to be sitting with his press secretary, Jack Comny. A hurry-up call took him away from the table. Then he approached the Governor with the news. We watched the expression on the Governor's face and then we told Mary Scranton that it was easy to see a great tragedy had taken place. The time was 1:40 p.m.

We thought it was some member of the family by the look on Mr. Scranton's face. Then the Governor interrupted the speaker to say:

"Gentlemen, I have some news for you. It isn't good.

"The President of the United States has been shot three times in the head."

Almost to a man there was a reaction: "Oh, my God!"

Arnie Goldberg of Uniontown summed it up when he said, "I feel sick to my stomach and we can't do a damn thing about it."

We realized how helpless a President is—even with the elaborate precautions of the Secret Service when a maniac with a gun is set on killing him. And you realize how united a country is behind a President in time of trial.

It wasn't too much longer the final word came. Then it was like a morgue. Newsmen used to big stories quietly moved away not knowing which way to turn.

It was a time when you wanted to be with one closest to your heart.

In short it was awful.

November 22 continued and it was nearly 6 p.m.—a mere 5 hours after the assassination and a President and his wife were getting off a plane at Andrews Air Force Base. It was not the one who left shortly before. It was Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Johnson.

The body of the former President and his grieving wife had preceded him to a waiting ambulance from Bethesda Naval Hospital.

The country had gone through a horrible day in its history—but it already had a new President. It would continue to go on.

Somehow, as you watched, you knew it—but somehow, too, you found it hard to believe because of the man in the casket—J.F.K.

The world was a poverty-stricken place.

[From the Farrell (Pa.) Press, Nov. 29, 1963]

### IN MEMORIAM

It was slightly past 2, Friday afternoon, November 22, when word rang around the world that our beloved President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. People just couldn't believe it. Thousands of men and women burst into tears, grieving at the thought of losing a President who has done so much and still had much to be done, but now will not have the opportunity to fulfill this mission.

Radio and television kept a constant continuity on his untimely passing and the public was well informed on all details. Churches and synagogues were jammed and the Nation went to prayer services.

The largest attended funeral in world's history was held Monday afternoon in Washington. President Kennedy now rests in Arlington National Cemetery with thousands of other veterans who gave their lives for their country. Millions attended the funeral by television and radio and were saddened by this terrible murder in these United States.

The Farrell Press joins millions of Americans in extending our sincerest sympathies to his courageous widow Jacqueline and the Kennedy family. With Mr. Kennedy's successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, at the helm, we know America will continue to go forward and meet every crisis well, in the true American tradition.

---

[From the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune, Nov. 26, 1963]

### A NATION GRIEVES

It was almost as though Americans, stunned by the swift turn of events of the past few days, could not fully comprehend that an assassin's bullet had taken the life of their President. But the burial of his body yesterday shocked all of us into the realization that President John Fitzgerald Kennedy no longer is our leader.

In death, President Kennedy unified the Nation as it never has been united except in times of national emergency. This dynamic, boisterous, exuberant country was brought to a virtual standstill by deep, heartfelt grief that mainfested itself yesterday.

Bereavement knew no party lines. People of high and low estate were emotionally upset. Protestants, Catholics, and Jews offered prayers, each in his own way, and Americans of no religion at all paused to contemplate their loss. All of this Nation, regardless of national origin or color, shared together feelings of personal grief as though each of us had lost a member of his family.

Indeed, the death of President Kennedy might be compared to the loss of the head of a household. For was he not the head of the American household? Did not each of us look to him for guidance and leadership, even though we may not have been in accord with his decisions? Did we not depend on him for our national security and our well-being both as a nation and as individuals? Our aspirations for peace, freedom and prosperity—and, indeed, the hopes of many throughout the world—were personified in him.

The name of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be entered indelibly in the history of this Nation. But time and events do not stand still, and the mantle of authority has passed to President Lyndon Baines Johnson. While we may grieve over the death of his predecessor, our loyalty and our confidence now are transferred to the new President. If the unity achieved by sorrow could be committed to the support of President Johnson and the course he takes to advance our national welfare, the memory of the late President Kennedy would be well served.

---

[From the Sharon (Pa.) Herald, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A Nation, indeed a world, united in sorrow, mourns today the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, martyred by an assassin's bullet.

For millions upon millions, his loss is a keenly personal one, the shock of which only now is being felt.

For this is the kind of man John Fitzgerald Kennedy was: As with all who are firm of conviction and strong in leadership, he could and did engender hate; what other force could have moved the demented mind of his assassin to commit his monstrous crime?

Yet, because of these same qualities, he could and did excite in millions throughout the world who felt their lives touched by him deep and abiding affection, profound respect and heartfelt admiration. It is these who now kneel beside the late President's wife and his family as they turn to the God of all for His comforting hand and His guidance in their hour of sorrow.

The Nation in anguish today asks itself: How could this be? How could this act of madness happen among us who live in a society in which stability in government, orderliness and tolerance are the touchstones of a way of life envied the world over? Are we a damned people?

The answer surely must be that we are not, for then how could the Republic survive? We are, rather, a people who harbor in their midst some so poisoned in both mind and heart they are incapable of understanding either the meaning of liberty or of discharging the responsibilities of freedom. The Republic, by the very nature of its foundation in freedom, is ill-equipped to guard against these.

History in its own good time will assess John Fitzgerald Kennedy as President. The first child of this century to achieve the Presidency, he brought with him to this noblest and yet most awesome of offices his youth, his keenness of mind, his soundness of heart and the firm determination to usher the country into a new era.

However one views his policies and programs, few will deny he was equal to the tasks of the Presidency. From the outset of his administration he was beset by the staggering problems of our times. Abroad, the threat of nuclear destruction hanging over all mankind, the Communist colossus, the deteriorating Western alliance, Cuba; at home, the lagging economy and persistent unemployment and that gravest of all domestic problems, the relations between the white and Negro races which another martyred President nearly a century before also was unable to solve—all these and scores of others tested him and he did not turn aside.

History, we believe, will look with favor upon John Fitzgerald Kennedy during the 2½ years he occupied the White House. If his life was cut short before he was able to achieve the goals he set for himself and his country, it was long enough for him to set the Nation on a course from which, for better or for worse, it will be unable to turn. Indeed, the assassin's bullet which ended his life fixed the Kennedy era into history. It will last long after him.

Now the monumental task of leading the Nation, particularly through this troubled hour, falls upon the shoulders of President Lyndon B. Johnson, so recently the Vice President. He has accepted the responsibility, gravely, humbly asking for the help and the support of his fellow countrymen—and for God's.

Americans all, though burdened with the grief for their dead President, will respond unstintingly to the appeal of their new President. For at this hour there can be no Republicans, no Democrats, there can be no whites or Negroes, no northerners or southerners—there can only be Americans. Only in this way will the Republic be preserved.

---

[From the Corry (Pa.) Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### HE CARED FOR THE PEOPLE

A writer of words is a poor craftsman to tell of greatness.

The indelible pen with which history writes will leave for posterity the unchangeable record of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Then will a determination on the balance scales be made.

Historians will record that President Kennedy led our Nation when we reached for the moon.

But we believe that he will be judged on the blueprint he fashioned for the people; for the Negro and the colored races when the world was watching; for the aged and the sick when no one but our own too-quiet conscience was watching; for the jobless when crushed and defeated spirits were watching;

**for the untrained, unlearned youth when posterity was watching.**

**For these he will be remembered long after other accomplishments of his short Presidency are forgotten.**

**And history will recall that he cared for the people.**

---

[From the Titusville (Pa.) Herald, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A TRAGIC LOSS

**The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy comes as a profound shock to all citizens of the United States and the free world. Although there were many who differed with him on matters of high policy, all true Americans admired his stamina, his articulateness, his longtime devotion to public service, his political adroitness, and his warmth of personality. The Nation has suffered a serious loss with the violent death of President Kennedy, the youngest man ever to be elected to its highest office. The Nation now mourns his tragic passing and extends its prayers and deepest sympathy to his fine family.**

---

[From the Albion (Pa.), News, Nov. 27, 1963]

### A WEEKEND OF TRAGEDY

**The 35th President of the United States was mortally wounded by an assassin in Dallas, Tex., Friday. He died at about 1 p.m. within 30 minutes of the shooting.**

**At 3:30 p.m., after a 2-minute ceremony, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President, while standing in a plane at Dallas. His first Executive order was: "Now, let's get airborne"—to Washington to assume the reins of Government.**

**The suspected assassin, 24-year-old Lee Oswald, was captured within an hour after the shooting. Forty-eight hours later he was fatally shot by Jack Ruby, a Dallas nightclub owner, while he was being moved from the Dallas city to county jail.**

**The late President's body was flown to Washington with his wife and President and Mrs. Johnson early Friday afternoon. He lay "in repose" in the White House Saturday, and Sunday was taken to the Capitol Rotunda. An estimated 250,000 grieving persons passed through Sunday, Sunday night, and until 9 a.m. Monday.**

**He was buried in Arlington National Cemetery after services in St. Matthew's Cathedral. Heads of state and representatives of 55 nations were among those present.**

**It was a weekend of world mourning.**

---

[From the Erie (Pa.) Lake Shore Visitor, Nov. 29, 1963]

### FALLEN HERO

**Millions of words have been written and spoken in the past 6 days about the life and character of the late President John F. Kennedy. His courage, vigor, intellectual prowess, dedication and skill as the leader of the free world have all received full and richly deserved praise.**

**One of the most remarkable aspects of his career was the unaffected way he fulfilled his duties as a Catholic and a family man. Unashamedly and with neither ostentation nor attempts at secrecy, the personal side of his life was lived without any posing or posturing.**

**The whole Kennedy family has given the world an example of closeknit family life that the world badly needs. They have proven beyond any possible quibble that Catholicism is in no way incompatible with political life.**

**In the stunned and confused atmosphere which followed last Friday's dark deed it has been impossible to look with complete objectivity on the life of the statesman, but it does seem clear that his example should and probably will have an influence long after things return to normal.**

Normal, wholesome family life has been at a discount in recent decades and it is a part of his greatness that President Kennedy with all his other great qualities was still the well-rounded, normal family man who has been too rare. He wore his private responsibilities almost gaily, but he always wore them.

We have always as a Nation cherished our heroes, and John F. Kennedy will be long remembered as an authentic one. In a century which has often not been very selective in the popular heroes or heroines it idolized for a brief moment, the late President stands head and shoulders above the crowd on whom the spotlight has fallen.

The responsibilities of the Presidency are, to repeat the shopworn phrase, truly awesome. It is a part of the measure of his greatness that Mr. Kennedy shirked none of them, public or private.

R.I.P.

---

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times, Nov. 25, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The unreal dream has become substance. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, was buried today in Arlington National Cemetery alongside other heroes who have given their lives for their country.

Lost to us is his compassion for the afflicted, his warmth for the young, needy and aged, his courage and leadership in times of international stress.

He left a legacy of courage and dignity. His own life was a story of pain surmounted, of heroism in the face of danger and of personal sorrow in the death of his infant son.

The tragic chain of senseless violence took three lives and accomplished only a national tragedy.

The assassin of the President died in the same violent manner, never actually comprehending the magnitude of his evil deed.

President Kennedy's widow has been a shining example of courage and fortitude in her personal grief.

It is as though she were taking our hand to comfort and solace us through the period of our national trial.

We must turn now and take up the tools of our daily lives to carry on as President Kennedy would have wished.

We are the greater people and Nation for having known him, even for so short a time.

---

[From the Greenville (Pa.) Record-Argus, Nov. 25, 1963]

### WE MUST LOOK FORWARD

The British have a way of saying it that we Americans might revise a bit and adopt for our own use in this dark day. The President is dead. Long live the President.

The implication, of course, is acceptance of the fact that our President, John F. Kennedy, is dead but our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, lives and we wish him well.

These are times that try men to their utmost. Times when it seems almost as if the world had stopped. But it hasn't stopped. All men, the world over, can only sorrow at the loss of John Kennedy to an assassin's bullet. His death will have far-reaching effects on the many complex problems the United States faces.

However, we must remember, and there's no doubt that Lyndon Johnson remembers, the world will go on. Vietnam won't disappear during our grief. The Berlin problem will be there tomorrow just as it was Friday morning. Castro and his Communist friends in Cuba won't go away. These and the many other perplexing problems the United States and President Kennedy faced together are still there.

They are no longer President Kennedy's problems. They fell on the broad, Texan shoulders of Lyndon Johnson at 2 p.m. Friday. They rest there now.

There have been many eulogies since the death of President Kennedy. But all men in every station have felt the same inadequacy of expression.

His former political foes, men with whom he had fought battle after battle right up to the very moment of his passing, wept. They recognized John F. Kennedy for what he was—a great man—despite their political differences. They felt the same pangs of sorrow as were felt by every man, woman and child in the Nation.

Those who lived through that black Friday will never forget it. The emotional shock was almost more than many could bear. Men's minds and hearts were shaken by extreme sorrow and at the same time anger and shame that this horrible thing should happen in the United States.

Today they laid John F. Kennedy to rest. He was a man of courage and expected every other American to be the same. He had seen death close by before and came back to win the highest office in the land. His success didn't dim his courage nor did it alter his faith in mankind. His patriotism was unchallenged. To him, the love of his country was part of life. He believed all Americans had felt the same.

Because he was the man he was, President Kennedy would wish nothing more than for Americans to unite in their common sorrow, shake off the cloud of grief and move forward. He was not a man to look back. The future was what counted. His philosophy, thought difficult at times to accept in this regard, is sound. It is the philosophy all Americans must adopt.

President Johnson has assumed the role of the highest office in our Nation. He has full knowledge of the turmoil that exists in the world. He also knows he faces a monumental task. Let all men make him aware he has our prayerful support.

America cannot afford to dwell in the past. The present won't wait for us. The future presses in too quickly. There are jobs to be done and men must be at them. The finest memorial we Americans could raise in memory of John Kennedy is a monument of a strong, united nation, its loins girded with the courage with which it was built, striving with even more vigor to preserve democracy.

His dream was of a free world. It is now our responsibility to see that dream come true. Lyndon Johnson, with the help of God and man, will lead us toward the realization of that dream.

The President is dead. Long live the President.

---

[From the Edinboro (Pa.) Independent, Nov. 28, 1963]

### PRESIDENT SLAIN—SHALL HE HAVE DIED IN VAIN

In Dallas, Tex., on the afternoon of November 22, 1963, a young man died in a hospital emergency room from wounds caused by an assassin's bullet.

What had been the body of an energetic young American man, now lay stilled in death.

Thus died, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America.

We are benumbed and grief stricken.

His kind of faith in our future and his unshakable belief in peace should confidently move us forward into a better society.

His civil rights program will require all our skills, tolerance, and understanding, in order that it may become fact, and not fancy.

Most definitely we want to retain the atmosphere of "a new era" in the White House which he and his family brought about. We should seek to prevent a loss of impetus and tempo on his outstanding programs, i.e., the

Peace Corps, tax reform, stable prices, Manpower Development and Training Act, urban renewal, 10-year city program, etc.

We feel strongly that Americans of all parties should cooperate, wholeheartedly, on these programs in order to better our own suvival as a nation, and to prove our good faith and intentions to the international community.

As President-elect, in 1960, he said, "In the * * * challenging, revolutionary, 1960's—the American Presidency will demand more than ringing manifestoes issued from the rear of battle * * *. In the coming years we will need a real fighting mood in the White House * * * a man who will not retreat."

On January 30, 1961, in his state of the Union address, he said to a joint session of Congress, "It was here * * * that I gained both knowledge and inspiration from your wise and generous leaders. * * * Let every man and woman of our National Government say with pride and honor: I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need.

"We greet healthy controversy as a hallmark of healthy change."

John F. Kennedy was a knowledgeable young man with almost unlimited energy. He possessed an unflinching determination to "get America moving again." He decerned the future of our country and our world with objectivity and logical analysis.

He perceived the mistakes and blunders of some of our country's past leaders, and took concrete steps to rectify them, and to make them right.

His stanch courage in the face of adversity and extremely trying conditions, was demonstrated during his first 90 days as our President, and has continued apace.

He was a dutiful son; a loving father, and a thoughtful and considerate husband.

Yet, he paid in full the penalty of leadership, in the form of criticism, detraction, the shafts of the envious few, and death by the stealthy, squeezing trigger finger of a hidden killer.

His vibrant words of courage, "To state the facts frankly, is not to despair the future nor indict the past," bespeak him well.

As fellow Americans, we are obligated to work unceasingly, with the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice, toward the realization and fruition of his aims, programs, plans, and ideals. Now, more than ever before in our history as a nation, we must present a united front to the entire world community, as he would have desired it.

Our job is: "To state the facts frankly" dedicating ourselves to the principles that the things he stood for are made a part of our American heritage.

If we fail—our young immortal pioneer will have died in vain.

In his own words, "We pray that we may be worthy of the unlimited opportunities that the Infinite has given us."

We also pray: That his inspiring image will remain undimmed for all eternity.

---

[From the Erie Morning News, Nov. 26, 1963]

### The Final Prayers Said, Taps Have Been Sounded

Our tears have fallen without shame.

Our last goodbye has been said.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been committed to the care of God and history.

It is painfully difficult to make any attempt to put the tragic events of the past few days in focus, or to begin to grasp the depth to which each of us has been affected.

This we know now. There is no American whose life was not altered during the 2 years and 10 months that President Kennedy was our leader.

The course of human events which seemed so inalterably directed toward holocaust and doom despite our resistance, suddenly was diverted to a new mainstream.

It is still too early to tell whether the river of life moves toward a real world of peace, or just a new plateau in the cold war.

Too much still depends upon our antagonists.

It would be completely impossible for any succeeding leader to negate the work of peace that has President Kennedy's indelible touch on its face.

Mere records will show that the late President was less than successful in his attempts to carry out many domestic changes, and that some of his strongest political opponents were of his own party.

But even political failures in our land are not without their advantages to the Nation as a whole, for by the very working of our system the open debates and discussions help many to a clearer vision of the needs of the people.

Where his domestic plans went astray in the simmering national forge, his successes as the leader of the free world were from the beginning bathed in a brilliance that unfortunately peoples of many foreign lands saw and recognized long before his own Americans did.

This we can only regret as all too many Americans must do now when it is too late.

For our last goodbye has been said.

---

### As We See It

(By Frances Moore, editor and assistant publisher, Allied Newspapers, Grove City, Pa., November 25, 1963)

By the time this is in print the body of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy will have been laid to rest on a hillside overlooking the scenes which were a part of his daily life. Even now almost 3 days after that dastardly deed that so suddenly brought to an end, the young, enthusiastic, and courageous life of our President—it doesn't seem quite possible that it all happened.

We take so much pride in our civilization, and in our democracy. We take for granted the fact that we can agree or differ as the case may be, with our leaders, yes, even with the President—yet live at peace with one another, on friendly terms. Then some anarchist fires a volley of shots, and our President dies. This can't happen in these United States, we tell ourselves. But it did.

The man who was accused of the unspeakable deed later died in the same manner, but not before he killed a police officer, who also was a husband and father of young children. One of the many thoughtful and considerate acts performed by Jacqueline Kennedy, in her time of deepest sorrow, was that of sending a message of sympathy to the bereaved wife of the slain policeman.

Her consideration for others has shown itself in deed and word almost from the very moment when death took the First Lady's husband from her. Those who have always admired her, admire her more; and those who have ofttimes been critical, have learned to admire her deeply during these days. And she has been, in truth, the First Lady.

Regardless of political differences, the populace, as one, felt the horror and shock when the news of the shooting first came over radio and television shortly after 1:30 Friday afternoon. They didn't matter then, those differences—a gun-carrying maniac had fired a shot that took the life of a man riding smilingly along a Dallas, Tex., street; riding in an open car because he loved to ride that way; riding without protection of bulletproof glass; riding so that he could put out his hand and touch a close bystander; riding so, because this was the United States of America and so he was safe from sniper's bullets—and this man was our President.

We ask why? And this we will never know, perhaps, since the man accused of firing the fatal shot also has been silenced by death, death at the hands of another murderer. This Nation has felt shock before at the loss of Presidents by assassins, and maybe those who lived then felt shock and sorrow as deeply as we who live today feel at the death of President Kennedy. It would seem that they must have, but as we feel now, it seems impossible that our country has ever before been subjected to shock so deep and so full of horror.

The people were shocked when on April 12, 1945, news was received of the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Nation mourned. But he died a natural death, even though suddenly, so the shock was not coupled with the horror of deliberate killing. An attempt had been made to take the life of this President, too, but the sniper was not so accurate—and another man died, instead.

The first President to die by an assassin's bullet was Abraham Lincoln, 16th President, shot April 14, 1864, and died the following morning. James A. Garfield, the 20th President, was shot on the second day of July 1881, and lived until the 19th of September. William McKinley, the 25th President, was assassinated since the turn of the century. His death took place September 14, 1901.

If anything can be realized by thinking back over this history it is that, in spite of shock and loss of good men, our Nation does go on and does continue to grow. One of the first speakers we heard after the first hours of awful news on Friday, said with great earnestness, that what we must know is that, although we have lost our President, we still have our country.

Now, if ever, we can see the value of our system of succession. We have a President. We have at the helm one who has had many years of experience in Government and who is fully aware of current affairs. And certainly no President has ever taken office who had the prayers of so many people as does Lyndon B. Johnson. A young man—in his early twenties, well known and very close to this scribe—said on Saturday, "All we need to do is pray." If young men know that, our country is in safe hands.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to extend my deep sympathy to his fine family.

Much will be written and said about the life and career of President Kennedy, but in substance the record will show:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great and dedicated American and person. He was a dedicated son, husband and father. He was a dedicated legislator and Chief Executive. His deeds in life were good ones. His aspirations for his Nation and its people were good ones. Love and respect for his fellow man were paramount.

This will be the record. It is the kind of record that all of us would like to achieve and leave as a legacy to our families, our friends, and our Nation.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to add my remarks to those of my colleagues. This is a tragic time in our history; and my deep and profound sympathy goes to all members of the late President's family.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible and terrible that in this great free land of ours a murder of our President could take place.

As we all know, President Kennedy was our President. He was the President of all the people. He was trying to do his best for his country. He was young, extremely intelligent and worked all the time for all of us.

It is heartbreaking for us all that a crazy wretch could, in a matter of minutes, so affect our lives, our country and the world.

My heartfelt sympathy, along with that of everyone else, goes to his courageous wife and family.

**Mr. BATTIN.** Mr. Speaker, tragedy begets tragedy. Calm begets calm. The President has gone to his great reward but the shock still hangs over the Nation. We mourn him as a leader of our country and as a person. He was the leader of the greatest country of the world today.

To meet such an untimely death at the hands of an assassin is beyond comprehension. We all take pride in the courage and composure of Mrs. Kennedy. She of course suffered the greatest loss.

The Nation and its people must go on and, without doubt, will. This is the fiber of the Nation and the strength of its people. This is what makes our country great.

Words are not adequate to express my personal feelings. Though I disagreed with him on political matters, he was my President, he was the President of all Americans.

My heart and that of my family, as well as that of all Montanans goes out to his loved ones. He did indeed pay the supreme sacrifice for his country.

**Mr. HOSMER.** Mr. Speaker, today we meet to eulogize our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was foully murdered in Dallas, Tex., on November 22. It seems like such a short time ago that he was alive and planning for his future and our future. Now he is part of history and lies in Arlington National Cemetery.

An assassin's bullet struck him down. It would be impossible to evaluate the greatness of the man at this time in history. He occupied the White House for but 3 short years. He did not have the time to see most of his plans brought to fruition. We can only guess what the outcome of his projects and grand designs might have been.

The suddenness of his death at the hands of a madman tinged by Communist philosophies at first brought great shock and then great grief to the whole Nation. It is unbelievable that such a monstrous atrocity could happen in a civilized country. The late President symbolized the hope in mankind for true peace and true freedom. His death is a loss not only to America but to the world. Every American, regardless of political viewpoints, has suffered a personal loss. President Kennedy requested and encouraged vigorous debate on the programs and projects he proposed. I was one of those who vigorously opposed his views relating to the nuclear test ban treaty. Because he invited such opposition and debate, and because others and myself accepted such invitation, the molding of our opposite viewpoints which eventually occurred resolved the issue in a much more satisfactory manner than otherwise it could have been. The debate was keen. It was on the issue. It was wholly without rancor or personal animosity on either side. The national interest was served, the issue was distilled to its essence, and safeguards were defined—all in accord with the highest tradition of open, democratic debate and discussion that characterizes American public life.

John Kennedy was not the father image. He was a man who belonged to us and our age. Now a foul deed has placed him in history.

During this period of mourning for our murdered President the Nation's thoughts turn to ways in which we as a people and as a society can better serve. President Johnson eloquently expressed this in his address to us by saying: "Let us here highly resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain." It is our duty and responsibility to see that the institutions which make up our great and mighty Nation are protected and perpetuated. It is our duty to see that the Kennedy children who have lost their father do not lose their birthright as well. Indeed, that our own children do not lose their heritage of freedom.

The Nation is fortunate that at this time of crises a men well-trained and skilled in the art of Government stood ready to assume the massive burdens of the Presidency. The firm strength and dignity with which Lyndon B. Johnson grasped the reigns of Government was reassuring both at home and abroad.

When we received the news of our President's death it seemed that nothing more could touch us or shock us for a long time, for it was a numbing blow. Then in just a day and a half his assassin was mortally wounded in view of the whole Nation. This Marxist fanatic was denied due process of law and the country was denied the right of knowing the truth. It was a second deep wound in our way of life. Now there are many things which we will never know with assurance from the assassin's lips.

President Johnson has appointed a very representative seven-man Commission to investigate the terrible tragedy which took John Kennedy's life. Like the rest of the Nation we are waiting to hear their report and learn all the facts in the case which can be uncovered.

But now we must take up our responsibility as citizens and legislators and see that the foundations of our country are strong. We must make sure that hate and subversion are not eroding our institutions.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy who was cut down so early in life will surely go down in history as one of our most tragic Presidents. In closing, I would like to use the words of the man whom we are eulogizing because I am sure he would want us to remember our responsibilities and would again urge us on by saying: "Peace and freedom do not come cheap, and we are destined to live out most if not all of our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril."

**Mr. DAGUE.** Mr. Speaker, the shock felt by the Members of this House was well-nigh universal and I have yet to find anyone so politically partisan as to confess to a lack of acute distress when he heard that our 35th President had been struck down in cold blood by the hand of a psychopathic killer. And we certainly do this great, decent American's memory a definite disservice when we try to link his death to the honest legislative opinions of sincere citizens, be they of the left or of the right.

The word of President Kennedy's tragic death came to me as I was entering my hometown post office. There I met one of the clerks coming out who told me he was going to lower the flag because our Chief Executive had just been shot to death. And all I could do was to remove my hat and stand there in bewildered numbness as our flag came down in tribute to the passing of the one man who symbolized all that we as a free people hold dear.

A scant hour later I gave this statement to the press and radio:

> The death of our President has brought the Nation to the verge of its greatest grief in my lifetime. Some fanatic has struck down a great statesman, a great leader, but equally as frightening has been the blow we have seen struck at all of our sacred symbols.
>
> I have been immeasurably shocked by the President's assassination and I know that I speak for the half million residents of this congressional district when I extend to Mrs. Kennedy and her children our heartfelt sympathy and condolences. May a merciful and all-compassionate Creator have them in His tenderest care.

The next few days, along with all of the free world, I stumbled through a series of tributes to this fallen leader, culminating in the moving ceremonies as his body was laid to rest in Arlington. Thereafter I addressed a personal letter to Mrs. Kennedy on behalf of Mrs. Dague and myself and since then I have continued to remember them in my prayers.

What more can I say? There is nothing that we can add in tribute to this decent American who has been so wantonly cut down at the peak of his service. But throughout it all John Fitzgerald Kennedy has symbolized for us everything that this Republic of Sovereign States stands for and his murder remains an attack on our priceless heritage, on all that we are committed to. Perhaps the periodical, National Review, has summed up for us better than most the real threat with which we are still faced.

> The assassination of President Kennedy was the act presumably of a madman, heir to the madman who killed Lincoln and McKinley and, for that matter, Christ, reminding us that the beasts are always with us, and that they continue to play decisive roles in history and in human affairs.

John F. Kennedy rests in hallowed peace, his memory enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen. The Nation lives. Let us get on with the job of keeping our heritage secure.

**Mr. CEDERBERG.** Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying our deep respect for our late President, John F. Kennedy.

This country became great by the hammering out on the anvil of public debate the great issues of our time. President Kennedy was an honest and eloquent spokesman for his viewpoint. The Nation has lost a great leader.

I express to Mrs. Kennedy and the family, on behalf of all citizens of the 10th Congressional District of Michigan, our very deepest sympathy.

**Mr. GOODLING.** Years ago, as a teacher in high school, it became my sad duty to attend the funeral of a student. She was a senior who appeared to have a great potential and was admired and respected by all who knew her.

An elderly minister used a very fitting but little known passage of scripture for the basis of his remarks:

> Her sun went down while it was yet day.

Friday, November 22, 1963, will always be remembered as a day of infamy not only in the United States but in the entire world. It was a day of sincere grief and righteous anger. It is incredible that such a heinous and dastardly act should have been committed in an enlightened nation.

Many did not agree with the political philosophy of the President. None could question his sincerity or devotion to duty. He gave unselfish service. All have a responsibility in seeing to it that his sacrifice may not have been in vain.

The sun of John Fitzgerald Kennedy did go down while it was yet day.

A poem by a constituent, Mrs. Sarah Ann Knaub, York, Pa., written during the funeral procession of our late President, appears appropriate:

### And They Took the Yankee Home

When emissaries of this mighty land,
Among the many hued peoples of the world have traveled,
They frequently have had to face the stinging
Placards of a venomous crowd, saying "Yankee, Go Home."
There are slinking forces alive in the world
Waiting, lurking, jabbing, stabbing, trying to
Divide our Nation from the world—indeed divide the Nation from within.
On that Friday of infamy a sign was
Seen among the crowd saying, "Yankee, Go Home."
A bullet sent on its way by one whose hatred may have been fed by those who would
Annihilate the Yankee, made it necessary
To take the Yankee home.
His widow uttered a cry—heard round the world—
And she took the Yankee home.
But the end is not yet.
Consider how they took the Yankee home.
To the sound of muffled drums,
On caisson slowly drawn—that all
The world might see and pay respect
To our dead leader.
And the world did see—the leaders of the world did come.
They came and marched to muffled drums as
They took the Yankee home.
From France, from England, Germany, Japan,
Belgium, Ethiopia, from all the cultures of the world.
Who dedicated his living as we dedicate his dying to the cause of world peace.
The leaders of the peoples of the world marched—together:
And will long remember
When God took the Yankee home.

—Mrs. Sarah Ann Knaub.

**Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.** Mr. Speaker, as each day goes by the enormity of the tragedy that befell this Nation in the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy becomes more and more apparent.

You find it in the expressions of his fellow man. It has a lingering and powerful influence in our schools, churches, national assemblies, in our newspapers; yes, in every walk of life.

As each day goes by we all endeavor to extend in some way our sympathy to his bereaved family to try to make their burden lighter and lessen their great sorrow.

It is fitting that today this House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States pauses in its deliberations to memorialize our dear departed President.

I have picked out several editorials in newspapers which reflect the sentiment in the 23d District of Pennsylvania, which follow:

[From the Kane Republican, Kane and Mount Jewett, Pa., Nov. 29, 1963]

### To Honor His Memory

When a leader of great power and presence and capacity for good dies in office, the cause to which he gave leadership suffers grievous loss. President John F. Kennedy was such a man. The cause he served, and so eloquently led, was the threefold cause of human dignity and equality and freedom.

Though President Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded.

Guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysberg almost exactly a century ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to reflect on Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the initial period of outraged shock at the murderous act in Dallas. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of heedless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams remain strong and malignant. Those forces must now be countered with new dedication, so that President Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain

The heaviest burden falls upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who became President the moment John F. Kennedy succumbed to the assassin's bullets. But all citizens must in some measure share that burden. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the American people: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." It is a commitment, and a challenge, worthy of the best that is in all of us.

---

[From the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., Nov. 25, 1963]

### Time of Dedication

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the United States youngest President, will be laid to rest today as the Nation mourns his tragic death.

The shock of President Kennedy's assassination will be with us for a long time; in a sense the rest of our lives.

That moment when the news was received will remain engraved in our memories as in the case of Pearl Harbor. No one could remain aloof from the emotional impact of this senseless deed. To their credit, children seemed to respond most appropriately—with prompt, wholesome tears.

The thoughts of Americans, in their sorrow, turn particularly to two individuals. First, to Jacqueline Kennedy. The horror of her experience wrings the heart. This courageous lady, who brought charm and gaiety to the national scene, was plunged in the wink of an eye into the terrible crisis for which nothing can prepare the strongest man.

She bore herself nobly. Beyond question, the time will come when Mrs. Kennedy will draw deep solace from the fact that she was there, comforting her husband in his last moments. The sympathy that has gone out to her and her children from all the world, is beyond measure.

The mind's eye turns, too, to the new President, Lyndon Johnson, in taking up his burden. To his own prayer, we add ours: God grant him wisdom and strength to know and to do the things that must be done.

This should, of course, be a time of reunion, a time of general dedication, when Americans of all persuasions draw closer in their mutual need.

If the death of President Kennedy engenders bitterness among the people he served, we shall betray his sacrifice. If it brings new resolve to meet the challenge together, John F. Kennedy may rest content.

---

[From the Warren County (Pa.) Observer, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Observations: Common Loss

(By Bob Walsh)

For the past 3 days we have lived as a nation in concert. We have set aside our differences and even those whose philosophies of government, economics, and perhaps we should include religion, were not parallel to those of our late President, have added their voices to the torrential expressions of praise and respect which have occupied much of the television time.

Some will label this hypocrisy, and there is little doubt that there is a measure of it to be found wherever humans are involved. But we prefer to believe that it represents a large degree of respect. Respect for an opponent in some cases, but also a previously unexpressed esteem by many who believed that here was a leader of whom we could be justly proud.

These days have proved that we may not be in complete agreement on all issues, but we are in agreement that there must be action. We honor this young man for his courage to act and the intellect and integrity which supported it. Though each of us might have a different way of attaining the desired ends, most of us would support such a leader once our Nation were committed.

#### UN-AMERICAN?

We have written that this tragic act was un-American. This is not altogether true. It is true in the sense that the American way is not one of violence and that we do not believe in resolving our differences through riot and military actions. It is true that whatever an assassination may represent, its purposes never are attained through such an action.

It is American in that it is limited to the death of one official, and not the overturn of a government. It is American in that it tends to bring us together in a more closely knit relationship as a nation.

It is American because such an act would be much more difficult to manage in nations which are less free and where the carrying of weapons or the permit to use them is very limited. It is American because an assassination in most nations would necessarily be accomplished by the military, thus representing not a personal whim, but a desire on the part of a political group.

In fact, the very characteristics which ease the way of the assassin in the United States make the violence represented extremely un-American.

### WHY?

The question constantly asked is why this costly loss of life is allowed to occur if our God is just. If this question is being put to the predominantly Christian share of our population the answer is an easy one. History, and specifically the Bible, plainly reveal that the leading figures in man's background often are lost at a relatively young age.

But many of those who have contributed the most, accomplished much of it, and sometimes almost all of it, through their deaths, which at the time caused others to ask, "Why? Why?"

We have lost a very strong crutch. It has been taken away from us suddenly, not allowing us time to dwell on how we will manage. We now must walk without that crutch, both as a nation of people who should be better informed today about what is going on in government than they were 3 days ago, and as leaders who must forget much of their petty politicking and resolve the problems before us with wise, positive action.

The death of President John F. Kennedy reaches many of us because of our vicarious tendencies. He represented a promising young gentleman, well informed, courageous, and personable. He had an obviously good family relationship, much as the average American family either has or would like to have. He was many of us personified if we could shape our lives without the effort he represented. Or even with such effort. All of us are not so blessed.

And perhaps it is this personal aspect that has brought a share of the grief into each of our lives and has made it seem almost a part of our homes. At least this is the way it has been with millions of Americans whose sense of a great loss this past weekend has been deeply felt.

Why? We shall learn the answer to that even as we help shape it through our own actions in the days to come.

---

[From the Warren (Pa.) Times-Mirror, Nov. 25, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

As the shadows of evening fall across this day of mourning, we shall all settle down to hope for a brighter tomorrow.

We no longer hope that we will awake to find that it has all been a bad dream; a joke in bad taste. But we do hope that, from this tragic event, the assassination of the President of the United States, we shall achieve a new dedication of purpose.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected to the Presidency. He was a man of controversy. He aroused violent likes and dislikes. He was a man with a purpose and a program—a program which some disagreed with.

Yet in that instant when a bullet slammed into his brain, he became simply a man; and in that same moment, we all became just one thing—Americans; not Republicans or Democrats; Americans, nor Catholics, Protestants, Jews, black, white or yellow or red, but simply, Americans.

We were so stunned, so unbelieving, so stricken with grief that this young, vital man had been mercilessly cut down in the very prime of life, that we had little emotional room to work up a deep hatred for the arrogant, twisted, vicious dog who destroyed him.

We learned the deep truth of John Donne's lines: "Send not to see for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee." Indeed, all of America was diminished by the death and by the manner of the death of this man who was our 35th President and the 4th to fall to the bullet of an assasin.

Texans, particularly residents of Dallas, are stricken not only with grief, but with shame and guilt; shame that in their city, the fabulous "Big D" of song and story, a man like the assassin could live unnoticed among them, to spring into sudden, infamous notoriety by pulling the trigger on a rifle.

We all share that guilt and shame, because there must be something very wrong with a Nation which can allow such an individual to grow to manhood without the attention of the police or the mental hospitals.

There is something wrong with an America which can take back to its soil a man like the killer; a man who had renounced his American citizenship, married a Russian woman and who, when he had been refused Russian citizenship, came crawling on his knees to the American Embassy to ask permission to go "home" and to even borrow the money to do so from embassy officials.

What went on in the mind of this killer as he was growing up? Why didn't someone notice him—someone understand that in the darkness of his mind he was hatching a deadly hatred which would find such terrible expression?

Yet we are a tolerant people, even as John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a tolerant, openhearted man. Just as his own openness led him to ride through Dallas with the bulletproof plastic bubble of his car stowed away, so did the tolerance of our society permit a mad dog Marxist to grow up among us.

There are ironies in this murder which strike deep. The right wing had accused Mr. Kennedy of being too friendly with the Communists, yet it was an avowed lover of communism that killed him. Mere logic would have made it seem more likely that his death, if it was to come like this, would have come at the hands of some diehard segregationist, or some hate-filled right winger like the one who only a few weeks before, had assaulted and insulted Adlai Stevenson in that same city.

The world is sadly out of joint when, in the midst of great prosperity, great culture, great promise, we can suddenly be thrust back into the Middle Ages; back to the time when drug-crazed youths, obeying the commands of the Old Man of the Mountain, first brought the word assassin into the lexicons.

It is a thing almost as incomprehensible as the deed itself.

As far as the man whose life was taken, what can one say? We have disagreed with some of his policies, as we have disagreed with many men in power. But like any American, we mourn his death and the manner of his passing. Perhaps the best that anyone can say is to quote the words of a little Yankee lawyer as he closed in death the eyes of another President who had fallen to a mad dog's bullet:

"Now he belongs to the ages."

---

**Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.** Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express adequately one's feelings when a tragedy is so immense and so intense that it affects intimately our whole Nation and in a real way the entire world. The human mind is incapable of expressing itself under such circumstances and words in any language are entirely inadequate. In a situation of such poignant magnitude one instinctively turns to Almighty God and calls on Him for faith and comfort, guidance and courage. Such an attitude is evident everywhere today on all sides and if any possible good could come as a result of this tragic assassination, it is this renewal of our faith in the God we trust.

The late President Kennedy was a remarkable man, gifted in many ways and respected by everyone. It was not always that I agreed with his philosophy of government and perhaps his methods, but his patriotism and sincerity were never questioned and there was never doubt about his loyalty to the ideals which have made our Nation great. He was a real leader of men and although he was persistent in advancing his own ideas, he saw the point of view of those in opposition to him. I can recall few men of my time who have made a greater impression on more people than did President Kennedy. His thinking was challenging and stimulated the imagination of all our citizens. Indeed I am convinced that his mind was so active he was an enigma to those who would overthrow our form of government and baffled them. Above all he was a Christian gentleman.

People everywhere, shocked by the unexpected crisis which confronts the world by his death, have expressed real, sincere and deep sympathy. Men and women have forgotten their political differences, and overcome by loyalty to America and with confidence that his work was not in vain, are united and determined to carry on in the best tradition of our beloved country. As an example of the universal feeling I append to these remarks a telegram I received from the First Aid and Rescue Squad, Matawan, N.J., which reads as follows:

> May we ask you, * * * to convey, when you think the time and place to be proper and fitting, our feeling of sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her family.

As further evidence of the universal feeling which is held throughout the country, I add a poem written by a good friend of mine, Paul T. Flood, of Winter Park, Fla., who is a stanch Republican, but above all a loyal American:

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—NOVEMBER 22, 1963

Would I had words to write a threnody
To honor John Fitzgerald Kennedy.
History must fully judge his acts—
I am too close—must deal with facts
Distorted by hearsay and sniping,
By petty malcontented griping.
Should he have died a World War hero
When his survival chance seemed zero?
What star of fate, what gesture callous
Beguiled him on to die in Dallas
Of bullet fired from ambushed gun?
Must we suppose his work is done?
No! No! We all helped trip that hammer!
Our national voice must lose its stammer,
Must rise in swelling, vibrant tone
Until his dream comes to its own!
Dear Jack, enjoy your rocking chair
In peace, in clear celestial air,
With certain knowledge that your drive,
Your grasp of history stays alive;
You gave us in your youth and prime
What we must carry on through time.

**Mr. BURLESON.** Mr. Speaker, since today is especially set aside for tributes to the late President, John F. Kennedy, it seems appropriate to place in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the Honorable R. R. Kelley, mayor of the city of Stamford, Tex., located in my congressional district.

It is with appreciation and justifiable pride that I make this request. The proclamation of Mayor Kelley followed a memorial service held at the First Baptist Church in Stamford on Monday following the death of our late President. It was issued on behalf of the sorrowing citizens of that city, and it pleases me to present it here, that others may know of this action:

### PROCLAMATION OF THE CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD, TEX.

With our hearts today we proclaim our sorrow as citizens of Stamford for the death of our President, John F. Kennedy, joining in the bereavement of this our land of free men, the United States of America, and may we with bowed heads today renew our allegiance to our Nation before God, for the solemn event of November 22, 1963 at Dallas, Tex. has happened and cannot be denied and must be remembered as the day on which for a tragic moment the imperfections of man tarnished by hatred, malice, and distrust merged to take the life of our President. This moment of personal tragedy for the family of John F. Kennedy is magnified by the tragedy and bereavement felt by each true American that this sorrowful event could happen in our land and it is clear that not one of us can deny our duty to America, faithful to our heritage, that we must move forward along the road of reason toward faith in our God with charity and good will toward all men and against all bigotry and all evils that afflict our town, our Nation, and our world.

Therefore, this day is proclaimed as a day of mourning in the city of Stamford, Tex., for our President, John F. Kennedy, that we may in his memory give our best for America in the days ahead in support of our Nation under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson with God's blessing.

Given under my hand and seal of office, this 25th day of November A.D. 1963.

R. R. KELLEY,
*Mayor, The City of Stamford, Tex.*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time in the history of our Nation a President has been assassinated, and now this generation shares the shock and the grief experienced by other Americans before us in the wake of such a terrible tragedy. We are understanding of the great sorrow that now consumes the parents of John F. Kennedy, his wife and children, brothers and sisters, and all who held him dear, and our hearts go out to them.

We are ashamed, too, that a fellow American could have so defiled our Nation by committing this barbarous act. He had learned, as a Marxist, that assassination was a recommended method of Communist action.

But through this whole nightmare our Government and its people have performed in the highest tradition and we have, spontaneously, shown the whole world the strength of our Constitution and demonstrated the unmatched qualities of a true Republic. Never for a moment did the structure of our Government tremble. We have moved from one President to another with absolute confidence. We have a great deal to be proud of.

Our way of government and our way of life met the greatest possible test magnificently. We are able, therefore, even now, to look ahead to the future with pride and hope. And this, I am sure, is exactly what President John F. Kennedy would have wanted.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the fine qualities of John F. Kennedy, we are impressed by the breadth of his character—compassionate, dynamic, religious, genteel, witty, warm and vibrant, intellectual, resourceful. We could continue at length.

This was a great man, struck down in the prime of life as he was just hitting his stride. The blow was sudden and vicious, shocking and unbelievable. Assuredly, the Kennedy family is now aware of the great love which the American people, and the entire world, held for our late President.

As a nation, we are fortunate in having Lyndon B. Johnson, an able and experienced statesman and legislator, as our new President, and to him we pledge our support and understanding.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, now that almost 2 weeks have passed since the tragic assassination of our late President John F. Kennedy and the murder of his assassin, I, like millions of Americans, have been offering my prayers for the repose of the soul of John F. Kennedy, and for Almighty God to bring strength and comfort to his widow, children, and family.

Words of sympathy carry very little meaning, but one message I bring to all people, speaking for myself. In politics and in my position as a Member of the House, I have had many differences of opinion with our late President, but never have I allowed these differences to reflect disrespect upon the Presidency or the individual holding that office. Why this fine young man should have had his life snuffed out in such a horrible manner, we will never really know. The answer will remain with our Maker.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a vigorous young man who began his successful career in public office in the House of Representatives has been taken from us. The tragic assassination of President Kennedy was an act of such violence to our way of life that no American will ever forget it.

The murder of President Kennedy was a dastardly blow at a brave man and an attack on the American system of government. The presidential office is the greatest elective office of cur democracy—it is sacred to our citizens. Even a verbal threat directed at the President is a threat to that which we hold near and dear.

Perhaps there is no more fitting time than now to emphasize to our fellow citizens the distinctions in political life to which President Johnson referred last week in his address before the joint session. He said:

> Our American unity does not depend on unanimity.

The qualities which unite us as Americans are at the very foundation of American government. They are our constitutional principles.

Public figures and their attitudes for one another have little connection with whatever partisan differences may separate them on the issues which they are elected to decide. This characteristic of judging policies apart from personalities brings to our democracy one of its finest and most distinguishing features. Freemen resolve their differences in the arena of fact where they meet in an atmosphere of mutual personal respect.

John Kennedy believed in the American dream as much as any man ever has. He fought valiantly for its realization.

Then a demented mind that had expressed preference for a totalitarian system which threatens freedom the world over shot down that valiant fighter. Time can never diminish the cry of "Why?" that all of us uttered on that dreadful day.

In expressing this tribute to the memory of our late President, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks the text of the weekly column I released this week to the news media in my congressional district:

### THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

Our Nation's heart is heavy. A man who brought enthusiasm and verve to the country's highest elective office has gone to his last reward. The assassination of President John F. Kennedy was a senseless and heinous act. His assassin did violence not only to a man but to a noble democratic institution.

I was in Rochester when the news of the President's death came. My initial reaction was doubtless the same that many had: this was some cruel joke, it just could not have happened. Then, disbelief turned to horrible shock and grief.

After sending a message of sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and other members of the Kennedy family, I felt it essential to wire President Johnson pledging my full support to him as he was summoned to defend the Constitution in this time of national crisis. Then I immediately returned to Washington.

The Saturday following the President's death was a sorrowful occasion. The leaden skies over the Nation's Capital and the steady rain spoke their own mournful message.

Many of my colleagues gathered in the Capitol in small groups on Saturday morning. Some there had witnessed the tragedy of the day before. They found words escaped them when they tried to talk about what had happened. Nobody pressed for information. We knew from the news media the tragic sequence of events.

That afternoon, I joined hundreds of other Congressmen and Senators in a solemn journey to the White House. We went to pay our final respects to a man who had served his country faithfully.

I could not help but be struck by the contrast of this visit to the White House and the last time I had been there a few months ago. On that occasion, President Kennedy had held an evening reception for the new Members of Congress.

I recalled going in the same entrance and being greeted by the President. He and I had engaged in a few minutes of conversation. We had discussed the needs and interests of our Nation and its people. It had been an occasion to remember. Men from opposing political parties gathered as friends.

Now, the door of the White House was draped in black. There was no lively conversation. There was no conversation. We walked into the East Room, near the room where the President and I had talked on that earlier occasion. Each of us paused at the casket and then moved on. There was little said on the trip back to Capitol Hill.

Sunday and Monday were days of grief for the country, too. The sadness brought by President Kennedy's death was evident on every face.

I was in the Capitol rotunda when the honor guard bore the casket from the Lincoln catafalque to the caisson, and the cortege began the last trip from Capitol Hill.

> Somehow, you felt the sorrow of the President's death and the need for the country to dedicate itself to carrying on the business of freedom.
>
> Now, that the remains of President Kennedy have been laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery and a new administration takes the reins of Government. I feel each of us must personally accept the obligation of working for the goals that are our heritage. The bitter divisions which too frequently have occupied people in the recent past should be forgotten. Strong partisan feeling should spring from love of country, not from hate directed at opponents.
>
> America is fortunate to have a system permitting the kind of continuity of government we are seeing today. Our memorial to John F. Kennedy should and can be, therefore, assuring the imperishability of the U.S. Government.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will no longer be with us.

Never before have the hearts of so many millions of Americans been so touched and saddened as by the death of a beloved leader.

Our President is dead. The leadership of the Nation continues under the hand of a new Chief Executive, backed by a grieving great Nation, united in sorrow, but welded into a strength to carry forth the best of American ideals.

The sudden, tragic, and violent death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has stunned the people of America and those of the entire free world. The news of the terrible tragedy reaching into homes, business places, meetings, conferences, and street corners was met with a general feeling of astonishment, horror, and disbelief. As the initial shock wore off, it was replaced by a general feeling of suppressed anger, frustration and deep personal loss—a feeling that when he died, a part of us died with him. Not only had the Captain of the Ship fallen, but a beloved and respected leader had become an honored martyr.

Here in our own United States the impossible turned into reality. President Kennedy had become a victim on the altar of freedom and justice through assassination. He was a victim of the times in which we live, and all society must bear a portion of the blame.

Surviving the battles and holocaust of war, having fought and conquered physical disabilities and seemingly insurmountable social and political obstacles, he was struck down by an assassin's bullets after serving nobly for 2 years, 10 months and 2 days in the highest post our country had to offer.

President John F. Kennedy's martyrdom will forever remain a tribute to the high ideals he set as his objective. During his short lifetime, his dedication to these high objectives has insured him an everlasting place in history.

From this time forward he will live in the hearts of his fellow Americans.

We shall miss him for many reasons; foremost because of his love for his God, his country and the millions of Americans who considered him their leader and their friend.

We willingly share with his family, and especially his young and bereaved wife and lovely children, the terrible sorrow that has befallen them.

As our President, he belonged to us—to all of the people of this Nation. No person could ever fill the void created by the foul deed of a perverted, twisted mind whose well-aimed shot brought to an end the close family and patriotic ties that surrounded him.

John F. Kennedy, the first President of the Catholic faith demonstrated that he was indeed a good Christian, and also that his kind of Christianity was a strength to his serving the whole people of the whole Nation under the Constitution and under God.

I close with a poem which is truly symbolic of his belief in God and which perhaps best expresses his concept of life and death.

### A Voice From Heaven

I am home in heaven, dear ones;
  Oh, so happy and so bright!
There is perfect joy and beauty
  In this everlasting light.

All the pain and grief is over,
  Every restless tossing passed;
I am now at peace forever,
  Safely home in heaven at last.

Did you wonder I so calmly
  Trod the valley of the shade?
Oh! but Jesus' love illumined
  Every dark and fearful glade.

And He came himself to meet me
  In that way so hard to tread;
And with Jesus' arm to lean on,
  Could I have one doubt or dread?

Then you must not grieve so sorely,
  For I love you dearly still;
Try to look beyond earth's shadows,
  Pray to trust our Father's will.

There is work still waiting for you,
  So you must not idly stand;
Do it now, while life remaineth—
  You shall rest in Jesus' land.

When that work is all completed,
  He will gently call you home;
Oh, the rapture of that meeting,
  Oh, the joy to see you come!

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying a tribute of respect to our departed President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy who was so ruthlessly felled by the bullet of a foul assassin on Nevember 22. In our expressions here on the floor of the House we are also voicing the sentiment of millions of Americans throughout the United States and countless millions of people throughout the world. The full effect of his untimely death will not be known for many years to come, if ever. History will record his determination, vigor, and courage, and his accomplishments will give him a prominent place in the hall of fame, notwithstanding the fact that he had such a limited time within which to implement his far-reaching programs.

His untimely death came as a severe shock and a personal loss to all of us who had the privilege of working with him. Many of us have fond recollections of him as he served with us in this House. His attractive appearance, genial personality and personal charm ingratiated him with all who came in contact with him. His dedication to public service was an inspiration to all who worked with him.

Our hearts go out to his charming wife who labored so effectively with him during his life and displayed such magnificent grace and courage at the time of his death. Her demeanor set new standards of womanly devotion and dignity which touched the hearts of millions.

We also grieve for his two attractive children who have been deprived of the wise and sympathetic guidance of a kind and loving father.

The outpouring of high foreign dignitaries at President Kennedy's funeral was evidence of the admiration and respect he enjoyed throughout the world. This popularity, due in part, to his magnetism and charm also resulted from his firm action in the Cuban situation when firmness was required, and his sincere interest in the cause of world peace as evidenced by his sanction of the test ban treaty and other international negotiations for the promotion of a better understanding among nations.

We are most fortunate in having such an able and strong leader as President Lyndon B. Johnson to succeed him. But we should never forget that it was President Kennedy who recognized the importance of a capable and able Vice President fully informed and trained for the role and the responsibilities of the Chief Executive.

The news of President Kennedy's assassination reached me in my office here in Washington as I was preparing the radio talk I make to my constituents each Saturday night. My thoughts of that grim moment remain as my tribute to the man we eulogize today and I would like to record them here as they were carried November 23, 1963, by radio station WRVA in Richmond, Va.:

> In this time of anguish and mourning in our country, I speak to you with a heavy heart. I know that you share the sadness that has enveloped all our fellow citizens and, in a sense, the entire world because of the assassination and the death on yesterday of our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The stunned lack of realization of yesterday has turned today to a great and vacant sense of sorrow. I know you will understand my loss for words to adequately express my own grief.
>
> The dastardly deed that took place in Dallas will be deplored by every American. President Kennedy's tragic and untimely death will be a great loss to this Nation and will be seriously felt throughout the world. It is a deep wound that we must bind with a pledge to continue his work for peace, justice, and freedom if meaning is to be given to the high purpose he pursued.
>
> President Kennedy was a great and good man and an exceptional leader who provided this country with wise direction in a period of great international stress. He served his country in war and peace and it was a dedicated service. He was my friend and I cherished his friendship. It was my high privilege to work with him when he was in the House of Representatives. It is still difficult to believe that he has been struck down at an age when he had so much left to give to his country.
>
> The work of the Congress will continue with what I feel will be a new sense of dedication. For now we must rally behind President Johnson, who asked yesterday, on his arrival in Washington, for our help and that of God. I ask you to join with me in pledging that help at a time when it is sorely needed.

**Mr. HARDY.** Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who shared the privilege in January 1947 of being a freshman Congressman with John F. Kennedy. During that first term, our offices were not far apart on the third floor of the Old House Office Building. I enjoyed the friendly association we had during those years when he was in the House, and although our contacts were infrequent after he moved over to the other side of the Capital, I took great pride in welcoming him to Virginia's largest city, Norfolk, in my district during his successful campaign for the Presidency. I look back upon that particular visit with a great deal of pride and satisfaction as well as to the privilege of serving in the Congress during the peak of his public career when he was our President.

Joining my colleagues in paying tribute to this truly great American, who was our friend, I would like to quote editorials from the two newspapers in my district. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot carried an eloquent memorial to John F. Kennedy and his contributions to the world in its editorial "To Light the Lamps of Our Time":

In scarlet and blue and green and purple, three by three the sovereigns rode, with plumed helmets, gold braid, crimson sashes and jeweled orders flashing in the sun. After them came five heirs apparent, 40 more imperial or royal highnesses, seven queens and a scattering of special ambassadors from uncrowned countries. Together they represented 70 nations in the greatest assemblage of royalty and rank ever gathered in one place, and of its kind, the last.—Barbara Tuchman, "The Guns of August."

The Kings who followed a black riderless horse on May 20, 1910, when Britain buried King Edward VII and those who followed another black riderless horse when President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was buried yesterday alike mourned men who were central to their time.

After the death of Edward VII there were but a few years left to the age of comfort and established order to which historians have given his name, and much of the royalty represented in his funeral procession was snuffed out in the upheaval.

In 1914, when the guns of August began to roar, Viscount Grey stood by his study window and said to a visitor, "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime." When the lamps went out, the hopes of men for a world at peace dimmed and flickered, not to be revived until a war had been fought to make the world safe for democracy, and another and greater had to be fought over the embers of the first, and a police action fought in Korea, and a host of lesser wars.

The great came from all over the world yesterday to pay their respects to the man who had begun to light the lamps in our time.

A dozen members of reigning royal families, 18 presidents, 35 foreign and defense ministers, representing 53 nations, they came to mourn the man who embodied the hope of a peaceful tomorrow for the whole world.

Far more than Americans realize, the 46-year-old President with the boyish good looks, the father of two young children, the man with the quick mind and ready wisecrack, represented freedom and generosity and man's good will to man for the entire free world and for those who aspired to freedom in the lands of the unfree.

To the Berliners who lit candles in thousands of windows in honor of the man who had only recently told them, Ich bin ein Berliner; to the Africans and the British and the Irish; to the millions who felt his loss as a personal stab and sought to express their sympathy in some way, he was the good man who tried to bridle the forces of unlimited destruction and find a path to the sunny uplands.

It was to the generation who talk of World War II as their war, and to those younger yet who hope to be spared their war, that Mr. Kennedy particularly seemed to speak. It is their idealism and intelligence that he mustered, and they grieve for his brave young widow with special understanding.

In the few months between the Cuban confrontation and the assassination of the President so senselessly last Friday, there seemed to be the beginnings of the chance of reaching some understanding, the chance of lighting lamps for tomorrow. That hope must not be buried with the President.

Let us look to the first few lamps that John Kennedy lit throughout the world.

The Norfolk Ledger-Star has beautifully expressed our pride in our great President and departed friend in a tribute entitled "Shoulder High We Bring You Home":

"Today, the road all runners come,
Shoulder high we bring you home,
And set you at your threshold down,
Townsman of a stiller town."
—A. E. HOUSMAN,
To an Athlete Dying Young.

Thousands of mourning Americans today, as yesterday, passed by the bier in the rotunda of the Capitol where lay in state the body of John F. Kennedy, touched by destiny for the ultimate reach of fame and of tragedy.

The two are almost one in the light shed by the brief candle of his life. It was tragedy that first started him to ultimate fame, for John Fitzgerald Kennedy walked in the shadow of his brother, Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., as long as his elder brother lived. It was Joe Kennedy on whom their father counted to make the Kennedy name even more famous. It was only when Joe was killed in World War II that Jack Kennedy fell heir, some say unwillingly, to the role of public service his father planned for the eldest son.

So the gangling Kennedy cadet, so full of charm, so full of life, who in the beginning may far rather have chosen his own way, was thrust by tragedy onto the path that led to fame and prestige and power, with all the cares and troubles of an office whose demands are really known only to those who hold it, onto the path that led to his own ultimate tragedy.

During the years between the decision to seek public office since Joe could not, the young man prepared himself for the demands and opportunities of political life. He was well equipped. He had an inquiring mind. He was an intellectual. He was widely read. He surrounded himself with other intellectuals on whose knowledge and mentality he honed fine his own.

His wit, his intellect, his charm, added to a prodigious political organization, led him to the highest and most responsible position in the free world. Except for the first Cuban crisis, the disaster at the Bay of Pigs, when it appeared to many that American policy was paralyzed, he led his administration with ability and with courage through the minor crises and the major crises. America stood tall, every man and woman in it, in the Cuban showdown in October 1962. There has been criticism, since, that later on the country did not require of the Russians what at first we seemed to require; but in the moment of the missile challenge and in moments since at the Berlin wall and checkpoints, America has stood grim and fast.

From that steadfastness has developed what Khrushchev has chosen to call the "spirit of Moscow." It represented a softening, as history since the end of World War II is assessed, of historic Russian obstinacy. The President moved slowly into this new area, and he moved cautiously. He was not going to be taken in by any suggestion that a mere thaw meant all sweetness and light forever.

For linked with the Kennedy intellect, whose tools were logic and reason, was also a deep-seated pragmatism. Almost, one might say, a touch of fatalism. A man reached high, but settled for what was within his grasp; in a complex world no one person is in control of events always.

History will assess the less than 3 years of this 46-year-old man's Presidency chiefly in terms of foreign policy. There were no great turns, as history records them, in his domestic successes. Most of his ideas had not come into law.

But there was a domestic success about his shooting-star career that blazed so brightly and was extinguished near its zenith that will mark for a long time the place he held.

He brought spirit and zest and learning and intellectual pursuit to the White House where it has too rarely been seen. He created a leadership for art and drama, and his brave and lovely wife for taste and discrimination, and he brought to the highest office of the land a youthfulness that, whatever one thought of his politics, swelled the hearts of nearly all with pride and affection. He was easy to oppose as a politician; as a person he was easier to love.

His personality and presence shone with a bright and golden light. He was gay. He had the gift of laughter. He was active. "Vigor" was a favorite word, and he used it in an intellectual as well as physical context.

Not everyone was a devotee of the mystique that already had begun to surround him in his lifetime. But the seeds of legend were there and they will sprout and grow and flower now. Today the Nation thinks of the ultimate reach of fame and of tragedy that overtook John F. Kennedy. But townsman of a stiller town though he may be in the ultimate democracy of death, the shining legend will remember him in other words of Housman's:

"The time you won your town the race,
We chaired you through the marketplace;
Man and boy stood cheering by,
And home we brought you shoulder-high."

**Mr. DANIELS.** Mr. Speaker, a great redwood has fallen in the forest. A massive tree has been felled by an unfeeling hand and has left us numb with remorse. The sound of the fall was echoed round the world. It was the sound of the fall of our late President—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Our sorrow is a deep well and leaves us with an infinity of emptiness. The loss of our leader makes us feel like fatherless children, something strangely unexplainable. We are mystified.

Yet with all the tragedy that has unfolded, we are grateful for our small blessings. We were blessed first when John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born in Brookline, Mass., May 29, 1917. We were blessed again when he became our 35th President and served us faithfully for almost 3 years.

He exemplified courage as a way of life during his full-worked days on earth and exhibited that same courage until his final hour.

He believed in humanity for all men and proclaimed from his Presidential chair their unequivocal right to it.

He strengthened our faith, not only of goodness in man, but in high office. He maintained his own simplicity, though there was no demand for it.

He took upon himself enormous tasks and responsibilities, and by his acts as a man wrote a new meaning for the word "duty."

He fought first with his body and later with his mind for the preservation of American ideals, and survived 4 arduous years of military combat.

He gave us peace on our land by his deeds, and in the midst of its greatest enjoyment, was shot down by an act known and expected only in wartime.

Why was this despicable deed perpetrated and carried to fruition? Why is the history of man besmirched with the untimely death of good men? Why must the good perish and the evil survive?

For some, conformity or violence is a single creed. For some, violence is their only byword. For some, death is their only answer in seeking solution.

But let us firmly restate and give full warning, as times demand strong action, that this Nation has no room for violent dissenters but a peaceful settlement of all differences in a manner dictated by law.

All humanity is rightly convulsed by this vicious deed which has severed the cord of life between a great man and his people—between a great man and his family.

But something strangely mystical has happened to us through all of this. It is as if the final shattering of our late President's life on that fateful black Friday caused his spirit to seep out and pervade a whole nation of people, and even the world.

He shall and will be missed, without doubt. But a small part of our fair President still lives in the heart of each of us today.

He was a great man, as well as a great leader. Our servant, as well as our master.

**Mr. BELCHER.** Mr. Speaker, last week a great nation's spirits bent low and the world's head bowed in humble sympathy as the news of President John Kennedy's untimely death filled the corridors of this era.

With stunned faces and puzzled eyes, Americans everywhere quickly turned back the pages of time to reminisce and talk in low tones of this young man's life—his quick rise to fame—his ascension to the highest office and honor this Nation has to bestow. Hearts echoed a lonely cry as the realization dawned that no longer could we hear J.F.K. speak with "vigah"; no longer would we hear the spontaneity of his wit; no longer could we feel the impact of his tireless nature. President Kennedy had passed from our sights.

And then, just as our hearts strained to an almost unbearable point, we took courage—from Mr. Kennedy's own example—and "looked forward," realizing that the future of a "nation under God" falters not, however great the blow, but ever unfolds in progressive steps.

I knew John Kennedy personally, I served with him in the House of Representatives before he went to the U.S. Senate. Our philosophy of government was radically different, but I knew him to be a hard working, energetic young man and his dedication to public service gave to this country a Navy lieutenant, a Congressman, a Senator, and a President. But more than these offices, this dedication poured forth upon American thought a youthful love of life and all the good it has to offer. Indeed, he had opened the door of public thought and strode in, with an easy and winning smile and lively eyes, an elegant quote and a political quip, warming the hearts of thousands not only in the United States, but around the world.

**Mr. DENTON.** Mr. Speaker, would it not be wonderful if we could only waken and find that what we experienced on that bleak Friday afternoon was but a terrible dream; that it was a forewarning, perhaps, to make us better appreciate the greatness that was among us. But alas, this cannot be. What is done must be accepted. Bitterly, and with deep regret, but nonetheless accepted.

In the words of Omar Khayyam "The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on."

How can one express the sorrow felt at the passing of such a great man as John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States?

Were he only an intellectual one could compose suitable poetry or prose that might, perhaps, do justice.

Were he only a courageous citizen, veteran of a great war, and hero one might inscribe his name among other heroes and that might suffice.

Were he only a fine example of a dedicated patriot one could, perhaps, erect a statue or monument that would suffice.

Were he only a loving father and husband one could commiserate with the bereaved family, share in their sorrow, miss the departed, and perhaps that might suffice.

But President John F. Kennedy was all these, and more.

All these attributes were combined with many others to make him a shrewd and capable leader of men.

We must all remember the vigorous, well planned campaign that led him through the nomination and election to the office of the Presidency.

We must marvel at the way he surrounded himself with capable and efficient aides and advisors and pushed this country forward. How he strived for improved conditions both at home and abroad and how he worked for world peace.

We must remember that in almost all things he attempted he was a great success.

What made this man the great and able leader that he was?

I would like to remember his great friendliness, his capacity for work and for play. And I cannot forget the world of experience he gained while serving as a Member of the House, and of the Senate. Experience and knowledge that he put to good use in the office of the Presidency; remembering the trials and tribulations of Members of both houses, and trying to make their jobs perhaps a little easier.

The dastardly deed that took from us our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will not soon be forgotten. It was an almost unbelievable shock to the entire country, yea to the whole world.

The tribute paid to President Kennedy by the leaders of the world was indeed heartwarming. It showed not only the respect with which they held this man but also the respect they hold for this Nation, which President Kennedy worked so hard to strengthen.

Although John Fitzgerald Kennedy is gone, his influence and spirit live on. And I am sure that we shall all hold dear the memory of our departed colleague and try to live up to the standards of devotion to our country which he set.

Many times he said he would willingly give up his life for his country.

Let us now vow that although he was called upon to make this supreme sacrifice he did not die in vain. Let us always remember those words from his inaugural address and to heed them in our daily deliberations on the problems of this country. "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

**Mr. RHODES of Arizona.** Mr. Speaker, with the passing of President John F. Kennedy this Nation loses not only its first citizen, but one of its most able sons. The intellect given by the Almighty to President Kennedy impressed itself upon the records of this House, the other body, and on the Presidency. Seldom in the history of the world has one so young been placed by his fellow men in positions of such high influence. Seldom has one so placed made such a profound impact upon his country, his fellow citizens, and the world.

The Creator also endowed President Kennedy with all of the charm usually attributed to the Irish. His personality endeared him to his countrymen and to his friends.

His passing is not only a great loss to the United States of America and to Americans, but to the entire world. Most especially, it is a blow of the first magnitude to his wife, to his young family, to his mother and father, and to his sisters and brothers. To all of them, and to all of the Americans who felt that in a great sense this man was theirs, Mrs. Rhodes and I extend our deepest sympathy.

**Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.** Mr. Speaker, the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will forever rank among the most infamous crimes ever perpetrated against humanity. Regardless of political persuasion or personal philosophy, we all recognize that this deed took from us a great intellect who, without doubt, would have written boldly across the pages of history. And history will be the final judge of the magnitude of these times and the impact this man had upon them.

I am personally convinced the tragic loss of President Kennedy will be profound and that the shape of things to come will bear the indelible imprint of his personality.

I join with the people of Virginia and of the Nation in mourning his death and our hearts go out to his widow and children.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy.

In 1947 Mr. Kennedy and I were freshmen Congressmen. Although we were on opposite sides politically this never affected my personal friendship with him, nor my high respect for him as a Member of Congress and later as our President.

Our Nation, and indeed the entire world, have lost a great man who labored so much for the betterment of all mankind.

Mrs. Norblad and I extend to Mrs. Kennedy our deep heartfelt sympathy in her courageous bereavement.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 22, South Dakota joined the world in mourning the tragic loss of President Kennedy.

The citizens of South Dakota felt they knew this man, even though few of them had met him. On some issues their views differed from his, but throughout his nearly 3 years in the White House they respected John F. Kennedy as their President. He was the leader of the Nation and the free world. Like all Americans, South Dakotans felt they knew him as a person and now they feel a deep personal loss.

John Kennedy visited South Dakota on three separate occasions—once as a U.S. Senator, once as a candidate for the Presidency, and once as the President of the United States.

On June 19, 1960, Senator Kennedy addressed a State convention of the American Legion at the Sioux Falls Coliseum.

Three months later, Candidate Kennedy addressed an estimated audience of 75,000 persons at the national plowing contest near Brandon. Rain poured down the day before Senator Kennedy's appearance and the field had become a sea of mud. As he began to speak, the rain resumed. Anticipating the address the following day by Vice President Richard Nixon, Senator Kennedy reminded his audience with characteristic wit that the rain falls on Democrats and Republicans alike.

President Kennedy's last visit to South Dakota was on August 17, 1962, when he dedicated power facilities at Oahe Dam near Pierre. It was a bright and radiant day, typical of the Dakota prairie country, as the President delivered his "power on the line" talk.

Senator Kennedy was adopted by the Sioux Nation on his first visit to the State. He received a colorful headdress and the name "Chief Eagle."

Indeed, South Dakotans felt they knew this man. They respected and honored him as the elected President of the United States.

Born to wealth, John Kennedy strived to serve those not so generously endowed. With sensitive consciousness, he vigorously sought to advance those ideas which he so fluently expounded and in which he believed.

The tragic death of the President has given pause for Americans to think twice about the future. As so ably put in one South Dakota newspaper, the episode in Dallas "does not cast a shadow on the whole of America." The shadow lies on the fringe—on the edge of extreme of both the left and the right. It is here that the violence and hate and bigotry lie.

If, by his passing, we are reminded of our duty to the truths of our heritage, our devotion to God and country, our obligation to a free society in order to keep it free, our rededication to "the great task remaining before us," then John F. Kennedy did not die in vain.

May God bless his memory.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States in Dallas, Tex., on November 22, 1963 shocked the entire world. The death of any President is a crushing blow to any nation but the demise of President Kennedy at age 46, at the very height of his physical and intellectual capabilities had the impact of a hydrogen bomb on all of the people of the United States. I suppose every Member of this House will forever remember exactly where he was and what he was doing on November 22, when the awful news of the fatal shot was broadcast in sad and ofttimes tearful words throughout the Nation. All Americans were stunned. Our minds were seared as if by a hot iron by the news. None of us will ever forget that moment. Most of us likewise will never forget the man. For John F. Kennedy was indeed a man to remember. For those of us in the Congress who came to know him, it was a tremendous personal loss. President Kennedy was many things to many people. He was at one and the same time a devoted husband, an obedient son, a loving father, a courageous President and an inspiring world leader. Few men in the history of the country and indeed the world accomplished what he did in 46 short years. A war hero, a Pulitzer Prize winner, an author and intellectual, a Member of the House of Representatives for 6 years and of the U.S. Senate for 8 years, he was elected by his fellow citizens at the age of 43 to lead the greatest Nation in the world at the most dangerous and difficult period in the world's history. In spite of every accomplishment, however, President Kennedy still possessed the virtue of humility and the love of fellowmen that made him accessible and loved by all the peoples throughout the word. Possessing all material things, he spent most of his life fighting for those who had little of the world's possessions. He was truly a champion of the underdog, the needy and the oppressed. He truly "walked with kings yet had the common touch." President Kennedy had already earned his place in American history. His martyr's death, however, will forever enshrine him in the hearts of all present and future Americans. Many of us must ask: "Why was this young, able, personable and dynamic leader taken from us in our day of greatest need?" Only God of course knows the answer to that question. Most Americans, however, will find some comfort and solace in the thoughtful words of Bishop Fulton Sheen who wrote concerning President Kennedy's death, "Nothing is as democratic as death for all of a sudden there is no distinction between Jew or Greek, male or female, Socialist or totalitarian, Republican or Democrat. All suddenly realize the wickedness of the world in which we live. Not until we see what is done to the humanity loving do we grasp the frenzied hate which will not be stilled by the tears of a little John or the whimpering sadness of a Caroline. Everyone now says: "The world has lost a great leader." True, but in the greater tomorrow we may speak of "Our second emancipator." It takes a sacrificial death to break down the walls of division. When some men refuse to acknowledge others as their equals under God words will not unite them. It takes blood. It took a Lincoln's blood to unite a nation; it has taken a Kennedy's blood to prepare for the equality of men in that same nation. This is the mystery of his death, the price men destined for greatness have to pay to prove that love is stronger than hate."

The death of President Kennedy must serve as a warning to all peoples everywhere. Life indeed is short and eternity is forever. Hopefully, President Kennedy's sacrificial death will be the inspiration needed to encourage all of us to live together in brotherly love and to devote ourselves to more useful and unselfish lives so that we in our own way may carry on the work commenced by President Kennedy. I join all Americans in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the entire Kennedy family.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the late President John F. Kennedy was a friend of the people in the Ninth District of Virginia, which I have the privilege of representing.

We, the people of the Ninth, gave a majority of our votes to the Democratic nominees of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson in the election of 1960.

We in the Ninth shared the deep shock and sorrow that came to the Nation and the world with the assassination of President Kennedy. It is impossible to find adequate words to convey our grief—to adequately summarize our respect for the Office of the Presidency and the man who occupied it so ably for almost 3 years.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute I can make to the late President is to record his concern for the problems that face the people of districts like mine and to express our gratitude for this concern.

That John F. Kennedy, son of a wealthy family, an Irish Catholic, and New England Yankee, would understand the needs of southwest Virginia's coal miners, family farmers, and small businessmen was in itself remarkable. But, he did more: First, he conveyed his sense of caring to these people; he won, as I said, a majority of their votes for his Presidential candidacy. Second, he translated his care into economic action programs that have benefited and will continue to benefit my people and their counterparts across the country for generations to come. Thirdly, and most important, he included us not only in his practical programs to improve our economic lot, but also in his dream of moving America forward educationally, spiritually, and culturally.

Last month, in tribute to his friend, Poet Robert Frost, our late President said:

> I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty * * * which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens * * * which commands respect not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And, I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diversity but also for personal distinction.

The President was speaking to an audience at Amherst College in Massachusetts, but we in Virginia's Ninth District knew he was speaking to us as well.

While still a Senator, John F. Kennedy went to my district and addressed a dinner meeting there. In his comments he said that it is "better to light a candle than to curse the darkness."

The Bristol Herald-Courier, in editorializing on the President's death, mentions this dinner and the President's comments. I herewith include this editorial in these brief remarks:

[From the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier, Nov. 24, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY: TOUCHED BY FATE

"I do not pretend to say that the future will always be easy," President Kennedy said in an address here in 1958 while still a Senator. "There will be crises, there will be problems."

But, he continued, "we can go forward to a new and better America, never satisfied with things as they are, daring always to try the new, daring nobly and doing greatly."

In the face of a "somber and uncertain future," he implored, "we ask you to bring candles to illuminate our way."

That future was not easy; it was filled with crises and with problems; it was more somber and uncertain than any believed possible on that blustery Friday evening in March little more than 5 years ago.

There have been candles along the way, sometimes burning brightly, sometimes flickering in those ebbtides which grace, at intervals, the lives of all men.

But now the candles are multiplied a thousandfold. Unbelievably, shockingly, tragically, malevolently, the future of which Mr. Kennedy spoke has ended for him. He is dead, and there remains only the heartbreak of mourning and the beginning of an assessment which will not end in our lifetime.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was touched by fate and possessed of those qualities which, in fine blend, lift men up and make them great.

He could inspire a nation and a world with his words. He could restate the cause of freedom, the purpose of these United States of America. And he could draw visions of the best that men can become if they but bend themselves to the task. "Let us begin," he said.

John Kennedy did not succeed in his every effort. No one can, for there are some problems which men cannot solve, and only the courageous choose to try. He chose to try, and in the trying to brave the slings and arrows—and finally the bullets—which came his way.

But while he did not succeed, at least he began. And though he cannot finish, at least he has made men more mindful of their own agonies and of the agonies of their fellows at home and abroad. And men so mindful are men more willing to wrestle with those seemingly insoluble problems which grind conscience and spirit.

He was a leader without contemporary peer, a man loved and hated with equal passion, a man who challenged men to meet him at the water's edge and fight against the tides which wash humanity with tyranny and grief.

Some fought with him. Others fought against him. But all now mourn, forgetful of political passions, unified as Americans are always unified in time of tragedy.

This is such a time.

We in the mountains of southwest Virginia are not given to excesses of emotion. But, in the tragic loss of our President our sorrow has no bounds.

As President Kennedy's casket was lifted from the caisson and carried to its final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery, an Air Force bagpipe band played the doleful hymn, "The Mist Covered the Mountain." In southwest Virginia, where we loved Jack Kennedy, and where we needed his understanding, his faith, and his courage, mist does indeed cover our mountains as we grieve our loss.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join hundreds of millions of people around the world in sorrow at the brutal and untimely death of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

History will recall as a part of his epitaph that he was among the greatest of our Presidents. His good works for equality of all men, his drive for adequate social legislation, and a decent standard of living for all Americans, and his efforts to secure a meaningful and lasting world peace with freedom for all, speak louder than any words that can be said by his friends and admirers.

The shot that snuffed out his life robbed the United States of an effective and well-beloved leader, who had successfully recast, for the better, the image of the United States around the world, and denied Americans, and the world, the leadership of a man who had only begun to make his contribution to mankind.

God be merciful to John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was a great President, and a good man. Americans everywhere pray for the repose of his soul and for strength and peace for his grieving wife and family.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation grieves. We grieve for our beloved and martyred President, John F. Kennedy. There was stunned disbelief at the terrible deed, then anguished hope that he would somehow survive, then a feeling of deep emptiness and sorrow. We who served under him, we who loved him, we who shared him with free men and women everywhere, can hardly yet believe that he is dead.

We are yet numb at this, one of the greatest tragedies in the history of mankind. And, in the solemn words of Adlai Stevenson, we "will bear the grief of his death to the end of our days."

By a twist of fate, I was in Texas with the Presidential party the day before the terrible tragedy. There was President Kennedy and his beautiful and courageous wife, in top form. Oh, the brilliance of the man. Oh, the wit. Oh, the style. Fortunate the Nation which had such a leader. So much of our optimism for the future, I thought, was wrapped up in this man who was so young, so much a man of action, with so much greatness yet before him. Then, in a split second, all of it was snuffed out. Up to that split second, any one of dozens of conceivable circumstances of fate could have intervened to make that fatal second impossible—but, to our grief, none did. Thus it was that, still stunned, still hoping it was all a bad dream, we came to the gravesite on the cold slopes of Arlington. Here, where he had just 2 weeks before honored our war dead, we gathered to pay our last respects—the humblest of men and the greatest of men, heads of state and anonymous citizens, merged in silent and grieving tribute.

An old proverb says: "A tree is best measured when it's down." The enormity of this disaster, the dimensions of its consequences, is hour by hour growing on us. The greatness of John F. Kennedy, mankind's love for him, the miracle of his great personal qualities, our compassion for his dear wife and children, has no bounds. The work of our Nation will go on because it must go on. But the world will never be quite the same for any of us.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is dead. The untold grief that has gripped the Nation and the world is beyond measure. Our Chief Executive, the leader of 190 million people, has been taken from us. The head of the leader-nation of the free world has been struck down by an assassin's bullets.

Even yet, the magnitude of the deed—in fact, the reality of the deed—is incomprehensible. Since its perpetration, the whole world, it seems, has acquired an aura of unreality. Words are inappropriate, expressions inadequate. Words cannot possibly be fashioned to convey the deep sense of grief and loss that has come to every American, to every human being.

Our President is dead, and the hand that allegedly took him, itself now lifeless, quit this world without a hint of the reason for this unreasoning act.

Mr. Speaker, in the person of John F. Kennedy was embodied the Office of the President of the United States. As an American citizen, I am outraged at this unspeakable blow to the very heart of our Republic. As an elected public servant, every fiber of my being cries out against this unbearably heinous crime. As a Republican, I join with my colleagues from across the aisle in mourning the untimely loss of their party leader who was the President and leader of us all.

To his wife and children, to his mother and father, to his brothers and sisters, to his many close, personal friends, who must all carry on as the country and the world must, I offer my deepest and most heartfelt sympathies.

To Almighty God, whose inscrutable will is often obscured to those of us who remain behind, I offer my prayers for our late President, and for his bereaved family and country.

And to our new President and to all who must pick up the reins and carry on with a continuity that must be a wonder to all the peoples of the world, my support in this trying but sure and steady period of transition is pledged.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the death of President John F. Kennedy is an awful truth that our Nation has found almost impossible to bear. Our Nation's heart has bled. Yet, we are a courageous people in a Nation that has long survived under a constitutional form of government, and we will survive the loss.

Our people loved and respected John F. Kennedy. They were proud of the vigor and the vitality, the youthful enthusiasm, that he stamped on our national image. He was intelligent and he was earnest and he cared about the people. The people responded to him as the epitome of the new pioneer who would lead them to the New Frontier.

John F. Kennedy was born with hereditary riches, yet he dedicated himself to elevating the impoverished; he was blessed with hereditary intelligence, yet he believed that knowledge should be available to all mankind; he was nurtured to an early understanding of political ideologies, yet he knew that America should be an example for men—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The continuing heart and the continuing hopes of our Nation—what has been called the genius of America—will attach themselves most naturally to men with a sense of history and an ability to place personal power and prestige below the Nation's aspirations. John F. Kennedy understood the genius of America. He put his Nation above his party; he revered freedom above personal security, and he tolerated no threat to peace.

Even a world as complex as our world must be still only a world of men. John F. Kennedy lived as a President, but he died as a man. There is a oneness that we all can feel in death—perhaps as there can never be in life. Our Nation felt it, each one of us felt it. One hundred and ninety million Americans knew the sorrow of our loss as if we were one when the man, John F. Kennedy, died. He was our President, and we sorrowed, but he was a man and our sorrow was even greater.

A poet has written that old men go to death, but death comes to the young. No man can truly choose his life or his death. He can only do his best. John F. Kennedy lived proudly and courageously; he died proudly and courageously. Death made his life brief, but he was beloved by his people and he has found an early immortality.

Men who live near the sea know that smooth seas never make skillful mariners. John F. Kennedy lived by and loved the sea, as a man who would rather be a skillful mariner than dwell on calm seas. Sailors say that God is closest to a man at sea. The awesome power the strength of the sea, the beauty of the sea help mold the character of men who, like John F. Kennedy, had learned to live bravely and die, even on adverse seas.

John F. Kennedy is no longer our President, but he is still our beloved friend. His death makes time seem shorter and days seem longer for all of us. We will miss him, but his demise—so unbearable a few days ago—may be eased if we recall, with Joseph Hall, that Adam, the first sinful man, did not die first; Cain, the first evil man, did not die first. Abel, a righteous man, was the first to die. God must love the ones he takes first.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, many words have been written and spoken about the tragedy of President Kennedy's death and I want mine to be among them. No one can experience a sad event such as this and feel that he has adequately expressed himself. Plainly and simply I join those who mourn the untimely passing of a young and eloquent leader. But the greatest tribute is not so much in our words as in the silent respect the entire Nation exhibited during the ordeal of the days immediately following the assassination. I saw it in the faces of the grief stricken who waited in front of the Capitol and the throngs that lined the route of the flag-draped casket as it was taken to Arlington Cemetery. It was also manifest in the leaders of foreign nations who humbly followed the cortege on its last journey. I mention this because it expresses much more effectively than I can the unity of the American people and the respect of the rest of the world in paying tribute not only to the fallen President but also to the great Nation of which he was the head.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, since the tragedy of November 22 the world has poured out its heart in grief. Much has been spoken and written about the admirable qualities of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a man and as our President. Only history will confirm his greatness and mark that fateful day as one of the darkest in the life of our Nation. As our country's leader he symbolized our hopes and purposes as well as those of the free world. The heavy responsibilities of his great office have been borne by all his predecessors but John Kennedy brought to the Presidency at a critical hour an unprecedented youthfulness and vigor which cloaked him with a special appeal. Under his leadership, the Nation and the free world had so much to anticipate. In so many fields America stood on the brink of new achievement. Thrilling breakthroughs were occurring in space technology and visible signs of a thaw on the cold war seemed apparent. Hope and thanksgiving were in our hearts. Then the blow was struck. Those hopes were crushed by the cowardly bullet fired by a wretched assassin whose mind was warped by the very communistic doctrines which divide the world and which we have sworn to oppose.

He left many enduring contributions but the Peace Corps best symbolizes his noble concept of public service as man's highest privilege and greatest responsibility. It will remain a living memorial to its founder.

Foremost, we admired his courage. As PT boat commander and as Commander in Chief, he ignored personal danger in his commitment to duty. He died in the service of his country and deserves the praise due a hero and the honor owed a martyr.

Saddened as we are by his death, we are proud of the reaction of our Nation. His grieving family, our new President, all of Government and, indeed, all our people have responded with a display of courage, unity, and dedication which gives heart to all the world. America will march on. Our national fabric is strong and our concept of free society deeply rooted.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, words are most difficult to find today to express the sorrow and loss that all of us here feel at the tragic death of our friend and beloved President, John F. Kennedy. Yet inadequate as any words may be, I rise to join in paying my own tribute to one of the greatest men who has ever occupied the American Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was a unique person and brought a unique spirit to the Presidency. Others have mentioned this quality—it was a lift, a special quality of grace, a kind of personal style that we have never quite seen before and perhaps shall never see again.

This indeed, as Theodore H. White wrote in this week's issue of Life, was, "for one brief fleeting moment, Camelot." All of us in this House have felt that unusual quality. No President ever did more to create a warm and understanding relationship with Members of the Congress. Without in any way detracting from the awe and respect in which we always hold his great Office, he and Mrs. Kennedy made us come to regard the White House not as a national shrine nor some top cold war command post, but as a gracious home where friends could meet and come to know each other better. He was not only our leader, he was also our dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous outpouring of grief from Americans all over our country and from people in every walk of life all over the world, have shown how well John Fitzgerald Kennedy, even in a comparatively brief period of service in his great Office, had established the same warm and intimate relationship with millions of persons who were never privileged to know him as well as we have been.

Mr. Speaker, of course John Fitzgerald Kennedy will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents. His life was an embodiment of the courage which he so much admired—not only physical courage, but moral courage too. His cool and calm courage during the Cuban crisis last October marked one of the real turning points in our Nation's history and perhaps in the whole cold war. It was the same cool and calm courage he displayed in the Solomon Islands back in 1943; it was the same courage he displayed in riding through the streets of Dallas on November 22 without the slightest regard for his own personal safety.

Because he was cut down so early in his life and so early in his Presidential career, John F. Kennedy did not complete the work he had set out on January 21, 1961, to do. But John Kennedy knew this was to be true. The tasks he set for himself and for our Nation were tasks that would not soon be fully achieved. "We shall not complete this job," he told us, "in the first 100 days or in the first 1,000 days. We may not see it completed," he said, "perhaps even in our lifetime or in the life of our generation. But," he said, "let us begin."

Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was given only about that first 1,000 days to get his program and his country started toward the bright goals and objectives he so clearly saw ahead.

Under John Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, we did begin, as he asked us to do. And now that John Kennedy has been taken so suddenly from us it is up to us who are left behind to carry on that great work which he so nobly began. Perhaps we too may not be able fully to complete that work either, but we must certainly do our best to push it forward as he would wish us to do.

When John Kennedy died his ideals and his objectives ceased, Mr. Speaker, to be purely personal or even partisan aims. They became a part of the goals of our whole American democracy and our great tradition. And it is up to all of us, regardless of geographic location or party, to join in working to build that world of freedom, of peace, of equality, of growth, and of continuing improvement.

This is surely no easy task, Mr. Speaker, but we who loved President Kennedy, we who were privileged to know him and to work with him, we who gather here today to pay him our humble tributes—surely we can do no less. And as we here in this House and those millions of others in every part of the world, join together to bring into being the kind of America and the kind of world to which he was so deeply committed, we shall be giving him the greatest possible tribute and shall be truly remembering his memory in the days to come.

Mr. Speaker, in pausing to remember President Kennedy, there come flooding back to my mind those lines of the poet, Lawrence Binyon, written in memory of all young men who have given their lives in the service of their country:

> He shall grow not old
> As we that are left grow old;
> Age shall not wither him
> Nor the years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun
> And in the morning
> We will remember him.

**Mrs. GRIFFITHS.** Mr. Speaker, the people of the 17th District of Michigan, as I am sure the people in the rest of America were numb with shock and grief when they learned that their President, John F. Kennedy, had been assassinated.

No words of remorse are sufficient. No words of sympathy and love to his widow, his children and his family are adequate. I agree with President Johnson that the proper way to show our respect for our late brilliant President, who sought in his time the brotherhood of man and peace in the world, can best be done by passing his programs immediately.

**Mrs. SULLIVAN.** Mr. Speaker, the shock and the sorrow which we have felt in these last 13 days will remain in our memories as long as we live. We shall never cease regretting that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was not spared long enough to complete his work on the many imaginative ideas which characterized his administration. We shall never know, of course, to what heights of greatness he would have ascended if he had been able to serve two full terms in office.

But while our hearts are heavy as we contemplate the might-have-beens in the promising future of so able a man as President of the United States, we have now had nearly 2 weeks in which to put into some perspective the greatness which he had already achieved.

The eulogies which have appeared in news media of every shade of political opinion have attested to the courage, the integrity, the imagination, the decency of this man who for nearly 3 years stood as the exemplar of leadership in the free world. Many things about President Kennedy's administration have been singled out in these past 13 days for particular attention and comment: The energy with which he pursued the cause of freedom and of understanding on the international level; the intelligence and ability of the men and women he selected for high office in his administration; the greatness with which he spoke and wrote of the meaning of American democracy; his cool and intelligent handling of critical and explosive threats to our security and to peace—the list of his achievements in office is long and impressive.

Even those who strongly opposed him politically have freely acknowledged the great gift for leadership which he brought to the Presidency. Americans without exception will remember not only the events of the past 13 days but also their deep personal involvement in those events. As the years go by, the drama surrounding the death and the burial of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will remain vividly alive to all who witnessed any part of that drama—whether in Washington as participants in one of the most moving episodes in American history, or whether as viewers of history-in-the-making on a television screen.

The sorrow with which we bade farewell to our fallen Commander-in-Chief in the battle for freedom is tempered by what I can only describe as a sense of joy and exultation that we have been privileged in our lifetime to have had a man of such unique talents serving as the leader of our country during a period of great danger and of great challenge.

Few men since Jefferson were able to breathe such life into the principles of American democracy—to make them meaningful to our citizens. His eloquence ranked him among the most effective spokesmen we have ever had for American idealism. The sincerity of his convictions has touched the hearts of all mankind. Negroes who write to me call him the Second Emancipator; Jews, Catholics, Protestants unite in praising his spiritual qualities—his humanity, and his respect for the dignity of the individual.

History will ultimately assess John Fitzgerald Kennedy in ways none of us can now foretell. His political innovations—such as the Peace Corps, his ability to communicate to the American people and to the peoples of other nations his commitment to decency and to human rights and to peace, the vast store of knowledge which he brought to his tasks in the most burdensome and demanding job in the world—these things, among many others, will keep President Kennedy's memory bright as a shining example of excellence among America's great public men.

One of the finest things President Kennedy did for his country and for his people, for all Americans, was to reestablish the concept of politics as an exciting force, a stimulating outlet for brilliance and imagination, a form of activity which can bring not only challenge but pleasure to those who, like John F. Kennedy, find a nobility in public service for public good.

Prior to his administration, we were often told, we who serve in elective office, that politics had no appeal to youth. Youth, we were told, looked upon political activity as self-serving and somehow not quite respectable.

But from the moment John F. Kennedy came upon the national scene as a candidate for President of the United States, this concept began to change. It was not merely because he was unusually young for the role he sought to play. Rather, it was the fact that John F. Kennedy reached out to youth and enlisted them as participants in politics as the most exciting aspect of American life, whether or not they were old enough to be voters. He made the history books come alive. He took patriotism off of a marble pedestal and put it into our daily lives, by translating into action and example the truths of our heritage which sometimes become lost in platitudes.

Mr. Speaker, when we met in bitter cold on the steps of the Capitol of the United States on that January day nearly 3 years ago to install a new President, we knew from his inspiring inaugural address that we were participating in what would be a great new chapter of American history. And when we met in the rotunda of the Capitol a week ago Sunday to say farewell to the mortal remains of John F. Kennedy, we knew we had been privileged, as few Congresses were privileged, to have worked with greatness in the office of President of the United States. A chapter had ended, but the lessons learned and the achievements recorded in that chapter of American history represented by the administration of John F. Kennedy will forever fortify the people of this country in facing the perils, the challenges, and the opportunities of new eras under new leaders, but under the same basic principles which have always guided the United States of America.

Miss him? Yes, Mr. Speaker, those of us privileged to know John Fitzgerald Kennedy and to work with him in great causes will forever miss his bright smile and great gifts for leadership. Our country will miss him. The world will miss him. But there will always be joy in our hearts when we remember not how he died but how he lived, and what he accomplished, and how he loved the job in which he served with such magnificent skill.

**Mr. CURTIN.** Mr. Speaker, today we all join in remembrance of the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, who was struck down by an assassin's bullet on November 22.

He was the fourth President of these United States whose term of office was cut short by such a despicable act.

The late President Kennedy served his country with ability and distinction both in the military service during World War II and later in the Halls of Congress and then in the Office of President.

This tragic assassination left this country in a state of shock, sorrow, and dismay which will be with us for a long time.

The sympathy of the world has gone out to the late President's family.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the term our late President Kennedy was allowed to serve was short—2 years, 10 months, 2 days. I am sure it is the sense of this House that he crowded into this brief span so much activity, such urgency of purpose, such vitality of spirit, that he left a permanent imprint on our Nation.

Many of us in this House today served with John Kennedy when he was one of us, a Representative from Massachusetts. Many knew him when he moved to other fields of public activity. We have all known him in the presidency to which he brought both zest and wisdom, both courage to act and patient resolution in seeking to persuade others to act.

It has been said by some, because he did not wear his emotions on his sleeve, that he failed to convey in his programs a sense of moral commitment that could warm other men's souls. The criticism, if that is what it is, has always seemed to me a dubious one. Here was a President who could talk about poverty in America and a stronger minimum wage law to a labor convention, where it would be expected, and then hit the same theme of poverty in America to an entirely different audience, such as the group of scholars and writers and intellectuals recently gathered at Amherst College for the ground-breaking ceremonies for a new library honoring the memory of the poet Robert Frost.

There was no political need, assuredly, for John Kennedy to curry favor with his academic audience by discussing the obligation of our best educated and most-favored citizens to play their part in meeting the problem of poverty. But that is precisely what he did. He was deeply disturbed by the discovery, in cold statistics, that we have vast quantities of "inherited poverty" as well as "inherited wealth" in this country, and he urged the young men of Amherst College in their future lives to help do something about it. To me, that spells a moral commitment to the achievement of a moral end.

The people, in any case, very often have a sure instinct for the style and the flavor of their leadership. Their estimate of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's leadership was measured in the outpouring of personal grief when he was senselessly and most savagely struck down. Men wept tears not only for his youth, for his lovely young wife and his children, for his family, but for the harsh fact that he was not allowed to finish his work. Men and women the world over wept in personal grief because they recognized in him a man of peace, a man worthy of trust even in other nations.

There were two incidents that, for many, spelled out John Kennedy's courage and integrity, and both of them are connected with the sorry situation in Cuba.

With one, we are still entirely familiar—how he forced the removal of Soviet missiles and rocket launchers from Cuban bases with the utmost frankness to the American people and with the utmost candor to the Soviet Union, while pushing the deployment of our military strength to the exact point where it would produce the necessary results without leaving the potential enemy no way to pull back from the danger.

The other incident was, in its time, a disaster—the Bay of Pigs episode, which left us all ashamed and unhappy and with a feeling that our affairs were in disarray. I was never prouder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than when he stood before his first press conference after that sad event and bluntly acknowledged that whatever blame attached to any officials should be laid at his door. He was our Chief Executive, he had allowed the plans to proceed, he had made other decisions—the responsibility was his, as always it must be a President's ultimate responsibility for the decisions to go or to stop, and he took it, publicly and without hesitancy.

We shall be legislating in this Congress for years to come, I believe, in the area of proposals first urged on us by President Kennedy or perhaps renewed after a long lapse.

Some of them are most certain to be acted on by us in the upcoming 2d session of the 88th Congress, including proposals of great sweep and significance in such fields as human rights and the education of our young people. Our actions, I have no doubt, will constitute in their way a kind of legislative memorial, and in the broadest possible sense they will be actions in the public interest and for the general welfare.

As for the rest, John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought a style to the Presidency that emphasized those things that are finest in our traditions, those things that ennoble, the things that are good and wise. His term was short, he was most brutally cut down, and nevertheless he has most powerfully influenced the ongoing of our people.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad purpose today to speak of the loss of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

When historians of the future look back on this era, they will see throughout our land the indelible footprints of a relatively small band of giants who towered over their fellow men in ability, in leadership, in devotion to duty. Because of these men, our Nation has continued to grow and prosper. Yes, Mr. Speaker, giants have left their unmistakable marks on this, our present age, and among their number was the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our 35th President of the United States of America.

The shocking news of his death reached me at my home in Meigs, Ga., within just a few minutes after he expired at the hospital to which he had been rushed immediately after the assassin's bullet felled him. My home county paper, the Thomasville Times-Enterprise, called me for a statement shortly thereafter, and I would like to quote my immediate reaction to his death as carried therein on November 22, 1963:

> U.S. Representative J. L. PILCHER, of Meigs, today said the shooting of President John F. Kennedy and Gov. John Connally in Dallas today "was the most dastardly crime anyone could commit."
>
> Congressman PILCHER, who was contacted at his home in Meigs, declared: "This was the most awful crime I can think of—a tragic blow to our country.
>
> "John Kennedy has been the most dedicated public official I have ever known. He loved his country with a passion. With his experience in both the House and Senate, he knew more about the Federal Government than any man who has been President in decades.
>
> "Whether you agree or disagree with his philosophy, whether you are a Republican or Democrat, you know this crime constitutes irreparable damage to our country at a crucial time like this.
>
> "The President's philosophies of government are the same as those of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson—and I am sure those same philosophies will continue.
>
> "Lyndon Johnson is the protege of, and was carefully tutored by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, Mr. Democrat.
>
> "All of us should pray for our new President, for the family of John F. Kennedy, and for divine guidance for our country."

Our late President was a charming man. He was a sensible man and he was a dedicated man. Soon after his nomination, it was my pleasure to meet with him as I am sure did many of my Democratic colleagues.

I will never forget his response when I said I was a Democrat and planned to remain a Democrat and would support his candidacy. I assured him that while I intended to support him for the Presidency that as between all individuals there would be times when I would scrap him when I thought he was wrong, but that I would scrap for him just as hard when I felt he was right.

As with all big men, his attitude was that he did not expect anyone to agree with him all of the time and would have very little respect for any man who would compromise his convictions. He was a gentleman beyond question, and this mark of a great man is further amplified by his attitude that men could disagree without being disagreeable.

After 2 years, 10 months and 2 days of service to his Nation and to the world, as President of the United States, this fine young man came home for the last time on November 22, 1963.

The light created by this dynamic man toward which every eye in the free world had become focused and dependent for comfort and courageous leadership had gone out. It was broken by an assassin's bullet. Yes, broken by the hand of a person who was so out of tune with a free society in the most enlightened and moralistic nation of people who ever graced the face of the earth that he brought unto himself the will to substitute a bullet for a ballot. Men of good will, men who truly appreciate freedom, men who love the concepts of democracy do not react as savages.

We do not know what causes some people to act one way, and, yet others to act another way. But, I am sure that being the great and compassionate man he was, if John F. Kennedy could but return and speak to the Nation here at this moment, he, undoubtedly, would in the manner of all compassionate and understanding man, dismiss the tragedy by saying to those who would seem to forget or disregard the Biblical teachings that man should respect and honor the lives of others, that, "hate is for those who are too weak to love."

All of the world will greatly miss this distinguished man, I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt condolence to President Kennedy's devoted wife, his children, and other members of the family. Their grief is shared by all of us who had the good fortune to know him.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know and work closely with our beloved late President, John F. Kennedy, for many years. His untimely passing is a great personal loss to me, for I have lost a wonderful friend.

I recall our first meeting more than a decade and a half ago, at the beginning of the 80th Congress, when John Kennedy and I began our service as new Members of the House. We introduced ourselves to each other and as new Congressmen with very similar political philosophies we immediately became close personal friends.

Because of a back injury, he was accustomed to sitting on the first aisle and I spent many hours in the seat alongside of him. He served as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, which was one of the most active committees of the 80th Congress, and I remember our long discussions and his outstanding work on complex labor legislation.

Later, the people of Massachusetts sent him to the other body and through the years we always kept in close touch with each other. After he became President, on occasions at the White House he would call me aside to talk for a moment or two of the days when we served together in the House.

John Kennedy was endowed with a gentle personality that attracted people to him. He had a wonderful sense of humor and a ready wit. The good-natured twinkle in his eyes radiated friendship and understanding. Those who were his opposition, no less than those who were his intimate associates, always recognized in him a rare crusader for the human race. His ideals were inspired by his love of his fellow man and his absence is keenly felt by mankind all over the world.

About 3 years ago, he spoke in my home city of St. Louis and, as I reflect upon the things he said that day, I think of the ancient lines:

> Men judge by the complexion of the sky
> The state and inclination of the day.

He drew a parallel between 1860 and 1960 and this is what he said:

> One hundred years ago Lincoln wrote a friend, "I know there is a God and He hates injustice. I see a storm coming, but if He has a place and a part for me, I am ready."
>
> In 1960, we know there is a God, and we know He hates injustice, and we see the storm coming. But if He has a place and a part for us, I believe we are ready.

In our sadness we are heartened only in the knowledge that the courage of great men outlives them, to become the heritage of our people. President Kennedy's courage still lives and upholds the high ideals and noble purposes for which he lived and died.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join you and the Members of this House of Representatives in tribute to a great man and great American. The assassination of President John F. Kennedy has been one of the most shocking and tragic experiences in our lifetime and in the history of our Nation. The sadness of the occasion will be with us for a long time to come. We all hope and pray that this catastrophe will never again be repeated and that our Nation will be able to dissolve the feelings and attitudes which could have nurtured such a tragic event.

To all of us, the assassination of our President was utterly unbelievable. We are a people who pride ourselves on selecting our political leaders through free elections by the people. Political assassination is completely alien to the traditions of freedom and liberty which we have developed over a period of 200 years. Only a madman could commit such a heinous crime in this day and age.

President Kennedy's death was a stunning and terrible blow to our country and to the world, to persons of all creeds and political beliefs, to those in all walks of life. He held the most powerful and responsible position in the world today, and yet all this might and power could not protect him from the vengeance of a single sniper.

The President was an alert, vigorous, intelligent, searching leader. He dedicated himself to moving the country ahead with programs he felt were in the national interest. Though there are those who did not always agree with his proposals or policies, none of us failed to respect and admire him and his efforts for our country.

In addition to his predominant public role, the President was also a beloved husband, father, son, and brother. All Americans extended their deepest sympathy to the members of his family, and hopefully the burden of their sorrows was lightened in some small measure by the knowledge that millions of mourners shared their grief. Certainly, the members of the First Family revealed a strength and devotion during this period which was an inspiration for all of us.

We can take solace during this time at the inherent strength of our form of government which provided for the immediate accession of the Vice President to the Presidency. Continuity of Government was maintained, even in this tragic time, and confusion and doubt were held to a minimum.

Our country lost an alert and energetic President at the apex of his service to the Nation. He made the supreme sacrifice in serving us all. Now we have taken a new President and he has moved swiftly and confidently to pick up the fallen reins of Government.

Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the 37th New York District, may I take this means to extend the heartfelt sympathy of the people of our area to the late President's family.

We will mourn the passing of President Kennedy for a long time to come; at the same time we extend our hands in cooperation and support to our new President to advance the best interests of our beloved country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and grieved about the great tragedy which has struck this Nation and the free world, the taking of the life of President John F. Kennedy. There is no doubt in my mind but what President Kennedy will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents this Nation has ever known.

During his short time in office, he accomplished much for the benefit of all freedom-loving people. He was truly a world leader who was making great progress in furthering the true cause of peace through understanding among the people of the world; through personal leadership and imaginative programs which gave the people of this Nation an opportunity to express in person the true spirit of the United States of America.

Here at home he was a national leader with a tremendous knowledge about the diverse problems of a vital, complex nation.

I, of course, representing an area in which natural resources play such a vital role in the welfare of our State and people, worked closely with the President in this field. He was a true leader in the wise utilization and management of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy has set an example of sincere, unselfish service to his country and his fellow man for all of us, whether we be in private or public life, to follow.

The Nation and the world will sadly miss this great man, and I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and all members of the Kennedy family.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not given us, and fortunately so, to comprehend or foretell tragic events which occur daily, and all the more so such a catastrophic atrocity as took the life of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Only the sustaining assurance in the existence of a Supreme Ruler of the universe supplies the spiritual consolation for such an unlooked-for tragedy Our deepest sympathy and prayers go to the bereaved family. It is well to remember in connection with this unbelievable occurence God's word to Noah as recorded in Genesis 9: 6:

> Whoever sheds the blood of man by man shall his blood be shed for God made man in His own image.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the brutal, tragic assassination of John F. Kennedy, our late President, was a grievous shock to all good Americans, and to millions of his admirers across the seven seas.

My heart felt sympathy and that of my wife and family is extended to Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and to the entire Kennedy family.

John F. Kennedy was a most sincere, deeply religious gentleman.

May the same God who called their loved one to his heavenly home, give the family strength to bear the great loss they have sustained.

God rest his soul.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was mortal, and now he is no more. But the ideals and the ideas for which he labored and died are immortal. He stood for the dignity of man, for the freedom of the human spirit, for decency, for universal understanding.

These ideals, which are as old as civilization and as immediate as today, cannot be extinguished by a sniper's bullet even as they could not be stamped out by the hate-filled acts of other evil and irrational men who have befouled the pages of history.

For all his brilliance, for all his wisdom, John Kennedy could not have understood the twisted mind which caused him to be struck down in the summer of his life. There was less hate about John Kennedy than any other person I have ever known.

There was no room in his heart for hatred. He met hate with compassion; he turned aside virulence with sparkling wit; he loved the challenge of political debate, but his mind recoiled at the thought of vituperation.

One of the remarkable things about John Kennedy, I think, was his capacity to understand the other fellow's point of view. He was too big a man to let personal difference of opinion control his emotions. In my own meetings and conversations with him, I could detect no trace of vindictiveness against any individual, against any group or against any region. He freely recognized the right and, yes, the responsibility of his contemporaries to disagree and disagree strongly with some of his policies and programs.

John Kennedy has now gone from among us. But he left a call to duty for all Americans, a call summed up best, perhaps, in these lines from his inaugural address:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

All too soon, his work on this earth done, John Fitzgerald Kennedy awaits the verdict of history. He will be judged by the inflexible guidelines that he himself had set down:

> Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment of each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the State—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: Were we truly men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation was shocked upon the assassination of our President in Dallas on Friday, November 22. The entire free world was saddened beyond expression.

When I first heard the news I was unable to comprehend or realize what had happened. It was unbelievable to me that such could happen in America.

Our Nation has suffered a great loss. The free world will miss him tremendously.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a brave soldier who defended his country in time of war fearlessly, wholeheartedly and voluntarily. To say he was a brave soldier is putting it mildly. He was a great statesman and whether one shared his philosophy, political or personal, he was recognized as a great scholar, a strong leader, and a dynamic President, who worked hard for what he believed to be right and best for the Nation.

We all mourn his loss and extend to his loved ones our heartfelt sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my personal shock and sadness occasioned by the loss of our great President, John F. Kennedy, and also to convey similar expressions from the people of my district.

As the depth of our feelings increase, the adequacy of words as a method of expression decreases. Today we find them so grossly inadequate as to seem superfluous and of little use except as a device for observing the requirements of formality.

The tide of feeling which arose with the news of President Kennedy's assassination, has been too deep and full for "sound or foam."

John F. Kennedy was inaugurated as President of the United States during a disturbed and tumultous period in a world divided on many issues, small and great. He knew that the responsibilities of the Presidency would perhaps be heavier than in any period of our history. In his inaugural address he said that he would not shrink from but would welcome these awesome responsibilities, and by his every word and act thereafter proved that he did indeed welcome them.

Whether one agreed with him on specific issues or not, none has ever doubted or questioned his vigorous and unswerving loyalty to the very highest ideals and aspirations of all Americans, as well as all of the freedom-loving peoples of the world. It will take a long time for us to fully understand and evaluate the extent of the loss we have sustained.

The first news of the President's tragic death left us shocked, dazed, in stunned disbelief, and found us unable or unwilling to accept as fact an event which has no parallel in human history. Alternately, we have felt indignation and sorrow, resentment and sadness, anger and bereavement, and at all times the deepest sympathy for the widow, the children and all members of the Kennedy family.

The poise and fortitude exhibited by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy throughout the ordeal so suddenly and tragically thrust upon her has become a subject of nation and even worldwide admiration and wonder. Surely, she has been possessed of and sustained by a strength not her own. Any who may have doubted now know that she not only held the title "first lady" but that she deserved it well indeed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was our President, honored and respected by all: He was also husband, father, son, and brother. May the days ahead bring to his valiant widow and to every member of his family a full measure of comfort and surcease from the sorrow occasioned by their sad loss.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been taken from us. The ideals to which he devoted himself shall live on. They shall not perish from this earth so long as man endures.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a patriot in the greatest American tradition. He gave unsparingly of himself to those ideals which he truly believed would strengthen America. He gave totally of himself in direct combat against this Nation's mortal enemy during World War II when evil, then too, tried to triumph. He gave totally of himself in this very House of Representatives where we stand today; and in the Senate, when utilizing the democratic processes our forefathers bequeathed us, he fought for those measures he believed would enhance this great Republic of ours. He gave totally of himself in the Presidency where he exerted all effort humanly possible, to guide this United States and the world, back from the brink of total nuclear destruction, but without placing in jeopardy the rights and freedom of man.

The well-aimed bullet of a mad-driven assassin struck down our President in the prime of life. This act of evil has provoked all men to search their souls and rededicate their lives to fulfilling those ideals on which our forefathers founded this Nation, and to which John Fitzgerald Kennedy has now given his life.

The dignity, love, and courage which Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has displayed in this hour of trial, has given added meaning and depth to her husband's whole life. By her every action, she has obliterated the evil of that moment in Dallas. She has symbolized, for all the world to behold, the triumph of good over evil.

May the evil, violence, and hatred which erupted in Dallas be interred with the assassin.

May the eternal flame illuminate and guide us along that path to freedom and dignity ennobling the lives of all men, first chartered by our forefathers and so joyously traveled by President Kennedy.

May abiding power for good always be at the helm of our Nation.

In rededicating ourselves to America and all for which it stands, do we honor our slain President and commit him to immortality.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, when the dreadful news of the assassination of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was broadcast over the Nation, I was on my way back by automobile to my home in southern Virginia. The tidings came like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky. I was stunned and shocked beyond all description, and upon arriving at my home I found the same consternation and disbelief on the faces of my family, my friends, and neighbors.

Foremost on my mind as I listened to the details of what the assassin's bullet had done was the thought of the effect it would have upon the Nation, as well as upon the late President's wife, children, and the members of his family. To be deprived in such a way of a loved one in the prime and glory of manhood, at a time when he was in the midst of official duties, waving in acknowledgment of the cheers of the throng, is a toll we do not like to associate with American politics and our generous and cherished way of life.

I have only the highest praise for the widow. Her display of courage and fortitude at this time of sadness will certainly go down in our annals as an example for bereft women over the world for many years to come.

This assassination took away from us one of the most personable Presidents in the period of my memory. Mr. Kennedy came into office at a crucial period in world history. Not always did his expression of policy fall upon friendly ears, but he listened to his opponents courteously and patiently. He was a man of courage, and his most disarming weapon was a smile that radiated good will and friendliness.

As I think of this tragedy, I join millions of others in a feeling of abhorrence that it should have brought death to such a young man occupying such an exalted position. But his end did not come before he had made his mark in life, before he had advanced to the ranks of those public servants who will be long remembered.

His tragic passing at such a youthful age reminds us all of the certainty of death and the magnitude of eternity. As the noted poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, so deftly phrased it:

Life is real! Life is earnest!
  And the grave is not its goal;
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
  Was not spoken of the soul.

Art is long, and Time is fleeting,
  And our hearts, though stout and brave,
Still, like muffled drums, are beating
  Funeral marches to the grave.

Lives of great men all remind us
  We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
  Footprints on the sands of time.

**Mr. ROOSEVELT.** Mr. Speaker, "nothing is true except as a man or men adhere to it—to live for it, to spend themselves on it, to die for it."

Four days before his death, John F. Kennedy thus quoted his favorite poet and fellow New Englander, Robert Frost, and pointed out that "we need this spirit even more than money or institutions or agreements."

This was the spirit in which John Kennedy lived—as a young naval officer selflessly risking his life for those under his command, as a Member of both bodies of the Congress, and as our President.

Within the all too brief time given to him to bear the massive responsibilities with which this age of chronic crisis has invested the Presidency, John Kennedy accomplished much.

But an attempt to summarize in terms of treaties signed, or laws enacted, misses the essential greatness of this man.

Some 30 years ago, one of his predecessors in the Presidency issued a call for "prophets of a new order of competence and courage."

John Kennedy was such a man; devoted to excellence, supremely courageous.

He sensed that the problems confronting the Nation demanded greatness of the American people.

It was a special grace in President Kennedy that he was able to capture the best in our Nation's heritage within the measured stanzas of his restrained eloquence. He laid before his people dreams and hopes to which all could aspire. He inspired the Nation. "Let us begin," he said, and thousands of America's young people took up the fight against ignorance, disease and poverty in the villages of Africa, the jungles of southeast Asia—wherever people needed help. He brought to the task of leading us a sense of fierce immediacy, a demand that each of us give of our best, to help hew out new frontiers of freedom.

He touched the hearts and minds of all Americans, everywhere. Because of this, each of us—not just here in the Nation's Capital, but on the streets, the farms, in the shops and factories—everywhere in this broad land he loved so well, every American feels a personal grief, a sharp sense of loss because of his untimely death.

The peoples of the world mourn him, too. Instinctively, they seemed to have perceived that here was a good and wise man dedicated to peace and the furtherance of global human understanding.

Lastly, may I add a personal word. I had known the late President as a personal family friend when he was a very young boy and man. I had the opportunity to watch his development, to see him grow as one would watch a young tree grow into sturdiness and majestic strength. It is not often that one has the privilege of seeing close, at firsthand, a human being emerge and attain the stature of true greatness. Mrs. Roosevelt and I have a very deep and intense feeling, therefore, when we realize that we have said goodbye to him forever.

**Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois.** Mr. Speaker, grateful for all time should the United States be for the service and sacrifice of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the President of courage and wisdom, whose vision and foresight in domestic and foreign affairs elevated his country in the eyes of the world.

A public servant, faithful to all mankind, his term of service as the President of the United States was brief but crowded with achievements that history and humanity will recognize in proper stature.

Before his terms in Congress and the U.S. Senate, he distinguished himself in the military service of his country.

He was a man of great valor. He was a man of prudence. He was a man, above all, who feared God, and only God.

For the loss of President Kennedy the United States is poorer today; yet with his interment in Arlington National Cemetery all of him could not be interred. As though it were willed to every citizen of our great country, his courage, his valor, his farsighted wisdom remain and are remanded to us.

Let every citizen of this great country recognize and hold dear in his heart, these gifts; for they shall become the American's heritage.

To his undaunted widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, in her fortitude, there is a greatness that awes all. May she in her deep grief find comfort and consolation in the love and affection of her children and be blessed by a merciful God.

**Mr. JONES of Alabama.** Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have paused, each of us, to reflect on the significance of the terrible calamity which befell this country with the murder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

When an assassin's bullet cut down the President, shock waves engulfed all of us and extended far beyond to people in every area of the globe.

I felt the loss of this vibrant and handsome man in many ways and even now it is difficult for me to sort out my personal reactions to that dastardly crime of November 22.

But one result of the tragic event is as clear to me now as when news of the assassination was first broadcast.

We have not only lost a great and energetic leader, we have lost a man of peace.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy dedicated himself, through words and actions, to the achievement of an honorable world peace—peace through strength, not peace through weakness. He was consumed by a desire to lead us from darkness toward the dawn of a new era of world understanding, based upon freedom, decency, and humanitarian principles.

Our young President faced an awesome task and no one realized this more than he. Peace was his dream, yet he was not a dreamer. No one knew better than John Fitzgerald Kennedy what this Nation faced in the painful progress toward peace. No one was more aware of the whirlpools and craters that we must conquer, the cliffs we must scale, the jungles we must traverse, as we moved toward the dawn of peace.

In his relentless drive for world amity and fellowship, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a realistic man and a patient man.

He first told us of his dream and then he took us by the hand and at the time of his death he was guiding us, inch by inch, toward a new and glorious day in world history. His touch upon us was both gentle and strong.

He tolerated neither laggards nor impetuous front-runners.

He vigorously opposed the apostles of gloom and doom and sharply rejected the philosophy of those who sought peace at any price.

Now, this man of peace is gone.

This fact, to me, represents the greatest wound we and the people of the world have suffered in the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

But in our grief and sense of great loss, I ask that we not forget that he has placed us—all of us—on the right track. He has headed us in the direction of peace.

So let us now proceed on the true course set by John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I have the feeling that his footsteps will always be there to guide us.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of our late President, I am moved to the thought that "the measure of a life is in the quality, and not in the length of it." And, although John F. Kennedy's life on earth was tragically ended in the prime of his manhood, his life was indeed of the very finest quality.

It was my privilege to know "Jack" Kennedy personally over a period of 17 years. We were administered the oath of office in the House of Representatives at the same time in 1947. Through the period that elapsed since then, we developed and maintained a cordial personal relationship while frequently and vigorously differing on numerous political, legislative, and other governmental issues and policies. I shall always cherish my association with this dedicated man and, so long as I live, shall remember, with appreciation, his warm personality, his enthusiasm, his brilliance, and his sincerity.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed the basic attributes which are necessary for leadership; and frequently—both as a Member of Congress and as President—those sterling qualities shone forth brightly, cloaking him in the aura of greatness.

Along with each of my colleagues and Americans everywhere, I deeply mourn the death of the President, and am appalled at the despicable act which took his life. And also, along with my colleagues and others who had known John Kennedy well through the years, there is a profound personal sadness and grief in my heart. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we shall find from the terrible tragedy of President Kennedy's dastardly assassination a lesson for all men—a lesson which will find us all dedicated to a more vigorous and courageous striving to live up to the fundamental principles of Americanism, and to build a civilization of law and order and respect for human dignity and life.

And, even though words are inadequate on such an occassion as this, I wish to join now in expressing to Mrs. Kennedy, our late President's devoted and courageous wife, and to each one of the members of his family my heartfelt sympathy and sincere condolences. May God's grace sustain and strengthen them.

And may they, as well as all Americans, find comfort in their faith of the certainty of eternal life. For, as Victor Hugo expressed this great truth:

> The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight, opens on the dawn.

President Kennedy's dauntless spirit lives on, and it will continue to live so long as the spirit of freedom remains alive in the hearts and minds of mankind.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, though the Nation and, indeed, the world is still filled with poignant grief over the passing of our distinguished President, the memory of his warm personality, his engaging smile, and his intense dedication still buoy the people.

Time will not erase the impression he left upon this Nation for he will be judged for the deeds he did and the dreams he dreamed.

I did not share the years of acquaintance with him as many of you here in the Congress have, but in the brief hour our paths crossed I learned quickly the reason for the devotion he inspired in those around him. I understood the magnetism of his personality. I felt the wave of enthusiasm that radiated from him.

That the world rushed to his side in the final agonizing hours of his life must give his family comfort against distress and consolation that, in his time, brief as it was, he became one of the most honored of men.

I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to mourn his passing.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are assembled to pay honor to a man who restored self-confidence to a free world, who defended freedom with all of his strength, and whose energy was spent making the United States a strong and dynamic country for us all—no matter of what race, color or creed.

It is impossible to describe in sufficient terms my deep feelings of sadness in the loss of our great President, truly a great American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

This brilliant young man in the short time he served as President fulfilled the promise he made in his inaugural address January 20, 1961, that he would not shirk from his responsibilities in "the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger."

From that day on John Fitzgerald Kennedy set out to establish a real peace the world over, a true peace built on a foundation of true brotherhood wherein each man is his brother's keeper.

The energy, the faith and devotion that John Fitzgerald Kennedy put forth in this endeavor has reflected upon our Nation as a beacon light of freedom to influence the whole world in its fight for liberty. This has been evidenced in the reverence shown by the people of the world who have given expression to their grief in many ways—in the dedication to his memory of edifices, public works, parks, and thoroughfares.

Generations still unborn will reap benefits from programs he instituted here at home and abroad.

His tragic death has, indeed, left this world poorer in the loss of his genius and leadership.

In behalf of my entire congressional district, I extend my heartfelt expressions of sympathy to the most courageous woman of this age, Jacqueline Kennedy, and her lovely children in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

May eternal rest be granted unto him, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him; may his soul rest in saintly peace, a peace well earned—for which he fought so valiantly to achieve for all men and all nations.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are sad over the assassination of President Kennedy. Although his articulate voice has been stilled forever, it shall never be forgotton. The individual, the Nation and the world mourn the loss of this truly remarkable man.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great President. He achieved a new level in quality in the White House that may never be matched. His courage, intelligence, and dynamic leadership were the qualities that endeared him to the people and won him world respect.

On November 14, 1963, I had the distinct and memorable pleasure of accompanying the President to the formal opening of the Maryland Northeastern Expressway and the Delaware Turnpike. We rode in his helicopter, leaving the White House at 3 o'clock p.m., and arrived at the ceremonies in the late afternoon. It was cold and chilly, but despite the weather, he was greeted by a large and enthusiastic crowd. The people loved him. His passing was a great personal loss to me.

We shall miss his articulate voice, his remarkable candor, the warmth of his personality, his wit, and the many wonderful and colorful characteristics that were the makeup of this energetic and likable man.

We shall miss his interviews with the press. I particularly liked them. We shall miss seeing the kind father with Caroline and little John-John. We shall miss the graciousness and elegance that he and Mrs. Kennedy brought into the White House.

We shall miss President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But, as he would expect us to do, we shall carry on.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with braveness, honor, and disbelief, we have laid to rest John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Days ago I stood with the countless numbers of Americans who gathered at his final resting place. I stood with those Americans and shared their sorrow and their hope. I knew that he was gone physically—but I knew and know, as they do, that those things for which he lived are not dead with him.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a 20th-century renaissance man. To catalog his interests is to catalog the range of human thought itself. To enumerate his virtues is to spell out the goodness in man. To speak of warmth, of strength, of compassion, of charity, of loyalty to friends, family, and country, is to speak of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

His was an exemplary life. He was a consummate statesman and a devoted family man.

His life and works are a source from which we can each of us replenish our own strength for the tasks that confront us.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today our Members are paying tribute to the memory of our martyred President. No man in history has risen to such phenomenal success in governmental leadership or world respect and renown as our departed President John F. Kennedy.

No man in modern times has demonstrated such remarkable talent to lead the people of our Nation, and indirectly, the nations of the world, on a program of international understanding for future world peace as the man whom we memorialize today.

President Kennedy's contribution to his country was not confined solely to serving in our Congress or as President. His heroic deeds as a member of the Armed Forces in World War II will forever stand alongside the records of our most outstanding military heroes of the past. As a lieutenant in our Navy, his deeds of valor in the South Pacific have already been recorded in the annals of newspapers, magazines, books, and a cinema called "PT 109." He received Navy and Marine Corps decorations for his heroism and was the recipient of the Purple Heart.

In January 1947, John F. Kennedy was sworn in as a freshman Congressman. He was assigned to the Committee on Education and Labor in the 80th Congress. I was a member of that committee and served with this youthful member during his first session in this legislative body.

He as a freshman soon demonstrated his natural ability as a legislator. He worked hard and diligently on the busy legislative schedule and devoted long hours to his district, State, and Nation.

Time and space do not permit a review of his record as Congressman, Senator, and President.

It is sufficient to say that no man in our Nation's history has made even a close approach at duplicating his extraordinary ascendancy in political and official life.

At the age of 30, he was sworn in as a "rookie" Congressman from Massachusetts and on January 20, 1961, 14 years later, he took the oath as President of the United States.

The multimillion words spoken and written about the abilities of this remarkable genius in government have sufficiently recorded his accomplishments and achievements for all posterity to revere and admire.

Although he was assassinated in the prime of his life, by a mentally twisted fanatic, his influence on our Nation's future economy and well-being has been implanted in the minds of millions and will live on and bear fruit for generations yet unborn.

His success in educating millions throughout the globe on building a solid foundation for world peace has not been in vain.

History reveals that our greatest Presidents and statesmen—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Franklin, and others—were slandered and maligned during their lifetimes.

In 1722, Benjamin Franklin wrote a letter to his old friend, Joseph Galloway, with whom he had shared a shattering political defeat a few years previously. The letter read:

> We must not in the course of public life expect immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a clear conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those who at the present are the most prejudiced against us.

Monuments will decay, buildings will disappear, portraits fade, and words written or spoken are soon forgotten. But the deeds, accomplishments, and programs of our young martyred President John F. Kennedy will live long in the future, and his memory will continue in the minds and hearts of millions of his fellow countrymen.

May the immortal soul of our great leader whom we memorialize today enjoy forever the rewards of blissful rest and peace.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at God's command and by His hand, our dearly beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was led from this mortal earth into the Kingdom of Heaven. We often question the wisdom of the Almighty because we do not understand. We are shocked and cannot comprehend why a man of such talent was called from a troubled world to a place beyond the horizons where there is no pain, no sorrow or strife.

We say it cannot be. But it is. He has gone away for a while. He had laid down his burdens of office for a well-deserved rest. His service is now to his God and Creator.

Our Nation mourns this tragic loss, but it is strengthened by the friendship extended by other Nations and other peoples.

My family and I are deeply grieved. We have prayed for Mr. Kennedy and his courageous widow. Our sympathies are with her and the children in this hour of sorrow and we hope they are comforted by the strength of our grief.

God giveth John Fitzgerald Kennedy and God taketh John Fitzgerald Kennedy. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for the Members of the House, today is a day of recollection on the life and works of our late President, John F. Kennedy. A great memory now begins on the countless deeds of his life which have left their imprint on this generation and upon history.

During his time in the Presidency, President Kennedy radiated justice, strength, trust, and wisdom in the struggle for the best kind of an America and for peace throughout the world.

The people of Cleveland had a special affection for our late President. He was a frequent visitor. He was seen by hundreds of thousands. In Cleveland, President Kennedy was welcomed by the largest and most enthusiastic crowds in America. The devotion of our people to the President was complete and unrestrained.

President Kennedy first came to Cleveland in February 1957 to address the annual meeting of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. At this very time, world attention was focused on the Suez Canal crisis and the violence between Arab and Jew in the Middle East. He stoutly opposed the use of sanctions.

A year later, in 1958, the late President made a brief visit to Cleveland to discuss his new book, "Profiles in Courage." Immediately after the luncheon meeting, he rushed to Washington to vote for the postal pay raise bill. As he left the luncheon he said:

> I have a strong suspicion that if I am absent on this important vote, the postmen of Massachusetts may not always ring twice.

In September of 1958, the President addressed the annual steer roast of the Democratic Party in Cleveland. At that very time, when the islands of Quemoy and Matsu were under fire and hotheads suggested a war with Red China, the President said the islands were not vital to Formosa and not worth fighting for. History has clearly approved the wisdom of this position.

In 1959, the President made two April visits to Cleveland. During the course of his earlier visit and in reply to a newsman's inquiry about the prospects of his candidacy in 1960, he stated:

> January is the time for a serious candidate for the Presidency to declare himself.

Later that month, he returned for another visit to an author's luncheon in Cleveland where he stated:

> I am not certain that all my fellow politicians would share my enthusiasm for these literary gatherings. But let us not forget how much the world of literature has always meant to the statesmen of America.

September 1959, the President again addressed the Democratic gathering in Cleveland and before enthusiastic unprecedented crowds, he delivered a fighting speech of a candidate, poised for the Presidency, prepared and ready. Our enthusiasm for his candidacy needed no formal announcement.

In 1960, in the midst of the presidential campaign, the President returned to Cleveland as the Democratic nominee. Over a quarter-million people lined the streets along a 12-mile route to the park at which he spoke where another 100,000 persons were assembled. To a cheering crowd of supporters, he stated:

> If you think America is a great country that can be a greater country, a powerful Nation that can be more powerful, if freedom can be held higher, then I want your help.

On October 19, 1962, the President made his last and only appearance as President in Cleveland. When he spoke on the Cleveland Public Square, he said in a typical bit of humor:

> Fellow Democrats—and Republicans who are passing through the square.

Later in his speech he spoke in support of the medicare bill, but he had more serious concerns on his mind. The next day he cut short his campaign plans and returned to Washington for the most vital decision of his life—the Cuban crisis was at hand. In hours, he rallied the American people to the danger of a nuclear war. He defied Russia on the Cuban missile crisis and won a bloodless victory. This was America's finest hour—we did not negotiate out of fear.

It is impossible to assess at this time the many vital contributions which President Kennedy gave to this country and to the world. He shook off the notion that America was either too tired or too obese to move forward. The spirit of the New Frontier administration stimulated a better moral and physical fitness on the part of the Nation and all of the people. The search for betterment and perfection was becoming contagious. People thought more of the plight of the unemployed at home and the hungry and unhoused abroad. Eager young people joined the Peace Corps to spread good will and progress in far-off places. Service to the Government again became a proud endeavor. Distressed areas received new hope on the preservation of their communities. The march on urban slums and juvenile delinquency became a crusade against crime and the misery of slums. America was indeed moving forward—and liking it. The captain at the helm of the ship of state was using every bit of sail to keep the country on a forward course.

Undoubtedly, the nuclear test ban treaty, ratified September 24, 1963, constituted the greatest achievement of all because it developed areas of agreement out of a wilderness of irreconcilable conflict. It demonstrated the President's capacity to negotiate a hard bargain. It was a giant step toward peace and world understanding. Our President was now strong in changing the course of history. Among the aging leaders of state, he had come forward at an hour of need to wisely move the entire world toward more reasonable things.

As one citizen and on behalf of the people whom I represent, I must express profound sorrow at the events which cut short a life so necessary and so meaningful. But I must also express gratitude for having seen and known the dynamic spirit of President Kennedy. That spirit will live in each of us for the rest of our lives, and each of us in our turn will pass it on to those who succeed. Such spirit needs no eternal light—it is eternal.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the world has lost a great man. One is tempted to go on, to try to enumerate his accomplishments, his qualities, and all of the things we loved and respected in him. But our best writers, our most fertile minds, have been humbled in their attempts to put our loss into words. Just as the name Abraham Lincoln is now a synonym for goodness and greatness, the name John Fitzgerald Kennedy will one day occupy that same place in our vocabulary, and we will not have to try to tell of him, as we are trying to do today.

When he was serving his country as a young lieutenant in the South Seas he was a member of a fraternity of people, most of whom are unknown to each other, but who have felt a special kind of kinship to our late President. I am talking about the thousands of American service men and women who served on ships sailing between the tropical islands with strange names like Eniwetok, Tinian, and Babelthaup and who lived for months and years on coral islands that could have been more accurately named Tedium and Apathy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for them and for my constituents. I will not name those who have written to me of their grief. There are too many. The words they have used are the familiar words we have heard from the great and the humble—courageous, wise, strong, gentle, concerned, beloved. He was all of these but there was something else—something that keenly affected those who knew him and which reached out to everyone who watched him campaign or conduct a press interview. It was an intensity, a joyfulness about life itself, that made the world seem a better place to live in. He served us all with a grace and good humor and gave his life trying to make it a better world.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the events since the tragedy of November 22, 1963, have caused much reflection upon the qualities of this fine man who as President of the United States for only 2 years and 10 months nevertheless has already made a most significant mark in world history.

His cool courage and his analytical appraisal of complex facts and forces during the Cuban crisis last year effectively convinced the Soviet Government of our Nation's determination to save freedom for the world even in face of the gravest threats of nuclear war.

President Kennedy's forthright action on the crisis in Cuba won for our Nation gratitude, admiration, and respect. The wanton assassination of this great leader rightly caused, first, revulsion and, then, despair in people in other lands who came to look upon John Fitzgerald Kennedy as the epitome of American strength and determination.

Americans have a right to be proud of John Fitzgerald Kennedy who embodied the virtues of which they are proudest. He had the vision, intellect, energy, ideals, ambition, wisdom, compassion, wit, courage, love of justice and mercy, the toughness, the sense of proportion, and the many other characteristics which we so admire in our leaders.

He practiced in his chosen craft of politician and statesman with pride and consummate skill to the benefit of his countrymen and to those economically and legally disadvantaged persons who sought—and found in John Fitzgerald Kennedy—a stout champion for their cause. It is they who are the poorer for the martyrdom of our late President. The plain people in other lands have instinctively sensed their loss and have poured out their sorrow and their sympathy in ways which best express the intense emotion of their personal bereavement.

The remains of John Fitzgerald Kennedy rest fittingly in hallowed ground with those other heroes who dedicated their lives to the service of our Nation, but his spirit shall long serve as inspiration.

A special tribute is due to Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy who quickly overcame the trauma of watching her beloved husband die in her arms and led the country through the pomp and ceremony of the President's funeral.

The majesty of her presence turned a Nation transfixed by the awful horror at Dallas to what in effect became a reconsecration of our democratic institutions. We are very much in debt to Jacqueline Kennedy for her magnificent participation in a most tragic situation.

History alone will make the final judgment, but I am confident the greatness of President Kennedy and his short administration will be a brilliant chapter in the American chronicles of which he was so appreciative a student.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there are no words that can adequately express the great sorrow which is in our hearts occasioned by the assassination of our beloved late President Kennedy.

I heard President Kennedy at each of his speakings in Texas. It was my privilege to be on his plane during his last flight—the one between Fort Worth and Dallas. He was very cheerful, confident, and pleasant. He seemed pleased by the kind of receptions he and Mrs. Kennedy had been accorded.

I would say in essence that his response was that of a person who was very optimistic for the future of Texas, the future of our Nation and the future of the free world.

I know we all are grief-stricken to the greatest degree. May God help us to bear the great burdens which have come to each of us as a result of the assassination of the late great President Kennedy.

In this connection it is my hope and my prayer that our present great President and native Texan, President Lyndon B. Johnson, will have the aid and help of the people of this Nation and the people of the free world in such a manner that success likewise will crown his efforts as our Chief Executive. I have great confidence in President Johnson; he can and will do an excellent job as our President.

Colonel Carl Estes is the able publisher of the Longview News-Journal. I desire to include his splendid editorial that appeared in the Sunday, November 24, issue of his Longview News-Journal.

The Russell Laschingers and Ray Greens are publishers of my home county seat newspaper, the Gilmer Mirror. I desire to include their splendid editorial that appeared in their paper on November 28 and also a reprint of a Dallas Times Herald editorial that appeared in the Gilmer Mirror.

[From the Longview (Tex.) News-Journal, Nov. 24, 1963]

### OUR PRESIDENT

(By Carl L. Estes)

Our President is dead, and as a people we are bowed in grief and respect. But we are thankful that in the unity of this common grief we can say to our new President and to each other: Long live our President.

Our city, State, and Nation, indeed the whole free world, was shocked and saddened by the death Friday of President John F. Kennedy. The circumstances were such as to numb the senses of all decent-minded men and women. A slinking coward, tentatively identified as a leftwinger and admirer of Soviet communism and Red Dictator Fidel Castro, of Cuba, coldbloodedly assassinated the man who in person and position had stood in the breach as chief leader of the forces of freedom against the Communist conspiracy to subjugate the world.

We people of Texas are the more deeply saddened because this tragedy occurred while our distinguished President was visiting in our State. Texans often have been divided in their views of some of his policies and programs, but there has been no division in our respect for him as our President and as a dedicated American.

In war, Mr. Kennedy and the writer fought in the Pacific in common cause and each carried home the scars of battle earned in defense of the high principles of democratic freedom, which includes the right to disagree. In peace, we have disagreed on many things, all in the interest of individual freedom and national safety; but we have stood together and the President has had our admiration and respect in the great essentials of love of country, our homes, our churches, and our God.

We spoke out in admiration and praise and urged all Texans to give the fullest support when President Kennedy stood up to Communist Khrushchev in the Berlin and Cuban crises. We now call attention to the fact that President Kennedy is due the honor of a national hero, for he has died on the firing line of the cold war in his country's service.

While all of us here in Texas may feel that sudden death is too good for the cowardly murderer who pulled the trigger from ambush, we expect to see that he is accorded the consideration which leftwing revolutionaries are unwilling to give others—courthouse justice before a jury of citizens, not a firing squad at dawn on orders of a dictator. We feel quite sure that President Kennedy would have had it so.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a patriot. He fought for his country and proved himself a determined and resourceful man of war. In peace, he sought opportunity and faithfully served his country, holding nothing in selfish reserve.

He was a devoted family man. Under the heavy duties and great stress of his office, he often was shown as watching his children at play and giving them his personal attention and interest. He always insisted that Mrs. Kennedy accompany him on his journeys, near and far, and he rested and vacationed with his family when opportunity presented.

Mr. Kennedy was an active and dedicated churchman. He was loyal to his church in attendance and worship even under the intense pressure and demands of his high office. He stood foursquare for Christian unity.

It is both in admiration of his many fine qualities and respect to him as our President and to his good family that our business and editorial offices will be closed during the funeral services between 11 a.m. and 12 noon Monday (Longview time). Wouldn't it be a fine show of public respect if all businesses would close for this solemn period?

While we all are deeply grieved, history waits for no man and vigilance calls us to duty. The example we need is before us in the courageous action of Mrs. Kennedy who, though numbed in grief at her great loss, stood in bloodstained clothing beside Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson as he was administered the oath as President.

President Johnson literally is a man on the spot in the hall of history. Seldom does a national or world leader have duty so suddenly thrust upon him. Never has a new President faced more trying and difficult problems, with our Nation infiltrated and the whole world on the brink of flame from the Communist world conspiracy.

As President, Mr. Johnson brings to the Office an unmistakable spirit of courage. He has demonstrated it not alone on the political front in public life but also face to face with the enemy on the war front. He saw service in the Pacific in World War II and, before being officially recalled to Washington, won the Silver Star for gallantry in action.

As the wheels of our American Government and leadership begin to roll under the direction of our new President, it behooves all of us as patriotic citizens to unite behind Mr. Johnson and give him the support and understanding he must have in order to lead our Nation firmly and effectively. This will be a natural thing for the writer to do, because ours were the first newspapers in east Texas and among the few in Texas which supported Johnson when he made his original campaign for the U.S. Senate.

We here again pledge to President Johnson our help and understanding in all ways in which we may be able to serve the cause of freedom and national safety and peace in the world. Long live our President.

---

[From the Gilmer (Tex.) Mirror, Nov. 28, 1963]

### WE LIVE SO HE SHALL NOT HAVE DIED IN VAIN

We looked into the jaws of death this past weekend. The black, sickening news of the murder of John Kennedy was akin that of a member of our own family. He was that familiar, and for most of us, that well admired.

Why? The exact workings of a psychotic's maddened mind can never be known, and stupidity which followed tragedy in Dallas made this certain as the assassin was also murdered.

But our system exposes our political leaders to these type goons, with only minimum amount of protection. We would not have a free society were it otherwise.

Every leader of any national cause in America is exposed to the crackpot, the extremist, the "nut" as most of us would say. But we cannot shrink from these minute few, and still have our open, free, responsible society.

We can—those who mourn and grieve—gain assurance that the President who died so suddenly, at the height of gaiety, the family who lost so hideously, and the Nation who suffered so grievously, faced all these dangers with high courage.

Surely he knew there were those who would try this. Certainly he knew the emotions were high around him, and the threats and risks uncertain, but lurking. But he took them in his stride. We must do likewise in our own lives to be true to his faith and his inspiration, and now his memory.

There are those who would pull the trigger today which not only would snuff out a national leader, but a whole nation. And John Kennedy knew it better than any of us.

There were those who said "He's a one-termer."

In one sense they are now right. But his words, actions, deeds, and efforts, in a wide range of endeavors in our diverse Nation, will now live far longer than a one-term President. As it was said of Lincoln, after his murder, "he now belongs to the ages."

It seemed a few months ago that things were piling up, and some unseen fate seemed to know something. For John F. Kennedy was rushing from here, to there, to elsewhere, with a hundred things going at once, trying to finish them before something happened. He was, as it turned out, in a race with a tragic destiny.

Those unfinished things we know will be done, and in his name. He set this Nation on the right road for this decade, perhaps longer. We have only to reread his thoughts, his words, his urgings, to stay on the right path.

As for the whys, ifs, recriminations, and reasons of the horrible Dallas murder, that cannot be undone, even if the failures of responsible people are found. It is a terrible setback, of course, to have found a man almost perfectly suited to the national leadership, then let a deranged marksman sit unmolested in a window for a chance. It cannot be undone, however. The world is full of ifs.

We must live with memories, with inspiration, with the example of courage, and with one of the most clearheaded moral guides we have found in national leaders today. These are the trail marks blazed by John Kennedy, who did more in less than 3 years as President than any other man in our history.

To those who still bear hatred, rancor, venom, spite, and bitterness toward him, we say—and he would, too—"This is a free America," or "Ameriker" as was his style. And this is our strength and our weakness, this democracy of ours.

Its weakness is the weakness of all democracies, which cannot protect themselves (or their leaders) as a dictatorship can. And for the short haul, the dictatorship can act more efficiently.

Democracy's strength lies in the historical fact that history has marched on sturdy legs of people who govern themselves. No matter the mistakes, the horrible mistakes, they are in the van of the future. And the dictatorships—even though they may protect their leaders—end in calamity, sorrow, or despair.

John Kennedy shall not have died in vain, if we as Americans follow the marks of the 20th-century world leadership he blazed in so few months as our President.

---

[From the Gilmer Mirror, Nov. 28, 1963]

### DEATH'S SAD INTIMACY

In death, Dallas has found a new love and respect for John F. Kennedy. And feeling the sad intimacy of his death that we do, we of Dallas also have a sudden, close, and indissoluble tie with his memory. John F. Kennedy and Dallas will forever be together on the pages of history.

It will be generations before the memory of him is relegated to the past. There was a magnetic quality, often noted, which drew attention to John F. Kennedy. It was a quality of destiny which bespoke exciting and important things in his personality, which hinted always of the future.

It was this quality of destiny which marked his career from its beginning. He became a national figure almost from the moment he strode onto the Washington scene as a freshman Congressman in 1946. His storybook heroism during the war, his precocious political ingenuity evidenced while still a collegian, his American good looks combined with this essence of excitement to mark every move of the man—in private as well as public.

By 1956 his importance was such that even in comparative youth his name on the Democratic party ticket as Vice President was considered only logical. And it took no bold prophet to predict his nomination for the Chief Executive's chair, even in 1956, for the race of 1960.

That campaign carried America's imagination back to the breathless early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt in searching for a suitable comparison. Not since Roosevelt, and seldom before, has a President's individuality been so identified with his administration.

John F. Kennedy was a controversial, at times impolitic, figure in the political ring. He made many enemies, it is true, but it was almost exclusively as the Chief Executive that he made them, not as Kennedy the person. This was the paradoxical factor of his career—that he was hated impersonally and loved fervently in a personal way.

But he was straightforward, which helps explain this paradox. He never soft-pedaled or side-stepped. No one can charge the memory of John F. Kennedy with the grayness of hypocrisy.

And he was bold. His noblest hours were those when he stood firm and strong in the face of our Nation's foes and said to them, "No more."

John F. Kennedy was distinctive in looks, manner, and speech.

This contributed to the enraging of his enemies and the endearment of his friends. His hatless, athletic way of moving about the Nation kept America alive to his youth. A mimicking artist became rich and famous just by imitating his famous accents. "Cuber" and "vigah" will remain for decades as crisp trademarks of his speech.

He was granted that journalistic accolade which only the familiarly great receive, identification by initials only. JFK is one with FDR. His bushy profile was accomplished easily by a few artist pen strokes.

In short, his was a figure history became instantly conscious of—and time will not soon diminish.

**Mr. ROBISON.** Mr. Speaker, the tragic event on Friday, November 22, and the deeply moving scenes that followed it have left their mark upon us all. It has been an unforgettable experience—one evoking the memory of another American President of courage and devotion to the duties of that office who, with his self-appointed tasks likewise unfinished, was also taken away from us nearly a century ago.

Within the fortnight, Columnist James Reston, writing in the New York Times, had commented on the late President's failure to move key portions of his legislative program through this Congress, and had speculated that this might be so because "he—President Kennedy—has touched the intellect of the country but not its heart."

Perhaps if one were to confine himself to political programs and policies, this was true. However, the spontaneous and obviously sincere outpouring of national grief that marked the shocking and senseless killing of John F. Kennedy, the President, has seemed to demonstrate beyond all doubt that the people of the United States have now taken John F. Kennedy, the man, to their hearts.

One could and did differ with President Kennedy—as I and many another here have on occasion—but one could not do so without an appreciation of his tolerance of honest differences over means, his patience in the midst of adversity, the breadth of his intellect and the keenness of his wit, and, of course, the encompassing warmth and vitality of his personality.

It has been reported that Mr. Kennedy, who greatly admired the work of the poet, Robert Frost, had as his favorite that one of Frost's verses that concludes with these lines:

> The woods are lovely, dark, and deep
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Some observers have thought to explain this Presidential choice as indicative of the possibility that Mr. Kennedy had some premonition about the brevity of the opportunity for leadership that was to be his. If this was so—and who is to say that it was not?—it may help to explain why Mr. Kennedy, an architect of change with eye fixed on distant goals, seemed so often to exhibit an inner need to hurry.

Out of that same sense of urgency may well have also come his approach to the Presidency which, in his own words, he regarded as "the wellspring of action in the American constitutional system."

To such a man, the reluctance of this and the previous Congress to adopt his programs and policies with a greater alacrity than they displayed must have been more frustrating than he permitted himself to reveal. In part, of course, his forbearance from congressional criticism had to stem from the political realities of his situation. I should like to think, however, that it stemmed from his understanding that the Congress was—by its own lights—also only playing its part in that same American constitutional system.

In his splendid inaugural address, he acknowledged that the goals he had set himself and the Nation might not be achieved, "in the life of (his) administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." But, he urged, "let us begin."

One does not have to completely agree with the desirability of those goals, nor with the means John F. Kennedy sought to apply to attain them, to share in the tragic realization that he was destined to make only that "beginning." Perhaps this fact, as much as anything else, has contributed to the feeling of emptiness to which so many of us have confessed during those first few days.

However, the stream of life flows endlessly on, and we are—unwittingly and sometimes unwillingly—an integral part of it. Although none can help but wonder at the ways of Divine Providence, nor still the cry of "Why?" we can take comfort from the fact that our God is the same God, yesterday, today, and forever, and from the inalienable fact that our Republic still stands.

Our prayers in the first days of our loss were for our fallen President, for his children and for the other members of his family, and particularly for that unforgettably gallant lady who was his wife, and whose great dignity and courage as his widow has been of such inspiration to us all.

As our prayers now turn—as turn they must—to our new President and to those who will counsel and guide him, let us also pray for our Nation—that, out of these sad hours, it may have found new resolution and its people a renewed sense of common purpose.

Mrs. Robinson joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy, in this, their continuing time of sorrow, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her children, and to the other members of the immediate family of the late John F. Kennedy.

**Mr. FOGARTY.** Mr. Speaker, in these sad and sorrowful days following the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, much has been said and written of him as a scholar, statesman, gifted intellect, professional politician in the truest sense, and world leader.

As one who had the opportunity to work closely with him for 6 years in the House of Representatives and in more recent years during his service as a United States Senator and finally as our Chief Executive, I not only enjoyed a close working relationship with him but I also came to know him as a good personal friend. In assessing the all too short period spanned by this experience, I can echo the sentiments of those who laud John F. Kennedy for his statesmanship, courage and world leadership in the great East-West confrontation just a few months ago. I can echo the sentiments of those who say that this young man brought to the White House a spirit of dedication and zest for public service unparalleled in modern times. And I can subscribe to the affirmations of those who point to his leadership on the domestic scene that will inspire this Nation for generations to come.

Though it may be true that John Fitzgerald Kennedy may achieve a status of greatness in the eyes of history for his resolute stand against encroachment of the Western Hemisphere by those who would break the peace or for his courageous leadership in quest of the unfinished business of our martyred Chief Executive a century ago, I am deeply impressed and thankful for his contributions to the public good in another sphere of activity.

I refer, of course, to the vision and resolute actions which Mr. Kennedy brought to bear on problems of vital importance to all of us, our children, and ultimately to the Nation and the entire world; health and medical research. His efforts to improve the health of our people and people everywhere took many forms. Though he spoke out more frequently and more forcefully on the subject of better health than any of the 34 Presidents of the United States who preceded him, he did not fight this battle with words alone. It was just 29 days after his inauguration as President that he took the first step to bring into being—via legislation—the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to provide a focal point for research on a wide array of health problems that had long been neglected.

This year—in fact, just a few weeks prior to his untimely death—three legislative proposals of greatest health significance to this Nation were enacted into law. I am convinced that none of these beneficial programs would have been enacted without the President's leadership and support. The first of these, the so-called Health Professions Education Assistance Act—which I had championed unsuccessfully for many years—will stand as one of the living monuments to Mr. Kennedy's deep interest in the health of our people. The other two bills—among the last to be signed by President Kennedy—provide the framework for all-out campaigns against two of our most perplexing health problems: mental illness and mental retardation. Today, over 5 million Americans are afflicted by mental retardation and almost 1 of every 2 hospital beds is taken by a person suffering from mental illness. Thus, these programs in which John F. Kennedy believed so deeply but never saw developed stand to improve the lives of millions of Americans who will know this man only through their history books.

One other point should be made in a brief assessment of Mr. Kennedy's love and concern for his fellow man. It may be considered by some to be relatively easy to do the things and say the things that will result in new programs for improvement of the public health. Mr. Kennedy—in word and deed—went far beyond this commitment. As a son, as a father, as a brother, he knew well the heartbreak of one who is helpless in the face of medical mystery. And so, he not only gave his leadership, vision, and official support to the furtherance of medical research; he gave lavishly of his own time and resources to help support the attack on disease, disability, and untimely death.

Thus, John F. Kennedy as a friend and public servant, emerges as one who devoted his entire life to that of giving. When there was war, he gave bravery; when there was peace, he gave service; when there was uncertainty, he gave inspiration; when there was vacillation, he gave vigor; and when there was hate, he gave his life.

All of us—as individuals and as a nation—are better off because John Fitzgerald Kennedy walked here.

**Mr. SHIPLEY.** Mr. Speaker, in his infinite wisdom, Almighty God has seen fit to take from us a great man who loved, and was beloved by, all humanity.

No man could possibly fill the tremendous void left by the passing of that noble soul. No words can ease the aching hearts of untold millions of every race, creed, and color. The world knows it has lost a heroic champion of justice and freedom.

Tragic fate has thrust upon us grave responsibilities. We must carry on. Our departed leader never looked backward. He looked forward and moved forward. That is what he would want us to do. That is what America will do.

So much blood has already been shed for the ideals which we cherish and for which John Fitzgerald Kennedy lived and died.

Here in America, President Kennedy labored long and hard to achieve a social order worthy of our great heritage; in his time tremendous progress was made for the really democratic way of life. Let us rededicate ourselves today, the forward looking people of America, that there will be no relaxation in our effort to improve the lot of the common people.

That is what John Fitzgerald Kennedy was striving to do and this was as Americans must strive to do also. John Kennedy never ceased his struggle to preserve and maintain our American way of life. He devoted himself to long hours of hard work, true uncomplaining self-denial and sacrifice, to rise to a position of influence, prominence and esteem. Indeed, he was a man of action, a doer, a man of intensity, striving relentlessly to accomplish worthwhile things for the people of America and the world.

The news of the sudden death of our President came as a hammer blow, it had a paralytic effect upon me and my family. I feel sure that most people throughout the Americas and the world felt the same way I did when they first learned the tragic news. A pall of gloom settled over our hearts and the world. His sudden death in the prime of life, when he had just reached a plateau in his life which gave promise of a long and distinguished career, not only saddened America, but the world.

During World War II, John Fitzgerald Kennedy fought with many honors to preserve American liberty. Returning home, he recognized the need of fighting to assure an American future of freedom and vitality, firmly anchored on the steadfast rock of our Constitution. With the vigor of his youth, the brilliance of his insight into historic truths, he was well armed for the living Constitution.

I never knew John Kennedy to qualify or apologize for his faith in the continued ability of Americans to determine freely their own and their Nation's destiny. I never knew John Fitzgerald Kennedy to bow to political expediency. He put the best interest of the country above all else. John Kennedy died in the triumph of knowing that the people of America had given him an overwhelming mandate to carry the battle of freedom to the world. He died in the knowledge that his was a righteous and live cause.

It is rare that one so young in years should be so wise in action. John Kennedy knew where he was going, and knew how to get there. The intensity of his drive and the sincerity of his belief led him many places where others would fear to tread.

He was primarily devoted to his country in time of war, and completely dedicated to it in time of peace.

This young man was truly a prince among men. On one occasion King David said to his servants, upon the happening of the death of Abner, "Know ye not that there has fallen a prince and a great man this day in Israel." And so we ourselves now note that upon the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy there fell a prince and a great man of our country, one who was high in intellectual attainments and totally dedicated to the service of his country in time of peace.

We have heard many tributes to this young man, however, there is one he truly deserves. It is a tribute expressing how great an American John F. Kennedy was. John Kennedy was genuine; he was genuine in all his thinking and all his doings, he was a man of genuine convictions, with courage to express and stand by those convictions.

The lines of a great American poet come to mind that are inscribed upon a memorial for Abraham Lincoln and they apply also to John Kennedy. They are: "Here is a man posed against the world, a man to match the mountains and the sea."

In future years there will be great memorials erected for this prince among men, however, he leaves a living memorial. In his brief 46 years, this remarkable young man wrote a noble record of courage and faith in the United States which will inspire men to carry his battle flag, so long as American liberty is cherished.

On one occasion I approached him on a matter which concerned Illinois residents. He knew immediately of the situation and grasped an extremely complex problem in a very few minutes and assisted me in taking necessary steps to solve the problem.

Although he will not be with us in person, the imprint of his association with us as a man of great character, courage, and friendly spirit will remain. I shall always cherish having known him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and children. May the good Lord give them supporting strength in their hour of great loss.

Our religions, faith, and our basic beliefs teach us that life, the true life of the soul, is not terminated by death. John Kennedy has layed aside his physical form. He has gone from us in life's prime, but his spirit is with God who gave it.

**Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.** Mr. Speaker, on the afternoon of Friday, November 22, in the city of Dallas, Tex., the President of the United States was murdered in cold blood.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for me to find fresh thoughts to express at this time. Hundreds of thousands of words are being written in tribute to John F. Kennedy, and messages of sympathy have poured into Washington from all parts of the world. An unprecedented gathering of royalty and foreign heads of state participated in the funeral ceremony, and thousands are continuing to pay their last respects to our fallen commander in chief at Arlington National Cemetery.

Almost everything that can be said about John Kennedy has already been set down. Our Nation weeps, and in the months and years to come the tributes will continue for it is true to say that never in our time has our country been so shocked and inwardly tormented.

John Kennedy was a complex man. There were many facets to his character and personality. Combined within his person was the hardheaded political realist; the shy and boyish introvert; the crowd-pleasing and crowd-loving extrovert; the orderly, disciplined mind of the scholar; and the introspective loneliness of the creative artist. Always in evidence, moreover, was the rich vein of his humor. More than any other President in this century, John Kennedy loved a joke and he could laugh at himself as readily as he could laugh at others.

In my opinion, this often hard to fathom but very human man will be long remembered for the style and polish he brought to the presidency. Not since Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill has a major world leader been so accomplished in the use of the English language. The major Kennedy speeches were classical in their simplicity, and in his speeches, messages, interviews, and other papers the President left the world a large volume of eloquent words and phrases defining and illuminating the political, economic, and social issues of our age.

The artistic talents of President and Mrs. Kennedy were also well demonstrated. In the less than 3 years of his administration, President Kennedy and his remarkable wife transformed the White House. Once again the presidential mansion became the center of our social and cultural life, and due to their good judgment and taste the venerable old building was refurnished and redecorated until it became a living symbol of American history. From the wallpaper to the furniture, room by room, the White House now portrays the story of America and all her Presidents. This legacy to the Nation will be ever appreciated.

Historians in the years to come will speak of John Kennedy's great promise, and they will speculate on—what might have been. It is my belief that if the Kennedy administration had been allowed to complete its course its record would stand with any in our history. John Kennedy had the touch of greatness, and the accomplishments of the past three years bear witness to this fact.

John Kennedy will receive much attention in the years ahead. He was the youngest man ever elected to the Presidency, and the first member of his religious faith to be so elected. Barriers of any kind were just one more challenge for him, and we have seen nothing like his dynamism and exuberance for more than 50 years.

The President was nominated for his high office by the Democratic National Convention in my home city of Los Angeles. I participated in that convention, and shared in the color and excitement of the later election victory. Therefore, in a very personal way I felt that John Kennedy was my President.

This young warrior represented all that was best in our society, and his tragic death has touched us all. I find that the most fitting words were expressed by a junior member of the administration in a recent television interview. Speaking for all members of our generation, he said:

> Yes, we will continue. We will go on. But we will never be young any more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues in this formal expression of the Nation's grief over the loss of our late President.

And—in these days of sorrow—I cannot help but also express my utmost respect and heartfelt pride for his widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. Her bravery—her courage—her dignity—and her willingness to share her husband with the people of the Nation, as well as the world, are far beyond the realm of duty.

By her conduct throughout those trying days and her considerate understanding of our loss, she has established for us an outstanding example of selfless devotion to one's nation and one's principles. I hope her sacrifice will not be in vain.

May I say—that in my 30 years in public life—never have I seen our Nation, indeed the world, so bereaved.

Our late President was a citizen of the world, and he was the hope of this troubled world.

His youth, his fresh approach to "old, tired problems," his realization that we could—and would—find a common ground on which peaceful international relationships can be established; his belief in the equality of all men and his desire to see all enjoy equal opportunities; his appreciation of the need of more and more education, for us here in America as well as for those in our newer undeveloped nations throughout the world; his joy of living and his wish for all others to share that joy; his concern for the aged, the infirm, the halt and the lame—these, Mr. Speaker, as well as his zest to met every challenge, these have been denied all peoples of the world—because of a dastardly act of one person. One individual—whose instincts to hate had been so well nurtured and so well cultivated by the "lunatic fringe" that all reasoning ceased to exist.

That lunatic fringe, those steadily increasing groups of fanatics, have indeed acquired another "distinguished" devotee in the person of the assassin.

Those people who fear what is ahead and who want to ignore the future; those people who not only wish to keep the status quo but hope to regress to the good old days when the health of the mule in the mines was of more concern than the health of our aged and our children; those people who are so intent on fighting "isms"—but are so anxious to return to the days of cheap labor, ill-fed and ill-housed families, undereducated children and desperate parents; those people who are not intelligent enough to realize and recognize they are advocating the best breeding grounds in the world for the birth of alien "isms"; those people—throughout the Nation, wherever they may be—can carry with them the responsibility for this act, committed by a receptive student of hate, and they can share their shame at their clandestine gatherings.

For those of us who believed in John Fitzgerald Kennedy—this is our opportunity to erect a living memorial to him.

Let us rededicate ourselves to carry this Nation forward to those broad horizons which John Kennedy had set as his goals.

Let us fan the flame and rekindle the fire of the true American spirit to help those who need aid and to help those others so they may eventually be able to help themselves.

Let us carry on John Kennedy's quest for peace on this earth and his desire for international cooperation in the exploration of space.

Let us assure the younger generation that educational opportunities will be available to adequately prepare them to become the leaders of this Nation when it is their turn to accept those responsibilities.

Let us—without further delay—provide first-class citizenship for all of our people and insure them opportunities for equal education and employment.

I firmly believe that John Fitzgerald Kennedy would prefer such a memorial as this, for, as a young and energetic man, he liked action and results.

This, Mr. Speaker, is our opportunity to show our people and the people of the world that our youngest President did not give his life in vain.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead and we are the bereaved.

The words I have spoken are words I never conceived of saying, words I never dreamed of hearing. Yet, they are true. And it is with profound sorrow and a deep sense of loss that I join my colleagues in the House, and citizens of this Nation and the world in mourning him.

We have had 2 weeks to absorb fully the nightmarish events of November 22. But our imaginations almost reject the knowledge of that day and what ensued. A whole Nation sat hypnotized by television and radio for 4 days, watching, but not believing, not wanting to believe. A pervading atmosphere of unreality surrounds this international tragedy, this national ordeal.

And it is a personal grief we feel for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, an intimate sense of loss. The qualities he brought to the Nation and to his office were unique and valuable. We have not only lost a President who demonstrated his sagacity and greatness, but a man whose personal being came to mean more to a country than the affection its leader can normally hope to expect.

In a short 3 years, his own youth and vitality permeated an entire Nation, stimulated the interest of young people in government affairs and indeed in generally seeking to achieve, precipitated the growth of enthusiasm for energetic pursuits of the body and the mind. The Peace Corps symbolized the Kennedy years and the Kennedy influence. The response of the Nation can only be characterized as overwhelming and it reflects the appeal of Kennedy the man to the public imagination.

There were many qualities which endeared him to his country and the world. The sheer personality and character of John Kennedy left indelible impressions on the United States. One sensed that, in his pursuits, he recognized that he was in the eyes of the Nation and had the responsibility to set an example to our youth.

He had a wit at once pungent, subtle, and kind—a wit revealing his capacity for self-evaluation and perception. Wit arises in one's ability to rise above a subjective, personal level and observe oneself on the stage of life. It reveals an interested, reasoned detachment and steadiness of judgment. That John Kennedy possessed these characteristics, he demonstrated time and again.

He had a mind—fertile and active, disciplined and practiced. There has been, perhaps, no other President who combined in such a happy mixture both intellectuality and pragmatism. He surrounded himself with men, not only accomplished, but brilliant and talented. When he spoke to the American people his appeal was not on an emotional plane, but it was nonetheless as effective as an impassioned plea for support. He accustomed the American people to hearing of the complicated issues involved in our national survival. His technique was a challenge to us—a challenge not to shirk thought and consideration, a challenge to react on a rational, reasoned basis, not on a lesser emotional plateau.

He had a keen sense of history, the possession of which will reveal itself in the years and generations ahead, even though he was fated to serve so briefly. His decisions were made with a comprehension of the broad sweep of history, with a world view so rare to those who occupy positions of power and authority.

Youth was the keynote of these 3 years. Not callowness and inexperience that are usually associated with this universally envied commodity, but appreciation and a sense of responsibility toward it. The world that John Kennedy hoped to build by his actions was a world that our young people would want to live in and build further in turn. He hoped to release energies in the country's youth that would dare them to seek responsibility. He thought ahead to the generations of the future as well as concerning himself with the problems of the present. Such enacted and proposed programs as the Peace Corps, its domestic counterpart, the National Service Corps, the drive for youth employment, the emphasis on improving our education, and of course the conviction that all our citizens must be on an equal footing with equal treatment and opportunities before we can truly succeed in our works—these all were consistent with the philosophy and beliefs of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

He was our President for a brief—all too brief—time. But he will be remembered and loved. He will be remembered for his charm and grace and wit and intelligence. But most of all he will be remembered in the time to come for his idea—his plan for the future of the country he loved so well, his belief that all our children should be given the opportunity equally to choose their future course and to share in all that our country can offer.

A man's brilliance and service and dedication are, indeed, sufficient for history to deal kindly with him. And for these alone would he be remembered. But a man who, in addition, is a builder of the future, is truly blessed. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was such a man and in his death we have suffered a bitter blow. We shall miss him.

**Mr. ST GERMAIN.** Mr. Speaker, one of history's greatest men has been taken from us. Seldom have the words "We share your grief," been so sincere from so many.

I am sure that all the people of Rhode Island join Mrs. St Germain and me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the late President's family. However, at this time of great loss, may I also express my sympathy to all the people of Rhode Island, of the United States and to all the freedom-loving people of the world.

History has shown us that in time of great need, God has provided men to fill the need. Such a man was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The President was close to all of us; not only to those of us who were honored to have known him personally, but to all who admired him, loved him, and had faith in him.

We must take heart. Pray for the soul of the late President; pray for the health and well-being of our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson; pray that God bless him and guide him upon his succession to this great office of trust and responsibility.

We shall deeply miss John F. Kennedy who was certainly a profile in courage.

One of President Kennedy's most outstanding characteristics was his love for the American people. He shared their hopes, sorrows, dreams, and aspirations. They, in turn, loved and revered him to a degree seldom seen in the annals of our Nation's history. A fitting example of this great feeling is expressed in a letter which I have received from one of my constituents. It should be pointed out that this lady did not have the benefit of a formal education and most of her years have been spent in a textile plant to supplement her husband's income in order to feed, clothe, and educate their children. Her letter follows:

> DEAR FRED AND RACHEL: Our sorrow is beyond expression as we share with Mrs. Kennedy the loss of her dear husband and our beloved President. Our only consolation is that he walked hand in hand with God, and took upon his broad shoulders the suffering and poverty that mankind was enduring. His life was sacrificed to eliminate this condition and find a solution to overcome the sufferings of this human race. His death was not in vain, because others will continue the programs that he had to leave behind. I never dreamt that I would be enclosing this note within this envelope. We still cannot face reality and realize that he is gone from us. His smiling face we cannot forget. God must have a special seat for him in Heaven among the great saints and prophets. He lived as God's chosen apostle and shall never be forgotten by those who loved him so dearly.
>
> I know how great your sorrow must be. We will all share it together and God will give us all the courage we need to face such a great loss.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ——— ———.

This simple but beautiful tribute gives eloquent voice to what is in all our hearts and minds at this sad time. We pray that Almighty God will give him peace and that perpetual light will shine upon him for all eternity.

**Mr. KIRWAN.** Mr. Speaker, we gather here to pay tribute to a great leader—John Fitzgerald Kennedy—the 35th President of the United States.

Words are inadequate to express my true feelings for this great leader—I feel I have lost a member of my family. I was privileged to be in this great legislative body in 1947 when John F. Kennedy arrived as a freshman Congressman from Boston. I watched him work and grow in the 6 years he served in the House of Representatives. I saw him fight and conquer insurmountable odds to be elected to the Senate of the United States, and there he continued to work and grow. I watched him again overcome obstacles and barriers unparalleled in history to be elected President in 1960. I watched him as he assumed that great burden, and he continued to work and grow, and I prayed that he would be granted divine light and guidance to continue his noble effort to accomplish the goals he envisioned for this great country of ours. In 3 short years he set new goals for all mankind, new vision for the free world, and new hope for peace on earth. Now he is gone—yet, his hopes, dedication, and goals for all the world are an inspiration to go forward to achieve those goals he so clearly desired.

It was a privilege to know this great man, and I extend to his widow, children, and family my deepest sympathy.

**Mr. WHITE.** Mr. Speaker—

> The great man, with his free force direct out of God's own hand, is the lightning. * * * The rest of men waited for him like fuel, and then they, too, would flame.

The spirit of those words, written by Thomas Carlyle, could very well have described our Nation's departed President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

His life personified the aspirations, the honor, the courage of all mankind and prompted lesser men to greater deeds. His leadership, faith, and confidence in our country, and our people, and our heritage never once faltered even in the light of other significant tragedies which are so much a part of our world today. His grasp of the problems of the 20th century were met without hesitation or excuse, and he well understood the destiny that our forefathers set forth for our Nation.

My first visit with the late President, then a Senator from Massachusetts, was in the early months of 1960 during one of his four trips to the State of Idaho. It was an interesting, educational visit, and we compared Idaho's local problems in perspective with those of the Nation and the world. His knowledge, frankness, candor, and willingness to speak freely were encouraging, and his words of advice were gratifying and appreciated.

He told one crowd of Idaho citizens that "we need people who can look ahead, men who believe in the future, men who are willing to try something new." John F. Kennedy exemplified this. He said that "Lewis and Clark did not travel this area on a mission they thought would be easy," and it can be said that John F. Kennedy knew the difficulties of his mission, too:

> Today the frontier they explored has been pushed aside. We stand on the edge of a new frontier—and we need more men to cross the mountains.
>
> * * * * *
>
> With your help, with many hands, we can make for all the Nation a living reality of this State's inspiring motto: "Esto Perpetua"—may this State endure forever.

That State and this Nation and the world will endure. They will endure because of persons with the wisdom and foresight of our departed friend and leader. Even though his horse is now without rider, the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will linger on forever. We are wiser because of him. We are more tolerant. His words and deeds will be repeated for generations to come and his actions will indeed be recorded in the archives of great men.

All Idaho shares the sorrow of this tragedy. One astute observer, William Johnston, editor of the Lewiston, Idaho, Tribune, had this to say:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Nov. 23, 1963]

### WHAT COULD HE DO FOR HIS COUNTRY?

> "And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country."
>
> —JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Slowly, among the shocked and sorrowing people of the world, the incredible news congealed into aching understanding that a great American President is dead.

One moment he was with us—a warm, kindly, human leader who mingled smilingly with crowds, shared his wit and wisdom without malice or meanness, and symbolized for all mankind a courageous, proud, friendly America. The next moment he was gone.

The terrible deed was the consequence of horrible hallucinations in one twisted mind.

> Yet, the shameful act was born in a climate of falsehood and hatred. The fierce, reckless accusations and the angry defiance of law and elected authority among other citizens feed the delusions of assassins and terrorists. Every hysterical hate cult in this land of free discussion and majority decision shares the shame.
>
> It was a question, in those long moments of suspense, whether the assassin was an ugly, ultimate caricature of the Kennedy-haters of the left or the right. Was the fatal bullet fired by an assassin whose soul had been poisoned by the President's crusade for civil rights and economic opportunity for all Americans? Or was this the foul crime of a brain warped by the ugly dreams of totalitarian communism? Americans should have learned something in the suspense. The answer could have come from either side. The left and the right become indistinguishable at the stage where hate supplants reason and terror supplants law.
>
> The martyred President must be judged in history, not so much by what he accomplished as by what he attempted. He had so tragically little time and so many massive barriers before him.
>
> Perhaps no other American President prepared himself so consciously and so completely for his office. Mr. Kennedy was a master of politics, which is the necessary prerequisite for statesmanship. After his election, he laid before his country and its reluctant Congress a program for progress which is as bold as it is comprehensive.
>
> He submitted to his countrymen imaginative new concepts in conservation and resource development, civil rights, education, public health, aid for the aging, employment, international trade, and domestic economic policy, to name a few areas of his interest and competency. He demonstrated in his press conference a continuous mastery of the varied facets of his bafflingly complex office. Many of the domestic programs he advocated doubtless will be achieved in years still to come.
>
> In foreign policy particularly the brilliant vision of this young President surely will help guide the Nation and the free world long after his tragic death. Surely the world will listen to him anew, as it listened to Lincoln, now that he is gone:
>
> "Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.
>
> "We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade; therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants."
>
> Or again:
>
> "I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph, for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailor of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat, or even by the wishes of all.
>
> "But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere—if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions—then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.
>
> "Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God."
>
> He left another message of special meaning this day for his grieving countrymen. He was speaking of Dag Hammarskjold and the United Nations, but he could as well have been speaking of his own beloved country and the voice he now leaves in it:
>
> "The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future."
>
> The unfinished work of John F. Kennedy awaits America. May this Nation grow to meet the challenge of our age.

So appropriate are the words of Mr. Johnston as are the words of Mr. Kennedy in his book, "Profiles in Courage":

> The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less than a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy now belongs to the history of our Nation. May the eternal light now burning over his grave at Arlington National Cemetery continue to remind us throughout the ages of his hopes and dreams of peace and good will for all mankind and our continuing efforts to make them come true.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, unbelievable and shocking was the murder of President John F. Kennedy. A catastrophic moment and an entire nation and world suffered a loss and experienced great sorrow and mourning. History and the future can only prove the real greatness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President, father, husband, son, brother, war hero.

Yes, the evil event of November 22 still remains unbelievable as a bad dream, but it is no dream, it is the raw, ugly reality that there was such a man as the murderer of our President. This unbelievable murderer who could harbor such thoughts and hatred changed the entire course of human events.

John F. Kennedy's life was dedicated to the people of this Nation as a war hero, legislator, and President. He could have led a peaceful life in luxury without harassment, without ridicule, but he chose the life of dedicated service to his country and fellowman. He sought programs and legislation he believed necessary to help all mankind, the Nation, and bring about world peace.

Though his programs were not in accord with everyone's beliefs or desires, I believe all respected him and in his death felt a part of each of us went with him.

I thank God and the people of my district for having given me the opportunity to have known John F. Kennedy personally—his friendliness, his understanding.

As we reflect on these past dark and sorrowful days, we remember a strong gleaming light as the warmth and strength of sunlight standing beside the sorrowful dark cloud—it is a lady of great majesty and strength—the grieving widow—Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. I believe great strength was given to all by this great First Lady and our prayers should include continued comfort for her and their two wonderful children.

Through the life and death of our President John F. Kennedy and the great majesty of his and our First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, I believe we can and should rededicate ourselves to the building and working for the basic principles on which this Nation was founded, the brotherhood of man, and love of country.

Words cannot really express what Mrs. Addabbo and I know nearly all feel in the loss of our President John F. Kennedy or lessen the grief of this loss. We extend to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, Caroline and John, Jr., his parents, our Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, our colleague, Senator Edward Kennedy, our heartfelt sorrow and pray for the repose of his soul and comfort upon them that mourn.

I believe what we all feel was aptly put by a constituent of mine, a child, Maria Papa, of Ozone Park, N.Y.:

### A GREAT LOSS

We lost a man, a man so great,  
A man that no one could ever hate,  
And, yet our disbelief is strong,  
Though we did not know him long,  
They mourned his death far and wide  
For a good and grateful man had died.  
And now we must quietly pray  
To help our Nation on its way.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, as Mrs. Toll and I traveled down on the train from Philadelphia to Washington that bleak, drizzly Saturday morning, November 23, to pay our last respects to our fallen leader, our recollections went back to other meetings with John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

To our first introduction in 1956 to the then Senator Kennedy in Chicago at the Democratic National Convention, when I substituted for Councilman Finley in voting for the Democratic candidate for Vice President.

To a meeting in 1958 in the office of Congressman KEOGH, of New York, where I was invited by Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., and he asked me some questions about Philadelphia.

To Los Angeles, July of 1960, after the Democratic Convention, when campaign pictures were taken with him and the then Senator Johnson after their nomination as our party's leaders. Later the campaign pictures with him at the White House.

To later that fall when it was my privilege to appear with him on the platform at Cheltenham Avenue and Washington Lane in Philadelphia, where he spoke to more than 25,000 people, and I rode with him through my district.

To the gay, memorable receptions which we attended at the White House. His friendly and informal manner, which Mrs. Kennedy shared. The annual prayer breakfast where he spoke. The annual St. Patrick's Day Party and the annual gym party for Members of the House. He showed up at many places where I did not expect him to be, and always greeted all Members from both political parties.

To meetings in the East Room of the White House where he personally briefed hundreds of Members of the House on important legislative matters, such as the tax cut bill. Always his explanations were clear and precise.

To a meeting during the 87th Congress when I, as one of the sponsors of the arms control and disarmament bill, was called to the White House along with various other Members to attend a meeting with the Chief Executive. At that time he helped us to prepare some of the language of the bill, including the title.

To a meeting just a few weeks ago, on the second story porch of the White House, the famous Truman porch, to discuss with him and 14 other Members of the House the civil rights situation.

To two other meetings with the late President and some of my committee colleagues in the White House Cabinet Room to discuss the provisions of the new civil rights bill. He helped us to get the bill out of the full committee and to keep the equal employment opportunity provisions in it. That was a major accomplishment because the opposition was very strong.

And then to my last meeting with the President on October 30 when the Philadelphia congressional delegation was invited to ride with him on the Presidential plane en route to Philadelphia where he was the speaker at the Democratic dinner held at Convention Hall. He came to our seats in the plane to chat with each of us.

As we neared Washington, the words of the Senate Chaplain the day before came to mind:

> Our Father, Thou knowest that this sudden, almost unbelievable news, has stunned our minds and hearts as we gaze at a vacant place against the sky, as the President of the Republic like a giant cedar green with boughs goes down, with a great shout upon the hills, and leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

Since first elected to public office in 1950, I have served in two legislative bodies with four executives. His executive manner was like no other—warm, friendly, knowledgeable. I truly believe he was an idealistic man and his philosophy of "do what you can for your country" certainly supports this belief.

Young in years but mature in judgment, fair to all people, dedicated to his country and its citizens, he labored hard and well for the security of our Nation and for peace in the world.

As the members of the Philadelphia congressional delegation walked up the White House steps to pay our last respects to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the rain continued to come down. Even the heavens wept.

**Mr. MONTOYA.** Mr. Speaker, today, I am reminded of words uttered about the United States more than a century ago by John Bright. He said:

> Every 4 years there springs from the vote created by the whole people a President over that great Nation. I think the whole world offers no finer spectacle than this; it offers no higher dignity.

Our admirer from Great Britain said it well, Mr. Speaker. My words could convey no greater dignity nor offer any comparable tribute to that already bestowed on John Fitzgerald Kennedy by his countrymen, for he has held the Office of President of the United States.

I would, therefore, address myself to the dignity and immeasurable tribute which our late President Kennedy has paid to the American people. With the approving roars of a demonstrative city still echoing in his ears, he sacrificed his life. He gave it for those many who stood cheering that they might have courage; he gave it for this Congress that we might show wisdom; he gave it for mankind that we might have peace; and, he gave it for his assassin that he might have justice.

What manner of man was John F. Kennedy that he offered his precious blood for ordinary commonsense—so much in exchange for so very little? He, himself, answered that question in a simple few words when he wrote:

> A man does what he must—in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality.

He penned those words in praise of others, but they truly describe him.

He traveled the road of progress, a tempestuous journey breached by many blind intersections, but without fail he took direction from a map not plotted for mere expedience but for truth and right.

None but a man inextricably bound to his fellow man could have so lived and died for mankind. The Presidency was a welcome burden to John F. Kennedy because he felt as one with each man and with all men. Unemployment, bankruptcy, thirst, hunger, fear, despair; it made no difference. "There but for you, go I," was his battle cry, and throughout this land we are better for his charge.

Now, John Kennedy is gone and we are led by a new commander of ability and virtue, who has been sharpened by trial and tempered by experience.

He urges that we continue our journey of progress. This Republic wants to move; she pulls to run a mile ahead. For the path is warm and the lead is strong. There is a sense of strength and a rebirth of purpose, for John Fitzgerald Kennedy strode down that way and it is not yet cold or devoid of hope.

**Mr. ICHORD.** Mr. Speaker, the American people have lost a great and courageous leader. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a very strong President who sought to incorporate his high ideals and standards into American society and to diffuse his high veneration for Christian principles and tradition into all our institutions.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a politician, a man well versed and experienced in the science of government, and even though his tenure of office was shortened by a meaningless, unintelligible act of a reactionary extremist, the comparatively short time he held the Presidency will record him in history as a true statesman. His influence in only 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days in the highest office in our land is probably unexcelled by any other Chief Executive. We mourn a great man who had limitless potential, and the true impact of the tragedy will not be fully felt for years to come.

These and many other words eloquently eulogizing our late President have been spoken and written since his remains were interred in Arlington National Cemetery. A master journalist in my district, publisher of the Rolla Daily News, Mr. Edward T. Sowers, perhaps, has best evaluated the situation and the event, and I borrow his words, appropriately entitled "Hail to the Chief—And Farewell," which so adequately express my own personal sorrow and regret for the needless loss of a great man:

> One of President Kennedy's last official acts was as Commander in Chief, to send Operation Big Lift on its way to demonstrate to the world our great strength and determination to preserve peace. This picture of Jack Kennedy as he reviewed the bombers and tankers before takeoff, is the way I wish to remember him—a rugged, hatless, bronzed warrior for freedom.
>
> As we sadly bow our heads in shame and say hail and farewell to the Chief, let us remember to eliminate our weakness within while we build our physical strength without—strength and the courage to use it—as President Kennedy helped build it, and left it, for our use.
>
> As this is written, the funeral cortege with many world heads of state has just passed the Lincoln Memorial where the inscription says, "Now He Belongs to the Ages."
>
> Moments later, the 20th century symbol of the doctrines we live by, fight for and die to preserve is buried in Arlington Cemetery. If we merit it, by our actions in the future, we shall build a memorial perhaps in stone, but, more importantly, in the hearts and minds of free men and women everywhere—and shall keep the eternal flame of freedom—the torch which President Kennedy's brave widow lighted—burning forever over his grave, and eventually, throughout the world.

**Mr. ASHLEY.** Mr. Speaker, the agony begins to abate, but a heartsick nation will know deep sadness for many years to come.

The world mourns John Fitzerald Kennedy because it has lost a gallant and gifted leader. Our bereavement is this and more. We grieve a President whose spirit and style reflected so splendidly the best that America stands for and the destiny we seek to fulfill in these difficult years of the 20th century. We grieve for his courage and dedication, his vitality, his sanity and wit, his confidence in his country and himself.

Perhaps the most immediate measure of this remarkable man is the extent to which each of us, each American, feels not only a sense of personal loss but an obligation to give more fully of ourselves, as he did, for the common cause of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of rare vision and ability, a strong President in a period of great challenge. History will accord him a proud place. May it also relate that those who mourned him kept faith, and that through their efforts, as well as his, the hopes and ideals of civilization were advanced.

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. Speaker, future historians will give to John F. Kennedy, our beloved President, his merited recognition as a great leader in a period when there was need for great leadership. His ability, his courage, his vision, his indomitable drive, his tolerance, and his great warmth are known to the present generation. But John F. Kennedy was more than a great leader of men. He was a faithful husband, a doting father, and a friend always patient and understanding with those upon whom he so lavishly bestowed his friendship. Despite the heavy burdens of his office and the demands upon his time, he was always available to those who sought his help as I and so many of you well know. In his tragic and untimely death, the Nation and the free world have lost a great and able leader and those of us who knew him well have lost a valued and true friend.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a stirring tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy was delivered at memorial services at Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla., by the president of the institution, Dr. James Ralph Scales.

More than 900 students, faculty members and townspeople gathered for the service at the Raley Chapel at Shawnee. Here is the complete text of that tribute:

### A "PROFILE IN COURAGE": SPECIAL TRIBUTE GIVEN TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Profile in Courage," a stirring tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy, was delivered Sunday in a special memorial service at Oklahoma Baptist University by Dr. James Ralph Scales, president of the university. More than 900 students, faculty and townspeople gathered for the impressive service in the beautiful Raley Chapel. Here is the complete text of that tribute.)

The youngest of our Presidents to be elected, the youngest to die, John Fitzgerald Kennedy cannot be measured in the days of his years. He was a man of quality, a man of character, a man of intellect.

To the end of his life, he remained faithful to his great loyalties: his country, his family, his religion, his school. In the conduct of his affairs, he brought honor and glory to all of these. But he was not the prisoner of these allegiances; his was not a parochial outlook. His spacious vision extended beyond the boundaries of his own land and encompassed the family of mankind.

He had a grand sense of history, and an endless fascination and respect for the institutions of our democracy: the courts of law, the Congress in which he served 14 years, the Presidency he sought and helped to fashion.

His was a reverent, almost mystical feeling for that office. He enjoyed power, and did not hesitate to use it. History will judge whether he used it wisely. When the balance is struck, I am persuaded that the judgment will be favorable.

The Presidency belongs to all of us. Every incumbent is cherished as the symbol of a great nation. As I read American history, every President has been enabled by his work, even the poorest of the succcession. The responsibilities of this awesome office are a refiner's fire that burns away the dross of pettiness and malice.

Because the hopes and fears of mankind settle upon his shoulders, the President is every citizen's kinsman. When a President dies, as General MacArthur noted in his tender message to Mrs. Kennedy, something within us dies. The most obscure of us, of whatever section, of whatever race, or whatever party, has a personal relationship to the President.

This then is my personal testament. President Kennedy, though he once shook my hand, did not know me; but I knew him.

I first met him in a book he wrote, "Why England Slept." It was his senior thesis at Harvard, an important book that traced the consequences of appeasement in the years before 1939. This young man, only an indifferent student his first 2 years, was gripped by the excitement of scholarship and its relevance to world events. His experience should be an inspiration to other young men to use their God-given gifts, to realize that even in their extreme youth, they can perform worthy public service, just as Mr. Kennedy performed a public service in arousing his fellow man in an hour of grave menace to civilization.

I next knew the future President in World War II as I sat in the coding room of my ship, breaking low-priority dispatches about some minor action in the Solomons, an action that was to become famous as the heroic exploit of *PT-109*. I did not even recall the commander's name, but I had seen nests of these little boats in tropic harbors as their tired, disheveled crews rested for the next mission. There is a comradeship of men at arms that transcends all barriers. We proudly identify ourselves with the occasional hero of our branch of service, and sublimate our own dull tasks in the achievements of a Sergeant York, an Audie Murphy, a Jack Kennedy.

I remembered the impact of young Senator Kennedy's next book, "Profiles in Courage." Its theme is his life's theme. Writing that book was itself a study in courage, for it was done in racking pain. But pain and sorrow were no strangers to the Kennedy family. For all their wealth and power, they have known the tragedy of violent death, the tragedy of losing children, the tragedy of an afflicted child.

I was a member of the convention in 1956 when Mr. Kennedy sustained his only political defeat. But I remember the roaring excitement of that afternoon, and the gallantry of Senator Kennedy as he moved to make unanimous the nomination of his successful foe, the late Estes Kefauver.

And who among us does not recall the campaign of 1960? We shall not review it here, for our purpose today is to unite and not to divide our people. On both sides it was a titanic exertion, with punishing schedules, television debates, exhiliration and despair. Indefatigable energy and courage aplenty were present in the four patriotic Americans, who led the two national tickets; and not a little courage was quietly shown by millions of voters who felt the tug of ancient loyalties, even as they weighed the pounding issues of war and peace. Once the choice was made, we closed ranks in the great tradition of a free society, and acclaimed a new President—just as we prayerfully close ranks today.

Those who "lost their vote," no less than his friends, expressed gratification that the ghost of second-class citizenship for human beings of any faith was at last removed.

And so my private memories have long since merged with yours. Except for two treasured souvenirs, a Christmas card from the Kennedys, with a picture of little Caroline; and a beautiful letter from the President saluting me on my inauguration and the completion of this chapel. (Both of us were inaugurated in blizzards in the year 1961, but there the parallel ends. Mine was inside, his was outdoors. Mine is a much humbler, and safer, presidency.)

President Kennedy's legacy is the sanity he exemplified in public life in a time of violence. He will not have died in vain if, in the soul-searching that is now going on, the American people return to reason and decency; if we recover our natural optimism; if we reject extremism in every form; if we ignore the intimidating and strident voices of those who would poison the wellsprings of public discourse; if we scorn the slander, name calling, spitting, and howling; if the national soul is cleansed and the national purpose is renewed.

Once our hearts resonated to the noble words of Jefferson, bugling forth the right of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It can be so again. We shall differ, but the debate must be conducted in decency and in reason.

In his last, undelivered address at Dallas, the President said, "Reason and learning must be the guides to Amercian policy." As he embodied reason, he also exemplified learning. He cared for the quality of American education. He was an activist, brought up in the tough school of Boston politics, yet he retained the nobility of the scholar. A finely tempered integrity, prevented his dramatizing some of the public issues that swirled about him. Robert Frost once advised him to "show a little less Harvard and a little more Irish." But the spirit of learning prevailed in the Kennedy style. An urbane, 20th century man thus joined the list of the presidential intellectuals, Jefferson and Wilson. And the forceful stylists, Lincoln and the two Roosevelts.

There are only a few great state papers which are remembered by every patriot. Among these treasures we think of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution (especially the Bill or Rights), Washington's and Eisenhower's Farewell Addresses, Wilson's and Roosevelt's war messages, Monroe's State of the Union speech enunciating the famous doctrine of hemispheric solidarity; Jackson's proclamation denying the South Carolina ordinance of nullification; Theodore Roosevelt's "standing at Armageddon and battling for the Lord" as he launched the Bull Moose Party; Lincoln's Farewell to Springfield, the immortal Gettysburg Address, and the letter to Mrs. Bixby, who had lost four sons in battle; Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, F.D.R.'s Four Freedoms and his annual message in the blackest days of World War II when, in ringing accents, he rallied the Nation with the words:

"The state of this Nation is good;
"The heart of this Nation is sound;
"The hope of the Nation is strong;
"The faith of this Nation is eternal."

And we remember the classic inaugurals: Jefferson's first ("This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it"); his second ("With malice toward none, with charity for all"); Wilson's first ("This is not a day of triumph, it is a day of dedication"); Roosevelt's of 1933 ("The only thing we have to fear is fear itself"); and of 1937 ("I see one-third of a Nation ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed").

President Kennedy ranks in eloquence with the best of these. Who among us did not respond to the calm but resolute message in October 1962 when he threw down the gauntlet in the Cuban crisis: Who was not convicted of our national failures when he gave moral leadership to the battle for human rights in a moving and compassionate address of last June?

And who did not thrill to the trumpet summons of his great inaugural, "My fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country?"

Tirelessly, patiently, despite many discouragements, misunderstandings, and cruel challenges, he proceeded to advance the cause of peace, making good on his inaugural appeal, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But never let us fear to negotiate."

In a time of national soul-searching and apprenhension, we take renewed spirit from the pledge he made then, and devoted superhuman energy to fulfill:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of American—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The word has gone out, and freedom stands.

Every nation does know, and in tribute to the strength of this country and the faithful servant who preserved it these 3 bitter years, there will assemble in Washington tomorrow the most notable group of rulers in recent world history.

The youngest to serve—the youngest to die. In our hearts he will be forever young.

"He shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old;
Age shall not weary him, nor the years condemn.
At the going down of the sun and in the morning,
We will remember him."
(Adapted from Laurence Binyon's "For the Fallen.")

**Mr. DULSKI.** Mr. Speaker, on November 22, 1963, an assassin's bullet was fired that echoed around the world.

Almost immediately, unbelievable accounts of President Kennedy's assassination flooded the airwaves. I would need a novelist's skill and a poet's words to adequately describe my emotions. I felt as if the entire world was standing absolutely still for a moment. And then came the word we all feared but did not want to hear—that he had left us. Our country lost a great leader, and I lost a good friend.

Despite his short term in the Presidency, he has left an indelible mark on the history in our time. He set out to make the United States of America an even better place in which to live, and to promote peace and good will among the family of nations so they, too, might have a fuller, richer life. His programs, his plans, his endeavors—all were designed to achieve this. He championed the causes of peace and the rights of man with undaunted courage. Is it any wonder then that the whole world has put on its mourning dress and shares the sorrow of every grieving American?

I first met the late President when he was a Senator. I was most impressed with his innate friendliness, his vivacious personality, and his illimitable storehouse of wisdom. Our paths crossed much more closely when he was a candidate for the Presidency in 1960 and campaigned in our city of Buffalo. After his election as President, I visited with him on several occasions, and in the fall of last year he honored us again by coming to Buffalo for our annual Pulaski Day observance. He witnessed one of the greatest crowds that had ever turned out to welcome an official.

I want to quote the last words of our late beloved President's inaugural address:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

And to the very last, this is what he did.

Mr. Speaker, to his brave widow and his family, we offer our deepest sympathy.

**Mr. TRIMBLE.** Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join with my colleagues today in tribute to our late, great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our former colleague in the House of Representatives. His tragic death has shocked all of us, the Nation, and the world.

While he served less than 3 years the impact of his service will be felt throughout the centuries.

He was a friend to all of us, and I join with others in deep sympathy to the family, especially to his widow and children. They have every reason to be very proud of him, as we all are.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I am humbly grateful for the opportunity to add a tiny tile of tribute to the national mosaic of sorrow, which has been formed by the tears of millions of my countrymen.

In the final analysis, the greatest scholar and most gifted orator among us cannot approach what the great mass of Americans, speaking simply and from the depths of their hearts, have already said.

Haltingly and movingly they have said what John F. Kennedy would have appreciated most—"He was our friend, as well as our President."

My heart has been touched by the letters which have come to me in recent days, letters containing urgent pleas for direction of the senders' sorrow. Some have proposed monuments; many have simply stated that they want to take up arms against the dark demons of hatred who achieved an unholy sacrifice of something precious to us all.

One hesitates to rummage in the debris of senselessness for words of consolation to a bereaved family or a bereaved Nation. And yet, in the grand design which men cannot comprehend, is it not possible that our fallen leader, in his martyrdom, won a mighty battle against the forces of darkness and malice and intolerance?

I do not believe John F. Kennedy ever hated anyone. If he hated anything it was hatred itself.

During recent months, many of us, hypnotized into immobility, watched a blight creep over our land. False prophets arose among us and preached the devil's doctrine in the name of patriotism. Wrapping the flag about their shoulders, they set themselves up as infallible, daring to judge the patriotism of their fellow men. Restlessly, they cast about for a man on horseback.

They railed at the President, the Supreme Court, the Congress. Those who differed with them were traitors and there were hints of violence, rather than debate; lynching rather than law.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this slimy river of hate reached into tortured minds and produced the most shameful crime of our generation?

We have always had extremists in our midst, some moving in the dark shadows of communism and some posing as the final arbiters of right and wrong.

So long as they remained only ugly sores on the body politic, they constituted no cancerous threat to our society and way of life.

Their menace became real and frightening when some of our good people began to echo their slogans. Some were willing to accept the enticing labels on the package, such as anti-Communistic, economy, and anti-socialism, ignoring the deadly poison within the package.

Then came the awful day in Dallas.

The shot which struck down our vibrant, young President and plunged our Nation and much of the world in grief also shattered into a million pieces the growing lure of the extremists for the "good people."

The tragedy of Dallas showed us the terrible end to which hatred could and did lead us.

Mr. Speaker, our President died and no words uttered today can bring back our friend. But, from the terror of it all, we have forged a new resolve, a resolve to bury once and for all the temptation of believing, ever, that the end justifies the means and that patriotism belongs to a self-anointed few.

President Kennedy died that we might learn there truths. We pray to God that we will not soon forget what we have learned.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a member of this body when I first came to the House of Representatives in January of 1951. I watched with great admiration the events and activities that took him to the U.S. Senate and then on to the White House as our President in the span of but a few years.

I pay tribute today to my former colleague and friend, not only as a great national leader, but as a dynamic and courageous leader of the free world. He led us well in our survival struggle with the Communists. He earned the respect of men of all nations and awakened their faith in his purposes. He laid a firm foundation on which to build a better and more secure world. I am sure at this time he would not want us to reflect on what might have been, but instead to meet the challenges to come with firm convictions and renewed dedication.

People around the globe are saddened by the tragic and untimely death of this able and dedicated man. His strong faith in his country and his quest for peace will be a lasting inspiration for men of good will everywhere. The United States of America has lost a great President and the whole world has lost a warm and devoted friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Friday, November 22, 1963, will be recorded as one of the blackest days in our Nation's history. For within a few horrifying and unbelievable moments on that black Friday, an assassin's bullet had robbed the United States of our beloved President, the world of a distinguished leader, and the Kennedy family of a loved one.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I was privileged to serve with President Kennedy during his days in the U.S. Congress. As a fellow Democrat, I was glad to work with him for the successful outcome of the 1960 election. Since that time, I have been honored to have him as my Chief Executive.

The entire Nation shares a deep sense of loss which is both public and personal. Our public grief is for the loss of a President who, in less than 3 years time, had made giant strides toward translating his ideas and ideals into reality for the good of the United States and the free world. Our personal grief is for the loss of a dynamic, brilliant and vital young man, whose murder has deprived his young family of a husband and father and has left all of us poorer indeed.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's tireless efforts for peace and a better life for the citizens of the United States and the world brought successes which will stand as living monuments to the greatness of the man. Even in death, he left us with an indelible message against hate, bigotry and violence.

As our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, pointed out so effectively in his first message to Congress, it is for those of us who remain to continue the good work which President Kennedy began. The concluding sentence of Psalm 15 states prophetically:

> Teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts to wisdom.

In these dark and disturbing times, I feel we must all keep in mind that it is better to light one small candle in the world than to curse the darkness. The eternal flame which burns at President Kennedy's grave in Arlington National Cemetery will serve as a constant reminder that he lived by such a noble philosophy.

**Mr. GARMATZ.** Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about John Kennedy in the past 2 weeks, it does not seem possible that anything has been left unsaid. However, I would like to add my few words of tribute to his memory.

We came to the House together in the 80th Congress, and at that time I was impressed with what I considered his youthful enthusiasm, his elan. I was confident that the duties and responsibilities of the office would soon take their toll of these admirable characteristics. How wrong I was you well know.

His service in the House and Senate provided a good background for the office of the President. It gave him an excellent opportunity to be in close touch with the people and to recognize their needs, their hopes for a better standard of living, greater security. Possibly this accounts for the fact that despite his having been brought up by an ultraconservative father, he became one of the most liberal Presidents we have had. His program, his admiration, was devoted to improving the health, the welfare, the conditions of all of our citizens.

There has been some criticism about the delay in fulfilling all of his campaign pledges. But how many past Presidents succeeded in accomplishing so much in such a short period of time? He has to his credit an increase in social security benefits for the elderly and disabled; an increase in the minimum wage; the Peace Corps; increased unemployment benefits; a manpower retraining program; aid for construction of medical schools; and financial assistance for medical students. In addition, considerable progress has been made on civil rights and tax reform and reduction. Could anyone reasonably expect more?

We shall never know how much more might have been accomplished by the end of his first term. However, we do know very well what he hoped to see accomplished. Since President Johnson has stated he will pursue the same program, and has the same aims and hopes for our people, the Congress can build on the excellent foundation which has been laid by John Kennedy, for the good of all of our citizens, our country, and the entire world, and as a fitting tribute to his memory.

**Mr. BUCKLEY.** Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 22 last, on a sunlit day in the city of Dallas, Tex., the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was assassinated. A great American was struck down in his prime. There was taken from this Nation and from the world a young, vigorous leader. This act which brought about the death of President Kennedy was an act of unparalleled viciousness that will rank as one of the most monstrous deeds in all recorded history.

The emotional shock and the sense of loss we have suffered and still suffer as a result of President Kennedy's passing will be with us for a long period of time. The death of any individual is always a sad occasion but the death of a man such as President Kennedy, who meant so much to his country and to the world, is tragic. It is doubly tragic when we look around us in this day and age and see the need for the leadership that President Kennedy represented.

I can recall John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a youthful Member of this House. I followed his career as he moved to the Senate and then to the highest office this country can give to any individual. I can recall John Fitzgerald Kennedy as he was in Congress with all that youthful zeal and drive that was still burning within him on the day he died.

I can see him during the presidential campaign of 1960. I was privileged to be one of his earliest supporters and I can see him now addressing a Democratic rally at the corner of Fordham Road and the Grand Concourse in my home borough of the Bronx, N.Y. I recall the crisp, sharp delivery, the intelligence behind his remarks and the enthusiasm with which the crowds greeted him in every available spot to see and hear this man whom they sensed to be a true leader. He was not only respected but loved by all who knew him. There was within him that intangible something that is reserved only for the great and by which men in high office are able to communicate with the people they represent.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a sense of history. He knew full well that the program he advocated would not come into being overnight. He knew it would not be finished within his lifetime or possibly within the lifetime of those who would follow him. He knew, however, there must be a beginning, a beginning to a program that would really provide a better world for all of us who live in it today and all who will follow us in the years to come. If we can follow this path he has laid out, if we can really by our deeds implement his ideas, I believe that will be the greatest tribute we can pay President Kennedy.

If we can see to it that in the days to come every effort will be made within this country and throughout the world to reach a peaceful solution to the problem of mankind; if we can eliminate the dark seeds of discord and hatred which have been sown by those who know nothing but fear and who would attempt to tear us apart; if we can continue to move forward on a path that will provide better living, better housing, and a greater spirit of unity for all of us, then truly John Fitzgerald Kennedy will not have died in vain. For we all must realize that which John Fitzgerald Kennedy sought is what all of us in our inner selves seek. His goal was really the goal of all of us—a better world for all.

Mere words such as these are inadequate to express my feelings today. It was my privilege to know President Kennedy and his family. To them on behalf of Mrs. Buckley and myself I extend our deepest condolences.

I am proud to have lived in a time when I could have known such a man as John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am certain that in the years to come when the history of these days is written those who write it and who look back upon this era will fully recognize the greatness of this man. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy may have died in Dallas on November 22 last but that for which he stood will be as alive in the ages to come as it was when he himself was expressing these ideas to all of us.

**Mr. CASEY.** Mr. Speaker, as we assemble here today to pay tribute to our fallen leader, President John F. Kennedy, my heart is filled with sadness and sympathy. Sadness and sympathy for his grieving but courageous wife, who gave a nation strength when strength was needed—for a son and daughter, who, like our people, will find the terrible cost of an assassin's bullet to be a lifetime of grief.

To this great family, we can only say that the prayers of our people are with you, and this tragic loss you have borne is shared by each and all of us.

Like most of our people, I was swept with shocked waves of disbelief, horror, and shame at the swift unfolding of the tragedy that struck our land. Our people cried, open and unashamed, as news of the President's death came. My grief was not only for the loss of the man, although that in itself was great enough, but also because something evil had been loosed in our land, and the shame of it was overwhelming.

My sorrow was heightened by the fact that only a few short hours before I had welcomed President and Mrs. Kennedy to Houston. I shall remember forever the way the people of my hometown took this warm, vibrant man and his wife to their hearts in a wonderful reception.

In the sorrowful days that followed President Kennedy's death, my memory kept returning to highspots of his brief 3 years in office. The things I remembered, surely, were not his greatest achievements, but were ones that had left a lasting impression with me that I shall cherish all of my days.

I remembered the bitter cold January inaugural, as I sat with my colleagues at the Capitol, and being struck with the tremendous vitality of this man delivering a call to all America that will ring down the halls of recorded time.

I recalled the feeling of pride as I watched this man stride into the House Chamber, vigorous and confident, a picture of strength in a time of uncertainty, to deliver his first state of the Union message.

Again, I pictured the days after his inaugural and felt anew the electric excitement that swept through Washington, the sense of urgency, the feeling of getting the country moving again.

My thoughts went back to another Houston visit, and the feeling of pride I had in seeing President Kennedy walk into a meeting of Protestant ministers, who had honest and sincere questions concerning his responsibility to his faith and to his country. The deftness and dispatch with which he handled the interview, his candid answers, his frank demeanor, nonplussed even his greatest critics and it was in fact the turning point of his campaign.

I doubt if anyone, even those blinded by animosity, would question this man's courage. But I recall vividly the deep emotions he stirred within me as I watched him apprise the Nation of the threat we faced, and the action he was to take, during the Cuban missile crisis. And I remembered again the courage it took for this man to shoulder full responsibility for this problem of Communist Cuba, partly inherited, and admitting in effect that he was not infallible and had listened to poor advice.

John F. Kennedy had, I feel, the attributes of greatness and had time been more generous, would have realized it to its fullest within his lifetime.

Surely it is no secret that during his 3 years in office the ardor of some of us here for his administration cooled somewhat. But it was influenced not by the man himself so much as by the decisions of those who surrounded him.

My admiration never ceased for the strength, the courage, the intellectual honesty, and warm good humor that set President Kennedy apart. Here was a leader that even in disagreement I viewed with an honest sense of pride and great respect.

As my colleagues know, we of Texas were not the earliest of President Kennedy's supporters, for in the preconvention days we pressed for our own great native son, Lyndon B. Johnson, for this high office. But even at the hour of that defeat, I felt renewed faith in my own judgment as President Kennedy picked this great American to be his Vice President. Even now, in this tragic hour of grief, our people give thanks for the courage and foresight of our fallen leader in selecting a man so eminently qualified to lead our country in the dark days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it is with endless sorrow that we see the closing of such a brief chapter in our Nation's history, one that had opened with such high hope and brilliant promise.

We cannot break faith with this man who asked so much of us—and gave more. As we stand here in sorrow, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which our Nation was founded and must survive—of justice, and liberty, and freedom, of one Nation indivisible under God. Certainly our pledge to eradicate the fear and extremism that divides us would be a living memorial to President John F. Kennedy, and the promise for a better world of brotherhood would burn as bright as the eternal flame that lights the final resting place of this great man.

Surely no words could better express our responsibility in the task ahead than those uttered by President Kennedy on that bitter cold inaugural day of January 20, 1961:

> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.
>
> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.
>
> My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.
>
> Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Mr. Speaker, we here can resolve no less than this.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the man had noble thoughts. The man spoke with eloquent words. The man did courageous deeds.

He envisioned a world where men could live in peace and prosperity; a world where the fear of a nuclear holocaust would be removed; a world where poverty, disease, prejudice, and ignorance would be conquered.

He spoke of need to use wisely the knowledge we have for "man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of poverty and all forms of human life"; of the need to control nuclear weapons "before the dark powers of destruction unleased by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction"; of the need for Americans to "bear the burden of a long twilight struggle—a struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

He acted to ban the testing of nuclear weapons in the face of false accusations of treachery and weakness; to extend basic human rights to all Americans arousing the bias and bigotry of those who seek someone to hate and a scapegoat for their own prejudice and ignorance; to balance the human budget by providing the opportunity for more jobs, better health care, and educational opportunity for all with ability despite bitter criticism from the short sighted.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great man who harbored no little thoughts.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great President whose words and deeds will leave an indelible mark on the scroll of our history.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great American who gave his last mortal breath to preserve the life of his country.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the sad and tragic events of the last few days have seemed like a continuous nightmare to all Christian men and women. All freedom loving people in every land have lost a great and wise champion—a champion who placed service to this land of ours we call America above his own personal health and liberty. Hundreds of thousands of words will be written and spoken about President Kennedy's character and deeds but none will adequately express the profound respect and admiration he enjoyed among those of us who were privileged to know him personally.

One of the most outstanding characteristics of the late President that will always remain in my memory was his eminent courage to act in the face of danger with wisdom, straightforwardness, and logic. Until the very instant a murderer snuffed out his life, this courage shone forth like a knight in armor—bright as a star on a dark night—for all the world to see.

President Kennedy had the physical courage not only to survive the sinking of his ship during World War II, but also to lead his men to safety. This was a man who had the courage to seek the nomination and to be elected to the highest office in any democratic country despite the handicap of his religion. This man we mourn today had the courage to risk his life every time he made a public appearance.

But our late President displayed the greatest courage known to mankind when he looked down the nuclear gun barrel at the Soviet Union and said, "remove your offensive weapons from Cuba or face the terrible consequences which will follow." Very well did he know what the consequences might be but equally well did he understand the meaning of political slavery, lack of intellectual freedom and the dismantling of this Nation's sovereignty. Those of us who have witnessed a nuclear explosion realize what great courage this action required and we hope and pray that no other American will ever be called upon to display this type of courage.

To Mrs. Kennedy, the Kennedy children, and to all of President Kennedy's family, Mrs. Morris and our children wish to extend our deepest sympathy. Let us hope and pray that this tragic experience will awaken our countrymen to a true understanding of tolerance toward our fellow man so that America will regain her composure and find even greater wisdom and strength.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire civilized world has expressed its heartfelt grief at the loss of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. However, I do not think that a more eloquent tribute has been paid his memory than that which I witnessed in the streets of New York City on that terrible November day.

There I saw thousands of New Yorkers, in the streets and on the subway, shocked by the loss which each of them felt so personally. At first they refused to believe and then, believing, they fell silent. People hurrying along the city's sidewalks suddenly walked softly. Jostling subway crowds suddenly became orderly and quiet. Many bowed their heads in silent prayer. Some wept openly and in the eyes of all there were tears.

I cannot hope to match this great tribute paid John F. Kennedy by his people. Neither can I hope to equal the many fine words of eulogy poured forth in his honor, but I would like to express my strong sense of personal loss.

He was my friend long before he was my President and I grieve deeply at his passing.

John F. Kennedy possessed not only dignity and intellect, but great personal warmth, understanding, and wit. I had never seen nor do I expect to see again the combination of zeal, vision, and dedication that he possessed.

John Kennedy captured America's imagination with his dream of the New Frontier and America followed him forward toward that dream. Under his leadership the sprawling giant of American industry surged ahead to greater peacetime heights than it had ever known. The young responded to his call and set out to bring the fruits of democracy to underdeveloped countries around the globe. He stiffened the spine of this mighty Nation and showed the world that America was willing to risk all-out war to fight the encroachment of communism and that this free land was equally willing to lead the world to peace through nuclear disarmament.

John F. Kennedy believed in the dignity of man as the source of national purpose, the liberty of man as the source of national action, the human heart as the source of national compassion, and the mind of the freeman as the best source of invention and intellectual progress.

He translated these beliefs into a strong anti-Communist foreign policy, an effective Defense Establishment, and a domestic program designed to give equality to all Americans, reduce unemployment, educate tomorrow's citizens, combat mental illness, and give old age the dignity it should possess.

To John Kenedy, liberalism was not a party creed or political platform, but an attitude of mind and heart, a faith in man's ability through the experiences of his reason and judgment to increase for himself and for all mankind the amount of freedom and justice and brotherhood which all men deserve.

When we look on the life of John F. Kennedy we see the prophecy—the destiny—in much that he said and did. He told us that this decade would be a hazardous experience, that we would live on the edge of danger. For him the most terrible danger has been realized.

He is gone now. The warmth and the vibrancy are no more and all mankind has lost a brother. However, his dreams live on and the plans he set forth for moving this country forward are still very much alive. The Government stands firm and, thanks to our democratic system, a strong and honorable man has stepped forward to lead.

John Kennedy was particularly fond of a statement made by Abraham Lincoln shortly before the Civil War. Lincoln said:

> I know that there is a God and that he hates injustice. I see the storm coming. But if he has a place and a part for me, I am ready.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was ready to meet the storm of this decade and, indeed, God had a very important place for him.

We sorrow deeply at his passing, but we thank Almighty God that he was here.

**Mr. BARING.** Mr. Speaker, for all decent Americans of all political views, the death of President Kennedy was a tragedy which we will remember all our living days. No matter how much conservatives disagreed with the policies of his administration, which was our right as citizens, we respected the constitutional office of the President, admired the individual who had served his country bravely in wartime, and wished nothing but personal happiness for Mr. Kennedy, his wife, and children.

The tragic way in which the President was removed from his high office was in a manner which no good man or woman in America would ever want or even think could ever happen. Not only was this a dastardly blow at a brave young man, but also a tremendous jolt to our American system. The assassin who fired at President Kennedy fired at our system of government, at our Republic, which is nearest and dearest to the hearts of all Americans.

Moreover, our hearts go out to Mrs. Kennedy and the young children in their deep sorrow and loss.

Mr. Speaker, I remember Jack Kennedy when he was a Member of our body back in 1949 and 1950. We were personal friends. His smile and personality set him off as a leader among men. About a year and a half before he filed for President, he called me over to his Senate office for lunch and on that occasion stated, "WALTER, I am going to run for President. What can you deliver me from Nevada in the way of convention votes"?

While I had read newspaper and magazine articles that his name had been mentioned as a Presidential candidate, I do not believe I had given it complete consideration, but when he so positively put it to me, I liked it, and I told him, "Jack, I will deliver you at least half of the delegation votes from Nevada." This, Mr. Chairman, I was able to do at the Los Angeles convention, and in the election that followed I want to point out that Nevada was one of the Western States which carried President Kennedy to victory.

Personally, being a Jeffersonian States rights Democrat, I differed with President Kennedy on numerous occasions relative to legislation, but we always maintained our personal friendship. His tragic death has so stunned the world that only history will fully reflect the impact of this dark event, and people will always wonder why his life had to be thusly taken.

Mr. Speaker, since President Kennedy's death, I have not been able to think of anything other than the words spoken by a bystander who saw the assassination. I have heard many fine words of oratory today, and I have read many masterpieces of eulogy in the newspapers, but I cannot forget the statement of the bystander who said, "He was looking so happy," as the parade went by, "and then came that awful look." It is a sad time in our history and words are not adequate to express any part of what took place.

**Mr. WICKERSHAM.** Mr. Speaker, may I quote from the words of our late President:

> I call upon all of you to join us in a journey to the new frontier. The voyage is a long and hazardous one, but we are all partners in a great and historic journey.

These were the words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who served his country well.

He was a young President, full of vigor, and his journey to the new frontier had indeed been hazardous. He narrowly missed death in the defense of his country in World War II, again in a serious illness 9 years ago. His dangerous voyage continued through his years as President by his being committed to sweeping civil rights proposals at acknowledged political cost. His historic journey ended November 22 with many accomplishments behind him.

> I want above all else to be a President known—at the end of 4 years—as one who not only prevented war but won the peace—as one of whom history might say: He not only laid the foundations of peace in his time, but for generations to come as well.

These were the words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who served his country well.

He will be remembered for his untiring efforts in working toward world peace. This was his most pressing goal. His actions to thwart the spread of communism in the Vietnam area, his firmness at the Berlin wall and his quick, but firm action to stop the flow of atomic missiles toward Cuba were recognized by all inhabitants of the free world as real acts of courage. His work in this regard, as leader of the free world, earned him the gratitude and praise of people the world over. Millions of persons in other countries mourned his passing as if they too had lost a leader, and indeed they had. History will tell us that John F. Kennedy laid the foundations of peace in his time and for generations to come as well.

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of human rights to which this Nation has always been committed.

These were the words of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who served his country well.

The torch has been passed. The eternal flame stands lighted across the Potomac in Arlington National Cemetery for all to see. John F. Kennedy's death must mean something to us all, or he will have died in vain. The people of the United States now have the torch, it is up to us to make good use of it.

I extend my deepest sympathy to all the members of the late President's family.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, a great man has passed to the great beyond and we who are his friends and admirers find an emptiness in our hearts that can never be filled.

We come today to salute the magnificent effort, the sterling image, that his life, before he was President, and while he was President, presented and which lingers today as a bright star over a horizon filled with the darkness of gloom and distress over the loss of this man; an irreplacable loss to his wonderful family, his legion of friends and admirers, his Nation, and his time.

I find it most difficult to find even one adjective of praise that has not already been applied. In each instance I find most properly, that in describing this man, what he did, what he proposed, the heritage he gave, and the hope he left, only superlatives are used. I have no new word of praise, but I feel no plagiarism in echoing the wonderful tributes which he, and his purposeful life, so richly deserve.

Now I reflect on some of the instances I was privileged to be a part of. When he came to Charlotte, N.C., in 1960, in the midst of the campaign, I was privileged to be present, and on the platform. I saw John Kennedy as the candidate, and having had limited experience in politics, recognized readily the strain, the tired eyes, the baggy trousers, and the tense determination to win. Despite the strain upon him, he was able to smile, he was able to inspire, he impressed that he could lead, and he was most happy that day at the reception in the coliseum at Charlotte.

Later he did honor to my State by visiting Columbia, S.C., and in front of the State Capitol made a magnificent impression before a crowd that waited more than an hour just to see and hear him. The newspapers played down that visit, but if honesty has its place in their records, now, they must admit that he was everything a candidate for President should be on the platform in Columbia that day.

We had known Jack Kennedy in South Carolina before. I am proud to refresh the memory of those assembled here today that he had been given an honorary degree by the University of South Carolina, which is my own alma mater. We had recognized his ability as a historian, as a leader, and his contribution to the constructive analysis of what a statesman should be, and what history should present.

On another occasion, I was at the White House to discuss a matter with him. I apologized for taking the time. I remember his telling me that he always had time for his friends, and he did.

The world is a better place because of his life, not only today, but for the future generations. In death, as in life, he has impressed all of us, and like others who gather in this Chamber today to do him honor, well knowing we can probably never do him justice, I am grateful to a benevolent Master that this man lived and served in my time.

To Mrs. Kennedy and the entire family, Mrs. Hemphill and I express our deepest and continuing sympathy. May they find comfort in reflection of a life truly lived for the betterment of mankind, the promotion of peace, and the improvement of civilization all over the world.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, it was the 80th Congress, the first in which I had the honor to serve, and it was the first Congress in which John Fitzgerald Kennedy served, and it was then when I had the opportunity to know that most promising young man from Massachusetts.

In the course of the years, he successively became U.S. Senator and President of the United States. In all those years there were a number of occasions when I discussed with him matters concerning Puerto Rico. Always I found him interested, understanding, sympathetic.

Twice did he visit Puerto Rico; first, as a Senator and then as President. Twice again I had the honor to greet him in the name of the people of Puerto Rico whom I represent.

He was the President of the United States, and as such he always had the respect of the people of Puerto Rico. But the people of Puerto Rico saw much more in him; they saw a great leader in the battle for freedom for all men and peace for all nations, and they saw a friend, a warm friend, their friend, always willing to help. When the cruel, sorrowful news reached the island, the people went in shock, speech was lost, eyes filled with tears; it seemed as though all life had ceased. The official mourning proclamations were duly issued, the flags were lowered to half-mast, but, even before that, schools and stores had closed, public amusements stopped, radio and television programs canceled, except those giving the sad news. The churches filled to capacity, and this continued for days.

I visited Puerto Rico the day following the funeral services, and the ambient was of profound sorrow and grief and despair, of actual paralysis. There was a general sense of helplessness. There was only one topic of conversation—the great loss, the unbelievable tragedy. President Kennedy had given Puerto Rico full attention and recognition. Now Puerto Rico was expressing, in a heartfelt way, its full recognition of the stature of the beloved President.

In these brief words, for they should be brief, let me express, in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, that to them someone very dear has ceased to be. That they accept the awesome reality because they must, but reality seems to them a nightmare from which they wish to awake, and they dream they will awaken from it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in view of our position in world affairs, the loss of our President is a mournful occasion for the entire free world. When President Eisenhower had a heart attack, the Nation prayed that he be saved and he was; but, President Kennedy's death was so quick and so violent as to add shock to dismay.

At first it seemed that the only thing we had left to be thankful for was that an able and experienced Vice President would firmly grasp the reins of Government; that the same society that produced a Lee Oswald and a Jack Ruby also could produce a John Kennedy and a Lyndon Johnson.

Although President Kennedy had already reached the most powerful office on earth, he was assumed to have more years of service ahead of him than behind him. The sudden calling of such a vigorous and youthful President and the common assumption that he would render great service to the Nation for many years after completing two terms as President, dramatically reminded everyone how transitory life is for all of us and how we are all subject to immediate call.

But even in passing, the President did something no living man has done. His violent death caused almost the entire world to pause collectively long enough to observe where we have been going. Never have so many world leaders assembled at one funeral; never has one man gained such stature and prestige after only 3 years as the leader of a country; and never have so many citizens of all countries of the world mourned and paid tribute to the leading apostle of peace so sincerely that a greater feeling of brotherhood became evident everywhere.

During all of the several occasions when I had the pleasure of talking with or working with John F. Kennedy when he was a Senator and as President, it was most evident that no man was ever more able or willing to serve his nation. It was evident that he lived to serve his fellow man. His deep sense of responsibility and understanding and his intense desire to serve were responsible for the great and good ultimate impact he has left upon the world. We share the deep and profound sorrow of his devoted wife and family and I wish to join my colleagues in extending a deeply felt expression of sympathy to them.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, we meet in one of the most tragic hours of our Nation's history and in one of the most sorrowful moments in the history of the House of Representatives. We meet to pay honor to the memory of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a truly great President who gave his life for his country.

The shock of his assassination was felt not only throughout our Nation, but in every part of the globe. The headlines screaming "President Is Shot Dead" will be forever emblazoned upon our memories. We were a nation stunned, and our first reaction was one of disbelief—we could not believe that such a horrible tragedy could befall our brave, young leader and ourselves.

We are benumbed by grief and millions of people of good will the world over are joining us in our mourning. Many people in the 22d District of New York whom I have the honor to represent have written me expressing their profound sorrow and love for President Kennedy, and I speak for them as well as for myself in offering this eulogy.

President Kennedy in his inaugural address pictured for us the New Frontier and filled us with hope for a better world and with a zest to achieve the goals he set; his enthusiasm, his courage, his strength of character, his love for humanity, his vibrancy, his love of life, all combined to make him the strong and trusted leader whom millions came to admire and love. He thought of all those who needed help—the oppressed, the poverty stricken, the jobless, the youth of our Nation, the sick and elderly, and suggested practicable programs for their benefit. He believed in the dignity and equality of all human beings.

He sought the Presidency, not because he loved power, but because he felt that he could use that power effectively to secure peace and the survival of human beings in the world; peace was always of foremost concern to him.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a highly talented author and historian. He was a brilliant legislator in the House and Senate before becoming our President. He was in the White House not quite 3 years, but in this short span of time he proved himself to be a man of wisdom, great knowledge, and a fearless Chief Executive; he was a reasonable man and sought the solution of local and world problems through reasonable and responsible discussion and action. He earned the trust of other nations, as was evidenced by the large number of heads of state and dignitaries from 92 countries who came to Washington for his funeral and who walked behind his body for the half mile from the White House to St. Matthew's Cathedral. They came to pay honor to a world leader they had come to respect, for they knew he had earnestly sought for peace among all nations.

He was willing to die for his country—he saw heroic service in World War II and at that time his life was miraculously spared. It is cruel beyond words that while on a friendly mission of good will, in peacetime, he was shot down by a murderer filled with unfounded hatred and fanaticism; these evils he had, as President, sought to curb and contain.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy excelled in all the roles his life demanded of him—as the youngest man ever to serve our Nation as its President and ruthlessly struck down before he could accomplish all he set out to do for us, he has nevertheless set the finest examples of good citizenship, tolerance, and responsibility toward our fellow men. We knew him to be a devoted husband and a loving and understanding father.

The dastardly act of the assassin was meant to kill our President; it was also meant to shatter our ideals, our faith in our Nation's institutions and our ability to achieve the true brotherhood of men for which we aim. It has also shocked us into the realization that there is indeed a sickness in this country which must be cured, and this is the job of each and every American. Blinding hate, bigotry, discrimination, malevolence, are undermining our Nation, and if our Nation is to survive, these forces which would destroy us must be overcome and conquered. These forces brought about the death of our beloved President Kennedy; if we earnestly work to rid ourselves and our Nation of such evils and strive toward the kind of nation our martyred President prayed and worked for, then he will not have died in vain.

Many memorials have been suggested to honor President Kennedy. No more precious or beautiful monument could be created for him than the fulfillment of his dreams, his plans, his programs, for the benefit of this country, which he so dearly loved. Passage of the civil rights bill, now, would please him more than any monument of stone. He was a man of purpose and action; he would prefer that we act speedily on those matters which were his chief concern rather than be idle in grief for him.

Our hearts go out to the young widow and the children of our slain President. Mrs. Gilbert, our three children, and I extend to them our deepest sympathy, as well as to all members of the former President's family.

And now, even as we say a sad farewell to our beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it is important that we stand united behind our 36th President of these United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, who has asked our help in the difficult days ahead. We pray that under his able leadership our Nation will achieve that greatness envisioned for us when he made the plea that all Americans "understand and respect one another." And when we do this, we carry out one of President Kennedy's dearest wishes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there are truly no words to describe the loss we have suffered. The death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is a tragic setback not only to the country he loved and served so well, but to the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world.

Sophocles once said, "One must wait until the evening to see how splendid the day has been."

John Kennedy had made a beginning, but he had only begun. He had laid the foundation of a program to make the American ideal a reality, here and wherever freemen are prepared to grasp the torch of liberty, of progress, of equality and self-determination.

His life was cruelly snuffed out before the task could be its own monument to his statesmanship, his courage and his determination. But in this all-too-brief period the Government and the American people had already begun to feel the impact of the man.

American foreign policy had become more aware, more alert and more adaptable. No practical step toward peace was left untaken or unexplored, while a vigilance was maintained and the security of the Nation advanced.

At home a sluggish economy was confronted and challenged. The dread disease of discrimination was attacked, and grudging progress toward final victory was begun.

John Kennedy was a man of courage and compassion, of keen intelligence and decisive action. He understood the world in which he lived, the Nation which he loved, and he gave the full measure of his life in their service—for their security and freedom. He was an American, but he was also a citizen of the world.

No more fitting epitaph could be made for this good man and great President than the one he delivered at his own inauguration—an epitaph which will excite the hearts and minds of Americans for all time to come:

> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

Mr. Speaker, the personal loss which Mrs. Kennedy and the family has suffered is deep and crushing. But the loss is overpoweringly ours as well, for John Kennedy was not only President of the United States, he was part of us all.

So let us dedicate ourselves anew to that for which he lived, and for which he gave his life—peace, understanding, justice, freedom in a free and open society with a will to tolerate diversity and to withstand tension. Let us dedicate ourselves to this "profile in courage" so that his death will not have been in vain.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a man destined for history's immortal stamp was John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a President to be well remembered as long as our Nation lives for the courage, the intelligence, the dignity, grace, and good humor with which he carried the staggering burdens of his office.

How very much our country has lost with his passing.

How much we who knew him will miss him.

How well we all will remember him.

But John Fitzgerald Kennedy's memory will be served poorly if we Americans do not now pledge to strive together, in cooperation and optimism, to find solutions to the wide range of problems confronting our Nation and the world. In his own search for these solutions, President Kennedy personified the American ideal of tolerance and moderation, and it is in this spirit that we must carry on. We may propose and dispose and differ, but can we all resolve to do so in the American way?

Let us not forget that the target of the assassination was not only John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the President, the man, but also was all for which John Fitzgerald Kennedy stood for and which this country must continue to stand; the bullets were aimed also at the institutions of freedom, of democratic government, of justice under law. Let we who hold the responsibility for guiding the Nation's destiny rededicate ourselves to the pursuit of constructive courses to resolve our differences of view, and to do our best to impress upon our fellow citizens the need for respectful understanding of these differences.

Our Constitution was the product of moderation; in its formulation it represented the coming together of ideas as to an establishment of government under which freemen could live out their lives in peace and justice. On the one bleak occasion in American history when the coming-together processes of moderation failed us, and differences remained unreconciled, a bitter and bloody civil war resulted. In the century since, our institutions of government were strengthened along with other phases of our national life, and it seemed to most citizens—until November 22, 1963—that We the People of the United States had formed a more perfect Union, had established justice, had insured domestic tranquility, had provided for the common defense, had promoted the general welfare, had secured the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Our best memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy would be to give our very best efforts toward the fulfillment of these goals expressed in the preamble of the Constitution.

**Mr. WHITENER.** Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound sadness that I join my colleagues today in paying my deep personal respects to the memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The people of the United States and the free world have lost a great leader in the tragic passing of President Kennedy. Although he had been President of the United States for less than 3 years at the time of his death, his services in behalf of the people of his country and in the cause of freedom throughout the world stand as a lasting monument to his memory.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was young in years yet he possessed a maturity of person and a philosophy of government and life that was far beyond a man of his age. He believed strongly in the dignity of man and in the economic and social progress of all mankind.

Our late President was proud of the fact that his Nation was a young country and a world leader. He took pride in our advanced society and in our democratic institutions of Government. Although John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a profound student of history, his face was pointed to the future. He realized that in the future lay the bright hope of his country and the progress of all mankind.

He approached the tasks of his high office with vigor and enthusiasm and with a high sense of dedication to the great mission his country had in the free world. He realized the dangers which threatened our society; yet he was open to conciliation and compromise so long as our vital interests were not threatened. He advanced the cause of peace in the world by constantly seeking new avenues of mutual understanding among nations while at the same time taking strong action where armed aggression threatened the cause of freedom.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed in his soul the humanity of Abraham Lincoln, the intellectual greatness of Woodrow Wilson, and the understanding of human nature so well exemplified by our beloved late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The American people have lost a great leader, and the world has lost a champion of freedom. The ideals of peace, freedom, social and economic progress for all men for which John Fitzgerald Kennedy labored will not be soon forgotten by his grateful countrymen and people throughout the world who looked to him for leadership.

He was a bright light of hope in a world beset with much gloom and despair. He gave to the Presidency of the United States a new meaning. His high office was brought closer to the people, and they responded with love and a sense of deep personal friendship.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead. His soul has gone on to immortality, and his memory has been enshrined forever in the hearts of freedom-loving people.

Master, I've done Thy bidding,
  And the light is low in the West,
And the long, long shift is over;
  Master, I've earned it—Rest.

**Mr. POAGE.** Mr. Speaker, not too many years ago a bushyheaded young man ofttimes occupied a seat on the front row to the Speaker's right. He was a Representative from the State of Massachusetts. He was friendly and intelligent, but few of us who served with him could foresee the height to which he would rise. He moved across the rotunda and took a seat in the U.S. Senate, where it was not long until the whole Nation was recognizing him as an outstanding leader.

In 1956, along with other delegates from Texas at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, I voted for him for Vice President. He was not the nominee, but from that day forward, he was very definitely in the public mind whenever men considered the 1960 presidential race.

In 1960 I felt that Texas offered the Nation its greatest leader. I did all I could to secure the nomination for the man who now occupies the Presidency. I failed, but I knew that we had been defeated by a worthy foeman. We left Los Angeles, knowing that the Democratic Party had an outstanding ticket and those of us who were not successful at the convention realized as never before that the party's candidate was a man of untiring energy, of towering intellect, of integrity, of commonsense, and possessed of the common touch. I was happy to give that candidate my wholehearted support.

In January 1961 John F. Kennedy became the 35th President of the United States. In less than 3 years he made an imprint on our history far surpassing that of many who served the Nation much longer. He became the very tangible symbol of world leadership. But his achievements were not his alone. Fortunately, the Nation and the world recognized that he had the love and the help of a great lady, and the people shared their love and admiration of our President with his wife and his family.

Two weeks ago yesterday President and Mrs. Kennedy flew from Washington to Texas. It was Mrs. Kennedy's first official visit to the State. More than 9 million people joined in extending a sincere welcome to their President and their First Lady. On the next day a warped mind of a Communist renegade planned the assassination of our beloved leader.

Wherever there are people of good will around the world there was grief and despair, and wherever there were Texans, there was deep hurt and humiliation that such a cowardly and cruel thing could have occurred in our State.

Of course, we recognize that great as the loss has been to the Nation and to the world that the keenest and most personal loss was that sustained by his wife, but never in history has there been a more magnificent example of dignity and courage than that of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. To her we all extend our most sincere sympathy, and for her we pray.

The memory of John F. Kennedy will long remain bright throughout our land. We, his friends of many years, can today but add our testimony to his great qualities of leadership character.

**Mr. GONZALEZ.** Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, is dead, a hero and a martyr. Only history can tell the measure of this man, but I believe that he will be judged among the greatest men of our time. Years must pass before the length of his shadow can be known, but I believe it will be a long one. And though he is gone from among us, as long as there is a flaming torch in Arlington his spirit will survive; as long as the hills stand over the valleys, his voice will echo its eloquent and urgent call to duty and service.

The voice and spirit of John F. Kennedy proclaimed for us new goals and new ideals, and it is for us who remain to heed his call and keep our eyes on the horizons he pointed to, and beyond which he has gone. It is for us to see the visions his eyes once saw, and to strive to complete the work he began.

For my part, I can only mourn his loss and vow to live by the light his life has given us.

Such men as John F. Kennedy are all too rare, and it is not easy for our limited visions to compass the measure of him. But before we can see his visions and dream his dreams we must make an effort to know what he stood for and who he was. It is not in my power to plumb the depths of our late President, nor to comprehend what he meant to the world. I can only estimate his measure as a man.

We measure a man in any number of ways, none of which can bespeak true accuracy. But of all the estimates of a man's worth and stature, surely courage is one of the best indicators we have.

There are many kinds of courage, and it can honestly be said that John F. Kennedy was lacking in none of them. For he knew a great deal about courage, having lived through infinite dangers; and he studied courage, having known and studied courageous men.

No man living today can say that he lacked courage in the face of pain and danger to himself. Only courage of an extraordinary kind enabled him to survive and save his fellow seamen from death at the terrible hand of war and in the depths of the lonely sea. And this same courage enabled him to smile in the face of the pain he so often knew as a result of those nights and days of war.

Courage of another kind was required of this young man as a Congressman and Senator. But he knew political courage as few men did; his study of it became one of the great books of our time. Only a man of great courage such as he was could understand it as he did.

History will record John F. Kennedy as a courageous man because of the unflinching calm with which he carried this Nation through the first nuclear confrontation in history. As the world edged toward holocaust during those terrible October days, he did calmly and quickly what had to be done, and won a victory whose dimensions we do not yet realize.

It must take an extraordinary kind of courage to hold the highest office in the land—most powerful in the world—yet John F. Kennedy enjoyed his burden. Not many Presidents in our history reflected the joy and exuberance he did while wrestling with the great problems of our time, and all time—peace, poverty, and all the others.

The courage to survive untold pain and peril, to face unafraid perhaps the most dangerous crisis of all time, to laugh in the face of misfortune, to stand for morality when expediency might have done, and to smile and actually enjoy the crushing burden of the Presidency. This was the courage with which John F. Kennedy lived and by which he must be measured.

Men are measured by standards other than courage, and these are legion. Deeds, words, intellect, capacity, energy, and leadership are all among the things that go into the shadow and substance of a great man.

The deeds of John F. Kennedy were cut short in his most promising time, but the things he did in his lifetime gave him greatness and they foreshadow what might have been. Which of his accomplishments are most meaningful, only time can tell. Perhaps it is enough to say that this, one of our youngest Presidents, proved himself equal to men far older and more experienced than he and proved himself as wise as any. No recitation of what he did in his lifetime is as meaningful as the simple fact that his accomplishments were enough for all mankind to recognize him as a leader of great wisdom and great vision, of wit and resourcefulness, of energy and nerve. Let his tribute be the respect showed him by the world and its leaders, and their weeping when he died.

Great words were also a mark and measure of the man. Few who heard it will ever forget the inaugural address of John F. Kennedy. Thousands of young people responded to his call to duty and service, heeding to the immortal call: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Nor will we ever forget those strong and measured cadences that he urged us forward with throughout his term in office. Even in his last speeches, he called us forward and exhorted us to shoulder the burdens of peace and world leadership.

He was also a man of great intellect and had a deep capacity to understand, as few men do, our world and our times. His glittering intellect and capacity have already become legend, and I will not dwell on it here.

Beyond all this, John F. Kennedy was beloved for his unceasing interest in human beings, young and old, and strived constantly for means to better utilize the human resources of this country. He was a patron of many causes, but above all he was a patron of learning, of scholarship, for he knew that knowledge is the key to man's hopes for survival and advancement. He also knew that a full man must know and respect the past, must master history or be forced to repeat it.

Beyond all else that he was, our late President was a loving husband and father; all America, even the world, shared the love and joy he had in his family. He loved his family enough to warm us all, and we were the better for it.

He was a man of strong courage, of action, of great word, and greater deed.

By any measure, John F. Kennedy was a great man. History will judge him well, and his shadow across the breadth of time will be long.

We must go forward, even with the loss of our beloved President. As we go, we will be guided by the light of his greatness and inspired by the echo of his words.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, so much has been so eloquently said and written that it seems impossible to add further to the national and international expressions of sadness because of the passing of our late President. I should like, however, to express my personal grief and to wish for his brave widow, and the other beloved members of his family, the blessings of divine providence to be with them and to sustain them because of their indescribable loss. I should also like to insert for the RECORD a letter that I wrote to my constituents, entitled "John F. Kennedy—In Memoriam":

JOHN F. KENNEDY—IN MEMORIAM

NOVEMBER 26, 1963.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: With millions of other Americans, my first reaction to the assassination of President Kennedy was one of shocked disbelief. There followed a feeling of indescribable sadness. This vibrant young man, gracious and understanding, invariably cast his shadow on all who knew him. His life—a profile in courage—was so dedicated to the service of his country that he had no time to hate. He accepted the noble challenge so eloquently expressed in his inaugural address when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

One of the last visits your Congressman had with President Kennedy concerned a project in our district. It was then after working hours, about 5:30 p.m., but this leader had time to talk of local affairs because no matter how demanding the task of foreign policy, he wanted to help the American people achieve a more abundant life.

With my wife, Sara, I attended the sad rites at the White House Saturday afternoon, the mournful ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday afternoon, and the melancholy interment in Arlington National Cemetery on Monday afternoon. My most vivid impressions of these heart-rending hours were the unbelievable composure of Mrs. Kennedy, Caroline, and little John; the grief of a million people who were a part of these somber historic events; the tributes from the representatives of 92 other Nations; and the emphasis on the spiritual need of this Nation, so prayerfully expressed by so many.

The Nation mourns the passing of President Kennedy. We cry out, as did Walt Whitman after the assassination of President Lincoln. "I, with mournful tread, walk the deck my captain lies, fallen cold and dead."

The only consolation in this sad hour is the feeling that the Ship of State has a skillful pilot in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson. This dedicated and able American has visited in our district many times. We know him and respect him. The transition of government is now completed. This continuity guaranteed by our Constitution must inspire us all to be worthy of our citizenship.

Let us resolve with the help of Almighty God to give more to our country than we take from it—so that we may deserve the final and full sacrifice made by John F. Kennedy.

Sincerely, your Congressman,
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the ways and means of the Almighty are not for us to question. It is a sad fact that it is most difficult to believe when that belief is most needed. Now is when America and every American needs that belief and faith the most.

It is rather for us to be grateful for the few short years John F. Kennedy was permitted to be among us. It may well be said of him what can be said of few—"He left the world a little better than he found it."

What better epitaph can be written? What better memory can be left?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a black day in the history of our country. The dastardly act removed from our midst a young man of unusual brilliance, one who had attained the highest office in our land at the youngest age of any of his predecessors.

The life of our late President was marked with achievement and success, from his days as a student to his last days as the leader of the American people. In the interim he had distinguished himself as a soldier, author, Representative in the U.S. House of Representatives and later as U.S. Senator. Seldom will this record be equaled, if ever again, in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I often found myself in disagreement with President Kennedy. I opposed much of his policies and programs. But I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that while I frequently disagreed on policy, our disagreement was never personal.

I knew him personally as a Member of this House. He had a remarkable memory for people, particularly his associates in the Congress whom he always warmly addressed by their given names.

While John Fitzgerald Kennedy had achieved great heights in politics, his greatest achievement was as a father and head of a family. He was very devoted to his wife and children. Busy and burdened as he was, he never let the day pass that he did not devote at least a part thereof to the interest of his family and particularly his two small children, Caroline and John.

We regret his passing. We condemn the act which took him away. Indeed such is not the way to protest in a civilized society. It was terrible. It left this entire Nation and the world saddened and terribly shocked.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his remarkable and devoted wife, his lovely children, his mother and father and all members of the family.

**Mr. FORD.** Mr. Speaker, the ignominy at Dallas was a tragedy for the United States and the world. Little can be added to the millions of words that have been spoken and written in expressions of shock, and of sympathy, and of support—of shock that such a crime could take place in our country, of sympathy to the family, and to all of us for whom John F. Kennedy was "Mr. President," and of support to Lyndon Johnson upon whom the responsibilities of the Presidency have fallen.

I first met Jack Kennedy in January 1949 when I came to Congress and was assigned an office across the corridor from his on the third floor of the Old House Office Building. Frequently during the ensuing 4 years we walked and talked together as we went to and from the House Chamber. Although on many fundamental issues we held different viewpoints, I always respected his ability and valued his friendship.

From 1953 to 1960 while Mr. Kennedy served in the Senate I saw him less frequently but whenever we met he was most cordial and congenial. Following his election to the Presidency in 1960 I had several close and intimate contacts with him. In the summer of 1961 during the consideration of the controversial foreign aid authorization bill, Mr. Kennedy asked me to come to his office in the White House for a conference on the legislation. This half-hour session with the President on an important legislative problem will remain one of the highlights of my experiences in the Nation's Capital. For 30 minutes just the two of us talked about his proposal to finance the development loan part of the mutual security program by the "back-door-spending" method. He was friendly and extremely well informed on the technical details of our differences. Although we did not see eye to eye on the controversy, I well remember his fairness and kind consideration of my views. The memory of that discussion in the President's White House office was vivid as we stood before the bier in the East Room on that solemn Saturday afternoon.

In full realization that I vigorously disagreed with President Kennedy on many basic issues of public policy, I did appreciate his friendship and I do commend to all people as a fitting tribute to his memory these words from his eloquent inaugural address:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

As we now proceed to carry on the Nation's business, we do so with a renewed sense of our responsibilities as American citizens. This sentiment was so well expressed in a recent letter on the President's death from a friend in a small Michigan town that I conclude with his statement:

> At this sad time of history, it is our aim to be the best kind of citizens—faithful to God, loving our fellow men, serving our country and defending it to the last by every effort no matter how small, including the education of our two children in the right way.

**Mr. CUNNINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, mere words cannot convey the shock which we all felt when we learned that a madman had shot the President. Inside all of us, all across the Nation, is the memory of this moment when the stunning news was first given us. It was unbelievable then. It still is.

We have taken the President's wife and children to our hearts since that moment. Her strength has given us all the realization that life goes on. And we recall the anguished words of the Senate chaplain, who prayed in those terrible moments when word of the shooting was received but before we knew the bullets had been mortal, "God lives. And the Government at Washington still stands."

As we thus look to the future, we find there have already been appropriate actions taken by men and governments to honor the memory of the late President. More will be considered, some in these halls of Congress in which he served.

Yet I think that he would have been pleased if Congress would take action on several things connected with his tragic death.

For example, had he been seriously injured and disabled but not killed, who would have acted as President while he was still alive but unable to carry out his duties? The speed with which President Johnson was sworn in—a very necessary speed—shows how important it is that someone have the power of the Presidency at all times. Crucial decisions can be made and certain other constitutional duties performed only by the President; yet we have no provisions for Presidential decisions when the President is disabled.

It would be well also to have a thorough investigation of the Oswald type, the leftists and pro-Castro element he represented in our country, to determine just what type of threat they pose. It is essential that all possible information be available so the American people can understand the nature of this radical element in our midst.

There is also much concern over the fact that it is not a Federal crime to assault or kill the President or Vice President, yet it is a Federal crime to kill an FBI agent or Federal marshal, U.S. judge or U.S. attorney, Secret Service agent, or certain employees of the Interior and Agriculture Departments. Many feel that the same provision should be extended to an assault on or assassination of a President or Vice President.

The sentiments in Walt Whitman's "O Captain! My Captain!" in my opinion, express the feelings of this Nation which has lost its leader:

O CAPTAIN! MY CAPTAIN!

O Captain! My Captain! Our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won,
The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting,
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessel grim and daring;
But O heart! heart! heart!
O the bleeding drops of red,
Where on the deck my Captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead.

O Captain! my Captain! rise up and hear the bells;
Rise up—for you the flag is flung—for you the bugle trills,
For you bouquets and ribbon'd wreaths—for you the shores a-crowding,
For you they call, the swaying mass, their eager faces turning;
Here Captain! dear father!
The arm beneath your head!
It is some dream that on the deck,
You've fallen cold and dead.

My Captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still,
My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will,
The ship is anchor'd safe and sound, its voyage closed and done,
From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won:
Exult O shores, and ring O bells!
But I with mournful tread,
Walk the deck my Captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead.

—WALT WHITMAN.

**Mr. DOWDY.** Mr. Speaker, these are sad days in our beloved country. In a troubled world, torn by strife and turmoil, with street demonstrations, riots, sedition, atheism, murder and assassination, we were shocked a few days ago by a Marxist rifle shot—a shot truly heard around the world—which took the life of the President of the United States. The tragedy is such that, even yet, it is hard to believe it really happened.

President Kennedy, in the prime of his life, full of the vigor of which he was so proud, acknowledging the plaudits of crowding throngs, most of whom had never before seen a President in person, was struck down, never knowing what had hit him—dying in the arms of his adoring wife, who, dismayed and distressed, was awed with unreality and unbelief, even as she held close his body, as its spirit returned from whence it had come.

Assassination is all too common in these modern times—in this age which we so proudly call enlightened and civilized. Being prone to disparage such events in other parts of the world, holding to the vain thought that "it cannot happen here," we are abruptly pulled up with horrible proof—it has happened here. Every effort is made to protect the life and limb of the President—yet history has repeated—it is again revealed there is no assurance—no insurance—against the assault of the assassin.

Our country was founded on the principle that our differences be settled by ballots, rather than by bullets and bayonets. The Communist does not hold to that principle. Mr. Kennedy is the victim of the vicious cold war, which has claimed its sacrifices, just as surely as any war we have ever fought.

As our Nation mourns the untimely death of our President, my heart goes out to his little children, and to Mrs. Kennedy. Her grief can only be known to one who has himself suddenly been confronted with the loss of life's companion.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, my family, and the people whom I represent in my part of the State of Washington, I wish to join my colleagues today in this tribute marking the tragic and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy. On this occasion I would first of all convey our heartfelt sorrow and deep sympathy to the late President's wife and children, and particularly to the President's wife, and with this sympathy a tribute, beautifully expressed in these words that appeared in an editorial in one of my newspapers:

> Perhaps the bravest lesson of all comes from Jacqueline Kennedy, whose courage in her ordeal has been beautiful to watch. She has set a noble example for those who pick up the burden from her fallen husband.

There are many facets to the grief that all of us have felt since the terrible day that President Kennedy was assassinated because of senseless action by unreasoning passion. Certainly our grief is based on the untimeliness of this loss—a brave and vigorous young leader struck down while he still had a long and important way to go to fulfill his destiny in American history. But it seems to me that herein lies an important cause for hope, too. Hope that this tragic event will, in the final analysis, inspire all the people of our Nation to unite so that we can provide the most fitting memorial of all to John F. Kennedy. That memorial—a national determination to join the battle against man's inhumanity to man.

May the black day of November 22, 1963, stand as eternal reminder to every American that all wars are inward. That we must fight until we have vanquished within ourselves the intolerances, the prejudices, the hates—all those things that cause us to commit crimes against our fellowman.

Within the reach of each of us is this opportunity to give John Fitzgerald Kennedy the chance to reach his hoped for destiny in history.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in punctuating a chapter in the history in this House and Nation. A chapter that relates the birth, life, and death of a President. John F. Kennedy was that President.

While his Presidential life was short in historic latitude, it has no parallel in historical design. Our memory is not strained to recall the birth of his Presidency by election and inauguration, and many still thrill to the enthusiastic response of the Nation as he accepted the mantle.

There followed in equal magnitude a Presidential service in a character that was commensurate with the vigor, color, and dispatch that was so evident at its birth. A restless Nation and world taxed every resource of decision, action, and future vision.

There was the brightness of sunshine and darkness of storm that strains the vitality and tenacity of a leading Nation in a troubled, confused, and struggling world. To chart its course in these unmapped waters at times defied man's understanding with demands of judgment and comprehension that only providence could properly provide. Yet, under the sharpest fire and stubborn resistance the Presidency must of necessity respond with faith and convincing confidence to a demanding people.

To be so taxed in the youth of a Presidency should by all known standards bear rewards of future sufficiency with time for the glory of recollection. But the historic chapter of John F. Kennedy's Presidency while so well written, has no such consistency, for it was rather to be hastily and brutally ended. The sinful weakness of men even in the atmosphere of divine freedom was to prematurely claim him, his strength, and his faith at the crest of achievement, as if to avenge and yet give credence to the weak and the unfaithful.

While it is not for us to judge or evaluate this destiny in terms of righteousness, it is for us to recognize and take heed that we may be guided by its worldly example. The blemish of the act on humanity, the Nation, and the world will not easily erase, but will fade with a rebuilt character in mankind and its behavior. Such character must be founded on Christian morals and faith emphasizing man's freedom to be thusly guided, rather than directed by his weakness to govern.

May the memory and review of this chapter serve all people to live with respect, faith, and regard for each other in free societies and nations.

Where our attempts to punish and reward may be replaced by forgiveness and the tranquillity of a faith in God; for only then will peace and justice prevail throughout the world. To seek this objective will bring peace to John F. Kennedy's memory.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been a time of shock, unbelief, realization of loss, and finally the grim and impressive ceremonies by which we paid our last respects to the President of the United States.

The death of President John F. Kennedy affected all of us deeply, regardless of political affiliation, for an attack on the President is an attack on our Nation.

The President was killed by a man who did not understand that political issues are not resolved by violence, but are hammered out on the anvil of debate, tempered by understanding and packaged in compromise.

During the entire brief administration of President Kennedy, human rights as they affect the individual overshadowed all other legislative discussion. It seems fitting that the Congress should now recognize that hate, based on matters of race, color, or creed, is not a fit companion of the 20th century, and that we should act quickly in the area of civil rights.

There were qualities in President John F. Kennedy that all of us admired. First, he was a man who was willing, ready, and able to fight for the things in which he believed. Many of us, even some in his own party, often disagreed with him. But Americans love a man who will fight hard for what he believes. President Kennedy showed his respect for men who would stand up for their convictions. He even wrote a book, describing and praising outstanding acts of individualism.

President Kennedy, then, stood for what he believed. It is a lesson for us all.

In his speeches, President Kennedy often spoke of the individual.

In his most famous remark, he told the individual American to ask "not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

This, certainly, is a sentiment to be honored.

On many occasions, President Kennedy showed the Nation and the world that he believed in God.

We can do him honor by remembering that in the tragic hours following his death we turned as a nation to our churches and our God—the only place where we could find understanding and solace.

There is no question but that God and religion and the dignity of man is the very basis of our right to govern ourselves. Let us, as time softens this blow, never confuse separation of church and state with separation of God from this Nation.

We should remember in honor to President Kennedy and to all Americans who died that we might live in freedom under God, that we must ultimately turn for guidance and aid to the Highest Authority of all.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, our Nation and the world were thrown into despair and sadness November 22, 1963, when an assassin's bullet ruthlessly claimed the life of the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

His tragic death has brought about a personal sense of loss to countless millions of people.

Mr. Kennedy had many attributes—an intellect of high order, dedication, a strong desire for public service, and many more. All of these qualities stood him in good stead in his rise to the Presidency. Those who have differed with him on issues and policies nevertheless found him to have an engaging, likable personality. He worked with dedication for those things in which he believed.

I first met Mr. Kennedy, then Senator Kennedy, in the 84th Congress when we both served on a conference committee discussing a measure which eventually became Public Law 84-863. This law embodied one of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission, to modernize Government budgeting and accounting procedures. Mr. Kennedy exhibited a deep interest in legislation of this type.

Above all else, when his life was taken Mr. Kennedy was President of the United States. He was serving each and every one of us. We pay respect here this afternoon to both the man and the high office he held.

As we move forward President Kennedy's memory will live in the hearts and minds of all of us.

**Mr. MILLER** of New York. Mr. Speaker, we who knew him will never forget the warm and youthful vitality of John F. Kennedy, characteristics which earned him the devotion of vast multitudes of his countrymen.

The words spoken here today, like the many tangible memorials which have been, and later will be, dedicated to his name, can never adequately memorialize the profound dismay of the civilized world over President Kennedy's death at the hands of an assassin.

In his brief tenure of the Presidency, John F. Kennedy was confronted by great, surging tides of social change and by national peril of unprecedented gravity, both offering challenges to tax even the most seasoned leaders.

It is for us to join together now and seek the sound and lasting solutions to the problems our late President articulated so well.

**Mr. SPRINGER.** Mr. Speaker, I have been in the House of Representatives for 13 years. Many of you here today have been in this House much longer.

All of us realize that many come and go. There are always a few of whom we become especially fond and miss their going.

I can remember when I first came to the House, John Kennedy had been here 4 years. I can still remember the first day I ever saw him. In the House the two parties were split over an agriculture bill. When the time came for a vote the Republicans stood in a body. At first, as I looked around, there were no Democrats standing. When I looked back again there was just one on his feet. That was John Kennedy. He showed me that day that he was his own man. He was independent enough that when he believed he was right he crossed party lines—even if he were the only member of the party who would. I can still remember a colleague going over to him and joking with him about being the only Democrat to vote with the Republicans. John Kennedy smiled and stood his ground.

In the Senate he often reflected more of this intellectual temperament. It was against his grain to have to be for something just because other people were for it when he thought it was wrong.

When he went to the White House he grew in stature spiritually and intellectually. He was almost a different man this last year than he was on January 20, 1961. He loved to surround himself with people of his same temperament. He had little use for second-raters. He could tolerate mistakes, but they had to be based on some conviction.

In the last year you could see the mellowing process at work and the maturity that came from solving difficult problems. I think it was in this period that he came to be loved and tremendously admired by not only his colleagues in the House and Senate but by people generally.

John Kennedy was a friendly man and by that I do not mean being friendly with the thought that he could influence you. He was friendly because he was that kind of a person.

John Kennedy was a gentle and kind person and I can point to many personal experiences that prove this to me. Although our political philosophies were poles apart I respected him and I am sure he did me. These are the relations which people in the Congress never forget about other Members with whom they have rubbed elbows over a period of many years.

I personally will miss John Kennedy, not only because he was a great man, but also because he was one of the least affected persons that I have ever known. I am not surprised at the popular image which he created throughout the country as a statesman, as a father, and as a husband.

We will miss John Kennedy here in the House of Representatives because for a long time he was a part of this body and when one of us dies a part of this body goes with him.

I am grateful for having known John Kennedy and I am thankful for the contribution that he has made to this House and to the people of this country. Men with his stature and personal charm are just that rare.

**Mr. MEADER.** Mr. Speaker, on the bright, crisp afternoon of November 25, I stood below Lee-Custis Mansion on the hill in Arlington Cemetery and looked toward the Lincoln Memorial across the bridge, waiting for the cortege to appear. I thought—this cannot be real; it must be a horrible dream; in this land of the free, the true and the brave—alert to defend itself—this brutish episode is impossible.

What venom, zeal, efficiency, and planning struck down with a little bullet not only an intelligent, able, personable young American but, at the same time, degraded the highest office in the world—the Presidency of the United States.

A devoted Marxist—refused Soviet citizenship because his fanaticism would be more useful in America than in Russia, where there are already sufficient Communists—pulled the trigger on a $12.78 mail-ordered rifle with telescopic sight—three times and cut down this young man and this Nation—and seriously wounded the chief executive of a proud and independent State.

Why?

What now?

A President assassinated.

All Americans have had the same sensation of sickness at this senseless sharpshooting.

Why? Who?

It is not that this is the first President to be assassinated. It is the fourth. Lincoln was the first.

But was this the individual act of a Marxist madman?

Possibly we will never know the complete accurate truth—even though State and Federal law enforcement agencies, and a Presidential Commission, to be headed by Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren are investigating.

The character of the affair—so incongruous—so insensate—so incomprehensible, evil and malevolent—has rocked and shocked the American ethic and the American mind.

### SHAKESPEARE'S "KING RICHARD THE SECOND," ACT III, SCENE II

KING RICHARD. Of comfort no man speak:
Let's talk of graves, of worms, and epitaphs;
Make dust our paper, and with rainy eyes
Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth;
Let's choose executors and talk of wills:
And yet not so—for what can we bequeath
Save our deposed bodies to the ground?
Our lands, our lives, and all are Bolingbroke's,
And nothing can we call our own but death,
And that small model of the barren earth
Which serves as paste and cover to our bones.
For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings:
How some have been depos'd, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have depos'd,
Some poison'd by their wives, some sleeping kill'd;
All murder'd: for within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court, and there the antick sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp;
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be fear'd, and kill with looks,
Infusing him with self and vain conceit
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable; and humour'd thus
Comes at the last, and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king!

Cover your heads, and mock not flesh and blood

With solemn reverence: throw away respect,
Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty,
For you have but mistook me all this while:
I live with bread like you, feel want,
Taste grief, need friends: subjected thus,
How can you say to me I am a king?

**Mr. ASPINALL.** Mr. Speaker, sorrowfully and prayerfully, I join with my colleagues of the House today in paying a tribute to the life and services of our martyred President, patriot, coworker, and friend, the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Sorrowfully, because I weep with the rest of the world for what has befallen us. Sorrowfully, because of my personal sympathy for the widowed mother and sweet children and the other members of the families who lost their loved one at the hands of a thoughtless and hate-filled monster of the human race. Prayerfully, because the United States of America, which I personally have served and loved for so many years, has shown a side to her body politic which I did not think could be a part of us. Prayerfully, because I earnestly beseech the Almighty that the personal and collective hate which led to the foul deed may be removed from the life of a people whose high resolutions call for liberty, freedom, and justice for all. I weep not for my generation today for it, too, is approaching the brink of the grave and what ideals it has had for a better world are about to go with it into the halls of eternity, but I do weep for the younger generations who follow who have found in our lately fallen President not only those ideals for a better world but a dedication of purpose to activate them in the interest of all members of the human race. Our late President was challenging that divine spark which is most noticeable in the young before it becomes tarnished and dimmed by the earthly cares which beset mankind. That these ideals and encouragement have received the setback that they have is the real tragedy of this hour.

Mr. Speaker, on an occasion such as this, words are so inadequate for the average person to express what is truly and really in his heart. It is not the lips that give the tributes. It is the heart that prompts those who would try to write on the pages of history how they feel about the loss we have suffered. So, like many of my fellow citizens, I stand almost mute before my colleagues in the sadness and despair that has been visited upon us. The pages of eternal history will be filled with the recitation of our late President's deeds and his utterances—his innumerable deeds of unselfish service to his fellow man and his statement of principles so high and noble. There is no need to record them in this ceremony in which we are presently engaged. Others far more qualified than we shall set them down for those who follow after. As for me, I shall be content to say to you that during my remaining waking hours I shall always hear the clarion call of service voiced so eloquently by our fallen leader when in resonant tones he spoke to America:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.

He offered his life many times for his country and he finally gave it. No man can do more. The debt we owe to him and his can never be fully repaid. But in trying to make our country a better Nation for all, we can at least make certain that he and the other martyrs before him have not lived in vain.

Part of his strength came from the understanding, talented, charming and heroic woman with whom he shared his successes, heartaches, and service. Seldom has the world experienced such a heroic and tragic personality. To me, she is the epitome of gracious and true womanhood. To her and their children and the families of each who have been caught in this incredible event of history, Mrs. Aspinall and I send our most sincere and deepest sympathy.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the people of North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District, and on behalf of my family and myself, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is always an occasion for mourning when untimely death removes a colleague or high Government official from a position of responsibility given to him by his fellow citizens. This occasion is all the more sorrowful not only because of the brutal and senseless way in which President Kennedy was murdered but because he was still a young man, energetic and vital, who had every right to anticipate many years of future service to his country.

This fact compounds the tragedy and deepens the sense of grief which has touched the country and the world since the terrible events that transpired on last November 22. President Kennedy was the first man born in this century to have been chosen for the highest office in the land and he was permitted to serve less than 3 full years in the high office to which he was called by his countrymen.

During the relatively brief period that John F. Kennedy was permitted to serve as our 35th President, he had succeeded in making a tremendous impact on the minds of the people of our own country as well as of the world. He had great personal charm which, coupled with a friendly manner, and with a quiet dignity and reserve, endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He had a quick wit that included an ability to poke gentle fun at himself. Added to these qualities was the strength of an active and inquisitive mind. These personal characteristics were easily conveyed to all the people through the modern media of communications. He also made excellent use of the more traditional written word and in this set a standard which will be difficult to match. Throughout President Kennedy's tenure of office he faced problems of transcendent importance to the country and the world. The supreme tragedy of the event we mourn today, aside from the personal loss suffered by his immediate family, was that he was not permitted to live long enough to view in retrospect the completion of the tasks he had begun.

This is a time to remind ourselves and all our people, as well as the people of the world, that although differences of political philosophy divide us we are one in our devotion and dedication to our country; and we are one in our determination to preserve the security of our country and the freedoms we enjoy as American citizens, whatever honest differences we may have about how to insure these goals.

It is a shame that it takes a tragedy of this magnitude to bring home to all of us that we can have but one President at a time and that whoever he may be at the moment all loyal Americans unite with him in his efforts to promote the interests and security of our country and a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Mrs. Jonas joins me in extending deep and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her children and in a prayer that God will comfort them in the days and years that lie ahead.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I pray that never again within my lifetime shall this beloved land be forced to undergo such a convulsion as shook it on Friday, November 22, with the monstrous act which resulted in the death of President John F. Kennedy.

President Kennedy had appealed to the higher motivations in all of us. He sought to move us to actions based on the essential brotherhood of mankind. He asked us to think not of ourselves but of the oppressed, the hungry, the diseased, the poor, and the elderly. To those of us who heard what he said, his life was a sermon, and because all of us are human beings, we all too frequently applauded the words which he gave us without acting upon them.

His death brought to the people of America and to the people of the world first, disbelief, next, shock, then dismay, and now, hopefully, a rededication to those goals and to those high ideals which he so eloquently set forth.

Into my office has poured mail from my district and from friends all over the country and all over the globe. It is perhaps as fitting a testimonial to the universal appeal of President Kennedy that I received this letter from a Protestant minister, the Reverend Herbert Perry, doing missionary work in southern Rhodesia, Africa:

> DEAR OTIS: News of President Kennedy's death reached here less than an hour after it happened (about 10 o'clock last evening, our time). We were of course deeply shocked and moved, while we stayed up listening to the Voice of America through the night.
>
> This morning finds us bleary eyed and shaken, but stanchly proud of our country—and of Kennedy himself, who seemed such a good symbol of all that America really means and stands for.
>
> I think I shall always remember him with respect and gratitude, and with the feeling that we have been deprived of a leader as near to being essential to our future well-being as a nation as any man can be. It can't be denied that there's a note of angry resentment and perplexity in our prayers, but neither can it be denied that there's also a note of gratitude for having been given such a man at such a time. Our prayers also go out the Nation, the Democratic Party, as well as to his family and many friends. But as he knew so well, prayers by themselves are far from adequate to the tasks and challenges facing our Nation and the world today. With something of his energy, zeal, and dedicated action in all of us, our civilization will perhaps become more worthy of such men as he.
>
> Fond regards,
>
> HERB.
>
> NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

This eloquent tribute speaks my own thoughts better than I can say them.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, as we gather here today on this most solemn occasion to pay tribute to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to express our grief and shock over his untimely and tragic death, we are keenly aware that the one to whom these tributes are paid does not belong to the Congress, the Federal Government, or indeed the Nation—he belongs to the ages. The scope and magnitude of the effect of President Kennedy's death on the civilized world is one of the imponderables. The canvas containing the imprint of his life and personality is so broad that it cannot be nationally contained.

As for my own tribute here today, let me say that there are times in the lives of men when through the medium of poetry we can best express the thoughts that lie within our innermost selves. The poem by Walt Whitman, "O Captain! My Captain!" holds for me the deep emotional impact experienced in learning the terrible news of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death:

O Captain! My Captain! Our fearful trip is done.
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won.

The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting,
While follow eyes the steady keel, the vessels grim and daring;
But O my heart! heart! heart!
O the bleeding drops of red,
Where on the deck my Captain lies
Fallen cold and dead.

I am reminded of the concluding words in the message which President Kennedy had designed for that fateful day in Dallas and which he was never to deliver, and how fitting these words were to the personality of the man, who ever looked to Providence for guidance for his personal life and for that of his beloved country:

> Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

Along with my colleagues, I had the sorrowful privilege of attending the final sad rites for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and I observed with a feeling of comforting satisfaction what a noble and magnificent site Mrs. Kennedy and the family had chosen for his last resting place. No more appropriate site in the vicinity of Washington could have been found. As one stands on the gently sloping hillside in the Arlington National Cemetery, the earthly resting place of many of the Nation's heroes, and gazes over the beautiful waters of the Potomac to the Nation's Capitol, the memorials to Lincoln and Jefferson and Washington, the splendid grandeur of the scene grips the throat and heart, and the lines of William Wordsworth come so quickly and so aptly to mind:

Earth has not anything to show more fair:
Dull would he be of soul who could pass by
A sight so touching in its majesty:
This city now doth like a garment wear
The beauty of the morning; silent, bare,
Ships, towers, domes, theaters, and temples lie

Open unto the fields, and to the sky;
All bright and glittering in the smokeless air.
Never did sun more beautifully steep
In his first splendor, valley, rock, or hill;
Ne'er saw I, never felt, a calm so deep!
The river glideth at its own sweet will:
Dear God! the very houses seem asleep;
And all that mighty heart is lying still!

Our hearts, and the collective heart of the Nation and the civilized world, go out to Mrs. Kennedy and her children and to all the Kennedy family, for John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of many parts, and one of his most important and endearing parts was his devotion and his close ties to his family. Mrs. Kennedy has borne her most grievous bereavement with a courage and a nobility worthy of the magnitude of her loss. President Kennedy now lies in a family plot, with his two small children by his side. His widow and his surviving little girl and boy, who are cradled in tenderness in the world's sorrow, may now visit the place where not only a President lies, but where a President lies with his family.

As we recall the charm and the vitality and the intellect and the accomplishments of this man, let us momentarily close the chapter of his interment with Stevenson's moving "Requiem":

Under the wide and starry sky
Dig the grave and let me lie,
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.

This be the verse you grave for me:
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we, as the Representatives of the people, are gathered here today to pay tribute to the young man who was the 35th President of the United States, for the people of the Nation—without regard to race, creed, or political faith—mourn the cruel death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

No mere words of mine can add to the flood of tributes which have poured from full hearts the world over—the hearts of great leaders of great nations but also the hearts of the men and women in the street—since President Kennedy was laid low by bullets senselessly fired by an assassin with a fevered mind.

As is the case with all of us in this House of Representatives in which Jack Kennedy first served as an elected official of this country, I am grieved by his death, angered by its manner, and share in the national shame that a thing such as this could happen in our country.

I am particularly grieved for John Kennedy the man, the husband, and the father. None of us, I am sure, can ever forget the courage and dignity with which his widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, bore her grief and shock from the time of her husband's death until he was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery on a day of majestic sadness. She had more to bear than most of us; she bore her burden better than most of us. I am certain also that none of us will forget the bewildered sorrow of the President's children, who had so obviously adored their daddy—and had been adored by him. My heart goes out to them—as must, I am sure, the hearts of all of us here today, and of all Americans.

I would hope that for their sakes, and for the sake of our President who has been struck down in the summer of his life and in the service of his country, that we in the Congress, and all of the citizenry we represent, will not let this tragedy deter us from our purpose of keeping this great and free Nation, and of maintaining its leadership in its quest for the freedom and dignity of all mankind, and peace and good will on this earth.

I believe that our slain President would want us to do this for the country he served. I do not believe that those of us spared to continue serving it could build a better memorial to John F. Kennedy than to achieve through our actions a better country and a better world.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead and even as we say it with our mouths and hear it with our ears, we cannot truly accept it in our hearts.

Of his death, many words have been spoken and written.

Of his life, each of us holds his own special memories.

Our Republic will be the richer for his service to it and the poorer for his untimely passing.

We grieve with his widow and family but admire their spirit and unflinching courage of which our departed leader displayed his own full measure.

This is a time for looking backward without stopping and moving forward without stumbling. The torch of liberty flickered briefly, but was quickly revived by those who indomitably refuse to let the death of this great man halt the march he led.

There are those who would cast blame upon many people and many concepts for the tragedy which has befallen us. There are those who deplore the weakness of the moral fiber of this proud Nation because this act has occurred.

Let it be remembered that John Fitzgerald Kennedy met his death not at the hands of a rebellious army or mob; not by the action of a massive throng or even a small group; but because of the twisted mind of one unfortunate creature; unable, even, to decide where to place his national allegiance.

All elements of America's citizenry mourned our President's death and the mighty of the world marched behind his widow to his funeral.

He left our Nation as strong as he found it; united, steadfast, free, determined to fulfill its destiny and a little further along the road to lasting peace.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the feeling expressed today by more senior Members—men who served alongside our late President here in Congress, and who therefore feel the loss of a close personal friend. For newer Members such as myself, knowing the man only as President, prevented this same easy personal friendship. The Presidency is indeed a lonely pinnacle.

And yet what an influence the Kennedy leadership has exerted on all of us. It has elevated the whole tone of government.

There was, first of all, the man's mental brilliance. His range of knowledge and clarity of thought shone through every meeting with press or public, and in every official utterance. I have twice watched Mr. Kennedy address great crowds without manuscript, yet with an orderly arrangement of ideas and perfect syntax.

Clarity of thought, in some men, offers no assurance of good works. It was the Nation's good fortune that, in John Kennedy, a brilliant mind was matched by a devotion to public service. Materially blessed by the accident of birth, this man could have chosen the easy life; instead, the story of his career reveals a long series of deliberate choices—choices resolved consistently in favor of exacting study, of hard work, of physical danger, of political risks. He despised the lazy, the mediocre, the satisfied.

Finally—and perhaps most of all—the name Kennedy will remain a synonym for courage. There was the raw personal courage of a PT commander whose craft was smashed in enemy action.

There was the courage required in meeting, head on, the threat of a hostile arms buildup in Cuba. And there were more subtle, in some ways more difficult demands for courage—the courage to face squarely some ancient prejudices built on religion and race. In refusing to flinch before bigotry, John Kennedy may have left his most lasting mark.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the eternal beacon of Arlington will continue to send its glow across the river—that in its light, those of us who were elected under the Kennedy banner, and all who serve in Congress, may be better, more highminded and more courageous men.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, those of us who stood in Arlington National Cemetery on the afternoon of November 25 were deeply moved by two emotions as we watched a family, a nation, and the world's leaders pay their final tribute to President John F. Kennedy.

We felt first a great sorrow that the life of such a lively and youthful national leader should end so cruelly and suddenly. Mr. Kennedy had qualities of greatness. He stimulated the enthusiasms and the imaginations of many of our people as few other American Presidents have ever done. Our hearts go out to Mrs. Kennedy and to their children. They will continue to symbolize the youthful spirit of our lost President.

Our second emotion was one of national pride. Two such incredible and fantastic acts of savagery as America had witnessed might well have sparked a serious outbreak of general violence among a less stable people. While deploring what did happen, we should take some satisfaction in seeing that as a nation our commonsense prevailed and our governmental continuity was carried forward.

It was surely that national strength of continuity together with the spirit of John F. Kennedy, which brought such a great representation of the world's leadership to Arlington National Cemetery that day.

We have lost a President, but we have gained a fresh new understanding of our national purpose. On behalf of the residents of Minnesota's Third Congressional District, and of the members of my family, I extend deepest sympathy to the surviving members of the family of John F. Kennedy.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, since our President was cut down 13 days ago in the cruelty of an attack that shocked the world, this Nation has drunk deeply of its cup of bitter grief and poignant sorrow. Our remorse has been quite moving and very real.

Of course, many of us disagreed with President Kennedy on various subjects. And even now in the sound stability of our individual minds we feel that whatever was unwise or unconstitutional before this dark specter of death cast its shadow over the Capitol is still unwise and unconstitutional. Yet all of us greatly respected the President and unanimously we honor him today with our eulogies. None of us would ever have wished the slightest physical detriment to come upon the leader of our Nation or any of his outstanding family. And we pour out our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and all members of the Kennedy family over their loss and the bitterness of this experience.

One reason I would honor President Kennedy today and forever is because he followed his country's flag in time of war. In the holocaust of a deadly war, some of the scions of very wealthy families do not offer to sacrifice themselves and their careers. But John Kennedy did so and no doubt even went beyond the call of that which was strictly his duty. He was true to the highest traditions of all the patriotic men and women who ever helped America survive in time of armed conflict.

President Kennedy was also a good exemplification of the American family man. He cherished his children and seized every opportunity to enjoy something of a happy homelife with his wife and little ones. And thus he projected himself as a good image of the well-being and success of the family leader here in our country. He will long be remembered for this idealistic conception he presented before the face of the Nation.

And now John Kennedy has gone through the valley of the shadow of this life and has ascended the sloping hillside up to that topmost height where life lets go and life at last is born. There he should find all the dreams that he ever lost on toilsome earth. And those, we feel, will be good dreams out there in the continuity of eternity.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, in all probability John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be one of the most widely quoted of our past Presidents in the speeches that will be delivered in America in the next 100 years. This is because a man with his rare combination of talents only comes along once every 100 years.

I first met Senator John F. Kennedy at Boise, Idaho, in 1958. I had the opportunity to renew our acquaintance in September of 1960 at Pocatello, Idaho, when he was seeking the Presidency and I was a candidate for Congress from the Second District of Idaho. I had the pleasure to visit with Senator Kennedy on political issues and the progress of our campaigns.

I was so impressed that the night before the election after I had invested several thousand dollars and many months of hard work in my own campaign for Congress, I told my wife that, "If only one of us can win tomorrow, I hope that it will be John F. Kennedy because the country needs his leadership." I was fully convinced that this great American had been blessed with those "once in a hundred years" qualities of leadership.

He had a great sense of humor. I now can remember both privately and publicly many of the remarks of our late President that enlightened the burdens that his listeners were carrying. Never anything vulgar or smutty, but always light and refreshing.

He was a powerful reader. His rapid reading rate of over 2,000 words per minute and 99 percent comprehension filled a mind that was constantly questing for knowledge. It enabled him to keep up with the experts on the many complex problems of national defense, international relations, and domestic prosperity.

He loved people. President Kennedy was the gregarious, outgoing type. He could not get off an airplane or go through a crowd without responding to the friendly persuasion that led him to shake hands, nod, speak to and show an instant interest in a person who was a complete stranger. It was this love of people, an outward friendliness, that enabled him to win in a West Virginia primary that had many of his stanchest supporters convinced that he would never win.

He had an enthusiasm for work. President Kennedy was a young man, eager, anticipating, vibrant, and enthusiastic. He was alive. To a nation that was used to Presidents in their sixties, this young President in his midforties provided a picture of activity, bounce, and movement. He stimulated others around him to respond to the challenges of the offices that they held.

He exuded confidence. While the President was youthful and energetic there was something about his personality that gave everyone an assurance that he could handle the job. All was well as long as he was at the helm. Even though he was lighthearted and gay, on occasions when toughness, determination, and resolution were needed, he showed that he had these characteristics in ample quantities. Whether he had to face Khrushchev over missiles in Cuba, the big steel companies over increased steel prices, and a hike in inflation, the labor leaders who were insisting on a cut in the 40-hour workweek, Jack Kennedy was able to meet their challenges with an air of confidence that enabled him to emerge the winner.

He was truly a man that comes along only every 100 years. I look back now on the many little experiences I have had at the White House, the stag parties in the House gymnasium, his addresses to the Congress, and two chance encounters at the funeral of our late Speaker Sam Rayburn in Texas and recently on the back lawn of the White House when the President broke away from his intended course to walk out of his way, shake hands, and visit briefly with me.

I am exceedingly grateful for this friendship that I have enjoyed with one of God's choicest sons and of America's greatest leaders. I am grateful also that I have been one of his stanchest supporters in the Congress, not only because I was supporting a program that was preserving the peace and moving the Nation progressively toward increased prosperity, but also because it was the program of a great President.

We are all going to miss our late President John F. Kennedy, but the greatest way that we can assure our appreciation for the life of this great man is by rededicating ourselves to the ideals in which he believed—a strong America with equal rights and opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, creed, or color. By following his exhortation,

**"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," with meaningful action we too make John F. Kennedy's ideals our ideals.**

**Mr. Speaker, the following are some of the many outstanding tributes that were paid to our late great President in the newspapers of Idaho:**

[From the Blackfoot (Idaho) News, Nov. 26, 1963]

### HE GOT THE COUNTRY MOVING

The bewildering shock felt by citizens in all walks of life following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy has been shared by the writers and news commentators of the Nation. Even those who knew him well have appeared muted and dumb.

Perhaps the terrible exhibition that proved an anarchist with a twisted and perverted mind can strike through the most careful protection given the Captain of the Nation has been a greater shock than can immediately be understood or borne.

A man whom most of the people of the Nation had come to look on as the guardian of our rights and our peace and as a great and good man has been stricken dead.

It is frightening to think that any one of our citizenry, given the proper twisted mentality, has such power to strike a blow at the entire Nation by striking down its chosen representative.

As we have taken counsel of our fears we have become introspective. What is it in our national character that permits the growth side by side of the highest idealism ever to find fruit in a national culture, and beside it the radicalism and hatred that more often than in any other land kills our greatest chosen leaders?

God save America, and save us from our hatreds. As we ponder the meaning of the death of John F. Kennedy we have all wondered what is in our own hearts that makes possible the horrible and frightful in our national life.

Many men of abilities with words will try to tell what the life and example of John F. Kennedy meant to the United States and to the world. Each of us would like to speak an expression of gratitude. Poorly expressed though it may be I should like to add a word of appreciation for what I think he has done for our country.

Prior to the year 1960 he was to me simply a young eastern politician with an enthusiastic local following. As a member of the opposite political party, there was considerable indifference toward his effort to achieve the nomination of his party for the highest office of the land.

It is well to remember the context of the times. To me it seemed the most important task was the preservation of peace in the world. At the helm was President Eisenhower, perhaps not a great President, but a good man who appeared to be approaching greatness by his determination to let his heart rule in assuming the road to international conciliation.

Alarm grew as it became apparent that elements in this country were as willing to prevent the approach to conciliation as were some of our opponents. Then came the culmination of reaction with the sickening U-2 affair; its clumsy handling by the men around President Eisenhower and the apparent blasting of further efforts toward conciliation.

The voice of the then Senator Kennedy gave evidence that hope might yet remain. Here was a man to be watched.

During the infighting prior to the Democratic National Convention, the man Kennedy appeared blurred by his political organization that was awesome in its efficiency. But with the nomination secured, John F. Kennedy emerged to speak hope, courage, and good cheer with his promise to get the country moving again.

There was one small incident in the campaign that brought home to me the fact that Kennedy was the man the Nation needed.

In the course of the fall of 1960, the Reverend Martin Luther King, the great civil rights crusader, was taken into custody in a city of Georgia. Circumstances surrounding the case indicated that his life might be endangered, as the life of any outspoken Negro is in danger in some sections of the United States.

Senator John F. Kennedy called Mrs. King offering her assurance that he would do all in his power to insure the safety of her husband; then called the Governor of Georgia to point out to him that the Nation's eyes were upon the State.

Some chose to call that an act of political expediency.

As one who is proud that the blood of abolitionist forebears runs in his veins and who has revered Abraham Lincoln as the statesman of modern history who cared most for the common man, I thrilled to a man with political courage who reacted from the heart in a case where more votes were likely to be lost rather than gained.

(Do you remember his message to the Nation the night of the riot on the campus of the University of Mississippi? And the reaction later reported by its central figure, James Meredith, the object of unlimited hatred and scorn, who for the first time in his life felt the majesty of the power of the United States on the side of a Negro, and who thrilled to the words "Mr. Meredith" from the lips of the President.)

I consider it fortunate that on two occasions it was possible to meet in rather small groups with John F. Kennedy. The first was at the press conference in Pocatello held in connection with one of the first political speeches of his campaign of 1960. The other was in company with a small group of Idaho newspaper publishers invited to dinner with him at the White House.

At the first I was impressed with his youthfulness; his idealism; his utter honesty. ("What is Burns Creek? I've never heard of it.")

At the latter I was impressed by his growth in 2 years; by the easy manner in which he carried the burdens of his office; by his grasp of the situation; by his utter frankness in answering any question; by the fact that he did not hesitate or say that anything was off the record. (The plea for discretion came later from Pierre Salinger.)

Such affairs are valuable perhaps in the process of confirming or reversing opinions formerly held. From both I emerged confident that the man who had been the center of all eyes was worthy: in the first case of a chance to assume the burden of the Presidency; in the second that he was doing a good job.

In the 2 years and 10 months that John F. Kennedy was President of the United States I felt that the peace of the world was secure in his hands because I felt sure he thought the thoughts of the average man and woman much better than they could think or express them.

As a Protestant, proud of much of the heritage of the Reformation, I am grateful to him for a demonstration of the unity of our common Christian heritage.

As a citizen of the United States I proudly claim that he fulfilled his promise to get the country moving again. He has pointed the direction of humanity, of brotherhood, of decency. The country has started moving along those lines.

It will move faster because of his martyrdom. I believe this devoutly and can see no other explanation of the meaning of his death.

---

[From the Idaho Falls Post Register]

### THE UNSPEAKABLE LOSS

The President dead. No one could believe it at first. But as the wire services haltingly unraveled the shocking assassination of President Kennedy Friday, incredulity slowly turned to revulsion.

Who would do such a thing? Why?

In the fevered brain of an assassin, reason has long since been assassinated itself—killed by the worst malignancy of the human race, extremism. In this emotional myopia, weird causes are justified, might makes right, the end justifies the means, and hatred is purified. And tragically, in this mental blur, the assassin often conceives himself a patriot of some kind.

Extremism is the total antithesis to this Nation's grand covenant, a nation under law. Within the scope of the law, you may criticize the President or castigate his programs, and maneuver for his and their defeat. But, all within the pale of the law.

In Dallas, Tex., Friday, November 22, 1963, an ugly symbol of extremism in effect proclaimed—I am the only right; there is no law but mine and the gun.

It may turn out to be a most isolated symbol—but just as ugly.

This incredibly inhumane thing which happened in Dallas Friday can never be explained. No explanation suffices. This young, vigorous, and impressively intelligent leader was silenced at the very pinnacle of his thrust for an always emerging America. He was a President who could stir his followers, excite them to dreams of new frontiers.

President Kennedy had an unusual warmth, unusual courage, and patriotism. People who disagreed strenuously with him as President, admired him as a man as well as a leader.

Only two impulses survive in the forlornly bleak aftermath—one of inexpressible sympathy for the Kennedy family, especially Mrs. Kennedy, and a prayer for our new President.

A strange, stifling hush settles over the land as the Republic makes its transition sadly but firmly to a new leadership. New frontiers, challenged so aggressively by President Kennedy, await a new matching in America.

Certainly Friday, November 22, was a black day in the history of this Nation and the world.

---

[From the Rigby Star]

### HERE AND THERE

(By Hope)

America hung its head in grief and shame Friday after an assassin's bullet in Dallas, Tex., took the life of President John F. Kennedy.

"Brutal, despicable, unbelievable, incredible," were the general reactions of the mass of American people as they rallied from the first shock of the news. Whatever their politics, their religion, their station in life, they were shocked and saddened, for this was not only the death of the President of the United States, but of a husband, father, son, and brother, an American who had served his country from the war in the South Pacific until the moment of his death. And his death came through an assassin's bullet, a fanatic, who had forsworn allegiance to this Nation.

There are very few who are not genuinely grieved that this young, intelligent, and energetic President was felled while on a mission of good will and friendliness. Unlike the three other Presidents of the United

States who were assassinated, President Kennedy is said to have died immediately—the others lingered on for a time.

If, out of the tragic death of President Kennedy, the people may learn that hate is a cancer upon the heart of the human family; that unless we as a people and a nation become more appreciative, more loyal, more dedicated to upholding the ideals of this country, we are going to fail. Moral degeneration can and will set in.

Fifty-three nations, including kings and queens, came to pay homage to our martyred President, a day of national mourning was set aside that we Americans could revalue our aims and purposes in life. Now we are in a 30-day period of mourning for President Kennedy and the world in retrospect will see the picture of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, her magnificent courage and dignity during the days just past.

I asked a Rigby high school senior his reactions: "I just couldn't believe that it could happen in America, we were stunned." It has happened here. Let's take stock of ourselves.

---

[From the Rexburg (Idaho) Standard, Nov. 26, 1963]

### To Honor His Memory

When a leader of great power and presence and capacity for good dies in office, the cause to which he gave leadership suffers grievous loss. President John F. Kennedy was such a man. The cause he served, and so eloquently led, was the threefold cause of human dignity and equality and freedom.

Though President Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded.

Guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysburg almost exactly a century ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to reflect on Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the initial period of outraged shock at the murderous act in Dallas. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of heedless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams remain strong and malignant. Those forces must now be countered with new dedication, so that President Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain.

The heaviest burden falls upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who became President the moment John F. Kennedy succumbed to the assassin's bullets. But all citizens must in some measure share that burden. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the American people: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." It is a commitment, and a challenge worthy of the best that is in all of us.

---

[From the Arco (Idaho) Advertiser, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Apology to a President

The cruel and senseless murder of President Kennedy shocked the world, and well it should have. To those of us in Butte County the news was heard in shocked disbelief, and then accepted in numbing grief.

Our President is dead, and forever it must be.

With acceptance of death came compassion for his widow and the two children who will grow up with only vague memories of the great man who was their father. And we selfishly wonder what the sudden changes in the Nation's leadership will mean to us.

Our President is dead, but his high ideals, his compassion for mankind the world over live on. Many of us were critical of the office and for this there is no shame. Sometimes in pettiness we heaped bitter scorn upon the man, and we would have those words unspoken.

It is a judgment against us that this man had to die to bring out much of the decency in mankind. It may be hoped that this tragedy may enlarge the desire in all people to unite in a world free from hatred and bigotry and greed. That we may now realize and put aside the petty differences and unite to carry on John Fitzgerald Kennedy's hopes of a world of freedom, equality, and love.

We have the power. May God grant us the will.

---

[From the Owyhee Chronicle]

### Mankind Walks a Narrow Ledge

The tragedy which deprived America of its President should awaken all to the shocking price of fanaticism and hate-filled thinking and arouse in each of us a reevaluation.

The late President Kennedy often reiterated "mankind walks a narrow ledge." Never before have Americans walked a narrower ledge than we walk today. Never before have we faced a more compelling need to erase this mesmerism of hate which turns race against race, brother against brother, culminating in this tragic event.

The savage irony is that President Kennedy, who had buoyant faith in reason and was an advocate of rational discourse, was cut down by the very fanaticism that as President he sought to contain.

But his death will not be in vain if it becomes the turning point toward a rational approach to the solution of today's crucial issues—if it has shocked us back from the brink of the ledge.

---

[From the Idaho Statesman]

### Our Leader Has Fallen

Profound shock and deep and bitter sorrow occasioned by the enormously tragic death of President John F. Kennedy must inevitably be shared by every rightminded individual.

In the gloom that is spread over the Nation and the world, philosophical and political difference in which he was inevitably involved pale now into insignificance as all of us are united in a common grief.

It is a moment in which attention is focused upon John F. Kennedy as an individual of high ideals, of dedication and of courage.

A product of his times, John F. Kennedy was called to national leadership in a period of widely prevailing uncertainty and perhaps of epochal transition involving the clash of strongly conflicting forces. He has fulfilled his part stoutly, conscientiously and fairly.

It has been his prime purpose to minimize the conflict and to do all within his power to make this country and the world a better place for all mankind to live.

It is perhaps that as an outstanding humanitarian his memory will be enshrined. He has been quick to respond to the appeal of human wants and needs. In his book it is the proper function of Government to provide the remedy, and he has not hesitated to call upon the resources of Government to that end.

In reference to the phrase that sounded like a clarion in his inaugural address, John F. Kennedy never asked what the country could give him personally; instead it has been he who has given his country and the world the last full measure of devotion.

So our leader has fallen, victim of one who could not have been other than a demented and tortured assassin. So in the tradition of nations we now must rally around a new leader and press forward toward the achievement of our national destiny.

---

[From the Idaho Sunday Journal, Nov. 24, 1963]

### Assassin's Bullet Takes a Courageous Leader

The hopes and fears of 180 million Americans center upon the Presidency of the United States with a white heat. Controversy and conflict is a part of the intense pressures upon the solitary man who bears the burden of that exalted office. Love, and hate, too, focus there. We know now, with stunned bewilderment, that one warped mind can rob our Nation and the world of its elected leader in an instant. We are reminded "In the midst of life, we are in death."

John F. Kennedy, the man, was a young, vital, courageous leader, wise beyond his years, a loving husband and father. The human tragedy of the swift and ugly assassination shames the Nation, and, in fact, the human race.

Youth and charm and grace characterized the Kennedy family in the White House. They were a part of American life, not aloof from it.

Youngest of our Presidents, John F. Kennedy fought for peace with justice, for true equality of human and civil rights. What history's verdict may be, we cannot foresee. But as a person, he embodied qualities which attracted admiration of millions, the envy and hate of few.

His lovely and gracious wife, his charming children, are bereft, and the heartfelt sympathy of all reaches futilely out to them.

Profound changes no one can foresee were set in motion by the deadly aim of the assassin.

But the headlong pace of history waits not. Lyndon B. Johnson is now our President. Even in the hour of his grief, the weight of office begins its unremitting pressures.

We can be thankful for the enduring structure of our Government that does not falter or fail under the stress of change and grief.

We can be thankful that President Johnson is as well prepared as any man can be to assume the mantle of leadership. He has courage and strength, experience and faith.

We can pray for the unhappy family President Kennedy was forced to leave. We can pray for God's help which President Johnson besought in taking the oath of office. In doing so, we pray for the world and for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues and the above representatives of the Idaho press in paying tribute to our late and great President John F. Kennedy.

On behalf of all of the people of Idaho, I want to express our sympathy to his beloved and courageous wife and companion. Her courage and bravery have been eloquently described in the following editorial:

[From the Gooding (Idaho) Leader, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Our Nation Goes On—A Woman's Courage

(By Herb Love)

Among the tragic events of the past few days one fact has become more and more apparent—the courage of Jacqueline Kennedy. Perhaps one in a million could see her husband shot at her side, hold his bleeding body in her arms, accompany him to the hospital and then home to Washington and attend all the last services of that husband without evidence of tears or hysteria.

Those who viewed the scenes as eyewitnesses or by television have marveled at her incredible composure and at her iron control of her emotions and actions.

Her bloodstained dress that she wore through those first long hours might well be preserved as a symbol of the bravery of an American woman.

She has been an exceptional First Lady, serving the United States well in securing the friendship of other nations. Her education and training and personality helped her husband, the President, in many ways.

Her courage will long be remembered. She has gained the love and respect of all Americans.

To this lovely lady, Jacqueline, their two children, Caroline and John, Jr., his wonderful parents and outstanding and talented brothers and sisters, I offer the sympathy, condolence, love, and prayers of the people of Idaho.

**Mr. EDMONDSON.** Mr. Speaker, we meet today to honor one of the noblest Americans of our Nation's history, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

As 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy had to contend with some of the most terrible challenges and dangers our Republic has known. The nature and gravity of those Presidential burdens are known in part to all of us, but I doubt if any man who has not held our Nation's most exalted office can fully appreciate them.

For me, the greatest quality of our country's 35th President was his courage.

In a time which sorely tried the soul and spirit of every thoughtful man, John Fitzgerald Kennedy faced danger and conflict with high courage and true gallantry.

The quality of bravery which he exemplified as a Navy lieutenant in World War II served the Nation well in the years of John F. Kennedy's service as President.

During this brief but memorable period our Nation and the world stood at the precipice of thermonuclear war, and saw many parts of the world torn and divided by strife and revolution.

The calm, determined courage with which President Kennedy faced and dealt with these crises will be an enduring inspiration to every American, just as I am sure his brave example inspired our late President's gallant widow in the trying days which have followed the tragedy of November 22.

To the family of our late President, and especially to his fine children and their brave mother, I join my colleagues today in this expression of deepest sympathy.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote several lines from the poem by David Randolph Milsten, written in tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

The world will know and long remember
That peace was his constant goal,
Surely for such an illustrious son
There is an immortal role.

If prayer can be the passport
To the presence of Almighty's grace
The whole universe has joined to
See him safely to his place.

Dear God, his soul is yours forever
He has come to you without despair
And we pray that what he sought
Will be waiting for him there.

**Mr. YOUNG.** Mr. Speaker, in this hour of great national sorrow, I take this opportunity and time to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late, beloved, and respected President, John F. Kennedy—the latest martyr in the cause of freedom. Our sorrow is, of course, exceeded by the pride and respect that we hold for this great American. Few men in history, at his age, have left such an impress on the times or such a mark of leadership and courage as a matter of course in his everyday existence. In his everyday life, John Kennedy displayed such a purity of purpose that his very nature seemed to exclude any consideration of fear or uncertainty. The fortitude that brought him through the greatest war of all time characterized his conduct of the greatest office of all time—the Presidency of the United States.

In this day of labels, many were applied to the President, but no label, save that of "American," was properly applicable. Liberal, conservative, or moderate—whatever the issue—if the matter was of consequence to the Nation, one could always be sure that President Kennedy would do whatever to him appeared to be in the best interest of the country.

We sorrow in his passing, Mr. Speaker, but his legacy of courage and love of country will always be with us.

**Mr. HAGAN of Georgia.** Mr. Speaker, I still find it hard to realize that John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead. November 22 and the days since—just as the life and activities of John F. Kennedy—will long live in the minds of citizens in the First District of Georgia as well as other parts of the Nation and the world.

Some of the most eloquent tributes to our late President have come from the pens of citizens in the district which I am privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States.

I include a few of the many editorials which have been published in connection with this tragic event in our Nation's history:

[From the Savannah Morning News, Savannah, Ga., Nov. 23, 1963]

### John F. Kennedy

To a country which he served both in bloody war and in uneasy peace, as a young Navy lieutenant, as a Member of Congress, and then as President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave the full measure of his devotion.

When he was slain yesterday by an assassin's bullet, the 35th President of the United States was 46 years old. He had not completed his first term in office, and he had much more to give to his country and to his fellow Americans. His loss is a national tragedy which words are too flimsy to describe.

Our Nation is outraged by the evil which was committed on Friday, November 22, and which will live forever in our memories. We are shocked, grief stricken. We bow our heads in mourning and in prayer for our slain leader's family, and we ask ourselves, "How could this happen here?"

But it has happened, and the grieving Nation must also pray for the man who has succeeded to the Presidency with all its awesome responsibilities and travail.

The grave tasks to which John F. Kennedy dedicated himself now rest in the hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who will need the strength and support of a united nation to help him carry on.

That John F. Kennedy should have died in such a manner, that a President of this country should be the victim of such a crime, is the greatest tragedy of all. But Mr. Kennedy was a man of courage who had risked his life more than once in the performance of his duties, and we recall the moving words he spoke in his inaugural address: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

No man could do more than to lay down God's greatest gift, life, in his nation's service. So it was with John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

---

[From the Savannah Evening Press, Nov. 23, 1963]

### John Fitzgerald Kennedy

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, the youngest man ever elected to the Nation's highest responsibility, is dead from an assassin's bullet.

Many Americans still find it difficult to accept the awesome truth of what has happened. Yesterday morning he was the vital leader around whom the course of national and world events revolved. Today he is dead and Lyndon Baines Johnson is President.

The enormity of events that have taken place in the last few hours is so vast that words are incapable of encompassing its significance. The full implications cannot even be guessed at this time.

Perhaps President Johnson's simple eloquence, stemming from his personal grief and profound understanding of the responsibility that had suddenly and unexpectedly been placed upon his shoulders, is all that can be said at this time: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's personal popularity was something the poll takers and analysts had tried in vain to chart. That his presence struck a responsive chord in millions of Americans is undeniable. He was an embodiment of mid-20th century generations now in charge of the destiny of this Nation, and as such he was a symbol of hope for new conditions which are still evolving and which are yet to be fully comprehended.

Whatever reservations and doubts there may have been about President Kennedy's specific proposals for meeting the challenges of our times, there was an implicit appreciation of his willingness to live in the present and look toward the future. He saw the second half of our century as offering a "New Frontier" for American aspirations, and political sloganism aside, it was a phrase that captured the imagination of a nation born in a pioneering spirit of freedom and individual opportunity.

Every American today is searching himself for the full implications of the tragedy played out on the crowded streets of Dallas, Tex., early in the afternoon of November 22,

1963. There will never be a way to understand the motives of the man who pulled the trigger, the confused thoughts which led him to take the life of a young and vibrant leader of the people of the United States, a man whose career has already affected the course of world history and which contained resources for future effectiveness in man's quest for peace and security that will now never be known.

A burning new page of American history was written in the confusion and numbing shock of yesterday's swift events, and now all a saddened America can do is to turn toward the future.

Parties and politics, policies and programs have been set aside to pledge President Lyndon Johnson the support and assistance he will need in bridging the abyss which opened up so suddenly before him. America has always responded to such challenges with a strength and unity of purpose that has continually confounded those who fail to understand our way of life. The American people will do so again. The world will once again be witness to the elements of greatness that have made America what it is.

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

So said John F. Kennedy on the day he took office as President of the United States. His words have a significance on this day after his tragic death which every fellow American will heed.

---

[From the Bulloch Herald and Bulloch Times, Statesboro, Ga., Nov. 28, 1963]

### THE GREATNESS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY EMERGES IN DEATH BEFORE THE EYES OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

Because a madman chose Friday, November 22, to kill John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the President of the United States, the man who in life created currents of controversy wherever he moved, now in death emerges as a man who has attained a cohesive influence over the American people. The Nation with its attention focused on TV screens saw this emergence as thousands and thousands of people let their prejudices and animosities go with the wind as they grieved, not just for the President of the United States, but for a man, for a woman, for a family.

We may know, as we do, that among so many people as there were on the streets and the city of Dallas that day, there will always be one who will erupt in violence; that is why, even in an orderly and peaceful society, we must make provisions to protect the President from men of twisted minds and convictions. Nonetheless, it is an event we guard against in disbelief that it will happen; indeed, it was this disbelief, shared by the President himself, that helped let it happen.

All the more, then, when it does happen, we stand in sudden shock not only before the death of a man but before the blow that assassination itself strikes at the very roots of our ways. That it should happen in our country above all others, seems to leave us naked before ourselves as well as our enemies.

Thus it is that now the people mourn for a man and for the Nation.

It is agreed that Mr. Kennedy was a man of force and direction. There was greatness in him that many refused to concede because their prejudices and strong feelings colored their appraisal of him. To call upon a tired cliche, "You may not have agreed with him but you had to respect him," was a widespread acceptance of him and his ideals.

John F. Kennedy was convinced that his political course was the right and best one for his country. Right or wrong, he was a man who put his convictions into action. And it now would seem that the future might prove him more right than wrong.

It is our sincere conviction that John F. Kennedy was a great man, and we share with the millions of Americans who were drawn together by the shock of his death, their grief, and sense of loss.

And we draw comfort with a bereaved people from what came afterward.

Surely and swiftly the institutions of an ordered society moved to fulfill their functions. At once the American people had a new President, and without a tremor all the vast machinery of Government moved under a new hand. Through all the change it was done with hardly a conscious thought of what a miracle it was.

Lyndon Johnson became President and brings to the office a love of country, a deep sense of responsibility, and an instinct for the reconciliation of views that sometimes divide us. He brings to the office long political experience gained in the House of Representatives and in the Senate and as Vice President. He was prepared for just this tradition.

And shining through it all was a lady who but a few hours before had cradled her husband's head in her hands. Instinctively she came to stand in public beside the new President of the United States while he took the oath of office. Her courage in so doing did honor to herself, her husband, and her country.

Such then are the ways our Nation moves forward after tragedy. Men pass and are mourned, but they leave behind them that which abides. This is the way, we think, that John F. Kennedy would have had it be.

The President is dead. Long live the President.

---

[From the True Citizen, Waynesboro, Ga., Nov. 27, 1963]

### A TIME FOR GRIEF, A TIME FOR PRIDE

(By Wilkes Williams)

A thousand men die in a mining accident and some people in the world take note. One man dies and the entire world is shocked, bewildered, bereaved and saddened. Never in history has one single event so moved the human race as this assassination of an American President.

This is the result of what one young man has done with his life. This man John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as leader of the greatest nation on earth, held out to the people of the world the hand of friendship. He represented a beacon of light in a dark sea, the messenger of freedom, the hope that sustains life.

He traveled the world over to show oppressed people everywhere the warmth and sincerity of the nation that produced him. He looked into friendly and unfriendly faces of many nationalities thousands of miles from home and told them of the peace-loving, law-abiding people he represented.

He told of his nation's heritage, the individuality of his people, their love of God, country and freedom, and of their generosity. He spoke with a sense of pride and never a note of shame.

He told of the unique system by which they govern themselves. And in all these things he told the truth.

If then, he did tell the truth, that his people are God-fearing, peace-loving people, why is this great American dead * * * assassinated in the heart of his own country?

Now, and in the months ahead, literally thousands of reasons, factors, and theories will be forthcoming. Political factions, religious differences, racial strife, all will find their way into the stream of reasons and analysis behind this dastardly act. But let it be said now that this was not an act of an American city, a section of our country, or the American people. It was the crime of one man. A man who could have been in any city, any State, or any country.

Certainly the Communist nations of the world will capitalize on this tragic event. They will emphasize the brutality of the act. They will hold every American up as the assassin, evil, cruel, and selfish.

This propaganda will no doubt cause many people of the world to wonder what type nation this can be for such a thing to happen. In fact, Americans themselves will search their souls for the answer.

Let the people of the world, including Americans, take note * * *

It is a nation where 3 years ago almost 50 percent of the people did not support this man for President, yet, they have followed him and now unanimously they sincerely mourn him.

It is a nation where 180 million people are free enough to be told of the terrible act and secure enough not to panic.

It is a nation where the people in this time of crisis have not had to wonder who would take control of their Government. They knew who it would be.

It is a nation where no thought had to be given to wholesale slaughter of Government officials in a grab for power when its President was murdered.

It is a nation where the assassinated President's family is loved and respected by the mass of the people and will always hold a place in their hearts.

It is a nation where one of the first acts of the new President was to seek the advice of two past Presidents, one from his party, one from the opposition party.

It is a nation that vengefully wanted to punish the guilty party, yet clung to a principle beyond the shadow of a doubt and overwhelmingly condemned the man who took it upon himself to execute the obviously guilty assassin.

It is a nation where the closeness of the people and their leaders, combined with certain freedoms they both consider essential, might have made possible this dreadful deed.

It is a nation, complex and simple, that in such trying times, when its newspapers are filled with stories concerning heads of states, on the same page can still tell of a little boy walking down the corridors of the White House saying, "Now I don't have anyone to play with."

It is a nation capable of criticizing its President, booing him in public, voting him out of office. Yet, when a foreign nation threatens its shores with missile bases, it becomes a united nation standing solidly with its President even in the face of a nuclear war.

These things we feel John Fitzgerald Kennedy believed, and if he could speak today, he would remind us of them.

It was a great nation into which this man was born 46 years ago.

It is a great nation that mourns him now, and it will be a great nation that perpetuates his memory and preserves his ideas in the future.

It is a natural thing that we are overcome with compassion, sorrow, and sympathy, and feel the heavy burden of this great loss.

But, as Americans, we should not confuse these emotions with feelings of shame either for our country or its institutions.

We can mourn the man, condemn the deed, and still be proud Americans.

---

[From the Pembroke Journal, Pembroke, Ga., Nov. 28, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY PAYS THE PRICE

The assassination of President Kennedy on the streets of Dallas, Tex., on Friday afternoon, when he was riding in a motorcade with his wife, Governor and Mrs. Connally of the State of Texas, who was also shot by the assassin, is one of the darkest blots in the American history, and especially bad for the great State of Texas. The President of the United States died within an hour after being shot, and the Governor of

**Texas is in a serious condition in a Dallas hospital.**

**John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a young President, who believed in what be believed and was willing to fight for it, and of course some of the things he fought for were not popular the world over, and there were many in the South that would not have voted for him again, still they respected the man, and condemn the man, or men back of his assassination.**

**President Kennedy was important to the entire free world, and he meant a great deal more to all of us, than many of us knew, or would admit. His death is a loss to many countries, and when the news flashed around the world of his assassination, although it was midnight in France and many other countries, the rulers and leaders of these countries sent wires of their sorrow and grief, which proved the respect that the entire free world had for this great leader.**

**His passing places our country in a precarious position, we have many things facing us in the immediate future, that it is going to take an iron hand, and a dedicated man to the principles he believed in.**

**The Journal joins all the other newspapers of America in paying tribute to this great leader, who was cut down by an assassin's bullet, in the prime of life, and at a time when he was so badly needed by all the free world.**

---

**[From the Darien News, Darien, Ga., Nov. 28, 1963]**

### ECHOES OF A DALLAS GUNSHOT

**The crack of a rifle in a Dallas street last Friday has brought echoes from all over the world. These echoes, like those of the Navy sonar, have given indications of the nature of the objects from which they came.**

**The message of shock and concern from Moscow indicates that even in the midst of avowed atheism there remains a semblance of basic human decency and an appreciation of greatness among those of opposing political persuasions. When the news came to the Kremlin, regular television broadcasts were interrupted, the announcement was made, and an interlude of somber organ music was played.**

**From certain southern Governors who had taken public stands against the philosophy and policy of the Kennedy administration in regard to civil rights there also came expressions of shock and sympathy, indicating their respect for human life and their appreciation of outstanding political leadership in those who do not agree with themselves.**

**The only death which has ever had a greater impact upon the human race was that of Jesus of Nazareth. Cries of dismay and anguish from around the globe indicated that the human race is at last beginning to realize its essential kinship, and that men—wherever they are found, and to whatever racial, political, or national group they belong—are, if they are men at all, an integral part of a worldwide humanity. This, in itself, is an indication that the dream of John F. Kennedy is in the dawn of its realizaton.**

**The story would not be complete, however, without mention of the ominous echoes which bounced off the rottenness of the world, and which were even more nauseating than the sound of the shot itself. These sickening echoes took the form of such phrases as, "Old man Kennedy is dead," "Have you heard the good news?," or "I'm not shedding any tears." These were reflections not upon the man of whom they were spoken, but of the venom of the hearts out of which they were spoken. They were manifestations of what newsman Chet Huntley described as "the ominous popularization of hatred" which has characterized American politics during recent years. This crowd has abandoned the Bible principle of love and brotherhood, and has preached that in some cases love is a vice and hate a virtue. Such a man was Kennedy's assassin. Such a man is Jack Ruby. And such are the men who applaud acts of violence, wherever they occur.**

**Let Americans thank God this Thanksgiving season that those among us who believe hate is the solution to our problems are in the minority. If it were not so, God would surely have long since said to us, as he did to ancient Jerusalem, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chicks under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate."**

**Most of the world feels today that our house is indeed left unto us desolate. But already the Nation, and the free world, are rallying around President Johnson. Our desolation shall be healed. An eagle has fallen, and the worms come out to gloat—but there will be other eagles. The army of darkness has won a battle, but the forces of light will win the war.**

**Truth is stronger than a lie. Love is stronger than hate.**

---

[From the Bryan Countian, Pembroke, Ga., Nov. 27, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A man is dead. A man—created in the image of God—lies in his final resting place; the victim of an unimaginable crime against God and mankind.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy died at the hands of an assassin; his death an unthinkable, unbelievable tragedy; a tragedy which shocked the Nation and the world into a state of numbness.

President Kennedy was much more than a man; he was a leader of men and nations; the living image of democracy for countless millions throughout the world; but, above all, he was a true humanitarian.

Words, perhaps, are futile in the face of this tragic event. We can only pray that God will give us the wisdom and ability to examine ourselves so that we may discover the terrible fault in our society capable of producing such a despicable deranged soul as the creature who murdered our beloved President.

John Kennedy will never be forgotten; the whole world mourns the loss of this great man, and our hearts go out to his family in their hour of sorrow.

---

[From the Springfield (Ga.) Herald, Nov. 29, 1963]

### THE WAY IT LOOKS TO ME

(By Ruth Lee)

Yes, I have wept with you, the Nation and the world, during these past few days. I wept unashamedly—our Nation had suffered a great loss, and if we had failed to feel it personally, certainly there would have been a great deal wrong with us as a nation.

On an occasion such as we have experienced we must rise above personalities, and personal differences; and yes, even sectional differences. We must show that we are one nation, under God; and I believe that we have.

No matter how much you or I, or anyone else, may have differed with John Fitzgerald Kennedy, he was our President, duly elected under our laws.

There have been many that have implied many things during this time concerning his death. In my own heart I can only feel that it was the work of one wretched and tormented soul, who felt that he must have personal vengence, for something for which he must take the full responsibility himself.

The one implication that must be seen is that this is the high price of liberty that our country has once again paid. A liberty that goes to all persons, whether they be deserving of it or not. The liberty that was enjoyed by the apparent assassin though he had renounced his country, though he had failed to serve with honor in his country's service, and though he was outspoken against the policies of our country and saw fit to take up the cause of one of our most violent enemies, Cuba.

Yes, that is the price of liberty; a price that I am sure President Kennedy all too well realized he might be called to pay.

While we differed with Mr. Kennedy; if we made the effort to study the man we must have realized that he was not an ordinary man. He had a vision, and was willing to make every effort to see it a reality; and we must respect him for that. We, in our short-sightedness, many times failed to realize that in all that he did he had to have the backing of the Congress or the courts. The next months and years will prove, I fear, on some grounds, that all of his actions were not just personal action because he personally felt they must be done, but that they were supported by many of our other national leaders.

Be all this as it may—the point at the present is that we lost our leader, and no nation can do this, especially under such terrible circumstances, without losing some part of themselves.

I make no attempt to write a eulogy, or defend the man—history will evaluate him, and persons more capable of fitting eulogy have voiced that the world over. But I feel impelled to say that we as a Christian people could have faced the situation in no other way but that of mourning the dead, and of sympathy for those loved ones he left behind.

I am told that there are those who found no sorrow in the tragedy. I can only feel sorrow for them—anyone that is incapable of some sort of sorrow or grief on such an occasion is more to be pitied than even those who personally suffered the loss. Are they so radical in their thinking that they could not rise above their personal hatred for a man and realize that a Nation, and yes, even the world, had lost a leader? If we are to call ourselves a Christian Nation and a Christian people we must practice a Christian love and compassion.

Some have said that they did not feel that all of the ceremonies and, as they put it, "the goings on" were necessary. This was our President that we buried, not an ordinary man. This was part of our national custom; we would have done less than we ought, if we had failed to carry it out. I am sure the Kennedys had no need for the ceremony that went with it—surely their grief would have been easier to bear in their own privacy. Mrs. Kennedy was known for her shying away from public view. I feel that their sharing their final moments as they did was a sacrifice on their part, but they must have realized that he was a man that belonged to the Nation and to the world. And the world did come to pay its final respects.

Surely, Mrs. Kennedy has made for herself a new place in history with her remarkable and unbelievable composure during these trying hours. Many have tried to imitate her in the past in dress, etc.; they would do well to take a lesson from her grace, dignity, and sense of duty in trying times.

Once again, the Nation has proved its greatness—tragedy has served to bring about a national unity that is not often known. We have seen our national leaders lay aside their differences and pledge their effort to see that our national image is carried forth in the high honor and impact that it, by all rights, must deserve. This in itself is perhaps the greatest eulogy of all to be given to the late President.

Our Nation has probably never gone through such a shocking experience, and as the full realization of its reality settles on us all—may we all pray to God that we, as a Nation, will be spared such tragedy in the future.

[From This Week in Savannah, Savannah, Ga., Nov. 29, 1963]

### VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS: A TRIBUTE TO J.F.K.

(By O. J. Murry)

A star fell from out of the heavens this day.

The world—and God—are the sadder for it. For somewhere the celestial machinery that guides the paths of stars had gone awry. A malfunction of hatred and violence, of malice, prejudice, and evil turned out this light at the height of its glory.

Yes, a light has gone out—a light of hope—and of courage—and of faith to free men everywhere. And, yes—to men who are not free.

There have been other stars at other times—guiding wise men to a Saviour, the adventurous and faithful to new lands—stars for spiritual and for mortal guidance.

God, in His infinite wisdom, has provided many stars. When one falters and fades away in a brilliant burst of glory, there is another to take its place. Such is the tradition and heritage of America.

Perhaps the paths of the stars that guide the destinies of men will someday cross again. Then all men will be led to a heavenly reunion where their souls can join with the heavenly chorus in praise of Him who is Creator of us all.

So we say—look up. Look up, ye who are heavy laden; ye who are sad of heart and of mind and spirit. There is a new star in the Heavens this day, a star that may well be the living spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of these United States.

[From the Claxton (Ga.) Enterprise, Nov. 28, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

We are yet too close to John Kennedy to truly measure him and his impact on history. Only time will assess this value.

We found ourselves poles apart in our philosophy of government, and far apart many times in its application to the people of our country.

Yet we deeply mourn his passing, and feel a great personal loss, for we never doubted his courage, or his conviction, or his deep love for this, our country.

As truly as if he were felled on the battlefield, or in the explosion of a naval vessel, he gave his life in the service of his country and in the defense of an ideal that he held dear.

For this we respect him and admire him, and to the measure in which a great country like this is made up of its members, we have lost a part of our country.

Out of the hatred and bitterness that brought his death—let us rise up as men dedicated to liberty, to make of this Nation an even greater bulwark of freedom for all men.

Like the mythical phoenix, may the dove of peace rise from the ashes of our grief as a nation, and bring to men everywhere the blessings of the one who said, "My peace bring I unto you."

[From the Metter (Ga.) Advertiser, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IN MEMORY OF OUR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

He disappeared in the dead of winter;
The brooks were frozen, the airports almost deserted,
And snow disfigured the public statues;
The mercury sank in the mouth of the dying day.
O all the instruments agree
The day of his death was a dark cold day.
Far from his illness
The wolves ran on through the evergreen forest,
The peasant river was untempted by the fashionable quays;
By mourning tongues
The death of the poet was kept from his poems.
But for him it was his last afternoon as himself,
An afternoon of nurses and rumors;
The providences of his body revolted,
The squares of his mind were empty,
Silence invaded the suburbs,
The current of his feeling failed: he became his admirers.
Now he is scattered among a hundred cities
And wholly given over to unfamiliar affections;
To find his happiness in another kind of wood
And be punished under a foreign code of conscience.
The words of a dead man
Are modified in the guts of the living.
But in the importance and noise of tomorrow
When the brokers are roaring like beasts on the floor of the Bourse,
And the poor have the sufferings to which they are fairly accustomed,
And each the cell of himself is almost convinced of his freedom;
A few thousand will think of this day
As one thinks of a day when one did something slightly unusual.
O all the instruments agree
The day of his death was a cold dark day.

[From the Millen (Ga.) News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, MAY 29, 1917—NOVEMBER 22, 1963

Multiplied millions of words have been spoken and written within the past few days in bringing the sad news of the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy; and in praise of his leadership as the Nation's 35th President. Tributes have been made by men in high places throughout the world. We cannot add to the sentiments that have already been expressed.

We were shocked as millions of others were on Friday when the news of the tragedy became known to one and all. There was a tug at your heart because of the tragic loss to the Nation and the world of this great leader.

We were privileged to occupy the same platform with him once and again to breakfast with him, still while he was Senator, and from this association we learned that he was a family man, a man with a vision and a man willing to give his all for his country; he loved people, despite the fact that he was independently wealthy; and he wanted to see above all else a world at peace. He worked hard at the job. We found it easy to disagree with some of his programs and some of his proposed legislation. But we never hated and we were not disagreeable because we disagreed. The man was honorable, conscientious and above all a worldwide statesman. Our Nation and the world shall miss his leadership.

No better tribute can be given than that which comes from the pen of the newly named poet laureate of Georgia, and we quote:

"TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT

"In Arlington where other martyrs sleep
He rests in peace. Oh, say not he is dead!
The nations gather there to pray and weep,
Recalling burning words that he has said.
His image, and the cause for which he stood,
Is etched in gold upon each stricken soul,
His vision of a worldwide brotherhood
And principles that make all mankind whole.
The chief is dead? No, he shall never die!
His voice will thunder down chaotic years
Echoing like a warrior's battle cry,
Shattering the dark labyrinth of man's fears.
Oh valiant one, so much you had to give,
Yourself—that other men might better live!

"—*Agnes Cochran Bramblett.*

"FORSYTH, GA., *November 25, 1963.*"

[From the Swainsboro (Ga.) Forest-Blade, Nov. 27, 1963]

### TRAGEDY WITHIN A TRAGEDY

The death of John F. Kennedy is all the more tragic because the lesson it offers will most assuredly be missed by the majority of American citizens.

His assassination was more than the result of a gun fired by a misguided, warped young Marixist. It is, at least in part, the product of a society that feeds upon hatred and utter disregard for the rights of others and for the God-inspired principles upon which this Nation was founded.

There is within modern-day America a growing urge to destroy or hurt those who disagree with us, whether it be politically, socially, or religiously.

As an example, take the use of economic boycotts by groups of people against businesses and institutions whose owners either refuse to endorse the principles or give in to the demands of the group.

Is this not economic assassination, robbing the business owner of his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

And we do not speak only of the much-publicized Negro boycotts, for even here in Swainsboro at least one group of white people has threatened use of such a boycott if a store owner did not refrain from saying that Georgia's gaming laws should apply to them as well as to all other citizens.

The Forest-Blade can speak first hand, also, for we have been threatened with violence on more than one occasion in recent years because we publicized the illegal activities of certain individuals.

Indeed, one or two governmental officials have even insinuated they will withhold payments of just debts to the Forest-Blade if we continue to publicize grand jury presentments beyond the mere legal requirements.

Pastors seeking to elevate the moral tone of the community have also been threatened or been publicly ridiculed for their efforts.

The tragedy of the President's death is not that America has lost its leader or that a family will weep; rather, the real tragedy is because we will not see in it a warning of a deadly danger.

We are rapidly becoming not a Nation of laws, but of men.

[From the Sylvania (Ga.) Telephone, Nov. 29, 1963]

### MAY GOD SAVE AMERICA FROM HATE

One person, probably conceived and born in hate, certainly reared and trained in it, with malice and aforethought, designed and planned in a warped and wicked mind to kill the President of the United States. The success of his atrocious plan shocked the entire world more, in our opinion, than any other like event in the world's history.

Whatever one's political evaluation of President Kennedy may have been, it must be acknowldeged that he was the world's most powerful voice for the freedom and peace of all people. His energy, sincerity, ability, and dynamic personality will be missed in the councils of the nations.

Words completely fail us in trying to express our contempt for the person, or persons, who conspired to kill our beloved and respected leader. We shudder to think of the future consequences of such hate. We are alarmed that organizations, built upon hate, rooted in the extremes of every issue, can thrive in America. One person can kill the leader, but organized hate can make demons of thousands and bring destruction to entire nations.

Even more contemptuous than the lone assassin are those groups who as apostles of hate incite the passions of the gullible for their own financial or political profit. Every American has felt the creeping venom of it in his everyday business and social intercourse as the passions of men are freely and publicly exposed in verbal explosions.

Someway and somehow, with God's help, those grouped apostles of hate, who set race against race, creed against creed, and class against class, must be halted.

America has always been able to rise to the demands of the crisis of the moment. We have every confidence that the political leadership will quickly close the ranks and the United States with President Lyndon B. Johnson at the head will assume its position among the nations of the world as the true leader in the mission for peace and freedom.

We average Americans must be ever aware that love only has the force to bring peace and understanding among our people and the people of the world, and only God has the infinite wisdom to guide us to the solution of our differences. Any other direction can but lead to our dissolution and decay as a nation.

May God save us from hate.

---

[From the Screven County News, Sylvania, Ga., Nov. 28, 1963]

## THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD

An eternal light burns on the grave of President John F. Kennedy in Arlington National Cemetery, while millions share grief of sorrowing loved ones.

### MANSFIELD GIVES CAPITOL TRIBUTE

Following is the text of a tribute to the late President Kennedy delivered by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Sunday:

"There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a wit in a man neither young nor old; but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment, it was no more. And, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a father with a little boy, a little girl, and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and, out of the giving and the asking, wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and, in a moment it was no more. And, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

"A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

"He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

"In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

"I pray to God that we shall and under God we will."

---

[From the Montgomery Monitor, Mount Vernon, Ga., Nov. 28 1963]

## THE WASTE OF HATE

Hate, the horrible force of ignorance in action, has blindly struck down a young President, husband and father—John F. Kennedy. The initial disbelief, shock, and concern which we have felt in this tragic loss is centered in the question, Why did this happen?

More than any American leader in recent history, Mr. Kennedy stirred in the people of the United States a new sense of vision, energy, and leadership. His administration brought a return of American prestige as leader of the free world and a reawakening of the promise of American life to millions of people in this country.

His youth, his family, and his imaginative and able appointees were subjected to a closer and a more adoring scrutiny than the American public has given any chief of state in recent years. And yet there were those who, guided by hate, set themselves in opposition to everything that this man, whom we mourn, stood for. What is the nature of this terrible force—hate?

Hate, among the strongest of man's negative emotions, begins in ignorance and fear, is nourished on intolerance and bigotry, and reaps a wasteful harvest of death and destruction.

Hate breeds intolerance and leads to a lack of concern for the things which concern others. People who recognize their own faults are usually tolerant of those same faults in others, but the hater generally finds something in others on which to pin his own sense of guilt and shame.

Hate leads to aggression, in which the control of thinking over behavior is so reduced that force is the only way of dealing with a tension that one cannot control.

Hate often springs from unconscious motives. Since it is often unconscious, hate is hard to deal with. One cannot catch himself at it. For that reason, many people refuse that there is any such thing in their own personality. The more self-deception involved in hate, the more likely it is to be harmful. In the mind of the hater his position always seems to be obviously true. The hater refuses to examine the evidence of both sides of an issue, especially the other side. In effect, he cuts off all new learning.

Hate breeds cowardice. Truth and the courage to speak it have been all too rare in history. We should strive to develop a picture of ourselves as those who would rather know the truth than be comfortable.

Hate deadens the power of creative thinking. Regular trips into the world of ideas can be an exciting activity rather than a dreary chore. Mr. Kennedy's mental alertness, imagination, and interest in foreseeing causes and consequences of events, coupled with his vigor, were in the highest tradition of the educated man and the mature personality.

Hate leads to a feeling of separation. Separation from our fellow man, estrangement from God, even the loss of self-respect are the products of hate. The deepest need of man is the need to overcome his separateness, to leave the prison of his aloneness. The full answer to the problem of existence lies in true and mature love.

What is mature love? It is union under the condition of preserving one's integrity, one's individuality. Love is an active power in man, a power which breaks through the walls which separate man from his fellow men, which unites him with others. Love makes him overcome the sense of isolation and separateness, yet it permits him to be himself.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy manifested those qualities of character and competence that are the measure of mature love and of greatness. He was too big to stoop to return the hate hurled at him by rabid fanatics. His confidence in faith and reason transcended the carping pettiness of partisan critics. His dedication to this country was but suggested in his heroic actions as commander of the illfated *PT 109* in World War II. Later, a lesser man might easily have given up his career in public life, when recurring back injuries laid him low.

The pattern of the late President's domestic programs and the foreign policies he pursued were not the vain motions of an unthinking, unfeeling demagog. Indeed, each of these programs bear the unmistakable stamp of Kennedy's convictions of their desirability and reasonableness in overcoming the common enemies of man—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself—which he enumerated in his inaugural address of January 20, 1961. He did not shrink from responsibility—he welcomed it. And at the time, he asked the citizens of the world not what America can do for them, but what together we can do for the freedom of man. That question remains before us.

This time of mourning symbolizes not the victory of hate over a good man, but rather a reconsecration of a nation to those ideals of truth, faith, hope, and justice which President Kennedy and a host of other Americans have given their lives to defend and perpetuate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was a tragic hour in American history when John F. Kennedy, young, vigorous President of our country, was murdered by an assassin.

Possessed of great wealth, this man could have turned his back on the problems of mankind. He could have remained aloof from all of the world's heartaches, worries, and cares. Instead, he thrust himself into the middle of them, giving of his immeasurable talent and energy to work for the freedom of all men and for peace throughout the world.

There were those who opposed his views, but there were few who did not admire him for his intellectual gifts, his courage, his fine qualities of character, and his dedication to human dignity, world freedom and the brotherhood of man.

I was impressed by the expressions of respect and worldwide grief coming from all parts of the world and by the attendance of some 220 world leaders at the Arlington funeral. These leaders showed great respect for this country and seemed to agree that the soil of America had never received a more courageous, more dedicated and finer American citizen.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy knew how to build on the experience of the past, how to face the realities of today, and how to dream and plan for a better tomorrow. Like a man of destiny, he did not shrink from the burdens of leadership. He welcomed them. He gave so much because he loved his country and his fellow man.

I salute his gallant and dynamic spirit and pay tribute to his wise leadership during a period of crisis in our national life. Though in office less than 3 years, he will be remembered as one of our greatest Presidents and greatest world leaders.

As expressed by President Johnson in his speech before Congress, let us hope that "the tragedy and torment of these terrible days will bind us together in new fellowship."

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the sadness of a mourning Nation over the tragic death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy continues to be felt in strong testimony to the love and admiration of our country for this great leader.

The tragedy of his death is heightened because it came so cruelly at the prime of his extraordinary life. It came as he was grappling with the gigantic problems of our times with skill and courage, moved only by high motives, guided by broad plans, and impelled by understanding and vision.

But as the tumult and grief subside, as the Nation resumes and moves forward, and as his own generation measures his works and achievements, what shall we say who knew him? History will judge his greatness as a President, but already it is clear that he will be remembered for the strength of his statesmanship, for the initiative he brought to the search for peace, for the selfless energy with which he pursued 17 years of honorable service in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and finally in the White House itself.

He was his own profile in courage. Well known was his bravery in battle during the war and the fortitude with which he bore the pain in his injured back during the grave illness of his Senate years.

This was a courage that went beyond physical courage. It was the special courage to believe in, with all his heart, and to dedicate himself to the attainment of the greatest of goals of mankind.

This courage was the courage of a man who emerged to reawaken the Nation to its finest meaning. It was the courage of one who struck new sparks of hope in a world dark with unspeakable fears. His was the courage to affirm the integrity of human life and equality and to seek a rational and durable solution.

With his death our constant prayer should be that his sincere efforts for the peace and happiness of our Nation and the world may not have been in vain.

We must find, in his death, the strength to follow the paths of reason on which he walked, and the strength to forge a new decency at home and a reasoned peace in the world.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Kennedy was truly a national tragedy and certainly every American felt a measure of the deep grief and sense of loss experienced by his family.

In the shock of such an event as this was dramatized the dual life of the individual who occupies the highest position the people of this Nation can bestow. Not only did we see John F. Kennedy as the President of the United States, but also John F. Kennedy as a son, father, and husband.

Not only did this Nation mourn the passing of the Chief Executive, but the hearts of his people were touched by a special sadness in the knowledge of the particular loss suffered by those who knew him best and loved him most. The gripping scenes of his children shortly after his death transmitted a sense of anguish that shall not be soon forgotten.

That John F. Kennedy loved his country and was prepared to give it his best each day, there could be no doubt. He committed his abilities and his energies to the fullest in war and in peace. He knew the awesome responsibilities he had assumed in the Presidency of the Nation fated to hold the leadership of the free world in a nuclear age. His chief hope, undoubtedly, was that he could contribute significantly to the establishment of a stable peace in the world, but he recognized the unhappy essentiality of keeping the Nation well girded against nuclear attack through the maintenance of a deterrent power balanced as between nuclear and nonnuclear capacities.

It was particularly fitting, therefore, that the guard of honor in his funeral procession and at his burial should include members of the Army Special Forces. A green Special Forces beret left at the grave testified eloquently in its silence to Mr. Kennedy's active personal interest in the development of means within our Armed Forces to cope with unconventional warfare techniques wherever they might be employed against the free world, and, if required in the defense of freemen, to employ surpassing ingenuity in multidimensional warfare against a devious, crafty, and resourceful enemy.

As the Nation mourns a slain leader, it gains reassurance, by strange and perhaps meaningful coincidence, from the words of another leader, also fated to be slain, uttered 100 years, almost to the day, before the tragic event in Dallas:

> Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, there are in this world people who by nature and temperament are activists—the "doers" in our society—impatient with the status quo and always seeking to enrich the lives of all of us.

Our late President, John F. Kennedy, was such a man.

The great men in our history have not been negative people who fear change and lack trust in government and its institutions. They have been men who trusted the will of the people and recognized that our Federal Government represents the people. Those having the greatest impact upon our Nation over the years since the American Revolution have been men who did not shrink from war or threat of war when the situation demanded it, but who unceasingly sought peace—men who knew that a government such as ours demanded that all people be given equal rights, and realized that we could not long deny dignity to one class, or finally it would be lost to all men.

History will assess the contribution of John F. Kennedy, but in my opinion the standards he set were the standards of greatness.

It was in May of 1961 that I first had an opportunity to talk at some length with the late President and to "size him up" as we say in New England. After this meeting I wrote a newsletter to my constituents in which I said:

> When the President entered the room he seemed somewhat tense but quickly broke into a wide smile as he greeted a few Members he knew well. He looks to be in the very best of health—tanned by the Florida sun—and by any standards younger looking in person than on television.
>
> As he made his way around the room, many of the characteristics of the man were obvious. He is still basically a rather shy and reserved person. This is something he does not feign, nor can he completely overcome it. Frankly, I find this an appealing side of the man. There are too many gladhanders and backslappers in politics today. The Presidency demands dignity. In this respect I found President Kennedy not unlike Former President Eisenhower.
>
> At that time, he went out of his way to make sure he did not neglect anyone. It would have been easy, and perhaps natural, for him to give the bulk of his time to those with whom he had served in the House, but he did not. A cynic would say this was just good politics, that he has a program to sell. But I believe the President is too good a politician to think he could influence many congressional votes with this device.
>
> Being only a few years younger than the President, I marvel that he has such a quick grasp of so many entirely unrelated subjects. His reputation as a gifted student of government and history is well founded. Watching him and hearing him talk, I thought what an awesome responsibility to be assumed by such a young man. For despite all his advisers, he is the final voice in making decisions affecting every American and many people in other countries. There will doubtless be many times that I will disagree with his conclusions on particular issues; but, after meeting him, I will not question his sincerity.

In my last newsletter a few days after the President's assassination, I recalled the many courtesies he had extended to me at White House functions and wrote of my last conversation with him during a flight to Maine where he was to receive an honorary degree at our State university only a few weeks ago. In my last newsletter I wrote:

> President Kennedy was a warmhearted human being.
>
> At times I have been mildly criticized by some of my constituents for not being partisan enough. I have always felt that I could personally contribute more to my district and State by seeking bipartisan cooperation wherever possible, particularly in view of the fact that Maine has only two Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. On the occasions when I have disagreed with the administration of our late President, I always tried to do so in a constructive, affirmative way. I am thankful that I never made hateful and disparaging remarks about the late President as so many did. Vitriol and meanness have no place in our political life.

John F. Kennedy set our Ship of State on the right course. Now that his hand has left the tiller, it is for another to safely bring us through troubled seas.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in eulogies for our late President being stated on the floor of the House of Representatives today. I have spoken before on the subject in this Chamber, and what I said then, out of deep sadness, need not be repeated, except that it is right and proper for the House to pay this additional tribute to the memory of our late President, a young man who stood for much, who died too early, and who leaves a bereaved family and country. The very genuine expressions of deep sorrow expressed by people all over the world, and by their leaders, were very remarkable testimonials to the life of John F. Kennedy and the worth of America under his leadership.

In this period of mourning all of us continue to pray for the comfort, and are thankful for the courage, of the young President's young widow, and we stand behind the new President in the critical period of transition.

Mr. Speaker, we read every day of new proposals for memorials to the late President. They vary in nature, but most of them take shape in tangible forms, in concrete or steel. Some are good proposals, some are less good. It seems to me that the greatest memorial that can be created to the memory of the late President would be the bettering and strengthening of institutions and processes by which this Nation may conduct itself under the rule of law, by which justice may done, by which tyranny is shutout and bigotry and hatred erased. If we wish to build a great memorial to John F. Kennedy, let us do these things in his name.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, her two small children and other members of the Kennedy family.

I rise also to say how deeply I personally feel the loss of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is a tragedy not only that he was struck down by an assassin while serving as President of the United States of America. Not only that he was a magnificent leader, respected and loved both in the United States and abroad. Not only that he was a man who was contributing so much to our world. But also that he had so much ahead in life, yet was killed before reaching the peak of his capacities, his talents, his intellect, his energies. This is a part of the tragedy also.

We can only guess what we have really lost with the death of this man. And we can only say that we know our loss is great.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy was a great national tragedy. However, in times of crisis the unity of the American people is a solid, significant, and reassuring fact of life. As a government of law, not men, we carry on despite a deep sense of grief and loss. We can all take pride in the dignity of Jacqueline Kennedy who helped to restore our faith in America after it was so suddenly shattered by a savage, senseless act of assassination. It is a time of soul searching. All Americans can only pray that, as a result, the safety of our Nation and the freedom of the world will be enhanced.

Perhaps the best way to truly eulogize President Kennedy would be for us, each in our own way, to the best of our abilities, and according to our individual principles and beliefs, to rededicate ourselves to the cause of government to which he dedicated his life and for which he gave his life.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, who risked his life in World War II to defend America, finally gave it 20 years later to make a better America. President Kennedy's death follows the pattern of the other actual and attempted assassinations in our history. When intense hatreds burn in the minds of millions of people—somewhere, somehow, a mentally diseased person resorts to this kind of terror. The individuals and groups who have fed the fires of these hatreds bear on their consciences the death of a brilliant and kind President.

Of President Kennedy's manifold accomplishments, the Nation will particularly remember his contributions to our national security; and his calm leadership during the Cuban crisis; his championship of excellence in national life—especially in the arts and sciences; and, though born to wealth, his concern for the poor, the sick, the blind, the unemployed, and the mentally retarded.

President Kennedy believed that America must go forward if it is to survive and he gave his talents to the growth of our Nation. In 3 short years he was not able to complete his great work, but what he began, let us carry on.

Mr. ABELE. When the news of the death of our President reached me at McMurdo Sounds in the Antarctica, I was shocked and saddened that such an evil deed could be committed. In attending a Memorial Service for the President at Christchurch Cathedral, New Zealand, many persons expressed to me their profound sorrow for the President's family and their good will for the people of the United States. When Admiral Reedy spoke in the church service in honor of our President, servicemen, public officials, and people in general manifested in a variety of ways their loyalty and great sense of grief at the death of the President.

The tragic and untimely death of our late President John F. Kenendy deprived the Nation of the services of a great and good man. His sense of responsibility, his keen intellect, his respect for the dignity of all mankind, and his willingness to labor for the ideas of ideals for which he lived and gave his life will live in the minds of men of good will throughout the world.

His work as a devoted servant of the people was a magnificent illustration of his philosophy that our people must be more concerned about how to serve the Nation. Because of his loyal service to his country in both peace and war, it could have been said of him in the tragic hour of his death, "well done thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the President, our former colleague, was felled by an assassin's bullet. It was a tragic death, especially for one so young, who had so much to do and, for the doing, he had so little time.

The good John Fitzgerald Kennedy has done will live long after him, and millions of people scattered throughout the world will have been helped, yes, will have been uplifted by his coming their way.

Throughout the world, there is mourning and deep sorrow. John Fitzgerald Kennedy has gone to the world of eternal peace, the peace he so earnestly sought in our time, for all people everywhere.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so much as been said in these past days about our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that one hesitates to add even a word. Yet I would do so.

Many years ago Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and her children came to my Florida home for swims and the like, so I knew them casually when they were young. Just before "Jack" entered the House a mutual friend brought him to see me, and among other things we discussed his election. Young, eager, full of energy, it was good to know that one of his intelligence was taking his citizenship seriously.

After he came he was ill—very ill—and one wondered if he could pull through. But he did—and went on to the Senate and then to the highest office in the land. With him went his energy, his eagerness, the urge within him to change some of the things he thoroughly disapproved, and plant the seed for those in which he deeply believed.

Then suddenly all that energy, all that vivid life ended. One wonders why. Must we not believe that even the tragic cutting off of such a life in the fullness of its youth and service may direct the people of this country to a more serious willingness to get at the heart of the problems that confront us? Was that perhaps why he was born and why he so tragically died?

Surely, the most difficult matter that we as Americans must solve is how to change the individual men and women that peace may be so deeply rooted in their hearts that America will pull herself back onto the road that leads to her original goals: Trust in God, respect for the individual and the law, and united among her people; that she by her very life, may bring peace to a confused and tragic world.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those who mourn the death of our late President.

It is always difficult to accept the passing of a friend. It is particularly difficult when he is young, energetic, and in the prime of life, with everything to live and fight for. It was a devastating blow to lose the President of the United States at the hands of an assassin.

I recall with pleasure the cordial relationship we enjoyed over the past 14 years, a relationship that persisted despite a growing difference in our political viewpoints. I recall particularly an occasion several years ago when I had the opportunity to help him in a time of political difficulty, and I shall always prize the autographed copy of "Profiles of Courage" which he sent me in appreciation.

Much has been said about the tragedy of a career cut short, and no one can deny that it is tragic even though he had already accomplished more than most men could hope in a full lifetime. To me the greater tragedy, therefore, is the personal tragedy that has been visited upon this family, for the assassin could do nothing more cruel than deny our friend the right to guide his children and see them grow to womanhood and manhood, surely the most precious gift any man can enjoy. My heart goes out to the children, to Mrs. Kennedy, and the other members of this family who have suffered so grievous a loss.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, Friday, November 22, 1963, started out the same as most every other day in the offices of the Members of Congress during the session—stacks of mail had been received, each Member and his staff were busy preparing answers to the letters, ordering Government documents requested by constituents, calling Federal agencies and committees for information on the status of legislation and programs already in operation so as to advise a constituent properly with regard to some personal problem. Some staff members were studying committee hearings and reports to develop important information helpful to their Representative or Senator in his consideration of legislative measures. The Member himself was attending a meeting of his committee, discussing proposed bills with his colleagues, meeting with constituents individually or in groups interested in a particular legislative proposal, working on amendments he felt would improve a measure under consideration, or he might be working out the language of a new bill he wanted to introduce. Throughout the Halls of Congress every Member was engaged in some official duty connected with his responsibility as a legislator. In other words, it was a typical workday at the U.S. Capitol.

Suddenly, in the midst of all the routine phone calls that come in constantly during the usual working day comes one into my office from the daughter of one of my secretaries who was home from school that day on account of illness and who was listening to the radio when the startling news of the shooting of President Kennedy was broadcast. All work stopped while the whole office staff and I sat in stunned silence. Someone had the presence of mind to get out the small transistor radio from the cupboard where it is kept for use by the staff members who want to hear special messages delivered before joint meetings of the House and Senate.

Little did we think it would ever be used to tell us such shocking and unbelievable news that our President had been assassinated. The shock was felt almost simultaneously throughout the world due to our wonderful communications system today and I am sure that every listener had the same reaction as we did in our offices and homes here in the Nation's Capital. No one could understand or immediately accept as a fact that in this country of ours such a tragic event could possibly occur.

Gradually, as the details of the tragedy were recounted over and over and the first plans were announced, Americans everywhere united in the usual traditional manner when disaster strikes and each in his own way prayed and renewed his dedication to his Government.

It is at a time like this that we most appreciate the foresight of the founders of this country who worked out the provisions of the Constitution. Too often we are only concerned with the precious privileges, freedoms, and opportunities it provides. Now we are grateful for its provision for continuity of Government when the Nation's leader is gone. Had the event that took place on November 22 occurred in many other countries, complete chaos and revolutions would inevitably result. Under our Constitution, however, it took only a matter of minutes to put the reins of Government in the hands of the Vice President to whom the oath of office was administered on the plane that was bringing the deceased Chief Executive back to Washington. In his saddened and stunned state of mind, he accepted the responsibilities of the office of the Presidency.

It became my sad privilege to visit the White House on Saturday afternoon, November 23, to express my sympathy in person to Attorney General Robert Kennedy and his two sisters before going to the East Room where the body of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy lay in repose in the flag-draped casket. I stood for a moment in silent prayer for him, his family, and our Nation. All around the fence surrounding the White House thousands of people from all walks of life stood in silent tribute.

It was a solemn and moving sight. Thousands of others joined them as the funeral cortege with the flag-draped casket containing the body of the President on the horse-drawn caisson and the honor guard moved along the route to the Capitol where the body lay in state. The same hundreds of thousands of mourners lined the streets of Washington, standing with bared and solemnly bowed heads in prayer, as the body of the President was borne to St. Matthews Cathedral for the service and thence to its final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery.

The heads of foreign states and members of the diplomatic corps of nearly all the nations of the world, the Governors of all our States, clergymen of all faiths, the highest officials of the United States, including the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, gathered together in the great cathedral to join with close personal friends and the family of the late President to pay honor and tribute to the memory of the life and service of this great man. As one of those designated by you, Mr. Speaker, to be an official representative of the House of Representatives, it was my sad privilege to join in the imposing religious service. Included in the 1,200 people, who occupied every possible seat in the cathedral, were high dignitaries from all over the world. They represented the largest group of important personages ever to be gathered together in any one nation. This not only shows the high respect in which our late President was held by the leaders of other countries who came to pay tribute to him, but it is indicative of the prestige our Nation enjoys among the people of the world who appreciate and understand our form of government and our ideals.

Ever since the day of the burial thousands have continued to visit the grave of the late President to silently pay their personal respects to his memory and to pray for the continuance of the great traditions of our history.

Though President Kennedy met an untimely death at the hands of a crazed maniac, the leadership and responsibility for the affairs of the Nation passed from the hands of one man into the hands of another with scarcely a ripple in the administrative functions of government. By divine grace and the wisdom of our Founding Fathers 174 years ago, the Constitution of the United States continues to serve and protect us all. We should be ever mindful of and grateful for the life and service of each of our past 35 Presidents. We should renew our pledge to so live and act that our Nation will continue to be the greatest in the world and that the rights and privileges of each and every citizen will always be recognized, observed, and protected.

As we reflect upon the tragic event that rocked our Nation and the world, let us, Mr. Speaker, also avow our devotion to a system of government that allows free and open disagreement with our leaders on the national scene. We, as true Americans, at the same time, unite in our love and respect for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the man, who died in the service of his country.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, when I first heard the news that President Kennedy had been assassinated, I could not believe it. I could not believe it because I did not want to believe it. When this ghastly news was finally confirmed, I wondered aloud why anyone privileged to live under our form of government would want to take the life of our President.

Why such a cruel, inhuman, barbaric, and senseless act would be committed in the United States was beyond my comprehension. The answer partially came when the suspected assassin was apprehended. This awful crime had been done by one adhering to a philosophy of government foreign to ours. To learn this cannot give solace or comfort to the President's widow, his children, or to a grieving Nation but I am certain that John F. Kennedy would like to know that he was not betrayed by one believing in the same principles and form of government for which he fought, worked, and died.

In the words of one of my constituents, President and Mrs. Kennedy brought a "special something" to the White House. This "special something" shall be missed and not soon replaced. It was separate and apart from the many Government programs espoused by the President. In short, it was something human and involved personalities. You do not replace these things.

On behalf of all the people I am privileged to represent, Mrs. Latta, and myself, I again extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, the Kennedy children—little Caroline and "John" John as he was affectionately referred to by the President—and to the other members of the Kennedy family.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the shocking death of John F. Kennedy, deeply reflected as it was in the universal outpouring of mourning throughout the world, affected everyone, whether a citizen having no personal contact, one who knew him only as an acquaintance, or those who knew him well. Even those who differed with him on public issues admired him as a vital and committed American who accepted the philosophy that the duties of those in high office transcend partisan limitations.

Our Nation and the world have been enriched because of his demonstration of deep dedication to public service. He has left an example to all of us, but more particularly to those who were privileged to serve in the Government now and in the future.

High tribute should also be paid to Mrs. John F. Kennedy for her steadfastness, resolution, and devotion during the trying hours of her bereavement and the unifying influence that she portrayed.

On behalf of those I represent in Ohio, and individually, I express the deep sense of shock and sorrow experienced because of the death of John F. Kennedy. We all share in the tragic loss of the Kennedy family and those close to them, and we extend our deep sympathy to them.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this is a day for paying tribute to the memory of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I want to join with my colleagues in paying respect to our former President and in further respect make reference to two memorial addresses delivered for President Kennedy.

One such address was presented by Dr. Frederick W. Whittaker, president of the Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine, and the other by Rev. Peter M. Kemper, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Pittsfield, Maine.

I introduce these addresses to the RECORD for I sincerely feel they appropriately pay eminent tribute to our late President.

### SUNDAY MORNING SERMON, NOVEMBER 24, 1963, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PITTSFIELD

(By Rev. Peter M. Kemper, pastor)

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." (Psalm 33: 12.)

How much does it mean to us who take our blessings for granted? How much does it really mean to us when we stand with hand over heart and "pledge allegiance to the United States of America?" Does it send chills up and down our spine, or do we say it quite indifferently? "One nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all"?

How does it affect you when we stand and sing the hymns that we have sung this morning?

> "O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
> Whose stern, impassioned stress
> A thoroughfare for freedom beat
> Across the wilderness!
>
> America! America!
> God mend thine every flaw,
> Confirm thy soul in self-control,
> Thy liberty in law!"

Stunned, shock, disbelief, sorrow, anger—these emotions engulfed America and the world like a great tidal wave. With shattering impact the news of the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, rocked the capitals of the world—an act which outrages decent men everywhere. Our differences, in a time like these are dissolved in shock and in sorrow. We no longer think of the petty things that sometimes divide us and keep us apart. The little things that seemed so big have faded into insignificance.

Emotions grip the world; many have called it the most tragic circumstance since the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

Hate and jealousy brooded in a twisted mind—brooded and planned, and then overcame as a finger squeezed the trigger of the assassin's $12.78 gun, obtained from a Chicago mail-order house, advertised in a national magazine.

The irony of President Kennedy's death is that this short administration was devoted almost entirely to various attempts to curb this very streak of violence in the American character. The Nation today mourns the death of a citizen who risked his life in battle but lost it, ironically, in peace—a martyr, like Abraham Lincoln, to the causes he championed.

Words are certainly inadequate to express our shock and sorrow. This morning we cannot but help think of some of those who are so personally involved. Uppermost in our thinking would be Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy who lost both a son and a husband within a few months. She was faced with the grim task of telling her children—Caroline and John, Jr., what had happened to their daddy last Friday in Texas.

Overshadowed, and almost forgotten, is the family of the Dallas Police Department detective sergeant, J. D. Tippit, age 39, shot to death by Lee Harvey Oswald, 24, being held by the Dallas police as the assassin of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, age 46—the youngest President of these United States of America, and the youngest President to die in office. Officer Tippit leaves three children and a wife—children whose ages are 14, 10, and 5 * * * Mrs. Tippit in her own hour of grief, sent her condolence to Mrs. Kennedy and said, "Express my sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy. I know how she feels."

We would also remember Gov. John B. Connally of Texas, his wife and those who stand by the vigil of his bedside. He is expected to make a complete recovery from his physical wounds sustained at the same time of President Kennedy's assassination.

But I hope that we as Americans, as Christians, as Baptists, as residents of Maine, of Pittsfield—do not forget Lyndon Baines Johnson. He took the oath of office a short time after the assassination and thus became the 36th President—the oath administered for the first time by a woman, Judge Sarah T. Hughes. In the first Presidential statement at the airport, President Johnson said, "I will do my best."

In tragic times such as these, it calls upon our own faith, our own belief, and our own trust in God. How often we have repeated, as we have read from the coins of our Nation, "In God we trust." We have witnessed the smooth transition of Government. It has been marvelous. It makes us even more proud to be Americans. When the first announcement shocked the world, just a few moments after that tragic event, people all over the world followed—on radio and television. We were there. The Nation, the world, has shared personally in this sorrow.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson has proclaimed tomorrow a national day of mourning for the late President, John F. Kennedy. He has requested that the respective places of divine worship be open and has encouraged and challenged the American people bow in submission to the will of Almighty God and pay their homage.

This church will be open all day tomorrow. We invite you to come, to stay as long as you might desire, to bow in silent prayer and meditation. Pray for those whose names we have mentioned this morning, so very personally and intimately involved in this experience. But then may we take the suggestion of President Johnson and pray God's continued blessing upon America and upon us as individuals; to rededicate ourselves, first as Christians and then as American citizens, to these truths we hold so dear and so faithful.

There are many personal things that touch our minds and hearts in times such as these.

I don't believe we will realize the impact of what has transpired, and what is transpiring, but we can thank God that through the clouds that overshadow, the veil of tears that sometimes blurs our vision, we can yet see the faithful, eternal hand of God leading us.

Friday and Saturday, and even this morning, I found myself, like many Americans, glued to the TV set and a slave thereunto. As President Johnson took his oath of office and took upon his shoulders great responsibilities of our Nation, I could not help but think of a personal experience. I hope you will forgive me for mentioning it this morning. On Tuesday, the 22d of May 1962, a very historical day in my life, the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, introduced me to the then Vice President of the United States, President of the Senate, Lyndon B. Johnson, a tall man from Texas with a warm smile and a firm handclasp. We sat in the corridor outside the door leading onto the Senate floor and talked about many things. One of the remarks which he made—and I can never express the feeling that came over me when he said it—"Another man called Peter will lead us in prayer today." I would never be able to describe, either, the feeling that was mine as I walked onto the Senate floor, and I realized the tremendous obligation and responsibility that was mine, not only for that moment but each day and each moment of my life. "Another man called Peter will lead us in prayer."

History will endeavor to calculate, to summarize, to evaluate all that has transpired. But history will never be able to tell the impact this has made on the hearts and lives of the American people—an impact that will cause us to renew our dedication and consecration to God Almighty and to this wonderful land of ours, this great America.

God help us that we will not take our blessings for granted. God help us, also, to say "God bless America."

John F. Kennedy was a family man. We have been impressed, regardless of difference in religious affiliation, by the fact that he did not neglect church attendance and personal religious discipline.

Are we going to be good citizens of our country because we are good citizens of the Kingdom of God? Christian principles were behind the movement for freedom of our forefathers. As those pioneers moved across the country the church took the lead. Life and its institutions must be understood in the light of God's will and God's law. These experiences bring us closer to Him who is the resurrection, our hope, our light, in whom is our faith.

"Righteousness exalts a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 13: 34).

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord" (Psalm 33: 12).

---

### A TIME FOR PRAYER

(Memorial address honoring President John Fitzgerald Kennedy by Dr. Frederick W. Whittaker, president of Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine, delivered in the Beach Chapel, Nov. 26, 1963)

This is a time for prayer—prayer of thanksgiving for the life and work of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; prayer of intercession for his eternal well-being and for the sustaining of his loved ones; prayer of penitence for the guilt which all Americans share in the assassination of our President; and prayer of petition for divine guidance of the Nation and its new Chief Executive. Prayer is our only sanctuary after a weekend of violence, shock, disbelief, grief, and sorrow which no one of us will ever forget. On the eve of this Nation's traditional day of gratitude it will not be easy for us whose lives have suddenly been saturated with sadness to revive our faith and to sing praises to our God. But we shall turn from the darkness to the light because we know that under divine providence gloom cannot for long overshadow hope.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in the moment of his cruel and untimely death, may have set in motion moral and spiritual forces which will guide the peoples of the world to a new era of mutual understanding and peace. His assassination by one of his own countrymen may have so dismayed the citizens of our beloved land that we shall seek and find new ways of living together in brotherhood from shore to shore. Chief Justice Earl Warren has called President Kennedy a great and good man. His greatness was shown in a life-long series of "profiles of courage," in his dealings with other nations through a rare combination of strength and compassion, and in his fearless support of the rights of minority groups within the United States. His goodness was readily recognized through his love for his family, his concern for the senior citizens of our country, and his willingness to mingle with the people as friend to friend even at the risk of his life. Very few men in so short a period of time have captured the minds and hearts of such a worldwide multitude. Testimony to this fact was given by the representatives of 53 foreign states and the millions of Americans who have wept for him and brought him tribute. Our first prayer, then, should be of thanksgiving for the life and work of our departed leader.

As Christians we believe that death does not end our individual existence but that by faith we inherit the everlasting life promised by God through Jesus Christ. Thus with confidence we may utter our prayer of intercessions for President Kennedy and for the sustaining of his loved ones. There is no doubt he was a man of religious conviction and one who was strengthened in his private and public acts by the teachings of his church. Our petitions for his eternal wellbeing will be echoed around the earth and with the assured hope that they will be answered. When news of the President's death was finally accepted as true by a stunned and disbelieving world, the early reactions of many took the form of anguished sympathy for the widow and for the fatherless children. That Mrs. Kennedy has been aware of this universal concern has been abundantly clear to all who have seen the majestic beauty and dignity of her composure in time of deepest grief. The spiritual stature of the first lady has been a source of inspiration and courage to innumerable men and women of lesser faith. God has indeed spoken through her abiding love for her husband and the obvious survival of that love beyond the grave. Yet we shall want to pray for Mrs. Kennedy, for her young ones, and for the members of the President's family in their present bereavement; and ask that the Holy Comforter may be with them steadfastly in the long days and years which are to come.

There is another prayer we must utter before the Creator and Judge. It is one of penitence and supplication, of begging forgiveness of the guilt which all Americans share in the assassination of our President. One man in a city far away fired the fatal shot. But my conscience has been burning within me ever since that fateful Friday. Do I not speak for you, too, and for countless others when I say that we and our fellow countrymen are implicated in this murderous crime because we have left undone those things which we ought to have done and we have done those things which we ought not to have done? Have we not been responsible for the development in our land of a climate of hatred, intolerance, lust, suspicion, dishonesty, intemperance, violence, and a host of other evils which served as a breeding place for the angry or misguided killing of our Chief Executive? Have we not condoned the glorification of sex, of lawlessness, and of greed for material possessions in our literature, our legitimate stage productions, our moving pictures, and our television fare? Have we not waited almost a hundred years since the assassination of another great American President before beginning to redeem his death by granting at last a measure of real freedom and equality to our Negro citizens? Have we not established an unnecessary and an unhealthy enmity among political parties in our Nation by seeking first to be partisan Republicans or Democrats rather than first to be loyal Americans, and by irrationally hurling at one another the epithets Communist and Fascist, leftwing and rightwing, liberal and conservative? Have we not in our religious communities sought to dwell in splendid isolation as Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews instead of acknowledging our common heritage and joining hands to take our best spiritual insights into the world for the uplifting of our bewildered society? And do not our affirmative answers to these questions have relevance to the terrible tragedy which engulfs us? We are, indeed, standing in the need of a prayer of penitence.

As those who seek forgiveness from above we shall be most worthy of God's blessing if we now and for the future rededicate ourselves as a nation in a commonwealth of nations to those ideals and high purposes for which our fallen President gave his life and met his death. To this end our final prayer must be a petition for divine guidance of the people of the United States and of our new leader. President Lyndon B. Johnson has been unexpectedly charged with a responsibility of great magnitude, but there is welcome evidence that he is prepared for the task. One of his most challenging legacies is the problem of racial justice and peace. That he intends to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor on this issue was made manifest by the then Vice President at Gettysburg on last Memorial Day where he declared at the close of an address marking the centennial of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: "Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free."

Our new President will surely need the help of the Almighty in the solution of this and a host of other vexing problems. He will also need the assistance of a people under God united in labor for holy and righteous causes. And so this day, in honor and memory of "a great and good man" we offer our prayers of thanksgiving, of intercession, of penitence, and of petition for divine guidance. Yet may we know that after our prayers are answered and the divine guidance has been given we cannot escape the awesome fact set forth by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in his inaugural address: "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that on this day set aside for tributes to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it would be appropriate to hear from those in my constituency, the Second District of New Jersey, through editorials and otherwise, as to the great loss which our Nation has suffered. It is, therefore, with considerable respect that I insert in the Record the following editorial which appeared in the Atlantic City Reporter and which has been so well written by its publisher and editor, Charles E. Seel. It certainly indicates how many of my constituents feel about the awesome tragedy which occurred on November 22.

### THE DAY THE WORLD STOOD STILL

(By Charles E. Seel)

It has been a week since—and still the Nation mourns.

We look back in retrospect at this intolerable tragedy.

"Friday, 2 p.m., November 22, 1963."

The shocking report that spread like the proverbial wildfire—"The President has been shot."

All matters else paled to insignificance.

Imaginations stubbornly balked at the fantastic incredible news?

"Such a thing couldn't possibly be true—Not our President," was the expression of skepticism on the faces of everyone who heard and rejected it as a false rumor.

All was a vague jumble of chaotic impressions.

Then came the heartbreaking report that reverberated around the world: "The President is dead."

It was at this moment that it seemed as though the world had stopped rotating on its axis.

"The world stood still."

The rush and bustle of daily doings—the banterings and chuckles a short time before, echoed off into a morbid silence.

A listlessness mixed with pain, sorrow and pity permeated the atmosphere.

All public places seemed to empty as if by robot command—some gathering on street corners to speak in low tones—others hurried to the sanctity of their homes—all stunned by the sudden calamity that beset our country, which we considered so powerful and guarded.

### NO SADDER WORDS OF TONGUE OR PEN

The inexhaustible marathon of wordage on radio, TV, newspapers with their vivid and chronological presentation of facts and events, as all verbally marched down the road to the assassination * * * the capture and arrest of the charged assassin * * * the assassination of the assassin * * * and * * * after this more of the infinite, endless, melange of on-the-spot news coverage and now there is but little else to say. They all sit back in a comatose state of fatigue from their gloomy reveries * * * tired, haggard, and to say any more would suffer them to phraseological quagmire.

Newsmen, commentators, their quavering voices throbbing with sad emotion as they went about their duties—men to whom events of the most sensational nature is just part of a day's work, were seen, as they propounded their stories, to flick a "dewdrop" from a corner of their eye.

It all started last Friday, November 22, 1963, at 2 p.m.

A day of infamy that will live in the minds of our people from here to eternity.

There is a saying: "Be it grief or sorrow—the passing of time will make it less." But not this tragic deplorable day of infamy—this day is one that time shall never surpress.

The Nation wept: It wept not in the sense that a President had been assassinated. To some it was like having a family loss—an endeared and beloved child or relative. To others it was a calamitous vanishing of something unexplainable—an image—or better, a symbol—a symbol of peace—of citizens' rights—a symbol of our country's power and security. Now gone.

And gone, too, is the alleged assassin.

However, to us, this is not where the story ends.

In dallying in maudlin regret and looking back at the ironic turn of events we become aghast at our country's manifestation of helplessness?

A crime, so serious, diabolical, and damnable—the ease with which it was perpetrated and by an insignificant communistic "germ" with a $12 rifle? Inconceivable absurdity? But it happened.

All the facts of why such a thing could happen are still hopelessly fogged.

The death of the assassin closes the door to many questions.

This is indeed most regrettable, for even though we all hoped with incarnate hate, that the alleged assassin would die—and a most sufferable death, we believe that his murderer's quixotic impulse thwarted efforts of our FBI to learn more from Lee Harvey Oswald.

That, perhaps this crime was not merely the vengeance of bestial fanatic—but a well-planned plot of intrigue—that Oswald was only the maddened scapegoat?

Thus it all leaves us with a bewilderment of feelings.

Is it a complacency on our part that makes us such easy prey to our enemies?

This may be an indelicate thought, and perhaps we will be criticized for so saying, but we are beginning to think that the great "freedoms" we so enthusiastically herald are a bit too free.

Much too free to the likes of the anti-American "Oswald," who openly declared his love for communism and Cuba.

Much too free to a rupture-headed rabble rouser name of Lincoln Rockwell who leads a pistol-packing race-hating group with headquarters a few miles from our National Capitol—and a group who call themselves "Nazi-Americans."

"Nazi-Americans" mind you. How our law enforcement agencies and our Government can shut their eyes, and stomachs, to the linking of such a blood-stained name as Nazi to that of America, is a glaring example, of how indifferent we are and to whom we grant our much-touted freedoms. Our freedoms have reached the stage where they are being vulgarized by too perpetual a-parroting. Especially so to our self-avowed enemies.

Our despair is in seeing groups of impudent, insolent, and insidious red fanatics, parading our city streets, and waving anti-American slogans and challenging the frustrated police to arrest them, with claims that our Constitution gives them the right of freedom of speech.

Their Communist leaders must chuckle as they rule with an iron hand of oppression, and observe the weakness we display to their puppets.

Puppets did we say?

Every Red—every anti-American in this country today is a potential assassin and murderer—and yet, we grant them the freedoms of our Constitution which only rightfully belong to the citizens of our country.

We will perhaps, in history and on the record, refer to our beloved President's death as an assassination.

This we reject with indignation.

We call his death murder—and in the worst degree. Out-and-out well-planned murder—premeditated—prearranged with professional integrity—and not the impetuous action of an enraged vengeful crank. We firmly believe that "Oswald" was merely a means to an end. There are hundreds like him.

With the swearing-in of the new President, Lyndon Johnson, we believe the time has come, to make the needed modifications to our many "freedoms."

We must tighten up on our loose freedoms to conform with these critical times.

We are no longer fighting Indians—and the crack in our Liberty Bell grows wider each day with laughter, as our enemies keep abusing and using our laws to further endanger our country as they destroy us from within.

When so dastardly a crime of lawlessness and violence can be so easily accomplished, on our own city streets, by such a wretched, vile, contemptible "nothing," then, unless we have all become callously deaf, we certainly can hear the "bells-of-alarm" ringing.

We no longer live in a world of melody and softness.

This is an era of madness and folly, and we are faced with enemies on all sides who are aggressive, nefarious, and pathological liars; who subtly speak of negotiations and bargaining on the one hand, but deal in monotonous negations and contradictions in order to nullify and destroy.

Our patriotism and reverence for our constitutional freedoms is pleasurable and wholesome, but in this day and age it has become ponderous and unwieldy.

The paltriness of our penalties against the crimes of our enemies are humiliating. Death to a dedicated fanatic is anticipated, and for him an easy way out compared to the enormity of his crime.

We've got to get tough. "Rough-on-rats."

We must stand up on our good ol' American legs and yell t'hell with Commies—all Commies who menace the life and peace of our Nation.

Let us for a change hand out a few "bloody noses," instead of sitting by and licking our wounds, hoping that the day will arrive when our enemies will become more docile, tactful, and conciliatory. This day will never be, unless we harden our convictions into resolves.

We must begin by expelling any and all anti-Americans from our country. We must dig them out of their ratholes by the scruff of their filthy necks—and if necessary order that our police officers and security men, beat-the-living-hell-outa'-them, if they act aggressive and sullen and scream for a copy of our Constitution and their rights.

Then deport them to their enslaved countries where they belong.

We say, "enough of this cacophonous, grudging, miserable squabbling. Stop all this abuse and slander—the South against the North—the left wingers and right wingers with their arrogant and overbearing claptrap. Such clamorous and wild shenanigans are playing us right into the hands of our enemies.

If we wish to survive as the greatest, freeest, and most democratic nation in the world, and retain leadership over free people, we must hold all else in abeyance for the moment, and join hands with one paramount purpose in mind—to make it clear, to everyone everywhere that we are a united people, ready, willing, and able to demonstrate our strength and determination to deal, and harshly, in order to maintain world leadership and respect. Let us no longer be played the patsy—let's get tough.

We feel, and most strongly, that if we do, our great and beloved President John F. Kennedy will not have died in vain.

**Mr. SHRIVER.** Mr. Speaker, in his address to the joint session of the Congress a week ago, President Johnson declared:

> Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to my fellow Americans, let us continue.

Following the terrible tragedy which deeply shocked and saddened all Americans, we have witnessed the continuation of Government and national leadership under President Johnson which is essential to the survival of the Republic and the way of life which we cherish.

However, as the Nation recovers its composure and resumes the business which must be done, we will continue to carry in our hearts the memories and appreciation of John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy was the leader of the greatest country of the world today. It is difficult to understand how assassination could occur in a civilized and free land such as ours.

Although I was not in agreement with him at all times on his policies and political positions, he was my President, he was the President of all Americans. He was sincere and dedicated to his convictions and ideas; and he respected those who held opposing views.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the citizens of my district in mourning the death of President Kennedy. Mrs. Shriver and I have conveyed our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the Kennedy family. We pray that God will bless them and our Nation.

It seems appropriate to repeat some of the words spoken in prayer by the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate shortly following the assassination of President Kennedy:

> Hold us, we pray, and the people of America, calm and steady and full of faith for the Republic in this tragic hour and our history.
>
> God save the state and empower her for whatever awaits for the great world role she has been called to fill in this time of destiny.

**Mr. DOLE.** Mr. Speaker, our late President John F. Kennedy was a politician in the finest sense. Politics was a profession of endless fascination and highest importance to him. He laid careful plans for winning—and serving in—the Presidency, a position so trying that scholars have said, "No man is good enough to be President, but someone has to be."

To this profession and position of power, unmatched in the world, John Kennedy brought not only the standard requirements in good measure, but some rare additional qualities.

As stated in the Washington Evening Star:

> He brought gaiety, glamour, and grace to the American political scene in a measure never known before. That lightsome tread, that debonair touch * * * that beguiling grin, that shattering understatement. He walked like a prince and he talked like a scholar. His humor brightened the life of the Republic. When finally elected, he saw no reason to hide his wit. It glinted at every press conference. His public statements were always temperate, always measured. He derided his enemies—he teased his friends. He could be grave, but not for long. When the ugliness of yesterday has been forgotten, we shall remember him smiling.

The mood following his assassination was universal. My hometown paper the Russell Daily News editorialized, "whether one was a member of Kennedy's party or shared his views was no longer important. Even his opposition respected him and the place he had earned in the world's affairs."

The Attica Independent muses:

> It is indeed a sad trait of man that only after death is a person recognized for what he truly was in life * * * his most ardent foe and his most outspoken ally, together, tell the world that he was truly a great man.

Comments the Hutchinson News:

> John Kennedy had a way of making America feel its greatness.

From the Norton Daily Telegram:

> Nearly all Americans have come to have a lot of affection for the most youthful of American Presidents, the man with the boyish grin who aged so fast in our service. President Kennedy had the power of leadership.

The Pratt Daily Tribune says:

> Though many differed with him on the handling of some of these problems, no one could deny him the respect due him for his vigor and doggedness in facing these momentous obligations.
>
> Kennedy was schooled in the art of government and politics. He understood an honest difference of opinion as part of the American way of life.

Over and over the comments refer to his courage. From the Advance Register, of Wichita:

> No one can deny he faced the task of serving his Nation courageously, unhesitatingly, unstintingly.

The Northwestern Kansas Register makes reference to his book, "Profiles in Courage" saying:

> Surely he fitted as well as any of the list of Presidents who had never failed—come what might—to take a conscientious stand.

The Glasco Sun surmises:

> Why was President Kennedy killed? The reason probably lies in the fact that he was one of the most courageous Presidents of our time. He fought vigorously for what he believed was right, regardless of the opposition.

The Ellsworth Reporter says:

> He will be remembered as one of the most outstanding men in our history. The Nation mourns the passing of a courageous leader.

The Hugoton Hermes:

> He will not be known as our best President, * * * nor our worst. He will, I think be one of our strongest in terms of world reputation.

Outstanding are the comments about his personality. The Larned Tiller and Toiler:

> John F. Kennedy brought to the office a youthful vitality, he was debonair, often radiant, but dignity and good taste were also faces of his character. He and his wife, Jacqueline, gave to the White House an intellectual and cultural atmosphere that was perhaps without precedent. He was himself a writer of distinction, and he shared with Mrs. Kennedy an appreciation of the other creative arts which she cultivated and encouraged as First Lady.

The Prairie Drummer:

> John Kennedy was a President very close to the people of the United States. His wartime heroics, youthful personality—all led to immense respect from millions.

The Spearville News:

> John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of courage, personality, power, and vast capabilities. He was young and filled with hope for peace. He loved life, he loved his country and her people and the people loved him.

The Kinsley Mercury:

> As President of this country he was naturally considered a great man. And yet—what made him great came from within himself.

The Great Bend Daily Tribune:

> He was not without opponents, not without critics, but beneath it all was a respect for the man because, while they opposed him and were critical, his opponents knew he was sincerely trying to do what he thought best.

The Lyons Daily News:

> With the tragic event comes the stark realization that when a man is elected President of the United States he becomes an exposed human being with prestige of such eminence that it is beyond comprehension.

The Smith County Pioneer:

> As this shocked Nation started to recover there came the realization—and admission—even by political enemies, that here was a great statesman and probably the most cultured man who ever held the office of President.

The Western Kansas World:

> Truly we can say President Kennedy gave everything a single individual could give for his country and for the freedom and peace of the world.

The Downs News:

> We gather here to reaffirm our faith in the democratic processes as they oppose the tyranny that suggests, "I can kill the man with whom I disagree."

These are but a few of the highlights of the flood of editorial comments in western Kansas papers, each recognizing in some form the late President's strength in and love of politics. It is important to the individual and the country, that politics be studied with the same sense of dedication successful men bring to the profession of farming, teaching, law, or medicine or any other.

We live in a country—in a world—of enormous complexity. The strength of a democracy is in its enlightened electorate and the complexity of modern life makes this ideal very difficult to achieve. During such a time, the professional politician, whether you agree or disagree with what he always says or does, is important. President Kennedy was such a person. His knowledge, his brilliant mind, his continuous study of politics, were of great importance and while many have these qualities, few have all the ingredients necessary.

His feeling of identification with people, his great interest and fondness for great crowds of humanity, his tolerance of the differences of human beings, was the wonder of John Kennedy.

The three previous Presidents assassinated shared many of the same qualities, and strangely each was slain during a period in his administration when there was peace, prosperity, and happiness. Furthermore, on the day the crime was committed, each was unusually happy, pleased with the progress, and held in great favor by the crowds who came to see them. Finally, each was slain by a person with little or no reason for the act or hope of gain once it was accomplished.

What is done is tragically history and as the Nation mourns and all hearts go out to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and all members of the Kennedy family, little can be said but let us recall the statement of Daniel Webster, carved in granite above the center door of the House of Representatives Press Gallery. It is a challenge to all now as it must have been to then Congressman John F. Kennedy when he first reflected upon it:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is premature to attempt to evaluate the place that the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, will hold in the history of this Nation or world as events are recorded by future writers. It is not too early to make several observations.

First, he was a man dedicated to public service. This was manifested through his military service in time of war and more recently in his rapid ascendancy in public office.

Further, probably few other national leaders have been as colorful as he in their own inimitable ways. No doubt this was due in part to his youth, but more particularly to his natural vivaciousness and a tremendous capacity for work. This particular capacity was not limited to John Kennedy but seems to be a common tendency throughout the entire Kennedy family.

History will probably record him as one of the Presidents that could be classified as an intellectual. This characteristic is evident in his literary manuscripts, his prepared speeches, as well as his extemporaneous remarks. Few other persons have I heard employ such a broad vocabulary as did the late President and have the faculty of selecting exactly the right word to accentuate the point he wished to make.

These things being said, I think it would be inappropriate not to mention my philosophical differences with the former President. As I have recited in earlier commentary, my differences with him were in principle, not in prejudice.

There is no question that his administration for only 3 brief years will leave a very critical imprint on American society. The cowardly assassination deprived his party, his country, and the world of a final judgment on what he might have contributed to mankind had his life not been taken. He shall be missed as our selected leader, as a friend and as a political adversary, but most important, it should be recorded that his disappearance from world politics will create a void that is discernible to all mankind for the present and for a time in the future.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, certainly John Kennedy was an extraordinary man. His assassination was a body blow to our ideals of free government. It was a sharp and painful human loss, too, especially to those of us who had met and known and worked with him, if only for 3 short years, here in Washington.

The thing about President Kennedy's assassination that hurt many of us more than anything else was the cutting off of his immense aliveness. As a man, as a politician, as President, he was alive and sensitive to his world as few of us are. And people everywhere seemed to be able to understand this, even though they had never seen him in person.

His vitality came through to large numbers of people in an immediate way. For example, he came to my hometown, Lawrence, Kans., in the late 1950's to speak to a student convocation at the University of Kansas. Even though he was then a young and junior Senator, our student body and faculty, as well as the citizens of the town, responded unforgettably to the excitement of John Kennedy's aliveness.

Then too, his aliveness and warmth called up an exuberant response from those who met him individually. Certainly this was true of Mrs. Ellsworth and me when we met and visited briefly with him at White House social occasions. His warm and friendly liveliness came through to me again one afternoon at the White House when he and I interrupted a legislative working session to visit about mutual friends in Springfield, Mass., where I had once practiced law.

But above all, John Kennedy was alive to the tides of changing ideas, to the shifts of political and social facts, to the sweep and rush of world history. People everywhere in the world, who are themselves sensitive and alive in any degree to what is going on in the world, know the world is changing. They knew that John Kennedy knew it, too; and they sensed he was doing his best to deal with the world. Here was a young man, born in this century, steeped all his young life in the study of history, fully alive and sensitive as well to the world of ideas as to the world of brutal power.

Not that all of us always agreed with every direction of his lively responses to the world; far from it. But he did respond. He couldn't help responding, so alive was he. And all people everywhere—even his opponents—granted that, and felt at his death a rude and human shock.

As the news of John Kennedy's assassination came to me over my car radio less than 2 weeks ago, I felt that shock.

As Mrs. Ellsworth and I walked solemnly past his casket and catafalque in the White House East Room, with the giant chandeliers and the fireplace draped in black crepe, where before we had danced to gayest music, we felt that shock.

And as at last the representatives of the American people, the Members of the Congress, and our families, joined his sad widow on the hillside under the giant oaks at Arlington that bright, cold November Monday afternoon, we shared that shock again, this time with all the great from all the world. Just as taps echoed finally from higher up the hill, the afternoon sun slipped down behind the crest and a very real chill indeed settled over Washington, and over our beloved Nation.

Yet so powerful and so beautiful was John Kennedy's aliveness that I cannot think he would have wanted us here now to bear the pall of that chill for long. After all, he died as he would have wanted—in the heat of the battle for a lively appreciation of the world by all of us. There he was in Dallas, moving freely and openly among the people, surrounded round about by his friends supporting him and his enemies attacking him.

Let us commit ourselves today to being as alive and responsive as we can be, and with that let us be warm and human and loving and understanding. Let us not suppose we have to agree with each other all the time, nor even with all of our late President's ideas—he never asked that, even in life.

But, because of him and of his hero's death, we will forever after give more respect, and more honor and glory than ever before, to those men and women who are alive as he was to ideas, to facts, to history, and to men and women as individuals and as part of the sweep of our human history.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is difficult to translate into words the thoughts which we carry in our hearts and minds. For me, this is one of those occasions.

November 22, 1963, and the event which transpired on that tragic day has left its mark upon our Nation's history—a mark which time may dim but can never erase. But I cannot in my own heart feel that all America should be adjudged guilty for the act of one warped mind, and I do not think that John F. Kennedy would want it so.

I did not know John F. Kennedy intimately. But anyone who was privileged to see him and hear him will never forget his wit, his smile and his personality. He served his country as best he knew how. No man can do more. His dreams, his aspirations and his goals for a better America in a world living in peace were shared by all of us. But so long as man has a free mind, honest differences will develop as to the methods, procedures and programs which should be followed in achieving these national objectives.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is gone. But as surely as the night follows the day the spirit of John F. Kennedy will live on. His work is finished. The heavy burden now falls upon the shoulders of his wife, Mrs. Jacqueline B. Kennedy. To those of us who attended the services in the rotunda of the Capitol, the courage, the fortitude and the majesty of Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, wife and mother, will long be remembered. Men and women cried unashamedly as they watched her kneel and press her lips to the flag which draped the casket of her beloved husband.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Kennedy, to Caroline and to John. I pray God has given them the courage, the will and the understanding to carry on, as I am sure that John F. Kennedy, husband and father, would have so wished.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we pay tribute to our assassinated President, John F. Kennedy, we realize the inadequacy of words and recognize the justifiable duplication that is produced. In the 2 weeks since the tragic assassination of the President, the Nation has expressed shock, sorrow, and respect for the late President.

Mrs. Derwinski and I extend to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, her children, and the Kennedy family our deep personal sympathy. Despite the natural preoccupation with governmental complications caused by the assassination, we recognize the great personal loss that Mrs. Kennedy and her children suffer, and certainly the citizens of the country manifested understanding and sorrow in the personal, as well as in the official nature of the tragedy.

The nationwide feelings of shock and sorrow can be very vividly recognized as we read the editorial comment from publications across the country. I include at this point editorial comment, eulogizing President Kennedy, that appeared in numerous independent community publications in the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois:

[From the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Nov. 28, 1963]

### NOVEMBER 22, 1963, WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

There is not one of us who will ever forget where we were or our surroundings—November 22, 1963—when the awful impact of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, finally became a part of our consciousness.

Who can forget the intoning of the radio announcer who said, last Friday, "two priests who have just left the hospital said that the President is dead"? Those few words changed the irrevocable, shocking possibility into a hard, unyielding actuality.

There has been no President since Lincoln who perhaps was so openly villified and ardently disliked by certain elements—his very youth and vigor, the multiplicity of activity of the Kennedy family—all seemed to add certain resentments to his career.

On the other hand, it took his brutal, untimely death to bring forth the now general appreciation of what this comparatively young man did for the world which last October wavered on the brink of atomic war. He stood steadfast in his talks to Khrushchev in a manner which demonstrated the same inherent courage he personally displayed, years before, in World War II.

The signing of the test ban treaty was another great accomplishment and victory of statesmanship he displayed during the past 3 years of worldwide crisis.

His extensive travels, particularly his trip to West Berlin and other troubled spots on the globe—all accomplished with safety and acclaim—made doubly horrible the fact that he should be cowardly murdered in an American city.

Sorrow is intermingled with indignation in knowing that such violence should exist against a head of state—our head of state. We are sure that everyone feels personally affronted, as well as aggrieved.

John Dryden, famous English poet, wrote a poem—strangely enough, for Saint Cecilia's Day—November 22. The title was "A Song for Saint Cecilia's Day, November 22, 1687."

"As from the power of sacred lays
The spheres began to move
And sung the great Creator's praise
To all the blest above:
So when the last and dreadful hour
This crumbling pageant shall devour
The trumpet shall be heard on high
The dead shall live, the living die
And music will contain the sky."

It was a concidence to read over those lines on November 22, 1963, exactly 276 years later, even though the context is not particularly applicable to the assassination of a President of the United States, still those sonorous last phrases of Dryden's poem might well be repeated as a form of requiem.

[From the Harvey Tribune, Nov. 24, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A saddened America mourns the tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and joins in worldwide prayers for the late Chief Executive and his family. A shocked America strives in vain to comprehend the base wickedness leading to so inexplicable a horror as his assassination.

If any seed of comfort can be derived from this great sorrow, it must be the common bond which so emphatically overrides political partisanship and all other considerations at times of great adversity. On our late President's death, we stand united, as we had stood united under his dynamic leadership in time of peril.

As Chief Executive of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the President of all Americans. As an individual, he was a man whose magnetic personality and courage won respect in addition to that accruing from the dignity of his office.

A measure of his character is the fact that he had given much of his short life to public service when the responsibilities were grave.

It is in this light that we add our humble words to the countless others coming from those in all stations of life who have lost their President.

And it is with an abiding faith in the fabric of American leadership and American principles that we confidently expect our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, to receive unreserved cooperation at every hand as he performs his duties in these trying times.

---

[From the Lemonter, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A GREAT AMERICAN DIES

It will be a week Friday, since John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, was slain by an assassin at Dallas, Tex.

News of this horrifying event stunned the civilized world. Horror, bewilderment, shock, and grief gripped all as word of the tragedy spread. It was as if some strange vacuum had been loosed, draining emotions and leaving people empty and dazed.

John F. Kennedy was a man who had captured the affections of the public. One might disagree with his political views and policies but at the same time like and admire the man. He was colorful, engaging and dynamic. He was an intelligent, shrewd leader—an intellectual with the common touch. One couldn't help but like President Kennedy. Millions who had never seen him in person considered him as a personal friend.

That he had endeared himself to all people was demonstrated by the spontaneous tears, evoked in all nations when news of his death was flashed over the air.

The late President was confronted with great and grave problems almost from the time he took office 34 months ago. He faced them with courage and fortitude.

The duties and responsibilities of the Presidency are terrific, physically as well as mentally. President Kennedy was further handicapped by a spinal injury incurred in college days, aggravated by his war service and further worsened by the grind of official rounds and the public demands upon his strength. As a result the late President suffered considerable pain but he kept it hidden and never hid behind it.

President Kennedy was a great American, a man devoted to the cause of peace, who endeavored to serve all according to his lights and aims. In time his place in history will be evaluated but there can be no dispute that he was a great leader, a man who loved people and in turn was loved by them.

Speaking for the people of the area we wish to extend the deepest and sincere sympathy to the family of our late President.

May his soul rest in peace and light perpetual shine upon him.

---

[From the Markham Bulletin, Nov. 28, 1963]

### AN EDITORIAL

Some of the initial shock of Friday's heinous assassination has by now worn off. Realization that things are as they really are is being established. The true impact of the tragedy—of course—remains unknown. History must now finally assess the greatness of our former President. Certainly the bereavement of this country has been felt by all. The tributes have been made, but words cannot suffice to fully convey the sense of loss felt by citizens of this country.

All will recognize that President Kennedy's brief tenure encompassed all the truly profound issues of our time—and that upon him was thrust the responsibility of establishing policy that would influence all generations unborn, as well as all living beings on earth. Weighty responsibility indeed—and perhaps unfair responsibility for any mortal.

Our former President met these duties with great personal courage; as a patriotic American, with utmost belief that his decisions were considerate of the best interests of the free world, and predicated upon the laws of our land. Surely it would be unfair to have expected his executive decisions to have been popularly supported by everyone. Maybe others could have executed his position better. This is doubtful, and the awesome burden of proof will now fall to those who will succeed him. Our prayers must be extended to these Americans.

Our former President combined his vast array of talents with personal warmth and compassion. A rare and wonderful combination—totally diverse from the dark forces that triggered Friday's atrocity. These forces are the manifestations of our imperfections: capacity for hate, greed, perversion. In all of us there are degrees of wrong: imperfections which make possible in our society the ultimate sin of murder. In some portion we can all share the blame of Friday's disaster.

On this Thangsgiving eve it would seem appropriate to be grateful that we were given such a leader as John F. Kennedy; that other brave and intelligent men will follow and guide this great country; that within the vast, vast majority of mankind there dwell forces for good far exceeding the resident evil; that as long as there is life there will always be this great exertion for right over might.

We might also pray that Friday's tragic sacrifice will not have been made in vain. That somehow from the depths of the grief and sickness that surrounds this loss there will emerge meaningful recognition of man's capacity for and need to love.

---

[From the Park Forest Reporter, Nov. 27, 1963]

### AND NOW, ETERNAL PEACE

Five days have passed since the world was stunned by the shocking international tragedy when an assassin's bullet on Friday took the life of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The esteem in which he was held by fellow Americans and nationals of many foreign lands was demonstrated by the tremendous outpourings of symathy and concern which emanated not only from the capitals of the world, but also from villages and the hinterlands all over the globe.

Across the length and breadth of our Nation, millions of grief-stricken men, women, and children mourned the passing of President Kennedy as though he were a member of the family. His 34-month tenure as our Chief Executive endeared him to all peace-loving people—those who agreed with his political philosophies as well as those whose party affiliations or foreign philosophy brought them into conflict with his views.

What manner of a man was Mr. Kennedy that he, at a youthful age of 46, should earn such worldwide acclaim and immortality?

It is left for history to record the scope of his deeds, but the personal excitement he created and the strength of character he displayed will long be remembered by those who were touched by his magnetism.

Culturally an intellectual, President Kennedy, born into a millionaire family, possessed the simple graces, which made him sincerely devoted to a cause which championed for a better America and a better world. His humility, his faith, his compassion for the underprivileged both here and abroad, his zeal toward a fulfillment of complete citizen rights for all Americans, regardless of their origins and the color of their skins did not make him most popular in some sections of the Nation, but he steadfastly refused to give ground until his cause triumphed.

His humor, wit, and charm added a new dimension to our Nation's top office.

His role as a husband and a father would qualify him for an all-American role, regardless of the competition. With wife Jacqueline, they made a couple without counterpart among the heads of all the world's nations.

Millions of words have been written and spoken since that dreaded black Friday of last week, eulogizing the world's most popular citizen in the postwar years. To repeat them now would be unnecessary.

In life he worked so earnestly for a lasting peace on earth. Deservedly he has earned eternal peace. There is no higher reward.

---

[From the Riverdale Advertiser, Nov. 25, 1963]

### IN PEACE AND HONOR REST YOU

The death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy can in no way destroy the sincerity of his thought for his country and for his fellowmen. Certainly it may be said of him that he did what he felt was right for him to do for the welfare of all of us and he did by his deeds and words, the very best he could do. No man could have done more than that.

---

[From the Sauk Villlage Review, Nov. 28, 1963]

### EDITORIAL

(By Lee Staley)

Wiser, more learned and profound men than I have already written about President Kennedy's assassination. But I felt a personal and moral obligation to our readers to express my thoughts.

I do not believe that the full impact or significance of what occurred last Friday in Dallas, Tex., was immediately felt by the stunned citizens of the free world.

A great and noble man had fought in two wars—in World War II as a naval officer fighting for the ideals of liberty for the country he loved—in the cold war as President of the United States fighting for the freedom and human dignity of mankind. He lost his life on the battlefield of humanity.

Now we must put forth our combined efforts to help maintain the peace and ideals of this courageous leader.

We must help our new President Lyndon Baines Johnson pick up the reins of our fallen President.

May God help him guide the reins to a peaceful world.

---

[From the Suburbanite-Economist, Nov. 27, 1963]

### HE SHALL LIVE ON

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the Nation's heroes in Arlington Cemetery while his country and the world continues in the throes of the most poignant grief ever known on a global scale.

Not even his most fervent admirers realized that he was the idol of peoples of all levels everywhere. Cables report natives in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America wept unashamedly on the streets, in houses of worship, or wherever they gathered.

To foreigners, he was the undisputed champion of all that is just, fair, and right, and they looked to him to lead the world back to peace.

To Americans he was regarded similarly, but, in addition, as the young leader who would correct the wrongs from which the Nation has suffered since its founding.

Now an eternal light burns on the cemetery slope at his grave. It can be seen from the Nation's Capital City, and it is to be hoped it will serve future governments as a reminder that the people want done the things this great man stood for and fought for.

His name has taken its place in history with those of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. It will never be forgotten.

---

[From the Worth-Palos Reporter, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IT'S UP TO US, NOW

Throughout these last tragic days, we have asked ourselves desperately "Why?"

Through all the horror, all the grief, each one asked each other, "Why?" Shock and disbelief echoed with each asking.

Now, because the evident assassin is dead, it may never be known what sickness twisted him so. It is for us, then, to turn from questioning to resolution. To give meaning to this martydom by the way we live and act.

This is not the first time one man has been a sacrifice for all men. Will we go through eternity letting our best and bravest die for us? Or can we learn, slowly and through terrible pain, some lesson from each one?

No man now living is untouched by John Kennedy's lifeless hand. Unless that touch reaches to our hearts and makes each one of us in some way better, we will be writing our own answer to that desperate "Why?". We will be answering, "For no reason."

### FOR GALLANTRY

A recurring theme expressed by every one of the newsmen who brought us the terrible details of tragedy has been admiration for Jacqueline Kennedy.

She has acted throughout as though each citizen of the country was a member of John Kennedy's family, and has let us mourn with her in dignity. Each of us has traveled with her through that bright Friday morning. We have followed her into shock as she cradled her dying husband in her arms.

Our hearts have ached for the wife who walked, dazed but resolute, beside her husband's coffin. And we have wept for the mother whose little daughter turned to her in bewilderment to learn what to do next as she knelt in the great rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, these editorials express fully the feeling that was obvious during the tragic weekend of the President's death. The President, with his energy and ability to communicate with the public, reflected an image of the Presidency of which the public was justifiably proud.

The overwhelming shock that all Americans felt was reflected in the statement, "I didn't think anything like this could happen here." The totally unexpected tragedy caused all Americans to reappraise the national scene, and reevaluate their understanding of our national heritage. In that reevaluation, they recognize the deep roots and true greatness of the Nation that has exhibited itself in the days of national sorrow that marked President Kennedy's death.

The fact that the assassin was motivated by Marxist philosophy was duly recognized by the public, and in the moment of national tragedy we note the reaffirmation of faith in the American way of life and the determination to maintain a world of freedom and peace to achieve the goal of ultimate victory of justice over the tyranny of communism.

It is truly fitting and timely in the memory of the late President Kennedy that we rededicate ourselves to the necessary triumph of free-world philosophy over the diabolical Communist ideology.

I know I speak the sentiments of all the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Illinois and express their profound sorrow in the tragic loss of President Kennedy.

To Mrs. Kennedy and the late President's family, I convey on behalf of the citizens I represent their deep personal sympathy and understanding, and with all Americans, we renew our determination to build America on the solid foundations of the past and demonstrate the stability of the Nation in surviving this tragic assassination.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our late President John F. Kennedy. I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the tragic event which took his life. His assassination was a grevious blow to our Nation and brought overwhelming sorrow to all of our people. It is still hard to believe that such a tragedy could occur in this country.

It is difficult to understand why the President should be cut down, without warning, at the peak of his career. The people of this country hold their President in great affection and respect. This is true regardless of political affiliation and they were completely unprepared for the shocking news which reached them on November 22. The Nation united in sincere grief for its stricken President.

I liked President Kennedy and always enjoyed a visit with him. He always had the same friendly greeting and was a most congenial person. It is not difficult to understand why he had so many friends, not alone in our own country, but throughout the world. He had a charm and grace which attracted people of all types to him.

President Kennedy was a most welcome visitor to Colorado. He visited our State several times, and on each occasion received a most cordial reception. He had many friends in Colorado, and in my congressional district, who deeply mourn his untimely death.

I recall that in August of last year President Kennedy came to Pueblo in my district to help us celebrate the authorization of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Transmountain water diversion project. He signed the bill at the White House on August 16, 1962, and came to Pueblo the next day. I am proud to have in my office one of the pens he used to sign this bill. The people of my district greatly appreciated the support President Kennedy gave this project, and he was accorded a most enthusiastic welcome. It is now proposed that the Pueblo Dam, an important feature of the project, be named in his honor.

The last trip of the President to Colorado was in June of this year, when he went to Colorado Springs to address the graduating class of the Air Force Academy. Over 30,000 persons gathered in Falcon Stadium to greet him, and thousands lined the streets to extend their welcome on his way from the stadium.

Mr. Speaker, I had the great honor of serving in the House with Mr. Kennedy. I recall how diligently he worked for the district in Massachusetts which he represented. I remember on one occasion the hard fight he made on the floor for funds for a flood control project in his district.

I was not close to President Kennedy politically, since we belonged to opposite political parties. However, I had great admiration and personal affection for him. His tragic death was an irreparable loss to our Nation.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the children, and the other members of the family.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the prime of his life and at the point where he could render his greatest service to his country, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was taken from our midst.

All America was saddened over the senseless assassination of our President by a Communist sympathizer. The motivation for such a barbaric act can be understood only by the twisted mind of an anarchist.

We mourn his death and we deeply sympathize with his wife, his children, and his family.

One of the finest tributes I have seen paid to John F. Kennedy was by the Vicksburg, Miss., Evening Post. In an editorial on November 23, 1963, the Evening Post commented on his death and I truly believe that the sentiments expressed in that editorial to be representative of the feeling of the people of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial as a part of my remarks:

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Only yesterday, in the full flush of manhood, John F. Kennedy was President of the United States, the acknowledged leader of the free world. Today, he lies cold in death, the victim of an assassin's bullet. Yesterday, in many of his proposals and programs, he faced a vigorous opposition. Today, in death, he finds 180 million people completely united in their horror at his tragic death. Yesterday he was the loving father and husband. Today the family circle is broken, never again to be regained.

The manner in which President Kennedy met his death will always remain in our annals as a crime of dastardly proportions. Not only was he wantonly murdered—that fatal shot was directed at the people of the United States, who had entrusted him with their leadership. It was a blow against American principles and freedom. It was the work of a warped and twisted mind. It was the act of one completely out of tune with every vestige of decency. November 22, 1963, will go down in our history as another day of infamy.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was in his 47th year, and in the 3d year of the Presidency.

He had brought a new concept to the Presidency, new ideas, new programs, both in domestic and international affairs. He was a controversial President in that many of his policies met with strong and vigorous opposition, but he was a man of courage, a man of sincerity, a man dedicated in his beliefs. Classed as a liberal, he was faced with mounting conservative opposition, and criticism of his administration was loud. But he met the criticism with courage and with a faith in his own ideas and ideals. The courage he had displayed as a naval officer in World War II, never failed him when he assumed the tremendous burdens of the Presidency. He was called upon to stand up to the Reds on more than one occasion. This he did unflinchingly and with firmness. He was the first President to have the full responsibility of warding off, or plunging the world into, a nuclear war. No one man in history had a greater burden to bear than that. John F. Kennedy met that responsibility, and the dreaded nuclear war did not materialize.

The cowardly attack upon this great leader has left a nation stunned and dazed, that such a thing could happen in a free country. The cry of the Nation now is that the guilty be apprehended, and that the world will know that under our American system, political or other differences will never be settled by violence, but only through the free and open discussion of opposite views can there be a resolution of differences in the true American tradition.

As John F. Kennedy comes back to the White House today in death, a saddened and deeply affected nation mourns his passing—it mourns the fact that his service to his Nation has been so tragically terminated—it mourns with his devoted wife and his children orphaned at such an early age—it mourns with his parents and the other members of his family—it mourns for America in one of her saddest hours.

John Kennedy, in his inaugural address, pleaded with his countrymen to give to their country. Yesterday he gave his all. His life was offered as a sacrifice on the altar of devotion to his country. Upon his tombstone should be inscribed "Killed in action," for in a very true sense he died the death of a hero.

His soul, troubled and weighed down by the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency, is now at rest. May a merciful God grant him an eternity of the peace for which he had given such dedicated service.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the bullet from the assassin's gun that felled President John F. Kennedy on that beautiful fall morning in Dallas, Tex., only a few days ago, was a national tragedy. Death as a result of natural causes is always a sad event, but when a young man, and particularly a young man who is President of the United States, is struck down at the hands of an assassin, it is most reprehensible.

On the morning of November 22, President John F. Kennedy rode down the street of Dallas, Tex., a happy man with the vigor of youth, with virtually the world at his feet. He was the leader of the greatest and most powerful nation in the world; he was possessed of wealth, power and happiness; he enjoyed the love and adoration of his parents, brothers and sisters as well as his charming wife and infant children. He had everything to live for. His popularity was worldwide; even those who did not share his philosophical views respected this young President of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult sometimes to understand the scheme of life and death. It is certainly most difficult to understand the motivation of this warped-minded individual who fired the fatal shot. And yet, we know that throughout the recorded history of mankind every generation of men has been plagued with such types of depraved human beings. Unfortunately, President Kennedy's tragic death is not without precedent in the comparatively short life of this Republic; as witness the unfortunate and tragic deaths of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley. In each instance, these four Presidents died at the hands of assassins of dubious objectives conceived by unbalanced minds. Possibly the greatest parallel in this most recent national tragedy is that of President McKinley who died at the hands of an admitted anarchist. The obvious murderer of President Kennedy was an admitted Communist.

Mr. Speaker, as one who honestly and sincerely but regretfully differed with our lamented President, as thank God it is our right to do under the American political system, I also was one of those who had a genuine affection for the President and, like all other Americans of good will, Mrs. Colmer and I join in extending our sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation was shocked beyond expression at the sudden and tragic death of President John F. Kennedy. It is almost inconceivable that such an assassination of an American President could occur in this enlightened age of American history.

I first became acquainted with President Kennedy when he joined us in the House of Representatives in 1946 and thereafter followed his career in the Senate and in the White House with keen interest. Truly he served with great honor and dignity.

John F. Kennedy's warm personality, genuine sense of humor, and outstanding intellect won for him the admiration of a world of friends. The whole world will continue to mourn the untimely passing of this great American and fine Christian gentleman.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, in this historic Chamber, where John Fitzgerald Kennedy served as a young Congressman and prepared himself for the destiny that led him not only to the highest office in the land but also to an untimely and tragic death, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory; also to extend my sincere condolences to his brave widow and his family.

No American could fail to respect him for his energy, his great ability, and his deep devotion to what he deemed to be his patriotic duty. I admired him for his unselfish dedication to public service and for his bravery as a young Navy lieutenant risking his life in the defense of this Nation.

And now he is gone, "Leaving his death as an example of noble courage, and a memorial of virtue, not only unto young men, but unto all his Nation."

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I join the millions of decent people worldwide in sorrow over the death of John F. Kennedy.

Truly the world has lost a great statesman, who—in his rather brief career as our President—accomplished much good according to Christian principles and the other ideals to which we adhere as Americans.

I was privileged to know the late President through conversation in my district and at the White House and learned the same respect for him that was learned by his more intimate acquaintances. My feeling is that here was a man of great humility, compassion for humanity, and tolerance and understanding of the strengths, weaknesses, and needs of people in every walk of life.

He could, without question, express the ideals of our democratic Republic better than any President since the time of our Founding Fathers and his spoken and written observations on the affairs of the Nation and the world will be textbook material for scholars forever.

Our sorrow for John F. Kennedy is matched by an admiration for his widow. Inevitably the wife of a great public man stands somewhat in his shadow during his lifetime. In the grim days following the death of her husband, however, Jacqueline Kennedy demonstrated qualities of courage, devotion, and dignity which will live in the memory of all of us. I am certain that her reactions under stress inspired millions of Americans to lead better lives in the service of our society.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I fully share the feeling that has been expressed here today concerning the tragic death of President Kennedy. His loss is mourned by the entire Nation, and indeed by the entire world where freedom, liberty and justice are respected. His life was dedicated to those principles.

It was my good fortune to have been rather closely associated with John Kennedy when he first came to Congress in 1947. He was a hard fighter for what he believed in. Everything he did was honorable and fair. There was nothing petty or small about that great American. The result was that he commanded respect and admiration in everything he did. Whether one agreed with him or not, he was respected as a worthy adversary and an able an energetic advocate.

As President he gained the confidence of freedom-loving people all over the world. He held high the banner of hope for freedom and tranquility in this troubled world. It is indeed a terrible thing to contemplate his loss at the very peak of his career. I join with my colleagues in an expression of condolence to the surviving widow and children.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour on a day set aside to eulogize our late President, it is difficult to add to what has been said without repeating the thoughts and phrases of others.

The story of John Kennedy, the man—his capacity for leadership—the dynamics of his personality—his devotion to duty—all have been articulated and documented by speakers and authors of great reknown. In fact, it is probable that more words than ever before concerning one man have been written in the press of the world and spoken to the world through the media of television and radio about his life—his death—and the reaction of people everywhere to the horror of his sinister assassination.

Among civilized people, grief is universal.

Should we in this hour of shock and moment of despair linger in a vague, subconscious hope that something can be undone that is done, time will not wait for us. We cannot recast the challenge of today. The press of new people being born every hour, demanding as they grow new opportunity to become a part of a higher order of civilization—the demands of nations for a larger share of the world's bounty, for independence but with protection; for aid but without obligation—the ever-present conflict between man's concept of freedom and his reaction to law and discipline—the awareness of these forces were a part of the total understanding within John Kennedy. His willingness to enter the arena to fight for his solutions, to accept the scars of battle as part of the job and to give of himself to motivate others is what I hope history will hold high in its reflection of the man.

America's strength and, most important, her future contribution to the development of man's lot on earth is the product of the forces which unite us as a people and a nation. These forces are strengthened, not weakened, by the partisanism of our politics. The differences of opinions and philosophies which conform us into a society of individuals rather than a herd are the dynamics of our ability to govern ourselves. We have the capacity to unite—unite in purpose—unite in fellowship, and yes, unite in grief and tribute because by open debate and by resolution of our differences through the honored processes of our system we have achieved this right to unite. The unity here today in grief and tribute is without bond, or control, or influence by any imposition, foreign or domestic. It is the product of free men working, thinking, and differing, but within the design of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, in final tribute to our late President we must recognize this crime of his death for what it is. Does it represent the imperfection of our system? Was it motivated by some wild extreme of our normal differences? On this, sir, may I quote in part the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], when he said on November 25 in the Senate:

> It was not a flaw in the American system or the American character that struck down John Kennedy. It was not the sin of a city or of its citizens. It was not a tragedy that struck from some dark stain of violence on the American system or in the American soul. And we do not serve the best interests of our Nation, of truth, or of the memory of a murdered President by letting wrongly placed recriminations overcome the good sense of this great Nation and its people.

To prejudge the crime is in itself a departure from the principles of our law. The mechanism has been set up to provide history with the truth. Let it function in due course.

Coupled with patience, there must be resolution on our part to accept the problems of the day, to keep moving toward the American horizon—a better day for men everywhere. Let us be able to say today and tomorrow, "this man did not die in vain."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were stunned by the tragedy of November 22, 1963. Their shock and disbelief gave way only slowly to an outpouring of grief of a magnitude and universally shared depth and quality we shall not again witness in this generation. Perhaps the grief of many is deeper through their realization of the qualities of a man only upon his passing.

My personal sorrow is the greater because of my opportunity to know this fine man and to appreciate the courage and determination with which he served us. During the climax of his all too brief years he brought to the Presidency a direction, a purpose, and a leadership we desperately needed in these perilous times. History will recognize his qualities and pay tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy as one of our greatest Presidents, a leader sent to us in time of crisis. Sadly, he cannot now share in seeing his work carried forward to fulfillment, but we can see that it is carried forward. We can here determine that our country shall realize those ideals for which he fought and for which he gave his life. We can here determine that his wisdom, tolerance, and dedication to the highest ideals of our country shall not be in vain. We can see that the bitter, vacant place in the hearts of the people of America shall be slowly filled to overwhelming with a renewed faith, and confidence in America and a determination to carry our country to the destiny in which John Fitzgerald Kennedy had abiding faith.

Our grief is too heavy upon us to understand the inscrutable will which has taken him from us. My faith tells me that will intends we shall be brought closer to the realization of those profound and everlasting truths for which our Savior also died. Out of sorrow, may we draw closer together, find love and confidence in each other to replace bitterness and hate. This shall be our witness to those who loved him, whose sorrow we deeply share, that John Fitzgerald Kennedy lives in the good works we shall carry forward.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I join with all Members of the House of Representatives today in expressing sorrow at the tragic assassination of our President. I say our President because John F. Kennedy was my President, regardless of the fact that I am a member of the opposite political party. This is a facet of our Government that is often overlooked by people not familiar with our American form of government. In the tradition of our freedom we compete strenuously through our political parties to elect those who will be the leaders of our Government. Once elected, however, these duly elected officials are the representatives of all the people not just of those who voted for them. Thus, John Kennedy was my President even though I was not one of those who supported him in his efforts to become President of the United States. I admired his courage and ability and even though I often disagreed with his proposals, he had my deep respect.

I feel a loss, as I am sure all true Americans feel a deep loss that this vigorous, articulate, aggressive young man was taken from us. When we ask why such a tragic event can happen, it is perhaps appropriate to reflect that a higher power makes these decisions and it is not for us to reason why. We can ask what influence prompts a demented human being to perform such a dastardly act. Is the assassin also one of God's children?

I am not endowed with an ability with words to add to what has already appropriately been said here today. My heart goes out particularly to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the two lovely children who have lost a husband and a father. A new President has taken over the responsibilities of guiding our Government and this great country will go on. The father and husband cannot be replaced.

On behalf of the people of North Dakota, whom I have the honor to represent, and my wife and I, I want to express deepest sympathy to the members of the entire Kennedy family in this hour of their great loss. John Kennedy is gone from among them, but the pride in this distinguished member of their family will live on.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The assassination of President Kennedy, a courageous and dedicated leader, will ever remain one of the great tragic episdoes in American history.

As a Nation, we have had taken from us the youth and grace and charm he brought to the Nation's highest office. An indomitable spirt and the sheer joy of living shone through his every word and act. His warmth gentle sense of humor will be sorely missed in a land where these qualities are often underestimated.

Those of us who so often found ourselves engaged in battle with President Kennedy have been deprived of a worthy opponent who never failed to command our deepest respect. He loved the hard and bitter give-and-take of political life, and he transmitted this zest to friend and foe alike. He recognized, more than others the need of his office and the country it served for debate and criticism and he never allowed disagreement over policy or issues to turn into petty personal animosity.

The tragedy of John Kennedy, and our tragedy, is that this man of so many virtues and such outstanding ability should be struck down so early in a career which held the promise of greatness.

We mourn his passing. Our hearts go out to his brave widow and children and to his family in their hour of sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the finest tribute to the late President Kennedy which I have run across were two editorials appearing in newspapers in my district, the Orlando Sentinel and the Titusville Star-Advocate.

These express far better than I can, what the people of my district feel about the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

I feel it fitting therefore to insert these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Titusville (Fla). Star-Advocate, Nov. 25, 1963]

### WITH A FULL HEART

The name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, has indeed been inscribed in the "scroll of the immortals."

As he is laid to rest today in Arlington National Cemetery, with full military honors, countless millions of people, from all walks of life the world over, feel a sense of grief and personal loss in the tragic death of this ambassador of world peace and understanding among nations.

That the life of our young Chief Executive should be snuffed out by an assassin sniper's bullet in Dallas, Tex., last Friday—here in the freest land on earth—the most highly civilized country in the world—in the culmination of a campaign of hate, the very hate which John F. Kennedy abhorred and worked so tirelessly to eradicate—surely has an unknown significance in this dark hour of grief.

Mr. Kennedy was a deeply religious and dedicated man, with tremendous enthusiasm and a dynamic personality, and in his short 34 months as President, exerted his untiring efforts for peace and understanding and abhorred the hate prevailing among peoples of different races and faiths, not only here in America, but throughout the world. He had, thusly, become an international symbol of good will.

We differed with the late President on many issues, but this in no wise lessened our respect for him and the high office which he held with dignity. He was truly a gentleman and a scholar as well as an able leader.

The record of John Fitzgerald Kennedy stands upon its merits—he served his country well in the time of World War II as commander of PT–109; he served for 14 years in the Congress of his country; and upon becoming our 35th President, gave his life for his country in the cause of peace and understanding in the year of our Lord 1963.

His life was truly patterned on the "last mile principle." May he not have died in vain."

---

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Every American in every walk of life feels a deep sense of loss today.

The death of the President touches each one of us, regardless of race, creed, religion, or political party.

We did not always agree with the President, but we never doubted his honesty, his sincerity and his devotion to his country—all the way from PT 109 to the White House.

He almost died during World War II for the country he loved.

And yesterday he did.

The way Mr. Kennedy died profoundly shocked all Americans. Men wept unashamedly at this wanton murder of a young President, a loving father and a devoted husband.

Mrs. Kennedy's lost cry of despair echoed in every heart throughout the land.

Justice must be swift for the assassins of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The presence in this country of men with minds like that is a more dangerous threat to the preservation of freedom than is the Soviet Union with all of its atom bombs and missiles.

Young Mr. Kennedy tried mightily in the biggest job in the world.

He wanted to be President and he worked hard at it. That the measures he thought would benefit the human race were not more widely accepted by Congress was not his fault, for he labored at being President, and at bringing his job closer to the people, as hard as anyone before him has done.

He liked people. All of his person-to-person visits, his handshaking with huge crowds, his motorcades and many trips were not entirely political.

He believed if he took the issues and his warm personality to the citizens that they would understand and join him.

And they did. Few people who ever met the President failed to like him. Even at a distance his magnetic personality captured friends for him to the confusion and irritation of Mr. Kennedy's political opponents.

The Nation now has a new President, Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, and the Nation wishes him well.

Mr. Johnson was not always a John F. Kennedy supporter, but he too was captured by the deep genuine warmth of J.F.K. and became, in the campaign days of 1960 and since, one of his most devoted admirers.

No man, it is said, is indispensable. The Nation will go on, and go forward as it has for 200 years.

But for many of those years ahead the people will remember the young President cut down in the prime of life by a madman's bullet. And none of us will ever understand the burst of hatred in which it was fired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation and the world mourns the passing of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as do the people of Florida and our own Sixth Congressional District, where we considered the President and his family as neighbors and friends.

The winter White House at Palm Beach was familiar to all and Palm Beach had witnessed not only the comings and goings of the President but his growth and development from childhood, as a teenager, college student, war hero, Congressman, Senator, and President up until the weekend prior to his tragic death. For this reason we will remember John F. Kennedy the man as well as the President.

Few men in our history have brought such a feeling of warmth and friendship as did John F. Kennedy. Representing the young, vigorous man overcoming wartime danger and personal illness by determination and strong will to reach the highest office of this Nation, he was an example to the world of what we hoped was the best in all Americans. He was able to face life and his personal and official responsibilities with strength and at the same time show tenderness and love for all, especially young people.

Many will remember most clearly the last few public appearances and photographs of him with his family as a mirror of the man. By his Veterans Day visit to Arlington he paid honor to our war dead and at the same time demonstrated a father's pride in the child who will have to defend our freedoms in the future, as did the father and honored war dead in the past. That the young son learned well from this experience was demonstrated to all by his salute to his father just 2 short weeks later.

A few days later, new photographs showing father and daughter and son again delighted us. The Presidency has been said to be the loneliest job in the world, and yet we could see the satisfaction given to him by his children at these moments.

On the very day of his death he showed his great devotion to his wife by his comments to the crowds outside the hotel and at the breakfast meeting, and as they drove together through the streets of Dallas.

The people of Palm Beach and all Florida will remember, as will those of Washington, Hyannis, and Middleburg, a young father and his family attending church together on a Sunday morning, looking very much like any other American family with the deep religious heritage of our Nation's forefathers.

We will remember the smile, the quick wit, the firm handshake, the steady gaze from bright, alert eyes and the personal interest taken by this man in our problems.

A group of schoolchildren will remember the time taken by their President for participation in a "People-to-People" film, after he had learned of it during a weekend visit to Palm Beach. The request had, as so many must be, routinely regretted by a staff member.

On this personal level, and through the success of the Peace Corps, John F. Kennedy will be remembered for his abiding faith in the young people of this Nation and the world. They returned this respect by the open outpouring of emotion at his passing. Perhaps the most memorable fact about the million people lining the streets of Washington on the route to Arlington was the number of young people who had come from near and far to pay their respects to the man who had given them example and a high standard by which to live.

Millions of words have been said, when we know in our hearts words cannot express our feelings. To that which has been said we can only pray, "May he rest in peace," and to his family, "God be with you." This has already manifested itself in the courage and strength which we have all witnessed and which will be an inspiration for years to come.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the pulsing beat of muffled drums has passed—bittersweet notes of "Taps" have faded on the wind—the clattering caisson has borne its lifeless burden to its last resting place on a quiet slope looking across the Potomac.

Our late, our honored President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, rests in peace there now—where his mortal shell will stay until new bugles call every man to that final judgment day.

Now our television sets stand mute as we seek to blot out the horrors of these last days, when one foul deed piled on another, stunning the Nation and the world. The drama of the assassination of the leader of the free world still holds a nightmare grip. Did it really happen here?

We still half expect to see that shock of hair, that gleaming smile, to hear that cultured voice plead with us to help get the Nation moving again. How can it be that this our leader is gone—with his grand plans unfinished, his dreams on drawing boards, his legislative program snarled in congressional morass?

How unfathomable are the ways of the Lord, who has chosen to take from us his gifted son, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, at the crest of his career? But who are we to question the hand of God? Indeed, had not this man drunk fully from a cup of life that overflowed with draughts enough for many men?

Uncommon was his rearing; in a home of wealth and luxury he was taught discipline, manly piety, a competitive spirit, a love for learning, and a fierce pride in his Irish forebears. His schooling was the finest money can buy. Gifted with a fertile mind and pen, he was achieving success in literature when the heroic death of his eldest brother handed him the mantle of a family tradition of political success.

In the swift years that followed he became a wartime hero in his own right, a canny political campaigner, a Member of the U.S. Senate, a Pulitzer Prize-winning author, the head of a most charming family, and, shattering the political prejudices of a bygone day, the first President of the United States to be a member of the Catholic faith.

Then, as the leader of the mightiest temporal power on earth, he moved the Nation forward, striving for new frontiers of justice, charity and love for all mankind. Even as he held the world's greatest nuclear striking power in his hand, he captured the imagination of the Nation and the respect of friend and foe around the planet.

In less than 3 years as President he stamped his forceful personality on the tablets of history. He launched the Alliance for Progress to help our Latin American neighbors help themselves. He stayed the military arm from committing the might of the United States to intervention in Cuba during the bloody Bay of Pigs debacle. Then, buckling on the Nation's breastplate and nuclear armor, he confronted the Russian terror, slavemaster of half the world, and forced withdrawal of its rocket threat from the Western Hemisphere.

Picking up where another assassinated President left off one century before, he proclaimed a new emancipation seeking equal justice under law for our Negro brothers. He forged an international bond of friendship and mutual assistance in the Peace Corps, where dedicated Americans of all ages ask only what they can do for their country—and their fellow man.

As if all these things were not enough, John Fitzgerald Kennedy demonstrated, for all the world to see, a model family life. His wife, Jacqueline, fulfilled her goal of providing a happy home life for her husband and family. She and her husband brought charm, warmth, music, culture, and gaiety to the first home of the land. He was a devoted husband and a loving father, and he practiced his religion without fear or public show.

Are not these deeds more than enough for any single life—however short? We submit they are. Despite our tears for the bereft little family—its head, husband, and father gone—we can resume our daily tasks firm in the knowledge that this young man for the ages has built an image of vigor, courage, intellect, and compassion, which men always and everywhere may admire and seek to emulate.

Let us accept as our own the standard he laid down for his brief but meteoric career as President of the United States:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

Truly, we have been blessed because of the days John Fitzgerald Kennedy served his Nation and the world. Let us claim his fallen torch and keep the flame alive.

Mr. Speaker, these words came from the pen of Bernard Casserly, editor of the Catholic Bulletin for the St. Paul archdiocese. I could not add to their eloquence.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the effort to find language for our mute agony has brought many Americans nearer to the lucid prose which was one of the distinguishing marks of the late President himself. I will not try to find words of my own. Instead, I would like to claim as mine, too, the words of a new citizen of the United States, Mrs. Lottie Adams, of Electra, Tex., who wrote me this letter to tell me what she felt. I think it is a lovely expression of the thoughts of many of us, and I want to share them with you.

> DEAR MR. POOL: Just 2 weeks ago I received your congratulations as a new citizen of this beautiful free land, but only today I sealed my oath, sharing the pain of the millions of freedom-loving people all over the world, over the tragic death of our beloved President Kennedy.
>
> The tremendous loss I feel is not only for our President, but also for the husband and father of such a wonderful family, as Jacqueline and her two children. I also am a widow with two children: a boy, 3 and a girl, 6. I lost my husband in a car accident in July 1961; he also died practically in my arms. So you see why I identify my sorrow with that of Mrs. Kennedy. I live through all the anguish all over again.
>
> I sent my warmest wishes of sympathy to the Kennedy family. At the same time I wish to congratulate our new President, President Johnson. We all know what a hard job fell on his shoulders but we all have confidence in him for as long as we the citizens of this glorious country have a right to vote, there shall be a striving for a free world, for we all, millions of us owe it to the memory of a courageous brave American, our beloved President Kennedy who died for this goal.
>
> May God lead us and guide us always.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MRS. LOTTIE ADAMS
> (A new citizen of the U.S.A.).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a fine President with his principles and far vision. We in Congress greatly admired his high integrity, his strong convictions, and his dedication to the overwhelming responsibilities of the Presidency.

Under President Kennedy's leadership, many advances were made for America. He achieved a higher standard of living for Americans, progress in international understanding, and safety and security for our good country and the people. President Kennedy worked hard to maintain historic landmarks for which he will long be remembered. His family life, his devotion to Mrs. Kennedy and his children Caroline and John are hearthstones and symbols of which all the people of our country can be proud. His wonderful receptions at home and abroad, and even on the day of the terrible event is indeed a credit to the Kennedy family, the U.S. Government, and the American people.

The respect of world leaders, which he had quickly won, was great evidence of his power, intellect, and ability to negotiate and reach reasonable compromises between nations, peoples, and all mankind. President Kennedy had strong devotions to all Americans, loyalty to our allies, and successful administrative ability. One of the chief characteristics of President and Mrs. Kennedy is that they never forgot their old friends.

It has been a real privilege to have served in Congress with President Kennedy, to have been part of the administration of the Federal Government under his leadership, and I will always remember his kindness, his personal interest and friendship with humility and pride.

My best wishes in this sad hour go out to all the Kennedys who have given one of the fine members of their family in the cause of American freedom and security.

Long may President Kennedy's high name, high principles, and warm friendly personality be remembered by this generation and generations to come.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late President of the United States.

Shortly after noon on Friday, November 22, 1963, the world was stunned when word was received that the President had been shot. Half an hour later the announcement of his death brought a combined feeling of shock, disbelief, and grief. It seemed as if a giant pall had fallen over our land.

Looks of horror and utter disbelief took the place of normal expressions and smiles. Tears came to the eyes of old and young.

Each of us remembers the exact time and place he first heard the news. Some were driving in automobiles and slowly pulled over to the roadside and stopped. Many were at dining tables for the noon meal. Others were at work in accustomed places. Nearly all experienced the same shocked and stunned reaction.

Suspense gave way to sorrow and grief. The realization that the President was dead brought a numbness that defies description.

Gradually the shock was replaced by the realization that there must be a manifestation of composure and control lest our national grief turn to national panic.

My own thoughts recalled the words of James Abram Garfield who, in announcing the death of President Lincoln, said, "God lives, and the Government in Washington still stands."

There must be and there would be orderly transition and the reaffirmation of the strength and stability of our Government.

Our Nation has suffered a grievous loss of its Chief Executive, cut down in the very bloom of his life by an assassin's bullets. I have suffered the loss of a personal friend. I remember many exchanges of evidence of friendship between us. I vividly recall exchanges of pleasantries in which his tremendous good humor and wit were scintillating. I also recall very serious discussions during which we either agreed or strove earnestly to resolve any differences.

He gave to America and to Americans a new kind of leadership. It was the dynamic and courageous leadership of a dedicated young man, mature beyond his years. He gave of himself and he gave to his country. He brought into the Office of the Presidency a brilliant intellect, a boundless enthusiasm, and a tremendous capacity for growth.

Endowed with a keen mind, sharpened by a fine education, matured by wartime service in our Nation's Armed Forces, seasoned by the experience of 6 years in the House of Representatives and 8 years in the U.S. Senate, at 43, he became the 35th President of the United States.

On a cold January day in 1961, he took the oath of office and delivered an inaugural address which became indelibly impressed on the minds and hearts of men. In it he said, "Now the trumpet summons us again."

On the tragic moment of that Friday afternoon in November 1963, the trumpet once more summoned John Fitzgerald Kennedy. This time to eternal rest.

It cannot be that he died in vain. Out of the period of mourning—personal and worldwide—which follows his death there must surely come a solemn rededication to those principles which underlie our system of government. With this rededication may there come a growth from strength to greater strength.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have read and heard some of the very finest tributes ever paid to mortal man inspired by the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Suddenly we have come to realize that in addition to the man we knew first as a colleague in the House, then as a Senator, and finally as our President, was one of the truly great men of all time. No one in history has made such an impact on the world and the loss which we have sustained at home and abroad can only be compensated for if we carry on as best we can the efforts in behalf of humanity on which he so ably launched us.

With all of the greatness which we are realizing and recognizing more and more with each passing day, my mind keeps returning to some of the intensely personal little things which he did for people. The warmth of his personality was evident whenever one was fortunate enough to be near him. It was the sort of warmth that can only come from the heart. It had to be genuine or it could not have impressed us as it did.

I keep recalling our last conversation shortly before his Texas trip. A comparatively minor decision with reference to the rice industry had been referred to him for final action. Somehow he knew that it was of tremendous interest to me and my people in Texas. He took the trouble to phone me personally to tell me that our request had been granted. He had done the same thing some 2 years earlier when a similar decision was in the making and he called me at my home in Texas, to personally give me the news. Just a few weeks ago, in the early morning hours, his naval aide called me at home and said the President wanted me to know that within an hour or two he would announce the appointment of Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene as new Commandant of the Marine Corps. He thought it might be nice for me, an old marine, to have the word a little ahead of the public announcement. Somehow he knew that Wally Greene and I had served together years ago and that I held him in very high regard.

To some, these little personal touches may seem unimportant. To me, they tell a story of a basic attribute of one of the greatest men we will ever know.

Now just one parting thought. A military commander when he takes over a new assignment is taught to immediately choose and thoroughly train his second in command. This understudy must be prepared to step immediately into the commanding officer's shoes in the event of an emergency. One of the greatest services that the President ever did for his country was to thoroughly inform his Vice President of all of the responsibilities that might conceivably fall on his shoulders. Certainly President Kennedy never dreamed of the tragedy that lay ahead of him but the fact that he took no chances and that he used his Vice President and informed him just as a military commander would have informed his next-in-line enabled our new President to move forward without the loss of a single stride.

The spirit of this great man will live in our hearts always and our lives will be enriched because we knew him.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, history will write the verdict on the Presidential administration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy—on the actions he took, the policies he followed, the programs he proposed. But we have no need to wait for the verdict of the historians to know that the late President was a man deeply beloved by his fellow Americans, and by those men all over the world who cherish freedom.

His personal popularity as a living man was repeatedly evidenced. His hold on the heartstrings of Americans in every walk of life has been demonstrated during the days since his tragic death. Millions of people have expressed their deep sorrow and their compassion by attending memorial services that have been held not only in the great centers of population but in the small towns and villages of America and in country church houses.

Yes, and from all over the world, heads of state came to express officially their great personal respect as their people poured out their own feelings in ceremonies and services in the four corners of the world.

This is as it should be. The late President was a man who liked to be among people and who drew strength from them. No one can doubt that who ever saw him going out to the people of the country either as a candidate or as President.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, Americans now are mourning not only for a President but for a man as well—a human being of courage, a man who possessed the charm and outgoingness that drew people to him, including those people who differed with his political philosophy.

This outpouring of grief speaks more than words of the warmth, the courage, the faith, and of the concern for his fellow man possessed by John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Removed now from the concerns and troubles of this world, may his soul rest in peace. And may this Nation wrest from the tragic sacrifice of this young man's life a new resolve to hold firm to the course laid down by the Founding Fathers.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, all America mourns the loss of its President, a good man and a strong leader, John F. Kennedy. The profound sympathy of the Nation goes out to his courageous widow and children. The President's life was snuffed out by an assassin's bullet in the prime of his life. God alone really knows why such a tragedy should happen in a nation like ours. We do know, however, that the Nation must go forward—there is work to be done—our Republic must survive. Let all of us seek the guidance of the Almighty in the critical days and years ahead.

A timely editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Bremerton Sun, a newspaper published in my congressional district, calls our attention to the fact that we have a task at hand. I include it with my remarks.

### THE TASK AT HAND

The long, agonizing weekend is over.

The people of America, stunned and silenced by the slaying of our President, resumed today the business of the living.

A new President tackles in earnest the official business of state and picks up the pace of America, slowed by the tragic events of the last few days.

The funeral procession has completed its awful task and the church bells are stilled again.

It is time now to look ahead with the memory of the destruction of hate still fresh in our minds.

Some good has surely come from all this. Americans, drawn together in their common sorrow, may stay together in their common prayer that what has happened may shock all Americans into the realization that our way of life is too precious to sacrifice on the altar of bigotry and hate.

The shocking example of revenge exacted by a Dallas innkeeper in what he incorrectly presumed to be an act of glory should startle all of us into a rededication of our determination to have justice by law and not by emotion.

The agonizing ordeal suffered so bravely by the widow of the President is an inspiration for all Americans.

The sight of the new President, his head bowed in grief and his shoulders carrying the burden of his new responsibilities, should recharge us all with loyalty and unity.

The recollection of the Kennedy children, still too young to fully comprehend the meaning of what they saw, reacting with typical childlike indifference, exemplifies

> for all of us the cherished unit of American life that is the hope of the future.
>
> Above all, the horrifying events of the last few days will, we hope, shock Americans out of their smug complacency and bring home with brutal impact the sure knowledge that to ignore our greatness is to lose it; to foster hate and greed and bigotry is to give life to the forces of destruction; to sneer at our principles of justice under the law for all Americans is to play into the hands of our enemies.
>
> It is time for each of us to get to work at the job of keeping this Republic safe.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the greatest and most sincere tribute that I can pay to the memory of the late President Kennedy is to stand here today with a heavy heart of sorrow and a silent prayer for the salvation of his immortal soul.

Like those martyred Presidents who have gone before him, he now belongs to the ages, and no words of mortal man can bring him back.

What more can I say than has been said here today by those who knew him, admired him, respected him, and loved him.

How hollow and meaningless would feeble words falling from my lips be compared to those strong words spoken here today.

How can I adequately say something that will ease the pain of the wife he loved and who loved him?

What can I say that will make those bereaved children understand the magnitude of the tragedy that cloaks their little bodies?

No, nothing can be done to return life to his lifeless body, but those who now live can use the life which remains in them to pray to God for his eternal rest and to God for the comfort of the family, so dear to him, which he left behind.

This we can do and must do in this, our moment of national grief.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound sense of shock that my fellow Nebraskans and I heard of the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. An atmosphere of utter disbelief fell over us all. It just did not seem possible that this young and dynamic individual had been taken from our midst. His personal magnetism had caused millions to identify themselves with his every deed and made his passing a personal as well as a national tragedy. Although historians will have to evaluate John Fitzgerald Kennedy's contributions to mankind, his contemporaries will not soon forget his driving force.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and her children our deepest sympathy. Further, I wish to say to them that we Nebraskans share their sorrow.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all the people of Michigan's Ninth Congressional District as I add my voice to the tribute being paid here today to a beloved President.

John F. Kennedy was as warm and friendly as he was courageous. All who knew him, whether they agreed or disagreed with his programs, were bound to admire and respect him.

Mr. Speaker, at a time like this, it is natural for each of us to look back upon his personal relationships with John Kennedy. As a House Member of the opposite political party, I had the privilege to become closely associated with John Kennedy when he served in 1959 as chairman of the 14-man Senate-House conference on labor reform legislation. It will be recalled that the legislation before that conference was controversial, to say the very least.

Serving as chairman of that particular conference was not an easy task, and the meetings went on and on over a 12-day period. He did an excellent job in presiding over the conference and in working to bring divergent points of view toward a concensus. During that period, a friendship developed between John Kennedy and me—a friendship which followed him into the White House and continued until his life was so abruptly ended by the dastardly act of an assassin.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress have lost a good friend. The Nation has lost a vigorous leader.

To Mrs. Kennedy and to the family of our late President I extend the deepest sympathy of everyone in the district I am honored to represent.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, God gave us John F. Kennedy to be our President for 2 years, 10 months, and 2 days.

Now on a hill overlooking the Lincoln Memorial an eternal flame flickers over his grave in Arlington Cemetery.

In the darkness, from the Memorial dedicated to the ideals of freedom and justice for which Lincoln also gave his life nearly a century ago, is visible the tiny beacon of John Kennedy's grave.

It will be an eternal reminder to free people all over the world that the struggle to make those ideals a reality is a continuing one.

In the brief span of his Presidency, he revitalized our country, charted new and far-reaching goals, and gave us peace based upon dignity and strength.

During these hours of self-examination and rededication to the ideals that John Kennedy espoused, our consolation must come in the form of thanks for having him with us as long as we did. We can find comfort in the knowledge that although he was on earth only a brief period, he led a complete life.

His own words in his book about his brother Joe are an appropriate epitaph for the President himself:

> It is the realization that the future held the promise of great accomplishments for Joe that has made his death so particularly hard for those who knew him. His worldly success was so assured and inevitable that his death seems to have cut into the natural order of things. But at the same time, there is a completeness to Joe's life, and that is the completeness of perfection. His life as he lived * * * could hardly have been improved upon.

As a sorrowful Congress turns its attention again to the ordinary business of government—and it must—we are solaced by the legacy of thoughts and actions he left us as an articulate Chief of State.

We can best serve his memory by striving to accomplish his objectives for the peace of the world and the future of mankind.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on November 22, 1963, two shots heard around the world snuffed out the life of a young and vigorous President.

Although I disagreed with many of his policies, it is with sincere candor that I can say my respect for the man himself never diminished, for Mr. Kennedy was a skillful practitioner of the noble political profession and a standout American whose love for the give-and-take of politics made him a challenging competitor in the great two-party system that is ours.

During the days following the President's assassination, the Communist press was reported as saying that the people who opposed Mr. Kennedy's policies "are now hypocritically praising him." How strange it is to us that the Communists do not understand that Democrats and Republicans are Americans first. And how strange it must seem to the Communists that it was Mr. Kennedy who, as a leader of men, exemplified this ideal—this give-and-take of ideas that were distilled into programs contributing to America's ever-increasing greatness.

It will be history that decides Mr. Kennedy's record as President. But there is not one of us here today that cannot truthfully say here and now that John Fitzgerald Kennedy, while serving as our First American, was an American first, that he served with great distinction, with love of country, and without fear in the best traditions of the practice of the art of statecraft.

I know of no higher tribute.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation continues its mourning for our late President, I would like to express the particular grief which the people of West Virginia feel for our fallen leader. It was in West Virginia that John F. Kennedy surmounted some of his greatest obstacles to the Presidency of the United States. No one can ever forget the memory of this courageous young man who captured the hearts of so many West Virginians in his brilliant quest for the presidential nomination and then the Presidency itself. In turn, we can always take great pride in the undoubted affection he had for us.

Now he is gone—taken from us by one of the most villainous acts in American history—but his memory will be with us forever. Here was a man who carried on the noble traditions of his predecessors in office—a man who was suddenly taken from us in the prime of life. No matter what our political pursuasion may be, all Americans feel a deep personal loss in President Kennedy's untimely death. Amazing in all of this was the strength our country received from the truly majestic bearing of Mrs. John F. Kennedy. Surely history will record that, in one of our Nation's most tragic hours, she made it one of our finest hours.

Finally, we can all take strength in the knowledge that our Republic remains strong, our Government remains stable, and our people remain confident in the face of a great national tragedy.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was only a week before the tragic event that

I wrote in a newsletter, referring specifically to Members of Congress: "We are all mortal—physically and politically."

No one could have then imagined that a scant 7 days later this common mortality of all men would be so terribly dramatized in the person of the President of the United States, under circumstances thus tragic, senseless, and wicked.

"We shall pay any price," President Kennedy had said in his inaugural address. The words he then spoke for the Nation speak now for him. He himself has paid the supreme price—the price which is always a hazard of the Presidency—the price paid thrice before by Presidents of the United States.

I was privileged to sit as a member of the official delegation named to represent the House of Representatives at the funeral of President John F. Kennedy.

It was an awesome gathering. Three Presidents of the United States were there. Assembled were the great of the earth as man reckons greatness—potentates and presidents and princes and ministers of state.

Death was there—and grief.

And the most awesome presence of all—faith.

Faith in the institutions of our Government which survive unscathed the blow of violence—and faith, as well, in the immortality which conquers even death.

Symbol and substance of constitutional continuity is President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In his stewardship as Chief Executive he is charged—by the oath he took so unexpectedly—"to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

To the best of his ability. So help him God.

He assumes that awesome responsibility and task with the sincere good will and earnest prayers of his countrymen.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy on November 22 possessed everything a man could gain from this mortal life. He held the highest position afforded any man. He had a beautiful wife, two small children, wealth, power, brilliance, personality, and charm. In his body was a zest for living, a reason for existence, and work to be done. The cheering crowds which he so dearly loved, the smiles on the peoples' faces on which so much admiration was written were the last crowds and smiles he would see.

In the darkness of ignorance, prejudice, one man sat among the books of learning, of democracy, squinting in the radiance of the sun. He aimed a cheap rifle with a cheap bullet in its chamber. He touched his finger on the trigger and in one second in endless time, snuffed out the light of brilliance. President John F. Kennedy was dead. John Kennedy lost all that the world could offer—but we too have lost.

John Kennedy left much behind. In his short time of leadership in the New Frontier, he forged through the virgin woods of hate, ignorance, strife, and poverty. He felled trees, cleared the land, plowed and planted seeds—seeds of progress, of brotherhood, of peace. The task now rests upon all Americans to continue to nourish these seeds and reap from the foresight, brilliance, and greatness of President Kennedy. Let us nourish seeds of newness and of courage.

The pioneer of the New Frontier was the light of the bonded, the liberator of the chained and imprisoned, the hope of the diseased world, the inspiration of the free world, the friend of the friendless, the hope of the hopeless, and the courage of the weakened.

From the many letters I have received from our fellow Americans, I want to quote from just a few. A grammar school girl:

> I could only cry.

A high school senior:

> The world will long remember President Kennedy, our Nation will always revere him. It is a shame that it required his death for many people to wake up and realize his great achievements, something you and I knew from the beginning of his years in the White House. His desire for peace, yet without surrender; his desire for a better educated people; his work for civil rights; the prosperity of the economy, point toward one thing, as did his death, and that is his love of the the United States and the betterment of it. I myself hold the opinion that no President since Abraham Lincoln worked as fervently for the Nation than did John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

A new college graduate:

> I doubt that any man has had a more powerful impact on the emotions of so many. In life he was respected as well as questioned. In death, he has been elevated to an almost "God-like" quality. His demise has rekindled in the hearts of all Americans our real purpose—peace through justice.

And a combat Army colonel:

> We in the Army have lost a great Commander in Chief—one who answered every challenge of the past 3 years in a true professional manner. History will prove John Fitzgerald Kennedy as worthy of a position aside Washington and Lincoln.

And now the eternal flame burns brightly at Arlington National Cemetery where our beloved President rests. His memory shall burn brightly in each of us. His ideals have been etched in the hearts and minds of all people. Let us now proceed through the darkness using the torch of John F. Kennedy to light our torches. Let us not be content until all Americans hold the light of hope in their hands for the world to see—until the world is freed from the chains of human bondage. In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said, "Let us begin"—we have begun and the road of our journey is infinite—let us continue—continue on the path he chose. Let us have the courage for correction, the desire for decision, and in his memory, move on to new frontiers.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, last week, my home community, like almost every single community across the Nation, held memorial services for President John F. Kennedy. The several churches participating, presented a service which provided a deep and meaningful experience. My own brief, inadequate address delivered during that service, follows:

> Abraham Lincoln said it—in the month of November, exactly 100 years ago—the words are as fresh, as true on this day, as they were a century ago. "It is for us the living to be dedicated here to the unfinished work. * * * It is for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us."
>
> Sadness has walked the land. Our shock has been so great we are almost ashamed to seek solace, consideration, or comfort. We want to share the grief of the entire Nation.
>
> In these past days, Americans have shared a variety of emotions. First, every American shares a common, personal loss engendered by the death of the man who was our President—our leader. As President, because of the nature of this Nation and the nature of the man, John Kennedy held a close personal relationship with the citizens. This is always true, not because all individual Americans view a particular President in the same light—but because we all view the holder of that high Office with respect, with honor, and with love. These feelings are far deeper than the adulation we pay to celebrities in other field of endeavor because the President is ours—and we are his. He represents the people, deriving his powers from the consent of the governed. Of greater significance is the realization that for peoples of all the earth—the President's image is our image. We are identified in his identity. People of foreign nations see America—see us—in our President. Small wonder that Americans follow with interest what the President eats for breakfast—what the First Lady wears on a particular day. From the moment a newly elected President and his family step inside the White Georgian Mansion on 16th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue in your Nation's Capital, their personal, private life is lost. They live in public. They belong to the public. Every sniffle—every sneeze or headache becomes public business. The President becomes a personality without individuality. He becomes an almost indefinable something. His name could be anything, for he is Uncle Sam, who in reality is everybody.
>
> According to recent reports Dwight Eisenhower noted the fact in this manner. Just after his inauguration, his secretary reported that Gen. Omar Bradley was on the phone. The President picked up the phone and said, "Hello, Omar." And then, General Bradley, classmate at West Point, comrade in arms, beloved friend, answered, "Mr. President, this is Omar Bradley." Then, said Mr. Eisenhower, I realized the lonesomeness of the job. I was no longer Dwight D. Eisenhower, I was "Mr. President."
>
> Harry Truman sometimes referred to the White House as the most lavish prison in the world, thus describing his separation from his former life.
>
> Is it any wonder then, this sense of personal tragedy which has enveloped us all as our young President, John Kennedy, has been taken from us? Is it any wonder that we so deeply appreciate the personal courage and majesty of our First Lady, Mrs. Kennedy, who has borne tragedy with such dignity through the trying hours—who twice, in only a few months, has walked with death?
>
> Too, our pride has been hurt. We say, "This sort of thing can't happen here." We must suppress those other emotions of hate, anger—the urge for revenge which surrounds the nature of our President's death. For if America is to be adversely judged by a lawlessness which prompted or permitted assassination of the President, the desire for, or the accomplishment of revenge compounds the essence of lawlessness.
>
> The other emotional aspect of the moment is our apprehension, our fear, our wondering about the present and future welfare of our Nation. You need harbor no fear.
>
> The greatness of the U.S. Government, the wisdom of those unbelievably understanding men who laid our foundations, have again been demonstrated. A free nation remains

free because all men have an opportunity for greatness, for leadership and for service. This Nation, therefore, always has a reserve of leadership—trained, experienced, capable and devoted. President Lyndon Johnson knows America. He knows government. He has had opportunity to face both foreign and domestic problems, and to participate in decision-making. His perception is great.

Perhaps some of you would have preferred a different leader. Be not dismayed. I have a favorite musical composition which I like so much that I have several recorded versions. I listen to one and I say, "This is perfect." Then I listen to another with a different conductor and find things I like better—some things I like less well. Our American symphony will have a different conductor, and the performance will be harmonious.

On Wednesday, President Johnson will ask the Congress for cooperation and for understanding. This he will receive. It will be demonstrated for all the world that this Government is in business with strength, with leadership to do what is right for our people and for all the worlds' people.

We cannot compare the assassination of our President with those acts of violence which occur so often in other lands where governments are overthrown. Our Government cannot be overthrown by a single act or a series of violent acts. It will not be lost until the people sleep. Asleep we are not.

May I also note the renewed evidence that ours is a spiritual nation—a nation which automatically turns to God in time of need. Would that we could remember this need is constant and eternal—that in the words of the hymn, "I need Thee every hour." How weak is the flesh, how undying the spirit.

It is ironic that our tragedy has occurred in the week of a national holiday—a family holiday with religious overtones—the season of thanksgiving. Perhaps it is fortunate that we will soon be entering the holy season when all our feelings will be submerged in that all-pervasive, indescribable spirit of Christmas—the season of peace on earth, good will to all men. For that is the season when our feet return to the ground so our thoughts might be more lofty.

Our President, John F. Kennedy, is gone. When he departed, he took something of us with him, and he left something of himself with each of us. Therefore, on this day, "Go not to ask for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

I join all American citizens in praying the Almighty God will attend the needs of this great Nation of free men and that we may be ever worthy of His grace.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, strange and mysterious are the vicissitudes of human life. Frail and precarious are our best holds upon human happiness. A few short days ago a young man lived and labored and loved. By his life he beautified the altars of freedom. Wherever he went, throughout the troubled world in which we live, he made a broad thoroughfare for friendship. Today he sleeps in the solemn silence of the grave. Yes, his soul sleeps in peace. Until the end of time men and women will cherish the memory of this illustrious man. We cannot beautify his character, nor can we dignify his life. We can only commune with his spirit. We shall always remember his genius, his labor, his wonderful achievements, and the beauty and simplicity of his life. His life was a blessing to the world in which he lived.

Having known our late beloved President for many years, and having enjoyed his friendship during the time he was our colleague here in Congress, I knew his true worth and I cherished his friendship. His record, though brief yet dynamic, was written on the hearts of men and women throughout the world. By the nobility of his soul and by the exalted purposes of his life he shall be remembered through countless ages. His contributions to the cause of peace were great and grand and all of those who love freedom owe him a debt of gratitude. He was a child of the universe and he believed that the world with all of its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams was still a beautiful world. He never suffered fears born of fatigue and loneliness, but he always nurtured strength of spirit to shield him in misfortune, and with courage, vision, and fortitude he stood forthright before the world as a champion of the cause of peace. By his life he made the world a better place in which to live and when his soul moved across the crystal sea into the great beyond the whole world grieved. Truly he was one of God's noblemen.

When I think of our fears and our tears, I am reminded of something I heard on the floor of this House many years ago:

> They say that life is a highway; the milestones are its years, and here and there is a tollgate where we pay our way with tears. It's a high road and a rough road and it leads near and far. But it leads at last to the golden town where the golden houses are.

When I think of the great sorrow we all have suffered, and of the life and the death of our beloved statesman, the first citizen of the world, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, my favorite song comes back to me:

Oh, heart of mine, we should not worry so;
What we missed of calm we could not have, you know,
What we met of a stormy pain and sorrow's driving rain,
We can better meet again if it blow.

For we know not every morrow can be sad.
So forgetting all the sorrow we have had,
Let us fold away our fears and put by our foolish tears,
And through all the coming years just be glad.

Just be glad that we have known and loved and here labored with Jack Kennedy whose soul has entered upon a new career in the regions of immortality. The tomb cannot enclose the fine virtues nor retain the influences of our departed friend. The unseen spirit will escape from the portals of the tomb to bless and enrich the lives of those who knew him and felt the tolerance and the kindness of his heart. His character was a tower of strength and his heart was the core of his greatness.

To his lovely and lonely wife, may I express my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. I hope that the love and sympathy of his friends will soften the sorrow she is now suffering. May the Lord of Mercy bless and sustain her as she goes forth to face the world alone.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on the night of January 19, 1961, Washington was visited by one of its heavist snowstorms. Literally hundreds of cars were abandoned along the roads, streets, and boulevards in and around the Capital City.

No one would have dared to predict that the next day would see bright sunshine and clear skies. Clear and bright came Inaugural Day. It seemed to symbolize the beginning of a new era in American Government.

The new 44-year-old President, John F. Kennedy did not disappoint the millions who witnessed the swearing in of a young vibrant new Chief Executive.

His inaugural address was brief but full of challenge for the people of our times. He recognized the period of crisis which all mankind was facing. He recognized the problems of poverty at home and mass misery abroad. He painted in clear strokes the danger of total destruction.

He asked that both sides "begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

It was a speech that contained assurance for our friends and recognized the dangers from our enemies. He did not threaten our enemies nor did he give them any reason to believe that America was afraid.

He welcomed the opportunity to serve his countrymen and the world.

Especially did he, in a few words, call upon all Americans for their aid and support. These words will be repeated as long as America holds aloft the beacon light of freedom for all the world to see.

Looking back to this day and the events which are now a part of history, I think all of us know what President Kennedy meant when he said:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

It was my privilege to be associated with this leader of men in an effort to do something about the twin problems of mental retardation and mental health. His great interest in this subject led to the enactment of a bill which will, I hope, become a landmark of legislative action in a totally new effort which will return millions of Americans to their homes as a result of new techniques, new drugs and adequate personnel in the long-neglected field of mental health.

This legislation will bring hope to the hopeless and will enable millions of America's neglected children to have care and treatment for the first time in the history of this Nation.

It would be difficult to select or choose the monument by which President Kennedy will be remembered but I believe that he would have chosen this effort as one of his contributions nearest his heart.

I am grateful to have had a small part in this effort.

The entire Nation shares in the bereavement of the entire Kennedy family and, particularly, his beloved wife, who, through a most trying time conducted herself in a manner reflecting one intimately associated with greatness.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when one wishes to convey a most sincere expression of loss one becomes painfully aware of the inadequacy of words with which to give voice to true feelings.

With millions of others around the world I grieve over the loss of our late President. Yet, this grief is tempered by the fact that our system is so organized as to prevent any gap in leadership. Therefore, my grief is occasioned even more by the loss of a great man, a kind man, a gracious man, a loving husband and father. For if our system provides for continuity of leadership, it cannot provide us with the characteristics and qualities which were uniquely those of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I grieve because a dastardly act has deprived us, and untold future generations, of the many contributions which John Kennedy was destined to make for the benefit of all mankind. Most assuredly would those contributions have been made. For we know now how completely this sensitive man had committed himself to the ideal of the brotherhood of man.

My heart is heavy with the realization that this courageous man should be the victim of so brutal and so cowardly an act. Those fanatical forces against which our late President stood so resolutely cannot claim other than a hollow and shameful and silent victory. Indeed, his death cannot and must not fail to have us band together to insure that his efforts shall not have been in vain. We must, by our reactions to the great loss we have suffered, give testimony to the fact that we are a people governed by the rule of law. While we permit and encourage diversity of opinion we can no longer by our inaction permit and encourage the growth of minds twisted by hate and bigotry and exploited by fanatical haters. Our task is clear. Let us be as resolute as was John Kennedy and let us heed the admonition of President Johnson to honor the late President's memory by acting now to remove from our national life all traces of hate and evil and violence.

Finally, as we meet at this time of grief, let us make known that we shall not forget John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Let us make known that while future historians will judge him with a detached objectivity, we, here in this Chamber, judging on the basis of personal knowledge of our former colleague can and do attest to his greatness.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. Speaker, it is certainly with the utmost humility that I approach the task of offering a eulogy of our late President, John F. Kennedy. Literally millions of words have been written and spoken in both poetry and prose since the tragedy of his assassination. It is truly at a time like this that we remember the words of another President spoken almost a century ago:

> The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

And a little later in that same immortal address Lincoln said:

> It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

Now that some of the shock and horror has begun to subside we must nevertheless seek to take up the task of making America a better place in which to live and the world a more peaceful planet on which men may dwell without the constant dread of atomic annihilation.

John F. Kennedy was taken from the American people and his high office by the bullets of an assassin, a self-confessed Marxist and Communist who was consumed with passion and hatred for a fellow human being. This is truly the tragedy of our age—that in a world which has enjoyed such unparalleled scientific and technological progress in recent decades—the ungovernable rages of men are still capable of causing acts of barbarism and violence of the most primitive nature. Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind that there are truly monumental tasks yet undone.

John F. Kennedy brought intelligence, vigor, and great personal charm to the office of the Presidency. He was extremely talented in the art and science of Government, and even those of us who differed with him on specific political issues sensed that he respected and admired an honorable opponent. Even as he believed that diversity of thought and opinion must be allowed to flourish in the world outside the United States, even so I know he believed in our two-party system and in the role of a loyal opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that our American heritage will be richer because John F. Kennedy lived. It is not merely respect for the high office which he held, but also respect for the man that prompts me to express my personal grief at his premature passing. My wife joins me in expressing to Mrs. Kennedy, the two Kennedy children, and other members of the Kennedy family both our heartfelt sympathy and the assurance of our prayers for the future.

**Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.** Mr. Speaker, millions of eloquent words have been written and spoken about our late and beloved President, his death and his impact upon America, its citizens and freedom-loving men everywhere. It is difficult to say anything which has not been said before—and said much better. Words come hard at a time like this and they never seem quite adequate to the task.

I knew John Fitzgerald Kennedy, although we were not close personal friends. Our acquaintanceship was not of long enough duration to establish such bonds. But I knew him well enough to like him as a person, trust him as a leader, and admire him as a President.

The sudden and violent death of President Kennedy has taken from the American people a great leader, from the free world one of its leading statesmen, and from his wife and children a devoted husband and father.

His death struck deep into American life. It was a stunning blow to the heart and mind of a great nation. The tremendous outpouring of grief is evidence enough of this. Here was a man who, with his wonderful family, had captured the heart of America. Here too was a man—a young man—who had kindled the hopes and aspirations of free men and women, and those who long to be free, in all parts of the world.

Who can forget the stirring pledge of his inaugural address on that cold day in January less than 3 years ago:

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

The world was to learn that here was a man who meant what he said.

As much as any President in our history, I believe John Kennedy symbolized the basic idealism, the faith, the vision, and the yearning for peace with justice of the American people. The undertakings of his administration—innovations like the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, the nuclear test ban treaty—these are among the deeds for which President Kennedy will be judged by history. But, as important as deeds in these difficult times are commitments—expressed not only in action but also in words.

It was through words—eloquent, but meaningful, from the mind and from the heart—that our late President spoke for us to friend and foe. And the world understood. For John F. Kennedy spoke the universal language—the language of freedom and justice.

Few of us will forget his triumphant tour of Western Europe and his "I am a Berliner" address. This, to our friends abroad, was the voice of America speaking—speaking out forcefully for a world of peace, a world of law.

To millions of them and other millions here at home, John Fitzgerald Kennedy personified the United States of America. His youth, his ideals, his creative efforts reflected the qualities of the Nation for which he spoke. It is for this reason that his death had such a tremendous impact in every corner of the globe. All over the world the man on the street had confidence in President Kennedy and expected that this vigorous young leader of a vigorous young nation could help "build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just."

We know not today how John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be judged by history, although we believe the judgment will be generous. We can, however, read the message written on the faces of freedom loving men throughout the world since the tragic events of November 22. We see there an almost universal devotion to an outstanding leader taken from us before he could fully realize the greatness that was in him.

**Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina.** Mr. Speaker, the tragic circumstances of the death of President John F. Kennedy has plunged the Nation and much of the world into confusion and grief. Perhaps no event in this century has so struck the conscience of men of good will as this senseless and barbaric act that struck down the President of the United States.

All of us here share a feeling of shock and dismay that this could happen in a nation which has been founded upon re-

**spect for dissent, freedom of speech, freedom of political opinion, and freedom of philosophical choice in our elected leadership. The act of brutal violence outrages every American.**

**I have not always agreed with the legislative recommendations of President Kennedy. Yet, he was a vigorous and articulate exponent of his political philosophy. He symbolized a thoughtful America searching for new pathways into this Nation's future.**

**Beyond the shock of national mourning, our sorrow extends to the personal tragedy and loss sustained by Mrs. Kennedy, the President's children, and the family left behind. Even now, we cannot properly assess the nobility and strength of spirit which has borne Mrs. Kennedy through this terrible ordeal.**

**The revulsion to the despicable act the world has witnessed is a demonstration by the American people of their instinctive devotion to government by law and the totality of their allegiance to the processes of democracy.**

**A deeply saddened Nation now moves on as a new President takes the helm. All Americans speak and pray as one that President Johnson's burdens will not be beset by new and unforeseen problems, and that the transition to his administration can be accomplished smoothly.**

**Mr. TALCOTT.** Mr. Speaker, the record will show that I was often in disagreement with the legislative program of President Kennedy. But, on November 22, 1963, the assassin killed my President.

I hate the assassin for his deed. If hating under these circumstances is wrong, I trust I shall be forgiven when the truth is made known to me.

Tears at death are the price we pay for many wonderful, happy experiences shared during life. If there had been no happy moments shared during life, there would be no sadness at death. The universality and enormity of the demonstrations of our Nation's sadness is a solemn measure of the respect and admiration which he properly enjoyed.

Mrs. Talcott and I convey our heartfelt and genuine condolences to Mrs. Kennedy, who was simply magnificent throughout her inordinately tragic and difficult ordeal. President John F. Kennedy passed on to his children a rich heritage of courage, dedication and patriotism. Few children will inherit greater treasures.

**Mr. BOGGS.** Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy appealed to all men, all races, and all nations, but he particularly appealed to young people. It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very moving tribute paid to him by a 16-year-old resident of the beautiful city of Lafayette, La. This young man is Joseph E. Le Blanc, Jr., and his tribute follows in full:

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

On November 22, 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was assassinated. To many, we lost merely a political leader; but to many more, we lost John Kennedy, the man. Though opposed by some in action, he was loved by all in virtue, and seldom before has any one man come so close to fulfilling the ideal of Americanism. He did more than what his superficial duties extracted of him, and actually reached into and captured the hearts of the American people. In bygone eras, when men such as Al Capone and Babyface Nelson were idolized, corruption and vice held the minds of young Americans in an iron paw; but with the coming of John Kennedy to the Presidency, a new image has assumed the pinnacle of American achievement, one of morality and of courage, of sincerity, and of dedication.

He was a true martyr for his cause, in every sense of the word, and had he been blessed with time, he undoubtedly would have proved successful in accomplishing his aim, the strengthening of an America bound by equally free men. John Kennedy revived the flame of equality enkindled by our forefathers of long ago, and caused this irrepressible fire to glow brighter than ever. We, as true, noble American citizens, must carry unfalteringly this torch of freedom handed us by John Kennedy, and if we should choose to extinguish this flare of fraternity among all men, then we shall be failing not only Mr. Kennedy, who worked so hard for us, but also ourselves, who are left to utilize the fruits of his labor.

Did this fine man, in the price of his life, die in vain? Did he give his life for American ideals only to have them cast aside by uninterested, inactive American citizens? Let us prove both to ourselves and to the future generations in whom President Kennedy expressed such complete confidence that this leader of our Nation, this champion of the American way of life, did not die in vain. Let future generations be able to look back on the late President Kennedy and say—here was a man.

JOE LE BLANC, Jr.

**Mr. BURTON.** Mr. Speaker, since the untimely death of John Kennedy, many speeches have been made and many beautiful phrases have been uttered to memorialize and honor our slain President.

This is a time when the outstanding personal qualities of our late President should be recognized and his accomplishments praised.

This is a time when his widow, children, and family should be comforted.

This is a time when many pertinent and searching questions should be asked of every American, and a time when valid answers must be given.

Of all the tributes I have read, none has asked more pointed questions nor supplied wiser answers than those contained in a letter to the editor of the Ogden Standard-Examiner on November 25, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that letter by Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Stout, of Layton, Utah.

### DEEDS OF KINDLINESS

EDITOR, STANDARD-EXAMINER:

The assassination of President Kennedy came as a deep stab to us who have not been political supporters of him; at a moment like this, politics and differences are swept aside. We feel the pain that comes when lifeblood rushes out of one so young, so full of vitality and leadership, a youthful husband and a father.

We think of him as he came here a few short weeks ago when we and the hosts beside us waved joyously, and the stalwart young President of the United States of America arose in his car, waving back and smiling broadly. In that moment we knew without doubt that we could love the person even though we didn't agree with all his politics.

We feel shame at his assassination. The evil deed is done. We cannot restore the life to the murdered President. Yes, the criminal will be caught and punished; that is the least that society can do.

Yet we can do more than merely mete out justice to the murderer. We can do something to prevent the hate, the malice, the greed for blood that lies behind assassinations. Let us start anew with self-government in our homes; let us make clear to our children that there is a difference between liking a man and embracing his politics, or his religion, or his philosophy, or creed. We can approve of the man even though we do not endorse, necessarily all that he does.

When our children quarrel or fight, let us seize this as an opportunity to increase their understanding of each other; to help them communicate more peaceably with each other. Let us, ourselves, refrain from evil speaking of others. When we must disagree with others' policies or viewpoints, let us make it clear that we do not hate nor dislike others personally.

Let us teach respect and reverence for the office of President of the United States, regardless of politics.

Let us plant and nourish daily small deeds of kindliness as a memorial to the man who had his own life cut short in this service—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America.

Mr. and Mrs. DONALD D. STOUT.

ROUTE 2, BOX 177, LAYTON.

**Mr. NELSEN.** Mr. Speaker, it was a dark day in the history of a great nation when we faced the incredible fact that our President had been assassinated, a dark blot on this Nation that such a thing could happen in our midst. We mourn this tragedy as a great personal loss to all of us, as a grievous loss to his family, and as a tremendous loss to the Nation.

John F. Kennedy served his nation to the best of his great ability, and died in its service. I join sorrowfully in paying him tribute.

**Mr. KASTENMEIER.** Mr. Speaker—

> Never send to know for whom the bell tolls: It tolls for thee. Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in Mankinde.

So wrote John Donne in the beginning of the 18th century, and today we may well echo those words about John F. Kennedy for the bell tolls for all of us. Indeed all America and much of the world mourns the loss of President Kennedy for he was a man of considerable courage and fine intellectual attainment who expressed the dreams of America and inspired young men and women to new dimensions of service in the cause of peace—and security from war. He knew that the people of this Nation want peace above all else, and he worked with imagination and determination to secure it. Thus spoke he,

> It is our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved.

Though born of wealth and personally removed from deprivation or want, he understood and was genuinely concerned with the welfare of the common man. Better still, he understood the dynamics of our economy and felt it must serve the welfare of the people—the jobless, the sick, the elderly.

Above all, he spoke with conviction and fervor about the need to banish racial hate and bigotry and challenged the

Congress to translate the American ideal of equality into a living reality. In these prophetic words he asserted that:

> Continued Federal legislative inaction will continue, if not increase racial strife, causing the leadership of both sides to pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence.

If by his tragic and shocking death, he has made us more aware of our shortcomings; if by his untimely passing we are made to realize the imperative urgency of fulfilling his mandate, then he will not have died in vain.

I can think of no more fitting tribute or monument to the memory of our late President Kennedy than to translate into law those national goals and purposes which he spoke and expressed so well, and I fervently hope that we will emerge from this tragic experience with renewed hope and high resolve for a stronger, more democratic and better America.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the world has lost the greatest leader of these troubled and dangerous times in which we live.

He had the spark, the fire, and the drive that, together with his brilliance, patience, knowledge, understanding, character, ability, kindness, and courage gave him many qualifications that few men in all history have possessed.

The sorrowing millions at home and abroad are shocked and saddened, for in President John F. Kennedy lived their fondest hopes for human progress, social justice, world understanding, and peace.

We have lost a great national leader and all of us have lost a good friend.

In his brief 3 years as Chief Executive, President Kennedy's accomplishments were enough to earn him the title of one of our country's great Presidents. His wisdom, energy, spirit, and dedication have placed him in the company of revered Presidents such as Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

His major accomplishment was bringing the goal of world peace closer to reality. It is a mark of his greatness that he put at least a small crack in the Iron Curtain. On foreign policy he showed both restraint and firmness that brought respect and admiration at home and abroad.

President Kennedy's greatness was affirmed when, against powerful opposition he successfully negotiated a limited nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

By this act, the President affirmed to the world that a strong America does not view the quest for peace as a weakness. He showed the world that America's national security did not require excessive numbers of nuclear weapons or the pollution of the atmosphere with its hazards to the health of our children.

One of the President's greatest achievements, as Prof. Henry Steele Commager, prominent American historian at Amherst College, told the country in summing up Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments, is that President Kennedy made the sense of public service and public enterprise a goal to America's young people. Not since the early days of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal have young Americans felt that service to the public should be the cherished goal of those who want to aid the cause of freedom and progress.

Without doubt the President's many words of wisdom, expressed with deep conviction and great courage, will echo throughout the land. Knowing President Kennedy as I did, I could not help but feel that no other President in our entire history possessed so many of the good and high qualities required for leadership. He was extremely well informed on every important issue. His contribution to our Nation and to the world has been tremendous. His greatness will grow with passing time. It was my privilege to know him as a giant among men and as a personal friend.

It is over a week now since the President was slain, but it is still difficult to believe that John F. Kennedy is no more. The last time I was with the President was at the White House 3 weeks before his death.

I had an invitation from him to participate in the signing ceremonies of a bill which he sponsored, and in which he was very much interested. As an assistant Democratic House whip, as a member of the Health Subcommittee, and as a Senate-House conferee, I played an active part in getting this legislation through Congress. It was a bill to authorize construction of community health centers and facilities for the treatment and care of the mentally retarded and mentally ill. In Washington at the annual banquet of the national leaders in this field, this legislation was hailed as the greatest achievement of the 88th Congress. President Johnson also mentioned it on Wednesday in his address to the Congress and the Nation.

I recall a lovely evening last summer when I spent more than 3 hours on the famous east portico of the White House with the President and several other House Members who were invited for an informal discussion. Before we left the President escorted us through the family living quarters.

I have known three Presidents, but none was I closer to than President Kennedy. We first met when we took the oath of office in the 81st Congress nearly 15 years ago. Later that year we visited the Pocono Mountains in Pennsylvania where we shared the speakers' platform at Unity House, the summer camp of the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Last year the concern and the support of the President was of much help to me in my reelection campaign, after the merging of Berks, Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties into one oversized congressional district.

As a active member of the Kennedy team in the House, I had frequent contacts with the President and his staff members.

Last year I was invited to the White House lawn to make a trip with the President by helicopter to Harrisburg, where he was scheduled to speak at the annual State Democratic dinner. That day there was an important bill on the House floor. The session lasted into the evening. Because of the importance of this bill, in which the President was deeply interested, and because of my duties as a House whip, it was not possible for me to travel with the President as I would have liked to do.

Together with my wife, I visited the White House with other Members of Congress to pay respect to the departed President. As my wife and I left the bier, we were met by the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who greeted us softly. It was most difficult to speak on this sad occasion.

On Sunday evening, we returned to Washington to be on hand for the funeral ceremonies the following day. On arriving in Washington at midnight we were amazed at the great throng of people waiting in long lines to enter the Capitol where the President's body was lying in state.

After some difficulty in getting through the crowds we went to the rotunda of the Capitol where people were silently passing the bier with saddened faces and tearful eyes.

The next morning, Mrs. Rhodes and I were back in the rotunda of the Capitol as preparations were being made to take the President's body on the final trip to the White House, then to St. Matthew's Cathedral for the pontifical low mass, and then to Arlington Cemetery for the final resting place.

Before the body was taken from the Capitol, and as we stood nearby, the the President's widow and his two brothers, Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Senator Ted Kennedy, knelt before the bier just before the honor guard began to remove the casket.

With other House Members and their wives, we journeyed to Arlington Cemetery in special buses and then to the site near the place of burial. It is difficult to describe the apparent feeling of sadness of those along the route of the funeral parade, past the Lincoln Memorial and over Memorial Bridge and to Arlington Cemetery where the hillsides were packed with sorrowing crowds. There near the famous Lee Mansion and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier were the important heads of states from many nations. They had come to pay their final respects and tribute to a man who was loved by so many, not only in his own country but by the mighty and the lowly from all corners of the earth.

Two days later President Johnson told the Nation in his address before a joint session of Congress that he would carry on the program to which President Kennedy was dedicated. It was quite evident to me as I listened to President Johnson's remarks that the death of President John F. Kennedy will have a powerful impact on Congress, for the legislation for which he fought.

Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I include a number of splendid editorials pertaining to the death of President Kennedy and the ideals, principles, and objectives for which he gave his life:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot]

### THE PRESIDENT—LET US PRAY FOR OURSELVES, TOO

When the first news came, it hit all of us. Hard. Some of us wept. Most of us felt like crying. It is always this way when the lightning hits our Presidents. It hits us, too, in a special way. Our Presidents are so much a part of our lives. Above all Americans, our Presidents embody so much that all of us hold close and dear. Wherever our Presidents stand, we stand, too. Whatever the burden they carry, we carry it, too. And the power and the glory.

Some of us found this out for the first time, perhaps, when the thunderbolt struck down John F. Kennedy in Dallas. Others of us of another generation, remembering an April day in 1945 when the thunderbolt struck down Franklin D. Roosevelt, recognized it once again.

Some of us wept. Most of us felt like crying. For President Kennedy. For his wife. For his little children.

And for ourselves and our country.

When the lightning strikes, suddenly and unexpectedly, it hits all of us.

The storm had swirled around John F. Kennedy in dissent and even anger. A very few among us excoriated his name. Especially in the Deep South where civil rights has become a flaming issue, too often consuming reason and simple human decency in its fire.

In our Deep North, too, where a few among us have spewed out deprecations and accusations right up to the ugly charge of treason. They have done all of this in the name of patriotism and Americanism, as if John F. Kennedy did not really know or care or try to lead us in the cold war against communism.

And so very many among us stayed silent while the lunatic fringe lashed out in passion and hatred.

It is little wonder that so many of us wept and so many of us felt like crying. For President Kennedy and his family. And for ourselves and our country.

We have prided ourselves so long and so much because, as a free people, we settle our arguments and conduct the institutions of our freedom in reason and in law. And we are reassuring ourselves that President Kennedy was struck down as Lincoln was before him, and Garfield, and McKinley, by a crazed man.

Those of us who believed in John F. Kennedy are heartsick. Those of us who were only waiting for next year to try and vote him out of the White House are heartsick, too. He was every American's President. He was, in his very special office, every American. The bullets fired by the fanatic hit us all.

Today many of us are praying for John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, and for Lyndon B. Johnson, the 36th President, who has picked up the terrible burden—and the power and the glory, too.

Let us also pray for ourselves.

Let us resolve to shed our silence when the extremists and the fanatics cut loose with their wild and reckless oratory, their completely baseless charges, their rumors and their ugly innuendo.

Let us speak out for reason, and right, and simple human decency, and let us regard our fellow Americans and the man who leads our Nation in trust and compassion and respect—whatever the differences we may have among ourselves and whatever issues divide us.

The finest monument any of us can erect to the memory of President Kennedy will be to do all we can to extinguish the passions and the hatreds which smoulder in this wonderful country he served so very well and loved so very much.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

### INTELLIGENCE WAS HIS HALLMARK—KENNEDY'S MIND WAS CONSTANTLY ON FIRE; MEMORY AND READING WERE PRODIGIOUS

(By Eric Sevareid)

What was John F. Kennedy? How will he stand in history? As this is written, hours after his death, it is hard even to assemble thoughts, easy to misjudge such a complicated human being.

The first thing about him was his driving intelligence. His mind was always on fire; his reading was prodigious; his memory almost total recall of facts and quotations. A friend of mine once crossed the Atlantic on a liner with the Kennedy family, years ago. She remembered the day 12-year-old Jack was ill in his stateroom; there lay the thin, freckled little boy—12 years old, and reading Churchill's early life, other books scattered about his bed. His was a directed intelligence; he did not waste his energies; he always seemed to know where he was going and he put first things first.

John Kennedy's intellectuality was perhaps the hallmark of his nature, even more than his youth; the thing that made him different from so many Presidents. But few thought of him as an intellectual in the sense of one seeking truth for its own sake; he sought it, in order to act upon it. He was that rare and precious combination, the man of contemplation as well as the man of action. He had a sharp sense of history from his immense reading, and was acutely conscious of what his own place in history might be. In a sense, he lived for that; much of his personal correspondence as President suggested his awareness that those letters would be part of the American archives and story for all time.

He brought a new style into Government; he surrounded himself with intellectuals, as did Franklin Roosevelt in his first years; but in his personal style he was more like President Theodore Roosevelt. Like the first Roosevelt, President Kennedy believed in action; he had no patience with those who were tired or skeptical or cynical; no patience with those who could not keep up mentally or physically.

He became, with his young and beautiful wife, the symbol of America as he and most of us like to think of America: itself young, itself always hopeful, believing, and believing that Government could change the face of our land and our lives and that America could do more than any country in the world to change the face and the nature of the world itself.

He showed no signs, even after 3 years in office, of growing tired, either in body or spirit * * * but the built-in obstacles to practical achievement were—and remain—prodigious and complex. He began some new practical courses of Government action—as with the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress; these, perhaps, were more imaginative than his domestic conceptions; in any case, it is in the domestic field that his difficulties were the greatest and progress the slowest.

Early on, he showed that his way would be to try to conciliate and persuade the Congress, and to compromise with it where he had to, rather than to try bulldozer tactics. Of his bold actions, his nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union over Cuba was the boldest, one of the boldest and most successful acts of statesmanship the history books will ever tell the future about.

But at bottom, Mr. Kennedy was a cautious, prudent man. He liked to have all his ducks in a row before he fired. However vibrant in his political behavior, he was, in his deepest emotional nature, a conservative human being. Rarely did the people become aware of his deep feelings about anything. When he spoke to the country by radio or television his head usually ruled his heart. Only in very special circumstances, as on the day of brutal events in Mississippi, did passion rise in his voice as he spoke. This is why some professional observers said that President Kennedy had opened his mind to us, but not his heart * * * that therefore, politically, he had not captured the heart of the people.

If that was so, it is so no longer; the heart of the people is with the young President in death; with all of his family.

The tears of the country are with them; its hopes are with the new President.

---

[From Pottsville Republican]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

John Fitzgerald Kennedy came to the Presidency of the United States as the bearer of great change. He was the symbol of something new, but he died by something as old as time—the hand of the fanatic.

He was the first man born in the 20th century to hold the office—and the second youngest in history. He was the first Catholic in the White House. He came as a naval hero of World War II who narrowly had missed death in Pacific waters, and survived a second brush with death in a grave illness 9 years ago.

To the Nation's high politics he thus brought a fresh stamp. The well-remarked "Kennedy style" was a blend of intellect, vigor, wit, charm, and a clear talent for growth.

On the always shifting, often troubled world scene, he sometimes moved with more caution than expected in young leadership. Soon after entering the White House, he gamely took full blame for the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco as an enterprise sadly lacking in boldness.

Yet only his worst enemies withheld from him the label "courageous" when he moved resolutely against Soviet Premier Khrushchev in the great Russian missile crisis in Cuba in late 1962. And he boldly pressed for an East-West test ban treaty this year in the face of heavy charges that this imperiled our security.

In domestic affairs Kennedy won much of his program in beginning 1961, gained far less the following year, and encountered a major stalemate in 1963. The constant note against him was insufficient leadership.

But again, when 1963 brought the greatest crisis of this century, Kennedy—at acknowledged heavy political cost—committed himself to sweeping civil rights proposals that opened a vast new battleground.

Amid all his efforts to put the imprint of vigorous, imaginative youth upon the country's affairs in the 1960's, the late President found himself moving against a deepening background of protest, with an ugly underscoring of violence which he sought with only limited success to wipe away.

Much of this protest went to the steady encroachments of the Federal Government and its rising cost. But the bitterest reaction was white and Negro response to the enlarging racial struggle. The far right gave the mood its most perilous texture.

That is the greater tragedy.

With the calamity in Dallas the lesson of the danger inherent in violent extremism now may be deeply implanted in America's conscience.

In this way, Kennedy in death may achieve what the living President could not do to curb the almost ungovernable rancor that increasingly discolored the politics of his brief time in power.

It was John Kennedy's good fortune to surmount many obstacles to rise to his country's highest office and bring with him the winds of a new era.

It was his final tragedy that as he labored in difficult times to use these forces for the Nation's and the world's gain, they were swiftly challenged by countering winds of bitter reaction. In Dallas, one swift gust struck him down.

The Nation thus loses a young leader whose great promise lived in the shadow of great controversy. The way he died must inescapably cost all Americans deeply in self-esteem as freemen of good will.

---

[From The Reading (Pa.) New Era, AFL-CIO Paper]

### WHY?

(By Bob Gerhart)

As memories of emotion-packed scenes starting in Dallas and ending in Arlington continue to flash through my mind, I constantly ask myself the simple question, "Why?" And then when the finality of this tragic slaying of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, sinks in and another man moves into the White House, the anger and bitterness that mingled with grief and sorrow gives way to a feeling that we must get on with the job.

Maybe it is the electronic journalism called television that is responsible for our feelings. Cameras were there when a bleeding young man was cradled in the arms of a loving wife and mother while an open car sped 100 miles-an-hour to a hospital. In our very living room all of us watched the sombre events unfold—a returning of the body to Washington that same day; the dramatic escort of President Kennedy's body from the White House to the Capitol rotunda; the all-night vigil which saw the face of America move silently past the bier in the heart of our democracy; the moving events in St. Matthew's Cathedral where Cardinal Cushing commended President Kennedy's soul unto God; the melancholy beat of muffled drums as the horse-drawn caisson left the Cathedral with the mortal remains of the leader of the free world; and finally, interment of President Kennedy's body in Arlington Cemetery, shrine of the Nation's honored dead.

And then, almost stealthily it was all over and the inexorable movement of time was inaugurating a new period, a new administration in American life, leaving the period from last Friday to Monday evening with a nightmarish quality—also as if you had to shake yourself occasionally to eradicate the disbelief. It couldn't happen, it wouldn't happen, but it did.

There now can be no doubt as to the love our people held for President Kennedy. Despite all the antagonism created in the press and by the hate cult that was being encouraged of high places reminiscent of the Roosevelt-haters of two decades ago, despite the bitterness which responsible individuals held against him over the civil rights controversy, despite the assaults on the entire Kennedy family by the hate elements of the extremist right wing including at least one presidential aspirant—despite all of these things, President Kennedy was loved by the people.

The outpouring of emotions over the weekend in front of the cameras which recorded the tragic event was a far more potent testimonial to this man's closeness to the common people than all the Gallup polls and political prognostications which, by and large, were controlled and manipulated by the very people who wanted to defeat him by what apparently has become standard format in American political life—namely, character assassination. The very least that should evolve from this bodily assassination of the President of the United States is a reappraisal of what has been happening to the democracy which we say we cherish.

Can there be any doubt that the hatreds inflamed on our political scene by reckless assaults on public figures for partisan political advantage was not to a great measure responsible for the climate in which a man by the name of Oswald found justification for his horrible crime? Just review the guilt by association devices and the dirty tactics employed in the recent election right here in Reading and Berks County and you have a pretty good idea of what we mean. Discussing the issues is no longer the American way. All you do today is call the other guy a crook and then lump everyone on his side together and you have a formula for winning elections. And is it merely a coincidence that this is the method employed by one of our major parties consistently to achieve power and control at local, State, and National levels?

Even Vice President Nixon, in his brief eulogy for President Kennedy, lamented the atmosphere in which the assassination took place and called on the American people to "reduce hatred that has driven men to this terrible deed." It is no secret that Dallas is the hotbed of the radical right in the South. Not only is it a center of unlimited wealth but it is the cradle of numerous extremist movements which embark upon forays into the far reaches of America, preaching hatred and spewing vituperation in its wake.

Hate movements take many forms. Its ugly head may appear in the religious arena where innocent clergymen may be duped into serving as its tool under the guise of advancing Christianity. What a mockery. It may appear in a Hitlerian mask seeking to divide Protestant, Catholic, and Jew. It may appear cloaked in the American flag preaching a doctrine of hatred for foreign lands and advocating a cruel isolationism by withdrawing from the United Nations. It may appear in the form of the billboard which I saw recently on the outskirts of Harrisburg boldly exhorting passersby to "Impeach Earl Warren," Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Adlai Stevenson, U.N. Ambassador to the United Nations, revealed in an interview with Martin Agronsky, NBC newscaster, that after the threat to his own life in Dallas, recently, he thought about the cloud of hate that hovered over the Texas city and then called the White House urging them to cancel out the President's trip. Stevenson said he was reacting to instinct. However, the President decided to go there anyhow to see whether he couldn't provide the moderating influence to bring warring parties to their sense. Maybe he has now done so in martyrdom.

Yet, even though our Nation shudders at the thought of what has happened in this great land of the free—"it can't happen here, only in South America, Europe, and Asia, we said"—can you imagine that there are people like the man in a local industry who called the assassination "my best Christmas present"? Hatreds may have temporarily been submerged in the sea of grief that engulfed the Nation. But make no mistake. The attitudes are still present because they are in the hearts of some people.

And what meaning does the President's slaying have to us here in Reading and Berks County? Has it mellowed the hearts of those who espoused President Kennedy's legislative cause yet permitted petty rivalries and bitterness to split and divide us? Will there now be a reappraisal, a new approach? Will we be able to rise above the bickering and envy to mold a sensible spirit of cooperation for the future? President Kennedy's unexpected death is forcing the Nation to take a new look and make a new beginning under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson. Can we do less here at home?

---

[From Time magazine]

### HOW SORROWFUL BAD

In halting English, a Moslem telegraph operator in the Middle East tapped out on the telex: "Is it correct Kennedy killed pls?" When New York replied, "Yes, an hour ago," the Moslem signed off, "How sorrowful bad."

As the shadow of the news spread across the world, it was received everywhere with stunned disbelief. The Empress of Iran broke into tears, as did the President of Tanganyika, and countless anonymous men and women. Along Rome's Via Veneto grief sounded operatic. "E morto." People called to one another, and at a cocktail party the guests put down their glasses and began to recite the Lord's Prayer.

Wherever monarchs still ruled—in the United Kingdom, in Jordan—formal court mourning was proclaimed. Hardly a nation in the world failed to order the rites of tolling bells and lowered flags. Theaters and sports arenas closed down on individual impulse. With the news of Kennedy's death, a Viennese ice show halted in midperformance; in Belgium, a 6-day bicycle race was interrupted; in distant Nepal, the ceremonial opening of a leprosarium was postponed.

Everywhere, bars, cafés and restaurants emptied long before closing time. Strangers spoke to each other in short, simple phrases—"Poor Jackie," or "How awful," or "It can't be true." The phones of Americans abroad never ceased ringing, as foreign friends and acquaintances—or even total strangers—called to offer sympathy. The streets in front of U.S. embassies were jammed with mourners who stood in line for hours to write their names in books of condolence. Some brought flowers, but many searched out an American diplomat merely to shake his hand.

#### MONSTROUS ACT

One by one the statesmen joined the chorus of commiseration. As Big Ben tolled every minute for 1 hour (a gesture normally reserved for deaths in the royal family), Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home said: "There are times when the mind and the heart stand still." From Sir Winston Churchill came a statement: "This monstrous act has taken from us a great statesman and a wise and valiant man." The words still seemed to carry the old, sibilant indignation of the ancient lion. Liberia's President William Tubman cabled: "The urn of grief has been opened and is being filled with tears of friends the world over." Israel's David Ben-Gurion only asked: "Why, why?"

Almost by reflex, people rushed to disclaim even remote complicity in the murder. "Thank God it wasn't a Negro," said a Negro in Toronto. Many others insisted on reading into the event their own political passions. Statesmen in Africa, Asia and elsewhere insisted that the deed must have been done by a racist, and that Kennedy was a martyr like Lincoln or Gandhi. And Nehru could not resist remarking that the murder gave evidence of "dark corners in the United States, and this great tragedy is a slap for the concept of democracy."

#### GOLDEN BOY

The mourning voices first of all were for the President of the United States, regardless of his name or identity. For in a sense far beyond daily foreign policy squabbles, he is to much of the world the protector of the weak, the benefactor of the poor.

Because of the changes in the cold war climate that occurred during his administration, millions, even on the enemy side, mourned John Kennedy as a man of peace. But above all they mourned him for his person. Perhaps even more than his own countrymen, other peoples saw in him the embodiment of American virtues—youth, strength, informality, good looks, the idealistic belief that all problems can eventually be solved. A Southern Rhodesian paper called him "the golden boy," and Common Market President Walter Hallstein said that Kennedy "personified the most beautiful qualities of his people."

Possibly more than any other President in U.S. history, he had set out to charm the world, and he had succeeded in convincing many a nation that it was his special favorite.

Alive, John Kennedy had been particularly idolized by the citizens of West Germany, who received him last June as they had no other foreign leader. When the President told a crowd of 150,000 West Berliners, "Ich bin ein Berliner," the German people were his. Dead, John Kennedy was instantly enshrined by Germans as a hero. On the night of his assassination, 25,000 West Berlin students assembled and marched on city hall, where Mayor Willy Brandt, exhausted from a trip to Africa, told them: "I know how many are weeping tonight. We Berliners are poorer tonight. We all have lost one of the best."

West Germany's Chancellor Ludwig Erhard was on his special train returning from a Paris meeting with Charles de Gaulle. A scotch and soda at his elbow, he was briefing himself for a trip to Washington to see Kennedy, scheduled for this week. When Erhard's press chief came suddenly into the car and blurted out the news that Kennedy was dead, Erhard sat in stunned silence. Finally he murmured, "Unfassbar, kaum fassbar [Inconceivable, hardly conceivable]."

### UNDER FIRE

In Paris, the news reached President de Gaulle in his private apartments at the Elysée Palace. He turned on his TV set. When Kennedy's death was confirmed, De Gaulle—himself twice the target of assassination attempts—called in his staff. His face drawn and pale, he dictated his statement of condolence: "President Kennedy has died like a soldier, under fire." Russia's Red Army Choir, performing at Paris' Palais des Sports, interrupted its program for the announcement of the death and then, after a moment of silence, sang a Schubert lied in Kennedy's memory.

In Geneva, Swiss citizens jammed traffic by abandoning their cars in the middle of the streets to snatch up newspapers. An old woman, tears staining her cheeks, cried, "What an age we are living in."

In Spain, no foreigner has ever won the public's heart as had Kennedy. Said a Madrid editor, "Nothing has jolted me so much since the start of our own civil war." Americans were sought out for a pat on the shoulder, a comforting phrase such as "Hombre, lo siento mucho [Man, I feel deeply]."

Italy was locked in a political crisis when the news came. Premier Aldo Moro promptly adjourned his attempts to form a Cabinet with leftwing Socialist Leader Pietro Nenni. Emerging from the meeting, 72-year-old Nenni, with tears in his eyes, said: "These are little affairs of ours, in the face of this tragedy for the whole world." At the Vatican, Pope Paul went to his private chapel to pray for the wounded President and, after the news of his death, said mass.

To Ireland, John Kennedy was the apotheosis of the country's hopes and history—the great-grandson of a poor emigrant who had stormed the ramparts of the New World and won its highest honor. He was looked upon, said the Irish Times, "as a younger brother and with great affection."

### REICHSTAG FIRE

On the other side of the Iron Curtain, Chairman Nikita Khrushchev and two aides drove to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Dressed in black and looking noticeably depressed, Khrushchev spoke for 19 minutes with U.S. Ambassador Foy Kohler, reminiscing about the slain President. Khrushchev's wife Nina cabled Jacqueline Kennedy. The genuine dismay in Russia was soon modified by politics, when it turned out that the prime suspect was a self-declared Marxist who had lived in Russia. Said one Soviet journalist suspiciously: "Is this affair being whipped up in the press? Is the situation grim?" Said another Russian taking up what sounded like an emerging propaganda line: "Remember that they found a Communist who started the Reichstag fire."

In the Middle East, one Iraqi was amazed: "We are used to this kind of thing in Arab countries. But in America?" In the Congo, East Katanga's President Edouard Bulundwe and his entire cabinet, together with their seldom seen wives, trooped into the home of the U.S. consul. "This is how we behave in Africa when a great chief dies," explained Bulundwe as they sat stiffly in the drawing room. "President Kennedy will be mourned in even the smallest village of our country as a man who cared for and worked for the blacks."

It was the same in Asia. In Thailand, authorities sent sound trucks into the villages to spread the mournful news that Prathanathibodi [President] Kennedy was dead. In Saigon, people were more shocked by Kennedy's death than they had been by that of President Diem; and Buddhists held special memorial services and prayers. In Japan, technicians were up before dawn to receive the historic first transpacific TV broadcast from the United States, which was to have included a personal message from the President. Instead, the voice of a Japanese newsman in Manhattan reported the news of Kennedy's death.

In all of Asia, Red China was almost alone in its determined lack of sympathy. Peiping radio carried the Kennedy story without comment. The Hong Kong Communist New Evening Post sneered that Kennedy had "used a two-faced policy to promote an imperialist war course."

### VANISHING BAITERS

Even Cuba proved less surly than Red China. Fidel Castro deplored the murder, said he had no reason to wish for Kennedy's death, but conceded that "perhaps" Cuba might have had motives "to feel like it" and vaguely suggested that "reactionaries" were really to blame. Elsewhere in Latin America, all the Yankee baiting seemed to disappear for the moment. A sense of pessimism about the future gripped Brazil, and the downtown streets of Rio de Janeiro were filled with people whose tight faces, glazed eyes and unaccustomed silence revealed their feelings. In the favelas (shantytowns) on Rio's outskirts, samba bands called off their rehearsals for the carnival, and President João Goulart said about Kennedy: "I kneel before his memory."

The most eloquent Latin American voices were those heard in the street. A janitor in Quito, who had been listening to the news on radio, refused to read his newspaper because "it's too painful to go over such a sad story again." Despite later revelations about the crime, most Latin Americans persisted in believing that Kennedy had been slain because of his support for Negro rights. In Buenos Aires, women cried, "Qué barbiridad," and old men made sad, futile gestures with their hands. Said one grieving Colombian: "It seems as though all the Presidents in all the Latin American countries have died."

To the north, throughout Canada, theaters and arenas closed their doors, and large cities became hushed with a curious quiet. Prime Minister Lester Pearson was just about to open a session of Parliament when he was handed a note. He threw it on the top of his desk, slumped back in his seat and seemed at a loss for words. His voice broke as he said: "The world can ill afford at this time in our history to lose a man of his courage."

History's more precise appraisals would come later, as would the resumption of all the world's usual enmities. But for a brief time at least, the U.N. General Assembly, standing in silence, was in a mood to agree with U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, who said: "All of us who knew him will bear the grief of his death to the day of ours."

---

[From the New Era]

### THE AMERICANS

(By Jere L. Gabrielle)

It's 2:30 in the morning of Monday, November 25. You're tired. You're emotionally drained by the events of the past 2 days. Your eyes are smarting under the strain of watching, watching, watching. Your ears somehow absorb the repetition of the macabre events that have transpired. You know you should hit the sack but you sit there transfixed, tired eyes glued to the television screen.

Actually you don't really know why you sit there trying to stay awake at 2:30 in the morning. You tell yourself it must have become a habit that started on Friday afternoon. Just one of those crazy ideas that you might miss something if you stopped staring.

Then through the haze of your clouded thoughts you suddenly realize what really holds you there. It isn't curiosity. It isn't a stubborn desire to sweat this out to the bitter end. It is people. You, sitting there in the comfort of your living room, are enjoying the privilege of a front-row-center look at America.

The voice of the commentator interrupts your reverie to tell you that people are silently passing before your eyes at the rate of about 5,000 an hour and that the prospects of the thousands who wait, in a line that extends for some 3 miles of ever getting a chance to see what they came to see are pretty slim.

Then the impact of this procession of human beings—Americans—really hits you like a ton of bricks. These folks, moving past the flag-draped casket, are not curiosity seekers. That kind would not wait out in the chill air of night for hours and hours just to say that they passed through the rotunda of the Capitol Building at 2:30 a.m., to look at a flag-draped coffin.

These folks are here because they want to be here. There is a compulsion, an inexplicable motivation that has moved them to this, short minute in history.

Perhaps a desire for personal affiliation with the event is the answer to some. To others, perhaps it is the desire for conclusive evidence that this monstrous thing has really happened. Some may feel that they must see, or touch, physically the only remaining material evidence of what is a closed chapter in their lives.

But as you watch the faces you know that without exception there is a spiritual link between each man, woman, and child in that endless shuffling procession and the man whose remains lie beneath that American flag. Yes, a spiritual link. A spark, however great or small, of understanding and love, of feeling that here was your brother, someone who thought as you do, someone who was tied in, however remotely, with your own personal aspirations, someone who had somehow shared with you in sorrow, exultation, ambition, and most of the other emotions evidenced in the complexity of your life.

Those who passed and prayed knew that this man had prayed. Those who wept knew that this man must have wept on occasion. Those carrying infants asleep on their shoulders knew that this man had carried his own children often on his shoulder.

The very young knew that this man was in tune with them. The very old, the lame, the blind knew that this man had held out his hand to them. Catholics felt a special spiritual brotherhood for him because he was a Catholic but those of other creeds thought of him as their own special brother also.

The face of bigotry was absent from this scene. There was no segregation in this face of America. The black man and the white man shuffled slowly side by side and together they stopped for their personal look or prayer. The man they came to see was really the image of those who looked at him. It was like a look into a spiritual mirror.

Yes, I was looking at the face of America and it made me proud. All the quips and jokes and the ugly stories and the hatred faded into nothing. In their place there rose only the countenance of the thousands upon thousands whom I must believe are, in essence, imbued with the same dignity and purpose as the man to whom they were paying homage. And I know, because of this, that my country will endure forever.

Our President, who battled to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons costing millions of dollars and capable of destroying millions of humans in one fell swoop, was murdered by a guy with scrambled eggs in his head, with a $12.75 mail-order rifle and a couple of 20-cent shells. But that man was not in the procession that I saw on Monday at 2:30 a.m. His face, thank God, is not the face of America.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker—

> There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens.
>
> A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to uproot the plant.
>
> A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to tear down and a time to build.
>
> A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance.
>
> A time to scatter stones, and a time to gather them; a time to embrace, and a time to be far from embraces.
>
> A time to seek, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away.
>
> A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to be silent, and a time to speak.
>
> A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace.—Eccelesiastes 3: 1–8.

His time was at hand. On a summer night in Los Angeles, his party called him to be its candidate for the Presidency of the United States. I watched him as he stepped from the darkness of the night into the brilliancy of the convention doorway. He left uncertainty behind; his was a sure and swift movement into the center of his people and on up to their leadership.

It was his right and time to lead and he had seized it. It had not been conferred upon him; he had won it over all. He had gone into the winter of New England, the rains of Wisconsin, and the hills of West Virginia and carried the day. Cynics said he could not be nominated. Skeptics said he could not win. His faith was against him. His youth would defeat him. He knew America better than they. Because of his faith in God and in his fellow man, he rejected the cynic and dismissed the skeptic. Because he was young and had the vision of tomorrow, he knew he would prevail.

He went forth from that convention with the message that it was better to light a candle than curse the darkness and his flame fired the Nation. Now it will never be extinguished.

He vowed that he would get this Nation moving. In 1,000 days he kept that vow.

He banished uncertainty and wore the mantle of world leadership with determination. There was a way to peace along a path of strength and he found that way. With more power in those young and sensitive hands than any man had ever held before, he fashioned a bond of nations against the spread of ultimate destruction.

He assessed the Nation's needs and neglected none. The health of our children and our elderly were his concern. He knew that only an educated people could truly enjoy the dignity and rights of freemen and he planned for that. He seized the equalitarian doctrine that was rooted in our heritage, reaffirmed it and did not flinch. He ran the risk for what was right. We will have a new birth of freedom because he lived as he believed that all men are equal before God.

He had a sense of history and he knew it was his time to lead us, that his time was at hand.

I saw him last in the Lincoln bedroom. He had called us around him, 12 of the people's Representatives, to discuss the Nation, district by district.

We met on the Truman balcony and we spoke to him of the national needs. He seized and sized each case, every detail, weighed and recommended, evaded nothing. No man who ever lived in the White House was close to the people of the United States, knew them better, loved them more, or served them with greater devotion. We went from the balcony to the Lincoln room and he spoke with reverence of the martyr President. He pointed to the portrait of Jackson whom Lincoln admired as he admired Lincoln.

A strong President himself, he revered a strong and martyred President.

I left him at the Lincoln room and I was sure as always that our Nation had chosen wisely and well. We had made him our President, he had chosen the hour. We had called him to lead, he had called us to sacrifice. We had sought strength, he cast out weakness. We looked for peace, he chained the monster of war. We searched for a way through dark and dangerous hours, he gave us light and sureness.

We made him our President, he made our President immortal.

With the warmth of the flame of the new fire at his resting place let us cherish the hours he was among us.

Through that flame let malice be seared away and hatred purged from the land.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, hero, martyr, President of the United States, must be more than remembered. His words must be followed and his works begun well finished.

To his widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, and the family of our late President, our gratitude and feeling is unbounded.

We know now that at his side was a gracious lady who helped him to help us. In our most tragic hour we, too, borrowed on her courage. What would we have been without him? What would we have done without his great and grand lady?

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has deprived the world of its youngest, yet its most effective leader in the quest for peace. His intellectual attainments, his wide knowledge and articulate speech, his courage and his compassion commanded respect and admiration throughout the world from friend and foe alike. Within the short space of 3 years as President of the United States he became the world's most respected and effective spokesman. His life was a symbol of freedom throughout the world.

And while he had become a world figure let us not overlook the fact that here at home his public and private life set the very highest standard of conduct for public officials. As Columnist Richard Wilson said of him last August:

> The world is much concerned, as it ought to be, with standards of human conduct. Moral, ethical, and spiritual questions are sharply presented in many different ways. They arise in the private and public lives of officials here and abroad, in the revolution of religious theology and dogma, in the morality of nuclear policy, in the relationships between the races, and, most of all, in the ordinary complexities of modern life.
>
> In this vortex of changing standards and values, when the individual finds himself troubled so much of the time, the conduct of the President of the United States provides a temporal precept and example.
>
> President Kennedy, in his public and family life, has set the very highest standard of American conduct. One need not agree with all, or any, of his policies to recognize that in his behavior, attitude, and demeanor he provides the needed example that the troubled or misguided may turn to with respect and admiration.

Despite the reality of the sad days following his assassination I find it difficult to believe that he is dead. Even so it is more difficult to understand that the catastrophe did occur in our land and in our time. As millions in stunned disbelief upon hearing of his death exclaimed, "Why?"—so must we today and everyday continue to ask, "Why?"

When we answer this question we will have fulfilled our obligation as public officials and provided in some measure that the life and deeds of John Fitzgerald Kennedy shall not have been lost.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at this moment I could wish for nothing more than to be a poet or writer, for only as one of them could I find the words to express my grief over the loss of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. In expressing my grief I would be expressing, also, the feelings of my family, my constituents, and my friends and acquaintances in an appropriate manner.

But I am not a poet, Mr. Speaker, and platitudes would never do for me at this moment. I will limit myself therefore to a few simple words. I knew John F. Kennedy well and I loved and admired him. I worked harder for his election in 1960 that I have ever worked for anyone, or than I ever shall again. My constituents approved of President Kennedy long before he was elected to that great office and they showed it by giving him a great majority of their votes, their unstinting support and above all, their loyalty and deep affection. They will miss him terribly, as will the Nation and, indeed, the world.

I am consoled by the fact that it was my privilege to know, to work for, and to support John F. Kennedy. He was deserving of far greater things than I could ever have given him and I regret only that I shall no longer have the opportunity to serve him, for to do so was to serve the Nation and the people of the world. I shall be mindful always of the things he stood for and I shall do everything possible to see that those things come to pass. By doing so perhaps I can show his brave widow and children the depth of my affection for John F. Kennedy and the things for which he stood. I could never express these feelings with words but I might be able to with deeds which last longer than mere words. My wife, my family, and all of our friends join me in this expression of loss and of our heartfelt sympathy to President Kennedy's family.

**Mr. ROSENTHAL.** Mr. Speaker, it was John Fitzgerald Kennedy who said at a news conference on March 2, 1962:

> There is always inequity in life. Some men are killed in war, and some are wounded, and some may never leave the country. * * * It's very hard in military or personal life to assume complete equality. Life is unfair.

No more telling meaning could have been given to these words than the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

President Kennedy gave his life in the service of his country. In that service he had won the love, affection, respect, and esteem of his fellow Americans and fellow citizens of the world. We mourn his loss, and grieve for his family and for ourselves.

John F. Kennedy assumed the Presidency with our hopes and his determination. He was proud and warmhearted, literate and articulate, dynamic and vital. He acknowledged that no experience can possibly prepare you adequately for the Presidency, and yet we know now that no man in our times could have had a greater preparation for the Presidency. The beauty and eloquence of his inaugural address assured all the world that the United States had chosen a President who would wear the traditional robes with grace and distinction. The inaugural address was but a first step in a long succession of profound and inspiring pronouncements—pronouncements that have already led to deeds in commemoration of his ideas and ideals.

It was this man among men who taught us that national security and freedom, and efforts for the preservation of the peace of mankind are all singular objectives of our people. It was his determination, and his alone, that permitted the execution of the nuclear test ban treaty, a first step in the breaking of the nuclear deadlock that threatened to engulf mankind. Surely, his dreams for world peace and understanding were never more eloquently expressed than at American University earlier this year when he said:

> And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we all are mortal.

John F. Kennedy's mission, and in fact his performance, was to advance the cause of all humanity. He was mindful of man's inhumanity to man, and determined to correct the world's inequities.

It was he alone among the free world's leaders who, more than any other, understood the revolution and rebellion of the underprivileged.

It was he who gave meaning and direction, and offered hope and help to those who sought to play their proper role in our society.

It was he who was both resolute and determined in dealing with threats from our antagonists, and at the same time and with the same degree of determination to lead the fight to "get the nuclear genie back into the bottle."

It was he who gave the American minorities the new hope for dignity, respect, and confidence that was too long overdue.

Indeed, he offered special inspiration to those of his generation. He was made for these times, and these times were made for him. He loved this land and its people, and they in turn offered to him their blessings in exercising the leadership that they willingly bestowed upon him.

The incredible tragedy of his death, and abruptness with which his life was terminated, leave a deep emptiness in the fabric of our life. Time may heal the pain we suffer, but it shall never replace for us Americans the loss of our good friend, and our devoted and distinguished leader.

America has lost a noble son, but we shall remain loyal to his ideals, his hopes, his dreams, and his memory.

**Mrs. GREEN of Oregon.** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the eloquent remarks made so far today in tribute to our late President. If I may paraphrase President Johnson's remarks last week in this very Chamber: I wish with all my heart we were not here this day doing what we are doing.

A witless act by an ignorant assassin struck down John Fitzgerald Kennedy—the fourth President of the United States to be slain. Ironically, he was a victim of a fanaticism his cool, sensitively honed intelligence abhorred and rejected.

Certainly, at this moment Shakespeare might well have written for Americans the words he placed in the mouth of King John:

> Of comfort no man speak
> Let's talk of graves, of worms, of epitaphs.
> Make dust our paper and with rainy eyes
> Write sorrow on the bosom of the earth.

Some of us grieve, because we knew John F. Kennedy as an able political leader and a kindly father and a civilized man. He gave us a glimpse of promise and fulfillment in our national life; gave us surcease from what Matthew Arnold once called "this strange disease of modern life, with its sick hurry, its divided aims, its palsied hearts."

Others among us grieve because, although they owed him no political allegiance, he was the President of us all. We all should grieve because most terribly the office of the Presidency, itself, has been damaged.

Private emotion, however, cannot redeem dastardly acts. There was grief and sorrow aplenty when a town mutinied in Mississippi because a Negro American wished to attend a State university that barred Negroes. Two men were slain in the civil strife. There was surely grief and sorrow when Medgar Evers was slain by a racist, thereby stopping his own fight to translate into performance the promises of our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. There was abundant grief and sorrow when Negro children were murdered in a church bombing one Sunday morning in Birmingham. What means our private grief and sorrow when it does not prevent the recurrence of the preventable?

There is entirely too much private sorrow that is uncoupled to individual, tangible contributions to public decency and responsibility.

There is a contribution each can make in this difficult hour by realizing that however profound our sorrow, it is to no avail unless coupled with a public act that condemns and rebukes extremes in word and deed.

And so the President of all the American people is gone—struck down in the summer of his life. A man who lived by the dictate that courage is grace under pressure.

All over the Nation, Americans mourned. It was as if collectively the Nation mourned in company with Jacqueline Kennedy. At a moment when this Nation desperately needed a proud and beautiful act, the Nation found it in the deportment of Mrs. Kennedy as she walked behind the flag-draped caisson bearing her husband's body. Certainly, she showed her profile in courage.

Portland and Oregon mourned no less than other communities and States in the Nation. Moving sermons and addresses were given. Memorial services were held. Constituents and friends sent letters.

Typical were these:

> This terrible loss comes to me as though it were one of my immediate family.
>
> Please convey my feeling of loss; I would gladly have given my life for his.

The Reverend Robert H. Bonthius, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Portland, spoke feelingly in his sermon of tribute:

> It is fitting that we remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy this morning, giving thanks to God for those gifts which he used in the service of this country and the world, and asking God that whatsoever was honorable and excellent in his leadership may be bestowed upon his successor. We remember his courage in war and in peace, the range of his mind and his capacity for amassing information and organizing it for policy decisions, his willingness to assume public

> and personal responsibility for serious mistakes, his boldness in times of international crisis, his concern for the weak and underprivileged and those deprived of civil rights. We recall his coolness in controversy, his broad human sympathy, his ability and willingness to draw upon the talents of both political parties for important missions across the world. We remember that he gave no special favors to one religion or one church at the expense of another. Perhaps more than all else, we recall his sense of destiny, his deep persuasion of the mission which this country has before it, his eloquent voicing of that mission to all nations, inviting in particular the Soviet Union to consider new proposals for arms control, disarmament, and peace. He could not rest or let the country rest when there was so much yet to do and be as Americans in a new and promising though threatening age.
>
> Four lines of Robert Frost, a friend of the President's and a favorite poet, were written by Mr. Frost for himself. They might be applied also to John Kennedy:
>
> "And were an epitaph to be my story
> I'd have a short one ready for my own.
> I would have written of me on my stone:
> I had a lover's quarrel with the world."

Rabbi Emanuel Rose of Congregation Beth Israel in Portland said at a memorial service for the late President on November 25, 1963:

> The uniqueness of John F. Kennedy is not to be found in the frailties common to all mankind, but in the particular strengths of the man. John F. Kennedy was a strong man. He was strong in his ideals. He was strong in his commitments. He was strong in his philosophy. He was strong in his determination to make real his philosophy. It was—in my opinion—his most obvious characteristic "his youth" which was his particular uniqueness in this office.
>
> It is in the nature of man that with the passing of years he becomes more complacent, for he has learned, perhaps due to disappointment, the emotional necessity of accepting more of what is. But with youth there is a greater zealousness. The visions of youth evoke more intensive action. It is the youthful vision which stimulates faster progress. It is the youthful vision which is less able to accept the status quo. It is the youthful vision which is less influenced by that rationalization which results from lengthier years.
>
> Although historians will long argue the point—was it the mere accident of time and circumstance, or was it John F. Kennedy, the man, who in his young years under his Presidency was able to secure a nuclear test ban treaty—yes, deliberations lasted for many prior years, but could they not just as well have continued through more years without arriving at a successful conclusion? Is it accident of time alone that the strongest civil rights bill of any administration has been presented to Congress? Is it accident of time alone that the mental health bill was presented to Congress—which will have profound impact upon our Nation? Is it accident alone that a Peace Corps came into being under his administration? Here was a man of deep commitment. He was, in the words of the Chief Justice, Earl Warren, "a fighter for justice," "an apostle for peace." His zealousness for his vision of America, his energetic dedication to his dreams for his Nation are the seal of his uniqueness as the 35th President of the United States. To be sure, his appeal to America toward the fulfillment of the American dream was not new, but it was fresh and vigorous. He was free of the shallow triteness of superficial nationalism, but suffused with a profound understanding of national integrity and individual dignity. He was emotionally distant and apart from the flag wavers, but intellectually akin to the deeper meaning of the Stars and Stripes. His vocabulary was void of ballyhoo cheapness, but his speeches were weighted with literary acumen.

The Portland Oregonian on November 26 was moved to comment editorially:

> The maniacal events of the past weekend, which brought into counteraction the enduring strengths of the American people—faith in God, unswerving loyalty to our ways of life and government, the disciplined courage of a widowed First Lady, the compassion of a multitude—have left us all drained of emotion.
>
> Drained, but not empty. From the ashes of our sorrow and anger rises a new sense of dedication. The lawlessness of the jungle will not prevail. Although there are savages among us, new ways will be found to restrain them. Our national purpose will not be blunted by the irrationalities of the few. There will be no gain to our enemies here or elsewhere in the world from the assassination of President Kennedy and the stupidity of the Dallas police in allowing the murder of his assassin. This Nation draws together in shock and adversity. The democratic ideal is as tough as it is rational. It will grow stronger until all the world learns that mankind cannot live without it.

Its sister paper, the Journal, editorialized on November 23:

> Tragically Mr. Kennedy did not have time to prove what his place in history might become. But he will be remembered as a courageous leader, one who proved his bravery in the face of death as a naval lieutenant in World War II and who in the White House faced crisis after crisis with the same kind of bravery.
>
> It has been easy to find fault with some of Mr. Kennedy's decision and policies. Now it is just as easy to forget the faultfinding. The President is a martyr to the causes in which he believed. Nothing that happens from now on can take this role from him.

On November 23, 1963, the Portland Reporter gave this accounting:

> We do not know John F. Kennedy's last words, but we know what he intended to say. In an advance copy of the speech he was to make in Dallas, were the words:
>
> "There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault, but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility."
>
> Kennedy was to say that these voices were preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality and that they "apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness."
>
> Men of good will seek to resolve differences by discussion and persuasion. Tragically there still are those of unbalanced minds with power to change the future of the world.
>
> Let us now accept the reality of the deed and dedicate ourselves anew to creating a better world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our 35th President. A Japanese destroyer tried to kill him by ramming the PT boat he commanded. It failed. But one of his fellow Americans succeeded.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy left millions of Americans grieving at his passing as though they were his immediate survivors, as though he had been a member of their own families, a brother, son, husband, even a father. This genuine grief and sense of loss are felt for many reasons. In the first place, he had often been in the homes of many Americans by way of their television screens, as a Senator, as a presidential candidate, and as President of the United States. He seemed to belong in those homes just as he seemed to belong in what became for a time his own home, the White House.

His personal characteristics were such as to endear him to millions here and abroad. He was handsome, his smile was radiant, his mind quick, his speech clear, his voice strong, his humor apparent, his courage unquestionable, and his dedication to his country and its people obvious. Some of his charm and grace was derived from the fact that he liked his awesome job so very much. He was a born leader. He knew it, and so did his country and the world. In losing him we have come to realize more accurately and much more fully how much he meant to all of us. The trust, the admiration that people in all lands held him in was revealed by the unprecedented outpouring of grief in the whole family of man.

Mr. George Gallup, whose public opinion polls have charted the President's ups and downs in the affections of Americans since his candidacies in the presidential primaries of 1960, said the other day that:

> During the nearly 3 years of his term in office, one group stood solidly behind the President—the majority of the American public.

Strangely enough, so it would seem, the high point of approval of John Fitzgerald Kennedy came in the aftermath of the ill-fated Cuban invasion attempt in the Bay of Pigs. Yet on examination this is not strange at all, but is rather an example of the American tradition of loyalty and stanchness in a crisis. The American people rallied around their new leader when they knew that the breaks had gone against him.

Since there will be many who will praise him for his triumphs, and only silence now from those who criticized him, it may be well to say a few words about the unhappy episode. Of course, he assumed all responsibility for any errors of judgment which had been made. Constitutionally the responsibility was his, and he accepted it and bore the critical onslaught with characteristic grace and good will.

It has been noted that only in this one instance did the President rely wholly on the judgment and advice of the experts. Of all who opposed the Bay of Pigs invasion he had felt the gravest skepticism; yet he accepted his responsibility when it turned out that the people who knew the most were shown to know the least, and no mistake of a similar nature or a comparable magnitude was subsequently made. He learned things quickly, well, and for good. The second Cuban crisis revealed him in his full stature. As Joseph C. Harsch, the noted columnist, has observed:

> That moment of the Cuban crisis grows larger in perspective as it recedes into the past. It stands out on the record of the past as the watershed between the period when the possibility of nuclear war ever was pres-

> ent in our lives and the period when the danger seems itself to be a major deterrent.
>
> Mr. Kennedy gave the West, indeed all the world, the priceless gain of release from fear of inevitable nuclear war. He gave us all a chance to look and think and plan ahead in an atmosphere of confidence and relief.

Just as he struggled so unceasingly to achieve a world of law and order, so at home he fought to insure that every American should enjoy the equal rights and equal opportunity guaranteed by our Constitution. A truly civilized man, he recognized the human dignity and worth of every individual and he sought to elevate our national standards to the lofty goals he envisioned. A devoted and solicitious son, husband, and father, he knew the importance of the family and wanted every family to enjoy a decent standard of living and the better things of life. He was the champion of the working people and sought the abolition of exploitation and misery.

President Kennedy summarized his goals in his brilliant inaugural address:

> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

We grieve that he has been taken from us so prematurely before he could achieve all he hoped to achieve in the cause of peace and freedom and equality. He has left us a noble legacy, and our finest tribute to this great man would be to dedicate ourselves as he did to the building of a world of peace and brotherhood.

One of the most moving tributes to the President came in a very short interview over Washington's Station WTOP. Daniel P. Moynihan, Assistant Secretary of Labor, was interviewed by WTOP Reporter Harold Walker. This is the way it went:

> Mr. WALKER. Is there any meaning you can find in what has happened?
>
> Mr. MOYNIHAN. I suppose the point that cuts deepest is the thought that there may not be. * * * You know the French author, Camus, when he came out at the end of his life, he said the world was absurd. A Christian couldn't think that, but the utter senselessness, the meaninglessness. * * * We all of us know down here that politics is a tough game. And I don't think there's any point in being Irish if you don't know that the world is going to break your heart eventually. I guess we thought we had a little more time. * * * So did he.
>
> Mr. WALKER. Is the New Frontier leaderless?
>
> Mr. MOYNIHAN. No, sir. We have a leader. He is the President. If we learned anything from John Kennedy, we learned to serve the President. I think that the single, one thing that some of us are holding to, to keep our minds together, is that we will do exactly as the President wishes us to do in exactly what capacity he indicates.
>
> Mr. WALKER. Will the New Frontier still be able to realize its dreams?
>
> Mr. MOYNIHAN. Oh, we're no good at answering questions like that. You speak of dreams. You recall the passage from "The Tempest":
>
> "We are such stuff as dreams are made on."
>
> Well, you know that passage begins, "Our revels now are ended."

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was uniquely a man of his time who spoke not just the words of this day and age but somehow breathed the spirit of this complex 20th century world. When he died a little bit of all of us died, not just in our own country but around the world.

When I returned from the White House on that sad Saturday afternoon following the tragic events in Dallas I sat down and wrote a letter to the people of my State. This is what I said to them:

> DEAR FRIENDS: As I stood with bowed head before that lonely flag-draped coffin in the east room of the White House, my heart cried out "Why, oh God, Why?"
>
> This was a good man, a man of faith, a man of courage. He was not a man of violence, nor of guile, nor of conceit, but a man of restraint and dignity, a tolerant man, one who loved life, who loved people, who wanted to help them, not hurt them. He was my friend. He was America's friend. His whole life is a testimonial to his love of country—a life almost in its entirety dedicated to public service both in war and peace.
>
> In every way he was a man of good will, a moderate and a Christian. His personal philosophy was to win—but fairly and according to the rules—to persuade with argument and facts, to appeal to the heart as well as the mind, to give unstintingly of himself—to ask no more than he himself was willing to give.
>
> He was of this time and this age. No one in public life so well typified the mood and spirit of our day. He spoke for millions of people, articulately, compassionately, naturally. His voice was theirs. He was one of them.
>
> Who then could commit this monstrous act? How could it happen, here, in the mid-20th century, in the greatest free nation on earth, the cradle of democracy, the haven for the world's oppressed and downtrodden, the world's hope for freedom and justice for all men?
>
> Is the fault only with the assassin who pulled the trigger or does the guilt go deeper? Is it not in fact with every man and every organization that has sowed the seeds of hate throughout our land? Is it not with every tongue that has spread the venom of distrust, and disrespect for our laws and institutions? Is it not with every radical and extremist, whether of the left or of the right, who spreads doubt and suspicion in our midst? Is it not with every deceiver who has fanned the flame of intolerance and preached the gospel of hate, and every idle tongue that has thoughtlessly wagged to defame the face of our leaders and our institutions? Do not they all share the guilt in this terrible crime?
>
> The man who pulled the trigger was preceded in the act a thousand times by all those who preach violence, hatred, and intolerance—by the extremists, the fanatical fringe, the character assassins, and the hate peddlers of our day. The President has died. The people of this Nation must now cleanse themselves from the disease of hate or he will have died in vain.
>
> Let us not forget too quickly. We have a tested and able leader to assume the great responsibilities of the Presidency, but because of that let us not too soon turn our thoughts away from what happened and why. It is for us as individuals and as a nation to examine our own conscience and to dedicate ourselves anew to those great principles of truth, tolerance, understanding, justice, and love that were taught us by the Prince of Peace, and that have guided our Nation these many years.
>
> President Kennedy typified those principles as much as any other American of our time. We would do well to build a monument to this good and great man—each one of us—in our own hearts—a monument of dedication to those great principles he so well exemplified. John F. Kennedy gave his life for his country. We owe him much, but especially we owe him this.

Mr. Speaker, America has suffered a great and irreparable loss. In our hour of grief we are infinitely proud of Jacqueline Kennedy who has shown us nobility of character in these hours of grief that will remain for all time a living inspiration to men and women everywhere. May God be good to Mrs. Kennedy and the children and all members of the family and may all of us help to pay the debt we owe by becoming more faithful servants of the land we love.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I join the leadership and my colleagues of the House in paying tribute to the memory of that great and noble American, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Much is being said on this floor today about our martyred President. No words of mine can accurately or adequately describe my thoughts about him.

Like many of you I knew him first when he was a Member of this House, then as a U.S. Senator, and then as our President. I admired him greatly and liked him very much.

It was my privilege to accompany him across Texas in the 1960 presidential campaign. I was honored when I could present him to the welcoming throng of Americans who met him at the Austin, Tex., Municipal Airport just after he had made the courageous and magnificent appearance before the Houston Ministerial Conference. I was never prouder of an American than I was of Senator Kennedy that evening.

I shall always remember with pride the great honor he afforded me when he appointed me as U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

I am glad that I had the opportunity as a Representative in the Congress of the United States to support him as the leader of this Nation and of the free world. Not only was I shocked but saddened beyond words when I first realized in Dallas that our President was dead.

Little did my colleagues from Texas and I realize that when we accompanied him to our State on November 21 and 22 that we would be close to the tragedy of his death. There is no way to tell of the shock and grief we experienced.

President John F. Kennedy is now immortal. History will record his greatness. All I can say here is that I am thankful I knew him and that I could serve in a small way to make his tremendous task easier. My family and I are grieved for his incomparable widow and children and his remarkable family.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, one of my earliest memories is of my father's enthusiasm for the late Teddy Roosevelt. I remember his reading to me the reports that Roosevelt sent back from his African trips, as published in a magazine which was a prime influence in our home at that time, but is no longer published, the old Outlook. And my own first boyhood involvement in politics was in active support of Roosevelt's Bull Moose campaign.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, because it has seemed to me that President John F. Kennedy had something of the same "flair" that characterized Teddy Roosevelt, an abundant vitality of body and spirit, combined with both idealism and pragmatism and intellectual capacity of a high order, which I found very attractive and even exciting.

Both men were quick and vocal in their recognition of social and economic problems which they felt threatened our Nation, and both vigorously espoused what they considered to be the effective and necessary reforms to solve such problems. Both also roused up strong opposition.

I will not attempt to press too far any recital of the similarities between these two great national leaders, Teddy Roosevelt and Jack Kennedy. They were different in many ways. But, Mr. Speaker, I do say that in my own impressions they had much of the same impact. They were similar in their ability to express ideas and ideals excitingly, and to capture the imagination and the support, especially of people who are young, imaginative, idealistic, full of energy and ambition, interested in creating a better world.

Yes; President Kennedy attracted me greatly as a person, even though I was not of his political party and even though I sometimes found myself thoroughly disagreeing with him. I believe he would be the first to appreciate that honest criticism has its rightful place in any sincere eulogy, and therefore I submit it shows no lack of respect for me now to say that I found exciting and admirable Mr. Kennedy's skill and eloquence in the use of words and ideas, but at the same time I was frequently distressed and disappointed by the actual solutions he offered for this Nation's problems.

His solutions too often seemed to lack originality and inventiveness. His proposal of the Peace Corps, I am quick to admit, is an exception to that rule. But too often I felt discouraged and frustrated when, after he would lift the Nation to heights with his calls for action, the specific programs he proposed would be largely mere repetition of the old New Deal remedies, emphasizing increased Federal expenditures and increased concentration of authority and responsibility in the Federal Government.

Perhaps the very fact that John Kennedy so relished the world of ideas and ideals and so enjoyed intellectual discourse, made him suspect in the eyes of some people. It is said that Americans are suspicious of intellectuals, and that the Congress mirrors such popular suspicion. That alone might be an important reason why the Kennedy legislative program had met with such public apathy and had made so little progress in the Congress, at the time of his tragic death. But my own personal appraisal is this, he was eminently successful in his statement of the problems and in his eloquent insistence that the problems must be met, and then he was too lacking in originality in the action he took to follow up on those words. He will be remembered much more as an idea man than as an action man.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, all of us here must admit that something wonderful was lost to each of us, was lost to all of America and to the world, when that dastardly assassin's bullet snuffed out with such shocking abruptness the vitality and the ability to excite and inspire which so characterized President Kennedy's leadership. And I for one will be quick to forget the ways in which I disagreed with him, but I will remember forever with gratitude and inspiration the young President's extraordinary "flair." As one of the newspaper editorials said on the day following President Kennedy's death, "He walked like a prince and talked like a scholar." It is those qualities in him—and many more—that will forever linger in my own memory.

I am humbly grateful that it was my privilege to come to Washington and serve here, even in a very small way, while John F. Kennedy was our President. It has been an unforgettable experience for all of us.

Jack Kennedy was much, much too young to die. His less than 3 years as President did not give him an opportunity to show the full range of his talents or of his capacity to be effective, even though he matured very rapidly in that impossibly difficult office. The assassin did not give him a chance to become one of the great Presidents, but even we whose admiration for him was tempered with occasional criticism, must admit that he might well have become one of the great Presidents, if he had been given the time.

Mr. Kennedy's own acute sense of history, and the delightful way he had of being able to laugh at himself, would mean, I suspect, that he himself would agree he had not yet achieved true greatness. He was an exceptionally ambitious young man, in the best sense of that word "ambitious," and he certainly understood his potential niche among the greats of history. It is a mockery, a terribly unfair thing that he was not allowed sufficient time.

But in death, he is not the greatest loser. We and all the world are the real victims of that assassin's bullet. The nature of the world in which we live and the course of history itself, are suddenly changed by the death of President Kennedy. It is a very real personal tragedy for each and every one of us.

Having lost our young President, Mr. Speaker, we have lost one of the most eloquent, articulate exponents of political ideas and ideals that this century is likely to know. In his brief time as President, Mr. Kennedy's impact upon all of us has been deep and indelible. I know that I speak the feelings of my own 13th Congressional District in Ohio when I say that all of us are deeply grieved by his death. In each of us there is profound sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy and for the children and brothers and sisters of the late President. The close ties by which that extraordinary family are united and by which they work together are an inspiration to all of us, and will undoubtedly continue to be.

We grieve for our lost President, Mr. Speaker, but in closing these brief remarks, let me say that the people in my district also join me in looking to our new President with loyalty and with hope, and with prayers that he may be given the strength and the wisdom which now more than ever we Americans so desperately need.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with all citizens of this country I was shocked and grieved by the wanton slaying of President Kennedy.

I first met our late President when he was a Member of the House of Representatives and, while I did not agree with his position on many issues then, nor later as President, I recognized him as an able, Christian gentleman, loyal to his country and dedicated to his purposes.

It seems inconceivable that he should be struck down so tragically and violently in the prime of life.

I extend sympathy to his widow and especially to the children who have been made fatherless.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now a part of history. The God that made him has taken him, and God's will be done.

No words can portray the shocking events of the last few days nor set forth the grief of our Nation. Each family in America feels a loss of a loved one, for the President belonged to us all. Let us measure our sorrow, however, by the agony of his brave wife and family who have lost a beloved husband, father, brother, and child. Our prayers should be for them.

President Kennedy was a man of intelligence and charm, a brave man and a dedicated one. His wit, his confidence, and his ability will be missed. We mourn him.

The Presidency, however, never dies. Our strength lies in the fact that we are a nation of laws, not men. The new President has assumed his full responsibilities. Our country is scarred but intact. Our hopes are high. Our faith is secure.

As we pray and mourn together, it is time for us to assume our full responsibility. Let our Nation draw closer together, more united, more dedicated.

The measure of a man is the effect he has on the lives of others. In life and death President Kennedy served us all. He told us we can do better, and I believe that history will show this Nation rose from its sorrow to stand taller than it ever did before.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we of Dallas want to join in remembrance of our late President, John F. Kennedy. We decry the violence and deplore the action of a twisted mind so filled with a foreign ideology and hate for all that is good in America that he could find release only in the murder of the President.

The most fitting memorial to John F. Kennedy is a rededication on the part of all Americans to the preservation of this Nation and its fundamental ideals, a pledge to hold freedom dear, and to subject all the issues which confront us to careful study and decision on merit determined only on what is good for America and all its people.

**Mr. COLLIER.** Mr. Speaker, little did any of us dream when we concluded legislative business for the week on Thursday, November 21, that we would find ourselves engaged in the sad but fitting and proper respect we have here today. As we pause to pay solemn tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy, we cannot help but feel the great impact that the tragic event of his assassination left upon millions of people around the face of the world.

When death takes one whose role in the destiny of our Nation and the world was so important, it is indeed a time of deep sorrow; but when that death comes in the sudden and shocking manner that it did to our late President, it is one of the historical tragedies of all time.

The assassin's bullet which struck down the 35th President of the United States snuffed out the life of a brilliant young man who was in the prime years of his life. Beyond the limited tenure of his office as Chief Executive, there is no doubt that he was destined to play a leading role in the affairs of this Nation and the world for many years to come. Now we shall never know how great an effect that role might have been in the future. But we do know that in the comparatively short years of his public service he left an indelible mark upon the records.

Like many Members of both legislative bodies, I had philosophical differences from time to time with programs recommended and supported by the Kennedy administration. Honest differences of opinion in dealing with the many complex problems of our time are certainly understandable. The late President frequently expressed his disagreement with programs and policies of President Eisenhower's administration when he served in the legislative branch of government. And this is as it should be in a nation that is established on a system of checks and balances and upon the fundamental representative form of government.

We who deeply respected the late President Kennedy's pursuit of his own deep convictions in providing legislative and administrative solutions to the many problems facing the Nation know that he respected the right of others to pursue their convictions in those things that they sincerely felt were in the best interests of the country. And while often our approach to handling the problems may have been different, we shared the recognition of these existing problems.

The late President Kennedy was dedicated to the policies and programs which he supported. He did so even in the face of opposition, in some cases within his own political party, and naturally to that of his political opponents as is so normal in a political system with two major political parties embracing somewhat divergent political philosophies.

John F. Kennedy fought for his country in time of war and in peacetime stood stanch in his belief in his dedication to strengthening the United States of America in its international conflict with the Communist world.

To his courageous widow, lovely children and beloved family, I extend my condolence and prayers. They have indeed been burdened with a loss and heartache which will remain with them forever.

**Mr. REUSS.** Mr. Speaker, the bitter events that began with the assassination of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, on November 22, have very forcefully reminded us how fragile are the things we prize most in this world. The tragedy reminds us how the inscrutable forces of evil impinge upon our best efforts to order our society rationally.

In the old story, the flame had flickered symbolically in the cathedral's niche for centuries. It could have been snuffed out at any time. But it burned on and on until one day an evil man entered the sanctuary and blew it out.

The President of an open democracy believed that he could communicate with his people best by going freely among them. Then an evil man shot him as he rode through the city of Dallas.

Like the flame of truth and justice, life—even of the most exalted—is fragile in a world where there is violence and hatred.

And now the President's body has been buried in the goodly company of heroes at Arlington.

Now we can only pay tribute to John F. Kennedy and to his memory.

We loved this man: his truth telling whether it was accepting full responsibility for the Bay of Pigs, or his never-delivered speech in Dallas calling for an end to the fanaticism and hatred that were rending the Nation; his taste for literature and history, music and the arts; his gaiety and high spirits; his tolerance and freedom from rancor and grudge bearing.

I shall particularly remember two tributes that came on the day he was buried—the ambassador of a new-founded African nation who said to me "My people mourn him, too"—and a cable from my friend, Walther Casper, head of the West German Peace Corps which John F. Kennedy had done so much to stimulate:

> In this hour of grief to you, the United States, and all mankind, we shall try to fulfill President Kennedy's heritage by continuing our German Peace Corps work.

He was a President in the great mold of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and F.D.R. Yet the time allotted him did not permit all the accomplishments that his greatness promised. But as a realist as well as an idealist he always knew that his work would not be finished.

In his inaugural address he sensed the limitations of his office:

> All this will not be finished in the first hundred days. Nor will it be finished in the first thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

The beginnings are surely with us. The Soviet power turned back at Cuba yet with the restraint that avoided a nuclear showdown; the challenge of equal opportunity for all Americans boldly accepted; the foundations for full employment and the general welfare at home, for trade and aid abroad, well laid. These are no inconsiderable foundations.

So let us turn aside from the bloody Gehenna of Dallas and ask ourselves to capture the truthfulness and taste, the high hopes and the high courage of John F. Kennedy, and to apply them to our problems of economics and ethics, race relations and peace on earth, in the trying days that lie ahead.

Like no other event in our times, the death of President Kennedy has inspired an outpouring of grief. Some expressions of a people greatly moved have been drawn together in the following article from the December 2, 1963, issue of the Milwaukee Journal:

### THE GRIEVING PEOPLE SPEAK

> Hundreds of letters have been written to the Journal about the death of President Kennedy, many by persons who have never been moved to write letters for publication before. Because it is impossible to publish all of them in their entirety, the following excerpts have been chosen to indicate the range of feeling among Wisconsin citizens on the tragic event and its aftermath.
>
> From a northside Milwaukee man:
>
> "I am not a reporter, but I experienced a sensation which made me feel how close we people of this country really are when a tragedy befalls us.
>
> "I walked into a store and heard a colored man explain to his 3-year-old son, 'We have lost the greatest friend we ever had.' I heard a lady tell a salesman, 'I am sorry. I don't want to look any more. I just don't feel I could concentrate on anything today.' This woman had tears running down her cheeks.
>
> From a Milwaukee housewife:
>
> "I shall deeply miss and mourn President Kennedy as though I would my own husband or child. I never met him, only heard and saw him on TV and in the papers, but he was to me, as countless others, a beloved and respected person. Let us hope and pray his death will not be for nothing. Somewhere in all this is a lesson; let us look for this hidden message."
>
> From a South Milwaukee mother:
>
> "Since Friday, almost every person I've talked with has expressed a furious hatred for the murderer of President Kennedy. Interviews with people of Dallas show an open feeling of hate.
>
> "But how many of these people have gone to church and sat quietly in prayer? Have they asked themselves why and how such a bizarre chain of events could happen in our Christian America? Have they let their young children hear them utter these disgusting expressions of hate?
>
> "Christ rode in a similar triumphant procession before His tragic crucifixion. But did God put hate into the hearts of the true mourners? I believe Christ's prayer was, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Certainly He did not teach the hate that seems to be in the hearts and minds of so many people in our country."

### NOW IS THE TIME WE SHOULD NOT PANIC

> From a 13-year-old Menomonee Falls girl:
>
> "Yes, there has been a great loss, not only to Jacqueline and family, but to many nations. I think now is the time that we should not panic, but think of the future and look forward in hope that many more leaders will come as strongly minded as John F. Kennedy."

From a Waupaca housewife:

"I strongly feel, as most of the Nation must feel, that President Kennedy fought the evil in our world with one of our most powerful weapons * * * love. The good that has been done by this love can never be wiped away by a mere bullet. It's almost as though the bullet, in shattering the man, spread his goodness, justice, patience, and love throughout the world. Who could do more?"

From a Milwaukee man:

"'Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted.' This truth was etched indelibly into the minds of a stunned and sorrowful people by the eloquent nobility and dignity of a young wife and mother, in very fact comforting all of us in the awesome silence of her own deep and tragic grief. She sustained us in our loneliness.

"May we now, in grateful acknowledgment of her unparalleled example, offer this woman our own fraternal comfort in return."

### OUR GAIN MUST SURPASS OUR LOSS

From a Milwaukee housewife:

"From this terrible, black weekend of numbness and utter dismay has come to the citizens of our young Nation a deep and renewed patriotic sense of unity and rededication. It is almost unbelievable that a few short days of abandonment of daily pursuits and frantic living could give way so readily to complete reflection as to why we are here and our real purpose for living.

"Our gain must surpass our loss, as great and tremendous as it is. Our concentration must be on the ideals for which our dear President died, and not on the conditions or reasons for which he died."

From a Marquette university student:

"We begin to realize we must live in this world and start to believe in something. We must stand for something. No longer can we go on letting events pass by without realizing their significance. What kind of power is invested in mankind? Will we use our power as Lee H. Oswald did, or will we channel it in a direction that will preserve the human race, that will make one human proud to be part of the other?"

From a 17-year-old Milwaukee girl:

"There is a freedom song that has become popular in recent years called 'We Shall Overcome.' I sincerely hope that the new President Johnson, and more important, all American people will make this simple song their theme. Then the eyes of the world will look with favor upon us, because we will have achieved what our beloved President strived for: Peace based on the brotherhood of man."

From a Racine housewife:

"President Kennedy loved all people, even our foe. He loved all and wanted to give all he could. Now, Mrs. Marina Oswald is left with a name and two children. Was she left to provide a future for these children? What is going to happen to the Oswald family? Let it not be written that she was condemned for her name."

### SPIRIT CAN BE BORNE TO ALL NATIONS

From a Waukesha man:

"Now the body lies in a hero's grave. The soul has been lofted to companionship with other departed great. But the spirit is not interred. It is free, as vital and eager as during life.

"The spirit lives on. It will not die as long as men can find shelter for a bit of it in each of their hearts. It can be borne to all nations, to all corners of the earth and beyond. It need never cease the quest for enduring peace which began as it pulsed in the mighty, compassionate heart now stilled."

From a University of Wisconsin student at Madison:

"So often it is only after death that we recognize a man's real qualities, and now we look at John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Abraham Lincoln and think:

"Both were killed by the assassin's bullet * * * both were followed to the Presidency by a Vice President named Johnson * * * both were killed during periods of tension—the Civil War then, the cold war now * * * both were instrumental in the rights of the Negro * * * both had a highly developed sense of humor * * * both were men of a deep faith in God * * * both left us addresses we will long remember * * * and most important, both believed in the basic human dignity that united all men."

From a West Allis man:

"Violent means to end political or social problems of any kind always bring tragedy, and whether the life or lives thus forfeited are those of a state dignitary or the average man, the end results are always the same.

"Perhaps the martyrdom of Mr. Kennedy will do something to halt or brake the headlong rush of otherwise intelligent nations into a holocaust of nuclear destruction. May he not have died in vain."

### BEAVER DAM WOMAN, MAN FROM WEST BEND

From a Beaver Dam woman:

"Surrender your heart to those qualities which claim it today—
Sorrow, in the loss of a monarch in human inspiration and dignity;
Sorrow, for the ruthless severance of a holy union, which, among men,
Is the cup of strength from a benevolent God;
Regret, for action too long withheld; regret, for truth too long denied;
Shame, for the yoke of responsibility that rests now, too late,
Heavy, heavy, on each of us, for each of us—one to the other."

From a West Bend man:

"As he died in search of this thing people call peace, a question is asked: Is there peace? Yes, and if all free men will unite, there will be peace. This is not an easy thing to ask of some people.

"It may mean that bigots will have to surrender their cause—perhaps they can find some other pastime. It will mean that racists will have to, if this is at all possible, realize that they live in a country that they did not inherit. When they got here, the trail was blazed by the blood of people of God's creation, be they red, black, white, or yellow."

From a Waukesha man:

"Their silent faces told that they had lost a son.
The world wept for one so young, so near with his devotion.
They asked, 'Why?' when caught in death's emotion,
And the spirit of dedication and love and will they knew
Answered: 'Ask not what the world can do for you.'"

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an angel of peace and human understanding has passed our way and we have touched his garment.

On November 22, 1963, his mission on earth tragically ended, the soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was freed from finite limitations to continue in immortality the work of peace on earth, good will among men, that was the purpose of his creation.

Peace on earth, good will among men, it is the goal of our prayers that will be reached. And the soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, gone only from the vision of the eye, will continue to lead us on, us who in his days on earth touched his garment.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought to the office of President of the United States a spirit of dedication to the service of his country which shall live in the hearts of all Americans forever. He dedicated himself to the task of making life better for all of us. He would improve the lot of mankind not only materially by wiping our poverty, ignorance, and disease; his sights were set upon the day when a lasting peace would free the minds and hearts of men to build "progress, human rights, and world law."

In his address before the American University, June 10, 1963, President Kennedy defined the peace he envisioned:

> What kind of peace do I mean and what kind of peace do we seek: Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace—the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—and the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

A student of history, he made history. He was a trail blazer. In promoting legislation to aid the unemployed, to make opportunities for our youth, to assist depressed areas, he was building upon established foundations. In establishing the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow, in supporting a Peace and Disarmament Agency, and in the negotiation of a nuclear test ban, and in building the Peace Corps, he carried the United States and the world across the threshold of a new era in human understanding.

Again we turn to his own words:

> According to the ancient Chinese proverb, a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step. My fellow Americans let us take that first step. Let us if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

The brief administration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, while serious in purpose, was colorful and exciting. His keen, ready wit, his brilliant intellect, made every speech a classic and his press conferences a delight.

The irony of it all lies in the fact that despite his effort to build peace and good will, to promote human rights, it was hate that killed him; the blind bitter hatred of which Birmingham was the symbol; the hatred which manifested itself in the extremist both of the right and of the left. In his last speech at Fort Worth he said:

> This is a dangerous and uncertain world—no one expects our lives to be easy—not in this decade, not in this century.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy died to make a better world of peace on earth, good will among all men. If we can dedicate ourselves to the achievement of his goals, he shall not have died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to all the members of the family of President Kennedy. No family in our national history ever was more closely knit together. Family affection is a precious thing. Love for and loyalty to family is akin to love for and loyalty to country. It is in the noblest of American traditions.

The story of those dreadful, sorrowful days will be told and retold throughout the centuries and the names of John and Jacqueline Kennedy forever will be linked together in one of the world's imperishable love stories.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] in his eloquent and moving remarks, made mention of the maternal grandfather of our martyred President.

When I came to the Congress in 1949 John Kennedy was commencing his second term in the House. At the time I was taping a half hour radio program for Chicago, and my young colleague from Massachusetts always responded with instant willingness and a smile to my request for participation. On occasions this was at considerable inconvenience to him, and to no personal advantage since mine was a local radio program that did not reach his constituency.

My fondness for him was deepened by the reports that came to me of his kind, gentle, considerate treatment of the men and women working in his office. One day I said to him: "Jack, you get your sweetness from your grandfather." I was referring to his mother's father, mayor of Boston at the time of the Spanish-American War. He was a man "all heart" and deeply beloved by the low and the high. He had been one of the idols of my boyhood.

Two weeks before his death, on the afternoon of Friday, November 8, I saw President Kennedy for the last time. It was at the White House, and although for the President it was a very busy day, he had, in the sweetness I shall always associate with his memory, set aside a quarter of an hour to meet and chat with Archie House, the newly elected commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, who in 1898, just turning 16, had gone with me, 2 or 3 months his junior, to the siege of Santiago in Cuba. To me it was an occasion freighted with tender sentiment to introduce my buddy of so long ago to the President of the United States. I had never seen the President looking better. He seemed filled with the vibrancy and cheer of life. When we were leaving, and the President was shaking hands with Archie, he mentioned his long friendship with me, and added: "BARRATT knew my grandfather." Those were the last words of President Kennedy that I was to hear. "BARRATT knew my grandfather." And now they are among the treasures of my memory, associated with my words to him at the commencement of our friendship: "Jack, you get your sweetness from your grandfather."

President Kennedy's naming of his yacht, the "Honey Fitz," and his insistence on the full spelling out of his middle name—Fitzgerald—indexed his pride in and his affection for his grandfather.

An angel of peace and human understanding has passed our way and we have touched his garment. I know of no other way of expressing what is in my mind and heart.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, exercising the general permission to revise remarks and to include editorials eulogizing our beloved, late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I join with my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from the Fifth District of Wisconsin, Congressman REUSS, in placing the editorials that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal and Milwaukee Sentinel at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A stunned people and a shocked world stand transfixed in the presence of most monstrous and senseless crime—assassination of the leader of earth's greatest Nation. There have been Presidents shot before by cowards and idiots, but the killing of John Kennedy appalls and numbs the mind as that of Abraham Lincoln did.

Politics and policies have no relevance at this moment. Here was a brilliant young man of great ability, great determination, great ideals for the future of America and the free world. His elevation to the Presidency had captured every imagination, and was a hope and a promise to millions on all the continents.

The mind almost repels belief that suddenly he is gone. Though he will be ably succeeded and the world will go on, the murder of the President in his young prime, still in the midst of his first term and of a dangerous era, so much to do and so little time, is stark catastrophe.

Words fail. There is no room even for rage at the murderer. For this moment, the heart can do no more than share in spirit the terrible grief of the young widow and two little children, and pray God's strength for President Lyndon Johnson.

---

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 24, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The tragedy of the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be with us and the world for a long time. This young, vibrant, eloquent man was leader not only of the United States but of the free world. The measure of the loss is still smothered by the impact of shock and the horror of the crime that took him.

President Kennedy was the vanguard of youth that was ready to take over the leadership of nations from the tired and aging men whose roots go well back into the beginning of the century. In a real sense his was the voice of the future and of a new and better world. That voice, always articulate, often moving, was listened to by men everywhere.

For the United States the tragedy is personal and bitter. Not all men liked the policies of the President. But few did not admire him as a human being. He and his family had brought a warmth and a vibrancy to the White House which had lacked them for too long.

But there are many who also admired him for his policies and his ideas and ideals. They looked to him as a hope in an uneasy world. There were many who loved him. The heart of every American will go out to his family, which loved him most.

There is so little that can be said when a great man has gone. The void always seems so tremendous, the future so dark, the fears so sharp. The country will go on, of course, for it is a great country of great strengths. The sun that goes down will give rise to new suns.

History has yet to deal with John Fitzgerald Kennedy. One can guess that it will deal well. He was a new type of political leader emerging from the old—freer of emotion than most, a pragmatist. He saw the world clearly, and while he aimed high he had the realism to accept the limitations of men and events.

The problems that men created, Mr. Kennedy said, can be solved by men. His no longer is the responsibility. It passes to other shoulders, and it is heavy. As the Nations mourns it will do well to take to heart the words that President Kennedy spoke in New York city only a few days ago:

"My fellow Americans, let us be guided by our interests, not our indignation. Let us heed the words of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians:

" 'Let us not be weary in well doing,' he wrote, 'for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.'

"And let the word go forth—to all who are concerned about the future of the human family—that we will not be weary in well doing and we will faint not; and we shall, in due season, reap a harvest of peace and security for all members of the family of man."

---

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

### OUR UNFINISHED TASKS

Eighteen days before he was assassinated, John F. Kennedy issued the Presidential proclamation of Thanksgiving Day for 1963. The document bears the marks of his gift for the felicitous strong phrase. It may now be reread as a sort of testament, telling what he would have us do.

After recounting how the tradition grew along with the Nation's population, plenty, and power, Mr. Kennedy wrote:

"Today we give our thanks most of all for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and humility, which they possessed and which we must seek every day to emulate.

"As we express our gratitude we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them."

And after the formal "Now, therefore," setting Thanksgiving on this fourth Thursday of November pursuant to law, the late President added a sort of postscript:

"On that day let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice and understanding among all men and nations, and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

---

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Nov. 23, 1963]

### TRAGIC LOSS

There are no words to express the Nation's shock.

One can only feel, each in his own heart and mind, the reaction to the assassination of President Kennedy.

Therefore, we do not attempt to set down here any words to describe the sorrow that besets America, and indeed the world. This we leave to each person, to mourn individually in his own way.

Not this! President Kennedy assassinated! Even as we write this, we find it impossible to believe.

But it is true.

The country will be a long time recovering from the numbness that gripped every citizen as the tragic news, in agonizing bits, came out of Dallas, Tex.

So vigorously did President Kennedy apply himself to the job of being President of the United States that it will take time to realize that he has been removed from the stage and out of the role into which he had poured his life.

He was very real in Wisconsin. We learned firsthand of his consuming drive to serve his country in its highest office.

Having gone into every nook and byway of this State in search of the votes that were to put him well on the way to the Democratic nomination, Mr. Kennedy was personally known by and held a special relationship with many Wisconsin residents. Wisconsin mourns the tragedy acutely.

Mr. Kennedy's death is a tragedy in countless ways, but perhaps most of all because he has been cut down in his prime.

Even Mr. Kennedy's most severe critics would have to concede that the man had grown greatly in the nearly 3 years he was given to hold office, until at his assassination he was becoming as much the statesman as he was the politician.

Now, as we write this only a few hours after the event, is not the time to be making any judgments about the record of President Kennedy. History will do that.

This is so because as the initial shock of the tragedy wears off, some idea begins to form of the magnitude of the influence Mr. Kennedy's assassination will have on the lives of us all.

Time enough for that. For now, for us all, there is nothing to do but mourn—and pray.

---

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Nov. 25, 1963]

### OUR NATION

To U.S. President assassins, past, present, and God forbid, future:

How can your crazed mind be made to understand that you can kill a man but you can't kill the President of the United States?

Four times now you have mortally wounded the Nation's Chief Executive. Yet the Office of President of the United States has remained filled and the Nation has gone on.

You have, to be sure, rocked the ship of state. Each time, the ship shudders. But each time she has stabilized herself and has sailed on. So it will be this time. So it would be again, if your madness should erupt yet once more.

Thirty-five Presidents, four assassinated. That is a rate of one in nine. It is appalling enough of itself, but all the more so in the light of what we so proudly hail as the American way of life.

We like to think that our system of government and society is the most enlightened the world has seen. An assassination shakes our faith in that system. Is the price of individual freedom the freedom for an individual to put a shot through the head of state?

Brutal as it sounds, perhaps that is the price. To prevent you, the assassin, from firing the fatal shot would require a police state condition that would be absolutely intolerable and would completely negate our precious democracy.

Still, neither can a society that believes itself to be civilized tolerate your madness. What can be done to stop you? It is humanly impossible to identify you in advance. Or is it?

For you—the potential assassin—are one of us, or will be in the generations to come.

That is why you—each of us, really—must be led to understand that the American system of government is not like any other sort of government—not a kingdom, not a dictatorship, not a state ruled by a power elite.

The United States, rather, is a democracy, a republican form of government, based on the consent of the governed; a government of laws, not men. None of this source of power can be destroyed, the way a man, however high or however low, can be destroyed.

On this funeral day, when the Nation's grief is deepest with the burial of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it is for us, the living, to search our own hearts, and in the process thereby to strengthen our faith, in ourselves, in our trust in God.

In this way lies the only hope of preventing you, the assassin, from infecting the American society with the cancer of hate.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven."

The world—the humanity—and the country he loved and served so well shall never forget him or his name—his aims and aspirations, his noble endeavors and his dedicated efforts for the sake of mankind. He will be a memory forever in the hearts and minds of freemen and in the hearts of his countrymen.

His was a true greatness—a greatness born of constant courage and deathless dedication in a crusade for great ideas and greater ideals. For his was a soul fired with a deep sense of mission in the endless and enduring struggle of his fellow man—to achieve brotherhood through understanding and understanding through brotherhood. Though recognizing the need for strong action in the name of freedom, he was unfailing in his pursuit of peace.

Believing that God's work on earth is "truly our own" he sought to bring from out of the darkness, light; from despair, hope; and out of hatred, love. And so he uttered wise words, did great deeds, and suffered noble sorrows for the cause of his country and the world.

He asked of his country only one thing—that he might be able to give: to give of himself—and this he did in the fullest sense for in its cause he truly laid down his life.

Though he has fallen, this knight in shining armor, his torch shall burn brightly and forever, and its eternal light will glow from generation to generation—as a beacon lighting the way for men of good will.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of John F. Kennedy on Friday, November 22, 1963, has brought a time of great sadness to all Americans. It is a most shocking thing to have a man dedicated to public service shot down in the prime of life.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Kennedy family. Their personal sorrow is shared by all of us as Americans.

This is a moment for reflection on the strength that is America. The continuity that our Constitution provides made the transition of government possible. The most fitting memorial we can provide for President Kennedy is to work together to strengthen this country we all love so well.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, only now are we beginning to understand what happened on that cataclysmic Friday, the 22d of November, when violent death removed the 35th President of the United States from his commanding position in America and the free world. For only now are we beginning to emerge from the numbness and the listlessness which cloaked so many of our people following the shock of sudden and tragic death.

So, only now can we begin to appreciate and define, with some measure of objectivity, the extent of the loss which has befallen the Nation as a result of the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

And only now, as events of the past 2 weeks slip into focus, can we begin to assess the consequences of the murder of a man and a President who attracted affection and widespread admiration and also inspired in others some deep misgivings, but toward whom no one could remain indifferent.

It is fitting, therefore, that we undertake this task of appreciation and assessment here in the Chamber from which the youthful Congressman began his historic climb to the height of mature statesmanship. At the same time, we owe it to this man with a sense of history and a respect for words to see him whole and deal justly with the facts. His life, I think, suggests that he would as quickly spurn the sticky, the sentimental, the emotional desire to canonize him, as he would resent slander and regret the failure to understand what he was trying to do.

What is it then, Mr. Speaker, that our country has lost and what manner of man is he whom we mourn in the death of President Kennedy? Others among us knew him personally far better than I. Yet, since he was preeminently a public person—one who sought, enjoyed, and understood the public nature of the office he held and who never seemed to seek refuge from the public spotlight in a false claim to privacy—the public record of what he did and said—as well as what he did not say or do—may provide us with everything we need to know, as opposed to everything we might like to know. On the public record, therefore, it is clear that the United States has lost a remarkable President and a gifted human being. Whether or not all agreed with each of his specific objectives or with the means he chose to achieve them, there is no doubt that he operated in the best postwar and postdepression American tradition of seeking peace and justice through national strength and the sharing of our national abundance, and of promoting equality and opportunity here at home through the judicious balancing of private and public activity.

In broad outline, these are national aims which are and have been generally accepted by the great majority of our people, and so President Kennedy's uniqueness lay not so much in making these purposes his own as in the style and spirit with which he articulated them and the way in which he pursued them.

There was a sureness of touch about the way the President managed the country's foreign affairs, a coolness and confident poise under pressure, an impressive grasp of detail wedded to a deep understanding of this historic moment and of the limitations and opportunities which influenced the directions we can take.

He saw in the cool light of reason, without sentiment, both the problems and the promise of our land and our people. He understood what we could be and do if ever we could assure equality, remove discrimination, improve education, provide enough jobs, protect the unfortunate, conserve our natural resources, make our cities truly habitable, and lift our aims to match our potential. We may have differed at times with his strategy, his tactics, or his timing, but his ideals had an undeniable splendor.

He was no visionary. His dreams—if, indeed, they could be called dreams—were made of solid stuff, the product of an active intellect, tempered by an acute awareness of what at any one time was practicable. He was said to have lacked passion and fire and warmth and deep feeling. Possibly so—but he was strong in the more reliable area of the intellect.

For President Kennedy was a man of ideas—not so much the creator or the innovator as the appreciator, the collector, the user of ideas. He admired excellence and honored the excellent, and ceaselessly searched for both in everything he did. He respected and understood the political process in all its frustration and ambiguous complexity as the interplay of power and personality, the essential means of translating ideas into action.

Conversely, he distrusted the emotional, feared the irrational, and was unimpressed by the cliches and platitudes of the doctrinaire left and right.

There was a special flavor and spirit about this man—restless, alert and aware, fresh and full of vigor, a word with which he shall forever be identified. There was grace too, and good taste. In partnership with his lovely wife, he inspired new zest and hope in the cultural and intellectual life of America whose leaders and practitioners sensed his interest and understanding and joy in what they were doing. A lot of good things happened in America during the Kennedy years, Mr. Speaker, not alone because he distinctly encouraged them but because he helped create an atmosphere in which the arts and science and the imagination could flourish.

John F. Kennedy possessed another great gift, Mr. Speaker, the gift of honesty in seeing himself and others as they really were, the rare ability to diminish himself momentarily from the hubbub and confusion of the Presidency and look at himself and his associates in the cold gray light of objectivity. He seemed never to be self-satisfied or complacent and, despite the partisan nature of much of his job, he could recognize the sincerity and perhaps the rightness of many who disagreed with his programs and policies.

In the perspective of his death, the capacity of this young President to grow and mature has come strongly to the fore. We have been abruptly and permanently denied the opportunity ever to know fully just what kind of President he might have become. But we have seen the tremendous changes that transformed Kennedy the campaigner into Kennedy the President. There was his greater awareness of the difficulties of his office, his increasing recognition of the need to consider many and varied points of view, his developed understanding of the limits as well as the powers of his position. The tedious process of reaching rational decisions about public policies and of obtaining consent to controversial proposals was rapidly maturing this gifted young man and now we can only speculate about what he might ultimately have meant to the Nation and the world.

In all that he was and was becoming, President Kennedy reflected the still youthful quality of our country. He, like all of us, was tested by the unending problem brought by our technological superiority and confounded by the shrinking world we live in. That his urgent search for the proper balance between national security and international responsibility, between public needs and private rights, was proceeding in the right direction has been certified by the unprecedented expressions of grief and loss and tribute which have poured forth from every corner of the earth. People everywhere seemed instinctively to regard him with hope and trust.

This is what we have lost, Mr. Speaker, and the loss has been a grievous one.

But in our losing we have also gained.

We have marveled at the gallantry of his young widow who, in the moment of her greatest grief, has carried herself with simple dignity and quiet courage and true majesty.

We have been enabled to look into our own hearts and minds in this time of national tragedy and challenged to remove the vestiges of bitterness and hate and suspicion.

We have been freed from the frequent distortion of the immediate and permitted to view our recent past more broadly and more accurately.

We have rediscovered the fundamental unity of our people as they shared experiences of national shock and mourning.

And we have demonstrated anew to ourselves and to the world the soundness and stability of our political institutions which allowed us to make the difficult transition of leadership with certainty and sureness.

In mourning the loss of John F. Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, we are conscious chiefly of what he was and what he might have been, but we also have ourselves to think of. To be true to ourselves and to our responsibilities we must get about our work—the work to which he devoted the last full measure of himself.

**Mr. PATMAN.** Mr. Speaker, only history many years hence can possibly give to the story of mankind the full and accurate evaluation of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's contribution to the freedom and the peace of the human race. Here under the pressure and the immediacy of the vast problems that confront us I believe the tendency is to undervalue the full dimension of what the late President Kennedy has wrought for the good of the free world.

And this undervaluation is taking place in spite of the enormous mountain of feeling and sentiment, bereavement and indignation, that is stirring in the souls of men everywhere on this earth. For President Kennedy has effected a series of breakthroughs on the brutality of national and international history in our time that marks him, in my humble judgment, one of the great statesmen of American history.

The meaning of his service as President of the United States is not to be found wholly in a kind of tabulation table of his accomplishments in terms of so many laws passed, and so many goals actually attained in all their completeness. The meaning of his service rather, as I see it, is in the enormous strides into the future that seemed impossible until he came along and that plowed new ground for a relatively peaceful world of peace and prosperity.

Nor was his service lacking in formidableness in the area of actual legislation on the statute books, and actual negotiations for peace on the international stage where the lives of tens and hundreds of millions of people were involved. Even in the cold terms of bookkeeping and statistics the hard facts show that in 1961 in the first year of the Kennedy administration Congress passed no less than 154 major laws, laws that in their totality had a profound effect on the American economy and the American way of life along progressive lines. In the second year of the Kennedy administration Congress passed 148 major laws—that was a year ago in 1962. And in the first 6 months of 1963 this Congress passed some 29 major laws.

This record, looked at through any manner of microscope, critically or with applause, may be said objectively to constitute on the whole an accomplishment of the first magnitude. The Kennedy administration was a working administration. It was a working administration that sought, as the President's personality revealed, to achieve its ends by calmness, by reason, by persuasion, and by good humor. Occasionally under the pressure of immense human and material forces strong tactics were employed to forward what seemed to the administration a vital and significant goal.

But the meaning in all its aspects of the personality of a man like John Fitzgerald Kennedy was such as to win him approbation, even affection, and support in many quarters both at home and abroad.

At home, even in the area of business where some hostility was said to exist and an area with which I have some familiarity, the Kennedy personality acted—as I look back—like the balm of Gilead. This does not mean that there was a state always of untarnished harmony but it does mean that the President felt it his duty to uphold the dignity of the White House. And this he did splendidly and magnificently and with great aplomb. And then in the sphere of practicality the President did for business, in my judgment through the regular executive channels, as much as he did for any other segment of American life and the American economy. And his whole heart and his whole soul was devoted to the American people. He himself, shortly before he was felled by the assassin's bullets, delineated his service to business and contiguous areas. He said:

> We have liberalized depreciation guidelines to grant more individual flexibility, reduced our farm surpluses, reduced transportation taxes, established a private corporation to manage our satellite communication system, increased the role of American business in the development of less developed countries, and proposed to the Congress a sharp

> reduction in corporate as well as personal income taxes, and a major de-regulation of transportation.

When I say the "balm of Gilead" I can imagine no more soothing lotion than these practical measures for the alleviation of the problems of our business community. They were definite. They were concise. They had the quality of touching problems at specific points and correcting situations that called for more enlightened legislative and executive treatment. Except for pending legislation—not abandoned legislation—pending legislation, this proved an immensely effective program and history will so honor it.

Yet this is—all of it—hardly more than a fragment of the work that President Kennedy actually put in for the good of our country, the good of the free world, the good of mankind now and for posterity. Will mankind ever forget, both this generation and generations to come, the skillful and adroit, the human and the wise, handling of the Cuban situation by President Kennedy? Of course the Kremlin backed down and was stopped and of course Khrushchev retreated.

But the sensitive and careful handling of this incredible potential world bomb is a tribute to statesmanship that comes close to the highest order of human genius. That fateful October in 1962 put all the qualities of the President to the supreme test. The President ordered a blockade that meant halting the Soviet Navy at sea and that could bring mankind to the day of doom. We had nuclear missiles at our very doorstep and these had to be removed.

The finesse of the Kennedy management of the problem was such as to permit the pride of the Soviets to effect their evacuation of missiles from Cuba without too much injury to their self-esteem. The main object was freedom for mankind and an end to the threat of nuclear enemy proximity to American shores. But the almost equal companion goal of the Kennedy strategy was to make it possible for the aggressive forces in the Soviet Union to be so handled from Washington as to provide them with a path out of the dilemma short of war.

And of course history knows with what success this was accomplished.

There was another confrontation of almost equal peril in 1961 when President Kennedy made sure that the Soviets would not again cut off Allied access to Berlin in the light of the threat presented by the East Berlin wall. The President, as has so often been noted, shipped highly mobile troops into the disputed area and assigned his eminently competent Vice President—Lyndon Johnson—to the Berlin crisis to reassure the German people and the free world of the sincerity and the firmness of our intent.

And of course history knows with what success the President's ends were accomplished.

It is in the very fact of this background of crucial confrontations, bringing the two greatest powers on earth to the very verge of war, that President Kennedy and his administration put over the now historic nuclear test ban treaty. This may go down as the prime achievement of his life. Should the Soviet Union fail to live up to its commitments on a matter of such immense moral and human significance, for itself as well as the whole world, it will forever expose itself to the suspicion, the contempt and the distrust of the human race, of all political faiths and all forms of government. It seems incredible to me that this treaty will not hold.

What the President has left behind for this generation, apart from his achievements in domestic legislation and foreign diplomacy, is the example of a great and a good man. He delighted in the Presidency and in his family. He exuded faith in the good things of life and he was a man of religion. The whole world came to his funeral, so to speak, and the honor that was conferred upon him in death reflected prestige upon the whole of his record as a President and his qualities as a man. We will never forget the poise and the dignity of the widow through this unspeakable calamity. Mr. Speaker, as we see the mantle fall upon the shoulders of the gifted and competent President Lyndon B. Johnson, who is raising our hopes and lifting our hearts, we can reflect upon the inherently tough structure of our Government, but nothing—just nothing—can expunge the feeling of irretrievable loss in the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President Kennedy was a shocking event to the whole Nation and to those of us who served with him in Congress.

John F. Kennedy was elected to his first post of national responsibility the same year I was. We both arrived in Congress in 1947.

I worked with him and I respected him. He labored diligently for the people of his congressional district and, I am sure, served them well.

His great drive and interest elevated him to the Senate and then the Presidency, the highest position Americans can bestow on their political leaders.

He was devoted to the philosophy and the causes he believed in and he gave unsparingly of himself to attain his goals.

It is a sad day indeed when a comparatively young man is struck down in the prime of life by an unbalanced, self-appointed executioner. And, especially sorrowful is the loss to his devoted wife and his little children.

President Kennedy's death is a loss to the Nation and the entire world.

I extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy in these days of their bereavement.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, I believe, to include in this particular issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted December 2, 1963, in the Senate of Pennsylvania. The resolution, which memorializes the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day, is as follows:

RESOLUTION

The 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was a day of sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C., as well as each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution Serial No. 9, introduced by Senators William J. Lane and James S. Berger on behalf of the entire membership of the Senate and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 2d day of December 1963.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President Kennedy had unusual meaning for the district I represent. My district, the 20th Illinois, is the heart of the land of Lincoln. It includes Springfield, Abraham Lincoln's home. It includes the countryside Lincoln traveled as a youth and as a country lawyer. It includes a city, Quincy, where one of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates occurred. Virtually all this area was in the district which Lincoln once represented in the House of Representatives.

And so, the people of this area know better than most the sorrow that comes when a President of the United States is slain.

Ninety-eight years ago Springfield knew the sorrow of bringing home for final rest the remains of President Lincoln. And today Springfield mourns anew. President Lincoln—like President Kennedy—was killed in the prime of his life and in the prime of his service to his country by an assassin's bullet.

Springfield had sent young Lincoln to Congress and had seen his rise to national fame in the debates over slavery. On February 11, 1861, the citizens of Springfield received Lincoln's affectionate farewell, as the President-elect entered the train that was to take him to the White House. Four years later he returned to Springfield in a coffin.

The Illinois State Journal of Springfield reported the news of Lincoln's rise to fame—and the news of his tragic death. Lincoln wrote:

> The Journal paper was my friend, and of course its editors the same.

The same newspaper reported the news of Kennedy's rise to fame—and the news of his tragic death. The present-day publisher of the Journal, Jack Heintz, spoke for all in the Land of Lincoln when he cried out with these words:

> What kind of a man is this? At 1 p.m. I look out my window at a street Christmas decoration which is now black. A man has died at the hands of a madman. The skies are darkened by a drizzling rain which echoes

my despair. What manner of man is this who would differ so violently with a father, a husband, a country's leader who would do but what he felt in his heart was best for his fellow American, fellow man? May God have some mercy on his soul to the end of his violent, misshapen, and maniacal days.

Yes, Lincoln's Springfield, and all in the district I represent, mourn anew.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we have had 13 days in which to try to comprehend and accept the reality of the incredible tragedy of the assassination of President Kennedy. Yet, it still remains beyond our grasp. And no doubt it will remain so until the history of our country is forgotten.

My own feelings and thoughts are echoed in the sorrow and sense of loss shared by my fellow citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan as expressed in two editorials which I placed in the RECORD last Wednesday, November 27.

Today I would but add to those sentiments the thoughts of David Lawrence, appearing in the December 3 issue of U.S. News & World Report, as they strike me as being both fitting and proper and worthy of recording on this memorial occasion.

### THE INCREDIBLE TRAGEDY

(By David Lawrence)

The American people and the peoples of the whole world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy.

For the assassin's bullet ended the life of a young man whose sincerity of purpose, dedication to duty, and devotion to what he believed was right characterized his service to the United States. Even as he had responded to the cheers of the crowds and had ridden happily in an open automobile through the streets of Dallas, Tex., he reflected the confidence of a man with faith in his fellow citizens.

What shall we say of the insane impulse which caused a despicable individual to destroy the President of this great country? Americans, regardless of party or faction, believe in morality and in respect for human life.

Three times before in American history a President has been killed while in office—Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley. In each instance, individuals of an erratic or unbalanced mentality were responsible. This strange hand of fate has taken from the White House four men of dedicated character. It is difficult to understand these tragic events in our history. For as a President is removed from this mortal life in a few minutes, there emerges a feeling that life and sudden death, even in high office, are beyond the comprehension of our finite minds.

We do know that every year the number of crimes committed by deranged individuals is increasing. Can we not devise some means of detecting in advance the symptoms of such behavior in our society?

The Secret Service has grappled with this problem for decades. Observation of the houses and buildings along a parade route, inspection in advance, and a multitude of bodyguards close at hand have evidently provided no sure preventive.

It was during a theater performance in Washington, on the night of April 14, 1865, that Abraham Lincoln, sitting in the Presidential box, was shot by an erratic individual, who was subsequently killed for his crime by soldiers in pursuit of him.

James A. Garfield was shot by a disappointed officeseeker as he was entering the railroad station in Washington on July 2, 1881. His assailant was hanged.

William McKinley was shot by a man who came up to shake hands with him after a Presidential speech at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 6, 1901. The revolver was concealed beneath a big handkerchief and thus escaped notice. The assassin, an anarchist, was electrocuted.

These happenings cast a cloud of gloom over the whole of our country. But somehow we do not seem to be able to forestall such incidents.

One wonders whether Presidents will venture hereafter to make public appearances except in halls and auditoriums under tight security guard. But our Presidents have been brave men who seem to feel that they must go before the people and take the risks that come with the duties of high office.

John F. Kennedy had that spirit of bravery and felt that he must see the people frequently, without regard to danger. On these pages in 1959 there was printed a detailed story of Lieutenant Kennedy's heroic exploits as commander of a PT boat in the Pacific during World War II. He was never governed by fear. His personal courage has been demonstrated on more than one occasion.

Mr. Kennedy came into office at a crucial time in world history when emotions ran high and differences of opinion on domestic and foreign questions were deepseated. But no President has tackled as many problems and such a variety of delicate and difficult issues as those into which John F. Kennedy delved so deeply during his 34 months in office.

President Kennedy listened patiently to his advisers and showed a remarkable familiarity with detail. Perhaps his outstanding characteristic was his readiness to listen to the arguments of those who disagreed with him. If a resolution of differences were possible so as to lessen friction and bring about an agreement, he conscientiously sought such a solution. He had shown the same attitude when he was in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. Kennedy manifested, in other words, a spirit of mediation and a desire to attain out of every controversy the maximum good for the public. For he adopted again and again the maximum that "half a loaf is better than none."

In world affairs, Mr. Kennedy exhibited a rare quality of patience and restraint. Whatever setbacks his administration may have encountered around the world, the fact remains that he tried his utmost to preserve peace for his country while maintaining the military strength so necessary to deter an enemy.

It is hard to believe that our President is dead at 46. It is hard to believe that this man who sought so earnestly to serve his country should be cut down in the prime of life.

This is an incredible tragedy.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, as I looked up at the Capitol dome from the rotunda awaiting the arrival of Mrs. John F. Kennedy to come for her husband's body, I could not help but think of the thousands of people who passed under this great dome to pay their respects in that brief space of time from Sunday afternoon until Monday morning while the President lay in state.

In a sense, it was ironic that so short a time had been available for these many people to view the President's body, because it was symbolic of the fact that there was so little time available on earth for John F. Kennedy to accomplish his work. He served only 2 years and 10 months as President of the United States and lived only 46 years. There was so much to do for John F. Kennedy and so little time in which to do it.

And then, later that same day, as my wife and I awaited the arrival of the funeral cortege at Arlington Cemetery, I could not help but think once again of the sad tragedy of it all.

Immediately after the President's body was carried past us at Arlington Cemetery, a large group of nearly all the leaders of the free world walked within a few steps of where we were standing, to pay their last respects to the President.

One could not help but be impressed with this great assemblage of free world leaders who thought so much of our late President to pay their personal tribute in this dramatic and unique way. Never in modern time had so many leaders of the free world been assembled in such a short time. No doubt this in itself was probably the greatest tribute that President Kennedy could receive from his contemporaries.

This assemblage demonstrated the great respect and admiration which they held for the youngest President of the United States ever to be elected to this important office.

Another remembrance of this tragedy hit deeply within me as I glanced up from his grave to see that striking giant, Air Force 1, pay its last respects by flying low over his grave and dip its wing as a final tribute to its great Chief.

All of these sad experiences made me wonder how such a horrible tragedy could have befallen our country during these enlightened times. It gave me pause to reflect on this dastardly act.

Our system of government is based on a differing of opinions. Such a divergence is healthy and necessary in our Republic, but fanatical extremism which engenders bitterness and hatred in depraved minds cannot only take the life of a President but the life of our country as well.

While I have not always agreed with President Kennedy, I admired his articulation of ideas, his devotion to duty, his strong leadership, and his exercise of responsibility.

My wife and I join with millions of Americans in mourning the death of our President and extend to his family our deepest sympathy in their tragic loss—a loss that will be felt throughout the world.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in every hamlet, town, and city across the land, for the past 14 days, the people of our Nation have paid their respects and their tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy. In the lonely reaches of their hearts, in the privacy of their homes, and in public gatherings, they have mourned the passing of a leader who, in a brief span of less than 3 years, had left his indelible imprint upon the course of our national history.

We are met today to record those sentiments—our personal feelings and those of our constituents—in the permanent RECORD of congressional proceedings. I speak, therefore, not only for myself but also for the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I represent here. And in so doing, I want to voice the sorrow and anguish which fill our hearts. The death of President Kennedy was a tragedy for each of us and for our Nation. In a larger sense, it was also a tragedy for the cause of human freedom throughout the world.

President Kennedy belonged not only to us and to the present, but also to the world and to the future. In his person he combined some of the best characteristics of the many nationality strains which comprise our great Nation. He was conscious of the spiritual, cultural, economic, and political values of countries whose birth predates that of our own Nation.

He was even more deeply steeped in that rare blending of different cultural heritages achieved in the United States which we know as the American tradition. In addressing himself to the problems of our day, in shaping the policies and the goals of the Government which he headed, he drew on both. He embraced the highest ideals of Western, Judeo-Christian civilization. And he was loyal to the institutions and the traditions which our unique experiment in human freedom and democracy produced upon the American soil. Thus, while serving his country, he served mankind.

President John F. Kennedy worked for, and died for, the implementation of the principles of human dignity, justice, and freedom. He fought against the denial of the basic human rights to people everywhere. It is now up to us to continue the task for which he gave his life. It is up to us to rededicate ourselves today to the attainment of these principles so that he will not have died in vain.

My prayers at this time are for Mrs. John F. Kennedy. I pray that God will send to her His choicest blessings to help her carry this cross—the death of her beloved husband, John F. Kennedy.

**Mr. DORN.** Mr. Speaker, the first time I met John F. Kennedy was, rather significantly, in the White House. We were invited by President Truman to the White House in the fall of 1946 as young Democratic nominees to the Congress. Mr. Truman wished to give us a bit of encouragement and a round of picture taking before the November elections. This was my very first contact with any of the future young Members of the 80th Congress.

On that September day, I remember well meeting John Kennedy for the first time. I was impressed then with his friendly manner and warm disarming smile. He was a bit shy and slightly gaunt from wartime service in the Pacific and from a tough rough-and-tumble Boston campaign. Kennedy at that time moved cautiously and somewhat awkwardly in high political circles. At that time he was and looked like a kid.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw John Kennedy was late last August, again in the White House, as President of the United States. My mother had never met any President, and Mr. Kennedy very graciously granted us an appointment. The President came out alone and met us in the Cabinet room. My mother, Mrs. Dorn, and one of my sons, Jennings, were with me. The President remonstrated with me for not bringing all of my five children and twice asked about my younger boy, Johnson, age 3, whom some of the neighbors called John John because of a resemblance to the President's son. My mother, who had seven boys in World War II, offered the President her sons again, if needed, in Berlin, Cuba, or throughout the world. The President's smile vanished, and he expressed the hope they would never be needed. The President asked us to come into his office and told about the desk, a gift from Queen Victoria, and other items in the office. Then we talked about John C. Calhoun, Clemson College, and football.

The President went into Mrs. Lincoln's office and asked for five fountain pens with his autograph which he personally gave to our son, Jennings, for each of my children. It was awfully quiet in the White House that day and strangely lonely. The President followed us rather wistfully and seemed not to want us to leave. He asked about the South and about the coming campaign. I observed he was no longer the kid I had met that day in September 1946. He was a grown man at last in the flower and bloom of manhood. He was heavier, filled out, and more handsome with a becoming grayishness around the temples. He was confident, sure of himself, and looked like a President of the United States.

Between that first meeting in 1946 and the one last August, I talked with Jack Kennedy many times. I saw him upon social occasions. I saw him on the floor of the House, and I noticed for the first time the jabbing forefinger so characteristic of his speaking style.

I remember a long talk alone with him during the Korean war in the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo, Japan. He had just flown in from a conference with Nehru in India. Kennedy that day expressed grave concern about the Far East and the advances of communism. He was fearful the United States was creating a dollar image rather than an image of freedom, good will, and individual liberty.

I remember appearing with Representative Kennedy as a rather nervous witness before the vitriolic Tom Connally who was serving as chairman of a Joint Senate Committee of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees on the question of troops to Europe. I remember his pushing through a crowded White House reception last winter to assure Mrs. Dorn and me the stories in the New York Times and Wall Street Journal were untrue about my being placed on his purge list. He assured me I was on no purge list of his—that we might differ on certain issues but we would always be friends.

John Kennedy is gone. He was stricken down by a misguided, deranged, Marxist assassin—one who in his warped mind was a follower of Fidel Castro and his ingenious schemes to subvert the Western World.

Washington will never be the same to me. President Kennedy represented an era—the era of television in politics for the first time, the era of downtown parades in open convertibles, the era of political glamour.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was an intellectual. He was brilliant. He was well-groomed, well-mannered, and cultured. He was gracious and hospitable. He loved the typical American. He was a man of humility and charm.

Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy was my President and my Commander in Chief. He was a man of unquestionable integrity, and patriotism. He loved the United States and all of its people. I will miss him so long as I live.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, his lovely children, and to his mother, father, brothers, and sisters.

**Mr. OSMERS.** Mr. Speaker, what is there to say? All of us who served here with John Fitzgerald Kennedy have suffered a great personal loss.

While we all must die, what a tragedy it is that this wonderful man should be taken from us in the prime of life and under such dreadful circumstances.

It matters not what our political beliefs may be in a time like this. Those of us who knew him have lost a good and noble friend and the Nation has lost an outstanding leader.

It is my sincere conviction that he would want us to move forward toward solving the Nation's problems without breaking step.

Once again, in this hour of our mourning, we can thank the founders of our Nation for their wisdom in providing for the orderly transfer of Executive power in our Constitution. We can also be thankful that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, is a man of known ability and vast experience.

**Mr. FRIEDEL.** Mr. Speaker, there are no words which can adequately express our profound grief at the sudden and tragic death of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Persons much more eloquent than I have tried to express their sentiments and those of our Nation in these dark hours, but what can we say that will do justice to the man?

Although born to great wealth, raised amid gracious and cultural surroundings, and educated at America's oldest and most renowned institutions, he sought not a life of ease and leisure, but a life completely dedicated to the service of his country and his fellow man. It is not only we in America who mourn his loss. The whole world is enveloped in grief because this great champion of the people has been snatched from our midst, and to our everlasting shame, by an assassin's bullet.

Public service was John Fitzgerald Kennedy's calling. To us here in the House of Representatives, where he served for 6 years, he was a source of inspiration. When he was later elected to the Senate from his native State of Massachusetts, we recognized full well that here was a man of destiny, which subsequent events proved.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of this century. In his brief term as President of the United States he made an indelible mark on the history of our time. We will remember him as a distinguished champion for peace in the world. The tragedy of his loss is increased because he was taken from us at the very time when he was contributing the most any man could to the cause of world peace. He understood the need of our time to transform ideals into reality and he magnificently began the long and difficult task of accomplishing this objective.

He reminded all Americans of the great principles that liberty could not be cheaply preserved. That vigilance and the willingness to make personal sacrifice are the eternal price to be paid for freedom. He set an example for courage and sacrifice. He showed us that Americans must always be willing to shed their own blood to preserve those things which we hold sacred: Freedom, liberty, and independence.

Because the life of President John Kennedy has been so senselessly and tragically cut short, our Nation has been cruelly deprived of part of its greatness and the life of every American is now poorer. With his death, a very precious part of each of us has died.

President Kennedy's inspiration, his tremendous courage, his integrity and the warmth of his feeling for his fellow man will be a beacon to those of us who share his convictions. And his hopes for the future of our Nation. For I believe he has left us with an inspiration that will serve throughout our own lifetime, and our children's and for generations to come. He inspired us to achieve greatness as a nation and good will and understanding as a people. He lit the lamp of peace and he showed us that the most noble and courageous thing a mighty nation can do is to attempt to find peace, with honor, for all men.

Mr. Kennedy's own life was the greatest example of unselfish and devoted service to his country. He was truly a man of greatness. He understood both the terrible perils and the magnificent promises of our times and he inspired greatness in all Americans. He often reminded us that actions, and not mere words, will be history's measure of this generation of Americans. He urged Americans to give, rather than take from their country. In the cause of his country he gave all that any man can give to his Nation—his life.

For his efforts on behalf of our own citizens and for the benefit of suffering humanity throughout the world, John Fitzgerald Kennedy has earned a lasting place among the truly great men of history. Even though an eternal flame was kindled at his last earthly resting place, another flame will forever burn brightly in our Nation's memory to illumine the future course of our leaders to help achieve a world freed from tyranny, aggression, senseless prejudice and bias. We can truly say that the world is a better place for all of us because of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Perhaps President Kennedy's best epitaph can be drawn from his own statement that:

> Whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice that we shall ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward with history, the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must be truly our own.

President Kennedy gave more to our Nation than he asked of us. He gave his life, and his sacrifice is our mandate to carry on his work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it was a happy couple that received the applause and warm greetings of the friendly Texans all out on the streets to welcome them to their city. It was a gala day—the weather was reflected in the silver lined clouds with quivering streaks of golden sunshine. The parade of autos moved on flanked by the cheering citizens.

Upon approaching the dispersing point, suddenly a sharp crackling of spewed lead was heard, thrice echoing its message of fatality. A lady moaning lament of wounded love was seen caressing her mate's blood-smeared face—head bleeding, resting in her lap—then a racing motor moving the car in speed toward medical aid, and so he died. Thus the fates wafted the purple crepe of mourning over the peoples of the world. Many prayed to their God for deliverance; others, in tearful reverence, wept openly for his greatness; and still others cursed the fates, stunned at the great loss; and those who loved him most, felt a part of self had died with him.

The leaders of nations, friend or foe, payed him high public homage. The common people of all nations were bereft for the loss of a friend who loved the little people—the poor, the sick, and the enslaved who looked to him for hope and help.

And, so proud Texas tilts its flag in grief that this foul bloody deed has stained its sacred soil—and the Nation's soul cringes, seered by the flame of hate, also bears its brunt of responsibility. The shock was great, the pangs of regret deep, but the Government still lives, and tradition dictates it must go on. The sad experience spurs each American to aspire to greater gains in our President's dedication to lead the freedom-loving nations to peace, and to support the spirited patriots of these captive nations enslaved who seek liberty—that they may not lose hope, we must move forward to the goal that our martyred President sought for all men—that peace and liberty would prevail among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, only history can measure the true loss suffered by the freemen of the world in futura before the death of President John F. Kennedy. He kneeled in humility before the altar of freedom, and pledged with action to rid mankind of the inhuman standard of inequality. He revered and respected God's law, that the inherent quality of man in character were of necessity an adjunct to his likeness in being.

President Kennedy was the intellectual aristocratic type of scholar whose vast knowledge of government equipped him with an infallible insight into its operational problems. He had a meticulous knowledge of national and foreign affairs. His speeches were carefully prepared and presented with a strength of feeling that reflected his deep sincerity and power of logic. His public utterances in support of legislative proposals in defense, civil rights, medicare for the aged, tax cuts, welfare legislation for the poor, and also, labor, unemployment, public works for depressed areas, and education showed him to be knowledgeable in the Nation's needs to go forward and also proved him to be a master of invective and sarcasm. He fortified his speeches with facts and figures to carry his point to the people. His grasp of public questions was swift, comprehensive, and positive. As an orator, President Kennedy's fame is established—few Presidents of our country matched his attractive and magnetic influence over an audience. His strong features—boyish and handsome—with touseled brown hair—heaped—his blue eyes fired with the sparks of sincerity—words flowing as easy and smooth as Bostonian colloquialisms interspersed would permit, transfixed his listeners. His diction—a message for the common man was simple, clear, and forceful—to the educated he was classical in expression.

He was decisive in his ability to meet any emergency that would arise—as in the Cuban crisis. He was always prepared—his intellect never failed him, even at the news conferences. His answers were clear and to the point. His high sense of humor was most perceptible in turning aside a question or questioner. His most noteworthy speeches represent the superlative oratorical effort in forensics, and will be placed among the historical documents of our Nation.

The loss of our young President, vigorous in mind and body, in the prime of life, a national figure of the highest type, respected, admired and trusted by the leaders of the free world in these critical times of trouble in world affairs emphasized to the Nation and the Congress, the need to solidify our forces in a unified front, and to go forward in the accomplishment of his aims for which he so valiantly fought and died.

The courage and loyalty displayed by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy throughout the perilous and sanguine experience, and the subsequent ordeal at the funeral ceremonies, gained the admiration, sympathy, and love of every American, and the people of the world; the true mother with her darlings at her side, statuesque in bearing, facing her grief with regal acceptance of tragedy, like the Madonna at the Crucifixion, stood in silent adoration of her love with a dignity that captured the hearts and emotions of millions throughout the world. No one can deny that as the late lamented President passed through the Portals of Oblivion, a deep sense of pride for her permeated his very soul. May God in His omnipotent wisdom bless the future of our Nation, and grant everlasting peace to our martyred President for which he so valiantly struggled to achieve for mankind and nations.

I dedicate to his memory the following stanzas:

HE PASSED THIS WAY TOO SOON

Every hurt—a tear, a moan, a sigh
E'en though of noble mien
Like the stranger, leaves the scene
Every man is born to die.

Every joy, a smile, a twinkling eye
Greatness seems to be God's loan
One was called before his turn
Every man is born to die.

Every courage, holds freedom high
Mortals ever for him pray
Nations mourn this tragic day
Every man is born to die.

**Mr. DULSKI.** Mr. Speaker, daily editorials have appeared in our newspapers throughout the country, reflecting the deep sense of loss our Nation has suffered in the tragic and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two excellent editorials which were carried in Buffalo's newspapers last week. These follow:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Nov. 23, 1963]

A MARTYRED PRESIDENT

The sense of incredulous shock and total tragedy that swept over a stunned nation with yesterday's terrible news from Dallas has been so universally experienced and so widely articulated that further words today could add no more than a trite echo.

The assassination of President Kennedy was a dastardly deed so senseless, so utterly devoid of any rational service to any conceivable cause, that it had to be an act of lunacy. But what precisely motivated the assassin, what sinister influences or psychopathic hates had worked him up to plot and do this thing—these are questions that still cry for answers on the day of grief and anger that follows the first day of shock.

Probably no other tragedy in our time has triggered such a profound sense of public disbelief. Death, to this young President so full of life and future, came so swiftly, so suddenly, so incongruously. In speeches that morning, he had sparkled with wit and zest. Texas had given him its warmest, most festive welcome. Just at the mortal moment, the wife of its Governor was happily chiding him, "You can't say Dallas is not friendly to you today." Then the shot, the slump, and his life, his Presidency, were over.

This assassination will inevitably be compared with the others—of McKinley here in Buffalo in 1901, of Garfield in the first months of his term in 1881, of Lincoln nearly a century ago, an act that brought another Johnson so unexpectedly to the Presidency. But of the four, we venture to predict that history will regard the striking down of John F. Kennedy as the most tragic in its timing. For Garfield's Presidency had hardly begun, and both McKinley and Lincoln had finished full terms and had the sense of fulfillment that decisive reelection gave them.

Of Lincoln, indeed, Walt Whitman could write, before his Captain "lay fallen cold and dead," that his "ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won; the port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting."

But for President Kennedy, the journey was only well begun. Some reefs were safely past, but the heaviest weather lay ahead. The prize of reelection, of a second term mandate, was only dimly perceived on the far horizon. And the safe port, the bells, the people all exulting—whether any of this could have been written of President Kennedy, history now can only speculate.

While today's journalism must defer to tomorrow's history for definitive judgments about the Kennedy Presidency, however, some things in appreciation can be said with assurance even now.

High among them is an enumeration of the great qualities of mind and spirit this young man brought to the Presidency—courage, both physical and moral; a high sense of purpose and patriotism; intelligence, cool and analytical; judgment, daring on occasion but usually balanced; an immense self-confidence tempered by a penetrating wit and disciplined by the wisdom to face and profit by his own mistakes; and with all this, a charm of manner that put on his administration a unique stamp of dash and verve.

By all the tangible yardsticks available, moreover, the state of our Union has fared well under this foreshortened Presidency. Our national economy has functioned at a steadily advancing pace; our national strength is high, militarily beyond compare with that of any combination of would-be foes. Where foreign threats were clear, we have resolutely faced them down. If the world has not been made measurably safer for free peoples, it is certainly not measurably less so. At home, while his leadership had yet to spark enough response from Congress to bring much of his domestic program to fruition, he will doubtless be best regarded by history for this year's moral leadership and appeal to national conscience in the field of civil rights.

What distinguished the Kennedy Presidency more than anything else, however, was its style. Here was a White House filled to overflowing with youth and vigor, charm and sophistication, a Presidency of culture and taste and deep regard for human achievement in all the enduring areas of art, literature, science, and intellect.

It is in this area, of course, where the Kennedy Presidency was a team effort, its magic touch deftly supplied by the beautiful and gracious First Lady. And it is to her and her children, that the Nation's heart pours out its deepest sympathy in this day of their tragic bereavement.

---

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Nov. 26, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY—MARTYR TO HATRED

Our President has been laid to rest. The brief but intense period of national grief is ended. Life in these United States will go on.

No one who sat before the television screen and watched the incredible unfolding of this horrible weekend could escape a sense of shock that these things could happen in this Nation. And no one can escape a share of the blame. For this Nation, a symbol of all that is great and good in Western civilization, a golden land of opportunity, must expel the hatred which caused this despicable act.

This propensity for hatred is prevalent not just in Dallas, not just in Texas, but everywhere. In Buffalo, in New York, in every corner of the Nation. It was not enough to oppose. We had to hate. Nationalistic hates. Racial hates. Hatred of unions by management and of management by labor. Hatred of the Birchites and hatred by the Birchites. Hatred of the Kennedys; hatred of Goldwater; hatred of Communists; hatred of Catholics, of Protestants, or Jews, or atheists. Hatred of modern art or modern music. Hatred of anything that did not conform to our basic beliefs.

Each of us can say: "No, not I." But each of us who told or laughed at a hate-inspired joke or story, each of us who spread or listened without complaint to a hate-inspired rumor or report helped to prolong and promulgate the wave of hatred which culminated so tragically on the streets of Dallas.

May God grant that life will not go on as before, that each of us will be able to view the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a symbol of the futility and corrosiveness of hatred, that we can oppose without rancor, dispute without venom, that we conduct our lives in public and in private in accord with the phrase so often spoken in connection with our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson: "Come let us reason together."

Let us resolve in this hour of national mourning to pluck the hatred from our hearts and in so doing give new meaning to the resolution uttered 100 years ago by another martyred President that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

**Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.** Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to render the eulogy at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Services held at Anchorage during those dark hours of November 23, following the assassination of our great President the day before.

The words are mine but they come from the hearts of the people of Alaska, as follows:

Fellow Alaskans, in simple words, we are gathered here as mourners to honor our honored dead, and with heavy hearts to pay a parting tribute to our beloved leader and fellow American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, whose life and dreams were ruthlessly taken from him—and from us—at the peak of his great career.

The consequent disruption of the lives of his lovely widow and children and sorrowing parents and other members of the Kennedy family calls forth from our hearts our deepest and most compassionate sympathy. Although we here are but a handful of grieving people, we symbolize the hearts and minds of Alaskans and Americans everywhere. We bespeak the tidal wave of admiration and affection for the memory of John F. Kennedy, which sentiments sweep across our land and indeed across the world. This admiration and affection, of course, stems from his own great personal courage, and friendliness and unflagging concern for the freedom and welfare of his fellow men. It is also directed toward his deep patriotism and dedicated and unstinting contribution of his great knowledge and talent for leadership to the service of his country, and in the interest of all of God's children everywhere.

Born at Boston, Mass., on May 29, 1917, he was reared by strong and farsighted parents to be strong, energetic, brave, industrious, knowledgeable, and wise, and these were the traits which characterized every crowded year of his full and rich and warm personal and public life. Reams will be written about his greatness, his achievements, his strength—but I want to remember, too, Kennedy the man—the devoted son, husband, and father—the good-humored way he met and talked to the people of the press at his news conferences, calling each by name—the way he shook his finger for emphasis—the way he said "Cuber" and "Alasker"—his big ready grin.

In terms of his public life, he was always way out in front—for example, his service in the Navy and heroism in World War II—his Membership in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate at an early age—the fact that he was the youngest President of the United States in history, and the first President of the Catholic faith. In keeping with his great gifts, he grasped the meaning of our changing times from colonialism to freedom, from feudalistic systems to democracy, and the appalling threat of catastrophic nuclear war in a world seething with change in the midst of a worldwide population explosion. Thus, his strength was matched by his farsightedness and desire and effort to keep America ahead in the cold war and related events, and in the effort to secure world peace through strength, as the only long-range guarantee of our national security and a better world. For this we blend our affection and admiration of our so recently departed great President with gratitude for the benefits America has derived from his having lived and worked with and for us. Among those benefits, we count the heritage of the great inspiration he has left with us to lead more magnanimous and stronger and better lives. This is the inspiration left to our able and distinguished and patriotic new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and to others in high places who will proceed to guide the ship of state through turbulent waters, on an even keel. Let us then join in standing strongly behind our new President with confidence that the destiny of our great Nation is in strong and capable hands, to take the place of those of our late great brother, John F. Kennedy.

**Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.** Mr. Speaker, while attending the burial services of John Fitzgerald Kennedy in Arlington Cemetery, I noted the stately figure of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the President of the Republic of France, standing at the bier. His appearance called my attention to the fact that two of the foremost leaders of the free world were present—one alive and one dead. On further reflection I realized that in a short period of 6 months the free world had lost four out of five of their outstanding leaders; namely, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, former Chancellor of the Republic of West Germany, retired on October 15, 1963; the Honorable Harold Macmillan, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, resigned on October 18, 1963; the Honorable Amintore Fanfani, former Premier of the Republic of Italy, resigned on May 16, 1963. And now the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States of America. My thoughts turned back pages of history to the year 44 B.C. when Julius Caesar, ruler of the Roman world, and the foremost leader of the world at that time fell victim at the hands of an assassin. History tells us of the momentous impact on the entire world through that great loss.

How will the world of today accept the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy who was the foremost spokesman of the free world? His untimely death has created a vacuum in world affairs, making it necessary for every nation to reevaluate its foreign policy. The peoples of the world received the tragic news with heartfelt sorrow. They knew of his vital contributions to the security of the free world. In the field of general welfare, the people of the world knew of his great interest in assisting other countries to become independent and self-supporting and to achieve economic and social progress through free institutions.

With the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the world has lost a mighty champion of peace and good will.

My family and I join the people of the world in extending our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Kennedy and to members of the late President's immediate family in their hour of bereavement.

**Mr. MOSS.** Mr. Speaker, we who are the Members of this distinctive parliamentary body today have had a great privilege in knowing and working with John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Our close association with our late beloved President assigns to us at this moment the role of evaluating the man. The wanton taking of his life by an assassin has assigned to history, to the generations of the future, the role of evaluating John Kennedy the President.

As a contemporary of the late President, I enjoyed an all too brief association with him. I found it an inspiring experience. No leader of our time was so completely a part of the 20th century. No leader of our time so fully understood the significance of the American role in the second half of the 20th century. No leader of our time was so obviously the master of the complexities of this most difficult and too frequently frustrating era. President Kennedy had an unusual zest for the challenge, however awesome that might be, in the high position he occupied for less than 3 years. This fact was so clearly stated in his own words in his inspiring inaugural address on January 20, 1961, when he said:

> In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

This was truer at the moment of death than at the time of inauguration. The outpouring of sympathy, the obvious grief evident throughout the civilized world, attested to the success of his efforts to minimize those things which divide the peoples of our time and build upon the opportunities which tend to unite mankind.

President Kennedy was a man of unusual intellectual capacity and yet he was a most comfortable person to be around because he understood not only the problems of his generation but the generation itself. Perhaps no President in his public utterances so phrased his statements as to make them fully quotable as did President Kennedy, yet few have shown the humor which characterized the dialogue of his administration. In fact, within a few hours preceding the senseless act of assassination, the President demonstrated the keenness of that wit, the delightful turn of a phrase, whether designed to have you laugh with him or at him. There was nothing pompous about John Kennedy, yet in the fullest sense he was the President and carried that role with every dignity befitting the office. He worked hard; he never ducked a fight and he enjoyed both to the fullest.

All America, yes, and I guess the greater part of the world has taken pride from the young President with his beautiful wife and very attractive family. All have enjoyed the delightful antics of Caroline and the President's beloved John-John. All have been proud of the regal dignity of Jacqueline Kennedy, and while the Kennedys became a political issue, all have enjoyed the vigor of the President's brothers and sisters. Nevertheless, none would deny the dedication of this family to the welfare of all our citizens. This was a vital family unique in the American political experience and we are all the poorer because of the tragedy of Dallas.

At the very moment when the world was beginning to sense the magnitude of his achievements, the success of his international policies and the almost spectacular emergence of a healthier domestic economy, we were robbed of the leadership of this vital young intellect. But even in that moment of darkest despair, the unusual insight of the President was again demonstrated when we witnessed a new President taking over the onerous burdens so unexpectedly thrust upon him, because the choice made by John F. Kennedy in Los Angeles in 1960 was a wise choice. He had wanted Lyndon Johnson as his running mate—a selection made with utmost care, a deliberate assessment of the needs of the nation. The President's wisdom in that choice each day becomes more apparent.

President Kennedy, the first man of my generation to achieve the Presidency, afforded all who lived through his brief tenure in office an experience of enrichment. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will most thoughtly review his many public statements, his carefully conceived programs recommended to this Congress, and after a more deliberate evaluation of them, make a renewed dedication to make them work as he knew they would for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, a tribute to President Kennedy would not be complete without mention of the great courage of his widow. Her conduct from the moment tragedy struck should make every American more proud. Perhaps no woman in history was ever called upon to play a more difficult role under more brutal or tragic circumstances. No one could have done it better. The British press stated that Jacqueline Kennedy gave the American people something they lacked. That something in their words was "majesty", but however we characterize it, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that the grief felt by each of us was only a small part of that felt by her. How many of us with our small part of the burden could have conducted ourselves with the grace, the courage, and the majesty of Jacqueline Kennedy?

I am pleased to announce to the Congress that the Sacramento City Board of Education on November 27, 1963, acted to honor our late President in a most fitting manner. All of us who were privileged to work with the late President knew of his vital concern to provide education for all the people of the United States. Therefore, it is most fitting that a new senior high school in Sacramento is to be named the John F. Kennedy Senior High School.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks with the resolution adopted by the Sacramento City Board of Education:

### RESOLUTION BY SACRAMENTO BOARD OF EDUCATION

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great statesman who served as America's eloquent spokesman throughout the world in our country's search for peace and security for all mankind; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a true champion of education and the equality of educational opportunity for all, regardless of color, creed, social or economic status; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was most articulate in his support of good citizenship, physical and mental fitness, vocational competence, and of improved living standards for all citizens; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy had become known and respected as a true champion of freedom, justice and understanding in America and among all nations; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with all his great responsibilities as the head of our Nation, still gave continued evidence of love of children and family and a deep concern for the values of home, community, church, and school; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy endeared himself through his sincerity, his high principles, and his ennobling example to young and older alike: Be it therefore

*Resolved,* That the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District, on behalf of all pupils and the entire district staff does herewith express sincere and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, daughter Caroline, son John F. Kennedy, Jr., and all members of the Kennedy family; and be it further

*Resolved,* In order to perpetuate in this Sacramento community the memory of a great and renowned man, a new senior high school, now in progress of planning and soon to be built, shall be known as the John F. Kennedy Senior High School; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District of Sacramento, Calif., in special meeting assembled, does approve this resolution in sincere tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, whose tragic death brought deep sorrow to all loyal Americans and to the entire world; and be it further

*Resolved,* To adjourn this meeting of the board of education in honor and sincere tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our late esteemed President.

We hereunto set our hand and seal on this 27th day of November 1963.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

By Jewel W. Blucher, president; Genevieve N. Didion, vice president; Marie E. Babich, M.D.; John Quincy Brown, Jr.; Alba Kuchman; Gladys R. Paulson; Milton L. Schwartz; and F. Melvyn Lawson, superintendent and secretary.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the heartbreak, grief, and sorrow shared by west Texans and folks around the world over the tragic incident that took the life of our President on November 22.

Although, I did not always agree with his philosophy or his legislative recommendations, President Kennedy was a vigorous and articulate exponent of his political philosophy. He was truly an outstanding young American and the world mourns his untimely death.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Mrs. Kennedy and her little children during these trying times. May God bless, love, and comfort them.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the bullet from the assassin's gun that felled President John F. Kennedy on that beautiful fall morning in Dallas, Tex., only a few days ago, was a national tragedy. Death as a result of natural causes is always a sad event, but when a young man, and particularly a young man who is President of the United States, is struck down at the hands of an assassin, it is most reprehensible.

On the morning of November 22, President John F. Kennedy rode down the street of Dallas, Tex., a happy man with the vigor of youth, with virtually the world at his feet. He was the leader of the greatest and most powerful nation in the world, he was possessed of wealth, power, and happiness; he enjoyed the love and adoration of his parents, brothers, and sisters as well as his charming wife and infant children. He had everything to live for. His popularity was worldwide; even those who did not share his philosophical views respected this young President of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult sometimes to understand the scheme of life and death. It is certainly most difficult to understand the motivation of this warped-minded individual who fired the fatal shot. And yet, we know that throughout the recorded history of mankind every generation of men has been plagued with such types of depraved human beings. Unfortunately, President Kennedy's tragic death is not without precedent in the comparatively short life of this Republic; as witness the unfortunate and tragic deaths of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley. In each instance, these four Presidents died at the hands of assassins of dubious objectives conceived by unbalanced minds. Possibly the greatest parallel in this most recent national tragedy is that of President McKinley who died at the hands of an admitted anarchist. The obvious murderer of President Kennedy was an admitted Communist.

Mr. Speaker, as one who honestly and sincerely differed with our lamented President, as thank God it is our right to do under the American political system, I also was one of those who had a genuine affection for the President and, like all other Americans of good will, Mrs. Wilson and I join in extending our sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, both on my own behalf and in behalf of the people of western South Dakota I join my colleagues in expressing our grief and sorrow at the unconscionable assassination of John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States.

While I liked and admired the man and his exceptional ability, I disliked and disapproved of many of his policies and programs. At the same time, however, I, as did many of my colleagues, recognized the personal ability and personal influence of this brilliant young man struck down in the prime of life.

I extend our sympathy to his widow and our deep feeling of compassion to his children who have thus had their father snatched from them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as we sit in this Chamber, each with a heavy heart, it is most difficult for me to realize that John F. Kennedy is dead.

Less than an hour before he was assassinated, he joined 8 or 10 of his friends on his airplane as it was preparing to set down in Dallas. He was cheerful and deeply appreciative of the warm and tremendously large reception he had received in San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth. He was anxiously awaiting the same warm reception by thousands of people in Dallas.

His death instantaneously brought to the surface the deep fundamental respect, admiration and devotion which the people of the United States and nearly every foreign country felt for him. That devotion, respect and appreciation of the man and his great work will make his memory stand out in American and world history. I shall not mention here his renowned works—volumes can and will be written on that subject.

I had the high honor and privilege of introducing him in Houston to a crowd of some 3,500 diners and one of the largest radio and television audiences on record in Houston, some 14 hours before his death. At that time I said, "This great leader will go down in history as one of the greatest men the United States has produced."

The human response to his tragic death from all over our Nation and the world clearly indicates that history will record John F. Kennedy, alongside George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, as one of our greatest Americans and one of our greatest Presidents.

My family joins me in extending to one of the bravest women I have ever known, his wife, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and to little Caroline and little brother, John, our sympathy and understanding in their great loss.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation, yes, even the world was shocked at the untimely passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States.

The ensuing grief and bewilderment which an assassin's bullet brought transcends party lines, and persons from all walks of life, both Republican and Democrat, have asked the question which confounds us all—why must it be? Only the passing of time and history itself will record what his place may be.

It is only honest to say that many Americans did not concur with his interests. I would be less than candid if I did not point out that my concept of the role of Government differed with his, and though on occasion I took exception with his philosophy of government, never at any time did I question his sincerity or motives in desiring to reach his objectives.

While I differed with him I respected his viewpoint as I am sure he was always able to see the other person's view. There were no sour grapes in the spirit of John Kennedy.

No one can deny that he was active and aggressive in the pursuit of endeavoring to bring his program to fruition. Most certainly he was a thoughtful and engaging young man.

A man of great determination, gay, friendly, and happy—ambitious beyond end but apparently always willing to listen to reason.

I am sure that he was the leader of a generation who felt he must contribute something to the fulfillment of an American dream. This he attempted to do.

Surely he will be missed, and I am sure, while we mourn his passing, we shall always remember the fullness of his patriotism and the untiring dedication he gave to his country's interest.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of brilliant words have been spoken and written in tribute to President Kennedy—for his magnificent leadership, brilliance, and humanity. I, too, want to join the distinguished leaders of this House of Representatives in paying a deep and sincere tribute to President Kennedy and to his courageous widow.

From my own heart, and from the hearts of the sorrowing people of my district, comes the deepest sympathy and our love to Mrs. Kennedy.

One single, simple sentence speaks eloquently for so many of us—the moving words of Theodore White in this week's Life magazine: "for one brief, shining moment there was a Camelot." These words will forever bring me the memory of faces, young and old, as they passed through our Capitol where the body of our President lay on that ice-cold November night—faces sorrowing, yet in their way reflecting some essence of the great spirit John Fitzgerald Kennedy left mankind. The spirit which was a shining symbol of faith and hope in a brighter, better world. Those faces said that they, too, saw Camelot.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the incredible and shocking news of the tragic death of President Kennedy stunned the civilized world.

The portrayal by modern news media of the sequence of events that followed even beyond the 21-gun salute and taps, sounding over the hills of Arlington National Cemetery, plumbed the depths of human emotions of mankind everywhere—perhaps to the greatest degree in history.

Countless eloquent words have been written and spoken in tribute to the life and work of our late President. He served his country well; he sought peace with justice for all nations. This brilliant, dedicated, and courageous young leader built his own monument—a monument to inspire his present and future countrymen.

The people of North Carolina have in many ways expressed their sorrow over this national tragedy. I extend my personal sympathy to all loved ones of the President.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's assassination is a tragedy touching the heart and mind of every American. The wanton destruction of this gay, ardent, vivid young man at the zenith of his powers first stunned us, and then left us with a deadening feeling which continues to persist. I believe this same effect has been felt by people throughout the world who had been inspired by his ideals so eloquently expressed.

I mourn the loss of this fine young man who was so boldly steering our ship of state through the turbulent waters of domestic troubles and international strife.

I had the privilege of knowing him since he first came to Congress. I watched his brilliant career, admiring his courage and ability.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and his two lovely young children at this time of their great sorrow, and to the other members of his family.

My heartfelt prayers go out to Almighty God for President Johnson, our new Commander in Chief, as he takes over the gigantic problems now facing the Nation. Fortunately, President Kennedy had seen to it, with foresight, diligence, and care, that President Johnson made the contacts and undertook the responsibilities which equipped him to step into the breach fully armed for the tasks ahead. This is one more thing for which we can thank our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as deeply as most of us loved and respected John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it would be that people who knew him so well may have underrated his stature. The intense grief that his mindless assassination has created throughout the free world has borne home to most of us the devotion and affection with which this young President was held by people in all walks of life in every land where freedom is cherished.

Perhaps this was best summed up in a personal letter written by the great Irish playwright, Sean O'Casey. Mr. O'Casey, writing to an American friend, said:

> What a terrible thing has happened to us all. To you, there; to us, here; to all, everywhere. Peace, who was becoming bright-eyed, now sits in the shadow of death: her handsome champion has been killed as he walked by her very side. Her gallant boy is dead.

It was a curious thing about the character and personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy that everyone, even those who lived in far-distant lands, thought of him as a warm personal friend whom they had known all their lives. There was no great difference between the public image of President Kennedy and the private image. The public personality was merely a clear projection of the vibrant spirit that animated the man in his personal relationships.

As we mourn his assassination, Mr. Speaker, each of us in this body cherishes personal memories. For instance, it was my privilege to fly with him in the Executive compartment of the airplane that carried him from Fort Worth to his rendezvous with destiny in Dallas. With the easy familiarity which his manner induced, we spoke about the importance to the Nation of our space program. As always, he was magnificently informed about the subject and fortified his contagious enthusiasm with extensive factual data. It was an inspiring conference and one that I shall always remember with pride modified by sorrow.

We came to Congress together, Mr. Speaker, in 1946 and, despite the fact that we sprang from different sectors of the country, and from different backgrounds, and despite the fact that we had basically different opinions on some issues, we were good friends, always. We served 6 years together on the District Committee, and I clearly recall the idealism with which he approached the task of trying to solve the problems that chronically beset the Nation's capital. Many Members of the Congress consider service on the District Committee an onerous and thankless task. Typically John F. Kennedy considered it an important challenge in the field of human relations.

On several occasions we put on the uniform of the Washington Senators together to play in the annual charity baseball game against our friends on the other side of the aisle. He played in these games, I believe, with a little more seriousness than did most of us. John F. Kennedy never saw any sense in engaging in any contest, athletic, mental or political, unless one played to win. And, until the cowardly murderer struck him down, he was a consistent winner in everything he attempted.

More than any President in our history, he was one of us. He was part and parcel of the Congress, and the Congress was a permanent element in his bloodstream. This was so apparent when—after his election to the Presidency—he would call us to the White House for conferences. He always understood what was possible of accomplishment in our deliberations, and what was not. He respected our judgment; he understood our problems; he treated us as friends and colleagues.

With his death, every one of us, Mr. Speaker, died a little.

We have lost a great leader.

We have lost a great friend.

And the entire free world has lost a living symbol of courage and decency. Indeed, as Mr. O'CASEY said, the handsome champion of peace was killed as he walked by her very side. Her gallant boy is dead.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my tribute this afternoon to the many eloquent ones which have been said in memory of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

The stunning news came to me as I had started my drive back to Illinois on that fateful Friday, November 22. I was between Hagerstown and Hancock, Md., when the confirmed report came over the radio that the last rites had been administered and that the President had died. I pulled off the side of the road to control my shock and emotion and sought out the first telephone that I might phone my wife. Neither of us could talk very intelligently but we did decide that I should turn back and return to Washington.

I shall never forget that drive back to Washington along Route 240 which I had driven so many times. Cars were pulling off to the side of the road in numbers and those still on the road were just poking along. It was quite obvious that drivers were listening intently to their radios for every fragment of news. As I turned onto Embassy Row, down Massachusetts Avenue, I never before had noticed so many flags representing foreign countries, and all were drawn to half mast. I guess there never has been so tragic an event that has touched so many capitals around the world and certainly attests to the stature this relatively young man achieved in so short a time.

His being taken from our midst in such an awful manner reminds us how the course of history seems to be charted more by accident than by design, and of the Biblical Scripture which tells us that these events can happen "within the twinkling of any eye." Rhetoric and prose are so inadequate at a time like this but I do want to simply add the profound sympathy and condolences of our family to those untold numbers which have gone out and continue to be said for Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and the entire Kennedy family.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget that tragic and dark day of November 22 when, with you in the House restaurant here in the Capitol, I heard the dreadful news about the assassination of our 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It was, and still is, extremely difficult to believe that such a terrible thing can happen in the United States today. But happen it did and a great leader was taken from us.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born to wealth and could have chosen a career in any field, but he chose the most difficult one of all, that of public service. And he served boldly and courageously, both in war and in peace. He was a strong and fearless leader, both in war and in peace.

The entire world recognized his outstanding character and qualities and our loss was also their loss, mourned even by our enemies.

To his bereaved widow and family I extend my heartfelt condolences.

The following poems by one of my constituents, Miss Bettie LaVeck, express much better the feelings of all Americans over this loss:

### We the People of This United States

We the people of this United States of America live in the manner we so desire with the right to speak as we believe, live as we believe, pray as we so desire. We have more as a family than any other country of living people on this whole earth, and yet we are still greedy, filled with hate, hate for others that we envy and are jealous of not realizing that each family, each person has a cross to bear of their own to enter into heaven, the heaven created by God for those whom are worthy of entering this Kingdom of Heaven. With this in mind, I write a few words to try to bring out the true meaning of love, of life, of the meaning of togetherness for all mankind. The hunger of greed, lusts of life, not truly believing in ourselves can be our very downfall as a Nation. Destroying each other in inhuman acts.

---

### Eternal Rest

The President's casket is now laying in state.
The murderer who has chosen his fate.
Noblemen pass to bid farewell
To their past President they knew so well.
Time passes.
Servicemen erect in form
Have their duties to perform.
The horses' hoofs beat upon the streets with time,
The drums beat with a rhythm rhyme.
In disbelief crowds gather and stare,
Time meaning nothing, they're going nowhere.
A small lad steps out in plain view,
Saluting his father in front of you.
Religion of all faiths busy with their prayer,
Each and every human willing to do their share.
Never in history have people turned to God as of this day,
No matter what color or age, they bow their heads to pray.
Time passes.
Each mourn the way he sees fit,
Throughout this vast world a small candle is lit.
The flag stands at half mast, the bugles gives its call,
The stillness echos through the air, the guns salute in all.
The sun slowly sinks into the west,
While we have placed our President to eternal rest.

—Bettie A. LaVeck,
Taylor, Mich. *Age 35.*

---

### We Mourn Our President

Today Mr. Kennedy with a smile on his face and a hand shake for all
Was shot and killed, into his wife's arms he did fall.
She cuddled him and cradled him while death came to call
Our Nation deeply saddened as bare trees in the fall.

Oh President, my President, what fate made you go?
The highest peak of your career was now that we know.
You worked each day for each of us, your courage never wavered,
Now I feel God chose you to sit beside your Savior.

And as the years go by, little John and Caroline will know,
That the President, their daddy, really loved them so.
For his love will live in history, his accomplishes reread with time
And you will tell your children, that daddy he was mine.

Mrs. Kennedy I touched you though you felt me not,
Your bravery and your courage could never be forgot.
May a candle brightly glow and kindle in your heart,
For God walks close beside your, for you He is a part.

I'm sure that each American feels hurt, shocked and sad,
Indigent acts such as this make America look rather bad.
It takes just one to start a heavy stone to roll,

And soon several others start to take their toll.

We wonder and we ponder, we shiver and we cry,

We cannot find the answers no matter how we try.

Yet, it was our President that gave his life this day

And set our Nation mourning for God to show the way.

—Bettie A. LaVeck,
*Age 35.*
Taylor, Mich., *November 28, 1963.*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include a transcript of a portion of a joint American Legion and Auxiliary fall convention, memorial services held in Minneapolis, Minn.; and the remarks made by the national commander, the Honorable Daniel F. Foley:

### Remarks by Daniel F. Foley, American Legion National Commander, at a Joint Legion and Auxiliary Fall Conference Memorial Service in Behalf of President John F. Kennedy Delivered at the Pick-Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., November 23, 1963

National President Mrs. Johnson, my fellow Americans, for some time, I have looked forward to this conference, for the wanderer yearns for home. To be home with members of my own department, where the Legion spirit is deep and where the Legion heart beats strongly.

But today we are sad. The heart of America is sad. The soul of freedom aches. Our President has died—a martyr for the cause of justice and of freedom, not just here in the United States, but throughout the world.

It is the character of the true American to love justice and to jealously regard the highest rights of man as a creature of God.

The sincere, determined efforts of President Kennedy to promote justice among men everywhere will speak well for him before the tribunal of divine justice.

It is the inborn desire of all men to be free, and throughout all of our history brave men and women of great courage have and do defend the cause of freedom. Defenders of the cause of freedom daily lay their lives on the line that freedom may endure.

President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat, and all men of good will are crushed by this tragic event.

But again the great character of the American people, their deep love of God, and loyalty to country will spring forth in all its fullness, for all the world to see, in this time of crisis.

Let no one think for a fleeting moment that this Nation will be divided in this hour of challenge.

Whatever differences of a political nature or disagreement on issues that may exist are quickly set aside as all Americans rush to accept the challenge these tragic circumstances have thrust upon our Nation.

One of the hallmarks of a free society under constitutional government is its continuity. What dictatorship can face the people of the world and say it speaks from the freely expressed will of the people?

But here in this Nation, which has now seen eight Presidents die in office, some at the hand of the assassin, such as Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley, and now John Kennedy, the Government of the United States continues on—confident and courageous are its people—dedicated and sincere its leaders.

It is this desire to perpetuate freedom that has inspired the American Legion in its many years of fruitful service. We pledge ourselves to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, maintain law and order, to promote peace and good will on earth, to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. Devotion to these principles characterizes the service which John Kennedy has left to all the ages, for his lifework was filled with courage, compassion for others, a deep sense of justice, and a love of freedom, as God willed it when he created man.

Into the stream of challenge, created at this hour, the American Legion, a powerful force for good, may well face its most crucial hour—its most difficult test.

We believe it to be the responsibility of every American to be an active participant in the affairs of the present, in a responsible manner. Every man who would enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in a free society must discharge the accompanying duties and responsibilities of citizenship. It is the total business of our life's work to be always consistent with the ideals of freedom, which encompasses a love of God—love of country—regard for the rights of others, and a renewed realization of our great responsibility to preserve for our children and our children's children, down through the ages, an America forever strong and forever free.

The Legion has the great challenge now, if it is to contribute significantly in these moving times, to hold its head high in service to the high cause of freedom, set an example for others to follow in all our actions, in all our utterances and so conduct ourselves in all of our posts across the length and breadth of the land, that our people will always see our work at its best and our ideals at their loftiest.

By so doing, we show reverence to the memory of our dearly loved President, who has fallen, and give hope and encouragement to our new President, who now assumes the awesome responsibility of leadership.

In this hour, so sad to us all, in this hour which challenges us so, we say for all men to hear:

Though the forces of evil, lawlessness, and hatred may beat with all their fury upon the breasts of liberty;

This Nation will endure strong in justice—

This Nation will prosper rich in compassion—

This Nation will stand down through the corridors of time secure in freedom.

**Mr. FOUNTAIN.** Mr. Speaker, I know I cannot add anything of significance to the very eloquent and moving words which have already come from the saddened hearts of so many Members of this House over the untimely, the unnecessary, the tragic and shocking death of our late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

However, I would betray every impulse of my nature if I did not express my own deep sorrow and pay my poor flower of tribute to the many bouquets of friendship and affection which have been offered here in his memory.

Like many others, I was honored with the privilege of seeing and being with him on a number of occasions both public and private. He was always gay and cheerful. As someone has already said, "you could see a laugh coming in his eyes before you could hear it from his lips." He was always hungry for information and one of the best listeners I have ever known. In fact, he was a questioner. He posed the questions and complimented you by listening to your answers. The fact that he was so well informed can probably be attributed to his inquiring nature.

The world is a poorer place with the passing of this gallant leader, whose true greatness will never fully be known. We are saddened all the more because our beloved President has been taken from us at a time when his star was strongly in the ascendancy and his efforts for world peace and a better society were only beginning to bear fruit. Even so, his contributions are impressive and John F. Kennedy is destined to become a legend in our time.

In so many ways, the President was a study in contrasts. He was a humble man and a person of aristocratic bearing. He was a very warm human being and yet reserved. He was gentle and he was forceful. He was practical and he was idealistic. And he expressed himself with both eloquence and simplicity.

All of us were touched in one way or another by the courage and the example of this young President, who was wise beyond his years. Those of us who had the privilege of meeting with him occasionally will remember him as a soft-spoken man of great charm and good humor who would rather hear an opponent's views than criticize his thinking. One could and did differ with President Kennedy, but one could not do so without appreciating his openminded receptiveness to differing points of view which characterizes the scholar.

John F. Kennedy, the President, had political opponents, but I cannot believe that John F. Kennedy, the man, had any enemies. Even the man who assassinated him must have had a twisted, distorted, and confused mind. He was mentally and spiritually sick. Those who fought the President and his programs in the political arena would, I believe, be the first to acknowledge his sense of fairplay and his dedication to the democratic ideals and institutions of the country he loved so well. More than any of us realize, during the days and months and years that lie ahead, all of us will miss John F. Kennedy more and more.

The dignity and courage of our late President are traits shared equally by his noble, gallant, and beautiful widow. Mrs. Kennedy's inspiring example during these trying days will remain in our memories forever. May she find some solace in the knowledge that each of us shares her bereavement and joins in her prayers.

**Mr. KEITH.** Mr. Speaker, while I realize that the constituencies of all of my colleagues deeply felt the loss of the President, his tragic death had a tremendous personal impact in my district, for—as I have noted—he was a part of it.

With this in mind, I think it would be most appropriate to include in the RECORD a sampling of the many editorials and articles which appeared in the newspapers throughout southeastern Massachusetts and Cape Cod.

The first is from the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, and was published on November 23, the day after the fatal shooting:

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The American people are in shocked disbelief that President Kennedy is dead. He was the symbol of America's vitality, a man who drove himself day and night to lead the free world through some of its most trying hours.

That was wiped out in a terror-filled moment in Dallas. A sniper's bullet proved once more that the President of the United States is not invincible even though he is the repository of more power than any other person in the world.

The assassin, somehow, thought his minuscule of discontent was greater than the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans who praised, admired, worked for and, yes, loved the President.

Tragedy had dogged Mr. Kennedy much of his life. An elder brother, Joe, was killed over France while on a special air mission during World War II. A sister, Kathleen, died in an airplane crash. It was only 3 months ago that the President's own son died, shortly after birth.

As a Harvard student, Mr. Kennedy injured his back playing football. He was badly wounded by enemy action in the South Pacific in 1943, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart. While on a Pacific island he contracted malaria, from which he suffered periodic attacks for several years.

None of these deterred John F. Kennedy.

He wrote "Profiles in Courage" in longhand in a hospital bed while recuperating from a spinal operation. His wartime injury did not prevent him from campaigning for a House seat and was not going to diminish his contributions as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts. Nor did a painful back discourage him from maintaining a rigorous schedule in the 1960 presidential campaign.

While in Canada, Mr. Kennedy injured his back once more. His pace never slackened. He was a living "profile in courage."

At this moment, Mr. Kennedy's widow and family are in their loneliest hours. Messages of condolence, letters of sympathy from around the world, and the tears of those close to the late President cannot fill the void in their lives.

Massachusetts mourns its brave native son. The Nation joins in the mourning for John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Next, Mr. Speaker, a particularly well-written tribute from the Wareham Courier of Wareham, Mass.:

### HIS LEGACY IS GREATNESS

Never before has one human being been mourned by so many throughout the world.

Never has there been such a spontaneous and universal expression of genuine grief. It became increasingly obvious that the assassin's bullet unleashed an emotional floodgate, the likes of which had never been known on this earth. It also became evident that John Fitzgerald Kennedy had achieved a stature, in a lifetime shorter than most, unparalleled in history.

Even those who, prior to the deed which plunged the world into darkness temporarily, were at the opposite political pole, or who would have denied a personal liking, suddenly discovered they harbored a steadily growing, sincere affection for this young man who wore the cloak of maximum responsibility and world leadership so gracefully. They, too, fought to hold back tears of sorrow.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy epitomized the American dream—that the Presidency is within the reach of anyone, regardless of race, creed, or color.

This young man, who was overtaken by destiny too soon, grasped the reins of Government of the greatest country in the world at a time when the greatest threat to survival faced that country. He held with a firm hand, and kept us on the road, avoiding the abyss of annihilation which faced us at every turn.

For his Americanism, for his leadership, for his timeless example of what a God-fearing man should be, we offer the words spoken regularly at the end of each of his press conferences, and which we now utter with a much deeper meaning, "Thank you, Mr. President."

For its special Thanksgiving edition, the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth, Mass., noted that while life goes on "remorselessly," and that a tragedy of timeless implications had befallen the Nation, we owe a debt of gratitude to this country's founders for a Constitution that insured the continuity of Government:

### THANKSGIVING DAY, 1963

The murder of the President and all its attendant circumstances have added up to the most harrowing public event that most of us shall ever know.

This was a tragedy of antique power, with timeless implications. Who now can doubt the workings of Providence?

Life goes on remorselessly. The darkest pall must disperse, the sun shine again. Yet Thanksgiving, 1963, cannot be like most, coming so closely as it does on the heels of this dreadful happening.

A great leap into the dark has been taken. Gone is a brave and clear-minded man, who strove with all his might to help and keep us. The bitterness of his taking lingers in the mouth and will not wash away.

Therefore, this year we must look outside our own circle for other things besides family togetherness, abundance of food, and traditional comforts to be thankful for.

Our gratitude must go to the Founding Fathers who, with great foresight, in making the Constitution insured the continuity of our Government, and with it our national life. The banner fell. But swiftly it was raised again.

We have cause for thanks, too, in the fact that our new President is a man of great experience, strong and wise enough to take over the great burdens of Chief Magistrate.

Then there is one more, final reason for thanksgiving. This is the certain knowledge, demonstrated on massive scale, that in crisis the people of America feel and react as one, and so doing draw the whole world in their train.

During the first hours after the President's death a great emptiness came on the land. But soon into the air stole intimations of a slow, sad music, the music of the people, murmuring as one. And presently the mighty and the weak, the few and the many, closed ranks, like the closing of a giant fist.

With this, quite spontaneously, affirmed by the very heart and instinct of all Americans, the President's death became felt as a kind of sacrifice, and the legacy of his hopes took on an even greater urgency than when he had lived.

For reasons inscrutable John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been reduced to dust and a cruel blow visited upon his beloved wife and children, his family and all who loved or liked him. Yet this same blow shocked all Americans into a unique awareness of their nationhood, warned them in terrible depth of responsibilities too often neglected.

This last circumstance has nothing, of course, to do with gratitude. Rather it calls, on this 1963 Thanksgiving Day, for meditation on the final meaning of this life, and a tally not of benefits, but of things worth living—and dying—for.

The famed Vineyard Gazette on Martha's Vineyard hailed the late President for his candor and for representing, as he did, "the utter routing of bigotry."

### A Memorial in the Hearts of Men

He will be forever young. His youth will live in the pages of history, and this is not a small or unimportant thing. Amid frustration and erosion of the spirit, gravity and crisis, the abundance of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's fresh spirit and optimism will supply the strength of his unforgettable example.

All else aside, he represented too the utter routing of bigotry. In candor of language and behavior, in the context of his personal and official life, it was inconceivable that he would abate in the least from his own faith, or that he would seek to impose it upon others. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews were free to support his policies, and they did; they were as free to oppose his policies, and they did.

The best memorial that can be erected to him is a larger sense of humanity in the hearts of men and women. The things that bind together are more important than the things that rend apart. What diminishes humanity for one, diminishes it for all.

The lesson has been taught for some 2,000 years, but it has not yet been completely learned. May not this tragedy, the dimensions of which are so hard to conceive, bring home again and in the new light of our times, the force of the spirit and ethic which alone can justify and fulfill our common heritage.

The base newspaper at Otis Air Force Base, where Air Force 1 made many landings, carried the following tribute from the wing commander, Col. Rudolph B. Walters:

It is difficult during this time of national sorrow to find words capable of expressing the depth of the grief felt by all persons at Otis AFB.

Each person here felt particularly close to President Kennedy, partially due, perhaps, to his frequent visits here. This tragedy has struck us a deep personal blow.

As for myself, I feel that—in addition to losing my Commander in Chief—I have lost a personal beloved friend.

Col. Rudolph B. Walters.

My predecessor in Congress, former Congressman Donald W. Nicholson, now in retirement at his home in Wareham, Mass., served in the House with the late President and counted him a personal friend. The Wareham Courier printed the following tribute from Congressman Nicholson:

It was with overwhelming shock and sadness that I heard of the untimely death of President Kennedy. I considered him a personal friend and I used to call him "Johnny." Besides his outstanding ability as a legislator for he was very much a friend and thoughtful to all, as everyone can testify.

Speaking for an area of Cape Cod that John Kennedy knew well, the Provincetown Advocate and New Beacon of Provincetown expressed the shock and remorse felt throughout the land:

[From the New Beacon, Nov. 27, 1963]

### Hail and Farewell

Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.—John F. Kennedy

"He did a great job as President." These were the words of Town Manager Walter E. Lawrence as he reflected upon the sudden and tragic death last Friday of President John F. Kennedy. "His loss is a tragedy for the country and the world," Mr. Lawrence continued. "He was a good, clean, honest, intelligent, young man, whose conduct of affairs met with the approval of his countrymen. Again, his death was indeed a tragic loss."

We echo these words. That such a man, who, in the prime of his life was leading his country ever forward, meeting the problems of the century, both foreign and domestic squarely, and solving them, had evoked nothing but praise from his fellow countrymen of both high and low station.

The late President was a friend of the people. He liked to shake their hand. When there was a problem he told them about it straight from the shoulder, and just what he intended to do about it. He was idolized and mobbed by the younger citizens wherever he went.

Also, the diplomats of the world came to know him as a tactful and resolute negotiator, who wouldn't back down, and always stood up for what he thought was right.

His life as a family man, a loved and loving father to his two children is well known. Much time was spent with Caroline and John, Jr., as much as the affairs of state would allow. Their loss is indeed great.

But to Mrs. Kennedy, the solid Jacqueline, who stayed with her husband from the time of the fatal shot, until the final taps at Arlington National Cemetery, go our heartfelt sympathies. This strong wife was forced to control her feelings and emotions, so that her husband's funeral would be a period of national solemnity, rather than hysteria. To this end she was admirable.

The cape, the State, the country, and the world has lost one of its most dynamic citizens of the 20th century. To him indeed should go the Nobel Peace Prize. As we go forward into the sixties and seventies, let us walk upon that road which he set out to travel; that road that may be paved with ruts and curves, but at its end we will find his goal, and surely our goal—peace and freedom for the whole world. This is his legacy to us. Let us use it well.

---

[From the Provincetown Advocate, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Cape End Stunned by Tragic Events—Schools, Businesses in Mourning

Even now Provincetown is quiet, drained of emotion, and still unbelieving.

The news of the assassination of President Kennedy on Friday afternoon came over television and radio minutes after it happened in Dallas, Tex., and it came to an incredulous cape end town far out in a November Atlantic.

First to feel the onslaught of the ghastly tragedy was the town telephone switchboard. Chief Operator Frances Raymond said that suddenly every line flared red, and she had to call for additional help until the force was doubled and every board position filled.

Gradually the streets of the town emptied, and cape enders sat at their radios and TV sets getting more news as soon as it was broadcast. There they stayed for most of the weekend through the tragic drama unfolding in Dallas and Washington.

As soon as reason began to return, many Provincetown people turned to their churches with questioning hearts, and they began to plan for their own mourning. Some places closed immediately and remained so through Monday, though most of the shops and offices closed for the day of the funeral. All schools, too, closed on Monday.

In all churches there were memorial services. At the Universalist Church here in Provincetown in place of the scheduled Thanksgiving message the service was devoted to John F. Kennedy as it was at the Truro Congregational Church. The Church of St. Mary of the Harbor held a memorial service Friday night and a requiem communion service on Monday noon. The Provincetown Methodist Church held a memorial service on Monday during the time of the services in Washington.

Over in Wellfleet the Methodist Church was opened on Friday night for prayers, and on Monday held a communion and prayer service at 3 p.m. The Christian Union Church in North Truro held a memorial service at 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

At the church of St. Peter the Apostle in Provincetown on Sunday night there was evening devotions and recitation of the rosary offered for President Kennedy and a requiem funeral high mass was held Monday night. In Wellfleet there was a funeral mass on Monday night at Our Lady of Lourdes Church and in Truro at the Sacred Heart Church, and at the Church of Our Lady of Perpetual Help in North Truro there were funeral masses at 8 a.m. on Monday morning. The First Church of Christ Scientist held memorial services at Orleans on Monday afternoon.

Two other fine Cape Cod newspapers published editorials that should be included in this small collection. The first, from the Cape Codder, published at Orleans, comments on the violence of the act, and the cruel irony that a man who stood for tolerance and good will was struck down by a moment of hate:

### What of Hate, Friends, What of Hate?

Why is the sense of loss so great? Why does it curl the heart with a pain that will not be quenched? We think it must be because the loss is, one and at the same time, personal and for the world of man. We grieve for our finite selves and for the infinite world. This is almost unbearable grief because we measure the loss not for ourselves alone but for man everywhere. Something in all mankind was killed by that hateful lead pellet and we all know it.

As and if we know this, there lies the hope. Perhaps—just perhaps—the incredible futility and waste of this mad act may serve to bring home the good this man worked for, a good whose essential was the eradication of violence among men and the hate that spawns violence. His death out of hate and through violence may demonstrate as nothing else could the necessity of bringing about the aims he stood for.

Let there be no mistake about this fact: The hate that killed him is the responsibility of all of us. It will not be fobbed off on the head of the madman who pulled the trigger. It is the same hate and violence that denies the brotherhood of man, that would pit brother against brother in bloodlust rather than tolerate the negotiation of honest differences of opinion between rational men. It is the mark of Cain that we all bear.

What he stood for was a great tolerance, a sense of feeling that encompassed the plight of our Negro citizens in their eminently just search for equality as well as the desperate struggle of all men for peace that would spare nuclear destruction. The great irony is that because of these things he was the object of hate when to all men of good will—and they are multitudinous, in the North and in the South, in the East and in the West—he should have been universally loved.

Now, in death, he is loved. Is it too late?
Hear the tolling bells?
Hear the muffled drums?
They toll, they beat for all of us.

The Dennis-Yarmouth Register made noteworthy comments on the late President's youth and the inspiration his youthful service has been to the young people of the country:

### Fire From a Dark Friday

By the time this is printed, volumes will have been written and spoken about the events of the past week. The Nation, under the practiced hand of President Johnson, will have ceased its trembling. The people, having purged their guilt through the mechanisms of mourning, will be composed.

In all probability there is nothing left to be said that could add to the eulogies or to the marvelous articulateness of President Kennedy himself, as passages of his speeches are played back over the radio and television and in our minds.

Nevertheless, one thought arises insistently from the fact of our President's youth. His death would have been more bearable if it had not been for that.

For we are left forever to speculate what might have been, what contribution might have come from a President of the United States, only just come to the peak of extraordinary personal ability.

This thought of youth colors another fact. The excitement aroused by this unusual President infected most deeply young people, people who will increase in places of power and influence for decades to come. His death, still so preposterous, must sooner or later come into perspective. It is the young people who must draw from it a meaning.

It was this generation which could light a fire, he said. The rifle shot extinguished one blazing figure. But could we hope it also kindled the fire of which John F. Kennedy spoke, kindled it among those best able to make it bright? Isn't that the only possible meaning?

As the Nation rearranges itself without President Kennedy, to face a world suddenly drab and tense, we should be looking beyond the shame and degradation of last week. We should look for the flame, and this time unfailingly nourish it.

The Nantucket Inquirer and Mirror tells of the impact of the President's death on that island, where he was considered a neighbor. The newspaper has characterized John Kennedy's greatness as resting in large part upon "his stature as a political idealist whose aspirations were the goals that the community at large wants ultimately to attain. The quarrels he had with his political adversaries usually concerned the timing and mechanical methods proposed to accomplish his ultimate objectives and not the ends themselves." I think all of us can agree with that statement:

### The Kennedy Tragedy

Severe shock and profound grief struck the Nation on Friday, following the assassination of President Kennedy. Good citizens here and everywhere extend deep and affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her children, to the President's parents, to his grandmother, and to his brothers and sisters.

The shooting of the President was the first of two acts of violence last week that contorted the posture of the United States as the world's outstanding society successfully based upon the rule of law. In the first one, a shot from the assassin's rifle overthrew the administration. In the second, the President's alleged assassin was himself summarily executed by one who chose to arrogate to himself the functions of the judicial process.

Had President Kennedy put less faith in the American people, it seems likely that the tragedy of his death would have been avoided. But he was apparently misled by the warmth of his Texas reception and he neglected to take advantage of measures and equipment available for his personal protection. In an unfortunate, though understandable, effort to return the friendship and good will being expressed by the people of Texas, he seems to have cast caution aside and his assassin took advantage of the opportunity thus offered.

In the light of what has happened, there should be imposed upon our Presidents a firm duty and obligation to observe security regulations prescribed for their protection by the officers placed in charge of their personal safety.

The violent, extra-legal execution of President Kennedy's alleged assassin could easily have been prevented if the local police had used ordinary care. There can be no excuse for moving the accused only at a time calculated to satisfy and accommodate representatives of the press, radio, and television. There was no reason for making a public spectacle of the accused by dragging him through a corridor filled with a milling throng of excited people.

The halls could and should have been cleared because the accused was entitled to protection. On the record he deserved no sympathy, but the State of Texas and the city and county of Dallas had a duty and an obligation to see that he was treated in accordance with the law.

The impact of President Kennedy's death has been very great here on Nantucket as it has been throughout the Commonwealth, the Nation, and the world. He was a distinguished neighbor who brought fame and prominence to the Nantucket Sound area. But more importantly, he was an admirable and attractive man because he was young, poised, cultured, handsome, articulate, magnetic, and dynamic. Possessed of all these qualities, he was a statesman who appealed to many world leaders as the one among them who might best be able to guide the world to peaceful solutions of its problems.

In his time, President Kennedy was certainly a great man, but his administration was a short one and much of his program remained unfinished when he died. Whether he has attained historical greatness only time will tell.

President Kennedy's present greatness rests in large part upon his stature as a political idealist whose aspirations were the goals that the community at large wants ultimately to attain. The quarrels he had with his political adversaries usually concerned the timing and the mechanical methods proposed to accomplish his ultimate objectives and not the ends themselves.

The simplicity of the short ceremony in and by which the administration passed to the hands of President Johnson was impressive. But much more so were the solemnity and ceremonial majesty of the return of President Kennedy's body to Washington and to the White House, its removal to the Capitol and its lying in state there in the great rotunda, the filing past by a vast throng of loving, reverent citizens to pay their humble respects, the funeral services and finally the burial itself, each of these episodes was planned and executed with dignity, discrimination and grace and together they satisfied the people of the United States that their late President was being accorded the reverence and respect that they knew the man and office ought to have.

Throughout her tragic ordeal Mrs. Kennedy maintained magnificent composure. A most attractive young woman of unusual beauty and dignity, she, with her charming children, Caroline and John, Jr., commanded tremendous admiration and sympathy from everyone.

The personal courage she so naturally and unwittingly displayed was at least equal in excellence and quality to the political courage extolled so ably in her husband's fine work "Profiles in Courage," so has amply earned the love and affection of the American people.

As its tribute to the late President, the Barnstable Patriot, which is published in Hyannis, printed a poem by Albert Epstein:

### Right Makes Might

(By Albert Epstein)

(Reprinted from the February 8 issue of the Barnstable Patriot as a tribute to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy).

I did not know where fate had cast me;
A Voice called, a Voice—There was nobody—
"Lincoln, enshrined in his memorial,
Will comfort and sustain you;"
I journeyed to his shrine.
Lincoln looked down upon me,
His eyes—the mystery of compassion,
His sad face brightened, illuminated by his gentle smile;
Serene, weighing carefully each word,
Kindness, wisdom, and understanding, faith,
Glorified his thoughts;
"Fear not.
Tyrants cannot destroy us,
Our Constitution or our Bill of Rights,
Degrade free men,
Transform them into slaves;
Our sacred boys have not died in vain.
With abiding faith in our heritage,
With humble pride in our achievements,
With eternal vigilance,
With the guidance of Almighty God,
Freedom, the Dignity of Man, will be preserved.
Convey your message to our countrymen,
Reveal it to the world,
For all men cherish Freedom.
Fear not—
Evil shall not emerge triumphant,
God wills the Brotherhood of Man."

Representative of the reaction in the South Shore area of my district, I wish to include in these proceedings a poem from the South Shore Mirror and an editorial from the Hull-Nantasket Times, as well as excerpts from a column, "How It Looks From Here," written by John Bond, editor of the Rockland Standard:

[From the Hull-Nantasket Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### WHAT WE CAN DO

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country, and, people of the world, ask not what can America do for us, but what can we do for all mankind."

The above inspired words, of course, are from the inaugural address of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

And after the shocking tragedy and almost unbelievable events of black Friday, November 22, in which the young Chief Executive was cut down in the vicious and cowardly act of a fanatical psychopath, shock waves of horror spread throughout the world, and millions who loved honor, deceny, and John F. Kennedy bowed their heads in grief and murmured prayers in their native tongues.

"What can we do, what can we do," echoed from memory of the President's inaugural words and blended in cadence with the measured tread of the marine guards removing the President's body from the plane to the ambulance, pathetically followed by his bereaved widow, and again in the beat of the military drums as the cortege proceded to the Capitol from the White House on Sunday, and to the last resting place for national heroes, the Arlington National Cemetery on Monday.

As President Kennedy's body was lowered into his grave, amidst worldwide sorrow, the answer to what we can do again came from his gallant soul and high spirit as left in his words from the inauguration: "In your hands, my fellow citizens, rather than mine will remain the future success or failure of our final course," and also from his speech prepared for delivery, but never delivered on Black Friday at Dallas:

"We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask therefore, that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of 'Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward Men.' That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For, as written long ago: 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.'"

Hatred, bigotry, racial and ethnic prejudice and warped personal rancor, greed, and spite must be made the objective of permanent correction, and its poisonous effect eliminated from all relations between men and nations.

Furthermore, experts in the fields of science, psychiatry, religion, and social welfare must merge their forces more effectively and constantly in a determined drive to reduce and eventually remove completely the basic causes which have given rise to the increasing wave of irresponsibility, immorality, and the wave of crime and violence which have erupted throughout our land.

Then truly we shall be keeping faith with the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded, and upholding the request of our martyred President by not only asking, but proving, what we can do for all mankind.

[From the South Shore Mirror, Nov. 28, 1963]

### THANKSGIVING

Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for broadminded courage.
For believing that Baptists would vote for Catholics,
For upholding constitutional religious freedom,
For friendships with Billy Graham and Cardinal Cushing,
Thank you for broadminded courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for physical courage.
For PT 109 determination,
For motorcades and quiet demonstration,
For braving chance assassination,
Thank you for physical courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for civil rights courage.
For sacrificing votes for rights of others,
For sharing a most certain Evers bullet,
For losing political life before the physical,
Thank you for civil rights courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for peace-minded courage.
For calm determination banning Cuban missiles,
For clean test ban air, the gift of treaty,
And "fear-not" drive to try negotiation,
Thank you for peace-minded courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for New Frontier courage.
For dollar concern to win foreign aid for others,
For Peace Corps youth now spread the world around,
For being a Berliner, a UN'er, a frontiersman,
Thank you for New Frontier courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.

—REV. CHARLES W. LUDEKING,
*Baptist Church.*
NORTH SCITUATE, MASS.

[From the Rockland Standard, Nov. 28, 1963]

### HOW IT LOOKS FROM HERE

Whatever you were doing between 1:30 and 2 o'clock on the afternoon of November 22, 1963, you will remember it the rest of your life. You will remember it because it was about midway of those hours that you heard the awful news that President John F. Kennedy had been shot in Dallas, Tex.

For me November 22 started like any other Friday afternoon. Shortly before 1:30 I got into my car at Scituate Harbor to drive to Marshfield for the weekly meeting of the board of selectmen at 2 p.m. As usual the car radio was on and Bruce Bradley had just commented that Saturday would mark the 60th anniversary of Enrico Caruso's debut at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City. With his usual whimsey Bruce took note of the occasion by playing a swinging number that could have been "Jumpin' at the Woodside."

Before the tune was over there was a break for a news bulletin. A tense voice announced that UPI in Dallas had flashed: "President Kennedy has been shot by a sniper—possibly fatally." A few fragmentary details followed. Then a CBS network alert confirmed what seemed too terrible to be true. The President had, indeed, been struck down by an assassin's bullet. How seriously he was hurt was not at once apparent. The grave voices of the reporters in Dallas were ominous.

Mr. Bond then described in detail the reaction he met from various townspeople—a shocked disbelief—and concluded on this fine note of tribute:

I realized as I talked to people, all of them sober faced and sad, that this young man whose loss had stunned the world, was more than a political leader of the highest magnitude. Despite deep and bitter differences that whirled about him in his office as President and leader of the free world, he had in less than 3 years at the vortex of world events won the respect and affection of many of those who politically disagreed with him. He was indeed a good man.

A few sentences from the Brockton Enterprise characterize very well the sense of personal pride that those of us from Massachusetts felt in the achievements of a beloved native son:

President Kennedy was from our State and whether or not you differed from him politically, there was that feeling of pride that a man from Massachusetts was in the White House. The President had visited Brockton before attaining the Presidency and many in our city were privileged to regard him as a friend. While campaigning for his seat in the Senate, President Kennedy made it a point to bring out that former Mayor Charles M. Hickey was a second cousin.

Men, women and citizens of all walks of life have had something to say about President Kennedy's death. We can add nothing to their eloquence. Sympathy for the Kennedy family transcends politics, transcends everything. This is a dark hour. Our hearts are heavy.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts are indeed heavy. I know that there are perhaps hundred of other articles and editorials that could be properly made a part of this RECORD. I have not attempted to pick out the best, by any means, but only a few articles that I felt would be representative of the reaction in an area that was well known to the late President—an area that was proud he considered it his home and made it the site of the vacation White House on many occasions.

Volumes have been written about this sad event and the loss to the Nation. Yet, all of us recognize that at such times words are inadequate substitutes for the deep feelings we have experienced.

Perhaps the best tribute we can pay the late President would be to, each of us, join with the Barnstable—in which town the village of Hyannis Port is located—Board of Selectmen in the resolution they have offered:

We hereby highly resolve that John F. Kennedy shall not have died in vain; that each one of us, under God, shall do everything possible to eliminate any ideas of hatred, intolerance, or revenge in our hearts to the end that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

**Mr. GALLAGHER.** Mr. Speaker, the United States, indeed the whole world, has passed, in recent days, through a long, dark, and dismal corridor. Having emerged once again into the light, we are left still in our grief and surrounded by the shrouds of mourning, grim reminder of the tragedy that haunts us—with the heritage of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

As we might expect, this is no ordinary heritage of material value, for this was no ordinary man. The heritage of John F. Kennedy is a challenge to all Americans, to men everywhere, to continue, even though he no longer leads us, the efforts to attain the goals he had set not only for himself, but for every citizen of the United States.

Few men in history are touched with greatness which, we all know, to be a combination of many talents of wisdom and courage, and of knowledge, of purpose and dedication, and of understanding and compassion. All these and more our late President possessed in abundance.

Perhaps history shall remember him best for having sought, above all else, the betterment of mankind. In perilous times and possessing power over the most awesome weapons ever created, he sought peace for the world.

In a land of plenty, he sought an equal share of our goods for all men—to aid the aged, to care for the ill, to educate the illiterate, to assist the underprivileged, to guarantee the constitutional rights of every citizen.

He promised to get America moving again. Maybe we just seemed to have stopped but many people here and abroad thought we did. Both friend and foe wondered whether our forward motion had ceased. Many questioned the future of our Nation and the system which made it great. They wondered whether the great changes taking place throughout the world foredoomed a free, competitive society. They wondered whether communism was not truly the wave of the future. They wondered if we were not too well off to protect ourselves, to liberal to fight, too tired to care. They pondered and then equated the Rise and Fall of Rome with the history of the United States. They felt that America would lose its freedom by default.

The inauguration of John F. Kennedy as President changed all this. Not only was America moving, but the spirit of our Nation thrust ahead. We had a new President, a new leader who instilled vitality, confidence, and faith in our Nation and our system. He demonstrated with great clarity that the United States of America as a Nation was still in its early ascendency.

He looked upon communism, not as an ogre too fearsome to behold but as something that contained within itself the seeds of its own destruction and that what was needed most was time and patience and strength. For he believed that the answer to communism rested not with the Communists but within ourselves provided we had faith in ourselves.

John F. Kennedy's time ran out all too soon, but the legacy he left America was faith, confidence, and a renewed belief in ourselves. The legacy he left the world was a future for freedom.

**Mr. ASHMORE.** Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the ranks of those patriots whose lives have been spent that others might live to enjoy the fruits of their battles. It is a most tragic and unfortunate fact that death is often the sacrifice of those who would promote a better life. All Americans must admire and respect him for his untiring energy, great ability and sincere devotion to what he believed to be his patriotic duty. He unselfishly dedicated himself to public service.

While he served as Chief Executive of our Nation he manifested strong convictions and sincere leadership, not only for America but the entire free world. His assassination is one of the greatest tragedies of this century. Both friend and foe were stunned with the unbelievable announcement that our President had been shot. Grief, sorrow, and sympathy immediately descended upon the civilized world.

We will long remember President Kennedy's contagious smile, sparkling humor, bright eyes, spontaneous gestures and aggressive leadership. This intellectually powerful young man showed tremendous courage both in war and in peace. His action in the face of the enemy on the field of battle stamped him as a wartime hero. But I am convinced that his highest ambition was to go down in history as the President who did most to bring lasting peace to all mankind.

**Mr. MATSUNAGA.** Mr. Speaker, the horror of the incredible tragedy which recently enveloped the Nation—and the world—still hangs over our head as an inenarrable pall. The senseless assassination of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy ended the career of a young, vigorous American in the prime of his life. The youngest man ever to be elected President of the United States, he had dedicated his life to serving his fellow beings unswervingly, unselfishly, unstintingly, with the highest code of morals and ethics as his guide.

As President, he reiterated again and again to the heads of other nations and to the peoples of the world the sincerity of our country in its desire to be their friend, to help them in their troubles, and to give them the assurance of assistance in friendship, whenever they felt the need.

From the days of his wartime service as a young naval officer on a PT boat, he had offered his complete time, service, and devotion to his country and his fellow men. He added in large measure to the dream of mankind—the attainment of the brotherhood of men in a world of peace.

He was mankind's man, a champion of the poor and lowly and of the rich and exalted, and though he walked with kings he never lost the common touch.

John F. Kennedy was the finest product of American democracy. He was a President in the truest of American traditions. Possessed of great intelligence and rare courage, he gave eloquent voice and meaningful action to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind. His deeds and spoken words will forever serve as an inspiration to men of good will everywhere in striving to reach greater heights.

To honor his memory let us heed his many words of wisdom, among them these:

> With a good conscience our only reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

**Mr. ROYBAL.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with millions of my fellow Americans and countless millions of people through the world in paying final loving tribute to the memory of our martyred 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is still almost impossible to believe that John Kennedy, that young dynamic, vibrant, and courageously statesmanlike champion of peace, is no longer with us—but has fallen before the merciless bullet of an assassin—now, to rest forever among the country's greatest heroes in the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery.

He was the living, surging, moving, thinking, doing embodiment of democracy.

With his compassion, his courage and his creative genius were blended a warm and good humor—a sparkling wit, a love for his fellow human beings.

The stirring words he spoke, the high causes he represented, and the bold actions he took during the short years he was permitted to spend among us, will live on to renew our own faith, and the faith of future generations of Americans, that the democratic heritage we treasure can be as meaningful and effective in the space age as it was in the early years of the Republic.

President Kennedy himself had said it:

> The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And John Kennedy spoke to all men in tragically prophetic words when he expressed the secret of America's great past, as well as the key to its bright future:

> We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival, and the success of liberty.

Now John Kennedy, himself, has paid that ultimate price, he has sacrificed his life to assure the survival of the ideals of freedom and liberty that give meaning to America.

On November 22, he passed the torch on to us, the living, to continue the struggle in which he gave the last full measure of his devotion.

And then we remember the words of his magnificent inaugural address:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

### VITALITY AND PROMISE

In future years, President Kennedy will be remembered for the vitality and brilliant promise he brought to the task of governing a democracy.

He will be remembered for the great search for peace he carried on in an age and in a world threatened with nuclear destruction.

Who can forget his words to the Congress in reporting on negotiations that ultimately led to the signing of the historic nuclear test ban treaty?

> A journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step. My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

### REASON, STRENGTH, AND COMPASSION

In international affairs, John Kennedy represented a force for reason, for strength, and for compassion. He sought to make the world safe for diversity, in a world that put a premium on conformity.

He will be remembered for new and imaginative efforts to achieve the goals of peace and prosperity around the globe. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and the food for peace program, all bear the mark of his untiring work.

### A YOUNG COUNTRY

Domestically, President Kennedy visualized his Nation as a young country striving to realize its full potential and secure for all its citizens the blessings of the great promise of America.

With a tremendous drive and determination he promoted the cause of equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color or national origins.

He moved on many fronts to stimulate our lagging national economic growth rate to provide the training and the jobs necessary for full employment in an age of rapid technological change.

### PERSONAL COMMITMENT

His program exemplified his deep personal commitment to free all Americans from poverty, from ignorance, from slums, from financial disaster in their older years, from the terror of mental illness and the gray confinement of retardation, from humiliating discrimination, from the chaotic backwash of automation.

While greatly expanding our military defense capability, he launched the country into the space age with characteristic vigor and with a characteristic goal of world leadership.

### EDUCATION: THE KEY

Realizing that the ultimate success of the American democratic experiment depended on the quality of its citizens, President Kennedy advocated major new programs designed to assure that American education from the first grades on through advanced graduate work would be second to none.

### A DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY OF ART

And he and his lovely wife Jacqueline have served as a constant encouragement to the arts as an essential civilizing influence in our national life.

Just a few months ago he expressed what was his own democratic philosophy of the arts:

> Art establishes the basic human truths which must serve as the touchstones of our judgment. The artist becomes the last champion of the individual mind and sensibility against an intrusive society and an officious state. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, society must set the artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him.

### THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA

I do not believe I have heard more fitting nor more deeply moving tributes to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than those delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday, November 24, 1963.

Let us, therefore, recall those eloquent statements at this time:

### Senator Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader of the Senate—"She Took a Ring From Her Finger"

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

---

### Chief Justice Earl Warren—"The World Is Poorer"

There are few events in our national life that unite Americans and so touch the heart of all of us as the passing of a President of the United States.

There is nothing that adds shock to our sadness as the assassination of our leader, chosen as he is to embody the ideals of our people, the faith we have in our institutions, and our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Such misfortunes have befallen the Nation on other occasions, but never more shockingly than 2 days ago.

We are saddened; we are stunned; we are perplexed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a great and good President, the friend of all men of good will, a believer in the dignity and equality of all human beings, a fighter for justice, an apostle of peace, has been snatched from our midst by the bullet of an assassin.

What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.

What a price we pay for this fanaticism.

It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event.

If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

Our Nation is bereaved. The whole world is poorer because of his loss. But we can all be better Americans because John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed our way, because he has been our chosen leader at a time in history when his character, his vision, and his quiet courage have enabled him to chart for us a safe course through the shoals of treacherous seas that encompass the world.

And now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, may he rest in peace.

---

### Representative John McCormack, Speaker of the House—"Faith, Bravery, Humanity"

As we gather here today bowed in grief, the heartfelt sympathy of Members of the Congress and of our people are extended to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and their loved ones. Their deep grief is also self-shared by countless millions of persons throughout the world, considered a personal tragedy, as if one had lost a loved member of his own immediate family.

Any citizen of our beloved country who looks back over its history cannot fail to see that we have been blessed with God's favor beyond most other peoples. At each great crisis in our history we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it. In our earliest days, when our strength and wealth were so limited and our problems so great, Washington and Jefferson appeared to lead our people. Two generations later, when our country was torn in two by a fratricidal war, Abraham Lincoln appeared from the mass of the people as a leader able to reunite the Nation.

In more recent times, in the critical days of the depression and the Great War forced upon us by Fascist aggression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, later Harry S. Truman appeared on the scene to reorganize the country and lead its revived citizens to victory. Finally, only recently, when the cold war was building up the supreme crisis of a threatened nuclear war capable of destroying everything—and everybody—that our predecessors had so carefully built, and which a liberty-loving world wanted, once again a strong and courageous man appeared ready to lead us.

No country need despair so long as God, in His infinite goodness, continues to provide the Nation with leaders able to guide it through the successive crises which seem to be the inevitable fate of any great nation.

Surely no country ever faced more gigantic problems than ours in the last few years, and surely no country could have obtained a more able leader in a time of such crisis. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed all the qualities of greatness. He had deep faith, complete confidence, human sympathy, and broad vision which recognized the true values of freedom, equality, and the brotherhood which have always been the marks of the American political dreams.

He had the bravery and a sense of personal duty which made him willing to face up to the great task of being President in these trying times. He had the warmth and the sense of humanity which made the burden of the task bearable for himself and for his associates, and which made all kinds of diverse peoples and races eager to be associated with him in his task. He had the tenacity and determination to carry each stage of his great work through to its successful conclusion.

Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural, but as the first bitter pangs of our incredulous grief begins to pass we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place among the great figures of world history.

While this is an occasion of deep sorrow it should be also one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and a future world of peace.

### A TIME TO BUILD

During the funeral service for John Kennedy, Bishop Philip Hannan quoted one of the President's favorite passages from scripture:

> There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to uproot the plant; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to tear down and a time to build.

The greatest memorial which we can create for President Kennedy is to see that this is a time to heal—and a time to build.

### THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS: A BEACON LIGHT

President Kennedy's inspiring and eloquent inaugural address, delivered from the east front of the Capitol to an anxiously awaiting world on that cold but clear January day of 1961, will always remind me of the true greatness of this courageous American statesman.

His words will be etched forever in the proud annals of our country's history, so that in times of trial and difficulty we may return to them again for strength and light and direction:

> We observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.
>
> The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.
>
> We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.
>
> Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay in price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.
>
> This much we pledge—and more.
>
> To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.
>
> To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.
>
> To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.
>
> ---
>
> To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.
>
> To the world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.
>
> Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.
>
> We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed. But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.
>
> ---
>
> So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.
>
> Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.
>
> Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.
>
> Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.
>
> Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens (and) let the oppressed go free."
>
> And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.
>
> ---
>
> All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.
>
> ---
>
> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.
>
> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.
>
> Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?
>
> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.
>
> ---
>
> And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.
>
> My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.
>
> Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

### MEDAL OF FREEDOM

The new President, Lyndon Johnson, expressed America's deep respect for the memory of our departed leader when he announced the award to John Kennedy of the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

In making his announcement, President Johnson said:

> Each of us will know that we are the lesser for his death, but each is somehow larger because he lived. As a simple gesture, but one which I know he would not have counted small, it is my privilege at this moment to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to John Fitzgerald Kennedy on behalf of the great Republic for which he lived and died.

President Kennedy's citation reads as follows:

> John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, soldier, scholar, statesman, defender of freedom, pioneer for peace, author of hope—combining courage with reason, and combating hate with compassion, he led the land he loved toward new frontiers of opportunity for all men and peace for all time. Beloved in life of selfless service, mourned by all in a death of senseless crime, the energy, faith, and devotion which he brought to his extraordinarily successful though tragically brief endeavors will hereafter "light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

### A SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

As he did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, so he would not have us shrink from carrying on his work beyond this hour of national tragedy.

In this spirit, therefore, let us face the future with confidence, and, with President Lyndon Johnson, resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the mayor and city council of Vestavia Hills, Ala., has adopted a resolution of condolence on the untimely death of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and a resolution commending our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for the courage and understanding with which he has assumed his new duties as President of the United States.

I include the resolutions, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

Whereas an assassin did take the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, on November 22, 1963, at Dallas, Tex.; and

Whereas the citizens of Vestavia Hills, Ala., join with their fellow Americans in mourning the assassination of our President, and deploring the godless philosophy which caused his murder; and

Whereas the citizens of our community desire to express their most sincere condolences, prayers for surcease from sorrow and wishes for the future welfare and happiness of the bereaved widow and children of the President: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled,* That we join in silent prayer to God for our departed President and, that we do, by this resolution, express our personal sorrow and deep sense of loss to the bereaved family of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the official minutes of the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and the original be sent to the widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

Unanimously adopted in regular session this 2d day of December 1963.

ROBERT M. GUILLAT, *Mayor.*

Attest:

HENRY G. GALLIMORE,
*City Clerk.*

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION

Whereas the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson did enter upon the high office of President of the United States of America under most tragic and trying circumstances, viz, the murder of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy by an assassin; and

Whereas the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, in assuming the duties of the office of President of our beloved Nation, conducted himself at all times with good taste, with Christian consideration of the sensibilities of those bereaved, with courage and understanding of his duties and the needs and requirements of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled,* That we express for ourselves and on behalf of the citizens of our community our grateful appreciation to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson for the tone of his words and decisiveness of his actions during those trying days, and that we pray to Almighty God for divine guidance to our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in the difficult days that lie ahead.

Unanimously adopted this 2d day of December 1963.

ROBERT M. GUILLAT, *Mayor.*

Attest:

HENRY G. GALLIMORE,
*City Clerk.*

## PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will kindly inform me of the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. There will be no legislative business the balance of the week. The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day and there are three bills:

H.R. 8929, transit development plan for the District of Columbia.

S. 1533, amending the D.C. Transit System Franchise Act.

S. 2054, unclaimed moneys held in trust by the District of Columbia.

We will have a conference report on H.R. 7885, Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, and a conference report on H.R. 6518, Clean Air Act.

We will also take up H.R. 7457, representation of indigent defendants, with an open rule and 2 hours debate.

Wednesday and the balance of the week. Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. We will consider H.R. 8720, amendments of Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and S. 254, providing for acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations that other conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to inquire of the majority leader: "Is there to be a Saturday session?" I have been reading in the newspapers that there is to be a Saturday session.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, the leadership has been advised that objection would be made if request were made to go over any day this week. So the answer to the gentleman is "Yes."

Mr. GROSS. And there is no business scheduled for Saturday?

Mr. ALBERT. There is no business scheduled for either tomorrow or Saturday.

Mr. GROSS. And this will be the first Saturday session this year, in this session of Congress. Is that true?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is correct.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. THOMAS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1111. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards;

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land.

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; and

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1410. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on uneconomical procurement of electronic equipment under contract AF 01(601)-31042 with Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, Long Island, N.Y., by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1411. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary procurement of office furniture for use in the Pentagon, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1412. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overprocurement of selected accessories for jet aircraft engines by the military services, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1413. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1414. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend chapter 153 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

**Mr. JONES of Missouri:** Committee on House Administration. H.R. 8465. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to organize and microfilm the papers of Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress"; without amendment (Rept. No. 997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. JONES of Missouri:** Committee on House Administration. H.R. 9036. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; 40 U.S.C. 193(n)-(w)), as amended, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; with amendment (Rept. No. 998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. MILLER of California:** Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 9334. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; without amendment (Rept. No. 999). Referred to the House Calendar.

**Mr. McMILLAN:** Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. McMILLAN:** Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. WILLIAMS:** Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1153. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:** Committee of conference. H.R. 6518. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; without amendment (Rept. No. 1003). Ordered to be printed.

**Mr. THOMAS:** Committee of conference. H.R. 8747. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; without amendment (Rept. No. 1004). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9362. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers designated to act as President in the event of a vacancy in that office a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9363. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9364. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 9365. A bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid and loans in order to assist the several States to construct facilities for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9366. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9367. A bill to designate the Peace Corps as the "John F. Kennedy Peace Corps"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 843. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 844. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.J. Res. 845. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 846. Joint resolution establishing a section to be known as the Shevchenko Freedom Library in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Res. 580. Resolution favoring the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9368. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9369. A bill for the relief of James F. Moore; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 9370. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Soos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9371. A bill for the relief of Benjamin H. Seals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9372. A bill to remove a cloud on the title of certain property owned by Wilmer Allers and Jane B. Allers, both of Malin, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9373. A bill for the relief of Ram Johl Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

478. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Joseph M. Bindas, city clerk, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to commemorating the memory of President John F. Kennedy and offering sympathy to the family of the late beloved President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

479. Also, petition of Diosdado G. Avecilla, president, United Filipino Council of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to expressing condolences and sympathy to the wife, children, and family of our great President, John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

480. Also, petition of Frente Democratica de Aracatuba, Aracatuba-Estado de São Paulo, Brazil, relative to transmitting a message of sympathy relating to the death of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

481. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation naming the area near Valley Forge, "Valley Forge-Kennedy National Park"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

482. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to ask the Chief Justice Warren investigators of President Kennedy's assassination to check upon anti-Catholicism, if any, of the President's assassin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

483. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., that the Congressional Medal of Honor also be given to Mrs. John F. Kennedy as suggested in petition No. 475 calling for the award to the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

484. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to cause the deans of all the law schools in the United States to meet biennially in "Kennedy conclave" and make recommendations relating to omissions and defects in Federal laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

485. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to ask certain questions of the investigation being conducted by Chief Justice Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

486. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the drafting of legislation in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

487. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., that the House Committee on Un-American Activities hold a full probe and investigation of the laxity of the Secret Service and the FBI in Dallas relating to the death of President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Rules.

# SENATE

## Thursday, December 5, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity, and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength: In the midst of the pressures of another day, as Thy servants here face its vast concerns, we pause with bowed heads and hearts at this shrine of our spirits.

Without Thee, even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves—once verdant and bright—now brown and crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Above all else, we pray Thee to save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to become cynical and to be men of a faith that has faded. Join us in kinship to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God, in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror.

In this faith, steel our hearts to march breast forward toward the clean world our hands can make as we labor together with Thee.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
*Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 179)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of July 1 through December 31, 1962.

This report reveals the significant accomplishments that are beginning to flow from our broadly based space effort. In cooperation with other agencies and through its own increasing competence, NASA is making a major contribution to a maturing national space program.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *December 5, 1963.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Fallon, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Jones of Alabama, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Baldwin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards;

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land;

H.R. 2906. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part of the emergency transportation of any accidentally wrecked or disabled motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; and

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the session of the Senate today, it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

William Jack Howard, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Cecil M. Childre, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President;

Gen. James Francis Collins, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list; and

Lt. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Charles H. Tenney is one of our most distinguished citizens, and I find great honor in the fact that his nomination to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York is about to be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications from foreign governments concerning the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," for fiscal year 1964 had been apportioned a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Export Control, covering the third quarter of 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### REPORT ON MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), for the year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL PROCUREMENT OF ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT UNDER CONTRACT WITH GRUMMAN AIRCRAFT ENGINEERING CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical procurement of electronic equipment under contract AF 01(601)-31042 with Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, Long Island, N.Y, Department of the Air Force, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### REPORT ON UNNECESSARY PROCUREMENT OF OFFICE FURNITURE FOR USE IN THE PENTAGON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary procurement of office furniture for use in the Pentagon, Department of the Air Force, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### REPORT ON OVERPROCUREMENT OF SELECTED ACCESSORIES FOR JET AIRCRAFT ENGINES BY THE MILITARY SERVICES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overprocurement of selected accessories for jet aircraft engines by the military services, Department of Defense, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### REPORT ON PROPOSED MOVE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICE FROM DALLAS TO WACO, TEX.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the proposed move of the Veterans' Administration regional office from Dallas to Waco, Tex., dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 153, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS BY CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 153 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs (Rept. No. 744).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1466. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies (Rept. No. 745).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 746).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 747).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2362. A bill for the relief of Marija Matijevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2363. A bill to incorporate the Air Museum; and

S. 2364. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2365. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2366. A bill to amend the acts of July 1, 1944, and February 28, 1948, to provide that the Chief Medical Officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall have the title of Assistant Surgeon General; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

## TO AUTHORIZE A STUDY OF THE LAW OF SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 231); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a comprehensive study and investigation of section 19 of title 3 of the United States Code, relating to the law of succession to the Presidency, devoting particular attention to whether such provision of law adequately serves the purpose for which it was enacted.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from the date on which this resolution is agreed to through June 30, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1964.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN STATUTES RELATING TO FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES UNDER THE NAVIGATION LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2365) to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, D.C., November 15, 1963.*

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill, to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws.

The proposed legislation would repeal certain statutes prohibiting the charging or collection of fees for certain services rendered to vessel owners by the Bureau of Customs. It would further repeal fees presently fixed by statute for other services rendered by the Bureau of Customs to vessel interests and thus permit the Secretary of the Treasury, under general authority, to fix fees to be collected upon the rendering of any of these services.

The services for which a fee may or may not now be charged are more specifically set forth in a memorandum accompanying this letter.

Similar legislation was submitted by the Department to the 87th Congress and introduced as S. 1886. However, the present proposal has been revised to eliminate provisions which would have repealed prohibitions relating to the collection of fees for services under the vessel inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the draft bill transmitted herewith before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the draft bill.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

### ANALYSIS

The proposed legislation would repeal the statutory provisions against the charging and collection of fees by collectors or other officers of customs for any of the following services:

Measurement of tonnage and certifying same; issuance of a license or granting of a certificate of registry, record, or enrollment; endorsement of change of master; certifying and receiving manifest, including master's oath and permit; granting permit to vessels licensed for the fisheries to touch and trade; payment of entry and clearance fees for vessels engaged in the foreign and coasting trade on the northern, northeastern, and northwestern frontiers; payment of clearance fees for vessels making daily trips between any port in the United States and any port in the Dominion of Canada wholly upon interior waters; granting certificate of payment of tonnage dues; recording bill of sale, mortgage, hypothecation, or conveyance, or the discharge of mortgage or hypothecation; furnishing certificate of title; furnishing a crew list; certificate of protection to seamen; bill of health.

In addition it would abolish certain fees which are prescribed by statute for entry and clearance of vessels, post entry, granting permits to proceed, receiving manifest, change of name of vessel, recording bills of sale, mortgages, hypothecations or other instruments, issuing certificates of ownership and issuing abstracts of title.

The repeal or amendment of these statutes is necessary in order that the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion set fee under the provisions of section 501 of the act of August 31, 1951 (5 U.S.C. 140).

It is contemplated that, in those regulations, fees will be established for, but not necessarily limited to, admeasurement of vessels, registry of vessels, issuance of enrollments and licenses, or licenses, renewals of licenses, issuance of special certificates to vessels, authorization for changes of names of vessels, furnishing and recording abstracts of title of vessels, recording of evidence of title to, and encumbrances upon, vessels and the discharge of the latter, entry and clearance of vessels, furnishing certificates of ownership of vessels, furnishing copies of documents, records, or other papers filed in offices of collectors of customs or in the Bureau of Customs, and certifying such copies. There is attached a schedule of proposed fees to be charged for each of the above services. The fees contained in the proposed schedule are based upon the amount of time the average service consumes plus an allowance for overhead cost.

It is also contemplated that, in addition to any fees which may be established in those regulations, there will also be prescribed therein charges for services performed by customs officers at places other than their official stations, as, for example, admeasuring or readmeasuring vessels at such places, entering or clearing vessels at points which are not ports of entry, furnishing customs supervision over vessels at such points, and the like. It is anticipated that any such charge will reimburse the Government for the compensation of the customs officer concerned while absent from his official station as well as any other expense incurred by the Government in connection with the service rendered.

Certain obsolete portions of section 4382 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (United States Code, 1958 ed., title 46, sec. 330), section 4383 of the Revised Statutes (United States Code, 1958 ed., title 46, sec. 333), and the act of June 19, 1886 (United States Code, 1958 ed., title 46, sec. 331), have been included in the comparative type although it is probable that they have been repealed by implication or at least superseded. They are the 16th, 18th, 24th, and 25th items of Revised Statute 4382; the reference to naval officer in Revised Statute 4383; and the last sentence of the act of June 19, 1886.

## DESIGNATION OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS AS ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Medical Director of the Federal prison system, an officer of the U.S. Public Health Service, directs the medical services provided to a daily average of nearly 24,000 Federal prisoners. These services have grown in scope over the years and the responsibilities have particularly increased with the enactment of legislation in 1958 which authorizes offenders to be committed to Bureau of Prisons institutions for observation and recommendation as to sentencing. Typically these cases involve problems of mental competency, physical handicap, or sexual aberration.

The medical center for Federal prisoners is located in my home State of Missouri, and I am familiar with the problems of the doctors and psychiatrists in Federal institutions from my own frequent visits to the medical center and to other Federal prisons. The diagnostic and mental competency procedures require high-caliber personnel to make the necessary studies and prepare recommendations which are meaningful and which the courts can use in determining the ultimate disposition of each case. As it now stands, the task of securing doctors, particularly psychiatrists, who are qualified to carry out these responsibilities is extremely difficult, and to retain them is virtually impossible.

The head of the medical service of the Bureau of Prisons is charged with directing every phase of the medical program, including the selection, training, development, and performance of the medical, dental, and psychiatric staff—consisting of more than 100 commissioned officers, 200 technicians, and a large staff of consultants. He is also guiding the planning of the new psychiatric hospital just entering into construction. But despite the scope of these responsibilities he has no higher Public Health Service grade and receives no larger salary than a dozen of the medical and dental officers stationed at various Federal prisons.

On the basis of his duties and responsibilities I believe that the Medical Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons should have the grade of Assistant Surgeon General. This would be commensurate with his value and contribution and the additional stature would make the medical service of the Bureau of Prisons much more attractive to the doctors, dentists, and psychiatrists that the Bureau is now trying to recruit and retain.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would authorize the grade of Assistant Surgeon General for the Medical Director of the Federal Prison System.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2366) to amend the acts of July 1, 1944, and February 28, 1948, to provide that the Chief Medical Officer of the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall have the title of Assistant Surgeon General, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 341)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC WORKS AID FOR CITIES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 342)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments to S. 1856, a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] which would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The first of my amendments would allow any appropriations made as a result of further authorization to remain available until expended, thus providing for sounder planning in the disbursement of funds and greater certainty on the part of local communities in the formulation of their capital improvement programs under the act.

The other amendment is intended to correct a glaring inequity that existed in the original $900 million accelerated public works program enacted by Congress last year.

I want to say that the basic act was a vitally needed and extremely valuable program. It triggered the construction of a host of essential public works—from sewers and libraries to beach erosion projects—and provided much needed job opportunities in areas where unemployment has been substantial.

New Jersey itself especially benefited from the program, having been allocated more than $40 million, as a result of extensive advance planning on the part of our local communities and farsighted leadership and effort on the part of Governor Hughes and other State officials.

Nevertheless, for technical reasons, many areas in New Jersey and throughout the Nation—areas suffering acute problems of severe hard-core unemployment—were denied the opportunity to receive desperately needed assistance under the program to help them cope with the unemployment problem.

In fact, of the 150 major labor market areas in the country, only 35 of them were eligible for aid as of July of this year.

The problem arose because the high unemployment rates of many of the larger cities were lumped with the lower unemployment rates in the more prosperous surrounding counties and suburban communities, and the average thus fell below the 6 percent unemployment rate required to benefit under the act.

Funds have been exhausted under the original authorization, but Congress is now considering legislation to provide up to an additional $1.5 billion for needed public works projects.

I have introduced this amendment because I cannot stand by while additional funds are made available and watch the denial of vitally needed assistance to cities in New Jersey and other States where tens of thousands of people are unemployed and vainly seeking work.

My amendment would make municipalities with exceptionally high rates of hard-core unemployment eligible for aid if the unemployment rate for the larger metropolitan area is at least 5 percent. At present, it is fair to say that eligibility hinges on having an unemployment rate of 6 percent.

I would like to note that my amendment would not make the entire metropolitan area eligible for aid, since many portions of them may be quite prosperous and well able to provide public improvements on their own. It would make eligible only those portions of the labor market area with severe hard-core problems at least as great as the rate of unemployment in other areas now presently eligible under the act.

This amendment is designed as a rifle shot to hit those critical areas of high unemployment that exist in many of our older cities with large numbers of Negroes who suffer an unemployment rate twice as high as the national average, and with large numbers of unskilled workers, minority groups, and undereducated workers who are confronted with truly desperate difficulty in finding jobs in an increasingly technical and automated society.

I might add that if we are to have any genuine hope of finding a satisfactory solution to the problem of job discrimination, we simply have to expand the opportunities for employment for all, so that men need not take out their job frustrations on others because of the color of their skin.

According to statistics as of July of this year, my amendment would extend eligibility to the hard-core unemployment areas of 19 major labor market areas throughout the Nation, 3 of them in New Jersey—the Newark area which embraces Essex, Union, and Morris counties, the New Brunswick-Perth Amboy area, and the Paterson-Clifton-Passaic area.

The other areas are as follows: Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.; San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Waterbury, Conn.; Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind.; Terre Haute, Ind.; New Orleans, La.; Worcester, Mass.; Kansas City, Mo.; New York, N.Y.; Utica-Rome, N.Y.; Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.; El Paso, Tex.; Spokane, Wash.; and Takoma, Wash.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope the committee now studying this basic legislation and the need for further authorization will give favorable consideration to this amendment and end the omission of so many cities where the greatest numbers of unemployed are to be found, and where the need for new capital improvements are vitally needed if these cities are to continue to serve their indispensable functions in this Nation.

Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by Senators YARBOROUGH, RIBICOFF, BAYH, HARTKE, KEATING, and LONG of Missouri.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2249) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TEST OF KREBIOZEN BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 101) authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000, which I introduced, together with other Senators, on July 18, 1963, and that his name may be printed at the time of the next printing of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of November 26, 1963:

S. 2333. A bill to redesignate the Peace Corps as the Kennedy Corps: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. FONG, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Authority of November 27, 1963:

S. 2347. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission: Mr. BAYH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. FONG, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 5, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1243. An act to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; and

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

## HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the very sad duty of announcing to the Senate the death of former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of which I have just learned. Senator Lehman served in this body from November 1949 to January 1951; and in 1950 he was reelected for the term ending January 3, 1957. At that time he retired, and I had the honor of taking the seat he vacated, following his determination not to seek reelection.

I think it fair to say that Mr. Lehman, as Governor, Senator, and a leading citizen of the State of New York, was one of the most distinguished New Yorkers, not only in his own time, but in the history of our State.

His good works on behalf of the State are fully recorded in the press and the history of his time. During his service in the Senate, he was one of the most beloved Members and one of the most stalwart, outspoken, and high-minded liberals ever to serve in this body. Even though he was a man of wealth and position, he always espoused the cause of those most disadvantaged economically and socially. He was an ardent fighter for the welfare of labor; he was an ardent protector of the natural resources of the people of the State of New York and of the people of the United States.

Even when he returned to private life, following his very great labors as Governor and Senator, he became—notwithstanding his then advanced years—one of the most distinguished leaders in philanthropies that our city has ever known. He undertook with considerable spirit a political reform movement in the very twilight of his life, in order to measure up to the high standards of public service which he had set for himself.

On another occasion, I shall hope to state for the record more of the details of the life of this very famous, very fine, highly patriotic, and most distinguished American, my fellow New Yorker. But today I wish to record my deep sympathy for Mrs. Lehman and the family, all of whom I know very well, and my sympathy for the very great number of causes which, for the moment, following the passing of Governor and Senator Lehman, have been left without a leader.

I know that others will step into his shoes; that is typical of these movements in our State. But for the moment, their grief must be very great, as is mine; and I mourn, along with all others who knew him or knew of him by reputation, the passing, after such a rich, fruitful, and outstanding life, of Gov. Herbert Lehman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the death of former Governor, former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, is a tragic loss to the State of New York and to the entire Nation. He was a towering figure, who rose above political strife to stand as a statesman and leader before the world.

Senator Lehman was a spokesman for all the people. His deep and continuing concern was for human rights and human dignity. He worked unceasingly for the economic and social betterment of the less fortunate. He was a leader in the struggle for civil rights legislation in Washington. In New York he laid the groundwork for policies of respect and equal treatment to all citizens regardless of race, color, or creed.

Senator Lehman fought for clean and honest government, so that the ideals of representative government would not be tarnished or abused by others who did not share his confidence in or respect for the validity of our system of government. All New Yorkers were proud of his example.

Senator Lehman's life was one of public service and dedication to the highest principles of free and responsible statesmanship.

New York is a better State because he governed it.

There will be sorrow at his passing, of course, but it will be tempered by the knowledge that the people of his State recognized his outstanding ability and used it in the fullest way they could.

He died full of years and honors. He died still remembered, still loved. He died a great New Yorker.

I join my colleague in expressing to Mrs. Lehman and to his devoted family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished Senators from the State of New York in expressing my deep sorrow in the passing of our former colleague, Herbert H. Lehman, who served so capably and with such distinction in this body.

His contributions to the welfare of the Nation as a whole were many and varied. He was the Director of UNRRA for many months in the postwar period. He served with distinction as Governor of the State of New York. He graced this body with his energy, ability, and integrity.

It was a distinct loss to many of us to note Senator Lehman's desire not to run again for reelection to the Senate, but he had served honorably and well into the twilight of his years. We missed him when he left us. We miss him more deeply now.

On behalf of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, I wish to extend our deepest sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Lehman and her family in her hour of trial and travail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I first came to know Governor Lehman when he was Administrator of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I had occasion to make a rather extensive trip abroad to survey the work of Federal agencies, and I gave particular attention to that Administration. When I made a report to the House, there were some statements in the report to which Governor Lehman took exception. But he did a most gracious thing. He came to my office and for hours we discussed the subject, because he had an intimate knowledge of his agency and its operations everywhere in the world.

In all my lifetime I doubt that I have ever encountered any person who had a higher sense of dedication to human causes than had Herbert Lehman. That was a consistent trait in his whole scheme of life. He will be remembered for his many contributions to humanity and for his dedicated work.

I share the spirit of condolence, and hope that our condolences will be conveyed to Mrs. Lehman and her fine family.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, another mighty figure moves into the imperishable pages of history in the passing of Herbert H. Lehman whom we knew as a colleague and valued as a friend.

A man who loved the citadel of home and family, nevertheless, he accepted the challenges of public service as a duty. He had the mind of a statesman, the heart of a humanitarian. His helping hand was always given with sincerity and simplicity. He made an impress on his times—a lasting influence on whatever the future may have in store for our country and the world.

There are many facets of the life of service Herbert Lehman rendered to his fellow man but, like a diamond that only changes its settings, its brilliance and worth were unchanged.

The ancient cause of his people gained a new freshness from his dedication and devotion. The heritage of his people Herbert Lehman shared with all people. He lived by and in the traditions of his beginnings and in the fulfillment of his conscience and his character as an America both of nobility and humility.

He wanted America never to lose her glory as the hope of the world and he worked to preserve this land as a bulwark of liberty, opportunity, and peace.

It was a privilege to have toiled here by his side—it was a pleasure through the years to witness the honors heaped upon him by those who knew him best—and now to those who loved him best—to the family of Herbert Lehman—his near ones and dear ones goes our deepest, heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a great American died today. He was Herbert H. Lehman, of New York. Mr. Lehman had probably the most distinguished and noble career of any Member who has ever served in this body.

He was Lieutenant Governor of New York from 1928 to 1932, when Franklin Roosevelt was Governor, and carried on much of the administrative work of the Governor's office. Mr. Lehman was Governor of New York from 1932 to 1942, serving 10 years. Only one Governor in the history of New York served for a longer period of time.

Upon his retirement as Governor of New York, Mr. Lehman became director general of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, serving without pay for 7 years, and devoting himself to the care and relief of the tens of millions of refugees who were displaced by the war.

He was elected to this body in 1949, and served until 1957.

In my judgment, Herbert Lehman was the noblest Senator of my generation. A man of great wealth, he devoted himself to the interests of the low- and middle-income groups, who had few friends among the powerful. He was completely unselfish. He had the courage of a lion. He was the best man I have ever known in political life.

The Nation can be grateful for the long and heroic life of service by Herbert Lehman, but we mourn the death of a noble American.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleagues for their intercession. I should not fail to mention Governor Lehman's outstanding leadership as a lay person in the field of the Jewish faith. Millions of Americans of the Jewish faith throughout the United States will feel a personal sense of loss in the passing of Gov. Herbert H. Lehman.

## CIVIL RIGHTS: WHERE IT STANDS TODAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, inasmuch as I had another matter of morning hour business, I ask unanimous consent, with the indulgence of the majority leader, that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the struggle for civil rights is, for the moment, spotlighted in the other body, where the bipartisan civil rights bill is seemingly stalled awaiting Rules Committee action. A discharge petition, which could bring up the bill for a vote, needs about 60 Republican signatures to become effective—and even then, for practical purposes, it could not be called up until December 23. But we have some responsibilities here—first, to consider our own situation; second, to help, if we can, our colleagues in the other body who are anxious to get to a vote on the bipartisan civil rights bill because this would affect so directly what the Senate does; and third, to call to the attention of our new President the opportunities still available to the Chief Executive on civil rights in the executive department.

Very understandably, the Republican leadership in the other body wishes to fix attention upon the fact that the Rules Committee there has 10 Democratic and 5 Republican members, that the chairman is a Democrat, and that therefore, the inability to move through the Rules Committee in the regular way shows once again the failure of governance inherent in the deep schism in the Democratic Party on this subject. The fact that the President must personally support the discharge petition and that the need for at least 60 Republican signatures is admitted, demonstrate this very clearly. For this reason, civil rights must be and is bipartisan and will remain so.

Therefore, the question now is what can best be done to forward the civil rights bill on that basis. Obviously, Republicans would prefer—and that is the best course—a prompt rule from the Rules Committee, in which case the bill could be brought forward for consideration in the other body and perhaps passed before the Christmas recess. But this course is clearly not available. Therefore, Republicans have only two choices—to get three Republican members of the Rules Committee to request a prompt meeting, which would then have to be backed by a majority of the committee, necessarily including Democrats, or to sign the discharge petition.

Taking either course would demonstrate that Republicans are pursuing the paramount course, which is to leave no step unused which can advance the civil rights cause. Unless a rule can be obtained promptly I believe that signing the discharge petition may turn out to be as important an action in the other body as the vote for cloture of debate on the civil rights bill will ultimately be in the Senate when that test comes here.

It is especially important that action be had in the other body because the majority leadership here in the Senate has clearly announced that it will not take up the civil rights bill in the Senate until it has passed the other body. I have, during the past few months, sharply disagreed with this strategy of waiting for a bill from the House because there is a civil rights bill ready and waiting right here—the public accommodations bill. The Senate Commerce Committee reported this out over 7 weeks ago, 14 to 3, but it has been held back since then from being put on the Senate Calendar. Yet, as this is now for all practical purposes water over the dam, wrong as I believe the strategy adopted by the Senate majority leadership to be, it is nonetheless clear that there is a vital need for action now, and the first practical opportunity presented for it is in the discharge petition in the other body.

Whatever the strategy, action must be taken now. The virtual moratorium on demonstrations for civil rights, which has been in effect for the past few months, may well end soon, and every Member of Congress should know, if he does not already, that public order and tranquillity are at stake in the fight for civil rights legislation—a fight which now boils down, almost too simply, to getting the bill before both Houses, by signing the discharge petition in the House and by voting for cloture in the Senate.

There are promises that there will be hearings before the House Rules Committee. I understand from the news ticker that the House minority leader, Representative HALLECK, has said that he confidently expects the bill to be reported in January, and that the votes of the five Republicans in the Rules Committee will be available. It seems to me that if the discharge petition can accelerate that process and can serve clear notice that a great majority of the House of Representatives wishes a bill to vote upon in order to send it to the Senate for action, it would be a measure of precaution to sign the discharge petition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. It should also be made clear what the bill as it now stands in the House is all about, so that is fully understood that it is neither new nor radical nor departs from the American tradition of preserving both human rights and property rights. The group of Republican House Judiciary Committee Members who yesterday filed their additional views on the bill made this point in detail. I strongly urge all Members to read that excellent documentation of the merits of each title of the bill in part 2 of the printed report, House Report 914.

Finally, I have for some time, in collaboration with my distinguished colleague, Senator HART, been canvassing the Federal departments and agencies to determine the extent to which Federal tax moneys are being spent to support State programs which are segregated or discriminatory, and whether the departments, and agencies believe they have legal power under the Constitution, without enactment of further legislation on the subject, to withhold funds from such programs. On July 2, Senator HART and I introduced into the RECORD the letters which we had each sent and the answers which we had then received. Almost all the replies indicated that there is constitutionally derived authority to remedy this situation even without further congressional authorization and specified what action was in fact being taken. At that time three Departments had not yet submitted full replies. Since then, two of the three have done so, the Department of Labor, which had given a partial answer, and the Department of Agriculture. The third, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has as yet submitted only a partial answer which to me appears to differ from the bulk of the other replies by selecting among the statutes which that Department administers, enforcing nondiscrimination under some but not under others. This I find unwarranted, since the power and duty to withhold funds from unconstitutional activities is derived from the Constitution itself, not from the individual enactments of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letters to these three Departments, and their replies since received, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 24, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
*Secretary of Labor,*
*Department of Labor,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been reported that in the administration of several programs by your Department:

1. Provisions are not made to assure that persons intended to benefit by the programs are actually aided commensurate with their need and without regard to their race, creed, color or national origin, and that

2. Provisions are not made to obtain assurances that Federal funds will be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, and, through a system of compliance reporting and surveillance, to see that these assurances are carried out.

Would you be good enough to advise me at your earliest convenience as to the following questions:

A. State employment service: What reporting and compliance procedures have been established to ascertain the extent to which State employment offices are conforming to the policies of the U.S. Employment Service which prohibit the acceptance and processing of job orders containing discriminatory specifications? What reviewing and reporting procedures have been established to determine whether Negro and white job applicants are receiving equal service on a nondiscriminatory basis at previously segregated employment service offices? Where are segregated offices still maintained? To what extent are applicants limited to particular local offices by geographic districts and neighborhoods and to what extent does this practice operate to limit equal job opportunity?

B. Apprenticeship program: What procedures have been established to measure the impact of the nondiscrimination provision which is now included in registered apprenticeship standards? Where are Negroes participating in training programs from which they had heretofore been excluded? Since the adoption of this policy, which State apprenticeship agencies have adopted a corresponding policy statement?

C. Manpower Development and Training Act and Area Redevelopment Act: What steps have been taken to assure that all potential trainees are recruited, selected, tested and referred on a nondiscriminatory basis? Please furnish a list of programs which have only white trainees, those which have only Negro trainees and those which have both, including the locations of the programs and the skills for which persons are being trained. Where State employment services do not operate on a nondiscriminatory basis, has your Department considered performing these functions directly under MDTA?

D. Is it your Department's view that sufficient authority already exists under the Constitution or laws of the United States to condition the grant of Federal funds upon assurance of nondiscrimination, or is enactment of further Federal law considered necessary?

I would appreciate your early reply.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
*Washington, D.C., July 25, 1963.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in further response to your letter of April 24, 1963, and provides the additional information which was indicated in my letter of June 7 to be under preparation. You will recall that question D of your letter asked whether the Department possessed sufficient authority to condition the grant of Federal funds upon assurance of nondiscrimination and whether enactment of further Federal law was considered necessary.

It is the position of the Department of Labor that we have sufficient legal authority to condition grants of Federal funds upon assurance that the funds will be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner. It is on this legal ground that the Department has initiated administrative actions to end segregated facilities and services in State employment security offices; to end discrimination in apprenticeship programs registered with the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor and to condition approval of Manpower Development and Training Act projects on the requirement that selection and referral to such projects shall be performed in a nondiscriminatory manner. In view of this authority, therefore, the Department does not feel it needs the enactment of specific new legislation.

As you know, however, the legal position of the Department of Labor may not be identical to that of other Departments of Government. In his recent message to Congress on civil rights and job opportunities, President Kennedy stated:

"Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the Administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients that the amount of administrative discretion remaining—which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended—is at best questionable."

The President therefore called for enactment of "a single comprehensive provision making it clear that the Federal Government is not required, under any statute, to furnish any kind of financial assistance—by way of grant, loan, contract, guaranty, insurance or otherwise—to any program or activity in which racial discrimination occurs." The Department of Labor supports enactment of legislation that would authorize administrators to withhold Federal funds, where they do not already have such authority, from programs in which racial discrimination occurs.

Your letter also raised questions about operations of the State employment service, apprenticeship program, and the Manpower Development and Training Act. A memorandum responding to these questions is enclosed. In addition, I am also enclosing a copy of General Administration Letter No. 711 issued by the Bureau of Employment Security which deals with several of the questions raised.

Please let me know if I may be of further assistance to you in this matter.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. HENNING,
*Under Secretary of Labor.*

---

### MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF SENATOR JAVITS ON ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

#### A. STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

1. What reporting and compliance procedures have been established to ascertain the extent to which State employment offices are conforming to the policies of the U.S. Employment Service which prohibit the acceptance and processing of job orders containing discriminatory specifications?

Answer. Periodic reviews and evaluations of State employment service operations, which take into account the conformance of local offices to employment service procedures and policies which prohibit the acceptance and processing of job orders containing discriminatory specifications are made by the regional offices and the national office. While specific inquiry into the incidence of such orders may be made in the course of review, orders containing discriminatory specifications are not reported to the Bureau.

2. What reviewing and reporting procedures have been established to determine whether Negro and white job applicants are receiving equal service on a nondiscriminatory basis at previously segregated employment service offices?

Answer. Integration of most previously segregated employment service offices has been accomplished concurrently with reorganization of offices. A followup review and evaluation is made of all reorganized metropolitan offices by national and regional office staff of the Bureau, and by State office staff, after a reasonable period following the installation of the new organization. The purpose of this review is to ascertain how the reorganized activities of the office are functioning, whether the reorganization is in conformity with the recommended plan, and whether the services provided to applicants and employers are adequate and effective. Such a followup review is made of formerly segregated metropolitan offices which are reorganized. In addition, reviews of local offices have been made by regional office staff upon a specific complaint, and remedial action has been taken if the allegations of the complaint have been confirmed.

Plans are now being developed for periodic and more comprehensive evaluations of local office compliance with Bureau policies and procedures barring racial discrimination in services to applicants. Our existing policy of making no indication of an applicant's race, creed, color, or national origin on any office record adopted to assure minority applicants equal opportunity in selection for job openings and training opportunities, makes it somewhat more difficult to evaluate or maintain surveillance upon local office services to minority applicants.

3. Where are segregated offices still maintained?

Answer: During the last several years, the Bureau has been actively working with State agencies to extinguish all segregated local office facilities. Significant progress toward this objective has been made, resulting in the elimination of a considerable number of segregated offices and in plans for the elimination of most of those now existing. According to information recently compiled by the Bureau, segregated local office facilities now are maintained:

*Location and comment*

1. Physically Separate Offices

Jacksonville, Fla.: Suboffice for Negro labor and domestic workers to be closed and operations transferred to integrated building within 60 to 90 days.

Lakeland, Fla.: Suboffice for Negro labor and domestic workers. State agency contends it is needed for convenience of applicants and employers, and no closing date scheduled.

Chattanooga, Tenn.: Office for Negro applicants to be closed as soon as suitable space for integrated operations located.

2. Segregated Services Within Single Office

Montgomery, Ala.: Integration scheduled for July 1963.

Atlanta, Ga.: Integration scheduled for July 1963.

Kinston, N.C.: Integration scheduled for August 1963.

Rocky Mount, N.C.: Integration scheduled for August 1963.

Since January 1961 segregation has been eliminated from the following offices:

1. Physically Separate Offices

Oklahoma City, Okla.; Tulsa, Okla.; Muskogee, Okla.; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; West Palm Beach, Fla.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Memphis, Tenn.; and Nashville, Tenn.

2. Segregated Services Within Single Office

Mobile, Ala.; Birmingham, Ala., Columbus, Ga.; Atlanta, Ga. (clerical and sales); Atlanta, Ga. (labor and domestic); Atlanta, Ga. (claims); Augusta, Ga.; Macon, Ga.; Savannah, Ga.; Texarkana, Tex.; Greensboro, N.C.; Raleigh, N.C.; Durham, N.C.; Charlotte, N.C.; Asheville, N.C.; Fayetteville, N.C.; High Point, N.C.; Wilmington, N.C.; Winston-Salem, N.C.; Richmond, Va.; Norfolk, Va.

4. To what extent are applicants limited to particular local offices by geographic districts and neighborhoods and to what extent does this practice operate to limit equal job opportunity?

Answer. Nonwhite applicants are limited to particular local offices as described in the statements pertaining to the three geographically separated offices discussed above. In these cases the limitation is not on the basis of district or neighborhood, since these offices serve nonwhite applicants without regard to residential site. While these offices are located in or adjacent to Negro residential areas, the job orders which they handle are those known or understood to be for Negro workers and come from employers throughout the local office area. In situations of this kind, the opportunity for nonwhite applicants to compete for job openings outside the traditional racial employment pattern and the assistance in competing for such openings given them by the Employment Service are severely restricted.

In some large metropolitan areas, district or neighborhood offices tend to limit opportunities for applicants if the job orders handled by the office are received primarily from employers in the district or neighborhood in which the office is located. This deterrent to an applicant's exposure to all job openings held by the Employment Service in the community has been recognized, and such measures as the establishment of centrally located offices where applicants will be exposed to all job openings, and multiple registration of applicants in several offices have been utilized to overcome this disadvantage. We do not believe that this is now a serious problem, because of the improvements which have been and are being wrought in metropolitan area organization and services.

### B. APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

1. What procedures have been established to measure the impact of the nondiscrimination provision which is now included in registered apprenticeship standards?

Answer. Factual data on the impact of nondiscrimination provision required in all apprenticeship programs registered since 1961, and in all programs involved in Federal construction, is not available in significant detail. The very prohibitions against designations of race have somewhat complicated the statistical job of determining minority participation in apprenticeship programs. Nevertheless, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training has instructed its field representatives to collect in whatever manner possible exact data on racial composition of apprenticeship classes so that the impact of the equal opportunity program can be determined. It is expected that within 6 months sufficient data will be available to provide an indication of the impact of this program.

2. Where are Negroes participating in training programs from which they had heretofore been excluded?

Answer. For the reasons cited above it is nearly impossible to provide data which would authenticate a judgment about training programs to which Negroes have been newly admitted. Aside from the construction trades programs in the District of Columbia which have the active attention of the Department as well as of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, data about increasing Negro participation will await implementation of the reporting system outlined in the question immediately above. Over a period of time it should be possible under this system to indicate with a fair degree of accuracy exactly in what fields increasing opportunities for apprenticeship are being made available to minority persons.

3. Since the adoption of this policy, which State apprenticeship agencies have adopted a corresponding policy statement?

Answer. The States of New York, Kentucky, California, Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico have nondiscrimination provisions in their apprenticeship legislation. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is preparing a current list of actions taken by State apprenticeship agencies to provide for nondiscrimination clauses in apprenticeship standards. This data is expected to be tabulated within the next few weeks.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is active in promoting apprenticeship opportunities for minority groups by working with the minority community, employers and labor unions in its field office locations. Industrial training advisers have been assigned to five of the Bureau's regional offices and an industrial adviser coordinator is assigned to the headquarters staff of the Bureau. These advisers act to promote increased job opportunities in established apprenticeship programs in cooperation with the technical field personnel of the Bureau. There are indications that there will be an increase in job opportunities in apprenticeship and training for minority group members as this promotional effort gains impetus. Using the services of the industrial training advisers, it is proposed to establish apprenticeship information centers similar to those in California and New York City in other locations in the country where there were are good prospects for their successful operation and where it will be possible to enlist minority group organizations to assist in selecting qualified applicants for referral to available job opportunities as these are promoted. An important adjunct of the apprenticeship information centers will be community activity through the public school guidance departments, the employment service, the minority community, labor and management. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is now working with the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council and the District Employment Service to establish such a center in Washington.

### C. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT, AND AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

1. What steps have been taken to assure that all potential trainees are recruited, selected, tested ,and referred on a nondiscriminatory basis?

Answer. During the past several months the Department has taken a number of steps to obtain conformity by the States with the policies which prohibit discrimination because of race, color, or creed in the operations of State employment services. To the degree that all services of the State agencies are conducted on a nondiscriminatory basis, the services provided under MDTA will also be on such a basis. In this respect the measure taken by the Department and outlined in answers to questions about the State employment service are relevant to the Manpower Development and Training Act. General Administration Letter No. 711, a copy of which is enclosed, directs State employment agencies to effect immediate compliance with departmental regulations. It should be noted that it specifically includes a requirement that all services performed in connection with referral of persons to training opportunities, must be performed in a nondiscriminatory manner.

2. Please furnish a list of programs which have only white trainees, those which have only Negro trainees and those which have both, including the locations of the programs and the skills for which persons are being trained.

Answer. With respect to your request for a list of all programs covering the 30,000 persons who have entered training indicating the race of each trainee, location of the program and skill for which the trainee is being trained, preparation of such a list will require a great deal of time and effort inasmuch as we do not keep all such data on a project-by-project basis and it must be specially assembled and processed. We do have some information on your area of inquiry, however, and I am enclosing it for your consideration. Approximately 2 months ago an analysis was made of persons then in training numbering approximately 6,000. This shows the racial composition of training groups, their age and other data. Since that time an estimated 24,000 additional persons have entered training and overall data on them is being prepared. In addition, in testimony July 8 before a select subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, Secretary Wirtz stated that more than half of Negro Manpower Development and Training Act trainees are enrolled in courses leading to white-collar and skilled jobs. A chart showing the breakdown of these data is enclosed.

3. Where State employment services do not operate on a nondiscriminatory basis, has your Department considered performing these functions directly under the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Answer. The President in his civil rights message June 19, 1963, directed the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare "to make use of their authority to deal directly with communities and vocational schools whenever State cooperation or progress is insufficient. * * *" This directive referred to a number of programs, including the Manpower Development and Training Act. Although the Department has not yet found it necessary to invoke the authority it possesses to operate directly in States where the employment service is not in conformity with Federal regulations, it is considering the efficacy of such action in the light of the President's request.

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
*Washington, D.C., June 28, 1963.*

To: All State employment security agencies.

Subject: Elimination of segregated office facilities, elimination of discrimination in the operation of Employment Service offices, and adoption of revised merit system standards.

Reference: GAL No. 683.

Purpose: To outline required actions to eliminate discriminatory practices in State employment security agencies.

Recent Federal court decisions consistently have held that public funds cannot be used to maintain or operate any facility or Government program in any discriminatory manner whatsoever based on race, creed, color, or national origin. This holding of the courts is equally applicable to funds granted or made available by the Federal Government to the States for the operation of the employment security program.

All State employment security agencies which have not already done so are accordingly required to take the following actions to conform with established policy:

1. Eliminate all racially segregated office facilities and operate such facilities without distinction based on race, creed, color, or national origin. In any specific case, or cases, in which a State employment security agency has formulated a plan to eliminate a racially segregated office and the plan cannot be effected by July 31, 1963, because of a legal commitment such as a lease, the State agency will submit such plans to the Bureau's national office for consideration.

2. Fully comply with established policies which prohibit any form of discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin in services provided to applicants, claimants, or others, including registration, selection, and referral for employment or training opportunities, counseling, or testing.

3. Fully comply with the revised merit system standards enclosed with GAL No. 683. The revised standards require: (1) a prohibition in State law, rules, or regulations against discrimination on the basis of race, creed, national origin, or other nonmerit factors, and (2) provision for appeals in cases of alleged discrimination.

4. Cooperate with governmental fair employment practice or antidiscrimination authorities by furnishing information developed through the operation of the employment security system relating to fair employment practices.

The policies of the U.S. Employment Service, published in title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations, are being amended to reflect these requirements. A copy of the proposed amendment is attached. Appropriate revisions of Employment Security Manual materials are being made and will be distributed promptly.

Manualization required: Employment Security Manual, part I and part II (appropriate sections will be revised).

Rescissions: None.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
*Administrator.*

---

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Section 604.8, chapter V, title 20 CFR (service to minority groups) is amended by adding the following new subsections:

(e) To register, counsel, test, select, and refer applicants to job openings and training opportunities on the basis of their occupational qualifications or suitability for training, and to conduct these and all other activities performed by or through employment service offices financed in whole or in part from Federal funds without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

(f) To make no selection or referral of applicants on job orders containing any discriminatory specification(s) with regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

(g) To cooperate with governmental fair employment practice or antidiscrimination authorities by furnishing information developed through the operation of the employment security system relating to fair employment practices.

---

### CHARACTERISTICS OF 6,000 WHITE AND NONWHITE PERSONS ENROLLED IN MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT TRAINING

(Data presented in this article represent the first to become available on characteristics of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees by race.)

Differences in personal characteristics between men and women Manpower Development and Training Act trainees were considerably more significant than between white and nonwhite trainees of the same sex, according to preliminary data by color on some 6,000 individuals enrolled in training. Less than 1,000, or 16.2 percent of the total were nonwhites, although the latter made up 22 percent of the unemployed in 1962. Since Negroes constituted over 85 percent of the nonwhite trainees, data for nonwhites closely approximately, the information for Negroes alone.

The typical white male trainee was the head of a family or household and had been jobless for periods of up to 14 weeks before being selected for training. He was between 22 and 34 years of age, had completed high school, and had over 3 years of gainful employment prior to undertaking training. His nonwhite counterpart had virtually identical characteristics.

The typical white female trainee, like the nonwhite female enrollee, was not the head of a family or household. She was under 35 years of age, had finished high school, and had over 3 years of gainful employment. Despite her schooling and work experience, she had been unemployed for at least 15 weeks before undertaking training.

Nonwhite men constituted 21 percent of the unemployed males in 1962 but 14 percent of the male trainees. Nonwhite women accounted for 24 percent of the jobless women in 1962 but 20 percent of the female trainees.

Approximately three-fifths of the 6,000 trainees were men—about the same as their proportion of the unemployed. About half of the nonwhites were men, compared with over three-fifths of the whites.

Relatively twice as many enrollees as all unemployed in 1962 had been jobless for over 6 months. Nonwhites represented a somewhat higher proportion than whites of the long-term (over 6 months) unemployed. The difference was largely among men. The proportion of women who had been jobless for such a duration was about the same for whites and nonwhites, but relatively more of the nonwhite than of the white men were in this unemployment category.

The Manpower Development and Training Act trainees tended to be younger than the average of all unemployed. About half of the men were in the "prime" age bracket—22 to 34 years of age—as compared with less than a third in the Nation's unemployed in 1962. However, relatively more nonwhite than white men were in this age bracket. Three-fifths of the nonwhite and less than half of the white men were in this grouping. On the other hand, there were relatively fewer nonwhites than whites in the older (45 and over) and younger (under 22) age groups.

Well over half of all enrollees had at least a high school education. This was true both by sex and by color, although relatively more women than men had completed secondary school, and comparatively more nonwhites than whites had some college training.

#### OVER 6,000 TRAINEES IN SURVEY

In 1962, nonwhite men accounted for 21 percent of all jobless males and nonwhite women for 24 percent of unemployed females. About 1,000 nonwhites, or 16.2 percent of the trainees, were enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act courses, according to preliminary data by color on some 6,000 enrollees.

TABLE 1.—*Persons enrolled*[1] *in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by sex and color, April 1963*

| Sex | Total | | White | | Nonwhite | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total | 6,029 | 100.0 | 5,052 | 100.0 | 977 | 100.0 |
| Men | 3,599 | 59.7 | 3,100 | 61.4 | 499 | 51.1 |
| Women | 2,430 | 40.3 | 1,952 | 38.6 | 478 | 48.9 |

[1] Does not cover all trainees; only those for whom an MT-101 was available and for whom information on color was obtained.

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

Participation of all men in the training program is roughly in proportion to their representation in the unemployed in 1962. Men accounted for about three-fifths of all trainees, approximately the same as their proportion of all unemployed. Nonwhite men, who made up 59 percent of all nonwhite unemployed in 1962, accounted for 51 percent of the nonwhite trainees.

#### ABOUT 45 PERCENT ARE LONG-TERM JOBLESS

As indicated in previous reports on characteristics of trainees, MDTA training programs are reaching the long-term unemployed. Nearly 30 percent of the 6,000 trainees in this survey had been jobless for over half a year, twice the proportion among all unemployed in 1962. Some 18 percent had been looking for work for more than a year.

A somewhat greater proportion of nonwhites (32 percent) than of whites (28 percent) had been unemployed for over 6 months. In particular, nonwhite men were more apt to have extended periods of unemployment than white men.

Women, both white and nonwhite, figured prominently among the very long term unemployed. Over 30 percent of the women had been jobless for more than a year before being enrolled in training. There was no significant difference between white and non-white women in this respect.

TABLE 2.—*Percent distribution of persons enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by duration of unemployment,[1] color, and sex, April 1963*

| Color and sex | Total | Duration of unemployment (weeks) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under 5 | 5–14 | 15–26 | 27–52 | Over 52 |
| Total | 100 | 25.8 | 29.4 | 16.1 | 11.2 | 17.6 |
| Men | 100 | 29.3 | 35.7 | 17.7 | 9.8 | 7.6 |
| Women | 100 | 21.1 | 20.6 | 13.8 | 13.1 | 31.4 |
| White | 100 | 26.1 | 29.8 | 16.0 | 10.9 | 17.2 |
| Men | 100 | 29.8 | 36.0 | 17.6 | 9.3 | 7.3 |
| Women | 100 | 20.8 | 20.5 | 13.7 | 13.3 | 31.8 |
| Nonwhite | 100 | 24.0 | 27.4 | 16.4 | 12.6 | 19.6 |
| Men | 100 | 25.4 | 33.9 | 18.3 | 12.9 | 9.6 |
| Women | 100 | 22.5 | 21.5 | 14.5 | 12.3 | 29.7 |

[1] Weeks of unemployment immediately prior to selection for MDTA training.

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

### TRAINEES ARE YOUNG

Nonwhite trainees were, on the average, younger than whites. About 23 percent of the nonwhites were 35 years of age or over compared with 32 percent of the whites. Over half of the nonwhites were in the prime age bracket—22 to 34 years of age—while two-fifths of the whites were in this age category. Relatively fewer nonwhites were in the older age group—45 years of age and over—and in the younger age groups—under 22 years of age. Three-fifths of the nonwhite men were concentrated in the 22 to 34 age group, compared with less than half of the white men.

TABLE 3.—*Percent distribution of persons enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by age, color, and sex, April 1963*

| Color and sex | Total | Age group (years) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under 19 | 19–21 | 22–34 | 35–44 | 45 and over |
| Total | 100 | 4.8 | 22.2 | 42.5 | 20.5 | 10.0 |
| Men | 100 | 4.8 | 22.9 | 49.1 | 16.1 | 7.2 |
| Women | 100 | 4.9 | 21.3 | 32.7 | 26.9 | 14.2 |
| White | 100 | 5.1 | 22.8 | 40.1 | 20.7 | 11.2 |
| Men | 100 | 5.0 | 23.7 | 47.3 | 16.0 | 7.9 |
| Women | 100 | 5.1 | 21.4 | 28.8 | 28.2 | 16.4 |
| Nonwhite | 100 | 3.4 | 19.0 | 54.5 | 19.0 | 4.0 |
| Men | 100 | 3.8 | 17.5 | 60.0 | 16.7 | 2.8 |
| Women | 100 | 3.8 | 20.7 | 48.7 | 21.5 | 5.3 |

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

### NEARLY TWO-THIRDS HAVE FINISHED HIGH SCHOOL

The average trainee enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act courses had more formal schooling than the average jobless person in 1962. About 65 percent of the trainees had completed high school, whereas the median achievement of all jobseekers in 1962 was the 10th grade. Among the enrollees, nonwhites had more formal schooling than whites. Nearly 70 percent of the enrollees had completed high school compared with less than two-thirds of the whites.

The differences in educational backgrounds are more striking for those who had some college training. Over 17 percent of the nonwhites had progressed beyond high school, compared with only 10 percent of the whites.

At the other end of the educational scale, 9 percent of all trainees had no more than 8 years of school. Relatively more of the whites and relatively fewer of the nonwhites were reported in this classification.

TABLE 4.—*Percent distribution of persons enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by education, color, and sex, April 1963*

| Color and sex | Total | Education (highest grade completed) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under 8 | 8 | 9–11 | 12 | Over 12 |
| Total | 100 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 26.0 | 54.0 | 11.4 |
| Men | 100 | 3.2 | 7.8 | 28.8 | 50.4 | 9.9 |
| Women | 100 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 21.9 | 59.3 | 13.7 |
| White | 100 | 2.5 | 6.8 | 26.0 | 54.5 | 10.3 |
| Men | 100 | 3.2 | 8.4 | 28.5 | 50.7 | 9.2 |
| Women | 100 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 22.1 | 60.6 | 11.9 |
| Nonwhite | 100 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 25.8 | 51.3 | 17.4 |
| Men | 100 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 30.5 | 48.5 | 13.8 |
| Women | 100 | .6 | 2.9 | 21.0 | 54.3 | 21.2 |

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

### MOST HAVE STRONG ATTACHMENT TO THE LABOR FORCE

The Manpower Development and Training Act is oriented toward assisting the adult unemployed worker. Toward this end, provision is made for the payment of regular allowances to such workers who are either heads of families or households and who have had at least 3 years of gainful employment.

Approximately three-fifths of both white and nonwhite enrollees were either heads of families or of households. In both groups, the proportion of men who were family heads was substantially higher than that of women.

TABLE 5.—*Percent distribution of persons enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by family status, color, and sex, April 1963*

| Color and sex | Total | Family status | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Head of family or household | Other |
| Total | 100 | 58.6 | 41.4 |
| Men | 100 | 70.7 | 29.2 |
| Women | 100 | 40.5 | 59.5 |
| White | 100 | 58.5 | 41.5 |
| Men | 100 | 70.0 | 30.0 |
| Women | 100 | 40.2 | 59.8 |
| Nonwhite | 100 | 49.0 | 41.0 |
| Men | 100 | 75.5 | 24.5 |
| Women | 100 | 41.8 | 58.2 |

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

About three-fourths of all trainees met the test of years of gainful employment to qualify for regular allowances. There was little difference in the proportions of whites and nonwhites meeting this requirement. Among the nonwhites, however, relatively twice as many men as women had worked for 10 or more years prior to undertaking training.

At the other end of the scale, about one-fourth of the white and of the nonwhite trainees had less than 3 years of employment. However, in both groups, approximately twice as many women as men were in this category.

TABLE 6.—*Percent distribution of persons enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act training, by years of gainful employment, color, and sex, April 1963*

| Color and sex | Total | Years of gainful employment | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Under 3 | 3–9 | 10 or more |
| Total | 100 | 24.6 | 45.1 | 30.3 |
| Men | 100 | 18.3 | 46.0 | 35.7 |
| Women | 100 | 34.1 | 43.8 | 22.2 |
| White | 100 | 24.4 | 44.8 | 30.8 |
| Men | 100 | 18.6 | 45.7 | 35.6 |
| Women | 100 | 33.5 | 43.4 | 23.1 |
| Nonwhite | 100 | 26.0 | 46.4 | 27.6 |
| Men | 100 | 16.3 | 47.4 | 36.3 |
| Women | 100 | 36.2 | 45.3 | 18.4 |

NOTE.—Based on preliminary data processed as of Apr. 24, 1963.

---

APRIL 19, 1963.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been reported that in the administration of several programs by your Department:

1. Provisions are not made to assure that persons intended to benefit by the programs are actually aided commensurate with their need and without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin; and that

2. Provisions are not made to obtain assurances that Federal funds will be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, and, through a system of compliance reporting and surveillance, to see that these assurances are carried out.

Would you be good enough to advise me at your earliest convenience as to the following questions:

A. What steps are being taken to encourage recruitment of nonwhite employees in your Department, particularly at higher level supervisory positions and to assure promotion without regard to race? The employment statistics of the Department, when compared to those of other Departments, are most disturbing.

B. Farmers Home Administration: Where have Negroes been appointed to State and county FHA committees? Where are Negroes employed by FHA outside of Washington? Has the segregated employment of Negro field employees been terminated? To what extent do Negro farmers utilize the benefits of the FHA program? Is any effort being made to increase use of this program by Negro farmers?

C. Federal Extension Service: To what extent has discrimination and segregation been eliminated from this program in terms of salaries, personnel, office facilities and operating procedures? Are the benefits of this program reaching Negro farmers commensurate with their needs?

D. What provisions are being made to eliminate segregation in the 4-H Club program?

E. Soil conservation service: Is this program run on a segregated basis similar to the FHA and extension service programs, i.e., are there Negro specialists to work with Negro farmers? Are the benefits of this program reaching Negro farmers commensurate with their needs?

F. School lunch and milk programs: Is there a disparity in the benefits afforded to white and Negro children under the program in States where schools are segregated? If so, what accounts for this disparity? Are the needs of Negro children being adequately served under the existing program?

G. Rural area development: What steps have been taken or are contemplated to afford expanded opportunities for Negroes under the rural area development program?

H. Is it your Department's view that sufficient authority already exists under the Constitution or laws of the United States to condition the grant of Federal funds upon assurance of nondiscrimination, or its enactment of further Federal law considered necessary?

Attached is a copy of a recent Southern Regional Council study of Negro farmers in South Carolina. May I have your comments on this study?

I would appreciate your early reply.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D.C., November 8, 1963.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Some time ago you raised a series of questions as regards several programs of this Department, with particular reference as to safeguards in these programs to guarantee that persons benefit from them without regard to their race, creed, color or national origin. You expressed concern also as to whether or not Federal funds as represented in the administration of these programs are utilized in a nondiscriminatory manner and, if not, did present legislation provide adequate authority to withhold these programs should discrimination occur.

We have now completed our inquiry into these and other specific problems you raised about several of our agency programs and herewith submit a response.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. ROBERTSON,
*Administrative Assistant Secretary.*

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### OFFICE OF PERSONNEL

Question. What steps are being taken to encourage recruitment of nonwhite employees in your Department, particularly at higher level supervisory positions and to assure promotions without regard to race?

Answer. Considerable effort has gone into improving the Department's equal employment opportunity posture since the Executive order on equal employment opportunity became effective. A major step taken by the Director of Personnel was the establishment of the position of Assistant to the Director of Personnel for Intergroup Relations. This position was filled by a competent Negro whose primary responsibility is to concentrate on problems of minority groups in relation to employment discrimination in the USDA. The Assistant to the Director has given focus and direction to efforts aimed at eliminating bias and promoting employment based on merit in the Department.

The Assistant to the Director of Personnel for Intergroup Relations has undertaken two programs to determine the degree of under-utilization of minority group qualifications and skills in the Department and to inquire into promotion patterns.

One program involves the mailing of a self-analyzing questionnaire to all employees, grade 5 and below, which seeks information as to training, education, and qualifications not being presently utilized in their current assignment.

The second is the Department's plan to include minority group designation in an overall study which the Personnel Research Staff of the Office of Personnel is making of the relationship of various factors; i.e., training, education, experience, tenure, etc., to advancement and utilization.

In addition to this, visits have been made to the major Negro land-grant college campuses in the South and contact established with placement and guidance officers to attract quality graduates for employment in the Department.

Other efforts to encourage nonwhite application include a series of articles in the Negro press with photographs of Negro employees in high level positions, many of which are "firsts" for the agency cited, and a pictorial brochure depicting the increased use of minority groups in the Department is presently being distributed widely. (Copy attached.)

A conference was held in the Department last spring between representatives of Negro land-grant colleges and top Department officials to develop a closer liaison and to emphasize the Department's desire to utilize qualified graduates from these schools.

Agricultural Research Service, an agency of the Department, has designated recruitment representatives to Negro land-grant colleges who will develop and maintain a continuing relationship with these schools, reviewing curriculum content, and assuring that course requirements will qualify graduates for consideration of specific job opportunities in that agency.

On May 13 and 14, Vice President Johnson, Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, opened a 2-day executive review meeting of equal employment opportunity efforts in the Department which was attended by agency administrators and their top staffs. Department policies and expectations were underscored, and workshops were held the second day at which the conferees received guidance from competent discussion leaders to improve future affirmative action efforts.

A review of 1962 statistics on the use of minorities in Agriculture as compared with 1961 reveals that the Department hired fewer Negroes percentagewise in the lower grades (1 to 4), and increased its employment of this group in the middle and upper grades considerably. For example, in 1962 total employment in grades (1 to 4) increased 21.6 percent, while Negro employment in these grades rose only 1.1 percent; in grades (5 to 11) nonwhite employment advanced 18.5 percent as against 7.6 percent white; and in grades (12 to 18) wherein the percent advance for the total Department was 16.8 percent, Negro employment skyrocketed to 205.7 percent. Admittedly the number of nonwhites in these upper grades remains small and yet this represents a trend away from the use of minority group employees predominantly in the lower grades, where they are presently concentrated, which we hope will result in an increasing use of their skills and potentials throughout the Department.

The office of personnel staff has met with Agriculture officials in cities across the country, along with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, to reiterate our concern and determination that the Department seek out and utilize the skills of minority groups at all levels without discrimination.

The Joint Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Land-Grant Universities on Training for Government Service meets twice each year. This Committee has one Negro member. It is an important Department contact and liaison with the land-grant schools.

#### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Question. Where have Negroes been appointed to State and county FHA committees? Where are Negroes employed by FHA outside of Washington? Has the segregated employment of Negro field employees been terminated? To what extent do Negro farmers utilize the benefits of the FHA program? Is any effort being made to increase use of this program by Negro farmers?

Answer. Since January 1961, Negro members have been appointed to State advisory committees in Mississippi and North Carolina; and to county committees in Phillips and Jefferson Counties, Ark.; and Okmulgee County, Okla.

Farmers Home Administration employs 29 Negroes in professional program positions outside of Washington. Ten of these employees have been hired since January 1961. These professional employees are headquartered at the following locations: Tuskegee, Ala.; Little Rock, Marianna, Marion and Helena, Ark.; San Jose and San Diego, Calif., Marianna, Fla.; Americus, Ga.; Alexandria, La.; Greenville, Jackson and Lexington, Miss.; Caruthersville, Mo.; Halifax, Lumberton, Graham, and Whiteville, N.C.; Okmulgee, Okla; Christiansted and St. Croix (Virgin Islands), Puerto Rico; Kingstree, Orangeburg and Sumter, S.C.; Jackson and Brownsville, Tenn.; Temple and Carthage, Tex.; and Petersburg, Va.

Farmers Home Administration also has clerical Negro employees outside of Washington as follows: One employee in each of these States—Colorado, California, Minnesota, Texas and the Virgin Islands; and 34 employees in the National Finance Office at St. Louis, Mo.

Segregated employment of field employees has been terminated.

In 16 Southern States, Farmers Home Administration made 5,937 initial loans to Negroes during the fiscal year 1962. This represents 18 percent of all initial loans made in these States. In the same period, 3,829 subsequent loans were made to Negro borrowers already on the program, making a total of 9,766 loans to Negroes during the year. This is an increase of 39 percent over the comparable figure for the fiscal year 1960.

Full information about Farmers Home Administration services is provided to the general public so that all potentially eligible families will know about the program and how to apply for assistance. Applications are processed [insofar as possible] in the order received. Our objective is to assure that this program serves the maximum number of eligible families in all localities.

#### FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

Question. To what extent has discrimination and segregation been eliminated from this program in terms of salaries, personnel, office facilities and operating procedures? Are the benefits of this program reaching Negro farmers commensurate with their needs? What provisions are being made to eliminate segregation in the 4–H Club program?

Answer. Federal Extension Service is an integral agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as such practices no discrimination in terms of salaries, personnel, office facilities and operating procedures. As evidence of this fact, since 1961, 20 percent of the change in the number of employees within the Federal Extension Service are Negroes, including one GS–13. Since 1961, three USDA Superior Service Awards have been made to Negro employees. Three outstanding performance ratings involving cash payments have been made to Negro employees. In 1963, 20 percent of all outstanding performance ratings given within FES were given to Negro employees. Among the five FES employees receiving a quality within-grade salary increase to date in accordance with USDA policies, one was a Negro.

FES does not conduct programs directed to specific individuals in behalf of the Department of Agriculture. The Smith-Lever Act originally passed in 1914 creating the Extension Service placed the responsibility for organizing and conducting extension work with each of the State land-grant colleges designated by their State legislature to receive the benefits of the act. Extension work in the field as it relates to educational assistance to individuals is the responsibility of the land-grant college in each of the States and Puerto Rico. The land-grant colleges in turn cooperate with the over 3,000 county governing bodies in the conduct of extension work in each of the counties. In order to provide specific information on progress in the States in eliminating discrimination, the Federal Extension Service conducted a special survey of the States during September 1961. The results of that survey are reported October 7, 1961.

An additional survey was made in June 1963 which indicates the following progress being made by the States.

Based on the information we have, 11 of the 17 States (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia) have eliminated the word "Negro" in their county agent titles. We have reason to believe the titles persist in Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and Virginia.

West Virginia, Delaware, Oklahoma, Maryland, and Missouri have positive programs to combine office facilities statewide. There has been some progress to date in combining county office facilities in Texas, Kentucky, Virginia, Arkansas, Tennessee, Florida, and Louisiana. We have no information which would indicate that any progress has been made in combining office facilities in North Carolina, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. All other States have combined offices.

Substantial progress has been made in closing the gap dollarwise in the salary for Negro and white extension agents in these 17 States. States moving to equalize salaries are Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and to a lesser degree South Carolina. Arkansas, Virginia, Missouri, Georgia, West Virginia, Delaware, and Texas have equal salary scales.

The dollar gap referred to is in terms of dollars rather than percentages. Two outstanding examples of this achievement are found in Missouri and Texas. In Missouri for comparable positions, Negro county agents' salaries have increased $1,800 and white salaries $1,200. For home economics work, Negroes' salaries have increased $1,100 and white salaries $800. In Texas for comparable positions, salaries for Negro county agents have increased $2,843 and salaries for white agents $2,316. For Negro home economics workers the increase was $2,850 and the increase for white home economics workers was $2,116. We understand that since our June survey, Texas has further increased the salaries of their Negro agents, thus making them comparable. The Federal Extension Service will continue to encourage and foster salary adjustments in all ways possible.

Recent informal reports indicate that since 1961, Negro agents have been employed in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Michigan. The reason we used the word "reports" is because official personnel actions do not provide an identification by race, creed or country of origin. While this report deals primarily with the employment of Negro extension workers, other minority groups—Indian, Spanish Americans, and Puerto Ricans—are employed by California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana.

As regards to services commensurate with needs, unfortunately, in many counties the number of farmers and rural residence per extension agent runs from 900 to 2,000. In these counties, few farmers if any, either Negro or white receive the benefits from extension programs commensurate with their needs. In no other educational or similar type service will the number of people assigned to one worker equal the number assigned to extension agents.

National 4–H Club activities, namely, National 4–H Conference held in Washington, D.C., and the National 4–H Club Congress held in Chicago in connection with the International Livestock Exposition, in which the Federal Extension Service plays a part, have no restrictions other than the number of participants from any one State. The National 4–H Conference held in Washington is limited to two boys and two girls per State.

The policy with regard to the operation of these two events is set forth in Extension's memorandum which is attached. Mixed clubs are not uncommon in many States. This is because of the population characteristics of the community being served by the clubs. There are other clubs which are made up either all white or Negro members primarily because of the population characteristics of the community making up the club. The first "Citizenship Laboratory" has been concluded recently at the National 4–H Center in Washington attended by 44 young men and women from 10 States for a 2-week period. Among those participating in this citizenship training laboratory were five young Negro citizens and two young Indian citizens. This is indicative of the progress that has been made and is being made in participation by 4–H members of the many 4–H activities conducted by the center. A recent 6-week short course in human development held at the National 4–H Center attended by approximately 100 professional Extension workers included 5 Negro Extension workers.

The selection of young people to attend national 4–H meetings is the responsibility of the State extension service in each State. The Federal Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture advises with the States in the development of program materials and methods. Based on the best information available, an open system of competition for selection of 4–H representatives across racial lines is limited in most of the 17 Southern States, yet plans vary from State to State and by counties within States. A Negro girl from Maryland was the first and only member of her race to attend a 4–H conference in Washington since the separate Negro 4–H conference was discontinued at Howard University in 1961. The Federal Extension Service is concerned about open system of competition problems and will use its good offices in an attempt to correct these problems.

As was indicated in an earlier section of this report, the Federal Extension Service does not conduct programs directed to specific individuals in behalf of the Department of Agriculture. However, within the operating relationships that exist, the Federal Extension Service takes every occasion afforded to it to discuss with State extension directors all facets of employment and program practices which may represent types of discrimination.

In all meetings of Southern State extension directors either in groups or in private, opportunities are taken to review with the directors progress which they are making and progress yet to be made in areas such as employment, salary scales, office facilities, secretarial assistance, titles, the availability of literature, clientele served, and training opportunities. State extension directors often find it not within their power to make final decision with regard to the above. One example is that the North Carolina extension service planned to eliminate the word "Negro" in the county agent's title, effective January 1, 1962. When this decision was reviewed with the Negro agents in North Carolina, it was the Negro agents' request that the action not be taken. As a result, implementation of the decision has been deferred until such time as it proves to be mutually satisfactory with the agents involved.

### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Question. Is this program run on a segregated basis similar to the FHA and Extension Service programs, i.e., are there Negro specialists to work with Negro farmers? Are the benefits of this program reaching Negro farmers commensurate with their needs?

Answer. The program of technical assistance to landowners and operators provided by the Soil Conservation Service is not run on a segregated basis. The Soil Conservation Service employs both white and Negro technicians.

It has deployed its 52 Negro technicians as follows: Arkansas 1, California 7, Florida 1, Georgia 2, Indiana 1, Louisiana 4, Massachusetts 1, Michigan 1, Nebraska 1, New Jersey 2, New York 2, North Carolina 1, North Dakota 2, Ohio 1, Oklahoma 1, Pennsylvania 3, South Carolina 1, Tennessee 2, Texas 6, Virginia 2, Beltsville, Md., Washington office 4.

Where both white and Negro technicians are employed, they are equally available to any landowner or operator requesting such assistance.

Since the program of the Soil Conservation Service is completely voluntary and dependent on the initiative of local landowners and operators in requesting technical assistance, it would be impossible to generalize whether or not the benefits of the program were reaching any particular minority group commensurate with their needs. When these needs are made known to the Soil Conservation Service through requests from local landowners and operators for technical assistance, such requests are serviced on an equal basis to the extent that technical staff assistance is available to meet these requests.

On watershed projects, grants for development of fish and wildlife and recreational purposes are conditioned on agreement that such facilities will be open to the general public.

### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

#### *School lunch and milk programs*

Question. Is there a disparity in the benefits afforded to white and Negro children under the program in States where schools are segregated? If so, what accounts for this disparity? Are the needs of Negro children being adequately served under the existing program?

Answer. The Department has no evidence of disparity in the benefits afforded to white and nonwhite children participating in the school lunch and milk programs.

On the basis of information gathered through the annual analyses and appraisals of State agency operations of these programs and from observations made during State agency and school visits, we know of no school subject to discrimination—in the selection for participation, in the setting of reimbursement rates, in the distribution of commodities, or in the provision of program service and assistance—because of the race, creed, color, or national origin of the children in the schools.

In States where segregated schools are operated, the needier schools generally receive a greater rate of Federal school lunch assistance in both cash and donated foods than the less needy schools. Many nonwhite schools draw attendance from areas of poor economic conditions and, therefore, receive program assistance at a higher rate per lunch served than many white schools. If any disparity, in fact, does exist as between white and nonwhite children, it is because many communities have been unable to equip their schools with food preparation facilities and, therefore, are unable to share in program benefits. However, this is an economic disparity and could be equally applicable to any community of low economic conditions.

In the communities of low economic conditions, participation is restricted by the limited income of many families although, generally, the percentage of free or reduced price lunches is higher in nonwhite schools than in white schools. Since Federal assistance pays only a portion of the cost of lunches, the balance must be secured from sources within the State, and in cases of extreme economic distress, the free lunch requirements may be so great as to force curtailment of free lunches or closure of the program in the absence of local support. Because of this, the administration sponsored an amendment to the National School Lunch Act last year to provide additional assistance to schools drawing attendance from areas of poor economic conditions. The Congress approved this request but failed to provide funds. The President's budget request for 1964 calls for $2 million to make a start on implementing this section of the revised act.

### RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Question. What steps have been taken or are contemplated to afford expanded opportunities for Negroes under the rural area development program?

The rural areas development program is built around the concept that local leaders in a community, aided by local representatives of Department of Agriculture agencies, other agencies of the Government, as well as State and local organizations and individuals, would work out and implement an economic development program leading to (1) economic efficient family-size farms; (2) income opportunities such as payrolls or the returns from recreation or tourism enterprises; (3) more adequate community facilities; and (4) proper training opportunities.

It is realized that specially disadvantaged groups, such as the Negroes, may need special attention in order that they may have full opportunity to improve their economic position as the revitalization of rural areas takes place. Several steps have been taken to provide this extra attention. These include:

1. The establishment of a subcommittee within the Rural Areas Development Public Advisory Committee to consider the special problems of the disadvantaged groups and make recommendation as to the actions which should be taken. The Rural Areas Development Public Advisory Committee consists of 34 members, 3 of whom are Negroes.

A copy of the recommendations made by this subcommittee and adopted by the entire committee is attached.

2. The creation of a special group of individuals within the small staff of the Office of Rural Areas Development to which is assigned the specific responsibility of assisting the disadvantaged groups to have an opportunity and to implement this opportunity to develop and take advantage of improved economic conditions.

Guided by a task force made up of representatives of various agencies within the Department, the individuals assigned the specific responsibility of working with disadvantaged groups have attacked first the problem of providing adequate information to the leaders of the Negro rural groups in several of the Southern States. This move has been taken because of the realization that:

(a) The basic concepts and objectives of the rural areas development program require special study and attention in order that their full implication may be understood. Opportunity for this careful study is particularly necessary for those groups most in need of the economic stimulation which can result from the application of this approach.

(b) Services available from the various Federal agencies, from State agencies, and from local authorities are often not fully understood. In order for these services to be fitted together into a coordinated and effective economic development program, it is necessary that State and local leaders become thoroughly acquainted with them.

In order to assure full understanding on the part of agency heads of this special effort to supply information, a memorandum was directed by the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation to the administrator of each of the agencies having major field activities that related to rural areas development. Most of the agencies in turn transmitted this memorandum to their State leaders.

On the basis of this introduction of the need for special educational and informational activities and following preliminary discussions with State leaders by Dean L. A. Potts of the Office of Rural Areas Development, special informational and educational meetings have been held at Tuskegee, Ala.; Tallahassee, Fla.; Fort Valley, Ga.; and Petersburg, Va. Each of these meetings has been handled on a workshop basis. White and Negro State leaders of the agencies have been present. Also, a small number of district or county workers of both races have been in attendance. There have been present at each of the meetings high level national officials of the agencies such as the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration and the Farmers Cooperative Service.

In most instances the conduct of the meeting has been in the hands of the State leaders. The form of the meetings has been that of short statements as to services available from the various agencies followed by discussion and answers to questions. Area Redevelopment Administration officials have been present in each of the meetings. Also included have been persons who could explain possible aids from nongovernmental sources.

A copy of the program at Tallahassee, Fla., is attached.

3. A special field office has been established at Little Rock, Ark., to provide contact with Negro leaders throughout the Southeast and to provide a focal point both for their requests for assistance and as an avenue for providing the additional services in order that these people might have adequate opportunity to share in the improved economic conditions.

The head of this office is making contact with Negro groups in Arkansas and throughout the Southeast to give information about possibilities through the rural areas development approach, to stimulate the development of local leadership and to give counsel on finding ways to improve economic conditions. Some groups are progressing toward the point where new payroll opportunities can be developed. In one instance a recreation project is being considered. In other instances, negotiations are underway for the establishment of new industrial and commercial operations.

### OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Question. Is it your Department's view that sufficient authority already exists under the Constitution or laws of the United States to condition the grant of Federal funds upon assurance of nondiscrimination, or is enactment of further Federal law considered necessary?

Answer. This Department administers over 25 programs of assistance involving the grant or loan of Federal funds. The purposes of the assistance, the character of the recipients, the possibilities for discrimination in connection with the application of the funds, and the statutory authority of the Department vary from program to program. We endeavor to see that discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin does not occur in the administration of our programs, and we have issued regulations to that effect where appropriate. See e.g., the school lunch program, 7 C.F.R. 210.17(b); 6 C.F.R. 503.8(a), 28 F.R. 55 (1963); the surplus food program, 6 C.F.R. 503.6(e)(10), 28 F.R. 54 (1963). Executive Order 10925 on equal employment opportunity and Executive Order 11063 on equal opportunity in housing are also applicable to certain of our programs, and we are presently examining the applicability of Executive Order 11114 as it relates to employment in federally financed construction contracts.

We are, together with the rest of the administration, constantly reviewing programs and seeking to improve them. If it is determined that additional conditions relating to nondiscrimination can usefully be imposed and that authority to do so exists, we will impose such conditions. I might point out, in addition, that title VI of the administration's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 would grant to the President and the departments and agencies whatever legislative authority might be necessary for eliminating discrimination in Federal assistance programs.

---

APRIL 23, 1963.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
*Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been reported that in the administration of several programs by your Department:

1. Provisions are not made to assure that persons intended to benefit by the programs are actually aided commensurate with their need and without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin, and that

2. Provisions are not made to obtain assurances that Federal funds will be administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, and, through a system of compliance reporting and surveillance, to see that these assurances are carried out.

Would you be good enough to advise me at your earliest convenience as to the following questions:

A. Grants to educational institutions: What steps are being taken to assure that colleges and universities receiving research grants and contracts, graduate fellowships and training grants accept students without regard to race, color, creed or national origin for general admission and for the specific aided activity? Are efforts made to acquaint predominantly Negro colleges and universities with the availability of these Federal funds? To what extent do predominantly Negro institutions receive funds under these programs? (Graduate fellowship program, National Defense Education Act, title IV; language and guidance training institutes, National Defense Education Act, title V–B and VI–B; vocational rehabilitation, sec. 4(a)(1); Public Health Service, NIH, etc.).

B. Impacted area program: What action is contemplated to assure that children of Federal military or civilian personnel who reside off Federal properties will be afforded equal educational opportunity on a desegregated basis under the impacted area school aid program?

(C) Library Services Act: In view of the statutory language that libraries receiving Federal funds serve "all residents," what steps have been taken to assure that "all residents" can in fact use the libraries aided by Federal funds for their benefit?

(D) Hill-Burton hospitals: What administrative procedures have been established to enforce the nondiscrimination provision of the Act governing those hospitals not constructed under the "separate-but-equal provision?" With respect to hospitals which are constructed under the "separate-but-equal" provision, will successful resolution of the pending litigation result in an administrative determination to assist only those hospitals which give assurances that their services will be available to all persons on a nondiscriminatory basis?

(E) Land-grant colleges: Are provisions being made to eliminate segregation in institutions of higher education which receive Federal assistance under the Morrill Land Grant College Act? In view of the Supreme Court's specific rulings that segregation in public higher education is unconstitutional, does the "separate-but-equal" clause of the Morrill Act constitute any impediment to such action?

(F) Vocational education: The Commissioner of Education has said that the regulation requiring a reasonable expectation of employment could not be used as a bar to minority participation in the vocational education program and that the regulation requiring nondiscrimination would be enforced. Where have vocational education schools been desegregated as a result of this clarification of policy and where are schools still segregated? What procedures does your Department use to verify compliance with this nondiscrimination policy?

(G) Health grants: Are provisions made to assure that other grants made by the Public Health Service to State and local facilities are not used to finance or support segregated services?

(H) Employment: Apart from recent departmental regulations prohibiting discrimination in employment under the merit system, what provisions does your Department make to assure nondiscrimination in employment which results from or is assisted by research, training or construction grants?

(I) What provisions are made to assure that persons who receive direct benefits, such as welfare assistance, are not denied these benefits by State or local officials because of their race or as a result of attempts to secure constitutional rights such as the right to vote?

(J) Is it your Department's view that sufficient authority already exists under the Constitution or laws of the United States to condition the grant of Federal funds upon assurance of nondiscrimination or its enactment of further Federal law considered necessary?

I would appreciate your early reply.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

---

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, D.C., August 15, 1963.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Enclosed is a copy of the information you requested for insertion in the transcript of the hearing August 8, before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower on juvenile delinquency. I have inserted the original into the record, which has been returned to the committee.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
*Secretary.*

### NONDISCRIMINATION ACTIONS CONCERNING DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PROGRAMS TAKEN WITHIN THE SCOPE OF EXISTING LEGAL AUTHORITY

1. National Defense Education Act institutes for counseling, guidance, and modern foreign languages: Colleges and universities conducting language institutes under title VI and counseling and guidance institutes under title V of the National Defense Education Act have been required to admit students to the institutes on a nondiscriminatory basis. This became effective beginning in the summer of 1962 and academic year 1962–63.

2. Federal assistance to public schools in impacted areas—the "suitable" ruling. The Department ruled in March 1962 that segregated schools do not provide a suitable education for children who reside on Federal property under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. These statutes provide that if no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for these children the Commissioner of Education is to make arrangements to provide education for the children.

3. Federal assistance to public schools in impacted areas—court actions: The United States brought, in 1962 and 1963, five lawsuits to require nonracial assignment of federally connected children to public schools which have received grants under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. To date, two of these suits (involving three school districts) have been dismissed. These decisions have been appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. In a third case, involving Prince George County, Va., the Federal district court has overruled a motion to dismiss, holding that the United States can require nonracial assignment of the federally connected children under one of the assurances which school districts give upon receipt of school construction funds under Public Law 815.

4. Library Services Act: This act authorizes payments of Federal funds for the further extension by the States of public library services to rural areas without such services or with inadequate services. A public library is defined in the act as a library "that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds." Under this act beginning with fiscal year 1964 funds, library services will not be federally-supported if the services are not available to all residents on a nondiscriminatory basis.

5. Hospital and medical facilities construction—Hill-Burton Act: The United States has intervened in a Federal court action, contending that the "separate-but-equal" provision of the Hill-Burton hospital construction act is unconstitutional. This case is now pending decision in the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

6. Manpower Development and Training Act: The Department has provided in its regulations implementing the Manpower Development and Training Act that there should be no racial discrimination in the training of persons referred under act.

7. Civil defense program: The Office of Education has informed State officials that beginning with contracts in fiscal year 1964 contracts under the civil defense adult education program will require that there be no racial discrimination with regard to the selection of trainees in and conduct of training projects.

8. Educational television: Departmental regulations implementing the Federal assistance program for educational television facilities require that the applicant give assurance that community participation in the activities of the ETV stations shall be without discrimination.

9. Merit system standards for selection of state personnel: In January 1963, together with the Secretaries of Defense and Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare issued amended merit system standards, with respect to personnel engaged in administration of certain federally aided programs, which require nondiscrimination on account of race or other nonmerit factors, as well as political affiliation or religion. The merit system standards apply to federally assisted programs in public welfare, health, employment security, and civil defense.

10. Juvenile delinquency program. Training project grants under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act are made only to educational institutions which do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin.

11. Public assistance. States are required to provide public assistance to the needy aged, blind, dependent children, and the disabled, without discrimination in determining eligibility or the amount of assistance.

Mr. JAVITS. This matter of the use of Federal funds to support discriminatory activities is one which deserves specific attention from President Johnson in view especially of the number one priority he has given civil rights, wholly apart from the civil rights bill which deals with this only in part. Most of the Federal agencies recognize a constitutional power or duty at this time, even before passage of the bill, to deny Federal funds to segregated State programs, but all of them do not, most particularly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The President should see to it that the executive branch is consistent in applying what should be, and undoubtedly is, Presidential policy. A Presidential statement to this effect would clarify this point, as well as infuse all Departments with enthusiasm in carrying out the policy.

I believe that if a discharge petition is signed in the House and if President Johnson will take Executive action with respect to these leakages in the Federal establishment, which are supporting State segregated programs with Federal help, we shall begin to make real progress on civil rights and have an opportunity to head off the impending demonstrations—in which people, from sheer frustration, because we have failed to do anything for so many months, may feel they have to restort to the streets again because they cannot get justice from the Congress.

## TAXES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in keeping with its left-wing policies of recent years, the Washington Post devoted its two leading editorials of today to a bitter and unjustified attack upon Virginia and Virginians, stemming from the fact that a majority of Virginians still place allegiance to the Constitution above political expediency.

The editorial concerning the Virginia Supreme Court charged that honorable body as furnishing a capstone for legislative folly in regard to the Prince Edward County schools. There was not one word in the majority opinion of the court in that case that indicated the majority approval or disapproval of the action of the Prince Edward County authorities in closing its public schools. All that the majority held in that case was that the provision in the 1901 Virginia constitution which required the General Assembly to establish an efficient system of public schools meant just what the previous courts had on several occasions held, namely, it was to be a system but not a compulsory plan for operation. The General Assembly of Virginia never has in the history of our State had the power to compel any political subdivision, and in Virginia all incorporated cities are independent subdivisions, to levy taxes for any purpose. And when the General Assembly of Virginia first passed a law to provide for a system of public schools, it did not appropriate one red penny for their support. The primary responsibility always has been upon the localities to support their local schools of which they were in control. Later, a provision was made for State aid to public education and that carried with it certain controls, such as attendance records, teacher qualifications, and so forth.

In its lead editorial entitled "The Last Alternative," the Post makes these statements:

> The blockade of the civil rights bill in the Rules Committee and the obstruction of the tax cut in the Senate Finance Committee present the Congress and the country with a very serious threat to orderly government.
>
> Something like a national consensus has gathered behind these measures. The support for the tax bill, in the most recent polls has been put at 66 percent of the people. The support for a public accommodation law also has been very high in both parties. Both measures probably would pass both House and Senate right now if brought to a vote.
>
> That vote is being prevented by Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and by Representative HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Those statements constitute an unjustified attack upon two of the ablest and finest Members of the Congress whose devotion to the fundamental principles of Jeffersonian democracy have frequently roused the ire of the Washington Post.

The essence of that attack upon BYRD and SMITH is that in the opinion of the Washington Post editor a majority favors prompt action on a tax bill and a civil rights bill and that the purpose of these two legislators to give the minority an opportunity to be heard constitutes "a very serious threat to orderly government." Incidentally, that type of orderly government is of the essence of which a dictatorship is made and is, of course, repugnant to the principles of Jeffersonian democracy.

In condemning Senator BYRD for conducting hearings for just 2 months on a tax bill which is calculated to affect the tax liability of more taxpayers than ever in the history of our Nation, the editorial in question completely ignores the fact that the tax experts of the Treasury Department considered proposals to revise the internal revenue laws for more than a year and after those well-considered recommendations were submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, it considered them for 8 months, lacking 6 days, and in making its report turned down most of the so-called tax reforms calculated to cost the taxpayers an additional $3 billion which the Treasury Department had recommended.

During my service in the House, I was privileged to help frame 12 tax bills between 1937 and 1946 inclusive and never during that entire period did the Ways and Means Committee deny taxpayers the privilege of being heard or report out a major tax bill in less than 60 days. So, the first fundamental principle involved in the attack on Senator BYRD is that he is following what was supposed to be a well established democratic principle, namely, in all legislative matters the minority is entitled to be heard. That statement, of course, presupposes that the Washington Post is right in saying that 66 percent of the people are for the pending tax bill. I challenge the accuracy of that statement.

In the first place, I doubt if 1 percent of the lawyers of the Nation know all of the technicalities involved in the bill and, of course, no layman does. In the second place, every worker who has felt the bite of our extraordinarily heavy high taxes favors lightening of that burden but there is a very considerable number of thoughtful persons who feel that a tax cut involving less than $100 for the average taxpayer would be a poor exchange for inflationary pressures that could easily add $200 to his cost of living. Consequently, many taxpayers who favor a tax cut have asked that it be accompanied by a cut in spending. And our President—the best trained Chief Executive in Federal procedure in the Nation's history—is acutely conscious of that fact in urging all departments and bureau chiefs to critically examine their basic needs and thus permit him to present to the Congress next year a budget that would show a definite trend in the direction of economy in Federal spending.

There is every reason to believe that the Senate Finance Committee will be able to report to the Senate early next month a tax bill. In fact, the distinguished minority leader has predicted that early next year the Senate will pass a tax bill and it will be made retroactive to January 1, 1964.

The unjustified attack upon Representative HOWARD SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, who wants to give opponents of the civil rights bill an opportunity to be heard, is on a par with the attack upon the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. The editorial statement that a majority of the country approves the public accommodations provision of the House civil rights bill is not well founded. That bill which by force of law would seek to deprive a man of private property without just compensation is so clearly unconstitutional and so highly repugnant to the people of every section of the Nation that the Senate leadership has been unwilling to bring it to a vote in the Senate. Thinking that quick action could be gotten on that bill if pulled out of the omnibus bill and jurisdiction taken away from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, title II of the omnibus bill was framed as a separate bill and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce on the specious claim that anyone who operated a hot dog stand or a small motel was engaged in interstate commerce and that the Constitution gave the Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce.

More than a month ago, after limited hearings, the Senate Commerce Committee voted to report that bill but the report has not yet been filed. The answer, of course, to that delay in the Senate action is that Senate leadership knew that the bill in question involved a bitter disagreement among the Members of the Senate and there was no prospect whatever of sufficient support for the bill on the floor of the Senate to enable the proponents of the measure to impose a gag rule and shut off debate. Therefore, the decision was made to await House action. Without giving opponents of the measure a proper opportunity to be heard, a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill. That report was so obnoxious to the House membership that it was sent back to the subcommittee with the request that it be revised and modified. The subcommittee then, without additional hearings, submitted a revision which was hailed by some members of the liberal press as being a weak substitute for the original bill.

However, the minority report on that substitute, which is H.R. 7152, clearly indicates that it is no weak substitute. On the contrary, it contains at least 15 major changes in existing law, many of which, including the fair employment practices section, are highly objectionable to every section of the Nation. In order that the Members of the Senate may get a clearer understanding of how unjust the Washington Post was in attacking Judge SMITH for insisting on adequate hearings on H.R. 7152, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the minority views, which so clearly show that the pending bill is not a moderate bill and that it has not been watered down.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The reported bill is not a moderate bill and it has not been watered down. It constitutes the greatest grasp for executive power conceived in the 20th century. We hereinafter analyze in detail each title of the reported bill and compare it to the subcommittee proposal.
>
> The majority report states: "The bill, as amended, is designed primarily to protect, and provide more effective means to enforce the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States." In truth and in fact, the bill, under the cloak of protecting the civil rights of certain minorities, will destroy civil rights of all citizens of the United States who fall within its scope. Congress would abnegate its duty to consider and protect all of the Nation's citizens.
>
> If the proposed legislation is enacted, the President of the United States and his appointees—particularly the Attorney General—would be granted the power to destroy the following civil rights of those who fall within the scope of the various titles of this bill:
>
> 1. The right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press concerning "discrimination or segregation of any kind * * * at any establishment or place," as delineated in the bill.
>
> 2. The right of homeowners to rent, lease, or sell their homes as free individuals.

3. The right of realtors and developers of residential property to act as free agents.

4. The right of banks, savings and loan associations, and other financial institutions to make loans and extend credits in accordance with their best judgment.

5. The right of employers "to hire or discharge any individual" and to determine "his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment."

6. The seniority rights of employees in corporate and other employment.

7. The seniority rights of all persons under the Federal civil service.

8. The seniority rights of labor union members within their locals and in their apprenticeship programs.

9. The right of labor unions to chose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their members, and to determine the relationship of their members to each other.

10. The right of farmers to freely choose their tenants and employees.

11. The right of farm organizations to choose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their members, and the relationship of their members to each other.

12. The right of boards of trustees of public and private schools and colleges to determine the handling of students, curriculums and teaching staffs.

13. The right of owners of inns, hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunch rooms, soda fountains, motion picture houses, theaters, concert halls, sports arenas, stadiums and other places of entertainment to freely carry on their businesses in the service of their customers.

14. The right of the States to determine the qualifications of voters in all Federal elections and many State elections.

15. The right of litigants to receive evenhanded justice in the Federal courts; this legislation places in civil rights litigants (particularly the Attorney General) in a special category with preferences and advantages not afforded parties in any other form of litigation.

In brief, the proposed bill now reported to the House by the committee does the following:

1. Amends every Federal statute setting up or appropriating money for any program or activity involving Federal financing by a mandatory requirement that every Federal department and agency "shall take action to effectuate" the purposes of the act (sec. 602). This makes available to President Kennedy and Attorney General Kennedy approximately $100 billion per year (being the amount of the Federal budget) to be used to the extent deemed necessary for political and sociological manipulation in the field of civil rights. Persons with less than 25 employees are not excepted from this title of the bill.

2. The various definitions contained in the bill, particularly titles II and VII, would extend "interstate commerce" so as to substantially encompass all intrastate commerce and thus bring under Federal control all phases of commerce, whether interstate or intrastate. Actions of any persons under color of local custom or usage, or which are encouraged, fostered, or required by any State or political subdivision thereof is classified as "State action" and subject to Federal control. This authority, if granted, would extend Federal control into the business and the home of almost every individual in the United States (secs. 201 and 202).

3. The reported bill creates an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to police and control the hiring, discharge and terms of compensation, conditions, and privileges of employment of all persons employed by any business or industry "affecting commerce" and which has 25 or more employees (title VII). The administration's original bill was much more limited, in that it applied only to employers involved in programs and activities financially assisted by the Federal Government; $2,500,000 for the first year and $10 million per year thereafter is authorized to support the Commission. The power of this Commission, if invoked, would destroy seniority in corporate employment and in civil service. Precedents destroying seniority have already been set in limited fields by Executive orders and administrative regulations. The exception of employers who have less than 25 employees (the exception is fixed at 100 employees for the first year and 50 employees for the second year) does not apply to those participating in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance by way of grant, contract, or loan under title VI.

4. The reported bill draws under Federal control inns, hotels, motels and other lodging houses, restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, soda fountains, gasoline stations, motion picture houses, concert halls, theaters, sports arenas, stadiums, and other places of exhibition and entertainment. It destroys the right of owners of such establishments to serve whomsoever they please. If this action is proper, it should logically apply across the board. Hence the exception of lodging establishments actually occupied by the proprietor which contain not more than five rooms for rent can be included only for political purposes. This constitutes one form of discrimination which can only be for political reasons.

5. A combination of (a) conferring new powers upon the U.S. Commissioner of Education (title IV), (b) requiring action by every agency and department of the Federal Government administering activities or programs involving Federal financial assistance (title VI), and (c) granting unlimited authority to the President to take whatever action he deems to be appropriate concerning employment in such programs (sec. 711 (b)), results in the following: Public and private schools and colleges benefiting from any Federal financial program are placed under Federal control in the handling of pupils, the selection of faculty members and also the choice of textbooks, insofar as they relate to race, color, or national origin and desegregation or discrimination in connection therewith.

6. The bill is designed to divest from State authorities and invest in Federal authorities the determination of the qualification of voters in all Federal elections and many State elections (title I). It has been framed to include all State and local elections where any Federal election is held as a part thereof.

7. The power of the Attorney General to file suits in the name of or in behalf of the United States is broadened so that, if this bill is enacted, such suits could be filed by him affecting voting, "places of public accommodation," all public facilities, education, and, apparently, all programs and activities assisted by Federal financing.

8. The orderly and usual procedures in litigation in Federal courts are varied to place civil rights actions in a special preferred category (sec. 101(d), sec. 203, sec. 707 and title IX).

The most flagrant and dangerous departure from accepted rules of civil procedure is embodied in title IX. Under existing law, certain civil or criminal actions brought in the State courts may be removed to the Federal court in the district and division in which the action is pending. The law of removal provides that immediately upon the filing of a removal petition by the defendant and the posting of a minimum bond, the State court is divested of jurisdiction to proceed. No process of any kind can issue by the State court, no depositions can be taken, hearings scheduled or in progress must be suspended and the State court is powerless to maintain the status quo. Title 28, section 1447(d) presently provides that an order of remand to the State court is "not reviewable on appeal or otherwise." This enables the State court upon remand by the Federal district court to promptly resume jurisdiction and proceed with the disposition of the cause and the enforcement of its orders. Any Federal questions are reviewable by the Federal courts through regular channels.

Title IX would add to section 1447(d) the words, "except that an order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1443 of this title shall be reviewable by appeal or otherwise." Thus the jurisdiction of the State courts (in these cases alone) could be destroyed for months by the simple filing of a petition to remove, followed by an adverse order of the U.S. district court, followed in turn by an adverse judgment of the U.S. court of appeals upon the appeal. This seemingly simple amendment would permit the whim of the civil rights claimants (and none other) to destroy the efficacy of State courts. For all of the years past this right has been reserved to the U.S. district courts, on the motion to remand, not the litigant.

It should be noted that the administration bill contained references to racial imbalance in connection with desegregation in public education. The subcommittee proposal and the reported bill have omitted this reference. It appears that this action is a matter of public relations or semantics, devised to prevent the people of the United States from recognizing the bill's true intent and purpose. As pointed out in this report, with reference to the matter of Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, it appears that the administration intends to rely upon its own construction of "discrimination" as including the lack of racial balance, as distinguished from a statutory reference to racial imbalance. A study of the 1961 Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and recent executive orders and regulations proposed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, demonstrate that the omission of this reference is upon the theory the same is not necessary to carry out the intention of the administration. However that may be, it will be noted that the word "discrimination" is nowhere defined in the bill.

The destruction of individual liberty and freedom of choice resulting from the almost limitless extension of Federal governmental control over individuals and business, rather than being in support of the Bill of Rights, is directly contrary to the spirit and intent thereof.

Judge Learned Hand, in 1958, said in his Oliver Wendell Holmes lectures: "The Bill of Rights is concerned only with the protection of the individual against the impact of Federal and State law."

Dean Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard University School of Law, said in 1957 in his "The Development of Constitutional Guarantee of Liberty": "Analytically the bills of rights are bills of liberties. They define circumstances and situations and occasions in which politically organized society will keep its hands off and permit free, spontaneous, individual activity; they guarantee that the agents and agencies of politically organized society will not do certain things and will not do certain other things otherwise than in certain ways."

In determining whether this bill should be adopted, it must be remembered that when legislation is enacted designed to benefit one segment or class of a society, the usual result is the destruction of coexisting rights of the remainder of that society. One freedom is destroyed by governmental action to enforce another freedom. The governmental restraint of one individual at the behest of another implies necessarily the restriction of the civil liberties and the destruction of civil rights of the one for the benefit of the other. This legislation, then, brings to mind the wise statement of George Washington: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

### EFFECT OF THE LEGISLATION

The depth, the revolutionary meaning of this act is almost beyond description. It cannot be circumscribed, it cannot be said that it goes this far and no farther. The language written into the bill is not of that sort. It has open end provisions that give it whatever depth and intensity one desires to read into it. In the language of the bill, "The President is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate to prevent" and "Each Federal department and agency * * * shall take action to effectuate." This vests, of course, almost unlimited authority by the President and his appointees to do whatever they desire. The extent to which the administration intends to accord preferential treatment to minorities in order to attain racial balance is illustrated by the standards proposed by the Secretary of Labor on October 25, 1963, pursuant to title 29, United States Code, paragraph 22, concerning union apprenticeship programs. These standards require, "The selection of apprentices on the basis of qualifications alone * * * unless the selections otherwise made would themselves demonstrate that there is equality of opportunity," and "the taking of whatever steps are necessary, in acting upon application lists developed prior to this time, to remove the effects of previous practices under which discriminatory patterns of employment may have resulted." This constitutes discrimination in reverse.

It is, in the most literal sense, revolutionary, destructive of the very essence of life as it has been lived in this country since the adoption of our Constitution. Because this is true, the minority members of this committee believe it wise to demonstrate, by example, the effects of this legislation on people; to demonstrate, by example, the meaning of lost liberty; to demonstrate by example, the power in this bill to completely dominate the lives of even the least of us.

To this end, there follow eight examples of the effect of the bill upon persons covered by the act. There might be offered innumerable examples, because this bill encompasses directly or indirectly nearly every adult American.

### FARMERS

For more than 30 years, the American farmer has been under Federal regulation in many programs involving financial aid. Whether these regulations have served him well or poorly is a matter of divided opinion. In any event, regulation per se is nothing new to the farmer. But this is a different kind of control. It is not related to the purposes for which the aid was rendered.

If this bill is enacted the farmer (regardless of the number of his employees) would be required to hire people of all races and religions, without preference for any race or any religion. If experience has taught the farmer a member of one race is less reliable than a member of another race, does less for his pay, he will no longer be allowed to hire those he prefers for this reason. If he is of the belief that members of one race are more prone to accident, less trustworthy, more neglectful of duties, are, in short, less desirable employees than those of another race, he will no longer be allowed to exercise his independent judgment. Under the power conferred by this bill, he must hire according to race, he must racially balance those who work for him or be in violation of Federal law.

The penalty for such violations can mean being excluded from every direct and indirect Federal benefit. It can mean the calling of his bank loans, being shut off by blacklisting from the agencies of Government that recruit labor, the right to purchase supplies from farmer-associated businesses which may, themselves, be dependent in one degree or another on Federal financial assistance. In short, he will become a pariah, an outcast. He will employ those people a Federal inspector says he shall employ or his farm will be deprived of every vestige of Federal "aid," without which no farm, today, can successfully operate.

The agencies required to police farmers, under the directions of the Attorney General and the Commission on Civil Rights, are all Banks for Cooperatives and Federal Land Banks, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Production Credit Associations, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Farmers' Home Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, and all other agencies or departments having to do with Federal financial assistance in the field of agriculture.

### HOMEOWNERS

The right of homeowners in the United States to freely build, occupy, rent, lease and sell their homes will be destroyed by this bill. Title VI will be construed by the administration to cover "land to be developed for residential use" and "the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities * * * or the occupancy thereof," whenever there is involved FHA or GI financing, financing by a national bank or any bank or savings and loan association covered by the FDIC or any other type of Federal financial support.

Federal personnel (not the homeowner or his wife) will make decisions as to the personnel building the home, the renting of a single room or several rooms, the rental, leasing or sale of the home, where race, color or national origin is concerned. They will also dictate the actions of realtors, developers, attorneys and the lending institutions.

What of the right of property? What if the person seeking to rent a room which has been advertised for rent, or to lease the home for a limited period, or to buy the home, is not, in the eyes of the homeowner, trustworthy or desirable for a number of reasons? If race, color or national origin is involved, the Federal inspector (not the homeowner or his wife) makes the decision. The alternative—foreclosure, blacklisting, cancellation of any Federal benefits under any program.

Already, without any legislative authority whatsoever, the President has issued Executive Order 11063 dated November 20, 1962, purporting to pull all of the above into effect concerning an estimated 30 percent of the home building in the United States. This has been done in spite of the fact that Congress, on six different occasions, defeated amendments to then pending housing acts granting the President authority to so act. If this bill is passed, it will validate such order and give the President carte blanche to subject every such homeowner to Federal control. The above quotations are from said Executive order.

### BANKS AND BANKERS

A dispassionate study of the power granted in this bill will convince anyone no bank could operate under its provisions without undue hardship.

If a bank under this bill were to deny employment, a loan, a line of credit or a sales contract to a person, it would have to prove its decision was based on facts that did not in any way, discriminate against the rejected applicant because of his race. Among the penalties that could be imposed on the bank would be the cancellation of the bank's Federal Deposit Insurance, its right to handle GI, FHA and other Government-insured money. The power granted in the bill goes further. If a depositor, a small businessman, for instance, has been held in violation of the Federal civil rights law, under the provisions of this bill the bank can be ordered to cease doing business with the culprit. This applies to depositors as well as borrowers.

If the bank extends a line of credit to finance construction of an apartment house and a tenant should be denied the privilege of leasing one of the apartments because his credit or character, in the opinion of the management, would make him an undesirable tenant, yet, if the Federal inspector decided this amounted to discrimination, the FHA or the FNMA guarantee could be canceled.

Among the agencies required to police banks and bankers, under the direction of the Attorney General and the Commission on Civil Rights, are all national banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve System.

Among the institutions and agencies which would be required to conform to the act and police business and professional establishments are all banks, savings and loan association and other financial institutions served by the FDIC or the Federal Reserve System, the agencies administering GI, FHA, FNMA, SBA, and all other loans and programs involving Federal financial assistance. Withdrawal of protection or credit, foreclosure of loans, blacklisting and similar sanctions may be expected.

### LABOR UNIONS AND MEMBERS

To millions of working men and women, their union membership is the most valuable asset they own. It is designed to insure job security and a rate of pay higher than they otherwise would receive. As none knows better than the union member, himself, these two benefits are dependent upon the system of seniority the unions have followed since their inception. Seniority is the base upon which unionism is founded. Without its system of seniority, a union would lose one of its greatest values to its members.

The provisions of this act grant the power to destroy union seniority. The action of the Secretary of Labor already mentioned is merely the beginning, if this legislation is adopted. With the full statutory powers granted by this bill, the extent of actions which would be taken to destroy the seniority system is unknown and unknowable.

To disturb this traditional practice is to destroy a vital part of unionism. Under the power granted in this bill, if a carpenter's hiring hall, say, had 20 men awaiting call, the first 10 in seniority being white carpenters, the union could be forced to pass them over in favor of carpenters beneath them in seniority, but of the stipulated race. And if the union roster did not contain the names of the carpenters of the race needed to "racially balance" the job, the union agent must, then, go into the street and recruit members of the stipulated race in sufficient number to comply with Federal orders, else his local would be in violation of Federal law.

Neither competence nor experience is the key for employment under this bill. Race is the principal, first, criterion.

Penalty for violation of the provisions of this bill has no defined limits; the President "is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate." There are specific penalties which, in addition to others, may be applied. Unions held in violation of this bill may lose their rights and benefits under such labor statutes as the National Labor Relations Act, the Railway Labor Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and other legislation beneficial to labor. Representation rights and exclusive bargaining privileges could be canceled. Unions could be denied access to NLRB or National Mediation Board procedures.

Moreover, this bill affects unions from the other end, that of the employer, since the law applies to the employer, as well. It extends to railroads, motor carriers, airlines, steamship companies, handling mail or other government shipments, enterprises receiving loans from the Small Business Administration, construction contractors financed through FHA or GI home-loan insurance, the rural electrification program and practically all others.

Consequently, however, meticulous a local union may be as pertains to its racial practices, if a contractor, for example, has been adjudged guilty of discrimination and must, therefore, hire 100 or 1,000 workers of a given race—in preference to all others—before his job becomes "racially balanced," it means the local which supplies his labor can send him only union members of that particular race—and the members of other races will sit until that number has been employed. If the union does not have among its membership the number required, it must recruit membership of that race to supply the contractor's needs. This is a specific instance of the Federal Government interfering in the contract rights of unions and employers.

By threat of contract cancellation and blacklisting, contractors could be forced to actively recruit Negro employees and upgrade them into skilled classifications, although this would displace union mechanics in the skilled trades. Where skilled Negro tradesmen were not available from union sources, the agency could direct that they be recruited from non-union sources, notwithstanding existing union shop of exclusive referral agreements.

INDIVIDUALS AT WORK

Union members are not the only working people affected by this bill. All employees of private industry and under Federal civil srvice will be affected. Assume that an individual, not a union member, is employed by a corporation which has more than 25 people on its payroll or that a smaller corporation which has a SBA, FHA, or other federally supported loan or contract; that his firm, in his job classification, historically has employed people only of his particular race, whatever that race may be, and that a demand is made that his firm abide by a Federal regulation requiring racial balance. To balance his department, racially, somebody has to go. Who?

Assume two women of separate races apply to that firm for the position of stenographer; further assume that the employer prefers one above the other, for some indefinable reason, whether personality, superior alertness, intelligence, work history, general neatness, or perhaps the employer has learned good things about the character of one and derogatory things about the character of the other. If his firm is not "racially balanced," under such regulation he has no choice, he must employ the person of that race which, by ratio, is next up, even though he is certain in his own mind the other woman would be a superior employee.

That such mandatory provisions of law approach the ludicrous should be apparent. That this is, in fact, a not too subtle system of racism in reverse cannot be successfully denied.

HOTELS, RESTAURANTS, AND THEATERS

Places of public accommodation do not cater by custom to one race in preference to another solely from proprietary preference. People are in business to make money and in certain areas they have learned, or have reason to believe, it is more profitable to serve one race or another. In other areas, proprietors have learned it is more profitable to serve all races indiscriminately. A host follows the customs of his community, else he suffers economically.

To force him to abandon his practice, to run counter to prevailing opinion, is to injure his business and his property. He does not, and he cannot, set custom. He follows it or suffers.

Under the provisions of this bill, the proprietor's right to decide whom he will or will not serve, as that decision pertains to race, color, religion, or national origin, is stripped from him. Moreover, if a customer proves objectionable, the owner can have him removed from his premises only at peril of being in violation of the race laws. For, under this act, the proprietor, if challenged, must prove he did not remove the objectionable customer because of his race, but because of some other reason. Which is a perversion of the basic principles of our law.

But a proprietor's trials as they pertain to customers are only the beginning of the problems which will be engendered if this bill becomes effective. His problems with employment of personnel may well go far beyond anything heretofore confronting the businessman.

How can a restaurant operate successfully if its owner is not given freedom of choice in selection of waiters, chefs and cashiers? Although a restaurant serves, and advertises as its specialty, genuine Southern dishes, under this bill the owner could not hire only Negro chefs. He could not, even though the success of his business depended on such chefs; even though his patronage was built upon the belief the food was being prepared by Negro chefs whose culinary art with "Southern" specialties is world renowed. He could be forced to hire in a "racially balanced" manner—so long as the potential employee had a modicum of skill—else be in violation of law. And a modicum of skill, it need not be added, is insufficient to attract clientele to a restaurant whose reputation is built upon the culinary art of Southern Negro chefs. The same conditions would prevail in the case of restaurants specializing in French, Italian, German or other national cuisines.

THE PRESS

Race, as the first criterion of employment, applies to newspapers, periodicals, radio and television under this bill, as well as to other elements of our commerce. If a job applicant can "write" and there is an opening and if he is of the race called for to balance the makeup of the staff, that person must be employed in preference to someone of another race.

What such employment would do to the character of the paper or program is quite apparent to those who earn their living in the world of mass media. Yet that is the sense of this bill. The bill grants the power to make it mandatory that the staff of a newspaper be thoroughly integrated, racially and religiously, else the owners are in violation of Federal law.

If the owners of a television station prefer an announcer of a certain race to enunciate its commercials, it is denied that choice. Announcers must be racially balanced across the board as well as commentators, actors, and supporting staff despite the fact the use of members of a certain race may, demonstrably, cause a loss of business to both station and sponsor.

Even so, this destruction of the right of free choice, serious as it is, is not the most fearsome feature of this bill as it applies to the "press."

Title II, section 203, says: "No person shall * * * incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the foregoing"; i.e., deny or attempt to deny any person any right or privilege described in the title.

Read that language as you will, in simple terms it means that no editor would dare editorialize in opposition to the provisions of the bill if it becomes law.

If a citizen takes a position in direct opposition to some provision of this bill and a newspaper writes an editorial in support of that position, indeed, urges others to take similar stands, is that newspaper inciting, or aiding, or abetting? It would seem so.

The fact of the matter is this: If a person stands in a public square or before a civic club and advocates that segregation is best for either race—and his stand was supported by a newspaper editorial—both would be in violation of Federal law and both would be subject to fine and imprisonment. Under such a circumstance, what becomes of the right of free speech? Or freedom of the press?

TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS

The proposed legislation ultimately would result in total Federal control of the education processes in the United States.

Under provisions of this bill, the President and his appointees in Federal agencies would have the right to dictate pupil assignments in local schools, approve the faculty, censor textbooks and change study courses. The alternative would be the loss of all Federal aid. The child who is given lunch through Federal grant must also study a federally approved curriculum. Under this bill, if the President or his appointees find a social studies textbook to differ from their beliefs in matters of race, Federal aid could be withdrawn from the school making use of the textbook. This applies to every school, public or private, benefiting from programs involving Federal aid.

Teachers and professors in such schools and colleges could not present conclusions honestly arrived at, unless their conclusions conform with the Federal racial policies then current.

The power contained in this bill to cut off Federal funds is not merely a negative power. Those who have already accepted Federal funds can be compelled, in various instances, by foreclosure, injunction and blacklisting, to meet the current Federal standards.

The bill gives the Attorney General the power to institute school integration suits, not only against individuals but against States and local governments as well. This action gives to one man a power which has never before existed; previously the Attorney General could only intervene in private suits. This new power, needless to add, can affect the rights of local school boards where no parents or pupils have filed any suits. Under this power the defendants could be deprived of the right of trial by jury. In any contempt actions arising out of U.S. suits, local school officials would be tried by the very judge whose order was allegedly disobeyed.

## PORK BARREL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently, and at other times in the past, I have been happy to support needed public works programs.

Many citizens, upon reading the attack in Life magazine on Federal public works projects—citizens who, by the way, are not fully, adequately, or properly informed—write their Senators voicing indignation over the millions of dollars spent for projects in Oklahoma and in other Western States, practically all of which were authorized during the Eisenhower administration. They write denouncing recent legislation which was passed by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, for necessary public works projects.

There is no cause for any attack on many of these projects in Life magazine or anywhere else. Life magazine itself is the recipient of a huge subsidy from our Government, in respect to mail costs, yet it denounces some of these projects as "pork barrel" expenditures. It seems to me that this magazine is not a very good source for complaint.

The historic fact is that President George Washington could be called father of the "pork barrel" in addition to Father of His Country. The first public works bill signed by President Washington provided an appropriation for a Federal road from the East to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, "to open up the western country." The Federal surveys in President Washington's administration resulted in land grants, opening up the then "western country"—Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana—to migration from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and other Eastern States. Federal surveys and land grants later made possible railroads to the west coast. All this contributed greatly to the wealth of our Nation, as the West became an economically productive area.

Regarding the comment in Life magazine on the Tennessee Valley Authority, the fact is that the TVA has increased Federal revenues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, increased income taxes due to the TVA and the vast electric power generated have resulted in such increased employment that the increased income taxes paid in that area far exceed all expenditures of the Federal Government for appropriations for the TVA. In fact, each year people living in the Tennessee Valley pay in increased Federal income taxes more than the total appropriations for the TVA from 1935 to 1964—29 years.

It is a happy personal recollection that, as Representative at Large representing the State of Ohio during 8 years, I supported every appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, it is obvious to anyone who has made research on the subject that the Life magazine article was poorly researched, unjustified, and unwarranted.

## STOCK OPTION FOR GAF EMPLOYEES PROPOSED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Government's continued ownership and operation of the huge General Aniline & Film Corp. is causing much concern. One of the most important problems is how the Department of Justice will dispose of its World War II vested stock in this giant enterprise.

This is an extremely important subject, since General Aniline & Film Corp. is a vital part of the economy of the communities in which it now operates. Certainly it cannot be disposed of in a manner which fails to consider the welfare of its employees and the related interests in the area in which it is now located. Every step must be taken to make certain that this important company will not be dismembered cr relocated after it is sold.

The Department of Justice announced some time ago that an advisory committee would be appointed to recommend the conditions of the company's sale to private enterprise. However, the Government's timetable has not been met and a consent decree allowing the sale has yet to be approved. While the Department of Justice has made it clear that it favors a sale to private enterprise, and has backed the legislation which I proposed in that regard, the confusion and delay in dealing with this problem has raised many uncertainties and is most unfortunate.

Some time ago, following a suggestion by Mr. William Tyne, of Binghamton, a trustee of the local 306 of the International Chemical Workers Union, I asked the Department to consider a proposal under which employees of the company would be given a preference in the purchase of a portion of the shares of the company. This would serve to diversify ownership in the company, especially on a local community basis, and to impress upon any new management the welfare of the company's long-time employees.

I am very pleased to report that the Department is giving this proposal serious consideration. While the details cannot be determined until after a consent decree is approved for the sale of the company, it is my information that this proposal is already under study by the Department and company officials.

Personally, I cannot think of a better plan for keeping General Aniline & Film Corp. in operation at its present locations and discouraging moves such as the present management's proposed transfer of the executive office of some of General Aniline & Film Corp.'s divisions out of the triple cities area.

This is a typical example of how individuals in our free Government and free society often have an important impact on what is done by Government. I commend Mr. Tyne for his excellent suggestion, and I intend to continue to do everything possible to make certain that General Aniline & Film Corp.'s loyal employees get a fair deal in any future negotiations involving the future ownership of this enterprise.

## SENATOR MANSFIELD'S EULOGY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AMONG THE GREATEST

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the eulogy to President Kennedy by the distinguished majority leader, Senator Mike Mansfield, has been republished in full in the Monday, December 2, 1963, edition of the Houston Post.

The Post in an article by Felton West, described the eulogy as one of the most touching pieces of oratory in American history. I ask unanimous consent that the article captioned "Senator Mansfield's Eulogy Among the Greatest" be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Senator Mansfield's Eulogy Among the Greatest

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, the Senate majority leader, has not been particularly famous as an orator. But in the eyes of Washingtonians he established himself as one of the great ones on Sunday, November 24, with a single deliverance.

His eulogy of the assassinated President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as the President's body was placed in the Capitol Rotunda to lie in state for a day, was so touching and heart-rending it may well receive frequent reprinting in history books and other literature.

Had Mr. Kennedy's alleged assassin not been assassinated himself on that very day, before the eyes of millions watching on television, Senator Mansfield's tribute to his fallen leader undoubtedly would have received far greater prominence in the news that day.

You probably remember that it contained a recurring reference to the fact that when the President died, his wife, Jacqueline, kissed his lifeless lips and took off her ring and put it in his hand.

Some parts of the eulogy have no doubt been heard or read by most Americans old enough to read. Parts of it were quoted in this newspaper last Monday. But the entire text was not because of the great volume of news that day about the second killing at Dallas and the events in Washington leading up to the President's burial.

For those who did not hear or see it all—and those who wish to save one of the most touching pieces of oratory in American history—we publish here the entire tribute:

"There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And, so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and a child's wisdom, and, then, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a father with a little boy, a little girl, and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

"There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and, out of the giving and the asking, wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

"A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us a good heart from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into human courage to seek peace without fear.

"He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

"In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

"I pray to God that we shall, and under God we will."

## EQUALITY, FAIRPLAY, AND JUSTICE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FONG

**Mr. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, on September 27, our able colleague, Senator Hiram L. Fong, delivered a noteworthy address on civil rights and civil liberties before a convention of delegates to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union Local 142 in Honolulu.

This speech—which is aptly entitled "The March Toward Equality, Fairplay, and Justice"—is of particular importance and historic significance because of the national and, indeed, international stature of my good friend and our distinguished colleague, Hiram Fong.

No Senator is more highly respected and esteemed by his fellow Senators as a warm and gifted leader of men. When he speaks, as he so often does on issues of great social importance, he speaks clearly and with reason.

Across the Nation and around the world, Senator Fong's leadership in championing the rights of the common man is well known. In the field of civil rights and civil liberties, his efforts have been constant, determined, and unyielding.

Mr. President, these are critical times. As Senator Fong notes:

> The common man, in his great march toward equality, dignity, justice, and respect, has been in the forefront of sweeping economic and political revolutions the world over. Our own Nation—

He rightly points out—

> has been swept along by the force of this movement for equal status, and today we are witnessing an upheaval of profound proportions in America.

Viewed in these contexts, Senator Fong's speech takes on a special and unique relevance for our time.

I have before me a copy of the text of Senator Fong's address, "The March Toward Equality, Fairplay, and Justice," together with a covering letter from Mr. Newton Miyagi, secretary-treasurer of the ILWU Local 142. I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the speech and letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and speech were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S
& WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
*Honolulu, Hawaii, November 27, 1963.*

Hon. Hiram L. Fong,
*New Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FONG: I am sending you a stenographic transcript of the excellent and memorable talk you gave to the sixth biennial convention of ILWU Local 142.

Many delegates told me how much they appreciated your forthright expressions for civil rights and civil liberties and said that they wanted to see the text of your talk in print. The officers of the local feel the same way and hope that you will be able to give it a wide circulation.

Again, warm thanks and aloha for your part in our convention.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON MIYAGI,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

### THE MARCH TOWARD EQUALITY, FAIRPLAY, AND JUSTICE

I am very happy to be here with all of you today. It is an honor, a pleasure and a privilege to participate in this sixth biennial convention of the ILWU Local 142.

In my long association with you and your officers, I have come to know how successfully and actively you have carried on your union negotiations and activities for the benefit and welfare of your members and how you have been sought after by so many laboring groups outside of sugar, pineapple and stevedoring to organize them as ILWU units, bespeaking the high regard they hold your officers and members. Employers who have dealt with your officers and leaders have expressed to me that you are a responsible and matured union.

I am also keenly aware that aside from your primary purpose of unionism for which you were organized, you take great pride and a very active participation in the manifold activities of our community. I am also deeply aware that you have been long in the forefront carrying forward the fight to achieve equal rights for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

Your resoluteness and dedication of purpose in the protection of our civil rights and civil liberties has placed you and your ILWU as stout champions of the individual in this century of great changes.

For all you have done and accomplished, for the benefit and progress of your members, for the benefit and progress of all Americans, and for the benefit and progress of our community, State, and Nation—I congratulate and commend you.

The 20th century has been called the century of the common man. And so it is, for during these 63 years, the common man has risen to form more nations, establish more self-government, cast more ballots, build more schools, study more books, cure more diseases, minister to more needy than ever before.

As a part of this movement in the rise of the common man, we are witnessing in our Nation today an upheaval, deep, broad and forceful. It is a revolution among the common man for equality, for fair play, for justice, for a chance to get a job, for dignity, and for respect.

In America, this whirlwind of revolt has swept across the face of the Nation, producing our Birminghams and our New Yorks, our Oxfords and our Chicagos, and finally building up to that climactic march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

I was asked whether I approved of this march for jobs and freedom. This was my answer. I said that the right of the American people to petition their Government is fundamental to our democracy. That right is guaranteed by the first amendment to our Constitution, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

I believe that the August 28 march is a legitimate exercise of this right. It is in keeping with the best traditions of America's heritage.

As one who believes in the right to petition and as one who is always willing to listen, I welcomed this opportunity to hear the petitions of my fellow citizens.

No one present at the civil rights march on August 28 could fail to be deeply moved by that stirring demonstration of 200,000 of our fellow Americans. No one could fail to realize that these petitioners were a living testament that our democracy, though imperfect, still endures. No one who looked upon the vast sea of faces turned upward toward the statue of Abraham Lincoln, and no one who listened to the rhythmic chant, "Pass the bill. Pass the bill" could fail to feel the depth of the commitment and dedication of his fellow man.

Because we have the good fortune to live in Hawaii, where there is so much freedom of opportunity and where the spirit of aloha is everywhere, and because most of us at one time or another have felt or witnessed the denial of justice and fair play, all of us can understand fully and deeply the very intense pleadings of our fellow citizens for equal status.

We all feel very strongly that discrimination and prejudice are morally wrong, wherever they are practiced. We all know that discrimination is not limited to one area of our land. It happens in too many places. We all know that discrimination is not confined to members of one race. It hurts the people of too many races. We all know discrimination is not aimed against only one color. Prejudice can spread to any color.

Whatever his racial background, all the common man wants is to be able to walk into a restaurant and be served, like anyone else. All he wants is to be able to buy a theater ticket or a bus token and sit wherever there is a vacant seat, like anyone else. All he wants is to be able to vote freely and without fear, like any other citizens. All he wants is the opportunity to give his child the best possible education, like any other American. All he wants is to be able to get a job, or to be considered an applicant, like anyone else. All he wants is to be able to live in a decent home in a decent neighborhood, like anyone else.

In other words, all the American common man, and especially the American Negro common man, wants is his birthright—all the rights his American citizenship entitles him to have, like any other American, rights which have been denied him for centuries. And he wants them now.

In this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, it is timely for all Americans to wipe out the last vestiges of racial discrimination and make equal opportunity a living reality in all areas of community life—in the voting booth, in the schoolrooms, in employment, in housing, and in public facilities.

A few months ago, the President in a long awaited message asked Congress to enact an omnibus civil rights act which would do seven things:

First, the bill would prohibit racial discrimination in all public accommodations, such as hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, and playgrounds. Nothing is more insulting to a citizen who is barred from places like a hotel or a restaurant just because of the color of his skin, or the slant of his eyes, or the shape of his nose. This injustice has no place in a country proud of its heritage of equal rights, of one nation, of one people.

Second, the civil rights bill would protect the right of all children to attend desegregated public schools by allowing the U.S. Attorney General to start school desegregation suits. All of us in Hawaii know how vital it is to have a decent education. In our complex, highly industrialized society where automation and other technological developments are moving swiftly ahead, if we take away a man's education, we take away his very livelihood. Every American should have an equal educational opportunity.

Third, the civil rights bill would protect the right of all persons who want to vote in any Federal election. The proposal says that anyone with a sixth grade education is educated enough to vote. This will prevent some States from denying a person who is qualified to vote from voting. If we are to have a strong, effective democracy, there can be no more important legislation than laws to insure everybody's right to vote.

Fourth, the civil rights bill would allow the Federal Government to cut off Federal money to any program or activity where there is racial discrimination. This provision would require that there be no discrimination in many federally supported programs.

Fifth, the civil rights bill would extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission by 4 years. Since it was set up in 1957, the Commission has served with great distinction. It has thrown a spotlight on many critical and unresolved civil rights problems. It has investigated and uncovered many cases where citizens were denied equal housing, education, and employment opportunities, denied the right to vote, and denied fair treatment by the police.

Sixth, the civil rights bill would establish a Community Relations Service to help local communities wipe out discriminatory practices.

Seventh, the civil rights bill would establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to help prevent racial discrimination in jobs where the Government is involved. Unemployment falls the hardest on certain minority groups. For example, the unemployment rate of the Negro is about double the rate for the whole labor force.

Now that the President has committed himself to a historical far-reaching civil rights program, Congress faces the job of enacting a strong and effective civil rights law. There is no doubt that civil rights legislation is the greatest single piece of unfinished domestic business. It is our number one problem at home.

The Senate's civil rights bill is still bogged down in Judiciary Committee hearings.

When the Senate finally takes up civil rights legislation, a southern filibuster is sure to come. Around-the-clock sessions will very likely be used to try to break it—but I am afraid that these 24-hour sessions are harder on those of us who want to break the filibuster than on the filibusterers.

The most critical vote will be on cloture to stop the talkathon. In that fight, the President cannot be a casual bystander. He will be counted on to use the great power of his office to stop debate and get some action on these badly needed civil rights measures.

As a Senator representing this State with its many races and many assimilated cultures, and with its world-famous spirit of fair play and aloha; as one who has long supported efforts to wipe out race discrimination in America; as one who helped to write 23 civil rights bills in the Senate, I am 100 percent behind the fight to pass a good, strong civil rights bill. And as a member of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I am in a position to do something about it.

While we are trying to wipe out the last traces of racial discrimination against our own citizens, is it not also good for us to reappraise this same relationship of man's equality to man with other peoples of the world? For as we move to erase racial discrimination against Americans, we should also move to erase racial barriers against citizens of other lands.

In 1952, Congress enacted the present Immigration and Nationality Act which wiped out total exclusion against Japan, the Philippines, and other Asian nations, and for the first time allowed many nations of the Orient a long-denied quota of immigrants. But today that 1952 law is very obsolete.

More than 10 years have now passed since it was enacted by Congress. Since then, our Nation and the world have witnessed revolutionary changes everywhere. Many areas emerged from colonial status to full nationhood. Many nations have changed their form of government. There is greater clamor for freedom, liberty, and justice, and, all over the world, peoples are on the march seeking equality.

At home, we have wiped out racial barriers in our Armed Forces, in interstate transportation, in our institutions of higher learning, and in many areas of our economy. We are making significant progress in desegregating our public schools, housing, businesses, and public accommodations, and protecting the voting rights of all citizens. And, we are continuing our battle for full equality. We must open our eyes and recognize this great upheaval in our Nation and throughout the world for equal status.

Again and again, America has been accused that it has been unfair in its immigration laws. We have erected racial barriers that deny equal dignity and respect to more than one-half of the world's population. These racial barriers are bad for America. They hurt America's image as the leader of the free world.

Our present immigration laws are filled with at least eight racially discriminatory provisions which I want to see eliminated. Let me give you a few examples.

First, the national origins system discriminates against orientals, Polynesians, and Negroes. It is a system that gives large quotas only to white nations, while the nations of Asia, Polynesia, and Africa are given tiny quotas of about 100 each.

Second, the Asia-Pacific triangle area was given only about 1½ percent of the total annual immigration quota—or 2,390 of 155,000. The Asia-Pacific triangle is an area in which more than half of the world's population lives. The overwhelming majority of quota immigrants, over 81 percent, comes from northern and western Europe; over 98 percent are from Europe; only 1.53 percent are from Asia and the Pacific.

Third, the place of birth determines what quota a white person falls under. But for orientals and Polynesians, it depends on race or ancestry. If you are a person of one-half Polynesian or oriental ancestry, you must wait your turn under the tiny Asian or Polynesian quotas, even if you were born and raised and your family lived for generations in a country outside of the triangle.

Fourth, the 1952 act sets up a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100. To this very small quota must be assigned thousands of Polynesian and oriental peoples living all over the world and in over 20 dependencies located in the triangle area like the Tongas and Okinawa.

Fifth, our present law clearly discriminates, not only against orientals, Polynesians, and Negroes, but also persons of Eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Mediterranean origins by giving them much smaller quotas than other European areas.

Let me give you some other examples of how discriminatory and unfair our present immigration laws are. Did you know:

That under present American immigration quotas for Asia and Pacific areas, more than 50 percent of the people of this state could be almost totally excluded from the United States?

That Ireland, with a population of 2,815,000, has a larger quota than all Asia, with a population of nearly 1½ billion?

That the quota for tiny Switzerland is greater than the quotas for the entire African Continent?

That the immigration quotas of nearly every nation in the Asia-Pacific area are so small that:

Japan's waiting list stretches all the way to 1989 or beyond?

The quota for Chinese persons is, for all practical purposes, exhausted in perpetuity, according to the State Department?

The quota for Okinawa, which does not fall under Japan's but under a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100 shared by 20 other Pacific dependencies, is backlogged for 48 years, until the year 2011?

It is very, very clear to me that in our immigration laws we have yet to live up to the ideals of equality our Constitution so eloquently proclaims. As one who is steadfastly determined to wipe out racial discrimination from our immigration laws and as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, I pledge every effort to write a new, fair, and just immigration law. We will then be showing the whole world that we practice what we preach, and that in the eyes of the law, all men are equal.

This march of the common man for equality in employment, in housing, in schools, in the voting booths, in public facilities, is also a march for justice and fair play in the courts.

In my study of this problem, I find that there is a compelling need to insure fair play and to insure constitutional protections when a GI in our Armed Forces is tried in a military court for committing a crime.

Congress 13 years ago recognized the need to safeguard the GI's constitutional rights and in 1950 passed the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This code expressly extended the protections of the Bill of Rights to all military personnel. Congress also set up the U.S. Court of Military Appeals to review the convictions and sentences of military courts. Even with these laws, I find that many abuses still persist to prevent our GI's from getting a fair shake and an impartial trial.

In some cases, because of the pressures of superior officers, GI defendants did not receive impartial trials. In summary court-martial cases, a single officer acts as judge, jury, prosecutor, and defense counsel—a clear violation of the Constitution's guarantee for due process of law. Some GI's have been denied the right to speedy trials because of military redtape. Some GI defendants have been harassed by unreasonable searches and seizures, infringing the fourth amendment to our Constitution. The constitutional right to counsel is denied in many cases.

In addition, more and more, military commanders have been getting around the safeguards of the Military Code by handling the cases administratively. For instance, even though a serviceman had been cleared and acquitted before by a court-martial, he can be administratively discharged under "other than honorable" conditions for the same alleged misconduct. This is a very clear infringement of the constitutional ban against double jeopardy.

Because I strongly believe that it is only fair and just to do everything possible to protect the rights of the men and women to whom we have entrusted the Nation's defense, I have sponsored a series of 16 bills to insure constitutional fairplay in military trials.

On the civilian side of the picture, I have found that there is also a serious need to protect the constitutional right of defendants in Federal criminal cases. Although the sixth amendment to our Constitution guarantees a speedy public trial, the Government has sometimes used delaying tactics that are clearly unconstitutional. I believe the purposes of the sixth amendment are to:

1. Prevent the Government from delay in bringing charges against the accused;

2. Prevent the Government from repeatedly bringing the same charge against the defendant by getting a voluntary dismissal of previously filed charges;

3. Prevent the Government from filing multiple indictments in different courts charging the same crimes, and keeping the defendant guessing which indictment to prosecute and at what time, if at all;

4. Prevent a long delay in beginning a trial after charges have been filed; and

5. Prevent any delay in imposing sentence on the convicted defendant.

To insure these guarantees of fairplay for a defendant, I have written a proposed law to prevent the Government from using such delaying, stalling, and unfair tactics.

On all 17 of these bills to protect the constitutional rights of military and civilian defendants, I shall work hard to see that they are enacted into law. For I am mindful of what Clarence Darrow once said about criminal defendants:

"The Constitution is a delusion and a snare if the weakest and the humblest man in the land cannot be defended in his right to speak and his right to think as much as the greatest and strongest in the land. I am not here to defend their opinions. I am here to defend their right to express their opinions."

And while I am protesting these abridgments of our constitutional rights, as an attorney with long experience in defense of people accused of crime in our State courts, I must also raise my voice against the strong efforts being made by the present U.S. Attorney General to have a bill passed allowing the Federal Government to invade the privacy of our lives by making wire tapping legal.

The Attorney General asked Congress in 1961, and again just a few days ago, on September 25, for authority to tap telephones and to use what is overheard as legal evidence in criminal trials. In effect, he wanted the power to eavesdrop, not only when a crime was already committed, but also when in his judgment a crime was about to be committed.

What a terrible encroachment on one of the most valued rights of a citizen—the right of privacy, the right to be personally secure. It was against precisely these kinds of police state tactics, this kind of tyranny, that our Founding Fathers rebelled from England and established our Republic. Justice Brandeis recognized this right when he said, "The makers of our Constitution * * * sought to protect Americans in their beliefs. their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred as against the Government the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of the rights of man and the right most valued by civilized men."

Can you imagine what such a law could do? With modern electronic devices, conversations within the home and the office could be recorded without tapping any wire. The intimacies of private life can be made public without a key being turned or a window being raised. Moreover, a wiretap cannot be limited to a particular person, place, or purpose. It is by its very nature unlimited and unlimitable. Whenever a tap is placed on a phone, it monitors all conversations on that phone, and every phone in the world which may be connected with it.

An American citizen's home is not likely to be much of a castle if law enforcement authorities can barge into it without so much as a warrant whenever they happen to merely suspect that he was about to commit a crime.

Of course, all Americans are concerned that those who violate the law are apprehended and convicted. But if wiretapping is made legal, is not the price we must pay, the loss of our personal liberty, far too high a price? When we open this door to the Government, as Alan Barth rightly points out, it is only a very short step to allowing the Government to rifle our mails and search our homes. Mr. Barth said further, "A great deal could be learned about crime by putting recording devices in confessionals and in physicians' consulting rooms, by compelling wives to testify against their husbands, by encouraging children to report the dangerous thoughts uttered by their parents. The trouble with these techniques, whatever their utility in safeguarding national security, is that a nation which countenances them ceases to be free."

Any of these actions would clearly violate the guarantees of the fourth amendment to the Constitution, that "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated."

What is at stake here—in the wiretapping proposal as well as all the other civil rights and civil liberties I have been talking about—is our very freedom embodied in those liberties inalienably guaranteed us by the Constitution. These are high stakes. A free society guards its liberties jealously. The most important lesson of history America has learned is that when freedom is denied to one man, it is denied to all.

For freedom is noble and indivisible. If we want to enjoy it, it must be extended to everyone. If we want to maintain it, we must fight for it.

It is time now for the true, clear voice of America to be heard, distinct and strong. It speaks to Americans of what this Republic really is and what this free Republic must do to remain true to herself.

The true voice of America reaffirms the American idea. It speaks of a rededication of all her people to the proposition that all men are equal. It speaks of a renewal of the commitment of heart and mind to the spirit of liberty.

Living as we do in Hawaii, it is easy for us to listen to this voice of America. It is easy for us to hold the simple truth of the essential equality of man to be self-evident.

We have learned to value highly the precious freedoms we now enjoy. Steeped as we are in a mixture of Christian idealism on the one hand, and the great oriental philosophies with their emphasis on righteous human and moral conduct on the other, we have molded a society which is a showcase of freedom and equal status here in the islands.

For we, the people of Hawaii, understand well the spirit of liberty which underlies all of our American ideals. The great judge, Learned Hand, has described it well:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. * * * What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

## THE CASE FOR THE ATOM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Mr. John W. Simpson, group vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp., recently addressed the Atomic Industrial Forum in New York City on the subject of civilian nuclear power. My home State of New Hampshire is one of the Nation's highest power cost areas. To a very great extent, this has resulted from the small size of the area served and the high transportation rates which our utilities must pay. The artificial shortage of residual fuel oil, arising from the import quotas maintained by the Oil Import Administration, aggravates this high power cost situation. Much though I deplore the upward cost pressures which our utilities must somehow resist, the high costs of conventional fuels in New Hampshire undoubtedly hasten the day when we will rely in much greater part on nuclear power.

The price for electric power sold by the Yankee Atomic Electric Power Co. at Rowe, Mass., in its first year of operation in 1961, was 10.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. The total 1961 cost of steam-electric power production for New Hampshire's largest electric utility was about 10.9 mills per kilowatt-hour. There can be no question but that New Hampshire will be one of the first beneficiaries of competitive civilian nuclear power. For this reason, I found Mr. Simpson's speech exceptionally revealing and highly relevant to the future of northern New England. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### The Case for the Atom

I would like to begin this talk by going back some 75 years, to recall to your minds an almost forgotten scientific war. I do so because I feel it may have some relevance to a similar situation developing today.

The place was New York City. The year was 1886. The central character was one of America's great engineers, George Westinghouse. Mr. Westinghoue had a plan.

A small but extremely vociferous minority charged that the plan could kill people in a few seconds and destroy large sections of the city by fire. The press, which was pretty irresponsible in those days, ran sensational stories on what it called "the murderer." The feeling of panic was encouraged by interested parties and groups.

New York's Mayor Hewitt was urged to take the law into his own hands if necessary to stop this thing, and when he failed to do so, one journal called for his arrest as accessory to "a carnival of avoidable suicide." An ex-Governor of the State wrote to the mayor urging him not to let the plan go into action anywhere within the city limits of New York.

What Mr. Westinghouse was proposing, of course, was alternating current. His proposal would spread cheap power throughout New York and keep the city from strangling in a network of low-voltage direct current lines. He might have expected applause, but what he got was an emotion-charged crusade.

Mr. Westinghouse explained patiently over and over again that alternating current was safe. "The transformers," he said, "are so constructed that the primary or street current can never by any possibility enter the home."

Despite this, the attacks increased. Even Thomas A. Edison attacked alternating current as unsafe. He wrote an article against it in the North American Review, which, you might say, was the Harper's magazine of that day. He was freely quoted in newspaper stories as being positive that no known method of insulation could render alternating current wires safe if they carried more than 200 volts. Their use underground in subways, he said, would not lessen the danger, because the high tension current would burn out the tubes and enter dwellings through the manholes.

There is a lot more to the story, but, as you know, everything turned out all right. The American people chose to go along with alternating current, and it is good that they did. Without it, our industrial growth would have been shackled for lack of available energy.

Now I would like to recall another historical event of some importance.

On the last day of the year 1946, President Truman signed a document that transferred the Nation's wartime atomic facilities—the whole complex of factories, laboratories and weapons—to civilian control under the newly created Atomic Energy Commission. Atomic energy was still a Government monopoly, but at that moment the Nation took its first small steps in a program to convert atomic energy to peaceful and constructive purposes.

Part of my purpose today is to try to measure, to assess, the progress we have made in that program since 1946. It has occurred to me that we might best do this if we looked at the program from a different point of view—if we tried to imagine how the results accomplished to date would have looked to scientists in 1946.

And so I ask you now to imagine, for a moment, that you are back with me in December 1946. We are at a meeting of top American scientists and engineers, and we are hearing a talk on potential civilian developments in atomic power.

As professionals, we know in 1946 something of the technical problems that lie ahead in atomic power. We understand what an enormous and doubtful task it will be to take the theoretical concepts of the physicist and convert them into a machine that works. We, of course, ignore the careless prophecies and loose promises that are going around in 1946—the promises of do-it-yourself atomic furnaces the size of a shoebox in every American home. The great unanswered questions in our minds are basic ones. Can it be done? Can practical, power-producing atomic reactors be built? Can they be built in the 20th century? Can we produce enough uranium and fissionable material to run them?

Now I ask you to imagine that someone stood up in that 1946 meeting and predicted, with absolute assurance, the course that atomic power would follow in the next 17 years. Suppose that he told us the following:

"Five years from now," (I am quoting this man) "an experimental reactor at Arco, Idaho, will produce, in laboratory amounts, the first electric power from nuclear energy.

"In less than 7 years, the prototype of nuclear reactor built to propel a submarine will produce the first usable atomic power in substantial quantities.

"In less than 8 years, the AEC will award a contract to build a nuclear power station at a place called Shippingport, Pa. A new Atomic Energy Act will permit private industry to build, own, and operate atomic reactors.

"In 8 years, an atomic submarine, named the *Nautilus*, will cruise out into the Atlantic on nuclear power. Eventually, it will sail under the Arctic ice cap to the North Pole.

"In exactly 11 years, the Shippingport plant will produce nuclear power on the line.

"In only 17 years—on November 21, 1963—there will be 12 major nuclear power stations in America producing electricity for utility systems. Utilities will have announced firm plans to build seven more nuclear stations, ranging from 325,000 to 1 million kilowatts.

"These new plants, when completed" (I am still quoting) "will be producing power at per-kilowatt cost competitive with conventional power produced in their areas.

"In 1963, the total U.S. civilian nuclear power capacity in operation, under construction contracted for, or publicly announced will total 5 million kilowatts. That will be equal to the 1963 installed electrical capacity of Belgium, larger than the capacity of Austria, or of Mexico.

"You will have all the uranium and fissionable material you need.

"The U.S. Government will accomplish this progress in civilian nuclear power without a crash program, for an average investment of $77 million per year over the period of 17 years."

Well, I am finished with the prophecy that might have been made in December 1946. In my opinion, any audience of engineers and scientists recently would have rejoiced 17 years ago at the prospect of such stunning success in nuclear power at so small cost within so short a time.

In 1946, I was working at Oak Ridge with the Daniels Pile group, and the potential of civilian nuclear power was constantly in our minds. I know that if we had been given any such firm assurance of the atomic future, we would have felt great relief and encouragement in the face of what appeared to be a difficult, perhaps impossible, task. For that prophecy would have had a deep importance to us. It would have said that mankind now has a whole new source of practical, usable energy.

You know, of course, that the atomic power program has developed exactly as I described it. This, it seems to me, gives us reason for pride, thanksgiving and bold plans for the future. Instead of these, we now hear from several directions sour complaints that the civilian atomic power program is a failure; that it is moving too slowly; that it is moving too fast; that it is costing the American taxpayer too much; that the electricity produced by atomic power is a disappointment because it is no different from the electricity produced by the combustion of coal; that atomic powerplants are lethally dangerous and, if built at all, should be built not here, not there, but somewhere else.

I confess that I am mystified that this is happening. I am unable to account for it on any basis of experience or logic. If things had gone wrong instead of right in the atomic power program, we could understand the doubts and fears. If the program had failed instead of succeeded, we could understand the attacks. But I have asked the basic questions that should be asked of such a program in order to form a judgment, and the answers I get provide no cause for fear and no justification for attack.

Question No. 1. Has the civilian atomic power program lagged or fallen behind original expectations?

Most scientists and engineers, I think, will agree today that the program has progressed with reasonable speed and far beyond the early expectations of those qualified to render a judgment. Back around 1948–50, many scientists thought that central station atomic power might be available "before the turn of the century." Some of the more optimistic said "within 25 years." Nobody, to my knowledge, predicted that it would be available in 1957.

Question No. 2. Are other nations performing better than we are in the development of atomic power?

It is generally acknowledged that the United States holds world leadership in atomic power. We have more atomic power stations in operation than any other nation.

Question No. 3. Has the atomic power program cost the American taxpayer too much money?

The civilian atomic power program has cost the Nation $1.3 billion since its inception 17 years ago. That expenditure for peaceful use of the atom is only 5 percent of the $26.5 billion the Nation has spent on atomic armaments. A distinguished Member of Congress has pointed out that it is exactly the same amount we have provided to help the nation of Iran. One billion, three hundred million dollars hardly seems an excessive amount to pay for a new technology, a new growth industry, and a new source of power.

Question No. 4. Are costs of the program skyrocketing or getting out of hand?

Annual costs of the program are less than they were 4 and 5 years ago. Costs recently have been running less than $200 million a year, and they are projected for no more than that for the future. This is the Federal investment for the research, design, development, and construction of prototype and experimental reactors, even including the buy-back of plutonium from private users which is truly an investment for the future.

A successful atomic power program will recover this investment for the American people many times over. If atomic power can cut power costs by only one-tenth of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, consumers will save more than $100 million each year on the basis of present power load. This saving would mount into the billions in the decades ahead, as load doubles and redoubles.

It is interesting to note that coal prices have been dropping in those areas where nuclear plants are being built or considered. If we can assume that this price decrease has come about because utility management now has another competitive source of fuel to choose from, then the American people are already beginning to receive dollar dividends from atomic power.

Question No. 5. Have the private utilities refused to support the program with their own money?

Since 1954, it has been Government policy to encourage utility companies, in the national interest, to invest in atomic power installations. Up to now, these companies have invested $500 million in atomic power. In 1963, the year atomic power came of age, they committed themselves to spend $500 million more. In addition, the manufacturers and suppliers have invested between $200 and $300 million in atomic facilities and development, and this investment has been mounting sharply. That is as it should be. In the not-too-distant future, the Federal Government will be able to devote itself exclusively to basic atomic research.

Question No. 6: Has it been demonstrated that atomic powerplants cannot compete in cost per kilowatt-hour with conventional plants?

Perhaps the best evidence that atomic power is becoming competitive lies in this commitment by utility executives to buy a half-billion dollars' worth of atomic plant. Westinghouse has had some experience in selling to utility executives, and I can attest that they are notoriously tough bargainers in a business deal. If anyone thinks these men would put any such sum in atomic power without a sound economic justification, he just does not know utility men. These executives recognize their obligations to the communities they serve, to their employees, and to their stockholders.

The fact is that the atomic plants now being bought by the utilities will be competitive, when completed, with conventional plants in areas where the cost of coal, oil and gas is relatively high—for example, on the west coast and in the Northeastern United States. We believe, further, that those atomic plants will, over their lifetime, generate power more cheaply than the conventional plants in their areas. And this is only the beginning of a new and burgeoning industry. As the industry grows, costs of plants, of fuel and of atomic power generation will continue to drop.

Norman Hillberry, former director of Argonne National Laboratory, used to say with a smile, "There are three kinds of lies in the world: lies, damn lies, and estimates of nuclear power costs." Those days are gone now. If anyone here is interested in buying an atomic powerplant, I'll be happy to quote him a firm price and give him guarantees and warranties.

Another indication that the atom is becoming competitive is the astonishing campaign that coal-industry spokesmen have launched against atomic power and against coal's biggest customer, the electric utilities, for investing in these plants. The assault has become so strong that President Kennedy felt impelled to say in a public address, "We cannot permit the mining industry to say there shall be no nuclear energy because it may affect them adversely."

Question No. 7: Has the safety record in atomic powerplants been bad?

In the U.S. atomic reactor program since 1946, no accident has ever occurred affecting public safety. Some 2 million man-years of experience have been logged on military, commercial and experimental reactors. In this period, the only serious incident involved experimental work in which three servicemen lost their lives. They were working at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho on an experimental reactor built for a special military use in remote areas. Three men are three too many, and the men have been mourned in our industry; but I still must ask: Is there any other industry in the world that has so good an accident record?

The Navy has now logged about 100 reactor-years of operating experience with its naval reactors. Thousands of its men have worked, eaten, slept, and relaxed through many millions of hours within a few feet of atomic reactors. They have done so without harm or injury.

In the 17 years of the civilian atomic power program involving 40 operating-years of experience with commercial reactors in the United States, there has been no injury and no loss of life involving a reactor. This record, I would think, is unparalleled in industrial experience. It could be achieved, of course, only with the cooperation of a safety-conscious and safety-vigilant labor force.

The 6-year safety record of the Duquesne Light Co.'s Shippingport Atomic Power Station is a representative one for this new industry. There have been three lost-time accidents at Shippingport in 6 years. Two were back sprains. One was a strained knee.

Question No. 8: Has there been some new development that indicates atomic reactors are unsafe or dangerous?

You know—but I must state for the record—that atomic powerplants are safe as designed. There are natural features inherent in operating plants, in plants under construction, and in plants on the drawing board, which control the maximum rate of energy release and, in case of malfunction, would very quickly shut the plant down. There's absolutely no possibility of an "atomic explosion" in an atomic powerplant. There is no way in which an atomic reactor can get completely out of control. The amount of radioactivity you would receive from an atomic powerplant in your neighborhood would be less than you would receive in natural radiation walking through Central Park, less than that thrown off by your own brick house.

In addition to the reactor's natural built-in features, extremely reliable safety devices are also provided in duplicate—sometimes even in triplicate. These would prevent any operating error from causing an accident. They would prevent any credible equipment failure from releasing any significant amount of radioactive material from the reactor. Even if there could be radioactive leakage from the reactor in an emergency, the steel and concrete container shell would protect the public from any possible adverse effect.

Atomic powerplants are no longer experimental installations. We are now building fifth-generation plants whose reliability and safety are a proven fact.

Question No. 9: Has there been some move on the part of the AEC, the manufacturers, or the utilities to relax atomic safeguards and cut back on safety provisions?

On the contrary, the safeguards have been immensely strengthened.

In designing a commercial atomic reactor, you begin by designing to prevent damage to the core for all credible accidents. Then you imagine all the possible coincident failures of reactor safety devices and you make certain that none of these failures can lead to core damage. When you have done this, you know that atomic reactors—even those without systems to contain the escape of vapors—are safe. Nevertheless, you go a step further.

You proceed to hypothesize a situation in which there is an accident many times worse than any credible accident—one in which there is significant core damage and release of fissionable products. Against this, you design for containment of escaping vapors—practically speaking, an airtight steel and concrete structure up to 7 feet thick. With this you achieve absolute assurance of a super-safe plant in the face of any possible situation.

Unfortunately—and for reasons that appear questionable—some people who know better are misinterpreting these extra precautions as an evidence that the plants present an abnormal public hazard. They are wrong.

Some sensational and quite inaccurate charges have also been made about the hazards of transporting and storing radioactive wastes from commercial powerplants. The facts are these. Most shipments are of low-level wastes. While every safety precaution is taken with these, they are much less dangerous than such chemicals as chlorine gas—which have been transported under regulation in this country for decades without public alarm or protest. High-level radioactive wastes are also transported safely under the strictest Federal regulations. They must be carried in containers able to withstand an impact of 60 g.—that is, 60 times the force of gravity.

As for storage, the industry, under AEC supervision, is developing a method for the fixation of high-level wastes into solids, so that as these wastes mount in volume, they may be safely stored in solid form in a cave, where they will be available for the future as byproduct uses are developed.

On October 1, 1963, AEC Commissioner James T. Ramey expressed the viewpoint of his colleagues on the matter of atomic safety with the words: "I want to reaffirm the basic AEC policy that all activities under its cognizance will be conducted in a manner which assures that operating personnel and the general public are well protected against all hazards."

On November 7, 1963, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, said this: "Never before in the public's experience has an agency responsible for the protection of public safety gone to such extremes to allow for every foreseeable contingency."

On the basis of both the men and the record, it seems to me that the American people can accept these words as meaning exactly what they say. There is no reason to feel lack of confidence in the Government officials, elected or appointed, who are charged with administering and supervising the atomic power program. We already place such confidence in officials who have far greater responsibilities even than the siting of an atomic powerplant. We trust those officials with the right to declare war, to defend the country, to transport atomic energy in a form that can explode—that was built to explode. We trust them, in a case of extreme emergency, even to use atomic weapons. It would seem to me that we can place a comparable confidence in those officials who are charged with protecting the public interest and safety in atomic power.

Question No. 10. Have there been complaints from communities where atomic powerplants have been operating for the past several years?

The people in communities where atomic plants are operating have actively expressed satisfaction at having the plants there. For one thing, they provide an additional source of fuel to the utility company serving the area. In southern California, for example, for most of the year a utility now is allowed to use only one fuel—gas. The availability of a second fuel offers a distinct economic advantage. For another, atomic powerplants produce no air pollution. This is especially important in a community like Los Angeles, which is bedeviled by smog, most of it from automobiles. Utilities are doing a good job of controlling the discharge from their stacks, but as power demand doubles in the next 10 years, and doubles again in the next 20, the gaseous discharge from fossil fuel combustion will become an increasing problem. In the case of a nuclear plant, there is no such discharge.

In my opinion, responsible leaders are now or will soon be aware that they harm only their own communities in opposing the construction of an atomic power station. It is the communities that get lower cost power that will prosper, and atomic plants offer the prospect of lowest costs in the year ahead.

It would appear that the American people are now beginning a third great national debate on atomic power. In the 1946 Atomic Energy Act, they turned atomic energy over to civilian control. In amending the act in 1954, they brought private industry into the picture and laid the foundations of the atomic power industry. Now they must decide if they are going to permit atomic power to fit into the normal pattern of industrial life. To put it in the simplest possible terms, the question is: Now that economic atomic power is within our grasp, do the American people want it, or do they not?

I would like to suggest that there are several key points to be kept in mind during this debate—in addition, of course, to the actual performance record of the industry to date.

First, an economic atomic power industry cannot be built in this country with plants restricted to remote and thinly settled areas. They must be in or near the areas they serve. This is especially true in large metropolitan areas where the problem of bringing extra-high-voltage power into the city from outside is very expensive.

Second, the atomic power program is nearing that point where it can stand on its own two feet without Federal support. As a New York Times editorial put it, "To slow down now is like faltering just short of the finish line in a 2-mile race." Although some reactor types now have achieved the long-sought goal of competitive economics in high fuel cost areas, it would be shortsighted to cut off research and development support before the fruits of our efforts can be made available to the entire Nation.

Third, regardless of what we do or fail to do in atomic power, our foreign competitors will continue right along with their programs. They will not slow down because we do. They are likely, rather, to accelerate their efforts. The world is going to have atomic powerplants. The only question is: Which nation will provide the leadership, do most of the work, and sell most of the plants? We hold world leadership in atomic power now. We will not continue to hold it if we slow down our program.

Fourth, and finally, it is within the power of an active and vociferous minority of the public to cripple and set back the atomic power program by years if the majority remains passive and silent. A continued barrage of ill-informed, emotional or highly motivated attacks can exert such pressure on legislators, administrators and utility companies that they will be reluctant to support atomic power development and subject themselves to harassment. There is danger now of a situation developing very much like the fanatical crusade carried on 75 years ago against alternating current.

We can hope that the private citizens and organizations in the community who favor the development of atomic power—and I believe it is a large majority—will stand up to the uninformed opposition and express themselves forcefully and effectively. To do this, they will need to be armed with background information, facts and ideas—with the complete rationale for atomic power.

It would seem to me that an industrywide program of education and rebuttal is called for. Our whole industry is being attacked; the whole industry should answer. The Nation's utilities and reactor manufacturers should join forces to spearhead this industry effort. The only weapon needed is truth—well presented and widely disseminated.

The atomic power industry has all the arguments on its side. It is a safe industry. It will bring cheaper power to the American people. It will conserve our natural resources. It will assure continued supplies of power in time of community or national emergency. It will give us continued leadership in a vital worldwide effort. It is being built in the national interest.

## JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President John F. Kennedy, only 46 years of age, happily married, father of two small children, brilliant, eager, foremost leader of the free world, died a martyr. He will no longer direct the destiny of our Nation and freedom-loving people the world over. His assassination so sudden, so revolting, is a supreme sacrifice to peace and understanding in the world. In World War II the life of this gallant young man was saved in enemy action. In this cold war he lost his life. Why, we ask? Perhaps the answer is that hate for fellow Americans has been building up, stimulated by lunatic fringe propagandists of the radical right and radical left. There has been too much hate built up by unscrupulous demagogs—hate for President Kennedy, hate for his administration; hate for the Chief Justice of the United States; false charges that our President was soft on communism; hate further inflamed by false scurrilous conclusions and innuendoes in the Lasky so-called biography; hate unbridled. Some citizens have been tolerant of extremist elements among us, evidently, in the belief they were crack brains, loudmouths, and habitual letter-to-editor writers who would disappear of their own accord in due time. Since the witch hunts of the early 1950's a climate was created which encouraged these lunatic extremist organizations to flourish unchallenged. Perhaps this atmosphere contributed to the death of our young President. If these lunatic fringe extremists of the left and right are to be restrained, they must be subject to constant exposure and relentless publicity. Unfortunately, there are too many of these patriots for profits. America is really last with them. The people of America and the entire world have poured out their grief, shock, and anger over the assassination of our President. Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, expressed the feelings of many Americans in his statement on this tragic occasion. He said, "A great and good President has suffered martyrdom as a result of hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our Nation by bigots, but his memory will always be an inspiration to Americans of good will everywhere." Those lunatic fringe extremists use divisive tactics—causing one American to hate and distrust another. They aid our Communist enemies, though they ignore Communist aggression from abroad while making outlandish statements alleging there are Communists in our State Department, on university faculties and even in the Protestant ministry. These bigots are really America lasters. They inflame addle-brained psychopaths. They sowed and reaped colossal tragedy. One of the greatest of all American Presidents, John F. Kennedy, killed by an assassin's bullet. We have a new President who is a great American. In his first public statement as President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson asked for the help of all. Now it is more essential than ever before that we Americans stand united before the world.

## FINNISH INDEPENDENCE DAY, DECEMBER 6, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, "we cannot escape geography." These four words, spoken by a former President of Finland, explain much of that country's past history and provide a basis for understanding its current role in European and world affairs. For, although the Finns are an ancient people, they did not throw off the curse of foreign domination until December 6, 1917. This freedom was made possible by the extensive internal upheaval in Russia at that time. Thus, on Friday of this week, Finland celebrates its 46th year of independence.

Since they wrested their independence from Russia, the Finns have lived from one crisis to another almost continually. The early days of national freedom were marked by a savage civil war. Later, the Republic was nearly overthrown by a Fascist movement. Then, between 1939 and 1944, Finland was forced to fight two disastrous wars with the Soviet Union. At the end of World War II, Finland was faced with two main tasks: First, paying more than one-half billion dollars in reparations to Russia; and second, settling some 477,000 refugees. This was comparable to our having to pay an indemnity of $20 billion and settling 18 million refugees. Only through much sacrifice and determined effort were the Finns able to shoulder these formidable burdens.

One of the cornerstones of Finland's foreign policy since the end of the last war has been that of not provoking the Bear to the east. The constant threat of Russia has made Finland determined to remain out of big power politics. That the Finns have survived such vicissitudes and maintained their independence and democracy is certainly an outstanding achievement. In addition, Finland has established a standard of living which is among the 10 highest in the world. Thus, although long dominated by foreign nations, ravaged by war, forced to contend with a cruel climate, and aware of a continuing threat to its independence, these sturdy people have made significant political, economic, and social advances in their 46 years of independence.

As we pay tribute to this stanch ally of freedom, let us not forget the contributions of its citizens to Western culture. We have read the works of Frans Emil Sillanpaa, a Nobel Prize winner; we have admired the sculpture of Waino Aaltonen; we have been moved by the symphonies of Jean Sibelius; and we have marveled at the architectural creations of Eliel Saarinen. Finland has indeed made significant contributions to the development of Western civilization.

In addition, those of Finnish origin have played vital roles in the progress of our Nation. At the present time, we have more than 400,000 citizens of Finnish descent in this country. They have performed numerous functions in the development of this Nation by their efforts in positions of leadership and management, in individual roles as artists and writers, and in essential but less publicized roles. Massachusetts has been fortunate to have had many of these people settle within its boundaries.

Thus, as Finland celebrates its independence this December 6, we are proud to reaffirm our friendship and express our gratitude for the contributions of its citizens, not only to America, but also to Western civilization. We have been enriched by the successes of those who have come to our shores and we have been inspired by the efforts and achievements of those who have remained in their native land. Congratulations and "kiitos." "Kiitos" is Finnish for "thank you."

## FAITH IN FREEDOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last night I had the privilege and pleasure of attending a dinner in honor of J. Edgar Hoover, sponsored by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.

Mr. Hoover delivered a notable address entitled "Faith in Freedom," which deeply moved all who heard it.

Mr. Hoover traced the manifold blessings of our American society back to the fundamental religious beliefs which formed the cornerstone of our public philosophy. But he did more than this. Mr. Hoover also analyzed the many flaws in our society and attributed them to a falling away from those same basic moral and ethical convictions.

Mr. Hoover spoke forcefully and compellingly of the need to do away with sentimentality in our efforts to control the growing crime wave. He said this:

> Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.
>
> There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is not longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.
>
> Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

I believe that everyone who reads this address will profit by it and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Faith in Freedom

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in Washington, D.C., December 4, 1963)

This is a great moment in my life. To be recognized in this manner by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

I am especially honored by the presence of so many close friends, including the distinguished civic leaders whom you have selected as recipients of other awards.

How have these men come to positions of prominence in our community? It is because they have dedicated themselves to service—they have eagerly accepted the responsibilities of good citizenship, and they are willing to be judged upon their records of positive contributions to the cause of decency and of justice.

Decency and justice—these are the high aims of this brotherhood, just as they always have been an integral part of the Hebrew religion which has given mankind the Ten Commandments and the concept of a monotheistic God. For these sacred gifts, all true religions of the Western World are eternally indebted to you.

Americans of the Hebrew faith are doubly blessed. The rich cultural inheritance that has been handed down since early Biblical times to generation after generation of Jews is combined, in our country, with a proud heritage of freedom. It is a heritage that was won by the sweat, the blood, and the sacrifices of men and women of many nationalities and many religious creeds.

Devotion to God, belief in the inherent dignity of mankind, faith in man's ability, through divine providence, to guide his own destiny—these are the strong ties that hold together our United States, the greatest brotherhood of freedom in the history of the world.

No one has a deeper understanding of the true meaning of freedom than the members of the Hebrew faith, for no peoples have suffered more relentless persecution and injustice at the hands of tyranny through the ages.

Today the fires of anti-Semitism continue to burn with fierce intensity in many areas of the world. This is particularly true behind the Iron Curtain where communism, the bitter enemy of Judaism and of all other religions of the world, seeks to destroy your priceless heritage and the right of your people to live according to the tenets of God.

During the past generation, the conscience of decent men everywhere has been shocked by the continuing vicious atrocities that have been committed against Jews in the Soviet Union. Rabbis have been arrested and imprisoned or executed; synagogues have been desecrated; the traditional Jewish school system has been liquidated; and Hebrew literature, language, and customs have been suppressed by the Russian Communists.

Despite Communist claims of improved conditions for Jews under the Khrushchev regime, the opposite actually is true. Additional forms of suppression have been introduced.

The observance of Passover no longer can be held according to tradition; sacred Hebrew burial customs have been obstructed; and a statewide program has been instituted to make Jews the scapegoats for criminal acts affecting the Russian economy. Jews are clearly identified by religion on the internal passport which all Soviet citizens must carry.

Last October, the outrageous extent of this program was disclosed by the Moscow newspaper Izvestia when it announced the arrests of several persons involved in an alleged criminal conspiracy. The leaders of this gang have "Jewish names," Izvestia told its readers in demanding a "show trial" and "death sentences."

Vicious outbursts of religious hatred such as this caused one American newspaper recently to warn its readers, "For reasons best known to themselves the Soviet leaders discriminate heavily against Jews. The evidence is overwhelming and incontrovertible and renewed almost daily by the Russians themselves."

In a joint statement released last summer, three American Jewish organizations denounced the Soviet press for conveying "a viciously negative image of the Jews," and indignantly proclaimed, "Soviet Jews are deprived by official policy of religious and cultural rights * * * and are the victims of discrimination. * * *"

Communism and religion—like communism and freedom—can never coexist, for Marxism is unalterably opposed to all forms of religious belief. Lenin acknowledged this fact more than 50 years ago when he exhorted his followers, "We must combat religion—this is the A.B.C. of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism." Then he declared, "The Marxist must be * * * an enemy of religion."

Since the time of Lenin, atheistic communism has surged forth from Russia to enslave nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Nowhere are its advance battalions more active than in our own Western Hemisphere, where agents trained by the Kremlin continue to burrow deeply into countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Their deadly objective is to undermine legitimate governments, foment revolution and create a Soviet Union of Latin American Republics.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Here in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, USA—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents, and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks.

Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within. Foremost in this campaign are the party's efforts to exploit misunderstandings and capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest wherever they exist. This is especially true in the intense civil rights movement, for America's 20 million Negroes and all others engaged in this struggle are a major target for Communist propaganda and subversion.

It would be absurd to suggest that the aspirations of Negroes for equality are Communist inspired. This is demonstrably not true. But what is demonstrable is that some individuals and groups exploit the tension for purposes not confined to the equality of human rights under the Constitution of the United States. The crusade should not become a vehicle for political radicalism or organized violence.

Devotion to race must not supersede devotion to established institutions.

It would be useful if responsible Negro leaders themselves could make it clear to all who follow them that their interest is solely in racial equality.

This Nation was conceived under God and its progress has been under God. There could be no greater disaster for our Nation than that it should deny in any respect, to even the smallest degree, the presence, the power, the guidance, the protection, the instruction of Almighty God.

There is unmistakable evidence of divine guidance all through the history of our Nation. We must guard it. We must cherish it. We must revere it. We must work for it.

The record of our Nation is better than that of any other nation in any other part of the world. It is true there are injustices in this Nation toward those of dark skin, as well as light, but even worse injustices prevail in other parts of the world. Whether the people are black, or yellow, or brown, or white-skinned, these things will have to be worked out.

America has taken the lead in working them out, and it is taking the lead today. It is doing more for its underprivileged minorities than any other nation in the world, but there is more to be done.

We thank God that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

As citizens of a free country, we must judge people as individuals—not by race, creed or color.

Legitimate civil rights organizations must remain constantly alert to attempts by the Communists to influence their actions, take over their programs and corrupt their ranks.

Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man.

These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to act of hate, terror and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace.

Invariably, these merchants of hate attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize upon ignorance, prejudice and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold.

Today, the Communists continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States. Their designs on American youth revolt and anger those steeped in our national ideals of freedom.

The peddling of their dishonest doctrine to highminded, largely inexperienced, and basically eager-to-believe young people is not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in demoralizing effect. It can undermine patriotism, create doubts about our social and economic system, and mock the many wholesome youth organizations in this country.

The great majority of American youths are genuinely convinced that they would not fall for the Communist bait. Many never would. But there are others who might never know they were "hooked" until the enormous tragedy of their loss of faith dawned after bitter years of fighting the American way of life, almost unwittingly, as dupes of the Communists.

It has happened to idealistic Americans before.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology. Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The God-given ideals which are responsible for this country's greatness are being attacked on many fronts today. Moral lethargy, self-indulgence, neglect of duty—these lethal forces are undermining many facets of business, labor, industry, and government.

We find their influence in the repulsive attitude of "half-way Americans" to whom life in this country is the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities.

We find their influence in those courts of law where the true purpose and intent of our Constitution as a document designed for the protection of society have too often been warped and distorted for the benefit of offenders.

We find their influence in the continuing increase of crime—a tragic national problem which is growing four times as fast as our expanding population.

Crime has no respect for age, nationality, sex, color or religious creed. It has turned our streets into virtual jungles of terror and fear.

Today, a brutal crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—is committed every 3 minutes. The number of these senseless atrocities will continue to grow until men of strong moral conviction assert greater influence toward the prevention of crime and administration of justice.

Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity and fair play. The moral strength of our Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to cure this moral illness.

Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.

There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the rock from which we were hewn.

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance, and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding, and faith in God.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience polices our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers had a vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, courage, and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus xxv, verse 10:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhood of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said: "As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a Nation of free people, united in one faith—Faith in God.

## MINNESOTA VOTERS SUPPORT PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in last Sunday's New York Times magazine Representative Clarence D. Long gave an entertaining and accurate account of the experiences of a freshman Representative. He defined the ideal role of a Representative as comprising two functions—to represent and to lead—both "indispensable if a democracy of ordinary humans is to survive scientific revolutions every decade."

This is a difficult and demanding task—a sort of perpetual analysis and synthesis engaged in cooperatively by the people and their Representatives. I must confess that the good people of Minnesota have often simplified this task for me. They are an electorate which is not led reluctantly to reform, but which positively points the way.

Of course, 100 years has been a long time for the self-education of the American people. That people is now ready to graduate—ready to put into practice the ideals of equal civil rights and opportunities for every American citizen. The Nation's leaders have not always fulfilled their twin responsibility to their electorate—to lead, as well as to represent. But the people are speaking out for strong and meaningful civil rights legislation—they know that it is necessary if democracy is to prosper, if justice is to reign.

In the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune last week, the reliable Minnesota poll indicated that 79 percent of voting Minnesotans are in favor of a public accommodations law. I ask unanimous consent that the results of this survey may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks as another confirmation of public support for this important legislation still pending before Congress.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, Dec. 1, 1963]

### Accommodations Act for Negroes Backed by 79 Percent in Minnesota

Nearly 8 out of 10 voting-age Minnesotans (79 percent) are in favor of a public accommodations law which would require hotels, restaurants, stores, and other public places to accord Negroes the same treatment as they give white people.

Such a state of mind throughout Minnesota is indicated in a public opinion survey conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll in November.

Other civil rights viewpoints expressed in the survey include these:

Forty-five percent believe Negroes get fair treatment in obtaining jobs in Minnesota; 34 percent say they do not.

When it comes to buying homes or renting apartments, only one-third of the State's adults (33 percent) think Negroes are treated fairly; 47 percent consider them to be treated unfairly.

Legislation designed to put an end to discrimination and segregation in public accommodations was part of a civil rights package sponsored by the late President Kennedy.

It would, in effect, overrule local custom if interstate travelers are served to a substantial degree, or if a substantial proportion of goods sold, or entertainment presented, is involved in interstate commerce.

This is the way one of the questions was put to a balanced sampling of men and women living in all parts of Minnesota:

"In general, do you favor or oppose Federal laws in the United States to require the same treatment for Negroes as for white people in hotels, restaurants, stores, and other public places?"

The replies:

[In percent]

| | Total | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|---|
| Favor such a law | 79 | 74 | 85 |
| Oppose it | 16 | 21 | 10 |
| Other answers | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| No opinion | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Minnesotans of all ages, in cities and towns and on farms, and of varied educational training, all substantially endorse the proposal. College-educated residents are the most affirmative; of that group, 9 out of every 10 express approval.

People also were asked:

"Do you think Negro residents generally do or do not get fair treatment when it comes to getting jobs in Minnesota?"

The responses:

[In percent]

| | Total | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do get fair treatment | 45 | 50 | 40 |
| Do not | 34 | 33 | 34 |
| Other answers | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| No opinion | 20 | 16 | 25 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

A related question was:

"Do you think Negroes in Minnesota generally are treated fairly or unfairly when it comes to buying homes or renting apartments?"

The answers of all adults questioned and of certain types of people within that group:

[In percent]

| | Negroes in Minnesota | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Treated fairly on housing | Treated unfairly | Other answers | No opinion |
| All adults | 33 | 47 | 2 | 18 |
| Men | 34 | 44 | 2 | 20 |
| Women | 31 | 51 | 2 | 16 |
| Residents of southern Minnesota | 35 | 38 | 3 | 24 |
| Twin Cities area | 26 | 59 | 1 | 14 |
| Northern Minnesota | 42 | 38 | 2 | 18 |
| Adults with grade school training | 35 | 40 | 3 | 22 |
| High school | 36 | 45 | 2 | 17 |
| College | 20 | 64 | -------- | 16 |

The Negro population in Minnesota in 1950 was 14,022. By 1960, U.S. census enumerators counted 22,262 Negro residents, a gain of 59 percent in 10 years, but still less than 1 percent of the total State population (3,413,864).

As part of the survey, people were asked:

"Large numbers of Negroes have been moving from Southern States to the North in recent years. Do you think the number of Negro residents in Minnesota during the next few years will increase a great deal, just moderately, or very little?"

The expectations:

[In percent]

| | Total | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|---|
| Negro population will increase— | | | |
| A great deal | 19 | 18 | 20 |
| Just moderately | 51 | 49 | 53 |
| Very little | 24 | 29 | 20 |
| Other answers | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| No opinion | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this support has been consistently demonstrated in my letters from home. I take this occasion to say to the voters of my State, "It takes a fast pace to keep up with you, but the U.S. Congress is moving. We will pass a good and effective Civil Rights Act."

## A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, of the many meaningful tributes which have been paid to our late President, few have so well described what John Kennedy meant to our Nation as the tribute by Emmet John Hughes in Newsweek magazine.

Mr. Hughes has said that President Kennedy strove to do what the founders of our country did—

> Studied seriously, spoke articulately, wrote fearlessly, debated rationally, and concluded—intelligently.

All of that is true, but there was more, too, and Mr. Hughes has succeeded in capturing the spirit of John Kennedy, a spirit which, indeed, "belonged uniquely to us" in this generation.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hughes' article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Dec. 2, 1963]

### An Echo in the Silence

(By Emmet John Hughes)

He belonged uniquely to us—to this time and place, to this Nation and generation—and to no other. In all history, what else could he have been, where else be seen, and when else be heard? A Hapsburg prince or a Bourbon sovereign? A minister to Victoria plotting designs of empire? A German Chancellor fretfully patching the Weimar Republic? Or some earlier American President slackly presiding over the 1920's? Each weird image confirms how wholly and how rightly he found his home in this—our—generation. He was ours as the first President to be born in this tempest of our century—to glimpse life during the First World War, to bear the ordeal of the second, and to fight back the darkness of a third. Sometimes it happens so: the instant of history and the instinct of the man appear almost to plot their meeting with secretly timed precision. So it seems with us. We were clearly meant to be together, for this while. And this is why the assassin, as he put a bullet in his brain, also put a scar upon our generation.

He did not find this place with us, of course, because he won universal assent and applause. He won something more important: a recognition of his person and his force. A student of history, he often quoted its earlier scanners, like Edmund Burke, to depict his own nation: "We sit on a 'conspicuous stage,' and the whole world marks our demeanor." And his demeanor indeed was so marked—down to the thrust of a finger and the flash of a smile. A student of the Presidency, too, he repeated the challenge of Woodrow Wilson: "The President is at liberty, both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can." We shall never know the laws this President might have signed. But we can be aware of the size of the man.

He cannot yet be measured, and he may never be measured, by the crises or debates that seemed—for fierce, fleeting moments—to stir his Presidency—steel prices and medical care—Peace Corps and managed news—tax reform and test ban—missiles in Cuba and troops to Alabama. Now, all that he did and all that his death left undone seem to matter far less than what he knew—and felt—of himself and of his country.

He understood the Presidency. There was quiet proof of it on one occasion last year—with his formal White House dinner to honor 49 Nobel Prize winners. He warmly hailed the assembled poets and physicists and dramatists, peacemakers and mathematicians. He saluted them as "the most extraordinary collection * * * of human knowledge that has ever been gathered at the White House—with the possible exception of when Thomas Jefferson dined alone." And so he let them know that he discerned the rare sign of Presidential greatness: the steady power to be, to believe, and to decide—alone.

He sensed the cruel paradoxes of democratic leadership, thus dismaying zealots and exasperating simplifiers. He knew a leader must summon his people to be with him—yet stand above, not squat beside, them. He knew that he must try to be resolute without being arrogant, patient without being timid, and compassionate without being maudlin. He detested cant but delighted in eloquence. He could appeal for conciliation without forswearing power. And he could respect ideas without confusing them with deeds, exhort action without unharnessing it from reason and esteem words without becoming infatuated with his own.

He belonged uniquely to us—above all—in his joyful passion for political life. For by this he proved he knew the root and genius of his Nation. He knew it to be conceived and dedicated—not to the propagation of such faiths as once came out of Israel, nor the fostering of the arts of a new Greece, nor the spread of sovereignty in the way of ancient Rome—but to the matchless political art of governing men in freedom. And so he knew, too, that his Nation was born not of an accident of history but of an act of intelligence: the triumph of men who studied seriously, spoke articulately, wrote fearlessly, debated rationally, and concluded—intelligently.

He strove to do as they. And he had some of this on his mind and ready for his utterance as he met death. The speech he never would deliver warned against hucksters of "seemingly swift and simple solutions." He was ready to deplore the confusion of "rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible." And he would firmly insist: "America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

He took lively pride in his native Massachusetts, of course, and its men of greatness. So his ear and his wit always and easily recognized the voice of the rebel of Concord, Henry David Thoreau. And he almost surely would have shared the philosopher's judgment, pertinent perhaps even to his own tragedy: "Better a monosyllabic life than a ragged and muttered one. Let it's report be short and round like a rifle, so that it may hear its own echo in the surrounding silence."

He leaves—lastingly—such an echo.

## A TRIBUTE TO JACQUELINE KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the country is deeply indebted to a great lady, and united in admiration, for the way in which Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy met the tragedy of the death of her husband.

Her perfect sense of dignity, her bearing throughout the terrible and awesome events of November 22 and the days following touched the hearts of the American people. She moved many of us to tears, to deep affection for her. While keeping her personal grief in check, she has led all America in our national mourning. She has helped us in our despair. This was a woman equal to her husband's greatness.

Theodore H. White, a close friend of the Kennedys and a brilliant writer, has described some of Mrs. Kennedy's feelings. His article should be read by every American.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. White's article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### For President Kennedy: An Epilog—For One Brief Shining Moment, Camelot

(By Theodore H. White)

Hyannis Port.—She remembers how hot the sun was in Dallas, and the crowds—greater and wilder than the crowds in Mexico or in Vienna. The sun was blinding, streaming down; yet she could not put on sunglasses for she had to wave to the crowd.

And up ahead she remembers seeing a tunnel around a turn and thinking that there would be a moment of coolness under the tunnel. There was the sound of the motorcycles, as always in a parade, and the occasional backfire of a motorcycle. The sound of the shot came, at that moment, like the sound of a backfire and she remembers Connally saying, "No, no, no, no, no."

She remembers the roses. Three times that day in Texas they had been greeted with the bouquets of yellow roses of Texas. Only, in Dallas they had given her red roses. She remembers thinking, how funny—red roses for me; and then the car was full of blood and red roses.

Much later, accompanying the body from the Dallas hospital to the airport, she was alone with Clint Hill—the first Secret Service man to come to their rescue—and with Dr. Burkley, the White House physician. Burkley gave her two roses that had slipped under the President's shirt when he fell, his head in her lap.

All through the night they tried to separate him from her, to sedate her, and take care of her—and she would not let them. She wanted to be with him. She remembered that Jack had said of his father, when his father suffered the stroke, that he could not live like that. Don't let that happen to me, he had said, when I have to go.

Now in her hand she was holding a gold St. Christopher's medal. She had given him a St. Christopher's medal when they were married; but when Patrick died this summer, they had wanted to put something in the coffin with Patrick that was from them both; and so he had put in the St. Christopher's medal.

Then he had asked her to give him a new one to mark their 10th wedding anniversary, a month after Patrick's death.

He was carrying it when he died and she had found it. But it belonged to him—so she could not put that in the coffin with him. She wanted to give him something that was hers, something that she loved. So she had slipped off her wedding ring and put it on his finger. When she came out of the room in the hospital in Dallas, she asked: "Do you think it was right? Now I have nothing left." And Kenny O'Donnell said, "You leave it where it is."

That was at 1:30 p.m. in Texas.

But then, at Bethesda Hospital in Maryland, at 3 a.m. the next morning, Kenny slipped into the chamber where the body lay and brought her back the ring, which, as she talked now, she twisted.

On her little finger was the other ring: a slim, gold circlet with green emerald chips—the one he had given her in memory of Patrick.

There was a thought, too, that was always with her.

"When Jack quoted something, it was usually classical," she said, "but I'm so ashamed of myself—all I keep thinking of is this line from a musical comedy.

"At night, before we'd go to sleep, Jack liked to play some records; and the song he loved most came at the very end of this record. The lines he loved to hear were: Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot."

She wanted to make sure that the point came clear and went on: "There'll be great Presidents again—and the Johnsons are wonderful, they've been wonderful to me—but there'll never be another Camelot again.

"Once, the more I read of history the more bitter I got. For a while I thought history was something that bitter old men wrote. But then I realized history made Jack what he was. You must think of him as this little boy, sick so much of the time, reading in bed, reading history, reading the Knights of the Round Table, reading Marlborough. For Jack, history was full of heroes. And if it made him this way—if it made him see the heroes—maybe other little boys will see. Men are such a combination of good and bad. Jack had this hero idea of history, the idealistic view."

But she came back to the idea that transfixed her: "Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot—and it will never be that way again."

As for herself? She was horrified by the stories that she might live abroad. "I'm never going to live in Europe. I'm not going to 'travel extensively abroad.' That's a desecration. I'm going to live in the places I lived with Jack. In Georgetown, and with the Kennedys at the cape. They're my family. I'm going to bring up my children. I want John to grow up to be a good boy."

As for the President's memorial, at first she remembered that in every speech in their last days in Texas, he had spoken of how in December this Nation would loft the largest rocket booster yet into the sky, making us first in space. So she had wanted something of his there when it went up—perhaps only his initials painted on a tiny corner of the great Saturn, where no one need even notice it. But now Americans will seek the moon from "Cape Kennedy." The new name, born of her frail hope, came as a surprise.

The only thing she knew she must have for him was the eternal flame over his grave at Arlington.

"Whenever you drive across the bridge from Washington into Virginia," she said, "you see the Lee mansion on the side of the hill in the distance. When Caroline was very little, the mansion was one of the first things she learned to recognize. Now, at night you can see his flame beneath the mansion for miles away."

She said it is time people paid attention to the new President and the new First Lady. But she does not want them to forget John F. Kennedy or read of him only in dusty or bitter histories:

For one brief shining moment there was Camelot.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my esteemed colleague, Senator Humphrey, has called the attention of the Senate to the beautiful tribute paid to Mrs. Kennedy by Theodore White.

I would like to join in expressing my admiration for the epilog and tender lociting of Mr. White. This "Day of Infamy" and its events are here portrayed in literature for the ages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be in a moment. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. SYMINGTON addressed the Chair.

## REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 o'clock having arrived, the Senate under its order of yesterday, will resume the consideration of S. 927, amending title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, with respect to which there is a limitation of 2 hours' debate, with a final vote on said bill to be taken not later than 2:30 p.m.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a statement on the balance-of-payments problem?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, indeed. It fits in very well with the subject under discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

## SUGGESTED MONETARY SOLUTIONS FOR UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—THE DANGERS IN CONTINUING DEFICIT FINANCING

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in three previous statements on the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States I presented first, an analysis of our present fiscal position as a result of the continued accumulation of deficits, second, the causes of this unusual weakness in an otherwise strong U.S. economy, and third, various proposals suggested to remedy this continuing problem of "balance of payments."

There would appear a growing realization, both in this country and abroad, that the ordinary, obvious, and well-recognized means of controlling balance-of-payments deficits are not available to the United States, because each has an undesirable consequence.

If we should raise our interest rates sufficiently to have an effect upon the "outflow of capital" and "internal price levels," we would retard economic growth, and curtail markets for imports from our European allies; but any such action would go contrary to our proclaimed national objective of encouraging economic growth.

On the other hand, if we should curtail imports unilaterally, by quotas and tariffs, our allies abroad would be hurt, and would vigorously oppose any such action.

If we seriously curtailed our foreign aid and military expenditures abroad, our allies in Europe, and also Japan and the Far East, would lose much opportunity to sell their products under our programs; and in any case would be emphatically opposed on political grounds.

Devaluation of the dollar should be ruled out as costly and useless.

Any such devaluation must be considered in two different aspects. First, in terms of the price of gold; second, in terms of the exchange rates of the dollar in relation to other currencies.

How could other countries permit the unilateral devaluation of the dollar in relation to their own currencies?

The same reason why they would not make unilateral concessions to us in trade negotiations would also apply to unilateral depreciation of the U.S. dollar. Naturally they would consider such depreciation a device to give an artificial and short-term advantage to U.S. exports, at the same time discouraging imports.

The European countries are in no mood to give us such a free and easy ride into their markets. Furthermore, since the basic causes of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits rests, still, in U.S. Government expenditures abroad, a devaluation of the dollar in terms of other currencies would merely increase the cost of our foreign aid and military operations abroad.

The defensive steps that our allies could, and in all probability would, take would be either to set up tariff and quota limitations on imports from the United States or, more likely, to follow us in devaluing their currencies, in order to maintain the exchange rates around the present level.

In the latter instance, all we would have achieved would be to increase the price of gold. This would give an artificial advantage to those who hold gold, particularly Soviet Russia.

At the present time, two-thirds of the gold supply of the world is in foreign hands. If the price of gold were increased, let us say, from $35 an ounce to $70 an ounce, our $16 billion of gold reserves would go up in value to $32 billion. But the $26 billion of gold reserves held by other countries would go up in value to $52 billion, and all the millions of ounces in private hoards would increase in dollar value commensurately. Then we, the taxpayer, would be forced to pay twice as much to buy this gold back when it was presented to us for sale. Thus, we would merely be increasing our contingent liabilities without receiving any advantage to our exports.

Another advocacy has been that of flexible exchange rates, a secondary recommendation of the Brookings report. But such action appears impractical. World trade cannot operate under conditions where the primary reserve currency has a variable value from day to day. No businessman could make any real plans for investment and trade under such chaotic conditions. The foreign liabilities of the United States would then be variable, from day to day.

It is now clear that the classical solution to balance-of-payments deficits; namely, a recession here in industrial production, employment, and prices, is just not available as a practical solution. It is clear also that increase in exports enough to cover the deficit is not practical and will be resisted by our prospective markets.

Exchange devaluation, and increase in the price of gold, appears to be no solution at all; and flexible exchange rates are unworkable.

There is a growing realization among economists and public officials in the United States, as well as in Europe, that if we try any of these methods, the economic and political consequences would be unpleasant. In fact, there are some indications that many of these people do not indeed wish to see the United States solve this balance-of-payments deficit, except in one way, which is self-serving; namely, to control U.S. private investments in Western Europe.

We have seen, in our previous discussion that U.S. private investments are the one bright item in our balance-of-payments picture, since they bring annually a growing amount of income back to the United States.

But now a great many Europeans would like us to curtail these U.S. investments, because they have become restive in the face of American competition. They foresee that, in the long run, they will have to continue paying interest and dividends to us, which they consider a drain upon their future foreign exchange earnings.

There is a basic conflict of interest, therefore, between the United States and our European allies, insofar as they would like us to continue spending money for these Government programs which are nonrevenue producing; and which nevertheless are also a positive contribution to our balance-of-payments deficits.

The Right Honorable Reginald Maudling, Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, speaking in Washington on October 1, 1963, at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, said that whatever method the United States adopts in solving the balance-of-payments deficit "may easily have painful results for someone." He went on to say that when a country, like an individual, has a deficit, the only way to solve it is to "earn more, spend less, or lend less."

To earn more, however, he does not approve of the promotion of exports "by artificial means such as subsidies." Furthermore, he welcomed our attempt to solve the balance-of-payments problem by "an expansion of the domestic economy rather than by restraint on its imports."

He continued:

> The remaining moves open to the United States, therefore, can only be reducing oversea Government spending or reducing oversea lending. I think we would all regret seeing a sharp cutback in U.S. aid to developing countries, whether by grant or loan. It is, therefore, in the realm of private capital movements, long- and short-term, that it seems most necessary to find a solution; and this, as I understand it, is how the United States is going about things.

If this represents the general thinking of the financial leaders of Europe, as our gold continues to pour out of this country, it would seem we too must now face up to the problem realistically.

As for U.S. economists who favor doing nothing about the balance-of-payments deficits because they consider any action contrary to national objectives, both here and abroad, their only solution seems to be, as recommended by the Brookings Institution, the continuance of deficits on borrowed money.

The Brookings report, after taking 240 pages in discussing the balance-of-payments deficits, arrives in chapter 9—the concluding chapter on policy recommendations—at the astounding conclusion that "the balance-of-payments deficit itself, however, is not the major source of the international financial problem of the United States"—page 241.

Again, on pages 242–243, the report says:

> It is clear, therefore, that the present problem is not primarily a balance-of-payments problem. More fundamentally, the problem is the basic inadequacy of the international monetary mechanism in relation to the requirements of the free world.

The report continues—pages 243–244:

> Four national objectives that have high priority for the United States would be increasingly threatened by preoccupation with the balance of payments. These are:
>
> 1. Achieving domestic economic stability, and sustained growth at full employment.
>
> 2. Maintaining the military strength of the free world.
>
> 3. Promoting and supporting economic development of underdeveloped areas and avoiding injury to the continued growth of other countries.
>
> 4. Assuring the greatest possible freedom of economically productive international transactions in the free world.

In other words, the problem of the inability of the United States to pay for its current political and military commitments abroad, through current earnings via exports, has been turned, in the abstruse jargon of the international economists and foreign central bankers, into a problem of liquidity.

These latter two groups recommend the establishment of an international bank, or the conversion of the International Monetary Fund into such a bank, which will permit us the continued borrowing and financing of deficits. There is growing support for this view in Europe, in all probability because most European bankers and economists see in such an institution the prospect of our continuing our own deficits, while they in turn build up their surpluses; and these latter surpluses they foresee can be deposited in such an international bank, with interest, and a gold value guarantee.

The net effect of such an arrangement, however, would be for us to get into an increasing amount of debt, at the rate of $3 to $4 billion a year, by borrowing from international sources; while at the same time our creditors could convert their current assets in the United States into time deposits in such an international institution. This would give them a satisfactory rate of earnings, plus maintenance of value of their credits in terms of an "established gold value."

With all due respect to some of my colleagues who last September endorsed such a bank, I cannot accept as beneficial to this country the prospect of a continued increase in the liabilities of the United States to foreign countries and to an international organization.

Supposing this deficit continues, say, for another 10 years. We would build up current liabilities of another $30–$35 billion. On top of our present liabilities of $28 billion, this would put us in debt to the extent of $60 billion, the equivalent of all of our investments abroad.

Our economic policies would then be completely at the mercy of our creditors, be they friendly or unfriendly nations, or "international" organizations.

Frankly, it appears to many of us that the proposals for creating an international bank from which we can borrow, and in which our creditors can deposit their surpluses in exchange for a gold content guarantee, is but a "ruse" for the United States to continue its already overextended program of international expenditures.

It was said in jest that at the end of the 17th century, William and Mary of England discovered the national debt, then built the Bank of England to put it in, for fear of "political economy."

Now we have discovered "international deficits," and are proposing to build an international bank to put them in.

But is this a worthy substitute for the "good housekeeping" necessary to preserve our economic freedom?

This is the fourth talk I have made on this problem of balance of payments. The fifth and final talk, which I shall make next week, will present my conclusions about how we can best attempt to solve this growing problem.

## REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in connection with S. 927, debate on which began yesterday, I believe there has been too much misunderstanding and misapprehension about the purposes of this bill. It is not something that was simply dreamed up for somebody's benefit, as has been asserted here on the floor. It is not special privileges for some merchant marine operators. It is definitely not something scandalous, as has been asserted by one opponent of the bill. And as for the imputation that there were some hidden shenanigans involved, because the bill was introduced by request of the association which represents the owners of the 300 vessels which operate under Government subsidy, I can only say that an industry which considers itself unfavorably affected by a statute has every right, and, indeed, has a solemn duty to its thousands of stockholders, to try to have the situation corrected.

Let me say here a word or two about the whole question of maritime legislation. After some years of close connection with legislative efforts in this field, and after many hearings on maritime proposals of every sort, I can say with the utmost sincerity that the maritime statutes are about as complex, and as little understood by persons outside the industry, as any laws on the statute books. And this statement has particular application with regard to this bill which would amend the section of the 1936 act dealing with war risk insurance coverage for vessels built with construction subsidy.

At the outset, let me say that the whole question of construction subsidy for vessels is fraught with misconception by opponents of the bill. Foremost among these opponents is the Federal departments, which bases their opposition to this and other maritime proposals on a mistaken concept of the purpose and effect of Government's subsidy payments to the shipyards where these vessels are built.

However, in connection with the Federal department's opposition there has been a kind of revolutionary change between 1962, when a similar bill was introduced, and 1963. At the earlier hearings the Government opposed any change whatever in the present law. When hearings were held on S. 927, in April of this year, the Maritime Administration came part way. The Maritime Administration changed its view, and agreed to one amendment in the law, and even urged the adoption of the amendment. The same situation existed with respect to the Comptroller General, who said in his report that in the year's interval between his consideration of these two bills he, too, had come to the conclusion that in one particular respect the law ought to be amended.

I suggest that, given another year, probably all Government departments will be in favor of the bill in the form in which it is now before the Senate. I do not choose to wait that long. I prefer to have the Senate exercise its independent and proper judgment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does any department of Government, connected with the merchant marine, support the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not in its entirety, but partially, in the manner in which I have just related.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the Department of Justice opposes the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. The Department of Justice opposes it on the basis of a mistaken consideration, to which I will allude soon. The Department of Justice could not be more wrong in its report on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not also a fact that the Comptroller General opposes the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. In part only. He opposed it altogether in 1962. In 1963 he opposes it only in part.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I must decline to yield further. I have a statement of some length to make. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], opponents of the bill, have an hour of debate allotted to them, I believe. I have already yielded 15 minutes to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] on another matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a 5-second statement?

Mr. BARTLETT. If the Senator from Delaware will assure me that I may have a comparative length of time yielded to me from his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Every department of Government opposes the bill. The only ones in favor of it are the beneficiaries. It is a windfall for them. It is a giveaway. In my opinion it is scandalous.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is not entirely accurate. Let me read from the report made by the Comptroller General:

> We heretofore have not agreed with somewhat similar proposed legislation primarily on the premise that the proposed basis of valuation for war risk insurance for a subsidized vessel would be inconsistent with the basis of compensation allowed for the same vessel if requisitioned for title pursuant to section 802 of the act. However, upon further consideration of the matter, and particularly with reference to the pending bill—

I call the attention to the Senator from Ohio to this—

> we have concluded that certain changes in our views are warranted for the reasons hereinafter set forth.
>
> It is our understanding that one of the primary objectives of title 12 of the act, and specifically section 1209, was to encourage continuance of regular private maritime service during periods of hostile action in order to sustain U.S. foreign commerce and the interests of the Government in such hostile areas. It would appear, therefore, that the attachment of Government insurance upon termination of commercial insurance due to events not controllable by shipowners should not operate to place the shipowners in a different position from the standpoint of collectible insurance in the event of loss from that existing when they were under commercial insurance coverage. Accordingly, we believe that repeal of that portion of section 1209(a)(2) of the act requiring the reduction of insurance valuation for the period prior to requisition for use would be equitable and proper.

Therefore, this important agency does not oppose the bill in its entirety, but actually supports as equitable and proper one of the two changes proposed to be made by the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska continue to read?

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall continue to read from my prepared statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to permit me to read further from that letter, on my own time?

Mr. BARTLETT. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall continue to read from the point where the Senator from Alaska stopped:

> With respect to the period of insurance subsequent to requisition for use, we believe, that the circumstances of such requisition are essentially the same as those underlying requisition for title. That is to say, ordinarily, a ship requisitioned for use is no longer carrying on commercial business for the shipowner in its regular trade service. To the contrary, the vessel is completely under the jurisdiction of the Government for purposes of operation. Thus, in terms of physical possession and operating control, the status of a vessel requisitioned for use and one requisitioned for title appear to be analogous. In our opinion, to fix an insurance valuation on a ship requisitioned for use different from the value which would be given the same ship if it should be requisitioned for title would be inconsistent with section 802 of the act. Therefore, we do not

favor the repeal of that portion of section 1209(a)(2) limiting the insurance valuation of a construction-subsidized vessel for the period after requisition for use to an amount not in excess of that which would be payable under section 802 in the case of requisition for title.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield to the Senator from Ohio from my time.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** The last sentence which the Senator from Delaware read is the crux of the position taken by the Comptroller General; that is, that the Comptroller General does not favor the proposed change in the valuation of the vessel to be insured.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** That is correct. The Comptroller General, as pointed out by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], said there may be some merit to a consideration of the revision, and made suggestions; but those suggestions were not accepted by the committee, and the Comptroller General, in the next to the last paragraph of his statement, said:

> Therefore, we do not favor the repeal of that portion of section 1209(a)(2).

So, as the Senator from Ohio pointed out earlier, the Comptroller General, the Department of Justice, and other agencies dealing with maritime affairs oppose the enactment of the bill on the basis that it would give larger benefits to the industry.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a minute?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield to the Senator from Ohio from my time.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** The Senator from Delaware did not mention the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce, which is in charge of the Maritime Commission, is vigorously opposed to the bill.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** That is correct.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** It has said that a windfall or a gift would go to the operators of the merchant marine. How we can pass the bill in the face of the opposition of three important departments of the Government is beyond my understanding. I suppose it will be passed, however.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** I trust so, because it is a good, proper, and equitable bill. I fear that the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio missed the point I was trying to make; that is, that the Maritime Administration and the Comptroller General have come a long way since the consideration of the 1962 bill. Both today recognize that some changes would be proper and the Committee agreed with the Comptroller General in respect to valuation before requisition.

Congressional policy on this point, which of course is national policy, was laid down in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Therein, after several years of study of maritime problems, a study begun at the instance of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Congress decreed that there was need of a merchant marine that would be adequate to the needs of the Nation's commerce and its defense, and that the vessels comprising this merchant marine should be constructed in the United States.

Congress was aware, at that time as well as now, that costs of shipbuilding in the United States were considerably higher than costs in foreign yards, so in the same 1936 act it provided a construction differential subsidy to offset this cost differential. This construction subsidy, Congress directed, would be paid directly to the shipyards. By this means, Congress moved to assure maintenance of a domestic shipbuilding industry, which could deliver vessels to American owners at approximately the same costs for which these owners could build abroad.

Is this a handout to the shipowners, as is all too often alleged? It is not. The Senate Commerce Committee report accompanying the 1936 legislation makes this point clear. This is what the 1936 report says:

> The financial assistance required to adjust the construction differential is for the purpose of equalizing the difference between American and foreign cost. It is not paid to the ship operator. It is paid to the shipbuilder and represents the difference in cost between the American and foreign ship from which American labor benefits. * * * A ship that would cost $1 million if built in the United States and $600,000 if built abroad is worth just $600,000 in foreign trade. The shipowner does not "get a million-dollar ship" as is stated, because its utility value is $600,000. American labor benefits from the difference, not the shipowner.

The operating subsidy paid to the shipowner, the 1936 Senate Commerce Committee report further makes clear:

> Is not, in any sense of the word a subsidy. The amount of this so-called operating subsidy is primarily limited to a repayment of sums of money which he has already disbursed in payment for the American labor employed upon his American ship and for the American materials required in its maintenance and operation. This labor and these materials cost more under the American flag than they would have cost under a foreign flag. The repayment * * * is merely an equalization of his American costs as against the costs of foreign-flag operation.
>
> There can be no profits to the ship operator in the repayment to him of these out-of-pocket excess expenses which he has already incurred. For this reason, many of the restricting and limiting provisions in this bill may seem unnecessary, but are inserted to make sure that there can be no recurrence of the alleged abuses made possible by deficiencies in the act of 1928. It is the purpose of this bill—

I am reading from the report on the 1936 bill—

> To endeavor to place the American owner and operator of an American-flag ship on a competitive party with his foreign-flag competitor. "Parity" carries with it no guarantee of profits, and if there are to be any profits, they must be made in competition with foreign shipping.

With this concept in mind as to what Congress intended in the way of aid to American shipping when it passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, let us see what the bill now before the Senate proposes to do. It simply proposes, as did the identical bill passed by the Senate last year, to put owners of vessels built in U.S. yards on a par with owners of foreign and U.S. unsubsidized vessels as to coverage under war risk insurance. These vessels built in U.S. yards are penalized by present war risk insurance statutes because of the mistaken claim that the subsidy paid to the shipyard somehow or other added to the value of the vessel. This is not so. A vessel costing $10 million in a U.S. shipyard, on which a subsidy of $5 million is paid to the shipyard, does not become thereby a $10 million vessel.

It is a $5 million vessel, because its counterpart could be built in a foreign yard for $5 million, and that freely available foreign cost determines its value in the world market. So to suggest that owners of such vesels want coverage beyond their $5 million cost is both unfair and absurd.

Nevertheless, the Government insists that the insurable value of a vessel costing $10 million, of which Government contributed half to the shipyard, cannot be insured—and in my opinion this is most unfair—in its first year at its $5 million owner's cost and world market value, but must be content with a $2,500,000 insurance coverage. And when Government insists, as it does with respect to the SS *America*, a passenger liner known favorably to thousands of American travelers, that it must be insured commercially for $6,400,000 in peacetime, but must be content with a $437,000 reimbursement if lost in Government war service, I say the statute responsible cries for such revision as that proposed by means of this bill. The testimony of the Deputy Maritime Administrator, to be found on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, illustrates clearly how inequitably owners of subsidized vessels are being treated, because of a subsidy payment which does them no good at all.

To sum up: The construction subsidy paid to a shipyard does not increase in any degree the value of a vessel built there, and to attempt to justify the present reduced coverage allowed on vessels built in a subsidized shipyard is manifestly unjust. This is specially so when owners of vessels built in foreign yards, who do nothing to maintain America's shipyard facilities, are permitted full war risk insurance coverage.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, that is a very important point. The foreign ship, flying a foreign flag, can obtain from our Government, full war risk insurance, whereas an American-built ship, constructed under a U.S. Government subsidy, with American dollars, and flying the American flag, and employing an American crew, cannot obtain the same coverage.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the intent of the Congress in 1936 is being subverted when vessels built in line with congressional maritime policy are penalized and restricted, while other owners, who contribute nothing to shipyard maintenance, are given far better treatment.

As chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill last year, when it received Senate approval, and again this year, I say in all sincerity that S. 927 should be passed by the Senate and sent to the House in time for it to act upon the bill during this Congress.

Mr. President, reference has been made to the attitude of the Department of Justice in connection with the bill. In that connection, I read from the committee report, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator:

> Nowhere is the unsoundness of the Government's position with regard to war risk insurance more clearly shown than in the report of the Department of Justice on this bill. In justification of the Department's opposition to enactment of S. 927, the Deputy Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, states:
>
> "Title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1281–1293), permits the Secretary of Commerce to insure vessels and cargo against war risks when such insurance is not obtainable on reasonable terms and conditions from private domestic underwriters. Section 1209 (46 U.S.C. 1289) limits the valuation of such vessels for war risk insurance coverage to 'just compensation,' but provides that such valuation must be reduced in the case of a vessel constructed under Government subsidy by such proportion as the subsidy paid bears to the entire construction costs. Thus, the valuation of a vessel constructed under a 50-percent subsidy must be reduced for war risk insurance coverage by 50 percent of its total value.
>
> "The bill would eliminate the provisions of existing law requiring vessel valuation reductions in the cases of vessels constructed under Government subsidies. This would result in placing subsidy beneficiaries in a more favored position than all others. They would be entitled to obtain full insurance coverage even though a part of the value of their vessels is derived solely from subsidy grants. The resulting potential windfalls appear to be neither necessary nor just."
>
> With regard to paragraph 1, cited above, an anomalous situation has developed, as reported by one vessel operator (and his case is not unique, by any means) in a statement to the subcommittee:
>
> "I cite the insurable value (depreciated value) at December 31, 1961, of the five C-2-type vessels owned by my company, all of which were built with construction-differential subsidy, and the insurable value of these vessels had they been built without construction subsidy. At December 31, 1961, the depreciated value of these vessels was $906,750, while the commercial (just compensation) value on that date was $4,189,465. This valuation was made by * * * the leading vessel's appraiser in the East."
>
> With regard to paragraph 2 of the report, it is simply not so that, "They (owners of vessels constructed under Government subsidy agreements) would be entitled to obtain full insurance coverage even though a part of the value of their vessels is derived solely from subsidy grants."
>
> When the Government pays to a shipyard $5 million toward a vessel which costs the ship operator another $5 million, it contributes absolutely nothing to the world value of the vessel.

Mr. President, I try to make this point again and again and again; namely, that the Government subsidy does not make that vessel worth a penny more for the world market.

I read further from the committee report:

> Its world market value is not $10 million. In fact, it is worth somewhat less than the value of an identical vessel built in a foreign shipyard for $5 million. The reason for this is that the ship built with construction subsidy has certain costly restrictions placed upon it as a result of Government's assertion of virtual part ownership.

Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Delaware desires to use a part of his time at this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, when the Senator from Alaska completes his remarks. The Senator from Ohio wishes to have me yield time to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, and that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Ohio is to speak for 10 minutes in the time of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. President, at the very beginning, I wish to state emphatically that this bill has been requested and promoted primarily by the navigating companies which would be benefited by it. The benefits in case of war would be great. No department of Government favors the bill. It was not initiated by the Department of Commerce, the Maritime Board, the Comptroller General or the Department of Justice. It was initiated by the navigation companies, which want a windfall and a gift at the expense of the taxpayers.

A feeble attempt has been made to refute the statement which I have made. It is contended that when the Attorney General opposed the bill, he did not know what he was talking about. It is contended that the language of the Comptroller General does not express opposition to the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to say briefly that I did not make that statement at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The final paragraph of the statement made by the Comptroller General specifically and clearly states that the provisions of the bill are not sound.

I am not deluded in thinking that I can stop the passage of the bill. I know it will be passed. But it should not be passed. It would be a theft from the taxpayers, and nothing less.

How can Senators justify voting for the bill when every branch of Government is against it?

The bill was before the Senate some 7 or 8 months ago, and it was then withdrawn from consideration. It had to be admitted that the only ones for it were the navigation companies that would obtain a great windfall. The Attorney General specifically uses the word "windfalls."

In a letter dated July 12, 1963, written by Nicholas Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, it was stated:

> The bill would eliminate the provisions of existing law requiring vessel valuation reductions in the cases of vessels constructed under Government subsidies. This would result in placing subsidy beneficiaries in a more favored position than all others. They would be entitled to obtain full insurance coverage even though a part of the value of their vessels is derived solely from subsidy grants. The resulting potential windfalls appear to be neither necessary nor just.

That is a serious statement to make. If next year I were to go back to the State I represent to seek reelection and had to face the argument that I voted for the bill; and, furthermore, if I had thrown at me the opinions expressed by the Comptroller General, the Attorney General, and the Department of Commerce opposing the bill, and then I were asked, "Why did you vote for it?" My answer would have to be that I voted for it because the merchant marine—the navigation companies—asked for it.

I might be asked, "Did the Attorney General of the United States say that it was unjust?" If I answered truthfully, I would have to say, "That is exactly what he said."

Yet Senators have the audacity to press the bill through the Senate.

I will soon have finished my job in an endeavor to stop it; but, I assure Senators that in the solitude of my room tonight I shall begin to wonder about our conscionable response and our moral approach to problems.

What testimony, except that of the interested parties supports the bill? The Attorney General has no interest in it. He opposes it. The Comptroller General opposes it. The Department of Commerce opposes it.

What is the testimony opposing the bill given by the Department of Commerce? I will discuss it briefly within the time allowed.

On page 6 of the testimony Mr. Gulick, representing the Department of Commerce, is reported as saying:

> We would like to answer some of the arguments industry made last year on behalf of an identical bill. One of these arguments is that we require commercial marine hull insurance on the *America* in the amount of $6,400,000, but that the *America* is eligible for Government war risk insurance only at the amount of about $450,000, and that these values are disproportionate. We think these different values reflect different conditions with regard to the probability of war and, therefore, with respect to the probability of the requisitioning of the ship at the $450,000 price.
>
> Commercial war risk insurance—

That is, insurance bought from private companies—

> is terminated upon the outbreak of war between the powers mentioned and it excludes loss resulting from an event that occurs within 90 days of the outbreak of war which leads to the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** The moment the signs of war appear private companies would be allowed to cancel the coverage. The private company would insure in the amount of the market value of the ship, but under the present War Risk Insurance Act the coverage can be only in accordance with the book value. Why? When the ship operator received his subsidy from the taxpayers of the United States—amounting practically to 50 percent of the cost of the ship—and when the Government promised, in the operation of the ship, that the taxpayers would subsidize the operators in an amount equal to the difference between what would be the operating cost if foreign workers were hired and the cost incurred in hiring workers in the United States, it exacted from the navigation company the promise that in case of war the Government could take that ship back. It would take it back on the basis of the depreciated value on the books of the company.

This is not mentioned in the discussions. Each year the ship is depreciated. While it is being depreciated, a construction fund is being established. The construction fund is intended to be equal to the depreciation which has been granted. So, while the ship is being depreciated in value, the reserve construction fund is being built up.

This morning I asked questions on this subject. One of the witnesses, who appeared on another matter, gave a figure of $26 million of construction reserve built up by the company being discussed. He said he was not sure the figure was correct, and I am not saying it is the correct amount, but the fact is that a construction reserve is being built up.

Where does that lead? The Government, by its operating subsidy, has helped to build up the construction reserve. As the construction reserve is built up, the ship is depreciated in value.

The proponents of the bill want the company to keep the construction reserve, which has become a substitute for the loss of value of the ship; and, in addition, if the ship is sunk in war, to have the market value paid for it.

That is what the Attorney General had in mind when he said:

> This is a windfall—unjustified and improper.

When company A appears before the Government, it says, "I want you to put up 50 percent of the money to build my ship. I want you to subsidize the operation of it."

The applicant promises, "If you will do this, Uncle Sam, in case of war, I will allow you to requisition the ship on the basis of the depreciated value of the ship."

The bill contemplates setting aside such an agreement.

The bill would provide that if the ship were sunk, in spite of the fact that the Government subsidized the operation and helped to build up the depreciation fund, the policy of insurance would be in an amount to cover the market value rather than the depreciated value of the ship.

If company X, on its own, wished to build a ship—to pay the entire price and to pay the full operating cost—it could obtain coverage on the basis of the proposal made in the bill. On the other hand, if company A should ask for a subsidy and get it, under the law it could obtain reimbursement under a policy of insurance only in the amount of the depreciated value.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 additional minute.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I repeat that I have no delusions. I know what is in the making. The Senate might as well proceed to a vote now.

Someday this practice will come to an end. The public will not stand for it. Someday there will be a rebellion. We, by our conduct, set the standards of morality for our youth. Our youth will imitate us. To the extent that we abuse ethics and justice and decency we ruin the character of the youth of our country.

I yield the floor.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Mr. President, may I inquire as to the status of time remaining on both sides?

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The proponents of the bill have 25 minutes remaining. The opponents have 41 minutes.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I should like to suggest to the Senator from Alaska that before the debate is closed there be a quorum call, and that a limited amount of time be reserved for each side after a quorum is developed. Is that agreeable?

**Mr. BARTLETT.** I did not hear the Senator's request.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** After I use about 10 minutes of my time, I suggest that there be a quorum call and that each side reserve approximately 10 minutes, to be used after a quorum is developed.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** That is agreeable.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Mr. President, I know of no stronger argument which could be used against the bill than that cited by the Senator from Ohio when he read the letter from the Department of Justice, wherein the Department denounced this proposal as an unwarranted windfall for the benefit of one special industry.

I serve notice now that a motion to recommit the bill will be made, and I am confident that, when the vote is taken, the bill will be sent back to the committee.

There can be no justification for a bill which is opposed by every segment of the executive branch as a giveaway program. As has been pointed out, the Department of Commerce takes a position of strong opposition to the bill on the basis that it is unfair. The Department of Justice denounces it as a windfall. The Comptroller General likewise has denounced it, and has recommended that the bill be defeated on the basis that it would be unfair to American taxpayers.

Certainly there can be no justification for passage of the bill in the face of such opposition.

The Department of Commerce, in its testimony, stated that it knows of only one group in favor of the bill—the maritime industry itself. I shall quote Mr. Gulick, the representative of the Department of Commerce. When asked a question as to who was in favor of the bill he answered:

> My understanding is that this comes from the shipowners who desire, instead of a reduced insurance payoff, representing roughly their depreciated contribution to the cost of the ship, they desire a current-market-value payoff, which would be considerably higher.

Continuing, on page 11 of the hearings Mr. Gulick said:

> We see no reason for the Government to pay the shipyard—using the 50 percent rate—half of what it cost to construct a ship today and then, under the war risk insurance program, pay that same 50 percent again to the owner when the ship is lost. The law provides for the replacement of that ship.

I know of no stronger statement that could be made than this. Why should the shipowners whose ships are being subsidized 50 to 55 percent by the American taxpayers be allowed to insure them at Government risk for the full market value of the ship? In the event of war they would obtain the full market value if the ship were sunk. That is wrong.

I fully agree with the principle that during a time of war the Government must take over the war risk insurance. The private insurance companies could not do it, but that does not mean that the taxpayers, who underwrite the Government's war risks, should allow a shipowner to insure that portion of a ship for which he never paid in the first place. Remember, the owners only paid one-half of the value of the ship under the construction subsidy program. Why should the owner be allowed to insure the ship and to collect on the basis of full value?

As the Department of Commerce so ably points out, the law already provides for the replacement of the ship in the event of destruction.

The argument has been made that when the ships are taken over by the Government they are taken over at prices substantially lower than world value. Certainly, they are taken over at lower prices. They are supposed to be. That is a part of the agreement entered into when the shipowner signs a contract with the Government asking the Government to pay for one-half the cost of construction of the ship.

I wish to quote the basic reason advanced in support of the subsidy in the first place. I quote Mr. Gulick, General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, in his testimony on the pending bill. I read from page 7 of the hearings:

> The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 also makes it possible, by Government aid, for American owners themselves to acquire ships which are the product of American labor. Without such aid the ships could not have been acquired. For this support of the owners by the Government, the Government gets certain ownership rights. They are three, and they run with title to the ships by law.
>
> They are: One, the right to control disposition. The construction-differential subsidy ship can be sold only to a company which will document the ship under the U.S. flag for the first 25 years of its life.
>
> Two, the right to control the use of the ship. The CDS ship must not only be operated in foreign trade, it may not be operated in domestic commerce, except within the limits provided in section 506 of the act. If it is so operated within those limits, a fixed percentage of the CDS is forfeited.
>
> Three, the right to reacquire the ship by requisition. The Government retains the right to regain ownership at a fixed price. These ownership rights affect the ship's value for war risk insurance purposes and may not be ignored. There is a fundamental difference between commercial war risk insurance and Government war risk insurance.

That was the basis of the whole argument. If war breaks out, we then permit insurance only on that portion for which the shipping company paid.

It is recognized that in the event of war the market value of ships rises substantially. There is a tremendous world demand for use of these ships, and naturally, there is a sharp increase in market value. Why should we engage in a Government subsidy program, in which the cost of construction of these ships is subsidized, unless the Government can get those ships in the event of war. The provision of the contract is that the Government may take those ships over in the event of war. Now, by a backdoor method, it is proposed to give the shipowners an opportunity to cash in on war inflated prices.

I agree with the Department of Justice, which denounced this bill as an unwarranted windfall for the shipping industry. The bill should be defeated.

If the bill passes, however, rather than describe it as an amendment to the War Risk Insurance Act, I suggest that it be called the No. 1 windfall of the 1963 Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the amendment should be agreed to, would a shipowner be entitled to buy insurance from the Government on a coverage basis equal to the market value of the ship in a period of war—which, of course, means, greatly enhanced prices?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Because of the grave need for ships in war, the market value changes. The owner, though he had invested in the ship a negligible amount of money, would be entitled to insurance from the Government on the basis of the market value. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The argument for the bill is based on the premise that shipping companies which build ships without benefit of a Government subsidy and operate them without any subsidy would get the benefit of the inflated prices as a result of war. Why should they not get it if they constructed and operated the ships with their own money? But in this case the ships will be constructed with taxpayers' money for 50 or 55 percent of the cost of construction. They want an operating subsidy, but they want the Government to forfeit its right to a claim on the ships in the event of war.

If that is done the subsidy program should be abolished, and the industry itself should pay for the entire construction of the ships. In that event I would have no objection to having the ships insured for full value. But if they want the taxpayers to pay half of the construction cost they should not expect the Government to pay for the full value of the ship in the event of war and the sinking of the ship. Remember that the company would have put up only 45 or 50 percent of the cost of the ship to start with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the hearings this morning I asked the representative of the United State Lines, which is the owner of the ship which has been discussed, to submit a tabulation of the operating subsidies received since 1948.

The operating subsidy in 1962 was $5,023,000. That is the amount our Government paid to the United States Lines to hire employees, make repairs, and in part set up a depreciation fund.

In 1961 the subsidy was $3,811,000.

In 1960 it was $4,217,000.

In 1959 it was $4,417,000.

I would say the average was $4 million.

Is it not a fact that it is the subsidies for operation and construction that cause a shipowner to promise that in the event of war he will turn over the ship at its depreciated value?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. That is the basis of the argument for the whole subsidy. If they are to be released from this obligation and be allowed to collect the full value of the ship in the event of war we may as well let them pay for the ship in the first place.

Under the construction subsidy we pay 50 to 55 percent of the construction costs. The Government also pays a subsidy for the operation of the same ships. But after a war is over, after the ships have been taken over by the Government, they are often sold back to the same shipping interests at prices which appear to be utterly ridiculous.

Yesterday I cited an example of two ships which were sold after World War II. These two ships were sold for only $17,000 each, yet the ships were fully capable of sailing the ocean.

I cited the case of three other ships, the *Mount Mansfield*, the *Scott E. Land*, and the *Louis McHenry Howe*, which were completed in 1946. They cost the U.S. Government respectively, $7,733,694, $7,802,672, and $9,125,039.

They were new ships, C–4's, which were built at the end of the war. They were not battle-scarred ships at all. They were sold as surplus ships to private owners. What did the Government receive for those ships, which had cost over $24 million? When those ships were sold, the American taxpayers received $102,944 each, or a grand total of $309,000 for three ships which only 2 or 3 years before had cost the Government $24 million.

However, there was a proviso in their sales contract that in the event of war the Government could requisition these ships on the basis of their sales price.

Should they be lost in the war, they would have been insured under the Government's war risk insurance for not to exceed this low sales price.

In other words the Government did not want to pay for them twice.

If the pending bill had been in effect and if war had broken out, the companies could have insured them not for the cost price but for the full world market value. In this case it would have been around $25 million for the three ships.

I do not believe that the Senate will pass any such bill to give any industry, whether it be the shipping industry or any other industry, such a windfall. If it does so, it might as well give the shipping industry the key to the Treasury and tell it to take out what they want.

In my opinion there has never been a more ridiculous proposal brought before Congress than the bill under consideration today.

In the case of the ships to which I have referred, of course there was a clause in the contract that the ships could have been taken back by the Government. Why should there not have been? That, incidentally, was one of the arguments that was used for this ridiculously cheap sales price. In other words, the Government could take the ships back at the same price less normal depreciation in the event of war.

Now, however, under the pending bill, it is said, "Oh, no. If we do not take them back we want you to have an opportunity to insure them at the expense of the taxpayers for the full world market value."

And if the ships are lost they would be paid for by the taxpayers on the basis—not of what they cost the shipowners—but on the basis of the inflated world market price in wartime.

That is the issue before us. In the particular case that I have reference to, if this bill had been passed, the owners would have collected $10 million apiece if the ships had been sunk. The Justice Department was mild when it called this a "windfall."

Why put a premium on a situation in which a man can make a great deal of money if the ship is sunk? Those who man the ships are not going to make any money if a ship goes down. They may lose their lives. The shipowners have no right to insure any of the ships at the expense of the taxpayers in a manner whereby they can reap these huge windfall profits.

At the appropriate time I shall move that the bill be sent back to committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator for his forceful argument. I should like to spend a minute on the three ships which the Senator has mentioned. After the war they were sold to private operators at a cost of how much?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They were sold for $102,944 each. The ships cost the U.S. Government, in the first place, for one, $7,733,694; for the second one, $7,802,672; and for the third ship, $9,125,039.

Those were not old, obsolete ships. They were C–4's, built in the Bethlehem yards at Baltimore in 1946. They came off the ways after the war was over. They were authorized for construction during the war, but they were not battle-scarred ships by any means.

I am glad the Senator brought up this question again because I overlooked one important point. When I took up this subject some time ago, in 1951 I believe, I found that the same company which had agreed to buy the three ships for $309,000 had arranged to borrow money from the Government of the United States, using the ships as collateral. The Government at that time had approved a loan of $4,950,000 on the same three ships, for which they were paying only $309,000. We stopped the loan, but we did not stop the sale.

Now, here today it is proposed to pass a bill allowing such a company, having bought these ships at such bargain prices, to insure them with the Government for the full world market value in time of war.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In connection with the three ships that were bought at that palpably low price, the buyers promised the Government that in the event of war the Government could requisition them at depreciated value. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. The Government, under a clause in the sales contract, could in the event of war take them back at the price at which they had been sold, subject to normal depreciation.

That was one clause. Then under the War Risk Insurance Act the ships could have been insured for an amount not to exceed the cost. However, if the pending bill is passed they could insure these ships at the wartime full value, which would be at least $24 million.

Why should the Government insure a ship for $10 million when just a few months prior thereto they had sold the same ship for $103,000?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what the Senate is urged to approve.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what Senators are urged to vote for here today. The question is whether this No. 1 giveaway act of 1963 should be passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I only wish that the people of the United States could see on television what is going on here and what is sought to be done. However, it is not our good fortune to have television broadcasts of Senate sessions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Ohio has said has brought me to my feet, because I have tried very hard to have television broadcasts made of Senate sessions. I have tried to have television services installed, just as we have newspaper reporters covering our sessions, to show what the Senate does. I have introduced bills, and I have tried to do something about this before the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have always been frustrated by the fear that to permit such a procedure somehow or other would destroy the dignity of the Senate.

Therefore I was very much pleased to hear the Senator from Ohio, in his spontaneous way, with which he has become so well identified, almost wrench me from my seat to join him in trying to have our people see what goes on in the Senate. I join him in his expressions; and I will do what I can to bring about that situation. I have already tried, by introducing a bill, to have a loudspeaker system installed in the Senate, with microphones placed in our ink wells, or in some other conspicuous place on our desks. That bill is still languishing in committee.

We talk about modernizing our procedures. Yet we refuse to take advantage of even the most simple electronic means for getting across to the country what we have to say, for the benefit of the people who send us here to do the job for which we are delegated.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The arguments of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware leave me a bit nostalgic, because when I first came to the Senate and for several years thereafter I tried to do what little I could to correct certain practices—on the part of segments of the U.S. Merchant Marine in its dealings with the U.S. Government. At that time, about 1940, the Federal Government was selling ships to private companies at a fraction of their value, and subsidizing the construction of others.

Then war came along, and the Government took over most of the ships, and many of them were subsequently sunk in the Atlantic Ocean. Then the exorbitant insurance bills were paid. I believe the worst instance of that kind was in the case of a ship that was called the *West Madiket*, which was insured for about 64 times the appraised value of the ship, as fixed by the Maritime Board.

That is the situation that prevailed. I suppose that similar sharp practices have prevailed in greater or less degree up to this time.

I realize that much of our shipping is listed under foreign flags, particularly under the flags of Liberia, Panama, and other countries, and in that way the owners escape certain responsibilities to the United States.

Unsatisfactory conditions prevail in land as well as ocean shipping. It seems impossible to obtain ships to haul grain from Midwest ports like Milwaukee and Chicago to ports on the St. Lawrence River, so that the grain could be made available in New England. We have been unable to correct that situation. Of course, that situation involves lake shipping, rather than international shipping. I know that injustices and exploitation of the taxpayers and shippers has been going on ever since the late 1930's, when the basic merchant marine law was passed. It seems to me the time has come for a thorough and impartial review of U.S. shipping, with a view to bringing legislation up to date and to the point where it will be fair to the operators, shippers, and taxpayers alike.

We have been reading lately of the advantage that has been taken of us through charging twice as much to export goods from the United States to other countries as it costs to bring cargoes from those same countries back to the United States. The whole situation needs a thorough investigation with a view to correcting it.

I am not undertaking to place blame. I suppose if one company indulges in what might be called shady practices, the others perhaps have to do the same thing to meet the competition. I well recall that during the 1940's Federal agencies were trying to force shipping lines to accept subsidies, and were even going so far as to set up competing lines if the private companies did not accept subsidies and put themselves under U.S. Government control.

So perhaps not all the blame lies with the shipping companies. Probably they had better do business on a better basis than that on which they have operated to date. Whether or not they have to operate on the present basis in order to meet competition, I do not know.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio are performing a real service in trying to bring about corrections in the industry, something which I rather futilely undertook to do some 15 years ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to express approbation of what has been said by the Senator from Vermont. If the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 needs revision, let it be revised, but not in this way, by making it worse than it already is.

We are dealing with one phase of it. I had considered offering an amendment to the bill, and I would have done so if I had not limited myself in time to 2:30. My amendment would have sought to prohibit work stoppages in the merchant marine which resulted from jurisdictional disputes between two or more unions.

Many things ought to be done to improve the law, but the bill before the Senate would merely make the whole situation worse.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for his generous statement.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I thank the Senator from Vermont. He has ably pointed out one thing that had been overlooked. When war breaks out Congress imposes controls on the wages of every American worker and on the prices that are paid for commodities. Congress passes price controls on agricultural commodities and on services performed. Why should this one industry now be exempt by providing that if war breaks out it can not only continue to make all the profits possible, but can even have a guarantee that if the ship sinks it will collect an even greater windfall.

The purpose of this bill is wrong. I should like to see it recommitted so that the committee may study the whole proposal further. Revisions should be made so as to protect the taxpayers, rather than to expand the act and make the situation worse.

Who ever heard of asking Congress to pass a law whereby a company could make more money if the ship sank than it could if it reaches port in safety?

Mr. President, although I know that the vote is not scheduled until 2:30 p.m., I wish to make a motion to recommit the bill.

In order that Senators may know what is proposed I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. the Senate vote on my motion to recommit, prior to any vote on the passage of the bill. Then Senators would be on notice. I make that motion now, and ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to recommit be in order at 2:30 p.m., rather than to have the vote on the final passage of the bill at 2:30 p.m.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** The Senator might wish to modify his request in light of the possibility that all the time between now and 2:30 may not be required.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Yes; I modify the request so as to provide that either at 2:30 or prior thereto, the first vote will be on my motion to recommit.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**Mr. MILLER.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield.

**Mr. MILLER.** The Senator has been discussing the cost to the taxpayers. I invite his attention to a statement on page 1 of the report, at the end of the paragraph headed "Purpose of This Bill." The statement reads:

> As the war risk insurance program is operated on a mutual basis, the increased coverage sought would not entail any Government costs.

A mere reading of that statement would, I suppose, cause the average person to believe that the bill is perfectly all right, and that there would not be any cost to the taxpayers.

The Senator from Delaware has been saying that apparently there would be a cost to the taxpayers.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Certainly there would be a cost to the taxpayers. That is the whole principle behind the bill. If war broke out, private insurance companies naturally could not afford to insure the ships; the rates would be prohibitive. To prevent that from happening the Government takes over and underwrites all the insurance during the time of war and would do so at the normal premium rates.

To the extent that ships were sunk, certainly there would be a cost to the taxpayer. The claims would be paid from the war risk insurance fund. What would be the difference? It would be our money.

**Mr. MILLER.** As I understand, the insurance premiums would be paid into the Treasury of the U.S. Government, based on the amount of the subsidy, at least.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Yes. Conceivably, this proposal may not cost the taxpayers any money. Conceivably, no ships might be sunk during a war, but that is most unlikely.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** The Government had considerable experience in this connection during World War II. This same system was used before. The Government profits amounted to $8 million. The premiums were established in somewhat the same fashion as the private companies would fix them. The Government came out ahead. The Government is not supposed to lose. The premiums were fixed so that the Government would not lose.

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** The Government would not lose unless ships were sunk. The whole principle is that behind this insurance there is pledged as security all the assets of the U.S. Government. If that is not true, the War Risk Insurance Act should be amended to provide that claims would be paid only to the extent that the money was in the fund as a result of premiums that had been collected. Then when the fund went broke, payment on claims would stop. If the Senate is willing to accept that as the proposal I will subside right now. But we know that the only strength of the War Risk Insurance Act is that it is anchored in the Federal Treasury.

Certainly it is possible, as was the case in the Korean war, to have the Government come out ahead. Few ships were sunk. But who knows what will happen in another war? If only one ship were sunk, why should a profit be collected? That is what we are arguing here today. If this were such a profitable operation and if there were no risk, private insurance companies would carry the insurance during the war.

**Mr. MILLER.** Do I correctly understand that the proponents of the bill are not merely arguing that, to the extent of the insurance proceeds, the shipowners should receive an allocable portion based upon their contribution to the building of the ship, but are arguing also that they should receive the entire amount of the insurance proceeds?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** Based upon the value of the ship.

**Mr. MILLER.** I can see a possible argument that could be made. If a shipowner contributed 50 percent of the cost and the Federal Government contributed 50 percent of the cost, and if this insurance program were in existence, and the ship were sunk, and the fair market value might even be double what the cost was, when the insurance proceeds were to be paid, the proponents might say they believe they ought to share the proceeds.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield, on my time, to permit me to answer the Senator from Iowa?

**Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.** I yield.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** I yield myself 1 minute for that purpose.

The Senator's fear that insurance might be paid on an enhanced value of a ship is incorrect. The insurance would be based upon the market value of the vessel not including any wartime inflationary pressure.

**Mr. MILLER.** I understand; but the point I make is that instead of having the Federal Government, which put up half the cost of the ship, receive half the insurance proceeds, which I think perhaps would merit some consideration, do the proponents of the bill want to have the entire amount of the insurance proceeds go to the shipowner?

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Yes.

**Mr. MILLER.** Why? That seems to me to be overreaching. Why not in proportion to the contribution the shipowner has made and the contribution the Federal Government has made?

**Mr. BARTLETT.** That is precisely what we seek to have done by means of the bill. Generally speaking, a ship costs twice as much when built in a U.S. yard as it does when it is built in a foreign yard; and under existing law the beneficial interest of the owner-operator is diminished automatically by 50 percent, the moment he seeks insurance. For example, if he has a $10 million ship in which he has $5 million invested, he can obtain insurance in the amount of only $2,500,000 if the vessel received the construction subsidy.

**Mr. MILLER.** The Senator from Alaska has made an observation which I also see set forth in the committee report. That observation is shocking to me; namely, that the cost of construction in a U.S. yard would be twice that in a foreign yard.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Roughly speaking, that is the case. In some cases the cost is a little less; in some cases it is a little more. Congress has fixed a ceiling of 55 percent over and above foreign shipbuilding costs.

I agree with the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio in saying that I am not sure that this situation has not grown up, like Topsy. Perhaps we should revise, reform, and begin anew. However, in making such an approach, I would be faced with a very considerable difficulty. I would not know how to begin, for, although the subsidy arrangement is unsatisfactory for everyone—including, I am confident, the operators—what alternative have we if we are to maintain a U.S. merchant marine?

Mr. MILLER. I am sure all Senator want the United States to be able to compete in merchant marine operations; but it seems to me there is an overreaching when one who long ago entered into a contract is told that now the contractual arrangement is to be changed and that he will be treated in exactly the same way as one who provided the entire amount of capital required. I say there should be a difference—perhaps not to the extent that the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware have been arguing, but certainly a difference. This is one reason why I am inclined to support the motion to recommit, so that this question can be studied further.

Mr. BARTLETT. However, not all of the advantages flow to the operator. After receiving the subsidized vessel, he is required to operate it on established routes, with established stops, and only to those places. He is required to employ exclusively American labor; he is required to make his ship immediately available to the Government in time of emergency; and he is subject to many other restrictions.

Mr. MILLER. In connection with the required operations, does he receive a Government subsidy?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Is not the situation taken care of by that means?

Mr. BARTLETT. I think not. I wish to emphasize very definitely that the construction subsidy does not represent a windfall to the owner-operator, because if the Government did not choose to give him a subsidized-built ship, he could have it built abroad for 48 or 52 percent, or some such percentage, of the cost of construction in a U.S. shipyard; and in that event he would not be subject to all the restrictions I have mentioned, and to more.

Mr. MILLER. I agree that there is a difference. However, I suggest that when the Federal Government requires him to operate on certain routes and to certain ports, there should be a kind of quid pro quo, which we call a subsidy, to cover those requirements.

Mr. BARTLETT. He is subject to many restrictions in return for any advantages he may receive.

However, I must refer again to the contention—repeatedly made—that this is a windfall. I do not see how it is.

Mr. MILLER. I did not say it is a windfall; I said it appears to be.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not have in mind, in that connection, the Senator from Iowa. However, that statement has been made.

I am sure the Senator from Iowa knows that if this bill were enacted and if such a vessel were insured at what its commercial value was at the time when war broke out, and if later the vessel were sunk, the operator would not receive *x* dollars from the Federal Government, to do with as he pleased. Instead, the insurance money would be placed in a fund—this is required by law—exclusively devoted to the construction of a replacement fleet; and the owner could not spend the money for dividends or for any other purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Let me suggest to the Senator from Alaska that the operator should have his head examined if he tried to use the money for any other purpose, because unless he used it for such a replacement purpose, he would have to pay a large income tax on the proceeds. So I do not think it is unreasonable to require him to invest the fund in another vessel.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not believe it is unreasonable either; and the law requires that this be done.

Earlier, it was stated that the president of the United States Lines, when testifying before the subcommittee, stated that there is a replacement fund in the aggregate amount of $26 million. However, at the same time he told us that on today's market it would cost $114 million to replace the SS *America*. So it seems to me that if equity is involved in connection with this bill, and I believe it is, it would be helpful to the American merchant marine to require that the replacement funds would, in the event of such an unhappy development, be enlarged.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Alaska has made a valid point, and I would be among the first to recognize it. However, this is but one example; and the Senator from Delaware has given examples on the other side.

I wish to ask a further question about a statement included in the committee report; namely, that the Maritime Administrator requires the owners of subsidized vessels to carry insurance in peacetime to the full commercial value of their vessels, as determined by the Administrator. It seems to me that, if we wish to have equity done, this could be somewhat of a windfall on the side of the Federal Government. If the Senator's bill included a provision which, for example, would require the Federal Government, which would be the recipient of all the insurance proceeds, to bear a portion of the cost of the insurance, the Senator would have a better case.

Mr. BARTLETT. The committee considered the bill at great length, both this year and last year.

I do not know whether it is a perfect instrument to achieve that which ought to be sought and entertained. But in defense of the bill I must say that today I was somewhat resentful when the insinuation or implication was made that only a few greedy shipowners, hungering for Uncle Sam's money, wanted the bill enacted into law. I do not refer to the Senator from Iowa in that connection. At the designation of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I was acting as chairman of the subcommittee which heard the bill now before the Senate and the bill last considered.

When the bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce, the only individual views which were expressed were those of the Senator from Ohio. Presumably every other member of the Committee on Commerce had approved the proposed legislation, or he would have submitted individual or minority views.

There are others besides the shipowners who believe that the bill is fair, just, and equitable.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his responses. However, I regret that an overall study was not given to the bill which would cover many of the ramifications which have been brought out in the course of the debate. I believe a better bill could be written. For example, I would like to see something done about insurance.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator from Iowa believe that if the bill should become law and apply to a vessel that would cost altogether $10 million—we will say $5 million on the part of the Federal Government and $5 million on the part of the owner—the owner could insure the vessel for $10 million?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa does not know. I know that the Senator from Alaska would refer me to page 3 of the committee report, at which page the point is raised. I am quite sure that, as I believe the Senator from Delaware brought out some examples that make some sense, the Senator from Alaska could also find examples which make sense. That is why I have the feeling that we are dealing with something that is a great deal more complicated than would appear to the eye.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is extremely complicated and very technical. I would be the first to admit that.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure the Senator from Alaska knows much more about the subject than does the Senator from Iowa, but I still believe that the bill could be reworked a little more, for example, to take care of the insurance problem. I can see some inequity if the shipowner is now required to carry all the insurance, pay all of the premiums, and then receive perhaps half of the proceeds. That is not fair, either.

Mr. BARTLETT. He would get all the proceeds, but he would not get enough proceeds because of the arrangement which is now operative for war risk insurance.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that some of the proceeds go to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. MILLER. Then they go into the replacement fund.

Mr. BARTLETT. The individual company's replacement fund.

I should like to bear down again on the point that the program is a mutual insurance program. The man who is to benefit pays the premiums, as the Senator from Iowa and I pay our life insurance premiums. The premiums are at a rate calculated by the Maritime Administration to make the Federal Government whole.

Returning to a discussion held yesterday between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, I point out that in the last war 246 ships were requisitioned for title and 403 ships were requisitioned for use.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], a vigorous opponent of the bill, spoke at some length about the opposition of Government agencies to the measure. It is in part true that there has been such opposition. It is likewise true, however, that the opposition has been modified very considerably from last year.

Yesterday morning and this morning I acted as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce which is holding hearings upon a bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] to end some jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry. I presume that those hearings will have to continue tomorrow, for there are many witnesses and much testimony is to be adduced. To date the Federal departments really concerned about the proposed legislation have not reported on the bill. They will do so at a later date. If the departments referred to should report adversely, would the Senator from Ohio then wish to abandon consideration of the bill or will he wish to press forward with it? My thought is that probably the latter will be the case. So it is with myself in connection with the bill S. 927. I believe that Government departments know that the bill is a good bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 8 minutes remaining and the opponents have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be an order for a quorum call, the time necessary therefor not to be charged to either side, and following which the debate can be closed and a vote had on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BARTLETT. That procedure is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the vote take place at 2:30 p.m.?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Following the establishment of a quorum, each side would have 8 minutes available for debate, followed by the vote.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. How much time does the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in a few minutes the Senate will vote on a motion by the Senator from Delaware to recommit S. 927, which was reported by the Committee on Commerce unanimously, except that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] filed individual views.

It was the judgment of the committee—and particularly it was my own judgment, as acting chairman of the subcommittee which heard the testimony in the spring of this year and last year—that the bill is justified, that it is equitable, and that it does not constitute a windfall of any kind for maritime shipping operators.

The bill seeks to make it possible for the owner operators whose vessels have been built by construction subsidies to obtain the same amount of war risk insurance for a given ship in time of war that they are required by the Government under existing law to take out in commercial insurance in peacetime.

The owner operators, to reach the higher value which the bill would permit, would pay premiums set by the Maritime Administration. The Government would not pay the premiums. It would be the function of the Government to decide what the rate ought to be, and to collect the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes yielded by the Senator from Alaska have expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARTLETT. The operators are perfectly willing to make those payments.

The best example I can use is that which I cited yesterday. I repeat it now.

The United States Lines, the owner of the SS *America*, is required to take out and maintain commercial insurance in the amount of $6.4 million. If an emergency should arise, and if the ship were requisitioned by the Government, prior to being taken over for use or title by the Government, the insurance amount automatically would drop to about $4.5 million. If the ship were requisitioned for use, the insurance would drop to $437,000. This makes no sense whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield myself 1 more minute, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARTLETT. The value of the ship is the value which ought to be computed in and out of wartime, in my judgment, for insurance.

I repeat, this would be no windfall. It is a business transaction.

The bill is a good bill. I trust the Senate will vote down the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the term "windfall" in connection with this bill is not a word which I coined. That is the word which was used by the Department of Justice when it reported to the committee its recommendations that the bill be defeated.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Department of Justice, as shown on page 8 of the report, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Washington, D.C., July 12, 1963.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title.

Title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1281–1293), permits the Secretary of Commerce to insure vessels and cargo against war risks when such insurance is not obtainable on reasonable terms and conditions from private domestic underwriters. Section 1209 (46 U.S.C. 1289) limits the valuation of such vessels for war risk insurance coverage to "just compensation," but provides that such valuation must be reduced in the case of a vessel constructed under Government subsidy by such proportion as the subsidy paid bears to the entire construction costs. Thus, the valuation of a vessel constructed under a 50-percent subsidy must be reduced for war risk insurance coverage by 50 percent of its total value.

The bill would eliminate the provisions of existing law requiring vessel valuation reductions in the cases of vessels constructed under Government subsidies. This would result in placing subsidy beneficiaries in a more favored position than all others. They would be entitled to obtain full insurance coverage even though a part of the value of their vessels is derived solely from subsidy grants. The resulting potential windfalls appear to be neither necessary nor just.

Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend the enactment of this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program,

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
*Deputy Attorney General.*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I read one paragraph of that letter:

> The bill would eliminate the provisions of existing law requiring vessel valuation reductions in the cases of vessels constructed under Government subsidies. This would result in placing subsidy beneficiaries in a

> more favored position than all others. They would be entitled to obtain full insurance coverage even though a part of the value of their vessels is derived solely from subsidy grants. The resulting potential windfalls appear to be neither necessary nor just.

The Department of Justice used the words "windfalls" and "neither necessary nor just."

The Justice Department, in its letter, recommended strongly against enactment of the bill.

I now wish to read from testimony of the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, as shown on page 11 of the hearings. The Department of Commerce likewise strongly opposed enactment of the bill:

> If I may, let me rephrase the last statement. We see no reason for the Government to pay the shipyard—using the 50-percent rate—half of what it cost to construct a ship today and then, under the war risk insurance program, pay that same 50 percent again to the owner when the ship is lost. The law provides for the replacement of that ship.

This situation boils down to a simple question. The construction of the ships is subsidized. When they are built in the first place the U.S. Government pays approximately one-half the cost of construction of the ships. Under the law in return for this subsidy, the shipowner agrees that in the event of war he will permit the Government to requisition the ship at a price based not on the world market value of the ship but on the basis of what the company paid for the ship minus the normal depreciation.

If they paid only half the construction costs then why should they collect the full value if the ship is lost?

Under the present law if a ship is sunk during use in war the Government pays the company based on the valuation of the ship in relation to the part the company paid.

If this bill were passed the company could insure for the full value of the ship without regard to the cost price, and this would result in a tremendous windfall profit. That word is not mine. That is the word of the Department of Justice in describing the bill.

I wish to cite one or two cases, to show how the system would work if this bill were passed.

After the war was over the Government sold a number of ships as surplus. Yesterday I cited two particular ships which were sold to the American South African Lines, Inc. The ships cost the U.S. Government when built $3,163,146 and $3,129,120. Those ships were sold for a net figure to the Government of $17,000 each.

When the ships were sold for $17,000 each—a ridiculous price—the contract did provide that in the event of war the Government could take them back at the same cheap price, minus the depreciation. The contract further provided that if the ships were sunk during a war the Government, under the War Risk Insurance Act, would pay the company's claim based on the $17,000 valuation.

If the pending bill should be passed, however, the owners could insure the ships for the full market value of the ships, at wartime values, which means that if the ships were lost they could collect a tremendous profit.

I cited one other case of three ships which were sold.

Those were new ships, constructed in 1946 at the Bethlehem Shipyards. They were C-4's, which are good ships. They cost $7,733,694, $7,802,672, and $9,125,039, respectively. The same three ships were sold for $102,944 each, with the proviso that if war should break out the Government could take them back at the price for which they were sold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded by the Senator from Delaware have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 1 more minute.

It was also provided that, if the ships were sunk during the war, the Government would be liable for insurance only to the extent of the cost of the ship.

If the pending bill passes, the owners will be able to insure the ships for the full maritime value, without regard to the cost, and if the ships are sunk they will be able to collect from the U.S. Government.

This bill should be defeated. It should go back to the committee in which it originated.

In conclusion, I repeat that every agency of Government affected—the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Comptroller General—has denounced the bill and declared it an unwarranted windfall to this particular industry.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I merely wish to repeat what the Senator from Delaware has said. No agency of the Government is in favor of the bill. All are opposed to it. I refer to the Department of Commerce, the Comptroller General, and the Department of Justice.

There is no public demand for the bill. No one has heard any public clamor that there is something wrong with the existing law. The only group that is urging passage of the bill is the one that would be benefited by it. It wants its subsidized ships to be insured, in case of war, on the same basis as nonsubsidized ships are insured. That is the crux of the issue.

On that score, each of the agencies of Government to which I have referred has said that the bill is wrong. The Department of Justice said that the bill provides a windfall. I am a member of the committee from which the bill came. In my judgment, the bill is completely unjustified. It is not in the interest of the security of the country. It is not fair to the taxpayers. It would serve only one group; namely, the owners of the ships involved. First we subsidize the building of the ships. Then we subsidize the operation of the ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I sincerely submit to my colleagues that it would be a grave error to pass the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, anything I might say now would necessarily be repetitive. However, I will say it again, but very briefly:

It is not the operators who would receive the benefit of the construction subsidy. It is the shipyards, and it is the national defense structure.

The operators do not receive the benefit of the operating subsidy that has been granted by Congress so American ships could be competitive with foreign carriers. It is the only way in which they could be competitive.

I think the bill is sound. I think it is justified. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill to the committee.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senate about to vote on the motion to recommit the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is about to vote on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh].

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would note "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Scott
Stennis
Symington
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—17

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hruska
Kennedy
Long, La.
McCarthy
Mechem
Randolph
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the motion of Mr. Williams of Delaware to recommit the bill to the committee was rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr Byrd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 263 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuzon
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Scott
Symington
Yarborough

NAYS—35

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Case
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Gore
Hickenlooper
Holland
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Bayh
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Engle
Goldwater
Hruska
Long, La.
McCarthy
Mechem
Randolph
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Tower
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 927) was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week and also for the following week, if he has that information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, it is the intention to lay before the Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, Calendar No. 483, to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress, and recommend improvements therein. This measure has been cleared by the policy committee. It is also intended to have the Senate take up several measures on the calendar to which there is no objection—measures having to do with various kinds of weeks, and whatnots.

On Monday, the Senate will take up the public works appropriation bill.

On Tuesday, the Senate will take up the military construction appropriation bill.

On Wednesday, eulogies for the late President Kennedy will be delivered.

On Thursday, the Senate will take up the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consider, in sequence, Calendar No. 661, House bill 5945, to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement in a democratic manner of the political status of Puerto Rico; Calendar No. 662, Senate Joint Resolution 113, for the designation of "Save Your Vision Week"; and Calendar No. 663, Senate Joint Resolution 128, to provide for the establishment of an annual National Farmers' Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will proceed to state these measures.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 661, House bill 5945, to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement in a democratic manner of the political status of Puerto Rico.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just now been informed that a request has been made to have this bill passed over. Therefore, I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

The resolution (S.J. Res. 113) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week", and inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations. The President is further requested to consider including in such proclamation an invitation calling upon the press, radio, television, and other communications media, the health care professions and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision to unite during such week in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

The preamble was agreed to.

## NATIONAL FARMERS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the seven-day period beginning on the first Sunday of April in each year is hereby designated as National Farmers Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

## CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, let me state that it is the hope of the leadership that at this time the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 483, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, with the proviso that the commitments in effect made to the Senate concerning what will be done next week will be observed, and in the hope that, in between, certain measures of a relatively noncontroversial nature will be considered.

So, Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 483, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend the improvements therein.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that objection has been made to the request for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution, which was reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and was cleared by the policy committee, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 483, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 264 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## THE EVIDENCE JUSTIFIES A FAIR TEST OF KREBIOZEN NOW

[Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Senate. His remarks together with related colloquy and exhibits, will appear in the RECORD of Friday, December 6, 1963.]

## WALL STREET JOURNAL CRITICIZES COMMUNIST TRADE CREDITS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, slippage is not a planned and constructive process. Clearly when we rely upon slippage to determine our foreign trade policies and are content merely to drift from one position to another as a matter of expediency, this is not the formula for the development of optimum policies or the exercise of world leadership.

I submit that the laying on the table by the Senate vote on S. 2310 does not relieve this administration and this Congress from the obligation to call together a free world trade-aid conference or to utilize some other form of constructive American leadership to rationalize and make consistent our present policies of foreign trade and aid. Neither does it make right or prudent the widescale extension of public credit—supported by the money of American taxpayers generally—to Communist dictators seeking to purchase in this country the tools, machines, and supplies which they desperately need to prevent a crackup in their staggering Communist economy.

I call attention to the editorial in the Wall Street Journal of December 5 entitled "How One Thing Leads to Another," as informative reading and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOW ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

When the Russian wheat deal was first proposed last October, the late President Kennedy, in clear and specific language, laid down some excellent terms. He carefully explained what the deal would be—and would not be.

This would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being limited to granting the necessary permission, he said. The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, in his words, "the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer * * * who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants."

In presenting this arrangement, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that one feature of it was that the wheat sold to the Soviet Union would be carried in American ships.

Thus while even then the wheat sale was not without its critics, it was generally accepted by the public on the basis of this straightforward arrangement. On such terms the Russians could buy wheat on the world market anyway, and it seemed as though we would get a fair "quid" for the Russian "quo."

Now, it seems things aren't quite what they seemed.

One of the first things that happened, once the Soviet buyers got the U.S. Government's approval to the principle of a sale, was that they balked at having the wheat shipped to them in American ships. Mr. Khrushchev, figuratively at least, banged the bargaining table, and the U.S. Government relaxed this part of the arrangement.

After that it developed that the Soviet Union didn't want to pay cash after all, either in gold or U.S. dollars. Nor were the Communists willing to deal on "normal commercial terms," meaning such short-term credit as they might get from either the private sellers or private banks. A few efforts at obtaining such credit on their terms, here and in Europe, were unproductive. Whereupon the Soviets said to us: No credit, no deal.

So next the proposition was that the U.S. Government, through the Export-Import

Bank, itself finance the Russian wheat purchase by guaranteeing a loan for 75 percent of the purchase price.

The first reactions to this, not unreasonably, were objections in Congress. A bill was introduced to prohibit this U.S. financing of Russian trade. And although Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that we must underwrite the sale or there would be no sale, the Senate Banking Committee appeared unpersuaded that the deal was worth that price. Appeared unpersuaded, that is, until the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the aftermath of that tragic event, the Senate committee quietly decided to put aside its objections to financing the Russian wheat sale. The explanation given was that this was intended as a tribute to the man who had so carefully spelled out the original terms, and somehow as a gesture of confidence to the new President.

This action had hardly been taken, yielding one more point to the Soviet bargainers when there developed an argument over the shipping rates for transporting the wheat to Russia. The Russians decided they were too high, implying that if something can't be done to get cheaper shipping rates—a special U.S. subsidy, perhaps?—maybe they would have to get their wheat somewhere else.

What interests us here is not so much the wrangle over the Soviet Union's credit standing, although Senator MUNDT had a point about the unpaid Soviet debts due us from World War II. Nor so much even the fact that a Soviet wheat loan would be a major change in the Export-Import Bank policy, which has so far never extended credit or credit insurance to a Communist bloc country.

Rather, the intriguing thing here is the progressive change in the wheat deal and the attitude of U.S. officials to the changing Soviet demands. We have witnessed a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposition that has the sound of reasonableness. Then, a bargain seemingly struck, demands for a "little change." Finally, this being agreed to, a new set of demands. The same sort of thing has happened a thousand times over in different kinds of bargaining with the Communists.

Unfortunately, the American rection is also all too typical. Congratulations at a well-struck bargain; next a little yielding in the hopes of saving the bargain. Finally, "getting a deal" seems to become to us as important as the terms of the bargain. And before you know it, the Russians have what they were after in the first place.

Whatever else may be said about the present proposals, they are a far cry from the thoughtful terms laid down by President Kennedy last October. It is really astounding, when you think of it, how one little thing leads to another.

## PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY AGAINST MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I speak today on behalf of the cattle producers of South Dakota and the entire Nation to discuss the need for protection of our livestock industry against the increasing imports of meat products.

The importance of livestock production in the agricultural economy of this country can hardly be overemphasized. Approximately a third of the value of our total farm and ranch production in the United States is represented by the meat from our cattle, hogs, and sheep. Cattle and calves alone accounted for nearly 23 percent of receipts from all farm marketings during 1962 and receipts from the marketings of all livestock and livestock products amounted to about 56 percent of the total cash receipts from all farm products marketed.

The percentage of farm income received by farmers in South Dakota from the sale of livestock and products is greater than the average for the Nation as a whole, accounting for nearly three-fourths of total cash receipts from all farm marketings in 1962. Receipts from the sale of meat animals in South Dakota amounted to 62.3 percent of total farm cash receipts compared with 32.4 for the Nation. Receipts from the sale of cattle and calves alone accounted for 43.2 percent of total receipts in South Dakota compared with nearly 23 percent for the United States. These data clearly indicate the importance of the cattle industry to the farmers of the country and to the State of South Dakota.

The Nation's cattle herd has increased substantially during the past 5 years, increasing from 93.4 million head in 1958 to 103.8 million on January 1, 1963, an increase of about 11 percent. The 103.8 million head of cattle on farms on January 1, 1963, represents an increase of nearly 4 percent over 1962.

The rate of growth of the cattle industry for South Dakota has been even greater than that of the Nation, increasing from 3.2 million head in 1958 to more than 3.7 million on January 1, 1963, an increase of nearly 16 percent. The number of cattle and calves on farms in South Dakota on January 1, 1963, was about 7 percent greater than a year earlier.

The decline in prices received by farmers for all beef cattle during this year can be attributed to the increased marketings from this unusually large herd and to increasing beef and veal imports.

The average price received by farmers for all beef cattle on October 15, 1963, was $19.50 per hundred pounds compared with $21.70 per hundred pounds on October 15, 1962, a decline of $2.20 per hundredweight or a decrease of about 10 percent. The average price received on October 15, 1963, was $1.10 per hundredweight below the average for the period January 1957 through December 1959.

These are substantial price declines over a short period and will seriously affect the income of our cattle producers if the downward trend continues.

Cattle numbers have been increasing at a high rate since 1958 and the current estimates indicate that cattle of farms and ranches on January 1, 1964, will be close to 107 million head—up 3 percent from the 103.8 million in January 1963. Since the number of cattle kept for milk production is expected to decrease by about 3 percent, the gain in beef cattle number may be up as high as 5 percent. The beginning inventory next year will provide the basis for a further increase in beef production during 1964. More important, a larger basic cow herd will furnish the source for future increases in the supply of feeder cattle suitable for feedlot fattening. Continued optimistic longrun outlook for the demand for beef likely will encourage further expansion and a buildup of 2 to 3 percent is in prospect for next year.

Even with further expansion in cattle numbers, cattle slaughter will increase again in 1964. With reasonably normal weather conditions, prospects are for an increase in commercial cattle slaughter in 1964 of about 3 to 4 percent above the 27.3 million head expected in 1963.

In view of our rapidly increasing livestock production and all factors that point to further increases it appears that we should give serious consideration to the economic effects of the sharp increase in meat imports. For example, let us compare imports of beef and veal with domestic production of those two products. In 1954 imports of beef and veal and live cattle and calves in terms of carcass weights were equal to 1.8 percent of total domestic commercial beef and veal production. This percentage has fluctuated sharply from year to year. It rose to approximately 10.6 percent in 1962 and has continued at that rate for the period January through August 1963. This may seem unimportant in relation to our total meat production and consumption but such a sharp rise in imports plus a rapidly expanding domestic industry gives farmers good reason to demand some means of protecting their cattle industry.

The United States imported 1,126 million pounds of meat products, carcass weight equivalent, during 1958. In 1962 imports of meat products rose to 1,804 million pounds, carcass weight equivalent, an increase of approximately 60 percent during the 5-year period. Imports of beef and veal accounted for about 80 percent of total meat imports, on a carcass weight equivalent basis. Beef and veal imports have continued to increase during 1963. Imports during January to August 1963 were 22 percent above the same months of 1962. Australia, which, in 1962, contributed 46 percent to the total U.S. tonnage imported, showed the largest increase as a source of imports over recent years.

Prior to 1959, imports from Australia were relatively small. In late 1958 the United Kingdom-Australian Meat Agreement, which restricted Australia from shipping other than token quantities of meat to countries other than the United Kingdom was modified. Since then, Australia has increased its meat production and exports, and has emphasized exports to the United States. Australian exports of beef and veal amounted to 549 million pounds in 1962, of which 81 percent was shipped to the United States. Cattle numbers in Australia have increased in the last 4 years, and supplies of meat for export are expected to continue at high levels.

New Zealand contributed 22 percent of the total product imported into the United States and was the second largest supplier last year. For the past 3 years, the United States has been the major market for New Zealand's boneless beef exports, taking over 90 percent of its exports in all 3 years.

In addition to beef and veal imports, 1,232,000 head of dutiable cattle and calves were imported from Canada and Mexico in 1962. For the first 8 months of 1963, imports of live animals were 5 percent below year earlier levels. Beef and veal imports plus the meat equivalent of feeder cattle imports have risen in recent years at a faster rate than United States beef and veal production. In 1962, as I mentioned earlier, beef and veal imports and the carcass weight equivalent of live cattle imports equaled 10.6 percent of domestic production, compared with 7.9 percent in 1961. These imports have been continuing at about the same percentage rate thus far in 1963.

The beef imported by the United States is largely boneless frozen lower grade beef suitable mainly for use in the processed meat industry. Of the beef and veal imports thus far in 1963, carcass weight, 81 percent was boneless beef; 14 percent was canned beef. Relatively little bone-in or chilled beef was imported. Some of the boneless frozen beef is suitable for uses other than processed products. However, quality is believed to compare generally to that of the lower grades of domestic beef.

Cattle prices in the short term are influenced primarily by the volume of cattle slaughtered. Fed-cattle prices depend largely on the number and weight of fed cattle marketed and the resulting production of fed beef. Similarly, cow prices depend principally on the supply of cow beef. To the extent that cow beef may compete with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow prices have some effect on fed-beef prices and vice versa. Imports affect these prices by changing the total supply of beef of that quality.

A recent study conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicates that imports of beef and veal do affect prices of choice steers as well as utility cows. The study indicates that the amount of influence on price is affected by the level of imports relative to domestic production. When imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production—as they have recently—an increase of 10 percent in imports would cause, on the average, a drop of about 1 percent in the price of choice steers. If imports are a smaller proportion of domestic production, the effect on fed-cattle prices is less; if they are a larger proportion, the effect on prices is greater. For utility cows the effect would be greater, under the same conditions as stated for choice steers, the price of utility cows would drop about 2.7 percent.

We cannot escape the fact that the total supply of lower grade beef is increased by imports and thus results in lower farm prices for lower grade cattle, particularly cows, than would prevail in the absence of the imports. It may also be argued that as we widen the range between the lower quality and higher quality meat there may be a tendency for consumers to shift to the lower priced cuts and thus lower the demand for higher quality products. Decreasing demand for a product without a decrease in supply tends to result in lower prices for such products. Thus imports of beef most likely have a greater influence on domestic farm prices for cattle than is generally recognized.

In view of the sharp increase in imports of livestock and meat products over the past 4 or 5 years and the decline in farm prices of beef cattle there is every reason for our cattle producers to request that some action be taken to protect their industry against further price declines. I therefore urge that the proper authorities in the executive branch of Government take such action as is feasible, the adjustment of quotas or duties, which ever is required, to protect our domestic cattle industry against excessive imports which most certainly will continue to have a price-depressing effect on domestically produced cattle.

---

## URBAN REDEVELOPMENT IN NEWARK, N.J.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the city of Newark, N.J., has done as much as any community in the Nation to rebuild itself as a modern American city, both through its own efforts and with the help of the State and Federal Governments. Gustave E. Wiedenmayer, president of the Commerce and Industry Association of Newark, spoke at the November 20, 1963, meeting of the New Jersey Association of Housing and Redevelopment Authorities in Atlantic City, N.J., with reference to the efforts which Newark has made and the gap which needs to be filled if there is to be additional progress. Mr. Wiedenmayer has some stimulating ideas to offer, I believe, about the future of the urban renewal program based on the experience of the business community of Newark in meeting the challenge of urban redevelopment, and I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT URBAN RENEWAL

(By Gustave E. Wiedenmayer)

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to have been invited to address you this afternoon. As you have heard, I appear before you as a representative of the business community of Newark, and my assignment is to give you, in effect, a private enterprise slant on urban renewal.

At the very outset, may I say that the Newark business community has some decidedly positive views on this complex subject. So, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to state our case before so distinguished an organization as yours.

As all of you know, Newark is not only the largest municipality in our State; it is also the "central city" in an economic area that is among the most important in the Nation.

In Newark, there is a high concentration of major commerce and industry. The top management of these enterprises, together with the leaders of the small business sector, make up what I've referred to as the "business community" of our city.

As I have said, our business community feels very strongly about urban renewal, and we do so because we feel very strongly about Newark as a central city.

We are convinced, for example, that geography and economics have blessed Newark with a potential for growth that is second to no other city in the United States.

We are located at the very heart of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region; and as a transportation center, we have unexcelled facilities for land, sea and air traffic.

But mind you, I specified that these advantages of geography and economics give Newark no more than a potential for growth. They most certainly cannot provide a guarantee of growth.

What Newark needs most is to realize its potential—to make it a reality. And for that to happen, Newark must battle—and, indeed, we must overcome—the obsolescence and the blight that creep up upon so many of the older cities in New Jersey as elsewhere in the Nation.

This is the conviction that is held by the business community of Newark, and it is upon this conviction that we who represent the private enterprise system base our attitude toward urban renewal.

Fundamentally, we feel that in Newark's battle against obsolescence and blight, our most promising weapon is a program of urban renewal and redevelopment, privately sponsored and publicly sponsored, privately and publicly financed. Newark has such a program.

Secondly, we feel that in urban renewal, there should be nothing less than full partnership between the business community, the municipal government, and the city's redevelopment agency—and such a spirit of teamwork does exist in Newark.

But unfortunately, we have also learned that it will take far more than community cooperation to guarantee the success of urban renewal.

In Newark, for example, the business community could not ask for a greater degree of cooperation or a greater competence than has been demonstrated by our redevelopment director, Lou Danzig, and his staff of the Newark Housing Authority.

But for all of this, the fact remains that Newark's urban renewal program is far from the success that we would like it to be.

If Newark or any other city is to have truly effective urban renewal, the administration of the program simply will have to be overhauled—from Washington on down to the local level.

It is true that in Newark, we have 15 urban renewal projects in various stages of development. But here it is, 14 years after the initial Federal act of 1949, and there is only one federally assisted urban renewal project actually completed and in use—this being the magnificent Colonnade apartments project in North Broad Street.

Over the same period of time, private business interests acquired land, cleared sites and actually erected large industrial, commercial, and residential buildings that have literally transformed the physical appearance of Newark.

In fairness, however, it must be said that in pressing their own projects, these private interests undoubtedly were influenced by the fact that a Federal urban renewal program did exist to complement their private efforts, and that our municipal authorities were committed to such a program.

In fairness, too, it must be said that while Newark and other cities may be disappointed over the pace of urban renewal, there is no reason why we should despair.

Over the years, local pressure already has been responsible for remarkable changes in Federal policy affecting low-cost housing and urban renewal. I am confident that this same local pressure could be brought to bear once again on Washington to force the full-scale review that is now so obviously and urgently needed.

My confidence that the faults of the present urban renewal process can be corrected is based upon my own belief that by its very nature, urban renewal is essentially a local enterprise.

Therefore, the local interest must be given precedence, and it will be if business and government, at the local level, work together to achieve this goal.

That is my conviction; and to support it, I would ask you to consider the situation that confronted the Newark business community in the years immediately following World War II.

Physically and psychologically our city was on the skids. Our buildings were obsolete, our taxes were climbing and our middle- and upper-income families were moving out. What is more, our commission form of government was not providing the leadership needed to dispel the atmosphere of depression that was settling over the city.

As a matter of survival, the business community decided that this trend had to be reversed; and in this we were joined by organized labor, whose interests also were at stake.

The city's first need, of course, was for a new form of government. So, in partnership, business and labor led a campaign that ousted the old five-man commission rule in favor of a strong mayor to be elected by the people. This centralized leadership had the immediate effect of reawakening public confidence in the future of the city.

The next need was to develop a program for the rebuilding of the physical plant of the city. So on the recommendation of the business community, our then Mayor Carlin created an economic development committee made up of business, labor and government representatives.

One of the first decisions of this committee was that the rebuilding of the city would require the mobilization of all resources available. These would include private investment capital as well as local, State and Federal legislation and funds.

It was at this point that the business community committed itself to support urban renewal as an essential tool in rebuilding the city.

In this respect, our next need was to deal with the tax problems that were likely to hinder the redevelopment of the city. So a subcommittee on taxation was formed; and as its chairman, I was made painfully aware of the extent to which Newark's revenue structure represented a major obstacle to our efforts.

It still does, I regret to say, for nothing has come of the subcommittee's recommendations that the State tax system be thoroughly revised to reduce the extreme dependence which Newark and other cities must place on real and personal property taxes.

The State legislature is still attempting to deal with the personal property tax, though unsuccessfully thus far. On other fronts, there has been more progress. The household property tax no longer applies in Newark, and the State tax policy commission, as set up by the governor and the legislature, has made a strong case for a broad-base tax to relieve the pressure on real estate and to replace, in part, the personal property tax.

Now that the $750 million bond issue has been defeated, I would hope that finally the governor and the legislature will come to grips, once and for all, with the need for a basic revision of the State's tax structure.

In the absence of major tax relief there was an even more urgent need for some new way to tax real estate in areas earmarked for urban renewal. So the economic development committee came up with recommendations that in 1961 were included in what we now know as the Fox-Lance legislation.

We're all aware of what tax certainty means as an inducement to a private developer in an urban renewal project. Private investors can now build in our central cities in spite of high property taxes. Indeed, without the Fox-Lance act, there would be little if any urban renewal in Newark or other older cities in the State.

This was a major achievement, but there were still other needs to be met. One of these arose from the fact that under the original Federal Urban Renewal Act, project areas had to be predominantly residential either before renewal or after. Naturally, this would have prevented Newark from obtaining Federal aid for the commercial and industrial phases of its rebuilding program.

So to solve that problem, the economic development committee suggested amendments to the Federal urban renewal law. With the help of Lou Danzig and the New Jersey Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials and others, amendments were enacted in 1956 and again in 1959 and 1961. In each instance, we had the fullest cooperation of our Representatives in Congress. We were fortunate that Newark's present mayor, Hugh Addonizio, was then a Congressman, serving in the House committee involved, and his help was crucial.

In any event, our amendments were written into the law. So today, redevelopment for nonresidential uses is possible where the project can be shown to be necessary for the proper development of the community at large.

Without that provision, Newark would have been unable to initiate the major downtown commercial projects and the tremendous Meadowlands industrial development that today represent the city's major hope for the future.

These projects, of course, are still far from completion and that is the reason why we are dissatisfied with the present urban renewal program.

Thus, a thorough review of the urban renewal program becomes the need of the moment with respect to the rebuilding of Newark—and, I daresay, of other central cities as well.

I have already outlined how other needs arose in the past and how they were met by the concerted efforts of business and government at the local level.

Much the same pressure could be exerted once again to correct the faults that are now so glaringly evident in the urban renewal process.

To that end, I would suggest that the first objective be a reduction of the redtape that now hobbles urban renewal at every stage.

No one can object to necessary checks and balances, but it simply is intolerable that from 3' to 10 years should be consumed in the process leading to the disposition of land for an urban renewal project.

As you all know, this process is divided into two periods—the planning of the project and its eventual execution. Both stages should be speeded up before the whole urban renewal program bogs down under the deadweight of redtape.

I am not qualified to specify how this streamlining should be carried out. But certainly there is a broad enough area in which to operate, considering that four governmental agencies are involved—these being the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, the local redevelopment agency, the municipal governing body, and the local planning board.

What is more, there are three processing stages within which each of these governmental agencies must act and interact. To be precise, these agencies are involved in no less than 16 official acts bearing upon the planning and execution of but 1 urban renewal project.

If you will bear with me—the URA and the local redevelopment agency each complete one action in each of the three processing stages. The local planning board entertains four separate actions. Finally—and, indeed, incredibly—the local governing body deliberates no less than six times.

Of course, each of these separate official actions involves a vast amount of paperwork. And as these papers are painstakingly shifted back and forth among the various agencies, delay mounts upon delay to a degree that is little short of appalling.

I am not here to place the blame on either Federal or local officials. But speaking as a businessman, I do feel that it is time for officials at both levels to address themselves to this obvious need for a speedup in the administrative process.

If we are to deal effectively with the delays that now plague our projects, we should strive to discover where the fault lies—whether it is with the Federal law, Federal interpretation of that law, or wherever. Then I would suggest that business and government, at the local level, initiate corrective measures—and I am sure we would have the cooperation of the officials involved.

Thus far, I've been focusing on the preparation of projects. But once the land has been acquired, cleared, and generally made ready for redevelopment, there arises still another problem—and this is the problem of attracting private users for an individual project, as distinct from the private developer of the project.

The investment of private construction capital is essential to the rebuilding of a city for two reasons. First, there are no Federal funds for the construction of commercial or industrial projects; and secondly, only the investment of private capital can produce the enormous amounts of new tax ratables that are essential to the survival of older cities.

To attract this private construction capital, we can offer an excellent inducement in the form of the tax abatement opportunities possible under the Fox-Lance legislation.

But the private developer of a commercial or industrial project cannot go very far without ultimate users, or tenants. To obtain mortgage money, for example, the chances are that the private developer will have to produce signed leases for more than 50 percent of his commercial or industrial space.

The attraction of users thus becomes an integral part of urban renewal. It also presents a sales problem not alone for the private developer but also for the Federal urban renewal authorities, the municipal government, and for a city's business community in general.

Obviously, in urban renewal, there must be good products in the form of good projects. But the job of urban renewal is not completed until these projects are sold, in effect, to those who can use them.

In Newark at the local level, we're already working on this sales problem. Mayor Addonizio has set up an industrial commission to promote our downtown projects as well as the new Meadowlands redevelopment. The business community is cooperating through the Commerce and Industry Association of Newark and through the Greater Newark Development Council.

At the Federal level, the URA recently approved a grant of $15,000 for an exhibit promoting our Meadowlands project in the New Jersey Building at the forthcoming World's Fair. We're grateful for this assistance; and right here today I should like to thank Mr. Nathan personally for his understanding and cooperation. May I also say that we are hopeful this modest grant means that in the future the URA will do more to help us sell the end product of the redevelopment program.

The big job is to bring users back to the city. A far easier way to win tenants is to provide urban renewal land to an existing industry or commercial enterprise that needs room for expansion. This also serves the purpose of holding industry which otherwise would be moving out of the city—and off the municipal tax rolls.

In Newark, we have two cases in point. The J. Wiss & Sons Co. has been manufacturing shears in Newark for 115 years. The Motor Club of America has had its home office in Newark since 1926. Both have purchased land for expansion outside the city.

It happens, however, that both these companies are located adjacent to what has been planned as the Fairmount urban renewal project in Newark. This makes it possible for each to be offered the land it needs under an urban renewal write-down with a tax abatement under Fox-Lance legislation.

So the users are there, ready to build and to use their buildings as soon as urban renewal can produce the land. But these firms also have expansion schedules to meet, so it is up to urban renewal to meet those deadlines. Otherwise, Newark will lose those firms—which should present a real challenge to men like Jason Nathan of the URA and Lou Danzig, working together, to cut the redtape and get the job underway.

Still another major need for Newark—and doubtless for other cities as well is—for a constructive approach to the problem of local costs. The so-called local share of an urban renewal project amounts to one-third of the overall cost while the Federal share comes to two-thirds. If the city puts in improvements directly related to an urban renewal project—a new school, for example—then the cost of the improvement is credited to the city as a noncash contribution.

This is highly inequitable on two counts. First, the city must put up large sums of money long before there is any tax return from the project. Secondly, the local share, as now set up, forces a central city to assume too great financial burden for a renewal project that actually would benefit a whole economic area.

In Newark's case, for example, the industrial development of the Meadowlands would directly benefit the Newark-North Jersey economic area, with important collateral benefits for the State at large. Yet Newark alone pays the local share.

To correct this inequitable situation, Mayor Addonizio has charted a course that is heartily endorsed by the city's business community.

First, the mayor has asked for State-aid to the extent of half the local share. This is a sound formula, and it has been successfully applied in New York State.

Secondly, he has appealed for revisions at the Federal level so that the cost of tax abatement and tax losses might be credited to the city's local share.

Finally, he has requested revisions that would permit a city with an approved urban renewal program to receive a local share credit for a public improvement that might be located outside an urban renewal area. As an instance, this would enable Newark to take credit for erecting a new Barringer High School, which surely will be serving families that urban renewal has displaced from other school areas in the city.

The mayor's efforts to get a better financial break for Newark are eminently justified on the basis of the hidden costs that must be borne by every central city that is trying to rebuild.

Indeed, the Newark business community feels that the much-advertised two-thirds to one-third ratio of Federal to municipal funds tends to deceive local taxpayers. They are led to believe that Washington is carrying the major burden, which is anything but accurate.

That is why my primary concern throughout this talk, has been for what best serves the local interest—that is, the interest of local taxpayers and their local government.

Such should be the objective of any revision of the urban renewal process. It should be the objective, too, of Federal authorities when they interpret urban renewal legislation.

As I have already pointed out, urban renewal is essentially a local enterprise. It is initiated by local people, so to speak, for the immediate benefit of their local community. So there should be a minimum of restriction on local autonomy in the selecting of sites in the planning of projects and in the disbursement of funds.

In that respect, no level of government—Federal or local—has a monopoly on integrity. Certainly, local officials can carry out local urban renewal responsibilities without being policed, in effect, by a Federal bureaucracy.

This is not to disparage the role of the Federal Government in urban renewal. To the contrary Federal supervision is essential; but once again, it should be confined, in the main, to seeing that local projects are executed at the local level in accordance with the intent of Congress.

On that score, no one can fault the principle of urban renewal. What should concern us here is the manner in which such a high-principled enterprise is being put into practice.

It was not the intent of Congress, for example, that urban renewal should revive cities and strengthen local economics at the expense of the overall national economy. At the moment, as we are all aware, our national economy is the subject of considerable debate.

On one hand, President Kennedy insists that a Federal tax cut is essential to the economic health of the Nation. In the Congress, however, some influential voices call for reduced Federal spending to precede or at least to coincide with any reduction in taxes.

What this means—without taking sides in the debate—is that there is growing concern over the course of the national economy. There is also an awareness, inside and outside Washington, that some measures must be taken to strengthen the dollar at home and abroad and to head off the inflationary trends that already are visible.

In this context, it is no contradiction to point out that urban renewal must be just as responsive to the needs of the national economy as it should be to the interests of the central cities.

Urban renewal is not a giveaway program, nor should it ever be exposed to the abuses of pork-barrel politics—whether at the Federal or local levels.

In conclusion, may I remind you that my assignment here today was to give you a businessman's slant on urban renewal. I realize that I have been critical of some aspects of the program, but this criticism, however, was intended to be constructive, and I trust you will regard it as such.

In any event, I would also repeat that however disappointing may be the pace of urban renewal, there is no need whatever for despair. In the American tradition, business, labor and Government have cooperated in the past to solve seemingly insoluble problems. And I am confident that these same elements of the community will do no less now to make urban renewal the success that we all want it to be.

Thank you very much.

## THE MARTIN MARIETTA CORP.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the November issue of Fortune magazine carries an unsolicited testimonial to the Martin Marietta Corp., of Baltimore, Md., and its dynamic president, George M. Bunker.

The Martin Marietta Corp. stands as a symbol of the successful operation of our free enterprise system. It has made a valuable contribution to the economic growth of the Baltimore metropolitan area.

Mr. President, during the past year, the Martin Co. was one of the first to agree to an incentive type defense contract on a major project, the Air Force's standard space launch system, Titan III. This cost plus incentive type of contract has been cited by Secretary McNamara as a most effective method of reducing the enormous expense of defense in the 1960's. I believe that Martin Marietta is to be congratulated not only for its accomplishments in space technology but also for its leadership in efforts to control cost. Martin's willingness to be the first company to accept such a contract on a $275 million project is a testament to its courageous and forward-looking executive.

I am confident that Martin will continue to assist the Government in receiving a dollar's value for a dollar spent in accordance with the new and needed emphasis which President Johnson has given to this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "The Millions Under Martin Marietta's Mattress," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE MILLIONS UNDER MARTIN MARIETTA'S MATTRESS

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

A word much favored by George Maverick Bunker, who is given to understatement and on occasion to the ambiguity desirable in a business strategist with fish to fry, is the word "interesting." When he has resort to it, the implications become a work of art. There is, for example, the matter of his unblinking, codfish-eye description of why, like the King of France in the famous rhyme, he marched up the hill in July to deal with the Sperry Rand Corp., only to march right back again. That empty adventure gave rise to the largest single auction in the history of the New York Stock Exchange. One forenoon in September, the Martin Marietta Corp., of which Bunker is president and chief executive, unloaded in a single transaction nearly 500,000 shares of Sperry common. This action completed the dumping in the span of 5 days, for a sum in excess of $13 million, of some 800,000 shares of Sperry Rand that Bunker had quietly acquired early in the year.

"There was quite an interesting situation in that company," Bunker remarked matter-of-factly after the transaction was over. "Our purchase of the stock was, obviously, a measure of our interest. It permitted us to walk in and look. We thought we could be helpful to Sperry Rand, and some of the people there seemed to think so, too. Well, it turned out that there wasn't much chance for us to be helpful, at least as we read the situation, so we got out. Sure, it was a risk, but we are willing to take risks, and all in good time something very interesting might have come out of the association, only nothing did."

Put so casually, so offhandedly, the end of the affair, although clearly disappointing to the suitor, appears to have been for him, under the circumstances, a natural and not particularly painful outcome. In truth, it represented a considerable jolt. As Bunker tells it, he bought into Sperry Rand with the knowledge and encouragement of the latter's president, Harry F. Vickers; there was an understanding that Bunker would come forward with some sort of joint-venture program, including even the possibility of merging Martin Marietta, with assets of over $500 million, and Sperry Rand, with assets of $900 million. But the sweeping nature of Bunker's proposals, once drafted, stunned and angered Vickers; the door between the two companies slammed shut. And Bunker is now looking for the resolution of the quandary that led him to Sperry Rand in the first place—an extremely interesting quandary, to say the least.

Bunker's perplexity consists centrally of where and how to invest upwards of $150 million in free cash, above and beyond operational needs, which is in the process of piling up in the Martin Marietta treasury. This embarrassment of riches represents in turn a climax in the series of successes achieved by Bunker over the past decade. Eleven years ago Bunker was called to the helm of the ailing Glenn L. Martin Co., of Baltimore, which he proceeded brilliantly to transform from an airframe manufacturer into a leading producer of rockets and other equipment for the space age. About 9 years later Bunker merged the Martin Co. with the American-Marietta Co., a curious and folksy conglomeration of enterprises primarily producing materials for heavy construction (cement, aggregates, brick, and concrete products) and paints and industrial finishes, and also represented in printing inks, dyestuffs, and a widely diverse group of businesses that included adhesives and resins, tobacco-processing machinery, and household cleaning products, to name just a few. The tangible result of the union was a spectacular new addition to the ranks of big U.S. industrial corporations. In Fortune's list of the 500 largest such corporations, Martin Marietta in 1962 stood No. 33 in sales (nearly $1.2 billion), and No. 56 in profits (with net earnings of $45,400,000).

Not surprisingly, this new billion-dollar corporate giant is now presenting Bunker with problems that lay but dimly over the horizon at its formation. On the one hand, Martin Marietta's net after taxes in 1963 will be sharply down to about $35 million, owing mainly to a decline in earning in aerospace and in cement, as well as to a deliberate selling off of some former American-Marietta properties. On the other hand, cash generation within the company from retained earnings, depreciation, sale of property, and other factors is accelerating. In 1961 cash throw-off ran to $77 million. In 1962 it rose to $97,300,000. For 1963 the estimate is at least $134 million, and possibly even $139 million and all this adds up to a cumulative total for 3 years of between $308 and $313 million. To be sure, much of this money has moved out, including $66,300,000 for dividends and $109,200,000 for capital outlays. But even so, Bunker has a lot of money burning a hole in the company mattress, which explains why he made his unsuccessful pass at Sperry Rand. "It's a lot of money," he acknowledges in his dry way. "There is imposed on me an absolute necessity to do something useful with it."

### "IT'S A SORT OF EXPLOSIVE CARTRIDGE"

A good number of companies these days, of course, find themselves at once excited and perplexed by the same phenomenon. In the opulent American economy the generation of corporate cash is going forward at an unprecedented rate. But Bunker's position is aggravated, if that is the right word for it, by a number of special considerations. One abnormality is a permanent characteristic of the aerospace side of the Martin Marietta house, from which come better than two-thirds of the corporation's total sales. Because of the often short and, in any event, uncertain life of most military programs, the amount of capital that a manufacturer can prudently invest in plant and tooling is limited—the Government, which gives and which also takes away, assumes most of that risk. Hence, while earnings on sales in defense work are always low, return on invested capital and hence potential accumulation of cash tend to be much higher. And this is particularly true, paradoxically, when, as is now the case with Martin Marietta, the volume of business is falling off somewhat, capital investment is being rapidly written off, and nothing new and big is firmly in hand to justify new capital outlays.

In a somewhat similar way, the major income producers on the civil side of the Martin Marietta house—most notably cement and aggregates (the crushed stone, sand, and gravel used in roadbuilding, the making of concrete, and other forms of construction)—generate, as a rule, higher earnings in relation to capital investment than do most businesses. To be sure, the inital capital investment for a cement plant is unusually large; but once a good plant is built, it can be depended upon to produce for many years without much additional expenditure. Right now there is an overcapacity of cement in many regional markets and prices and profits have sagged. This very condition of the market, while pulling down Martin Marietta's earnings, has naturally tended to discourage, at this juncture, large new investment in cement operations. So the cash retained tends to remain substantial.

There is a third abnormality that further aggravates Bunker's situation. After the merger he made up his mind to slough off a number of the American-Marietta properties in the interest of more profitable and efficient operations. Additionally, even before the negotiations were opened, American-Marietta had come under a complaint by the Federal Trade Commission, which alleged that certain of the company's operations, particularly the divisions making concrete products, were illegal. Under a consent decree entered into by the new corporation last spring, Bunker is obliged to rid his company before March 1965, of a number of properties, the lot having an aggregate book value of $48 million. These various divestitures, some already completed and others in process, are expected, when consummated, to add a total of about $123 million to the supply of cash.

From these three different situations flows the free, profit-seeking cash that constitutes Bunker's unusual quandary. Actually the $150 million or more that he soon will have in the till represents only a part of what he calls "our capacity for probe and maneuver." Martin Marietta's long-term debt is down from $78,800,000 at the end of 1961 to $55,500,000, an extraordinarily low figure in relation to its total capitalization. In these circumstances Bunker could easily raise at least another $150 million in long-term loans, lifting his cash to between $300 million and $400 million. Thus he is in the position, not always comfortable, of a field commander who has collected a costly force for a campaign, the target of which is not yet clear. "There's no point," he argues, "in a company the size of ours poking around for $10-million and $15-million acquisitions here and there. That would just complicate matters. Whatever we do will have to be big—a major event. The power of having $300 million or $400 million or so to invest is the power to enter into a major situation. It's a sort of explosive cartridge. The difficulty is finding a rifle to fit it to." While waiting for the shot, let us take a closer look at the stalker.

At 55, Bunker is a neat, trim fellow with an owlish look and an air of aloofness. He has, however, a livelier side not immediately in evidence. He plays a good businessman's game of golf, is one of the principal owners of the feckless Washington Senators, and seems to know just about everybody—other businessmen, politicians, generals and admirals, scientists, and bankers. "Business," he says with absolute conviction, "is an exciting way of life. I always have a good time in the company of risk takers and entrepreneurs."

For a man of such parts, he was surprisingly unthrusting, even haphazard in his youth. He grew up in Chicago, where his father, Gerald deForest Bunker, was in the insurance business. In 1918 the family moved to Toronto, where Bunker attended public schools and the University of Toronto. In 1928, with help from an uncle, he moved on to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and presently found himself caught up in the depression. For pocket money in Cambridge he depended upon part-time jobs, and he bleakly recalls that such sums as came to him were unfailingly inadequate. In 1931 he graduated from MIT with a degree in mechanical engineering, having majored in thermodynamics. That first summer he took a job with the Campbell Soup Co. at Camden, N.J. He was put to work swabbing out soup kettles at 38 cents an hour. The industrial folklore of that period still put great store in the desirability of a man's starting his rise from the factory floor. Besides, it was the only job a thermodynamicist could find that grim summer.

### "I FOUND MYSELF WANTING TO PLAY THE PIANO"

Although soon promoted to the engineering staff, he stayed with Campbell Soup for only 3 years. While he preserved through the experience a fondness for soup in its many varieties, he became powerfully uninterested in the process of producing it. Being married by then, he accepted a better-paying job in Chicago with Wilson & Co., the meatpacker, for which he became chief engineer. This job held him 2 years. A friend in the Chicago management-consultant house of McKinsey, Kearney & Co. invited him to join its industrial-engineering staff. He advised the firm's clients on inventory management, plant layout, cost control, manufacturing techniques, and such. In his 6 or 7 years with the firm, of which he presently was made a partner, he came to know the manufacturing process in a dozen industries, ranging from the greeting-card business to the farm machinery and stove-producing interests of Sears, Roebuck. He was on the road much of the time, and all the chasing to and fro as a troubleshooter began to wear him down. The work, moreover, left him unsatisfied. "Being a consultant," he recalls, "calls for a passive temperament. All the while I found myself wanting to play the piano."

The first keyboard that presented itself was Kroger Co., a Cincinnati grocery chain, where Bunker became vice president for manufacturing, a post that he held through the war and until 1949. Among the friends he made in Cincinnati was Wade Childress, whose family controlled the Trailmobile Co., of which Childress was president. Trailmobile, a sorry second to Fruehauf in the truck-trailer field, was in serious trouble and on the verge of being ridden off the road. On Childress' invitation, Bunker moved across town to take command. He demonstrated his mettle from the start. One of the basic troubles—and there were others—was that control over the inventory had been lost; costs had got out of hand, inventories were overvalued, and, additionally, realistic reserves had not been set aside. In two vigorous years Bunker swung Trailmobile around. He more than doubled sales to $52 million, increased pretax profits from $326,000 to $7 million, and boosted the common stock about 400 percent. However, to stay competitive with Fruehauf and the other trailer manufacturers, the company needed more working capital in order to finance installment sales of its equipment. Its credit with the banks had been so stretched that no more loans would be forthcoming unless new equity money was brought into the business. This meant a stock issue that would have diluted the value of the outstanding shares, a solution that did not appeal to the Childress family or to Bunker, who himself had options on 25,000 shares at $4 a share. It was decided to sell out to Pullman, Inc., which, very much like Martin Marietta today, had idle cash carried over from the Government-forced sale of its sleepingcar business.

### "I MADE A DEAL WITH MR. BUNKER"

Trailmobile marks the takeoff point for George Bunker. With the exercise of these and other options, which, as he recalls, netted him about $500,000, he became financially independent. The company's sharp recovery had, moreover, marked him as a resourceful, aggressive executive. A grateful observer of the turnaround was Frank Denton of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., one of Trailmobile's bankers. It so happened that another of the Mellon Bank's debtors, Glenn L. Martin Co., was in a state of crisis. It had lost $22 million in 1951 alone, and its cumulative losses for the postwar period were $75 million. It was in hock to the Mellon Bank, to the RFC and other Government agencies for over $70 million, and to the airlines for some $14,800,000 in advance payments.

There was no question among observers as to the source of the rising catastrophe. It lay with the founder and principal owner, Glenn L. Martin. "G.L." was one of the truly heroic figures of U.S. aviation. Among his proteges were Donald Douglas and "Dutch" Kindelberger of North American. His plants in World War II employed 55,000 workers and produced 10,000 aircraft. It was the violent readjustment thereafter that proved too much for him. With military sales plummeting, the company gambled on breaking into the civilian field with a medium-range transport, but lost heavily. In his stupendous plant at Middle River, just north of Baltimore, which still awes travelers on the Pennsylvania Railroad, Glenn Martin became a withdrawn, brooding figure. The bankers whose loans were in jeopardy, the airline operators whose planes were overdue, the Navy and Air Force, which together had supplied him with $400 million in backlog, had all seen what he could not bring himself to admit: That unless he yielded pride of place, his great enterprise was doomed. The only question, by late 1951, was whether the company would founder into bankruptcy before G.L. let someone else take charge.

It was in the face of these alarming circumstances that banker Denton, who handled the Martin situation for the Mellons, bethought himself of George Bunker, who was then running Trailmobile for Pullman. Denton suggested Bunker's name to his good friend, the late Howard Bruce of the prominent Baltimore family, the only member of the Martin board whom G.L. would listen to. Bruce was a businessman whose respect for capital was tempered by a strong sense of ethics and civic responsibility. An aristocrat and leading citizen of Baltimore, sitting on, when he did not preside over, the most important boards, he had reluctantly moved in alongside Martin in an effort to right things. While he himself had a substantial investment in the company and great affection for G.L., his first interest was to keep afloat Baltimore's largest single employer of labor, and a new hand at the controls was clearly necessary.

He had quietly measured and rejected a number of candidates. Finally, in January 1952, he decided to have a look at the man whom Denton admired. Bruce's diary records succinctly, "I had two or three conferences with Mr. Bunker and was most favorably impressed with him. The result was that, with the approval of Martin's board of directors, I made a deal with Mr. Bunker at a salary of $75,000 a year and options for 70,000 shares of Martin stock, which then had little, if any, value." From Bunker's view, the situation was not all that tidy. "A whole lot of people," he recalls, "were in the act. I was the only guy they could agree on—nobody had anything against me." With the title of president, he reported for work at the Baltimore plant on the morning of February 21—not just with the idea of quietly hanging up his hat but to bring down a monarch with one quick show of force.

### THE EERIE TAKEOVER AND THE SWIFT TURNAROUND

According to an enduring account, Bunker went directly to G.L.'s office. It was a fine, big one, with paneled walls and a fireplace that took real logs. Dozens of autographed photographs covered the walls, and model airplanes of G.L.'s own design were perched on mahogany shelves. One door opened into a bathroom with a shower and dressing room, and another into a spacious conference room. This was a fortress from which G.L., still board chairman, never expected to be dislodged. It was his thought that a quite bare, two-window cubicle close by would do well enough for the stranger.

Bunker had already made up his mind where the chief executive should conduct business. As he crossed the thick carpet, he said politely, "Good morning." G.L. did not rise. Bunker pointed to a table beyond G.L.'s handsome desk. "Is that being used?" he asked. On the cold answer that it was not, Bunker walked to the table, pulled back a chair, sat down, flung open his briefcase, and then, with a masterly show of abstractedness, bent over the papers relating to the company's immediate situation with which he had been supplied by Bruce. During the next hour or so, not a word passed between the two men. G.L. took some telephone calls, his secretary came and went on tiptoe. When at last Bunker looked up in a silence that had turned eerie, it was to find that he was quite alone. G.L. never came back. Next day Bunker ordered that the office and the conference room be cut up so as to provide several additional offices.

A banker who watched the takeover was torn, as Bruce had been, between his respect for Bunker and his pity for the founder. "Bunker," he says in reflection, "must have decided that he had to end that one-man rule and the surest way was physically to smash all signs of it. It was a familiar tragedy—a once superior man grown old who refuses to change with the times or bow out gracefully. Luckily, it was only Martin's tragedy. The company was saved."

### "LET'S GO FOR MISSILES"

Salvage was not all that easy. On Bunker's taking command at Martin, the directors of the company and the Defense Department put in train a series of actions that replenished the ebbing supply of working capital. Bunker swiftly brought down the alarming production costs of the B-57 bomber, then on the line, and also landed a development contract for a huge Navy flying boat, the Seamaster; by 1954 the company earned $15 million. Yet Martin's bomber was obsolescent, the flying boat would (as matters turned out) never have a real production run, and, finally, the post-Korean reconstruction of the military procurement programs under the Eisenhower administration had left the really important airframe production concentrated in the other "primes." After weighing the plane prospects day after long day Bunker finally arrived, sometime in 1953, at a conclusion that he put to his senior people in these words: "I don't see how we can ever bust our way back into the plane business. So let's go for missiles."

That was a brilliant decision, seen in hindsight. None of the multibillion-dollar rocket programs that sustain what now is called the aerospace industry, made up mostly of reconstituted airframe primes, were then in sight, let alone up for bids. Such leadership as Martin could claim in rocketry derived from a modest presence in a quite empty field. In fact, its business there produced less than $30 million in 1953, not quite 15 percent of the company's total billings. But Bunker had come to have an almost joyful confidence in the resourcefulness, technical competence, and imagination of the Martin staff. "I was amazed," he says, "by the talent there." Most of the Martin men were just as happy with him. "I never thought a man who was an utter stranger to the plane business—some of us called him 'that soup salesman'—would ever be accepted by us tinbenders as quickly as Bunker was," says William Bergen, now president of the Martin Co. division and chief engineer under G.L.

The dramatic changes in Martin's line of staples that followed Bunker's decision took many forms, but two were decisive. The transformation of the airframe industry in the mid-1950's was brought on by the Air Force's decision to produce strategic-range rockets—the so-called ICBM's. Convair won the competition for the starting weapon system, the Atlas; Martin stood off Douglas and Lockheed in the bidding for the backup system, the bigger and more complex Titan. Sure that he had finally landed something big and enduring, Bunker bought 6,000 acres of ranch land in the foothills of the Rockies east of Denver. There he built a new plant in which the company's investment rose swiftly to $34 million. Its 14,200 workers make this plant the biggest employer of labor in Colorado. Its billings this year, all for the Federal Government, are calculated to total nearly $410 million (down $60 million from 1962). During the 8 years the plant has been operating, it has produced close to $2 billion in revenues for the company.

While the Denver operation was only just getting underway, Bunker made another bold move. He acquired a big tract of land at Orlando, Fla., and there invested $27 million in another plant in the expectation that Martin would capture profitable pieces of the developing demand for tactical missilery. A brisk trade soon materialized with the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Orlando division today is the largest industrial employer in Florida, with 11,000 workers. It is producing, among other weapons, the Army's Pershing rocket. This year it won a promising study contract for determining the feasibility of the rocket destroyer envisaged under the so-called Sprint concept, the only scheme for intercepting hostile ICBM's that Defense Secretary McNamara deems worthy of close study.

Still the Titan rocket is the vehicle that has lifted Martin—and Bunker—into a famous recovery. The immediate operational requirements of the Strategic Air Command will soon be met, and the military business is therefore slowing down. The space business, however, is picking up speed. Titan II is being adapted as a booster for the Gemini scheme, which is to put two men in orbit and experiment with rendezvous techniques. A much bigger rocket, Titan III, is in development for certain Air Force space missions and NASA is considering using it for exploration in far space. Under a reckoning that the company considers conservative, the demand for Titan III's should last until 1970 and generate upwards of $2 billion worth of business. In the meantime, though, Bunker has had to swallow a substantial disappointment—the loss to North American of the Apollo moon project, the biggest space contract up for bids. This was extremely worrisome, now that so much of him is up there.

### BACK TO THE PIANO

In setting these and other enterprises afoot, Bunker was not satisfied merely to conduct the orchestra from Baltimore. On a memorable occasion he returned to the piano as a solist. During the summer of 1959, not long after the test firings of the Titan began at Cape Canaveral, the whole operation fell apart, or seemed to. The first four or five down-range shoots all fulfilled the test objectives—a performance that astounded everyone. Then the next two were failures. The Air Force became alarmed. So did the Department of Defense and Congress. Teams of Government experts raced to Denver. Martin's misfortunes came in the midst of the national breast-beating over the revelations of the supposed "missile gap." There was talk of canceling the Titan program altogether.

The day before Thanksgiving, Bunker dropped everything else, and moved to Denver, to take command of the Titan operation. He stayed "on the Hill," living in a little suburban house, until the next fall. Bunker prowled the factory floor; some executives were switched around. Came another heartbreaking failure or two at Canaveral. Then, in February, the first of a series of successful down-range shoots. The crisis evaporated. Bunker insists that nothing fundamental had been wrong. "All I did was to simplify things," he says. "I got an unholy amount of credit that I didn't deserve." Still, what had been Martin's darkest hour became Bunker's finest.

### A RUDE REPULSE

Martin by then was in fine shape. Sales in 1960 were $651 million, up 24 percent from the year before. Net earnings after taxes were over $16,800,000, up 26 percent. The company's 17.3 percent return on invested capital far surpassed that of the other major primes. (North American earned 11 percent, Boeing 10.3 percent, and Lockheed, and Douglas, and General Dynamics were in the red.) But Bunker had the sense all the while of walking on quicksand. No new strategic military systems, the great breadwinners for the primes, were in sight. The competition even for subcontracts had turned fierce.

"For several years," Bunker says of this period, "we had been looking around for some way to broaden our profit base and to diversify into other businesses. We had a guy on the staff who had nothing else to do but poke around and look into other companies." Bunker had already recruited several hundred engineers and physicists for a nuclear experimental division at Baltimore and was anxious to thrust deeper into electronics.

His first major move toward diversification was aimed at General Precision Equipment Corp. of Tarrytown, N.Y., predominantly a defense producer, but also a manufacturer of a wide variety of products for industry, including electronic-control and information systems. It was a substantial organization, with sales of $216 million, and Bunker as early as 1959 measured the property as promising ground for the diversification he sought. In any event, with the knowledge of the management, he bought into the company, until by early 1961 Martin owned, for an outlay of $11 million, about 15 percent of the voting stock. And for a while matters appeared to be progressing toward merger in friendly fashion.

Then, as later with Sperry Rand, a chill suddenly entered the atmosphere. In this instance a request by Bunker for a drastic change in the board of directors appears to have caused the breach. With little or no warning to him, General Precision, in February 1961, obtained an order in the Federal Court for the Southern District of New York enjoining him from buying any more shares in the company. They followed this up with a warning to the stockholders that Bunker was preparing to pounce on their property. A few months later Bunker politely sold its stock, pocketing, however, profits of nearly $3,900,000 after taxes.

This rude rebuff from General Precision had sudden and important consequences. In Chicago a spare, courtly gentleman of 70, extremely rich and very shrewd, had been following Bunker's misadventure on the business pages of his newspaper. This man controlled a confederacy of close to 100 companies whose sales were approaching $400 million a year. He was Grover Hermann, founder, ruler, and principal owner of the American-Marietta Co., the interests of which ran from the Atlantic to the Pacific and, in a small way, into Canada. Bunker's work at Martin had earlier caught Hermann's eye. He had read an account of how Bunker had straightened out the Titan program at Denver and had noted to himself that "a man who could do that must be pretty good." He was sufficiently impressed, in any case, to instruct his broker to purchase 500 shares of Martin common for his private account, and he therefore had a certain personal interest in the collapse of the negotiations with General Precision. Then, as Hermann sat in his pleasant office reflecting on Bunker's circumstances, an errant notion became pregnant in his mind. Why not consolidate American-Marietta with Martin, which was clearly bent on merger or acquisition? The idea was doubly appealing because Hermann, sensible of his advanced years, felt it was high time that "I put my finances in order, moved into at least semiretirement, and made good dispositions for my own company's management."

The overture to Bunker was made in June and presently Hermann and Bunker met face to face in the latter's Washington office. Of that encounter, Bunker says, "Mr. Hermann and I had quite a long talk about general principles—such matters as the philosophy of management, the strengths and weakness of our separate enterprises, and the like. We got along fine and have done so ever since." There was, however, something else about the meeting that was memorable for Bunker. It was Hermann's easy narrative, as if by way of personal introduction, of American-Marietta's start.

Hermann had grown up in upstate New York, in Sullivan County, where, in the little town of Callicoon, his father owned a small lumber and building-materials business. Hermann had been a salesman for his father. One of the suppliers for which they were agents was an asphalt-paint company in Chicago that went into bankruptcy in 1913. The younger Hermann, then 23, had formed an acquaintance with a traveling salesman for the firm, and with $5,000 Hermann had saved the two men formed a partnership and bought up the bankrupt firm, which was revived as the American Asphalt Paint Co. In a little shop in Jersey City they produced a black asphaltic paint that was popular as a waterproofing for tin roofs. By 1929, having meanwhile moved to Chicago, they passed the million-dollar mark in sales, and profits were about $100,000.

### A TRAVELING MAN FROM CALLICOON

Eighteen years later, in 1931, the partner was killed in an accident. Hermann bought out his interest and proceeded to expand the business. His first acquisition was a property making finishes for furniture manufacturers in the South—the Marietta Paint & Color Co. in the Ohio town of that name. Hermann adopted the name, and as he proceeded to pick up other small, local paint, adhesives, and resin companies American-Marietta became nationally known for its heavy-duty industrial paints; by 1948, with sales of $38 million, it stood fifth or sixth in the paint business.

Although doing well in his field, Hermann was dissatisfied. A student of corporate financial statements, he observed soon after the postwar construction boom was underway that companies producing the more basic building materials were reporting earnings well above the pretax 10 percent on investment that he was making from paint. So he bought up brick and concrete-pipe companies that caught his eye as he traveled the hinterland. Then cement gripped his attention. "Some companies," he told Bunker, "were showing a wonderful return—20 percent on investment after taxes." In 1954 he bought a cement company in Baltimore, and kept on buying until he finally had six more.

The traveler from Callicoon went on collecting properties right and left until his portfolio included perhaps 100 different enterprises. There probably never was a more acquisitive American businessman. If (as the story goes) Hermann did not actually pay for a company on the spot, from a sheaf of stock certificates conveniently at hand in an inside coat pocket, he usually managed such deals, by his own account, "without much fuss." As he says, "It was my habit to make up my mind quickly. If a company interested me, I'd visit the premises, look around, and size up the character of the people and the tidiness of the housekeeping. These are the important things, the things the business-analysis approach all too often misses. I came to know many wonderful people in my travels—families that generation upon generation had provided the business underpinnings of their communities, gentle, decent people, fine Americans you've never heard of—and I can say, with all the companies we acquired, that we never had any unpleasant surprises."

Bunker had the sense of listening to the happy ending of an old-fashioned classic of U.S. private enterprise. But as he sorted out the hard facts in the romantic tale what really engaged his curiosity, as a diversifier, was the revelation that American-Marietta, as a primary producer of heavy construction and building materials, was strategically placed to benefit from the surging demand associated with population growth. In the decade before, from 1951 to 1960, the company's sales had increased nearly sixfold, from $66 to $368 million; its earnings had risen better than eightfold, from $2,800,000 to $24,400,000; and the cash flow in 1960 was $41,200,000, more than 11 times what it had been 10 years earlier. The growth and earnings record was all the more appealing to Bunker because American-Marietta markets were governed by cyclical factors entirely different from those that affected Martin. "Khrushchev," Bunker has since noted, "makes and unmakes the defense market, but the growth of the American economy makes the market for building materials."

### HOW THE BIG DEAL WAS MADE

Once committed, Bunker moved with lightning speed. In the third week of June 1961, only a few days after he and Hermann had first met, a proposal for merger was separately presented to the two boards, and both went for it. On October 10, 4 months after the first contact, the stockholders voted that the idea was fine with them, under terms giving the American-Marietta stockholders one share in the new company for each share they then held, and the Martin stockholders 1.3 shares of the new for each share they held.

In the readjustment the interests of founder Hermann, who became chairman of the board of Martin Marietta, were attended to. Under the terms of the consolidation the American-Marietta class B common, all of it in the Hermann family's possession or under his control, was wiped out. For it he took 380,000 shares of 4½ percent $100 par value cumulative preferred stock in the new company, all of which stock, like the other, is directly or indirectly in his possession. The transaction cost the Hermann interests about $4 million in the book value of their former holdings, but this was hardly a penalty, considering that their stock had been tightly locked in before. By agreement the company must set aside each year $1,150,000 as a sinking fund to be applied to the retirement of the preferred and, after October 1964, the company has the option, at a premium of 5 percent, of redeeming the entire issue, which is to say of liquidating the Hermann holdings.

Along with most of the founder's fortune, these shares are lodged in a family foundation, and the golden product of all the hard work and travel that began in Callicoon half a century ago has begun to flow to charities, schools, universities, and churches. Although Hermann continues on as board chairman, he is content to leave the active management to Bunker. Being a risktaker of a later school, Bunker, naturally enough, assesses the transaction in a somewhat different idiom. "Our problem at Martin," he says, "was to diversify with all deliberate speed into a situation where we could participate in the general growth of the economy. When the American-Marietta offer came along, we grasped it. Maybe we were like the girl in the story who picked up the telephone and when a voice asked, 'Mandy, dear, will you marry me?' she said right away, 'Of course I will. Who's askin'?' "

### THE FOLKTALE GOES MODERN

As Bunker delved into the dusty crannies of the American-Marietta establishment, he was both fascinated and troubled by what had come to his hand. American-Marietta, he discovered, was not so much an industrial empire as it was a loose, congenial confederacy of quite independent and intensely local enterprises that individually came under Hermann's cognizance in Chicago only when the sales or profits or one or another fell short of some agreed level. During the 2 years he has been chief executive of the consolidated enterprises, Bunker has been primarily occupied with lopping off the Marietta deadwood, centralizing the management over what survives of Hermann's congenial confederacy, and simply getting things turned around so as to face them in the direction he desires. Among the new talent he imported into his headquarters on Park Avenue, the most influential is the company's top financial man, Joseph E. Muckley, 53, a former Seattle banker. Muckley, and Martin's long-time lawyer in Baltimore, Clarence Miles, who is also a director, serve Bunker as his right and left bowers. There is no doubt, however, as to who makes the decisions. Bunker does. "Real management," he says, "must begin with a chief executive, good or bad, who is willing to take the rap for his acts."

In addition to tightening up the managerial contacts, Bunker performed a number of summary, even heroic, amputations. The paint business, from which Hermann's empire evolved, has been shed completely—sold in July to a Socony Mobil subsidiary reportedly for $25 or $30 million. Gone, too, is the conglomeration of small adhesives and resin plants, mostly on the west coast, that were supplying the plywood companies there. What with one thing or another, Bunker has voluntarily sold off for about $75 million, a sum slightly above book value, about 20 percent of American-Marietta's assets in less than 2 years. All together, these properties generated sales of $126 million in 1962, but while they constituted 14 percent of Martin Marietta's corporate assets, they contributed less than 9 percent to its profits.

### UNDER THE GUN

Elsewhere, Bunker has been fitfully occupied with the chore of shedding the operations that incurred the censure of the Federal Trade Commission. Here, of course, he is retreating under a gun that first was pointed at Hermann. Martin Marietta is obliged to get rid of all its concrete-pipe business, save for seven small plants that Hermann himself had built. This will leave the company but 30 percent of its former market in these products. It is further obliged to dispose of some aggregates plants and quarries, and two lime plants. All together, the properties so affected represent an investment of $48 million, equal to 8 percent of Martin Marietta's total assets. At this writing, only a few of these properties have been sold, for sums totaling about $5,500,000. For the remainder, which Bunker must divest by March 1965, he expects to receive at least book value, and this should add about $43 million to the supply of free funds.

When all this is finished, the Marietta side of the business will have shrunk down to two main fields of operations—construction materials (principally cement, lime, and aggregates) and four specialty companies, only one of which is related to the construction business. Cement figures heavily in Bunker's calculations for the future, and lime and aggregates go along with it.

He has brought on stream—in Atlanta and Tulsa—two cement plants that Hermann had started, and he also purchased for $6 million a going plant at Bay City, Mich., with the objective of forcing his way into the Great Lakes market. These additions have raised Martin Marietta's cement capacity to 24,800,000 barrels, sufficient to place it along the top 10 producers. Bunker has also built a number of distribution terminals and is contemplating a strong move into the ready-mix concrete field in order both to expand and guard his outlets.

### THE PROBLEM WITHIN BUNKER'S QUANDARY

The outcome of these various shifts, expansions, and divestitures is, on the one hand, a more shipshape corporate structure and, on the other, the quandary engendered by the cash accumulation, which Bunker cheerfully confesses imposes upon him an absolute necessity to stage in all good time some kind of major event. The divestitures are themselves a principal source of another and even more embarrassing problem for him—how to recover the nearly $10 million in earnings that have been lost betwen this year and last. For a substantial part of this reduction in earnings is attributable to the loss of income from the eliminated properties. Until the capital obtained from sale of properties is effectively at work—instead of drawing nearly 3.5 percent or so in interest at the bank—Bunker's stockholders are going to wonder just how the merger has improved their lot.

Their curiosity is sharpened by the fact that Martin Marietta's profits have been pulled down for other reasons. As previously pointed out, the cement and aerospace businesses, the two principal profit producers, have both declined. With Federal billings this year calculated to drop to about $700 million, sales and earnings from the military and space business are off approximately 13 percent. Profits from cement, lime, and concrete products, because of higher costs and the price cutting induced in the cement business by overcapacity, will be sharply down. On the figures, Bunker walked off one plateau onto another.

For the stockholders these conditions are reflected in a substantial drop in per-share operating earnings to an estimated $1.65 a share for 1963, compared to $1.91 in 1961. Martin Marietta common, which sold at close to $28 when the new stock came on the market in October 1961, was down $9 just 2 years later. In terms of the stock-conversion ratio arranged between the two companies, the American-Marietta stockholder has taken, since the eve of the merger, a loss of about 46 percent in the market value of his equity and the Martin stockholder one of about 37 percent. In terms of dividends, again related to the conversion rate, with the company paying $1 a share, the American-Marietta stockholder is no worse off than he was when on his own, and the former Martin stockholder is somewhat better off in 1963, since he is being paid at the rate of $1.30 a share, compared to the 85 cents he got before. And there is, of course, for both groups that remarkable cash generation—$3.49 per share the first year, $3.62 last year, and an estimated $3.25 this year.

All of which brings us back to Bunker's central problem. Where will he put the money? It was in pursuit of an answer to this question that he approached Sperry Rand. "My interest in Sperry Rand," Bunker says, "was engaged by the fact that its situation was not unlike that of Martin Marietta—it with nearly half its sales in the defense and space areas, we with better than two-thirds of ours there, and both of us deeply mixed up in unrelated commercial businesses." With the knowledge of President Vickers, he accumulated about 3 percent of Sperry Rand's stock and went on the board last spring. "As a party of interest," he says, "I could ask questions."

During Bunker's several conversations with Vickers, merger was never openly mentioned. But it was in Bunker's mind, if not zestfully. Much more to his preference would have been some sort of highly selective, joint operation. Sperry Rand's expertise in certain military components would enlarge Martin Marietta's competence as a systems manager. Bunker furthermore hungers for a position in the data-processing field, and Sperry Rand's Univac would give him that, were Vickers of a mind either to sell that division outright or to detach it and invite Martin Marietta in as a partner. All that idle cash under Bunker's mattress could, in the latter circumstance, provide the working capital needed for financing those costly machines on lend-lease.

### WAITING FOR THE RIGHT COMPANY

That opening having vanished, Bunker is left for the time being with no place to go. He professes to be sanguine. "Remember," he says, "the quandary is one with which we deliberately confronted ourselves. When we decided to sell off the Marietta operations, we had the choice of holding off until we had selected some other more promising investment. Instead of cutting off the dog's tail in thin slices, we elected to do the job in one stroke." Bunker also knows the kind of rifle to which he would like to fit his explosive charge of cash. "The proposition that would make most sense to us," he observes, "is one that would take us either into another business having, like the Martin Co., a high technological content or closely related to the growth of the country."

A number of easy, cautious alternatives are, of course, available to him. He could, for example, tidy up Martin Marietta's financial structure by redeeming all the Hermann preferred, or by buying in some of the company's shares, thereby enhancing the earnings of the common. As he answered one of his stockholders in the spring, the latter course would be a form of cannibalism. He could cut the melon by increasing the $1 dividend on the common, which last year represented a payout of less than 54 percent of operating profits. This solution does not interest him either.

Bunker, in a word, still is stumped. The pressure on him is all the more intense for the reasons that many companies are likewise accumulating large amounts of surplus cash; that many sizable mergers and acquisitions have taken place or are in negotiation; and that in the present climate the asking price being demanded by candidates for merger or purchase are becoming less attractive in relation to their present or potential earnings. Should an opportunity for a great leap forward be denied him, Bunker is not foreclosed from being absorbed by a larger company. Being a pragmatist, he would probably not be averse, so long as his stockholders benefited, to having Martin Marietta linked as a junior partner to some larger corporation, possibly even one of the big motor companies, which lacks a commanding position in the defense technologies and which could use the cash in its own business. In the meantime, all is suspense. It is an interesting situation.

---

## THE AMA—HANDMAIDEN TO THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY?

**Mrs. NEUBERGER.** Mr. President, future historians may look upon many of our most cherished institutions as quaint and quizzical, and one of these may be the American Medical Association.

The latest AMA exercise in errant behavior took place just yesterday in my own city of Portland, at present host to the AMA house of delegates convention.

Yesterday morning, the delegates received a monumental report from Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, director of research for the American Cancer Society. The report, a summary of which I shall include at the close of my remarks, was designed to test criticisms of earlier statistical researches which had been interpreted as demonstrating a causal relationship between smoking and disease. In the words of Dr. Hammond, the "results fully confirm findings in previous studies."

The unequivocal nature of the report left the AMA two rational courses of action: First, the delegates could accord official sanction to the Cancer Society's findings. The AMA, virtually alone among major medical groups, has failed to take an official position on the relationship between smoking and health, though critics such as Dr. I. S. Ravdin, former president of the American Cancer Society, have long accused the AMA of "pussyfooting" in its approach to smoking and health.

As a second alternative, the delegates might reasonably have determined to abide by the March 12, 1963, statement of Dr. Blasingame, executive vice president of the AMA, that the AMA would wait upon the pending report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health and would, "after a study of the report, make a statement based on a critical evaluation of the data." At that time, the AMA announced the abandonment of a planned AMA Council on Drugs study of the relationship between tobacco and health. Dr. Blasingame explained that "since Surgeon General Luther Terry has appointed a committee of outstanding scientists to conduct such a study, the AMA's council felt that there should not be a duplication of effort."

The medical world is expectantly awaiting the Surgeon General's report, scheduled for publication within the next month. I may add that the nonmedical world is also curious.

Which course did the delegates select? Neither. Without acknowledging the Cancer Society report or the pending Surgeon General's report, the delegates adopted a "long range, comprehensive program of research on tobacco and health" proposed by the AMA board of trustees. Why? "Because so many gaps exist in knowledge about the relationship of smoking to health."

No one questions the need for further research in exploring the precise mechanism by which smoking causes and aggravates disease. And the initiation of a program of research by the AMA, however belated, is a welcome addition to the research program.

But these truisms should not obscure the undeniable import of the board's statement and the delegates' action: That not enough is known of the relationship between smoking and disease to justify remedial action now.

Thus, the board of trustee's statement never acknowledges the extraordinary body of evidence incriminating smoking, and in so doing magnifies the "gaps."

The closest that the board comes to recognizing the established relationship between smoking and death is the following pallid sentence:

> A mass of statistical information has been developed indicating certain relationships between smoking and disease which cannot be ignored, even though the significance of them in terms of cause and effect is still being debated.

This kind of equivocal statement virtually ignores the harsh and dramatic conclusions of the Hammond-Cancer Society report.

Mr. President, this has been a long established excuse of the tobacco industry, and now of the AMA, for not further exploring the relationship between smoking and health. They say, "We do not know what causes cancer." I may say, Mr. President, that we treat the common cold without knowing its cause.

The board expressed the need "to go beyond statistical evidence, to search for answers not now available to such questions as which diseases in man may be caused or induced by the use of tobacco." Beyond statistics to what? Occult inspiration?

This is what the Hammond report had to say on that score:

> It has sometimes been suggested that the association between cigarette smoking and death rates might conceivably result merely from an incidental association between cigarette smoking and some other factor(s) which has a great influence on death rates.
>
> This is extremely unlikely in light of: (1) The quantitative relationship between death rates and the degree of exposure to cigarette smoke, (2) the finding that among ex-cigarette smokers death rates diminish with length of time since last smoking, (3) the known biological effects of some of the components of cigarette smoke, and (4) pathologic evidence of the effects of cigarette smoking upon bronchial epithelium and the tissues of the lung parenchyma.
>
> Nevertheless, we decided to investigate the matter by studying the death rates of cigarette smokers and nonsmokers who were alike in respect to many characteristics other than their smoking habits.

The results: Twice as many deaths among the smokers of 20 or more cigarettes a day as among like subjects who had never smoked regularly.

The board acknowledges the "extraordinary social, legislative, and economic implications" of the evidence and gratuitously suggests that "prohibition" would be "unrealistic, even if causal relationships were irrefutably established."

Yet no responsible medical or public official is recommending prohibition.

What is being recommended is a moderate and rational program designed to meet the severe medical evidence against smoking, within the democratic framework. The board jumps from the acknowledgment that "prohibition is unrealistic" to conclude that: "Because of these social, legislative, and economic aspects of the problem and because so many gaps exist in the knowledge of the relationship of smoking to health, it is the belief of the board that an intensive, long-range research program, such as is proposed, is imperative."

In other words, because prohibition is unrealistic, all that this Nation can do, to respond to the evidence that smokers are dying at twice the rate of nonsmokers, is to engage in long-range research.

Is it not a little late for the AMA to tell us to start at the beginning? Of course, we need additional research; but what we need more, and now, is unequivocal warning to every American that smoking, by whatever mechanism, is a serious threat to health.

The board's statement appears almost deliberately designed to discredit the pending Surgeon General's report. The board said:

> It is logical that the American Medical Association, as a national organization with historic concern for all matters affecting public health, should be the organization to sponsor such a research project. * * * In fact * * * the AMA-ERF—

The Educational Research Foundation—

> is in a unique position in this respect because of the professional stature of the AMA which would insure public confidence in such a tobacco research project.

Since the AMA feels that it should be "the" organization, and that it occupies a "unique position" of respect, I take it that the Public Health Service is therefore an inappropriate agency to evaluate the evidence against smoking. This is, of course, sheer nonsense.

Moreover, the board self-righteously announces that—

> A director for this project will be procured whose experience, qualifications and integrity will insure that such a research project will be conducted, exhaustively and with complete objectivity.

Are we to conclude, therefore, that the scientists selected by the Surgeon General somehow lack these qualities?

The AMA had previously recognized the desirability of an AMA official position on smoking and health. Yet, yesterday's action seems also to have abandoned that objective. Nowhere does the board's statement contemplate a time limit for an authoritative conclusion by the AMA that "cigarette smoking is harmful."

Mr. President, I do not know why the AMA has taken this action in this way, at this time. But I do know that this action could not have been better designed to achieve the objectives of the American tobacco industry. So long as the industry succeeds in convincing the American public that the verdict on smoking is not in, that great "gaps" of knowledge remain, that the evidence is still subject to "debate," the vast majority of habitual smokers will be able to rationalize their habit, comforting themselves with the belief that the case against the cigarette remains "unproved."

The New York Times turned to the Tobacco Institute this morning for its reaction to Dr. Hammond's findings. The answer was neatly at hand. George V. Allen, president of the Tobacco Industry Institute said:

> It is interesting to note that following Dr. Hammond's report, the AMA today approved a program for the AMA's Education and Research Foundation to undertake an extensive, long-range research program on smoking and health * * * designed to probe beyond the statistical evidence.
>
> We welcome any program for further scientific research in these important health

> fields, where so many questions remain unresolved.

Mr. President, the line from Mr. Allen that particularly intrigues me is the one in which he questions the value of statistical evidence. Yet I find that the very organization which is going "to probe beyond the statistical evidence"—the American Medical Association—frequently uses statistics to show that there is no need for the administration's plan to provide health care for elderly people. Only last week there was published in the Portland Oregonian, as the result of the AMA meeting there, an article stating that the president of the AMA said there is now increasing evidence of less need for hospital care for the elderly. So he was quoting statistics. He also often quotes statistics to show that the Kerr-Mills bill is the answer to the health problems for the elderly.

Mr. President, statistics are very handy when one wishes to use them; but if one does not wish to use them, there seems to be an inclination to state that they are ineffective or inconclusive.

And Dr. C. C. Little, chairman of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee chimed in:

> We are gratified by the reports of the AMA's recognition of the need for additional research on smoking and health.

Mr. President, in 4 weeks or so, when the Surgeon General's committee announces its conclusions, what will the response of the Tobacco Institute be?

"Yes, but the AMA, which speaks for the Nation's doctors——", and once again as it has for the last 15 years, the tobacco industry will possess a weapon, however shoddy, to stave off a meaningful public health response to the evidence against smoking.

Mr. President, in addition to the statements contained in Dr. Hammond's Cancer Society study, one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, Representative MORRIS UDALL, has just issued a most interesting news report to his constituents, in which he refers to the reaction of the tobacco industry to any reports showing the hazards of smoking. I think his analogy and description most apt to this time. Very often the tobacco industry's research committee says, "The facts are not all in." Representative UDALL replies as follows:

> The committee's main theme is: "but the facts aren't all in." In the world of science the facts are never all in; Galileo or Newton or Einstein may ultimately be proved wrong on some theory as new facts turn up. However, we built modern science on the discoveries of Galileo and Newton, and we built an atomic bomb with Einstein's theories. Surely the causal relationship between smoking and lung cancer (or heart disease) requires no greater order of proof. In truth, nearly all medical scientists agree that the case has been made.

An eminent scientist from the private research institution, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, talked with me at some length upon this subject, and said that regardless of all the studies and research and animal tests, we finally come back to the showing that there is very little lung cancer among nonsmokers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various articles concerning Dr. Hammond's study, as published in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, together with correspondence which I have had with the American Medical Association during the past 2 years on the subject of smoking, a statement by the executive vice president of the AMA on March 12, 1963, and yesterday's "news release" from the AMA.

There being no objection, the articles and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1963]

### CANCER SOCIETY REPORT AFFIRMS HIGHER DEATH RATE FOR SMOKERS

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

A new mass of statistical data linking cigarette consumption with death rate was reported yesterday.

The report was described by its author, Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, as the first real analysis of information gathered by the American Cancer Society in a huge health study that began October 1, 1959.

Dr. Hammond's report analyzed the records of 422,094 men over 40. The analysis represents only one phase of the study, which is probably the largest and most extensive of its kind ever attempted.

The entire study is designed to seek meaningful statistical relationships between health and illness and various factors of environment, personal habits, and heredity.

Altogether, some 1,078,894 men and women have been enrolled in the prospective study.

A key feature of the analysis presented yesterday, at a meeting of the American Medical Association, was data showing that men who smoked 20 cigarettes or more a day had higher death rates than nonsmokers who were matched with the smokers with respect to many other personal characteristics.

The disparity in death rates held for all age groups and all causes of death studied, according to the report.

This kind of evidence was gathered to test the possibility, suggested by critics of previous statistical studies, that the smokers and nonsmokers differed from each other in fundamental ways other than smoking and that it was these other fundamental differences that accounted for the disparity in death rates.

The Tobacco Industry Research Committee, which sponsors research on smoking and health, declined to comment on Dr. Hammond's report except to say that it expected to study the report in detail.

"It is an analysis of a large body of complex statistical data which certainly deserves and requires serious scientific review," the committee said.

George V. Allen, president of the Tobacco Industry Institute, said: "It is interesting to note that following Dr. Hammond's report, the AMA today approved a program for the AMA's education and research foundation to undertake an extensive, long-range research program on smoking and health * * * designed to probe beyond the statistical evidence."

"We welcome any program for further scientific research in these important health fields, where so many questions remain unresolved," Mr. Allen said.

Dr. Hammond, who is director of statistical research for the American Cancer Society, presented his report yesterday in Portland, Oreg., to the 17th annual clinical meeting of the medical association. Copies of the report had been distributed earlier to news media.

Dr. Hammond's report said that the new analysis confirmed the several earlier studies that had shown statistical relation to those who had started to smoke earlier in life.

The new analysis, Dr. Hammond said, also covers "a great many factors which were previously not covered or only partially covered."

Death rates were found to be far higher among men who smoked cigarettes heavily than in men who did not smoke. Death rates were found to increase with the number of cigarettes smoked each day and with the degree of smoke inhalation. Death rates were also found to be higher for men who had started to smoke earlier in life.

There have been at least six major previous statistical studies on smoking and health during the last decade. These have convinced many specialists and several major organizations that excessive cigarette smoking constitutes an important health hazard.

A few scientists of excellent scientific reputation have always disputed that this proposition has been proved by the statistics. They have pointed out that an association between two events does not necessarily imply a cause-and-effect relation between them.

The critics have also suggested that differences between smokers and nonsmokers far more basic than the smoking habit itself may be responsible for the statistical correlations that have been observed.

#### CAUSES OF DEATH IN STUDY

Following is a table comparing deaths, by causes, among 36,975 men who never smoked regularly and 36,975 men who were smoking 20 or more cigarettes a day at the time of enrollment in the study:

| Underlying cause of death | Number of deaths | |
|---|---|---|
| | Never smoked regularly | Cigarettes, 20 or more a day |
| Cancer (total) | 96 | 261 |
| Lung | 12 | 110 |
| Buccal; pharynx | 1 | 3 |
| Larynx | 0 | 3 |
| Esophagus | 0 | 6 |
| Bladder | 1 | 2 |
| Pancreas | 6 | 16 |
| Liver and biliary passages | 1 | 7 |
| Stomach | 9 | 10 |
| Colon; rectum | 20 | 25 |
| Other specified sites | 43 | 64 |
| Site unknown | 3 | 15 |
| Heart and circulatory (total) | 401 | 854 |
| Coronary | 304 | 654 |
| Other heart | 30 | 64 |
| Aortic aneurysm | 8 | 30 |
| Cerebral vascular | 44 | 84 |
| Other circulatory | 15 | 22 |
| Other diseases | 73 | 127 |
| Emphysema | 1 | 15 |
| Gastric ulcer | 3 | 5 |
| Cirrhosis of liver | 9 | 17 |
| Other specified diseases | 59 | 86 |
| Ill-defined diseases | 1 | 4 |
| Accidents; violence; suicides | 58 | 66 |
| Total death certificates | 628 | 1,308 |
| No death certificates | 34 | 77 |
| Grand total | 662 | 1,385 |

In a telephone interview before his talk, Dr. Hammond said the new study had sought to answer these criticisms.

"It has sometimes been suggested," the report said, "that the association between cigarette smoking and death rates might conceivably result merely from an incidental association between cigarette smoking and some other factor(s) which has a great influence on death rates." The report went on:

"This is extremely unlikely in light of: (1) the quantitative relationship between death rates and the degree of exposure to cigarette smoke; (2) the finding that among ex-cigarette smokers death rates diminish with length of time since last smoking; (3) the known biological effects of some of the components of cigarette smoke, and (4) pathologic evidence of the effects of cigarette smoking upon bronchial epithelium and the tissues of the lung parenchyma.

"Nevertheless, we decided to investigate the matter by studying the death rates of cigarette smokers and nonsmokers who were alike in respect to many characteristics other than their smoking habits."

(Bronchial epithelium is the tissue lining the insides of the air passages leading to the lungs' air sacs. Parenchyma refers to the air sacs themselves.)

### SELECT 36,975 PAIRS

From the 422,094 men in the population under study, Dr. Hammond and his colleagues culled 36,975 smokers who could be rematched on many points of history, habit, and health with 36,975 nonsmokers.

The information on these men came from answers they had supplied to detailed questionnaires since the study began. In the cases of those who had died this was supplemented by information from the death certificates and from the attending doctors.

The 2 men in each pair had to match in each of 16 respects. These were:

Race; height; nativity (native or foreign born); residence (rural or urban); urban occupational exposure or lack of exposure to dusts, fumes, vapors, chemicals, radioactivity and the like; religion; education; marital status; drinking of alcoholic beverages; usual amount of sleep; usual amount of exercise; presence or absence of severe nervous tension; use of tranquilizers; health or sickness at time of reply to questionnaire; a history, or lack of history, of cancer; the same for heart disease.

Because it was hard to match persons who had any highly unusual characteristics the resulting pairs needed to be those who were average in several of the respects considered.

Dr. Hammond said that any two men who were similar on all of these points, would also, presumably, tend to be similar in many other respects. The point here was that he and his colleagues were attempting to find men who differed little except in their smoking habits.

The difference, in this respect, was between men who smoke 20 or more cigarettes daily and men who had never smoked regularly.

The deaths among men of these 36,975 matched pairs were then studied. From the start of the project to September 30, 1962, there were 1,385 deaths among the 36,975 cigarette smokers and 662 deaths among the equal number of nonsmokers—a difference of almost exactly two to one although the pairs were also matched in terms of age.

### CAUSES ANALYZED

In every 5-year age group, from that of 40 to 44 to that of 75 to 79, there were substantially more deaths among cigarette smokers than among the nonsmokers.

The deaths among the men of the matched pairs were also analyzed according to cause of death. Of the cigarette smokers 110 died of lung cancer while only 12 of the nonsmokers died of that cause.

Cancer of the buccal cavity (inside of the mouth) and of important structures inside the throat killed 12 of the smokers and 1 of the nonsmokers. Emphysema, a condition in which the air spaces inside the lungs are enlarged and abnormally ineffective in their work, accounted for the deaths of 15 smokers and only 1 nonsmoker.

Coronary artery disease—disease of the heart's arteries—was the principal cause of death in both groups, accounting for the deaths of 654 cigarette smokers and 304 nonsmokers.

Beyond the matched pairs, the report also analyzed groups of smokers and nonsmokers—among the 422,094 men—who matched with respect to various single factors, ranging from the longevity of their parents or grandparents to the amount of fried foods the men ate each week and their degree of baldness.

### RESULTS ARE SIMILAR

Tables of age-standardized death rates were drawn for these groups and also showed substantially higher death rates for the smokers than for the nonsmokers.

There was no category in which the nonsmokers' death rate was as high as that for the corresponding group of smokers.

Age-standardized death rates are death rates adjusted to take into account the differences between age groups. Generally, death rates increase with increasing age.

Oddly enough, the death rates of men classified according to their use of fried foods showed that the lowest death rates were among the heaviest users. This was true both of smokers and nonsmokers. It may be a reflection of a tendency to stop eating fried foods among men who become ill, Dr. Hammond suggested.

He said he was particularly intersted in the data showing that the shortest and tallest men, both smokers and nonsmokers, had higher death rates than men of middle height. Future aspects of the study will devote great attention to many of those factors other than smoking that do show unusual correlation with death rates or disease, he said.

### DEATHS BY AGE GROUP

Following is a table comparing deaths, by age group, among 36,975 men who never smoked regularly matched with 36,975 men who were smoking 20 or more cigarettes a day at the time of enrollment in the study:

| Age group | Never smoked regularly | | Cigarettes, 20 or more a day | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of men | Number of deaths | Number of men | Number of deaths |
| 40 to 44 | 3,410 | 15 | 3,410 | 40 |
| 45 to 49 | 10,468 | 59 | 10,468 | 192 |
| 50 to 54 | 9,583 | 123 | 9,583 | 252 |
| 55 to 59 | 6,534 | 135 | 6,534 | 323 |
| 60 to 64 | 3,990 | 150 | 3,990 | 254 |
| 65 to 69 | 2,083 | 98 | 2,083 | 193 |
| 70 to 74 | 747 | 64 | 747 | 98 |
| 75 to 79 | 160 | 18 | 160 | 33 |
| Total | 36,975 | 662 | 36,975 | 1,385 |

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1963]

***Table of age-standardized death rates***

[Table of age-standardized death rates per 100,000 man-years comparing groups of men who never smoked regularly and men who smoked 20 or more cigarettes a day. The smokers and nonsmokers are matched according to other characteristics]

| Definition of subgroup | Age-standardized death rates | |
|---|---|---|
| | Never smoked regularly | Cigarettes, 20-plus a day |
| Family history: | | |
| Long lived (parents, grandparents) | 592 | 1,261 |
| Short lived (parents, grandparents) | 913 | 1,832 |
| Cancer: | | |
| 1+ (parents, siblings) | 758 | 1,610 |
| 2+ (parents, siblings) | 746 | 1,752 |
| Long lived: No cancer | 614 | 1,291 |
| Short lived: 1+ cancer | 875 | 1,827 |
| Age of mother at birth of subject: | | |
| Under 20 | 796 | 1,828 |
| 20 to 24 | 773 | 1,635 |
| 25 to 29 | 784 | 1,507 |
| 30 to 34 | 686 | 1,459 |
| 35 or older | 788 | 1,487 |

***Table of age-standardized death rates*—Continued**

[Table of age-standardized death rates per 100,000 man-years comparing groups of men who never smoked regularly and men who smoked 20 or more cigarettes a day. The smokers and nonsmokers are matched according to other characteristics]

| Definition of subgroup | Age-standardized death rates | |
|---|---|---|
| | Never smoked regularly | Cigarettes, 20-plus a day |
| Number of brothers and sisters: | | |
| No siblings | 987 | 1,775 |
| 1 sibling | 880 | 1,689 |
| 2 siblings | 795 | 1,577 |
| 3 or more siblings | 800 | 1,563 |
| Height of subject: | | |
| Under 66 inches | 1,065 | 1,782 |
| 66 to 67 inches | 815 | 1,705 |
| 68 to 69 inches | 806 | 1,620 |
| 70 to 71 inches | 784 | 1,529 |
| 72 to 73 inches | 687 | 1,481 |
| 74-plus inches | 735 | 1,672 |
| Religion: | | |
| Protestant | 790 | 1,578 |
| Catholic | 858 | 1,607 |
| Jewish | 1,095 | 1,522 |
| Education: | | |
| Grammar school or less | 945 | 1,703 |
| Some high school | 864 | 1,637 |
| High school graduate | 766 | 1,594 |
| Some college | 755 | 1,550 |
| College graduate | 676 | 1,439 |
| Race and nativity: | | |
| Native born white | 789 | 1,595 |
| Foreign born white | 859 | 1,423 |
| Negro | 1,358 | 2,317 |
| Years in present neighborhood: | | |
| Under 3 years | 960 | 1,803 |
| 3 to 4 years | 796 | 1,572 |
| 5 to 9 years | 852 | 1,500 |
| 10 to 19 years | 782 | 1,592 |
| 20-plus years | 800 | 1,603 |
| Place of residence and occupational exposure: | | |
| Rural | 815 | 1,507 |
| Town or suburb: | | |
| No occupational exposure | 816 | 1,659 |
| Occupational exposure | 770 | 1,495 |
| City: | | |
| No occupational exposure | 844 | 1,596 |
| Occupational exposure | 740 | 1,702 |
| Disease history: | | |
| Yes | 1,916 | 3,120 |
| No | 502 | 1,125 |
| Marital status: | | |
| Single | 1,074 | 2,467 |
| Married | 796 | 1,560 |
| Widowed | 1,396 | 2,570 |
| Divorced | 1,420 | 2,675 |
| Selected occupations: | | |
| Farmers | 716 | 1,451 |
| Teachers, lawyers, clergy | 762 | 1,359 |
| Doctors, dentists, veterinarians | 727 | 1,740 |
| Fried food: | | |
| No fried food eaten | 1,208 | 2,573 |
| 1 to 2 times a week | 1,004 | 1,694 |
| 3 to 4 times a week | 642 | 1,714 |
| 5 to 9 times a week | 781 | 1,520 |
| 10 to 14 times a week | 722 | 1,524 |
| 15-plus times a week | 702 | 1,399 |
| Nervous tension: | | |
| No nervous tension | 876 | 1,713 |
| Slight nervous tension | 777 | 1,589 |
| Moderate nervous tension | 776 | 1,493 |
| Severe nervous tension | 881 | 1,783 |
| Use of common medicines: | | |
| Use tranquilizers | 1,308 | 2,286 |
| Do not use tranquilizers | 755 | 1,501 |
| Use laxatives | 883 | 1,661 |
| Do not use laxatives | 727 | 1,515 |
| Use antiacid medicines | 748 | 1,593 |
| Do not use antiacid medicines | 830 | 1,577 |
| Exercise: | | |
| None | 834 | 1,416 |
| Slight | 579 | 1,347 |
| Moderate | 486 | 1,065 |
| Heavy | 474 | 998 |
| Sleep: | | |
| Under 5 hours | 2,029 | 3,936 |
| 5 hours | 1,121 | 2,655 |
| 6 hours | 805 | 1,601 |
| 7 hours | 626 | 1,426 |
| 8 hours | 813 | 1,562 |
| 9 hours | 967 | 1,729 |
| 10 plus hours | 1,898 | 2,694 |
| Baldness: | | |
| None | 768 | 1,550 |
| Slight | 851 | 1,572 |
| Moderate | 792 | 1,720 |
| Much | 903 | 1,614 |

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1963]

## SUMMARY OF CANCER SOCIETY'S REPORT ON SMOKING

(Following is a summary of the findings from a report titled "Smoking in Relation to Mortality and Morbidity. Findings in First 34 Months of Follow-Up in a Prospective Study Started in 1959." Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, director of statistical research of the American Cancer Society, presented the report yesterday in Portland, Oreg., to the 17th annual clinical meeting of the American Medical Association)

1. Death rates in relation to smoking habits and other factors were studied in 422,094 men between the ages of 40 and 89 who were traced for an average of 34.3 months after they answered detailed questionnaires.

2. The results fully confirm findings in previous prospective studies. Death rates were found: (a) to be far higher in cigarette smokers than in men who did not smoke cigarettes, (b) to increase with amount of cigarette smoking and (c) be lower in ex-cigarette smokers who had given up the habit for a year or longer than in men who were currently smoking cigarettes at the time of enrollment. Death rates from the following diseases were greatly higher in cigarette smokers than in nonsmokers: cancer of the lung, cancer of the buccal cavity and pharnyx, cancer of the larynx, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the pancreas, gastric ulcer, emphysema and aortic aneurysm. Death rates from coronary artery disease were considerably higher in cigarette smokers than in nonsmokers and this accounted for nearly half of the difference in total death rates between cigarette smokers and nonsmokers.

3. Lung cancer death rates were 11 times as high among current cigarette smokers as among men who never smoked regularly and 18 times as high among very heavy cigarette smokers as among men who never smoked regularly. Lung cancer death rates were considerably lower among ex-cigarette smokers who had given up the habit for several years than among current cigarette smokers.

4. Coronary artery disease death rates were highly related to cigarette smoking among men in the middle age groups but less related to cigarette smoking among men in the old age groups. In age group 40 to 59, the coronary artery disease death date was 1.95 times as high among light cigarette smokers as among men who never smoked regularly; and 3 times as high among men who never smoked as among men who had never smoked regularly. Ex-cigarette smokers who had given up the habit for several years had lower death rate from coronary artery disease than current cigarette smokers.

5. A study was made of men who were hospitalized and men who developed cancer, heart disease or gastric and duodenal ulcers during the first 2 years of the study. The proportion of men hospitalized and the proportion who developed these diseases was considerably higher among cigarette smokers than among nonsmokers and increased with amount of cigarette smoking.

6. Death rates were found to be highly related to degree of inhalation of cigarette smoke and age at start of cigarette smoking. Age at start of cigarette smoking appears to be particularly important in this respect.

7. Death rates of cigarette smokers and nonsmokers were studied in relation to many other factors such as longevity of parents and grandparents, cancer in parents and siblings, height, exercise, sleep, race, religion, education, marital status, nervous tension, and prior history of certain diseases. Within every group studied, the death rate of men who smoked 20 or more cigarettes a day was considerably higher than the death rate of nonsmokers.

8. Nonsmokers were matched individually with men who smoked 20 or more cigarettes per day, the two men in each matched pair being similar in respect to: age, height, race, nativity, religion, marital status, residence (urban or rural), certain occupational exposures, education, drinking habits, nervous tension, use of tranquilizers, sleep, exercise, well or ill at time of enrollment, and past history in respect to cancer, heart disease, stroke and high blood pressure. Altogether 36,975 such pairs were found. During the course of the study, 1,385 of the 36,975 cigarette smokers died, while only 662 of the nonsmokers died. Of the cigarette smokers, 110 died of lung cancer and 654 died of coronary artery disease while of the nonsmokers, 12 died of lung cancer and 304 died of coronary artery disease. Emphysema accounted for the death of 15 cigarette smokers but only 1 of the nonsmokers. Far more of the cigarette smokers than the nonsmokers died of cancer of the buccal cavity, pharynx, larynx, and esophagus; cancer of the pancrease; cancer of the liver; aortic aneurysm, and several other diseases.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 5, 1963]

## SMOKING—MOST DAMAGING STATISTICS YET

### MILESTONES IN DEBATE

In 1939: Cologne doctor, comparing 80 male lung cancer patients with 80 healthy males, found much more smoking among cancer patients.

In 1950: Drs. Ernest Wynder and Evarts Graham find excessive use of cigarettes an important factor in lung cancer.

In 1954: American Cancer Society study of 187,766 men indicates death rate among smokers is 75 percent higher than nonsmokers.

In 1957: U.S. Surgeon General says evidence indicates excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer.

In 1958: Tobacco industry sets up unit to sponsor research on tobacco and health.

In 1962: Study of American Tobacco Co. workers finds they smoke heavily, yet have no deaths from lung cancer.

In 1962: British Royal College of Physicians reports heavy smoking cuts life expectancy, government begins campaign to alert public of dangers.

### THE STATE CAMPAIGN

(By Joseph R. Hixson)

The matchbook bearing the New York State seal says, "I used to smoke with both lungs." A poster says, "Ashes to ashes. Here lies a man who went up in smoke."

The respected cancer research arm of the New York State Department of Health, Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, is distributing 100,000 matchbooks and 12,000 posters in this State, aimed at persuading school children and adults not to smoke.

The money to pay for Roswell Park's vigorous antismoking campaign comes mostly from private contributions but there's also a State health department educational allotment, approved in Albany but not yet distributed to the institute.

That's not surprising, considering Health Commissioner Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham's remarks last spring.

"There is now adequate evidence," he said, "to satisfy me and I think most other people that cigarettes are killing, through the mechanism of coronary heart disease, two to three times as many people as they are killing through the mechanism of lung cancer. * * * Here then is a lethal agent that is killing more people than any other single recognized noxious agent, more than any combination of bacteria, more than any known virus, more than the American automobile, yet we aren't doing very much about it."

Reached by telephone, Dr. George E. Moore, Roswell Park director, said his hospital's posters, matchbooks, and antismoking clinics are frankly aimed at determining the most effective methods of fighting the smoking habit.

Dr. Moore said it doesn't look as if the nicotine substitutes are much use in helping smokers kick the habit. He said the "stop smoking" clinics at Roswell Park are working fairly well, with 80 percent of smokers off cigarettes after the first week, and all smoking fewer cigarettes at the end of a month. The institute is now working with its fourth group of heavy smokers.

Dr. Moore said the antismoking matchbooks will be discontinued after distribution of 100,000, but he noted that 1,000 posters with varying "Don't smoke" messages had been sent out last week.

He said some U.S. National Institutes of Health funds have been allocated to the smoking clinics because they are aimed at finding why people smoke and how they can stop.

In California, six statewide organizations have joined forces in a campaign to alert the public to the effects of cigarette smoking.

The united organization, called the California Interagency Council on Cigarette Smoking and Health, was formed Tuesday, by the American Cancer Society, the California Heart Association, the California Medical Association, the California State Department of Education, the California State Department of Public Health, and the Tuberculosis and Health Association of California.

Dr. Sol R. Baker, Los Angeles, radiologist and chairman of the council said its first move would be to prepare information for use in schools to warn against cigarette smoking.

### THE COMPUTER STORY

(By Earl Ubell)

The numbers flowed from the American Cancer Society's electronic computer in New York faster than cigarettes from a factory. At the end, it was quite clear: the statistics had drawn a web of logic more tightly than ever around cigarette smoking as a destroyer of men.

Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, pipe-smoking head of statistics for the society, gave these computer results on 442,000 men—no women included—yesterday to the Portland, Oreg., sessions of the American Medical Association. His full paper was also made available in New York.

In the broadest study of the cigarette puzzle ever attempted, Dr. Hammond illuminated more clearly than ever before the associations between cigarette smoking (but not pipes or cigars) and lung cancer, cancer in general, stomach ulcers, heart attacks and such breathing troubles as emphysema.

Once again, the lung cancer hunters found that coronary artery heart attacks accounted for more of the deaths among smokers than nonsmokers. In fact, the death rate among heavy smokers was twice that of nonsmokers and therefore cigarette smoking could be said to kill more men from heart disease than lung cancer.

And then there were the new findings: proof that the more deeply you inhale cigarette smoke, the greater your risk of death; proof that the younger you were when you took to the weed, the greater your risk of death; proof that if you stop smoking longer than a year, you can prolong your life; proof that smokers end up in the hospital more often.

Finally, in a spectacular statistical tour de force, Dr. Hammond found 37,000 pairs of men, each pair identical in 14 respects—height, race, etc.—except that one man of each pair smoked 20 cigarettes a day, the other didn't smoke. Result: the smoker's death rate was twice as high as the nonsmokers'.

This finding was at the core of Dr. Hammond's central theme: a logical refutation of the criticisms of his previous study of 187,000 men (which he did with Dr. Daniel Horn starting in 1951). It comes at a time when the U.S. Public Health Service is in the throes of preparing a report on cigarette smoking and health.

After the report was presented, the American Medical Association's policymaking house of delegates voted to undertake an all-out study on smoking to find out exactly which human ailments are "caused or aggravated by smoking" and which part of the cigarette may be responsible. Once before, the AMA attempted to start such a study, but dropped it when the Public Health Service began its review.

The Tobacco Institute in a statement by George V. Allen, its president, said it is sure that scientists will give strong attention to the cancer society's study.

Dr. Clarence Cook Little, scientific director of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, commented yesterday only on the AMA's action but not on the Hammond report. He said that the AMA study will speed the day when "science will learn the causes of major health problems such as lung cancer and heart disease and what role, if any, smoking may have."

The tobacco industry and others have asserted that the statistical association demonstrated by Dr. Hammond and others between cigarette smoking and health could represent a spurious statistical quirk. They said that men predestined to an early death might also be constitutionally inclined to smoke.

### *Findings*

As Dr. Hammond put it: "It has sometimes been suggested that the association between cigarette smoking and death rates might conceivably result merely from the incidental association between cigarette smoking and some other factor or factors which have a great influence on death rates."

Such things as the consumption of alcohol, exposure to city air pollution, lack of sleep, country of national origin and marital status, to name a few, have been cited as factors that could cause both smoking and early death.

Dr. Hammond then proceeded to demolish these contentions with a multipronged attack, citing statistical, laboratory and human biological evidence:

There is a quantitative relationship between death and exposure to cigarette smoke: the more you smoke, the greater the risk. Thus the statistics indicate a connection between the two.

The risk of ex-smokers diminishes the longer they keep away from smoking. It is as if a toxin were slowly being washed from their bodies.

Extracts of cigarette tars and smoke produce known biological effects on men and animals. Tars produce cancer in mice; the nicotine changes the circulation of the blood, and recent research on behalf of a cigarette company shows that the fine fibers of the throat—the cilia—stop moving when bathed in smoke.

### *Factors*

Microscopic studies of the lungs of smokers and nonsmokers reveal changes in the blood vessels and air sacs that could produce breathing difficulties and have been interpreted by some as precancerous.

Despite these powerful arguments, Dr. Hammond decided to attack the problem of other factors directly, using his huge sample of 442,000 men and the fantastic data-handling capacity of a modern computer.

First, he made a list of all the factors considered to be associated with a high risk of death: race, height, foreign or native birth, residence in city or country (air pollution), occupational exposure to noxious substances, religion, education, marital status, alcohol consumption, sleep, use of tranquilizers as an indicator of tension, present state of health, history of cancer, heart disease, stroke or high blood pressure.

From the 442,000 men, he found 37,000 pairs of men who were alike in each of these factors except that one of each pair smoked 20 or more cigarettes a day and the other did not smoke regularly.

In other words, if there was a man 70 inches tall, born in the United States, Negro, a nondrinker, who slept 6 hours a night, etc., the computer dug into the histories of the 442,000 and found another man with the same characteristics. The only difference: one smoked and one didn't.

Such a hunting procedure would have been nearly impossible a decade ago, since the amount of information to be sorted and handled reached beyond human comprehension.

Next, Dr. Hammond and his colleagues in the American Cancer Society followed up on these 37,000 pairs, and found that in 2 years 1,385 of the smokers had died and only 662 of the nonsmokers: a death rate of 2 to 1.

Dr. Hammond, the statistician, said such a result could occur by chance only one time in a million.

### *Mortality*

What did they die of? Of the cigarette smokers, 110 succumbed to lung cancer, while only 12 of the nonsmokers did. Coronary artery disease—heart attack—killed 654 of the cigarette smokers, 304 of the nonsmokers. Fifteen smokers died of emphysema; only one nonsmoker did. More cigarette smokers than nonsmokers died of cancers of the mouth, throat, pancreas and liver.

Of the new findings, the relationship of hospitalization to smoking reveals that cigarettes may cause a great deal of nonlethal illness. For example in the age group 40 to 69, only 14 percent of the nonsmokers saw the inside of a hospital, while 22 percent of the two-pack-a-day men were hospitalized in the 2-year period. Between these extremes, the more a man smoked, the more likely he was to end up in a hospital.

In addition to the facts about smoking, Dr. Hammond and his associates uncovered some other conditions of living that may affect your longevity. For example, men who didn't exercise at all had a much higher death rate than those who exercised heavily. In general, the taller a man was, the lower his death risk. Baldness did not affect the death rates one way or the other.

### *Massive study*

All these data came out of the cancer society's massive study of 1,070,474 persons in 1,121 counties in the United States. Each of them, visited by a cancer society volunteer, filled out a questionnaire on health, habits and habitat. Dr. Hammond and his colleagues then tabulated all the data by computer.

Two years later, the volunteers went out to find the original men and women. If they were dead, the society got the death certificate. If cancer was mentioned, the society wrote to the doctor and got more details.

In this gold mine of information, Dr. Hammond also hopes to find the answers to many questions including: Does cigarette smoking affect the health of women, too?

---

APRIL 10, 1962.

Dr. LEONARD W. LARSON, M.D.,
*President,*
*American Medical Association,*
*Bismarck, N. Dak.*

DEAR DR. LARSON: The Royal College of Physicians, the British Ministry of Health, the British Medical Research Council, the National Cancer Institute of Canada, the International Union Against Cancer, the World Health Organization, the Netherlands Ministry of Social Affairs and Public Health, the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Public Health Association, the Public Health Cancer Association, the American Heart Association, and the National Tuberculosis Association have all concluded that cigarette smoking is injurious to health.

Has the American Medical Association taken an official position on the relationship between cigarette smoking and health or does the association plan to adopt such a position within the foreseeable future?

Sincerely,

MAURINE E. NEUBERGER,
*U.S. Senator.*

---

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
*Chicago, Ill., April 20, 1962.*

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
*U.S. Senator,*
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Dr. Larson has referred your letter of April 10, concerning the official position of the American Medical Association on the relationship between cigarette smoking and health, to this office for reply.

We have made available through our official publications and scientific meetings an opportunity for full expression of the point of view of the Public Health Service and other Government agencies, the American Cancer Society, and others. AMA as an organization, however, has not taken a formal stand on the relationship between smoking and health.

As a general rule, AMA has not expressed "official" opinions on scientific questions. There have been notable exceptions to this rule: Krebiozen and cancer, artificial fluoridation of public water supplies for the prevention of dental caries, poliomyelitis vaccines, and other scientific questions that have aroused considerable public debate. Exceptions are greater than rule. Approximately 3 years ago the council on drugs of AMA, a group of distinguished pharmacologists and therapeutists, was asked to consider the development of a project to review the available data concerning the relationship between smoking and cancer. The council then, and again a few months ago, recommended that AMA not undertake such a study.

The board of trustees of the association will meet in May; and I am, therefore, holding your letter for more definitive consideration by the trustees. The question you raise is a profoundly important one. I assure you that the association will give it the careful consideration that it deserves.

I shall keep you informed of whatever action is taken by the board of trustees next month.

Sincerely,

ERNEST B. HOWARD, M.D.

---

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
*Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1962.*

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
*U.S. Senate, Special Committee on Aging, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Board of Trustees of the American Medical Association considered your inquiry regarding the official position of the American Medical Association on the subject of smoking and health. I am happy to report to you that the board instructed the Council on Drugs of the AMA to study and report on the relationship of tobacco and disease. I shall keep you apprised of the progress of the council in its study of this important subject.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the impetus you have given, both to the American Medical Association and the Public Health Service, on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ERNEST B. HOWARD, M.D.

### STATEMENT BY F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, MARCH 12, 1963

The AMA Council on Drugs has recommended to the AMA's board of trustees that a projected study by the AMA of the relationships of tobacco and health not be undertaken.

This recommendation should not be interpreted as any lack of interest in this important subject.

Since Surg. Gen. Luther Terry has appointed a committee of outstanding scientists to conduct such a study, the AMA's Council felt that there should not be a duplication of effort.

The AMA has been assured early access to the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee. After a study of the report, the AMA will make a statement, based on a critical evaluation of the data.

---

[News release from the American Medical Association]

DECEMBER 3, 1963.

PORTLAND, OREG.—The American Medical Association's board of tustees today proposed "a comprehensive program of research on tobacco and health" to discover which human ailments may be caused or aggravated by smoking, how they may be caused, and what properties of smoke may be the guilty agent.

The board's proposal is subject to approval by the AMA's policymaking house of delegates which convened in Portland today for its annual fall meeting.

The board's statement to the house said that "so many gaps exist in knowledge about the relationship of smoking to health it is the belief of the board that an intensive long-range research program such as is proposed is imperative."

If authorized by the house, the project would be initiated by the AMA's education and research foundation, a separate corporate entity from the AMA itself.

The board recommended that the long-range program be financed by a substantial contribution from the AMA with contributions solicited from other sources—industry, foundations, voluntary health agencies, and physicians.

The board emphasized that, if the program is authorized, contributions will be received "only if they are given without restrictions."

"A director for this project," the board said, "will be procured whose experience, qualifications, and integrity will assure that such a research project will be conducted effectively, exhaustively and with complete objectivity."

The board said that "a mass of statistical information has been developed indicating certain relationships between smoking and disease which cannot be ignored, even though the significance of them in terms of cause and effect is still being debated."

"The proposed research projects," the the board said, "would be designed to probe beyond statistical evidence, to search for answers not now available to such questions as which diseases in man may be caused or induced by the use of tobacco. Determination needs to be made whether some element or elements in smoke may be a direct or aggravating cause of cancer and other diseases and to identify these substances chemically. Questions of constitutional or physiologic factors, or psychological dependence, and of habituation require answer. Continuing and further clinical and pathologic studies need to be made along with collection and correlation of statistical data as it is collected to establish that relationships exist between the use of tobacco and disease. Since smoking may produce a tranquilizing effect as well as other favorable psychic reactions not so well identified, these factors need further study in evaluating the whole matter of the relationship of tobacco and disease. The Board also said that "this complex problem contains extraordinary social, legislative and economic implications."

"For example," the board said, "the habit-forming characteristics of smoking, and the fact that many millions of people indulge in smoking, would appear to make strict legal prohibition unrealistic, even if causal relationships were irrefutably established.

"Because of these social, legislative and economic aspects of the problem and because so many gaps exist in knowledge about the relationship of smoking to health, it is the belief of the Board that an intensive, long-range research program such as is proposed is imperative."

"Since smoking has been declared by some to be a national health problem," the Board said, "it is logical that the American Medical Association, as a national organization with historic concern for all matters affecting public health, should be the organization to sponsor such a research project through the Education and Research Foundation it has established." "In fact," the Board said, "the AMA-ERF is in a unique position in this respect because of the professional stature of the AMA which would insure public confidence in such a tobacco research project, because of its ability to encourage the talented research personnel necessary for an endeavor of this magnitude, because of the AMA's position in contributing and obtaining funds from other groups for these purposes, and because of the ability of the AMA to communicate rapidly and widely information to the profession and the public."

The AMA-ERF, the board said, is in a position to and would conduct such a research project along the lines of (1) a continuing survey of the literature on the subject, (2) initiating reasearch on tobacco and disease, and (3) coordinating research carried out by others. The AMA itself will utilize various avenues in communicating the results of the research studies as they become available.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that I really believe that this tacit recommendation by doctors—and the AMA must speak for the doctors of this country—for the continuation of smoking is a disservice to the American people.

An eminent British scientist, the president of the Royal College of Physicians, Sir Robert Platt, said the night before last, when speaking in Chicago:

> The pleasures of smoking must be weighed against the danger of health.

Mr. President, I should also like to have the American people keep in mind the statement by the man from the Sloan-Kettering Institute:

> There is very little lung cancer among nonsmokers.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending business is a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which was submitted by me and some 30 other Senators on January 14, 1963.

As originally submitted, the concurrent resolution called for the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, to be composed of seven Senators and seven Members of the House. The concurrent resolution stated that the duty of the committee would be to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and to recommend improvements with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying and expediting its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution.

The committee would be given broad jurisdiction under the concurrent resolution as originally submitted, including authority to recommend improvements in "the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, and the consolidation and reorganization of committees and committee jurisdiction."

The remainder of the concurrent resolution was what is known in legislative parlance as "boilerplate." It dealt with places at which the committee could sit, its power to maintain staff and fix compensation and allowances for expenses, and a requirement that the committee should report from time to time to both Houses.

A hearing was conducted before the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which the concurrent resolution was referred, on June 27 and 28, 1963, the hearing being held before the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate. That subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

The subcommittee struck out everything after the resolving clause of the concurrent resolution and substituted a new concurrent resolution which, in addition to changing a number of less important subjects in the original resolution, struck out the authority for the committee to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the "rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

In its amended form the concurrent resolution was favorably reported to the

Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration by a vote of 6 to 3. As a part of the committee report, individual views pointing out the desirability of reinstating the original phraseology of the concurrent resolution were filed by my Pennsylvania colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and by me, and supplemental individual views were filed by me.

That report was dated September 19, 1963.

Thereafter the amended concurrent resolution was cleared by the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Shortly thereafter it appeared on the calendar and was called up by the majority leader today.

In what I believe to be an almost unprecedented action, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] objected to the request of the majority leader for unanimous consent to make Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 the pending business.

So far as I know, although I may be incorrect, the only other times when objection has been lodged to a motion by the majority leader for the Senate to consider some measure approved by a legislative committee and approved by the majority party policy committee has been in connection with efforts to change rule XXII and civil rights legislation. There may have been a few other instances in which this highly unusual procedure has been utilized.

I believe I am fair in saying that the procedure of objecting to the request by the majority leader to consider a measure which has been cleared on the calendar for floor action is for the purpose of delay.

I am confident, from reliable information which has come to me, that the objection to the unanimous-consent request was made for purposes of delay, and is the first move in a filibuster intended to prevent a vote on the merits of the amendments which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I submitted on October 24.

The purport of the amendments is to restore the right to be given in the original resolution to the committee to investigate "the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House."

I shall be prepared to make an argument on the merits in support of the amendments if the time ever comes when that is relevant. For the present, I merely point out that the unquestioned leader of the Senate establishment—a man for whom I have the most intense personal respect, admiration, and indeed affection; with whom I have never exchanged a cross word; who has rendered me in my nearly 7 years of service in the Senate courtesy far beyond the normal—as is his right under the present Senate rules, has determined to conduct a filibuster to prevent a vote on the merits of amendments intended to permit a joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate matters which are clearly at the heart of the inability of the Senate and the House to perform their assigned constitutional duties with expedition, efficiency, and dispatch.

I regret greatly that the senior Senator from Georgia has felt impelled to take this position. I do not challenge in any way his right to do so. I merely point out that the fact that he has this right is one reason why the creation of the committee should be expeditiously authorized. It should be organized to begin its arduous task of removing those many obstacles to action when action is required in the national interest which presently obstruct and delay the performance by the Congress of its constitutional duties.

It has been suggested to me that if the Senator from New Jersey and I would drop our amendments, there would be no further objection to approval of the concurrent resolution.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] may be added as a cosponsor of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Speaking for myself only, I am unwilling to withdraw the amendment. My unwillingness stems from the fact that without the amendment the concurrent resolution, as reported, would remove a significant and important part of the jurisdiction to be given to the committee under the original concurrent resolution.

It is true that without the amendment the committee, if authorized, still could do useful work. It is true also that the original resolution contained the provision, now incorporated in the proposed amendment, to permit the consideration of "the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House."

This language was not contained in the original LaFollette-Monroney resolution, adopted in 1945, which led to the passage a year later of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I submit, however, that the failure to incorporate such a provision in the La Follette-Monroney resolution of investigation and inquiry was responsible for the failure of that committee to recommend comprehensive and far-reaching reforms regarding those matters excluded which continue to plague us today to an even greater extent than they did in 1945 in our efforts to update, streamline, and make more effective and efficient the procedures, operations, and organization of both branches of the Congress.

Mr. President, we find ourselves in an odd parliamentary situation, a situation in which, to my mind, there is absolutely no question that in the long run the senior Senator from Georgia, if he is determined to persist in his filibuster, will be able to succeed.

It is now the 5th day of December. The first session of the 88th Congress must of necessity draw to a close before the end of this month. I think 8 of the 12 major appropriation bills, which by law should have been passed no later than July 31 of this year, remain unpassed.

There are two very important education bills which have passed both Houses, one of which is in conference, and in the other case the conference report has been agreed to.

The majority leader informs me that there is other legislation, much of it noncontroversial, some of it controversial, which should be passed before Congress takes what may well be a very brief recess over Christmas.

Therefore, it is clear that the Senator from Georgia can work his will on the Senate.

I have advised the majority leader, after consultation with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], that I would have no objection to the concurrent resolution being set aside from time to time temporarily in order that other pressing business which it is the duty of the Senate to enact may be taken up.

It is probably true that under the parliamentary precedents, if the Senate were to adjourn rather than recess, the pending motion would fall of its own weight and would have to be renewed. I cannot control this procedure, particularly under these circumstances. I should like to register, however, in all candor, and in all good humor, my strong and vehement protest against this filibuster action, which I believe to be against the best interests of the Senate, and against the best interests of the people of the United States, and which tends to bring the Senate into disrepute with the public at large, both in the United States and abroad.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to be associated with the Senator from Pennsylvania in any measure. My satisfaction in this case is very great indeed and is increased by the fact that we have the association of our colleague, the junior Senator from New York, both with respect to the measure in chief and also the amendment the Senator from Pennsylvania has been discussing.

It is not my purpose to speak at length. The situation speaks for itself. The need for congressional reform, revision of the rules, the procedures, and the practices, could hardly be more eloquently demonstrated than by the present situation. It is perfectly true that the majority leader is powerless to bring up a matter from the calendar.

After long consideration, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported favorably a concurrent resolution. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, it is far from what we would like. It does not embody provisions in the measure which the Senator from Pennsylvania introduced or the measure which I introduced. It takes pieces of both.

We are happy for what we could get from the committee. Our chief concern is the limitation on the proposed committee to investigate congressional procedures or inquire into the rules or make any recommendations as to them.

The amendment which we are seeking to join to the measure, once it reaches the floor, would eliminate that restriction. Even with such restrictions, a useful purpose could be served by the proposed committee—but not nearly as useful a purpose as if it were unfettered by such restriction.

The existence of the restriction is an illustration of the need for a complete change in the rules and practices.

Who, looking from Mars, or from any other part of the universe, or, indeed, from most parts of this country, would imagine that it is impossible for the Senate of the United States even to consider a matter which has been regularly introduced by a Member of the Senate—by several Members in this case, deliberately considered at proper and ample length by the committee to which it was referred, presided over by one of the most honored, respected, and wise Members of this body, and composed of very fine men, which has been reported favorably to the Senate by that committee, and put on the calendar, with an amendment, which we have already discussed—the Senator from Pennsylvania at some length and I more briefly—but reported favorably with a recommendation that it pass?

The ordinary machinery for bringing the measure from the calendar to the floor was utilized and was operated to bring it to the floor—namely, the majority conference. The majority leader, in sympathy with the proposal, purporting to act in accordance with the instructions of his democratic conference, made a request, which the Senator from Pennsylvania recounted, that it be made the pending business. It was met by objection by the Senator from Georgia. In accordance with instructions, the majority leader moved to make it the pending business, and was met by what we know is a filibuster. As the Senator from Pennsylvania indicated, the majority leader is powerless to do anything about it.

If this is not a shocking indictment of the Senate and its practices, procedures, and rules, and acquiescence in being led by the nose by a small bunch of willful men, I do not know what could be.

I have been surprised that the people of this country have been so acquiescent in the apathy of Congress in the face of great needs. This situation has continued far beyond the point where the Congress can be called a do-nothing Congress, which this Congress has been for the entire year. This is a very serious matter. It would be bad enough if we were merely a do-nothing Congress, but we are a prevent-any-action Congress, which is even more serious.

The appropriation bills which have not reached the Senate have dealt with current and future needs of this country, and the deliberate slowdown by the chairmen of those committees, which has brought us to this criminally bad situation, has prevented schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, for one example, from obtaining adequate instruction for the entire year, because we have not passed the budget for the District of Columbia school year, which started last September. That is merely one illustration of what we are up against.

The same procedure operates against the whole mechanism of the Government of the United States.

We are operating under a continuing resolution, which has been extended again to the end of January. It will not be merely half a year that will have gone by before we have acted; it will be at least seven-twelfths of a year.

Why do we appropriate at all? Why not pass continuing resolutions from now to doomsday, draw our pay, and do nothing? But it is not merely a question of doing nothing; we are responsible for preventing any action.

Congress still has that power—Congress has not; a few individuals have. Perhaps a dozen Members who comprise the chairmen of the committees have that power. Congress has not. The Senate has not. The majority leader and the minority leader and others do not have such power. A few individuals have it. And we sit still and do nothing about it. It is a shocking thing. If this does not awaken the conscience of the country, if it does not awaken the information media of the country to putting some pressure behind the move to change the rules, I shall almost be inclined to despair.

I know this will happen. These attempts in which we have acquiesced year after year after year, to tie our hands and to shackle ourselves and to half strangle Congress, will come to an end. The tighter the opponents attempt to draw the noose around us, the more sure that end will be and the more drastic the reaction to it will be.

I said I would not speak at length on this subject. I am sorry I talked as long as I have. I apologize to my colleagues, because I know they have other matters to attend to.

I should like to reach a vote on this subject, because the basic issue is reaching a vote. It is not a question as to how Senators will vote. I do not believe anyone should tell any Member of Congress—any party leader or President or anyone else—how he should vote. No one should attempt to tell Congress how it should vote on a particular question. We should listen to others with respect for their office and their experience, to the extent that office and experience entitled them to be heard. However, the issue is whether we shall vote, whether we shall be permitted to vote. The time has come when we should put an end to our suffering. We have suffered too long on this matter. It is inconceivable that one man or a dozen men should be permitted to stop us from voting. The time has come for us to vote on the question.

I challenge Senators who are raising this issue now as to why they are afraid to let the Senate vote. If they have the votes against us, let them make a motion to table. That vote can come in less than five minutes. Do they not want people to know that they are opposing this proposal? Are they trying to do this under cover? If so, it is time for the cover to be stripped off. It is time for us to place the responsibility upon a little group of willful men who for their own purposes have far too long emasculated the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the efforts to bring about a careful study of the rules and procedures of the Senate will be frustrated by the continued strife over rule XXII of the Senate Rules.

I am not unmindful of the importance that rule XXII, its preservation for one group, its abolishment for another, or its modification for still another, plays in the minds of many Senators in expediting the Senate's business.

However, Mr. President, you and I are practical men. We have been here for a number of years, and we know that if rule XXII is included in any reorganization proposal and opened up for study and recommendation, it will be difficult, if not completely impossible, to establish a joint House and Senate study commission to try to bring about a reformation of many of the rules of the Senate and of the House.

A study, whether it continues for 1 month or 12 months or 36 months, will not add any information to the Senate concerning the meaning of rule XXII. There are basic and clearly defined difficulties which surround its modification or its repeal.

Therefore, I came to the conclusion long ago that if we intend to achieve anything in the immediate future in an age in which things move fast and require the very best machinery for Congress that is possible, it is long past time to appoint a committee of the House and the Senate, equally divided between the two parties, which could conduct hearings and take testimony from people from outside the Congress, and also from our own Members, and to consider the many proposals that have been made, numbering in the hundreds, and to get on with improving as much as we possibly can our obsolete and creaking machinery.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator. I compliment him on his continuing interest and his efforts, which exceed those of any other Member of the Senate, to achieve a degree of reorganization of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Oklahoma. The Senator is far too wise an individual to want to throw the baby out with the bath water. I point out that before the subcommittee, before the full committee, and now again on the floor, I offered to exclude rule XXII of the Senate from the jurisdiction of the committee that I ask to have appointed. If my friend from Oklahoma would like to propose that I modify the amendment submitted jointly by the Senator from New Jersey and myself, I am sure that we shall be happy to exclude rule XXII from the jurisdiction of the proposed committee.

However, I again point out that there is a great deal of "baby" left in the amendment which would be thrown out with the bath water if the amendment were defeated.

There are a great many other rules, other than rule XXII, in both Houses.

There are innumerable procedures which have nothing to do with rule XXII. There is an incredible number of practices and precedents in each House which have nothing to do with rule XXII. There are many other matters involving consideration of any number of matters on the floor of each House which have nothing whatever to do with rule XXII.

Therefore, if my friend from Oklahoma, whom I honor and respect as the survivor of the two giants who pressed through the Houses of Congress the Reorganization Act of 1946, will join with me in excluding rule XXII from the amendment, I shall be only too happy to praise him for this action. However, let us not throw the baby out with the bath water.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am unable to discern just where the offense would lie that would frustrate early consideration, in a harmonious and united manner, of an effort to try to move forward with some improvement in the machinery that we now have.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is identically the rule which Senator La Follette—God rest his soul, because he was a great partner and a great man to work with—accepted as a part of the authorizing legislation when the committee was established in 1945.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I point out that in the Senate rule book, which I hold in my hand, there are some 40 standing rules, among which, I am sure my friend will agree, there are many which require careful scrutiny and possible amendment, change, or repeal. I hold in my hand the book on Senate procedure, written by our two Parliamentarians, which contains approximately 650 pages. No doubt many of the procedures listed in it should be scrutinized. I suggest to my friend in all candor that it may well have been the reason why the Reorganization Act of 1946, of which he was the very distinguished cosponsor, did not remedy many of the deficiencies from which we now suffer is that there were excluded matters which 30 Senators thought important enough to cosponsor in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1. I appeal to my friend to join me in amending our amendment so as to exclude rule XXII, because I do not care a whit about a further investigation of rule XXII. We all know about that. If we do not know now the report of an investigating committee will rot tell us how we should act in that regard.

But I say again that I offered, three times, to exclude rule XXII. My offers were rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry I was unable to be present during the earlier period of debate, because I was serving on an appropriations conference committee with the House.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has not missed much. All he missed was a speech by me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I always find speeches by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey instructive and helpful.

For whatever the experience is worth, I should say that the value placed upon the precedents of the House, which occupy perhaps a 10-foot shelf, at least, going far back, carefully recorded, is very high in that body. I would doubt seriously whether the Members of the House would be willing to go into a study of those precedents.

I would hope that in the later discussion, or even now—and I understand the debate will continue tomorrow—the Senator from Pennsylvania, on the basis of all his study—and he has done a great part of it—would give us some examples of some of the precedents that we should study, if an investigation of the machinery of the Senate were to occur.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am writing a book which will be published in May of 1964, and will be entitled either "Congress, the Sapless Branch," or "Congress, the Withered Branch." I would not want to detract from the potential sales of that book by revealing its complete contents on the floor of the Senate this evening. However, in view of the Senator's suggestion, I shall be happy at an appropriate time tomorrow to list a few of the many matters which might be considered under the general subject—excluding rule XXII—of the rules, procedures, practices, and floor actions of both Houses.

I should like to pose this question to the Senator from Oklahoma: There may be some merit in his view that the House would revolt against Members of the Senate examining into House practices. I do not know whether that would be true or not. I would welcome having House Members examine into Senate practices. I think we need an outside and objective look at some of the practices that are occurring in the Senate, practices that we are unwilling to subject to the scrutiny of anybody except those of us who live by those rules.

How would the Senator from Oklahoma propose that we in the Senate ever begin to take a look at these problems, which the Committee on Rules and Administration has excluded by striking out the provisions of the original resolution? The Senator knows full well that the standing Subcommittee on Rules consists of three able and extremely busy Senators: our beloved President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN], who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], who serves on four major legislative committees and is up for reelection next year; and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is one of the senior ranking Republicans on major committees, and is quite busy, too.

It has been most difficult to obtain an adequate hearing on these many complex matters before that small subcommittee. Would the Senator from Oklahoma be willing to join me in proposing a Senate resolution which would create an ad hoc special committee to investigate the subject of rules, procedures, precedents, and floor actions—excluding rule XXII—and to report back to the Senate before the end of 1964?

Mr. MONRONEY. Based on experience, I should say that we would lose half the drive, half the Nation's interest, and probably half the academic participation in reorganization if the investigation were confined to one body only. The previous limitation was not too difficult, in that each House, as the Constitution provides, shall be the sole judge of its own rules.

To secure the passage of the reorganization bill, it had to be restated that it would be passed with the understanding that the Senate rules were applicable solely to the Senate and were concerned only with the Senate, and that the House rules were of concern only to the House.

It is not incumbent upon the Senate to attempt to improve the procedures and perhaps to make more democratic the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, a committee which has long been the target of many of those who would seek reform. That was sought to be done earlier, in the discussions preceding the Reorganization Act. Likewise, rule XXII and the filibuster have long been understood.

Embodied in the Senate rules of long standing are many precedents and practices. I have never recognized them as defeating the will of Congress unnecessarily, except in the case of rule XXII, which I must say can defeat the will of the majority. But that is well understood. It takes an even greater number than a mere majority of those who advocate change to close off debate in the Senate, under cloture.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator does not believe that the creation of a special Senate investigating committee would enlist the interest of the country to an extent sufficient to make that a desirable thing to do?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would much prefer—and I believe it would be attainable—to have, again, a joint study made of the two bodies, because Congress in the public mind embodies both the Senate and the House. One of the important things that needs to be studied, and upon which the comment of scholars, political scientists, and others would be useful, is the relationship between the two Houses. I see it deteriorating. I see the need for a revival of the cooperation that for so long held these two great bodies together. I would feel that in a Reorganization Act problems could be studied that would help to bring about a better relationship between the two bodies. Perhaps, for example, we could reach an understanding as to how to mediate a tieup such as occurred in connection with the appropriation bills last year. That happened because there was no formal body that could try to solve such problems.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and me should not be adopted, after a fair and full debate and an open vote on the floor, obtained without any filibuster to stop it, I quite agree, as the Senator from New Jersey already has agreed, that there is enough remaining merit in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 to make it worthwhile debating. Two-thirds of the value of the resolution would be eliminated if the amendment were not adopted; but there would be a remaining one-third as to which it would be most useful to have joint exploration. That one-third has been ably elucidated in the remarks just made by the Senator from Oklahoma.

But let me ask the Senator a question: It occurs to me that he has placed himself in this position. He will, of course, tell me if I am in error. Either he thinks there is no need to investigate the rules, procedures, practices, and floor actions of both Houses—exclusive of rule XXII—or, in the alternative, he despairs of having a body appointed to examine into the situation. Therefore, he is content to live for the rest of his senatorial life under the present obsolete, archaic, quite impractical rules, practices, procedures, and floor actions, other than rule XXII.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am, and always have been, desirous of changing the rules whenever necessary or whenever possible or achievable. It is important to try to act now to achieve that which can be gained. That is why I spoke only 2 days ago in this Chamber to urge the adoption of the Pastore resolution on a rule of germaneness, and why I urged the adoption of the Church resolution which would grant permission for committees to meet while the Senate is in session during the morning hour. These are minor problems.

But reorganization, if it is to be successful, will have to embody some changes, probably numbering 20, 30, or 40. Individually, they may be minute and unimportant to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who seeks bigger game. But if we can begin to improve our machinery, if we can work together to improve our machinery, if in harmony we can ameliorate the divisions that occur on the floor of the Senate, we shall be moving at least into an area of better understanding and more satisfactory performance. Unfamiliar as I am with the goal the Senator seeks in the additional areas he is willing to open up, but which are violently objected to by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], I am not prepared tonight to comment on that matter. But I am persuaded—as I was at the time when the great Senator La Follette, an outstanding leader, persuaded the committee in 1945 to accept this amendment, and it was accepted as a part of the Reorganization Act, on which we worked for a full year—that the Legislative Reorganization Act was full of many deficiencies. I was unsuccessful in having many of my brain children included; many of them were never adopted in the course of the passage of that Reorganization Act, even though today they stand in the Senate rules.

However, I believe we should do now what we can and should leave to another day what we cannot achieve at the present time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree that Senator La Follette and the Senator from Oklahoma, then a Member of the House, had to agree to such amendments to the original scope of the 1945-46 reorganization to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred. In my opinion the reason why they had to accept them—although I was not a Member of the Congress at that time, and my opinion may not be correct—was that the same establishment which today is filibustering against the present attempt to change the rule, advised them that it would filibuster at that time if a broader attempt were made to change the existing rules, practices, and procedures of the two Houses. Therefore, perhaps in their wisdom, Senator La Follette and the Senator from Oklahoma, then a Member of the House, yielded to that heavy pressure, and so restricted the resolution under which they operated that they did not make many changes in the rules, although I realize that they recommended that a number of changes be made in the rules of both bodies, and many of those recommended changes were made.

Let me say that instead of 40 or 50 proposed changes being actually recommended, as the Senator from Oklahoma has recommended, there would be 140 or 160, in my opinion, if the Senate—acting alone, if you will, and excluding rule XXII, if you will—were, either jointly with the House or acting on its own, to make the comprehensive and careful investigation of its rules, practices, procedures, and floor action which the Senator from New Jersey contemplated in connection with his resolution, which called for the appointment of a commission, including outside experts, to look into these matters.

Again I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that unless we can include in the joint resolution authority to look into those matters—excluding rule XXII and, if the Senator from Oklahoma desires it, we can restrict the Senate Members to the extent of directing them not to look into the House practices and procedures, and we can restrict the House Members to the extent of directing them not to look into the Senate practices and procedures, and in that way an objection based upon having the Members of one body study the rules of the other body can be avoided—we will never make that study, and certainly it will never be made if it is to be made only by the three busy members of the committee, for we cannot expect them to devote to the study all the time that it will require.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly I have endorsed the Senator's proposal for a study of such matters by a bipartisan group. In the previous action, we studied some of them for a year. We heard from the leaders in Government and others and we tried to reach a consensus. The present resolution, however, prohibits an investigation of the Senate's rules, procedures, precedents, and practices. When all is said and done, the important thing is to achieve something. On the other hand, if all that was first proposed were to be included, no such reform would be achieved. Certainly it is not easy to have such a measure passed. These practices have rather deep roots, and it is difficult to change them. Similarly, it was difficult to abolish half of the existing committees of both Houses, inasmuch as many Senators and many Members of the House of Representatives had been in the custom of informing their constituents that membership on the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers was most important, or that membership on the Committee on Post Roads was most important, or that membership on one of the three Veterans Committees which then existed in the House of Representatives was most important. So it was most difficult to eliminate any of the committees.

However, it is clear that today we need to limit the number of major committees on which a Member may serve. It is necessary that there be such a limitation, in order that the Members may make proper use of their available time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would not that be an action changing the Senate rules? Why should we let the House look into that matter, if the Senator's argument is a correct one—although he knows that I differ with him as to that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Of course the Senator knows that the Senate will not permit the House to dictate the Senate rules, any more than the House would permit the Senate to dictate the House rules. But it is worthwhile for each group to participate in the study.

Mr. CLARK. Then why not exclude the Case-Clark amendment as to rule XXII?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I do not exclude consideration of the idea that we might amend the amendment, but I think we should not consider amendments of any sort at this time, when only two or three Members of the Senate are on the floor. Instead, we should wait until there is a full attendance of Senators on the floor. All the Senators who now are on the floor are interested in making progress in what we regard as the right direction; but at this time we should not consider ourselves a little group trying to bargain with the other side.

The question now is whether the Senate will take up the resolution which would authorize a study of the procedures, practices, and so forth, of the two Houses of Congress. I think the time to consider any amendment or limitation on this is not now, but when there is debate on the floor of the Senate with a rather large attendance of Senators. The right to vote is what is of concern.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is entirely correct, and I support everything he has said.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate that very much, and I also appreciate very much the help we have received and the help we will receive from the Senator from Oklahoma, who has been a leader in connection with this matter.

But I think all of us must recognize that various parts of the country face various problems, and we must not proceed on the basis of bargaining ahead of time in connection with amendments, thus limiting what the Senate might do when the proposed legislation is considered by the Senate as a whole.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly the final proof of the pudding is in the eating; and the final question in regard to such a study is what it will achieve in terms of legislation enacted. For 50 years before the enactment of the 1947 act there had been practically no reorganization or consolidation of congressional committees. Many changes or reforms were clearly needed. To try to proceed as a united body, in the House, and to try to have the Senate proceed, in turn, as a united body, and to try to bring the two bodies to concur and to reach a consensus will represent progress to a considerable degree. Of course, we will not attain all we want, because it is impossible to get human beings to agree at any one time on so large a number of proposed changes. It will be difficult; but certainly we can move ahead to some extent both this year and next year.

I ask Senators to believe me when I say, judging from experience, that it will require a strong consensus to achieve any worthwhile changes at all. If we do not proceed on that basis in these public forums, we might as well not engage in the study.

I wish to see afforded to whatever committee undertakes the study an opportunity, a climate, and a list of goals that could be reached, as Senator La Follette achieved in 1947 in the Senate, and which was achieved to a degree in the House. Those recommendations led to a unanimity of opinion that they were important enough to be enacted into the structure of the House and the Senate.

We know that all people will not agree on the recommendations of any committee, regardless of its composition—whether the committee be composed of Senators and Representatives or experts and executives as well as Senators and Representatives, as proposed by the Case measure—because anything dealing with human beings often involves a wide difference of opinion.

I personally prefer the plan under which congressional Members would hear the testimony of expert witnesses rather than the proposal that Senators and Representatives should be a part of a commission to advise on how our affairs should be conducted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? I promise that it will be the last time I shall ask him to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Why does the Senator object to voting on the question of taking up Senate Concurrent Resolution 1?

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not object to voting on that question. I shall probably vote to consider Senate Concurrence Resolution 1. I have applauded the Senator from Pennsylvania. I appeared before the committee to testify in behalf of the proposed concurrent resolution. But, as a practical person, I urge and suggest that the amendment that was accepted by Senator La Follette be added so that we could all go into the study united, and, by doing so, achieve the possible.

I have always felt that to fail to proceed in that manner would start us off without the hope of success to which such a study should be entitled to look forward to after the committee performs its long, hard chores, listening to hundreds of witnesses and then trying to distill out of the volumes of testimony a program that experienced and understanding men in both bodies could accept as being a somewhat better blueprint than the jerry-built system that we now have or that we have had in the past.

So the question is one of practicality. If we wish to start with a spirit of reform that will carry forward the sentiment in this body and, I hope, in the House, we should move onward without dispute at this time. But if we wish to fight every inch of the way in this body, we might well be divided; and then the hope of reform that we might have as we start will be lost in the long pull.

I wished to interject my feelings in the debate because I have never seen a time when improvement in our machinery has been more sorely needed to enable us to keep up with the extra tasks that are upon us. We have seen a demonstration of breakdown and failure. It has been more glaring than we have had previously in many respects. I believe that it is time to go on with the job; and that in trying to get on with the job we should have some opportunity, as a result of our planning and attitudes, to bring about perhaps not the complete job of renovation and reconstruction, but at least a job of which we will be proud, for we will know that we shall be a few steps better off than we were when we started.

I thank my distinguished friend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his great contribution on this whole problem and for the illuminating questions which he has asked. I am sorry that we differ on the method of approach. I wish to see something done. I have been down this lonely path before. I hope that the next time we shall have the support of a sufficient number of Senators to bring about approval of the action of the special committee in respect to the reforms that will have been testified to, considered, and recommended by such a committee such as the one which the Senator has proposed. It would not have the full range that the Senator seeks, but enough range to do the considerable job that is long past due.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the hour is growing late, and I shall not detain the Senate for any length of time.

First, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] has made remarks indicating that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] was doing something out of the ordinary when he objected to a unanimous-consent request.

It is entirely in order for any Senator, at any time, to object to any unanimous-consent request. I have heard the Senator from Pennsylvania object many times. The purpose of Senate procedure is to give every Senator the authority, power, dignity, and ability to represent his State and his constituents.

Any time a Senator believes a unanimous-consent request does not have merit, he is derelict in the performance of his duty if he does not object. I assume that every Senator has, on occasion, made objection to a unanimous-consent request.

It has been intimated that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], has launched a filibuster. If so, it is probably the shortest filibuster in the history of the Republic, because all the senior Senator from Georgia said about the measure was two words: "I object."

We frequently hear discussion about southern Senators launching a filibuster, but this is the first time in slightly less than the 7 years that I have been a Member of the Senate that the senior Senator from Georgia has been accused of conducting a filibuster with merely two words.

Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which the majority leader has requested unanimous consent to make the pending business of the Senate; but I do seriously object to the amendment that has been proposed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

The objectionable part of the amendment that they propose to offer is "the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House of the Congress, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

Be it remembered that Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration would establish "a joint committee on the organization of Congress (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) and be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives."

Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the constitution of the committee proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 to make the study that the Committee on Rules and Administration requested and authorized the committee to make.

However, I do vigorously object to Members of the House of Representatives making recommendations and studying "the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents of either House of the Congress, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

**My objection is based on the Constitution of the United States of America. I read:**

> **Article I, section 5, paragraph 2: Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.**

**Mr. President, that language is written in plain English. It does not require much education to understand that provision of the Constitution of the United States. It merely states that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. That means that the Senate may determine its rules and the House of Representatives may determine its rules.**

**The Constitution does not authorize the House of Representatives to study and determine the rules of the Senate. It does not authorize the Senate to study and determine the rules of the House. The rules of the two bodies are different—and rightly so.**

**The Senate is a forum of States, composed of two Senators from each of the 50 sovereign States, who are sent to Washington to consider matters for the welfare of our country.**

**Every State has two Senators, regardless of geographical size and regardless of population.**

**In the House of Representatives, representation is based on population, and Representatives do not represent the sovereignty of entire States.**

**The rules of the two bodies are vastly different, and properly so. The precedents of the two bodies are vastly different, and properly so.**

**What Member of the House of Representatives would be familiar with the precedents of the Senate? I have been a Member of this body for 7 years, and it is still necessary that I confer with the Parliamentarian almost daily to determine what are the precedents of the Senate. Certainly a Member of the House of Representatives could shed no light on our precedents. Certainly Members of the Senate could shed no light on the precedents of the House.**

**The senior Senator from Oklahoma stated a moment ago that the precedents of the House of Representatives occupy 10 feet of shelf space. Who in the Senate knows what are those precedents?**

**The Constitution says we have no right to determine those precedents. I share that view.**

**I am willing to permit the House to have its precedents and its rules of procedure. I insist that the Senate, acting in accordance with constitutional authority, have the same right.**

**If the rules of the Senate need to be changed, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That committee has original jurisdiction. The Senator can submit resolutions to change the rules of the Senate. He should not come to the Senate to claim that we are so derelict and bereft of reason and unable to handle our own business that we ought to create a joint commission, with Members of the House of Representatives involved, to tell us what to do.**

**The Senate is not yet ready for the appointment of a guardian, either outside the Senate or from Members of the House of Representatives.**

**Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?**

**Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.**

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Of course, I do not have to state that, although I greatly respect the Senator's views and his right to express them, I disagree with them.

That is not my point in rising. My point in rising is to say that, granted there may be faults in the resolution, and there may be objections to an amendment to it to be proposed, we cannot offer such an amendment until there is some resolution before the Senate to which to offer the amendment.

Why would that not be the proper time to make an objection, rather than now, before the resolution is before the Senate? Why do Senators fight against bringing a resolution before the Senate, where it can be dealt with properly, where amendments can be offered and printed, so that Senators may discuss the subject? Why should Senators prevent the measure from coming before the Senate for consideration?

Mr. TALMADGE. Because I am opposed to the Senate abdicating its constitutional responsibility to make its own rules. That is why.

Mr. CASE. I understand the Senator's position. The Senator has made it very clear and stated it with eloquence and force. I disagree with it completely, but nevertheless the Senator has stated it well.

Still, why should that not be done before the Senate as a whole, rather than on the question of bringing up a measure for consideration?

Mr. TALMADGE. I have answered the Senator's question. I have pointed out the constitutional requirement that the Senate make its own rules.

I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, which would provide for appointing Members outside the Senate to make recommendations to change our rules. I am equally opposed to the House of Representatives being brought into the picture, to try to determine our rules.

Mr. CASE. I do not believe the constitutional argument in any way applies, and therefore I do not believe that the argument is any good at this point, however good it may be later. I would disagree at any point with it.

We are not seeking to give anybody else power to make our rules. We are only asking for a body, to consist half of Members of the Senate and half of Members of the House, to study the subject, to comment upon the existing situation, and to recommend changes. Certainly there is nothing unconstitutional in asking for a select group to do that task.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator formerly sat as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator had the power at that time to make recommendations.

The cosponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is now a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That is the appropriate body in which to originate such recommendations.

This particular amendment was offered in the Committee on Rules and Administration and was rejected in the committee. Now the Senator seeks to bring it before the Senate.

Mr. CASE. What is to be brought before the Senate is not the Clark-Case-Keating amendment, though that may be offered later. We intend to offer it. What is to be brought before the Senate is the concurrent resolution recommended unanimously, with one exception, by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection to what the Committee on Rules and Administration is recommending. What I am opposed to is what the Committee on Rules and Administration rejected.

Mr. CASE. I suggest, respectfully, that what the Senator and the little group who join him seek to do is to shackle the Senate from even considering the matter, before it is brought before the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. The amendment was considered in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and rejected. I believe it would be rejected by the Senate.

That is all the Senator from Georgia objects to.

Mr. CASE. Nobody would object to that. Let us have the concurrent resolution brought before the Senate so that the amendment can be voted up or down. It can be done that way in 5 minutes or less, on a motion to table, if that is the desire of the leadership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to my good friend that he is objecting now not to the Clark-Case-Keating amendment, but to a motion to consider a concurrent resolution.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am speaking only because the Senator has signified his intention to offer the amendment. I am opposed to it. The Committee on Rules and Administration is also opposed to it. I hope the Senate will be opposed to it.

I have no objection whatever to the Senate's passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, but I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, which was rejected by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is also opposed, I believe he will have to admit, to permitting the Senate to vote on the merits of my amendment, because he is presently filibustering against a motion to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator has spoken at much greater length tonight than has the junior Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has accused my colleague of filibustering because he uttered two words. The Senator from Pennsylvania has accused the the junior Senator from Georgia of filibustering because he has spoken for 5 minutes.

I listened to the Senator from Pennsylvania speak for an hour, and I did not accuse him of filibustering.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to tell the Senator off the floor—and, if he presses me, on the floor—the basis for my comment that the Senator and his colleague from Georgia were engaged in a filibuster.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection to listening to the Senator. I merely state the facts. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that my colleague was filibustering. I was in the Chamber. I heard the senior Senator from Georgia. He uttered two words.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the question be put.

## RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, December 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 5, 1963:

### Department of Justice

Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

George I. Cline, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years.

---

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Thanks to the Television and Radio Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of our Members have already expressed their gratitude and thanks for the great sacrifices made by the employees of the television and radio industry through almost 4 days following the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I, too, would like to express my appreciation to the television and radio industry for their splendid achievements in presenting to the American people and people around the world, the saga of all the events following this great international tragedy.

The industry and its employees spared nothing in time, effort, money, and imagination to present these historic events to millions of people; every ounce of energy, every available personality and employee, every known engineering device, every piece of available equipment, was utilized to bring to a saddened world the picture and word story of the calamity of the assassination of the President of the United States.

As my colleagues know, following the slaying of President Kennedy, the leaders of all the networks and major television and radio stations in our country decreed that all commercials and regular programs would be canceled until after the solemn ceremonies were completed a week ago Monday. As a result of this unparalleled and unprecedented coverage of the death of our late President, the industry lost in revenues an estimated total of $28,700,000. This is a tremendous sum of money, and represents a splendid example of patriotism and unselfish devotion to the people of our country and to our departed leader.

I know that I speak for all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the gratitude of the Congress is sincerely given to the television and radio industry, to all of its reporters and writers, to its engineers and cameramen, to its producers and couriers, and to its officials, for a job well done—done truly in the American way and in the American spirit.

## In Memoriam—John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, joining in tribute with thousands of other houses of worship throughout our Nation to pay honor to the memory of our late beloved President, the Bialyskoter Synagogue in New York City's lower East Side, held a memorial meeting on Sunday, December 1, 1963. The meeting was attended by an overflow crowd, not alone of the Jewish faith, for the Bialystoker Synagogue is one of the oldest orthodox Jewish synagogues in New York City whose services are performed by the truly orthodox patriarchs of the Hebrew religion, but by other residents of the area representing all races and religions. Within these hallowed halls there was but one desire—to pay homage to a man beloved by all and to offer prayers for his soul.

It was my privilege to be one of the speakers at this meeting, not only as a Representative to the Congress for the area, but as a resident of the area and a member of the congregation of the Bialystoker Synagogue.

At the request of the membership, I am taking the liberty of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement which was greeted with favor by those assembled:

> The bells have tolled in the canyons of Wall Street; over the factories in Detroit; schools and universities across the land and on our ships at sea or wherever news could travel; across Washington's broad avenues; and in thousands of towns and villages throughout the United States—the bells have tolled a great President has died.
>
> At the American Embassy in Bogotá, Colombia, a lone marine walks across the lawn, salutes the flag and lowers it to half mast. Wherever the American flag flies throughout the world, whether under the searing sun or a soft and gentle rain, the flag flies at half mast. A great American President has died.
>
> At U.S. bases throughout the world, from Saigon, South Korea to London, England, cannons boom out every half hour, from dawn to dusk, in a tattoo of grief. A great President has died.
>
> It was the kind of a feeling one can hardly describe—people gathered in knots on street corners, an air of disbelief in their faces, their heads shaking, muttering to themselves, "It's not possible."
>
> People who seldom enter the church or synagogue are suddenly drawn into their holy walls: some pray, some cry, some merely sit or kneel in silence. A great President has died.
>
> On a street corner, a blind Negro woman plucks at her guitar, half singing, half weeping a funeral dirge—"He promised never to leave me" she sang. An Italian barber on the lower East Side said what was in his mind in two words, "I cry." A woman on Times Square said them in another way, "My God!" Jacqueline Kennedy said them as her husband fell forward, dying, "Oh, no!" A Roman Catholic priest said them after administering the last rites to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, "He is dead." A great President has died.
>
> In the U.S. Senate, the chaplain says, "We gaze at a vacant place in the sky, as our President falls like a giant cedar."
>
> On the morning that Lincoln died, James A. Garfield then a Representative in Congress who was to die by assassination himself 16 years later, said, "God reigns and the Government in Washington still lives." Mortal man goes on to his reward, but our institutions remain. A great President has died.
>
> John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, has walked through the valley of the shadow of death yet our Government continues—though a great President has died.
>
> No one believed that it really happened, but it did. A young, vigorous, aggressive, scholarly President had been assassinated. The bullet that struck down John Fitzgerald

Kennedy, struck at the hearts and minds of all the people, in this country and throughout the world; a world that had learned to admire and respect this young man who in a few short years had left his mark on it.

When he died we, all of us, died a little bit and I died just a little bit more because John Fitzgerald Kennedy had befriended me. I recall visiting him at the White House. He was a man who could disagree without being vindictive. He was young, vigorous, aggressive, and scholarly. He knew the needs of his country and fought to fulfill that need.

He was wedded to peace and vigorously sought this greatest of all goals of mankind. He believed that the extension of the enjoyment of living was a goal that could and should be achieved not alone by the wealthy, but also by the humble and the poor. He was a great man, a good man, a humble man.

Why must the life of a young man, moved only by high motives, impelled by understanding and vision, be brought to an untimely end with his labors unfinished? And why, in a free land, untouched by the heel of a dictator, where the humblest citizen may freely utter his grievances, must that life be cut short by an evil instrument moved by malice, frustration, and hate? This is the incredible thing which leaves us bewildered.

Some months ago, when I learned that Egypt had hired Nazi scientists for the purpose of building up an arsenal of deadly weapons, of terrible, destructive powers; to build missiles and submarines, I became alarmed. I knew that they could be meant for only one nation—Israel.

I wrote to the State Department complaining that by our assistance we were enabling Mr. Nasser to prepare for war against Israel; that he had sworn to drive Israel into the sea. I asked the State Department to make representations to both the German Government to recall its scientists and to the United Arab Republic to desist from spending its needed moneys for these devilish purposes.

The State Department replied saying that they would not interfere in the internal affairs of another country; that if the German scientists were withdrawn or removed, Russian scientists would take their place. Being unhappy on the receipt of this reply, I then wrote directly to President Kennedy. I received a reply in letter form from the White House and 3 days later the President publicly announced at his press conference in Washington, "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors" * * * "We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Near East which, would, of course, destroy the independence of the people."

President Kennedy was the first President of the United States to sell defensive military armaments to Israel. This was a change from the policy set down by the previous administration—not to incur the displeasure of the Arabs by selling Israel arms. At the direction of President Kennedy, Hawk missiles are being sold to Israel. These defensive weapons are the latest word in destroying invading aircraft.

And he went further. He invited members of the Israeli air force to come to this country so that they could learn to operate these Hawk missiles.

This is the man whose passing we mourn. This is the man who was cut down as the result of the hatred of a diseased mind; hatred that has been engendered of late in this country both from the extreme right and the extreme left. What a waste has been committed upon the body politic.

Let me also say that our hearts go out to Mrs. John Kennedy and her two children, Caroline and John, Jr., who have sustained such a great loss.

Before I close, I want to say a word about the man who has now become the 36th President of these United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson. In 1957, when President Eisenhower threatened Israel with punitive sanctions unless she withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula, Mr. Johnson was then the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He told President Eisenhower that the Senate would not approve economic sanctions against Israel. He called for a just peace and deplored the attempted coercion of Israel as "a method of settlement."

As a Senator, President Johnson fought to obtain for Israel a fair share of economic aid, noting that Israel was forced to divert its own resources for defensive arms against the Russian arms that were flowing into Egypt. I am confident that President Johnson will continue the policies of the Kennedy administration toward Israel.

A great President has died. Let us pray that our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the loftiest symbol of the American way of life, shall not have died in vain; that by our own treatment of others, by our own considerate treatment of our neighbors, we shall build a living memorial to his desire for the equality of man. And that with his passing, he shall be a pleader for the cause of mankind, and let us also pray that the countenance of the Almighty may shine upon our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and lead him along the path of righteousness and good fortune.

---

## This Congress May Have Set a Record in Reducing Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think many of our news commentators and observers of the Washington scene today in criticizing Congress for its slow action disregard the fact that speedy action is not necessarily the test of good legislation.

When July 31 was established as an adjournment deadline by the Reorganization Act of 1947, as I recall, the budget was $38 million and the population of the United States was about 140 millions of people. Certainly a $98 billion budget and public services for 190 millions of people should require more time for Congressional scrutiny of programs and Government spending.

While Congress this year is setting a record for slow action on annual appropriations bills, it also may well establish an outstanding record for budget cutting.

In this connection, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce suggests that the net reduction on the 1964 budget will be a reduction from the original budget request of in excess of $5 billion—the largest total cut since 1953.

Some of us have anticipated this reduction will be more than $6 billion and since this would represent a saving of $129.96 for each family in America I think it might indicate to the taxpayers of America that there is some merit in proceeding slowly when spending other people's money.

---

## Sweeping Changes Needed in Procurement Division of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, another battle has been won in the fight to save taxpayers' dollars in the purchase of our defense equipment. This battle took 2 years and there is going to be some waste involved. But just as at the end of the rainbow there is a pot of gold, so there is a considerable amount that will be saved for the taxpayer when this radio set—the ARC–54—is bought by competitive bidding.

The Army has reluctantly agreed to buy half of its next year's requirements for the ARC–54 by competitive bidding. Just last week, it advertised a sole-source purchase of 853 of these sets from the sole-source developer. Its last price was about $6,000. When the next sole-source price is calculated, I intend to compare it to the competitive price due next year. Then we shall see how much could have been saved in the past, and we can calculate the savings of the present.

Mr. Speaker, the Army originally intended to keep purchase of this radio under the expensive sole-source shelter for at least all of fiscal year 1964. This was my conclusion after studying the case since September 1961.

However, on July 17, 1963, I made a speech on the floor of the House attacking the sole-source shelter that surrounded this radio. That speech can be found in the RECORD for July 17, 1963, on pages 12781–12784.

After making that speech, Mr. Speaker, I referred the case to the Comptroller General for a complete study. Here again, as in past cases, I hoped to prove that intelligent inquiry and hard work would establish that a competitive purchase should be undertaken, whereas superficial investigation by the Army only buttressed its contention that purchase must be by sole source.

On September 27, 1963, the Comptroller General reported to me in a 6-page letter, which showed the depth to which GAO went to get at the truth of the ARC–54 case.

The GAO report concluded:

> Every effort should be made to effect procurement of the radio sets (ARC 54) for the balance of the fiscal year 1964 on a competitive basis at the earliest possible date.

The GAO had upset the Army's sole source applecart and wrote the Secretary of the Army with its recommendations. Any Member is welcome to look at that letter in my office.

On October 7, 1963, I reported GAO's findings to the Members of the House, and that speech may be found on page 18897 of the RECORD for that day.

On October 22, 1963, the Comptroller General advised that the Army had agreed to split its purchase of the ARC 54 for fiscal year 1964, buying about half sole source and about half through competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, the last sole-source price for this radio was $6,000. The latest sole-source procurement, opened last week in Chicago, will probably be a little under that figure. However, when the competitive procurement for this radio is opened early next year, I predict a startling drop in price under past sole-sources prices.

That lower price will prove just how much money could have been saved for the taxpayer in the past had better planning, more efficient work, and a more protective attitude toward the taxpayers' dollar been in force in Army purchasing departments.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more reason why it is imperative that the purchasing machinery of the military be completely overhauled. Here is another instance in which the Army has been forced to allow competition to save tax dollars. How many more are there that have gone or will go undiscovered?

Sweeping changes are needed in procurement divisions of the military, and they are needed now. I have been able to show in the past how some errors have been admitted and corrected by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but progress is entirely too slow.

## General Statement on Need for Additional Authorizations To Make Loans for Various Rural Community Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, many of the small rural communities which have requested FHA assistance in developing or improving domestic water supplies have also needed the same type of assistance for sewerage. Expansion of business, attraction of small industry and often the basic health of the community are dependent upon better facilities for sewage treatment and disposal. In many instances where rural water systems have been installed, the availability of adequate supplies of pure water has resulted in increased use of water and the overloading of existing septic tanks and other makeshift sewage facilities.

The rapid expansion of suburban areas and rural residences into farm communities, together with the increased demand for modern living has resulted in a large increase in the use of septic tanks for waste disposal. Increased use of septic tanks where soil is inadequate for a proper disposal field is continuing. Approximately 14 percent of rural dwellers have sewage disposal systems available to them and about 56 percent use septic tanks for waste disposal, leaving around 30 percent of the rural facilities without either of these forms of sewage disposal facilities.

For many of these rural communities, there is now no adequate source of long-term credit. In addition to credit, most of them need advice and technical assistance in planning and operating their projects if they are to be successful.

The Farmers Home Administration has received many requests from interested farmer groups concerning the possibility of financing rural gas distribution systems. The increasing popularity of natural gas in many areas as fuel for irrigation-pump motors and the widespread use of gas in the same areas for heat and other domestic purposes makes it advisable to provide financing for these facilities. Private utilities are not interested in extending service to most rural areas, and no other financing is presently available to associations of farmers and rural residents for this purpose.

In areas where gas is available nearby, the needed improvements in rural homes and services to local industry can best be provided if gas is made available locally at economical rates.

There is a widespread need for community centers in rural areas. Provisions have already been made by Congress for the financing of water systems, and recreational facilities. However, these programs will result in a much greater degree of development for many rural communities, and as they develop, there will be certain other service facilities which will then be necessary, or at least highly desirable, for the well-being of the communities. These will include better fire-protection facilities, community halls, visiting clinics, libraries, auditoriums, and many other special-purpose improvements of this nature.

Other Federal programs have been established in recognition of the need for Federal assistance in the development of utilities and other community facilities. Similar authority should be provided the Farmers Home Administration so that grants could be made up to 50 percent of the total costs of projects serving low-income communities through the development of water supplies, waste disposal, fuel distribution systems, and rural community services such as auditoriums, clinics, community halls, fire-protection facilities, and libraries. Such grants would be available to rural nonprofit associations and to public bodies in those areas not eligible for such assistance from other existing programs.

## The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee received for the first time the final additional report of members of the Judiciary Committee on the civil rights bill, which bill has been before the Rules Committee 8 legislative days. The bill, introduced June 20, had been before the Judiciary Committee about 6 months and the new substitute bill finally reported has had no hearings before the Judiciary Committee or any other committee.

The civil rights bill is the most controversial and emotional bill that Congress has had to deal with in my recollection. It is one that requires sober reflection and careful consideration in a calmer atmosphere than exists at present.

However, I realize the great national interest that has been aroused on both sides of this controversy and it is my purpose and intent, with the approval of the majority of the Rules Committee, to hold hearings on this bill reasonably soon in January after the Congress reconvenes.

## Takoma Park Adopts a Sister City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

In June 1961 the Congress commended the sister city project of the people-to-people program as a major step forward in increasing good will and understanding in bringing the people of all nations together in the bond of mutual understanding, friendship, and cooperation.

Today more than 150 American cities representing every section of our country and every size of community, from New York City to Oakland, Nebr., with a population of only 1,600, have affiliated with sister cities in other nations.

In the November 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower writes of this program in an article titled "An Epidemic of Friendship." He states that—

> The sister city projects have a basic common denominator: A breaching of the age-old barriers of geography, language, race, history, and customs. As the dark breeds fear in children, so ignorance breeds suspicion in the people of this world. But now, in the middle of the 20th century, communications have been speeded and the flow of knowledge has grown from a trickle to a wide, steady stream.

I am pleased to report that the city of Takoma Park, Md., in my congressional district, has officially adopted the Sister City project by affiliating with the town of Jequie, in the State of Bahia, in Brazil, South America.

A permanent citizens' committee has been named to supervise and expand Takoma's Sister City affiliation with Jequie. This information is contained in the November 1963 issue of the Takoma Park City Services, the newsletter of the city of Takoma Park, Md.

The newsletter continues by giving information that formal affiliation with the Brazilian city took place last January when the Honorable Antonio Lomanto, Jr., then mayor of Jequie, and now Governor of the Province of Bahia, met in Takoma Park with Mayor George Miller, and officially exchanged town affiliation charters, uniting the two communities. The exchange concluded 3 years of negotiation between the city, the State Department, and the American Municipal Association.

The October 10 meeting was in effect the first formal organization of some 30 citizens who expressed strong support of the project.

One of the first problems facing the committee was finding a home for the Brazilian student who is expected to arrive in January. The student, Miss Arly Souza Britto, niece of Governor Lamanto, is expected to stay with Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Coffman, Takoma Park's public affairs director, and attend a local high school on an exchange basis. Because of time differentials, Takoma's student, upon selection, is expected to visit Jequie next June.

The individuals who have been named to head the new citizens' executive committee for the Sister City project are as follows: E. W. Tarr, chairman; W. H. McClenon, first vice chairman; Leslie Pitton, second vice chairman; Mrs. Esther Geib, secretary; and Mrs. Rhoda Ross, associate secretary.

In addition to this, the citizens' committee decided to name subcommittee chairmen in order to develop full exchange in communication with the citizens of Jequie. These citizens are as follows: Robert Chasm, community relations; John Postle, ham radio; H. Eugene Walker, education; Mrs. Ruth B. Pratt, fine arts; Mrs. Rita Robinson, library; Mrs. Fred Grabe, public affairs; Mrs. Barbara Thorn, student exchange; Mr. Herbert Smith, technical; Mrs. Hilda Rocco, translation; and W. H. McGlenon, organization.

Takoma's Sister City, Jequie, has a population of 51,000, is a county seat, and is located on the left bank of the Contas River, 120 miles southwest of Salvadore, capital of the Province of Bahia.

The State Department, in cooperating with the city's efforts, has continually emphasized that the success of the Sister City program is based upon grassroots communication, volunteer citizens activities, and the basic exchange of mutual interests through common communications. Takoma Park, Md., is achieving this through the establishment of this citizens committee and widespread community support.

The committee has reviewed the definition of a town affiliation, and they determined that the affiliation is mutually established between an American city and a city of another country of the free world, jointly affecting a program of practical communications on a people-to-people level. The purpose of the organization is twofold. First, to promote mutual understanding, respect, and friendship between the people of the sister cities, and to help create an international relationship which will ultimately replace differences with meetings in an atmosphere of cooperation and amity.

Throughout Maryland we find that there are five cities with Sister City projects. They are as follows: Frederick, Md., with Landau, Germany; Forest Heights with Villaviciosa, Philippines; Hagerstown with Wesel, Germany; Rockville with Pinneberg, Germany; and Takoma Park with Jequie, Brazil.

Mayor George M. Miller and the Takoma Park City Council are cooperating with the citizens committee in setting up arrangements for making this program a reality. The organization is also cooperating with the American Municipal Association.

This Sister City or town affiliation program is a dramatic movement which is vitally important in a tense world.

The Sister City project offers the means by which individuals in Takoma Park and all Maryland cities can learn from individuals in other nations. This willingness to learn on the part of our citizens of Maryland is significantly important today, and I wish to commend them here for extending the hand of friendship as neighbors and as partners to the people of Jequie.

---

## The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 5, 1963*

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it appears parliamentarily impossible to hold and conclude hearings, or to take final action, on the civil rights bill now before the Rules Committee until January, and in light of the fact an application for a rule was not filed by the Judiciary Committee until November 22, and the final report on the civil rights bill was not filed by the same committee until yesterday, which under the rules would prevent the holding of any hearings before tomorrow or Monday, the minority members of the Rules Committee accept at full face value Chairman Howard W. Smith's statement he will promptly schedule hearings on the civil rights bill for early January, to be continued until the committee has an opportunity to vote on the adoption of a rule to send the civil rights bill to the House floor.

It is believed the above results can and will be accomplished without undue delay, despite the fact that no hearings on the pending civil rights bill were held by the House Judiciary Committee or by any other committee of the House.

---

# SENATE

## Friday, December 6, 1963

(*Legislative day of Thursday, December 5, 1963*)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, strong to save, amid the shifting shadows of the temporal, give us clear and clean eyes to discern the shining truth of the eternal. Forgive us that in the heat of partisanship so often we have forgotten that above our selfish ambitions and our hollow pride lie unchangeable verities like granite peaks piercing the sky.

Facing days which tax all our resources, give us the untroubled calm which illuminates faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world, and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. And in a world which is a battlefield where truth and falsehood are locked in mortal combat, even as we face unnumbered foes, bar our own hearts from all corroding hatred; and as we fight the good fight, may our strength be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who declared, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 5, 1963, was dispensed with.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2220. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists (Rept. No. 748).

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as one of the cosponsors of Senate bill 2220, which has just been reported.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 6975. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida (Rept. No. 749).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 750).

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of October 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, OCTOBER 1963 AND SEPTEMBER 1963, AND PAY, SEPTEMBER 1963 AND AUGUST 1963

### NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal services shown in table I of this report are for the month of September 1963 and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of August 1963, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of October 1963 and are compared with the month of September 1963. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside the United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside the United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside the United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns. Table V is a separate report on foreign nationals who are not counted in tables I, II, III, and IV.)

### PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for October 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

| Total and major categories | Civilian personnel in executive branch | | | Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In October numbered— | In September numbered— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) | In September was— | In August was— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
| Total [1] | 2,494,522 | 2,492,170 | +2,352 | $1,276,294 | $1,341,472 | −$65,178 |
| Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense | 1,449,115 | 1,445,753 | +3,362 | 735,074 | 778,910 | −43,836 |
| Department of Defense | 1,045,407 | 1,046,417 | −1,010 | 541,220 | 562,562 | −21,342 |
| Inside the United States | 2,325,409 | 2,324,026 | +1,383 | | | |
| Outside the United States | 169,113 | 168,144 | +969 | | | |
| Industrial employment | 555,496 | 556,910 | −1,414 | | | |
| Foreign nationals | 159,940 | 160,605 | −665 | 28,371 | [2] 28,034 | +337 |

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1963, and comparison with September 1963, and pay for September 1963, and comparison with August 1963*

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | October | September | Increase | Decrease | September | August | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 107,453 | [1] 108,364 | | 911 | $53,199 | $59,054 | | $5,855 |
| Commerce | 31,069 | 31,175 | | 106 | 19,279 | 21,240 | | 1,961 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 81,682 | 81,491 | 191 | | 43,874 | 43,158 | $716 | |
| Interior | 69,613 | [3] 68,154 | 1,459 | | 37,108 | 39,619 | | 2,511 |
| Justice | 31,886 | 31,953 | | 67 | 20,631 | 21,366 | | 735 |
| Labor | 9,471 | 9,499 | | 28 | 5,697 | 6,079 | | 382 |
| Post Office | 590,042 | 587,754 | 2,288 | | 271,459 | 287,983 | | 16,524 |
| State [2] [3] | 42,867 | 42,517 | 350 | | 21,843 | 22,630 | | 787 |
| Treasury | 85,415 | 85,661 | | 246 | 48,942 | 52,137 | | 3,195 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 371 | 375 | | 4 | 258 | 260 | | 2 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 485 | 482 | 3 | | 421 | 447 | | 26 |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 56 | 47 | 9 | | 39 | 51 | | 12 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 73 | 74 | | 1 | 44 | 40 | 4 | |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council | 29 | 29 | | | 26 | 27 | | 1 |
| National Security Council | 43 | 42 | 1 | | 34 | 35 | | 1 |
| Office of Emergency Planning | 440 | 467 | | 27 | 370 | 392 | | 22 |
| Office of Science and Technology | 87 | 109 | | 22 | 45 | 34 | 11 | |
| Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations | 28 | 27 | 1 | | 23 | 21 | 2 | |
| President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation | 15 | 7 | 8 | | 5 | 7 | | 2 |
| President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing | 4 | 4 | | | 4 | 7 | | |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1963, and comparison with September 1963, and pay for September 1963, and comparison with August 1963*—Continued

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | October | September | Increase | Decrease | September | August | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | 25 | 32 | | 7 | $21 | $22 | | $1 |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 421 | 436 | | 15 | 80 | 94 | | 14 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 7,249 | 7,227 | 22 | | 5,347 | 5,566 | | 219 |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 622 | 616 | 6 | | 398 | 427 | | 29 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 860 | 859 | 1 | | 641 | 667 | | 26 |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,041 | 4,038 | 3 | | 2,474 | 2,583 | | 109 |
| Civil War Centennial Commission | 5 | 5 | | | 4 | 6 | | 2 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 6 | 6 | | | 5 | 5 | | |
| Commission on Civil Rights | 64 | 62 | 2 | | 49 | 58 | | 9 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 294 | 293 | 1 | | 209 | 211 | | 2 |
| Farm Credit Administration | 241 | 240 | 1 | | 171 | 183 | | 12 |
| Federal Aviation Agency | 45,820 | 46,157 | | 337 | 32,084 | 33,718 | | 1,634 |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 7 | 7 | | | 4 | 4 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,459 | 1,462 | | 3 | 1,002 | 1,073 | | 71 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,266 | 1,274 | | 8 | 844 | 850 | | 6 |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 1,232 | 1,234 | | 2 | 832 | 867 | | 35 |
| Federal Maritime Commission | 242 | 240 | 2 | | 179 | 189 | | 10 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 405 | 398 | 7 | | 338 | 358 | | 20 |
| Federal Power Commission | 1,149 | 1,154 | | 5 | 800 | 855 | | 55 |
| Federal Radiation Council | 4 | 4 | | | (4) | | | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 1,150 | 1,155 | | 5 | 800 | 868 | | 68 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 149 | 150 | | 1 | 78 | 86 | | 8 |
| General Accounting Office | 4,480 | 4,511 | | 31 | 2,920 | 3,093 | | 173 |
| General Services Administration | 33,270 | 32,993 | 277 | | 16,091 | 16,755 | | 664 |
| Government Printing Office | 7,291 | 7,244 | 47 | | 4,247 | 4,399 | | 152 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 14,107 | 14,117 | | 10 | 8,604 | 9,040 | | 436 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 21 | 21 | | | 21 | 21 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,408 | 2,411 | | 3 | 1,638 | 1,711 | | 73 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 29,971 | 29,963 | 8 | | 22,924 | 24,422 | | 1,498 |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 443 | 441 | 2 | | 199 | 208 | | 9 |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 60 | 59 | 1 | | 44 | 45 | | 1 |
| National Capital Transportation Agency | 63 | 65 | | 2 | 52 | 58 | | 6 |
| National Gallery of Art | 313 | 310 | 3 | | 138 | 140 | | 2 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,980 | 1,988 | | 8 | 1,377 | 1,455 | | 78 |
| National Mediation Board | 143 | 138 | 5 | | 102 | 94 | $8 | |
| National Science Foundation | 1,026 | 963 | 63 | | 660 | 687 | | 27 |
| Panama Canal | 15,123 | 14,970 | 153 | | 5,313 | 7,625 | | 2,312 |
| President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity | 57 | 57 | | | 38 | 41 | | 3 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 1,928 | 1,936 | | 8 | 1,059 | 1,126 | | 67 |
| Renegotiation Board | 217 | 220 | | 3 | 175 | 182 | | 7 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 164 | 163 | 1 | | 103 | 103 | | |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,366 | 1,359 | 7 | | 920 | 983 | | 63 |
| Selective Service System | 6,910 | 6,889 | 21 | | 2,154 | 2,268 | | 114 |
| Small Business Administration | 3,410 | 3,381 | 29 | | 2,152 | 2,246 | | 94 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 1,507 | 1,482 | 25 | | 765 | 851 | | 86 |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,083 | 1,073 | 10 | | 356 | 365 | | 9 |
| South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission | 10 | 11 | | 1 | 6 | 7 | | 1 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 25 | 25 | | | 20 | 20 | | |
| Tariff Commission | 276 | 275 | 1 | | 197 | 208 | | 11 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 154 | 156 | | 2 | 132 | 126 | 6 | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 17,266 | 17,788 | | 522 | 10,599 | 11,323 | | 724 |
| U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency | 165 | 151 | 14 | | 116 | 123 | | 7 |
| U.S. Information Agency | 12,005 | 11,999 | 6 | | 5,343 | 5,712 | | 369 |
| Veterans' Administration | 173,518 | 172,759 | 759 | | 76,779 | 80,068 | | 3,289 |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 513 | 553 | | 40 | 167 | 126 | 41 | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,449,115 | 1,445,753 | 5,787 | 2,425 | 735,074 | 778,910 | 788 | 44,624 |
| Net change, excluding Department of Defense | | | 3,362 | | | | 43,836 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 2,152 | 2,154 | | 2 | 2,010 | 1,511 | 499 | |
| Department of the Army | 374,252 | 374,791 | | 539 | 187,714 | 195,930 | | 8,216 |
| Department of the Navy | 339,996 | 340,919 | | 923 | 184,638 | 193,196 | | 8,558 |
| Department of the Air Force | 297,579 | 297,269 | 310 | | 150,870 | 155,524 | | 4,654 |
| Defense Atomic Support Agency | 1,983 | 1,996 | | 13 | 979 | 1,029 | | 50 |
| Defense Communications Agency | 652 | 626 | 26 | | 380 | 383 | | 3 |
| Defense Supply Agency | 25,518 | 25,422 | 96 | | 12,589 | 12,695 | | 106 |
| Office of Civil Defense | 1,057 | 1,050 | 7 | | 861 | 946 | | 85 |
| U.S. Court of Military Appeals | 39 | 39 | | | 33 | 34 | | 1 |
| Interdepartmental activities | 13 | 13 | | | 7 | 9 | | 2 |
| International military activities | 61 | 60 | 1 | | 41 | 42 | | 1 |
| Armed Forces information and education activities | 427 | 421 | 6 | | 205 | 220 | | 15 |
| Classified activities | 1,678 | 1,657 | 21 | | 893 | 1,043 | | 150 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,045,407 | 1,046,417 | 467 | 1,477 | 541,220 | 562,562 | 499 | 21,841 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 1,010 | | | | 21,342 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense [5] [6] | 2,494,522 | 2,492,170 | 6,254 | 3,902 | 1,276,294 | 1,341,472 | 1,287 | 66,465 |
| Net change, including Department of Defense | | | 2,352 | | | | 65,178 | |

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] October figure includes 17,012 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 17,054 in September and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The October figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the September figure includes 4,654.

[3] October figure includes 1,034 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,012 in September and their pay.

[4] Less than $500.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[6] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

| Agency | October | September | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture Department | 4,843 | 3,897 | +946 |
| Interior Department | 5,553 | 3,038 | +2,515 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 52 | 61 | −9 |
| Total | 10,448 | 6,996 | +3,452 |

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1963, and comparison with September 1963*

| Department or agency | October | September | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive Departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 106,103 | [1] 107,064 | ------- | 961 |
| Commerce | 30,408 | 30,521 | ------- | 113 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 81,030 | 80,843 | 187 | ------- |
| Interior | 69,018 | [1] 67,587 | 1,431 | ------- |
| Justice | 31,528 | 31,587 | ------- | 59 |
| Labor | 9,353 | 9,391 | ------- | 38 |
| Post Office | 588,534 | 586,252 | 2,282 | ------- |
| State [2,3] | 10,677 | 10,736 | ------- | 59 |
| Treasury | 84,796 | 85,048 | ------- | 252 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | |
| White House Office | 371 | 375 | ------- | 4 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 485 | 482 | 3 | ------- |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 56 | 57 | 9 | ------- |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 73 | 74 | ------- | 1 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council | 29 | 29 | ------- | ------- |
| National Security Council | 43 | 42 | 1 | ------- |
| Office of Emergency Planning | 440 | 467 | ------- | 27 |
| Office of Science and Technology | 87 | 109 | ------- | 22 |
| Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations | 28 | 27 | 1 | ------- |
| President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation | 15 | 7 | 8 | ------- |
| President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing | 4 | 4 | ------- | ------- |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | 25 | 32 | ------- | 7 |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 7 | 7 | ------- | ------- |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 7,217 | 7,194 | 23 | ------- |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 622 | 616 | 6 | ------- |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 859 | 858 | 1 | ------- |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,037 | 4,035 | 2 | ------- |
| Civil War Centennial Commission | 5 | 5 | ------- | ------- |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 6 | 6 | ------- | ------- |
| Commission on Civil Rights | 64 | 62 | 2 | ------- |
| Delaware River Basin Commission | 2 | 2 | ------- | ------- |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 294 | 293 | 1 | ------- |
| Farm Credit Administration | 241 | 240 | 1 | ------- |
| Federal Aviation Agency | 44,761 | 45,107 | ------- | 346 |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 7 | 7 | ------- | ------- |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,457 | 1,460 | ------- | 3 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,264 | 1,272 | ------- | 8 |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 1,232 | 1,234 | ------- | 2 |
| Federal Maritime Commission | 242 | 240 | 2 | ------- |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 405 | 398 | 7 | ------- |
| Federal Power Commission | 1,149 | 1,154 | ------- | 5 |
| Federal Radiation Council | 4 | 4 | ------- | ------- |
| Federal Trade Commission | 1,150 | 1,155 | ------- | 5 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 109 | 110 | ------- | 1 |
| General Accounting Office | 4,393 | 4,420 | ------- | 27 |
| General Services Administration | 33,246 | 32,970 | 276 | ------- |
| Government Printing Office | 7,291 | 7,244 | 47 | ------- |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 13,914 | 13,927 | ------- | 13 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 21 | 21 | ------- | ------- |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,408 | 2,411 | ------- | 3 |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 29,953 | 29,950 | 3 | ------- |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 443 | 441 | 2 | ------- |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 60 | 59 | 1 | ------- |
| National Capital Transportation Agency | 63 | 65 | ------- | 2 |
| National Gallery of Art | 313 | 310 | 3 | ------- |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,947 | 1,955 | ------- | 8 |
| National Mediation Board | 143 | 138 | 5 | ------- |
| National Science Foundation | 1,013 | 949 | 64 | ------- |
| Panama Canal | 167 | 170 | ------- | 3 |
| President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity | 57 | 57 | ------- | ------- |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 1,928 | 1,936 | ------- | 8 |
| Renegotiation Board | 217 | 220 | ------- | 3 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 164 | 163 | 1 | ------- |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,366 | 1,359 | 7 | ------- |
| Selective Service System | 6,761 | 6,740 | 21 | ------- |
| Small Business Administration | 3,351 | 3,324 | 27 | ------- |
| Smithsonian Institution | 1,490 | 1,466 | 24 | ------- |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,083 | 1,073 | 10 | ------- |
| South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission | 10 | 11 | ------- | 1 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 25 | 25 | ------- | ------- |
| Tariff Commission | 276 | 275 | 1 | ------- |
| Tax Court of the United States | 154 | 156 | ------- | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 17,265 | 17,788 | ------- | 523 |
| U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency | 165 | 151 | 14 | ------- |
| U.S. Information Agency | 3,396 | 3,378 | 18 | ------- |
| Veterans' Administration | 172,513 | 171,763 | 750 | ------- |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,383,833 | 1,381,098 | 5,241 | 2,506 |
| Net increase, excluding Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 2,735 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 2,101 | 2,101 | ------- | ------- |
| Department of the Army | 322,843 | 323,381 | ------- | 538 |
| Department of the Navy | 315,299 | 316,245 | ------- | 946 |
| Department of the Air Force | 269,962 | 269,972 | ------- | 10 |
| Defense Atomic Support Agency | 1,983 | 1,996 | ------- | 13 |
| Defense Communications Agency | 619 | 595 | 24 | ------- |
| Defense Supply Agency | 25,518 | 25,422 | 96 | ------- |
| Office of Civil Defense | 1,057 | 1,050 | 7 | ------- |
| U.S. Court of Military Appeals | 39 | 39 | ------- | ------- |
| Interdepartmental activities | 13 | 13 | ------- | ------- |
| International military activities | 37 | 36 | 1 | ------- |
| Armed Forces Information and Education Activities | 427 | 421 | 6 | ------- |
| Classified activities | 1,678 | 1,657 | 21 | ------- |
| Total, Department of Defense | 941,576 | 942,928 | 155 | 1,507 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 1,352 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,325,409 | 2,324,026 | 5,396 | 4,013 |
| Net increase, including Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 1,383 | |

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] October figure includes 2,837 employees of the Agency for Interntional Development as compared with 2,895 in September.

[3] October figure includes 660 employees of the Peace Corps, as compared with 647 in September.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1963, and comparison with September 1963*

| Department or agency | October | September | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,350 | 1,300 | 50 | ------- |
| Commerce | 661 | 654 | 7 | ------- |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 652 | 648 | 4 | ------- |
| Interior | 595 | 567 | 28 | ------- |
| Justice | 358 | 366 | ------- | 8 |
| Labor | 118 | 108 | 10 | ------- |
| Post Office | 1,508 | 1,502 | 6 | ------- |
| State [1,2] | 32,190 | 31,781 | 409 | ------- |
| Treasury | 619 | 613 | 6 | ------- |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 414 | 429 | ------- | 15 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 32 | 33 | ------- | 1 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 1 | 1 | ------- | ------- |
| Civil Service Commission | 4 | 3 | 1 | ------- |
| Federal Aviation Agency | 1,059 | 1,050 | 9 | ------- |
| Federal Communications Commission | 2 | 2 | ------- | ------- |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 2 | 2 | ------- | ------- |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 40 | 40 | ------- | ------- |
| General Accounting Office | 87 | 91 | ------- | 4 |
| General Services Administration | 24 | 23 | 1 | ------- |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 193 | 190 | 3 | ------- |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 18 | 13 | 5 | ------- |
| National Labor Relations Board | 33 | 33 | ------- | ------- |
| National Science Foundation | 13 | 14 | ------- | 1 |
| Panama Canal | 14,956 | 14,800 | 156 | ------- |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| Selective Service System | 149 | 149 | ------- | ------- |
| Small Business Administration | 59 | 57 | 2 | ------- |
| Smithsonian Institution | 17 | 16 | 1 | ------- |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 1 | -------- | 1 | ------- |
| U.S. Information Agency | 8,609 | 8,621 | ------- | 12 |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,005 | 996 | 9 | ------- |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 513 | 553 | ------- | 40 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 65,282 | 64,655 | 708 | 81 |
| Net increase, excluding Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 627 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 51 | 53 | ------- | 2 |
| Department of the Army | 51,409 | 51,410 | ------- | 1 |
| Department of the Navy | 24,697 | 24,674 | 23 | ------- |
| Department of the Air Force | 27.617 | 27,297 | 320 | ------- |
| Defense Communications Agency | 33 | 31 | 2 | ------- |
| International Military Activities | 24 | 24 | ------- | ------- |
| Total, Department of Defense | 103,831 | 103,489 | 345 | 3 |
| Net increase, Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 342 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 169,113 | 168,144 | 1,053 | 84 |
| Net increase, including Department of Defense | -------- | -------- | 969 | |

[1] October figure includes 14,175 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,159 in September. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The October figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the September figure includes 4,654.

[2] October figure includes 374 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 365 in September.

**Table IV.**—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during October 1963, and comparison with September 1963*

| Department or agency | October | September | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 3,850 | 3,853 | | 3 |
| Commerce | 5,613 | 5,624 | | 11 |
| Interior | 8,800 | 8,852 | | 52 |
| Post Office | 260 | 262 | | 2 |
| Treasury | 5,327 | 5,363 | | 36 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 261 | 262 | | 1 |
| Federal Aviation Agency | 2,940 | 2,965 | | 25 |
| General Services Administration | 1,733 | 1,730 | 3 | |
| Government Printing Office | 7,291 | 7,244 | 47 | |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 29,971 | 29,963 | 8 | |
| Panama Canal | 7,554 | 7,427 | 127 | |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 162 | 162 | | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,075 | 14,598 | | 523 |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 513 | 553 | | 40 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 88,350 | 88,858 | 185 | 693 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 508 | |

| Department or agency | October | September | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | |
| Inside the United States | [1] 135,144 | [2] 135,370 | | 226 |
| Outside the United States | [1] 4,332 | [2] 4,333 | | 1 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | |
| Inside the United States | 194,758 | [2] 195,462 | | 704 |
| Outside the United States | 1,277 | 1,273 | 4 | |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | |
| Inside the United States | 128,815 | 128,758 | 57 | |
| Outside the United States | 1,065 | 1,083 | | 18 |
| Defense Supply Agency: | | | | |
| Inside the United States | 1,755 | 1,773 | | 18 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 467,146 | 468,052 | 61 | 967 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 906 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 555,496 | 556,910 | 246 | 1,660 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 1,414 | |

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

**Table V.**—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of October 1963 and comparison with September 1963*

| Country | Total | | Army | | Navy | | Air Force | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | October | September | October | September | October | September | October | September |
| Canada | 24 | 24 | | | | | 24 | 24 |
| Crete | 82 | 83 | | | | | 82 | 83 |
| England | 2,883 | 2,987 | | | 120 | 119 | 2,763 | 2,868 |
| France | 20,843 | 21,175 | 17,061 | 17,321 | 11 | 12 | 3,771 | 3,842 |
| Germany | 77,691 | 77,619 | 65,707 | 65,633 | 84 | 85 | 11,900 | 11,901 |
| Greece | 259 | 258 | | | | | 259 | 258 |
| Japan | 50,034 | 50,236 | 17,481 | 17,638 | 14,365 | [1] 14,332 | 18,188 | 18,266 |
| Korea | 6,210 | 6,226 | 6,210 | 6,226 | | | | |
| Morocco | 1,309 | 1,400 | | | 732 | [1] 739 | 577 | 661 |
| Netherlands | 56 | 57 | | | | | 56 | 57 |
| Trinidad | 549 | 540 | | | 549 | 540 | | |
| Total | 159,940 | 160,605 | 106,459 | 106,818 | 15,861 | 15,827 | 37,620 | 37,960 |

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

### FOREIGN NATIONALS

Table V segregates and accounts for certain categories of personal services rendered to the U.S. Government overseas, which cannot be regarded as ordinary direct employment.

This personal service is rendered to U.S. agencies overseas under agreements with the foreign governments. In most cases the employment is indirect. The foreign governments hire the employees. The U.S. military agencies in most cases administer or direct the activity.

Personnel hired and used under such circumstances cannot be properly considered in the same category as regular employment, but they are used and should be counted for what they are.

For this reason the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures counts employees of this type along with, but separate from, regular U.S. employment overseas.

### Statement by Senator Byrd of Virginia

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of October totaling 2,494,522, compared with 2,492,170 in September. This was a net increase of 2,352, including a net increase of 3,452 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87-658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1964, which began July 1, 1963, follows.

| Month | Employment | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|
| July | 2,518,858 | 9,149 | |
| August | 2,515,033 | | 3,824 |
| September | 2,492,170 | | 22,863 |
| October | 2,494,522 | 2,352 | |

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of October was 1,449,115, an increase of 3,362 as compared with the September total of 1,445,753. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in October was 1,045,407, a decrease of 1,010 as compared with 1,046,417 in September.

Civilian agencies reporting larger increases were Post Office Department with 2,288, Interior Department with 1,459, and Veterans' Administration with 759. The larger decreases were in Agriculture Department with 911 and Tennessee Valley Authority with 522.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Navy with 923 and the Department of the Army with 539. The Department of the Air Force reported the largest increase with 310.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 1,383 and outside the United States employment increased 969. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in October totaled 555,496, a decrease of 1,414.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

### FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,494,522 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 159,940 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during October who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in September was 160,605. A breakdown of this employment for October follows:

| Country | Total | Army | Navy | Air Force |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Canada | 24 | | | 24 |
| Crete | 82 | | | 82 |
| England | 2,883 | | 120 | 2,763 |
| France | 20,843 | 17,061 | 11 | 3,771 |
| Germany | 77,691 | 65,707 | 84 | 11,990 |
| Greece | 259 | | | 259 |
| Japan | 50,034 | 17,481 | 14,365 | 18,188 |
| Korea | 6,210 | 6,210 | | |
| Morocco | 1,309 | | 732 | 577 |
| Netherlands | 56 | | | 56 |
| Trinidad | 549 | | 549 | |
| Total | 159,940 | 106,459 | 15,861 | 37,620 |

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of August 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, AUGUST 1963

#### INTRODUCTION

This is the 45th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of August 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of August 1, 1963, totaled $13,756,165,745, and as of August 31, 1963, they totaled $14,465,338,281, a net increase of $709,172,536 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

*Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category*

| Major category | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategic and critical materials: | | | |
| National stockpile [1] | $5,813,052,400 | $5,804,537,900 | −$8,514,500 |
| Defense Production Act | 1,496,434,900 | 1,493,255,200 | −3,179,700 |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,340,697,172 | 1,345,059,356 | +4,362,184 |
| Total, strategic and critical materials [1] | 8,650,184,472 | 8,642,852,456 | −7,332,016 |
| Agricultural commodities: | | | |
| Price-support inventory | 4,652,255,144 | 5,367,471,967 | +715,216,823 |
| Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1] | 126,990,583 | 126,369,680 | −620,903 |
| Total, agricultural commodities [1] | 4,779,245,727 | 5,493,841,647 | +714,595,920 |
| Civil defense supplies and equipment: | | | |
| Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense | 35,470,752 | 35,430,457 | −40,295 |
| Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare | 189,727,955 | 190,348,652 | +620,697 |
| Total, civil defense supplies and equipment | 225,198,707 | 225,779,109 | +580,402 |
| Machine tools: | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 2,208,600 | 2,208,600 | |
| National Industrial Reserve Act | 90,108,500 | 89,665,700 | −442,800 |
| Total, machine tools | 92,317,100 | 91,874,300 | −442,800 |
| Helium | 9,219,739 | 10,990,769 | +1,771,030 |
| Total, all inventories | 13,756,165,745 | 14,465,338,281 | +709,172,536 |

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), August 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, August 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

#### *New stockpile objectives*

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials.

Appendix B contains excerpts from the Office of Emergency Planning statement setting for the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), August 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

| Commodity | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Maximum objective [1] | Excess over maximum objective |
| Aluminum, metal: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | $487,680,600 | $487,680,600 | | Short ton | 1,128,989 | 1,128,989 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 435,124,700 | 432,989,500 | −$2,135,200 | do | 861,710 | 857,587 | −4,123 | | |
| Total | 922,805,300 | 920,670,100 | −2,135,200 | do | 1,990,699 | 1,986,576 | −4,123 | [2] 450,000 | 1,536,576 |
| Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain: | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 14,129,453 | 14,569,297 | +439,844 | do | 47,369 | 47,894 | +525 | (3) | 47,894 |
| Aluminum oxide, fused, crude: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 21,735,100 | 21,735,100 | | Short dry ton | 200,093 | 200,093 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 22,747,400 | 22,747,400 | | do | 178,266 | 178,266 | | | |
| Total | 44,482,500 | 44,482,500 | | do | 378,359 | 378,359 | | 200,000 | 178,359 |
| Antimony: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 20,488,000 | 20,488,000 | | Short ton | 30,301 | 30,301 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 12,501,785 | 12,575,753 | +73,968 | do | 21,483 | 21,582 | +99 | | |
| Total | 32,989,785 | 33,063,753 | +73,968 | do | 51,784 | 51,883 | +99 | 70,000 | (4) |
| Asbestos, amosite: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,637,600 | 2,637,600 | | do | 11,705 | 11,705 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 6,468,914 | 6,789,574 | +320,660 | do | 26,239 | 27,365 | +1,126 | | |
| Total | 9,106,514 | 9,427,174 | +320,660 | do | 37,944 | 39,070 | +1,126 | 45,000 | (4) |
| Asbestos, chrysolite: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 3,356,200 | 3,356,200 | | Short dry ton | 6,224 | 6,224 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 2,102,600 | 2,102,600 | | do | 2,348 | 2,348 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 3,934,500 | 3,934,500 | | do | 5,532 | 5,532 | | | |
| Total | 9,393,300 | 9,393,300 | | do | 14,104 | 14,104 | | 11,000 | 3,104 |
| Asbestos, crocidolite: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 702,100 | 702,100 | | Short ton | 1,567 | 1,567 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 7,236,190 | 7,278,290 | +42,100 | do | 27,438 | 27,438 | | | |
| Total | 7,938,290 | 7,980,390 | +42,100 | do | 29,005 | 29,005 | | (3) | 29,005 |

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table 1.**—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), April 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

| Commodity | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Apr. 1, 1963 | End of month, Apr. 30, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Apr. 1, 1963 | End of month, Apr. 30, 1963 | Net change during month | Maximum objective[1] | Excess over maximum objective |
| **Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | $13,925,000 | $13,925,000 | | Long dry ton | 879,740 | 879,740 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 18,168,000 | 18,168,000 | | do | 1,370,077 | 1,370,077 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 89,353,258 | 89,398,758 | +$45,500 | do | 5,780,590 | 5,780,590 | | | |
| Total | 121,446,258 | 121,491,758 | +45,500 | do | 8,030,407 | 8,030,407 | | 2,600,000 | 5,430,407 |
| **Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 78,552,500 | 78,552,500 | | do | 4,962,706 | 4,962,706 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 45,326,200 | 45,294,200 | −32,000 | do | 2,927,260 | 2,927,260 | | | |
| Total | 123,878,700 | 123,846,700 | −32,000 | do | 7,889,966 | 7,889,966 | | 6,400,000 | 1,489,966 |
| **Bauxite, refractory grade:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 11,347,800 | 11,347,800 | | Long calcined ton. | 299,279 | 299,279 | | 137,000 | 162,279 |
| **Beryl:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 9,768,400 | 9,768,400 | | Short ton | 23,230 | 23,230 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 1,425,800 | 1,425,800 | | do | 2,543 | 2,543 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 22,788,000 | 22,788,000 | | do | 11,321 | 11,321 | | | |
| Total | 33,982,200 | 33,982,200 | | do | 37,094 | 37,094 | | 23,100 | 13,994 |
| **Beryllium metal:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 14,253,383 | 15,363,012 | +1,109,629 | do | 123 | 132 | +9 | (3) | 132 |
| **Bismuth:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,674,300 | 2,674,300 | | Pound | 1,342,402 | 1,342,402 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 52,400 | 52,400 | | do | 22,901 | 22,910 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 5,540,200 | 5,540,200 | | do | 2,506,493 | 2,506,493 | | | |
| Total | 8,266,900 | 8,266,900 | | do | 3,871,796 | 3,871,796 | | 3,000,000 | 871,796 |
| **Cadmium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 20,327,700 | 19,760,500 | −567,200 | do | 10,354,727 | 10,065,810 | −288,917 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 12,327,700 | 12,327,600 | −100 | do | 7,448,989 | 7,448,989 | | | |
| Total | 32,655,400 | 32,088,100 | −567,300 | do | 17,803,716 | 17,514,799 | −288,917 | 6,500,000 | 11,014,799 |
| **Castor oil:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 51,290,600 | 50,914,100 | −376,500 | do | 196,035,582 | 194,194,997 | −1,840,585 | [2] 22,000,000 | 172,194,997 |
| **Celestite:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 1,412,300 | 1,412,300 | | Short dry ton | 28,816 | 28,816 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 225,646 | 225,646 | | do | 5,416 | 5,416 | | | |
| Total | 1,637,946 | 1,637,946 | | do | 34,232 | 34,232 | | 22,000 | 12,232 |
| **Chromite, chemical grade:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 12,288,000 | 12,288,000 | | do | 559,452 | 559,452 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 21,766,349 | 21,841,249 | +74,900 | do | 699,654 | 699,654 | | | |
| Total | 34,054,349 | 34,129,249 | +74,900 | do | 1,259,106 | 1,259,106 | | 475,000 | 784,106 |
| **Chromite, metallurgical grade:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 264,674,600 | 264,565,500 | −109,100 | do | 3,797,409 | 3,795,292 | −2,117 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 35,879,900 | 35,879,900 | | do | 985,646 | 985,646 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 224,671,600 | 224,759,700 | +88,100 | do | 1,543,114 | 1,543,113 | −1 | | |
| Total | 525,226,100 | 525,205,100 | −21,000 | do | 6,326,169 | 6,324,051 | −2,118 | [2] 2,970,000 | 3,354,051 |
| **Chromite, refractory grade:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 25,149,300 | 25,149,300 | | do | 1,047,159 | 1,047,159 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 5,039,000 | 5,039,000 | | do | 179,775 | 179,775 | | | |
| Total | 30,188,300 | 30,188,300 | | do | 1,226,934 | 1,226,934 | | 1,300,000 | (4) |
| **Cobalt:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 169,238,700 | 169,205,200 | −33,500 | Pound | 76,725,545 | 76,711,860 | −13,685 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 52,074,600 | 52,074,600 | | do | 25,194,122 | 25,194,122 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 2,169,000 | 2,169,000 | | do | 1,077,018 | 1,077,018 | | | |
| Total | 223,482,300 | 223,448,800 | −33,500 | do | 102,996,685 | 102,983,000 | −13,685 | 19,000,000 | 83,983,000 |
| **Coconut oil:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 12,706,400 | 11,341,500 | −1,364,900 | do | 83,841,206 | 74,839,083 | −9,002,123 | (3) | 74,839,083 |
| **Colemanite:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 2,636,400 | 2,636,400 | | Long dry ton | 67,636 | 67,636 | | (3) | 67,636 |
| **Columbium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 23,919,200 | 23,919,200 | | Pound | 7,487,499 | 7,505,853 | +18,354 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 50,238,900 | 50,238,900 | | do | 8,222,684 | 8,222,684 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 799,100 | 799,100 | | do | 388,877 | 388,877 | | | |
| Total | 74,957,200 | 74,957,200 | | do | 16,099,060 | 16,117,414 | +18,354 | 1,900,000 | 14,207,414 |
| **Copper:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 522,727,200 | 522,749,800 | +22,600 | Short ton | 1,008,273 | 1,008,273 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 59,918,400 | 59,181,800 | −736,600 | do | 106,812 | 105,463 | −1,349 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 8,150,100 | 8,170,000 | +19,900 | do | 12,382 | 12,381 | −1 | | |
| Total | 590,795,700 | 590,101,600 | −694,100 | do | 1,127,467 | 1,126,117 | −1,350 | [2] 775,000 | 351,117 |
| **Cordage fibers, abaca:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 37,740,900 | 37,740,300 | −600 | Pound | 149,736,028 | 149,736,028 | | 150,000,000 | (4) |
| **Cordage fibers, sisal:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 42,779,500 | 42,779,500 | −3,600 | do | 316,123,573 | 316,123,573 | | 320,000,000 | (4) |
| **Corundum:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 393,100 | 393,100 | | Short ton | 2,008 | 2,008 | | 2,000 | 8 |

**See footnotes at end of table.**

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), April 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

| Commodity | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Apr. 1, 1963 | End of month, Apr. 30, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Apr. 1, 1963 | End of month, Apr. 30, 1963 | Net change during month | Maximum objective [1] | Excess over maximum objective |
| **Cryolite:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | $7,092,000 | $7,024,000 | −$67,300 | Short ton | 25,683 | 25,439 | −244 | (3) | 25,439 |
| **Diamond dies:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 488,100 | 489,100 | +1,000 | Piece | 16,201 | 16,231 | +30 | 25,000 | (4) |
| **Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 61,609,500 | 61,609,500 | | Carat | 31,113,411 | 31,113,411 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 15,800,500 | 15,800,500 | | do | 5,550,579 | 5,550,579 | | | |
| Total | 77,410,000 | 77,410,000 | | do | 36,663,990 | 36,663,990 | | 30,000,000 | 6,663,990 |
| **Diamond, industrial, stones:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 100,501,500 | 100,501,500 | | do | 9,315,183 | 9,315,183 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 186,324,500 | 186,324,500 | | do | 15,425,827 | 15,425,827 | | | |
| Total | 286,826,000 | 286,826,000 | | do | 24,741,010 | 24,741,010 | | 18,000,000 | 6,741,010 |
| **Diamond tools:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 1,015,400 | 1,015,400 | | Piece | 64,178 | 64,178 | | (3) | 64,178 |
| **Feathers and down:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 37,505,000 | 37,481,000 | −24,000 | Pound | 9,052,886 | 9,047,078 | −5,808 | [2] 3,000,000 | 6,047,078 |
| **Fluorspar, acid grade:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 26,167,500 | 26,167,500 | | Short dry ton | 463,049 | 463,049 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 1,394,400 | 1,394,400 | | do | 19,700 | 19,700 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 33,528,800 | 33,530,700 | +1,900 | do | 673,232 | 673,232 | | | |
| Total | 61,090,700 | 61,092,600 | +1,900 | do | 1,155,981 | 1,155,981 | | 280,000 | 875,981 |
| Fluorspar, metallurgical grade: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 17,332,400 | 17,332,400 | | do | 360,443 | 360,443 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,508,100 | 1,508,100 | | do | 42,800 | 42,800 | | | |
| Total | 18,840,500 | 18,840,500 | | do | 412,243 | 412,243 | | 375,000 | 37,243 |
| **Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 937,900 | 937,900 | | do | 4,455 | 4,455 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 341,200 | 341,200 | | do | 1,428 | 1,428 | | | |
| Total | 1,279,100 | 1,279,100 | | do | 5,883 | 5,883 | | 3,600 | 2,283 |
| **Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 7,056,200 | 7,056,200 | | do | 34,233 | 34,233 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 221,143 | 230,343 | +9,200 | do | 1,907 | 1,907 | | | |
| Total | 7,277,343 | 7,286,543 | +9,200 | do | 36,140 | 36,140 | | 17,200 | 18,940 |
| **Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 1,896,300 | 1,896,300 | | do | 5,487 | 5,487 | | 2,100 | 3,387 |
| Hyoscine: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 30,600 | 30,600 | | Ounce | 2,100 | 2,100 | | 2,100 | (4) |
| Iodine: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 4,082,000 | 4,082,000 | | Pound | 2,977,648 | 2,977,648 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,066,000 | 1,066,000 | | do | 994,920 | 994,920 | | | |
| Total | 5,148,000 | 5,148,000 | | do | 3,972,568 | 3,972,568 | | 4,300,000 | (4) |
| Iridium: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,525,800 | 2,525,800 | | Troy ounce | 13,937 | 13,937 | | 4,000 | 9,937 |
| **Jewel bearings:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 4,110,500 | 4,110,500 | | Piece | 51,387,563 | 51,387,563 | | 57,500,000 | (4) |
| Kyanite-mullite: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 798,800 | 794,500 | −4,300 | Short dry ton | 9,239 | 9,190 | −49 | 4,800 | 4,390 |
| Lead: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 319,298,100 | 319,298,100 | | Short ton | 1,050,370 | 1,050,370 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 1,696,600 | 1,668,100 | −28,500 | do | 4,479 | 4,403 | −76 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 78,398,600 | 78,398,600 | | do | 327,998 | 327,908 | | | |
| Total | 399,393,300 | 399,364,800 | −28,500 | do | 1,382,847 | 1,382,771 | −76 | [2] 0 | 1,382,771 |
| **Magnesium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 130,600,300 | 130,253,600 | −346,700 | do | 179,896 | 179,420 | −476 | 107,000 | 72,420 |
| Manganese, battery grade, natural ore: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 21,025,500 | 21,025,500 | | do | 144,485 | 144,485 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 13,621,900 | 13,621,900 | | do | 137,700 | 137,700 | | | |
| Total | 34,647,400 | 34,647,400 | | do | 282,185 | 282,185 | | 50,000 | 232,185 |
| Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 3,095,500 | 3,095,500 | | Short dry ton | 21,272 | 21,272 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 2,524,700 | 2,524,700 | | do | 3,779 | 3,779 | | | |
| Total | 5,620,200 | 5,620,200 | | do | 25,051 | 25,051 | | 20,000 | 5,051 |
| Manganese, **chemical grade, type A:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,133,300 | 2,133,300 | | do | 29,307 | 29,307 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 7,898,600 | 7,917,200 | +18,600 | do | 117,607 | 117,607 | | | |
| Total | 10,031,900 | 10,050,500 | +18,600 | do | 146,914 | 146,914 | | 30,000 | 116,914 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), April 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

| Commodity | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Maximum objective [1] | Excess over maximum objective |
| Manganese, chemical grade, type B: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | $132,600 | $132,600 | | Short dry ton | 1,822 | 1,822 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 6,683,300 | 6,665,700 | −$17,600 | do | 99,016 | 99,016 | | | |
| Total | 6,815,900 | 6,798,300 | −17,600 | do | 100,838 | 100,838 | | 53,000 | 47,838 |
| Manganese, metallurgical grade: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 248,240,300 | 248,240,300 | | do | 5,851,264 | 5,851,264 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 176,474,400 | 176,474,400 | | do | 3,056,691 | 3,056,691 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 236,271,711 | 238,019,670 | +1,747,959 | do | 3,504,706 | 3,555,080 | +50,374 | | |
| Total | 660,986,411 | 662,734,370 | +1,747,959 | do | 12,412,661 | 12,463,035 | +50,374 | 6,800,000 | 5,663,035 |
| Mercury: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 20,039,500 | 20,039,500 | | Flask | 129,525 | 129,525 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 3,446,200 | 3,446,200 | | do | 16,000 | 16,000 | | | |
| Total | 23,485,700 | 23,485,700 | | do | 145,525 | 145,525 | | [2] 200,000 | (4) |
| Mica, muscovite block: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 27,631,200 | 27,630,800 | −400 | Pound | 11,621,211 | 11,621,031 | −180 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 40,857,700 | 40,856,900 | −800 | do | 6,456,251 | 6,456,024 | −227 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 5,100,741 | 5,266,011 | +165,270 | do | 1,536,182 | 1,585,807 | +49,625 | | |
| Total | 73,589,641 | 73,753,711 | +164,070 | do | 19,613,644 | 19,662,862 | +49,218 | 8,300,000 | 11,342,862 |
| Mica, muscovite film: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 9,058,100 | 9,058,100 | | do | 1,733,083 | 1,733,083 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 633,300 | 633,300 | | do | 102,681 | 102,681 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,001,362 | 1,033,612 | +32,250 | do | 102,614 | 105,640 | +3,026 | | |
| Total | 10,692,762 | 10,725,012 | +32,250 | do | 1,938,378 | 1,941,404 | +3,026 | 1,300,000 | 641,404 |
| Mica, muscovite splittings: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 40,598,300 | 40,598,300 | | do | 40,040,294 | 40,040,294 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 6,225,800 | 6,225,800 | | do | 4,826,257 | 4,826,257 | | | |
| Total | 46,824,100 | 46,824,100 | | do | 44,866,551 | 44,866,551 | | 21,200,000 | 23,666,551 |
| Mica, phlogopite block: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 303,600 | 303,600 | | do | 223,239 | 223,239 | | 17,000 | 206,239 |
| Mica, phlogopite splittings: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,580,500 | 2,580,500 | | do | 3,079,062 | 3,079,062 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 2,379,579 | 2,399,384 | +19,805 | do | 1,971,397 | 1,985,474 | +14,077 | | |
| Total | 4,960,079 | 4,979,884 | +19,805 | do | 5,050,459 | 5,064,536 | +14,077 | 1,700,000 | 3,364,536 |
| Molybdenum: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 84,196,200 | 84,196,800 | +600 | do | 79,513,992 | 79,513,992 | | 59,000,000 | 20,513,992 |
| Nickel: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 181,978,100 | 181,978,100 | | do | 334,272,028 | 334,274,346 | +2,318 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 102,162,900 | 102,053,500 | −109,400 | do | 107,050,155 | 106,842,433 | −207,722 | | |
| Total | 284,141,000 | 284,031,600 | −109,400 | do | 441,322,183 | 441,116,779 | −205,404 | [2] 100,000,000 | 341,116,779 |
| Opium: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 13,661,700 | 13,661,700 | | do | 195,757 | 195,757 | | [2] 141,280 | 54,477 |
| Paladium: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,079,000 | 2,079,000 | | Troy ounce | 89,811 | 89,811 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 177,300 | 177,300 | | do | 7,884 | 7,884 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 12,170,200 | 12,170,200 | | do | 648,124 | 648,124 | | | |
| Total | 14,426,500 | 14,426,500 | | do | 745,819 | 745,819 | | 340,000 | 405,819 |
| Palm oil: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 4,509,500 | 4,409,400 | −100,100 | Pound | 25,053,989 | 24,497,878 | −556,111 | (3) | 24,497,878 |
| Platinum: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 56,879,900 | 56,879,900 | | Troy ounce | 716,343 | 716,343 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 4,024,500 | 4,024,500 | | do | 49,999 | 49,999 | | | |
| Total | 60,904,400 | 60,904,400 | | do | 766,342 | 766,342 | | 165,000 | 601,342 |
| Pyrethrum: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 415,100 | 415,100 | | Pound | 67,065 | 67,065 | | 66,000 | 1,065 |
| Quartz crystals: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 69,060,700 | 69,060,700 | | do | 5,601,481 | 5,598,672 | −2,809 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 3,128,700 | 3,200,900 | +72,200 | do | 232,352 | 232,352 | | | |
| Total | 72,189,400 | 72,261,600 | +72,200 | do | 5,833,833 | 5,831,024 | −2,809 | 650,000 | 5,181,024 |
| Quinidine: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,010,900 | 1,942,800 | −68,100 | Ounce | 1,743,377 | 1,684,377 | −59,000 | 1,600,000 | 84,377 |
| Quinine: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 3,622,600 | 3,622,600 | | do | 5,727,732 | 5,727,732 | | (3) | 5,727,732 |
| Rare earths: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 7,134,900 | 7,134,900 | | Short dry ton | 10,042 | 10,042 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 5,748,920 | 5,774,409 | +25,489 | do | 7,492 | 6,264 | −1,228 | | |
| Total | 12,883,820 | 12,909,309 | +25,489 | do | 17,534 | 16,306 | −1,228 | 5,700 | 10,606 |
| Rare earths residue: | | | | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 657,800 | 657,800 | | Pound | 6,085,570 | 6,085,327 | −243 | (5) | 6,085,327 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), April 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

| Commodity | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Maximum objective [1] | Excess over maximum objective |
| **Rhodium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | $78,200 | $78,200 | | Troy ounce | 618 | 618 | | (3) | 618 |
| **Rubber:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 764,548,400 | 760,533,100 | −$4,015,300 | Long ton | 988,855 | 983,668 | −5,187 | 750,000 | 233,668 |
| **Ruthenium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 559,500 | 559,500 | | Troy ounce | 15,001 | 15,001 | | (3) | 15,001 |
| **Rutile:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 2,070,100 | 2,070,100 | | Short dry ton | 18,599 | 18,599 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 2,725,100 | 2,725,100 | | do | 17,410 | 17,410 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,061,300 | 1,061,300 | | do | 11,632 | 11,632 | | | |
| Total | 5,856,500 | 5,856,500 | | do | 47,641 | 47,641 | | 65,000 | (4) |
| **Rutile chlorinator charge:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | | | | do | 6,817 | 2,923 | −3,894 | (3) | 2,923 |
| **Sapphire and ruby:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 190,000 | 190,000 | | Carat | 16,187,500 | 16,187,500 | | 18,000,000 | (4) |
| **Selenium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 757,100 | 757,100 | | Pound | 97,100 | 97,100 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1,070,500 | 1,070,500 | | do | 156,518 | 156,518 | | | |
| Total | 1,827,600 | 1,827,600 | | do | 253,618 | 253,618 | | 400,000 | (4) |
| **Shellac:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 8,605,400 | 8,589,000 | −16,400 | do | 17,165,033 | 17,132,260 | −32,773 | 7,400,000 | 9,732,260 |
| **Silicon carbide, crude:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 11,394,500 | 11,394,500 | | Short ton | 64,697 | 64,697 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 26,802,700 | 26,802,700 | | do | 131,805 | 131,805 | | | |
| Total | 38,197,200 | 38,197,200 | | do | 196,502 | 196,502 | | 100,000 | 96,502 |
| **Silk noils and waste:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 1,607,900 | 1,441,200 | −166,700 | Pound | 1,219,013 | 1,112,950 | −106,063 | 970,000 | 142,950 |
| **Silk, raw:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 486,600 | 486,600 | | do | 113,515 | 113,515 | | 120,000 | (4) |
| **Sperm oil:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 4,775,400 | 4,775,400 | | do | 23,442,158 | 23,442,158 | | [2] 23,400,000 | 42,158 |
| **Talc, steatite block and lump:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 496,800 | 496,800 | | Short ton | 1,274 | 1,274 | | 300 | 974 |
| **Talc, steatite ground:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 231,200 | 231,200 | | do | 3,901 | 3,901 | | (3) | 3,901 |
| **Tantalum:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 10,992,700 | 10,992,700 | | Pound | 3,420,478 | 3,443,657 | +23,179 | | |
| Defense Production Act | 9,734,400 | 9,734,400 | | do | 1,531,366 | 1,531,366 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 21,100 | 21,100 | | do | 8,036 | 8,036 | | | |
| Total | 20,748,200 | 20,748,200 | | do | 4,959,880 | 4,983,059 | +23,179 | 2,420,000 | 2,563,059 |
| **Thorium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 42,000 | 42,000 | | do | 848,354 | 848,354 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 17,486,238 | 17,590,648 | +104,410 | do | 8,440,675 | 8,481,100 | +40,425 | | |
| Total | 17,528,238 | 17,632,648 | +104,410 | do | 9,289,029 | 9,329,454 | +40,425 | (3) | 9,329,454 |
| **Tin:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 816,070,600 | 814,755,400 | −1,315,200 | Long ton | 335,622 | 335,081 | −541 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 16,404,000 | 16,404,000 | | do | 7,505 | 7,505 | | | |
| Total | 832,474,600 | 831,159,400 | −1,315,200 | do | 343,127 | 342,586 | −541 | [2] 200,000 | 142,586 |
| **Titanium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 176,463,100 | 176,361,200 | −101,900 | Short ton | 22,415 | 22,403 | −12 | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 32,097,700 | 32,097,700 | | do | 9,021 | 9,021 | | | |
| Total | 208,560,800 | 208,458,900 | −101,900 | do | 31,436 | 31,424 | −12 | (3) | 31,424 |
| **Tungsten:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 369,127,300 | 369,127,300 | | Pound | 120,071,339 | 120,071,339 | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 318,813,900 | 318,813,900 | | do | 78,186,563 | 78,186,563 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 18,651,400 | 18,651,400 | | do | 5,774,827 | 5,774,827 | | | |
| Total | 706,592,600 | 706,592,600 | | do | 204,032,729 | 204,032,729 | | 50,000,000 | 154,032,729 |
| **Vanadium:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 31,567,900 | 31,567,900 | | do | 15,730,893 | 15,730,893 | | 2,000,000 | 13,730,893 |
| **Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 11,932,800 | 11,932,800 | | Long ton | 42,770 | 42,770 | | 30,000 | 12,770 |
| **Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 49,188,200 | 49,169,700 | −18,500 | do | 198,803 | 198,728 | −75 | 180,000 | 18,728 |
| **Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:** | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 9,826,900 | 9,826,900 | | do | 38,962 | 38,962 | | 39,000 | (4) |

**See footnotes at end of table.**

**TABLE 1.**—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), April 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

| Commodity | Cost value: Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | Cost value: End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Cost value: Net change during month | Quantity: Unit of measure | Quantity: Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | Quantity: End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Quantity: Net change during month | Quantity: Maximum objective | Quantity: Excess over maximum objective |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Zinc: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | $364, 346, 400 | $364, 346, 400 | | Short ton | 1, 256, 848 | 1, 256, 848 | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 79, 588, 200 | 79, 588, 400 | +$200 | do | 323, 896 | 323, 896 | | | |
| Total | 443, 934, 600 | 443, 934, 800 | +200 | do | 1, 580, 744 | 1, 580, 744 | | [2] 0 | 1, 580, 744 |
| Zirconium ore, baddeleyite: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 710, 600 | 710, 600 | | Short dry ton | 16, 533 | 16, 533 | | (3) | 16, 533 |
| Zirconium ore, zircon: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 189, 400 | 181, 800 | −7, 600 | do | 3, 201 | 3, 072 | −129 | (3) | 3, 072 |
| Total: | | | | | | | | | |
| National stockpile | 5, 813, 052, 400 | 5, 804, 537, 900 | −8, 514, 500 | | | | | | |
| Defense Production Act | 1, 496, 434, 900 | 1, 493, 255, 200 | −3, 179, 700 | | | | | | |
| Supplemental—barter | 1, 340, 697, 172 | 1, 345, 059, 356 | +4, 362, 184 | | | | | | |
| Total, strategic and critical materials | 8, 650, 184, 472 | 8, 642, 852, 456 | −7, 332, 016 | | | | | | |

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 22469.)

[2] New objective. (See app. B, p. 22469.)

[3] No present objective.

[4] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

**TABLE 2.**—*Agricultural commodities inventories, August 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

| Commodity | Cost value: Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | Cost value: End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Cost value: Net change during month | Quantity: Unit of measure | Quantity: Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | Quantity: End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Quantity: Net change during month |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Price-support inventory: | | | | | | | |
| Basic commodities: | | | | | | | |
| Corn | $601, 698, 233 | $771, 731, 750 | +$170, 033, 517 | Bushel | 490, 441, 161 | 627, 434, 170 | +136, 993, 009 |
| Cotton, extra-long staple | 4, 350, 336 | 9, 815, 842 | +5, 465, 506 | Bale | 15, 865 | 37, 075 | +21, 210 |
| Cotton, upland | 647, 367, 508 | 1, 230, 378, 231 | +583, 010, 723 | do | 3, 749, 501 | 7, 453, 137 | +3, 703, 636 |
| Peanuts, farmers' stock | 10, 262 | 6, 119 | −4, 143 | Pound | 104, 707 | 55, 507 | −49, 200 |
| Peanuts, shelled | 11, 725, 345 | 11, 492, 722 | −232, 623 | do | 68, 707, 457 | 67, 641, 033 | −1, 066, 424 |
| Rice, milled | 139, 012 | 170, 244 | +31, 232 | Hundredweight | 14, 029 | 17, 024 | +2, 995 |
| Rice, rough | 9, 754, 016 | 9, 804, 101 | +50, 085 | do | 1, 831, 950 | 1, 840, 269 | +8, 319 |
| Wheat | 2, 159, 184, 221 | 2, 132, 036, 542 | −27, 147, 679 | Bushel | 1, 077, 964, 550 | 1, 064, 042, 832 | −13, 921, 718 |
| Bulgur | 263, 638 | 213, 372 | −50, 266 | Pound | 4, 854, 112 | 3, 945, 790 | −908, 322 |
| Total, basic commodities | 3, 434, 492, 571 | 4, 165, 648, 923 | +731, 156, 352 | | | | |
| Designated nonbasic commodities: | | | | | | | |
| Barley | 43, 174, 088 | 43, 577, 332 | +403, 244 | Bushel | 49, 981, 957 | 50, 427, 635 | +445, 678 |
| Grain sorghum | 689, 693, 879 | 681, 970, 484 | −7, 723, 395 | do | 627, 204, 171 | 619, 186, 434 | −8, 017, 737 |
| Milk and butterfat: | | | | | | | |
| Butter | 230, 980, 899 | 212, 620, 464 | −18, 360, 435 | Pound | 397, 333, 261 | 365, 695, 138 | −31, 638, 123 |
| Butter oil | 75, 812, 629 | 87, 325, 166 | +11, 512, 537 | do | 95, 623, 479 | 110, 572, 609 | +14, 949, 130 |
| Cheese | 20, 227, 826 | 23, 568, 300 | +3, 340, 474 | do | 53, 861, 359 | 62, 539, 239 | +8, 677, 880 |
| Ghee | 1, 751, 446 | 1, 545, 175 | −206, 271 | do | 2, 169, 883 | 1, 914, 331 | −255, 552 |
| Milk, dried | 109, 755, 986 | 106, 515, 273 | −3, 240, 713 | do | 744, 533, 582 | 723, 099, 301 | −21, 434, 281 |
| Oats | 11, 465, 445 | 11, 597, 158 | +131, 713 | Bushel | 19, 129, 773 | 19, 333, 144 | +203, 371 |
| Rye | 1, 701, 701 | 1, 722, 504 | +20, 803 | do | 1, 641, 719 | 1, 664, 075 | +22, 356 |
| Total, designated nonbasic commodities | 1, 184, 563, 899 | 1, 170, 441, 856 | −14, 122, 043 | | | | |
| Other nonbasic commodities: | | | | | | | |
| Beans, dry, edible | 8, 628, 998 | 7, 024, 418 | −1, 604, 580 | Hundredweight | 1, 142, 699 | 912, 423 | −230, 276 |
| Cottonseed oil, refined | 290, 040 | 622, 250 | +332, 210 | Pound | 1, 739, 132 | 3, 685, 928 | +1, 946, 796 |
| Flaxseed | 16, 059, 077 | 15, 964, 633 | −94, 444 | Bushel | 5, 415, 584 | 5, 384, 798 | −30, 786 |
| Soybeans | 5, 234, 345 | 5, 859, 143 | +624, 798 | do | 2, 219, 134 | 2, 507, 711 | +288, 577 |
| Turpentine | 45, 240 | | −45, 240 | Gallon | 86, 209 | | −86, 209 |
| Vegetable oil products | 2, 940, 974 | 1, 910, 744 | −1, 030, 230 | Pound | 17, 362, 311 | 11, 854, 299 | −5, 508, 012 |
| Total, other nonbasic commodities | 33, 198, 674 | 31, 381, 188 | −1, 817, 486 | | | | |
| Total, price support inventory | 4, 652, 255, 144 | 5, 367, 471, 967 | +715, 216, 823 | | | | |
| Inventory transferred from national stockpile:[1] | | | | | | | |
| Cotton, Egyptian | 103, 256, 435 | 102, 640, 561 | −615, 874 | Bale | 122, 223 | 121, 494 | −729 |
| Cotton, American-Egyptian | 23, 734, 148 | 23, 729, 119 | −5, 029 | do | 47, 188 | 47, 178 | −10 |
| Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile. | 126, 990, 583 | 126, 369, 680 | −620, 903 | do | 169, 411 | 168, 672 | −739 |
| Total, agricultural commodities | 4, 779, 245, 727 | 5, 493, 841, 647 | +714, 595, 920 | | | | |

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. (See app. A, p. 22468.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

| Item | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month |
| Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense: | | | | | | | |
| Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings). | $10,019,829 | $10,022,623 | +$2,794 | 10-mile units | 45 | 45 | |
| Chemical and biological equipment | 1,814,233 | 1,806,793 | −7,440 | (1) | | | |
| Radiological equipment | 23,636,690 | 23,601,041 | −35,649 | (1) | | | |
| Total | 35,470,752 | 35,430,457 | −40,295 | | | | |
| Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: | | | | | | | |
| Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses. | 146,525,451 | 136,925,874 | −9,599,577 | (1) | | | |
| Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations | 5,305,582 | 5,330,284 | +24,702 | (1) | | | |
| Civil defense emergency hospitals | 37,371,677 | 37,330,782 | −40,895 | Each | 1,930 | 1,930 | |
| Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals). | 525,245 | 486,864 | −38,381 | (1) | | | |
| Supply additions (for civil defense emergency hospitals. | | 10,274,848 | +10,274,848 | (1) | | | |
| Total | 189,727,955 | 190,348,652 | +620,697 | | | | |
| Total, civil defense supplies and equipment | 225,198,707 | 225,779,109 | +580,402 | | | | |

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

| Item | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month |
| Defense Production Act: | | | | | | | |
| In storage | $21,400 | $21,400 | | Tool | 7 | 7 | |
| On lease | 2,144,300 | 3,144,300 | | do | 103 | 103 | |
| On loan | 42,900 | 42,900 | | do | 7 | 7 | |
| Total | 2,208,600 | 2,208,600 | | do | 117 | 117 | |
| National Industrial Reserve Act: | | | | | | | |
| In storage | 79,933,300 | 79,487,200 | −$446,100 | do | 7,193 | 7,172 | −21 |
| On lease | 27,500 | 27,500 | | do | 1 | 1 | |
| On loan to other agencies | 2,176,600 | 2,176,600 | | do | 225 | 225 | |
| On loan to school programs | 7,971,100 | 7,974,400 | +3,300 | do | 1,916 | 1,917 | +1 |
| Total | 90,108,500 | 89,665,700 | −442,800 | do | 9,335 | 9,315 | −20 |
| Total, machine tools | 92,317,100 | 91,874,300 | −442,800 | do | 9,452 | 9,432 | −20 |

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, August 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

| Item | Cost value | | | Quantity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during monh | Unit of measure | Beginning of month, Aug. 1, 1963 | End of month, Aug. 31, 1963 | Net change during month |
| Helium: | | | | | | | |
| Stored aboveground | $219,629 | $231,806 | +$12,177 | Cubic foot | 19,700,000 | 21,000,000 | +1,300,000 |
| Stored underground | 9,000,110 | 10,758,963 | +1,758,853 | do | 1,065,800,000 | 1,188,300,000 | +122,500,000 |
| Total, helium | 9,219,739 | 10,990,769 | +1,771,030 | do | 1,085,500,000 | 1,209,300,000 | +123,800,000 |

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

## APPENDIX A

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

### STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIAL

### *National stockpile*

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V-7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

### *Defense Production Act*

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

### *Supplemental—barter*

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A CFR, ch. I, DMO V-4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemented stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191-2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

## AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

### *The price-support program*

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

### *Inventory transferred from national stockpile*

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per-bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

## CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

### *Civil defense stockpile*

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

### *Civil defense medical stockpile*

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

## MACHINE TOOLS

### *Defense Production Act*

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

### *National industrial equipment reserve*

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

## HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167), and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

---

## APPENDIX B

## NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials: aluminum, castor oil, chromite (metallurgical grade), copper, feathers and down, lead, mercury, nickel, opium, sperm oil, tin, and zinc.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a "basic objective" and a "maximum objective" for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V-7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

### STATEMENT BY MR. BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of August 31, 1963, totaled $14,465,338,281. This was a net increase of $709,172,536 as compared with the August 1 total of $13,756,165,745.

Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

| Major category | Cost value August 1963 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Net change during month | Total, end of month |
| Strategic and critical materials | −$7, 332, 016 | $8, 642, 852, 456 |
| Agricultural commodities | +714, 595, 920 | 5, 493, 841, 647 |
| Civil defense supplies and equipment | +580, 402 | 225, 779, 109 |
| Machine tools | −442, 800 | 91, 874, 300 |
| Helium | +1, 771, 030 | 10, 990, 769 |
| Total | +709, 172, 536 | 14, 465, 338, 281 |

These figures are from the August 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

### STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 61 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of August 31, 1963.

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. This report contains pertinent agency explanation and reflects the new objectives for 12 materials.

Increases in cost value were reported in 20 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 26 materials, and 48 materials remained unchanged during August.

National stockpile: The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of August 31, 1963, totaled $5,804,537,900. This was a net decrease of $8,514,500 during the month. The largest decreases were $4,015,300 in rubber, $1,364,900 in coconut oil and $1,315,200 in tin.

Defense Production Act inventory: The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of August 31 1963, totaled $1,493,255,200. This was a net decrease of $3,179,700. The largest decrease was $2,135,200 in aluminum.

Supplemental-barter: The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of August 31 totaled $1,345,059,356. This was a net increase of $4,362,184. The largest increases were in manganese and beryllium metal.

### OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major increases in agricultural commodities during August were reported for cotton and corn, partially offset by decreases in wheat and grain sorghum.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in medical stocks; the machine tools inventories showed a net decrease; and the helium inventories showed an increase during August.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2367. A bill concerning low-interest loans to needy students to pursue courses of study in trade schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2368. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Gigante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 2369. A bill to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MECHEM):

S. 2370. A bill authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorized appropriations for that purpose; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence; ordered to lie on the table.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

## PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT"

Mr. McGEE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development", submitted by Senator GALE W. McGEE to the Committee on Appropriations and that ten thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

## LOANS TO ASSIST NEEDY STUDENTS ATTENDING TRADE AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which would establish a system of student loans to assist needy students attending trade and technical schools.

A companion measure is today being introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education.

The program recognizes the economic needs of great numbers of young people who do not pursue college training after leaving high school. The loan program which is modeled on the very successful student loan program in the National Defense Education Act, would be made available to students pursuing a course of study in a trade or technical school. In order to qualify for loans, such students must either be enrolled in or accepted for training in schools which are licensed by the State to provide training and schooling in vocational subjects.

There are a great many highly motivated young people who unfortunately are children of unemployed parents and, therefore, find it impossible to attend schools wherein they may acquire trades and vocational skills. Providing financial help through repayable loans for such young people will contribute greatly to reducing unemployment and will help trainees to prepare for employment in the technological and highly skilled fields which currently are in need of more workers than are qualified to do the work required.

Enactment of such a program, in my judgment, will meet a need in the vocational education program in a manner which can scarcely be met in any other way. It complements and supplements the vocational training programs we are seeking to provide under H.R. 4955 now in conference. It is my hope that careful consideration can be given to this legislation by the committee prior to the end of the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2367) concerning low-interest loans to needy students to pursue courses of study in trade schools, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Section 1. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at trade schools of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreements between the Commissioner and trade schools, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

### ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 2 (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1967, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in trade schools in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in trade schools in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in trade schools for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 1 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

### PAYMENT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 3. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which trade schools in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by schools with which he has agreements under this Act and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such school shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by schools in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 2 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to a school shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under this Act.

(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any trade school for any fiscal year exceed $25,000.

### CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

Sec. 4. An agreement with any trade school for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this Act shall—

(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such school;

(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal contributions, contributed by such school, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this Act, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan; and

(4) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this Act and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the school.

### TERMS OF LOANS

Sec. 5. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by trade schools from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this Act may not exceed the tuition and fees charged the student.

(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any trade school shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the school) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of training; and except that—

(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of training at such school, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the school, of maintaining good standing in such course of training, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such school or, in the case of a student already attending such school, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there;

(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of training at a trade school and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of training at a trade school, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

(3) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

(4) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except that, if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

(5) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

(6) such a loan by a trade school for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the school under this Act and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the school that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

(7) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the trade school making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another trade school participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such school.

(c) An agreement under this Act for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such school in need thereof.

### DISTRIBUTIONS OF ASSETS FROM STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

Sec. 6. (a) After June 30, 1968, and not later than September 30, 1968, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this Act by each trade school as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1968, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this Act bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the school's capital contributions to such fund.

(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the school.

(b) After September 30, 1968, each school with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this Act shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the school after June 30, 1968, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined by the Commissioner under subsection (a).

(c) Upon a finding by the school or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1968, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this Act exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such school or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the school.

(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the school.

LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Upon application by any trade school with which he has made an agreement under this Act, the Commissioner may make a loan to such school for the purpose of helping to finance the school's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such school shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this Act. Loans made to schools under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of $5,000,000.

(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this Act, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this Act and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this Act.

(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this Act, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "trade school" means a school in a State providing training and schooling in vocational subjects which (1) admits as regular students only persons who completed or discontinued their regular program of secondary education, (2) is licensed by such State or by a nationally recognized accrediting agency to provide training and schooling in vocational subjects, (3) does not provide courses which are acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree, (4) is not operated under public supervision or control, and (5) has been in operation for not less than two calendar years.

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

---

## MAINTENANCE OF FLOOD AND ARROYO SEDIMENT CONTROL DAMS, RIO GRANDE CANALIZATION PROJECT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grand canalization project and authorized appropriations for that purpose.

The Rio Grande Canalization Act authorized the Commission to construct, operate, and maintain the canalization of the Rio Grande, which work was constructed in accordance with the engineering plan accompanying the act. The present authority, therefore, limits the Commission activities to the now existing project and although the construction of flood control work on arroyos entering the project will benefit and lessen the maintenance work required on the project the Commission authority is not considered sufficient to perform maintenance or contribute to the cost of maintenance for arroyo control projects.

The legislation we are introducing is essential in order to permit the Commission to participate in the maintenance work to the extent of benefits to be derived therefrom as mutually agreed by the two parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement expressing the need for this proposal, and a brief statement explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2370) authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorized appropriations for that purpose, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MECHEM), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purposes of facilitating and implementing operation and maintenance of the international Rio Grande canalization project, the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized to enter into agreements with the appropriate official or officials of local organizations, as defined in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954 (70 Stat. 1088), as amended (16 U.S.C.A. 1001, et seq.), for the maintenance by said local organizations either directly or indirectly through mutually satisfactory maintenance agreements with others, including the United States, of all those flood and arroyo sediment control dams, together with all related works, heretofore or hereafter installed or constructed in the Rio Grande watershed between Caballo Dam and El Paso, Texas, in accordance with said Act, and which are necessary, in the opinion of said Commissioner, to facilitate and implement the operation and maintenance of said project.

Such maintenance agreements between the local organization and the United States shall provide the extent of contribution by the United States as may be mutually agreed by the two parties, based on the degree of benefits to be derived from said dams and related works, and the contribution by the United States may be either in the form of funds or performance of the actual operation and maintenance.

Arrangements made between the United States shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture for defraying cost of maintaining such work of improvement in accordance with regulations prescribed by said Secretary.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for contributions to maintenance authorized by this Act.

The statements presented by Mr. ANDERSON are as follows:

STATEMENT OF NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission have by memorandum of agreement dated October 12, 1962 (Contract No. IBM-6833), undertaken the funding and accomplishment of surveys and investigations necessary to determine the economic feasibility of watershed control dams and related works on specific arroyos entering the canalization project between Percha Dam and Leasburg Dam in Rincon Valley, N. Mex.

Such works as may be constructed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954, as a result of these surveys and investigations will be of significant benefit to the Commission in the maintenance of the canalization project. The Elephant Butte Irrigation District and the Caballo Soil and Water Conservation District have sponsored these projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act subject to the Commission maintaining or contributing to the maintenance of the works constructed, depending on the degree of benefits derived therefrom as mutually agreed by the two parties.

The Rio Grande Canalization Act authorized the Commission to construct, operate, and maintain the canalization of the Rio Grande, which work was constructed in accordance with the engineering plan accompanying the act. The present authority, therefore, limits the Commission activities to the now existing project and although the construction of flood control work on arroyos entering the project will benefit and lessen the maintenance work required on the project the Commission authority is not considered sufficient to perform maintenance or contribute to the cost of maintenance for arroyo control projects.

Specific legislation is, therefore, sought to permit this Commission to maintain, or contribute to the maintenance by sponsoring agencies, to the extent of benefits to be derived therefrom as mutually agreed by the two parties, of flood control and related works constructed by the Soil Conservation Service under the act of August 4, 1954 (70 Stat. 1088).

### Statement Regarding Proposed Bill Submitted by Elephant Butte Irrigation District, Las Cruces, N. Mex.

The basic purpose of the proposed bill is to authorize the International Boundary and Water Commission to maintain, to the extent of its interest therein as determined by benefits, certain watershed control projects that have been sponsored by this district and the Caballo Soil Conservation District. These projects will be planned for future construction, over a period of years, in accordance with procedure established by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended).

The primary purpose of the watershed projects now under consideration will be to prevent the inflow of sediment into the river channel within the Rio Grande canalization project located in this district in Dona Ana and Sierra Counties in south central New Mexico. The Rio Grande canalization project has been maintained with Federal funds by the International Boundary and Water Commission, an agency of the State Department, since its construction by that agency about 25 years ago.

The Rio Grande canalization project was constructed for the purpose of controlling major floods entering the river immediately below Elephant Butte dam and to convey reservoir discharges and uncontrolled local flood waters, with a minimum of water loss and flood damage, for the irrigation and protection of lands within the Rio Grande project (New Mexico-Texas), and to deliver water to Mexico under the provisions of the Treaty of 1906. The canalization project, during the past quarter of a century, has made a substantial contribution to the economy of the highly developed and heavily populated area in New Mexico, Texas, and in Mexico, extending from Elephant Butte Dam to a point 65 miles southeast of El Paso, Tex., by conserving the limited water supply available to the area from the Rio Grande, and by preventing major floods which, prior to the construction of the project, inflicted heavy damage in the area.

Proper operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande canalization project is essential to the economy of the entire area served by the Rio Grande in both the United States and Mexico below Elephant Butte Dam. One of the major maintenance problems in the Rio Grande canalization project has been created by inflow, into the river channel, of large volumes of sediment transported by several arroyos, or intermittently flowing streams, that enter the river at various points. This sediment forms obstructions in the river channel that not only hinder the flow of water in the channel, but also raise the elevation of the river water surface, and of the adjoining water table, thereby increasing water losses by seepage and, at the same time, damaging adjacent lands. At intervals, the accumulation of sediment in the river channel reaches the point where an attempt must be made to remove it; otherwise, the efficiency of the canalization project will diminish to the point where it will not fulfill the purposes for which it was constructed.

In properly maintaining the Rio Grande canalization project, the International Boundary and Water Commission is faced with the choice of either removing the sediment from the river channel, or of preventing it from reaching the channel by the use of detention dams and reservoirs located on tributary arroyos. The latter method is considered preferable because the removal of sediment from the channel is a costly procedure that yields only temporary results. Experience indicates that it is better to prevent sediment from entering the river channel than to carry on a never-ending attempt to remove it from the channel after it has been brought in by tributary arroyo flows.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a division of project maintenance costs between the local sponsors and the United States according to benefits received from the projects by the respective parties.

## ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE COMMISSION ESTABLISHED TO REPORT ON ASSASSINATION OF LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and printed; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137), authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

## THE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 343 AND 344)

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 14 AND H.R. 10

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing on S. 14 and H.R. 10, to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes, will be held on Wednesday, December 11, 1963, in room 6202, New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m.

Those wishing to testify may arrange to do so by calling Capital 4-3121, extension 5451.

## TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what a great servant the American people lost in the death yesterday of Herbert H. Lehman. And those of us who served with him in this Chamber or in any of the many State and Federal duties he undertook know that we have lost a leading example and inspiration of what a public servant should be.

Like any man or woman, Herbert Lehman learned from his work. But unlike many in public life, he brought to it far more than he took from it. His humanitarianism, his unwavering integrity of mind and principle, his understanding of the workings of the American economy, and his appreciation of the opportunity America offers to people of all racial and religious backgrounds were all well developed in him before he ever sought public office.

As a result, no office he held was ever sullied by a breath of scandal, corruption, expediency, or other low motives. On the contrary, for over 30 years of public office, at both the State and the Federal levels, his service was always marked by the highest standards of American life. No obstacle could daunt him; no failure could discourage him from pursuing the objectives of equal justice and equal opportunity for all the American people.

It was no accident that when death struck him down, Herbert Lehman was preparing to leave his New York home to come to Washington to receive from the President of the United States the Medal of Freedom. Its citation read:

> Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of the government and has made politics the highest form of public service.

It is sad, but appropriate, that the citation should also be his epitaph.

I shall always remember that the qualities that characterized Herbert Lehman's public service also characterized his personal relationships. A kindly and humane person, the only kind of indignation that ever overtook him was righteous indignation. We who knew him personally and those throughout the country and the world who knew him only by his good works have all lost a dear friend.

Mr. President, I close by saying that Herbert Lehman was one of my great teachers and one of my sources of inspiration as we served shoulder to shoulder in the Senate in common causes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Herbert H. Lehman," which was published today in the New York Times, and also a telegram which I have sent to Mrs. Lehman.

There being no objection, the editorial and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*December 5, 1963.*

MRS. HERBERT LEHMAN,
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR EDITH: Midge and I send you our deep and heartfelt sympathy. You know how much we loved Herbert and what an inspiration he has always been to me. Our prayers are with you and we are asking God to strengthen and bless you.

Affectionate regards from us both.

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the death of Herbert H. Lehman, the Nation has lost a conscientious, dedicated and effective leader in the fight for equal rights and human dignity for all our people. The extent of Lehman's greatness, the scope of his work, the impact of his example, are well revealed in the editorials that have appeared in our Nation's leading newspapers on the sad occasion of his death.

He was a leader not only in New York State which honored him as Senator and Governor, but also throughout the country where all those who shared his deep and pervading concern for good government and individual rights mourn the loss of a vigorous and high-principled leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the editorials from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post evaluating the distinguished career of this great public servant.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the United States Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and national Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired, and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was then already 50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career, Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National, and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime vote-getter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity, and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

There was so much simple goodness, generosity and grace in Herbert Lehman that one rarely thought of him as suited to the rough realities of American political life. He neither looked nor talked like a politician. Nevertheless the roster of public offices which he won, and filled with nobility and effectiveness, testified to a powerful political appeal rooted in the extraordinary qualities of conviction and courage which he brought into public life.

Entering politics at 50, after a notable career in business and banking, Herbert Lehman teamed with Franklin D. Roosevelt to become Lieutenant Governor of New York, then Governor for four terms when F.D.R. went to the White House, and finally U.S. Senator. In between, he served as director of the wartime Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation and as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Help for those whom the war had made helpless could not have been entrusted to more devoted hands.

A product of Wall Street and a multimillionaire, Herbert Lehman was an unreserved champion of underdogs and of progressive political ideas through the whole of his public career. If he never became a power in the Senate or a member of its inner circle, he exercised influence nonetheless because, for the country at large, he symbolized sincerity. The dauntlessness with which this quiet, unpretentious little man challenged Joe McCarthy, the Senate's bully, illuminated the murkiness of a shabby decade in American politics. The country owes much to Herbert Lehman for its recovery from McCarthyism.

Senator Lehman's efforts to infuse charity and reason into American immigration policy may well constitute his most significant contribution. He was an implacable foe of the national origins quota system. That system has not yet been extirpated from the immigration statutes; but a proposal for abandonment of it was sent to Congress not long ago by John F. Kennedy. Its enactment would be Herbert Lehman's best monument.

Had he lived and held his health, Herbert Lehman would have been among those to be given the Presidential Medal of Freedom at the White House today. No one deserved it more. No one could have defended freedom more fervently.

**Mr. MONRONEY.** Mr. President, for many years it was my privilege to sit next to a truly great Senator, Senator Herbert Lehman. He occupied this desk which I now have and I had the seat to his left.

Watching him, seeing him, hearing him over the years made me appreciate this great man's constant effort through every waking hour to better the condition of all mankind. Senator Lehman was the champion of the underprivileged long before most of the later advocates of liberal programs had thought out any of the needs or the methods of extending legislation to better the condition of our citizens.

One of the earliest advocates of civil rights legislation, Senator Lehman pioneered in sponsoring legislation in this field. He was an active crusader for the improvement of wages and hours of our unorganized working men and women—and for protecting the rights of labor.

In the foreign field as well as domestic, Senator Lehman's great service stands as a monument to his compassion for his fellow man and his tireless effort to assist them.

His protests against injustice and oppression were always ready as he would seek the Senate floor to call this Nation's attention to its moral duty.

It is significant that his death at 85 occurred as he prepared to fly to Washington to receive the highest civilian peacetime honor that this Nation could award, the Presidential Freedom Medal Award.

**Mr. GRUENING.** Mr. President, within a fortnight the United States—indeed the world—has lost two great leaders.

Two weeks ago a great President of the United States—John Fitzgerald Kennedy—was snatched from our midst by the cruel and cowardly bullet fired by a hidden assassin.

Yesterday's unexpected death of Herbert H. Lehman—our former colleague—compounded the loss in leadership suffered by the United States in recent days.

The death of Herbert Lehman—financier, diplomat, philanthropist, and political leader—leaves on the national scene a void which cannot adequately be filled. Kindly, wise and farsighted, Herbert Lehman, as Governor of the State of New York, as a U.S. Senator from that State, and as a private citizen, could be found at all times throughout his very active life in the forefront of every important fight for human rights.

Many men and women alive today in the United States owe an unfulfillable debt of gratitude to Herbert H. Lehman for his leadership role during the depression of the thirties not only as Governor of the State of New York but also as the "good right arm" of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Many men and women alive today throughout the world also owe an unfulfillable debt of gratitude to Herbert H. Lehman for his wise, efficient and humanitarian administration of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency.

But we here in the U.S. Senate owe Herbert H. Lehman a special debt of gratitude which we can recognize but never repay. For during the course of his service in this body he was in all truth the active and able "conscience of the Senate." His was the voice that spoke out strongly and wisely against the witch hunters of those times. His was the voice that was raised on behalf of the poor, the sick, and the downtrodden both here and abroad.

His was the voice that was raised for middle income housing, for liberalization of our antiquated immigration laws, for protection of the civil rights of men and women without distinction on the basis of race, creed, or color, for programs to combat juvenile delinquency, and on behalf of countless other good and important causes in defense of human rights and dignities.

Herbert Lehman will be sorely missed in this Nation and in this world. And, in encomium, all that can be added is that while this world will miss Herbert Lehman and his good deeds, in any event this world is a better world for his having graced it with his presence for these past 85 years.

It is truly ironic, Mr. President, that Herbert Lehman should have departed this earth just as he was preparing to come to Washington to receive at the hands of the new President and his former colleague, Lyndon B. Johnson, the highest civilian award granted by this Government. I hope that suitable ceremonies will be planned in the days ahead to make that award posthumously to his gracious and able widow. But the point I make, Mr. President, is that it is most gratifying to know that this Nation during the lifetime of Herbert Lehman, recognized the many deeds of greatness that he had performed. Those deeds will live on in the memory of men and women throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials on Herbert Lehman appearing in the Washington Post and in the New York Times be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the boarders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during the difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

There was so much simple goodness, generosity, and grace in Herbert Lehman that one rarely thought of him as suited to the rough realities of American political life. He neither looked nor talked like a politician. Nevertheless the roster of public offices which he won, and filled with nobility and effectiveness, testified to a powerful political appeal rooted in the extraordinary qualities of conviction and courage which he brought into public life.

Entering politics at 50, after a notable career in business and banking, Herbert Lehman teamed with Franklin D. Roosevelt to become Lieutenant Governor of New York, then Governor for four terms when F.D.R. went to the White House, and finally U.S. Senator. In between, he served as director of the wartime Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation and as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Help for those whom the war had made helpless could not have been entrusted to more devoted hands.

A product of Wall Street and a multimillionaire, Herbert Lehman was an unreserved champion of underdogs and of progressive political ideas through the whole of his public career. If he never became a power in the Senate or a member of its inner circle, he exercised influence nonetheless because, for the country at large, he symbolized sincerity. The dauntlessness with which this quiet, unpretentious little man challenged Joe McCarthy, the Senate's bully, illuminated the murkiness of a shabby decade in American politics. The country owes much to Herbert Lehman for its recovery from McCarthyism.

Senator Lehman's efforts to infuse charity and reason into American immigration policy may well constitute his most significant contribution. He was an implacable foe of the national origins quota system. That system has not yet been extirpated from the immigration statutes; but a proposal for abandonment of it was sent to Congress not long ago by John F. Kennedy. Its enactment would be Herbert Lehman's best monument.

Had he lived and held his health, Herbert Lehman would have been among those to be given the Presidential Medal of Freedom at the White House today. No one deserved it more. No one could have defended freedom more fervently.

**Mr. RIBICOFF.** Mr. President, the long and distinguished career of one of America's foremost statesmen came to an end yesterday with the passing of Herbert Lehman. His death closes a book on a lifetime of public service devoted to the betterment of all mankind.

After a brilliant career in private business which might have satisfied a lesser man, Herbert Lehman turned his remarkable talents to public causes and politics where he set election records still unmatched in the history of New York State. Here was a man who entered politics at the age of 50 as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of New York in 1928 and 35 years later was the guiding spiritual leader of a political reform movement usually the domain of younger men. In the years between, he held all the highest elective posts in his State in addition to being the first Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Truly his life proves the poet's words to be true:

> Grow old along with me the best is yet to be.

It is significant that the day he died Herbert Lehman was to receive the Nation's highest civilian honor—the Presidential Freedom Medal. As President Johnson has pointed out the citation accompanying the award provides the most fitting epitaph for this beloved man:

> Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.

The millions he helped mourn him. Those of us who knew him will miss him. But he has left his mark on his times as few men in our Nation's history have done and for that he will be always remembered.

Mrs. Ribicoff joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the family.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point editorials from this morning's New York Times and New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was then already 50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his 80's, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, national, and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime vote-getter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

**Mr. CASE.** Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, Herbert H. Lehman. His courage, wisdom, compassion, and deep understanding made him an outstanding public servant. The Senate is richer for his service here, and so is the country. His service in the Senate, as the Governor of New York, and also in many other capacities of public service, quasi-public service, and private service, made the entire period of the Nation during which he lived the richer and the better.

**Mr. SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Herbert H. Lehman.

I first knew him as a fellow Governor; the first Governors' conference I attended was held in Albany, N.Y., when he was Governor of New York. We met at that time, and I came to have great respect for him and for the way in which he administered the office of Governor of that great State. We worked together as Governors for several years, and thereafter both of us came to the U.S. Senate where our friendship continued.

Herbert Lehman was always frank and direct in stating what he felt was the right thing to do. He expressed himself well, and he lived up to his ideals. He wanted a better life for all the people of the United States; and he worked tirelessly, energetically and sincerely in striving to attain that objective. He also interested himself in legislation relating to immigration and worked hard to reunite families separated by our immigration laws.

I join my colleagues in extending sympathy to Mrs. Lehman, with whom my wife and I had a very happy friendship, and to the other members of his family.

**Mr. JOHNSTON.** Mr. President, I, too, had the pleasure of serving with Herbert Lehman at Governors' conferences prior to our coming to the Senate. Immediately thereafter, when we came to the Senate, we served on the same Senate committee.

I found Herbert Lehman at all times—both as Governor and as U.S. Senator—working tirelessly for the things he thought right and best for the people of the United States. He was always fighting for the man who needed help and assistance, for the man who was an underdog. He constantly tried to make the world a better place in which to live.

We greatly admire and appreciate such a man; and today, when we realize that he is no longer with us, we can truly say that in spirit he will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who came into contact with him, and the imprint he left upon others will be an asset and a force for good in our Nation for as long as it stands.

I join in extending our sympathy to his good wife. At all times she was at his side, working with him and helping him in all the things he undertook to do for the good of those about him.

So, Mr. President, today we pay our tribute to Herbert H. Lehman for the wonderful work he did during his long and honorable life.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the sweetest words in the English language is the word "compassion."

As a freshman Member of this body I came to know Senator Lehman; and he was most kind to me. I believe that his compassion, the heartfelt concern that he had for all people, was the ruling passion of his life. All of us share that virtue, but many of us, by reason of necessity, must temper it with certain elements of prudence and frugality in government.

Senator Lehman had full knowledge and appreciation of the duties of the Government but, nevertheless, with a singleness of purpose he was ruled by compassion.

That will be the memory he will leave in our hearts and minds. It was the keynote of his life as I remember it.

I join in extending sympathy to his loved ones, and to the great numbers of people who will miss him so much.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in tribute to the late Senator Lehman of New York. He raised the standards of public service in New York and in the Nation. He served in a tradition of idealism and of public service, supporting good issues and just causes rather than mere personalities.

His friends and admirers, of whom I am one, were scattered all over this Nation. Though my period of service in the Senate did not touch his, I have known Senator Lehman during my years of service here, and have had talks with him, not infrequently. I feel a loss in his passing away.

Being from the most populous State in the Nation, he was plagued with the problem of a too small staff for the work here, as are all Senators from the States with larger populations. He cut the Gordian knot by employing and paying from his personal means enough office assistants to promptly and properly care for all constituents' requests and mail. It is said that his private payroll to office employees to handle Government mail in his office exceeded the Government payroll to answer Government mail, in the same office.

Looking at the damage done the Gulf and Atlantic coasts by hurricane each year, in 1956 he coauthored the Lehman-Kennedy bill, with the late President John F. Kennedy, to provide insurance protection against loss from damages caused by rising waters. His law is on the books, as yet unimplemented, but it is there for the user and in time it must certainly be used.

Senator Lehman's achievements in a life of more than fourscore years are too great to be enumerated by me here, and indeed, they have in some measure been recounted by others yesterday and today. His leadership in public health, patronage of the arts and all welfare legislation is well known. But I wanted to mention one or two smaller items, illustrative of the meticulous care with which he considered the slightest request, as well as the damage from the largest natural disasters.

His service here brought dignity, patriotism and probity as hallmarks. His life enriched America.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I mourn the death of Herbert H. Lehman yesterday in New York City, a death that suddenly came to him just as he was preparing to come to Washington to receive our Nation's highest peacetime award, the President's Medal of Freedom.

Although I was not a Member of the Senate when Herbert Lehman was our colleague, I have long admired him. He was truly a "man who, as he said, says what he thinks and does what he says." And those who knew him well not only admired him, but loved him. I well recall how my father, a former Congressman from New York and chairman of the Democratic Party in New York, admired and respected Senator Lehman. He was a man with whom both Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt could join forces and agree upon as being one of the best Governors of New York. He worked and fought for the Democratic Party when many people of his own financial background held themselves aloof from the political hurly burly. He was a leader in the fight toward liberalization of our immigration laws, the defense of civil rights for all men, and the spearheading of philanthropic activities. He was a moving spirit, with seemingly unendless energy in the Democratic Party of New York, from the days of Al Smith to the day of his death.

It is my hope that Senator Lehman's zeal for democratic processes and humanitarian causes will be his eternal legacy to the present and future leaders of government in the great State of New York.

---

## PRESENT STATUS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the indulgence of the Senate for not more than 5 minutes, I should like to make a report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a progress report to the Senate in regard to the present status of the conference on the vocational education bill.

Perhaps I should entitle these remarks as "a report of no progress." The conference met again this morning and recessed until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

Speaking for myself, although I am sure my view would be shared by the overwhelming majority of my Senate conferees, the odds are apparently against our getting a vocational education bill. If that proves to be the case, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, it will be my position that all proposed legislation on education should be postponed for consideration until some time after January including action on the higher education bill.

The Senate Republican and Democratic conferees voted unanimously this morning against the House substitute proposal in regard to the equalization formula.

In 1947, when many of us stood shoulder to shoulder on the issue of education with Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, the equalization formula was developed at that time. It is a formula which has prevailed in Senate bills relating to education ever since. It is a formula that is based upon the sound proposition of coming to the aid of the poorer States. We have often spoken of it as the 3-to-1 formula, although when the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, first proposed the legislation in this field he was for all Federal money going to the poorer States—none of it to go to the richer States. That was the original position of the Senator from Ohio. However, he became confronted with political realities in both bodies and it became perfectly clear that if we were going to get aid from the Federal Government in the field of education it was going to be necessary to develop a formula that would provide some aid to the rich States as well as to the poor States.

The equalization concept, by and large, has prevailed ever since in Senate legislation.

The House has become adamant on its proposal to change the formula. I have taken the position that there is enough merit in the position of the House, to justify trying to reach a workable compromise on the issue. I have been trying to work out a workable compromise. But the compromise that was offered by the House this morning is completely unacceptable to the Senate, because it is not even based on a 2-to-1 equalization formula. I have said that I would be willing to try to get my Senate conferees—although we are split on the question—to compromise on a 2-to-1 formula. The House substitute which was offered as a 2-to-1 formula is not in fact a true 2-to-1 formula at all since it applies to only half the money distributed. If we are going to have an equalization concept, then we should apply it in this bill.

The conference recessed this morning to reconvene at 10 o'clock on Monday morning, to consider further the formula issue on the basis of suggestions we have left with the House conferees in the hope that they will be accepted on Monday morning. The Senate conferees are meeting at 2 o'clock this afternoon to discuss other differences that we have with the House, and many of those differences are great. We are a great distance apart. Do not forget, the Senate vocational education bill was passed in the Senate after President Kennedy sent up to the Congress his subsequent message on education dealing with the problem of vocational education on June 18. The Senate bill sought to carry out the recommendations of the President. It also in part B has amendments to the National Defense Education Act which are vital to thousands upon thousands of young people in this country who will become unemployable if we do not keep them in school. The National Defense Education Act amendments of the Senate are essential to keep those young people in school. But the House version of the bill has no provision in it concerning the National Defense Education Act.

The testimony supporting the recommendations of the President of the United States in that June civil rights message in regard to residential vocational schools and in regard to a student work-study program show that we need to try new approaches if we are to begin to come to grips with the problem of school dropouts. We cannot begin to come to grips with the children whose homes are so poor that they have little or no opportunity to go on to school unless we come to grips with the principles of the Senate bill dealing with such programs as residential schools and the student work-study proposals.

As some of my Senate colleagues know and as the Senate majority leader knows, the very last conference I had with President Kennedy was on foreign aid and pending education legislation. He was very appreciative of the action taken by the Senate on the Senate version of the vocational education bill. He made very clear to me that he hoped very much that the Senate bill would be agreed to in conference.

The differences which have developed in our conference involve positions taken by the House in conflict with the views of the late President. That I know.

As chairman of the conference, I wish to say that if an adamancy of position continues in respect to the House side, in our endeavor to try to work out a reasonable compromise in regard to the provisions in the Senate bill which are not included in the House bill, then I believe this whole question should go back to the precincts of America for the next few weeks and let the people speak.

Then in the next session renew further consideration of proposed education legislation at all levels. I shall continue to do what I can on Monday to try to bring out a sound compromise bill. My Senate conferees will try to do the same thing.

I note that the House does not seem to have any problem in agreeing to come now with a conference report on foreign aid which will involve the expenditure of millions of dollars for educational aid abroad, and in some areas where it is a bit questionable whether a single American taxpayer's dollar should be used. I am for reasonable educational aid abroad but not in any such sums as we have been spending and that the conference bill on foreign aid proposes to continue to spend. I urge that we spend for our own boys and girls a reasonable amount for aid to our own American schools first.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, we will not keep our economy strong, so that the taxes can be paid to make it possible for us to undertake an AID program in the years ahead in those areas where it is needed, unless we develop the potential brainpower of future taxpayers of this country.

I say most respectfully that if the House can vote millions of dollars for aid to education abroad, the time has come for the House to take a look at the needs for education in the United States. I say most respectfully to my friends in the House, that this is not the place to economize on our budget at the expense of the development of the brainpower of the youth of this country.

I believe we have about reached the time for the American people to speak on this subject, and that is what I shall favor next week unless on Monday a fair, equitable, and reasonable compromise can be arrived at between the two Houses.

## DECEMBER 7, 1941: IN MEMORIAM

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, 22 years have passed since December 7, 1941.

But our memories and the pages of history keep the events of that day forever with us.

The gallantry of Americans at that time and place, and in the later great struggles, have made it possible for freedom to exist today.

On this 22d anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, each of us must salute the memory of those who died on that fateful Sunday morning. Today, we should also render our thanks to the military and civilian defenders of our country who make it possible for us to continue to live in peace and relative security.

On this day, too, each of us in this Chamber must rededicate ourselves to the principles for which this Nation stands—to renewed devotion to our duty to maintain our Nation strong and free—and to renewed efforts to attain world peace.

Pearl Harbor provided a lesson that we must never forget: Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

Modern weapons of warfare, and the swiftness of their delivery, mean that today devastating attack can be carried out anywhere in the United States within minutes, and that no one, man, woman, or child, is safe from the quick death of the bomb's blast or the lingering death from fallout. In the face of this new fact of life, we cannot shirk our duty to maintain a defense second to none.

Today, military defense and civil defense are one and the same. They are inseparable. Missiles make no distinction between the soldier and the civilian; between the weapons of war and the mother and her child.

We have some of the best defensive and offensive weapons in the world today but they are of no avail unless we have the means of protecting our people from the nuclear warheads of intercontinental missiles. We must insure the survival of our most importance resource—our people. Otherwise we shall cease to exist as a Nation.

I saw some of the first U.S. civilian casualties in World War II. I saw them because I was there on that infamous Sunday morning, 22 years ago carrying the dead and dying to first aid stations as a young civil defense volunteer. Perhaps this is why I think in terms of civil defense and national survival on this anniversary day.

Today, with weapons that span oceans in a fraction of an hour, a surprise attack is even more possible than it was more than two decades ago. Although we may not be able to prevent such an attack we must be prepared to survive it, not alone as individuals but as a nation. It is our responsibility as leaders and lawmakers to guarantee to the people of the United States that they will not be left unsheltered and unprotected from an unexpected and unprovoked attack a thousand times more deadly than that which came on that quiet Sunday morning long ago.

It is only by remembering and acting on the lesson of Pearl Harbor that we can hope for peace and security for our families and our friends, today and for the future.

## THE PENDING TAX BILL SHOULD BE STUDIED CLOSELY—WILL IT, IN ITS PRESENT FORM, DO WHAT PRESIDENT JOHNSON HOPES FOR IT?

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, now that we have reasonable expectation of having a tax bill come before the Senate in the not too distant future, it would be well if we informed ourselves fully, and our constituents, as to just what is in the package.

I have a very interesting letter from one of my constituents, an extremely knowledgeable citizen—Mr. Bernardus J. Smit, of Bethel, Alaska—who writes that the tax bill now being studied by the Senate Finance Committee appears to him "very unfavorable to persons earning less than $10,000 and very favorable to those over $50,000." He adds his view that the high tax rates for upper bracket people are not the effective rates they appear to be; and he states, from his own experience, that when one gets into the higher earnings brackets there are almost unlimited tax-avoidance devices. And he says:

> The big tears shed about confiscatory taxes are in my opinion blatant hypocrisy and should be resisted.

It is my hope that before this bill emerges from the Finance Committee some of these flagrant loopholes will be

**plugged. Otherwise, we will have to face the fact that this is merely a bill to make the rich richer and, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, in this form it is not the measure that the country needs in order to decrease unemployment and create new jobs as President Johnson hopes it will. It will, I am convinced, do nothing of the kind.**

**Ample confirmation of what Mr. Smit says appeared in two recently published articles. One by T.R.B., a regular and perceptive columnist in the New Republic magazine, refers to an article by Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post, wherein the latter makes the challenging comment that any rich man looking over the present tax bill ought to be a riproaring Democrat. And T.R.B. quotes Alsop as follows:**

> If Richard M. Nixon were President, and if he had proposed such a bill, it would have been denounced as a rich man's tax bill and a payoff to business by the whole northern Democratic Party and the entire liberal press. It would never have had a chance of passing.

**And, T.R.B. says:**

> We think Alsop has a point.

**I, too, am convinced that Alsop has a point, and I am hoping that President Johnson, who has made such a magnificent start in tackling the overwhelming burdens tragically thrust upon him, will have his experts take a sharp, deep, and penerating look at the present draft of the tax bill and lend his support to some of the amendments which will be proposed in committee and, if voted down there—as they probably will be—will be reoffered on the floor.**

**I might say that one of the amendments which strikes me as essential is to provide a substantial increase in the present exemptions. The present exemption is $600 for the taxpayer and for each of his dependents. There are further exemptions for people who are blind and who are over the age of 65. These exemptions are readily understood by every taxpayer. They furnish the most essential relief to the man with a large family, precisely the man who needs such relief. Moreover this relief would apply equally to all—rich or poor.**

**Some months ago, our able and distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] proposed an amendment to the tax bill which would raise the exemptions from $600 to $1,000. I was happy to cosponsor this. I think this is an admirable amendment, and whether or not the Senate would accept the full amount of this $400 increase to the present exemptions, some such increase, applicable to all exemptions, or at the very least to exemptions for dependents, should be included in the bill. I hope that such an amendment will be offered to the bill. I intend to support it and I am confident that the American public would support it by an overwhelming majority.**

**I share the views expressed by my correspondent, Mr. Smit, and voiced by T.R.B. and by Stewart Alsop in his article entitled "The Great Tax Myth," and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Smit, the article by T.R.B. which appeared in the New Republic of November 30, 1963, and Stewart Alsop's article from the Saturday Evening Post, be printed at this point in my remarks.**

There being no objection, the letter and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHEL, ALASKA,
*November 18, 1963.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
*U.S. Senator,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is to let you know that I have acquired an intense dislike for the tax bill which is now before the Senate. It seems to me very unfavorable to persons earning less than $10,000, and very favorable to those over $50,000.

The high tax rates for upper bracket people are not the effective rates it seems. I know from my own experience that when you get into a higher earnings bracket you have almost unlimited tax-avoidance devices. The big tears shed about confiscatory taxes are in my opinion blatent hypocrisy and should be resisted.

There has been a lamentable lack of guts on the part of Congress to tackle the tax loopholes. If these would be closed I would be happier with the bill. As it stands now, the bill is a method to rob the poor and give to the rich. And I am not so convinced that this is the only method to create new jobs.

I have noticed your making national headlines and history in the past weeks, about foreign aid. Millions of people have been waiting for years for what you said and did. I daresay your efforts were 99 percent supported by the voters. The newspapers have carefully refrained from pointing out the unfavorable aspects for the poor man flowing out of the tax bill. Perhaps some loud noises will help. I noticed that Senator DOUGLAS has started but the papers do not print it.

Best wishes from all of us.
Sincerely,

BEN SMIT.

---

[From the New Republic magazine, Nov. 30, 1963]

### T.R.B. FROM WASHINGTON: UNGRATEFUL BUSINESS

Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post makes the challenging comment that any rich man, looking over the President's tax bill, ought to be a rip-roaring Democrat: "If Richard M. Nixon were President, and if he had proposed such a bill, it would have been denounced as a 'rich man's tax bill' and a 'payoff to business' by the whole northern Democratic Party and the entire liberal press. It would never have had a chance of passing." We think Alsop has a point.

What impresses this column are the extraordinary and almost abject concessions the administration makes to scornful business in the agonizing effort to do something that is in the best interest of the Nation and also of business itself. In the short run these concessions may aid the administration, too, and help Mr. Kennedy get reelected, but we regard the price paid as terribly high and even, perhaps, ultimately self-defeating.

Kennedy has given business, to begin with, the longest period without a recession since the war; indeed, it has lasted so long that the administration walks on tiptoe every time it goes into the same room with it, lest it explode. Eisenhower never did this for business. He gave business one sickening recession after another. Kennedy has given business some of the highest profits in history and prices that so far, at any rate, are uniquely stable.

Hardly a week goes by when the NAM or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce doesn't denounce one of Kennedy's mild reform proposals. Sometimes the attack is incomprehensible.

The most bizarre episode was when the chamber attacked the liberalized depreciation guidelines and twin tax reduction last year, that handed over $2.2 billions to corporations. Please the chamber? No; it demanded more and called the proposal a "gimmick."

Most businessmen, we think, are plain dumb; but Mr. Kennedy is trying to save them from a recession because it might cook his own political goose in the next 12 months. He believes his pending, massive tax cut will head it off, and we think it will, if anything can. The present graduated income tax bite is too sharp. A shopkeeper who finds that he can't make money because he has priced his goods too high modifies the price and sells more, with larger profit. Uncle Sam is trying to take too much in income taxes, and would gain more we think by asking less. The rates were imposed in wartime and poor old Ike never got around to reducing because when he thought about it his budget was generally unbalanced. Give Kennedy credit; he is the first President to try to cut that Gordian knot.

But what a price he has paid. He has been trying to get business support for the plan, saying over and over again, "I am a friend of business." He said it again before the Florida Chamber of Commerce last week. He boasted that he had established a private corporation to manage the satellite communications system, and that he was cutting back on Federal employees, and that "domestic civilian expenditures—excluding national defense, space, and interest on debt—were budgeted below last year, a feat rarely accomplished in the last 15 years."

#### WHY THE BOASTING?

The President boasts about something we consider deplorable. Every year America's population increases 3 million and civilian Federal expenditures ought at least to keep pace. He contrasts the modest overall increase in Federal expenditures with the huge increase in State and local expenditures. Of course, the latter are going up; if the Federal Government doesn't step in soon the States and cities will bankrupt themselves by doing the things that have to be done.

We don't blame the President entirely; he is caught in a cleft stick. He knows the tragedy and economic risk of letting the unemployment hemorrhage continue; for 5 years it has stayed over 5 percent. The thing that is going to tip the balance toward our next recession is lack of purchasing power, and you increase purchasing power by ending unemployment.

But almost in despair, as it sometimes seems, the President has sought to get the business-boosting tax cut through by making it more acceptable to conservatives. There isn't another modern nation on earth that wouldn't meet the crisis by public works and large-scale spending as well as a tax cut. With a certain unction that we deplore the President has disclaimed the spending remedy, and Secretary Dillon continually boasts of the fact.

#### A TERRIBLE GAMBLE

Again, the tax cut has been stripped of its so-called "reform" provisions and by that we mean the gaping loopholes to favored business groups; for example, 27½-percent oil depletion allowance. And finally, as Alsop writes in the Post, as Bernard Nossiter writes in the Progressive, and as Leon Keyserling sturdily testified in Congress, the sugarplums and lollipops of proposed tax cuts go primarily to large corporations and rich men.

The real question is whether a tax cut that aids already-favored producers will supply enough purchasing power to sustain prosperity, after its first shot-in-the-arm effect. It is a terrible gamble. Corporate beneficiaries will build bigger plants, but will there be enough consuming power to buy the goods from those plants?

Yet, in the short run, why should business worry about unemployment. It provides a docile army of scared workers who will think twice before striking. Government figures show incontrovertibly that wages are lagging behind productivity. Trade unions used to be aggressive in keeping wages ahead of workers' output—they aren't now. Kennedy has given business fatter profits, steady prices, a continuing labor surplus and proposed tax cuts. Is business for him? You bet it isn't.

---

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

### THE GREAT TAX MYTH

(By Stewart Alsop)

Washington.—Most of us, when we pay our income taxes, find comfort in the thought that the very rich are really getting stuck. Alas, this happy thought is a myth. If the rich are rich enough and smart enough, they pay very little more, proportionately, than the rest of us. They may even pay less. If you don't believe this, try the tax quiz which follows.

The quiz is based on statistics prepared by the Office of Tax Analysis of the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury. The statistics are derived from taxes actually paid in 1960 by typical taxpayers—married, with two dependents, and with "typical dividends, capital gains, and other income, and typical itemized deductions." In other words, the statistics apply not to some fellow with a special tax situation, but to a typical taxpayer in each bracket. Here is the quiz:

1. It is a widely advertised fact that under present law the highest tax rate in our system of progressive income tax is a confiscatory 91 percent. How many people in this country pay 91 percent on their real incomes? (a) 323; (b) none; (c) 8,429; mark one.

2. Take a taxpayer with an income of a million dollars a year after deductions. What percentage did Mr. Million pay on his adjusted gross income (line 11, page 1 on your tax return)? (a) 87 percent; (b) 59 percent; (c) 26 percent; (d) 71 percent.

3. How much did Mr. Million have left out of his million-a-year income after paying his tax? (a) $187,000; (b) $1,239,659; (c) $91,362; (d) $9.28; (e) $525,478.

4. Under our system of progressive taxation, which of the following typically pays the highest percentage of income as taxes under present tax laws? (a) $9,000-a-year man; (b) million-a-year man; (c) $50,000-a-year man.

5. Same question, under the administration-approved, House-passed tax bill.

Here are the answers, as supplied by the Treasury Department:

1. (b) No one in the country pays 91 percent on real income. The reason is simple. Anyone who makes that kind of money also has enough money to hire a good tax lawyer. The tax lawyer will find all sorts of ways to cut back on taxable income, while leaving his client with plenty of untaxed or low-taxed spending money.

2. (c) Mr. Million paid $261,929—or about 26 percent—on his adjusted gross income of a million dollars. Actually, Mr. Million undoubtedly paid less than 26 percent on his real income. Just about every Mr. Million in the country has part of his money in tax-free bonds. The income from such bonds, which is free of Federal tax, need not be reported to the Treasury.

3. (b) Yes, that's right—after paying his tax of $261,929 on his adjusted gross income of $1 million, Mr. Million ended up with an "after-tax income" of almost a million and a quarter. The explanation of this neat trick is, of course, the special treatment of capital gains, with a maximum tax of 25 percent. Under present law, only 50 percent of realized long-term capital gains are included in adjusted gross income. The money he made on the other 50 percent explains why Mr. Million's after-tax income was higher than the adjusted gross income he reported to the Treasury. Obviously, Mr. Million's tax lawyer makes certain that as much as possible of Mr. Million's income is in the form of capital gains, as little as possible in income taxable at the progressive rate.

4 and 5. (c) Under what is supposed to be a system of graduated tax, a man with $50,000 a year typically pays a greater percentage of his income to the Government than a man whose income is 20 times as big. Mr. Typical $50,000-a-year, according to the Treasury figures, pays 28.5 percent of his income under present law, and would pay 24.5 percent under the administration bill. Mr. Million pays 26.1 percent and would pay 23.8 percent. Actually, since Mr. Million undoubtedly has a lot of money in tax-free bonds, the disparity is almost certainly greater than that.

These rather surprising statistics were furnished by the Treasury Department as an answer to Senator Albert Gore's charge that the administration-supported, House-passed tax bill was a "rich man's bill." They were intended to disprove Senator Gore's charge that a very rich man would more than double his income after taxes under the administration bill, while a man in the $12,000-a-year bracket would get a mere 5 percent increase in after-tax income.

Senator Gore's statistics are as accurate as the Treasury's, as regards taxable income. But what the Treasury's statistics make clear is that no rich man in his senses takes the bulk of his income in taxable form. He uses all sorts of techniques to keep his money out of the Treasury's grasping hands—capital gains, depletion allowances for all or other resources, real-estate deals, charity, tax-free bonds and so on. Thus, in fact, Mr. Millon's real income will not increase by a much greater percentage than the $12,000-a-year man's, if the administration bill is passed.

In the process of proving this point, the Treasury statisticians have inadvertently proved another. The widespread notion that this country's tax system is steeply progressive, and in the top bracket confiscatory, is a myth.

Certain further conclusions can reasonably be drawn from the Treasury's surprising statistics. First, the rich, if they regarded their own economic self-interest, ought to be rip-roaring Democrats. If Richard M. Nixon were President, and if he had proposed such a bill, it would have been denounced as a "rich-man's tax bill" and a "payoff to business" by the whole northern Democratic Party and the entire liberal press. It would never have had a chance of passing.

Second, if the Treasury really took nine out of ten dollars from the income of a man with a lot of money to invest, the capitalist system would collapse—no sensible man wants to risk his capital for the Treasury's benefit.

And third, a man cannot possibly get rich by earning a salary or other taxable income—dear old Uncle will take the stuff away from him. Under the capitalist system, which works imperfectly but better than any other yet devised, the only way to get rich is to be a capitalist. The only way to make money and keep it is to use money to make money.

---

## TRADE WITH OUR ALLIES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as the United States takes appropriate action in the so-called chicken war, there is looming another problem, of equal concern to the poultry and dairy industries.

The European Economic Community has also moved to raise import fees and levies on dried and frozen egg products. In a recent letter, the Agriculture Department stated that present EEC duties on eggs vary from 27 percent ad valorem duty on dried yolks to 38 percent on frozen yolks.

There can be no doubt that this level of duty will be most injurious to U.S. trade and that every effort must be made to reduce these levies. It is incredible to me that the nations of Western Europe are on the one hand refusing U.S. efforts to restrict long-term credits to the Soviet Union, yet on the other hand, goods coming primarily from the United States are subject to ever-increasing duties that may well result in a large cutback of U.S. sales and other activities in Europe.

Mr. President, I hope our Government will not let this matter drop but will pursue it vigorously to secure a better understanding among our allies of the basic principles of international trade and a more sympathetic attitude, not toward the Communist bloc, but toward their own Atlantic trading partners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the text of a letter received from the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Foreign Agricultural Service,
*Washington, D.C., November 20, 1963.*

Hon. Kenneth B. Keating,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Senator Keating: This is in reply to your inquiry, addressed to the U.S. Tariff Commission, on October 7 for information on the recent action of the European Economic Community in raising its import fees and levies on certain dried and frozen egg products. The Tariff Commission forwarded your inquiry to this Department for further, more detailed reply.

West Germany is the primary customer in the Community for U.S. dried eggs and frozen egg yolks. Prior to the adoption of the common agricultural policy for egg products, West German import duties were ad valorem rates equivalent to about 8 cents per pound for dried whole eggs and 7 cents per pound for frozen egg yolks. With the adoption of the new import regulations for egg products, which became effective in August 1962, the levy on West German imports of dried whole eggs was established at 36.8 cents per pound and on frozen egg yolks at 18.6 cents per pound. In addition, gate prices were established in a fashion similar to those imposed for poultry meat.

By November 1962, West German importers were expressing concern with the high levies, and the West German Government requested the EEC Commission to grant a reduction in the levies for egg products used in the manufacture of other foods—primarily noodles. In January 1963, the EEC Commission granted this concession and lowered the levies for egg products to be used for manufacturing to 12.2 cents per pound for dried whole eggs, 12 cents per pound for dried yolk, and 6.2 cents per pound for frozen egg yolk. The levies continued to rise, however, as quarterly adjustments were made, and by October 1963 the levy for dried whole eggs had increased to 21.7 cents per pound, for dried egg yolks to 23.3 cents per pound, and for frozen egg yolks to 11.9 cents per pound.

The gate prices at that time were $1.038 per pound for dried whole eggs, $1.128 per pound for dried yolks, and 57.4 cents per pound for frozen egg yolks.

On October 7, the EEC Commission imposed a supplementary levy of 17 cents per pound on dried whole eggs, and 5.67 cents per pound on both dried and frozen yolks. This was imposed because egg products from some competing countries were being offered at prices below the gate prices, although reports from U.S. exporters indicate sales of dried whole eggs at slightly above the gate price, while sales of U.S. frozen egg yolks were being made at somewhat below the established gate price. The adoption of the supplemental levy has increased the total levy on West German imports of dried whole eggs to 38.7 cents per pound, or an equivalent ad valorem of about 35 percent, of dried yolks to 28.9 cents per pound, or an equivalent ad valorem of about 27 percent, and of frozen yolks to about 17.5 cents per pound, or the equivalent of about 38 percent ad valorem. The total charges on frozen egg yolks now amount to about 17.5 cents per pound, or the equivalent of about 38 percent ad valorem.

This action can be expected to hurt our trade sharply, and we are protesting it. In the last tariff negotiation with the Community, we were not able to negotiate concessions on the level of duties on egg products with the EEC or to make the same sort of arrangement that was made for poultry, so our basis for action is not as clear cut as that for the action we are taking in the case of poultry meat. However, we will do all we can to obtain a reduction in these levies.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. Eskildsen,
*Associate Administrator.*

---

## THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES IS TO BE COMMENDED

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Judge Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Committee on Rules, merits the thanks of all Americans opposed to governmental tyranny for insisting that the House Committee on Rules should conduct hearings upon H.R. 7152, the misnamed civil rights bill.

As the minority report accompanying this bill so well states, this bill was "reported to the House without the benefit of any consideration, debate, or study of the bill by any subcommittee or committee of the House and without any member of any committee or subcommittee being granted an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill. This legislation is the most radical proposal in the field of civil rights ever recommended by any committee of the House or Senate. It was drawn in secret meetings held between certain members of this committee, the Attorney General and members of his staff, and certain select persons, to the exclusion of other committee members."

It is to be hoped that the House Committee on Rules will conduct hearings upon H.R. 7152, and let its contents be made known to the American people before the House of Representatives votes upon this proposed legislation. The crucial importance of conducting hearings upon bills of this nature is made manifest by what has befallen other so-called civil rights bills presented to this Congress; namely, the original H.R. 7152, the substitute adopted for H.R. 7152 by the drafting subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and S. 1731. Hearings were conducted upon these three prior so-called civil rights bills by the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. During the course of these hearings, the constitutional and legal sins embodied in these three prior proposed civil rights bills were pointed out, and even those who originally urged their enactment have forsaken them.

The bill now pending before the House Committee on Rules is the most monstrous blueprint for governmental tyranny ever presented to Congress, and for this reason, it is to be hoped that a majority of the House Committee on Rules will conduct hearings upon this bill before sending it to the floor for House action.

The present bill is incompatible in many respects with the system of government created by the Constitution. Moreover, it will rob all Americans of some of their most basic economic, legal, personal, and property rights for the supposed benefit of only one segment of our population. If this bill should be enacted into law, it will do more to concentrate the power to control the functions of local government and the basic economic, personal, and property rights of American citizens in a centralized Federal Government at Washington than any other law passed by the Congress since the foundation of the Republic.

Since the bill undertakes to concentrate in a centralized Federal Government powers of unprecedented severity and sweep, the House Committee on Rules should conduct extensive hearings upon the bill to the end that both the Congress and the American people might learn the threat which it poses to local self-government and to the basic liberties of all Americans.

Indeed, all of us who are vested with any degree of governmental power would do well at this crucial time to heed these words of Woodrow Wilson:

> The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

---

## FOREIGN AID

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most impressed by an address on foreign aid delivered to the New York Chamber of Commerce by the Honorable Eugene R. Black, former Director of the World Bank.

Mr. Black began his address by words of high praise for Mr. David Bell, the present Director of the Agency for International Development. I share this high regard for the ability, the integrity, and the devotion of David Bell. But considering the brilliant success which Mr. Black has enjoyed in his own handling of aid programs, his expressed confidence in our present AID Director should be most assuring to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the highly informed address by Mr. Black be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Foreign Aid

(Text of an address by Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, November 12, 1963)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches, and, on leaving the World Bank I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally, to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year; the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support for foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clear-cut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA, and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because, after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and I think quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do. I do not want any thing I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on those three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foreign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so, too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them, foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban Government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq, and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or, as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed Prime Minister, Kassem, lacked staying power; he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian Government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not alined with the Communists.

If the Soviets have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and troublemaking interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I'm afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps toward action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength in the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which expropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support Government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate for our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities: Is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the Agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it become more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of mutlilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations, like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund organizations, whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally, or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first; now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: "Should we continue foreign aid?" Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: "How can we improve the quality of the products?" Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

## PEARL HARBOR DAY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the 22d anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. I remember that day of infamy vividly—I was there in Honolulu only a few miles from the scene of the attack.

Hawaii was our bastion in the Pacific and busy with preparations for the possibility of war. Yet when the attack came, it caught us by surprise.

Today, while we pause to pay tribute to those brave men who died that day at Pearl Harbor, we here in the Congress must resolve that Americans will never die through our failure to provide for their protection.

The memory of man is short but we must never forget the tragic lesson of Pearl Harbor. America has an Army, Navy, and Air Force second to none, but our protection for our civilian population is far behind such countries as Sweden, Switzerland, or Finland.

We must forge a program of protection for both the military and the civilian population that will guarantee a fighting chance for survival to each of us, not only as individuals but as a nation.

This means a strong and adequate civil defense program for the Nation, as well as strong military forces.

As Members of the Senate of these United States, we must dedicate ourselves to the strengthening of our armed might and of our civilian front, even as we intensify our quest for peace.

Through strength and alertness, we can best defend our peace at home and abroad, and prevent a repetition of the day of infamy 22 years ago.

## THE EVIDENCE JUSTIFIES A FAIR TEST FOR KREBIOZEN NOW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as Members of this body may know, I have been interested for some years in obtaining a fair and impartial test for the chemical preparation known as Krebiozen, developed by Dr. Stevan Durovic of Chicago. The distinguished physiologist, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, is its chief scientific sponsor, and believes Krebiozen to be beneficial—and I emphasize the word "beneficial"—in the treatment of cancer.

Not being a medical man or a physiologist, I have always made it clear that I have never claimed that Krebiozen was a cure for cancer. I have merely asked that it be given a fair test along with the thousands of preparations which, according to verbal statements made to my office by officials of the National Cancer Institute, are now tested by them each year on animals and the approximately 100 which are annually tested by them on human beings.

### WHY I HAVE ASKED FOR A FAIR TEST OF KREBIOZEN

I was led to make this request for several reasons.

First. The first was the high quality of Dr. Ivy's work and scientific reputation. I have known of this man for over 40 years and was for some years his colleague at the University of Chicago. He was the favorite student of the great physiologist A. J. Carlson, and went on to a distinguished record at the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, and the University of Illinois.

At the University of Illinois he was vice president charged with the general supervision of the medical faculties, hospitals, and medical research laboratories.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical statement of Dr. Ivy, taken from "Who's Who in America" for 1962–63, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### BIOGRAPHY OF ANDREW CONWAY IVY FROM WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA, VOLUME 32 (1962–63)

Ivy, Andrew Conway, physiologist; b. Farmington, Mo., Feb. 25, 1893; s. Henry McPherson and Cynthia (Smith) I.; A.B., B.Pd., State Normal Sch., Cape Girardeau, Mo., 1913; B.S., U. of Chicago, 1916, M.S., 1917, Ph. D., 1918; M.D., Rush Med. Coll., 1922; D. Sc. (honorary) University of Nebraska, 1947, Grinnell (Ia.) Coll., 1947, Boston University, 1948; LL.D. (honorary), Loyola University, 1950; married Emma Kohman, December 24, 1919; children—John Henry, William Harvey, Andrew Conway, Horace Kohman, Robert Emerson. Instr. in physiology, U. of Chicago, 1917, asso. prof., 1919–1925; intern Mercy and Augustana Hosps., Chicago, 1921–22; head of div. physiology and pharmacology, Northwestern U. Med. Sch., 1926–46; vice pres. charge Chicago Professional Colls., U. of Ill., 1946–53; distinguished prof. physiol., head dept. clinical science, 1946—; scientific dir. Naval Medical Research Inst., 1942–43; cons. U.S. Army Q.M., 1943–44; mem. Nat. Adv. Cancer Council, 1944–51; exec. director, 1947–51, dep. dir. Chicago Medical Civil Defense since 1950. Commander, Aviation Med. N.R. Corps., 1941; consultant Sec. War on War Crimes, 1946–47. Served as 2d lt., Missouri National Guard, 1912–13; student officer, M.O.T.C., AUS, 1917–18. Mem. bd. mgrs. Young Men's Christian Assn., 1955—. Fellow American College Physicians, Gorgas Medical Society (hon.); mem. A.M.A. (chmn. sect. physiology and pathology 1931), Ill. and Chicago med. socs., Soc. Internal Medicine (pres. 1941–42), Am. Assn. U. Profs. (council 1929–31), Am. Gastro-Enterol. Assn. (pres. 1940–41; mem. editorial bd.), Harvey Soc. (hon), Am. Physiol. Society (sec. 1935–39; pres. 1939–41; mem. editorial bd.), Soc. Exptl. Biology (mem. editorial bd.), Des Moines Acad. Med. (hon.), Chicago Inst. Med. (pres. 1943), Am. Inst. Nutrition, Ill. Acad. Science, Assn. Study Internal Secretions, Commn. Chronic Illness (mem. exec. comm.), Alpha Omega Alpha, Sigma Xi, Alpha Kappa Kappa, A.A.A.S. Methodist; Mason; author: Peptic Ulcer; Observations on Krebiozen in Management of Cancer Patients, 1956, 1500 scientific articles. Mng. editor Gastroenterology 1942–52. Address: 1835 West Polk St., Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, whose father was one of the most eminent physicians in the State of Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator from Illinois has said, Dr. Ivy, the chief scientific sponsor of Krebiozen, is a man of extraordinary qualifications.

I emphasize that the biography which the Senator from Illinois has just placed in the RECORD is most impressive.

Is it not true that Dr. Ivy has three degrees from the University of Chicago; namely, a B.S., an M.S., and a Ph. D. in physiology; and that he also has an M.D. from the Rush Medical College, which, as I understand, is the medical school of the University of Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was at that time; it is not now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He has also earned an honorary degree from the University of Nebraska; as well as a degree from Grinnell College, in Iowa; a degree from Boston University; and an honorary degree from Loyola University. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This man not only has a superb education, which would qualify him as well as any man possibly could be qualified to evaluate a chemical or a drug, but he has been an instructor for most of his life. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. He was a member of the National Advisory Cancer Council from 1944 to 1951, and was the executive director of it from 1947 to 1951.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I think the biography is so impressive that, rather than merely put it in the RECORD, we should discuss it.

He was an instructor in physiology at the University of Chicago in 1917, and associate professor from 1919 to 1925. He was the head of the Division of Physiology and Pharmacology at Northwestern University Medical School from 1926 to 1946. He was vice president in charge of Chicago Professional Colleges, University of Illinois, from 1946 to 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He was a distinguished professor of physiology, and head of the department of clinical science, from 1946 for a period of years. He was the scientific director of the Naval Medical Research Institute in 1942 and 1943.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He was consultant to the U.S. Army Quartermaster in 1943 and 1944. He was a member of the National Advisory Cancer Council from 1944 to 1951. He was the executive director of it from 1947 to 1951, or the latter 3 years of that time. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The latter 4 years—from 1947 to 1951.

Mr. PROXMIRE. His standing in the medical profession is indicated by the fact that he was a fellow of the American College of Physicians; a member of the American Medical Association; and chairman of the section on physiology and pathology of the AMA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So he is an expert and has been recognized by the AMA as an expert in this particular field.

He was also president of the Society of Internal Medicine from 1941 to 1942.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And he was president of the American Gastro-Enterological Association in 1940 and 1941.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is still correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He was also president of the Chicago Institute of Medicine in 1943.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of the Society of Internal Medicine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was reading beyond that point in his biography.

Here is a man who has written 1,500 scientific articles, and is managing editor of "Gastroenterology," which is considered the official publication in this field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He was editor from 1942 to 1952.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct—10 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When Dr. Ivy gave his endorsement to Krebiozen, the American Medical Association and various pundits in the medical profession took it on themselves to subject him to disciplinary action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it possible to conceive of the biography of a man who would possibly qualify better, on the basis of education, experience, and recognition by the profession, than Dr. Ivy in evaluating a drug, particularly for the cure of cancer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know of no better qualified man in the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that what the Senator from Illinois is asking is not that Krebiozen be approved, but that it simply be given a test?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all I am asking. That is all my associates are asking.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What the Senator from Illinois is asking is that this most eminent professor and doctor be given an opportunity to prove what he says?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess my ignorance of this subject, but I have received a few letters from my own State, in which it was stated that husbands, wives, or children had been saved by this drug or preparation, and that they hoped it would not be done away with; but I was of the opinion that I had read in the press the Food and Drug Administration had made an exhaustive inquiry into it and issued a statement, sometime since, that it had no medical value whatever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The FDA issued a statement that Krebiozen was identical with the substance creatine, but no clinical test or exhaustive inquiry was made. I am presenting to the Senate today the report of a committee of qualified experts whose study has shown not only that there was no exhaustive inquiry, but that the reports of the FDA and the NCI were based on unfair, inaccurate, and prejudiced statements.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator proposing that another study or inquiry be conducted?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; a fair and impartial clinical study. I should like to present to the Senate and to the country the reasons why I believe the statements of the Food and Drug Administration, and indeed of the National Cancer Institute were ill founded; and why the product should be judged only on the weight of the evidence of scientific opinion, as well as the opinion of the intelligent lay public.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course I know almost nothing about it, and I have very little information in this field. But I was rather surprised, in the light of the letters I have received

**from intelligent people, who thought that they had been assisted by this preparation, to read in the newspaper that the Food and Drug Administration had declared it to be altogether worthless.**

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was surprised and shocked, and it forced me, as I shall show, to ask that there be an independent inquiry and a report made to me. I shall present that report in a few minutes.

Second. A second reason which led me to ask for a fair test was that I had personally interviewed many cancer patients who have been treated with Krebiozen. The number of these people whom I have seen runs up into the scores and may total as many as a hundred. Many of these patients have told me that they were on the point of death from cancer until Krebiozen treatments arrested their decline. In some cases, I have been given the clinical records of these people. All of these patients have testified that upon taking Krebiozen they had greatly improved. They gave external evidence of being in good physical condition. In some cases, this treatment had been given over a considerable period of time.

Perhaps I may be pardoned if I give one of many illustrations that have come to me. I attended a dinner in Chicago some years ago in honor of Dr. Ivy. At that dinner Dr. Ivy read the clinical record of a young man, who was in attendance at the dinner. When he had first come to be treated by Dr. Ivy, he was what is known as a vegetable; that is, he was not able to eat, he was not able to move, he was not able to talk, and he was given up for dead.

After reading the clinical record to the guests at the dinner, Dr. Ivy asked this young man to come forward and testify. He did so, in a very straightforward fashion, obviously mentally alert and in good physical condition.

During the dinner I noticed that this young man was looking at me with very interested eyes. At the end of the dinner he came to me and said, "Senator, do you think that Signor Fanfani will be able to organize a Catholic-labor coalition in Italy and put through land reform?"

I said, "Young man, I think your good health has been restored."

That is a spectacular case, but there have been other cases in which Krebiozen apparently has brought about similarly beneficial results.

I have also interviewed several doctors who have treated patients with Krebiozen and who stated that the results were markedly beneficial.

Third. A third reason I was lead to ask for a fair test was that the statistical record submitted by Dr. Ivy on the first 4,000 cases treated with Krebiozen and which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 11, page 14287, seemed to indicate that in a large percentage of cases markedly beneficial results had been obtained in first, the reduction of pain and the necessity for narcotics; second, the arresting of cancer and the reduction in the size of the cancer tumors, this being particularly true in the cases of breast cancer in women, and third, the improvement in the general condition of the patients.

I certainly did not regard all these factors as proving Krebiozen to be a cure for cancer and I believe neither did Dr. Ivy, but I did believe that they justified a fair and honest test.

### MY EFFORTS TO OBTAIN SUCH A TEST

I therefore privately urged that there be such a test, by letter and by conferences with leading officials of the National Cancer Institute, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Specifically, I conferred with Drs. Heller and Endicott—the successive heads of the Cancer Institute—Dr. Shannon, the head of the National Institutes, and Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, who, though, I am informed, not a doctor, is nevertheless the chief medical adviser to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the early days of these negotiations, I thought there were prospects for such a test being conducted, particularly while I was dealing only with Dr. Heller. Later, however, the attitude of the Government officials hardened and I became convinced that they would never voluntarily agree to such a test. I also became exposed to the opposition of many members of the American Medical Association, who were influenced by the written and spoken propaganda emanating from the leaders and officials of that organization. I knew that the course I was following was unpopular and that I was ranging powerful forces against me, but I also knew of the hundreds of thousands of men and women, and yes, children, who die each year after great agony from cancer and of the millions who will suffer such a fate in the future unless a cure or beneficial treatment is discovered. Knowing of the way the medical profession has often historically persecuted its pioneers and pathbreakers, I resolved to push on and to continue to ask for an honest test. I found that the cancer institutes are spending approximately $44 million a year on cancer research and according to a verbal statement made to my administrative assistant, Howard Shuman, they are testing as anticancer agents—approximately 25 thousand chemical preparations a year on animals and at least a hundred a year on humans.

It seemed to me that no harm, and possibly some good, would be done if Krebiozen were added to the list, particularly when the costs would probably not exceed $250,000 at the outside. Therefore on July 18 of this year, in association with Senators Kefauver, Bayh, Case, Engle, Holland, Javits, Keating, Pell, Proxmire, Scott, Smathers, Symington, Williams of New Jersey, Williams of Delaware, and Yarborough, I introduced a resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 101—directing the National Cancer Institute to "undertake immediately a fair, impartial, and controlled test."

### THE ATTACK ON KREBIOZEN FROM THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute replied with an extraordinary series of moves. The Food and Drug Administration issued a press release on September 7 and later held a joint conference October 25 and 26, under the auspices of the American Medical Association in which Krebiozen was branded as a "hoax" and as being an illustration of "quackery."

The press release of the Food and Drug Administration is appended to the report of the Robinson committee in exhibit 14 which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. In the process, Doctors Ivy and Durovic were threatened with criminal prosecution by the FDA. The action of the FDA was based on the alleged identity of Krebiozen with the substance creatine, which identity, it was stated, had been discovered through comparison of the spectrographic analyses of the two substances by a 20-year-old summer volunteer in their offices. The report of the National Cancer Institute, issued on October 16, 1963, which denied a test, was allegedly based upon an analysis of records of 504 typical cases submitted to them by Dr. Ivy. The press release issued by the NCI also is appended to the Robinson report in exhibit 14. Mr. President, I have copies of these case records in my office up to date as to the time when another set of copies went into the hands of the NCI, and they have therefore been available to me and my associates for examination. The Cancer Institute conducted extensive field investigations to enlarge the records of these cases, but I have not been able to have these additional data examined, nor will the Cancer Institute permit anyone else to look at them. Despite my request that in order that he might answer any questions they might have, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare refused to permit Dr. Ivy to appear before their anonymous board of 24 "experts" who were called upon to appraise the cases. This committee in turn was shielded from public scrutiny.

Mr. President, only following the denunciation of Krebiozen by FDA and the NCI was a list of the names of these 24 men made public. This list is a part of the HEW press release of October 16 which is appended to the Robinson committee report as exhibit 14. We are analyzing the records. They seem to show that these gentlemen received a total of well over $700,000 in 1 year in grants from the National Cancer Institute, and over a 2-year period the figure is much larger than that.

When the Food and Drug Administration and the Cancer Institute published their denunciation of Krebiozen, I was, I admit, somewhat shaken. Could it be that Krebiozen was a hoax, after all, and completely unworthy of a test, as was being charged?

### MY EFFORTS TO GET AN INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE FDA AND NCI

But I recalled the persecution by the medical pundits of many of the great medical scientists: Harvey, the man who discovered the circulation of blood; Jenner, who discovered the vaccination for smallpox; Holmes and Semmelweis, who found that the cause of the deaths of mothers and their children in childbirth was due to the dirty hands of the doctors in attendance; Pasteur, who discovered bacteria and the bacterial theory of disease; Lister, who discovered the principal of antisepsis in surgery; Keen, a student of Lister and later a great surgeon of Philadelphia; Ehrlich, the discoverer of 606; and more recently Sir Alexander Fleming, who discovered penicillin, but said that penicillin was neglected by the medical profession for about 12 years and called "quackery," and that thus tens of thousands of lives were lost during the intervening period by the attitude of official medicine. Remembering, I say, the way all those men had been persecuted by the official leaders of the medical profession of their times; and knowing at firsthand of the record of the heads of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with high protein fish concentrate, about which I spoke several days ago on the floor of the Senate, and in connection with wheat germ bread, and thalidomide, as well as the heinous conflicts of interest which have been recently revealed about one or more of its high officials, I felt it was my duty to see if I could not get an independent appraisal of the two sets of conclusions issued by the Food and Drug Administration and by the National Cancer Institute.

But how could this be conducted? I was not competent to do it myself, and most doctors were either frightened by the pressures of the American Medical Association or fearful that, if they questioned the Cancer Institute or the Department of HEW, their research grants would be cut off in reprisal.

But fortunately I was able to find a brave, honest, and competent doctor, Dr. Miles H. Robinson, of 10120 Chapel Road, Potomac, Md. Dr. Robinson is a member of a distinguished Pennsylvania family with whose members I have been acquainted for a third of a century. His parents achieved genuine eminence in the fields of finance, economics, social service, and religious betterment. Dr. Robinson is a man of the same breed. He graduated from Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, and was later on the medical faculties of Vanderbilt University and the University of Pennsylvania, and subsequently in private practice. Fortunately, he has an independent income so that he could afford to take the time to act at my suggestion as chairman of the committee which I asked him to organize to prepare a report appraising the agencies' conclusions. Dr. Robinson has worked for virtually 3 months on this matter, voluntarily, without pay or reward.

### THE QUALIFICATIONS OF DRS. ROBINSON AND ANDERSON AND MESSRS. CLARK AND SHUMAN

I also asked my Administrative Assistant, Howard E. Shuman, to work with Dr. Robinson as an editor or, as the French say, "redacteur" of his report. Mr. Shuman is a graduate of the University of Illinois and of Oxford University, where he was president of the Oxford Union, the highest distinction which a student can win. He came to me in 1955 from the University of Illinois, where he was an instructor in economics.

Let me say a further word about Dr. Robinson. I instructed him to search for the truth and to state his results regardless of whether or not these helped or injured Drs. Ivy and Durvoc. He did not need any such injunction, but he abundantly fulfilled it. We owe him an inestimable debt.

We speedily found that two distinguished Illinois scientists, Dr. Scott Anderson, a physicist, and Mr. H. S. Clark, a chemist, both of Urbana-Champaign, had been conducting independent tests of Krebiozen over a period of years and had direct evidence to refute the contention of the Food and Drug Administration that Krebiozen is identical with creatine. They came to Washington at their own expense to report to us on their studies, and their material furnishes the basis for part I of the report and for several of the exhibits which they prepared. These men are also of the highest competence and character.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the qualifications of the members of the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement of qualifications was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMITTEE PREPARING REPORT

#### DR. SCOTT ANDERSON

Ph. D. in physics, University of Illinois.

Fellow, American Physical Society.

Member, American Chemical Society, American Optical Society, and American Association of Physics.

Formerly taught at Carleton College and at Carnegie Tech.

Formerly acting head of Physics Department, Illinois Wesleyan University.

Member of board, Illinois Wesleyan University.

Owner of the Anderson Physical Laboratory in Urbana-Champaign, Ill.

#### MR. HOWARD S. CLARK

B.A., Ohio State University.

Member, American Chemical Society, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and Illinois and New York Academies of Science.

Helped establish course in microanalytical chemistry, Ohio State University.

Microanalytical chemist 4 years with Merck & Co. Research Laboratory, Rahway, N.J.

Chemist 10 years with geochemical section, Illinois Geological Survey.

Owner and director of Clark Microanalytical Laboratory, Urbana, Ill., 16 years.

#### DR. MILES H. ROBINSON, M.D., CHAIRMAN

B.A., Swarthmore College.

M.D., University of Pennsylvania Medical School, 1938.

Instructor in physiology, Vanderbilt Medical School, 1942–45.

Instructor in pharmacology at University of Pennsylvania Medical School, 1945–46.

Original research in these fields published in leading basic science medical journals, American Journal of Physiology, Journal of Pharmacology & Experimental Therapeutics, etc.

Member of Maryland State Medical Society and Montgomery County Medical Society.

Member, medical staff of Washington Sanitarium and Hospital.

Practices internal medicine in Potomac, Md.

Fought Teamsters and AMA in Washington State where they had a private agreement to block any labor controlled health insurance plan and to preserve high prices of local AMA doctors who owned and operated their own commercial health insurance corporations.

#### MR. HOWARD E. SHUMAN, SECRETARY AND EDITOR

Administrative assistant to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS since 1961; formerly legislative assistant, 1955–60.

B.A., M.A., University of Illinois, 1946, 1948.

B.B.A., University of Michigan, 1949.

B. Litt., Oxford University, England, 1951

On economics faculty, University of Illinois, 1953–54.

Rotary Foundation Fellow, Oxford, England, 1949–50.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of the finest things in the record of Dr. Robinson is that when he was practicing medicine out west, he fought the Teamsters Union and the American Medical Association in the State of Washington, where the AMA and the Teamsters Union tried to preserve the high prices and the high fees of the local AMA doctors who owned and operated their own commercial health insurance corporations.

Mr. Shuman, whose qualifications have been given, is a highly honorable and competent man.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Presdent, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Before the Senator goes to his next point, will he yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. What was the effect of the action of the Federal Food and Drug Administration with respect to the ability of cancer patients who had been taking this cure to secure the drug following its disapproval by the Food and Drug Administration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was made impossible for them to receive it.

Mr. ERVIN. Like the Senator from Illinois, I am not a doctor. Personally, I do not feel competent to express an opinion as to the usefulness of the drug Krebiozen in the treatment of cancer. However, I am impressed by the number of letters I have received from persons who were suffering from cancer, who had been taking the drug, and who have great faith in it. Is that the experience of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very much so. There are only two places where the drug can now be distributed: in the State of Illinois, where the American Medical Association is trying to have it barred, unsuccessfully as yet; and in Canada, where Krebiozen is permitted to be sold.

Mr. ERVIN. Irrespective of the question of the usefulness of the drug as a therapeutic agent, it seems to me that those who have been taking the drug and are convinced that it has been of benefit to them ought to be permitted to continue to receive it. Does not the Senator from Illinois think so, irrespective of the other question involved?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a large degree of agreement. I do not go the full way and I do not say that patients have the right to take whatever they want to take. Everyone admits that Krebiozen is nontoxic; that no harm results from taking it. The Food and Drug Administration claims it is worthless, and that, therefore, if taken, it would stand in the way of more worthy and more efficacious preparations and methods.

What I do say is that the evidence shows that there should be, immediately, a full and fair test.

Mr. ERVIN. It seems to me that people who suffer from the scourges of this disease ought to be permitted to continue to obtain the drug, irrespective of its therapeutic quality, if it gives them mental and physical ease.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Carolina can make a strong case for that position. I do not go that far. I am not a member of the League for Medical Freedom, although I have great respect for its sponsors. But I do say—as I hope to develop in a moment—that no harm is done by taking this preparation, which all agree is nontoxic. We believe there is strong evidence that it may be beneficial; and we strongly disapprove of the methods used and the conclusions issued by the Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair), I understand that all that the Senator from Illinois is asking is that a fair test be made of this drug, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it has therapeutic properties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois submit his ideas in regard to what a fair test would be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not an expert on this point; but certainly a fair test should include a test on human beings who are willing to subject themselves to the test. The test should not be forced on anyone against his will; but if someone is willing to have the test made on him, I think that should be permitted, so that there can be a determination as to the efficacy or lack of efficacy of Krebiozen in the treatment of the different types of cancer. There should be what is called a controlled test, and it should be based on the willingness of persons to undergo the test. It is always possible to find volunteers.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his efforts to have a fair test made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. As a cosponsor of the resolution and as a supporter of the Senator from Illinois, I wish to express for both of us the great satisfaction we are deriving this afternoon from the accession of support from certain quarters in the Senate that have not been so active up to now. I think it is fine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

### THE FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE BY DR. DUROVIC

Madam President, we also had the full cooperation of Drs. Durovic and Ivy. Dr. Durovic made available to the public a full statement of his income and a copy of his income tax statement for 1962, together with the statement of the Internal Revenue Service that they examined his tax liability for 1960 and approved his return.

The full details are given in exhibit 12 of the Robinson committee report, which should be studied in detail. Dr. Durovic has been charged with fraud by the American Medical Association and by the Food and Drug Administration. The exhibit includes a copy of a letter from the Bank of London, which shows that in May 1949, when he came to this country, he had a balance of $190,000. So he did not come to this country impoverished. We include a copy of his individual income tax return for 1962. It shows heavy indebtedness as of that year. We also include a letter from the Treasury Department, showing that the income reported for 1960 was correct. We also include a letter from Canada, as of 1954, authorizing the sale of this drug in Canada. These statements are appended to the Robinson committee report as exhibit 12.

Madam President, we also have, and present for the first time, photostatic copies of letters which the officers of two big drug companies, Abbott Laboratories and Eli Lilly, wrote to Dr. Durovic in 1951 confirming their proposals to purchase and market Krebiozen. The letter signed by the president of Abbott Laboratories proposed to pay Dr. Durovic $1.6 million for 200,000 ampules of Krebiozen conditioned on a "mutually satisfactory" contract "in respect to the future manufacture of this product and other pertinent terms."

Madam President, the letter from the Lilly Research Laboratories offers to pay Dr. Durovic huge sums for his formula and patent totaling probably at least $2 million.

But, Madam President, Dr. Durovic refused these offers, and the Robinson committee report, on page 11, column 2, refers to Dr. Durovic's statement that he refused to make such a sale because he could not get the companies to agree to set a ceiling on the prices charged.

He had an opportunity to become a wealthy man if he would permit the drug companies to fix a charge of $30 to $40 per ampule for Krebiozen. But he rejected that offer, on the ground that this was an unfair and improper charge to levy upon the general public.

### THE EVIDENCE IS NOW BEFORE THE PUBLIC—MAY THE TRUTH PREVAIL

Madam President, I now present the final report which the group chaired by Dr. Robinson has made to me. It does not go into the question of whether Krebiozen is a cure for cancer, but merely whether it is worthy of a test and, specifically, whether the refusals of the Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute to conduct such a test were proper or whether they were grossly biased.

I ask my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to go over this report with care and in minute detail and to come to their own conclusions.

The authors of the report believe that the record shows that the Food and Drug Administration has been grievously biased, and that the claimed identity between Krebiozen and creatine is definitely mistaken. They also point out that the Cancer Institute imposed unduly harsh and severe standards of judgment upon Krebiozen which they do not apparently impose upon most, if any, of the other substances which they test, and that the evidence in favor of Krebiozen is far stronger than the Cancer Institute will admit.

Madam President, the alleged identity was based upon a spectrographic analysis of the sample of Krebiozen submitted to the Food and Drug Administration and of the common substance creatine. Figure 1 of the graphs which are displayed in the Senate and which Senators have on their desks, is an enlargement of a photograph which, at my request, was sent to me by the Food and Drug Administration. It shows the spectrograms of creatine—shown above—and Krebiozen—shown below.

Spectrograms are made by exposing a substance to light of different frequencies, and recording how much of the light at each frequency is absorbed by the substance. Absorption causes the line in the spectrogram to drop down.

The more completely the light is absorbed, the more the figure approaches zero. When the light is not all absorbed, the figure is 100. The frequency of the light waves is shown on the horizontal scale.

It will be noted that there is a general similarity between Krebiozen and creatine, and that this led the Food and Drug Administration to pronounce the two identical, in the press release it issued That statement is reproduced in exhibit 14 of the Robinson committee report.

The Robinson committee superimposed the Krebiozen graph upon the creatine graph, and photographs were made. If the two substances were identical, the two charts would completely coincide. It will be noted that there is substantial identity from a wavelength of 2¾ microns to perhaps 7 microns, but that from 7 microns to 13 microns there are significant differences, and that the Krebiozen line is distinctly below the creatine line. If the Food and Drug Administration had simply superimposed one graph squarely upon the other, the differences would have shown up.

The similarity between the two graphs in certain areas is due to the presence of some creatine in the Krebiozen, but the point which the spectrographic analysis establishes is that there is another substance besides creatine in Krebiozen which can be called Krebiozen. Krebiozen is not the same as creatine.

Now the experts go even further. Dr. Anderson made a mathematical comparison by which he constructs a differential spectrogram, taking the differences from point to point in the spectrographic analysis of Krebiozen and the spectrographic analysis of creatine. This is shown in figure 4.

Suffice it to say that if creatine and Krebiozen were the same, the line of the graph in figure 4 would be flat. But it is not. Therefore, Krebiozen and creatine are not the same.

What did the Food and Drug Administration do? What it did is shown in figure 3. It made transparent films of the Krebiozen and creatine spectrograms and laid them on top of each other and photographed them. Figure 3 is an enlargement of the Food and Drug Administration photograph which we have enlarged from a small photograph which the Food and Drug Administration gave us.

This was widely published in Life magazine to show that Krebiozen was the same as creatine. But the Food and Drug Administration did not squarely overlay the two graphs. It dropped one graph 7½ percent below the other. This obliterates the area of maximum difference between the two graphs. The lines now seem intertwined, as if oscillating around an identical line—the same for both substances. A layman would naturally assume an identity. I do not say this was done intentionally. I do say that the result was deceptive, in that it would serve to convince a layman, who did not know spectographic analysis of the identity of the two substances.

The Krebiozen submitted to the Food and Drug Administration is known as Krebiozen-1, but three other batches of Krebiozen have been developed. There was the original Krebiozen, which we will call Krebiozen-zero, produced in the Argentine and brought into this country. A spectrographic analysis of it is different from that for Krebiozen-1. Then there is Krebiozen-2 and Krebiozen-3, which we will call K-2 and K-3. K-2 and K-3 are more recently developed, and have had much more of the creatine taken out. The differences between K-2 and K-3 on the one hand, and creatine on the other, are quite marked.

We have not had time to produce photographic enlargements of the comparative spectrographic analyses of the latter two substances, but the originals are available in my office. We also have chemical formulas and statements from Dr. Anderson and Mr. Clark that show that whereas K-1 was creatine plus from 2 to 8 percent of another substance, which we will call Krebiozen, in the case of K-2, over 40 percent of the sample was Krebiozen, differing from creatine; and that in the case of K-3, 79.4 percent was Krebiozen, differing from creatine.

As the analysis has proceeded, it has been possible to separate out more and more of the creatine and obtain a more and more pure Krebiozen substance. But even if the substance X, which we will call Krebiozen, which is in K-1 over and above the creatine, is as small as 2.8 percent, or an average of 5 percent, that difference is extremely significant from a biological point of view.

In one of the appendices, and in part II of the report, the committee calls attention to the way in which small differences can have the most profound biological effects.

For example, the amount of fluoride added to community drinking water, to stop the decay of teeth, is less than 1 part in 1 million—0.7 part per million. The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 30,000 to 80,000 times this amount. There is, of course, very much more in K-2 and K-3.

Adrenalin has an easily detectable biological effect in a blood concentration of 1 part in 1.4 billion. The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA samples was from 42 to 112 million times this amount.

Biotin, a B vitamin, is biologically active in a concentration of 1 part in 10 billion. The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 300 to 800 million times this amount.

The concentration of free thyroid hormone in the normal blood is 1 part per 10,000 million parts of blood plasma. These minute amounts are physiologically active and necessary for health. The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 300 to 800 million times this amount.

Fever in man can be produced by injecting one ten-millionth of a gram of an extract from the bacterium, E. Coli.

The lethal dose of purified botulinum toxin in man is 0.06 millionth of a gram.

I could multiply these tests. I wish to say, in addition, that the Food and Drug Administration did not conduct any bioassay tests. They have not made a single biological test.

The test for the effectiveness of biological substances is to use them on animals and/or man and to determine their biological effect.

Dozens of the most common biological substances have been used for long periods of time in medical treatment despite either their lack of uniformity or the fact that their full chemical composition is unknown—such as female hormones and the hormones of the pituitary.

Neither the Food and Drug Administration nor the Cancer Institute made any biological test of any kind on Krebiozen. But Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the chief scientific sponsor of the drug, routinely uses the bioassay to determine both the potency of the samples of the drug Krebiozen and its biological effects.

In other words, he uses the method of ultimate importance when dealing with a biological substance. He measures the potency of the sample by testing its effects on human breast tumors and by measuring the effects.

I point out also that creatine and Krebiozen differ in color. I have seen these tests. Creatine is pure white. Krebiozen has a tan color. The chemical composition of the two is different, as Mr. Clark shows. The molecular weights of the two substances differ.

### THE CANCER INSTITUTE IMPOSED UNDULY HARSH AND SEVERE TESTS

I point out further that the Cancer Institute imposed unduly harsh and severe standards of judgment upon Krebiozen which apparently they do not impose upon most, if any, of the other substances which they test, and that the evidence in favor of Krebiozen is far stronger than the Cancer Institute will admit.

I recommend that this part of the report of the Robinson committee, part III, be studied with great care.

The committee of 24 proceeded in secret. It did not interview a single patient or a single doctor who had treated a patient. It refused to Dr. Ivy the right to appear, although I requested that they grant him the right to appear.

Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic were not given a detailed evaluation of the case records. The National Cancer Institute and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare refused to make the case records available for independent analysis and review, despite the fact that on October 22, 1963, I wrote them making that request.

The National Cancer Institute set extremely harsh and severe standards. I remind this body that the National Cancer Institute tests thousands of substances annually as potential anticancer agents. We understand they test as many as 24,000 a year on animals and 100 a year on humans.

The National Cancer Institute, in the case of the Krebiozen patients, determined only whether the NCI would test the drug, and set extremely harsh and severe standards as to whether it was a cure.

First, the Institute threw out 216 cases for reasons which have not been explained in adequate detail.

Second, of the remaining cases the Institute threw out all cases in which there was a decrease in pain or a withdrawal of narcotics.

Third, it threw out all cases in which the tumor was arrested.

Fourth, it threw out all cases in which the tumor decreased in size from 1 to 50 percent.

Finally, it counted only those cases of the 288 in which the tumor had decreased in size by 50 percent or more. They found 15 of these.

Then, on a variety of grounds, many of which were questionable, as will be shown, they threw out 13 of these 15.

Finally they arrived at two cases in which there was a regression of more than 50 percent, for which they could find no grounds for any adverse judgments. They ascribed these to spontaneous or natural cures or regressions.

### THE EVERSON-COLE STUDY

A classic study of spontaneous regression of cancer was reported by Dr. Everson and Dr. Cole in 1956. At that time they found only 47 cases with adequate documentation to accept as probable examples of spontaneous regression out of approximately 4½ million cases, from 1900 to 1956. That is a ratio of about 1 case for every 100,000.

Newspaper reports indicate that they have now increased the number to 130 out of a proportionately larger total number of cancer cases.

I ask Senators to note how Drs. Everson and Cole define "spontaneous regression." It is the "partial"—and I emphasize the word "partial"—"or complete disappearance of a malignant tumor in the absence of all treatment, or in the presence of therapy which is considered inadequate to exert a significant influence on neoplastic disease."

They went on to say that they did not imply that spontaneous regression need progress to the point of complete disappearance of a tumor, or that spontaneous regression is synonymous with a cure.

They stated that, in a few cases, they counted it as spontaneous regression when the tumor disappeared in one area but flourished unchecked in other areas or reappeared later.

They found only 47 cases from 1900 to 1956, and have found 130 to date; which is a ratio of about 1 to 100,000 or possibly 1 to not more than 80,000.

I ask Senators to note that the Everson & Cole standards include "partial" regression, not merely those of 50 percent or more. They include cases in which there was other therapy which was considered inadequate to influence the disease. In some cases the NCI threw out a Krebiozen case when there was other therapy which was inadequate.

Everson & Cole included cases in which the cancer flourished in other areas of the body. The NCI threw out, of the 15 cases with a 50-percent regression or more, the cases in which the cancer flourished elsewhere. They may have thrown out many more which do not appear in the final 15 cases.

Everson & Cole included cases in which the cancer reappeared, but the NCI threw out, of the 15 cases with a 50-percent or greater regression, some cases in which cancer later appeared.

Thus the NCI set up standards which were far more severe than the standards of Everson & Cole, yet on that basis they found 15 cases, but threw out 13, many of which, by the standards of Everson & Cole, should have been included.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator state that the Everson & Cole statistics suggest that in 1 case out of 80,000 or 1 case out of 100,000 there was spontaneous regression?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. There were only 47 cases from 1900 to 1956, out of nearly 5 million cases, and only 130 cases up to date, with a much larger total number of cases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How many cases were subjected to Krebiozen?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There were records of the treatment of approximately 5,000. Of those, Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic submitted 504 cases—not that they were the best cases, but because they believed they were typical cases.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of the 504 there were 15 which showed regression?

Mr. DOUGLAS. At least 15.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At least 15 of the 504 cases?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. It is difficult to identify the cases allegedly studied by the NCI. The NCI placed its own numbers on the cases and refers only to its numbers. There may have been as many as 33. Dr. Robinson has been able to identify 9 in addition to the 15. There were also another nine which were also cases of substantial regression.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In part III of the Senator's presentation, on pages 6 and 7, is a list of valid cases ignored, including case after case in which the cancer not only regressed but diminished very greatly in size.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The metastasis disappeared in most cases?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, the spreading of the cancer elsewhere disappeared in case after case, and the tumor itself declined.

### SOME APPARENT CASES WHERE KREBIOZEN WAS MARKEDLY BENEFICIAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. The first case is that of a Mrs. J. F. She had a breast cancer which was 5 by 7 centimeters, an area of 35 square centimeters. This was decreased to 2 by 2 centimeters, or 4 square centimeters.

Mrs. H. W. had a breast cancer of large size, 12 by 11 centimeters, or 132 square centimeters. That was decreased to 3.5 by 2.5 centimeters, which would be 8.75 square centimeters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are declines of 70 or 80 or 90 percent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These were rejected? These were not included among the 15?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

(At this point Mr. McGOVERN took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. So even if one takes what seems to be an unfair selection on the part of NCI, the statistics are still impressive, because there still are 15 cases in which there was some regression. Even if one considers the two in which there allegedly was spontaneous regression, it is a far better record than the record of virtually no spontaneous regression in the history studied by NCI generally; is that not correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is completely correct.

Also, in 1951 there were 10 cases in which apparently there had been great improvement. Officials of the American Medical Association, nevertheless, listed these patients as among a group about to die in their status report on Krebiozen in 1951.

But 10 of those were still living and they were presented at the Illinois legislative hearings on Krebiozen in 1954.

In one of the exhibits we submit, showing that seven of them are still living after 12 years, we give their names and addresses. If necessary, they will be produced. One of them is now living in Norway, but will come here, if necessary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I call attention to three examples which seem to be particularly convincing.

> Mrs. I. P., age 40, breast cancer 16 by 11 centimeters, decreased to zero; axillary node 2 by 1 centimeters, disappeared; pain disappeared; regained use of arm and went back to work as telephone operator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I read another example:

> Mrs. M. Z., age 67, breast cancer metastasis on chest wall 2 by 3 centimeters decreased to less than one-third. Came back when Krebiozen was stopped and again decreased 50 percent when Krebiozen again given. Doctor's comment: "Amazing."

Another example:

> Mrs. I. K., age 51, breast cancer metastases to neck glands completely disappeared. New metastasis appeared after Krebiozen stopped 1 month, and with more Krebiozen, this also disappeared.

These cases were all thrown out, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They were among those that were ignored.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Those examples are amazing to me. The Senator from Illinois is not a doctor or a physiologist. Neither am I; but both of us can understand statistics and read the English language. The Senator from Illinois is particularly qualified, as an economist, to understand statistical treatment and make a determination as to what are fair statistics and what are unfair. This is a most impressive situation, which certainly should be given every kind of scrutiny by competent medical authorities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator; but the whole credit goes to the voluntary committee, headed by Dr. Robinson, and including Dr. Anderson, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Shuman.

They have prepared their report in three sections, running to 25 mimeographed pages, which I have not yet introduced into the RECORD. I have merely summarized some of the high spots. They submit also exhibits running to over 50 mimeographed pages.

So we have laid a factual basis for every point, if we can only persuade people to read the evidence.

One of the extraordinary circumstances goes back to the 1951 cases, 7 of whom are still living after 12 years. Many of those who died were advanced in years and could well have died because of age.

Let me say for the sake of the record that when the AMA issued its "status report" on 100 proved cancer cases treated with Krebiozen, which has served ever since as the backbone of all opposition to this preparation, 73 of the 100 cases were so close to death when the Krebiozen treatment was begun that 40 received only 2 injections, and the other 33 received only 4 injections of Krebiozen.

The report of the AMA also omitted all mention of objective cancer regression recorded in the medical records of 18 of these patients; and, on the basis of its survey, covering only a few weeks to a few months, the report characterized all of the 100 patients as dead or dying.

However, of the 23 remaining patients, 10 were alive and well, and appeared in person before the Illinois Legislative Commission on Krebiozen in 1954, and 7 of them are still alive and well today, in December 1963, as follows:

Alive in 1954: Mrs. Julian Howard, Mrs. Cecile Luebkemann, Mrs. Catherine Firnsthal, Irene O. Kibby, A. M. Howard, Eleanor Gahan, Helen Arndt, Magda Johansen, Evelyn Vogel, and Irene R. Pietrowicz.

Alive in December 1963: Mrs. Julian Howard, 2429 West Berenice Street, Chicago; Mrs. Cecile Luebkemann, 6439

Newgaard Street, Chicago; Irene O. Kibby, 2021 West 73d Court, Elmwood Park, Ill.; A. M. Howard, 9410 North Monticello Street, Skokie, Ill.; Eleanor Gahan, 1619 Garfield Boulevard, Chicago; and Magda Johansen, 3810 North Troy Street, Chicago, now in Norway, who, I understand, is willing to fly here to testify.

Evelyn Vogel, 1820 West Nelson Street, Chicago.

These are people who the AMA in 1951 said were either dead or dying.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So there is no question in these cases that these people did have cancer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the chances of spontaneous regression are virtually nil, and there is no question that these people are still alive?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question that the only treatment they had was with Krebiozen?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The majority of them had nothing but Krebiozen. Two had inadequate surgery followed by recurrence of the malignancy which was then treated with Krebiozen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But Krebiozen was the principal treatment and the principal reliance of the doctors?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The National Cancer Institute explicitly imposed standards stricter than Everson and Cole standards, and indeed, in addition, more severe standards than the general criteria which they said they were going to impose and follow.

On the 28th of October 1963, I addressed a letter to Dr. Endicott, head of the National Cancer Institute, about the records of the 504 patients.

I asked the following questions:

> Of the 288 cases which your group qualified as fulfilling the necessary conditions for evaluation, how many showed a decrease in pain and/or the withdrawal of narcotics?
>
> In how many was the growth of the tumor arrested?
>
> In how many was there regression of the tumor less than 50 percent? i.e., from 25 to 50 percent, etc.

Then I asked the following questions:

> How many drugs or alleged anticancer substances or agents is the National Cancer Institute testing this year?
>
> How many of these are being tested on humans this year?

I understand that 24,000 alleged anticancer chemical preparations a year are being tested on animals and 100 on human beings, but I wanted this in writing.

Then I asked the following question:

> In how many of these agents did you determine that there was more than a 50-percent decrease in tumors in a large number of cases prior to agreeing to test?

In other words, did the National Cancer Institute insist on the same standards for other substances as they insisted on for Krebiozen?

I further asked:

> How much is to be spent this year on these drugs, agents, tests, and scientific evaluations?

I understand it is $44 million, but I have not yet received a written reply. I also asked Dr. Endicott:

> In addition, would you provide me with exactly the same information for prior years—that is, how many drugs have you tested, how many have been tested on humans, what has been the cost, and how many met the prior criteria of a 50-percent regression?
>
> Would you provide, in addition to the numbers, the specific names of the substances in each of these cases?

I understand they admit that many highly toxic substances have been approved for both testing and treatment of cancer, and in some cases the tests have been accompanied by the death of the patient. Krebiozen is admittedly nontoxic. One of the toxic substances is 5-F-U, in which the American Cancer Institute had a one-half interest, and now has a one-quarter interest, in the profits that may be made.

I also asked Dr. Endicott:

> Would you provide for me the amount of funds that either the NCI or the NIH have provided to the various institutions represented by members of the committee since the NCI has been making grants of funds?

We shall submit later tentative records of some of the grants we have been able to find. I think it will be found that all of the 24 members of the committee were either receiving research grants, or the departments of the universities, with which they were connected, were, or else they were employees of the National Cancer Institute or the Veterans' Administration. There is a real question therefore as to how independent their judgments would be.

I stated in my letter:

> I note that you base your final opinion at least twice in part on the findings of the Food and Drug Administration that Krebiozen is creatine. In view of the previous NCI finding of 21 percent carbon, which is wholly incompatible with creatine, do you concur in this finding? Do you believe that there are other substances or "impurities" in the Krebiozen submitted in such quantities that the substance could not be as conclusively identified as done by the FDA when it said it was creatine?
>
> Is it not true that with respect to biological effects and in the case of antibodies, amounts in the quantity of one part in thousands, or millions, or billions can and do have significant biological effects, and also that those are more often than not undetectable by spectrographic, chemical, and the other forms of analysis used by the Food and Drug Administration in their analysis of krebiozen.
>
> I would like very much to have very definite answers to this last set of questions.
>
> With best wishes.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

That letter was sent on October 28. It is now December 5. Approximately 40 days have passed since then. Six weeks have passed, and no reply has been received from the National Institutes of Health or from the National Cancer Institute.

### LET US SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH

Mr. President, I ask that the scientific community study all this material and come to an independent judgment not based on gossip, hearsay, or the pronouncements of administrative and medical bureaucrats.

Who should be afraid of the truth? How can the truth be established except by tests?

Truth should be established in the laboratory and in the hospital; that is where I want to put the study.

Should the bureaucrats be privileged to shut off a fair test?

Are civil servants always right?

Are the leaders of the American Medical Association always fairminded?

Let us remember the great medical discoveries of the past, how the medical pundits are frequently wrong, and how they hounded many of the great benefactors of mankind, sometimes to their very death.

I spent a part of the summer of 1923 with the great surgeon, Dr. W. W. Keen. I talked with him many nights. He told me how he had abandoned surgery as the result of his year's work with the Union Army during the Civil War, because he felt surgery was nothing more than butchery; and how he then read in medical journals, when he was a farm laborer in New Jersey, about a crazy Quaker doctor named Joseph Lister, who was operating in Scotland, on the theory that bacteria developed in wounds and that the thing to do was to kill the bacteria, and that then the natural health of the organism would bring about recovery.

Lister was persecuted by the British Medical Association. He was threatened with having his license revoked. However, the stories given out by Lister's detractors showed that Lister's theory checked with what Dr. Keen had observed in the tragic year of the Civil War, from March 1864 to April 1865, when he was a surgeon with Grant, and had seen many men die from the suppuration of wounds after he had operated.

He told me that in those days he would hold the sutures in his teeth, and sharpen his knife on the sole of his boot, after he had raised up his boot from the muddy ground. That was the accepted practice at that time.

He said that he decided to go to see this crazy man in Scotland, because he thought he might be right. He went to Scotland and studied under Lister. Lister had his hospital built over or near the public Potter's Field which was crawling with vermin. Yet in Lister's hospital virtually no one died as a result of operations because Lister had developed a carbolic acid wash and disinfectant. Dr. Keen came back from Scotland and started to practice. He was referred to as a crazy Listerite. No one would engage him. He was denied an opportunity to practice in every hospital in Philadelphia. He told me that he finally got down to one suit of clothes and to one meal a day. He said that when he walked along the street everyone would cross over to the other side so they would not have to greet him.

Finally there was one openminded surgeon in the great Pennsylvania General

Hospital. He said, "Let us give this young fellow a chance." So they let him operate.

Keen disinfected the wounds and his knife with carbolic acid. That was pretty strong medicine, but it killed the bacteria. And none of his patients died from infection as a result of his surgery.

Then the hospital set aside one ward in which he was permitted to operate. All around him people were dying in the best hospitals in the United States, but no one died from infection under Keen. He had great technical skill, because the year he had spent operating on Union soldiers had given him great skill and virtuosity. He used the Lister method of disinfecting the wounds. Then he was made chief surgeon of the hospital. He directed the surgery in all the cases in that great hospital, and virtually no one died from infection.

He began to chronicle the results in statistical articles. He was threatened with expulsion from the Pennsylvania Medical Society. However, he hung on. Gradually the statistical record was so overwhelming that the doctors from around Philadelphia came to study under him. Then doctors from all parts of the country began to study under him.

This was in the 1890's. In general, even then, most hospitals were nothing but charnel houses.

Finally he was accepted as the greatest surgeon in the United States.

The old man told me—and he started to cry—about his experiences. He said, "I nearly went under. I was nearly shut off."

Lister had gone through the same experience in England. However, the British moved more rapidly. They made him a knight. He became Sir Joseph Lister. Then he was made Lord Lister.

The father of the great Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL, studied under Joseph Lister and he was the Senator's godfather. Lister was then called from Scotland to England. He was established as a great surgeon of England.

Let me make it clear that we should not conclude that innovators are correct merely because they are persecuted. Persecution does not make a man correct. But we do say that some who are correct are nevertheless persecuted because they are innovators.

I will go further, and say that the leaders of the American Medical Association have a vested interest in discrediting Krebiozen, and that this goes back at least a dozen years. One side of the story, which narrates the alleged reasons for their opposition, has been published in Herbert Bailey's "A Matter of Life and Death." I do not know whether all that Mr. Bailey says is accurate, but if it is untrue, it is clearly libelous. Yet so far as I know, no suit for libel has ever been brought.

Some of Mr. Bailey's statements are corroborated by the documents which I now publish for the first time, such as the big offers for the patent on Krebiozen, made by Eli Lilly and by Abbott Laboratories, offering between $1 million and $2 million. This information is indeed corroborated by these documents and photostatic copies of the original signed letters are in my office.

As to the AMA, I do not make the statements; we merely reproduce the statements made by no less than five persons. The then treasurer of the American Medical Association is alleged to have said that unless control over Krebiozen were given to two gentlemen, one with the same name as the AMA treasurer, but not apparently related, he would see to it that the AMA destroyed the reputation of Krebiozen. This statement may not be true. But it was corroborated under oath by five persons before an Illinois legislative committee. They are referred to by Mr. Bailey.

I spoke yesterday with a member of that Commission and asked him if he remembered that testimony. He said he did. Furthermore, he said that the testimony was given under oath.

### A FINAL APPEAL

I appeal to Senators and to the scientific and general public for an honest and unbiased study of the facts.

Once again, I repeat, I am not claiming, nor have I ever claimed, that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer. I am merely stating that on the basis of the Robinson-Anderson-Clark-Shuman report, it is worthy of an honest and fair test. It is a terrible thing to be compelled to say, because of the facts revealed in this report, that our confidence in the ability or readiness of the appropriate Government agencies to make such a test is now open to very grave doubt. They are indeed on trial.

We remember that during the Dreyfus case, Emile Zola published his article entitled "J'Accuse," in which he accused certain members of the French General Staff with forging documents attributed to Dreyfus. I shall not imitate Zola. I am not making any charges; I am presenting evidence. Specifically, I make five requests:

First. That an appropriate Senate committee, probably the Subcommittee on Reorganization and Internal Organization of the Committee on Government Operations, conduct an open investigation concerning the nature and accuracy of the publicly issued statements by the Food and Drug Administration and the Cancer Institute in the matter of Krebiozen. I reprint those statements as appendices of my statement.

Second. That an independent scientific investigation be made of Krebiozen and creatine to determine whether they are, as the Food and Drug Administration charges, identical. Universities could conduct such a test.

Third. That the case records of the 504 cases submitted by Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic be reexamined by neutral scientists. I would regard Dr. Bing, a scientific adviser to the late President, as competent to make such a test. I would regard Dr. Lasagna, of Johns Hopkins, a great and fearless doctor, one who is not afraid to speak his mind, and who has many doubts about Krebiozen, as competent to make such a test. Miss Elinor Langer, one of the scientists attached to the outstanding magazine Science would be competent to serve on such a committee.

It is a terrible thing that we cannot really trust either the Food and Drug Administration or the National Cancer Institute. We need, therefore, an independent scientific investigation.

Fourth. That the Food and Drug Administration retract the false statements it has made about Krebiozen and Drs. Ivy and Durovic and apologize to them for the reflections they have made upon their characters.

Fifth. That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reply to my letter of October 28, 1963, which asked searching questions about the criteria they applied in appraising the Krebiozen cases as compared to those followed in the other substances which they are testing, and which up to the date of delivery of this speech they have ignored. My letter is printed in the body of the report of the Robinson committee which follows.

Let me make it clear that my inquiries are not intended to head off the threatened criminal prosecution of Drs. Durovic and Ivy. If the Food and Drug Administration thinks it has a case, by all means let it proceed. Let the Food and Drug Administration hail Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic into court and prosecute them for fraud, as it has threatened to do. Drs. Ivy and Durovic tell me they would welcome such a trial, so that they can meet their detractors head on in open court. Let the American Medical Association also appear in public before the able and honorable Attorney General of Illinois, William G. Clark, and give its alleged proofs against Krebiozen. To date, I have not heard that the American Medical Association has done so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report made to me by the Robinson Committee, with its attendant exhibits, be printed as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in ordinary type, so that it may be more easily read by the great public, both scientific and lay, in whose ultimate fairness I must now rest the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consistent with the authority of the Senate to grant the request, it is so ordered.

### REPORT ON THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE ANNOUNCEMENTS OF SEPTEMBER 7 AND OCTOBER 16, 1963, WITH RESPECT TO KREBIOZEN

#### LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DECEMBER 4, 1963.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: You and other Members of Congress have been seeking a "fair test" for Krebiozen over a considerable period of time. When the Food and Drug Administration announced on

September 7, 1963, that Krebiozen was creatine, you asked us to bring together as much of the available evidence bearing on this issue as possible in order that you could make some judgment based on the facts about this matter. Subsequently, the National Cancer Institute made its announcement about the cases on October 16, 1963, and we were asked to include that matter as well in our final report to you.

We have brought together a great amount of original material as well as material from the scientific literature about these matters. We obtained the original reports of the FDA scientists, the reports of two independent laboratories and the results of a third. We have seen the records of the scientific, chemical, and physical evaluation of Krebiozen extending back for a decade. We have had before us the Krebiozen Foundation records of the 504 cases. We have gone to the classical studies on natural regression in cancer and have searched out independent scientists for their judgment concerning how accurate and how significant were the tests done by the FDA.

In matters relating to the spectrographic and chemical analyses we have gone directly to the scientists involved and have not worked through third parties.

While we bear responsibility for the report, those who have aided us, of course, bear responsibility only for their particular contribution.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

MILES H. ROBINSON, M.D.,
*Chairman, Committee To Appraise FDA and NCI Conclusions on Krebiozen.*

HOWARD E. SHUMAN,
*Secretary and Editor, Administrative Assistant to Senator Paul H. Douglas.*

### LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Analysis by Dr. Anderson of FDA photograph of spectrograms published in Life magazine.
2. Purpose of difference spectrum.
3. Method of the difference spectrum.
4. Calculation of the difference spectrum.
5. Anderson analyses of FDA spectra.
6. Clark chemical analyses of Krebiozen.
7. Slight differences in drugs which save lives.
8. Biological facts bearing on Krebiozen.
9. Excerpt from letter from HEW denying to Dr. Ivy right to appear before medical committee, September 10, 1963.
10. Letter from HEW refusing access to case records, October 30, 1963.
11. Statement of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy on theory of Krebiozen.
12. Documents on income of Dr. Durovic.
13. Offers of drug companies to buy Krebiozen rights.
14. Press Releases of Food and Drug Administration and National Cancer Institute, September 7, 1963, and October 16, 1963.
15. Behind the campaign against Krebiozen.

### DEFINITIONS OF KREBIOZEN SAMPLES AND SPECTROGRAMS AND FIGURES

K–0: First Krebiozen, made in Argentina—so designated in this report for purposes of clarification.

K–1 or K1 or KI: Krebiozen submitted by Dr. Durovic to the FDA on July 12, 1963, or spectrogram made by FDA July 12, 1963, of Krebiozen.

K–2 or SD–84: Later Krebiozen sample. Also, spectrogram of same by Anderson, November 7, 1962.

K–3 or SD–201(B): Spectrogram of still later Krebiozen from which bulk of creatine has been removed.

A–1: Sample of Krebiozen K–1 given to NCI, September 1961. Chemical analysis by Clark on September 8, 1961.

Nos. 5084, 5089: Spectrograms by Anderson of Krebiozen K–1 submitted by sponsors along with sample K–1.

No. 80: FDA spectrogram of creatine hydrate. Used to compare with K–1.

3588 (CIP 1 and 2): Spectrogram of original Krebiozen K–0 material, isolated from ampules by the Clark Microanalytical Laboratory, November 22, 1958. CIP 1 and 2 means Clark Isolation Product 1 and 2.

Figure 1: Spectrograms made by FDA, No. 80 of creatine hydrate, and No. K–1 of Krebiozen.

Figure 2: The same, squarely superimposed.

Figure 3: The same, superimposed by FDA.

Figure 4: Differential spectrum of same, calculated by Dr. Anderson.

### GENERAL FINDINGS

This report and its exhibits will show that:

First. The conclusion of the Food and Drug Administration that Krebiozen is creatine is demonstrably false.

Second. The presence of Krebiozen in the sample which the Food and Drug Administration labeled creatine was of the utmost chemical and medical significance. It was present in a concentration from 30,000 to 80,000 times greater than the fluoride added to community drinking water to stop the decay of teeth, and from 42 to 112 million times greater than the concentration of adrenaline in the blood, both of which concentrations can easily be detected by appropriate tests.

Third. The conclusion of the National Cancer Institute that the drug was an ineffective anticancer agent (Exhibit 14) was arrived at by judging the cases by harsh standards, and in many cases by ignoring cases which qualified even under these harsh standards. The standards the NCI established merely to determine whether it was to test the drug were more severe than the standards applied in the scientific cancer literature to determine natural regressions of cancer; and they were ones which, according to the verbal statement of the Director of the NCI to one of us (HES), have seldom been applied to any of the other 24,000 or so substances tested routinely on animals or the 100 or so substances tested on humans each year.

## PART I

### WHAT IS KREBIOZEN?

The opponents of Krebiozen have, over the years, charged that it was a "secret" preparation and that its theory and production methods were unknown. This is not true. Its theory has been expounded widely by the producers and sponsors ever since the drug was first used. In 1956 the general production method was published, and in 1961 it was filed with the FDA in the fullest detail.

Furthermore, the sponsors time and again have offered both to the Federal Government and to the State government the opportunity to observe the actual production of the drug from beginning to end, but this has always been either refused or unacknowledged. In addition, the chief scientific sponsor of the drug has long had a standing offer to teach the production method to any qualified person who was willing to spend a few months in his laboratory. We understand that such has now been done.

In view of the numerous charges of secrecy made both officially and unofficially in the past by the AMA, NCI, and FDA, the theory of Krebiozen and its exact method of production are given here.

### THEORY OF KREBIOZEN

There is a disease in horses called "lumpy jaw," which is a non-malignant but chronic and disabling tumor of the jaw caused by the ray fungus, Actinomyces bovis. In this tumor is found an extraordinary abundance of the special defensive cells of the body known as reticuloendothelial cells.

Since the horse more or less keeps the "lumpy jaw" tumor under control, Dr. Durovic reasoned that the horse's blood might contain antitumor substances active against cancer in man.

The basic idea of using animals as a source of anti-disease substances which can be injected into man to save his life has been the very foundation of our successful treatment of dread diseases such as tetanus, diphtheria, anthrax, rabies, and others.

Krebiozen is produced by injecting intravenously into horses a non-infectious dead extract of the ray fungus. This cannot infect the horse, but makes it temporarily sick, and stimulates it to produce substances antagonistic to the ray fungus. Such stimulation is a basic biological phenomenon. (See also exhibit 11.)

### OTHER ANTITUMOR SUBSTANCES PRODUCED BY THE RAY FUNGI

Note that this same ray fungus is a normal inhabitant of the mouth and gastro-intestinal tract of healthy man and animals; and that when these ray fungi are grown in broth culture, some of the substances (antibiotics) they produce have anticancer activity in man:

"Perhaps the most exciting aspect of antibiotic research today (1963) has to do with the isolation and characterization of those antibiotics which exhibit antitumor activity. Research in this area has expanded rapidly in recent years both in this country and abroad * * * at least six of these agents exhibit interesting activity in human neoplasia (cancer). In addition, there are now in various stages of development more than twenty new products endowed with antitumor activity, which have resulted from the antibiotics programs supported by the Cancer Chemotherapy National

Service Center of the National Cancer Institute during the past several years. The structures of many of these agents, like their mechanisms of action, are unknown * * * those of most current interest in the chemotherapy of human neoplasia (cancer) are the actinomycins." (Exhibit 8.)

An analogy can be drawn between the anticancer antibiotics directly produced by the ray fungus, and Krebiozen. The antibiotics are the product of a reaction between the ray fungus and its culture broth; Krebiozen is the product of a reaction between a sterile extract of that ray fungus and the horse.

Of great importance is the fact that the ray fungus anticancer antibiotics are generally too toxic for continuous use in human cancer, whereas bringing the horse into the picture, as in the production of Krebiozen, gives a substance which has no toxicity for man.

Another extraordinary fact about the ray fungi is that another "waste" product of their growth in broth cultures is the famous antibiotic, streptomycin, which revolutionized the treatment of tuberculosis; and still another "waste" product is vitamin $B_{12}$ which is life saving in pernicious anemia.

### THE SCOPE OF THE THEORY

It is thus evident that the health and disease of man, including cancer, are intertwined with the activities of many other forms of life ranging from the most minute micro-organisms up to large animals like the horse. We live in this living milieu, all of it the product of evolutionary forces, and man is only beginning to understand his close yet changeable relationship with other living creatures which are sometimes his implacable enemies and sometimes his indispensable friends.

### GREAT MEDICAL DISCOVERIES OFTEN IGNORED

Many important ideas have had great difficulty in penetrating the conservatism of orthodox medicine; for example, smallpox vaccination by Jenner, the cause and prevention of fatal childbed fever by Semmelweis and Oliver Wendell Holmes, antiseptic surgery by Lister, penicillin by Flemming, and others.

This difficulty still remains and it is not necessary to cite Krebiozen as an example, for just recently we find that the famous exfoliative test for uterine, lung, and other cancers, now an important lifesaving technique, "was ignored for several years after its discovery and almost abandoned by its developer, Dr. George Papanicolaou." (U.S. Public Health Service Publication No. 457, p. 10).

### PRODUCTION AND EXTRACTION OF KREBIOZEN

In March 1961, the Krebiozen sponsors made a filing with the FDA which included the detailed data on the production and extraction process for Krebiozen, the reports of the chemical studies on the drug, and spectrograms of the samples submitted.

The extraction method begins with giving the horse four to eight injections of a sterile emulsion of Actinomyces bovis within a month. One month later, the horse is painlessly sacrificed, sodium citrate is added to its blood to prevent coagulation, and the red blood cells are separated by centrifugation.

The resultant serum is then extracted by an equal amount of ethyl ether or benzene. The latter is then separated and evaporated. The extraction of the serum is then repeated with petroleum ether. The fatty residues of both extractions are then combined and extracted with distilled water. The aqueous extract is then filtered through Berkefeldt filters of decreasing porosity until a clear filtrate is obtained. The filtrate is then evaporated and Krebiozen is obtained in the form of a tan or yellowish powder. The drug is then dissolved in light mineral oil, measured into glass ampules, and the filled ampules sterilized in an autoclave for 1 hour at 270° C.

The foregoing simple procedure was published in 1956 (Ivy, Pick, & Phillips, Henry Regnery Co.), except that the common substances, ether, benzene, and petroleum ether were designated as an organic solvent, and the common Berkefeldt filtration was described as "care to obtain a clear solution."

In the application for license in March 1961, the foregoing extraction procedure was complete including these details.

### FDA AND NCI ANNOUNCEMENTS

On September 7, 1963 (Exhibit 14), the Food and Drug Administration announced that it had identified Krebiozen as creatine. It did not qualify or hedge its statement in any way.

In their release they refer to Krebiozen "as creatine." Again they say, "It was creatine." Further, they say that their tests "leave no doubt" as to the identity of the powder labeled Krebiozen.

In a letter from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to Dr. Durovic, dated September 26, 1963, it is stated that:

"The Food and Drug Administration has established that the material in the vial supplied by you and Dr. Ivy on July 12, 1963, and claimed by you to be Krebiozen, is, in fact, creatine."

The letter further states that "The results are conclusive" and asserts that the FDA analyses are "scientifically unimpeachable."

It also states that the identification was "conclusive" and that there was nothing "speculative" about it.

Finally, it says that "The full moral responsibility for the consequence (to the cancer patients) is yours."

In the ensuing FDA publicity great stress was laid on how a part-time summer student first found the "fingerprint" of Krebiozen from the "rogues' gallery" of spectrographic fingerprints of chemical substances. Co-workers are referred to as "detectives."

The FDA soon released photographs of the superimposed Krebiozen and creatine "fingerprints" supposedly proving that they were identical.

Meanwhile, the producers and sponsors of the drug were not consulted in any way nor offered any opportunity to present their abundance of scientific information and data. Without any notice the FDA "unloaded" on them at a hurriedly called press conference on September 7th after first leaking their conclusions to two friendly newspapers.

### CRIMINAL CHARGES AND MILLION-DOLLAR OFFERS

At this press conference, the FDA also put its full weight behind innuendoes, widely circulated by the opponents of Krebiozen, that its sponsors have been profiteering on the distribution of the drug. On October 23, 1963, the AMA added a charge that the drug is also being illegally distributed in Canada.

Both these charges are answered by documents contained in Exhibit 12.

As reported in Medical World News for September 27, 1963, p. 49, Commissioner Larrick of the FDA stated that:

"Criminal charges are in preparation against the sponsors of Krebiozen * * * fines * * * and jail sentences are the penalty * * * With the facts that have been reported to us by our investigators, the normal course would be to recommend that these people be given an opportunity to show cause why they should not be prosecuted in Federal court."

As a matter of fact, the sponsors have consistently welcomed any action in the jurisdiction of a court, since they are confident of vindication under fair conditions where due process obtains.

In connection with innuendoes of fraud, it is significant that two of the most prominent drug companies in the United States have each offered approximately $2 million in cash and royalties for the "Exclusive right throughout the world, to manufacture and sell Krebiozen" (photostats, exhibit 13).

It may be assumed that these firms arrived at a careful judgment of the intrinsic worth and potential of Krebiozen before they made these extraordinary offers in writing.

Dr. Durovic refused these offers mainly because he understood that the companies planned to retail the drug at a price of $30–$40 per ampule instead of the $10 which he thought was right. (Illinois Legislative hearing, p. 1139).

### FDA REJECTS FURTHER DATA FROM SPONSORS

After the FDA, without any warning, publicly condemned Krebiozen at its press conference of September 7, efforts by the producer and sponsors of the drug to present further scientific information to the FDA were arrogantly dismissed on the grounds that the FDA analyses were "scientifically unimpeachable."

In a letter dated September 26, 1963, from the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in reply to the sponsors' letter of September 11, 1963, the Department said that the chemical studies of the material Krebiozen made by two reputable independent laboratories which indicated Krebiozen was different from creatine, "would not affect the results of the FDA analyses, which are themselves scientifically unimpeachable." (p. 1).

When the sponsors stated that the interpretation by their chemists of the infrared spectrogram was different from that of the FDA chemists, the reply stated:

"A different interpretation of the infrared spectrogram by your chemists from that made by the FDA chemists * * * alter in no way the conclusions reached by FDA scientists and non-Government consultants." (p. 3)

The FDA was as uninterested in the scientific evidence after their unqualified pronouncement of September 7, 1963 as they had been before their unqualified pronouncement.

Finally, on October 16, the National Cancer Institute said, after study of the 504 cases presented to them by the sponsors of the drug, that Krebiozen was ineffective as an anti-cancer agent and that it would not sponsor or participate in a clinical trial or test of Krebiozen (Exhibit 14).

### THE CONCLUSION OF THE FDA THAT KREBIOZEN IS CREATINE IS DEMONSTRABLY FALSE

The conclusion reached by the FDA that Krebiozen is creatine is demonstrably false, not only on the basis of new or additional evidence but on the basis of evidence produced by the FDA itself.

First, the so-called identical "fingerprints" are not identical but there are significant differences throughout at least half the span of the spectrum.

Second, chemical analysis demonstrates that Krebiozen is not creatine.

Third, the difference in color demonstrates that Krebiozen is not creatine.

Creatine is pure white or colorless to the naked eye. It does not fluoresce under ultraviolet light. But Krebiozen is light tan to the naked eye and fluoresces under ultraviolet light. Color of Krebiozen is noted no less than six times in the reports of the FDA scientists.

Fourth, Krebiozen contains at least six sugars and nine acids not creatine nor in creatine. This has been verified many times and by independent analyses.

Fifth, many of the clues that Krebiozen is not creatine are found in the reports of the FDA scientists themselves but were totally ignored by the FDA.

### THE SPECTROGRAPHIC "FINGERPRINT"

The FDA regards its strongest evidence that Krebiozen is creatine as the so-called "fingerprint" of Krebiozen which it claims is the "fingerprint" of creatine.

The FDA has produced for publication in such journalistic organs as Life magazine and the Medical World News the superimposed "fingerprints" or spectrograms of the two substances which they claim are identical.

The two "fingerprints," however, are not identical, as will now be shown.

### HOW A SPECTROGRAM IS MADE

To make an infrared spectrographic analysis, a sample of the substance is prepared and different frequencies of infrared light are beamed at it. When the light is absorbed by the sample at a specific frequency, the line of the graph at that frequency drops down. This is called an "absorption" which is seen in the shape of a "band."

### THE FDA SPECTROGRAMS

In figure 1 attached,[1] the spectrograms of creatine, No. 80, top, and of the Krebiozen sample, K-1, bottom, are shown.

The FDA said that these two spectrograms were the same, and that therefore the two substances were the same, and that the Krebiozen sample was creatine.

However, if the bottom graph of Krebiozen is squarely overlaid on the top graph of creatine, as in figure 2, the difference between the two is clear. It is very evident that the Krebiozen line drops down significantly below the creatine line, from about 7.5 microns across through 13.5 microns, or for almost one-half the distance of the line.

This means that in this area there is a substance or material in the Krebiozen sample which is definitely not in the creatine sample.

The Food and Drug Administration, however, in their efforts to prove that the two were the same, widely published the picture shown in figure 3, e.g., in Life magazine—October 4, 1963—and in Medical World News—September 27, 1963—to show that the Krebiozen sample was creatine.

To get the effect in figure 3, the Food and Drug Administration did not squarely overlay one graph on the other, such as is done in figure 2, but deliberately dropped down the creatine graph about 7½ percentage points below the Krebiozen graph so that at the particular area of most obvious difference mentioned above, the creatine and Krebiozen lines would coincide and this difference would be obliterated.

Any remaining differences would appear to a non-expert to cancel each other out, because one would easily assume that the lines of the two substances weave back and forth across each other, and that any variations between them are simply due to minor experimental errors.

This false assumption cannot be disproved in the Life photograph (fig. 3) because the similar darkness of the unlabeled lines prevents the observer from knowing which line is which and whether or not they cross.

### INDEPENDENT EXPERT ANALYSIS

The three more technical ways by which our expert consultant determined that the spectrograms of creatine and Krebiozen are not the same are given below.

First, by visual inspection. Dr. Scott Anderson, a Ph.D. in physics and an expert in spectrographic analysis, in a memo attached to this report as Exhibit 1 has pointed out from 8 to 10 areas in the superimposed "fingerprints" of creatine (#80) and Krebiozen (K1) where significant differences occur and where the absorption patterns differ.

Second, in Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5 he gives the method and the results of "plotting" the points of difference. In the first table in Exhibit 4, he plots 39 points across the spectrum, 29 of which show a difference. The smooth curve drawn through all the plotted points indicates that the Krebiozen sample contains a substance or substances possessing nine distinguishable broad absorption bands not in the spectrum of creatine.

Third, from this he plots a "differential" spectrogram of the two. This is a well known and standard procedure which shows the plotted difference between the spectrograms of creatine and Krebiozen but which, unfortunately, was not done by the FDA.

This differential spectrogram is shown in figure 4, attached.

If the spectrograms (fig. 1 or fig. 2) of the two substances, (creatine and Krebiozen) were the same, the differential spectrogram (fig. 4) would be a straight line. Differences in the two are measured by deviations from a straight line. It will be noted that there are deviations from the straight line throughout almost the entire length of the spectrum.

Finally, he compares the differential spectrogram (fig. 4) which gives an indication of the absorption pattern of Krebiozen distinct from creatine, with the spectrogram of the original Krebiozen material which was extracted from the ampules.

His conclusion is that (exhibit 4, p. 5):

"When these data are plotted and the difference spectrum compared with No. 3588 (spectrogram of original Krebiozen material, K-0, extracted from the ampules) the resemblance is remarkable." This and other spectrograms are available in Senator DOUGLAS' office.

"Thus it appears that the substance in K1 (the Krebiozen sample given the FDA) which is not creatine, is similar to the material that gives No. 3588 its broad bands."

Thus it can be shown from the spectrograms or so-called "fingerprints" mainly relied on by the FDA to characterize Krebiozen as creatine, that Krebiozen is not creatine and that the infrared spectrogram of the Krebiozen tested by the FDA: First, differs from creatine (a) by visual inspection; (b) by plotting; (c) by differential spectrographic analysis; and second, these differences are not technical and are much greater than would be due merely to tolerances or reasonable margins of error (exhibit 3); and third, that differences of this magnitude are of the utmost significance chemically and, especially, biologically (exhibit 8).

Furthermore, as every analytical chemist knows, any discrepancy in the results from even one of several methods or tests used to analyze or determine the final composition of a substance renders the results inconclusive.

It is especially true that discrepancies in one or more tests render the results inconclusive when one is dealing with biological substances where such minute quantities as 3 to 6 millionths of a gram, as in $B_{12}$, are clinically active and can result in the saving of the life of a human who would otherwise die of pernicious anemia (Exhibit 8).

In this case differences are noted in both the infrared spectrograms and in the reports on the mass spectrography (see below) that is, two of the four methods used by the FDA to determine that Krebiozen is creatine.

The other two methods used by the FDA—namely microscopic crystallography and X-ray diffraction can be even less sensitive to relatively small quantities of a foreign substance in a mixture than the other two methods. If the crystals of the active principle are very small, the optical method can miss them, and the X-ray method will fail if the "heavy lines" of similar substances coincide. Both methods will not detect an active principle if it is amorphous rather than crystalline. (See also Exhibit 8.)

---

[1] These charts were exhibited by Senator DOUGLAS at the time of his speech and were attached to mimeographed copies of this report. Because of the printing rules governing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they cannot be reproduced here. They are available for inspection.

### WHEN IS A FINGERPRINT NOT A FINGERPRINT?

The Food and Drug Administration has indulged in considerable "press agentry" in describing the spectrograms as "fingerprints" which give conclusive evidence as to the identity of substances.

There is obviously no identity when these so-called fingerprints are not identical but contain differences which can be seen with the naked eye and which when plotted show differences throughout most of the span of the spectrum.

As George L. Clark points out in his Encyclopedia of Spectroscopy (p. 7), it is the advertisers of equipment who may refer to the spectroscopic curves as a kind of fingerprint (exhibit 8, p. 1).

As we know, the fingerprints of two humans are never identical. But the so-called spectrographic "fingerprints" by no means meet this standard.

For example:

Olive oil can be diluted as much as 25 percent with corn oil before the impurity is even detectable (and not at all identifiable) in the infrared spectrum.

The spectrograms of two commonly occurring sterols, cholesterol and B-sitosterol, have absorption patterns which are identical.

Most of the antibodies in the blood, and which are highly important defenses of the body against disease, cannot be detected at all by spectrographic analysis.

In general, many substances with the greatest biological activity and effects cannot even be seen yet alone analyzed by this method. (See exhibit 8, sec. 2, for further examples.)

Consequently, when differences are found which can be seen with the naked eye, or plotted, or to which differential analysis can be applied, these are of great significance.

### DIFFERENCES NOTED IN BASIC REPORTS OF FDA SCIENTISTS

What is most alarming about the FDA's announcement is that some of these differences are noted in the basic reports of the FDA scientists themselves.

For example:

Mrs. Hayden reports differences in the relative intensities of the 3.0 and 9.0 $\mu$ bands of the infrared spectrograms.

Dr. Lippincott noted differences near the 3$\mu$ band. He ascribes this to water, but this is one of the key points where both Krebiozen and creatine absorb and it is one of the points where polysaccharides absorb strongly.

Professor Biemann states that "slight intensity differences show in the many small peaks, but this is of course due to differences in impurities."

This latter is a monumental admission for "impurities" is the name which is given to the foreign substances in a mixture, and indicated quite clearly that something other than creatine was in the sample the FDA claimed was creatine.

Consequently, the key clues that the sample of Krebiozen given to the FDA is not creatine alone can be found in the facts given in the reports of the FDA scientists themselves.

However, in their zeal, these were ignored by the FDA.

### CONDEMNATION WITHOUT DELIBERATION?

Almost immediately following the FDA announcement on September 7, Senator DOUGLAS asked the FDA for the detailed written reports of the scientists on whom the FDA had relied to make their unqualified announcement that Krebiozen was creatine. Only after almost 2 weeks and considerable effort were these obtained.

There are some very interesting points about them. One of them is dated September 9 and another September 12, or 2 to 5 days after the FDA announcement. A third, dated September 6, appears to have been sent from the consultant in New Mexico. This raises the question as to whether it could have arrived by the time the press conference was held on Saturday morning, September 7.

One of these reports is written in the third person and is unsigned. This report is the one which includes the statement that the curves of the two spectra "matched band for band, frequency for frequency, and band shape for band shape for all bands," but it happens to be true that there are at least nine distinguishable absorption bands in the Krebiozen spectrum not in the spectrum of creatine, so that this statement cannot be correct.

Note that the FDA spectrogram of Krebiozen is dated September 3, only four days before the press conference.

A real question arises as to whether the FDA acted merely on the verbal reports of its scientists, and did not in fact analyze the written reports before its announcement in the detail which the importance of the situation deserved. This must, of course, be true in the case of two and possibly three of the reports which are either postdated or arrived after the announcement was made.

### CHEMICAL ANALYSIS DEMONSTRATES THAT KREBIOZEN IS NOT CREATINE

The Clark Microanalytical Laboratory has performed repeated chemical studies on Krebiozen over a 10-year period. (This is shown by exhibit 6.)

They have extracted Krebiozen from the ampules and have done both chemical and, in conjunction with the Anderson Physical Laboratory, infrared studies on a variety of samples.

Work has been performed on the original Krebiozen from Argentina, K-0, and on later samples from batches 2 and 3 made in the United States.

Approximately the same chemical composition for Krebiozen has been found over the years except for the admixture of creatine, and when these and the infrared curves made from these samples are corrected for the now known impurity creatine, the continuity of results is confirmed.

Furthermore, the Shuman Chemical Laboratory, Inc., of Battle Ground, Ind., working closely with Prof. Roy Whistler, of Purdue University, who is a specialist in carbohydrates and polysaccharides, also isolated the original Krebiozen material from the ampules independently of the Clark Laboratory. Their findings have confirmed key points in Clark's isolation of Krebiozen.

Spectrograms of the first Krebiozen produced (for purposes of clarification referred to herein as K-0) performed in November 1958, and of later samples—SD-84 of November 7, 1962 (hereafter referred to as K-2) and SD-201 (B) of October 17, 1963 (hereafter referred to as K-3)—are mutually confirming.

Their work establishes that the chemical composition for Krebiozen clearly differs from that of creatine.

*Krebiozen*

| Atom | K-0 initial sample, highest percent Krebiozen | K-1 FDA sample, 2.7-8 percent Krebiozen | K-2 sample [2] (SD-84) 46.31 percent Krebiozen | K-3 sample [2] (SD-201) 79.45 percent Krebiozen | Creatine | Creatine hydrate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 38.55 | 32.61 | 41.22 | 39.22 | 36.63 | 32.21 |
| H | 8.02 | 7.32 | 6.41 | 6.12 | 6.92 | 7.43 |
| N | (1) | 27.42 | (2) | (2) | 32.05 | 28.17 |
| O | 53.43 | 32.65 | 52.34 | 54.65 | 24.40 | 32.19 |

[1] Not detected.

[2] Calculated creatine free, and all nitrogen presumed to be in creatine portion. (See exhibit 6.)

From their studies they are able to say that the sample sent to the Food and Drug Administration contained a minimum of 2.7 percent and a maximum of 8 percent Krebiozen. They have found that different samples vary from Krebiozen-rich to creatine-rich samples.

The creatine-rich samples, which include K-1, are those where the sponsors in the laboratory attempted to meet the repeated requests of the FDA for a so-called "pure" product.

This purification can now be seen in retrospect to have raised the percentage of creatine and lowered the percentage of Krebiozen in the sample given to the FDA, a circumstance which often happens in the exploration and purification of a biological substance the exact composition of which is unknown and which frequently takes years to determine (exhibit 8, part 3).

The 2.7 to 8 percent figure of K-1 is established by calculating from the nitrogen content in the mixed substance (exhibit 6). If all the nitrogen is in the creatine, there was an absolute minimum of 2.7 percent Krebiozen in the sample. If some of the nitrogen is in the Krebiozen, and there are indications of this in the fact that a small amount of glucosamine was found in the hydrolysate of the original material (K-0) which was almost creatine free, then as much as 8 percent of the sample was Krebiozen. Again, these are significant quantities chemically, and especially, biologically. (Infrared suggests 8 percent.)

Not only have they been able to establish the basic chemical composition of Krebiozen and to distinguish it from creatine, but they show in their attached report an historical continuity going back over a period of years for the chemical composition of Krebiozen which was isolated from the ampules as well as that performed on the powder itself.

The same continuity can be seen in the infrared spectrograms of these samples and, as Dr. Anderson points out, the similarity of the spectra is very striking even though not identical. (These additional spectrograms are available in Senator Douglas' office.)

In addition, he has pointed out that the difference spectrum plotted from the differences between the Food and Drug curves for creatine and for the sample submitted by Dr. Durovic on July 12, 1963 (K-1), when compared with the spectrum of the original Krebiozen material isolated from the ampules (K-0), has a remarkable resemblance (See Exhibit 4).

Thus, the chemical studies performed on a variety of samples of Krebiozen over the years prove conclusively that Krebiozen is not creatine although the samples contain varying amounts of creatine.

### NCI ERROR

The Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute which together have had from 8 to 14 mgs. of Krebiozen, and at least 450 ampules, have performed no comparable work.

In fact, the NCI in 1962 performed a combustion analysis on a Krebiozen sample (K-1), the spectrogram of which the FDA says proves it was creatine (fig. 3), and came up with a carbon content of 21 percent. This is entirely incompatible with the carbon content of creatine (36.6 percent), creatinine (42.2 percent), and creatine hydrate (32.2 percent).

### BUREAUCRATIC SCHIZOPHRENIA

This is an amazing case of bureaucratic schizophrenia.

The fact is that the FDA and the NCI, with their elaborate resources for analysis, have not only arrived at conflicting results but it is now clear that neither of these conflicting results is correct.

One can only hope that the FDA will be more charitable towards the NCI for its mistaken results, than it has been towards the producer and sponsors of the drug whose chemical and spectrographic analyses are more complete and more accurate than those arrived at by Government agencies which have had the total scientific resources of the Government at their call.

### THE FDA IN ITS IVORY TOWER

On November 19, 1963, in a letter to Dr. Wiley, Director of FDA's Chemistry division which claimed that Krebiozen was creatine, Senator Douglas stated that,

"At least two independent laboratories have extracted Krebiozen directly from ampules and have run spectrographic analyses of these. It can be done and can be done quite easily if one knows how.

"Therefore, before the Food and Drug Administration issues any announcement of any kind that they are unable to find Krebiozen in the ampules, I think it important that the scientists who have extracted Krebiozen from the ampules in the past demonstrate how it is done. They should do so with either you or your representative present but under the auspices of a neutral third party, such as a person trained in chemistry from the President's Scientific Advisors.

"I want to predict (1) that Krebiozen can be extracted from the ampules and (2) that a spectrogram from the sample will show a continuity with the many Krebiozen spectrograms over the years. and (3) that the spectrograms will differ fundamentally from creatine."

As of December 3, 1963, this letter has been neither acknowledged nor answered. Yet in the Chicago Sun Times on that date, it is reported that the FDA announced on December 2 that,

"Analysis of Krebiozen ampules shipped before 1960 show they contain nothing but mineral oil * * * Ampules since then contain mineral oil plus minute amounts of amyl alcohol and 1-methyl hydantoin * * * a laboratory curiosity."

While it is gratifying that the FDA is at last on record with an opinion of some sort about the ampules which have been in its hands for investigation for the last 2 years, again we have here the latest example of the absolute determination of of the FDA to shut itself up in its ivory tower and rebuff all offers of cooperation and assistance aimed simply at establishing the scientific facts about Krebiozen.

Senator Douglas is renewing his request of November 19 that the FDA permit the sponsors of Krebiozen and their laboratory consultants to demonstrate to the FDA how to get Krebiozen out of the ampules.

In making its unqualified announcement on September 7, and by its subsequent refusal even to consider the abundance of scientific evidence offered by the sponsors, the FDA has shown a disregard for the scientific method in a matter which could be of the greatest importance to the health and welfare of the country.

### DIFFERENCES IN COLOR DEMONSTRATE THAT KREBIOZEN IS NOT CREATINE

Creatine, creatine hydrate, and creatinine (the only forms of creatine) are all pure white or colorless. (See, e.g., Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, Chemical Rubber Publishing Co.)

They have no color on visual inspection and do not fluoresce under ultra violet light.

Krebiozen, on the other hand, has a light brown or tan color upon visual inspection and fluoresces under ultra violet light.

On no less than six occasions in their reports, the FDA scientists themselves describe the color of the Krebiozen samples submitted to the FDA. This fact is incompatible with the FDA conclusion that Krebiozen is nothing but creatine.

Krebiozen is variously described by the FDA scientists as a (1) beige powder, (2) with an orange tinge, (3) as light tan, (4) as brownish white with a shade of pink, and (5 and 6) twice as having a "pale buff" appearance.

How does it happen that a substance which the FDA confidently and without qualification calls creatine can nonetheless be described time and again by their own scientists with attributes of color which neither creatine, creatine hydrate, or creatinine have?

### KREBIOZEN CONTAINS SUGARS AND ACIDS NOT IN CREATINE

The following six sugars or sugar derivatives and nine acids which are not creatine or in creatine or its relatives have been identified in the Krebiozen extracted by the Clark Microanalytical Laboratory (see Exhibit 6) and verified by the Shuman Laboratory after independently performing the same extraction:

1. Polysaccharides or derivatives: galacturonic acid, glucosamine, galactose, glucose, arabinose, xylose.
2. Fatty acids: palmitic, oleic, palmitoleic, myristic, stearic, C-15, C-17, lauric, shorter chain acids.

### CLUES THAT KREBIOZEN IS NOT CREATINE ARE FOUND IN THE REPORTS OF THE FDA SCIENTISTS AND WERE TOTALLY IGNORED

As we have seen, an abundance of clues that Krebiozen is not creatine are to be found in the reports of the FDA scientists themselves.

Absorption patterns at 3.0 and 9.0 microns are noted by one scientist from the spectrographic analysis.

Similar patterns by a second scientist are noted at 3.0 microns.

One notes "slight intensity differences in the many small peaks" but ascribes these to impurities which, of course, means that a second or foreign substance was present in the sample. (Mass spectra.)

Six scientists note the presence of color in the Krebiozen sample.

Some of them qualify their findings, unlike their Food and Drug Administration superiors, with such terms as "good agreement" or "practically" or "substantially."

However, even the scientists substantially ignored the clues which were present in their work.

Others of the scientists misstated the facts.

One states that the spectrum of creatine monohydrate was identical with that of Krebiozen, which is not true by a variety of tests including visual inspection, plotting, and differential analysis.

Another states that for practical purposes the results of the mass spectra show the materials to be "identical." This is not true, for the results of the mass spectra show many differences in the peaks and, in dealing with a biological substance, what is "practical" in dozens of substances may be far too minute to be detected by mass spectrography.

When one scientist stated that the curves of the two spectra "matched band for band, frequency for frequency and band shape for band shape for all bands" he had not matched them band for band, frequency for frequency and band shape for band shape.

When this was done subsequently by non-FDA scientists, differences throughout the two supposedly identical spectra were found and plotted.

The administrative bureaucrats ignored the clues entirely. They caused to be issued to the public under the authority of their Department and the Government of the United States information and conclusions which are demonstrably false and for which they must bear the public responsibility.

It is interesting to note that almost none of these persons is scientifically trained and they appear to be uninterested in the scientific method or in attempting to attain scientific truth.

### PART II

### THE FDA MISSES AN ELEPHANT IN THE PARLOR

It can be stated without fear of contradiction that Krebiozen and creatine are entirely different substances.

Even a small percentage of Krebiozen in creatine is of the utmost significance, because in dealing with biological substances, only one part in millions or billions can and does have the most profound biological effects.

There are many examples of this:

#### FLUORIDE IN DRINKING WATER

1. The amount of fluoride added to community drinking water, to stop the decay of teeth, is less than 1 part in 1 million (0.7 part per million).

The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 30,000 to 80,000 times this amount.

#### ADRENALINE

2. Adrenaline has an easily detectable biological effect in a blood concentration of 1 part in 1.4 billion.

The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA samples was from 42 to 112 million times this amount.

#### BIOTIN

3. Biotin, a B vitamin, is biologically active in a concentration of 1 part in 10 billion.

The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 300 to 800 million times this amount.

#### THYROID HORMONE

4. The concentration of free thyroid hormone in the normal blood is 1 part per 10,000 million parts of blood plasma. These minute amounts are physiologically active and necessary for health.

The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 300 to 800 million times this amount.

#### GOITER PREVENTION

5. Goiter is easily prevented by the ingestion of only one part of sodium iodide per 10,000 to 100,000 parts of common salt.

The proportion of Krebiozen in the FDA sample was from 300 to 800 times this amount.

#### FEVER IN MAN

6. Fever in man can be produced by one ten-millionth gram of extract from the bacterium, E. Coli. A Krebiozen ampule contains 100 times this amount of Krebiozen.

#### DEATH IN MAN

7. The lethal dose of purified botulinum toxin in man is 0.06 millionths of a gram. A Krebiozen ampule contains 167 times this amount of Krebiozen.

See exhibit 8, section 1, for references.

Further evidence that the slightest changes in drugs can have the most profound effects is found in the hearings before the Kefauver committee when Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, testified as follows on February 23, 1960:

"In the infinite complexities of the human organism, the slightest change or improvement in a drug for a particular patient can mean the difference between health or illness, life or death." (Hearings, pt. 19, p. 10700).

The Food and Drug Administration, in terms of biological effects, had an elephant in the parlor and missed seeing it.

A first-year chemistry student might be forgiven such an error, but when a Department of the Government not only fails to discover significant chemical and biological amounts of a foreign substance in a compound, but then uses the full force of its public relations arm to publicize its mistaken results, it must bear responsibility for its errors.

#### BIOASSAY IS THE EFFECTIVE TEST FOR BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES

The biological effects of a drug cannot even be tested by any of the means used by the Food and Drug Administration to test Krebiozen. In fact, they made not a single biological test.

The test for the effectiveness of biological substances is to use them on animals and/or man and to determine their biological effects.

Dozens of the most common biological substances have been used for long periods of time in medical treatment despite either their lack of uniformity or the fact that their full chemical composition is unknown.

After establishing that a drug is not toxic, the way it is tested is to start with exceedingly small amounts and to measure its actual effects.

For example:

All six hormones of the pituitary, many of which are used clinically, are analyzed only by biological or immunological assay. Some have yet to be isolated in their pure form.

The estrogens (female hormones) were used for about 25 years on the basis of bioassay alone before their structure was determined.

Insulin was used for over a decade in the control of diabetes before its chemical structure was determined.

Bioassay is perhaps the most sensitive test of progesterone and detects one five billionths of a gram. (See exhibit 8, section 3, for references and further examples.)

It is not unique for a hormone or hormone like substance to be used in medical treatment for decades before its entire chemical structure is revealed.

Another example is the fact that antibodies, which are chemically altered proteins in the blood and which protect man against a variety of serious and sometimes fatal illnesses, have never been isolated by chemical or physical means, and only by biological assay can their presence or effects be determined.

#### FDA TESTS INADEQUATE FOR BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES

The various tests made by the Food and Drug Administration are at best crude ones when dealing with biological matters. In fact, neither the Food and Drug Administration nor the National Cancer Institute made any biological tests of any kind on Krebiozen.

The bioassay method or technique is, in many cases, the only reliable method to determine biological effects.

#### DR. IVY ROUTINELY USES BIOASSAY METHOD

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the chief scientific sponsor of the drug, routinely uses the bioassay to determine both the potency of the samples of the drug Krebiozen and its biological effects.

In other words, he uses the method of ultimate importance when dealing with a biological substance. He measures the potency of the sample by testing its effects on human breast tumors and by measuring the effects.

Chemical, spectrographic, and microscopic and X-ray crystallographic tests are tests which in almost all the examples cited above are wholly incompetent to determine biological activity or to identify the biologically active agents in the drug.

When dealing with a biological agent, one part in a million is often as effective as 50 parts in a hundred. For example, in the treatment of pernicious anemia, a few millionths of a gram of $B_{12}$ is as effective in most cases as any multiple of that dose could be. In the treatment of scurvy, one orange a day is as good as a hundred, and will cure practically any case.

#### KREBIOZEN SPONSORS FOLLOW APPROPRIATE METHODS

The producer and sponsors of the drug have routinely followed the correct, scientific, and most sensitive method of determining the potency and biological effects of the drug, while the Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute have applied only the most crude measures to test the effects of a biological substance.

These facts can only add to the sense of outrage and indignation at the FDA's methods and publicity as well as their "unqualified" and "conclusive" judgments about matters upon which they have no right or no proper evidence to make such unqualified statements.

As is often the case, those who are most certain and dogmatic have the least to be dogmatic and certain about.

### PART III

### NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE ESTABLISHES UNREASONABLE STANDARDS BY WHICH TO JUDGE KREBIOZEN CASE REPORTS

On October 16, 1963, the National Cancer Institute announced that the report of the 24 man committee which had examined the case records of 504 patients who had received Krebiozen, "clearly establishes that 'Krebiozen' does not possess any anticancer activity in man." (Exhibit 14.)

This section will show that:

First. The announcement by the Food and Drug Administration on September 7, 1963, that Krebiozen is "worthless" creatine made it virtually impossible for the 24 man NCI committee to report favorably on the 504 cases.

Second. The procedures of the 24 man committee and the subsequent refusal of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to have the work independently reviewed or to consult with the sponsors do not meet ordinary and accepted standards or the scientific method.

Third. The committee set extremely harsh and severe standards by which to judge the cases, namely, standards greatly in excess of those ordinarily established for the hundred or more substances which are clinically tested routinely in humans, and standards more exacting than in the classical cancer literature.

Fourth. They did not follow, in many cases, even these harsh and severe standards. Instead, they ignored many cases which appear to be valid even under these standards.

Let it first be understood that the cases were presented not to determine if Krebiozen was a "cure" for cancer—which neither its sponsors nor those who have supported a fair test of it claim—but merely to establish whether the NCI ought to conduct a "fair test" of the drug. That was all that was asked.

Instead, they really established a standard of "cure" as shown by the fact that the only cases they finally admit could have benefited from Krebiozen were those patients alive today and in whom they claimed spontaneous or natural regressions occurred.

The NCI was supposed to be looking for "anticancer activity" but in the end they threw up a straw man of "cure" in order to knock it down.

### PREJUDICING THE JURY

The report of the FDA on September 7, 1963, that Krebiozen is creatine made it impossible for any committee to report favorably on the cases. If any member of the committee or official at NCI reported favorably on cases treated with what the FDA had already said was the "worthless" substance creatine, he ran the utmost danger of ruining his reputation, for how could a worthless substance possibly have any effect? (Re general background of prejudice, see Exhibit 15.)

In fact, the FDA report that Krebiozen was creatine was one of the grounds on which the NCI refused to test.

To quote from the October 16, 1963, report:

"The first basis upon which a drug might be considered for clinical trial is theoretical. The proponents of Krebiozen have advanced the theory that 'Krebiozen' is a tissue hormone which inhibits the multiplication of cancer cells. The Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated that 'Krebiozen' is not a tissue hormone but rather creatine, a normal component of the human body concerned primarily with muscle contraction."

Note very carefully that this paragraph does not say that there is no basis for the "Krebiozen" theory. That cannot be said, for many groups, including the NCI itself, are proceeding with work along these lines. Rather, it says, that the FDA says Krebiozen is creatine and consequently it will not be tested. It is ruled out not on "theoretical" grounds, but on the basis of the FDA announcement.

Attached to this report as exhibit 11 is a paper by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy on the theoretical basis of Krebiozen in which he cites the abundance of evidence and literature supporting its theoretical basis.

Additionally, for weeks prior to the public announcement on October 16, "informed sources" at the FDA were already pronouncing that the report would be unfavorable.

To quote only one example, in the edition of the Medical World News for September 27, 1963, in an article appearing on page 47 and which must have been written from 3 to 4 weeks prior to the NCI committee announcement on October 16, the following statement occurs:

"Meanwhile, informed sources said that a team of experts, after analyzing 507 [sic] selected cases of Krebiozen patients, will report that the drug has no apparent effect."

And further (p. 49):

"As far as FDA is concerned, establishing the identity just about wraps up the case against Krebiozen. Commissioner Larrick thinks that this plus evidence regarding production and distribution methods and the expected negative report on the 507 cases, should convince all but the most fanatical that the drug is of no value whatever in the treatment of cancer."

The article further refers to the "FDA's scientific and legal offensive against the so-called anticancer drug."

Thus, it is not unfair to say as the Queen of Hearts said in Alice in Wonderland: "Sentence first. Verdict afterwards."

### QUESTIONABLE PROCEEDINGS

Now let us look at the proceedings of the committee.

First. Secrecy: In the first place the proceedings were secret. Neither the members of the committee nor the place of meeting nor the procedures established nor the standards set were known or available even to the sponsors of the drug prior to the October 16th announcement.

Second. No patients seen: Not a single patient nor a single doctor who had treated a patient was seen by the committee.

Third. Dr. Ivy was refused the right to appear.

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, the chief sponsor of the drug, was refused the right to appear before the committee and to present his findings and to answer questions.

On September 4, 1963, Senator DOUGLAS wired the Department of HEW as follows:

"Why should not the committee see and hear Dr. Ivy, whose scientific standing is unquestioned, for purposes of explanation and interrogation? We are not asking that he be made a member of the committee but we are asking that this committee have the benefit of a direct statement from him and be able to ask any question which in any way might perplex them. I believe this is essential in the cause of truth. He is ready to meet with the group and answer all questions. Why should he be judged unheard and unseen?"

The following reply was sent on September 10 by Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant to the Secretary.

"The purpose of the study by the National Cancer Institute is to determine whether the medical records available justify a claim of benefit. Most of the records are not the records of Dr. Ivy or of the Krebiozen Foundation, but are the records of hospitals, laboratories, and private physicians, including pathological slides and X-ray films, secured by our representatives to supplement the inadequate records from Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy. These records do not require interpretation by Dr. Ivy. They are being independently and objectively evaluated. Dr. Ivy has no special knowledge of these additional records and his personal participation in such evaluation is neither necessary nor appropriate."

So, Dr. Ivy was not allowed even to appear before the Committee.

It was important for Dr. Ivy to present the cases and answer questions for the cases were presented in seven categories to show certain general and specific results.

The Committee, however, judged the cases on grounds entirely foreign to the way in which the cases were selected and presented.

The general purpose of the cases was:

(a) To show the increase in appetite, decrease in pain, and/or the withdrawal of narcotics which, in the advanced cancer patient who is suffering from excruciating pain is highly significant. This would not result merely from a sense of "euphoria."

(b) To show cases in which tumors ceased to grow but did not necessarily regress. This, too, is highly significant.

(c) To show cases in which there was an actual regression of the tumor.

Fourth. Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic were not given detailed results of evaluation of the cases: At the press conference on October 16, 1963, the NCI and HEW were asked if, in response to a request of Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic, they would be given the names and detailed results of the NCI studies of the individual patient records. Dr. Ivy had presented these records, but the NCI had reordered and renumbered them and omitted both names and initials with the result that Dr. Ivy could not identify even the 15 cases individually commented on in the press release of October 16.

The NCI and HEW spokesmen refused to state, in answer to specific questions, that they would identify these 15 or any of the 504 cases to Dr. Ivy and, as of this date, the sponsors of the drug have had no information from the NCI with respect to the detailed review except that in the NCI release.

Fifth. NCI and HEW refused to make cases available for independent analysis and review: On October 22, 1963, Senator

DOUGLAS wrote to the Secretary of HEW asking that these cases be made available to qualified independent groups to evaluate and judge.

This was requested, as stated in the letter, because the nature of science is that the work done by one group of scientists should be available for independent evaluation by others.

By letter of October 30, 1963, the Assistant to the Special Assistant to the Secretary replied that:

"We cannot undertake to make them (the records) available to other groups as you suggest." (See exhibit 10.)

### NO CONSULTATION

Not once, in all of these proceedings, have the parties with a direct interest been consulted or conferred with in any way or in any manner.

### OFFER FOR SCIENTIFIC CONSULTATION SPURNED

Furthermore, their specific proposals to have their chemists and physicists consult with the Department were dismissed and spurned on grounds that the work of the FDA scientists was "unimpeachable."

These are not proper proceedings, let alone fair ones.

### NCI SET EXTREMELY HARSH AND SEVERE STANDARDS

The NCI tests thousands of substances as potential anticancer agents. Many are merely tested routinely. Many are also tested on humans.

The NCI in the case of the records of the Krebiozen patients, which were presented merely to determine whether the NCI would test the drug, set extremely harsh and severe standards.

First, the Committee threw out some 216 cases for reasons they have not explained in any adequate detail.

Second, of the remaining cases, they threw out all cases in which there was a decrease in pain or withdrawal of narcotics.

Third, they threw out all cases in which the tumor was arrested.

Fourth, they threw out all cases in which the tumor decreased in size from 1 to 50 percent.

Finally, they counted only those cases of the 288 in which the tumor had decreased in size by 50 percent or more.

They found 15 of these.

Then, on a variety of grounds, many of which are questionable, as will be shown, they threw out 13 of the 15.

Finally, they arrived at two in which there was a regression of 50 percent or more and for which they could find no grounds of any kind adverse to the case. They ascribed these to spontaneous or natural cures or regression.

### NUMBER MUCH HIGHER THAN CAN BE ACCOUNTED FOR BY SPONTANEOUS REGRESSION

Natural or spontaneous remission in cancer, according to the classical study of spontaneous regressions by Everson and Cole, occurs in from 1 in 80,000 to 1 in 100,000 cases. As they point out, some believe it does not occur at all (exhibit 8).

Even using the final results of the NCI Committee, 2 in 5,000 cases (the total number treated with Krebiozen) is from 33 to 40 times the incidence of spontaneous regression which would occur naturally.

### STANDARDS HIGHER AND MORE STRINGENT THAN IN EVERSON-COLE STUDY

In the classical study of Spontaneous Regression of Cancer by Everson and Cole, a study supported by the National Cancer Society and published in the Annals of Surgery, September 1956, spontaneous regressions are defined as follows:

1. "We have defined spontaneous regression of cancer as the partial or complete disappearance of a malignant tumor in the absence of all treatment."

2. "Or in the presence of therapy which is considered inadequate to exert a significant influence on neoplastic disease."

3. "We do not imply that spontaneous regression need progress to complete disappearance of tumor."

4. "Nor that spontaneous regression is synonymous with cure."

5. "In a few cases reported in this paper, tumor which underwent apparent spontaneous regression in one area flourished unchecked in other areas of the body or reappeared at a later time."

Everson and Cole found only 47 cases with adequate documentation to be accepted as probable examples of spontaneous regression, out of approximately 4½ million cases from 1900 to 1956. Newspaper reports indicate that they have now (1963) increased the number to 130 out of a proportionately larger total number of cancer cases.

Note that the standards set by Everson and Cole in which they found only 47 cases in 56 years from all known cases are much less severe than the standard the NCI established merely to determine whether there would be a test of Krebiozen.

The Everson and Cole standards include "partial" regression, not just those of 50 percent or more.

Everson and Cole include cases where there was other therapy which they considered inadequate to influence the disease. In some cases, the NCI threw out a Krebiozen case where there was other therapy which was inadequate.

Everson and Cole include cases in which cancer flourished in other areas of the body. The NCI threw out of the 15 cases with a 50 percent regression or more, cases in which cancer may have flourished elsewhere. In fact, they may well have thrown out many more which do not even appear in the final 15.

Everson and Cole included cases in which cancer reappeared. But the NCI threw out of the 15 cases with a 50 percent or greater regression, some cases in which cancer later appeared. (See p. 6, A1 of NCI Report.)

In fact, on p. 6, A1, the NCI report establishes the following standard: "no new lesions should appear nor should tumor growth progress elsewhere."

The NCI thus set up standards more severe than Everson and Cole, and yet even on this basis they found 15 cases, but threw out 13 of these, many of which by Everson and Cole standards would be included.

### A TYPICAL EXAMPLE OF BIAS

As we have seen, the NCI cast misleading doubts on the anticancer effects of Krebiozen in the 15 cases which met its stringent objective criteria of a 50 percent regression.

A typical example is seen in case NCI No. 362 described in the press release of October 16, 1963, which we have been able to identify in the records of Drs. Ivy and Durovic as Mrs. R., a 67-year-old woman with breast cancer. She is one of the patients about which the NCI states, "doubt exists as to whether or not they should be considered in this category." (I.e., showing regression.)

The NCI specific criticisms on this case (table A, 12th patient) are that the date of onset of the cancer prior to diagnosis and treatment is not certain; that the 7 month remission continued for a further unknown length of time; and that the patient died 8 months after she stopped Krebiozen therapy.

All these comments are true; all are utterly irrelevant to the question of whether there was or was not anticancer activity; and all represent a careful development of the unessential to mislead the reader.

### FURTHER BIAS IN THE FIFTEEN CASES

Only in the report accompanying the press release of October 16, 1963, is there available from either the NCI or FDA any details of their criticisms of the 15 cases with which they condemn Krebiozen.

No other scientific report has been issued; and all requests for further details and for matching the identities of the cases in the press release with the case records in our hands and in the sponsors' hands have been ignored.

On each of the 15 cases, which the NCI salvaged from the 504 case records it studied, the NCI raised specific objections which it considered threw grave doubt on the justification of concluding that Krebiozen caused the objective tumor regression which the NCI admits took place.

For example, Everson and Cole standards allow a few cases in which tumors, while they regressed in one area, flourished unchecked in other areas of the body. But in patient #51 one of the key criticisms was that "the clinical picture suggests that, while regression occurred in the lung masses, metastatic disease was progressing in the CNS" (central nervous system).

In patient #141 the comment is that "a chest X-ray during the period of complete regression revealed a suspicious pulmonary infiltrate suggesting that tumor growth was occurring in the lung."

In patient #439 in which the lesion was said to have disappeared, the criticism of the NCI was that "the question arises whether or not progression was occurring elsewhere at the same time regression was noted."

While Everson and Cole in some instances counted cases in which a tumor flourished elsewhere, the NCI casts the greatest doubt on cases where they merely suggested that the tumor might be flourishing elsewhere.

Under the standards they set up, Everson and Cole do not consider that spontaneous regression need progress to the complete disappearance of the tumor, or in other words, to "cure." But even though the NCI said they would count cases where there was a 50 percent regression or more, basically they established a standard of "cure."

For example, in patient #177 they state that mediastinal metastasis was said to have disappeared but they cast doubt because the "disease recurred and the patient died of metastatic cancer 21 months following completion of Krebiozen therapy."

In patient #362 there was a complete regression over a seven month period and perhaps for longer. But they criticized the case because the patient died eight months after completion of Krebiozen therapy.

Throughout the extremely sketchy comment on these cases, much space is taken up with irrelevant remarks which have a bearing only on "cure," and not on the issue of whether a regression (anti-cancer effect) did or did not occur. For example, remarks are made as to whether an autopsy was performed, whether the tumor later increased, whether the patient eventually died and what he died of, whether the patient later had X-ray therapy. No such facts have any bearing on the central issue which is this: did Krebiozen have an anti-cancer effect?

### VALID CASES IGNORED

Independent medical analysis of the first 60 of the breast cancer cases finds that the stringent NCI criteria of a 50 percent regression by actual measurement is easily met by an additional nine pathologically proven breast cancer cases. That the following additional cases were not among the NCI 15 is evident from the difference in patient age and disease descriptions given by the NCI:

Mrs. J. F., age 58, breast cancer 5x7 cm., decreased to 2x2 cm., axillary metastases disappeared. Doctor's comment: "I am amazed."

Mrs. H. W., age 51, breast cancer 12x11 cm., decreased to 3.5x2.5 cm., axillary metastasis disappeared.

Mrs. M. H., age 57, breast cancer size of orange decreased to less than one-third that size, axillary metastases decreased by one-half; bleeding stopped; complete pain relief; healing of ulcers. Doctor's comment: "Marked improvement."

Mrs. A.A., age 54, breast cancer 13x16 cm., decreased to 4.5x6.5 cm., with complete disappearance of pain on palpation, and microscopic evidence of cancer destruction.

Miss K., age 70, breast cancer 17.5x7.5 cm., decreased to 2x2 cm., skin ulcer over cancer 8x5 cm., decreased to 6x3 cm.

Mrs. I.P., age 40, breast cancer 16x11 cm., decreased to zero; axillary node 2x1 cm., disappeared; pain disappeared; regained use of arm and went back to work as telephone operator.

Mrs. A.M., age 42, breast cancer 5x3 cm., decreased 50 percent axillary metastasis disappeared, later recurred.

Mrs. M.Z., age 67, breast cancer metastases on chest wall 2x3 cm., decreased to less than one-third. Came back when Krebiozen was stopped and again decreased 50 percent when Krebiozen again given. Doctor's comment: "Amazing."

Mrs. I.K., age 51, breast cancer metastases to neck glands completely disappeared. New metastasis appeared after Krebiozen stopped one month, and with more Krebiozen, this also disappeared.

### AT LEAST ANOTHER 9 BREAST CANCER CASES MEET EVERSON-COLE STANDARD OF PARTIAL REGRESSION

There are at least another 9 breast cancer cases which the NCI has refused to recognize where the regression is not fully 50 percent. It is nonetheless considerable and substantial and in amounts which would probably meet the Everson-Cole test of "partial" regressions.

We have not thoroughly examined the balance of approximately 400 case records to determine how many of them meet NCI or Everson and Cole standards, but on the basis merely of spot checks, it is apparent that many of them do.

### LETTER TO NCI

The failure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to allow any independent analysis of their results raises very serious questions when independent medical analysis can spot many more cases which meet the NCI stringent requirements as to regression, pathological proof immediately prior to Krebiozen, and no other therapy but Krebiozen.

As a result of these discrepancies the following letter, which is self-explanatory, was addressed to Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott of the National Cancer Institute on October 28, 1963.

As of the 4th of December, 1963, no reply or acknowledgment had been received.

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH M. ENDICOTT,
*Assistant Surgeon General, Director, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR DR. ENDICOTT: I want to ask some detailed questions about the recent report of the committee which reviewed the records of the 504 patients treated with Krebiozen. I want to get the information as soon as possible, and it is not necessary for you to assemble all the information before any of it is sent along. In the case of much of it, I would think that you would have the facts readily at hand.

The questions I have are as follows:

Of the 288 cases which your group qualified as fulfilling the necessary conditions for evaluation, how many showed a decrease in pain and/or the withdrawal of narcotics?

In how many was the growth of the tumor arrested?

In how many was there regression of the tumor less than 50 percent? That is, from 25 to 50 percent, and so forth.

The next area of general questions I would like to have answered is this:

How many drugs or alleged anti-cancer substances or agents is the National Cancer Institute testing this year?

How many of these are being tested on humans this year?

In how many of these agents did you determine that there was more than a 50-percent decrease in tumors in a large number of cases prior to agreeing to test?

How much is to be spent this year on these drugs, agents, tests, and scientific evaluations?

In addition, would you provide me with exactly the same information for prior years—that is, how many drugs have you tested, how many have been tested on humans, what has been the cost, and how many met the prior criteria of a 50-percent regression?

Would you provide, in addition to the numbers, the specific names of the substances in each of these cases?

The third general area of questions I have concerns the members of the committee.

Would you provide for me the amount of funds that either the NCI or the NIH have provided to the various institutions represented by members of the committee since the NCI has been making grants of funds?

In addition, would you provide me the amount of NIH or NCI funds which have gone directly to each member of the committee?

In addition, may I ask on what basis you selected Dr. Albert Segaloff in view of the fact that he was so prominently connected with the highly controversial status report of the AMA?

May I ask the same question about Dr. George Escher of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, which, as you know, has made prior pronouncements about the effectiveness of this drug?

In addition, would you provide for me tables, like Table A of your release, on all of the 288 cases?

Furthermore, of the 216 which fell in the inadequate test situation, would you also provide to me information comparable to Table A.

I note that you base your final opinion at least twice in part on the findings of the Food and Drug Administration that Krebiozen is creatine. In view of the previous NCI findings of 21 percent carbon, which is wholly incompatible with creatine, do you concur in this finding? Do you believe that there are other substances or "impurities" in the Krebiozen submitted in such quantities that the substance could not be as conclusively identified as done by the FDA when it said it was creatine?

Is it not true that with respect to biological effects and in the case of antibodies, amounts in the quantity of one part in thousands, or millions, or billions can and do have significant biological effects, and also that those are more often than not undetectable by spectrographic, chemical, and the other forms of analysis used by the Food and Drug Administration in their analysis of Krebiozen?

I would like very much to have very definite answers to this last set of questions.

With best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

### (EXHIBIT 1)

### ANALYSIS BY DR. ANDERSON OF LIFE PHOTOGRAPH OF SPECTRA (PHOTOGRAPH PREPARED BY FDA)

An inspection of the Life photograph of the two spectra reveals that it was made by laying the two spectra juxtaposed on a viewing table illuminated from below. The two spectra are displaced vertically relative to one another. The measured offset in the photograph itself is about 4 mm. This is easily determined at the 40-percent transmission points.

It is a little bit difficult to follow both curves separately all the way through the spectrum, but it is evident that if they had the same absorption throughout the spectrum, then both curves would be offset 4 mm. at every point and there would be no difficulty in distinguishing between them at any point. Since this is not the case, one of them must contain some absorption bands not in the other.

In particular, note that at 2.5μ the curve separation is 6 mm. It is obvious that one transmits more here than the other. At 3μ the offset is a "hair" less than 4 mm, at 3.25μ it is 5 mm, and at 5μ it is again 4 mm. The two curves are separated throughout this region so it is easy to compare them with one another. It is evident that the upper curve has a greater transmission at 2.5μ than the lower because the separation is greater than the offset of 4 mm. Similarly at 3.25μ the separation of 5 mm is greater than the offset of 4 mm, so the upper must have the greater transmission. On the other hand, at 3.0μ the separation is less than 4 mm, so the lower curve has the greater transmission. This means the upper curve has an absorption band in this region not in the lower curve. Moreover, the fact that the lower curve has the smaller transmission at 3.25μ indicates that the material in the upper curve which is causing the increased absorption at 3.0μ does not have the absorption at 3.25μ.

In the region of 7.5μ another absorption in the lower curve is evident. In the lower curve the transmission peak at 7.6μ is level with the little plateau at 7.9μ, whereas in the upper curve the transmission peak at 7.6μ is less prominent and is below the plateau at 7.9μ. This indicates an absorption near 7.6μ in the upper curve.

In the region of 8.25μ to 9.5μ there appears to be another absorption in the upper curve. It is noted that the transmission peaks at 8.25μ and 8.75μ in the lower curve are virtually the same. In the upper curve the one at 8.75μ is well below the one at 8.25μ. It is not possible to tell definitely from these curves but it appears that the lower curve at 9.25μ really belongs to what we have called the upper curve. In any case, they are together again at the absorption peak at 9.5μ. Therefore, the indications are that the upper curve has a broad absorption band between 8.25μ and 10μ with a peak absorption near 9.25μ.

The offset of the transmission peak at 10.9μ is less than it is at 10.2μ and 12μ. Although it is impossible to tell which spectrum is which, it's obvious that one has an absorption near 11μ not in the other.

SCOTT ANDERSON.

OCTOBER 30, 1963.

### (EXHIBIT 2)

### RE: DIFFERENCE SPECTRUM OF FDA NO. 80 AND K1

A casual inspection of the two infrared curves of creatine hydrate (No. 80) and Krebiozen Crystals (K1), which were determined by the Government scientists, shows that K1 is largely creatine hydrate, containing, however, a small percentage of some other material. If one plots the difference between these two spectra as a function of wavelength, one obtains a curve which is similar to the spectrum of the additional constituent present in K1. This plot is in no way dependent upon the manner in which the difference is calculated, but neither is it the exact spectrum of the unknown constituent. The way to obtain this spectrum is to isolate the constituent by chromatography or other means and actually determine its spectrum. Nevertheless, the difference spectrum properly calculated will be a close approximation if one neglects any differences due to impurities in the creatine.

The significance of the final plot we obtained is the fact that it is so similar to Spectrum 3588. In fact, if one assumes that the sharp bands in 3588 are due to creatine (they do occur at the wavelengths of the strong absorptions in creatine) and subtracts them mentally, the similarity is very striking. K1 is a sample which Dr. Durovic gave to the FDA, saying it was a fraction he isolated from Krebiozen serum, whereas Spectrum 3588 is the spectrum of material Mr. Clark isolated from Krebiozen ampules. Since the broad-banded structure in 3588 is similar to the difference spectrum, and the sharp bands in 3588 correspond to the strong bands in creatine, it appears that the material of 3588 has the same origin as K1 and that K1 represents a creatine rich fraction, whereas 3588 (actually separated from ampules by an independent chemist) is a noncreatine-rich fraction.

### (EXHIBIT 3)

### CALCULATION OF THE "DIFFERENCE SPECTRUM"

It sometimes happens that two materials of nearly the same composition have infrared spectra that differ largely in their "backgrounds." If one of the materials is nearly pure, one can obtain a fairly good notion of the spectrum of the impurity in the second material by calculating the "difference spectrum."

The "difference spectrum" is determined by calculating the difference in optical density of the two spectra. This type of calculation gives the best results when the spectra are made with the same cell thickness (or concentration in the case of pressed discs). This is the case with the two government spectra #80 and K1. At 5μ where neither has any absorption bands, both spectra have 78 percent transmission. This indicates that both briquettes were quite comparable as far as light scattering and reflections are concerned. And according to the labels they had the same concentration. The briquettes were well prepared and are quite amenable to a "differential" calculation.

The optical density, O.D., is directly proportional to cell length and concentration (and extinction coefficient at a given band but since we are going to get a difference spectrum they cancel out) and is equal to $\log_{10} 1/T$ where T represents the transmission, i.e., $O.D.=\log_{10} 1/T$.

To get the optical density difference construct a table with columns for: 1) wavelength (or wave numbers), 2) percent transmission for #80 and K1, 3) the optical density for #80 and K1, 4) the optical density difference −△O.D., and a final column for the percent transmission difference. Measure the percent transmission with dividers (I found that the spacing between the 5-percent lines corresponded to 20 divisions of the 50 scale on my architect's ruler). Try to use the center of the line trace. It's virtually useless to make measurements on the steep sides of bands but one can use transmission peaks, absorption peaks, and the plateaus.

Since an inspection of the curves shows that K1 has greater impurity absorption than does #80, it is easier to consider △OD positive when $OD_{K1} > OD_{\#80}$.

In view of the fact that #80 obviously has some impurities not in K1 and if the difference spectrum is to be compared with actual spectra it is desirable to add an equalization factor to ΔOD to take care of scattering, reflection, etc., found in real spectra. In this way when one converts (ΔOD + equalization factor) to percent transmission, the plotted values will all be less than 100 percent. Since the OD for 78 percent is 0.109, this makes a logical equalization factor for these particular spectra. However, if it makes the arithmetic any easier, a factor of 0.100 is just as good.

The chosen equalization factor is added to OD, watching the sign convention, i.e., $OD_{K1} > OD_{80} => + \triangle OD$. This synthetic optical density is then converted back to a percent transmission and the wavelength versus percent transmission curve drawn.

If one does not use the equalization factor, then one should take a 100 percent transmission line across the middle of the chart and plot just ΔOD versus percent transmission. In this way, where #80 absorbs more strongly than K1 the plot will be above the 100 percent line and when K1 absorbs the stronger the plot will be below the 100 percent line. The final plot is similar to a differential spectrum and one may get a good portion of the spectrum of the major impurity, particularly if K1 has appreciably more impurity than #80. It is distorted by the presence of a sharp banded impurity in #80 not in K1. Moreover, where the absorption is so great in both spectra, as near

3μ, the measurements cannot be too significant. Here the width of the line is an appreciable difference in optical density. A decrease of percent transmission from 12 to 11 is a 19.6 percent increase in the optical density. I made measurements in this region the best I could and got an intelligent result but I did it more to show that #80 absorbed more strongly here than K1. I consider the fact that I could draw a smooth line through the points to show an apparent additional band in K1, a circumstance that would require more proof.

SCOTT ANDERSON.

OCTOBER 29, 1963.

(EXHIBIT 4)

### CALCULATION OF THE DIFFERENCE SPECTRUM

OCTOBER 25, 1963.

Recently Mr. Clark gave me copies of the report of the government scientists to Dr. Frank H. Wiley of the U.S.F.D.A. Among these is a report by Mrs. Alma L. Hayden. With the written description of her work she submitted copies of the spectrum of Creatine Hydrate (#80) and KI which was described as Krebiozen Ampule 12–435X 7–12–63 RND. Mrs. Hayden mentions that the sample KI is a beige powder (p. 3 of her report). Also on p. 3, line 11, fourth paragraph, she states that "the spectrum of Krebiozen (12–435X) is identical with that of Creatine Hydrate." Yet an inspection of the two infrared curves supplied with the report shows that this is not 100 percent true. For example, in spectrum #80 the two bands at 9.51μ and 10.9μ have about the same maximum intensity whereas in KI the peak absorption of the 9.51μ band is about 43 percent and the 10.9μ band is about 49.5 percent.

There are other points of obvious difference but I decided to see if we could determine the spectrum of the trace material in KI. (Several points lead one to believe that KI has the greater amount of impurities although one can make out some bands in #80 not in KI.) At 5μ they both have a transmission of 78 percent which indicates that both briquettes are equivalent. Therefore one seems justified in measuring the optical densities point by point and subtracting them and having the λ vs. optical density of their difference. In other words, we should have something close to the differential spectrum. The extinction from 3 to 3.25μ is so great in both spectra that measurements here shouldn't mean too much. Even the trace line width at these optical densities amounts to a readable difference in optical density. Many of the bands are very sharp so measurements on the sides of bands will be virtually meaningless. Nevertheless, we attempted it. I constructed a table with the wave length at which points were made and the percent transmission of each curve at that point. The percents transmission were converted to optical density and the difference calculated. The difference was considered positive if the optical density of KI was greater than that of #80.

Since we were going to compare the synthetic curve with the spectrum of real samples in which there is scattering and reflection losses we added 0.109 to the ΔO.D. so that when the ΔO.D. was zero as at 5μ the synthetic curve would have a transmission of 78 percent.

| λ | Percent trans. | | Opt. density | | ΔO.D. | ΔO.D.+ 0.109 (percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | #80 | KI | #80 | KI | | |
| 5μ | 78.0 | 78.0 | 0.109 | 0.109 | 0 | 78.0=100 |
| 1,710 | 12.5 | 12.4 | .903 | .906 | .003 | 77.5 |
| 1,680 | 30.0 | 28.5 | .523 | .545 | .022 | 74.1 |
| 1,668 | 25.0 | 24.0 | .602 | .620 | .018 | 74.6 |
| 1,648 | 31.3 | 30.0 | .504 | .523 | .019 | 74.5 |
| 1,575 | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 1,490 | 59.0 | 58.3 | .229 | .234 | .005 | 77.0 |
| 1,428 | 33.5 | 34.0 | .475 | .468 | −.007 | 79.2 |
| 1,312 | 22.5 | 23.0 | .648 | .638 | −.010 | 79.5 |
| 1,250 | 60.0 | 57.5 | .222 | .241 | .019 | 74.5 |
| 1,200 | 62.0 | 58.7 | .208 | .232 | .024 | 73.7 |
| 1,160 | 60.0 | 56.0 | .222 | .252 | .030 | 72.6 |
| 1,130 | 56.0 | 50.0 | .252 | .301 | .049 | 69.5 |
| 1,112 | 29.5 | 27.6 | .530 | .559 | .029 | 73.0 |
| 1,050 | 50.0 | 42.6 | .301 | .371 | .070 | 66.5 |
| 1,000 | 69.5 | 62.0 | .158 | .208 | .050 | 69.2 |
| 931 | 74.0 | 65.0 | .131 | .187 | .056 | 68.4 |
| 890 | 72.5 | 65.5 | .140 | .184 | .044 | 70.5 |
| 918 | 52.6 | 49.0 | .279 | .310 | .031 | 72.5 |
| 830 | 53.0 | 52.0 | .276 | .284 | .008 | 76.4 |
| 825 | 55.0 | 53.0 | 0.260 | 0.276 | 0.016 | 75.0 |
| 810 | 47.0 | 47.6 | .328 | .322 | −.006 | 79.0 |
| 800 | 48.0 | 48.0 | .319 | .319 | 0 | 78.0 |
| 1,350 | 51.0 | 51.0 | .292 | .292 | 0 | 78.0 |
| 1,420 | 37.0 | 39.0 | .432 | .409 | −.023 | 82.0 |
| 1,500 | 59.0 | 58.0 | .229 | .237 | .008 | 76.5 |
| 1,695 | 12.9 | 12.4 | .888 | .906 | .018 | 74.5 |
| 1,550 | 48.0 | 47.5 | .319 | .323 | .004 | 77.0 |
| 1,900 | 77.0 | 77.0 | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 1,800 | 71.5 | 71.5 | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 2,000 | 77.0 | 77.0 | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 2,500 | 70.0 | 69.5 | .155 | .158 | .003 | 77.4 |
| 2,800 | 49.0 | 50.2 | .310 | .300 | −.010 | 81.2 |
| 3,090 | 15.0 | 15.8 | .824 | 8.01 | −.023 | 82.1 |
| 3,200 | 27.0 | 26.5 | .568 | .576 | −.008 | 79.4 |
| 3,400 | 16.2 | 16.2 | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 3,800 | 74.0 | 78.0 | .131 | .109 | −.022 | 82.0 |
| 2,900 | 45.0 | | | | 0 | 78.0 |
| 1,440 | 51.0 | 51.0 | | | 0 | 78.0 |

When these data are plotted and the difference spectrum compared with #3588 the resemblance is remarkable. Of course, the synthetic spectrum (which was plotted as 5853) does not have any of the sharp bands but the broad banded portion of 3588 matches remarkably well with 5853. Thus it appears that the substance in KI not creatine is the same material that gives 3588 its broad bands. Moreover, it would appear that the sharp bands in 3588 are probably due to a creatine impurity.

We then tried the same thing with SD–84, Spectrum 5455. This time we ran a 75 percent creatine briquette and subtracted its optical density from 5455. This procedure is not as elegant as it was for the government curves. What we need to do is to work out extinction coefficients for creatine and find out how much creatine is in SD–84 and then subtract a band at a time. Nevertheless, we gave it a try and added an equalization factor of 0.250 to compare the plot 5855 with 3588 and 5850. The similarity between 3588, 5855, 5853, and 5850 is most striking.

| λ | Percent trans. | | Opt. density | | ΔO.D. | ΔO.D.+ 0.250 percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0.75 percent C | SD-84 | 0.75 percent C | SD-84 | | |
| 3,800 | 61 | 50 | 0.215 | 0.301 | 0.086 | 46 |
| 3,600 | 57 | 45 | .244 | .347 | .103 | 44 |
| 3,500 | 46 | 25 | .338 | .602 | .264 | 31 |
| 3,400 | 35 | 10 | .456 | 1.000 | .544 | 16 |
| 3,300 | 35 | 5 | .456 | 1.301 | .845 | 8 |
| 3,200 | 39 | 5 | .408 | 1.301 | .893 | 7 |
| 3,060 | 35 | 11 | .456 | .958 | .502 | 18 |
| 3,000 | 37 | 11 | .432 | .958 | .526 | 17 |
| 2,900 | 45 | 20 | .347 | .698 | .351 | 25 |
| 2,500 | 64 | 55 | .194 | .260 | .066 | 48 |
| 2,000 | 66 | 64 | .180 | .194 | .014 | 54 |
| 1,900 | 64 | 63 | .194 | .200 | .006 | 56 |
| 1,800 | 57 | 57 | .244 | .244 | 0 | 56 |
| 1,690 | 35 | 16 | .456 | .794 | .338 | 26 |
| 1,600 | 36 | 10 | .443 | 1.000 | .557 | 16 |
| 1,615 | 26 | 5 | .583 | 1.301 | .718 | 11 |
| 1,550 | 45 | 26 | .347 | .587 | .240 | 32 |
| 1,500 | 52 | 40 | .284 | .397 | .113 | 43 |
| 1,450 | 45 | 28 | 0.346 | 0.552 | 0.206 | 35 |
| 1,420 | 38 | 22 | .420 | .658 | .238 | |
| 1,450 | 45 | 28 | .346 | .552 | .206 | 35 |
| 1,390 | 49 | 29 | .310 | .538 | .228 | 16 |
| 1,325 | | | | | .263 | 31 |
| 1,325 | | | | | .263 | 31 |
| 1,250 | 54 | 33 | .268 | .482 | .214 | 34 |
| 1,200 | 56 | 38 | .252 | .420 | .168 | 38 |
| 1,150 | 55 | 29 | .259 | .537 | .278 | 30 |
| 1,110 | 39 | 15 | .408 | .824 | .416 | 22 |
| 1,060 | 56 | 18 | .252 | .744 | .492 | 18 |
| 1,000 | 59 | 32 | .229 | .495 | .266 | 30 |
| 980 | 50 | 26 | .301 | .584 | .283 | 29 |
| 850 | 58 | 48 | .236 | .318 | .082 | 47 |
| 800 | 48 | 34 | .318 | .468 | .150 | 40 |
| 750 | 52 | 38 | .384 | .420 | .036 | 52 |
| 700 | 39 | 18 | .408 | .744 | .336 | 26 |
| 675 | 42 | 25 | .376 | .602 | .226 | 33 |

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that these calculated difference spectra are not the spectra of any compound but do give an indication of the spectrum that will be found when creatine is removed from the sample and the residue run alone.

SCOTT ANDERSON.

October 25, 1963.

(EXHIBIT 5)

### ANDERSON ANALYSES OF FDA SPECTRA

THE ANDERSON PHYSICAL LABORATORY

(Progress report for the month of October on problems J–1139, by Scott Anderson, October 26, 1963.)

During the last 10 years our laboratory has determined the infrared spectra of samples received by Mr. Clark from the Krebiozen Foundation. However, it was not until 1958 that he brought us a sample which he said was "all the isolated Krebiozen in the world." We ran its spectrum as our No. 3588. It was a rather monotonous sort of thing, which had the general appearance of a polysaccharide or higher sugar with perhaps an amine impurity.

Subsequent to that time we have determined the spectrum of perhaps 2 dozen samples related to Mr. Clark's work for the Krebiozen Foundation. These spectra have varied from that consisting of a few broad weak bands to a rather complicated spectrum of many sharp bands, as well as all degrees of mixtures of the two types. The two extremes and one mixture of the two are shown in figure 1.* The 3588 is the original 1958 spectrum and was labeled "Combined Isolation Product 1 & 2." SD–84 is another sample from Dr. Durovic. And 5084 is the spectrum of a sample called "Krebiozen Crystals."

All these spectra appeared to be those of mixtures of compounds, yet one could see running through them the "threads" of the two basic types of spectra. Seldom did we determine a spectrum that didn't display a sharp band or so like the one at 1400 cm$^{-1}$ in CIP 1 & 2. Only rarely, if indeed more than twice, did we obtain a spectrum like K1 which shows almost no broad banded structure. The spectrum of SD–84 is much more typical of the fine-structured spectra. Most samples varied between CIP 1 & 2 and SD–84. Of course, I am told, we have by no means determined the infrared spectra of all the samples received by Mr. Clark.

In the last couple of years when asked to determine the spectrum of a sample we have been asked to compare it with 3588. This repetition of comparisons has pointed to a special significance in CIP 1 & 2 of spectrum 3588 in spite of the fact that 5084 was labeled "Krebiozen Crystals." The question arises as to the nature of "Krebiozen Crystals" because this is the sample submitted by Dr. Durovic to the F.D.A.

To quote the Government scientists:

1. Mary E. Mrose, U.S. Geolog. Survey "a pale buff" aggregates. X-ray "powder data indicate very good agreement between the data of creatine and Krebiozen." "Krebiozen and creatine are one and the same compound."

2. Mrs. Alma L. Hayden, Div. of Pharmaceutical Chem.–BPS "The (infrared) spectrum of this disk (creatine monohydrate) * * * was identical with that of Krebiozen spectrum" p.1. "The spectrum of sample 2 is very similar to that of the anhydrous creatine with differences only in the relative intensities of the 3.0 & $9.0\mu$ bands." (Based on NCI spectra) p. 2. "a beige power" p. 3. Based on her own spectra "the spectrum of Krebiozen (12–435x) in KCI was identical with that of a micro-plate of Creatine hydrate in KCI."

3. Dr. Ellis R. Lippincott, University of Maryland, "The IR spectrum corresponding to B also matched the IR curve for d (anhydrous creatine) with the exception that evidence for water near $3\mu$ indicating that the sample from which this curve (B?) was taken was creatine with some water present" p. 2. "* * * slight orange tinge" to crystals. p. 3. "The two curves matched band for band, frequency position for frequency position and band shape for band shape for all bands." p. 3. "His conclusion was that Krebiozen labeled KI was definitely and unequivocally creatine hydrate." p. 4.

4. W. V. Eisenberg, Microanaly. Br., Div. of Microbiology (refractive index measurement) "light tan powder" "material is practically pure creatine monohydrate." ("practical" test, of course, in a biological is anti-cancer activity.)

5. Prof. Raymond N. Castle, University of New Mexico "buff colored" p. 2. "so the Krebiozen is substantially pure creatine monohydrate."

6. Mr. Joseph Damico (mass spectra) Div. of Food of the FDA, "For all practical purposes, the results obtained indicated that the spectra (mass) of creatine hydrate, creatinine, and Krebiozen powder are identical."

7. K. Biemann, Prof. Chem. MIT "brownish white with a shade of pink" p. 1. "slight intensity differences show in the many small peaks, but this is of course due to differences in impurities" p. 2. "for all practical purposes" identical with either creatine (hydrated or unhydrated) or creatinine."

The IR spectra of creatine monohydrate and KI as determined by Mrs. Hayden are given in figure 2. KI has some broad band not in creatine monohydrate at $9\mu$. If one draws a line across the transmission peaks at 8.25, 8.75, $9.4\mu$ in the creatine spectrum #80, the line slopes up to the right, whereas in the spectrum of KI it slopes down, indicating the presence of something in KI which has its maximum absorption near $9.5\mu$ or something in creatine with absorption near $9.5\mu$ or something in creatine with absorption maximum at $8.75\mu$. There are other points somewhat less obvious at which the presence of a second constituent is indicated. For example, the line across the transmission peaks at 7.55 and $7.8\mu$ slopes downward to the right in creatine and upward to the right in KI.

The ideal way to obtain a notion of the spectrum of the impurity difference is to subtract the creatine spectrum from KI and plot the difference or "differential" spectrum. This we did by noting that both spectra have a transmission of 78 percent at $5\mu$. We normalized the difference spectrum to 78 percent so that it would have the appearance of a spectrum made with a very small amount of material. The spectrum is not as dramatic (if the "impurity" content is very great) as the straight differential spectrum but to my way of thinking is more "natural" and if comparisons are to be made with actual spectra it is more realistic. The only way to really get the spectrum accurately anyway is to separate out the constituent (or constituents) and run the isolated component by itself. However, the calculation gives a good indication of the general character of the "impurity" spectrum.

Our calculated differential spectrum is given in figure 3. If one compares this with 3588 one is immediately impressed with the similarity of the two curves with the exception that 3588 has bands at 3200 cm$^{-1}$ and sharp points at 1640 ($6.2\mu$), 1390 ($7.2\mu$) and 1150 cm$^{-1}$ ($9\mu$) not present in the differential spectrum. The disappearance of these bands in the differential spectrum indicates that creatine was present as an impurity in 3588 and that the bulk of 3588 is the component which is a minor constituent in KI.

A similar calculation was performed on SD–84 (fig. 1) by subtracting out the spectrum of a 0.75 percent KBr briquette and normalizing to 45 percent transmission. Again this was done because comparisons are to be made with single component spectra.

In figure 3 we have compared the two differential spectra with 3588 and SD–201 (B), a sample of Krebiozen from which the bulk of creatine has been removed. The similarity of all the spectra is very striking even though admittedly not identical. The indications are that the non-creatine portion is not a single component and relative concentrations vary from sample to sample. Only some very neat chromatography can tell the facts. In addition, it must be remembered that our "differential spectra" are at best approximation.

Therefore it would appear that most samples consist of at least two components—Creatine plus some substance (or substances since relative concentrations appear to vary) which had an IR spectrum consisting of broad bands centered near 3400, 1650, 1450, 1050 cm$^{-1}$ with still weaker bands beyond 900 cm$^{-1}$ typical of many polysaccharides.

Very truly yours,

SCOTT ANDERSON, Ph. D.,
*Director.*

(EXHIBIT 6)

### CLARK CHEMICAL ANALYSES OF KREBIOZEN

CLARK MICROANALYTICAL LABORATORY,
*Urbana, Ill, October 29, 1963.*

KREBIOZEN—CHEMICAL STUDIES

The initial sample was received February 10, 1953. Analysis indicated: C 12.02, H 1.99, Ash from CH 71.45, N

---

*Figures in this exhibit refer to spectrograms available in Senator DOUGLAS' office for inspection by members of the press. (Editor's note.)

None detected, P none, Cl 11.30*, calculated ash free C 42.10, H 8.37. Reanalysis after redrying, loss of weight of 1.73 was found, C 9.95, H 2.07, ash from CH 74.19, calculated ash free, C 38.55, H 8.02.

Infrared and ultraviolet studies gave us some ideas as to chemical composition and emission analysis showed the ash to have a broad spectrum of metals. Various attempts at solubility separation were made without marked success. Finally, as a calculated risk, we resorted to the use of ion exchange resin to remove the ash, but after evaporation of the slightly acid solution there was such a marked change in solubilities that we concluded that there had been some change in the molecule which we did not understand and hesitating to proceed we temporarily terminated the project although the materials were retained.

Several years later we were given a supply of ampules which would allow us to make our own extraction. Using water and methanol-water, we were able to obtain enough material for a significant infrared study which indicated that we were working with either a carbohydrate acid joined with a polysaccharide or that we had a mixture containing the two classes of substances.

With this information we went back to the residue of the original material and separated the water soluble and methanol soluble materials from each other. Infrared indicated the water soluble portion to be polysaccharide and the methanol soluble to be aliphatic acid.

All infrared studies were done by the Anderson Physical Laboratory of Champaign, Illinois, under the direction of Dr. Scott Anderson.

We next had our isolation confirmed by the Shuman Chemical Laboratory, Inc. of Battle Ground, Indiana, working closely with Professor Roy Whistler of Purdue University who is a specialist in carbohydrates and polysaccharides. They also confirmed our cleavage and the class identity of the cleavage parts. Next by strong hydrolysing conditions the polysaccharides portion was further divided and by paper chromatography galacturonic acid, glucosamine, galactose, glucose, arabinose and xylose were identified. This was done several times.

The fatty acid portion was esterified and by gas chromatography the acids in their order of abundance were palmetic, oleic, palmitoleic, myristic, stearic, and smaller quantities of C–15, and C–17, lauric and shorter chain acid.

Up until the time Dr. Durovic began the preparation of more material we had never had enough for combustion analysis since that done on the initial sample. These new preparations have always shown varying amounts of nitrogen although none was found in the original material. It is true that glucosamine was found in the hydrolysate, and there is some evidence of creatine in the material isolated from the original ampules, but they must have been present in a very small quantity and thus almost negligible to the whole material.

Now, creatine, which contains a high percentage of nitrogen, is known to be present in some of these new preparations. When there are two substances in a composition and one is known, that one can be calculated out mathematically and thus the percentage of the other established.

This has been done with two samples:

Sample No. SD–201 (79.45 percent Krebiozen): C 39.22 percent, H 6.12 percent, O 54.65 percent.

Sample No. SD–84 (46.31 percent Krebiozen): C 41.22 percent, H 6.41 percent, O 52.34 percent.

(See attached appendix for the calculation.)

This finding of approximately the same percentage composition, as the initial material makes them mutually confirming. Their infrared curves also corrected for the known impurity, creatine, are comparable to the isolation product (Spectrum No. 3588) and serve as further confirmation of continuity. (See report from The Anderson Physical Laboratory, Oct. 26, 1963.)

There is a bit of difference in the hydrogen content but the initial material could have been influenced by water of hydration in the mineral content and thus these later findings for this have our greatest confidence.

This brings us to this date.

Howard S. Clark.

APPENDIX

October 29, 1963.

If we presume that all of the nitrogen in SD–201 is due to creatine hydrate we can calculate the percentage composition of the remaining material which is presumed to be Krebiozen.

SD–201: C=37.78%, H=6.39%, N=5.79%, O=50.04%. (Observed Values.)

Creatine Hydrate: 32.22%, 7.44%, 28.18%, 32.19%. (Actual Composition.)

The equations become:

$$\frac{\%\text{ N in SD–201}}{\%\text{ N in creatine}} = \%\text{ creatine}$$

$$\frac{5.79}{28.18} = 20.55\%\text{ Creatine}$$

By difference = 79.45% Krebiozen.

(% of element in substance) (% of substance in the sample) =% of element from substance in the total.

C=Total % Carbon in sample____ 37.78
  Less Creatine
    Carbon____(32.22) (20.55)= 6.62

  Carbon from
    Krebiozen____(79.45) (X)= 31.16
    X=C in Krebiozen=39.22%.

H=Total % Hydrogen in sample_ 6.39
  Less Creatine
    Hydrogen__(7.44) (20.55)= 1.53

  Krebiozen
    Hydrogen____(79.45) (X)= 4.86
    X=H in Krebiozen=6.12%.

O=Total % Oxygen (by difference) in sample___________ 50.04
  Less Creatine
    Oxygen_____(32.19) (20.55) 6.62

  Krebiozen
    Oxygen_________(79.45) (X) 43.42
    X=O in Krebiozen=54.65%.

C=39.22%
H= 6.12%
O=54.65%

99.99%

SD–84 calculated in the same manner shows it to be 46.31% Krebiozen whose percentage composition is:

C=41.22%
H= 6.41%
O=52.34%

K1=A–1 2.7% Krebiozen; A–2 (Companion lot) 2.5% Krebiozen (too small to allow calculation).

Howard S. Clark.

(EXHIBIT 7)

SLIGHT DIFFERENCES IN DRUGS WHICH SAVE LIVES

Testimony of Dr. Austin Smith, president, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, February 23, 1960:

"The critical importance of swift, comprehensive new product information is unique to the prescription drug industry. Even slight differences or product improvements can be important to the patients. Doctors are aware that unacceptable side effects may be produced in a patient treated with one form of a drug, but in some patients new or improved drugs frequently can reduce these side effects. In the infinite complexities of the human organism, the slightest change or improvement in a drug for a particular patient can mean the difference between health or illness, life or death."

Citation: Hearings, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Administered Prices in the Drug Industry, part 19, page 10700.

Testimony of Dr. Philip S. Hench, Mayo Clinic, December 10, 1959:

"So in talking about a minor modification from the standpoint of chemistry, there is really a minor modification that makes all the difference in the world. You can rationalize these modifications. For example, sir, in due time they made a compound called hydrocortisone, and that one simple change made all the difference in the world.

"It raises the effect on electrolytes many, many times. There was no reason to understand why, but it did, so you would conclude therefore that every new cortisone that has that would have that same excessive action. But no, later without any reasoning they found that the addition of another factor, which is a minor thing, canceled out the first affair.

"So that what is minor is a decision after things have been discovered, not before. And if we were to ask the pharmaceutical chemist not to bother with minor modifications on the drawing board, we might miss some of the most amazingly helpful cortisones that would ever be discovered."

Citation: Hearings, Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Administered Prices in the Drug Industry, part 14, page 8172.

---

* Later knowledge shows this was probably ionic and resident in the mineral ash content.

## (EXHIBIT 8)

## BIOLOGICAL FACTS BEARING ON KREBIOZEN

### 1. EXAMPLES OF MINUTE AMOUNTS OF BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES WHICH HAVE LARGE BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS

NOTE.—FOR COMPARISON, THE AMOUNT OF KREBIOZEN IN ONE AMPULE IS 10 MILLIONTHS OF A GRAM

(a) A single dose of 3 to 6 millionths of a gram of $B_{12}$ is clinically active in a patient with pernicious anemia (The Vitamins, vol. 1, Sebrell (former director of NIH) & Harris, Academic Press, N.Y. 1954, p. 397). 0.00013 millionths of a gram are required per cc. to support half maximum growth of L. lactis Dorner (ibid., p. 397).

(b) The human body makes only 50 to 100 millionths of a gram of thyroid hormone per day (Starling's Human Physiology, 13th ed., Lea & Febiger, Phila., 1962, p. 1423).

(c) The concentration of free thyroid hormone in the normal human blood is 1 part per 10,000 million parts of blood plasma, and this concentration is physiologically active and necessary for health (ibid., p. 1421).

(d) Goiter is easily prevented by the ingestion of only 1 part of sodium iodide per 10,000 to 100,000 parts of common salt (ibid., p. 1423).

(e) Biotin, a B vitamin, is biologically active in a concentration of 1 part in 10 billion (The Vitamins, supra).

(f) Adrenalin has an easily detectable biological effect in a blood concentration of 1 part in 1.4 billion parts of blood—McLeod's "Physiology in Modern Medicine," 9th edition, 1941, page 171.

(g) Adrenalin is so powerful that the nonpregnant rat's uterus suspended in Tyrode's solution—modified—is relaxed by a concentration of 1 part in 10 billion (Starling's "Human Physiology," supra, p. 1412).

(h) The blood plasma concentration of many of the ovarian hormones are of the order of 2 millionths of a gram per 100 cc. of blood (ibid., p. 1474).

(i) To produce fever in man, one need only inject one ten-millionth of a gram of an extract from the bacterium, E. Coli (ibid., p. 1527).

(j) The lethal dose in man of purified botulinum toxin is 0.06 millionths of a gram (ibid., p. 1529).

### 2. EXAMPLES OF MINUTE AMOUNTS OF BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES WHICH HAVE LARGE BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND CANNOT BE DETECTED BY INFRARED SPECTROSCOPY, MASS SPECTROSCOPY, X-RAY DIFFRACTION ANALYSIS, OR MICROSCOPIC CRYSTALLOGRAPHY

(a) Vitamin $B_{12a}$ has only half the biological activity of $B_{12}$ in chicks, but an overlay (by MHR) of their infrared spectrograms (The Vitamins, supra, p. 407-8), shows as little or less difference than the overlay of creatine and Krebiozen spectrograms.

(b) "A number of synthetic 5,6 dimethyl benzimidazole glycosides (compounds related to vitamin $B_{12}$) possess absorption spectra indistinguishable from each other" (ibid., p. 412).

(c) "The chemical properties of antibodies are as yet indistinguishable from those of other gamma globulins of serum" (Starling, supra, p. 1531).

"Except for their ability to react with specific antigens, (a biological test), antibody globulins show no chemically recognizable differences from normal globulins" (Zinser's Microbiology, 1960, Appleton Century Crofts, N.Y., p. 131).

(d) General principles—"Some advertisers of equipment may refer to such a curve as a kind of fingerprint. However, it should be emphasized that a spectrophotometer is a nondiscriminatory instrument; that is, for a mixture of two or more absorbing substances the absorption spectrum shows simply the effect of all absorbers. If the curves for an unknown and for a known compound agree closely, identity of composition or structure is indicated strongly, but not confirmed. It is possible for two quite different systems to yield closely agreeing curves, at least over limited spectral regions." (Encyclopedia of Spectroscopy, Ed. by Geo. L. Clark, Res. Prof. Analyt. Chem. Emeritus, Univ. of Illinois, Reinhold Publ. Corp., N.Y. 1960, p. 7.)

(e) Inaccuracies with sterols (sex hormones and their relatives): "It has been shown that because of the similarity of the spectra, infrared absorption spectrophotometry is not entirely satisfactory for the qualitative identification of the commonly occurring sterols. This is especially true in the case of cholesterol and B-sitosterol which have absorption patterns that are identical even in the smallest detail. While other sterols differ somewhat in the details of their spectra, in many cases these differences are insufficient for positive differentiation and/or identification.

"X-ray diffraction, on the other hand, yields powder patterns which differ sufficiently to permit positive identification of a given sterol. However, certain precautions must be observed in the use of powder patterns for this purpose, since a number of sterols can crystallize in more than one system and then yield more than one pattern for the same substance.

"In the case of cholesterol and dihydrocholesterol mixtures, infrared spectrophotometry would appear to be applicable, since each sterol has specific spectral absorption bands. Unfortunately, because of the weakness of these bands, the spectra of mixtures containing less than 25 percent dihydrocholesterol or cholesterol cannot be distinguished from the spectra of the major component. It is clear that this method is not reliable qualitatively and is useless from the quantitative point of view.

"As applied to the analysis of sterol mixtures, X-ray diffraction was more effective than infrared spectrophotometry. This method could be used to determine the composition of physical mixtures within 10 percent by using diffractometer calibration charts. The X-ray technique was inadequate for the analysis of crystallized mixtures of sterols. When dissolved, mixtures of sterols often crystallize as complex crystals, the pattern of which differs from that of the physical mixture of the same percentage composition. The formation of these complex crystals depends in an undetermined way on the percentage composition of the mixture. Therefore, until further studies have been completed, the use of X-ray diffraction for quantitative determination of mixtures—other than physical—is not recommended." (Ibid., p. 577.)

(f) "The mass spectrum is a 'fingerprint' of a compound just as the infrared spectrum is" (ibid., p. 583). (Note: therefore with some of the same limitations.)

"Ordinarily the mass spectrometer cannot be used for detecting components in a mixture in the parts per million range" (ibid., p. 585).

"Mass spectrometric analyses are relatively rapid, an hour or two being sufficient for the analysis of a moderately complicated mixture" (ibid., p. 628).

(g) Re: Microscopic crystallography: "Polymorphic transformations occurring after the isolation of a crystalline compound may be misleading or troublesome. Thus, if enantiotropic (occurring in more than one form) crystals are separated at a temperature above the transformation point, they may crumble to a powder of different melting point on being stored." (Technique of Organic Chemistry, vol. II p. 441, Arnold Weissberger, Ed., Interscience Pub., N. Y. 1956.)

"Sometimes a compound will crystallize in different modifications from different solvents. If the velocity of transformation of the unstable to the stable is very small, the two modifications may crystallize together from solution at an appropriate temperature. It is therefore extremely important to make sure that any sample whose physical constants are to be measured is a single modification and not a mixture of polymorphs" (ibid., p. 441).

### 3. BIOLOGICAL SUBSTANCES WHICH HAVE BEEN USEFUL IN MEDICAL TREATMENT DESPITE THEIR LACK OF UNIFORMITY AND/OR THE FACT THAT THEIR CHEMICAL COMPOSITION WAS UNKNOWN

(a) "Parathormone (the active hormone of the parathyroid glands which controls calcium metabolism) appears to be a peptide containing about 80 amino-acid residues, but its structure is not yet known exactly" (Starling, supra, p. 1427). It has been known since 1925 and used therapeutically since that time. The standard unit is based solely on the bioassay involving its effect of raising the plasma calcium concentration in dogs (ibid., p. 1427).

(b) All 6 hormones of the pituitary, many of which are used clinically, are analyzed only by biological or immunological assay. Some have not been isolated in pure form (ibid., p. 1432).

(c) The estrogens (female hormones) were used for about 25 years on the basis of bioassay alone before their structure was determined (ibid., p. 1471).

A sensitive test of progesterone is by bioassay, which detects one five billionth of a gram (ibid.).

(d) Vitamin $B_{12}$ was used therapeutically in the form of raw liver and raw liver extracts for 23 years to save lives in the routinely fatal disease of pernicious anemia before it was isolated as a red crystalline substance (The Vitamins, supra, p. 397).

"The structure of vitamin $B_{12}$ is not yet fully elucidated, and no synthesis of this vitamin has been accomplished" (ibid., p. 414).

"There are 5 clinically active constituents other than $B_{12}$ in crude liver. It is optically active * * * its molecular weight was determined by the ebulliscopic (same as Krebiozen) method * * * exposure to sunlight decreases activity. * * *" (ibid., p. 400).

"In the light of present knowledge many more forms (of $B_{12}$) may exist" (ibid., p. 407–8).

"As the compound ($B_{12}$) was found in an industrial laboratory and proved to be of clinical value from the very beginning, it was only natural that it was practically available to the medical profession a short time after its isolation; 4 months after the first publication of the group around Karl Folkers, Merck & Co., Inc., announced at the meeting of the Hematological Society in Buffalo that crystalline Vitamin $B_{12}$ was available for therapeutic purposes (August, 1948) (ibid., p. 417).

"Three sources of raw material may be considered as a starting point for the isolation of $B_{12}$ as such or in the form of concentrates: 1. The mother liquors of the microbial formation of antibiotics like streptomycin, aureomycin, and terramycin, after the removal of the antibiotic.

2. Cultures of micro-organisms which produce $B_{12}$ as the only valuable product, e.g., B. megatherium.

3. Activated sludge from sewage disposal (U.S. Patent). A concentration in the starting material of 1 to 2 millionths of a gram per cc. is considered worthwhile.

"Processes (for making $B_{12}$) center around U.S. Patents, 2,582,589; 2,563,794" (ibid.).

"The natural cobalt content of normal ingredients of the broth (for growing bacteria which make $B_{12}$) is very small. The addition of small amounts of cobalt salts to the broth increases the $B_{12}$ production; the increase goes up 17 fold (above that obtained) without the addition of cobalt. The optimum concentration is about 2 parts per million of cobalt in the nutrient medium. Four parts per million already decreases the simultaneous production of streptomycin to nearly ¼''" (ibid., p. 420).

"About twenty U.S. patents protect methods of production and isolation of $B_{12}$, whereas the compound itself is protected in this country by a product claim defining $B_{12}$ clearly by its absorption spectrum and biological activity. Merck & Co., Inc. leads the field by owning the product claim and the addition of cobalt to the fermentation nutrient" (ibid., p. 420).

"$B_{12}$ has become one of the most important vitamins, therapeutically as well as economically * * * production in 1952 was 94 pounds and sales totaled 61 pounds with an estimated value of $13 to $14 million, the original price was $12,500 per gram" (ibid.).

### 4. THE RELATION BETWEEN KREBIOZEN AND KNOWN ANTICANCER SUBSTANCES PRODUCED BY RAY FUNGI

(a) The important antituberculosis antibiotic, streptomycin, is produced in the culture broth of one of the varieties of the ray fungus (actinomycetes). This fungus was first discovered in and isolated from the tumor of "lumpy jaw" in cattle. It is a sterile extract of this fungus which is injected into horses to cause them to elaborate the antitumor principle of Krebiozen.

(b) In addition to streptomycin, these fungi produce in their culture broth other antibiotics which have antitumor activity.

Thus, these known antitumor substances are analagous to Krebiozen. That is, they are produced by the reaction between the ray fungus and its broth environment; whereas Krebiozen is produced by a reaction between an extract of the ray fungus and the environment of the horse.

On pages 84–85 from Metabolic Inhibitors, edited by Hochster & Quastel, Academic Press, 1963,[1] it is stated, "Perhaps the most exciting aspect of antibiotic research today has to do with the isolation and characterization of those antibiotics which exhibit antitumor activity * * *."

Note that "there are now in various states of development more than 20 new products endowed with antitumor activity, which have resulted from the antibiotic programs supported by the Cancer Chemotherapy National Service Center of the National Cancer Institute during the past several years."

Well might we ask why the discovery of Drs. Durovic and Ivy is being held up, while research of their competitors also based on ray fungi activity is pushed with all possible speed.

"The structures of many of these agents (the antitumor antibiotics), like their mechanism of action, are unknown" (p. 85).

### 5. EXCERPT FROM METABOLIC INHIBITORS, EDITED BY HOCHSTER & QUASTEL, ACADEMIC PRESS, 1963, PAGES 84–96, OF SECTION BY E. J. MODEST, G. E. FOLEY, AND S. FARBER

#### "3. ANTITUMOR PROPERTIES

"Perhaps the most exciting aspect of antibiotics research today has to do with the isolation and characterization of those antibiotics which exhibit antitumor activity. Research in this area has expanded rapidly in recent years both in this country and abroad, as attested by the increasing number of reports describing new antibiotics exhibiting such activity. There are now some two dozen antibiotics which exhibit antitumor activity in experimental tumor systems (39), and at least six of these agents exhibit interesting activity in human neoplasia (33, 63). In addition, there are now in various stages of development more than 20 new products endowed with antitumor activity, which have resulted from the antibiotics programs supported by the Cancer Chemotherapy National Service Center of the National Cancer Institute during the past several years (64).

"The structures of many of these agents, like their mechanisms of action, are unknown. Although antitumor activity is not peculiar to the polypeptide antibiotics (33, 39, 64, 65), those of most current interest in the chemotherapy of human neoplasia are the actinomycins. The available information concerning the mechanism of action of these polypeptide inhibitors already has been discussed. The chronological development and differentiation of the actinomycins has been reviewed elsewhere (33, 63).

"a. Actinomycin A. Actinomycin A was isolated by Waksman and Woodruff (20, 31, 32), but was considered to be too toxic to be useful as a chemotherapeutic agent. Stock (66) and Reilly et al. (67) reported slight inhibition of Sarcoma 180 in vivo, but only at toxic doses.

"b. Actinomycin C. Actinomycin C was isolated by Brockmann and Grubhofer (21) and has been studied extensively by Brockmann and his associates (39). Hackmann (68) described the carcinolytic effects of this agent in man in 1952, and it has since been studied extensively in a variety of experimental tumors (49, 69, 70).

"The most extensive experience in the chemotherapy of human neoplasia has been reported from European clinics. Actinomycin C is of most interest in the chemotherapy of Hodgkin's disease and other lymphomas (51, 63), although it is occasionally effective in other forms of neoplasia (71–73). Actinomycin C is a potent agent, an average, daily adult dose being only 50–100 $\mu$g. Its use in combination with X-irradiation has been reported to be more effective than either agent alone in the therapy of Hodgkin's disease (73–75).

"c. Actinomycin D. Actinomycin D (I) was isolated by Waksman and his colleagues (22), and is one component (actinomycin $C_1$) of actinomycin C (37–39, 41). Farber et al, first described its antitumor activity in experimental tumor systems (52, 76, 77) and in man (51, 63, 78, 79).

"Actinomycin D also is a potent agent, the usual daily dose in man being 60–75 $\mu$g/kg. Preliminary studies indicated that there was sufficient evidence of clinical improvement in a variety of human neoplasia to warrant extensive clinical trial against a spectrum of human tumors (63). Although marked clinical effects have been observed occasionally in a variety of human tumors, actinomycin D is most effective in the chemotherapy of the lymphomas and Wilms' tumors (51, 63, 71, 78–84). The effectiveness of actinomycin D also is potentiated by X-irradiation (51, 73, 78–80).

"d. Actinomycin $F_1$. Actinomycin $F_1$, a product of "directed" biosynthesis, was reported by Schmidt-Kastner (85), and its inhibitory activity in experimental tumor systems was described by Sugiura and Schmid (86), and Burchenal et al. (70).

"The activity of actinomycin $F_1$ in a variety of human neoplasia has been reported by Tan et al. (71). Its clinical usefulness and limitations in general appear to be similar to those of actinomycin C."

---

[1] See item 5 below for complete quotation.

### SPONTANEOUS REGRESSION OF CANCER: PRELIMINARY REPORT[1]

**(Tilden C. Everson, M.D., Warren H. Cole, M.D., Chicago, Ill., From the Department of Surgery, University of Illinois College of Medicine)**

"Spontaneous regression of cancer is a very intriguing and challenging phenomenon, which has been mentioned as a probability or fact by numerous writers in the field of oncology, but proof of its existence is difficult to obtain. Very few writers have ventured a statement relative to its frequency, but Bashford has estimated it occurs once in 100,000 cases of cancer and Boyers once in 80,000. Some authorities have expressed serious doubt that the phenomenon ever occurs.

"However, in recent years the publications of Dunphy, Stewart, and Morton and Morton, in particular, have suggested that on extremely rare occasions neoplastic disease may not continue its inexorable progressive course, but may undergo temporary or permanent spontaneous regression. Since the last collective review of possible cases of spontaneous regression of cancer was made by Rohdenburg in 1918 a comprehensive study of the incidence and nature of this phenomenon has been initiated by the authors with the support of the American Cancer Society.

"We have defined spontaneous regression of cancer as the partial or complete disappearance of a malignant tumor in the absence of all treatment, or in the presence of therapy which is considered inadequate to exert a significant influence on neoplastic disease. In general, this is the definition of spontaneous regression as proposed by Stewart. We do not imply that spontaneous regression need progress to complete disappearance of tumor, nor that spontaneous regression is synonymous with cure. In a few cases reported in this paper, tumor which underwent apparent spontaneous regression in one area flourished unchecked in other areas of the body or reappeared at a later time.

"Although over 600 cases of tumor regression published or obtained by personal communication have been reviewed, to date only 47 cases have been considered by us to have adequate documentation (including histologic confirmation of the malignancy of the primary or metastatic tumor) to accept as probable examples of spontaneous regression. However, for this preliminary report certain categories have been arbitrarily excluded from consideration. These include publications prior to 1900, certain types of tumor in which the consistency of diagnosis of malignancy is highly controversial (chorionepithelioma, epithelioma of skin, and lymphomas), tumors conceivably totally removed by curettage or biopsy, metastases diagnosed only by roentgenograms without biopsy, long surviving cases without specific evidence of decrease or disappearance of tumor, some foreign articles in which interpretation of certain salient points is difficult, and certain cases obtained by personal communication in which more information has been requested."

(EXHIBIT 9)

### EXCERPTS FROM LETTER GIVING HEW REPLY TO PROPOSAL THAT DR. IVY APPEAR BEFORE SECRET COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This will acknowledge your telegram of September 4 asking five questions concerning Krebiozen as an outgrowth of my letter of August 23 and our conversation of August 26. I am replying to your questions in the order in which they appear in your telegram.

* * * * *

Question 3. "Why should not the committee see and hear Dr. Ivy, whose scientific standing is unquestioned, for purposes of explanation and interrogation? We are not asking that he be made a member of the committee but we are asking that this committee have the benefit of a direct statement from him and be able to ask any question which in any way might perplex them. I believe this is essential in the cause of truth. He is ready to meet with the group and answer all questions. Why should he be judged unheard and unseen?"

The purpose of the study by the National Cancer Institute is to determine whether the medical records available justify a claim of benefit. Most of the records are not the records of Dr. Ivy or of the Krebiozen Foundation, but are the records of hospitals, laboratories, and private physicians, including pathological slides and X-ray films, secured by our representatives to supplement the inadequate records from Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy. These records do not require interpretation by Dr. Ivy. They are being independently and objectively evaluated. Dr. Ivy has no special knowledge of these additional records and his personal participation in such evaluation is neither necessary nor appropriate.

* * * * *

Sincerely yours,
/S/ Boisfeuillet Jones
BOISFEUILLET JONES,
*Special Assistant to the Secretary,*
*Health and Medical Affairs.*

(EXHIBIT 10)

### LETTER FROM HEW REFUSING ACCESS TO CASE RECORDS

OCTOBER 30, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Your letter of October 22, 1963, concerning the clinical records of persons treated with Krebiozen has been referred to this office for reply.

In obtaining the records on the 504 cases submitted by Drs. Ivy and Durovic, we did not ask and did not obtain permission to make them public. We therefore believe it would be improper to do so. Although we have no intention of destroying these records in the foreseeable future, we cannot undertake to make them available to other groups as you suggest.

The procedure followed in reviewing these records was designed with the sole objective of obtaining as skilled and impartial an evaluation as was humanly possible to obtain. We are completely satisfied that the procedure which we followed met this specification.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. STEWART, M.D.,
/S/ William H. Stewart
*Assistant to Special Assistant to the Secretary, Health and Medical Affairs.*

(EXHIBIT 11)

### THE KREBIOZEN[2] THEORY AND ITS RECENT CONFIRMATIONS, OR ON THE PRESENCE OF AN "ANTI-CANCER SUBSTANCE" IN BLOOD SERUM AND BODY TISSUES

(By A. C. Ivy, Ph. D., M.D.)

#### THE THEORY

The body of the cancer patient sometimes displays the existence of local and general physiological mechanisms which produce a complete or partial regression or a prolonged arrest of the manifestations of malignant or cancerous disease. It should be possible, then, to discover how the body arrests the growth or "cures" itself of cancer, and to apply such knowledge to the treatment of the cancer patient.

Local tissue hormones, or chemical substances may exist inside or outside normal cells, particularly in the defensive system of cells (RES)[3] in the body and are concerned in the normal multiplication and cessation of multiplication of cells in the repair of an injury. Such a substance may also be concerned with the maturation or specialization of cells, since when a cell is dividing it is not performing specialized functions or the functions of a mature cell.

Stating the theory more simply, an "anticancer" substance or substances exist in the normal blood serum, and normal cells of the body. It should be possible to isolate this substance or these substances by appropriate chemical procedures and they should have an inhibitory or a destructive effect on the cells of spontaneous cancer in at least some types of cancer in animals and man, depending perhaps on their degree of malignancy or autochthonous nature.—Published March 1951, 1953, 1956, 1959, 1961.

#### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE THEORY

The historical background of the Krebiozen theory starts soon after the beginning of this century. An inhibitory substance of cell multiplication was observed by the early users of the tissue culture technique, for example, by Champy (1). When this substance was removed the cells continued to multiply like primitive cells and did not mature.

---

[1] Presented before the American Surgical Association, White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, April 11, 1956.

Supported by grants from the American Cancer Society and the Illinois Federated Women's Clubs.

We wish to take this opportunity to thank numerous friends who have very generously contributed their time in sending abstracts of their cases, and given us consent to include them in this report.

[2] From the classical Greek meaning "that which regulates growth."

[3] Reticuloendothelial System.

In 1907, Reinke (1A) found a substance soluble in ether which inhibited mitotic (cell) division. In 1909, Askanazy (1B) made an observation similar to that of Reinke.

In 1910, two German scientists reported that a substance which cytolyzes cancer cells in vitro (tissue culture) was present in the blood of cancer-free patients but not in the blood of cancer patients (2,3,4). This cancer-cell dissolving substance was soluble in anesthetic ether (see Woglum, 1913, for a review; ref. 5).

In 1917–20, Ivy (6), working on cancer of the thyroid in dogs in Chicago which had "goiter" found that about 2 percent of the dogs with a goiter developed cancer of the thyroid which spread to the lungs. The cancerous cells in the lungs when suspended in a physiological saline solution and injected intravenously into 60 dogs would not take hold in the lungs and develop cancer there. This observation resulted in the theory that an "anticancer" substance exists in normal tissues and cancer develops and starts growing in distant tissues because the animal has too little anticancer substance to prevent the development of a cancer.

Such a theory was later supported by Alexis Carrel who in 1925 found an ether-soluble substance (vide supra) in blood serum which inhibited the growth of primitive connective tissue cells (7). This substance was then found in other tissues by Waterman (7A, B) and by Fichera (8). Between 1935 and 1947, five different groups of scientists found a substance in body fat which inhibited the production of cancer when potent cancer-producing chemicals were used (9–13,14).

In 1944, Ivy (15) started a study to isolate the growth stimulating and inhibiting substance in the liver. An anticancer substance was shown to be present in the liver in 1948 (16).

In 1946, Dr. Stevan Durovic (17) started working on the isolation of an anticancer substance from the blood serum of horses. In August 1949, Dr. Durovic presented to Dr. A. C. Ivy of Chicago protocols of experiments on dogs and cats (18) with cancer showing that he had obtained an "anticancer" substance. The substance was not toxic.

Dr. Ivy was sufficiently impressed to undertake a cooperative study with Dr. Durovic. From the results of an extensive series of experiments started in August 1949, it was found that the "anticancer" substance had no acute or accumulative toxicity. And, studies were started on patients with hopeless or advanced cancer. Since then the observations made on roughly 4,000 patients by some 3,000 physicians have been analyzed and presented in a report of some 890 pages and 200 tables and charts.

It was found by Doctors Dorothy Nelson and A. C. Ivy that Krebiozen retarded the onset of spontaneous cancer of the breast in C3H mice (14).

In 1956, a small book was published with the title of "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer" (14). From time to time since 1951, the use of this "anticancer" substance has been referred to as a "new approach to the treatment of advanced cancer".

### CONFIRMATION OF THE KREBIOZEN THEORY

The first evidence that the Krebiozen theory which Doctors Ivy and Durovic presented first in March 1951, was about to be seriously studied appeared in 1961, or 10 years later. Dr. Bardos of the University of Buffalo, and of the Roswell Memorial Institute, received a grant of $39,000 from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) to study the presence of a cancer inhibitory agent in normal body tissues. A publication of the results has not been found in the literature (19).

In April 1961, a new item indicated that Dr. E. D. McLaughlin (20) of the NCI had "isolated" or demonstrated the existence of an "anticancer" substance in the blood serum. In June 1961, P. A. Herbut, T. T. Tsaltus and W. H. Kremer of Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, found an "anticancer" substance in extracts of the liver (21). This confirmed the observations made in 1948–50 by Doctors Robert Denton and A. C. Ivy (16).

In April 1962, J. Fogh and B. Allen of the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute of New York City reported the "isolation" of an "anticancer" substance from normal cells in tissue culture (22. 24). Dr. Mary Stearns of Columbia University, New York City, reported in June 1962, the presence of an "anticancer" substance in normal tissues cell cultures which inhibited the growth of 19 different types of cancer cells (23).

In October 1962, E. D. McLaughlin (25) reported the presence of an "anticancer" substance in human blood serum which was higher in concentration in the serum of normal patients as compared to cancer patients.

In October 1962, Albert Szent-Gyorgyi of Woods Hole, Massachusetts, reported that he had extracted an "anticancer" substance from the thymus gland and other tissues of calves (26).

In April 1963, Fogh and Allen made a progress report on their prior work referred to above (24).

In June 1963, Szent-Gyorgyi (27) made a rather complete report indicating that his substance had an "anticancer" effect on three different types of cancers in mice.

Not one among these recent investigators has administered his "anticancer" product to patients with cancer.

### REFERENCES

1. Champy. Loc. cit., Bayliss, Principles of General Physiology, London, P. 25, 1915.

1A. Reinke: Muench. Med. Wochschr 54:2381, 1907.

1B. Askanazy: Zentr. Allgem. Pathol. Anat. 20:1039, 1909.

2. Freund, E., and G. Kaminer: Biochem. Zeit. 26:312, 1910.

3. Neuberg, C.: Biochem. Zeit. 26:344, 1910.

4. Stern, K., and R. Willheim: "The Biochemistry of Malignant Disease", Reference Press, Brooklyn, 1943.

5. Woglum, W. H.: "The Study of Experimental Cancer. A Review", Columbia University Press, 1913.

6. Ivy, A. C.: The Biology of Cancer, Science 196:14, 1947.

7. Baker, L. E., A. Carrel: J. Exper. Med. 42:143, 1925.

7A. Waterman, N.: Biochem. Zeit. 188:65, 1927.

7B. Waterman, N.: Zeit. Krebsforschung 34:327, 1931.

8. Fischera, G.: "Tumori", Hoepli, Milano, 1933.

9. Watson, A. F.: Am. J. Cancer 25:753, 1935.

10. Peacock, P. R., and S. Beck: Brit. J. Exper. Path. 19:315, 1938.

11. Morton, J. J. and G. B. Mider: Proc. Soc. Exper. Biol. Med. 41:357, 1939.

12. Murphy, J. B. and E. Sturm: Cancer Research 1:477, 1941.

13. Dickens, F.: Brit. Med. Bull. 4:967, 1946–47.

14. Ivy, A. C., J. F. Pick, and W. F. P. Phillips: "Observations on Krebiozen in the Management of Cancer", Regnery Press, Chicago, 1956.

15. Ivy, A. C.: Students Theses, Northwestern Univ. and University of Illinois.

16. Ivy, A. C., and Robert Denton: Reports to Lakeland Foundation, Chicago, 1948–50.

17. Durovic, S.: Personal communication.

18. Ivy, A. C.: Personal Communication, "Action of Krebiozen on Tumors in Dogs and Cats", 1950. Unpublished, but submitted to NCI in 1961.

19. National Cancer Institute Grants-in-Aid, 1961, Bethesda, Md.: Bardos, Dr., University of Buffalo or Roswell Memorial Cancer Hospital, Buffalo; New Item.

20. McLaughlin, E. D.: National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

21. Herbut, P. A., T. T. Tsaltas and W. H. Kremer, J. A. M. A. 178: Nov. 18, 1961.

22. Fogh, J., and B. Allen: Fed. Proceedings, March-April, 1962, p. 159.

23. Stearns, Mary: Proceedings Tissue Culture Assoc., June 1962.

24. Fogh, J.: Proceedings Tissue Culture Assoc. June 1962.

25. McLaughlin, E. D.: Proceedings Am. College Surgeons, Oct. 1962.

26. Szent-Gyorgyi, Albert: National Acad. Sciences Sept. 1962 (N.Y. Times, Nov. 11, 1962).

27. Szent-Gyorgyi, Albert: Science June 28, 1963.

### (EXHIBIT 12)

### DOCUMENTS ON INCOME OF DR. DUROVIC

In answer to innuendoes of fraud, the attached documents show (photostatic copies available in Senator DOUGLAS' office):

(1) The producer was a wealthy man when he arrived in this country 14 years ago.

(2) Ever since his arrival, his adjusted gross income has shown a net loss each year. All of these losses were incurred in connection with the experimental work on Krebiozen.

(3) The Internal Revenue Service has audited his books, and in 1962 confirmed that he was then over $70,000 in debt.

(4) Krebiozen was distributed free for the first 6 years, and the majority of patients have received the drug without charge or at a very reduced charge.

(5) The Internal Revenue Service allowed a cost of $9.50 per ampule.

(6) The Canadian Government specifically granted to the producer the privilege of distributing the drug in Canada.

### PRESS RELEASE

OCTOBER 23, 1963.

I, Dr. Stevan Durovic, wish to publicly answer the smear campaign which is currently being waged against me. Specifically it has been stated that I have been making a personal fortune as a result of the distribution of Krebiozen for the treatment of cancer.

This allegation is false and is calculated to discredit me and to divert attention from the main issue, which is, incredibly, whether or not the worth of this drug in the treatment of cancer should be tested at all by independent agencies.

Krebiozen was distributed during its first 6 years—from 1949 to 1954—at no charge. No compensation or contribution of any kind was either requested or accepted for this entire 6-year period. This fact was verified by the Krebiozen Investigating Commission of the 68th Illinois General Assembly of the State of Illinois which carried on its investigation into the Krebiozen controversy during the years 1953–54.

The Argentine firm which first produced Krebiozen had to sell its laboratory and was liquidated in 1959 because of enormous financial losses. As a result of this situation, I personally had to undertake the production of the drug in order to continue the experimental work with Krebiozen. Subsequently in 1960, under the name of Promak Laboratories, I produced two additional supplies of Krebiozen in the United States, which supply is at present almost exhausted.

Krebiozen was distributed to physicians for a voluntary compensation which was left entirely to the determination of the physician and his patient, the amount, however, not to exceed $9.50 per dose, which is the cost of the drug. The majority of the patients received the drug without charge or at very reduced amount, due to the fact that all Krebiozen patients were in advanced or terminal stages of cancer and generally had exhausted their financial means on previous other types of treatments.

I not only lost what personal funds I had but also incurred substantial debts in the distribution of Krebiozen in the United States. When I arrived in the United States in 1949, I had $190,000 cash in the Bank of London and South America, Ltd.—New York branch. This fact is verified by the enclosed letter of that bank.

Since my arrival in the United States my U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns have shown a net loss each year for adjusted gross income. Since I started individually to operate Promak Laboratories in 1960, my U.S. Individual Income Tax Returns for the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962 showed a net loss for adjusted gross income in the amounts of $115,237.06, $40,176.90 and $76,719.08 respectively. My books for the calendar year 1960 were audited and on September 20, 1962 I received a letter from the U.S. Treasury Department—Internal Revenue Service, Chicago office—approving my return as filed, a photocopy of this letter is attached. All of these losses were incurred in connection with the experimental work on Krebiozen.

In regard to the latest statement of the American Medical Association, which appeared in the press today, October 23, 1963, and which represents the sale of Krebiozen in Canada as illegal, I should like to point out the following:

The decision of the Department of National Health and Welfare of Canada, of October 6, 1954, file No. 960–D15–2/21, of which a photostatic copy is enclosed, is a Permit for the sale of Krebiozen under section C.01.302 of the regulations "to investigators, qualified to use such a drug, for the sole purpose of obtaining clinical and scientific data with respect to safety, stability, dosage or efficacy."

If it were not for the sales of Krebiozen in Canada and a few other countries, my losses for experimentation in the United States would have been such, that I would have been obliged to discontinue all scientific and experimental work on Krebiozen a long time ago.

Attachments:

1. Letter of Bank of London & South America, Ltd.—New York dated May 24, 1949.
2. 1962 Income Tax Return.
3. Letter of U.S. Treasury Department (Internal Revenue Service) dated September 20, 1962.
4. Letter of the Department of National Health and Welfare of Canada, dated October 6, 1954.

STEVAN DUROVIC, M.D.

### BANK STATEMENT

Duplicate, Agency of Bank of London & South America Limited, 34 Wall Street, New York 5, May 24, 1949.

In your reply please refer to Dr. Stevan Durovic, New York.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your verbal request, we confirm, by means of the present, that at the close of business on November 3, 1948, the balance of your current account was $190,000.—(One hundred ninety thousand dollars) in your favour.

Yours faithfully,

——— ———,

*Sub-Agent.*

### EXCERPTS [1] FROM PHOTOSTATIC COPY OF U.S. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN, 1962, OF STEVAN DUROVIC, CHICAGO, ILL.—OCCUPATION: SCIENTIST

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Business income (schedule C) | (36, 542. 18) |
| 7. Net operating loss carryover—schedule attached | (40, 176. 90) |
| 9. Total (add lines 4 through 8) | (76, 719. 08) |

STEVAN DUROVIC.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
*Chicago, Ill., September 20, 1962.*

DR. STEVAN DUROVIC,
*900 Lake Shore Drive,*
*Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR DR. DUROVIC:

Kind of tax, income.

Taxable year, 1960.

Our recent examination of your tax liability for the year indicated above discloses that no change is necessary to the tax reported. Accordingly, the return will be accepted as filed.

——— ———,

*District Director.*

DOMINION OF CANADA, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE,
*Ottawa, October 6, 1954.*

KREBIOZEN RESEARCH FOUNDATION, INC.
*122 South Michigan Avenue,*
*Chicago, Ill.*
Attention: Dr. Marko Durovic.

DEAR DR. DUROVIC: Mr. Lipschultz' visit to this department on September 29th helped to clear up several points concerning your material "Krebiozen". He asked that a letter be sent to you defining the present status of this drug in Canada.

You may sell this drug in Canada under section C.01.302 of the regulations "to investigators, qualified to use such a drug, for the sole purpose of obtaining clinical and scientific data with respect to safety, stability, dosage or efficacy, if

"(a) The Minister is first informed of the identifying name or mark by which the drug can be recognized,

"(b) Both the inner and the outer labels carry the statement 'For Experimental Use By Qualified Investigators Only',

"(c) The manufacturer, prior to making a shipment takes the necessary steps to ensure that any person to whom the drug is sold is a qualified investigator and that he has adequate facilities for the investigation to be conducted by him, and that such drug will be used solely by him or under his direction for the investigation, and

"(d) The manufacturer keeps accurate records of such distribution and makes these records available for inspection upon the request of an inspector."

These points have been explained fully to Mr. Lipschultz and he was in full agreement. It was pointed out that during this time evidence would be collected to qualify this material for status as a new drug under section C.01.301 of the regulations.

It is hoped that additional batches of Krebiozen will be prepared and that clinical and pharmacological data on the new batches will be submitted.

I am enclosing a copy of our trade information letter No. 116 which will explain more fully my letter.

Yours very truly,

C. A. MORRELL,
*Director, Food and Drug Divisions.*

---

[1] A photostatic copy of the income tax return of Dr. Durovic is available for inspection at the office of Senator DOUGLAS. These are the main entries showing loss for the year.

(EXHIBIT 13)

OFFERS OF DRUG COMPANIES TO BUY KREBIOZEN RIGHTS

ABBOTT LABORATORIES,
*North Chicago, Ill., March 26, 1951.*

Dr. STEVAN DUROVIC,
*531 Kenilworth Avenue,*
*Kenilworth, Ill.*

DEAR DOCTOR DUROVIC: This letter is to again confirm our interest in marketing the product which you have discovered for the treatment of malignancy.

Following our most recent conversation of last Friday and the open meeting with the clinicians which is to be held at the Drake Hotel today, we are looking forward to our discussion with you here tomorrow as to the more specific details of an arrangement covering our marketing of "Krebiozen."

As we informed you last Friday, Mr. Moore and Mr. Brainard have indicated that they believe that they have certain interests in the business aspects of this matter. Since we have not participated in any discussions between you and those gentlemen, we have not felt that we could add anything to your discussion with them. Mr. Moore informed us this morning that he and Mr. Brainard had a discussion with you yesterday evening, March 25, and that it appears likely that you and they will be able to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

We understand that there are some 200,000 ampoules of "Krebiozen" which may be sold. You have indicated that the price to us will be $8 an ampoule for this material. We are prepared to purchase these ampoules provided they are properly standardized and meet the specifications indicated by Dr. Ivy, and that you and your brother and anyone else involved will enter into a contract with Abbott Laboratories which will be mutually satisfactory in respect to the future manufacture of this product and other pertinent terms; all of this arrangement, of course, to be subject to the approval of our Board of Directors before having any legal effect.

Sincerely yours,
E. H. VOLWILER.

---

THE LILLY RESEARCH LABORATORIES,
*Indianapolis, Ind.,*
*April 20, 1951.*

Dr. STEVAN DUROVIC,
*Palmolive Building,*
*919 North Michigan Avenue,*
*Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR DR. DUROVIC: I have been out of town a good deal during the past week and it was not until today that we were able to have a discussion regarding the "Krebiozen" matter. In the meantime the director of our biological division, while in Washington, discussed with Dr. Workman the type of governmental control and regulation applicable to a product of this character.

After considering the matter from all angles, we are prepared to submit the following proposition, subject to the preparation and execution of a formal written agreement embodying the points outlined below and other provisions customarily and usually contained in our form of license agreement in general use.

1. We will pay to you or your nominee the sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000) in cash upon the execution of the contract.

2. Upon the execution of the contract, you will make a full and complete disclosure to us of all scientific and technical information within your knowledge pertaining to the chemical identity and structure of "Krebiozen" and methods, techniques and processes involved in the production, purification, standardization, and assay of "Krebiozen".

3. We will place in escrow with one of the well established Chicago banks (either the Continental Illinois, the Harris Trust or the Northern Trust, as you may elect) the further sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) to be payable to you or to your nominee if and when "Krebiozen" is approved for sale by the National Institute of Health, is duly licensed by the National Institute of Health and is actually marketed by us.

4. You will file promptly patent applications covering "Krebiozen" (and its method of production) in the U.S. Patent Office and will file corresponding foreign patent applications in such countries as may be mutually agreed upon. The company will cooperate in the preparation, filing and prosecution of all such applications through its own patent attorneys, and will bear the expense thereof.

5. Under the contract the company will be granted the exclusive right to manufacture "Krebiozen", to make clinical studies thereof and to complete the evaluation of the product from a clinical and laboratory standpoint. Any improvements made by the company during the term of the contract, whether by way of synthesizing the material or the discovery of improved manufacturing, production or testing techniques, will be assigned to you or to your nominee. If deemed important, such improvements will be covered in patent applications filed by the company and such applications will be assigned to you or to your nominee.

6. The company will work closely with governmental authorities, will make such disclosures to governmental authorities as may be required by applicable law and regulations, but will not otherwise disclose any of the information concerning "Krebiozen" or its method of manufacture except to its own employees to such extent as may be necessary to the proper and efficient manufacturing thereof or except as may be necessary in connection with scientific publications and reporting.

7. If the tests conducted by the company conclusively demonstrate to the satisfaction of the company that "Krebiozen" is of value in the treatment of cancer and that the same may be manufactured and marketed on a basis profitable to it, the company will commence the marketing of "Krebiozen" as soon as it is permitted to do so by the National Institute of Health or by such other governmental agencies as may have jurisdiction in the premises. In this connection, the company will use its best efforts to obtain governmental approval as soon as the clinical reports on "Krebiozen" justify such approval.

8. The contract shall grant to the company and its subsidiaries the exclusive right thoroughout the world to manufacture and sell "Krebiozen" upon payment of:

a. The sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000), (deposited in escrow with one of the Chicago banks upon the execution of the contract) at the time of first marketing of "Krebiozen" by the company, as provided by paragraph 3, above.

b. Royalties upon its sales of "Krebiozen" at the following rates and for the periods indicated.

(1) 5 percent beginning with the first sale and ending upon the expiration of the patent, if the substance "Krebiozen" or its use in the treatment of cancer is covered by a valid U.S. patent.

(2) 2½ percent beginning with the first sale and continuing for 8 years, if no valid patents are issued upon the substance "Krebiozen" or its method of manufacture.

(3) 2½ percent beginning with the first sale and continuing for the life of the U.S. patent if the process of producing "Krebiozen" is covered by a valid U.S. patent, and no valid U.S. patent issues covering the product "Krebiozen" or its use in the treatment of cancer.

c. Royalties will be payable upon the company's net sales determined by deducting from gross sales all discounts to its customers, transportation charges, returns, allowances for defective or damaged material, and sales or excise taxes imposed directly upon the sale of the product by the company. Sales by the company to its subsidiaries, or by one subsidiary to another subsidiary would be exempt from royalties, but in such cases royalties would be payable on all final sales by subsidiaries to the drug trade on the basis of net export wholesale prices.

d. Royalties will be payable quarterly within thirty days following the close of each calendar quarter. Of the total sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) payable pursuant to paragraph 8a. above, one-half thereof or Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) shall be treated as an advance in respect of future royalties. Accordingly there shall be withheld by the company from the total royalties payable under paragraph 8b. above, 50 percent of the amount payable in respect of each quarter, until such time as the aggregate amounts withheld equal the sum of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000).

9. Royalties, to the extent that they are based upon the existence of a valid patent, will be discontinued in the event the patent is held invalid by an unappealed or an unappealable decision of a court of competent jurisdiction.

10. The company will have the right to grant sublicenses and in such event the royalties received by the company under such sublicenses will be divided equally between the company and you or your nominee.

11. Prior to the approval and licensing of "Krebiozen" by the National Institute

of Health, the company may, upon thirty days notice, cancel and terminate the contract if, in the opinion of the company, "Krebiozen" is not a valuable therapeutic agent useful in the treatment of cancer or if, in the opinion of the company, "Krebiozen" cannot be manufactured and marketed profitably by it. In the event of any such cancellation or termination, the company will notify the bank holding the escrow deposit and upon receiving such notice the bank will be authorized and directed to return to the company the total amount then held under the escrow agreement.

12. We anticipate that in addition to the technical information to be disclosed upon the execution of the contract, your personal assistance and consultation will be very helpful. Accordingly we would expect you to spend such time as might be necessary at our biological laboratories to assist us in the manufacture of "Krebiozen" and in this connection we would agree to pay you a reasonable per diem plus living expenses during periods devoted to such consultation and assistance.

In the foregoing points, no mention has been made of the 200,000 ampoules, more or less, now owned by you. After reviewing the law and regulations it seems quite questionable whether this material could be lawfully sold to anyone. Apparently "Krebiozen" is a biological product and obviously it has not been manufactured in an establishment holding a biological license from the National Institutes of Health. Under these circumstances we question whether any of this material can be sold.

In this connection we would suggest that in the event you are interested in negotiating a contract along the lines set forth in this letter, a provision might be included whereby such quantities of the 200,000 ampoules as we might deem necessary for additional clinical or laboratory evaluation might be made available to us at the rate of $7.26 per ampoule.

Of course it would be necessary to elaborate the conditions of the escrow arrangement, and in all probability it would be desirable to prepare an escrow agreement separate from the license agreement.

The license agreement should contain a provision whereby we are protected against any claims that might be asserted by Brainard and Moore or others claiming any rights in the product.

No attempt has been made in this letter to cover all of the provisions in the type of licensing contract which we have in general use. Moreover, even the specific points mentioned in this letter may involve controversial questions when it comes to the language to be employed in the preparation of the contract.

If you are not interested in negotiating a contract along the lines suggested above, it occurs to us that the following alternative might afford some basis for a satisfactory arrangement. As you know we maintain a biological establishment which is licensed by the National Institute of Health. At that establishment we have horses, treatment and bleeding facilities and laboratory equipment of the type commonly used in the manufacture of biological products. It is entirely possible, subject to the approval of the National Institute of Health, that we could work out an arrangement with you whereby a portion of the facilities at our biological laboratories could be set aside for you for the purpose of enabling you to begin promptly the manufacture of "Krebiozen" for your own account, at least for a limited period of time. We would be in a position to supply horses and equipment and I believe we could make arrangements so that you would be assured of any degree of security that you might desire in connection with production. Of course an arrangement of this sort would contemplate that after a given period of time we would have the first option to negotiate with you for a license.

We are enclosing two additional copies of this letter in order that you may refer them to your associates for their consideration. We hope that it will be possible for you to give prompt consideration to these proposals and advise us of your conclusions as promptly as possible. If you desire that we send representatives to meet with you in Chicago, we shall be glad to do so.

Very truly yours,

A. H. FISKE.

(EXHIBIT 14)

PRESS RELEASE OF FDA, SEPTEMBER 7, 1963

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D.C.*

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF "KREBIOZEN"

The Food and Drug Administration has identified the "Krebiozen" powder given to its inspector by Dr. Stevan Durovic and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy on July 12, 1963, as creatine. Creatine is an amino acid derivative plentifully available from meat in the ordinary diet and is a normal constituent of the human body. It is readily available as an inexpensive laboratory chemical.

The identification of "Krebiozen" resulted from the analysis of the powder by several scientific methods. This was undertaken under the supervision of Dr. Frank H. Wiley, director of FDA's Division of Pharmaceutical Chemistry.

The first step was the reexamination of the infrared spectrogram supplied by Dr. Durovic to the National Cancer Institute in September 1961 and the infrared spectrograms made by the National Cancer Institute from the small samples (1.5 mg. of powder and 5 mg. of crystalline material) supplied to it at the same time. These curves were all quite similar. On the basis of these tracings, the Division's Spectrophotometric Unit, under the direction of Mrs. Alma Hayden, attempted to identify the material from which the tracings were made. They duplicated the curve submitted by Dr. Durovic by using a sample of creatine hydrate. The curve obtained by the National Cancer Institute on the powdered material was that of creatine which had absorbed a small amount of moisture.

The second step was to do a considerable amount of work on creatine obtained in pure form from chemical supply houses. This creatine was examined by infrared spectrophotometry, by X-ray diffraction to study its crystal structure, by microscopic study of the crystals, and by mass spectrographic methods, preliminary to opening the vial containing the material supplied by Dr. Durovic and Dr. Ivy on July 12, 1963, and described as "Krebiozen."

The third step was the examination and identification of the contents of that vial. To supplement the evidence to be obtained by infrared methods, the Food and Drug Administration enlisted the aid of other of its scientists and experts from other Federal agencies and from universities:

Microscopic Crystallography: William Eisenberg and Arnold Schultze, Division of Microbiology, FDA; Dr. Raymond Castle, University of New Mexico.

X-ray Crystallography: Miss Mary Mrose of the Geological Survey, Department of Interior; Dr. William Bradley, University of Texas.

MASS SPECTROGRAPHIC STUDIES

Joseph Damico, Division of Food, FDA; Dr. Klaus Biemann, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In addition, the Food and Drug Administration asked Dr. Ellis R. Lippincott of the University of Maryland to work on the infrared studies. Representatives of the National Cancer Institute and the Division of Biologics Standards of NIH, the Geological Survey, and the National Bureau of Standards also assisted the FDA's Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

The small sample (approximately 2 mg.) was weighed and divided. An infrared spectral curve was made. This "fingerprinted" the material Dr. Durovic had supplied. It was creatine. This was then converted to creatinine, to which creatine changes when treated with hydrochloric acid. The converted product was identified by spectral curve as creatinine. Only creatine could have produced the creatinine by the treatment used. X-ray diffraction studies next confirmed the creatine identity. Crystallographic studies established that the powder was creatine. Mass spectrographic studies, conducted at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, established that the material was either creatine or creatinine. All of these tests leave no doubt as to the identity of the powder Dr. Durovic labeled "Krebiozen."

Creatine is in muscle tissue, and in blood in lesser amounts. The human body will produce in 24 hours as much as 100,000 times the amount of creatine as the alleged content of "Krebiozen" in one ampule. The chemical was tested some time ago against animal tumors in the routine cancer chemotherapy screening program of the National Cancer Institute. It was found to be ineffective even in very high doses.

Laboratory studies are continuing to determine how much, if any, of this substance can be dissolved in mineral oil and how much, if any, is in the ampules of "Krebiozen" which FDA has obtained.

FDA is continuing its investigations of all of the facts regarding "Krebiozen."

PRESS RELEASE OF NCI, OCTOBER 16, 1963

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D.C.*

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today released a report from the director of the National Cancer Institute concerning his decision not to undertake clinical testing of Krebiozen.

The statement was accompanied by a report from the committee of cancer experts which reviewed the records of 504 patients treated with Krebiozen. The committee unanimously recommended against clinical testing of Krebiozen.

OCTOBER 15, 1963.

To: The Secretary.
Through: The Surgeon General and the Director, National Institutes of Health.
From: The Director, National Cancer Institute.
Subject: Clinical Trial of "Krebiozen" Under National Cancer Institute Sponsorship.

In mid-August of this year, I appointed a committee to review clinical records on patients treated with "Krebiozen" and to recommend whether or not the National Cancer Institute should sponsor a clinical trial of "Krebiozen." The committee has been engaged in an extensive study of clinical records, microscopic slides, X-rays, and other records of these patients and has now completed its study and submitted a report to me. A copy of the report is attached.

The committee is unanimous in its conclusion that "Krebiozen" is ineffective as an anticancer drug and strongly recommends that no clinical trial be undertaken.

On the basis of this report, the findings of the Food and Drug Administration that "Krebiozen" is creatine and my own study of the extensive data previously submitted by Doctors Ivy and Durovic, I concur in the committee's findings and have determined that the National Cancer Institute will not sponsor or participate in a clinical trial of "Krebiozen."

As with any other potentially experimental drug, clinical trial of "Krebiozen" would have to be justified on one of three grounds. "Krebiozen" does not qualify on any one of the three.

The first basis upon which a drug might be considered for clinical trial is theoretical. The proponents of "Krebiozen" have advanced the theory that "Krebiozen" is a tissue hormone which inhibits the multiplication of cancer cells. The Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated that "Krebiozen" is not a tissue hormone but rather creatine, a normal component of the human body concerned primarily with muscle contraction.

The second basis for a clinical trial, and the one upon which most are based, is that the drug must possess consistently strong anticancer activity in experimental animals. "Krebiozen" does not qualify on these grounds.

The third basis is the accidental discovery that a drug has anticancer activity in human beings. If "Krebiozen" had been shown to possess such activity despite the failure to satisfy the other two justifications for trial, I would have been prepared to sponsor a controlled clinical trial after appropriate animal toxicity study and the development of a procedure for the control of the identity of the substance.

The committee's report of the 504 case records clearly establishes that "Krebiozen" does not possess any anticancer activity in man.

The National Cancer Institute has completed its consideration of "Krebiozen." There is no justification for a clinical trial, and from a scientific standpoint we regard the case closed.

REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE—EVALUATION OF KREBIOZEN CLINICAL RECORDS

Committee Membership: The committee was chosen by the director of the National Cancer Institute to review all available records concerning a selected group of patients treated with Krebiozen. The committee was charged with determining, on the basis of an analysis of these clinical records, whether Krebiozen should be recommended for further clinical trial. All of the committee members have had extensive experience in the clinical problems of cancer, in particular experimental cancer chemotherapeutics, and represented the disciplines of surgery, internal medicine, pathology, radiotherapy, and endocrinology. Since a large number of breast cancer cases were submitted, several of the participants were selected because of their special interest and knowledge of this disease. The committee was composed of the following members:

Dr. Fred Ansfield, associate professor of surgery, Cancer Research Division, Department of Surgery, University of Wisconsin Medical School, Madison, Wis.

Dr. Harry Bisel, director, Pennsylvania Division, American Cancer Society, assistant professor of medicine, University of Pittsburgh, School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. Kirkland C. Brace, Radiation Branch, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Frank Dietrich, professor of medicine, University of Tennessee, School of Medicine, Chief, Medical Service, Kennedy Veterans Administration Hospital, Memphis, Tenn.

Dr. George C. Escher, associate member, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, associate attending physician, Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Emil Frei, III, associate scientific director for Experimental Therapeutics, chief, Medicine Branch, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. David Grob, assistant dean, professor of medicine, State University of New York, College of Medicine, director of medical services, Maimonides Hospital, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dr. Thomas Hall, senior consultant in oncology, Lemuel Shattuck Hospital, associate physician, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Donald Kayhoe, head, Medical Groups Section, Clinical Branch, Collaborative Research, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Alfred Ketcham, chief, Surgery Branch, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Lyndon E. Lee, Jr., associate director, Research Service, coordinator, Research in Surgery, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Mortimer Lipsett, assistant chief, Endocrinology Branch, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Gregory O'Conor, Laboratory of Pathology, National Cancer Institute.

Dr. Kenneth Olson, professor of medicine, Albany Medical College, Albany, N.Y.

Dr. Albert H. Owens, Jr., associate professor of medicine, Johns Hopkins Medical School, director, Medical Oncology Unit, Baltimore City Hospitals, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Robert Ravdin, associate professor of surgery, University of Pennsylvania Medical School, Codirector Neoplastic Chemotherapy Clinic, University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. Juan A. del Regato, director, Penrose Cancer Hospital, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Dr. Shirley Rivers, research associate, Cancer Chemotherapy, Veterans Administration Hospital, associate in medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. Albert Segaloff, professor of clinical medicine, Tulane University School of Medicine, director of endocrine research, Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation, New Orleans, La.

Dr. Bruce Shnider, associate professor of medicine, Georgetown University School of Medicine, director of Tumor Service and Cancer Chemotherapy Research Program, Georgetown Medical Division, D.C. General Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Jesse Steinfeld, associate professor of medicine, director, Cancer Chemotherapy Program, University of Southern California, School of Medicine, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. Grant Taylor, chief, Section of Pediatrics, University of Texas, M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, Houston, Tex.

Dr. T. Phillip Waalkes, associate director for Collaborative Research, National Cancer Institute.

Mr. Emanuel Landau, statistical consultant, National Cancer Institute.

REVIEW DATA

The Krebiozen Research Foundation had selected 504 of its case records of the more than 4,000 patients treated with Krebiozen. These records consisted primarily of forms prepared by the Krebiozen Research Foundation and returned at intervals to the foundation by the practitioner who administered the Krebiozen. Copies of laboratory, X-ray, and pathology reports were included occasionally but not usually. The foundation often added a case summary of its own with comments on the chronological course and with conclusions regarding the efficacy of Krebiozen. Information widely distributed by the Krebiozen Research Foundation regarding tumor type and response rate in 4,227 patients (1962 report) was also available.

Because the material provided by the Krebiozen Research Foundation was inadequate for scientific evaluation, the FDA undertook the collection of complete medical records of all the cases submitted by the foundation. This involved for each patient, whenever possible:

(1) Copies of hospital and doctors' records; laboratory, pathological, X-ray, surgical, and autopsy reports; and death certificates.

(2) Pathology slide preparations.

(3) X-rays.

(4) Report of interviews with all physicians involved in caring for the patient.

(5) Report of interviews with living patients.

(6) Report of interviews with relatives and friends of patients.

A regional representative of the FDA personally conducted each interview and, following a specific protocol, sought answers to a comprehensive group of questions.

### REVIEW PROCEDURE

Working with this total information on each patient, a committee member, using a 13-page worksheet, tabulated all pertinent data with particular emphasis on factors related to objective measures for evaluation. The committee member then rated each case in terms of objective regression and subjective response.

In addition to individual evaluation, each case was reviewed either by the entire committee or by a subcommittee following the scheme diagrammed below:

(Diagram omitted because of rules governing printing of the RECORD.)

### EVALUATION STANDARDS

The most important criterion necessary to assess the effectiveness of a specific cancer therapy is the presence of measurable disease. Most frequently used are tumor masses, either directly accessible or clearly outlined on X-ray film, which can be followed and serially measured during the course of treatment. However, because of the importance given to subjective improvement attributed to Krebiozen, e.g., pain relief, the exact role and significance of subjective changes seen during therapeutic trials should be understood. The use of subjective response in evaluating the effectiveness of an agent without reference to objective regression is treacherous. In clinical trials of antitumor agents conducted by experienced investigators, subjective response is recorded and evaluated but is considered important only if paralleled by objective improvement. In addition, the majority of such patients are receiving drugs for the control of symptoms. Moreover, the administration of any new agent almost invariably improves the patient's outlook and hope for some period of time.

### A. OBJECTIVE CRITERIA

Three categories were used in determining the final status of each patient:

1. Objective regression: A significant regression of a proven neoplasm occurring while the patient was receiving Krebiozen as the only antitumor agent. In accordance with nationally accepted criteria, tumor regression is considered significant if a 50 percent or greater decrease in the product of measured diameters occurs. At the same time, no new lesions should appear, nor should tumor growth progress elsewhere. The vast majority of the cases did not have serial measurements recorded. In such instances the practitioner's statement of definite tumor decrease was accepted and the patient was classified as showing an objective regression unless contrary evidence existed in the clinical records to indicate that the other criteria had not been met.

2. No regression: An absence of significant objective regression, as defined above, while the patient was receiving Krebiozen as the only antitumor therapy.

3. Inadequate test situation: A broad category of conditions in which some feature of the case made an objective evaluation of Krebiozen impossible.

a. Concurrent or immediately prior antitumor therapy.

b. No histologic diagnosis of cancer.

c. No residual cancer (following previous therapy) upon initiation of Krebiozen treatment.

d. Other, e.g. inadequate data.

In each of the above four situations, no decisions regarding the efficacy of Krebiozen can be made. For example, with concurrent therapy, a specific treatment of demonstrated value, it is impossible to distinguish between the effects of Krebiozen and the other modalities of therapy whether the patient's tumor progresses, remains static, or regresses. In some instances such treatment known to exert antitumor effects over a 6 to 8 week period was given immediately before Krebiozen administration. Such cases were placed in the "Inadequate test situation" category.

### B. SUBJECTIVE CRITERIA

In considering subjective effects, a number of factors including degree of disability, pain, narcotic requirement, and other symptoms such as nausea, vomiting, dyspnea, and vertigo were considered. These were evaluated in light of concurrent and prior specific, symptomatic and supportive therapies, e.g., blood transfusions, oxygen, narcotics, and antiemetics. In no instance was subjective improvement alone considered evidence of an objective remission.

### FINDINGS

A. Objective.

Of the total 504 cases, 288 fulfilled the necessary conditions so that the effects of Krebiozen could be evaluated. The remaining 216 fell in the "Inadequate test situation" category. Of the latter, 101 had had concurrent antitumor therapy, 50 had no histologic diagnosis of cancer, 49 had no residual malignancy at the time Krebiozen was started, and for 16 the data were inadequate.

Of the former 288 cases, 273 when evaluated, on the basis of the criteria indicated above, showed no significant regression.

Two of the remaining 15 patients were considered to meet the criteria for objective regression. Patient 68 had an abdominal mass which at the time of surgery was determined by frozen section to be a malignancy. The exact type could not be classified and permanent sections were not obtained for a more definitive diagnosis. Consequently, the committee could not be certain of the nature of the disease in this case. Following the operation in 1951 the patient received X-ray therapy and thereafter was treated with Krebiozen. As of the latest report the patient was apparently living and well. Patient 183 had an adenocarcinoma of the stomach which regressed. The diagnosis was made from a biopsy obtained at surgery in August of 1954. The patient was treated with five injections of Krebiozen over a 4-week period in September 1954. No other therapy was given. Subsequent abdominal surgery in May 1956 for suspected gall bladder disease disclosed no evidence of carcinoma.

For the remaining 13 patients, although included as regressions, doubts existed as to whether or not they should be considered in this category. The matter was complicated because the tumor changes for some were of a very equivocal nature and there were questions concerning the actual amount of decrease in tumor size, the true validity of the measurements or statements given, and the precise status of the disease. Inadequate documentation often made accurate assessment difficult. Nevertheless, the committee classified the 13 patients as regressions despite the obscure conditions. The attached table A is presented to give a clearer picture of the disease status of each one of the 15 patients and to indicate the problems surrounding the objective evaluation of the 13 questionable cases.

In three instances, patients 72, 157, and 143, the tumor regression was of very short duration and followed by death due to metastatic disease. The latter fact indicates that although regression was noted in one anatomic site, the disease was progressing simultaneously in other areas. Essentially the same is true for patient 51, whose records show that while the lung nodules due to a hypernephroma decreased, metastatic involvement of the central nervous system became apparent and persisted during Krebiozen administration. It should be noted that the pulmonary lesions of a hypernephroma may become smaller on occasion even though no specific antitumor therapy is given.

Of the 13 patients, 4 had breast cancer. Patient 149 had a reported metastatic tumor growth in the fundus of one eye. This small lesion regressed during the period she received Krebiozen. Periodically within the same time interval, the patient was also given hormonal agents which are known to produce objective regression in breast cancer. The exact dates she received these latter materials were not recorded but their administration might logically be considered concurrent therapy.

Upon examination of the histologic slides of the tumor of patient 449 by expert pathologists, the diagnosis was made of a rare type of breast tumor which in all known instances had never metastasized. In addition, this patient and patient 141 as well had biopsies taken of their tumor masses during Krebiozen treatment. Such excisions alone, by actual measurement, could have been a factor in the recorded regression. Patient 362 is reported to have had a complete regression of a breast cancer, although the duration of the regression and actual onset of disease is not documented.

Patient 425 had a fibrosarcoma, grade I. The malignant potential of this tumor is considered highly uncertain.

Patient 308 had a neuroblastoma partially resected at the age of 5 months. Several reports in the medical literature substantiate the fact that this malignancy, particularly in patients under one year of age, may spontaneously regress or change to a benign tumor.

Patient 145 had histologically documented melanoma of the face in 1946 and of the elbow in 1951 which were excised. Krebiozen was administered in 1951 for an unbiopsied nodule of the leg which disappeared. Patient 439 also had a melanoma and received Krebiozen seven years after the original diagnosis. Krebiozen therapy was continued for 21 months until the patient died with widely metastatic disease.

Patient 177 died of metastatic cancer 1 year and 9 months following Krebiozen therapy. No X-rays or radiologists' reports were available for review to verify the disappearance of the mediastinal metastasis reported to have occurred while the patient was receiving Krebiozen.

B. Subjective.

Of the 421 patients who could be evaluated on the basis of subjective symptoms, 44 patients showed subjective improvement. However, as previously pointed out, the use of subjective response in evaluating the effectiveness of an agent without reference to objective regression is extremely unreliable in assessing the true status of malignant disease.

C. Toxicity.

The administration of the ampuled Krebiozen was associated with definite toxic effects in 35 cases. In most instances only induration and inflamatory granulomas at the injection sites were noted. In some cases the pain associated with these lesions necessitated discontinuance of further injections. Abscesses or sloughs occurred in six patients. There was little evidence of systemic toxicity, although one patient who died with broncho-pneumonia was found to have lipid deposits scattered through the lungs, heart, liver, and spleen, possibly due to the large amount of mineral oil administered.

### CONCLUSION

On the basis of data reviewed and objective criteria employed to assess antitumor response, it is the unanimous opinion of the review committee that Krebiozen is ineffective as an antitumor agent. In a very small number of patients, tumor regressions of varying degrees were seen during Krebiozen treatment. The validity of the majority of these regressions is subject to question for several different reasons. It is the opinion of the committee that the nature, degree, and number of effects noted are what one might expect in any large random sample of cancer patients. The committee strongly recommends that no clinical trial of Krebiozen be undertaken.

TABLE A.—*Patients evidencing tumor regression while on Krebiozen*

| Patient | Age when Krebiozen started | Sex | Diagnosis | Reported tumor regression | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Character | Duration | |
| 51 | 69 | Female | Hypernephroma | Decrease in size of pulmonary metastases. | 5 months | After tumor regression, pulmonary metastases again increased in size while the patient was still on Krebiozen. Signs of CNS metastases appeared about the time Krebiozen was started and persisted with varying severity until the patient's death, said to be due to cerebral hemorrhage or embolus. It could not be determined whether autopsy was performed. The clinical picture suggests that while regression occurred in the lung masses, metastatic disease was progressing in the CNS. In addition, pulmonary lesions of hypernephroma are known to decrease in size on occasion even though specific therapy has not been given. |
| 68 | 12 | Male | Grade IV malignant intra-abdominal neoplasm of undetermined primary site. | More than 50 percent decrease in tumor mass on multiple occasions while on Krebiozen. | June 1951 to present | The exact type of tumor represented by this case was never determined. Only frozen sections were obtained and no permanent slides prepared. Consequently, the Committee could not assess the true nature of the disease. Postoperatively the patient received X-ray therapy and thereafter was given Krebiozen. At the last report the patient was living and apparently well. |
| 72 | 21 | Female | Fibrosarcoma left sacrum. | More than 50 percent decrease in mass of tumor in 2 areas. | 10 days | 16 cubic centimeters of Krebiozen was given over a 10-day period, during which tumor regression was noted. The patient died on 10th treatment day of metastatic disease. The rapid decline and death of the patient due to cancer, despite regression of the tumor masses, suggest that malignant disease was progressing elsewhere. |
| 141 | 55 | do | Adenocarcinoma of breast. | Complete regression | 1 year | The patient was said to have been free of disease for 1 year. A number of areas, including the breast mass, were biopsied during the period of Krebiozen therapy. The possibility must be considered that such biopsies may have been a factor in the recorded decrease in tumor size. A chest X-ray during the period of complete regression revealed a suspicious pulmonary infiltrate suggesting that tumor growth was occurring in the lung. The patient died, probably while on Krebiozen, 5 years after diagnosis. |
| 143 | 47 | Male | Adenocarcinoma of colon. | More than 50 percent decrease in palpable abdominal mass. | 2 months | During the 4 months following the regression, the tumor mass again increased in size, although Krebiozen therapy was continued. The patient died shortly thereafter. |
| 145 | 44 | Female | Malignant melanoma of face. | Module on lower extremity disappeared. | Disease diagnosed in 1946. Krebiozen given August 1951. Patient living at last report. | The patient had histologically documented melanoma of the face in 1946 and of the elbow in 1951. She was given 5 cubic centimeters of Krebiozen from August to November 1951 for a nonbiopsied lesion of the lower extremity, consequently the exact nature of the nodule is unknown. This disappeared. She received multiple courses of $I^{131}$ before and after Krebiozen. This latter therapy with $I^{131}$ is of questionable value. |
| 149 | 44 | Female | Infiltrating duct cell carcinoma of breast with lymph node metastases. | Disappearance of metastatic lesions in fundus of the eye and retinal reattachment. | 3 months | The patient with metastatic breast cancer was bedridden and blind with a detached retina and metastases in the fundus when Krebiozen was started. The patient received steroids and ACTH as well as Krebiozen and died 7 months after initiation of Krebiozen therapy, apparently from carcinomatosis. The possibility that the hormonal agents may have been a factor in the regression noted must be considered. |
| 157 | 51 | Male | Teratocarcinoma | Disappearance of pulmonary metastases. | 8 weeks | Following a brief regression, pulmonary metastases reappeared. Increasing doses of Krebiozen had no effect. Transient regression followed repeated courses of radiotherapy but the patient died of progressive disease. |
| 177 | 34 | do | Seminoma | Mediastinal metastasis said to have disappeared. | 1 year | Disease recurred and the patient died of metastatic cancer 1 year 9 months following completion of Krebiozen therapy. No X-rays or radiologist's reports were available for review. |

TABLE A.—*Patients evidencing tumor regression while on Krebiozen*—Continued

| Patient | Age when Krebiozen started | Sex | Diagnosis | Reported tumor regression | | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Character | Duration | |
| 183 | 38 | -----do------ | Adenocarcinoma, stomach. | Complete regression----- | Diagnosis 1954, Krebiozen 1954, living and well at present time. | Inoperable adenocarcinoma of stomach was found in 1951. No tumor was found at reexploration in 1956. |
| 303 | (1) | Female----- | Neuroblastoma, retroperitoneal. | Complete regression of recurrent abdominal disease and metastatic disease. | 1962 to present---------- | This female infant had an 80 to 90-percent resection of a neuroblastoma at age 5 months. With the appearance of abdominal recurrence, supraclavicular and mediastinal metastases, Krebiozen was started in March 1962 and by September 1962 there was no evidence of disease. It should be noted that in patients under 1 year of age this malignancy on occasion regresses or changes to a benign tumor. |
| 362 | 67 | -----do------ | Scirrhous adenocarcinoma of breast. | Complete regression----- | (?)-------------------- | Cancer, first symptomatic in(?) 1949, was diagnosed in 1957. The patient had no therapy before Krebiozen which was given in 1958 over the 7-month period during which complete disappearance of the mass was said to occur. The duration of remission is unknown although the patient died 8 months after completion of Krebiozen therapy 18 months after diagnosis. |
| 425 | 36 | -----do------ | Fibrosarcoma Grade I of thigh. | Complete disappearance of 4- by 4 inch lesion, left thigh. | Diagnosis 1944. Last Krebiozen December 1954. Living at last report. | After multiple surgical procedures and courses of irradiation between 1944 and 1952 the patient presented in 1953 with a lesion on the thigh which was not biopsied. The exact nature of the lesion here is unknown. If a fibrosarcoma grade I, it would be of questionable malignant character. During the period of Krebiozen administration, the lesion disappeared leaving only a defect in the area. |
| 439 | 42 | -----do------ | Malignant melanoma of lower extremity. | Lesion on lower extremity said to have disappeared. | Months---------------- | Melanoma initially treated in 1945, continued to recur despite excisional and X-ray therapy until 1952 when Krebiozen was started. Krebiozen therapy was continued for 21 months until the patient died with widely metastatic disease. Apparently the tumor was a very slow growing malignancy. Nevertheless, the question arises whether or not progression was occurring elsewhere at the same time regression was noted for the lower extremity lesion. |
| 449 | 70 | -----do----- | Adenoid cystic carcinoma of breast. | More than 50 percent reduction in tumor size reported. | Living from time of diagnosis in 1958 to present. | Following a year of Krebiozen therapy, 2 biopsies of the lesion were made: 1 measured 3 by 2.8 by 1.8 centimeters; the other 4.5 by 4 by 2.5 centimeters. Such large biopsies could well have accounted for a very substantial decrease in tumor mass. The original mass size was reported as 10 by 16 centimeters. Upon further review, the specimen was felt to represent an adenoid cystic carcinoma, an extremely uncommon lesion which, in the experience of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, has not been observed to metastasize. |

[1] 11 months.

APPENDIX

Table 1 shows the distribution of the 504 cases according to primary site with a breakdown into categories for evaluation as determined by the review committee.

Table 2 indicates the number of objective regressions for those primary sites containing 10 or more patients who fulfilled the requirements for an adequate test situation.[1] For comparison, the total number of patients treated with Krebiozen as of the 1962 report is shown for the same sites.

Table 3 is the same as table 2 but for primary sites of less than 10 acceptable test patients.

---

[1] All patients were included in this category unless the nature of the experimental conditions made an objective evaluation of Krebiozen impossible as stated under "Inadequate test situation" on page 6.

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of Krebiozen cases by primary tumor site and test situation*

| Primary tumor site | Number submitted | Adequate test situation | Inadequate test situation | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Concurrent therapy | No pathological diagnosis of cancer | No residual cancer | Other |
| Total | 504 | 288 | 216 | 101 | 50 | 49 | 16 |
| Brain and cord, primary | 17 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Breast | 180 | 93 | 87 | 39 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Cervix uteri | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Colon | 49 | 33 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Duodenum and small intestine | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Esophagus | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Gallbladder | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Head and neck | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Kidney; ureter | 10 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Larynx | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Liver and bile ducts | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lung; bronchus | 22 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Nasopharynx | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ovary [1] | 19 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pancreas | 15 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Prostate | 11 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Rectum | 23 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Salivary glands | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stomach | 24 | 12 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| Testes | 6 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thyroid | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Tongue | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Urinary bladder | 10 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Uterus | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Vagina; vulva | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Undetermined site | 20 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Hodgkin's | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lymphosarcoma | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Melanoma | 8 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Osteogenic sarcoma; bone; spine | 12 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Sarcomas—Soft tissue | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Distribution of Krebiozen cases by primary tumor site and test situation*—Continued

| Primary tumor site | Number submitted | Adequate test situation | Inadequate test situation | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Concurrent therapy | No pathological diagnosis of cancer | No residual cancer | Other |
| Acute myelocyticleukemia | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous abdominal malignancies [2] | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mediastinum, undifferentiated | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous skin cancers [3] | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Neuroblastoma | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of established diagnoses of malignancies | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 |

[1] One of these cases was shown at autopsy to be metastatic carcinoma from the breast.

[2] Includes mesothelioma, neurofibrosarcoma, and sympathicoblastoma.

[3] Includes 1 patient with epidermoid cancer of hand, and 1 with squamous cell cancer of penis.

TABLE 2.—*Objective regression category (for selected primary tumor sites—Large samples)*

| Primary tumor site [1] | Number of patients | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total [2] treated | Total submitted by Krebiozen Foundation | Fulfilled adequate test situation | | |
| | | | Total [3] | No objective regression | Objective regression |
| Breast | 870 | 180 | 93 | 89 | 4 |
| Colon | 463 | 49 | 33 | 32 | 1 |
| Lung | 340 | 22 | 19 | 19 | 0 |
| Ovary | 228 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| Pancreas | 177 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Rectum | 237 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 0 |
| Stomach | 286 | 24 | 12 | 11 | 1 |
| Undetermined site | 102 | 20 | 11 | 10 | 1 |

[1] For sites with 10 or more cases fulfilling the requirements for an adequate test situation.

[2] Source: "Report on Krebiozen, an Agent for the Treatment of Cancer, 1962," Krebiozen Research Foundation, table 1, p. 9.

[3] As determined by Review Committee in present study of 504 cases.

TABLE 3.—*Objective regression category (for selected primary tumor sites—small samples)*

| Primary [1] tumor site | Number of patients | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total [2] treated | Total submitted by Krebiozen Foundation | Fulfilled adequate test situation | | |
| | | | Total [3] | No objective regression | Objective regression |
| Osteogenic sarcoma | 23 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 1 |
| Brain [4] | 178 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Kidney, ureter | 116 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Nasopharynx | 48 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Urinary bladder | 107 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Uterus | 71 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Melanoma | 115 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Liver and bile duct | 62 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Testes | 31 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Cervix uteri | 147 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous abdominal [5] malignancy | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Prostate | 130 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Salivary glands | 21 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Duodenum and small intestines | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Larynx | 26 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Thyroid | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Vagina; vulva | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Lymphosarcoma | 44 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Sarcomas | 115 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Neuroblastoma [5] | | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Miscellaneous skin [5] | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mediastinum undifferentiated [5] | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

[1] For sites with less than 10 cases fulfilling the requirements for an adequate test situation.

[2] Source: "Report on Krebiozen, An Agent for the Treatment of Cancer, 1962," table 1, p. 9.

[3] As determined by Review Committee in present study of 504 cases.

[4] Includes brain and cord, primary, and brain metastases.

[5] Not listed in 1962 report.

(EXHIBIT 15)

BEHIND THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST KREBIOZEN

The influence of the American Medical Association upon Government health agencies is immense, because inevitably they must largely depend upon the 180,000 medical doctors of the country for answers to medical questions, and the AMA is the only organization which speaks for, or claims to speak for, all these doctors.

It is alleged by no less than five persons testifying under oath at the Illinois Legislative hearings on Krebiozen, that at the time of the million dollar offers, in personal conversations with the treasurer of the AMA he made clear to them that he was trying to take away financial control of Krebiozen from the Durovics, and that he would have the drug smeared and suppressed by the AMA if he were refused control of Krebiozen.

These allegations have been widely published in Herbert Bailey's books about Krebiozen, and he states in his books that they have never been denied in or out of court.

About 6 months after the million dollar offers, the AMA issued its "status report" on 100 proved cancer cases treated with Krebiozen, and this report has served ever since as the backbone of all opposition to Krebiozen.

Of these 100 cases 77 were so close to death when Krebiozen treatment was begun that 40 received only 2 injections and the other 37 received only 4 injections of Krebiozen.

The report also omitted all mention of objective cancer regression recorded in the medical records of 18 patients; and on the basis of its survey covering only a few weeks to a few months, the report characterized all of the 100 patients as dead or dying.

However, of the 23 remaining patients, 10 of these were alive and well and appeared in person before the Illinois Legislative Commission on Krebiozen in 1954, and 7 of them are still alive and well today in December 1963, as follows:

Alive in 1954: Mrs. Julian Howard, Mrs. Cecile Luebkemann, Mrs. Catherine Firnsthal, Irene O. Kibby, A. M. Howard, Eleanor Gahan, Helen Arndt, Magda Johansen, Evelyn Vogel, Irene R. Pietrowicz.

Alive in December 1963: Mrs. Julian Howard, 2429 West Berenice Street, Chicago; Mrs. Cecile Luebkemann, 6439 Newgaard Street, Chicago; Irene O. Kibby, 2021 West 73rd Court, Elmwood Park, Ill.; A. M. Howard, 9410 North Monticello Street, Skokie, Ill.; Eleanor Gahan, 1619 Garfield Boulevard, Chicago; Magda Johansen, 3810 North Troy Street, Chicago, now in Norway; Evelyn Vogel, 1820 West Nelson Street, Chicago.

Note.—Mrs. Firnsthal died at age 84.

The FDA and NCI condemnations of Krebiozen on September 7 and October 16 may have been timed just to precede the combined AMA–FDA Quackery Congress of October 25, 26, 1963, all expenses of which were paid by the AMA, and at which AMA president Annis denounced Krebiozen as "one of the greatest frauds of the 20th century." (AMA News, November 11, 1963).

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the Senate, I ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator turn to Calendar No. 614, H.R. 6001?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, is this by unanimous consent?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the request has been honored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, I had a "hold" order on Calendar No. 614.

## CONVEYANCE TO WAUKEGAN PORT DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 614, H.R. 6001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6001) to authorize the conveyance to Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the majority leader knows, I had a "hold" order on the bill until I could complete an analysis of the bill with respect to its compliance with the Morse formula. I am pleased to say that to the supporters of the bill that, in my judgment, the bill does not violate the Morse formula, for the following reasons:

H.R. 6001 would authorize the gratuitous conveyance of a 0.53-acre tract of Federal land by the Secretary of the Army to the Waukegan, Ill., port district.

The facts underlying this proposed conveyance are somewhat complicated, but at the root of the proposed conveyance is a gratuitous transfer of land that was made by the city of Waukegan to the United States in 1880 covering approximately 5.2 acres of land on the shore of Lake Michigan. A harbor was constructed in the area, and as a result of this construction, land was added to the 5.2-acre tract by accretion.

In 1926, part of the accreted area was conveyed to Waukegan by the United States for $1,000 plus a gratuitous conveyance by Illinois to the United States of another tract of land. The 0.53-acre parcel is the remaining portion of the land conveyed by Illinois to the United States as part of the 1926 transaction.

A question concerning the possible application of the Morse formula is involved, because the conveyance proposed under H.R. 6001 is gratuitous.

Although the facts relating to these land transactions are complex, a careful analysis discloses that the 0.53-acre tract has a direct relationship to the gratuitously conveyed original 5.2 acres of land, and the accretions thereon. It is important to reiterate that the 5.2-acre parcel was donated to the United States in 1880 by the city of Waukegan. That being the case, and in view of the further assurance of Acting Secretary of the Army Ailes, appearing at page 4 of Senate Report No. 637, that there is no need for Federal retention of the 0.53 acre tract, no violation of the Morse formula would occur under this bill. The case falls within the implied reversion doctrine of the Roseburg Veterans' Administration land transfer case which was discussed in volume 102 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part 7, page 9323.

The report discloses improvements by way of two steel bulkheads costing $42,500 and $22,800, respectively—Report No. 637, page 2. Obviously, these installations involve no market value; in fact, they represent negative values to the United States.

If the United States continues to maintain them, the maintenance cost alone for 1 year would be far in excess of the market value.

At the present time, they require maintenance and annual costs of maintenance to the United States. The obligation of maintenance and the cost incident thereto would be assumed, under the specific language of H.R. 6001 by the port district.

That is another reason for taking the case out from under the Morse formula.

Also, it should be noted, that if the 0.53 acre should cease to be used for public harbor purposes, it would revert to the United States.

Mr. President, inasmuch as no violation of the Morse formula is presented under this bill, I join in urging favorable action thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 6001) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## AMENDMENT TO UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 656, Senate bill 949.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 949) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736), which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, on page 4, after line 18, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Such Act is hereby amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"SEC. 9. The President may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1765 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 70; 31 U.S.C. 529), grant certain officers having important representation responsibilities as determined by the representative of the United States to the United Nations, an allowance adequate to defray the additional housing costs necessitated by such representational responsibilities during the period such officer is assigned for duty in the continental United States as a member of the United States Mission to the United Nations."

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, Eighty-first Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any deputy representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g), respectively, and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European Office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I would suggest that, for a bill of this character, a part of the report or an explanation of the bill should be in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts has anticipated the unanimous consent request I was about to make; namely, that portions of the reports or other statements as necessary may be printed in explanation of the legislation considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 676), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The main purpose of the bill is: (1) to enable the principal U.S. representative to the United Nations to assign duties to his colleagues on a somewhat more flexible basis than at present; and (2) to provide statutory authority for the existing position of the U.S. representative to the European office of the United Nations.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The first section of the bill, while rewriting subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 2 of the basic act, makes few changes of substance in existing law. There is no provision for any additional personnel; neither is there any diminution whatsoever of the current requirement for Senate confirmation of the officials concerned. Specifically, in view of wholly erroneous charges which have been circulated among the public, it should be stressed that any U.S. representative serving on a United Nations body concerned with nuclear energy or disarmament would have received his appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Under existing law, of the five top members of the U.S. mission, only three may represent this country in the Security Council, and only the main U.S. representative and his first deputy may represent the United States both in the Security Council and in "any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies * * *." The major substantive effect of the first section of the bill would be to permit the use of the five top officials as a group of interchangeable representatives. This alteration is justified by the fact that several important United Nations meetings normally are occurring simultaneously. Moreover, frequently an issue with which a particular representative is most familiar may be considered in several forums, in one or more of which the official might not be able to represent us at present.

The second section of the bill would provide statutory authority for the position of the U.S representative to the European office of the United Nations in Geneva. The President would be authorized to designate that official's rank and status; the appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation; and the appointee would also represent the United States in connection with other international organization activities at Geneva at the discretion of the Secretary of State. The present occupant of the post (Roger Tubby) has the rank of Ambassador by Presidential appointment, but—in the absence of statutory authority—has salary and status lower than the position would warrant.

The United States has had a mission to the United Nations European Office in Geneva since 1949. Fifty-eight other countries currently have permanent missions in that city, and about half of them are headed by persons with ambassadorial rank. Altogether, 116 public and private international organizations now have their headquarters in Geneva, and 57 have branch offices there. Regularization of the position of a senior U.S. diplomatic official in connection with international organization affairs at Geneva should promote better coordination, direction, and representation of our activities.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MOSS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining measures on the calendar be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CERTAIN BASIC AUTHORITY FOR U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2213) to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment on page 4, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 3. In any contracts for the use of international radio stations and facilities, the Director may, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), include agreement on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), any contract for the use of international radio stations and facilities may provide, with the approval of the Director, that the United States will indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose against either or both of the following, but only to the extent that they may arise out of the direct performance of the contract and to the extent not compensated by insurance or otherwise:

(1) Claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) by third persons for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

(2) Loss of or damage to property of the contractor from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

(b) A contract, made under subsection (a), that provides for indemnification must also provide for—

(1) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the contractor for the death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

(2) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of that suit or claim.

(c) No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Director certifies that the amount is just and reasonable.

(d) Each contractor which is a party to an indemnification agreement under subsection (a) shall have and maintain financial protection of such type and in such amounts as the Director shall require to cover liability to third persons and loss of or damage to property.

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Director of the United States Information Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Director" and the "Agency", respectively) may—

(a) employ, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, aliens abroad for services in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General). Such persons may be admitted to the United States, if otherwise qualified, as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) for such time and under such conditions and procedures as may be established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General;

(b) pay travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States;

(c) incur expenses for entertainment within the United States within such amounts as may be provided for in appropriation Acts;

(d) obtain insurance on official motor vehicles operated by the Agency in foreign countries, and pay the expenses incident thereto;

(e) pay claims to any persons, in amounts not to exceed $15,000 each in the manner authorized in section 2734, as amended, of title 10, of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries, as though the Director were the Secretary of a military department and as though officers and employees of the Agency were commissioned officers and members of the Armed Forces;

(f) advance funds within the meaning of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(g) employ aliens by contract for services abroad;

(h) provide ice and drinking water abroad;

(i) pay excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad;

(j) pay the actual expense of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in Agency activities;

(k) rent or lease, for periods of less than ten years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad;

(l) maintain, improve, and repair properties used for information activities in foreign countries;

(m) furnish fuel, water, and utilities for Government owned or leased property abroad;

(n) pay travel expenses of employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–842), but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Appropriated funds made available to the Agency for any fiscal year for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel shall be available for all such expenses in connection with travel or transportation which begins in that fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed until the following fiscal year.

SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), any contract for the use of international radio stations and facilities may provide, with the approval of the Director, that the United States will indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose against either or both of the following, but only to the extent that they may arise out of the direct performance of the contract and to the extent not compensated by insurance or otherwise:

(1) Claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) by third persons for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous.

(2) Loss of or damage to property of the contractor from a risk that the contract defines as unusualy hazardous.

(b) A contract, made under subsection (a), that provides for indemnification must also provide for—

(1) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the contractor for the death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property; and

(2) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of that suit or claim.

(c) No payment may be made under subsection (a) unless the Director certifies that the amount is just and reasonable.

(d) Each contractor which is a party to an indemnification agreement under subsection (a) shall have and maintain financial protection of such type and in such amounts as the Director shall require to cover liability to third persons and loss of or damage to property.

SEC. 4. The Director may appoint or assign Foreign Service Reserve officers for service with the Agency for such periods as he may determine, without regard to the provisions of section 522 of the Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 922).

SEC. 5. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this Act and such appropriations may be made without fiscal year limitation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 677), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### 1. MAIN PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The primary objective of S. 2213 is to supply basic legislative authority to support certain items which have been included in past acts providing appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency (USIA). In the absence of such authority, any item concerned may be stricken from an appropriation bill if a point of order is raised against it.

* * * * *

### 3. PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Except for section 3, which is discussed below, the provisions of S. 2213 are explained in the appendix accompanying this report. Several provisions which deal with an expansion of authority USIA has had in the past are also discussed below.

Section 3 of the bill, as proposed by the executive branch, related to indemnification of owners and operators of international radio stations and facilities. The authority requested by USIA in this regard was virtually identical to language which has regularly been carried in acts appropriating funds for the Agency since 1953. No claims have been made or paid pursuant to the indemnification provision carried in prior USIA appropriation acts. At the present time, the only contract in effect with an indemnification clause is one the Agency has with the National Broadcasting Co. relative to the operation and maintenance of a radio facility in Bound Brook, N.J.

In connection with its examination of the proposed section 3, the committee decided it would be best to make the indemnification authority substantially similar to basic authority now possessed by the military departments (10 U.S.C. 2354). Section 3(a) specifies that any contract for the use of international radio stations and facilities may provide, with the approval of the Director of USIA, that the United States will indemnify the owners and operators of the stations and facilities against certain loss or damage arising out of the direct performance of the contract and to the extent the loss or damage is not covered by insurance or otherwise. The indemnification coverage extends to (1) claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement) by third persons for death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous, and (2) loss of or damage to property of the contractor from a risk that the contract defines as unusually hazardous. Indemnification pursuant to section 3 is subject, in the final analysis, to such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose. Under section 3(b) a contract providing for indemnification must also provide for (1) notice to the United States of any claim or suit against the contractor for the death, bodily injury, or loss of or damage to property, and (2) control of or assistance in the defense by the United States, at its election, of that suit or claim. And before any indemnification payment may be made, the USIA Director must certify that the amount is just and reasonable (sec. 3(c)).

Pursuant to section 3(d), each party to an indemnification agreement must maintain financial protection of such type and in such amounts as the USIA Director may require to cover liability to third persons and loss of or damage to property. One witness appearing before the committee expressed concern that the Agency's present indemnification authority might result in having a competitive effect upon private insurance carriers. The committee believes that USIA will exercise diligence and care to avoid such a result.

In the following respects, S. 2213 would expand the Agency's existing authority.

For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations with peoples abroad, the Director of USIA would be authorized by section 1(e) of the bill to pay meritorious claims against the Agency arising overseas. Such claims may not exceed $15,000, and the authority granted would parallel that contained in the Military Claims Act (10 U.S.C. 2734). Past appropriation acts have accorded USIA claims authority equal to that of the administrative settlement authority of the domestic Tort Claims Act which USIA has felt has hampered the Agency by imposing upon it a virtually impossible requirement of claims settlement "in accordance with the laws of the place where the act or omission occurred."

Section 1(k) of the bill would enable USIA to rent or lease, for a maximum period of 10 years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad. Present law limits rentals for leases to 5 years, and the 10-year term would place USIA on the same footing as the Department of State and the Agency for International Development, thus making it possible for the three agencies to standardize their rental and leasing practices.

In addition, section 1(k) would have the effect of permitting the Agency to rent or lease living quarters not only for its own officers and employees overseas—as it currently can do—but also, when circumstances require, for binational center grantees and contractor personnel engaged in USIA activities abroad who encounter difficulties in securing housing. In certain countries, particularly in Africa, housing is available only on payment of several years' rent in advance, and in many cases only on extensive renovation of quarters. Government housing provided for an individual pursuant to section 1(k) will be in lieu of the quarters allowance he would otherwise receive.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize the appointment or assignment to the Agency of Foreign Service Reserve officers without regard to the 10-year statutory limitation on tenure contained in section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. USIA has no authority to make appointments to the Foreign Service Officer Corps which is the career officer category for the Foreign Service. It does have, however, authority to make Foreign Service Reserve appointments, and appropriations acts have regularly included a yearly extension of these appointments in order that the Agency might retain senior Reserve officers who have served more than 10 years. The authority in section 4 would eliminate the possibility of a point of order being raised against these annual extensions.

### 4. CONCLUSION

The annual cost to the U.S. Government of this legislation is expected to approximate $5,000 a year resulting from the settlement of meritorious claims.

The committee believes S. 2213, by providing a firm base of substantive authority for various USIA activities, will remove uncertainties and facilitate the Agency's performance of its administrative and other tasks. Most provisions in the bill deal with matters for which money has been appropriated in the past, and the new authorities granted seem reasonable. Therefore, the committee recommends Senate passage of S. 2213.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL SERVICES TO GUAM

The bill (S. 692) to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and maintain an agricultural program in Guam which will include such programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to as "Department", as are determined by the Secretary will promote the welfare of that island. This authority may be exercised without regard to section 25(b) of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 390; 48 U.S.C. 1421c(b)), or any other provision of law under which Guam may have been excluded from such programs. The Secretary is authorized to provide for such modification of any such programs extended to Guam as he deems necessary in order to adapt it to the needs of Guam. The program authorized by this section shall be developed in cooperation with the territorial government of Guam and shall be covered by a memorandum of understanding agreed to by the territorial government and the Department. The Secretary may also utilize the agencies, facilities, and employees of the Department, and may cooperate with other public agencies and with private organizations and individuals in Guam and elsewhere: *Provided,* That the number of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture stationed on Guam to carry out the purpose of this Act shall not exceed five at any one time.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The moneys appropriated in pursuance of this Act shall also be available for the purchase and rental of land, the construction or acquisition of buildings, for the equipment and maintenance of such buildings, and such other expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department, and may be allocated to such agencies of the Department as are concerned with the administration of the program in Guam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 678), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 692), to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to S. 2121, which passed the Senate June 25, 1962, too late to be acted upon by the House of Representatives. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an agricultural program for Guam under a memorandum of understanding with the territorial government of Guam. Any program of the Department of Agriculture which would promote the welfare of Guam could be included in the program with any appropriate modification. The primary need is for technical assistance. The number of USDA employees stationed on Guam under the act at any one time would be limited to five.

The bill would carry out the recommendations of a Department survey group report made in March 1958; and is more fully explained in the attached request of the Department of Agriculture for this legislation.

## FOOTHILLS PARKWAY, TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 2218) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, who is hereby authorized to accept such transfer, not to exceed three hundred and sixty acres of national forest land in Cocke County, Tennessee, now part of the Cherokee National Forest, located within and adjacent to the right-of-way for section 8A of the Foothills Parkway between Tennessee Highway Numbered 32 and the Pigeon River.

Upon publication in the Federal Register of an order of transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture, the lands so transferred shall be a part of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and available for the scenic parkway as authorized by the Act of February 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 19; 16 U.S.C. 403h–11).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 679), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2218), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill provides for the transfer of 360 acres of land from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior. The land is now part of the Cherokee National Forest and is needed for the Foothills Parkway.

The request of the Department of the Interior for this legislation and the favorable report of the Department of Agriculture on an identical bill are attached.

## CROW INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1757) to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That all conveyances made prior to October 18, 1957, in violation of the acreage limitations contained in the first paragraph of section 2 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), as amended by the Act of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 252), are hereby validated, ratified, and confirmed insofar as such acreage limitations are concerned, but the right to challenge such conveyances for any other cause recognized by law, and the right to obtain access and ways of necessity pursuant to State law, shall not be affected by this Act: *Provided,* That no conveyance ratified, confirmed, or validated by this Act shall be construed to convey to the original grantee of any allottee, his heirs or assigns, and mineral rights in the lands to which this Act applies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 680), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1757, introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf, is to validate, ratify, and confirm certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., in violation of section 2 of the act of June 4, 1920.

### NEED

The act of June 4, 1920, provided for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe of Indians. Section 2 of the act reads as follows:

"Sec. 2. No conveyance of land by any Crow Indian shall be authorized or approved by the Secretary of the Interior to any person, company, or corporation who owns at least six hundred and forty acres of agricultural or one thousand two hundred and eighty acres of grazing land within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, nor to any person who, with the land to be acquired by such conveyance, would become the owner of more than one thousand two hundred and eighty acres of agricultural or one thousand nine hundred and twenty acres of grazing land within said reservation. Any conveyance by any such Indian made either directly or indirectly to any such person, company, or corporation of any land within said reservation as the same now exists, whether held by trust patent or by patent-in-fee shall be void and the grantee accepting the same shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment not more than six months or by both such fine and imprisonment."

This paragraph was amended by the act of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 252), to permit the Secretary of the Interior, under certain circumstances, to approve sales of allotted and inherited lands to members of the Crow Tribe without regard to the acreage limitations.

**Shortly after the passage of the 1920 Crow Act, the acreage limitations set forth in section 2 of the act were violated. Upon the discovery of the still-existing limitations, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs immediately suspended all sales of land on the Crow Reservation and ordered an inquiry to determine the extent of the possible violations.**

The Indian Bureau's investigation disclosed a substantial number of violations of the statute, involving thousands of acres of land. How this situation developed is not entirely clear, but it is evident that many individuals believed that the statutory limitation had been repealed by Congress. Once this belief became prevalent, and precedents were established for making sales without considering the statutory limitation, the practice continued without question. In many cases, the individual competent Indians on the Crow Reservation obtained fee simple title to their lands and in turn sold the land to non-Indians who exceeded the maximum acreage limitations. Other Indian lands were sold under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with complete disregard for the statutory restrictions. In their testimony before the committee, representatives of the Indian Bureau stated that they could offer no satisfactory explanation for the failure to enforce the provisions of the 1920 act.

The Department of the Interior is of the opinion that legislative action is the most practical and desirable method of removing the cloud on conveyances made in violation of the 1920 act. While S. 1757 validates, ratifies, and confirms all conveyances made in violation of the 1920 Crow Act, the right to challenge such conveyances because of fraud, duress, or any other cause is not affected. The right to obtain access and ways of necessity pursuant to State law is also included.

Under the terms of the 1920 Crow Act, the minerals under the lands allotted to the individual Indians were reserved to the tribe for a period of 50 years. S. 1757 provides that no conveyance ratified, confirmed, or validated by this act shall be construed to convey to the original grantee of any allottee, his heirs, or assigns, any mineral rights in the lands to which the bill applies.

Legislation similar to S. 1757 was passed by the Senate in the 84th Congress (S. 3698) and in the 85th Congress (S. 332). Extensive field hearings were held in 1957 on legislation introduced in the House to clear the land titles involved.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico, was announced as next in order.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Over.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be passed over.

## ESCAPE OR ATTEMPTED ESCAPE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1319) to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 684), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that a juvenile delinquent under 18 years of age, as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent, who escapes from custody, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

### STATEMENT

S. 1319 is identical to S. 1954 of the 87th Congress, which was reported favorably by the committee and passed the Senate on September 18, 1961. This legislation is recommended by the Department of Justice, as contained in three letters, two directed to the Vice President of the United States dated January 19, 1961, and January 18, 1963, and the third to the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, dated April 12, 1961. All of the facts surrounding this legislation and the justification therefor are contained in Senate Report 1047 of the 87th Congress on S. 1954, and are as follows:

"Section 751 of title 18, United States Code, provides for a maximum penalty of 5 years imprisonment or a fine of $5,000 for the escape or attempted escape from lawful custoday or confinement following a conviction for any offense, or from custody or confinement prior to conviction of a pending felony charge. However, a lesser penalty applies if the escape is attempted or effected on a pending charge involving a misdemeanor.

"The Department of Justice in its report states that it has consistently advised U.S. attorneys to decline to prosecute committed juvenile delinquents under section 751, commonly known as the Escape Act. The Department has taken the position that a conviction for an offense is a prerequisite to prosecution under the Escape Act, and that a juvenile delinquency proceeding terminates merely in the adjudication of a status, not a conviction.

"This proposed legislation clearly brings within the statute's purview all persons committed under the Juvenile Delinquency Act, irrespective of whether or not such persons have attained their 18th birthday. It does, however, subject such escapes to the lesser of the two penalties now provided for by section 751 of title 18.

"In a statement on the floor of the Senate in relation to this bill, Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, indicated that on occasion, police officers and guards have sustained serious injuries at the hands of youths bent on making an escape from custody.

"The committee, after a review of all of the foregoing, sees no reason why juvenile delinquents should not be subject to a penalty in the situations heretofore outlined. The committe concurs in the recommendations of the Department of Justice and recommends that the bill, S. 1954, be considered favorably."

The committee does not feel that the enactment of this proposed amendment to the Escape Act would be contrary to the basic philosophy and purposes of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act. It does not mean that those who have been adjudicated as juvenile delinquents would be treated as convicted persons. Nor would it result in the placing of a juvenile in facilities or programs designed for adult criminals. It would amount to an extension of the original commitment to a specialized type of program. In addition, it would provide a more effective means of controlling those who have been committed under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act and through their conduct have demonstrated that they are unamendable to the relaxed supervision contemplated by the act and unsuited for treatment in the usual facilities available for juvenile delinquents.

There is no thought that all or even most of the escapees in this category would be prosecuted under the Escape Act, but the act would be available for those cases where administrative actions prove to be ineffective. This proposal is intended to preserve the integrity of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act by making it possible to process under the Escape Act the occasional case which turns out to be unfit for treatment under the juvenile statute.

In this connection, the committee notes that the concept that one who escapes from custody after having been committed under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act should not be subject to prosecution solely because he has not been convicted is basically inconsistent. Under existing law any person who escapes from the custody of the Attorney General or from any custody by virtue of any process or lawful arrest is subject to the provisions of the Escape Act. Those who have not yet been convicted of a violation of law or adjudicated to be a juvenile delinquent can be prosecuted under this act. It is therefore incongruous that a juvenile may be prosecuted as an escapee after his arrest and before he has been adjudicated as having committed a violation of law, but after an adjudication of delinquency he is immunized from prosecution for escape.

The committee, in considering the foregoing and the attachments hereto, believes that the same compelling reasons exist for the passage of this legislation as existed when the committee made its favorable report to the Senate in the 87th Congress. The committee, therefore, adheres to its former recommendation and recommends that the bill, S. 1319, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are the communications from the Department of Justice hereinbefore referred to.

**Mr. DODD.** Mr. President, although section 751 of title 18 of the United States Code now prescribes strong penalties for adult escapees detained or committed in connection with a criminal proceeding, the Justice Department has refused to allow prosecution of juvenile escapees under these provisions because the latter are not subjected to a criminal proceeding and are not convicted of a crime.

The point is well taken that juveniles should not be exposed to penalties applicable to adult felons. It is imperative that rehabilitation and treatment, rather than punishment, always remain the basic goals and the main substance of any handling procedures directed against minors.

This does not mean, however, that punishment and penalties have no value or place in the treatment and control of juvenile offenders. Indeed, some penalties as disciplinary measures are very much a part of any rehabilitative process.

A case in point is the need for such penalties to discourage young offenders from attempting to escape after detention or commitment in an institution.

We must recognize here that by their very nature as treatment centers rather than penal institutions, juvenile detention and commitment facilities are operated with minimum security provisions, both in terms of personnel exercising guard functions and in terms of the mechanical security measures of the physical plant.

On the other hand, we know that many delinquents exhibit the same kinds of disturbances as adult offenders.

A juvenile delinquent is often equally as hostile, equally as aggressive, and equally as anxious to escape from an institution as his adult counterpart. Indeed, with the enthusiasm, the energy, and the rebellion against authority characteristic of the delinquency-prone segment of our youth population, a juvenile offender may often be more escape-minded than the most vicious adult inmates of penitentiaries.

The present lack of legal penalties allows a juvenile to plan and attempt escapes time after time without jeopardizing his release from an institution at the predetermined time, but often at the risk of physical violence, at the risk of physical harm to the institution's personnel or himself, and at the expense of rehabilitation and treatment programs beneficial to all juvenile offenders.

Records submitted to the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee indicate that correctional officers have been either killed, have suffered permanent brain damage, or have been otherwise seriously injured in the course of attempts to escape by youthful inmates.

The records of the Federal Bureau of Prisons show that from January of 1961 to November of 1962, over 600 boys either escaped or attempted to escape from the several juvenile institutions under the Bureau's jurisdiction. Some months the combined total of both successful and unsuccessful escapees is as high as 45 individuals. But even these figures do not tell the whole story, because they may not reflect all attempts to escape, nor do they reflect the damage done to the rehabilitative programs by continuous preoccupation with plans to escape by a large number of young inmates.

The physical and emotional health, safety, and general well-being of the juvenile offender and of persons associated with him dictate that preoccupations with plans and attempts to escape be discouraged among the inmate population of juvenile institutions.

The proposed amendment to section 751 of title 18 of the United States Code would substantially contribute to a solution of the problems outlined above.

This measure would subject juvenile offenders who attempt to escape to the penalty of one year's imprisonment, a $1,000 fine, or both.

In a letter to me concerning the amendment, Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, made the following statement:

> It is our opinion that the enactment of this amendment, which would authorize the imposition of a sentence of up to 1 year on juvenile delinquents who escape or attempt to escape, would greatly reduce the number of such incidents. Many of the juveniles contemplating escape would be effectively deterred by the knowledge that they would be subject to prosecution.

I feel that he is correct in his judgment and urge the Senate to consider this amendment favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 751 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape from the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for a violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the discretionary authority vested in the Attorney General pursuant to section 5032 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 752 of such title is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempted escape of any person in the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

---

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4766) for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

---

## UNAUTHORIZED COPYING OF ORNAMENTAL DESIGNS

The bill (S. 776) to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### DESIGNS PROTECTED

SECTION 1. (a) The author or other proprietor of an original ornamental design of a useful article may secure the protection provided by this Act upon complying with and subject to the provisions hereof.

(b) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) A "useful article" is an article which in normal use has an intrinsic utilitarian function that is not merely to portray the appearance of the article or to convey information. An article which normally is a part of a useful article shall be deemed to be a useful article.

(2) The "design of a useful article", hereinafter referred to as a "design", consists of those aspects or elements of the article, including its two-dimensional or three-dimensional features of shape and surface, which make up the appearance of the article.

(3) A design is "ornamental" if it is intended to make the article attractive or distinctive in appearance.

(4) A design is "original" if it is the independent creation of an author who did not copy it from another source.

### DESIGNS NOT SUBJECT TO PROTECTION

SEC. 2. Protection under this Act shall not be available for a design that is—

(a) Not original;

(b) staple or commonplace, such as a standard geometric figure, familiar symbol, emblem, or motif, or other shape, pattern, or configuration which has become common, prevalent, or ordinary;

(c) different from a design excluded by subparagraph (b) above only in insignificant details or in elements which are variants commonly used in the relevant trades; or

(d) dictated solely by a utilitarian function of the article that embodies it.

### REVISIONS, ADAPTATIONS, AND REARRANGEMENTS

SEC. 3. Protection for a design under this Act shall be available notwithstanding the employment in the design of subject matter excluded from protection under section 2, if the design is a substantial revision, adaptation, or rearrangement of said subject matter: *Provided,* That such protection shall be available to a design employing subject matter protected under title 17 or 35 of the United States Code or under this Act, only if such protected subject matter is employed with the consent of the proprietor thereof. Such protection shall be independent of any subsisting protection in subject matter employed in the design, and shall not be construed as securing any right to subject matter excluded from protection or as extending any subsisting protection.

### COMMENCEMENT OF PROTECTION

SEC. 4. (a) The protection provided for a design under this Act shall commence upon the date when the design is first made public.

(b) A design is made public when, by the proprietor of the design or with his consent, an existing useful article embodying the design is anywhere publicly exhibited, publicly distributed, or offered for sale or sold to the public.

### TERM OF PROTECTION

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the protection herein provided for a design shall continue for a term of five years from the date of the commencement of protection as provided in section 4(a), but if a proper application for renewal is received by the Administrator during the year prior to the expiration of the five-year term, the protection herein provided shall be extended for an additional period of five years from the date of expiration of the first five years.

(b) If the design notice actually applied shows a date earlier than the date of the commencement of protection as provided in section 4(a), protection shall terminate as though the term had commenced at the earlier date.

(c) Where the distinguishing elements of a design are in substantially the same form in a number of different useful articles, the design shall be protected as to all such articles when protected as to one of them, but no more than one registration shall be

**required. Upon expiration or termination of protection in a particular design as provided in this Act all rights under this Act in said design shall terminate, regardless of the number of different articles in which the design may have been utilized during the term of its protection.**

THE DESIGN NOTICE

**SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any design for which protection is sought under this Act is made public as provided in section 4(b), the proprietor shall, subject to the provisions of section 7, mark it or have it marked legibly with a design notice consisting of the following three elements:**

**(1) The words "Protected Design", the abbreviation "Prot'd Des." or the letter "D" within a circle, thus Ⓓ;**

**(2) The year of the date on which the design was first made public; and**

**(3) The name of the proprietor, an abbreviation by which the name can be recognized, or a generally accepted alternative designation of the proprietor; any distinctive identification of the proprietor may be used if it has been approved and recorded by the Administrator before the design marked with such identification is made public.**

**After registration the registration number may be used instead of the elements specified in (2) and (3) hereof.**

**(b) The notice shall be so located and applied as to give reasonable notice of design protection while the useful article embodying the design is passing through its normal channels of commerce. This requirement may be fulfilled, in the case of sheetlike or strip materials bearing repetitive or continuous designs, by application of the notice to each repetition, or to the margin, selvage, or reverse side of the material at reasonably frequent intervals, or to tags or labels affixed to the material at such intervals.**

**(c) When the proprietor of a design has complied with the provisions of this section, protection under this Act shall not be affected by the removal, destruction, or obliteration by others of the design notice on an article.**

EFFECT OF OMISSION OF NOTICE

**SEC. 7. The omission of the notice prescribed in section 6 shall not cause loss of the protection or prevent recovery for infringement against any person who, after written notice of the design protection, begins an undertaking leading to infringement: *Provided,* That such omission shall prevent any recovery under section 22 against a person who began an undertaking leading to infringement before receiving written notice of the design protection, and no injunction shall be had unless the proprietor of the design shall reimburse said person for any reasonable expenditure or contractual obligation in connection with such undertaking incurred before written notice of design protection, as the court in its discretion shall direct. The burden of proving written notice shall be on the proprietor.**

INFRINGEMENT

**SEC. 8. (a) It shall be infringement of a design protected under this Act for any person, without the consent of the proprietor of the design, within the United States or its territories or possessions and during the term of such protection, to—**

**(1) make, have made, or import, for sale or for use in trade, any infringing article as defined in subsection (d) hereof; or**

**(2) sell or distribute for sale or for use in trade any such infringing article: *Provided, however,* That a seller or distributor of any such article who did not make or import the same shall be deemed to be an infringer only if—**

**(i) he induced or acted in collusion with a manufacturer to make, or an importer to import such article (merely purchasing or giving an order to purchase in the ordinary course of business shall not of itself constitute such inducement or collusion); or**

**(ii) he refuses or fails upon the request of the proprietor of the design to make a prompt and full disclosure of his source of such article, and he orders or reorders such article after having received notice by registered or certified mail of the protection subsisting in the design.**

(b) It shall not be infringement to make, have made, import, sell, or distribute, any article embodying a design created without knowledge of, and copying from, a protected design.

(c) A person who incorporates into his own product of manufacture an infringing article acquired from others in the ordinary course of business, or who, without knowledge of the protected design, makes or processes an infringing article for the account of another person in the ordinary course of business, shall not be deemed an infringer except under the conditions of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraphs (a)(2) of this section. Accepting an order or reorder from the source of the infringing article shall be deemed ordering or reordering within the meaning of clause (ii) of paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

(d) An "infringing article" as used herein is any article, the design of which has been copied from the protected design, without the consent of the proprietor: *Provided, however,* That an illustration or picture of a protected design in an advertisement, book, periodical, newspaper, photograph, broadcast, motion picture, or similar medium shall not be deemed to be an infringing article. An article is not an infringing article if it embodies, in common with the protected design, only elements described in subsections (a) through (d) of section 2.

(e) The party alleging rights in a design in any action or proceeding shall have the burden of affirmatively establishing its originality whenever the opposing party introduces an earlier work which is identical to such design, or so similar as to make a prima facie showing that such design was copied from such work.

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION

SEC. 9. (a) Protection under this Act shall be lost if application for registration of the design is not made within six months after the date on which the design was first made public as provided in section 4(b).

(b) Application for registration or renewal may be made by the proprietor of the design.

(c) The application for registration shall be made to the Administrator and shall state: (1) the name and address of the author or authors of the design; (2) the name and address of the proprietor if different from the author; (3) the specific name of the article, indicating its utility; (4) the date when the design was first made public as provided in section 4(b); and (5) such other information as may be required by the Administrator. The application for registration may include a description setting forth the salient features of the design, but the absence of such a description shall not prevent registration under this Act.

(d) The application for registration shall be accompanied by a statement under oath by the applicant or his duly authorized agent or representative, setting forth that, to the best of his knowledge and belief: (1) the design is original and was created by the author or authors named in the application; (2) the design has not previously been registered on behalf of the applicant or his predecessor in title; (3) the design has been made public as provided in section 4(b); and (4) the applicant is the person entitled to protection and to registration under this Act. If the design has been made public with the design notice prescribed in section 6, the statement shall also describe the exact form and position of the design notice.

(e) Error in any statement or assertion as to the utility of the article named in the application, the design of which is sought to be registered, shall not affect the protection secured under this Act.

(f) Errors in omitting a joint author or in naming an alleged joint author shall not affect the validity of the registration, or the actual ownership or the protection of the design: *Provided,* That the name of one individual who was in fact an author is stated in the application. Where the design was made within the regular scope of the author's employment and individual authorship of the design is difficult or impossible to ascribe and the application so states, the name and address of the employer for whom the design was made may be stated instead of that of the individual author.

(g) The application for registration shall be accompanied by two copies of a drawing or other pictorial representation of the useful article having one or more views adequate to show the design, in a form and style suitable for reproduction, which shall be deemed a part of the application.

(h) Related useful articles having common design features may be included in the same application under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

BENEFIT OF EARLIER FILING DATE IN FOREIGN COUNTRY

SEC. 10. An application for registration of a design filed in this country by any person who has, or whose legal representative or predecessor or successor in title has previously regularly filed an application for registration of the same design in a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States shall have the same effect as if filed in this country on the date on which the application was first filed in any such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within six months from the earliest date on which any such foreign application was filed.

OATHS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SEC. 11. Oaths and acknowledgments required by this Act may be made before any person in the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States authorized to administer oaths, or before any official authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country concerned, whose authority shall be proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and shall be valid if they comply with the laws of the state or country where made.

EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION AND ISSUE OR REFUSAL OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 12. (a) Upon the filing of an application for registration in proper form as provided in section 9, and upon payment of the fee provided in section 15, the Administrator shall determine whether or not the application relates to a design which on its face appears to be subject to protection under this Act, and if so, he shall register the design. Registration under this subsection shall be announced by publication.

(b) If, in his judgment, the application for registration relates to a design which on its face is not subject to protection under this Act, the Administrator shall send the applicant a notice of his refusal to register and the grounds therefor. Within three months from the date the notice of refusal is sent, the applicant may request, in writing, reconsideration of his application. After consideration of such a request, the Administrator shall either register the design or send the applicant a notice of his final refusal to register.

(c) Any person who believes he is or will be damaged by a registration under this Act may, upon payment of the prescribed fee, apply to the Administrator at any time to cancel the registration on the ground that the design is not subject to protection under the provisions of this Act, stating the reasons therefor. Upon receipt of an application for cancellation, the Administrator shall send the proprietor of the design, as shown in the records of the Office of the Administrator, a notice of said application, and the proprietor shall have a period of three months from the date such notice was mailed in which to present arguments in support of the validity of the registration. It shall also be within the authority of the Administrator to establish, by regulation, conditions under which the opposing parties may appear and be heard in support of their arguments. If, after the periods provided for the presentation of arguments have expired, the Administrator determines that the applicant for cancellation has established that the design is not subject to protection under the provisions of this Act, he shall order the registration stricken from the record. Cancellation under this subsection shall be announced by publication, and notice of the Administrator's final determination with respect to any application for cancellation shall be sent to the applicant and to the proprietor of record. Remedy against such a final determination may be had by means of a civil action against the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of section 1361 of title 28, United States Code, if commenced within such time after such decision, not less than sixty days, as the Administrator appoints.

(d) When a design has been registered under this section, the lack of utility of any article in which it has been embodied shall be no defense to an infringement action under section 20, and no ground for cancellation under subsection (c) of this section or under section 23.

### CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 13. Certificates of registration shall be issued in the name of the United States under the seal of the Office of the Administrator and shall be recorded in the official records of that Office. The certificate shall state the name of the useful article, the date of filing of the application, the date on which the design was first made public as provided in section 4(b) or any earlier date as set forth in section 5(b), and shall contain a reproduction of the drawing or other pictorial representation showing the design. Where a description of the salient features of the design appears in the application, this description shall also appear in the certificate. A renewal certificate shall contain the date of renewal registration in addition to the foregoing. A certificate of initial or renewal registration shall be admitted in any court as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein.

### PUBLICATION OF ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INDEXES

SEC. 14. (a) The Administrator shall publish lists and indexes of registered designs and cancellations thereof and may also publish the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs for sale or other distribution.

(b) The Administrator shall establish and maintain a file of the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs, which file shall be available for use by the public under such conditions as the Administrator may prescribe.

### FEES

SEC. 15. (a) There shall be paid to the Administrator the following fees:

(1) On filing each application for registration or for renewal of registration of a design, $15.

(2) For each additional related article included in one application, $10.

(3) for recording assignments, $3 for the first six pages, and for each additional two pages or less, $1.

(4) For a certificate of correction of an error not the fault of the Office, $10.

(5) For certification of copies of records, $1.

(6) On filing each application for cancellation of a registration, $15.

(b) The Administrator may establish charges for materials or services furnished by the Office, not specified above, reasonably related to the cost thereof.

### REGULATIONS

SEC. 16. The Administrator may establish regulations not inconsistent with law for the administration of this Act.

### COPIES OF RECORDS

SEC. 17. Upon payment of the prescribed fee, any person may obtain a certified copy of any official record of the Office of the Administrator, which copy shall be admissible in evidence with the same effect as the original.

### CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN CERTIFICATES

SEC. 18. The Administrator may correct any error in a registration incurred through the fault of the Office, or, upon payment of the required fee, any error of a clerical or typographical nature not the fault of the Office occurring in good faith, by a certificate of correction under seal. Such registration, together with the certificate, shall thereafter have the same effect as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form.

### OWNERSHIP AND TRANSFER

SEC. 19. (a) The property right in a design subject to protection under this Act shall vest in the author, the legal representatives of a deceased author or of one under legal incapacity, the employer for whom the author created the design in the case of a design made within the regular scope of the author's employment, or a person to whom the rights of the author or of such employer have been transferred. The person or persons in whom the property right is vested shall be considered the proprietor of the design.

(b) The property right in a registered design, or a design for which an application for registration has been or may be filed, may be assigned, granted, conveyed, or mortgaged by an instrument in writing, signed by the proprietor, or may be bequeathed by will.

(c) An acknowledgment as provided in section 11 shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, grant, conveyance, or mortgage.

(d) An assignment, grant, conveyance, or mortgage shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee for a valuable consideration, without notice, unless it is recorded in the Office of the Administrator within three months from its date of execution or prior to the date of such subsequent purchase or mortgage.

### REMEDY FOR INFRINGEMENT

SEC. 20. The proprietor of a design shall have remedy for infringement by civil action instituted after (1) the issuance of a certificate of registration of the design, or (2) the final refusal of registration of the design by the Administrator notwithstanding the due filing and prosecution of an application therefor in proper form: *Provided, however,* That such action is commenced within one year after such final refusal and that the Administrator is given notice by the plaintiff of the commencement of the action.

### INJUNCTION

SEC. 21. The several courts having jurisdiction of actions under this Act may grant injunctions in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent infringement, including in their discretion, prompt relief by temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunction.

### RECOVERY FOR INFRINGEMENT, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 22. (a) Upon finding for the claimant the court shall award him damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than the reasonable value of the use made of the design by the infringer, and the costs of the action. When the damages are not found by a jury, the court shall assess them. In either event the court may increase the damages to such amount, not exceeding $5,000 or $1 per copy, whichever is greater, as to the court shall appear to be just. The damages awarded in any of the above circumstances shall constitute compensation and not a penalty. The court may receive expert testimony as an aid to the determination of damages.

(b) No recovery under paragraph (a) shall be had for any infringement committed more than three years prior to the filing of the complaint.

(c) The court may award reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing party.

(d) The court may order that all infringing articles, and any plates, molds, patterns, models, or other means specifically adapted for making the same be delivered up for destruction or other disposition as the court may direct.

### POWER OF COURT OVER REGISTRATION

SEC. 23. In any action involving a design for which protection is sought under this Act, the court when appropriate may order registration of a design or the cancellation of a registration. Any such order shall be certified by the court to the Administrator, who shall make appropriate entry upon the records of his Office.

### LIABILITY FOR ACTION ON REGISTRATION FRAUDULENTLY OBTAINED

SEC. 24. Any person who shall bring an action for infringement knowing that registration of the design was obtained by a false or fraudulent representation materially affecting the rights under this Act, shall be liable in the sum of $1,000, or such part thereof as the court may determine, as compensation to the defendant, to be charged against the plaintiff and paid to the defendant, in addition to such costs and attorney's fees of the defendant as may be assessed by the court.

### PENALTY FOR FALSE MARKING

SEC. 25. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of deceiving the public, marks upon, or applies to, or uses in advertising in connection with any article made, used, distributed, or sold by him, the design of which is not protected under this Act, a design notice as specified in section 6 or any other words or symbols importing that the design is protected under this Act, knowing that the design is not so protected, shall be fined not more than $500 for every such offense.

(b) Any person may sue for the penalty, in which event, one-half shall go to the person suing and the other to the use of the United States.

### PENALTY FOR FALSE REPRESENTATION

SEC. 26. Whoever knowingly makes a false representation materially affecting the rights obtainable under this Act for the purpose of obtaining registration of a design under this Act shall be fined not less than $500 and not more than $1,000, and any rights or privileges he may have in the design under this Act shall be forfeited.

### RELATION TO COPYRIGHT LAW

SEC. 27. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect any right or remedy now or hereafter held by any person under title 17 of the United States Code.

(b) When a pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work in which copyright subsists under title 17 of the United States Code is utilized in an original ornamental design of a useful article, by the copyright proprietor or under an express license from him, the design shall be eligible for protection under the provisions of this Act.

### RELATION TO PATENT LAW

SEC. 28. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect any right or remedy available to or held by any person under title 35 of the United States Code.

(b) The issuance of a design patent for an ornamental design for an article of manufacture under said title 35 shall terminate any protection of the design under this Act.

### COMMON LAW AND OTHER RIGHTS UNAFFECTED

SEC. 29. Nothing in this Act shall annul or limit (1) common law or other rights or remedies, if any, available to or held by any person with respect to a design which has not been made public as provided in section 4(b), or (2) any trademark right or right to be protected against unfair competition.

### ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 30. The Administrator and Office of the Administrator referred to in this Act shall be such officer and office as the President may designate.

### SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 31. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act or the application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby

### AMENDMENT OF COPYRIGHT LAW

SEC. 32. Chapter I of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding the following:

"§ 33. Ornamental design of useful article not subject to deposit; effect of utilization of copyrighted work in design of useful article

"(a) For purposes of deposit under sections 12 and 13 of this title, the Copyright Office shall in no case be required to accept for deposit a useful article even if it embodies a pictoral, graphic, or sculptural work, but nothing in this subsection shall preclude deposit and registration of pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works that portray useful articles or that are intended for utilization in the designs of useful articles.

"(b) When a pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work in which copyright subsists under this title is utilized in an original ornamental design of a useful article, by the copyright proprietor or under an express license from him, the design shall be eligible for protection under the provisions of the Design Protection Act of 1963.

"(c) Protection under this title of a work in which copyright subsists shall terminate with respect to its utilization in useful articles whenever the copyright proprietor has obtained registration of an ornamental design of a useful article embodying said work under the provisions of the Design Protection Act of 1963. Unless and until the copyright proprietor has obtained such registration, the copyrighted pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work shall continue in all respects to be covered by and subject to the protection afforded by the copyright subsisting under this title. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to create any additional rights or protection under this title.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall affect any right or remedy held by any person under this title in a work in which copyright was subsisting on the effective date of the Design Protection Act of 1963, or with respect to any utilization of a copyrighted work other than in the design of a useful article.

"(e) A 'useful article' as used in this section is an article which in normal use has an intrinsic utilitarian function that is not merely to portray the appearance of the article or to convey information. An article which is normally a part of a useful article shall be deemed to be a useful article."

### AMENDMENT OF OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 33. (a) Subdivision a(2) of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended (11 U.S.C. 110(a)), is amended by inserting "designs," after "patent rights," and "design registration," after "application for patent,".

(b) Title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by inserting "designs," after "patents," in first sentence of section 1338(a);

(2) by inserting ", design," after "patent" in the second sentence of section 1338(a);

(3) by inserting "design," after "copyright," in section 1338(b);

(4) by inserting "and registered designs" after "copyrights" in section 1400; and

(5) by revising section 1498(a) to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever a registered design or invention is used or manufactured by or for the United States without license of the owner thereof or lawful right to use or manufacture the same, the owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such use and manufacture.

"For the purposes of this section, the use or manufacture of a registered design or an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.

"The court shall not award compensation under this section if the claim is based on the use or manufacture by or for the United States of any article owned, leased, used by, or in the possession of the United States, prior to, in the case of an invention, July 1, 1918, and in the case of a registered design, January 1, 1965.

"A Government employee shall have the right to bring suit against the Government under this section except where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce use of the registered design or invention by the Government. This section shall not confer a right of action on any registrant or patentee or any assignee of such registrant or patentee with respect to any design created by or invention discovered or invented by a person while in the employment or service of the United States, where the design or invention was related to the official functions of the employee, in cases in which such functions included research and development, or in the making of which Government time, materials, or facilities were used."

### TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 34. This Act shall take effect one year after its enactment.

### NO RETROACTIVE EFFECT

SEC. 35. Protection under this Act shall not be available for any design that has been made public as provided in section 4(b) prior to the effective date of this Act.

### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 36. This Act may be cited as "The Design Protection Act of 1963."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 680), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying. The bill is intended to offer the creator of ornamental designs of useful articles a new form of protection directed toward the special problems arising in the design field, and is intended to avoid the defects of the existing copyright and design patent statutes by providing simple, easily secured and effective design protection for the period of 5 years, or, if renewed, a period of 10 years, under appropriate safeguards and conditions.

Such designs are presently protected by design patents issued under title 35, United States Code, if they meet the requirements of title 35. A design patent may not be issued until a search has been made to determine that such design possesses novelty. The design patent law, while affording protection to some designs, has proved inadequate to protect those whose designs have only a short life expectancy.

The present copyright statute is equally inappropriate for the protection of such designs. The term of copyright protection is too long for the majority of designs. The scope of copyright protection is too broad, while the notice and registration requirements do not fit the needs of design protection. Also, the copyright law protects only those designs which can be separately identified as "works of art."

Because of the limitations of both the design patent and copyright laws, this legislation proposes to establish a new form of protection for "original ornamental designs of useful articles." The subject matter of the bill is limited to designs of useful articles, the term "design" referring to those features of the useful article intended to give it an ornamental appearance. The protection provided by this legislation would begin when a useful article, bearing the design, is made public, and would last for 5 or, if renewed, 10 years.

Nothing in this legislation would affect any rights or remedies presently available under titles 17 and 35 of the United States Code.

### ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATION

An analysis of the provisions of S. 776 follows:

Section 1(a) provides that the author of an original ornamental design of a useful article may secure the protection provided by this bill upon complying with certain provisions. Section 1(b) defines the terms "useful article," "design of a useful article," "ornamental," and "original."

Section 2 of the bill specifies that protection under this bill shall not be available for a design that is not original, staple, or commonplace; different from a design that is staple or commonplace only in insignificant details; or dictated solely by a utilitarian function of the article that embodies it.

Section 3 provides that protection for a design shall be available notwithstanding the employment in the design of subject matter excluded from protection under section 2 if the design is a substantial revision, adaptation, or rearrangement of said subject matter, provided that such protection shall be available to a design employing subject matter protected under titles 17 or 35 of the United States Code or under this legislation only if such protected subject matter is employed with the consent of the proprietor thereof. It is further provided that such protection shall be independent of any subsisting protection in subject matter employed in the design, and shall not be construed as securing any right to subject matter excluded from protection or as extending any subsisting protection.

Section 4(a) provides that the protection provided for a design shall commence upon the date when the design is first made public. It is provided in section 4(b) that a design is best made public when an article embodying the design is anywhere publicly exhibited, publicly distributed, or offered for sale to the public.

Section 5(a) provides that the protection provided for a design by this legislation shall continue for a term of 5 years from the date of the commencement of protection but if an application for renewal is received during the year prior to the expiration of the 5-year term, the protection shall be extended for an additional period of 5 years from the date of expiration of the first 5 years. It is provided in section 5(b) that when the design notice actually applied shows a date earlier than the date of commencement of protection, protection shall terminate as though the term had commenced at the earlier date.

Section 5(c) declares that where the distinguishing elements of a design are in substantially the same form in a number of useful articles, the design shall be protected as to all such articles when protected as to one of them, but no more than one registration will be required.

Section 6(a) provides that whenever any design for which protection is sought is made public, the proprietor shall mark it or have it marked with a design notice consisting of the three specified elements.

Section 6(b) requires that the notice shall be so located as to give reasonable notice of design protection while the useful article embodying the design is passing through its normal channels of commerce.

Section 6(c) specifies that the removal, destruction, or obliteration by others of the design notice shall not affect protection under this bill when the proprietor of a design has complied with the provisions of this section.

Section 7 declares that the omission of the notice prescribed in section 6 shall not cause loss of the protection or prevent recovery for infringement against persons who, after written notice of the design protection, begins an undertaking leading to infringement. However, such omission shall prevent recovery against a person who began an undertaking leading to infringement before receiving notice, and no injunction shall be issued unless the proprietor of the design shall reimburse for any reasonable expenditure or obligation in connection with undertakings incurred before written notice of design protection.

Section 8(a) provides that it shall be infringement of a design for any person without the consent of the proprietor of a design to make, have made, or import, for sale or for use in trade, any infringing article or sell or distribute for sale or for use in trade any such infringing article. It is provided that a seller or distributor of any article who did not make or import the same shall be deemed to be an infringer only if he induced or acted in collusion with a manufacturer to make or an importer to import such article or if he refuses or fails to make a prompt disclosure of his source of such article, and he orders or reorders such article after having received a personal written notice of the protection subsisting in the design.

Section 8(b) provides that it shall not be infringement to make, have made, import, sell, or distribute any article embodying a design created without knowledge of, and copying from, a protected design.

Section 8(c) specifies that a person who incorporates into his own product of manufacture an infringing article acquired from others in the ordinary course of business or who, without knowledge of the protected design, makes or processes an infringing article for the account of another person in the ordinary course of business shall not be deemed an infringer except under the conditions set forth in the section.

Section 8(d) defines what constitutes an "infringing article."

Section 8(e) requires that the party in an action alleging the validity of a registered design shall have the burden of affirmatively establishing its originality whenever the opposing party introduces an earlier work which is identical to such design or so similar as to make a prima facie showing that the registered design was copied from such work.

Section 9(a) provides that protection shall be lost if application for registration of the design is not made within 6 months after the date on which the design was first made public.

Section 9(b) specifies that application for registration or renewal may be made by the proprietor of the design.

Section 9(c) requires that the application for registration shall be made to the Administrator and states the matters which shall be included in the application.

Section 9(d) requires that the application shall be accompanied by a statement under oath and sets forth the matter that must be sworn to by the applicant.

Section 9(e) guarantees that error in any statement or assertion as to the utility of the article shall not affect protection under the act.

Section 9(f) provides that errors in omitting a joint author or in naming an alleged joint author shall not affect the validity of the registration, or the actual ownership for the protection of the design, provided that the name of one individual who was in fact an author is stated in the application.

Section 9(g) provides that the application shall be accompanied by two copies of a drawing or other pictorial representation of the useful article.

Section 9(h) permits related articles having common design features be included in the same application under prescribed conditions.

Section 10 provides that an application for registration of a design in this country by a person who has previously filed an application for registration of the same design in a foreign country which affords similar privileges to U.S. citizens, shall have the same effect as if filed in this country on the date on which the application was first filed in any such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within 6 months from the earliest date on which any such foreign application was filed.

Section 11 prescribes the procedures for the administering of the oaths and acknowledgements required by this act.

Section 12(a) provides that upon the filing of an application and upon payment of the fee, the Administrator shall determine whether or not the application relates to a design which, on its face, appears to be subject to protection and if so, shall register the design. It is further provided in section 12(b) that if the Administrator determines that the application on its face relates to a design which is not subject to protection, the Administrator shall notify the applicant, who shall have 3 months in which to request reconsideration of his application. After consideration of such a request, the Administrator shall either register the design or send the applicant a notice of final refusal to register.

Section 12(c) provides that any person who believes he is or may be damaged by a registration may, upon payment of a fee, apply to the Administrator at any time to cancel any registration on the ground that the design is not subject to protection. This section further provides for the procedures to be followed in such cancellation proceedings.

Section 12(d) provides that when a design has been registered, the lack of utility of any article in which it has been embodied shall be no defense to an infringement action and no ground for cancellation.

Section 13 authorizes the issuance of certificates of registration and provides for the contents thereof.

Section 14(a) instructs the Administrator to publish lists and indexes of registered designs and cancellations thereof and authorizes him to publish the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs.

Section 14(b) instructs the Administrator to establish and maintain a file of the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs.

Section 15(a) specifies the fees which shall be paid to the Administrator.

Section 15(b) authorizes the Administrator to establish charges for materials or services furnished by the Office.

Section 16 authorizes the Administrator to establish regulations for the administration of this legislation.

Section 17 provides for the obtaining of certified copies of official records of the Office of the Administrator.

Section 18 authorizes the Administrator to correct errors in registration incurred through the fault of the Office of the Administrator.

Section 19(a) identifies those in whom the property right in the design shall rest and provides that the person or persons in whom the property right is vested shall be considered the proprietor of the design.

Section 19(b) provides for the transfer of ownership of the property right in a registered design or a design for which an application for registration has been or may be filed.

Section 19(c) specifies that an acknowledgment, as provided in section 11, shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, grant, or conveyance.

Section 19(d) provides that an assignment, grant, or conveyance shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee for a valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded in the Office of the Administrator within 3 months from its date of execution or prior to the date of such subsequent purchase or mortgage.

Section 20 provides that the proprietor of a design shall have a remedy for infringement by civil action instituted after the issuance of a certificate of registration of the design, or the final refusal of registration of the design by the Administrator.

Section 21 authorizes the granting of injunctions for the prevention of infringements.

Section 22(a) provides that the court, upon finding for the claimant, shall award damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than the reasonable value of the use made of the design by the infringer, and the costs of the action. It is further provided that the court may increase the damages to such amount, not exceeding $5,000 or $1 per copy, whichever is greater, as to the court shall appear to be just.

Section 22(b) excludes recovery for any infringement committed more than 3 years prior to the filing of the complaint.

Section 22(c) permits the court to award reasonable attorney fees.

Section 22(d) authorizes the court to order the destruction or other disposition of all infringing articles and devices employed in the making of the same.

Section 23 authorizes the court to order a cancellation of a registration.

Section 24 provides a penalty for any person bringing an action for infringement knowing that registration of the design was obtained by a false representation.

Section 25(a) provides a penalty for the false marking of a design which is not protected under this legislation.

Section 25(b) specifies as to who shall have a right of action to sue for the penalty.

Section 26 provides a penalty for whoever knowingly makes a false representation materially affecting rights obtainable under this legislation.

Section 27(a) makes clear that nothing in this legislation shall affect any right or remedy now or hereafter held by any person under title 17 of the United States Code.

Section 27(b) specifies that when a work in which copyright subsists under title 17 of the United States Code is utilized in an original ornamental design of a useful article, the design shall be eligible for protection under the provisions of this legislation.

Section 28(a) provides that nothing in this legislation shall affect any right or remedy available to any person under title 35 of the United States Code.

Section 28(b) provides that the issuance of a design patent for an ornamental design under title 35 shall terminate any protection of the design under this legislation.

Section 29 specifies that nothing in this legislation shall restrict (1) common law or other rights or remedies available with respect to a design which has not been made public as provided in section 4(b), or (2) any trademark right or right to be protected against unfair competition.

Section 30 provides that the Administrator and Office of the Administrator shall be such officer and office as the President may designate.

Section 31 guarantees that if any provision of this bill or the application of such provision is held invalid, the remainder of the legislation or application shall not be affected.

Section 32 provides that chapter I of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding a section 33 pertaining to the "ornamental design of useful article not subject to deposit; effect of utilization of copyrighted work in design of useful article."

Subsection (a) would provide that the Copyright Office shall in no case be required to accept for deposit a useful article even if it embodies a pictorial, graphic or sculptural work, but it is further provided that nothing in this subsection shall preclude deposit and registration of such works that portray useful articles or that are intended for utilization in the designs of useful articles.

Subsection (b) would provide that when a work in which copyright subsists under this title is utilized in an original ornamental design of a useful article, the design, shall be eligible for protection under this legislation.

Subsection (c) provides that protection under this title of a work in which copyright subsists would terminate with respect to the design of a useful article in which the work has been utilized whenever the copyright proprietor has obtained registration of an ornamental design of a useful article embodying such works under the provisions of this legislation. It is further provided that unless and until the copyright proprietor has obtained such registration, the copyrighted work shall continue in all respects to be covered by the protection afforded by the copyright subsisting under title 17 of the United States Code.

Subsection (d) would provide that nothing in this section shall affect any right or remedy held by any person under this title in a work in which copyright was subsisting on the effective date of this legislation, or with respect to any utilization of a copyrighted work other than in the design of a useful article.

Subsection (e) would define "useful article" as used in this section.

Subsection 33 makes minor amendments to the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898 (11 U.S.C. 110(a)); and title 28 of the United States Code.

Section 34 specifies that this legislation shall take effect 1 year after its enactment.

Section 35 provides that this legislation shall have no retroactive effect.

Section 36 states that this legislation may be cited as the Design Protection Act of 1963.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 579) for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova was announced as next in order.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Over.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be passed over.

## LIVIA SERNINI (CUCCIATI)

The bill (S. 2242) for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Livia Sernini (Cucciati) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

## AMENDMENT OF TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE—WRITTEN DECLARATION IN LIEU OF OATH

The bill (S. 2040) to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new sections after section 24:

"§ 25. Declaration in lieu of oath

"(a) The Commissioner may by rule prescribe that any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration in such form as the Commissioner may prescribe, such declaration to be in lieu of the oath otherwise required.

"(b) Whenever such written declaration is used, the document must warn the declarant that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C 1001).

"§ 26. Effect of defective execution

"Any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be executed in a specified manner may be provisionally accepted by the Commissioner despite a defective execution, provided a properly executed document is submitted within such time as may be prescribed."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 2 of title 35, United States Code, immediately preceding section 21, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.

"21. Day for taking action falling on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday.

"22. Printing of papers filed.

"23. Testimony in Patent Office cases.

"24. Subpoenas, witnesses.

"25. Declaration in lieu of oath.

"26. Effect of defective execution."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 689), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to facilitate the procedure of the Patent Office by permitting the Commissioner of Patents to prescribe by rule that any document which presently is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration.

A number of provisions in title 35 of the United States Code and the Trademark Act of 1946 (ch. 22 of title 15 of the United States Code) as well as various other statutes, require an applicant or other party in Patent Office proceedings to execute certain documents under oath. These requirements have added to the workload and expense of the Patent Office and have caused considerable inconvenience to persons seeking to comply with the requirements.

### SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill will permit the Commissioner of Patents to prescribe by rule that any document may be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration in such form as the Commissioner may prescribe. It is also provided that when such a written declaration is permitted by the Commissioner, the document executed by the written declaration must warn the declarant that willful false statements are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both. It is also provided that any document, filed in the Patent Office and required by law, rule, or other regulation to be executed in a specified manner, may be provisionally accepted by the Commissioner, despite a defective execution, if a properly executed oath or declaration, in lieu thereof, is submitted within a time prescribed by the Commissioner.

Section 2 of S. 2040 merely revises the analysis of chapter II, title 35, and incorporates new sections 25 and 26.

After a study of this legislation, the committee adheres to its former endorsement and recommends that the bill, S. 2040, be favorably considered.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is a communication from the Department of Commerce dated February 12, 1963.

## EXTENSION OF PATENT TO UNITED DAUGHTERS OF THE CONFEDERACY

The bill (H.R. 5703) granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 690), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 5703 is to extend and renew design patent No. 29611, the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, for a period of 14 years from the date of enactment of the bill.

### STATEMENT

The report of the Department of Commerce indicates no objection to the enactment of this legislation. H.R. 5703 was approved by the House of Representatives on August 6, 1963. The Senate Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, to which H.R. 5703 was referred, has received no objections to this bill.

The design patent was originally issued on November 8, 1898. It was previously renewed and extended for a period of 14 years by Public Law 242, 69th Congress, approved May 18, 1926, and again by Public Law 220 of the 77th Congress, approved August 18, 1941. The last extension of the patent expired on August 18, 1955.

Paragraph (b) of the proposed legislation provides that no person who has manufactured the design of such patent between August 18, 1955, and the date of enactment of this act shall be held liable for infringement of this patent by the continued manufacture and sale thereof. This, of course, will preclude any penalty for manufacturing such design during that time.

The Senate during the 85th Congress passed a bill (S. 732) to extend the design patent but no action was taken in the House. The report of this committee on S. 732, 85th Congress, reads in part as follows:

"The design patent referred to undertakes to protect the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. In the report of the Secretary of Commerce on this legislation it is stated that the Department generally opposes the extensions of patents but that an exception has been made with respect to legislation extending the statutory period for design patents for emblems or badges of patriotic, fraternal, or religious organizations and for that reason the Department of Commerce interposes no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

"* * * * *

"It is noted in the report of the Secretary of Commerce that insofar as the records of the Patent Office show, the title to Design Patent No. 29,611 has never been transferred to the United Daughters of the Confederacy but remains in the name of the patentee, Simeon E. Theus. Inquiry was made in relation to this situation, the result of which is expressed in a letter to the Honorable James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, from Senator A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, dated April 15, 1957, in which it is suggested that the bill be amended by inserting the words in line 5, on page 1, after the patent number "which is the insignia of the United Daughters of the Confederacy."

"It is intended that such amendment will at least give some recognition to the rights of the United Daughters of the Confederacy to continue official use of the design insignia even though there is not a record of assignment by the original patentee. Apparently, this has been the intent of the Congress over the years because, as indicated, there have been two extensions of this patent in the name of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and further, that it is not the policy of the Congress nor of the Patent Office to recommend extension of this type of patent unless it is in the interests of patriotic, fraternal, or religious organizations."

After a study of this matter the committee concurs in the action of the House and recommends that the bill, H.R. 5703, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are the report of the Department of Commerce on H.R. 5703, dated September 25, 1963, the Secretary of Commerce on S. 732, 85th Congress, and a letter from Senator Robertson to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 15, 1957.

---

## DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY

The bill (S. 1832) granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of said supplemental compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof:

"Supplemental Agreement Between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey Further Amending and Supplementing the Agreement Entitled 'Agreement Between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey Creating The Delaware River Joint Commission as a Body Corporate and Politic and Defining Its Powers and Duties' Enlarging the Public Purposes of the Delaware River Port Authority and Extending Its Jurisdiction, Powers and Duties and Defining Such Additional Purposes, Jurisdiction, Powers and Duties

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

"(1) Article I of the compact or agreement entitled 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating The Delaware River Joint Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its power and duties,' which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge Commission by its members on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and which was consented to by the Congress of the United States by Public Resolution Number twenty-six, being chapter two hundred fifty-eight of the Public Laws, Seventy-second Congress, approved June fourteenth, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, as heretofore amended and supplemented, is amended to read as follows:

" 'ARTICLE I

" 'The body corporate and politic, heretofore created and known as The Delaware River Joint Commission, hereby is continued under the name of The Delaware River Port Authority (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and which shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

" '(a) The operation and maintenance of the bridge, owned jointly by the two States, across the Delaware River between the City of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the City of Camden in the State of New Jersey, including its approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

" '(b) The effectuation, establishment, construction, operation and maintenance of railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any bridge or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission, including extensions of such railroad or other facilities within the City of Camden and the City of Philadelphia necessary for efficient operation in the Port District.

" '(c) The improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes by or through the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any and all projects for the improvement and development of the Port District for port purposes, or directly related thereto, either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner.

" '(d) Cooperation with all other bodies interested or concerned with, or affected by the promotion, development or use of the Delaware River and the Port District.

" '(e) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable any project within its powers to be carried forward.

" '(f) The construction, acquisition, operation and maintenance of other bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, between the City of Philadelphia or the County of Delaware in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the State of New Jersey, including approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

" '(g) The promotion as a highway of commerce of the Delaware River, and the promotion of increased passenger and freight commerce on the Delaware River and for such purpose the publication of literature and the adoption of any other means as may be deemed appropriate.

" '(h) To study and make recommendations to the proper authorities for the improvement of terminal, lighterage, wharfage, warehouse and other facilities necessary for the promotion of commerce on the Delaware River.

" '(i) Institution through its counsel, or such other counsel as it shall designate, or intervention in, any litigation involving rates, preferences, rebates or other matters vital to the interest of the Port District: *Provided,* That notice of any such institution of or intervention in litigation shall be given promptly to the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey, and provision for such notices shall be made in a resolution authorizing any such intervention or litigation and shall be incorporated in the minutes of the commission.

" '(j) The establishment, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction and operation of a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail, and baggage, or any of them, between points in New Jersey within the Port District and within a thirty-five (35 mile radius of the City of Camden, New Jersey, and points within the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and intermediate points. Such system may be established by utilizing existing rapid transit systems, railroad facilities, highways and bridges within the territory involved and by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary, and may be established either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner.

" '(k) The performance of such other functions which may be of mutual benefit to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey insofar as concerns the promotion and development of the Port District for port purposes and the use of its facilities by commercial vessels.'

"(1) The performance or effectuation of such additional bridge, tunnel, railroad, rapid transit, transportation, transportation facility, terminal, terminal facility, and port improvement and development purposes within the Port District as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it by the action of either State concurred in by legislation of the other.

"(2) Said compact or agreement is further amended and supplemented by adding thereto, as a part thereof, following Article XII–A thereof, a new article reading as follows:

### " 'ARTICLE XII-B

" '(1) In addition to other public purposes provided for it and other powers and duties conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other article hereof, the Commission shall have among its authorized purposes, and it shall have the power to effectuate, the construction, operation, and maintenance of a bridge for vehicular traffic across the Delaware River, between a point or points in the Township of Logan, New Jersey, and a point or points in the City of Chester, Pennsylvania, including approaches thereto.

" '(2) In addition to other public purposes provided for it and other powers and duties conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other article hereof, the Commission shall have among its authorized purposes, and it shall have the power to effectuate, the establishment, rehabilitation, equipment, construction, maintenance and operation of ferries for passengers and vehicular traffic over and across the Delaware River within the Port District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey. Such ferries may be established either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner, and may be established by utilizing any existing ferries within the Port District across the Delaware River between said Commonwealth and said State and by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary. Any such ferry may include such approach highways and interests in land or other property necessary therefor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey as may be determined by the Commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of any such ferry or to connect any such ferry with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or said State.

" '(3) (a) For the effectuation of any of its purposes authorized by this article, the Commission is hereby granted, in addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it, power and authority to acquire in its name by purchase or otherwise, on such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem proper, or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, any such land and other property which it may determine is reasonably necessary to acquire for any of its purposes authorized by this article and any and all rights, title and interest in such land and other property, including public lands, parks, playgrounds, reservations, highways, or parkways, owned by or in which any county, city, borough, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has any right, title or interest, or parts thereof or rights therein, and any fee simple absolute or any lesser interest in private property, and any fee simple absolute in, easements upon, or the benefit of restrictions upon, abutting property to preserve and protect such land and other property. Upon the exercise of the power of eminent domain under this paragraph, the compensation to be paid with regard to property located in the State of New Jersey shall be ascertained and paid in the manner provided in Title 20 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey insofar as the provisions thereof are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions contained in this paragraph, and with regard to property located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall be ascertained and paid in the manner provided by the act approved the ninth day of July, one thousand nine hundred nineteen (Pamphlet Laws 814) and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, insofar as the provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions contained in this paragraph. The Commission may join in separate subdivisions in one petition or complaint the descriptions of any number of tracts or parcels of such land and other property to be condemned, and the names of any number of owners and other parties who may have an interest herein, and all such land and other property included in said petition or complaint may be condemned in a single proceeding: *Provided, however,* That separate awards shall be made for each tract or parcel of such land or other property: *And provided further,* That each of said tracts or parcels of such land or other property lies wholly in or has a substantial part of its value lying wholly within the same county.

" '(b) Whenever the Commission acquires under this paragraph (3) the whole or any part of the right of way of a public utility located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Commission shall, at its own expense, provide a substitute right of way on another and favorable location. Such public utility shall thereupon provide for the transfer to, or reconstruction upon, in, under or above said substitute right of way of any structures and facilities of said public utility located upon, in, under or above said original right of way at the time the same is so acquired. The Commission is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with such public utility to contribute toward the expense of such transfer or reconstruction, and in the event that they are unable to agree on the amount to be paid, the matter shall be referred to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission which shall, after hearing thereon, make a finding of the amount to be paid to such public utility by the Commission. In case of failure of such public utility, within a reasonable time after notice so to do, to remove its facilities to such substitute right of way, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission shall have jurisdiction, on petition of the Commission, to order such transfer or reconstruction. Any party to such proceedings shall have the right of appeal from the ruling of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. The Delaware River Port Authority is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, any necessary land or right of way for the relocation of any such public utility right of way and facilities. The substitute right of way thus acquired shall be equal in estate to the original right of way acquired from the public utility, and the Commission shall deliver to the public utility a deed, duly executed and acknowledged, conveying to it an estate in the substitute right of way at least equal to that owned by the public utility in the original right of way, or if such substitute right of way is to be acquired by purchase, the Commission shall procure and deliver to the public utility a deed conveying such estate to it from the owner of the land on which such substitute right of way is located.

" 'This subparagraph (b) shall have no application to the relocation of public utility facilities located in the beds of public streets, roads or highways.

" '(c) In addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it, the Commission, in connection with construction or operation of any project for the effectuation of any of its purposes authorized by this article, shall have power to make reasonable regulations for the installation, construction, maintenance, repair, renewal, relocation and removal of tracks, pipes, mains, conduits, cables, wires, towers, poles or any other equipment and appliances (in this subparagraph (c) called "works") located in the State of New Jersey of any public utility as defined in section 48:2–13 of the revised statutes of New Jersey, in, on, along, over or under any such project. Whenever in connection with the construction or operation of any such project the Commission shall determine that it is necessary that any such works, which now are or hereafter may be located in, on, along, over or under any such project should be relocated in such project, or should be removed therefrom, the public utility owning or operating such works shall relocate or remove the same in accordance with the order of the Commission: *Provided, however,* That, except in the case of the relocation or removal of such works located in, on, along, over or under public streets, roads or highways, the cost and expenses of such relocation or removal, including the cost of installing such works in a new location or new locations, and the cost of any lands or any rights or interest in lands or any other rights acquired to accomplish such relocation or removal, less the cost of any lands or any rights or interests in lands or any other rights of the public utility paid to the public utility in connection with the relocation or removal of such works, shall be paid by the Commission and shall be included in the cost of such project. In case of any such relocation or removal of works as aforesaid, the public utility owning or operating the same, its successors or assigns, may maintain and operate such works, with the necessary appurtenances, in the new location or new locations for as long a period, and upon the same terms and conditions, as it had the right to maintain and operate such works in their former location.

" 'In case of any such relocation or removal of works, as aforesaid, the Commission shall own and maintain, repair and renew structures within the rights-of-way of railroad companies carrying any such project over railroads, and the Commission shall bear the cost of maintenance, repair and renewal of structures within the rights-of-way of railroad companies carrying railroads over any such project, but this provision shall not relieve any railroad company from responsibility for damage caused to any authority or railroad structure by the operation of its railroad. Such approaches, curbing, sidewalk paving, guard rails on approaches and surface paving on such projects as shall be within the rights-of-way of a railroad company or companies shall be owned and maintained, repaired and renewed by the Commission; rails, pipes and lines shall be owned and maintained, repaired and renewed by the railroad company or companies.

" '(4) The power and authority granted in this article to the Commission to construct new or additional approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the Commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the Commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

" '(5) The effectuation of any of the purposes authorized by this article, and the exercise or performance by the Commission of any of its powers or duties in connection with effectuation of any such purpose, shall not be subject to any restrictions, limitations or provisions provided for or set forth in Article XII hereof. The bridge or ferries referred to in this article may be established, constructed or erected by the Commission notwithstanding the terms and provisions of any other agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

"'(6) The Commission shall not construct or erect the bridge referred to in this article unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the Commission their written consents to such construction or erection.

"'(7) The Commission is hereby granted the following powers in addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it:

"'(a) To abandon, close off, dismantle, sell or otherwise dispose of, any project or facility, or any part thereof, or any other property, which the Commission may determine to be no longer useful or necessary for public use.

"'(b) To effectuate any of its authorized purposes either directly or indirectly by or through wholly owned subsidiary corporations. Any such subsidiary corporation shall be a public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for such purposes and shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes. Any such subsidiary corporation and any of its property, functions and activities shall have such of the privileges, immunities, tax and other exemptions of the Commission and of the Commission's property, functions and activities, and such of the rights, powers and duties of the Commission, as the Commission shall determine.

"'(8) The power of the Commission, which is hereby confirmed, to purchase, construct, lease, finance, operate, maintain and own a terminal facility consisting in whole or in part of a parking area or place, garage, building, improvement, structure, or other accommodation for the parking or storage of motor or other vehicles, including all real or personal property necessary or desirable in connection therewith, shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement, be exercised only at such place in the vicinity of and in connection with, or as a part of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, railroad, rapid transit system, transportation or terminal facility, as the Commission may determine to be necessary or desirable.'

"In witness whereof, this 25th day of June, 1963, Richard J. Hughes has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached hereto.

"Richard J. Hughes,
*"Governor, State of New Jersey.*

"Attest:

"Robert J. Burkhardt,
*"Secretary of State.*

"In witness whereof, this 26th day of June, 1963, William W. Scranton has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached hereto.

"William W. Scranton,
*"Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.*

"Attest:

"George I. Bloom,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

Sec. 2. Public Laws 573 and 574, being respectively chapter 921 and chapter 922 of the Public Laws, Eighty-second Congress, second session, both approved July 17, 1952, are hereby confirmed and continued and shall be construed to apply to the aforesaid supplemental compact or agreement as if the supplemental compact or agreement had been consented to by such Public Laws.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 691), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to grant the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission. The bill also contains provisions necessary to the implementation of the agreement.

STATEMENT

The bill, S. 1832, would grant the consent of Congress to an interstate compact between Pennsylvania and New Jersey supplementing an earlier agreement consented to by Congress in 1932. The body corporate and politic, established in 1932 and known as the Delaware River Joint Commission, would be continued under the name of the Delaware River Port Authority. It would be empowered to construct and operate bridges, tunnels, railroads, rapid transit systems, and other facilities. The new body would be empowered to cooperate with and make recommendations to other bodies interested in the use or development of the Delaware River.

Senator Clark, introducing the bill, on behalf of himself and Senators Williams of New Jersey, Case, and Scott, stated, July 2, 1963:

"This supplemental compact would increase the jurisdiction of the port authority so that it would have the power to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge for vehicular traffic across the Delaware River at a point between New Jersey and the city of Chester, Pa.

"Approval of the supplemental compact in no way passes upon the merits of any design proposed for the bridge. This is a matter upon which local authorities and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must agree. It simply grants the power to construct and operate a bridge once all interests have agreed upon a specific structure.

"Madam President, the supplemental compact has been agreed to by the Legislatures and signed by the Governors of both New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The compact adds to, and in no way diminishes, the previous powers of the Delaware River Port Authority."

In reporting on the bill, the Department of the Interior stated that enactment of the legislation would not conflict with programs of interest to that Department. There has been no indication that the proposed supplemental compact would in any way intrude upon or interfere with any interest of the United States being administered by any other Government agency. Accordingly, the committee recommends that S. 1832 be given favorable consideration.

Attached is a report submitted by the Department of the Interior on S. 1832 under date of October 18, 1963.

---

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1213) for the relief of World Games, Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## MRS. FUSAKO LEITZEL

The bill (S. 1332) for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Fusako Leitzel may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That if the said Mrs. Fusako Leitzel is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

---

## PIETRO MAGGIO

The bill (S. 1410) for the relief of Pietro Maggio was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Maggio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

---

## HIPOLITO MORA LORILLA

The bill (S. 1549) for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hipolito Mora Lorilla shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

---

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1760) for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1781) for the relief of Antonio Credenza was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

### APOSTOLOS GERONTIS

The bill (S. 1822) for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

### ALVA ARLINGTON GARNES

The bill (S. 1829) for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Alva Arlington Garnes shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil Edgar Taitt, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

### MRS. WILLIAM H. QUASHA

The bill (S. 1943) for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. William H. Quasha, who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 17, 1947, shall be held and considered to have complied with the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act and her petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction,

### DR. GABRIEL ANTERO SANCHEZ (HERNANDEZ)

The bill (S. 1976) for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled,* That Doctor Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez) may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 13, 1960.

### WILLIAM MAURER TRAYFORS

The bill (S. 2085) for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of paragraph (7) of section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William Hoff Trayfors, Junior, a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States, prior to the birth of his minor son, William Maurer Trayfors, for a period of five years after the said William Hoff Trayfors, Junior, had attained the age of fourteen years.

### NICK MASONICH

The bill (H.R. 1221) for the relief of Nick Masonich was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 703), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay Mr. Nick Masonich the sum of $17,000 as final and full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising from an accident that occurred in 1921 which resulted in the loss of his sight.

STATEMENT

H.R. 1221 is a companion bill to S. 29, now pending before this committee. The House of Representatives in its consideration of H.R. 1221 reduced the amount sought by the claimant from $53,946.78 to $17,000, for the reasons that will appear in the language of the House report, which is herein set forth:

"Mr. Masonich suffered the injuries which eventually resulted in the complete loss of his sight on August 17, 1921, when he was working with a station gang employed by the Alaskan Engineering Commission.

"If Mr. Masonich had been injured while working as an employee of the Alaskan Engineering Commission he would have been eligible for benefits provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. However, due to the circumstances of his employment, as more fully described in the attached report of June 26, 1963, from the Department of the Interior, he was not considered to be an employee of the United States within the meaning of the act of September 7, 1916, and hence was not eligible for benefits. The Department in indicating that it has no objection to the bill, if amended as suggested, stated:

"'We believe that there is merit to the argument that the Alaskan Engineering Commission's method of subcontracting construction work to individuals may have unduly deprived Mr. Masonich of the rights and benefits of disability compensation coverage without provision for any alternative protection of compensation.'

"The records before the committee reveal that Mr. Masonich was hopitalized for a long period after the explosion which injured his eyes, and underwent numerous operations culminating in the removal of his right eye in 1939 and surgery in 1955 ending in complete blindness of the left eye. Except for the initial 19 days of hospitalization in Anchorage, Alaska, Mr. Masonich has had to pay all hospital, medical, surgical, and other expenses associated with the accident. Prior to 1955, he worked at the Wisconsin State Workshop for the Blind and was able to support himself without the aid of blind payments. Since 1955 he has received Federal payments to the blind through the Milwaukee County Public Welfare Department. Mr. Masonich is 67 years old, has no other income and no close relatives to rely on for other support.

"In the 1st session of the 69th Congress, Senate Report No. 523 on S. 2348 recommended a monthly pension for Mr. Masonich out of the Federal employees' compensation fund based upon wages of $100 per month at the time of the injury. An amended version of this bill was enacted in the 2d session, 69th Congress, awarding Mr. Masonich the sum of $5,000. The measure was signed by the President March 1, 1927, at a time before Mr. Masonich had lost his right eye.

"The present bill proposed to pay Mr. Masonich the sum of $53,944.78 as lifetime permanent disability benefits calculated from the date of injury in 1921. The Bureau of the Budget recommended that the amount of award should not exceed $17,000, representing the approximate present actuarial value of the prospective payments that would be payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to a Federal employee earning the same salary and suffering the same injuries at the same time as Mr. Masonich."

This committee agrees with the House Judiciary Committee that the suggested reduction in the amount of the claim to $17,000 represents a fair and equitable amount for payment. While the committee has always been reluctant to approve claims against the Government arising from injuries which were sustained so many, many years (August 17, 1921) before relief is granted, it must take cognizance of the fact that it was subsequent to surgery in 1955 when complete blindness of the left eye, the right eye having been previously removed, was an end result of the old injury. It is, therefore, recommended that H.R. 1221 be favorably considered.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are communications to the House Judiciary Committee from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Labor in connection with the proposed legislation. Neither Department is opposed to the enactment of the bill in the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

### DR. JAE H. YANG

The bill (H.R. 1271) for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

### BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1273) for the relief of Bay Kow Jung was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 1432) for the relief of Pasquale Marrella was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## JOHN WILLIAM HORLING

The bill (H.R. 1475) for the relief of John William Horling was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 708), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve John William Horling, U.S. Navy (retired), of Grand Rapids, Mich., of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $22,756.34, representing salary paid to him in violation of the Dual Employment Act (the act of July 31, 1894, 28 Stat. 162, 205), while he was an employee of the Post Office Department.

### STATEMENT

Information before the committee reveals that John William Horling retired from the U.S. Navy on September 1, 1955, in the rank of chief warrant officer after more than 22 years of honorable service. In order to support a family of four in 1956, Mr. Horling sought to supplement his retirement income of about $2,874 a year by seeking employment.

Section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a), also referred to as the Dual Compensation Act, permits retired employees to receive combined civilian and retired pay up to a $10,000 limit inserted in the law by a 1955 amendment. Mr. Horling has learned through the Navy of this amendment and assumed that his case was governed by this law.

Custodial employees were needed at the Grand Rapids, Mich., post office and he took the civil service examination for the position. He was selected and on November 27, 1956, was employed by the Post Office Department at that post office. The Navy Finance Center on November 27, 1956, advised the post office at Grand Rapids that Mr. Horling might be subject to the restrictions on dual employment. Immediately on receipt of this notice, the postmaster on November 28, 1956, inquired of the regional director of the seventh U.S. civil service region in Chicago as to whether civil service regulations barred the appointment of an employee receiving retired pay from the U.S. Navy. The postmaster included in his letter the facts concerning Mr. Horling's employment, including the fact that his application form 60 was in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. This form fully declared his status as a retired Navy warrant officer. The reply from the regional director for the seventh U.S. civil service region merely referred to section 212 of the Economy Act in answer to the postmaster's question about Mr. Horling's status. The letter made no reference to the dual-employment statute. Section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932, known commonly as the dual-compensation statute, limits the total combined income derived from a Federal civilian office or position (whether elective or appointive) and from retired pay in any 1 calendar year to $10,000.

The regional director's letter failed to refer to the still effective limitations of the 1894 dual-employment statute, and also failed to apprise the postmaster of the fact that the 1894 act precluded Mr. Horling's employment. In view of the lack of reference to the dual-employment statute, the postmaster concluded that Mr. Horling was eligible for employment.

The applicable provisions of the Dual Employment Act provide that no person who holds an office, the salary or annual compensation attached to which amounts to the sum of $2,500, shall be appointed to or hold any other office to which compensation is attached unless specifically authorized by law.

Over 5½ years later, the postmaster received an inquiry from the Navy which prompted him to again contact the regional director of the seventh U.S. civil service region. At that time he specifically inquired whether the act of July 31, 1894, applied to Mr. Horling. On June 25, 1962, the regional office of the Post Office Department informed the postmaster that the General Counsel of the Department had ruled that Mr. Horling's appointment on November 17, 1956, was illegal and void. This information was finally received 5 years and 7 months after the appointment was made. During this entire period, Mr. Horling had faithfully performed his janitorial duties and was paid for his services.

Mr. Horling is now 54 years of age. He is married and has two children; a 20-year-old son who is serving in the Navy, and a 16-year-old daughter who remains at home. He is presently working as a maintenance employee in private industry and has a take-home pay of $79 per week. The requirement that Mr. Horling repay the full $22,501.04 that he was paid for his services as a janitor for over a 5½-year period has imposed an unconscionable burden upon Mr. Horling and his family. It has made it impossible for him to purchase a home, for this indebtedness has caused both a bank and the FHA to refuse him a loan in connection with such a purchase.

The Post Office Department in its report to the committee on the bill details the history of Mr. Horling's employment with that Department and indicates that it would have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

This committee is impressed by the fact that throughout the period involved Mr. Horling served in a relatively low-paying position and rendered services to the United States. To allow this situation to continue for over a 5½-year period and then hold that the compensation must be repaid is clearly inequitable. This places the Government in a position of gaining the benefit of the services rendered while denying Mr. Horling compensation for those services. This case is clearly a matter for legislative relief. Mr. Horling should not be charged with this liability when his employment was allowed to continue for a period in excess of 5½ years due to a series of conflicting interpretations and administrative errors. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are reports submitted by the Post Office Department, the Department of the Navy, and the Comptroller General of the United States.

## CHING HEING YEN AND CHING CHIAO HOANG YEN

The bill (H.R. 1495) for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## MRS. SANDRA BANK MURPHY

The bill (H.R. 1542) for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS AND FORMER ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE

The bill (H.R. 1545) to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the Report No. 711, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to credit the named enlisted members of the Air Force with payments made by them to a civilian clerk at the Manhattan Beach Air Force Station against certain overpayments erroneously received, which payments were appropriated by the clerk to his own use. Additionally, payment is authorized to those individuals named who made repayments both to the United States and the civilian clerk of the excess by which such total repayments exceed the amount due the United States.

### STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force, in a letter to the Congress, has reported that it has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter to the Congress, has reported that he has no objection to favorable consideration of the bill should Congress determine that there is sufficient equity in the matter.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has set forth the facts in the case and its recommendations as follows:

H.R. 1545 was introduced to provide relief to 27 enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force who were the innocent victims of fraudulent transactions by a civilian clerk. During the processing of members returning from oversea duty for separation or transfer to a new duty station, the clerk devised a scheme to falsify pay and allowance records so that overpayments were made. After the enlisted men had received their final payments, the clerk contacted each privately, informed him of the overpayment, and attempted to collect the repayment due in exchange for what appeared to be a valid official receipt which had been made out in advance. The money paid by the member to the clerk was not turned in to the account of the finance officer, nor was the member given credit on official records for making repayment of any portion of the overpayment.

The perpetrator of this ingenious scheme was apprehended, tried, and convicted. After a review of the facts and circumstances surrounding the overpayments, the Air Force determined that the enlisted men were liable for the full amount of the overpayments. The Air Force, in reporting no objection to enactment of the proposed legislation, stated as follows with respect to the sums involved:

"Upon determination that the members who received the overpayments were in fact indebted to the United States, the Air Force initiated action to collect the amount of the overpayment each had received. As of January 23, 1963, of the 27 persons listed in H.R. 1545, 17 were out of service and 10 were on active duty. Payments totaling $3,043.70 made to 10 of the individuals had been certified to the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, as uncollectible. The Air Force had collected a total of $9,904.70 from 17 members and former members; the balance due from these 17 individuals was $2,797.28. Collection action has been suspended at the request of Representative RODINO and with the concurrence of the Comptroller General. If H.R. 1545 is enacted, 11 of the 17 members will be entitled to refunds, totaling $1,328,12. Three individuals who received larger overpayments than the amounts paid to Mr. Lorenz will still owe small amounts, the total of which is $35.10. The Air Force has no information on the status of collection with respect to the 10 cases which have been referred to the General Accounting Office as uncollectible."

"It is recognized that the civilian clerk was not an authorized agent to collect moneys due the United States. Therefore, the payments made to the clerk could not be construed as fulfilling the enlisted men's obligation to make restitution of the overpayment received. However, it does not seem fair and equitable for the enlisted men to bear the burden resulting from the evil deed of the civilian clerk. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee believes that this is a proper matter for equitable relief by private legislation and accordingly recommends the bill favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report are (1) a letter from the Department of the Air Force, dated April 23, 1963, and (2) a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated January 30, 1963.

The amendments to the bill recommended by the Department of the Air Force in its letter were made in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives.

## MRS. ANNIE ZAMBELLI STILETTO

The bill (H.R. 1566) for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## ZOLTAN FRIEDMANN

The bill (H.R. 2305) for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## HURLEY CONSTRUCTION CO.

The bill (H.R. 2944) for the relief of Hurley Construction Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 714), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the Hurley Construction Co., St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $19,664, representing costs incurred in the construction of family housing at Duluth Air Force Base for which no compensation has been made.

### STATEMENT

The Department of the Army has no objection to the bill.

The facts concerning this matter are set forth in the favorable House report, as follows:

"During the performance of the contract for construction of 50 type-E family units at the Duluth Air Force Base, Duluth, Minn., the Hurley Construction Co. incurred additional costs because of changes in specifications, alleged delays attributable to the Government, and numerous modifications as set forth in the proposed legislation, all at the insistence of the contract officer for the Government.

"On May 26, 1961, the Corps of Engineers Board of Contract Appeals decided in favor of the contractor on all items in dispute with one exception. Subsequent negotiations resulted in an agreement that an additional $50,413.87 was due the contractor. Only $30,794.87 of this amount could be and was paid, however, because of the limitation in the 1956 Department of Defense Appropriation Act of costs to the sum of $12,000 per unit for type-E housing.

"The sum of $19,664, as provided in the bill, represents the excess cost for 50 family units of $398.28 per housing unit above the $12,000 limitation. The renegotiated contract provided that the unpaid balance of $19,664 would be paid by supplement, providing the necessary authorization for payment in excess of the statutory limitation was subsequently obtained.

"The Department of the Army interposes no objection to the bill, and stated: 'Since the only reason for not paying the balance was the statutory limitation, it would be against justice and good conscience for the Government to refuse to compensate the contractor.' Under these circumstances, the committee concludes that equity requires payment of the uncompensated costs incurred by the Hurley Construction Co. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

## FERENC MOLNAR

The bill (H.R. 3366) for the relief of Ferenc Molnar was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## MRS. MARGARET PATTERSON BARTLETT

The bill (H.R. 3662) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 716) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay $10,000, free of Federal tax liability, to Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett as compensation in lieu of living quarters as part payment for property acquired from her for the Andrew Johnson National Monument in Greeneville, Tenn.

### STATEMENT

In a favorable report on the proposed legislation the Department of the Interior commented that it recommended enactment of the bill to compensate Mrs. Bartlett but that the Department was not in a position to express an opinion as to the correctness of the amount to be paid.

The bill, as introduced in the House of Representatives, provided for the payment of $15,000 to the claimant. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives reported that after a full consideration of the facts it was the committee's judgment that a payment of $10,000 would constitute a fair and equitable settlement of the matter. The bill was accordingly amended by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House to provide for the payment of $10,000.

In its favorable report to the Congress the Department of the Interior set forth the facts as follows:

"In 1941, Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett and her mother, Mrs. Andrew Johnson Patterson, agreed to sell the Andrew Johnson homestead and other property to the Federal Government for $44,000. Negotiations leading to this agreement were carried on by correspondence between Mrs. Andrew Johnson Patterson and the then Director of the National Park Service.

"In a letter of January 22, 1941, this Director referred to five conditions Mrs. Patterson had presented before she and her daughter would sell. In recapitulating the conditions, the Director wrote that he understood one of Mrs. Patterson's conditions to be as follows: '* * * That, when the monument is established, this Service will endeavor to obtain funds as soon as possible to do such work as may be necessary to one of the houses on the monument area so it can be used as a residence for the monument superintendent and be occupied by you and Miss Patterson, with the understanding that quarters deductions will be made from Miss Patterson's salary to cover such occupancy.'

"He concluded this letter, thusly: 'The sale of the above-mentioned property, owned by you and Miss Margaret Patterson, must be entirely independent, of course, so far as the legal requirements and documents are concerned, of any of the above-mentioned conditions, to which you and this Service's representatives have agreed, as such conditions will have to be worked out administratively.'

"In a subsequent letter, written on April 30, 1941, the Director, writing to Mrs. Patterson, said: 'The only way we can proceed [sic] is in accordance with the procedure outlined in our letter of January 22. We are willing to take the steps outlined in that letter as they are considered by this Service to be administratively desirable. Moreover, you will note that this procedure would accomplish essentially the same things which you have in mind but which cannot, as we have advised you, be set forth as conditions in connection with the sale of the land and other property involved to the Government.

"'We do not now foresee any possibility that these steps will not be carried to final and satisfactory conclusions * * *.

"'In the event you are willing to modify your position to the extent that the five conditions you have coupled with your offer are no longer legal conditions of the proposed sale and in lieu of which you will rely upon such administrative steps as the Government may be able to take as set forth in our letter of January 22, we have attached for your convenience and consideration a form of option.'

"From the foregoing, it is apparent that Mrs. Patterson and Mrs. Bartlett entered into the sale of their property to the United States relying 'upon such administrative steps as the Government may be able to take' to fulfill the conditions she had stipulated, including the providing of a residence on the monument area for Mrs. Patterson and her daughter, Miss Margaret Patterson, now Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett.

"It is evident from our records that conditions brought on by World War II interfered with this Department carrying out the commitment made to Mrs. Patterson relative to providing a residence on the monument for her and her daughter. As an alternative, this Department permitted Mrs. Patterson and her daughter to continue to occupy the Andrew Johnson homestead. This arrangement was continued by Mrs. Bartlett after the death of her mother.

"By 1956, the Department had restored as nearly as possible the Andrew Johnson home to the condition it was in at the time Andrew Johnson and his family occupied it. Mrs. Bartlett then agreed to vacate the premises so that the home could be displayed to visitors without the intrusion of evidence that it was continuing to serve as a modern dwelling.

"At the time Mrs. Bartlett vacated the premises, she expressed, and continued to do so, the feeling that the Federal Government had a moral obligation to provide a residence for her in lieu of the quarters which had been furnished to her in the Andrew Johnson house. The late Congressman Carroll Reece, who had an intimate firsthand knowledge of the negotiations which led to the U.S. purchase of the Andrew Johnson property, fully concurred in, and supported, Mrs. Bartlett's views on this point.

"Though we recognize that a moral commitment to build a residence on the monument grounds for their occupancy was made to Mrs. Patterson and Mrs. Bartlett in 1941, we feel that it would be highly unsatisfactory to carry it into effect now because a modern intrusion would be completely incompatible with the aims of the Department to depict as accurately as possible the historical scene as it was when the events occurred which justify preserving it.

"We, accordingly, recommend the enactment of the bill as a means of discharging what we consider a moral obligation on the part of the United States toward this great-granddaughter of a former President of the United States.

"S. 3276 is similar to H.R. 4964, except that (1) the payment to Mrs. Bartlett provided in the Senate bill is $17,000 as against $10,000 in the House bill, and (2) the Senate bill contains no provision similar to the provision in the House bill that the payment 'shall not be subject to any Federal tax liability.'

"Although the payment authorized by the Senate bill is substantially higher than that in the House bill, we are unable to say whether the amount in the Senate bill is more, or less, appropriate than that in the House bill. We recognize that, being private relief bills, the pending legislation is in the nature of an exercise of congressional equity in a situation where no legal right of action is involved.

"We are unable to ascertain with any precision the amount of monetary loss sustained by Mrs. Bartlett. The commitment made by former Director Drury in his letter of January 22, 1941, was for the use of a Government house by Mrs. Patterson and Miss Patterson (now Mrs. Bartlett) 'with the understanding that quarters deductions would be made from Miss Patterson's salary to cover such occupancy.' In other words, the arrangement contemplated was that of furnishing quarters to Mrs. Bartlett as a Government employee, she, in turn, to make the payments customarily made by employees who occupy Government quarters. In fact, Mrs. Bartlett did occupy Government quarters until July 1, 1956. She is still employed by the National Park Service but since the 1956 date has not occupied Government quarters.

"Presumably, a measure of her loss would be the difference between the amount she was required to pay for non-Government housing from 1956 to date and the amount which she would have paid if Government quarters had been available, plus the additional amount she may pay in the future until the termination of her Government employment. We have no information as to the amount she has actually paid for housing from 1956 to date nor do we have any basis upon which to compute her future costs.

"Another possible loss not subject to quantitative measure may be the inconvenience of living away from the scene of her employment in nongovernmental quarters.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program."

The committee believes that the bill, as amended by the House of Representatives to pay $10,000, free of tax liability, to Mrs. Bartlett is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

---

### JEUNG SING

The bill (H.R. 3908) for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

---

### SMITH L. PARRATT AND MR. AND MRS. LLOYD PARRATT

The bill (H.R. 4141) for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 718), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive applicable limitations so as to permit an action to be brought under the tort claims provisions of title 28 based up the injuries suffered by a 10-year-old boy, Smith Parratt, when he was mauled by a grizzly bear while a member of a party of five led by two park rangers on a hike in Glacier National Park on July 18, 1960.

#### STATEMENT

The Department of the Interior in a letter to the Congress has reported that it has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in its favorable report on the bill has set forth the facts in the case as follows:

"On July 18, 1960, Smith Parrett, age 10, was invited by two park rangers to take a hike with the rangers up one of the regular park trails, the Rose Creek Trail, to Lake Otokomi. At about 3:30 in the afternoon, their hiking party was returning from the lake down the trail. The party consisted of five people and was led by Ranger Edomo Mazzer. The party included Ranger Allan Nelson, Smith Parrett, and two visitors from Sweden, Gote Nyhlen and Brita Noring. The party was approaching a lake, at approximately the 8,000-foot level, with Smith Parrett hiking behind the lead ranger, when the ranger turned screaming "There's a grizzly bear with cubs—run," and "Climb up in a tree." The grizzly bear, about 200 yards up the trail, charged. Three of the five were injured. Smith Parratt, the 10-year-old boy, was injured most severely. He nearly lost his life.

"A good indication of the extent of the injuries suffered by the boy is given by the following description by Lewis L. Reece, M.D., who treated him after he was brought down to the ranger station campground area:

" 'The first victim to be brought to the ranger station campground area was the Parratt boy, about 10:30. He was conscious, and talked some. He was found to be suffering of mutilation of the face and scalp with a disengorgement of both eyes and avulsion of the right check. He also had a fracture of the distal end of the right humerous. Also sever laceration and crushing injury to the right chest. His right arm was splinted and placed in a sling. His head was bandaged and an intravenous was started of normal saline. He was placed in the ranger ambulance with an attendant to hold the intravenous solution and two people (campers) were sent along. Type O universal blood donors were sent along for possible blood transfusion.'

"The injured boy was taken to the Cardston Memorial Hospital in Alberta, Canada, which is some 35 miles north of St. Mary. The committee is advised that the opinion of the physicians was initially that Smith Parratt didn't have any chance and that if he did survive he would be blind. The doctors continued their procedures and operations, and the series was completed late the morning of July 19, 1960. Since that time the boy has had numerous operations and procedures. On October 4, 1962, the eighth operation was performed at Children's Hospital in Los Angeles, Calif. This most recent operation was for the removal of two ribs which had been infected because of the penetration of the teeth of the bear into the chest in the original injury. The necessity for this eighth operation became apparent when a huge abscess appeared on the back of Smith Parratt in the late summer of 1962. All of these operations, and especially the last one, have had great physical and mental drain on him, as well as on the parents. The boy has, of course, lost much schooling, and Mrs. Parratt has given up teaching for 3 years in order to take care of her son and help him do homework and home schooling.

"In the future, Smith Parratt faces at least 2 more years of operations, including reconstruction of crushed orbital bones, removal of scar tissue, reconstruction of the bridge or of some nose shape, enlargement of the opening of the good eye (he has lost the use of one eye) so that vision may be more complete. There is also plastic surgery required to build up and reconstruct his facial tissues.

"Smith Parratt is already facing daily problems of being stared at by curious people. and even with the best of plastic surgery, he faces a life with permanent disability, diminished choice of jobs and earning capacity, and restricted participation in normal sports, recreational activities, and schooling. His medical costs already have come to over $10.000 out of pocket, and additional medical and surgical costs should come to at least $7,500. These medical costs of course do not include the more general losses mentioned above, and the pain and suffering and anxiety not only to the boy but to the parents.

"This committee has carefully weighed the basis for the relief which would be afforded by this bill. At the outset, it is clear that this bill would merely waive limitations so that a court can pass upon the question of the liability of the United States based upon these facts. Under the particular circumstances of this case, the committee finds that legislative relief, as provided in the bill, should be granted. As is obvious from the Interior Department report, the parents did not bring suit within the 2-year period immediately following the attack on their son. It appears that the father did immediately begin gathering evidence and facts concerning the accident. Further, as noted in the

Interior Department report, he did not want to commence suit against the Government, and the facts therefore indicate that he did not want to assert such a claim without adequate preparation and assembly of facts. Yet, however this may be, the committee feels that the rights of the boy were prejudiced by a failure to commence an action within the time limit. It is obviously unfair to deny this seriously injured boy his day in court. Further, since the facts concerning the case remain available to the Government, the United States will not be unduly prejudiced by a waiver of the statute of limitations in this instance. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

## MRS. M. ORTA WORDEN

The bill (H.R. 4288) for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 719), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to Mrs. M. Orta Worden the sum of $10,864.89 in full settlement of all claims against the United States resulting from injuries sustained by her in a fall on April 25, 1958, at the class VI concession building at Nouasseur Airbase, Casablanca, Morocco.

### STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force, while objecting to a similar bill which would waive the 2-year statute of limitations under section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, states in its report on that bill as follows:

"It is recognized that the Air Force had a legal obligation to maintain, in a safe condition, the building in which the accident occurred and that the Air Force exchange involved did not carry liability insurance. Should the Congress believe that Mrs. Worden is entitled thereto, the Air Force would not be opposed to an award of damages in the amount Congress considers equitable."

The House of Representatives in Report No. 546 on H.R. 4288 amended the bill to pay the sum of $10,864.89, and in connection with the claim states as follows:

"Mrs. Worden, wife of an Air Force employee, suffered injuries when she tripped over a metal strip protruding from the floor as she was leaving the front entrance of the Air Force exchange concessionaire building at Nouasseur, Morocco. She received a wound above the angle which bled profusely, and was taken immediately to the base hospital in a Government ambulance. It was determined that she had suffered a compound fracture of her right leg and a sprained left ankle. The base physician's report concerning the initial hospitalization states:

" 'The patient sustained a compound comminuted fracture of the lower third of the right tibia which underwent emergency debridement and open reduction with internal fixation on the day of admission. At surgery, the patient early in the operative procedure underwent laryngospasm, and after the application of a single screw, the patient underwent hypotension with diminished heart sounds and an absence of radial pulse. At this point in the operative procedure, it was chosen to terminate the procedure as quickly as possible and arouse the patient by use of stimulants, vasopressers, and oxygen. The initial screw which had been placed in the tibia was about one-fourth inch longer than desired and it was the surgeon's plan to remove this screw and replace it by a shorter one after a second screw had been secured in place. Both the plan to change the initial screw and to put a second screw in position had to be abandoned when the above circulatory failure was evident. While applying a long-leg plaster cast, the fracture site could be felt to have moved. It was necessary, consequently, to wedge the fracture in plaster after the patient was fully revived.'

"Military medical records indicate that Mrs. Worden responded satisfactorily to the initial treatment but that, because of the interrupted operation, her ankle was not placed in functional position as would be desirable. Subsequently she was hospitalized in the Air Force hospital at Weisbaden, Germany, from which she was discharged on May 28, 1958. She then returned to the United States and consulted her own orthopedic physician. Almost all of 1958 was spent in a wheelchair with the right leg elevated. The final cast was removed in September 1959 but Mrs. Worden found it necessary to utilize crutches until July 1960. It also appears that the screw placed in the leg during the operation in Morocco, which screw was found to be one-fourth inch too long, actually kept the fracture apart and delayed healing. In January 1961, a private physician removed the screw. Thereafter, Mrs. Worden's recovery was satisfactory, although the weakened foot and ankle bones made normal walking and standing somewhat painful for an extended period.

"The bill as introduced provided that the claim of Mrs. Worden should be considered as timely filed notwithstanding the statutory requirement that the claim be presented to the Department of the Air Force in writing within 2 years of the occurrence of the incident involved. At a hearing held on June 19, 1963, before the subcommittee to whom the bill was assigned, it was established that written notice of intention to file a claim was submitted to the claims officer at Nouasseur Air Force Base on May 2, 1958; that is, 1 week after the accident. Mrs. Worden and her husband were advised to wait until all medical bills and records of the hospitalization and treatment were available to file so that the claim could be for a sum certain. Because of the prolonged period of medical treatment, it was not until June 23, 1961, that a claim for $10,864.89 was submitted to the Department of the Air Force. On February 19, 1962, the claim was denied because it had been filed after the expiration of the 2-year period from the date of injury.

"At the hearing it became evident that the matter should be resolved not by a waiver of applicable limitations, but rather by direct congressional action. The testimony presented by the claimant's representative and the Air Force clearly establish liability for the injury. Medical expenses totaling $2,164.89 are verified by itemized bills and receipts. Additionally, the sum of $8,700 is claimed as lost wages for 1958, 1959, and 1960. This amount is calculated on the basis of an average annual earned salary by Mrs. Worden of $2,900 for the 10-year period prior to the accident. Income tax withholding statements and pay records were submitted to the committee to support this calculation. It is also to be noted that no amount has been claimed for pain and suffering. In the view of the committee, the amount claimed is reasonable in the light of Mrs. Worden's medical history following the injury.

"The Department of the Air Force has indicated that it feels that the payment of compensation to Mrs. Worden for her injury is a matter for congressional decision. The record in this matter clearly establishes responsibility for the injury, and evidence that the sum of $10,864.89 is justified and reasonable as compensation therefor.

"Subsequent to the hearing on H.R. 4288, the Bureau of the Budget submitted an adverse report on the bill in which it suggested that, should a valid justification for enactment of the bill be found, payment of the claim should be made not out of the general funds of the Treasury but from exchange funds. This suggestion was based on the understanding that claims arising in an Air Force exchange are paid from reserves set up by the exchange services for this purpose. The subcommittee inquired into the matter of responsibility in service exchanges and was advised that claims arising in the interior of an exchange building are the responsibility of nonappropriated funds, but that the exterior of buildings, entranceways, etc., are the responsibility of Air Force maintenance personnel. Under the facts in this case, it was testified, since the accident in which Mrs. Worden was involved occurred at the entranceway of the exchange building it was an Air Force appropriated responsibility. Under these circumstances, the committee recommends that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably."

The committee, after a review of all of the foregoing, concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 4288, be considered favorably.

## ANGELIKI DEVARIS

The bill (H.R. 4507) for the relief of Angeliki Devaris was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## ELIZABETH MARY MARTIN

The bill (H.R. 4760) for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4862) for the relief of Tricia Kim was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## JOHN STEWART MURPHY

The bill (H.R. 5083) for the relief of John Stewart Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MRS. ZARA M. SCHREIBER

The bill (H.R. 5289) for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 724), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is that the written election, to provide the annuity specified in paragraph (1) of section 4(a) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 to his wife, Zara M. Schreiber, which was executed by Capt. Joseph S. Schreiber on November 14, 1953, stamped and notarized but not mailed prior to his death on November 18, 1953, shall be deemed to have been an effective election under section 3(b) of such act.

### STATEMENT

According to the House report, testimony on this legislation was heard and it was established that Capt. Joseph S. Schreiber, the husband of the claimant, was retired from the U.S. Army on March 8, 1945, and was granted disability retirement pay. Under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, retired military personnel had from November 1, 1953, to April 30, 1954, in which to elect to accept a reduced annuity and make provision for an annuity for their survivors. Under regulations promulgated by the U.S. Army, such election had to be in writing, signed, and delivered by April 30, 1954.

## MRS. DENISE JEANNE ESCOBAR

The bill (H.R. 5453) for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## RELIEF OF CITY OF BINGHAMTON, N.Y.

The bill (H.R. 5495) for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 726), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 5495) for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y., having considered the same, reports favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommends that the bill do pass.

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the city of Binghamton, N.Y., the sum of $10,130 in full settlement of all the claims of the city of Binghamton and Our Lady of Lourdes Memorial Hospital against the United States, for payment of civil defense matching funds for an emergency generator for an addition to such hospital.

### STATEMENT

Pursuant to section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, criteria are established and Federal financial contributions are made to the States for civil defense purposes and through the States to their political subdivisions.

During the winter and spring of 1960, Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital and the city of Binghamton investigated the possibility of coming within a program for financial assistance, then being conducted by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. This program provided for the sharing by the Federal Government of the cost of auxiliary emergency generators to be placed in hospitals for use in connection with an overall civil defense operational plan for the Binghamton area.

"The project application and necessary supporting data were prepared and, on or about May 12, 1960, submitted by the city to the State of New York.

"The State of New York did not act upon the project application for the reasons that, under then existing administrative rules, new project applications were not being processed for fiscal year 1960 contributions. The State itself had set a cutoff date for submission of applications to it by political subdivisions of April 15. Region I of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization had set a cutoff date of May 15.

"Meanwhile, without approval either of the State or the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the city went ahead with the procurement and, on or about May 13, 1960, issued invitations to bid on the generator. Bids were opened on May 25, 1960, and a contract awarded on June 1, 1960.

"In July 1960, the State returned the project application to the city which resubmitted it on July 21, 1960. The State passed it on to the regional office of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It reached there on August 8, 1960.

"During fiscal year 1960, there was in effect a regulation of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization which regulation had been in effect for many years previous and is still in effect. It provided that no contribution could be made for materials acquired prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which the funds to be used for the contribution were appropriated. This regulation is based upon an application of the general rule that appropriations are for prospective expenditures and not retroactive unless specially provided. This is set forth in an opinion on the civil defense contribution program by the Comptroller General (31 Comp. Gen. 308).

"Incidentally, effective July 1, 1960, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization adopted a rule now in effect that no contribution would be made for materials acquired prior to the date of approval of the project application. This regulation had been published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1960.

"By the time the project application was presented to region 1 headquarters of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the only appropriation available for obligation for the contribution for the hospital generator was the fiscal year 1961 appropriation and, since the procurement had occurred in fiscal year 1960, it could not then legally be approved.

"The State and city were not immediately notified of this, probably because of a freeze which had been placed by region 1 on the processing of applications for hospital generators.

"Installation of the generator appears to have occurred during the fall of 1960. At least it was at this time that payment to the successful bidder was accomplished.

"OCDM might, had the project application been processed during fiscal year 1960, have approved it and provided the financial asistance. A civil defense purpose would have been (and for that matter still would be) served by the provision of assistance. The basic reasons for not acting in fiscal year 1960 involved administrative rules made by the region and the State in the interest of efficient administration of the program and applicable only there. The region 1 rule is no longer used."

The General Counsel of the Department of Defense, in reporting to the House Judiciary Committee on the merits of a similar bill of the 87th Congress, advised that committee that after July 1, 1960, the only course which could have been taken was denial of the application. The Department concluded, in view of the circumstances, that it would not object to relief in the instant case.

The committee is of the belief that this is a case meriting legislative relief. The installation of the generator was originally agreed upon as a civil defense measure, the hospital was significantly altered for such installation, and the generator certainly would serve the civil defense effort. This committee had taken favorable action for the relief of Elmore County, Ala., in settlement of that county's claims for reimbursement for one half of the cost of certain civil defense communications equipment. (H.R. 555, 87th Cong., 2d sess., act of October 23, 1962.)

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 5495, without amendment.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report submitted by the General Counsel of the Department of Defense on a similar bill of the 87th Congress.

## QUALIFICATION OF STEAMSHIP TRADE ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE-WATERFRONT GUARD ASSOCIATION PENSION FUND

The bill (H.R. 5753) relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 727), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to extend retroactive qualification under the Internal Revenue code to the pension plan of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association from April 1, 1955, the date from which the collective bargaining agreement provided for employer pension contributions, until June 2, 1962.

### STATEMENT

The Treasury Department has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

This committee has recommended favorably similar legislation extending retroactive qualification to pension plans under the Internal Revenue Code in similar situations.

In its favorable report on the bill the Treasury Department has commented:

"The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that this fund, which was established under a collective bargaining agreement, meets the requirements for qualification under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code for taxable years ending after June 1, 1962. However, the fund does not so qualify for prior taxable years, although the collective bargaining agreement specified that employers were to make contributions to the fund as of April 1, 1955. This is because it was not until June 2, 1962, that a complete written pension plan, containing features essential to a qualified pension plan, was actually established."

The purpose of the bill is to give the employers concerned the right to deduct contributions made to the pension fund before it qualified under the Internal Revenue Code in the year in which they made the contributions. The bill also would grant the fund exemption from tax on its investment income during the period before June 2, 1962, provided it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, or his delegate, that the trust has not been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report is a letter, dated June 19, 1963, from the Treasury Department.

## ERIC VOEGELIN AND LUISE BETTY ONKEN VOEGELIN

The bill (H.R. 5902) for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## MARIANO CARRESE AND VINCENZINA CIAVATTINI RESTUCCIA

The bill (H.R. 6038) for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzwa Ciavattini Restuccia was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## GENEROSO BUCCI CAMMISA

The bill (H.R. 6316) for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6624) for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore, Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 6806) for the relief of Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 7268) for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Brown, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 7601) for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## MICHELLE SU ZEHR (LIM MYUNG IM)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 633) for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im) may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Byron D. Zehr and Patricia P. Zehr, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im) pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## MARY G. EASTLAKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1518) for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the service of Mary G. Eastlake, Nurse Director (retired), Public Health Service, performed while in the employ of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, before July 1, 1955, shall be deemed to be active service in the Public Health Service for the purpose of computing her retired pay from the Service as of the date of her retirement (December 1, 1962): *Provided*, That the increase in retired pay authorized by this Act shall not exceed the amount which would be payable as a Civil Service retirement annuity based on such service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 736), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to authorize the Public Health Service, for the purpose of computing the claimant's retired pay from that Service, to credit her with all of her service with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, as if such service had been performed for the Public Health Service rather than for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

### STATEMENT

In the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, commenting on S. 1518 and recommending an amendment, the facts of the case are set forth as follows:

"Mrs. Eastlake was a civil service nurse in the Bureau of Indian Affairs when the health functions of that Bureau were transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Public Health Service on July 1, 1955. She continued in a civil service position with the Service until March 12, 1956, when she was appointed as a commissioned officer in the Service's Reserve Corps. As a commissioned officer of the Reserve Corps, her coverage under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act continued until she was appointed to the Regular Corps effective April 1, 1956. It was this action, appointment to the Regular Corps, that resulted in the transfer of Mrs. Eastlake to a position not within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

"The Civil Service Retirement Act, as it existed prior to October 1, 1956, provided that an employee subject to the act who transferred to a position not within the purview of the act could receive a refund of retirement deductions but otherwise lost all eligibility for an annuity under that act. However, under section 8(a) of Public Law 84–854 (5 U.S.C. 2258(a)) the Civil Service Retirement Act was amended to permit an employee who transferred on and after October 1, 1956, to a position not within the purview of the act to receive a deferred annuity at age 62 if the employee had not received a refund of contributions and had 5 or more years of civilian service.

"The Civil Service Commission in a ruling dated July 9, 1962, held that since Mrs. Eastlake's coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act terminated on April 1, 1956 (when she was commissioned in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service) prior to the effective date of the amended law (October 1, 1956), the provisions of the amended law do not apply in her case. It was further held that she was entitled only to a refund of her retirement deductions."

Thus, the present situation is that Mrs. Eastlake is being denied retirement credit for annuity purposes for the 18 years of civil service employment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which was identical in most respects to her subsequent service with the Public Health Service.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1951) for the relief of George Elias Nejame was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## IVANKA PEKAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1958) for the relief of Ivanka Pekar which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available." and insert "Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by one number the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964."; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivanka Pekar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by one number the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## REAR ADM. WALTER B. DAVIDSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1395) for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 17, after the word "section", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 739), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows :

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson, U.S. Navy, retired, of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $21,475.17, which is the amount of overpayments of retired pay to him during the period beginning November 13, 1958, and ending August 21, 1961, while he was employed by the Western Contract Furnishers, of San Francisco, Calif.; and to authorize the repayment to him of the amount withheld from him by the United States on account of the liability, and in addition such amounts as represent the balance of retired pay otherwise due for the period.

### STATEMENT

The Comptroller General of the United States has advised the Congress that the question of whether Admiral Davidson should be relieved involves primarily a matter of policy for Congress to determine and, accordingly, has no recommendation concerning the merits of the bill.

The Department of the Navy has advised the Congress that it favors the enactment of the bill.

The facts in the case giving rise to Admiral Davidson's liability are set forth in the report of the Department of the Navy as follows:

"The facts in the case as disclosed by the records of the Department of the Navy are that Rear Admiral Davidson was placed on the temporary disability retired list in May of 1956 and permanently retired for disability in December of 1960. In June of 1958 he accepted employment with Western Contract Furnishers as an independent salesman.

"The Comptroller General noted that of five contracts awarded to the Western Contract Furnishers by the Navy during the period from November 13, 1958, to November 20, 1961, three resulted from bids which were signed by W. B. Davidson as assistant manager of the company. There three contracts are summarized as follows:

"(a) A contract awarded November 13, 1958, which covered mess furniture for the U.S. Naval Air Facility, Monterey, Calif., resulted from a bid and amendment thereto signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager.

"(b) A contract awarded May 19, 1959, which covered items of furniture for the Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nev., resulted from a bid signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager. There was also a modification to this contract which covered a change of upholstery fabric for one item, at no change in price; and the acceptance was signed for the company by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager.

"(c) A contract awarded February 28, 1961, which covered items of furniture for the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif., resulted from a bid signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager.

"The Comptroller General's description of Admiral Davidson's conduct and actions with respect to the contract of February 28, 1961, as 'a series of negotiations' was an unfortunate term as applied to the facts in this case. In this connection, the record shows that after the first bid was submitted and signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager. There was a readvertisement and another bid submitted by the company, also signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager. There was a letter of February 17, 1961, verifying comments on the bid, and another letter of February 23, 1961, extending an option, both of which were signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager. A letter of March 9, 1961, contained modification No. 1 to the contract and incorporated a design change and provided for a price reduction. There was another letter which related to the preparation of two items of chairs, and constituted modification No. 2 to the contract. Thereafter an exchange of correspondence resulted in modification No. 3, which incorporated two minor design changes in the furniture and extended delivery time, but resulted in no change in price. There was also an exchange of correspondence between the company and the air station between May 10, 1961, and July 10, 1961, which related to the failure of the company to make timely deliveries of certain items under the contract. Each of the letters from the company to the air station was signed by W. B. Davidson, assistant manager.

"Admiral Davidson's relation to these contracts is clearly stated in the following extracts from a letter signed by Mr. Rex S. Stevensen, vice president and secretary of Western Contract Furnishers:

" 'As to the matter of you signing "assistant manager." You will remember that on several occasions we were late in submitting some bids, due to my absence from the office. To obviate a repetition of late bids awaiting my signature, I directed you to sign such bids thereafter as "assistant manager," simply as a means of expediency and convenience.

" 'The title as used, has no significance other than to satisfy a bid form. You are not, in fact, an assistant manager and you have no authority or prerogatives as such. Your duties and responsibilities are those of a salesman working on commission.'

"It is apparent that Admiral Davidson signed the bids in accordance with the arrangement with the vice president, and that his signature on subsequent correspondence was merely for purposes of identity of the contract. Admiral Davidson was not an official of the concern, had no authority to approve changes or modifications in the contract, and merely signed the correspondence as a ministerial act. In no case did Admiral Davidson sign any of these papers using his military title.

"Facts of record negate any intention on the part of Admiral Davidson to violate 10 U.S.C. 6112(b). On the contrary, they reveal an affirmative effort to avoid even the possibility of such violation through inadvertence or lack of information. Thus, on April 26, 1959, following receipt of a Navy Department notice to retired regular officers advising them of the Comptroller General's decision of January 6, 1959 (38 Comp. Gen. 470) Admiral Davidson addressed a letter to the U.S. Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, outlining the nature of the business conducted by the Western Contract Furnishers; specifying in detail the nature of the work he performed as an employee of the firm; and specifically requesting an early clarification as to whether or not he could continue to carry on that phase of his work concerned with Federal Government contracts, and advice concerning any restrictions which might apply to him. Understandably, nonreceipt of a reply led him to conclude that his employment did not violate the only conflict-of-interest statute which could have been applicable in his case.

"Admiral Davidson's personal situation, furthermore, would militate against any intentional action on his part which would jeopardize his continued receipt of retired pay. When placed on the temporary disability retired list in 1956, with a 100-percent physical disability rating (arteriosclerosis, cerebral embolism, and acute bursitis), he was limited to seeking employment involving the minimum of physical exertion—a fact recognized by his employer. A heart attack in 1958, with attendant temporary incapacity, and the constant awareness that a recurrence, if not fatal, could permanently bar his further civilian employment and thus result in his complete dependence upon his retired pay for his own support and that of his invalid wife would, if there were any questions as to his good faith, have inhibited any action which could have resulted in forfeiture of this mainstay. These circumstances serve equally to highlight the hardship which he would encounter if the legislation now introduced on his behalf should fail enactment.

"The Department of the Navy favors the enactment of H.R. 12906."

The claimant has filed with the committee a personal statement setting forth the financial hardship involved.

From the information before it, it appears to the committee that Admiral Davidson received his retired pay in good faith; that he made a full disclosure to the Government in regard to his private employment; and a considerable financial hardship is involved.

Accordingly, the committee feels that this is a case which warrants relief by private legislation and recommends the bill favorably.

## PEITRINA DEL FRATE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2084) for the relief of Peitrina Del Frate which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act,", to strike out "Peitrina" and insert "Pietrina"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietrina Del Frate shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate."

## MARIA MERGHETTI (MOTHER BENEDETTA) AND ANNUNZIATA COLOMBO (MOTHER CHERUBINA)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1289) for the relief of Maria

**Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Maria", to strike out "Merghetti" and insert "Mereghetti".**

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina)."

## CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE RESERVATION

**The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1169) to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "proceedings" and insert "claims"; in line 4, after the word "Commission", to strike out "in dockets numbered 161, 179, 181-A, 181-B, 181-C, 222, and 224,", and in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "$350" and insert "$350, to the extent that such funds are available,"; so as to make the bill read:**

***Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Colville Tribe, San Poells-Nespelem Tribe, Okanogan Tribe, Methow Tribe, and Lake Tribe (certain constituent groups of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation) that were appropriated to pay a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission dated March 1, 1960, in docket numbered 181, and the funds which may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the said constituent groups or any other constituent groups of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to pay any judgments arising out of claims presently pending before the Indian Claims Commission and the interest on said judgments, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be credited to the account of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a per capita distribution from such funds of $350, to the extent that such funds are available, to each enrolled member of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. Any part of such funds distributed per capita to the members of the tribes shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.**

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 742), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

**The purpose of S. 1169, introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON at the request of the Colville Confederated Tribes, is to** authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make a $350 per capita payment to tribal members, from judgment funds, to the extent that such funds are available.

BACKGROUND

The act of April 24, 1961 (Public Law 87-24), provided for a division of funds between the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho and the Colville Tribes from a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 175-A ($4,177,605.06). It further provided for the same division—86.6 percent to the Nez Perce and 13.4 percent to the Colvilles—in connection with judgments that might be awarded to either group in the future.

The act of September 26, 1961 (Public Law 87-298), provided for the use of the funds (approximately $1 million) from an award to the Colville Tribes in docket 181, and from judgments that might be made in other pending claims. It provided that the money could be advanced or expended for any purpose that is "authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

In connection with the possible distribution of the funds, this committee in Senate Report 1068, accompanying H.R. 8236, which became Public Law 87-298, made the following recommendation:

"On September 13, 1961, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 8236 and S. 2123, the companion bill introduced by Senator Jackson. Witnesses from the Colville Indian Association, representing approximately 400 Indians on and off the reservation, and representatives of the official tribal governing body, the tribal business council, testified on the proposed legislation. Spokesmen for the Colville Indian Association recommended amending the bill to require that the judgment fund be distributed on a per capita basis. While the proposed amendment was not adopted, the committee is of the opinion, based on testimony given, that a real need exists for a per capita payment to tribal members.

"The Colville Tribes are currently preparing a program for terminating Federal supervision and control over their affairs. Approximately 75 percent of the Indians reside off the reservation, and there appears to be no desire on the part of the tribe to invest the proceeds of their claim in a tribal development program. Moreover, it was the statement of the official tribal delegates that the Secretary of the Interior would be requested to approve a per capita distribution. Under the circumstances, it is the committee's recommendation that following passage of H.R. 8236, the Secretary of the Interior take steps to provide for a per capita payment to the Indians from the funds covered by the legislation."

To date, no per capita payments have been made to the Colville Indians from judgment funds.

NEED

On October 24, 25, and 26, 1963, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs conducted field hearings on S. 1169 at Spokane, Nespelem, and Seattle, Wash. Several hundred members of the Colville Tribes attended the subcommittee sessions. Every witness, including official tribal spokesmen, requested early enactment of S. 1169.

This tribe has submitted legislation to Congress (S. 1442) that would, if passed, put into effect the first steps of a program leading toward termination of Federal supervision and control over the Colvilles. It is evident from the hearing record that a substantial percentage of these Indians wish to discontinue the existing relationship with the Government in the very near future. Many of the 4,700 Colvilles now live off the reservation. Therefore, it does not appear desirable or necessary to preserve the judgment funds for tribal development purposes.

Based on the lengthy hearing record and the strong urging of individual members and the tribal governing body, it is the committee's recommendation that S. 1169 be enacted, notwithstanding the adverse reports from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

AMENDMENTS

The committee has struck from the bill certain language and docket numbers that may not have accurately reflected the claims still pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

Language has been inserted at the appropriate place to make clear that if there is an insufficient amount of judgment funds to make a payment of exactly $350 that a per capita as close to that figure as possible be made. It is believed that adequate funds are presently available.

COST

Enactment of this legislation will result in a saving to the Federal Government of approximately $60,000 a year, which is the amount of interest now being earned by the judgment funds on deposit in the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations on the Executive Calendar be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Jack Howard, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Air Force be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## U.S.S. "UTAH"

**Mr. MOSS.** Mr. President, tomorrow, December 7, will mark the 22d anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. I cannot let this day go by without pausing for a moment to pay tribute to the heroic American fighting men who gave their lives there that freedom might live.

Particularly do I want to pay tribute to the 54 men who lie entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*, but who seem to have been forgotten by the country they loved. We honor the men of the U.S.S. *Arizona* day in and day out by a magnificent memorial which was built over the hulk, and by raising the colors over her at dawn each morning and lowering them at sundown. The men of the U.S.S. *Utah*, who lie in silence less than a mile from the *Arizona*'s fine memorial, are honored only by a small plate, which does not even list the names of the officers or the men who went down with her, and whose bodies have never been recovered. Thousands pass the *Utah* each day after having seen the *Arizona* without even knowing it is the tomb of equally brave men who died defending their country.

Earlier this session I introduced a bill to erect a simple flagpole over the *Utah* so that the colors may be flown over her as they are over the *Arizona*. I had hoped that by December 7 of this year Congress would have passed the bill and that the simple platform and flagpole for which it provides would have been built. I had anticipated a ceremony in which we could raise the flag for the first time over the U.S.S. *Utah* hulk, and assure that this simple tribute to American men fallen in battle would be perpetuated for all time to come.

I am deeply disappointed that this ceremony must be postponed for another year. I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] to schedule hearings on my U.S.S. *Utah* bill, but because of the press of important legislation before that committee this session, it has not been possible to consider the *Utah* bill. I am hopeful that hearings can be held early next session. I know that my 38 colleagues who joined in cosponsoring the resolution support me in this request.

Almost every State—and certainly every area of the country—has one or more of its boys listed among the *Utah* dead. Of the 54 men whose bodies were not found or identified, 13 gave California as their home State; 11 Texas; 3 each Illinois, Iowa, Washington State, and New York; 2 each Colorado, Missouri, Virginia, and Massachusettts; 1 each Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Ohio, Nebraska, and 1 who did not list his home. His record, however, showed he was born in Iowa. Another man was a native of the Philippine Islands. Many men showed next of kin in States other than their home at the time of enlistment, so there is hardly a State which is not touched in some way by the ghostly hands of those entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*.

I salute these heroes of Pearl Harbor and express my fervent hope that our country will soon demonstrate its honor and gratitude by the simple act of flying Old Glory over their watery grave.

## STATISTICAL MALPRACTICE

**Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.** Mr. President, the reactionary members of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association have become expert practitioners of the art of propaganda. Like all paid professional would-be brainwashers of the public, they do not hesitate to resort to distortion and exaggeration to beef up their arguments. Of the 227-member house of delegates, fewer than 50 are family physicians. The remainder are political doctors.

Recently the U.S. Public Health Service caught them in the act of statistical malpractice. In expressing opposition to Federal aid in constructing and equipping medical schools, the AMA, through this leading group, announced that there is no shortage of doctors in the United States; that there had been an 8.9-percent increase in the ratio of physicians to the total U.S. population. Not so, says the Public Health Service, charging these political doctors with downright juggling of figures. The facts are: During the period of 1960 to 1963 only 1 more doctor has been added per 100,000 population. In many counties of the United States there is not even one physician. In an emergency requiring surgery, in some counties in many States, this situation is calamitous.

The AMA did some figure juggling as follows: They counted American physicians and surgeons all over the world who are serving with our Armed Forces, embassies, and governmental agencies. Then they excluded the population of Puerto Rico—a total of 4 million—even excluding servicemen and their families located there. Puerto Rico is, of course, a part of the United States. AMA officials then issued an inflated claim that 29,000 doctors had been added to the total number of physicians and surgeons in this country during this period. In attempting to fool the American public, they included medical students attending universities in the 50 States and in Puerto Rico in this total and then added 2,000 osteopaths. The legislature of California gives medical degrees to the osteopaths of that State. They are evidently recognized in California as physicians, but would not be in Ohio and in most other States.

It is bad enough that the AMA ruling clique is spending many thousands of dollars lobbying against hospital and nursing home insurance for the elderly under social security coverage, commonly termed "medicare." Now their leaders resort to quackery, deceit, and fraud in creating arguments and pooh-poohing factually correct statements that there is a shortage of doctors in the United States. Do these political doctors fear to share their bounty—the highest professional income—with ambitious, intelligent young men and women who desire to embark on a medical career?

Mr. President, I am—or rather was—a lawyer. The need for tens of thousands of additional lawyers in our country could be debated. The need for tens of thousands of additional physicians and surgeons is very evident and urgent. I am delighted that a bill to provide Federal aid in the construction of medical schools became law this year, despite the expensive and unscrupulous efforts of the AMA, which maintains one of the most expensive and powerful lobbies in Washington.

Mr. President, I do pay tribute and manifest my admiration for all of the doctors in the Public Health Service of our country and to the many thousands of physicians and surgeons in the United States who feel that the AMA is misrepresenting them. Despite the unyielding opposition of AMA leaders to social security coverage for doctors, 68 percent of Ohio doctors responding to a referendum of the Ohio State Medical Association, a branch of the AMA, expressed their desire and hope for social security coverage. Doctors in other States have expressed the same wish, but to no avail.

## PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, occasionally a terrible tragedy or crisis causes Congress to galvanize itself into action to meet a problem which has existed over the years, but about which nothing has been done. If as a result of the tragic assassination of our late President we can be driven to attack head on the complex problem of Presidential inability, there will have been at least one redeeming aspect to the horrible events in Dallas that are so fresh in our minds.

The late Senator Estes Kefauver and I were deeply interested in this problem and cosponsored a proposed constitutional amendment, which is now before the Committee on the Judiciary. Senator Kefauver often discussed this problem with me at great length. He had a unique understanding of the difficulties which could arise and an intense practical grasp of the many proposals for remedial action.

If the bullet that killed our President had, instead, inflicted brain damage or other serious injury resulting in his incapacity, or if former President Eisenhower, when he had his illness, had become worse instead of better and possibly lapsed into a coma for a time, there would not have been, as there is not now, any provision in the Constitution, our fundamental law, for the Vice President to succeed to the powers and duties of the office of President.

The Vice President in office at the time of President Wilson's serious illness and Vice Presidents in office when other Presidents have become incapacitated have been very reluctant to do so—for among other reasons, because it was uncertain whether the Vice President would then succeed to the office itself or instead only its powers and duties.

We must come to grips with this problem. At the last meeting of the Judiciary Committee, I brought up for discussion the Kefauver-Keating constitutional amendment, which had been approved by the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of that committee, and it was discussed at some length. I think it fair to say that in the committee there was unanimous recognition that some action along these lines should be taken. I believe it was generally felt, however, that the appropriate time to go forward will be in the early part of next year; and it is quite possible that President Johnson might refer to this or a similar proposal in his state of the Union message. Obviously, any suggestions he might make should have earnest and serious consideration.

Roscoe Drummond has written a penetrating analysis of the problem; his article, which was published today in the New York Herald Tribune, and other papers is entitled "Congress Must Face Up Now." I sincerely feel that that is true, and that really there is no time for us to dally further before dealing with this situation.

Many ideas for the best method of determining inability have been advanced, and sincere men and students of this question can reasonably differ. Senator Kefauver and I had our own differences on the precise mechanics of determining whether a President has become unable to fulfill the duties of office. Therefore, our proposed constitutional amendment merely provided that Congress should have power to legislate in this field. We believed that that proposal would be most likely to receive a two-thirds favorable vote in the Senate and to be ratified by the required number of State legislatures. The Attorney General had rendered an opinion approving that course of proceeding.

So the way has been paved; and it would be a tribute to the memory of Senator Kefauver, who labored so long in this area of constitutional law, if in the early part of the next session our committee reported the proposed constitutional amendment and if it were then passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The time for taking such action is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Congress Must Face Up Now," by Roscoe Drummond, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Congress Must Face Up Now—A Gap at Top if President Should Fall Seriously Ill

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—It is immensely valuable that the President's bipartisan commission, headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, is studying, appraising and preparing to report to the country all the evidence bearing on the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

This needs to be done. By virtue of the stature of the panel, it is going to be done well.

But there is something equally vital and urgent—in fact, because it concerns the present and the future, more vital and more urgent—than this useful inquiry into the past.

I refer to the imperative necessity of repairing at the earliest possible moment the gaping hole in the Constitution as to what happens when a President is temporarily unable to discharge his duties because of illness or any other emergency.

In the wake of President Eisenhower's heart attack and subsequent illnesses, Congress walked right up to this problem—and stopped. At this time only one voice is being raised in behalf of beginning now, without delay, the action needed to correct the constitutional defect, which can no longer be safely left as it is. This is the voice of Senator Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York.

Let me state the problem briefly. The Constitution provides in article II that in case of the inability of the President "to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President."

This leaves unclear and unsettled so many matters that twice in our history, in the less exacting times of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, the Government was paralyzed for months. In today's world, the U.S. Government cannot afford to be paralyzed for minutes.

Here are the matters which the Constitution leaves unanswered:

Who shall decide when a President is for any reason unable to discharge his duties and how?

Who shall decide when a President is ready to assume his duties and how?

What is to be done if a disabled President seeks to assert his authority before he has recovered?

In case of the disability of the President, does the Vice President—or the man next in line—succeed to the office of President or only to the duties of the Presidency?

This latter question is exceedingly moot. Some distinguished constitutional scholars hold that the Vice President would merely act as President temporarily. Others hold that he would in fact become President for the remainder of the term.

This is not an academic question. Because of this uncertainty, two Vice Presidents refused to discharge the duties of President during long inability for fear that the President would think they were trying to seize the office from him. When Garfield was ill and when Wilson was paralyzed for months, the real difficulty was not to determine inability. In each case the Vice President either did not wish or did not dare to move because he was not sure that the President could then take back the office again.

Bear in mind that three out of the last four Presidents have been the targets of an assassin's bullets—Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. Each could have suffered long disability.

Bear in mind that President Johnson as well as President Eisenhower have suffered serious heart attacks.

It is not ghoulish to face this problem openly and candidly. It is recklessly irresponsible not to do so.

Senator Keating is making the right beginning by proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to enact that necessary clarifying legislation.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress, and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senators, let me state that it is anticipated that, in the immediate future, two speeches will be delivered by Senators—one, by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]; the other, by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

It is hoped that, following those speeches, it may be possible, under a unanimous-consent agreement, to lay aside temporarily the pending question, and to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 546, Senate bill 2100, to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; and then to return to the question which now is pending.

I have discussed this course with some of the interested Senators, and it meets with their approval, at least for the time being.

Mr. KEATING. Has the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] been consulted?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, although I would have done so if he had been in the Chamber at that time. However, I consulted the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and this course is agreeable to him.

Mr. KEATING. I shall consult the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New York.

## THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the various articles and editorials to which I shall refer in the course of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is a tragedy that has touched the heart and life of every American—a tragedy which crosses the lines of party and religion to make its imprint on the Nation. The President of all of us has been slain, and the entire Nation mourns.

But in the aftermath—in the frantic efforts to learn the "whys" of this heinous crime—there is the danger of yet another assassination: the assassination of the American character.

From all strata of American life—from pulpit, press, and the Nation's highest court—has come the enunciation that a great deficit in American morals is the underlying cause of the Dallas tragedy. This, I vehemently resent.

This tortured introspection is alleged to reveal an obsession in America with hatred, lust, and violence—emotions which hardly seem to fit a nation that has expressed such genuinely spontaneous grief and shock at the death of its President. The very character of our Nation is being impugned by these intemperate attacks; and it is time they were studied, for never before has a vocal minority attempted to find so much hatred and viciousness permeating the American spirit.

Says the Wall Street Journal editorially:

> The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America * * * in America the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation.

After nearly 2 weeks of national remonstration, it seems quite clear why the assault is continuing: There are people who hope to gain political advantage from warping the uncontestable truth of the assassination to produce alleged facts which simply do not exist.

### HATE AND RIGHT WING THEORY

One such bit of vicious fiction is the proposition that the so-called political right somehow had a finger on the trigger of Lee Oswald's rifle, along with the entire city of Dallas.

Mr. President, these attempts to misrepresent the plain, unvarnished facts of the Kennedy assassination do a grave disservice to the country and to the fallen Chief Executive.

Unless the protagonists of the hate and collective-guilt theories have a different set of facts than those which have been made available to me, it was not a rightwing fanatic who killed John F. Kennedy. It was a single, kill-crazy Communist who was acting to the dictates of his own unexplainable leftwing dementia. To insinuate that conservative elements in America are to blame for the killing makes about as much sense as to blame Billy Mitchell for the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Every fact brought to light since the firing of those fatal shots at Dallas further exonerates the right.

I am relieved to find that the press here and in my home State has started questioning the hate-the-right propaganda. Several writers have done so with great decisiveness in examining the belabored postulates of collective guilt, rightwing culpability, and national hatred.

As the Washington Star pointed out December 3:

> In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons on the evils of hatred. The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the radical right * * * the sermons are sincere * * * but they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

The Star continues by examining the absurdity of tacking blame for the killing on the political right and the equal absurdity of affixing this responsibility to some enveloping moral weakness in America as a whole.

> Until we know something different—

Continues the Star—

> the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

Richard Wilson, writing in the November 27 Star, notes the odd views evoked by the killing, and observes:

> In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in the city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable. Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning.

The Wall Street Journal continues:

> To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow.

### DALLAS

Mr. President, enough is known of the assassination that it can be definitely stated the American political right did not commit the savage act. Neither did some vague nationwide miasma of hatred. Neither the city of Dallas nor the State of Texas fired the fatal shots, although several columnists have enterprisingly blamed the whole affair on Dallas.

Those who blame the city—meaning apparently its population in toto—are forgetting that the President was receiving one of the warmest and most enthusiastic welcomes of his career there, even though Dallas does contain elements opposed to his political philosophy. The deepest schisms were within his own party.

The President knew of these people when he went to Dallas, and it is obvious that he did not fear them for no extraordinary safety precautions were taken. He rode in a convertible with its top down, in full view of thousands who lined his route, and his conduct was not that of a man whose perspicacity told him he would be shot dead by the city. As the press has reported, the Texas welcome was so enthusiastic, so spontaneous and genuine, that Governor Connally's wife had exclaimed to the President an instant before the fatal shots:

> You cannot say that Dallas isn't friendly to you today, Mr. President.

Those who excoriate Dallas forget the shock and disbelief that gripped that city November 22. They forget—with intent, perhaps—the line of mourners which still files past the spot of the killing. They disregard the genuine outpouring of sympathy and grief from millions within Dallas and within Texas—sentiments that came spontaneously and sincerely from persons of both parties, from left and from right.

There is cause for questioning the gross negligence of some Dallas policemen in allowing the assassin to himself be assassinated, but in the words of the Wall Street Journal:

> It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share the murderous guilt or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious. For our part we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who in their moment of shock would indict a whole Nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria that they would charge to others and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Statements affixing a collective guilt, whether it be upon Dallas, the great State of Texas, or the Nation, can come only from men who have lost contact with the American spirit. They are ignoring both the facts of the assassination and the manner in which the American people responded to the tragedy.

Editor James Flinchum of the Wyoming State Tribune puts it this way:

> The city of Dallas and its people are no more guilty than those of any other city in the country, but there are those who would have you believe it, and interestingly enough, among them is the Soviet press which suddenly has recovered its voice and denounces the entire tragedy as the product of rightwing reactionaries and the Dallas police.

Dallas is not to blame because it had residing in its bosom for a few weeks the man whose tortured mind ended the life of our President. The city of Dallas has no reason to don a mantle of guilt because some groups which have alined themselves with extremist causes are found there. Such extremism did not take the life of the President.

### POLITICAL RIGHT

Those who would accuse the political right of pulling the trigger overlook the plethora of facts which point the finger of guilt at Lee Oswald and his affinity to leftwing dogmas from Marx to Castro.

There may be in America a radical right movement—just as there is a radical left—but there is a clear distinction between the radical right and America's bona fide political conservatives.

Let me interject here that as extreme as its views may be, the radical right has not sold our nuclear secrets to Russia, has not allowed free China to be driven to Formosa, has not condoned the enslavement of the captive nations of Europe, and has not helped communism establish a beachhead in Cuba. The only genuine hatred they seem to be guilty of is a hatred of communism.

It remains, however, a favorite ploy of the hate-the-right movement to wrap up every nonliberal—conservatives and others alike—in one nice neat package under one extremist label. It seems to be the fashion nowadays, and this is what some are attempting to do in the hysterical aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination.

Those of us who watched the unfolding of the tragedy on television on that unforgettable black Friday were shocked at the instantaneous prejudging of the assassin before his identity was known.

"A rightwinger killed the President," said some directly or by innuendo, and there was an unmistakable note of disappointment when they were forced to admit later that same day that the most probable suspect was in the fold of the left, not the right. Even now the fact of the matter is being obscured by the shakily constructed premise that an atmosphere of hate, created by the rightwing, inflamed the mind of Lee Oswald. "Maybe," some say, "the poor boy wouldn't have done the whole thing if he hadn't been tainted by the Dallas atmosphere."

But what of Oswald's own admission that he had been a Marxist since his midteens? In the ensuing years, during his tenure in the military, his infatuations with marxism and communism had been intensified to the point that hatred played a very great role in his mental chemistry.

### HATRED

Oswald's hatred was directed at America in general, her institutions, her private enterprise system, all those things which differentiate the free world from the world of chains and darkness. If hatred was a factor in the killing of John F. Kennedy, and it probably was, that hatred was from the left—the hatred which would "bury" America.

Editor Flinchum continues:

> Not very surprisingly, there have been those who have sought to place blame on political groups in this country, especially on rightwingers, although the immediate patent evidence is that the slaying was done by a Marxist, a subscriber to communism and a member of a pro-Castro Cuban organization.

As I have said, Mr. President, it is unlikely that a conspiracy of Oswald's leftist compatriots exists in the assassination. It is my understanding that a soon to be released report by the FBI substantiates that Oswald acted as a "loner" in the killing. But why was not Oswald under the closest scrutiny during the President's visit in Texas?

Oswald was known by the State Department to have sworn to an affidavit affirming his allegiance to the Soviet Socialistic Republic. He had a psychopathic record as well. He had vented his hatred of the United States publicly through the far left Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He considered himself a protege of the bearded dictator who governs Cuba.

But Lee Oswald was not watched on that fateful Friday. The danger from a man who had renounced his allegiance to America was ignored. Oswald was able to perch calmly and confidently in a window, munching fried chicken and drinking a coke, while he waited to gun down our President. Why? Why?

Columnist Holmes Alexander who recently interviewed my friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. TOWER], asks:

> Was it because the Federal Government and to some extent the general public have really come to believe that foolish, ill-mannered hecklers who spat at Adlai Stevenson represent a graver danger than the Communist system whose members and fellow travelers are the terrorists of Venezuela, the guerrillas of Vietnam, and the conquerors of Cuba?

Mr. President, has our Government been galloping about like Don Quixote seeking rightwing windmills to tilt, while the proliferating dangers from the left fester unchecked? This is one of the most important questions that can be resolved by the Executive Fact Finding Committee.

### THE PRESIDENT'S INTELLECT

Mr. President, critics and supporters alike agree that John F. Kennedy was possessed of a clear, rational mind. Whether one acquiesced in or opposed his political theories, there can be no denying that he had tremendous intellect, an almost instantaneous cognizance, and an extremely keen sense of propriety and reality. His disagreements with the political right notwithstanding, he would be appalled could he witness the perverse logic and irrational pronouncements evoked by his assassination.

The objurgation of conservatism is grossly unjustified when the facts of this killing indicate, as Columnist Wilson noted:

> The accused and likely murderer was a proudly professed Marxist. He never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

Wilson continued in an admonition that should be heeded by the entire Congress and all Americans:

> Nothing could be more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy than the notion that the attack on the President can be traced to the segregation or the far right issues.

I suggest that we resolve here today, each in his own mind, to cease feeding the fires of fanaticism kindled by the assassination. I suggest that we cease attempting to "nail" one political faction in America by exploiting the grief of the President's fine family.

The President was killed by a tortured man with a long record of erratic behavior and Communist inclinations.

There is no evidence to the contrary.

We have continuity of government under the Constitution. The Republc has weathered the storm, as have her institutions and her cherished political system. And so must survive the right to offer dissenting opinions without being labeled an extremist.

The assassination will not end political debate in this country. It will not, and it should not, cause all Americans to support controversial programs that met opposition before the murder.

There is no reason for the give and take of debate to be stilled now, for the issues remain to be evaluated on their merits, on reason, and on philosophy. The late President was one of the most vocal champions of the full give and take of debate. We have all seen him in action.

Let us then turn to the task to which we have been elected and truncate the activity of those who would manipulate the facts of the tragedy. The enemy continues to be the international conspiracy to destroy all free men. To assert otherwise is the grossest travesty on the truth.

It is fitting that the Nation honor and perpetuate the memory of the 35th President. Numerous bills and proposals to that effect have been propounded, and many will become law. But let us not make a mockery of such memorializing by interring with our fallen President the corpse of our assassinated American character.

Above all, let us as a people truly memorialize President Kennedy by uniting in devotion to our God and our country, and save our righteous indignation for those who defy both.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the able Senator from Wyoming for the magnificent address he has just delivered. The Senator from Wyoming has said some things which needed to be said. I commend his vision and his courage in making these remarks. I feel that it is important for the RECORD to show the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and for them to be recorded for history. Future generations should know the aftermath of what occurred in Dallas. What has been recorded here today by the able Senator from Wyoming as to what occurred there will be very helpful to historians in future generations.

Again I commend the fine Senator from Wyoming for the important contribution he has made on this occasion.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I am flattered by the accolade paid me on the floor of the Senate by that distinguished gentleman. It comes from one whose patriotism is unalloyed. He is one of the great patriots of America. Certainly it does service to the speech I have delivered.

### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 3, 1963]

### THE ASSAULT ON THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all "our unharnessed hates."

The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place, how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great civil war, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a variety of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

Such qualities are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

## ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy to Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man-in-the-street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influenced public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murdered was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far righter.

---

[From U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 9, 1963]

## NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

(NOTE.—Are the American people to blame for the assassination of President Kennedy? Men high in public life implied that in statements about the tragedy. They seemed to detect a national sickness that led to the assassin's bullet. This attitude prompted Vermont Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal, to write the following for his newspaper.)

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and, in so doing, show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men—they include public commentators, members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and, by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of State move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyanka Prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of state that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Dec. 1, 1963]

### HATRED AND HYSTERIA

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of hatred. The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the radical right—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our blood stream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simple-minded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1900 years after the Crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac, where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to reverence the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

---

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Nov. 29, 1963]

### THE 7 LONG DAYS

It now is 1 week since the awful assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas, 7 of the longest days in the history of this country.

As Dwight Eisenhower said an hour or so after the fatal events of that frightful afternoon, the American people will be admirable in their steadiness, courage, and—as the former President put it—"their good commonsense."

And so they have, to the amazement not necessarily of themselves, but of the rest of the world.

It is a tribute not only to their levelness and their ability to cope with moments of great crisis such as we have had in the past and must face again in the future, but also to the sound foundations on which our society and our governmental processes are constructed.

In the wake of this terrible event the people can, must, and will remain calm while the duly constituted authorities proceed with their investigation of the murder of the President of the United States.

In the mourning that is taking place there must be no succumbing to a hysteria which would injure the fundamental bases of the democratic processes and of the Republic.

It is well enough to abjure evil, hate, and violence; that is to set one against sin, and if a vote were to be taken, the "ayes" would have it unanimously.

But in doing so let us take care that the sacred right of free speech, and the right to disagree in politics or otherwise, are not tampered with, for to do so would be to weaken the stanchions of our existence as a nation.

In the mass welling up of emotions as a consequence of Mr. Kennedy's death, there has been much self-flagellation en masse both by the people of the city where the slaying took place and by the Nation at large, as if the whole country had assumed the guilt for this horrible deed.

"God forgive us all," said the words on a wreath placed in the little park beneath the Texas Book Depository building from where the fatal shots were fired.

"I was born and raised here," said a Dallas ambulance driver who helped place the slain President's body in its casket, "but now I am ashamed."

Not very surprisingly there have been those who have sought to place blame on political groups in this country, too, especially on rightwingers, although the immediate, patent evidence is that slaying was done by a Marxist, a subscriber to communism, and a member of a pro-Castro Cuban organization.

In advance of the FBI's expected exhaustive report on the circumstances surrounding the killing, it might be well to point out that all previous assassins of Presidents of the United States have been out-and-out psychopaths with only superficial political motivation: John Wilkes Booth, a Confederate sympathizer but also an alcoholic nut; Charles Griteau, a screwball subject to delusions and an obvious psychotic; and Leon Czolgosz, an anarchist who nevertheless was so obviously deranged that the real practicing anarchists wouldn't have anything to do with him.

This kind of person, in minute numbers, has been with us always and will continue to be with us long into the future. To cry out against extremism, however one might assess that, still does not protect the President of the United States against the dangers posed by the type of individual who has reached that degree of lunacy, who is so dangerously disturbed mentally that he would commit such an act.

We must reexamine, then, our physical protective measures for safeguarding the person of the President against those who conceivably could do him harm in the future. That the Government seems to be doing at this time.

For that reason the cries about guilt and shame, the accusations against the city of Dallas, and other such denunciations serve no very good purpose.

The city of Dallas and its people are no more guilty than those of any other city in this country, but there are those who would have you believe it and interestingly enough, among them is the Soviet press which suddenly has recovered its voice and denounces the entire tragedy as the product of rightwing reactionaries and the Dallas police.

The proper authorities may be expected to adequately determine just who is guilty of the President's death, however, as indeed they already have done to a degree.

In the meantime let us reflect on the safety of Presidents for now and for the future.

While a President cannot be a prisoner of those who would protect him against danger, it is apparent that he must be shielded more closely in the light of what happened 7 long days ago.

This thing has happened before, it has happened now, and it is demonstrably clear that it can happen again unless all possible physical precautions are taken.

---

### AN ELECTION ISSUE TAKING SHAPE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Was John F. Kennedy assassinated because the Secret Service and FBI were watching every radical rightist in Dallas and letting lunatic leftists like Lee Harvey Oswald run wild?

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, has raised this question in an interview with me. The Senator waited for a decent interval after Mr. Kennedy's stately, heart-touching funeral, but now he says:

"We have reports from Texas that the rightist figures were closely watched during the President's visit to Dallas on November 22d. It appears that the leftist figures were not watched."

TOWER, a conservative but no radical by any definition, is an anti-Birchite. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1962, will prove it. On that date, TOWER caused the reprinting of a famous article in the rightwing magazine, National Review, in which the John Birch Society leader, Robert Welch, was drummed out of the conservative movement.

Nevertheless, TOWER has been the target of leftist crackpots who blame the Kennedy assassination on rightist extremists. Undaunted, the Senator will demand investigation of his Dallas reports. He sticks by his conviction that America's worst enemies have been misidentified:

"The radical right," he says, "is the symptom of the disease we call extremism. The radical left is the disease itself."

Was there a failure in high places to take the Marxist menace as seriously as the Birchite menace? Did that failure contribute to the President's coming within gunfire of a Leftist crackpot? It is a hideous thought to contemplate, but it cannot be discarded for that reason. Even if Oswald turns out not to have been the killer (and we may never know), TOWER has much documentary evidence to show that the man was one who bore watching.

In January 1962 Oswald wrote from Minsk, in Russia, complaining to his Senator that the Soviets were holding him and his Russian-born wife in the U.S.S.R. against their will. Upon inquiry at the State Department, TOWER was told that Oswald was a man who had "requested that his American citizenship be revoked," and also a man who had previously, on November 2, 1959, sworn to this affidavit:

"I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

Yet the Federal Government, having helped Oswald to return, apparently did not mark him as a dangerous citizen. Oswald was able to buy a murder weapon, hide himself with the weapon in a warehouse along the route of Mr. Kennedy's fatal journey in

Dallas. Why wasn't Oswald under surveillance? Was it because the Federal Government, and to some extent the general public, have really come to believe that foolish, ill-mannered hecklers who spat at Adlai Stevenson represent a graver danger than the Communist system whose members and fellow travelers are the terrorists in Venezuela, the guerrillas in Vietnam, and the conquerors of Cuba?

These queries at the heart of TOWER's main question are going to uncork the vials of political passion which abated, very briefly, during the tragic interval of Mr. Kennedy's death and burial. Three investigations—Federal, congressional, and Texas—are now haltingly in motion to search out the causes of J.F.K.'s foul murder. One or more of these probes had better come up with plausible reports.

Otherwise, the sensational and unprecedented issue of a Presidential slaying will be at the center of next year's election.

## THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently a series of articles appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot. I believe they make a significant contribution to a much needed understanding of the problems and challenges faced by Negro Americans in the business world.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles, written by Morton A. Reichek for Advance News Service, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Against the backdrop of recent civil rights advances, the Negro business community—a small but bustling world of commerce and industry little known to the non-Negro—is in a ferment.

(Lured by increasing Negro purchasing power, white companies are invading markets which have been the traditional preserve of Negro businessmen. Then, as racial bars go down, Negro proprietors of restaurants, hotels, and places of entertainment are losing trade to white-owned establishments.

(In short, Negroes in business are faced with a moral quandary. As Negroes, they want desegregation on principle. But as businessmen who have lived under the protection of segregation, many of them face the threat of being integrated out of business.

(But there is a countertrend. Fortified by new managerial skills, easier access to capital, and a more congenial public climate, many Negro businessman are trying to move out of the segregated marketplace into the American economic mainstream. They are now competing against white firms in their own industries and are investing in businesses where Negroes were virtually unknown before.

(In a nine-part series of articles by Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service, presents a profile of the Negro businessman, examines the social and economic changes which beset him, and assesses their impact on American life.)

BALTIMORE, MD.—"I am not a Negro businessman. I am a Negro in business."

So speaks Henry G. Parks, Jr., a tall, athletic-looking man in his late forties who heads a company which produces breakfast sausages and scrapple. He sits in a richly paneled office. Plaques on the wall show his membership in Baltimore's city council and awards from leading business groups. A colorful Utrillo print overlooks his desk, and golf trophies are stacked up behind him. He is the prototype of the successful American businessman.

Parks is not hypersensitive about his race. Nor is he engaging in semantics when he talks this way. This is simply his way of saying he does not want to be typed. He wants to sell his product competitively to all consumers regardless of race. He wants no advantage in the Negro market, and he wants an equal crack at the white consumer.

Parks represents a new breed of Negro in business—the entrepreneur who has advanced out of the traditionally restricted Negro market to compete in what Negro intellectuals like to call the American mainstream.

Married and the father of two children, Parks personifies the American business dream come true. Twelve years ago he started from scratch in the sausage business, using rented secondhand production equipment and trucks.

He has since built up a firm which will rack up more than $4 million in sales this year, and is growing so fast that he soon plans to spend almost $1 million to build a new plant.

The Parks Sausage Co., Inc., services 7,000 stores and central warehouses in a market ranging from Massachusetts to Virginia. It has branch sales offices in New York City, Philadelphia, Washington, and New Haven, Conn., employs 140 persons, and competes against the giants of the meatpacking industry.

Close to 80 percent of Parks' consumers are probably white. Few if any of them know he is a Negro.

At the start, Parks concedes he went after what he defines as a "specialized market"—the Negro. "It was untapped in this region," he says, "and a market I knew best. My idea was to use it as a springboard to emerge into the bigger general market."

Parks now advertises heavily to the general public, and successfully avoids the image of a Negro product. His TV commercials in this area—featuring a small boy who shouts, "more Parks sausages, mom"—have made a considerable impact.

A remarkably self-assured and articulate man, Parks says that as a Negro, "I have to be better than my competition. I would love to have the right to mediocrity."

Born in Georgia, raised in Dayton, Ohio, he is a graduate of Ohio State University. He majored in marketing—an unusual academic field for Negroes in his day—and ranked high in his class. With some bitterness, he recalls that the large corporations snatched up many of his white classmates who had inferior academic records. Upon graduation, Parks went to work in a grocery store for $18 a week.

But he doesn't like to dwell on racial discrimination in his business career. "I have been insulted to the point of desperation, and I have swallowed gall," he says. "I have been able to divert my reaction, however, to positive purposes. I don't like to spend too much time contemplating on the past. I have gone into business, civic affairs, and politics without being resentful and negative."

Parks has a widely varied business background. From the grocery store, he went into administrative work for the National Youth Administration, a depression-era Government agency, then to work as a salesman in Chicago and New York City for a nationally known beer company.

"I didn't think the big companies were ready to allow a Negro to advance," he says. "So I resigned and went into business myself." His ventures included a New York partnership in public relations, advertising, theatrical bookings, and promotions (one was the ill-fated effort to push a soft drink known as Joe Louis Punch); drugstores, cement block manufacturing, and a real estate brokerage in Baltimore; a sausage company in Cleveland; then back to Baltimore where he set up his present company.

Parks has a silent partner, a local Negro financier, with whom he shares ownership of the sausage firm. They are also in the truck leasing business.

The company has a few white salesmen and production workers. He says he has tried unsuccessfully to hire more, and blames labor unions for failing to cooperate with him in his efforts.

Though active in the civil rights movement, he carefully separates this activity from his business life. Says Parks: "This is a business I'm in, not a social battle."

He claims there are other Negroes who own major businesses catering to the general public who "live in fear and hide their identity." He cites the case of a large floor-covering contractor with an all-white work force and a Negro handyman, who, unknown to all but a handful of select employees, is the firm's owner.

"The Negro businessman," says Parks, "needs the satisfaction of real accomplishment, the solace of a significant job well done, the thrill of being measured by his fellow man and not found wanting. If Americans cannot accept the Negro's privilege to get out and compete and to seek normal rewards, there is no hope left for any of us."

### PART 2: THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

WASHINGTON.—In this city, where well over half the population is Negro, you can't buy a man's shirt or suit from a Negro merchant. With very few exceptions, the same can be said for most any other American city.

This fact rankles many Negro community leaders. Not that they see anything sacred about the privilege of selling clothing. But this symbolizes to them the backwardness and ingrained limitations of Negro-owned business enterprise.

No one knows for sure how many Negro businesses there are. About 20 years ago, the Census Bureau dropped racial designations from its business surveys. Now, ironically, some Negro business experts want the Bureau to resume counting by race. They need some authoritative facts and figures on which to base their plans for revitalizing Negro-owned enterprise, nowadays, however, Government officials are squeamish about racial censuses.

Educated guesses on the number of Negro-owned businesses range from 45,000 to 60,000. Manufacturing of any consequence is rare. About 12 companies make hair straighteners, skin lighteners, and other cosmetics and toiletries for Negro use. A handful of others produce such items as caskets, chemical disinfectants, embalming fluids, food products, and sanitary supplies—also mainly for Negro consumption.

Equally rare is retail merchandising on a large scale. In Washington, for example, of 388 retail liquor stores, only 4 are owned by Negroes. Complains a Negro civic leader: "We know very little about how to buy something for a nickel and sell it for a dime. Yet this is where the real money is in business. We are mired down in personal service trades where normally you can only make enough to feed yourself."

The traditional pattern of Negro business consists of funeral parlors, grocery stores, shoe repair shops, lunch counters, barbershops, beauty parlors, and the like, in rundown neighborhoods—tiny ventures, and marginal at best, serving other Negroes.

Captive, low-income markets have held back the competitive pressures to improve.

Says one businessman: "Negro business has been forced off the main highway of commerce on to a detour. And no one can go as fast on a detour as on the main road."

There are lots of exceptions, of course, to this unalluring picture. Prosperous insurance and real estate firms, banks, truckers, restaurants and nightclubs, publishers, and taxi operators enhance the image of Negro business.

Banking and insurance are the major Negro-owned enterprises. At the end of last year, there were 12 Negro commercial and savings banks with total assets of $71.3 million. All but two are in the South. At least three others—in Houston, Tex., New York City, and Los Angeles—are opening up this year.

The latest count shows close to 50 Negro-controlled savings and loan associations (3 years ago there were only 28), 20 Negro-operated life insurance companies, and 2 multiple-line casualty insurance firms.

Compared to large non-Negro institutions, however, these are small potatoes. With a couple of exceptions, the banks are primarily small loan companies which generate few big commercial loans. The three largest ones have total assets of $35 million; New York's Chase Manhattan alone, by comparison, has some $10 billion. North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co., the largest Negro-owned business, has about $67 million in assets and less than $300 million worth of insurance in force—which rates it among smaller white companies.

There has been little traditional interest in business and Negroes. No doubt this reflects the Negro cultural heritage. In a slavery economy, Negroes were never even exposed to the rudiments of trade and commerce. In contrast, the European ethnic minorities who migrated here during the past century were steeped in cultures where business was an important ingredient.

To some extent, this background speeded the cultural assimilation of many of the immigrants. A foothold in business made it easier for some of them to force their way into the general society.

Barred from certain labor unions, for example, they went to work for employers of their own minority group. They were paid lower wages than native-born union members in the same industry. The immigrant employer was thus able to underbid his competition. Ultimately, the unions were forced to admit the foreign worker just to maintain higher wage levels.

For the most part, Negroes have been unable to use this tactic to get into unions. Not enough of them have been entrepreneurs. Now the situation is changing—particularly in the construction business where Negro contractors employing nonunion, lower-wage Negro workers have a competitive advantage. In effect, business enterprise is facilitating integration.

Young Negroes have not been normally attracted to business enterprise. Historically, the prestige or status roles in Negro communities have been held by doctors, lawyers, teachers, and preachers. Just recently, Ebony magazine published its ranking of the Nation's 100 "most influential Negroes." Only eight were primarily business entrepreneurs.

In many Negro communities, academic people have been the prime movers in business. For instance, in Atlanta, Ga., the citadel of Negro business life, most of the top executives of the major Negro insurance companies and banks have been or still are on the faculties of the city's six Negro colleges.

In Houston, Tex., the president of the new Negro-operated Riverside National Bank is Dr. Edward D. Irons, chairman of Texas Southern University's commerce department. In Baltimore, Md., Dr. Wilfred D. Bryson, chairman of Morgan State College's economics department, founded a Federal savings and loan association which now has assets of over $3 million. In Durham, N.C., there are close working connections between North Carolina Mutual and the local North Carolina College.

Negro doctors have also been important wheelers and dealers in business. Dr. J. E. Walker, a Memphis, Tenn. physician, founded the city's leading Negro bank and insurance company. In Atlanta, a surgeon was a founder and still is a major stockholder in Southeastern Fidelity Insurance Co., the first Negro multiline casualty company.

Dr. James E. Roberts of Washington is a fairly typical example of a Negro medical entrepreneur. A practicing obstetrician and a professor of medicine at Howard University, Dr. Roberts also owns a thriving laundry.

Aside from the basic cultural lag in business affairs, Negro business growth has been consistently hampered by lack of adequate capital resources and managerial know-how and by restrictions in business mobility.

Now advances in civil rights are helping reshape the Negro business world. The forces are working in two directions. On the one hand, the protective cloak of segregation, which has given many Negro entrepreneurs a monopoly on certain kinds of Negro business, is falling apart.

Lured by increasing Negro purchasing power, white companies are invading markets which have been the traditional preserve of Negro businessmen. Then, as racial barriers go down, particularly in northern and western cities, Negro proprietors of public facilities such as hotels, restaurants, and places of entertainment are losing trade to white-owned establishments.

But there is also a positive side. Fortified by new managerial skills, easier access to capital, and a more congenial public climate, many Negro businessmen are moving out of the segregated market place into the economic mainstream. They are competing against white firms in their own industries and are investing in areas where Negroes were unknown before.

---

### PART 3: THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

WASHINGTON.—When Berkeley G. Burrell, a young Negro master sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps, got out of the Army after World War II, he had an ambition common to many ex-GI's. He was—as he now puts it—"Determined to call myself my own boss."

In the service, Burrell had helped run the post drycleaning plant at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. He decided to parlay his military experience into a civilian business. He invested $1,500, some of it from Army savings and some borrowed, in a drycleaning store.

Over the years, Burrell, now 44, has developed a thriving Washington enterprise, Superb Cleaners. He has 2 retail outlets and a wholesale drycleaning plant which serves some 30 other retail stores and the Statler-Hilton Hotel. He has 15 employees and cleaning equipment valued at $50,000. His annual sales, now amounting to over $100,000, have been rising steadily.

Burrell who studied political science during 3 years at Howard University here, is active in civic affairs (Boy Scouts and community projects to combat juvenile delinquency), lectures to the local police department on race relations problems, and has become a national leader in Negro business affairs.

Recently elected president of the 10,000-member National Business League, a sort of nationwide chamber of commerce for Negro businessmen, Burrell is a man with a self-imposed mission: to increase the numbers of Negroes in business and to promote modern management techniques among Negro entrepreneurs.

"Only through the emergence of Negro business on a significant scale can this country hope to eradicate the economic and social gap between Negroes and whites," he says. "We can only integrate from a position of strength. And in America, this means financial strength."

Burrell is not talking about a surge of Negro business dependent upon Negro customers, nor does he want a "buy black" movement among Negroes. He envisages Negro businessmen competing in an open, nonracial market.

At least half of his own drycleaning business' customers are white. Says Burrell: "I hate to think of what would happen to me if I were restricted to a segregated market."

Burrell recognizes the absence of historic Negroes ties to business endeavor, and is pushing a campaign to make business enterprise more attractive to young Negroes. In his own case, he was motivated by his father, a barber and Government worker who took frequent fliers into the restaurant business, and by his mother who operates a hairdressing shop.

Militant Negro civil rights leaders, Burrell argues, have failed to appreciate the importance of creating more Negro-owned businesses. He contends that Negro-owned enterprises, catering to both whites and Negroes, act as a tool in integration. He plays up the significance of places like Paschal Bros. nightclub and restaurant, opened 4 years ago in Atlanta's southwest Negro section. A fabulously successful venture, it features topnotch jazz talent and attracts a trade which is at least one-quarter white.

Says Burrell: "Even in Jackson, Miss., if some Negro had a really first-class, air-conditioned hotel, the whites would find some way to use it."

He brushes aside criticism from some Negro leaders that Negro businessmen have been dragging their feet on the civil rights cause. "The Negro businessman doesn't have to be out in the street with a picket sign," says Burrell. "His responsibility is to furnish jobs." Burrell notes that Negro-owned businesses provide jobs for only less than 1 percent of the Negro work force.

Burrell has become a crusader on the question of fostering up-to-date management practices among Negro businessmen. Says he: "Our innate inefficiency makes it difficult for Negroes to keep their own markets, let alone to consider the pursuit of open markets. Business has become a science. It's no longer something that can be handled off the top of your head."

The lack of expertise early in his own career resulted in two serious business blunders. "In my first week in business," he recalls, "I did so well—$600 to $700 worth of sales—I thought I could do five times as well if I had five more stores." In a short time, he opened up additional cleaning outlets, then had to shut them down when he discovered how far he had overextended himself.

In another case, he paid off a 10-year loan of $49,000 in 3 years, then realized there was no advantage in paying off the long-term debt with fast payments. "This left me in a miserable cash position and created a tax liability I couldn't overcome."

He has subsequently taken several business management courses and is encouraging other Negro businessmen to do the same.

Burrell believes Negro businessmen should be more conscious of civic affairs. "Negro businessmen have never been involved before. So they aren't able to relate their own growth to the growth of their communities."

Burrell's views recently generated a squabble, within the local Washington chapters of the National Negro Business Organization. Some members disagreed with Burrell's stress on community interests. They said the more immediate problems of Negro businessmen rated a higher priority in the organization's program. The dissenters eventually quit Burrell's chapter and formed a rival group.

---

### PART 4: THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

WASHINGTON.—The Gotham, once the most popular hotel for Negroes in Detroit, is shut down. In New York City, the Hotel Theresa, a Harlem landmark for years, is in receivership. Here in Washington, close to Capitol Hill, Harrison's Restaurant, long patronized by upper class Negroes, is described as "a shell" by a former patron. In St. Louis, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and other cities, Negro newspapers are struggling against severe advertising and circulation declines.

These are symtoms of the boomerang effect of advances in civil rights.

As the major hotels, restaurants, and places of entertainment drop racial bars, Negroes in many cities are shunning the inferior facilities of Negro-owned establishments. The impact is the same on many other Negro enterprises exposed for the first time to searing competition from more strongly endowed white-owned businesses.

"Civil rights advances have complicated the problems of Negro businessmen whose activities were predicated on a segregated community," says Prof. H. Naylor Fitzhugh of Howard University here. "Their monopoly in the marketplace has been removed."

Although they don't like to talk about it very much, many Negro businessmen are in a moral quandary: emotionally, they are tied to the civil rights cause. But as men who have lived off segregation, they now face the threat of being integrated out of business.

Some Negro spokesmen are rather cold-blooded about the consequences. Says Texas-born Hobart Taylor, Jr., a Detroit lawyer who is executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity: "Negro business isn't going to exist anymore. Negroes have a concept of racial business only because of artificial barriers."

"Inefficient, mismanaged Negro businesses will die," says John H. Johnson, publisher of Ebony and other magazines aimed at Negro readers, "and they deserve to."

Stores in so-called fringe neighborhoods are feeling the pinch badly. Negro-owned enterprises dealing in personal services in completely Negro neighborhoods—barber shops, beauty parlors, mortuaries, and the like—are relatively unaffected. In cosmetics manufacturing, a major Negro industry, nationally advertised white companies are pouring into the Negro market.

Hotels and restaurants are hurting worst. "Whenever I came to Washington before," says a Negro college professor who visits here often, "I used to stay at the Dunbar. Why should I go there now when I can go to the Mayflower or the Shoreham?"

During the past year in Chicago, a major convention city, at least 10 conventions of Negro organizations have been held. In the past, the meetings were held in Negro hotels, churches, the YMCA and settlement houses. The delegates would stay at Negro hotels, roominghouses, and private homes, and eat in Negro-owned restaurants. Now the conventions meet in the major hotels in the Loop or lake shore area; the delegates patronize the finer nearby restaurants.

Theodore R. Hagans, general manager of Washington's Dunbar Hotel and president of the Nationwide Hotel Association, representing 200 hotels operated for Negroes, says that "our concern is not the total loss of Negro patrons, but the problem of competing with open hotels with inadequate funds. We can't finance the improvement of our facilities to meet the competition.

"We can make our prices competitive, but we no longer get the cream of the Negro traveler—the big entertainers, and so forth. As long as we maintain an economic situation, we will still get the bulk of the Negro trade. The majority of Negroes are interested in economy as long as the facilities are not offensive."

Hagans predicts that "many Negro hotels will go by the wayside." But he's optimistic that many—including his own, which supports itself on residential guests—will survive by sprucing up their facilities.

"Now it's fashionable to go to a white hotel to prove you can go where you want," he says. "But this won't be as important 5 years from now. When the dust settles, you go where you feel most comfortable, where you are treated as a preferred patron."

Bankers, the elite of the Negro business community, say they have been largely unaffected by civil rights advances. "We have always competed with white banks," says Lorimer D. Milton, president of Atlanta's Citizens Trust Co., which until recently was the only Negro-controlled bank belonging to the Federal Reserve System. "There's no segregation against money."

But life insurance companies, the other major element in Negro business, are encountering new competition from white firms. In the past, many insurance companies would not write policies on Negroes. Or, if they did accept Negro customers, the premium costs would be higher. Increased Negro purchasing power and improved Negro mortality rates, however, have recently made the Negro a major sales target.

Says Earl B. Dickerson, president of Chicago's Supreme Life Insurance Co., the North's largest Negro-run business: "A number of white companies have hired our agents, are able to give them more money and a more established name. They are coming into our market with great zest and force."

A Chicago Negro agent, formerly employed by a Negro insurance company and now working for a major white firm, has sold at least $1 million worth of insurance every year in the past 7 years. "This is real penetration of our market," says a Negro leader.

Negro insurance firms, however, are not suffering a decline in business. Supreme, for instance, paid a record high dividend this year. North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., is constructing a magnificent 12-story sculptured glass and concrete office building in Durham, N.C.

Instead, their problem has been an inability to gain as much as they might have in the past from the rapidly growing number of Negro insurance buyers.

"Segregation has given me 10 percent of the national market," says T. M. Alexander, an Atlanta Negro insurance man. "Now the white man is after my 10 percent. What we have to do is go after his 90 percent. We have to be good enough to do this. I think we are. I don't mind running the race on a competitive basis. But I don't want more holes in my path than in my competitor's."

---

### PART 5: THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

ATLANTA, GA.—Not so many years ago, two local Negro boys, Herman J. Russell, a plasterer's son, and Alfred L. Knox, the son of a grocer, were classmates at David T. Howard High School.

Today both are prosperous businessmen, and each is a notable example of how the traditional patterns of Negro business are being shattered.

Russell, now 33, is a construction contractor who specializes in apartment houses, warehouses, and other commercial structures. Normally, Negro builders have stuck close to the Negro market, particularly here in the Deep South.

But Russell is competing vigorously on the open market. He figures that about 90 percent of his clientele is white. So is at least 10 percent of his 170-man work force.

Knox, 34, is the proprietor of a five-and-dime variety store. A college graduate who majored in business administration, he has a huge attractive store building which he and a brother, a partner in the business, built almost 3 years ago. He is a student of the latest techniques in retail merchandising, and says his prices are in line with those of the large white-owned chainstores. Since so many of his customers own cars, he considers any store within 5 miles his competition.

Although Knox's store is in a low-income Negro neighborhood, Knox is the antithesis of the typical Negro retail merchant.

"The usual Negro merchant," says a noted marketing consultant, "maintains second-rate operations in substandard facilities, trading on racial loyalty. He has no opportunity for experience in modern merchandising methods. His inbred market doesn't demand more. His thinking, experience, and growth potential are limited."

Russell is described by a local Negro businessman as "Atlanta's next colored millionaire." (The city already has several, mostly bankers, insurance men and doctors.) Russell is a soft-spoken, unaffected man who feels most comfortable in work clothes even in his ultramodern, spanking-new office building.

His firm will handle $10 million worth of construction work this year both in general construction and plastering and drywall subcontract work.

Russell also manages a 150-unit interracial housing development he built; is partner in a joint venture which is building a $5-million, 520-unit housing project for the Wheat Street Baptist Church (the largest construction job ever handled by a Negro firm, he claims); and is vice president of Security Development and Investment Co., which he and four white men (two builders, an accountant, and a dentist) have organized for construction of up to 1,000 apartment units and other projects.

For his family, a wife and two children, Russell is putting up a $125,000 home with an indoor swimming pool. Last year, he became the first Negro member of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

Russell was reportedly invited to join when the chamber mistakenly assumed he was white.

Ten years ago, Russell was graduated from Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, where he majored in building construction. Following his father's example, he started a plastering business, then later expanded into general construction.

"Race has been more of a challenge than a handicap to me in business," Russell says. He credits improved race relations for his success. "My daddy never had my opportunities," he says. "If he had knocked on 70 architects' doors to bid on the kinds of jobs I do, they'd have thought he was crazy."

How does he compete successfully for white business against white firms? Russell's answer: "We have the best mechanics in town in our shop, which puts us in a position to compete with anyone. We have a group of people wedded to work, and we know how to sharpen our bids."

An agent of the local building trades unions complains that Russell employs nonunion men, pays less than prevailing wages, thus can undercut competing bids. Defending Russell, an Urban League official charges that the building unions "have not been fair to Negro workers."

Russell's firm was recently awarded a major plastering job at the Atlanta Airport. According to an authoritative source, the firm landed the job on the basis of its reputation; it had submitted the second lowest of three bids.

In terms of business volume, Knox isn't in Russell's league. His store, which carries hardware, a small line of dry goods, cosmetics, patent medicines, notions, work clothes, girls' dresses, lingerie, plants, and greeting cards, takes in about $60,000 a year.

Knox and his brother ran a grocery store until 2½ years ago, then were pushed out by an urban renewal project. This is a problem for many Negro merchants in large cities. Most are displaced from slum areas in which even a marginal business could survive, then are unable to afford the higher rents required in newer neighborhoods.

The Knox brothers had enough money to build their present store and to acquire an adjacent property for possible expansion. In Northern cities, Negro businessmen constantly complain about the lack of capital. "This is no problem for us in Atlanta," Knox says.

Knox says his business problems are matters of size, not race. He faces the classic problem of small merchants, white or black, who compete against large chainstores. The chains can buy merchandise and advertising cheaper and can usually trim profit margins.

However, says Knox, "If Woolworth's or Sears were to put up a store across the street, this would help me. It would make me get more on the ball. I have an asset they don't have. The personal touch. I get to know my customers by name. It means something for them to be wanted."

Knox says, "I try not to think about being the only Negro-owned store of its kind around here. I don't want my Negro customers to trade with me because I'm a Negro. They might expect to pay more, and I might start thinking about raising my markups. I want people to trade with me because I can give the same price and service—or maybe better—than the downtown stores."

## Part 6: The Negro Businessman in America

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

WASHINGTON.—Like most American Negroes, Negro businessmen have what Dr. Samuel Z. Westerfield calls a vague mystical kind of racial interest in Africa.

On the basis of racial kinship with the newly independent Africans, many of them dream of fabulous business opportunities awaiting them in the huge undeveloped continent. Most are frustrated by their lack of resources to exploit them.

Westerfield, who was formerly dean of Atlanta University's School of Business Administration and is now a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, warns that Africans are more interested in the competence of investors in their nations than in race.

Ambassadors from several new African nations have told him, in effect, that "the American Negro does not represent what we need. We don't want second-class American citizens who lack technical know-how and capital resources."

Prof. Horace Mann Bond, an Atlanta University historian and a leading student of African affairs who has acted as clearinghouse on the continent for many American Negro businessmen, says that the African outlook is brightest for Negroes who are "associated with the large American corporations, not for the small individual investor."

Bond points out that "expansion in Africa is big stuff—development projects which require massive capital investment. It is not for private people."

Despite this sort of talk from the experts, many American Negro businessmen are probing into African business opportunities. And some of them are making good.

One of the most successful cases involved three New Yorkers, a lawyer, an actuary, and an accountant, who set up a life insurance company in Ghana 8 years ago. Last year, the Ghana Government nationalized the firm. The company's founders were compensated, and one of the Americans, Robert Freeman, was retained to manage its operations.

Another New York Negro, Tom Brown, a refrigeration and air conditioning specialist, has started a company in Accra, Ghana's capital, called Camafrica. Brown's company produces coolers for Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola, and oil cans and service station equipment for Texaco, Shell, and Mobil Oil Co. He also has a crew of 30 Ghanaian sheet-metal workers, welders, electricians, and mechanics to service refrigerators and air conditioning equipment.

A Harvard-educated American Negro lawyer who was once a classmate of Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah at Lincoln University, a Negro school in Pennsylvania, has a Pepsi-Cola franchise in the same country.

Also in Ghana: The American proprietor of the country's first clothes pressing shop and a Chicagoan who has bought a trawler and is starting a frozen fish business.

In Liberia, American Negroes have established a liquid oxygen plant, an electric utility system in Monrovia, and are participating in the massive American-Swedish Minerals Co.-Bethlehem Steel Co. iron mining project on Mount Nimba.

In Nigeria, a couple of Negroes from Detroit have begun a lumbering operation, and a group from Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York is manufacturing concrete block. In Kenya, an American Negro is now in the coffee business.

Last October, a group of eight Negro businessmen from California, headed by Willis Carson, a Los Angeles real estate broker, and James Woods, a Compton builder, conducted what they called "The Men of Tomorrow Trade Tour of West Africa." They visited Liberia, Ghana, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria in a widely heralded effort to examine investment opportunities. So far, the results of the tour are uncertain.

A. G. Gaston, Sr., of Birmingham, Ala., one of the wealthiest Negro businessmen in the country, has also junketed around Africa looking for business opportunities. Gaston, who has many interests at home—ranging from a funeral parlor and insurance agency to a savings and loan association and a motel—reportedly has invested in a Liberian business.

A few years ago, Dunbar McLarren, an economics Ph. D. from the University of Illinois, attached himself to the late Patrice Lumumba, the first native leader of the former Belgian Congo, hoping to promote business interests. When Lumumba turned out to be an erratic rabblerouser with ideological leanings toward the Soviet bloc, McLarren jumped off the Congolese's bandwagon. He is now reportedly in Nigeria for the Rockefeller interests determining the feasibility of developing a glass industry.

Some American Negroes have demonstrated unusual naivete in their approach to African business. A former student of Dr. Westerfield, who was earning $30,000 a year operating gas stations in Atlanta, sold his business and rushed to Africa to try his luck. He went over with a minimum of preparation. Westerfield doesn't know what has happened to him.

A New York business consultant who specializes in African matters tells of a small Negro floor-wax manufacturer from Brooklyn who wanted a list of potential customers in Nigeria.

The man thought he might have a competitive advantage because he is a Negro. First off, the consultant told him he couldn't expect to establish sales contacts by mail, that he would have to scratch up enough money to go to Nigeria personally. He also told him his race was irrelevant.

Says the consultant: "If he can buy a better product more cheaply from Lever Bros. in the United Kingdom, the Nigerian businessman will do so, and disregard a Negro supplier from the United States. This will be the case even though he has to buy from his former colonial master."

LeRoy W. Jeffries, vice president of Chicago's Johnson Publishing Co. (Ebony and other magazines), sums up the view of American Negro businessmen on Africa:

"As Negro businessmen with a vested interest in America, we should make every possible financial effort to profitably aid in the development of (African) nations. After all, who can be a better salesman of democracy than an American Negro businessman with some worthwhile product or service to offer?"

## Part 7: The Negro Businessman in America

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

CHICAGO.—S. B. Fuller, a dapper, ebullient 58-year-old man who reminds you of a fire-and-brimstone preacher, is the biggest Negro industrialist in America. Little known to the general public, Fuller is one of the most controversial figures in the Negro community.

He is president of Fuller Products Co., a firm he started 28 years ago on $25. He now sells over $10 million worth of cosmetics and allied products to both Negroes and whites. Fuller also controls eight other corporations, including a Chicago department store, the Courier chain of Negro newspapers published in five cities, and a New York real estate trust. His income runs well over $ 100,000 a year.

Fuller is a rugged individualist of the old school, a fierce business competitor, and an exponent of the "hard sell" who conducts inspirational singing meetings for his salesmen.

He has provocative opinions about the racial situation which never fail to infuriate other Negroes. In essence, Fuller believes that Negroes have been held back not because of racial discrimination but because of their failure to work harder. He says Negroes should channel their energies more toward business enterprise than to civil rights demonstrations.

Fuller also thinks that public welfare measures are destructive for the Negro. "If you feed a man who's hungry," he once told a friend, "he'll have no incentive for improving himself."

Fuller likes to tell of his father who collected old bottles, rags, and other scrap with a horse and wagon in a southern town some 25 years ago. At the time, Fuller was in Chicago peddling soap, door to door.

He told his father he would save money to buy him a truck. His father said he didn't need a truck, disposed of his horse and wagon, and went to work for the WPA. To this day, Fuller tells people that WPA "destroyed" his father and prevented him from becoming a successful scrap dealer.

Louisiana-born, Fuller had a sixth-grade education, moved to Memphis at 15, and arrived in Chicago on a boxcar at 23. The Fuller Products Co. emerged from his door-to-door peddling. Recently he built a $100,000 home in a rundown Negro neighborhood to "inspire his people." He rarely, if ever, contributes money to Negro civil rights causes.

It was obviously men like Fuller who prompted one Negro intellectual leader—now a high-level official in the Kennedy administration—to say recently: "The Negro businessman is not in tune with the main thrust of our social revolution. He's out of touch."

It can be said—and many Negro intellectuals like to emphasize it—that some Negro businessmen have a vested interest in segregation. This is not necessarily true in Fuller's case. His company has bought two brands of cosmetics marketed for white people, and is pushing into the general market. About 20 percent of the 600 persons directly on his payroll are white, as are almost as many of the 3,000 people who sell Fuller products door to door.

A prominent Negro real estate and insurance broker in Washington with a largely Negro clientele has this to say: "Civil rights advances have helped us greatly. As Negroes get improved education, housing, and employment opportunities and a higher standard of living, there are more people with properties for us to insure and more customers to buy and rent homes. As the community is enriched, our business is helped."

Negro businessmen, as conservative by nature as any other businessman, have indeed been slow to support the civil rights militants. One who has been widely criticized for his aloofness is A. G. Gaston, Sr., a millionaire who lives amid quasi-Victorian splendor on a farm outside Birmingham. In recent months, Gaston's home and a motel he operates have been bombed. He is now a large contributor to the civil rights movement and has frequently paid jail bond for Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers.

"Gaston and others like him," says a Negro critic, "were never interested in the cutting edge of change. They used to belong to the don't-rock-the-boat school."

Most Negro businessmen bristle at such criticism. Says John H. Johnson, publisher of Ebony and other Negro magazines: "No Negro has a stake in segregation. Segregation keeps the Negro businessman from 90 percent of his sales potential."

"Sure, I don't march with a sign on my back," says Jesse B. Blayton, Sr., president of the Mutual Federal Savings & Loan Association in Atlanta, "but I give lots of money to those who do."

Some prominent Negro businessmen have walked on the racial picket lines. Two notable examples: John Wheeler, president of the Mechanics & Farmers Bank in Durham, N.C., a member of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and T. M. Alexander, Sr., executive vice president of Atlanta's Southeastern Fidelity Fire Insurance Co., who also operates real estate and insurance brokerages.

Edwin Berry, director of the Chicago Urban League, defends the Negro businessman against criticism from the intellectuals: "He's more in touch with the Negro masses than the Negro egghead. He has to go to the store where the masses are. He's not stuck in an ivory tower.

"Some of these people feel you're indecent if you haven't been to jail for picketing. You can't expect everyone to grab the flag and run."

"We need to join the fight for civil rights in our own way," says one Negro merchant. "There's more than one way to win the war. Businessmen have provided the money and facilities to fight the battle. We fight the hard way, the way to permanent respect."

A southern white social worker who has been active in the civil rights movement defends the role of the Negro businessmen like this:

"The criticism has been unfair. The achievements of these men have been based on working out some sort of modus operandi with the white power structure. You can't build a successful business in a state of warfare with the authorities."

---

### PART 8: THE NEGRO BUSINESSMAN IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

CHICAGO.—There is a growing awareness among Negroes of the impact of business on national life," says a leading Negro civic leader. "We have gotten a peek into the larger community, and we see that economics, more than politics, controls things.

"We used to think it was a big deal if we got to use a white restaurant or hotel. Now, when some of us spend money in white establishments, we think what a shame this money isn't going into Negro-owned business."

This kind of talk makes most Negro civil rights leaders shudder. It clashes with their effort to minimize racial loyalties and flies in the face of their drive for total cultural integration.

Even more significantly, this attitude conflicts with the aim of the more sophisticated Negro businessman who wants to advance out of the segregated marketplace into the Nation's economic mainstream by playing down the image of a special Negro market.

Paradoxically, the push for integration and the resulting racial stresses have created Negro chauvinism of a degree which has never existed before in this country. There is a growing sense of racial identification and consciousness spawned by the emotional conflicts over civil rights.

T. M. Alexander, Sr., executive vice president of Atlanta's Southeastern Fidelity Fire Insurance Co. and a leading advocate of competition by Negro businessmen in the open, nonracial market (an insurance brokerage he owns was the first Negro agency to represent white companies south of Washington, D.C.), concedes this.

He says, probably with misgivings, "My business is helped by agitation in civil rights. Negroes have become more conscious about doing business with other Negroes in areas where they have always had an opportunity to do so. All adverse racial experience simply sends more business to my agents."

The volume of trading by Negro consumers with Negro businessmen is frequently a barometer of racial tensions. "When tensions are not sharp, Negro businessmen have to compete on the basis of competence and economics," says Jesse B. Blayton, Sr., an Atlanta banker, radio station owner, CPA, and college professor.

When tensions are hot, he says, the tendency will be for Negroes to buy from other Negroes, regardless of price and other competitive factors.

In the wake of recent racial disturbances in Birmingham, new deposits have been burgeoning in the Citizens Federal Savings & Loan Association, a Negro-controlled institution, as Negroes remove savings from white banks.

Even when the racial climate is more relaxed, many Negroes have demonstrated extraordinary racial loyalty in business matters. In Houston, Tex., a new Negro-owned bank is siphoning off deposits from white-managed banks. In Miami, Fla., where two Negro-managed savings and loan associations have been set up, there has been considerable withdrawal of Negro funds from white-owned savings institutions.

In its most extreme form, Negro racial chauvinism manifests itself in the racist, pseudo-religious Black Muslim movement which advocates both cultural and economic separation of the races.

The movement's ideal is to create enough business enterprise to provide a self-contained source of employment for all Negroes, according to C. Eric Lincoln, historian at Clark College in Atlanta and a noted student of the Black Muslims.

Wherever they set up temples, the Black Muslims try to establish small business enterprises. Lincoln says, "I know of no city with a Black Muslim temple which does not also have a business run by the movement." The movement now has temples in 78 cities.

It has a used car lot in Boston, a used clothing store in Pittsburgh, and restaurants in New York and Atlanta. In other cities, the movement operates barber shops, shoe repair shops, laundries, and drycleaning stores. It has a 400-acre farm outside Atlanta and a smaller one in Michigan.

Lincoln appraises the extent of Black Muslim business activities so far, however, as "not significant."

Some Negro businessmen, notably those without pretensions of advancing into the open nonracial market, have used their economic power as a lever for racial demands. For example, A. G. Gaston, Sr., a millionaire Birmingham entrepreneur with varied interests, is a regular and substantial buyer of limousines for a thriving funeral parlor he operates. He recently told his limousine supplier not to come back for new orders unless he sends a Negro salesman.

Even Negro businessmen who want to repudiate racial loyalty as the basis for doing business assume that race will continue to be an ingredient in certain kinds of enterprise.

Discussing the future of his magazine, Ebony, a monthly Life-like magazine with a circulation of about 1 million, John H. Johnson, the publisher, says: Certain things bind Catholics, Jews, farmers, and teenagers together. There are publications for each of these specialized areas. I see no reason why integration should diminish my opportunities."

---

### PART 9: THE NEGRO BUSINESS IN AMERICA

(By Morton A. Reichek, Advance News Service)

WASHINGTON.—Will Negro-owned business go down with segregation? Or will Negro business enterprise expand as racial barriers fall?

Dr. Andrew F. Brimmer, a Negro on leave as assistant professor of finance at the University of Pennsylvania, now Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, offers this assessment:

"There are not likely to be many major enterprises owned and operated by Negroes which can flourish in a Negro market exclusively. They must look to the marketplace in general. There will be a withering away if they plan to live entirely in the Negro community. Anyone who thinks he has a safe preserve in the Negro market is in for trouble."

Already, many larger Negro-managed businesses are engaging in vigorous open competition in what could amount to a fight for survival.

Many Negro banks are soliciting white accounts. In Atlanta, the Citizens Trust Co. has landed an account of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., which has a large defense plant nearby at Marietta, Ga.

Negro-controlled savings and loan associations, particularly in California, are acquiring deposits of non-Negroes.

Q. V. Williamson, a major Negro realtor in Atlanta, says he is selling for and to whites for the first time. "This represents only about 3 percent of my volume," he says, "but I know of other Negro real estate men here who have a considerably larger volume of white business."

Negro insurance companies are bracing for the competitive battle by merging with smaller firms, issuing new types of policies, and hiring white agents to sell on the open market.

North Carolina Mutual of Durham, the largest Negro-owned business in the world, has merged with Unity Life. Chicago's Supreme Life, the biggest Negro business in the North, has acquired five smaller Negro insurance companies in the past 8 years. Now it is trying to crack Japanese and Mexican insurance markets on the West Coast by hiring Japanese and Mexican salesmen. Many of the major companies are reducing premiums and diversifying into medical and casualty insurance.

A primary objective of the larger Negro companies is to hire more white employees to enhance the image of integration. But many of the firms are not as successful as they would like to be.

"The old prejudice against white-Negro associations keeps whites from working for us," complains Supreme Life's president, Earl B. Dickerson, who is looking for white data processing technicians as well as agents. "Whites have declined our opportunities. They don't want to work at close range with Negroes. They fear this might adversely affect their future careers in other companies."

In cosmetics, the larger Negro-owned firms are invading the white market. Chicago's Fuller Products Co. has succeeded by acquiring established product lines in the white market. The Cannonlene Co. in Atlanta, has hired white salesmen and is selling to department stores in Northern cities.

A notable trend among Negro businessmen is to get outside the traditional Negro industries. In Chicago, Louis Alexander has set up a small electronics company and landed a military contract. Louis Roberts, a Fisk-trained physicist and Richard Walker, an MIT graduate in engineering, started Microwave Associates, near Boston.

Ernest Wilkins, a Chicago mathematician, formed a firm known as Nuclear Research Associates in New York City. Henry Hill, a Negro chemist, established Riverside Research Laboratories at Cambridge, Mass.

Archie Smith, a Texas-born pilot examiner for the Federal Aviation Agency, operates Warhawk Aviation Service in White Plains, N.Y. He offers flight instruction, sightseeing tours, air-taxi service, and charter service to any spot in the United States or Canada.

The Vee-Jay Record Co. in Chicago, begun on less than $3,000 in 1946 by a Gary, Ind., record shop owner and his wife, now grosses $3 million annually, has a talent roster which includes about 30 percent white artists.

Dealer franchises in such fields as appliances, automotive equipment, heating oil distribution, gasoline stations, and automobiles are enterprises which figure prominently in the plans of Negro businessmen. Forty out of 700 gasoline service stations in the metropolitan Washington area are now owned and operated by Negroes. More Negro money is invested here in this type of enterprise than in any other three major kinds of retail business combined.

Chrysler Corp. is considering the award of a Chrysler-Plymouth franchise to a Negro in Detoit, Edward Davis. This would make Davis, now a vice president in a white-owned Ford dealership, the Nation's first Negro new car dealer.

Still, the number of Negro-owned businesses is on the decline. But this reflects general economic trends rather than racial considerations. Negro-owned enterprise is essentially small business. The overall national pattern shows rougher sledding for small, independently owned businesses, regardless of racial ownership. In merchandising, the large chainstores are pushing aside small retail stores. In other industries, the profit squeeze is getting tighter on the smaller entrepreneur.

One consequence of civil rights advances also discourages the growth of Negro-owned business. As better employment opportunities open up, many Negroes will find it more attractive to work for some one else than to strike out on their own.

Many Negro business observers, however, consider this a short-term trend. They believe that as more Negroes acquire greater managerial know-how in new fields of endeavor, are exposed more widely to the world of business, and can accumulate capital under liberalized employment conditions, the long-range outlook is for an upsurge in Negro-operated business enterprise.

Meantime, Negro-owned businesses are getting a steadily declining share of the Negro consumer dollar. The problem is this: Negro-operated business is primarily of a service nature and the Negro service market is shrinking.

As overall Negro income continues to zoom, Negro families—especially the rising numbers entering the middle class—are spending fewer dollars on services and more for purchases of consumer appliances and in other areas where Negro businessmen are not yet active.

While many Negroes talk excitedly about the future of the American Negro in business, there is considerable sour talk from others who see no particular virtue in increased Negro participation as entrepreneurs.

Says one cynic, a Negro social worker in Chicago: "I hope Negroes don't rush into business. White people are always trying to sell us hand-me-downs."

---

## ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT WAS AN INDIVIDUAL ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President. A group of propagandists in foreign lands and a few commentators and writers in America have sought to convey the erroneous idea that the tragic and brutal assassination of President Kennedy reflected "an American attitude" and that all our citizens should have a sense of guilt because of this atrocious act. Fortunately, however, wiser and more thoughtful spokesmen are now making clear the fact which should have been apparent to us all; namely, that Oswald was a malicious killer and that his murderer, in turn, was an erratic individual and publicity seeker.

Except for the established fact that Oswald was an avowed and admitted Communist and a leader of a group supporting Castro and his Communist regime in Cuba, there is no evidence indicating he was a member of a conspiracy planning the assassination of the President nor active in any of the "Hate America" groups whose mimeographed mailings and rantings in a public press seemingly eager to balloon such statements up into important news stories to clutter our American scene. So the murder of the President is Oswald's individual guilt and the killing of Oswald was by another guilty individual by name of Ruby or Rubinstein, whichever is correct. Neither individual remotely reflects American attitudes, or thoughts, or sentiments, and no American other than those two need feel twinges of conscience because two madmen out of nearly 200 million Americans decided to violate the laws of God and man by committing coldblooded murder.

In our vast country, murders are committed somewhere and by somebody every day of the year. Whether committed as acts of passion or premeditation or fear of capture or detection, each murder to be sure demonstrates a weakness somewhere in our society, but this side of heaven, I presume violent men will at times resort to violent acts and perfect law and order can never be obtained. We can and should strive for improvement, of course; better child training in the home and in the schools will help; a more successful program of instilling the respect and restraints which a good religion teaches will also assist; more vigorous law enforcement and more severe terms for those arrested for breaking the law will surely be helpful; the early detection of the mentally depraved or maladjusted will be useful together with better methods of correcting or curtailing the likelihood of violence from those mentally unbalanced.

But, perfection, we shall never have except as a distant goal toward which we all should strive, so when madmen strike at high places it is a demonstration of an individual failure just as when they run amuck in their own communities and take the lives of their own neighbors, but certainly this is not a demonstration that as a nation we have gone mad, or that we condone murder, or that we lack the morals and methods necessary to maintain a sound society.

Recently, three separate articles from widely separated sources have come to my attention, calling attention to the facts obtained in the assassination of our President and stressing the fact that this tragedy was caused by individual actions reflecting not at all upon the honor, the integrity, the stability, and the good judgment of Americans as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I feel they will be useful to historians many decades from now who will be called upon to assess the era of the sixties.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 27, 1963]

### ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DEPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-extermination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy To Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man in the street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far-right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well-conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root-causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Dec. 1, 1963]

### ALL AREN'T RESPONSIBLE FOR MADMAN'S CRIME

Enough time has now elapsed since the assassination of President Kennedy to view the event with some detachment from the excitment of the moment.

And it is to be hoped that this means a more objective and understanding appraisal. If this is not the case, then it may well be said we are an immature nation.

Sharply distressing was the manner in which many persons in high places succumbed to emotional hysteria and actually descended to an intellectual gutter in their comment.

Among these, for example, was no less a person than Chief Justice Warren of the Supreme Court who charged that the murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence that are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

The Minneapolis Tribune said much the same thing. So did many other prominent voices, including various Members of Congress as well as Drew Pearson and Walter Lippmann.

#### NO COLLECTIVE GUILT

Such nonsensical drivel was in effect a refutation of the factors of American freedom that permitted the crime to take place.

To say that all America shares the guilt is to say that vigorous moves should be made to control all noncomformists, to place them in cells, if need be, to prevent their misbehavior.

The Wall Street Journal ably stated the case a few days ago when it insisted, in a potent editorial, that this is "no time for collective guilt."

It said: "We find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding."

#### ALSO IN THE PAST

What seems to have escaped these critics of the American mood is the realization that the killer was a mad zealot. Also apparently escaping them is the fact that the killing or the attempted killing of an American President is nothing new under the sun.

To describe the Dallas incident as a particular product of these times is to ignore history.

The blunt truth is that it has been always thus.

Almost a century ago—in 1865—Lincoln was killed. An assassin shot Garfield in 1881. McKinley was killed in 1901.

Even earlier—in 1835—Jackson escaped death because a would-be assassin's weapon misfired. While campaigning for a third term in 1912, Theodore Roosevelt was shot by a man who tried to kill him. Just before Franklin Roosevelt's inaugural in 1933, an attempt was made on his life. A guard was killed in 1950 when two fanatics attempted to shoot Truman.

#### IF WE ARE TO BE FREE

It is not pleasant to recite this record but it seems necessary to do so to place historical events in proper perspective so that all may understand that the life of a President is constantly in danger.

And those dangers in a sense stem from the very freedom and democracy of America.

Men go about freely. Even Presidents do. Fanatics are tolerated. Extreme expressions of opinion are permitted.

What should be made clear is that a potential killer of a President is almost invariably a man whose mind has become deranged. As I sought to set forth in my comment of last Sunday, President Kennedy's killer was obviously a madman. And this has been the case in respect to others who have made assaults on the lives of American Presidents.

To eliminate this possibility in any community or in the Nation means the imprisonment actually of all persons who seem to be queer or odd in their behavior. Such a policy, of course, would do damage to the principle of civil liberty about which so much is heard today.

#### BALLOTS, NOT BULLETS

Americanism permits wide expression of opinion. It grants an individual the right to campaign for war or peace. It allows him to attack the capitalistic system and, if he so desires, to criticize the President. He may call for the impeachment of his elected or appointed public officials.

But it doesn't allow anarchy. Happily the American people—the overwhelming percentage of them—accept the ballot box and our legal institutions as the proper and only way to effect the changes they advocate.

But occasionally men go berserk. And that, one might say, is virtually a calculated risk. Certainly the aberrations of these few are not to be construed as an indictment of the moral tone of the American people as a whole or of their way of life.

No occasion exists for hanging our heads in collective shame over the episode in Dallas. The incident, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out, "does not cast a shadow on the whole of America." As it says, an indictment of this type is vicious.

Let us go forward now with this realization, stressing our obvious strength instead of dwelling unpon fictitious weakness.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

### GUILT IS PERSONAL

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The grief was spontaneous and, in most cases, wholly sincere. Not because Mr. Kennedy's policies were universally beloved, but because he was a man so intensely charming, whose personal vigor and robust enjoyment of life so invigorated almost all who beheld him. The metabolism of the whole Nation rose on account of the fairyland quality of the first family. After all, no divine typecaster could have done better than to get J.F.K. to play J.F.K., Jackie to play the First Lady, and the children to play themselves.

It is, of course, a little eerie how, in response to tragedy, everyone ends up saying just about the same thing. It is not the easiest thing to do to distinguish even between Khrushchev's encomium and the Pope's. It is absolutely impossible to distinguish between tributes given to him, and the messages of sorrow sent to his family, by officials at opposite ends of the political spectrum.

Those who were unmoved by Mr. Kennedy's career, and opposed his policies, tend to sound exactly like those who loved him and loved his programs as well.

Wanting to show their opposition to treachery, his critics, even at the expense of apparent hypocrisy, are prepared to blur in deference to the awesome occasion their estimate of (a) the man's fate and (b) the policies to which they were in opposition.

My own message, which I was called upon to make a few minutes after the President's death, began as follows (and thereby hangs a tale): "The assassination of President Kennedy was," I said, "the act presumably of a madman, heir to the madmen who killed Lincoln and McKinley, and, for that matter, Christ, reminding us that the beasts are always with us, and that they continue to play decisive roles in history and in human affairs."

I meant in that first sentence to try to warn against an impending storm, whose electricity was hot on the air.

The opinionmakers of the country, and probably large segments of the population, were getting ready to turn the President's tragedy into an excuse for a pogrom against the American right.

Within a matter of minutes, nationally known radio and television commentators had started in, suggesting that the assassination had been the work of a right wing extremist, and recalling that it was also in Dallas that Adlai Stevenson had recently been hit on the head by an anti-U.N. placard.

However, to the quite obvious dismay of the bloodhounds, it was only a matter of hours before the Dallas police put their finger on the probable culprit. An almost undeniable case apparently has been built against him and lo and behold—the assassin turned out to be a member of a Communist front who only a few years ago tried to give up his citizenship in Russia as a means of expressing his contempt for this country.

Goodness knows what would have happened if Lee Oswald had not been apprehended, or even if he had been apprehended a day or two later.

Even as it was, the dissappointment was more than some could bear, and the genocidal fury here and there broke its traces.

The point to remember is that the act in question, although it was done by a far left winger, is not an act for which the far left bears the collective guilt. It was made by a fiend. Oswald was, in all probabilty, psychotic; it is of no importance whatever whether his political delusions were of the left, or of the right. The finger that pulled that trigger was directed by a febrile mind. The political coordinates of that mind are purely coincidental, and nothing of a general nature is to be gathered from his membership in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, or his sympathy with Marxism.

I do not suggest, obviously, that the far left is incapable of organized acts of political assassination. I say, merely, that this horror did not have the earmarks of one. The presumption, on all such occasions as this, is against a conclusion of collective guilt, whether imputed to the left or the right, whether to all the whites in Birmingham, all the Vietnamese in Saigon, or all the Jews in Jerusalem.

Let us hope there will not be a next time, though history is against such optimism; yet let us all recall that in crime, as in art, there is great scope for individuality.

So this is a time for courage. Even his most adamant political opponents acknowledged the personal courage Mr. Kennedy showed during his young and dazzling lifetime. Now, no doubt, he would desire that his countrymen also act courageously enduring their grief; and demonstrating to his bereaved family not only their compassion, but also their fortitude.

---

## HATE, THE HIGHLY INFECTIOUS DISEASE

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, millions of sorrowful, thoughtful Americans listened Tuesday night as their FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, spoke to them and for them. His speech was very thoughtful and important and, in fact, was one of the most intelligent addresses I have ever read.

This man, who has built our Federal Bureau of Investigation into an organization of which each observant, thinking, forward-looking American can be proud, had much to say about the ways we can move to safeguard our Nation. He also spoke regarding the course of action taken today by entirely too many who, believing they are protecting our Nation, too often are doing exactly the opposite.

I am glad J. Edgar Hoover has won the Brotherhood Award of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. He deserves it.

I am also glad he has spoken as he has, because, if followed, his blueprint can help build a better America, one in which tolerance can replace hate. History has proved that hate produces little beyond destruction, while the exercise of tolerance with vigilance can build a nation and a better future.

I ask the unanimous consent that both the article written by Jerry O'Leary, Jr., concerning Mr. Hoover's speech, and printed in the Washington Evening Star on December 5, and the complete text of Mr. Hoover's address be printed in the Record.

Mr. President, later I shall speak further in regard to the address delivered by Mr. Hoover; but I make this request for the printing of his address in the Record, so that others will be able to have copies of his address.

There being no objection, the article and the speech were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Hoover Says Fanatics Are Threat to Nation

(By Jerry O'Leary, Jr.)

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warned last night against "venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right" and branded their acts of hate, terror, and intimidation a national disgrace.

Mr. Hoover's speech was broadcast by all the major radio networks as he accepted the Brotherhood Award at a testimonial dinner in his honor by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. At the dinner in the temple at Massachusetts Avenue and Macomb Street NW., Brotherhood President Arnold J. Fine presented Mr. Hoover with a Ner-Tamid, or everlasting light lamp of silver that once hung in a 13th century synagogue.

The inscription of the lamp reads: "The Brotherhood Award of the Washington Hebrew Congregation presented to John Edgar Hoover for his unswerving devotion to the betterment of brotherhood of all races, creeds, and colors."

### MALICE SERVES COMMUNISM

Mr. Hoover said the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe and the other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man. He said they are carriers of a "highly infectious disease."

"They clutter the streets, and the mails, with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror, and intimidation," said Mr. Hoover. "They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship."

Mr. Hoover said these merchants of hate invariably attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. "But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize on ignorance, prejudice, and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold," said the FBI Chief.

He said the Communists today continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States and that the peddling of "their dishonest doctrine to inexperienced and eager-to-believe young people it not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in its demoralizing effect."

### HYSTERIA OF NO USE

Mr. Hoover declared that communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name-calling but by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The FBI Director pointed out that moral lethargy and neglect of duty has contributed to an increase of crime that has turned the streets into jungles of terror and fear.

"Disrespect for law and order," he said, "is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fair play. The moral strength of the Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption.

"We are at war with communism, and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be."

Jimmy Durante and his oldtime companion, Eddie Jackson, headlined the entertainment attended by 450 persons.

---

### Faith in Freedom

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

This is a great moment in my life. To be recognized in this manner by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

I am especially honored by the presence of so many close friends, including the distinguished civic leaders whom you have selected as recipients of other awards.

How have these men come to positions of prominence in our community? It is because they have dedicated themselves to service—they have eagerly accepted the responsibilities of good citizenship, and they are willing to be judged upon their records of positive contributions to the cause of decency and of justice.

Decency and justice—these are the high aims of this brotherhood, just as they always have been an integral part of the Hebrew religion which has given mankind the Ten Commandments and the concept of a monotheistic God. For these sacred gifts, all true religions of the Western World are eternally indebted to you.

Americans of the Hebrew faith are doubly blessed. The rich cultural inheritance that has been handed down since early Biblical times to generation after generation of Jews is combined, in our country, with a proud heritage of freedom. It is a heritage that was won by the sweat, the blood, and the sacrifices of men and women of many nationalities and many religious creeds.

Devotion to God; belief in the inherent dignity of mankind; faith in man's ability, through divine providence, to guide his own destiny—these are the strong ties that hold together our United States, the greatest brotherhood of freedom in the history of the world.

No one has a deeper understanding of the true meaning of freedom than the members of the Hebrew faith, for no peoples have suffered more relentless persecution and injustice at the hands of tyranny through the ages.

Today the fires of antisemitism continue to burn with fierce intensity in many areas of the world. This is particularly true behind the Iron Curtain where communism, the bitter enemy of Judaism and of all other religions of the world, seeks to destroy your priceless heritage and the right of your people to live according to the tenets of God.

During the past generation, the conscience of decent men everywhere has been shocked by the continuing vicious atrocities that have been committed against Jews in the Soviet Union. Rabbis have been arrested and imprisoned or executed; synagogues have been desecrated; the traditional Jewish school system has been liquidated; and Hebrew literature, language and customs have been suppressed by the Russian Communists.

Despite Communist claims of improved conditions for Jews under the Khrushchev regime, the opposite actually is true. Additional forms of suppression have been introduced.

The observance of Passover no longer can be held according to tradition; sacred Hebrew burial customs have been obstructed; and a statewide program has been instituted to make Jews the scapegoats for criminal acts affecting the Russian economy. Jews are clearly identified by religion on the internal passport which all Soviet citizens must carry.

Last October the outrageous extent of this program was disclosed by the Moscow newspaper Izvestia when it announced the arrests of several persons involved in an alleged criminal conspiracy. The leaders of this gang have Jewish names, Izvestia told its readers in demanding a "show trial" and "death sentences."

Vicious outbursts of religious hatred such as this caused one American newspaper recently to warn its readers, "For reasons best known to themselves the Soviet leaders discriminate heavily against Jews. The evidence is overwhelming and incontrovertible and renewed almost daily by the Russians themselves."

In a joint statement released last summer, three American Jewish organizations denounced the Soviet press for conveying "a viciously negative image of the Jews," and indignantly proclaimed, "Soviet Jews are deprived by official policy of religious and cultural rights * * * and are the victims of discrimination."

Communism and religion—like communism and freedom—can never coexist, for Marxism is unalterably opposed to all forms of religious belief. Lenin acknowledged this fact more than 50 years ago when he exhorted his followers, "We must combat religion—this is the A.B.C. of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism." Then he declared, "The Marxist must be * * * an enemy of religion."

Since the time of Lenin, atheistic communism has surged forth from Russia to enslave nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Nowhere are its advance battalions more active than in our own Western Hemisphere, where agents trained by the Kremlin continue to burrow deeply into countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Their deadly objective is to undermine legitimate governments, foment revolution, and create a Soviet Union of Latin American Republics.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Here in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents, and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks.

Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within. Foremost in this campaign are the party's efforts to exploit misunderstandings and capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest wherever they exist. This is especially true in the intense civil rights movement, for America's 20 million Negroes and all others engaged in this struggle are a major target for Communist propaganda and subversion.

It would be absurd to suggest that the aspirations of Negroes for equality are Communist inspired. This is demonstrably not true. But what is demonstrable is that some individuals and groups exploit the tension for purposes not confined to the equality of human rights under the Constitution of the United States. The crusade should not become a vehicle for political radicalism or organized violence.

Devotion to race must not supersede devotion to established institutions.

It would be useful if responsible Negro leaders themselves could make it clear to all who follow them that their interest is solely in racial equality.

This Nation was conceived under God and its progress has been under God. There could be no greater disaster for our Nation than that it should deny in any respect, to even the smallest degree, the presence, the power, the guidance, the protection, the instruction of Almighty God.

There is unmistakable evidence of divine guidance all through the history of our Nation. We must guard it. We must cherish it. We must revere it. We must work for it.

The record of our Nation is better than that of any other nation in any other part of the world. It is true there are injustices in this Nation toward those of dark skin, as well as light, but even worse injustices prevail in other parts of the world. Whether the people are black or yellow or brown or white skinned, these things will have to be worked out.

America has taken the lead in working them out, and it is taking the lead today. It is doing more for its underprivileged minorities than any other nation in the world, but there is more to be done.

We thank God that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

As citizens of a free country, we must judge people as individuals—not by race, creed, or color.

Legitimate civil rights organizations must remain constantly alert to attempts by the Communists to influence their actions, take over their programs, and corrupt their ranks.

Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice, and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe, and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man.

These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror, and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace.

Invariably, these merchants of hate attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize upon ignorance, prejudice, and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold.

Today, the Communists continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States. Their designs on American youth revolt and anger those steeped in our national ideals of freedom.

The peddling of their dishonest doctrine to high-minded, largely inexperienced, and basically eager-to-believe young people is not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in demoralizing effect. It can undermine patriotism, create doubts about our social and economic system, and mock the many wholesome youth organizations in this country.

The great majority of American youths are genuinely convinced that they would not fall for the Communist bait. Many never would. But there are others who might never know they were "hooked" until the enormous tragedy of their loss of faith dawned after bitter years of fighting the American way of life, almost unwittingly, as dupes of the Communists.

It has happened to idealistic Americans before.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology. Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The God-given ideals which are responsible for this country's greatness are being attacked on many fronts today. Moral lethargy, self-indulgence, neglect of duty—these lethal forces are undermining many facets of business, labor, industry, and Government.

We find their influence in the repulsive attitude of "half-way Americans" to whom life in this country is the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities.

We find their influence in those courts of law where the true purpose and intent of our Constitution as a document designed for the protection of society have too often been warped and distorted for the benefit of offenders.

We find their influence in the continuing increase of crime—a tragic national problem which is growing four times as fast as our expanding population.

Crime has no respect for age, nationality, sex, color, or religious creed. It has turned our streets into virtual jungles of terror and fear.

Today, a brutal crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape, or assault to kill—is committed every 3 minutes. The number of these senseless atrocities will continue to grow until men of strong moral conviction assert greater influence toward the prevention of crime and administration of justice.

Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity and fair play. The moral strength of our Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to cure this moral illness.

Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.

There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets, and our families, will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the "rock from which we were hewn."

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding and faith in God.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience polices our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers had a vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, courage and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus xxv, verse 10: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhood of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said—"As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a nation of free people, united in one faith—faith in God.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I join in commending to the reading of Senators the article written by Jerry O'Leary, Jr., and published in the Washington Star.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—GLEN ELDER PROJECT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 343 AND 344)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 9140, the public works appropriation bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 11, line 18, change $187,425,000 to $182,425,000 and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

On page 12, line 5, add the following: ": *Provided further*, That no funds in this bill, for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first I wish briefly to describe these amendments.

The first amendment would eliminate the $5 million to be appropriated under the bill for the so-called Glen Elder project. That is a dual-purpose project, one purpose being to provide flood control in the Kansas City area and the other purpose being to provide irrigation in the vicinity of Glen Elder, Kans., for Kansas farmers.

The first amendment would eliminate the entire project, so far as the appropriation is concerned, at this time.

The second amendment would provide that none of the funds for the project shall be spent for irrigation.

I shall address myself primarily to the second amendment today, though I shall discuss both amendments to some extent.

I wish to make some parliamentary inquiries, and I ask for the attention of the Parliamentarian.

I read the second amendment, which is very short.

On page 12, line 5, add the following:

*Provided further*, That no funds in this bill, for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes.

My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment, when offered, will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I honestly and frankly submit this amendment with great reluctance. Last year I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this particular project, and I made the longest speech any Senator made in the Senate last year. It was a 10-hour speech. I made it because I felt then that this was the most wasteful project I had ever seen, and I wanted to dramatize how wasteful these projects can be when conceived as this one has been conceived and when based on a totally unrealistic estimate of the discount ratio, which I shall explain in a moment, and of the life of the project, which I shall also explain shortly.

This project is particularly wasteful in view of the fact that the irrigation portion—$17 million of the $76 million project—would be for the prime purpose of bringing more feed grains into production. Thirteen thousand acres of additional land would be brought into the production of feed grains. If there is something which the country needs less than feed grains, I am not familiar with what it is.

We are now spending hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce the supply of feed grains. We are spending more than a billion dollars.

I have a table which shows the estimated total payments under the feed grain program for 1963 to each of the States in the Union; and almost every State including Rhode Island is included. I point out that unless my amendment passes the Public Works Appropriation bill will bring additional land into production of feed grains at a cost of millions of dollars, although Kansas is receiving $44 million for taking land out of the production of feed grains. The total payments in the Nation in 1963 will be $843,842,000 for taking land out of production.

I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the "Estimated Total Payment under the Feed Grain Program for 1963," listing amounts for each State now being expended by the Federal treasury to take land out of the production of feed grains, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Estimated total payment under the feed grain program for 1963* [1]

[In thousands]

| | |
|---|---|
| Alabama | $10,364 |
| Arizona | 3,242 |
| Arkansas | 2,805 |
| California | 10,186 |
| Colorado | 6,919 |
| Connecticut | 85 |
| Delaware | 1,479 |
| Florida | 3,230 |
| Georgia | 11,950 |
| Idaho | 1,699 |
| Illinois | 87,564 |
| Indiana | 53,693 |
| Iowa | 121,709 |
| Kansas | 44,375 |
| Kentucky | 18,378 |
| Louisiana | 3,109 |
| Maine | 20 |
| Maryland | 3,025 |
| Massachusetts | 13 |
| Michigan | 21,236 |
| Minnesota | 54,015 |
| Mississippi | 7,696 |
| Missouri | 65,424 |
| Montana | 1,813 |
| Nebraska | 68,138 |
| Nevada | 16 |
| New Jersey | 2,366 |
| New Mexico | 2,838 |
| New York | 6,633 |
| North Carolina | 20,853 |
| North Dakota | 13,742 |
| Ohio | 36,730 |
| Oklahoma | 9,668 |
| Oregon | 2,308 |
| Pennsylvania | 8,162 |
| Rhode Island | 1 |

See footnote at end of table.

*Estimated total payment under the feed grain program for 1963* [1]—Continued

[In thousands]

| | |
|---|---|
| South Carolina | $6,018 |
| South Dakota | 15,643 |
| Tennessee | 14,925 |
| Texas | 64,524 |
| Utah | 694 |
| Vermont | 49 |
| Virginia | 6,298 |
| Washington | 2,942 |
| West Virginia | 733 |
| Wisconsin | 26,016 |
| Wyoming | 516 |
| Total | 843,842 |

[1] This includes corn, barley, and grain sorghum.

This is only a part of the cost. In the second place, each year we spend a large and increasing amount of money for storage, interest, and transportation costs for the feed grain program.

In 1961 we spent $463 million.

In 1962 we spent $473 million.

In 1963 we spent $475 million.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing storage and interest costs of feed grain programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Storage and interest costs of feed grain program*

[In millions]

| Year | Storage and handling | Transportation | Packing and processing | Reseal storage | Imputed interest | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1961 | $224.8 | $52.9 | $0.7 | $38.1 | $147.4 | $463.9 |
| 1962 | 213.5 | 67.3 | 3.3 | 59.5 | 130.1 | 473.7 |
| 1963 | 184.0 | 78.2 | .8 | 66.5 | 145.8 | 475.3 |

Source: Department of Agriculture.

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** If there is added to the amount being spent for payments of $844 million the amount being paid for storage and interest, the cost of the feed grain program is now $1,319 million a year; think of it: $1⅓ billion.

I submit that it does not make any sense to appropriate millions of dollars to build a dam for the purpose of bringing more feed grains into production.

Even if the feed grain were needed, it would be an unjustifiable and uneconomic investment. But when we do not need them, when from an irrigation standpoint the dam has a zero value—in fact, less than zero, because not only can we not use the feed grains, but we would have to spend money to store them—it is particularly nonsensical.

The project will be urged on the ground that it would help the farmers. Not only would it not help farmers generally throughout the country; it would not even help farmers who are supposed to benefit from having their land irrigated.

We should recognize that no group in America has shared less in our prosperity in the past 10 or 15 years than have the farmers. During that period the farmers have increased their efficiency three times as rapidly as have people off the farm. They have done a fine job of increasing productivity and efficiency. In the past 15 years they have doubled their productivity. Today, one farmer does what two farmers did 15 years ago.

The farmers work long hours. According to the Department of Agriculture statistics, farmers in Wisconsin last June worked 11½ hours a day. They work 7 days a week. They work 52 weeks a year. The cows must be milked. The job always must be done.

Furthermore, the farmer makes an investment. He does not merely bring his own efforts, skill, and energy to the job. He brings those, but he also brings a significant amount of his money. The investment has been increasing greatly. The average farmer in Wisconsin must make an investment in his farm of $35,000 or $40,000.

Throughout the United States there is a tremendous investment in farms.

The farmer takes a bigger risk than perhaps any other large group of people in our economy. In spite of that fact, his income is low. It is shamefully low. The income of our farmers is less than half the income of people off the farm. The hourly income is about one-quarter of that of people off the farm.

Why is it low? The farmer's income is low because of overproduction; because we cannot solve the problem of tailoring farm production to demand; because we find ourselves in a position where the efficiency and the productivity of the farmer is so great that he is drowning under his productivity. The more he produces, either the greater the drain on the taxpayers or the lower his income, or both.

The crux of the farmer's difficulty, the heart of the difficulty, is that there is too much production of farm products. That is why our farm program is designed to take land out of production, to discourage farmers from producing so much. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for this purpose. Now we turn around with the other hand, in another bill, the public works bill, and appropriate millions of dollars to bring more land into production to produce the very crops that we are spending so much to take out of production.

It is not as if the situation were going to be better in a few years. The fact is that the situation will become worse in coming years.

We can expect over the next few years to have literally millions of additional acres going back into production as the soil bank contracts expire.

The fact is that in 1963, before this year is through, there will be some 6,800,000 additional acres in production. That means they will be in production or the taxpayer will have to dig into his pocket to pay the farmer to keep that land out of production.

In 1964, the additional acreage will be 3,400,000.

In 1965 it will be 577,323.

In 1966 it will be 2,271,644.

In 1967 it will be 1,691,506.

In 1968 it will be 6,120,064.

In 1969 it will be 3,570,020.

And so on ad infinitum.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C.—*1956-61 conservation reserve program—Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]

| State | Acres to be released as of Dec. 31 | | | | | | | | | | Total acres in reserve | Total number of contracts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | | |
| Northeast area | 91,491 | 49,882 | 421,945 | 244,795 | 4,405 | 18,500 | 31,431 | 236,067 | 223,942 | 27,274 | 1,349,732 | 27,917 |
| Connecticut | 118 | 36 | 2,522 | 717 | 92 | 17 | 108 | 498 | 451 | 3 | 4,562 | 190 |
| Delaware | 502 | 122 | 8,418 | 2,887 | 91 | 336 | 231 | 5,149 | 521 | | 18,257 | 279 |
| Maine | 12,817 | 9,355 | 15,141 | 15,943 | 198 | 3,113 | 9,075 | 23,868 | 21,427 | 10,416 | 121,353 | 2,632 |
| Maryland | 8,846 | 3,490 | 39,669 | 13,013 | 266 | 1,140 | 1,498 | 10,207 | 4,853 | | 82,982 | 1,467 |
| Massachusetts | 111 | 38 | 1,081 | 361 | 38 | 31 | 53 | 376 | 588 | 40 | 2,717 | 109 |
| New Hampshire | 67 | 63 | 1,469 | 400 | | 147 | 312 | 4,390 | 4,330 | 314 | 11,492 | 437 |
| New Jersey | 2,962 | 1,727 | 25,130 | 14,066 | 33 | 341 | 91 | 1,991 | 1,913 | | 48,254 | 1,061 |
| New York | 36,009 | 21,160 | 127,155 | 76,760 | 1,260 | 7,384 | 10,417 | 96,738 | 107,656 | 11,938 | 496,477 | 9,472 |
| Pennsylvania | 20,097 | 11,009 | 138,407 | 82,858 | 677 | 2,385 | 3,656 | 47,632 | 53,609 | 323 | 360,653 | 7,163 |
| Rhode Island | 19 | | 10 | 25 | | | | 8 | | | 62 | 4 |
| Vermont | 87 | 121 | 3,651 | 2,789 | 198 | 663 | 1,920 | 11,651 | 7,107 | 4,214 | 32,401 | 987 |
| Virginia | 8,422 | 1,806 | 38,831 | 22,891 | 1,187 | 2,811 | 1,933 | 21,671 | 13,650 | | 113,202 | 2,355 |
| West Virginia | 1,434 | 955 | 20,461 | 12,085 | 365 | 132 | 2,137 | 11,888 | 7,837 | 26 | 57,320 | 1,761 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE C.—*1956–61 conservation reserve program—Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]—Continued

| State | Acres to be released as of Dec. 31 | | | | | | | | | | Total acres in reserve | Total number of contracts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | | |
| Southeast area | 150,653 | 114,081 | 734,749 | 412,730 | 6,699 | 298,727 | 537,763 | 1,155,973 | 780,126 | 18,976 | 4,210,477 | 70,745 |
| Alabama | 12,060 | 5,515 | 64,141 | 33,959 | 387 | 29,624 | 50,206 | 122,783 | 88,210 | ---------- | 406,885 | 8,279 |
| Arkansas | 33,806 | 28,042 | 171,382 | 76,519 | 1,302 | 12,070 | 39,304 | 150,452 | 76,806 | ---------- | 589,683 | 9,289 |
| Florida | 8,703 | 3,470 | 10,772 | 15,985 | 253 | 50,409 | 28,241 | 58,418 | 49,821 | ---------- | 226,072 | 2,162 |
| Georgia | 23,211 | 16,852 | 83,374 | 60,652 | 1,375 | 109,401 | 223,926 | 315,665 | 220,721 | 301 | 1,055,478 | 14,730 |
| Louisiana | 4,707 | 2,822 | 46,506 | 22,092 | 318 | 13,875 | 41,757 | 59,703 | 25,509 | ---------- | 217,289 | 3,275 |
| Mississippi | 30,488 | 26,396 | 108,577 | 26,659 | 1,056 | 17,568 | 21,184 | 61,376 | 24,706 | 1,528 | 319,538 | 5,652 |
| North Carolina | 5,488 | 4,931 | 61,481 | 53,362 | 273 | 20,453 | 24,001 | 67,478 | 29,804 | ---------- | 267,271 | 7,728 |
| South Carolina | 12,676 | 6,004 | 46,360 | 48,383 | 445 | 32,123 | 87,080 | 196,450 | 187,581 | 17,147 | 634,249 | 11,754 |
| Tennessee | 19,514 | 20,049 | 142,156 | 75,119 | 1,290 | 13,204 | 22,064 | 123,648 | 76,968 | ---------- | 494,012 | 7,876 |
| Midwest area | 296,132 | 139,365 | 2,079,972 | 1,027,477 | 11,660 | 49,628 | 33,862 | 678,863 | 402,519 | 2,909 | 4,722,387 | 70,035 |
| Illinois | 13,017 | 4,414 | 270,298 | 85,750 | 546 | 2,454 | 986 | 43,890 | 11,896 | 412 | 433,663 | 6,048 |
| Indiana | 22,831 | 6,065 | 257,796 | 118,357 | 1,859 | 1,458 | 723 | 53,186 | 24,607 | 69 | 486,951 | 7,800 |
| Iowa | 60,508 | 18,669 | 352,304 | 159,598 | 2,275 | 1,607 | 1,244 | 34,263 | 16,765 | 158 | 647,391 | 7,541 |
| Kentucky | 13,901 | 7,212 | 164,837 | 66,532 | 1,071 | 1,858 | 3,196 | 95,862 | 31,445 | ---------- | 385,914 | 5,467 |
| Michigan | 52,948 | 23,358 | 254,267 | 150,722 | 1,864 | 17,249 | 10,067 | 93,141 | 96,613 | 392 | 700,621 | 11,444 |
| Missouri | 50,766 | 50,552 | 265,884 | 150,577 | 1,987 | 6,703 | 6,167 | 209,207 | 83,043 | 276 | 825,162 | 10,882 |
| Ohio | 26,051 | 9,003 | 237,407 | 137,567 | 905 | 1,568 | 1,012 | 48,190 | 47,793 | 107 | 509,603 | 8,690 |
| Wisconsin | 56,110 | 20,092 | 277,179 | 158,374 | 1,153 | 16,731 | 10,467 | 101,124 | 90,357 | 1,495 | 733,082 | 12,163 |
| Northwest area | 774,404 | 521,399 | 2,144,852 | 1,184,354 | 37,182 | 554,122 | 409,886 | 1,955,700 | 1,289,441 | 9,571 | 8,880,911 | 59,067 |
| Idaho | 20,004 | 8,545 | 85,696 | 40,633 | 1,848 | 8,844 | 2,343 | 78,614 | 34,862 | ---------- | 280,789 | 1,502 |
| Minnesota | 225,629 | 199,603 | 506,303 | 153,502 | 10,727 | 231,892 | 174,140 | 285,848 | 93,935 | 9,509 | 1,891,088 | 19,972 |
| Montana | 31,496 | 16,342 | 140,702 | 59,405 | 2,734 | 17,144 | 16,958 | 221,076 | 122,650 | 46 | 628,553 | 2,031 |
| Nebraska | 59,614 | 25,864 | 323,621 | 130,566 | 2,307 | 13,559 | 10,919 | 221,955 | 84,692 | ---------- | 873,097 | 7,359 |
| North Dakota | 204,060 | 138,980 | 495,601 | 398,803 | 8,407 | 200,843 | 137,886 | 557,151 | 558,020 | ---------- | 2,699,751 | 12,280 |
| Oregon | 24,457 | 14,253 | 75,804 | 33,015 | 1,314 | 11,749 | 8,427 | 37,933 | 23,021 | 16 | 229,989 | 2,229 |
| South Dakota | 182,319 | 95,485 | 380,893 | 315,365 | 5,646 | 61,239 | 43,600 | 417,962 | 317,286 | ---------- | 1,819,795 | 10,964 |
| Washington | 11,019 | 18,822 | 106,270 | 44,500 | 4,199 | 3,168 | 14,082 | 91,629 | 40,081 | ---------- | 333,770 | 2,181 |
| Wyoming | 15,806 | 3,505 | 29,962 | 9,165 | ---------- | 5,684 | 1,531 | 43,532 | 14,894 | ---------- | 124,079 | 549 |
| Southwest area | 1,191,937 | 489,006 | 1,433,613 | 551,771 | 517,377 | 1,350,667 | 678,564 | 2,093,461 | 873,992 | ---------- | 9,180,388 | 73,241 |
| Arizona | 4,846 | 476 | 400 | ---------- | ---------- | 1,552 | 385 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 7,659 | 65 |
| California | 19,749 | 9,814 | 84,529 | 36,134 | 2,927 | 2,552 | 3,103 | 30,680 | 11,336 | ---------- | 200,824 | 1,071 |
| Colorado | 104,019 | 43,979 | 123,634 | 26,643 | 3,192 | 192,088 | 95,025 | 587,812 | 111,554 | ---------- | 1,287,946 | 4,733 |
| Kansas | 80,665 | 86,954 | 301,484 | 102,539 | 12,990 | 93,776 | 113,139 | 397,763 | 257,912 | ---------- | 1,447,222 | 12,624 |
| Nevada | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| New Mexico | 88,425 | 15,355 | 13,657 | 568 | 250,642 | 310,756 | 111,819 | 72,092 | 415 | ---------- | 863,729 | 3,496 |
| Oklahoma | 167,519 | 104,159 | 296,861 | 141,207 | 6,166 | 153,375 | 98,242 | 308,558 | 213,048 | ---------- | 1,489,135 | 16,841 |
| Texas | 706,668 | 220,615 | 571,826 | 232,023 | 240,531 | 549,013 | 242,689 | 628,916 | 255,594 | ---------- | 3,647,869 | 33,431 |
| Utah | 20,046 | 7,654 | 41,228 | 12,657 | 929 | 47,555 | 14,162 | 67,640 | 24,133 | ---------- | 236,004 | 980 |
| United States | 2,504,617 | 1,313,733 | 6,815,131 | 3,421,127 | 577,323 | 2,271,644 | 1,691,506 | 6,120,064 | 3,570,020 | 58,730 | 28,343,895 | 301,005 |

[1] Report from Data Processing Center of contracts on record as of Dec. 1, 1961.

ASCS, Soil Bank Division, Dec. 29, 1961.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Some people argue that by the time the dam is built and more land is brought into production we shall need it.

The fact is that we shall need not more, but less land for production in future years. This assertion takes into account the prospect that there will be a larger population, and that people will eat more. Even if more agricultural products are exported, we shall need less land than we now need.

The reason is obvious to anyone who has studied land chemistry, irrigation, insecticides, and who recognizes the marvels of modern American agriculture. There are many ways in which farmers, by the use of irrigation and fertilizer, can greatly increase productivity.

We shall not need more productive land in the foreseeable future, or during the life of this dam. We shall need less land.

Most Senators have perhaps seen a motion picture, "Bridge on the River Kwai," or, if they have not, perhaps they have read the book. It is one of the most dramatic and beautiful demonstrations of the utter, sheer irony and waste of war that I have ever seen. It was a dramatization of a British regiment which had fallen into the hands of the Japanese soldiers in the southwest Pacific in World War II. The British had superb morale and a leader with great courage and fine leadership qualities. The colonel was disturbed about the possibility that this wonderful regiment, with their fine courage and spirit, might lose their morale. He himself stood up to the toughest kind of torture inflicted by the Japanese. They placed him in circumstances that were cruel and difficult for him, but he was able to stand up to that torture.

The Japanese proposed that, in order to keep the regiment occupied and keep their morale up, they build an extraordinarily complicated and difficult bridge for the Japanese which the Japanese had failed repeatedly to build. The captured British regiment under the colonel's inspired leadership built a magnificent bridge, one that the commanding officer said would last for 600 years. Of course, the irony was that the bridge frustrated the very purpose for which those brave British soldiers had fought and sacrificed and risked their lives to hold back the Japanese military effort, to frustrate and defeat it, not help it. The commanding officer became swept up in the building of that bridge, and had his men working hard and using their genius and effort endlessly day after day in building the bridge. But after the bridge was finished, the Allied forces sent saboteurs to blow up the bridge.

The saboteurs, after terrific trials and tribulations, came to the bridge and ingeniously contrived to blow it up. As they were about to do so, the British colonel, who had devoted so much of his genius and leadership and the efforts of his men to building the bridge suddenly saw them. He saw that they were about to blow up his pride and joy, his magnificent 600-year bridge. He was out of his head with fury. In an instinctive betrayal of his country he called attention of the Japanese to the saboteurs and tried to cut the wires, to keep the bridge from being blown up. The patriots, heroic saboteurs who had come there at great risk on this dangerous mission in behalf of the allied cause, were shot down and killed.

"Bridge on the River Kwai," was a dramatic illustration of what happens when ends are forgotten and how apparently honorable means can violate the ends they only exist to serve. The reason why I give this example is that I believe we have lost sight of the end, the objective of our reclamation program by going into this idiotic and obsolete notion of bringing more land into production.

At the time the project was authorized, back in 1944, we needed more land. We had a shortage of food in the free world, and we were supplying the free world with food for war purposes.

At that time it made some sense. However, today, the last thing on earth we need is more land in production. However, that is what we are doing. This food, when it is produced, will have to go into surplus. We do not need it. Nevertheless, it will be produced, and then put in storage.

What really puts the icing on the cake is the fact that the farmers whose land is to be irrigated do not want the project.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee in 1962, and again this year against the project. After I appeared in 1962 I expected that the people from Kansas would not be happy about my appearance against the project, and that I would receive some letters protesting my butting my nose into their business. Not so. I received many letters in support of my position. I received sworn affidavits from farmers.

I received affidavits from 90 percent of the farmers in the area who own 85 percent of the land, in opposition to the project. They said they were against it. I have a list of the farmers who are involved. I have their names and addresses. They are the farmers who own the land in this area. In order that there may be no mistake about the fact that the farmers involved do not want the project and are against it, I ask unanimous consent that every name and every address on the list I have here be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Landowners within the proposed Glen Elder Irrigation District who have registered their objections by petitions to the formation of said irrigation project*

| Name | Address | Acreage |
|---|---|---|
| Floyd Rominger and Thelma Rominger | Glen Elder, Kans | 80 |
| W. L. Fuller and Etta Fuller | do | 160 |
| Elwood Harrison and Mary Harrison | do | 160 |
| Quentin Kelley and Pauline Kelley | Beloit, Kans | 160 |
| John Bunger, guardian of William and Frederick Bunger, minors. | do | 146 |
| William Thiessen and Emma J. Thiessen | do | 427 |
| | | 186¾ |
| Stewart Barker and Louise L. Barker | do | 160 |
| Charley V. Vetter and Charlotte Vetter | do | 318 |
| Anna J. Olson | Denver, Colo | 151 |
| W. D. Thiessen and Olivene Thiessen | Beloit, Kans | 154 |
| A. C. Remus and Irena Remus | do | 560 |
| Effa May Metcalf | do | 126 |
| Paul James | do | 221 |
| Gerald Smith and Aileen Smith | do | 241 |
| W. Earl Porter and Thelma Porter | do | 466.8 |
| Elmer Golladay and Sarah Golladay | Glen Elder, Kans | 80 |
| Lena James and M. R. James | Beloit, Kans | 160 |
| Maggie McClintock | do | 306 |
| Minnie Thiessen | do | 160 |
| Lena James and M. R. James | do | 110 |
| Louise Thiessen | do | 384½ |
| Ellen Davis | Salina, Kans | 160 |
| Florence L. McKechnie | Glen Elder, Kans | 160 |
| Hamer Williams and Emma C. Williams | Beloit, Kans | 480 |
| Millie Clover | Glen Elder, Kans | 320 |
| Winifred Johnson | Beloit, Kans | 435 |
| Elmer Porter and Christine Porter | do | 200 |
| Jay F. Johnson | do | 110 |
| Doyle L. Remus and Mrs. Shirley Remus | Glen Elder, Kans | 283 |
| Maxine Reinhardt, R. A. Reinhardt, Elizabeth Dean, and Keith Dean. | do | 150 |
| Mrs. Carl A. Porter | Beloit, Kans | 160 |
| Anna R. Thiessen, Carol Thiessen, Marjorie Thiessen Havel, Kenneth D. Havel, Vernon Thiessen, and Anna L. Thiessen. | do | 105 |
| William J. Remus and Orpha A. Remus | Glen Elder, Kans | 160 |
| Emma Lund and Frank J. Lund | do | 280 |
| Leo H. Eberle | do | 10 |
| Mrs. Sylvia E. Vetter and John C. Vetter | Beloit, Kans | 383 |
| Guy Noller | Glen Elder, Kans | 196 |
| Lula Rawlins | Beloit, Kans | 398½ |
| Mrs. Ruth Kirgis and George Kirgis | do | 160 |
| Roy A. Fobes and Trella Fobes | do | 360 |
| J. A. Muck and May E. Muck | Glen Elder, Kans | 23 |
| Vincent Engelbert and Elizabeth Engelbert | Beloit, Kans | 160 |
| E. D. Metcalf and Mrs. E. D. Metcalf | do | 160 |
| Albert McDysan | do | 20 |
| Darrell L. Fobes | do | 80 |
| Robert Metcalf and Elizabeth Metcalf | do | 160 |
| Doyle V. Neifert and Esther G. Neifert | Glen Elder, Kans | 80 |
| Elden McCune and Chloe McCune | do | 112 |
| Dean Miller | do | 5 |
| Fred Boehner, Laura Boehner, Earl Boehner, and Doris Boehner. | do | 160 |
| Davida Simpson and Elmer E. Simpson | do | 40 |
| L. L. Humes and Bessie Humes | do | 80 |
| George Megli and Bernice Megil | do | 240 |
| Sadie M. Gansel and Helene Gansel Wood | Beloit | 23 |
| Ferd R. Gansel | Hill City | |
| Martha P. Morton | Concordia | |
| Joe D. Gansel | Beloit | |
| Joe Hicks, William Hicks, and Virginia Bunger | do | 256 |
| H. E. Marquis | Glen Elder | 120 |
| Carl Thiessen and William Thiessen | Beloit | 150 |
| Eva Irean Grigsby and James W. Grigsby | Jacksonville, Oreg | 160 |
| Verna D. Rawlings and E. B. Rawlings | Santa Clara, Calif | |
| W. Earl Porter and Fronia Porter Harned | Beloit | 109 |
| Carl Thiessen | do | 100 |
| Arnold C. File and Dee Ann File | do | 160 |
| A. Graff by Paul T. Graff, agent | do | 140 |
| Amos Chapman and Alma Chapman | do | 145½ |
| Arnold C. File and Dee Ann File | do | 200 |
| Ralph Nicholson and Meredith Nicholson | Glen Elder | 80 |
| John Porter | do | 80 |
| G. H. Gish and Lacy Gish | do | 9 |
| Ralph Nicholson and Meredith Nicholson | do | 220 |
| M. E. Gentleman and Ava B. Gentleman | do | 262 |
| Gerald Farr | Beloit | 160 |
| Ora Porter | do | 160 |
| Frank T. Nash and Marcy T. Nash | Glen Elder | 425 |
| Nash estate by Frank T. Nash, administrator | do | 300 |
| Mrs. Clara Rominger | do | 160 |
| Merle L. Campbell | Topeka | 37 |
| Seth F. Wilson | Asherville | 199 |
| Alfred Emmot and Carrie Emmot | Beloit | 80 |
| Duane K. Stilley | Seabrook, Tex | 600 |
| Vera M. Cruse and Floid E. Cruse | Farragut, Iowa | |
| Louis E. Stilley | Fort Worth, Tex | |
| T. Boyd Hull | Beloit | 389 |
| Mrs. Ross Strawn | do | 178 |
| Nick A. Ernzen | do | 254 |
| Lola Remus, Mary Virginia Remus, Kim Remus, Twila V. Remus, and John B. Kruse | do | 160 |
| Kenneth Wendell and Lucile K. Wendell | do | 47 |
| John H. Matheis | do | 345½ |
| Charlotte File | do | 80 |
| Mrs. Anna Jones | Wichita, Kans | 160 |
| Susan File | Beloit | 235 |
| Donald Dooley | do | 160 |
| John C. Vonderheide, Rose Vonderheide, Katherine Vonderheide, and William Vonderheide. | do | 280 |
| Lucy A. Brackett | do | 95 |
| Mary E. Stover, agent | do | 160 |
| Seth F. Wilson and Theron Wilson | Asherville | 135 |
| Lawrence Briney | Beloit | 20 |
| Wilbur W. Kent | do | 137 |
| Harry R. James and Margaret M. James | do | 160 |
| Robert Vernon, Betty Jean Vernon, and Mrs. Effie J. Vernon. | Simpson | 280 |
| Bon Duff | Beloit | 160 |
| Joe McClure | Simpson | 160 |
| Mrs. May Vernon | do | 160 |
| Thomas L. Carlin | Beloit | 120 |
| Joe Krone | do | 42 |
| Edgar T. Pierce and Hazel Pierce | do | 79 |
| Mrs. Ella C. Wagner | do | 153 |
| Irma Schellinger | do | 88½ |
| Daisy E. Guard | do | 122 |
| Everett M. Burkhead, Ethel Wolverton, and Doris Lieurance. | do | 109 |
| Gertrude E. Burnette and William Burnette | Asherville | 152 |
| Chas File | Beloit | 359 |
| Otto E. Lange and Mary L. Lange | Asherville | 226 |
| Marietta Stilley | Beloit | 80 |
| Viola E. Pearce | do | 126 |
| Frances Heinen | do | 302 |
| R. J. Fittell and Cora B. Fittell | do | 148½ |
| Lola Remus | do | 388 |
| Mrs. Ethel Burnette | do | 160 |
| Jess Dameron | do | 67 |
| Regina M. Hodler | do | 215 |
| John A. Heller and Rose D. Heller | do | 146 |
| Leonard J. Heller | do | 69½ |
| William T. Heller | do | 80 |
| Robert N. Sherrard | do | 178 |
| Duane E. File | do | 160 |
| Susagnes Heller Schwerman | do | 79 |
| Irene Hyde Miller | do | 120 |
| Louise Hyde Dooley | do | 420 |
| Elizabeth Myers | do | 80 |
| Vernon Thiessen and Anna L. Thiessen | do | 200 |
| Wilfred J. Wendell | do | 187 |
| Thomas S. Hyde | do | 240 |
| Elizabeth Schwerman | do | 241 |
| Miles E. File | do | 480 |
| Melvin C. File and Mrs. Melvin C. File | do | 120 |
| Earl File and Telva File | do | 583 |
| Mrs. Lena M. Roberts | do | 307 |
| V. R. Schmidt and Katherine M. Schmidt | do | 160 |
| Dan G. Wood and Helene K. Wood | do | 200 |
| Robert Wagner and Margaret Wagner | do | 80 |
| Do | do | 106 |
| C. E. Plymire, by Lois Plymire Pruitt, guardian | do | 120 |
| Margaret Anderson and Edwin Davis | Glen Elder | 10 |
| Mrs. N. L. Davis | do | 120 |
| Albert L. Davis | do | 40 |
| Rex Borgen | Asherville | 160 |
| Mrs. Melva McClintock | do | 240 |
| Frank O. Pearson | Simpson | 123 |
| C. A. Robertson and Mrs. C. A. Robertson | do | 240 |
| Mrs. Thelma Spicher | do | 320 |
| James Robertson | do | 239 |
| Marie Niehaus | Beloit | 81 |
| Eugene File | do | 94 |
| Charles Pearson | Simpson | 208¼ |
| Harrell Guard, Sr | Asherville | 160 |
| Beatrice Childs | Simpson | 425 |
| Total | | 28,603¼ |

*Cloud County landowners registering objection by petitions to formation of Glen Elder irrigation project*

| Name | Address | Acreage |
|---|---|---|
| W. A. Adams | Glasco, Kans | 240 |
| Mabel A. Childs and C. R. Childs | Delphos, Kans | 80 |
| Do | do | 195 |
| T. M. Butler | Glasco, Kans | 340 |
| Walter Sheets and May Sheets | do | 200 |
| Florence Gray Bundy | do | 40 |
| Mrs. Howard Courtney and H. L. Courtney | do | 170 |
| Wesley Fuller | do | 160 |
| Emery Yenni and Maxine Yenni | do | 640 |
| Lawrence Sheets and Eva Sheets | do | 697 |
| Joe Sheets | Concordia, Kans | 304 |
| Peter H. Beck and Maude C. Beck | Glasco, Kans | 160 |
| Willis Beck | do | 204 |
| Leona Smith (Cyrier) McKemey | Jamestown, Kans | 74 |
| John V. Downey | Glasco, Kans | 160 |
| Joe Downey | do | 320 |
| Ada J. Orebaugh | do | 551 |
| Leslie O. Wealand and Elsie L. Wealand | do | 80 |
| William K. Dopp | do | 100 |
| Sarah E. Dopp | do | 11 |
| Hattie M. Nowels | do | 153 |
| Arden E. Halderson and Orville Halderson | do | 160 |
| Boyd Chapman and Mrs. Boyd Chapman | do | 9 |
| Blanche Teasley and Dale Teasley | do | 4.49 |
| Claude Orebaugh | do | 10 |
| Max D. Martin and Lorene Brown Martin | do | 345 |
| Mrs. Mary Ellen Lott | do | 80 |
| Jess M. Dalrymple and Evelyn H. Dalrymple | do | 150 |
| J. M. Davidson | do | 900 |
| Mrs. Clara Pinkall | do | 160 |
| Earl E. Keller | Clyde, Kans | 360 |
| Mrs. R. L. Brock and John R. Brock | Glasco, Kans | 396.05 |
| Walter Butler and Bertha Butler | do | 448 |
| John R. Brock | do | 454.07 |
| Martin E. Butler | do | 320 |
| Virginia L. Steinbrock | do | 220 |
| Ray H. Fetters | Manhattan, Kans |  |
| Celestine Louthan and Robert Louthan | Simpson, Kans | 320 |
| Robert Louthan, Celestine Louthan, Frank Louthan, Mrs. Frank Louthan, James R. Louthan, John E. Evert, Mrs. Etta Evert; Herman Evert, and Mrs. Emeline Evert. | do | 400 |
| Clint Evert | do | 12 |
| Jean M. Noel, Elizabeth L. Chestnut, and Robert Chestnut. | Glasco, Kans | 267 |
| Chas. Gehrke, Ida Gehrke, Duane Gehrke, and Carol Gehrke. | do | 480 |
| George E. Bond, Mrs. George E. Bond, and Catherine Bond. | do | 1 |
| Sophia C. Horn, Marie G. Horn, Eleanor H. Thompson, and Letha J. Horn, by Sophia C. Horn, attorney in fact. | do | 160 |
| Homer Hoffman and Elizabeth Hoffman | Simpson, Kans | 80 |
| Margaret C. Gruenthal | Glasco, Kans | 106 |
| Elmer Halderson | do | 480 |
| Henry Prochaska and Mrs. Henry Prochaska | do | 160 |
| Emma E. Chapman | do | 413 |
| George M. Chapman | Beloit, Kans |  |
| Total |  | 11,810.61 |

*Ottawa County landowners registering objection by petitions to formation of Glen Elder irrigation project*

| Name | Address | Acreage |
|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Caroline Atwell McKain | Manhattan, Kans | 160 |
| Alva F. Adams | Delphos, Kans | 70 |
| Christina Hurtig | do | 160 |
| John Nelson, Sr | do | 1,341 |
| Harold C. Hollis | do | 160 |
| Avis Taylor and Earl G. Taylor | do | 308 |
| Avis Taylor and Ellis Paramore | do | 320 |
| J. M. Hart | do | 20 |
| Allen L. Atwell | do | 204 |
| B. M. Halderson | do | 439 |
| Fred L. Jilka | do | 160 |
| Lawrence J. Hart and Mary A. Hart | do | 357 |
| Leo Allison | do | 160 |
| Charles E. Parks | do | 250 |
| Mrs. Neva Wilkins | do | 161 |
| John R. Nelson | Delphos, Kans | 160 |
| Minnie G. Wealand | Glasco, Kans | 80 |
| Clara Latham | Delphos, Kans | 79 |
| Alma Atwell and Guy Sumerll | do | 202.5 |
| Grace M. Narns and Nellie C. Burger | Kansas City, Mo |  |
| Theodore Paramore, Corliss Paramore, and Ellis Paramore. | Delphos, Kans | 868 |
| Larry C. Atwell | Tucson, Ariz | 160 |
| Clyde Smith | Ottawa, Kans | 374 |
| Burton Smith | Delphos, Kans | 323 |
| Robert Mortimer | do | 372.5 |
| Laura Olson, Anna Olson, and Mary Olson | Glasco, Kans | 100 |
| W. A. Adams | do | 160 |
| Total |  | 7,149 |

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, these farmers are opposed to the project. They were not satisfied or won over last year when the Senate appropriated planning money, even though it was a relatively small amount—about a million dollars or so; they are still fighting it. These farmers do not want the project. They are still against it. They are spending their hard-earned money to send spokesmen to Washington to oppose the project. They have appeared before the Appropriations Committee. They are incensed about it. They are good, patriotic citizens, who are looking at the project from their own standpoint. They say this project is bad for them. They say it will not work. They say they will not use the irrigation that is to be provided. They are opposed to it for many reasons. They do not want it.

It seems to me that when the Senate is considering a bill in connection with which the only beneficiaries of the bill are against it, we should pay some attention to that opposition. After all, who else could benefit from the irrigation aspect of this program but the farmers who own the land? The farmers have said they do not want the project. They have petitioned this Senator and have told him that they do not want it. They have signed affidavits to that effect.

Under the circumstances, the Senate should not appropriate the money for that purpose.

Mr. President, the entire irrigation justification of the project is based on the value of additional farm crops. If the farm crops are valued at zero, the irrigational investment brings a zero return. As I tried to emphasize, the value is less than zero so far as the taxpayers are concerned, because all of the additional production of feed grain can go nowhere else but into storage. When it goes into storage there will be the additional cost of the storage on the taxpayer; also the interest and the cost of transportation on the taxpayer. We shall have to pay that additional cost. Can anyone honestly appraise additional feed grains as worth anything to our economy? The original estimate of $17 million for the costs of the irrigation aspect of the project would not only yield no return, but would add a multimillion dollar additional dollar burden.

What is it costing to bring these worse than worthless acres into production per acre?

We have made some calculations. It is not easy to make such calculations, because they involve complex discount factors, as well as other factors. One must use very careful arithmetic to make accurate calculations.

The total construction cost is estimated at $17 million. That represents a cost of $810 an acre.

The amount repaid by irrigators is $4 million. That is without interest. That represents a cost of $191 per acre. That is over a 50-year period. We can calculate the interest by determining the average balance, which would be $2 million, and then applying the interest rate factor to it.

In addition, $13 million would be repaid by power users after 100 years are up.

This is about as fantastic a conception as anyone can imagine.

It is wholly unjust, because not 1 kilowatt of energy will be used. We are assuming that the power users will repay it. Under the law they will be required to repay it after a hundred years. They will have to repay this amount in higher rates.

The chances are that the overwhelming majority will not realize that they are paying it, but they will have to repay it. However, they will not receive any benefits. The difficulty is that the interest factor is not considered, and that the Federal Government does not get money for nothing. It must pay interest on the money. The Federal Government must pay for the money. It must borrow the money and pay interest on it. That means that if we multiply 50 years by $80,000, which is the average annual interest at 4 percent—and that is what the Federal Government will have to pay, on the average—the interest amounts to $4 million.

Then, 100 years times $520,000—that is 4 percent on $13 million—is $52 million, or a total of $56 million with a per acre cost of $2,700.

That much money, 100 years from now, or even 50 years from now, is involved, but that will not be worth as much as it is today. We must use the present value, and that figure must be discounted. If we provide a 2.5-percent discount factor, which is the factor that is used by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers—and apply it to $80,000 for 50 years, the amount is $2,269,000. $520,000 for 100 years, applying the same discount factor, amounts to $12,742,000.

The present discounted value total is $15,011,000, not $56 million.

The acreage cost is not $2,700, but much less. If we apply the 4-percent discount factor, it is $20,619,000, instead of $15,011,000. The per acre cost is $982.

I shall not detain the Senate further. I ask unanimous consent to put a table showing these costs per acre in the RECORD, because I believe anyone who is interested in determining whether my calculations are accurate should have an opportunity to do so.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Aggregate and per acre costs of the Glen Elder irrigation project with and without imputed interest*

| | Aggregate | Per acre |
|---|---|---|
| Cost without interest: | | |
| Total construction cost | $17,000,000 | $810 |
| Amount repaid by irrigators | 4,000,000 | 191 |
| Amount repaid by power users | 13,000,000 | 619 |
| Different estimates of related interest cost (4 percent interest rate in all cases): | | |
| Total over the years: | | |
| 50 years × $80,000 (average) | 4,000,000 | ------ |
| 100 years × $520,000 | 52,000,000 | ------ |
| | 56,000,000 | 2,700 |
| Present discounted value of interest: | | |
| 2.5 percent discount factor: | | |
| $80,000 for 50 years | 2,269,000 | ------ |
| $520,000 for 100 years | 12,742,000 | ------ |
| | 15,011,000 | 738 |
| 4 percent discount factor: | | |
| $80,000 for 50 years | 1,580,000 | ------ |
| $520,000 for 100 years | 19,039,000 | ------ |
| | 20,619,000 | 982 |
| Total cost: Present construction cost plus present discounted value of imputed interest: | | |
| 2.5 percent discount factor | ------------ | 1,548 |
| 4 percent discount factor | ------------ | 1,792 |

Mr. PROXMIRE. On this basis, I think it is completely fair—and this was checked carefully with mathematicians and experts of the Bureau of Reclamation—to say that the cost per acre would be between $1,500 and $1,792. That is the cost per acre for worthless land. This land is worth nothing. It is acreage producing feed grain; and feed grain has no value; it is surplus.

Think of it: $1,500 to $1,800 per acre. The best farmland in Wisconsin is worth $800 or less. Yet unless my amendment passes we spend $1,500 to $1,800 per acre.

Last year in my speech in the Senate, I described the way in which the total irrigation cost of $17 million was divided among irrigators, power users in the Missouri River Valley, and general taxpayers. This table, entitled "Calculation of the Subsidy From the Public to the Irrigating Farmers on the Glen Elder Unit," shows how the total cost is allocated. Two and one-half percent and 4 percent discount factors are applied to the total estimate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Calculation of the subsidy from the public to the irrigating farmers on the Glen Elder unit*

[In millions]

| | Total payment, ignoring interest | Present discounted value at following discount factors | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2.5 percent | 4 percent |
| Payment by irrigators [1] | $4.000 | $2.269 | $1.581 |
| Payment by power users in the Missouri River Basin [2] | 13.000 | 1.100 | .260 |
| Payment by the general taxpayer | --------- | 13.630 | 15.162 |
| Total repayment of the reimbursable costs of the irrigation project | 17.000 | 17.000 | 17.000 |

[1] Payment by the irrigators is on the basis of $80,000 annual payments for a 50-year repayment period.

[2] The payment by the power users is assumed to be made in the year 2060 when the power features of the Missouri River project will be repaid, along with the other existing irrigation projects, which will then permit the annual net income of the power features of the Missouri River Basin project to be used for the Glen Elder project. Lump-sum payment is assumed, since the annual net income from the power features will be large enough for this once it becomes available.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The table shows that over the years the burden on the general taxpayer—not the irrigator whose farm is proposed to be irrigated and who would get some benefit from it; not the power user, on whom is imposed a burden, although he gets no benefit—but the general taxpayer in Hawaii, Wisconsin, Texas, and throughout the Nation, will be between $13.6 million and $15 million for a $17 million project. In other words, the general taxpayer would be paying most of the cost of the project.

We hear, over and over again, when we dispute reclamation projects, that they are fully repayable; that the taxpayers do not have to worry about them, because the irrigators will pay the money back, or the power users will pay it back.

If we recognize what interest rates are today, if we recognize the way in which the payments will be made, the real burden is in fact on the general taxpayer. The general taxpayer will bear about 75 to 90 percent of the burden. It cannot be argued that this money will be paid back; it will not be paid back.

One of the primary benefits to which the proponents of the project point is supposed to be the irrigation storage return. Of the annual benefits of slightly more than $3 million anticipated from this project, $564,700 annually is anticipated as a result of irrigation. However, more than 80 percent of the landowners living below Glen Elder in the area that logically would be in the irrigation district have signed notarized petitions that they do not wish to join an irrigation district. I do not want this statement to be confused with the fact that 90 percent of the landowners have signed affidavits that they sent to me, indicating that they are opposed to the project. In addition, 80 percent of the landowners have said that they will not join any irrigation districts; they will not permit their land to be irrigated; they will not have anything to do with the project. These 383 landowners control 49,795 acres in the valley just below the proposed irrigation dam. In view of this, water storage for irrigation would be completely useless. The expense of acquiring additional land for this storage would be wasteful.

This is another reason why my amendment, which the Parliamentarian has indicated will be in order, makes sense. The money should not be spent for irrigation, not only because of the argument I have made that additional feed grains are not needed, but also because the landowners have indicated that they will not join any irrigation district and will not permit their land to be irrigated.

The proposed dam would cover Waconda Springs, a mineral water spring. Thus the water in the lake would be of questionable value either for irrigation or for a multiple water supply. Moreover, the land below the proposed dam is not suitable for irrigation. It develops into a tight so-called gumbo soil that is not conducive to immediate water absorption.

One of the astonishing things about this $76 million project is the mystery surrounding its authorization. The project now is to cost $76,131,000. We shall be asked to appropriate, in the bill which will come up on Monday, $5 million to begin construction. Of course, after that it will be undoubtedly too late to do anything about this scandalous waste. A year ago, the total cost was estimated at $60 million, when I first spoke on the subject. The amount has increased by $16 million in the past year.

Yet the sole congressional authorization for this project is one line in a 1944 act—an act 19 years old—which contained more than 300 projects. This project appeared in the so-called Pick-Sloan Authorization Act of 1944. Moreover, as listed in that wartime omnibus act, the project differed almost completely from the current proposal. The only carryover is the name and apparently the authorization.

One of the great problems that confronts President Johnson in keeping the budget down is the number of built-in increases in the budget. That is always a terrible problem for the President and Congress when they want to economize. How can they economize when Congress, by law, has built in provisions for money that must be spent in the future?

That is what is occurring in connection with this project. We shall be spending $5 million now, but guaranteeing that if President Johnson or some other President in the future wants to cut spending, he will not be in a position to do so, because Congress is forcing spending on the President.

I have tried to indicate that the Glen Elder project is as worthless and unjustified as can be conceived. Furthermore, to show the difference in the project, in 1944, when it was authorized—and that was the only time it was authorized—Glen Elder Dam was to have cost $17 million and would have provided 300,000 acre-feet of storage capacity. Today the same project is to cost $76 million and is estimated to provide probably more than 1 million acre-feet of storage capacity.

The Pick-Sloan authorization was open ended; that is, the projects could be initiated at any time. The $17 million listed for Glen Elder was merely an estimate in the committee report and was not included in the bill. That kind of authorization contains great dangers and very little protection for the taxpayer. Once a small amount has been authorized, it can be expended in any way desired and the amount can go as high as is desired; the sky is the limit.

Some 300 projects were originally described in the 1944 legislation. Only about 40 have been initiated to date.

The original authorization permitted appropriations of about $200 million; but based on the original estimate, the cost of all projects was to have been about $1 billion. The authorized appropriations have been gradually increased from time to time. For example, the last increase, of roughly $100 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, was in the Public Works authorization bill just passed, H.R. 8667. The total estimated cost of all the original projects in the 1944 legislation is now about $3 billion. In other words, the amount has expanded threefold.

As Senators know, the Senate approves projects, by and large, on the benefit-cost principle. That is, if the benefits exceed the cost, the Senate is likely to go ahead with the project. If the benefits are less than the cost, I do not know of any project that has been passed. There may have been one or two in the past. Theoretically, such a project could be passed. But under such circumstances, Senators usually say that such a project is not worth the money; that arithmetic proves the project is not worth the cost, so the Senate does not proceed with it.

In the case of Glen Elder, the benefit-cost ratio is currently 1.34 to 1. This is a quite feeble benefit-cost ratio.

Admittedly, some are less, but this is low. A ratio of 1.34 to 1 would suggest that the benefits, as computed by the Bureau of Reclamation, are slightly in excess of the costs of the project. However, the assumptions used in computing the benefits are extremely artificial.

The discount rate which has been applied to obtain a ratio of 1.34 to 1 is 2½ percent. This is about as artificially unrealistic an assumption as one could make.

The interest rate now being used for benefit-cost ratios has been increased in recent months. It is currently 2⅞ percent for new projects and, I understand, will shortly be raised to 3 percent. However, no attempt has been made to revise the benefit-cost ratio for existing projects such as Glen Elder.

A low interest rate is absolutely crucial, to justify this project. The more the money costs, the more one has to pay to borrow, and the more benefits one expects to receive. Therefore, the lower the discount or interest rate, the less one can assume he has to pay for the money, the easier it is to justify the project, because the less the benefits have to be.

The interest discount rate in this case should be, at a minimum, 4 percent, because the Federal Government borrows money at 4 percent. The lowest prime commercial rate today is about 4 percent. On this basis, the benefit-cost ratio from this factor alone would fall to 0.9 to 1.

In other words, if we assume a 4 percent interest rate, the benefits would be exceeded by the cost, so the project would be unprofitable to the Government, and would be ridiculous to undertake. In fact, on any basis, even if we give the benefit of the doubt to the alleged irrigation benefits and if we assume that the feed grains thus brought into production would be worth the alleged price—although we know they would be worth nothing—it is clear that this project is unjustified. It is apparent that the ridiculous, inaccurate, and dishonest—and I use carefully and accurately the word "dishonest"—2½-percent rate must be used if the project is to be justified. But, Mr. President, even that is not enough; even then, it is necessary to assume that the proposed project would have a life, not of 25 or 35 years, but of 100 years—a most unrealistic assumption. A projected life of 25 or 35 years might seem fairly reasonable and logical in view of changing technological methods and changing farming and irrigation projects and the possibility of making breakthroughs with flood control and the use of water and in supplying the need for water, and in view of the fact that certain water studies are now being undertaken for the first time. Therefore, one might believe that a projected life of 25 or 35 years would be fairly realistic. However, the life of the project which has been assumed in this case is the fantastic one of 100 years, which is entirely unreasonable.

Furthermore, if we assume a 4-percent interest rate and a 50-year life, which still would be extremely favorable in the case of Glen Elder, the benefit-cost ratio would be only 0.8 to 1. In other words, on the basis of this more reasonable assumption, we would be getting 80 cents worth of service for every dollar spent on the project; but that is in direct and arithmetically provable contrast to the very welcome assurance given by President Johnson that he expects a dollar's worth of services to be provided for each dollar of taxes spent.

But in this case, only 80 cents worth of services would be obtained for each dollar of taxes spent on the project—and then only on the basis that the feed grains thus brought into production would be worth something, whereas, as I have already stated, they would be worth less than nothing at all.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this project, if actually constructed, would essentially—essentially, not eventually—destroy the city of Downs, Kans. The people of that city would have to abandon their homes, shops, and stores, because the reservoir which would be created by the project would inundate the city, unless a very substantial dike or wall were built virtually completely around the entire community; and even if that were to be done, who would wish to live behind such a wall?

Furthermore, Mr. President, the costs of the project, now estimated at more than $76 million, do not take into account the probable cost of condemning the city of Downs, which would be at least $2 million more than is now contemplated.

It is said that the people of Downs are a little "sticky" in regard to making arrangements for this project. Of course it is not difficult to understand why that would be the case.

In addition, the railroad there probably would have to be moved, at an estimated cost of approximately $5 million; but that additional cost is not included in the cost figures which have been submitted.

Of course all these additional costs would further reduce the alleged benefit-cost ratio, which—without including these additional costs—I charge should be assessed at 8 to 1.

As the previously mentioned table shows, the general taxpayers all over the country will pay between three-fourths and seven-eighths of the cost of this project. Essentially, this means a redistribution of income from taxpayers generally to a specific area in the State of Kansas. Although I recognize the meritorious character of the citizens of Kansas, I question whether Senators should vote to require their constituents—throughout the country—to pay some of their taxes to the residents of the State of Kansas, and especially when the Kansans who would be directly affected have emphatically shown that they do not want the project constructed. In that connection, I placed in the RECORD today the names and addresses of those who say they do not want the project constructed, and they are the only ones who could benefit from it and they are the ones whose farms would be irrigated. However, they have testified overwhelmingly that they do not want it.

Mr. President, I summarize as follows:

The proposed $76 million cost includes $17 million for irrigation. However, that irrigation would be of value only if it brought additional feed grains into production. On the other hand, we now have approximately $3 billion worth—$3,000 million—worth of feed grains which are in surplus supply, and we are spending approximately $1,300 million both in payments to keep land out of production and in payments for storage of the feed grains. Yet, as I have said, $17 million of the total amount for this project—which, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, is divisible, and the $17 million can be taken off—would be for the exclusive purpose of bringing into production land on which more corn, rye, and other feed grains could be produced. But 90 percent of the farmers in the Solomon River Valley who allegedly would benefit from the project are opposed to it, and they own 85 percent of the land involved. In addition, 80 percent of the farmers in that area have signed petitions—and their signatures to them have been notarized—to the effect that they would not join any irrigation district which would irrigate their land.

In any case, Mr. President, if such an irrigation district were established, the result would be to increase the size of our surpluses of feed grains, as I have already documented and detailed.

As I have stated, the overall cost-benefit ratio is alleged to be 0.80 to 1, even if we assume that the feed grains would be worth something, although actually they would be worthless.

Finally, Mr. President, the project is improperly authorized. Neither the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs nor the Public Works Committee of either the House of Representatives or the Senate has ever considered the project in any detail. The only previous reference to it was a single line in the 1944 omnibus Pick-Sloan authorization, where the project is listed along with 325 other projects. Since that time, however, the cost of the project has more than tripled, and has now gone up to $75 million.

Furthermore, if it is desired to reduce flood losses in Kansas, it would be more efficient to build some of the alternative flood control projects which have much higher benefit-cost ratios. Such alternative projects would make much more sense.

This project, however, would affect only a small percent of the water that now flows into the area subject to flood losses. Furthermore, it is approximately 200 miles away from the main site to be protected. So in my opinion it makes no sense to state that this project would be the most efficient way to accomplish a flood control project.

Mr. President, on Monday I expect to call up both of these amendments; and I hope the Senate will support me in my effort to save $76 million for the taxpayers of the United States.

I yield the floor.

## GRAVITY OF COTTON AND TEXTILE PROBLEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we are all acutely aware of the gravity of the cotton and textile problem.

We know the seriousness of it from our cotton farmers who struggle against overwhelming odds to eke out an existence in the production of this commodity which once was king in my region of the Nation, but which now has been virtually banished.

We know how critical the problem is when we see hundreds of textile mills closing down, throwing thousands out of work, or converting to synthetics, because they are unable to compete in world markets at world prices.

Why is this so? It is because of the inequitable two-price cotton system which allows foreign mills to buy U.S. cotton and to manufacture textile products much cheaper than can our own mills in this country.

Furthermore, we know from the taxpayers that our cotton program is long overdue for an overhaul. Our present cotton subsidy program costs about $1 billion a year, and only relatively few benefit from it.

Because the Government is engaged in such extraneous activities as buying, storing, transporting, selling, and giving away cotton, we see an annual public outlay of more than a billion dollars, including subsidies and carrying charges.

This, then, is our present cotton program and, Mr. President, I submit that it makes absolutely no sense at all.

How much longer are we going to permit this situation to exist?

How much longer are we going to ignore this problem?

Piecemeal or stopgap legislation is not the answer. Nor is a new subsidy-upon-a-subsidy program.

Mr. President, a fresh approach is needed, and anything short of a complete revision of the present program will only compound the problem.

I submit without fear of contradiction by textile manufacturers or farmers who want to get back in the business of free and competitive cotton production, that the compensatory payment plan as embodied in the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill is the most sensible and economical solution to this dilemma.

The Talmadge-Humphrey bill would do away with existing subsidies, thus eliminating the two-price cotton system, take the Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling, and giving away cotton, revitalize our textile industry, and help those cotton farmers who most need assistance.

I urge the Senate to give close attention to the ailments of the cotton industry, and prescribe what I believe to be the only cure.

I have had occasion to read an editorial published in today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "Logic." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 6, 1963]

### LOGIC

Problem: High price supports for growers price American cotton out of world markets.

Answer: Subsidize exporters so they can compete on the world market.

Problem: Foreign mills buy U.S. cotton at the subsidized export rate, make it into goods and sell them in this country, while U.S. mills have to pay the higher price-propped domestic rate.

Answer: Subsidize the U.S. mills by the somewhat oblique device of subsidizing cotton brokers. (The House has just voted to do just that.)

Problem: The foreigners might not like it.

Possible answer: Subsidize them. (We wouldn't be surprised; the United States already subsidizes practically everything on earth.)

Problem: What about the American consumer who gets triply or quadruply stung by this ferocious political logic?

Answer: Who cares? He doesn't have a lobby.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I also wish to call attention to an editorial entitled, "The Sad Cotton Dilemma," and a news analysis entitled, "Huge Textile Interests Wait Cotton Decision," both published in the Atlanta Journal of December 4, 1963, which point out the need for a new program.

I ask unanimous consent to have both the editorial and the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, Dec. 4, 1963]

### THE SAD COTTON DILEMMA

Sentiment for the cotton bill now before Congress seems lukewarm at best and it would be our guess that this lack of enthusiasm extends even to many of the textile manufacturers it is designed to help.

Most of those who vote for it probably will be doing so only because they reason it's all they have and consider it better than nothing.

But why should they be forced into such a predicament when there were other bills, notably that of Senator TALMADGE, that would have come a lot closer to offering a fair solution to the cotton problem?

The bill which made it to the floor of Congress embodies Government subsidy for the textile industry. It's the contention of one opponent of the proposal that 34 textile mills would get 70 percent of the $292 million in subsidy payments, with one firm alone receiving $28 million.

Yet traditionally such large industrial enterprises have been violently opposed to Federal handouts. Once they get on the receiving end how can they maintain such a stance?

Still there is the contention that unless something is done to permit American mills to buy American cotton as cheaply as it can be purchased abroad, there's real uncertainty as to whether our mills can survive.

That's the impasse. It's a shame that more acceptable plans had to be sidetracked to make way for one that elicits such a mediocre response.

---

[From the Atlanta Journal, Dec. 4, 1963]

### HUGE TEXTILE INTERESTS WAIT COTTON DECISION

Congress has got down to basics on the big cotton controversy of 1963, the hassle over what to do with the so-called two-price cotton system.

What Congress finally does will have an impact in Georgia's huge textile interests—from the farmer growing the cotton to the millowner weaving it into cloth. The taxpayer is also interested.

Georgia supplied more than one-tenth of the Nation's cotton in 1930. In 1961 the State supplied only 3.5 percent. Only about half of Georgia's cotton farmers actually planted any cotton last year.

The trouble in Georgia and the Nation, Congressmen have charged, is the present cotton subsidy program which costs about $1 billion a year.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has subsidized the export of cotton. The Government has paid 8.5 cents per pound on cotton shipped out of the Nation to bring its price down to 24 cents, the going world rate.

Domestic textile manufacturers have chafed under this system since shortly after it was started and late in 1962 began a major program to do away with it.

The mills claim the system is unfair.

Textile representatives have testified before congressional committees that foreign textile manufacturers can buy the U.S. cotton at 24 cents, ship it to their countries for processing and back to the United States and undersell cloth made in this country.

This has not been disputed. Neither has it been disputed that the price difference on labor is much greater than on the price of the cotton.

The mills have asked the Government to do away with the price differential and provide payment of 8.5 cents per pound on cotton bought in this country for use here. Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, has introduced a bill which would do just that.

American cotton sold during the last marketing year for 32.47 cents a pound. Domestic consumption of cotton last year was 8.2 million bales.

Of the cotton exported, only 650,000 bales came back into the country as textile goods. This amount, which is 8 percent of the total national consumption is the effective competition which spurred the U.S. textile industry to seek 8.5 cents per pound on its full 8.2 million bales.

This would cost the taxpayer an estimated $367 million.

Textile interests have maintained the cost would be returned twice in savings to the American consumer since raw material costs have traditionally directly affected the cost of finished goods at a 2-to-1 ratio.

Dissent comes from Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, who has introduced a bill in the Senate doing away with the entire present system and substituting a different concept.

Senator TALMADGE would let the Agriculture Department determine the amount of cotton each farmer could grow in numbers of bales instead of numbers of acres as now done.

In addition, the Talmadge proposal would allow farmers to grow more cotton than the Department allotted. All cotton would be sold at the world price.

Farmers, under TALMADGE's plan, would receive a Government subsidy only on cotton grown under the allotment amount. This cotton would be available, to domestic consumers, at the world price. No subsidy would be paid for cotton grown in excess of the allotment.

The House received Representative COOLEY's bill Tuesday and it was thought possible it might reach an early vote.

Backers of the Cooley bill reportedly were having difficulty in getting support to guarantee passage. Virtually all Congressmen from cotton States are convinced the textile industry is in bad shape and urge some kind of program quickly.

Senator TALMADGE said in introducing the bill the cotton textile industry "cannot much longer endure unless the Congress takes action to restore American cotton and American textiles to a competitive position in the marketplace of the world."

Senator TALMADGE said the Cooley proposal is not the answer because it would add to the costs of the already burdened American taxpayer.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LILA EVERTS WEBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may set aside temporarily the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 and turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 602.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may continue—which has been held up until the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] clarified some points which were of interest to him on this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—with the permission of the majority leader I wish to make a brief statement.

In consultation with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] I was persuaded that it would not be in the public interest to permit the filibuster of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 to continue to the detriment of passage of bills be they uncontested or contested, which the majority leader felt should be brought up and passed.

I wish to make the point that there is a filibuster against Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 going on, consisting of only two words uttered by the senior Senator from Georgia, "I object." It is nonetheless a filibuster.

However, I am interested in the speedy expedition of the public business, and I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Does the majority leader expect to return to consideration of the motion to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 before the Senate adjourns tonight? I hope he does.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I would hope that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and his colleagues would understand the situation—as I am sure he does, based on his explanation—and recognize the need for getting legislation passed while we still have time to do so.

I would hope also that, as the afternoon goes on, the Senator would seriously consider the strong possibility that the leadership may well move to adjourn tonight, with all its possible consequences.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would ask the Senator whether there is any reason he knows why, after disposing of the business which he wishes to have passed today, the Senate might not stay in session all night and all day tomorrow before we adjourn, in order to determine whether we can break this filibuster in short order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All I can say, speaking personally, is that I would not stay in session on a 24-hour basis, as the Senator from Pennsylvania seems to indicate he would like, to break a two-word filibuster. I believe what we are experiencing now is a trial run. When that trial run develops into the real thing, it is going to be a lot more than two words.

To make the answer as brief as possible, no.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that what we need is a trial run and a little more practice. It will be harder to break a filibuster which consists of more than two words than one which consists of two words, but we need not a little spring training but a little winter training.

Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 689) for the relief of Lila Everts Weber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike section 2 of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

> SEC. 2. No amounts shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this Act with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have discussed the pending amendment with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], who is the author of the bill. We have agreed on the amendment. The amendment is designed to keep this from being a precedent or an exception to the basic law. I am sure it will satisfy the principal equities of the situation covered by the bill.

I move that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 689) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in the administration of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, Lila Everts Weber, widow of Judge Randolph H. Weber, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, shall be deemed to be entitled to receive an annuity under such

section in like manner as if the said Randolph H. Weber had rendered five years of service as a judge of the United States during which the salary deductions provided for by subsection (b) of such section had been made, except that such annuity shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the difference between the amount which would have been deducted and withheld pursuant to such subsection from the salary of the said Randolph H. Weber had he served for such five-year period and the amount actually deducted and withheld pursuant to such subsection during his service.

SEC. 2. No amounts shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this Act with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment.

Passed the Senate December 6 (legislative day, December 5), 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 624), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is tn provide that, in the administration of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, Lila Everts Weber, widow of Judge Randolph H. Weber, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, shall be deemed to be entitled to receive an annuity under such section in like manner as if the said Randolph H. Weber had rendered 5 years of service as a judge of the United States during which the salary deductions provided for by subsection (b) of such section had been made. The resultant annuity is to be reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the difference between the amount which would have been deducted and withheld pursuant to such subsection from the salary of the said Randolph H. Weber had he served for such 5-year period and the amount actually deducted and withheld pursuant to such subsection during his service.

Section 2 provides that any amounts payable by reason of enactment of the bill with respect to any period prior to the date of such enactment shall be paid in a lump sum within 60 days after the date of enactment.

The Department of Justice declines to make a recommendation on the bill.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts also declines to make a recommendation, stating that "* * * it presents a matter of policy for the determination of the Congress."

The records of the Department of Justice show that Judge Randolph H. Weber died on November 23, 1961, after serving approximately 4 years and 8 months on the bench of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. Under the provisions of the Judicial Survivor's Annuity Act, 28 U.S.C. 376, a Federal judge must have "rendered at least 5 years of civilian service" for his widow to be eligible for an annuity. The bill would authorize payment of an annuity to Mrs. Weber to be computed on the basis of 5 years' judicial service, less a small deduction for salary deductions that would have been due the judicial survivor's annuity fund.

The committee is sympathetic with the purposes of the proposal and therefore recommends that the bill do pass.

## CREATION OF HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 638.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 4276) was passed.

## SHELBURNE HARBOR SHIP AND MARINE CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 712.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6808) for the relief of Shelburne Harbor Ship and Marine Construction Co., Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6808), which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## CODIFICATION OF GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 723.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 7, section 11–521(a), sixth line, strike out "September 1, 1963," and insert "January 1, 1964,".

Page 19, section 11–982(b), seventh line, before the word "prescribed", insert the word "otherwise".

Page 26, section 11–1503(b), seventh line, after the word "until", insert "the removal of such disability, and".

Page 26, section 11–1521(a), first line, after the word "appoint", insert "from the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission,".

Page 29, section 11–1551(G), third line, strike out the word "or".

Page 29, section 11–1551(H), second line, strike out the word "or".

Page 30, section 11–1555, strike out all text of said section and insert in lieu thereof "The Juvenile Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings to determine paternity of any child alleged to have been born out of wedlock and to provide for his support in the manner provided by subchapter II of chapter 23 of title 16."

Page 33, section 11–1586(c), seventh line, after "duties," insert "upon conviction thereof,".

Page 50, section 13–336(a), fifth line, after the word "persons", insert ".".

Page 63, section 15–106(c), seventh line, change the word "defendants" to "defendant's".

Page 66, section 15–307, fourth line, change the word "debtor" to the word "defendant".

Page 66, section 15–310, sixth line, change the word "property" to the word "estate".

Page 67, section 15–315, in the heading of said section, change the word "on" to the word "or".

Page 79, section 15–710, fourth line, change the word "action" to the word "actions".

Page 92, section 16–503, fifth line, change the word "affidavits" to the word "testimony".

Page 93, section 16–507(a), first line, after the word "on", strike out the words "any interest in".

Page 101, section 16–531, third line, change the word "property" to the word "estate" wherever it appears.

Page 102, section 16–532, third line, strike "property" after "personal" and insert in lieu thereof "estate".

Page 102, section 16–532, fourth line, strike "property" after the word "personal" and insert in lieu thereof "estate".

Page 110, section 16–703(e), second line, change the figures "15–710(b)(2)" after the word "section" to "15–709(b)(2)".

Page 113, in the analysis of chapter 9, section 16–912, strike out the words "on intestate share".

Page 114, section 16–905, first line, strike out the word "for" after divorce and insert in lieu thereof "from".

Page 115, section 16–912, strike out all of the heading and text of said section and insert in lieu thereof:

**16–912. Permanent alimony; Enforcement; Retention of dower.**

When a divorce is granted to the wife, the court may decree her permanent alimony sufficient for her support and that of any minor children whom the court assigns to her care, and secure and enforce the payment of the alimony in the manner prescribed by section 16–911, and may, if it seems appropriate, retain to the wife her right of dower in the husband's estate; and the court may, in similar circumstances, retain to the husband his right of dower in the wife's estate.

Page 116, section 16–914, first line, change the word "granted" to the word "granting".

Page 142, section 16–1503, fourth line, after the word "favor", strike ";" and insert ",".

Page 149, section 16–2302, in the last sentence of said section, change the word "is" after "required" to the word "are."

Page 150, section 16–2303, fourth line, after the word "person", strike out the words "who has the" and insert the words "or persons who have".

Page 155, section 16–2316, third line, strike out the words "so construed" and insert in lieu thereof the words "liberally construed so".

Page 161, section 16–2382, second line, after the word "persons", change "," to "." and strike out the remainder of said section.

Page 164, section 16–2922, in the heading after the word "Widow", insert the words "or widower".

Page 164, section 16–2924, in the heading after the word "widow's", insert the words "or widower's".

Page 168, section 16–3111, second line, change the word "widowers" to the word "witnesses".

Page 177, section 16–3739, fourth line, strike out the words "or publication".

Page 180, section 16–3902(g), third line, strike out all text after "action." and substitute in lieu thereof "Where, in a case controlled by another statute, a greater or lesser time for hearing is specified by the other statute, that specified time is controlling. All actions filed in the Branch shall be made returnable therein."

Page 181, section 16–3903, tenth line, change the words "informa pauperis" to "in forma pauperis".

Page 193, section 17, fifth line, strike the words "September 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, section 20, first line, strike the words "September 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, section 21(a), seventh line, strike the words "February 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "August 10, 1963".

Page 205, Table of Statutes at Large—Continued, opposite date of October 23, and in the third column, add "1," before the figure "2", and in the sixth column opposite same date of October 23, move the reference "11–751a" which is the fifth from the bottom of said column, to a position in said column opposite the extension of date October 23, and add ",", making the fourth reference from the bottom of said column read "11–751a, 11–755".

Page 205, Table of Statutes at Large—Continued, after the second "Do", under October 23, strike out "5(b) (c)".

Page 205, Table of Statutes at Large—Continued, at the end thereof insert the following:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1963—July 8 | 88-60 | 2, 3 | 77 | 77 | 11-755, 11-756. |
| Do | 88-60 | 4 | 77 | 78 | 11-756. |
| Do | 88-60 | 5 | 77 | 78 | 11-520a,<br>11-771a. |
| Aug. 5 | 88-85 | 1, 2 | 77 | 117 | 11-805. |

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 4157) was read the third time and passed.

**Mr. ERVIN.** Mr. President, H.R. 4157 was received in the Senate after passage, with amendments, in the House on June 19, 1963, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. By referral to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, I summarize hereinafter the steps taken by the subcommittee staff in connection with this bill.

Shortly after receipt thereof, the committee after reviewing the House bill and report, referred the matter to the following officials who have direct responsibilities in the field covered by part II of the District of Columbia Code with which H.R. 4157 deals exclusively:

Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, chief judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Hon. John Lewis Smith, Jr., chief judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions.

Hon. Morris Miller, chief judge, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Hon. John H. Pratt, president, District of Columbia Bar Association.

Responses were received from Judges Smith and Miller but no response was received from Judge McGuire. The committee received a letter from the president of the District of Columbia Bar Association stating that the matter had been referred to Mr. Michael A. Schuchat, Chairman of the Committee on Revision of the District of Columbia Code. This letter was dated August 1, 1963, and set forth the deadline of August 20 for any suggestions to be made. As of this date, no further communication has been received from the bar association of the District of Columbia.

On July 30, 1963, I inserted a notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

> NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 4157, A BILL TO ENACT PART II OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, ENTITLED "JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE"
>
> Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 4157, 88th Congress, 1st session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 377, regarding revision and codification of Part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure."
>
> The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to such legislation.
>
> It is requested that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 341, Old Senate Office Building, on or before August 20, 1963.
>
> The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]; and myself, as chairman.

A letter was received from Judge Morris Miller, chief judge, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, making certain suggestions, all of which appeared to be reasonable and have been accepted and amendments prepared to the House bill accordingly.

On August 13, 1963, in response to my letter dated July 31, 1963, to the Honorable John Lewis Smith, Jr., chief judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions, the committee was supplied with a memorandum of the same date, prepared for him by the Attorney Advisors of the District of Columbia court of general sessions. In view of the suggestions for changes recommended in this memorandum, copy of same was submitted to the Equity Publishing Corp., the codifying contractor to the House committee. Subsequent thereto, a memorandum was received from Equity making certain recommendations pertaining to the suggestions contained in the memorandum from the District of Columbia court of general sessions. Several of the suggestions in said memorandum from the court have been accepted and amendments prepared; however, there were numerous suggestions contained in said memorandum which are not being recommended by the committee and the following is an explanation in each instance as to why it is not recommended that the changes as suggested in said court memorandum be made in this bill:

### (1) SECTION 11–741(a)(1)

We question whether reference should also be made to final judgments of the landlord and tenant branch and the criminal division. There is a landlord and tenant branch in the civil division of the court of general sessions, but we cannot find any statute establishing it. Nor do we find that it was established by rule of that court, although the court does have separate procedural rules for that branch. There are statutes establishing a domestic relations branch and a small claims and conciliation branch. District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, sections 11–758, 11–801, and those two branches are also mentioned in District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, section 11–772, from which new section 11–741 is partly taken. That is why we mentioned them in new section 11–741, but the language used is not exclusive of other branches.

Regarding the omission of the reference to the criminal division, it is not referred to in section 11–772 of District of Columbia Code, except in the manner preserved by us in new section 11–741(c), which relates to a matter of procedure, rather than jurisdiction.

It seems to us that, actually, the words in new section 11–741(a)(1) "final orders and judgments of the District of Columbia court of general sessions" are all inclusive.

If—in the future—references to the landlord and tenant branch and the criminal division are to be included, paragraph (1) should be divided into two paragraphs as follows:

> (1) final orders and judgments of the civil division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, including final orders and judgments of the small claims and conciliation branch, the landlord and tenant branch, and the domestic relations branch of that division;

> (2) final orders and judgments of the criminal division of the District of Columbia court of general sessions;—

With consequent renumbering of present paragraphs (2) and (3) as "(3)" and "(4)", respectively, and with consequent redrafting of the revision note.

Or to preserve the present paragraph numbering, perhaps paragraph (1) could be rewritten merely to provide as follows:

> (1) final orders and judgments of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, including final orders and judgments of any of its divisions or branches;.

The above would render it unnecessary to amend the paragraph should additional branches or divisions be established in the future, whereas the first redraft proposed above would render such amendment necessary.

But we feel that new section 11–741 (a)(1), which follows more closely the present statutes, is adequate as it now reads.

### (2) SECTION 11–1141(A)(3)

We have not as yet received the Advance Sheet pamphlet containing *Johnson* v. *Johnson*, U.S.D.C.A., No. 17,260, dated July 19, 1963. We have, however, looked over the case of *Johnson* v. *Johnson*, 183 A. 2d 916—municipal court of appeals—and presumably, if the first case referred to above is a U.S. court of appeals case, it must have affirmed the judgment rendered in 183 A. 2d 916. But in 183 A. 2d 916 there is a strong dissenting opinion by the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals—now District of Columbia court of appeals—and, even if the first case mentioned above is an affirmance of the judgment in 183 A. 2d 916, we question whether this judicial interpretation should be incorporated in section 11–1141(a)(3) at this stage of the matter. Perhaps the judgment will even be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. It might create controversy to put it in.

### (3) SECTION 11–1141(A)(9)

Apparently, the case mentioned states the law, that is, the judicial interpretation of paragraph (9)—see 1961 code edition, section 11–762—which has been the interpretation for some time, but again we question whether it would be wise to attempt to spell it out in the statute.

If in the future this is to be done it is suggested that present subsection (b) be designated "(c)," and that a new subsection (b) be inserted as follows:

> (b) Notwithstanding clause (9) of subsection (a) of this section, if a divorce, absolute or limited, is not granted in an action or proceeding, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, or the Domestic Relations Branch thereof, has no power or authority to partition or award to one spouse real or personal property held by the entireties.

If the above is done, the following should be inserted in the revision note to section 11–1141, immediately preceding the paragraph "Changes are made in phraseology and arrangement":

> Subsection (b), while new as text, states the law as held in the case of ***Ridgely*** v. ***Ridgely*** (D.C. Mun. Appeals 1963) 188 A. 2d 296. See, also, ***Hogan*** v. ***Hogan*** (1957) 102 U.S. App. D.C. 87, 250 F. 2d. 412, which was decided while the District court had jurisdiction of matters relating to divorce, maintenance, etc., and section 16–910 of this revised part.

### (4) SECTION 11–1141(A)(11)

The memorandum makes no recommendation here, but we should like to point out that in table 7 in the House Report to H.R. 4157—page A220—we are recommending that section 16–1601 et seq., of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, be transferred to chapter 3 of title 30—in part V—hence our reference to that chapter in section 11–1141(a) (11).

In this connection, we are wondering if we could be advised at an early date if you plan to follow our recommendations as to transfers—in table 7—and also as to what the exact new classifications will be. This will enable us to keep a tab on the matter. There may be other references in part II—or revised part III—which should be watched, and corrected if necessary.

### (5) SECTION 11–2301

As pointed out in the revision note, section 1861 of title 28, United States Code, is applicable to the district court in the District of Columbia. It contains the residence requirement. In our opinion, it superseded section 11–1417 of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, to this extent. See, also, 28 United States Code, sections 88, 132, 451. The provisions of section 11–2301 are made uniform for all courts in the District of Columbia, in view of the other sections cited in the first paragraph of the revision note. All of this is pointed out in the revision note.

### (6) SECTION 11–2313

We do not believe that we are in position to specifiy just what jurors in the court of general sessions and the juvenile court are to receive for their services, other than to specifiy that—as indictated in the code sections cited in the first paragraph of the revision note to section 11–2313—they are to receive the same fees as those provided for jurors in the district court. This is effected by referring in new section 11–2313 to section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, which is applicable to the district court.

In a previous bill—several years ago—we did provide in this section that jurors serving in the municipal court and the juvenile court should receive the fees "and travel and subsistence allowances" as may be fixed by section 1871 of title 28, United States Code. The reference to travel and subsistence allowances was deleted from the later bill, however, because, apparently, of the following reasons: Several years ago, the first bill covering part II was circulated among the courts and members of the bar association, and various memos were prepared by the courts and bar committees appointed to examine the bill. In this connection, we refer to page 71 of a lengthy memorandum prepared by J. Hendren Holmes and A. Roy MacKay and submitted to Judges Myers, Beard, and Walker—constituting a committee on code revision—and entitled "Memorandum Re Revision of Part II, District of Columbia Code, Entitled 'Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.'"

Page 71 of the memorandum is the first page of an "addenda" containing suggestions by Judge Munter and "the clerk." We do not know which court this is. Regarding section 11–2313, it is stated that the clerk questions the feasibility of applying the language "and travel and subsistence allowances" to purely local juries in purely local courts. See bottom of page 71. Probably it is because of this comment that the reference to travel and subsistence allowances was later deleted from section 11–2313.

### (7), (8) SECTIONS 15–101(A)(2), 15–102(A)(2)

We think that in both of these sections, the reference to "civil division" is broad enough to include all branches of the court of general sessions. See new sections 11–901, 11–1101, and 11–1301. As previously stated, there is no statute creating the Landlord and Tenant Branch, but obviously it is in the civil division.

### (9) SECTION 15–501(A)

We agree that the amounts of the several exemptions are not realistic, considering the decrease in the value of the dollar today. They should be raised, but to do so was beyond the scope and authority of the revisers.

### (10) SECTION 15–705(A)

Section 11–1519 of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, as amended by act October 4, 1961, Public Law 87–349, section 2, 75 Stat. 769, does include fees. See supplement II, 1963, page 69.

The other comment relates to a question of style.

### (11) SECTION 15–707 OF H.R. 8857—86TH CONGRESS

This section, which was based on section 11–1510 of District of Columbia Code, 1951 and 1961 editions, and which related to marshal's fees in the District of Columbia, was omitted from H.R. 4157 because said section 11–1510 was repealed by act August 31, 1962, Public Law 87–621, section 2, 76 Stat. 418, and is now covered by section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by the same act.

### (12) SECTION 15–709

The comment in the memo apparently refers to subsection (b)(1) of this section, which relates to fees of the marshal with respect to civil actions in the court of general sessions. Apparently, it states the law as specified in the first paragraph of section 11–748 of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, which provides that the marshal's fees in such actions in the "municipal court" shall be as prescribed by the district court.

It may be, however, that some clarification is necessary. Although we have been unable to find, in the local rules of the district court, any reference to former section 11–1510 of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition—now repealed; see our comment under section 15–707, H.R. 8857 above—which the comment in the memo states is contained therein—but does not state which rule makes the reference—apparently it is correct, as the memo states, that the district court, at least in its own local rules, has not prescribed the marshal's fees for services in civil actions—or any other kinds of actions—in the municipal court—now court of general sessions.

What is also somewhat mystifying is that volume 5 of Flaherty's District of Columbia Practice, 1949 edition, section 4162, at page 15, there is set out a schedule of marshal's fees in the "municipal court, District of Columbia, civil division," which the comment states is based on the old rules of that court, 1935. The comment there goes on to state:

> Marshal's fees in municipal court, District of Columbia, civil division. The following schedule of fees charged by the marshal's office for services rendered in connection with actions and proceedings in municipal court, District of Columbia, civil division, is based on the old rules of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, 1935. The new rules of the municipal court, District of Columbia, do not contain any such schedule but inasmuch as the schedule shown below appears to be correct and applicable at the present time it is here shown as a convenient reference and as a complement to the foregoing schedule of fees of the clerk's office of municipal court, District of Columbia, civil division. A schedule of such fees corresponding to the above rule, with a few additional items, is posted in the marshal's office in municipal court, District of Columbia, somewhat as follows:

Then follows the schedule.

As stated in Flaherty, the present rules of the municipal court—now court of general sessions—do not prescribe a schedule of marshal's fees. But what we do not understand is how that court could have prescribed such fees in the first place, that is, in its old 1935 rules, considering the provision of section 11-748 of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, that the fees must be prescribed by the district court.

It seems to us that we must adhere to the law governing the matter, unless we are given authority to change it. Considering the greatly enlarged powers and jurisdiction of the court of general sessions, it may be that court, rather than the district court, should be permitted to prescribe the marshal's fees in civil actions therein. But this involves a matter of policy which perhaps was beyond the scope and authority of the revisers.

### (13) SECTION 16–517

As stated in the revision note, the present wording, in proposed section 16-517, was substituted for the purpose of clarification. We do not believe the substitution creates a substantive change.

### (14) SECTION 16–552

We have no record of having made this change here, that is, the substitution of "asking about" for "concerning." The same change was made in new section 16-521—based on District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, section 16-303. But we do not believe the substitution changes the meaning or intent of either section.

### (15) SECTION 16–416 OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, 1961 EDITION

As indicated in table 5 of the House committee report to H.R. 4157—at page A213—section 16-416 was omitted from revised part II as covered by rules 1 and 7 of the civil rules of the court of general sessions; rule 1 of the rules for the domestic relations branch of that court; those rules and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, generally, which merged law and equity procedure; and sections 11-1141 and 13-101(b) of revised part II of the code, as set out in the bill, H.R. 4157.

### (16) SECTION 16–920

We do not understand the comment: "Note: This is a situation in which the effective date should be mandatory," unless it is meant that the section should provide definitely when the decree shall take effect, rather than using the language "A final decree * * * is not effective * * * until" and "Every decree * * * may not be absolute and take effect until."

In any event, except for minor style changes, the language follows the source section, 16-421 of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, and, without authority, we do not believe that it should be revised further.

### (17) SECTION 16–2701

We agree that the court of general sessions ought to be given jurisdiction of actions under this section and chapter, if the damages claimed are within the jurisdictional amount—$10,000. But may we make this substantive change? The reason why it was held in the case referred to in the memo—125 A. second 847—that such actions, regardless of amount, could not be brought in the municipal court—now court of general sessions—was because the section provides that the U.S. court of appeals is the only court to which appeals may be taken from the action; and that court does not take appeals directly from the court of general sessions.

If the section is changed to permit such actions in the court of general sessions, this could be done by taking the following steps in section 16-2701:

1. In the next to the last sentence of the second paragraph—commencing "If, in a particular case,"—substitute "appellate court" for "United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit".

Second. Add a third paragraph reading as follows:

> The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions has exclusive jurisdiction of actions brought pursuant to this chapter, if the damages claimed do not exceed the sum of $10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, as well as all cross-claims and counterclaims filed in the actions, regardless of the amount involved.

> NOTE.—We are not sure of two things in connection with the above-proposed third paragraph: Whether the jurisdiction of the court of general sessions should be made exclusive, if within the jurisdictional amount (as we are proposing, if it is decided to change the section); and whether the proposed language "exclusive of interest and costs, as well as of all cross-claims and counterclaims," etc., is, or should or could be applicable to this type of action (see sec. 11-961(a) of revised pt. II as set out in H.R. 4157, p. 17).

If the jurisdiction of the district court should be concurrent, regardless of amount, then the third paragraph could read:

> The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, within the limits of its jurisdiction as provided by section 11-961, have concurrent jurisdiction of actions brought pursuant to this chapter.

### (18) SECTION 16–3732

We believe we were correct in changing the value of the goods to not more than $10,000, in view of the enlarged civil jurisdiction of the court of general sessions. See section 11-961(a) of revised part II.

Shortly after receipt of the House bill and report by this subcommittee, copies of said report and bill were furnished to the Senate District of Columbia Committee for consideration. On October 2, 1963, a discussion was had with the staff of the District of Columbia Committee and the committee has been kept advised by memorandum of our actions on this bill.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> U.S. SENATE,
> *December 3, 1963.*
>
> Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR: This will refer to your subcommittee's consideration of H.R. 4157, a bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.
>
> My committee staff advises me that your staff has discussed with them within the past month the contents of the House-passed legislation together with certain proposed amendments under consideration by your subcommittee. It is my understanding that the Law Revision Counsel of the House Judiciary Committee and his staff together with the Equity Publishing Corporation, the codifying contractor to the House committee, has spent several years on the codification preparation contained in this legislation. It has not been possible for myself and this committee, in addition to my committee staff, to examine the bill and the proposed amendments. However, my committee staff advises me that they have been informed by the staff of your subcommittee that no substantive changes are contained in the bill or proposed amendments and that the language thereof deals simply with codification of the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and the judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.
>
> Your courtesy in submitting, on an informal basis, the contents of this bill together with proposed amendments thereto and a memorandum dealing with the consultation by your subcommittee staff with the judges of the several District of Columbia courts, and the president of the District of Columbia Bar Association, is appreciated.
>
> Please accept my best wishes.
>
> Cordially,
>
> ALAN BIBLE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 743), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE OF ENACTMENT

The purpose of this bill is to revise, codify, and enact part II of the District of Columbia Code.

This bill constitutes one phase of the comprehensive program of the Committee on the Judiciary to revise and enact, without substantive change, all the titles of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. The manuscript and editorial work was done under contract to the House Judiciary Committee by the Equity Publishing Corp.

Revision, as distinguished from simple codification, means the substitution of plain language of awkward terms, reconciliation of conflicting laws, omission of obsolete, superseded, or repealed sections, and consolidation of similar provisions. The purpose of this enactment is not to change substantive law, but to put that law in a form that will be more useful and understandable.

### SCOPE

This bill is based upon part II of the 1961 edition of the District of Columbia Code, with the addition of a few provisions from other parts which are transferred to improve the arrangement of the code as a whole.

Before actual revision was begun a scientific plant was assembled. This included—

1. the complete text of Part II, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, and the latest cumulative supplement (Supp. 55);
2. the complete text of original acts from the Statutes at Large;
3. applicable constructions of the courts; and
4. pertinent congressional reports, and other background materials.

### HISTORY

The last code of laws for the District of Columbia enacted by Congress was the code of 1901, as set out in act of March 3, 1901, chapter 854, 31 Stat. 1189. All "codes" published since that time, including the 1961 edition, were consolidation and compilations only, and were not enacted as law.

Actually, the 1901 Code did not contain all the local law applicable in the District at that time. By its own terms (sec. 1 of the act; District of Columbia Code, 1961, ed., sec. 49-301), in addition to providing for the applicability of the common law, the principles of equity and admiralty, all general acts of Congress not locally inapplicable in the District, and all acts of Congress by their terms applicable to the District and to the other places under the jurisdiction of the United States, in force in the District in March 3, 1901, it provided that all British statutes in force in Maryland on February 27, 1801, should also be applicable in the District "except in so far as the same are inconsistent with, or replaced by, subsequent legislation of Congress." Further, there were a number of prior acts relating to the District, the provisions of which were not carried into the code, and which were specifically or impliedly saved from repeal (unless inconsistent with or replaced by the provisions of the code) by section 1636 of the 1901 act (31 Stat. 1435). Consequently, later code compilations have been based, not only on the 1901 Code, as amended or supplemented, but also on all prior acts, including sections of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia, 1874, and British statutes (sometimes as amended by Act of Maryland prior to February 27, 1801), which the codifiers considered as still being in force in the District. Some of the British statutes date back to the 13th century.

More than 60 years have passed since the laws relating to the District were enacted as a code. Many of the British statutes set out in the 1961 compilation, and prior compilations, while they may have been considered as technically being in force in the District, not only are archaic in language but actually can have no present application in the District, or are obsolete. Others, like many of the other provisions of the 1901 Code and of later independent acts relating to the District, have been repealed, superseded, or affected in some way by subsequent legislation. New legislation enacted since the publication of the 1961 compilation has increased the bulk of the latest cumulative supplements to the extent that they cannot be placed in the pockets inside the back covers of the main volumes.

There is an urgent need for a new reconciliation and codification of the laws relating to the District, and the revision contained in this bill is the first step in that direction. Part II of the code was selected for the initial step because it was felt that, before anything else along this line is attempted, it is of primary importance to reconcile and present in a manner useful to Congress, the bench and bar, and all other interested parties, the laws relating to the organization of the courts of the District and to the practice and procedure in those courts.

### PARTICULAR PROBLEMS

In addition to the usual comparison of similar statutes to determine what parts of the older statutes were in conflict with those enacted later, and therefore superseded, considerable study had to be given to the problem of reconciling statutory procedural provisions with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and other court rules adopted under authority of law. Many of the statutory provisions, including some of the old British statutes referred to above, apparently had been replaced by one or more of these rules, and accordingly have been omitted from this bill. Table 5 of this report lists all sections of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, omitted from the bill which are included in the schedule of repeals. In each case, the table gives the reason for the omission and repeal. Table 6 lists certain sections of District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, which are also omitted, and gives the reasons for their omission. They are not included in the schedule of repeals, however, because it was discovered that they had already been repealed, or because they were based on British statutes which technically could not be repealed, or because the particular sections of statutes from which they were derived contain other provisions which are classified elsewhere in the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, and are not subject to repeal. In the latter case, the basic provisions are amended by separate sections in the bill, for the purpose of deleting the superseded or obsolete provisions.

### ARRANGEMENT AND NUMBERING

In the revision, part II is redesignated "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and is rearranged so that only the provisions relating to the organization and operation of courts of the District, including the appointment of court officers and employees, selection of jurors, duties of the coroner, and admission to the bar and other regulation of attorneys, are retained in the first title, that is title 11. All procedural matter that was in that title has been separated therefrom and transferred to the procedural titles following thereafter. This arrangement follows, substantially, that of title 28, United States Code, which was enacted in 1948, although the system of captions and numbering in the District of Columbia Code is different from that used in the United States Code.

The revision contains the same number of titles as contained in part II of the 1961 edition of the code, and uses the same style of section numbering, but chapters within titles are given odd numbers only, leaving even numbers for use in future expansion.

### AMENDMENTS, ENACTING PROVISIONS, AND REPEALS

The text of the revision of part II of the District of Columbia Code is set out in section 1 of the bill.

Sections 2-13 of the bill amend statutory provisions classified to other parts of the District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition, so that they will conform with provisions in this revision.

Section 14 provides for separability of provisions of part II of the code, as set out in section 1 of the bill.

Section 15 provides against any inference of a legislative construction by reason of classification or captions or catchlines used throughout the revised part.

Sections 16 and 17 are saving provisions with respect to certain jurisdiction and powers, organization of the courts, appointment, tenure, and compensation of judges and court officers and employees, etc.

Section 18 authorizes appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of revised part II.

Section 19 lists the British statutes which heretofore have been classified to part II of the District of Columbia Code, and provides that they have no further force and effect in the District. However, those provisions of the British statutes that were regarded as still having force in the District have been rewritten in modern language as far as possible and carried into revised part II, as set out in section 1 of the bill. Upon the enactment of the bill, they will continue as part of the law of the District, but no longer as British statutes.

Section 20 provides for the effective date.

Section 21 provides for the specific repeal of laws either incorporated in the revision or considered obsolete or superseded.

### REVISION NOTES AND TABLES

The revision notes are keyed to sections in the revision and explain the changes made in the text.

In addition to the tables referred to above, reference tables are set out elsewhere in this report to facilitate the study of those interested in the revision. These show the distribution, in the revision, of statutes, sections from the 1961 edition of the District of Columbia Code, and those British and Maryland statutes which were not discarded.

---

## RIGHT OF PERSONS TO BE REPRESENTED BY ATTORNEYS IN MATTERS BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 725.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1466) to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorney in matters before Federal agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "acts", to insert "and that he is currently qualified as described in section 1(a) of this

Act"; in line 9, after the word "construed", to strike out "(i)"; in the same line, after the word "either", to insert "(i)"; in line 13, after the word "discipline", to insert "including disbarment, of"; in line 14, after "(iii)", to strike out "or"; in line 17, after the word "agency", to insert a semicolon and "or (iv) to prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney before the agency transfers funds to the attorney for the party whom he represents", and on page 3, line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "1(a)" and insert "2(a)"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### PRACTICE BY ATTORNEYS

SECTION 1. (a) Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia, in which he resides or maintains an office, may represent others before any agency.

(b) When such a person acting in a representative capacity appears in person or signs a paper in practice before an agency, his personal appearance or signature shall constitute a representation to the agency that under the provisions of this Act he is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts, and that he is currently qualified as described in section 1(a) of this Act. Any misrepresentation under this Act shall subject the person to the provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(c) Nothing herein shall be construed either (i) to grant or to deny to any person who is not a lawyer the right to appear for or represent others before any agency or in any agency proceeding; (ii) to authorize or limit the discipline, including disbarment, of persons who appear in a representative capacity before any agency; (iii) to authorize any person who is a former officer or employee of an agency to represent others before an agency where such representation is prohibited by statute or regulation of an agency; or (iv) to prevent an agency from requiring a power of attorney before the agency transfers funds to the attorney for the party whom he represents.

### SERVICE BY OR UPON ATTORNEYS

SEC. 2. When any participant in any matter before an agency is represented by an attorney at law and that fact has been made known in writing to the agency, any notice or other written communication required or permitted to be given to or by such participant shall be given to or by such attorney. Where any other method of service is specifically provided by statute, service shall also be made as so provided. If a participant is represented by more than one attorney, service by or upon any one of such attorneys shall be sufficient.

### DEFINITION OF AGENCY

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, "agency" shall have the same meaning as it does in section 2(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (60 Stat. 237, as amended).

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, it is a matter of some personal pride for me to witness the passage of this legislation by the Senate. My interest in legislation to free members of the bar in good standing from onerous admissions qualifications imposed by a number of Federal administrative agencies extends back to my days as a Member of the other body, and for a number of Congresses I sponsored bills on the subject. Support for them continued to grow over the years, and culminated in widespread endorsement this session of both the bill (S. 318) introduced by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and myself, and the bill (S. 1466) approved by the Senate at this time. Although the two bills are somewhat different in form, they have a common purpose, and enactment of S. 1466 today is as satisfying to me as would be the enactment of the other bill under the sponsorship of Senator HRUSKA and myself.

I hope this legislation will not be commonly conceived of as being in the nature of a private bill exclusively for the relief of members of the bar, although it certainly has that aspect to it, too. In great part, this bill is for the relief of the American taxpayer. The Hoover Commission long ago concluded, after careful study, that savings of at least $300,000 a year could be made by the Treasury Department alone by eliminating intricacies in its formal admissions procedures for attorneys. To a lesser but by no means inconsiderable extent, the costs of administration in other agencies are similarly more than is required in the interests of regulating practice and preserving agency disciplinary powers over persons appearing before them. Therefore, this legislation serves an overriding public interest, and I am certainly heartened at the progress today toward its final enactment into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1466) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no Senator seeks recognition, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

## SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920, WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF LUMBER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent again that the Senate may temporarily lay aside the motion to proceed to consider the Clark-Case resolution and turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 546, S. 2100. I make that request at this time in line with the others previously granted, because I understand those Senators most interested in the measure are in the Chamber and prepared to go ahead. This will not displace the motion to proceed to consider the Clark-Case resolution.

The legislative clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2100) to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator amend his statement so as to read "The Clark-Case-Keating" resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Clark-Case-Keating resolution, sponsored by 28 other Senators.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield prior to action on the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to inquire of the majority leader approximately how long he thinks it will take to dispose of this measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My guess, from what I understand, would be somewhere in the neighborhood of half an hour.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No longer than that.

Mr. KEATING. Is it contested?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Some speeches will be made on it. There will be no rollcalls.

Mr. KEATING. I hope we can reach the consideration of the question of whether we are to take up the measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Which one?

Mr. KEATING. The Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not lose any sleep over that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can assure the distinguished Senator from New York that it will not be taken up, and will not be voted on.

Mr. KEATING. That is a curious answer to get. Does the Senator mean there are speakers to take up the time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean the minority leader, if it became necessary, would be here to speak at considerable length on the matter.

Mr. KEATING. Is it the intention of the majority leader to take action or make any effort to dispose of it today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, it is not. To be perfectly honest, it is the intention of the majority leader to move to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next, at an appropriate time, after Senators who wish to speak on this and other matters have done so.

I am sure the Senator from New York and other Senators will recognize that there are certain courtesies extended to the leadership with respect to adjournment.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; and the leadership has been courteous to me from time to time. I was seeking to find out what the intention of the leadership was.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it has been stated.

**Mr. KEATING.** This question involves a motion to take up a measure. I was not entirely informed as to what was intended for the afternoon. That was the reason for the inquiry.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** I apologize to the Senator. He should have been notified, as one of the chief sponsors of the resolution.

**Mr. KEATING.** I do not feel that way at all; but I do feel that when there is a motion to take up a measure, Senators ought to be able to debate it with reasonable dispatch and come to a decision as to whether or not to take up the measure, and to get on with the consideration of that matter or other matters.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** The Senator is as practical a Senator as I am. He knows what the situation is. I would never accuse him of being unrealistic. At times I think he is too realistic. I think the situation is understood perfectly on all sides. I hope there will be no objection.

**Mr. CASE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** I yield.

**Mr. CASE.** I appreciate the Senator's yielding. I had not intended to discuss this question any more fully than it has been discussed; but inasmuch as the discussion has been quite extended, we might take another moment. What we have been talking about in euphemisms might be described, in a plainer way, realistically. When the majority leader mentioned that the Senator from New York recognized the realities of the situation, he meant to say, and therefore put his imprimatur on the fact, that we are already suffering from a filibuster.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** As I understand, a 2-word filibuster.

**Mr. CASE.** A 2-word filibuster, which is extraordinarily effective.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** It really has not got underway.

**Mr. CASE.** How potent an instrument it is that can stop completely action to bring up—not a motion to pass, but a motion to bring up for consideration—a simple resolution. That is all I wanted to demonstrate.

Since the matter has proceeded as far as it has, I wonder if we could have assurance, which has been given to us informally by the majority leader, that so far as he was able, he would see that the matter was brought up before this body for consideration, or on a motion to take up, before the session ended.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** I do not know whether it can be done before the session ends. I would not want to be held down too closely. But the leadership will do its best, at an appropriate time, very probably in the next session, to bring this matter up for consideration again. It is growing a little late, in all honesty, to try to bring it up in this session again.

**Mr. CASE.** This is a little disappointing in view of the understanding the Senator from New Jersey had in a private discussion with the Senators from Montana and Pennsylvania, who had the thought that before the session ended the Senator would try to bring it up again.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** If there is a possibility, we will, but it is a long-range possibility. That should be understood.

I respectfully request that Senators leave that responsibility to the leadership. If there is any criticism, we will take it. If there is any credit, we will pass it on.

**Mr. CASE.** Nobody could be fairer or more sweet or gentle.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT ON A BILL TO ESTABLISH A FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

**Mr. BIBLE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield, while the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is in the Chamber?

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** I yield.

**Mr. BIBLE.** Mr. President, I announce that the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will conduct a hearing next Wednesday, December 11, 1963, at 10 a.m., on S. 1365, a bill to establish a Fire Island National Seashore. The hearing will be in room 3110, New House Office Building.

This hearing is for Washington witnesses.

The subcommittee hopes to handle the Fire Island proposal as expeditiously as possible in the second session of the Congress. The hearing next Wednesday is intended to get a general understanding on what is proposed and determine the views of the executive agencies in regard to it.

The subcommittee will schedule hearings in the Fire Island area early next spring when local citizens will be heard. It will not be necessary for the many local citizens who have indicated their interest in this proposal to come to Washington at this time.

I invite the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from New York to that announcement.

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. BIBLE.** I yield, with the permission of the majority leader.

**Mr. KEATING.** I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for scheduling these hearings. He has been very helpful in this matter. I sincerely hope that a strong case can be made for this project.

With this announcement coming so close to the previous discussion, I do not want in any way to appear to be acquiescing in the action of the majority leader in not pressing for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 this afternoon. I dissent from that strongly.

**Mr. BIBLE.** I realize the Senator's keen feeling about it. I thought this announcement would make his weekend much happier.

**Mr. KEATING.** It has. Now I have something to make me happy, and something to make me sad—which is not unusual at the end of a week in the Senate.

**Mr. BIBLE.** I now yield to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] with permission of the majority leader.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Mr. President, I wish to make inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who is chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, on which I have the honor to serve as the ranking minority member, as to why it is necessary at this time to have hearings upon this bill. I must confess that I know nothing about it. The reason I propound the question is that I am sure the Senator, and other Senators, are aware that Senators who serve on the Appropriations Committee will be involved either in conference committees or in markups or in hearings on foreign aid appropriations all of next week. It is not that the consideration of one committee is necessarily more important than that of another, but we are all aware that we must get rid of appropriations before we can go home for Christmas.

I have a deep interest in this matter. I have no objection to, and no support for the bill, because I know nothing about it. However, I do object—and I say this deferentially to my fine friend, because both of us came into the Senate together, and we have been friends ever since—to a hearing being scheduled which is so inconsequential as to time during the next week with respect to this matter. It means that some of us cannot be at that hearing.

**Mr. BIBLE.** The Senator from Colorado recognizes the makeup of the membership of the Public Lands Subcommittee. We always do our best to accommodate every member of the Public Lands Subcommittee. There may be hearings on the foreign aid appropriation bill next week; if so, those hearings will concern, at most, two members of our subcommittee. I am one of them, and the Senator from Colorado is the other member. We must consider many park, lakeshore, and seashore proposals. These days and weeks and months move along rather quickly.

Therefore, I thought it well that we should commence the hearings. I use the word "commence" advisedly, because field hearings have been scheduled for next year. By the time we finish our other commitments, I am sure all of us will have been very busy.

I recognize that it would be desirable to schedule hearings in order to accommodate everyone. I am sorry that this hearing will interfere with another commitment which the Senator from Colorado feels he should keep.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** It is not another commitment that the Senator from Colorado feels he should keep. I feel a sense of obligation. Every Senator knows that Congress must finish consideration of the appropriation bills before it adjourns. The public works bill must be marked up. There must be action on the conference report on the independent offices appropriations bill. Hearings must be held on the foreign aid bill, and the military construction bill must be brought to the floor.

While my friend from New York may be very much interested in this subject, I cannot conceive, with the importance of the appropriations, how this bill could possibly have any corresponding significance. I do not see how it can have enough significance to warrant hearings on it before Senators go home for whatever Christmas recess they will get.

My friend from Nevada has always been kind. He has always been considerate. I do object, however, because certain Senators will not be able to be present to cross-examine witnesses, and to determine the facts. I say this without any idea as to whether I will be in favor of the bill or against it.

**Mr. BIBLE.** I am sure that we will do the best we can to accommodate the Senator from Colorado. It is not possible to accommodate every Senator. I am sure that the Senator from Colorado inadvertently said that it would be necessary to mark up the public works appropriation bill, because it has already been reported.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I did not mean the mark-up of the bill. I meant to say that the public works bill would be on the floor of the Senate. The same is true of the military construction bill.

**Mr. BIBLE.** Yes. A rather full program is already scheduled for January, February, and March of next year. The schedule is made up even at this early date. We always try to accommodate those who make various requests for a hearing. All I can say to the Senator from Colorado is that we shall do our very best in trying to accommodate all Senators. We shall certainly try to do our best to accommodate the Senator from Colorado. I am sure that he will be ably flanked on his side of the aisle by two very able Members of the Senate who have taken a particularly active part in the field of national parks and national seashores.

I can also assure my friend from Colorado that, if anything develops in the hearing on Wednesday, as a result of the Government witnesses testifying, which he would like to question them further on, we will call them back so that he may do so. A rather full schedule is programed for next year. We are proud of the work we have done on this subcommittee, in turning out our work moderately well, and we shall attempt to continue to do so.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I would not have taken this subject up publicly in this way had I had any previous knowledge of it; I would have discussed it with my friend privately. Nevertheless, the question has been raised, and I have made my objection to the meeting. Of course, the chairman has his prerogatives. If anyone thinks that there will be speedy action on the bill, if the subcommittee holds hearings next week, or that there will be action on it before we adjourn this winter, without giving it long and thorough and detailed consideration, he is mistaken. I cannot understand why we should be playing around—that is literally the truth—with such minor bills when so many important matters are pressing at this time.

**Mr. BIBLE.** If my friend from Colorado had followed my announcement, he would have noted that there was no intention to complete action on the bill in the next 2 weeks. We are simply starting hearings on the bill. There will be hearings on it next year, as I have said. They will be held early next year, early in the spring. Again I must repeat that it is difficult to schedule hearings to accommodate every Member of the Senate. We do the very best we can. That is exactly what the Senator from Nevada has tried to do in this instance.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I realize that it is not possible to schedule hearings for the convenience of all Senators. The appropriation bills, which involve so many people, must be taken care of before adjournment. That fact would prevent attendance at the Senator's hearing.

**Mr. BIBLE.** Both the Senator from Colorado and I are members of the Appropriations Committee. Both of us were able to work on the public lands bill and on the appropriations bill last week. I am confident that we can do exactly the same thing next week.

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, probably I am more at fault than anyone else in this connection. I should not only have talked with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, but also with the distinguished Senator from Colorado. It should be stated, in fairness to the Senator from Nevada, that I have been "on his neck" trying to have hearings started. The Senator from Nevada has made a commitment to start the hearings, and he is trying to keep that commitment. No one believes that action would be taken on the bill next week. We wish to start the hearings, and to get on the record the position of the Government departments involved in these preliminary hearings. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not be prejudiced against the bill on the sole ground that the Senator from New York, in his zeal to arrange for the hearings, neglected to consult him as well as the Senator from Nevada.

## SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920, WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF LUMBER

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, what is the pending business? I have asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 546, S. 2100.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2100) to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "thereof", to strike out " 'The' " and insert " 'During the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, the' "; and on page 2, line 6, after the word "occurs", to insert a comma and "and inserting in lieu thereof ', or upon the expiration of the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, whichever first occurs' "; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes", approved October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1200), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out "During the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "During the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, the"; and

(2) in subsection (b) by striking out ", or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs", and inserting in lieu thereof ", or upon the expiration of the two-year period which begins on October 24. 1963. whichever first occurs".

## OPPOSITION TO THE HEALTH CARE PLAN

**Mr. MILLER.** Mr. President, in the December issue of Nation's Business there appears an article entitled "Ex-Cabinet Member Opposes Health Care Plan."

The article is written in question and answer form by former Postmaster General J. Edward Day.

Because of General Day's vast experience in the insurance field, I believe it is particularly interesting that he opposes a form of governmental assistance in the nature of hospitalization or medical care financed by social security.

His answers are based upon a vast amount of personal knowledge, and I believe they merit the attention of all those who are interested in this problem, which probably will come before us during the next session of Congress.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### EX-CABINET MEMBER OPPOSES HEALTH CARE PLAN

(The year ahead will see a vigorous new drive to win congressional approval of a Federal health care plan tied to social security taxes. A strong opponent of such a plan is J. Edward Day, former Postmaster General, who resigned from the Kennedy cabinet on August 9. While Mr. Day, of course, does not oppose the whole New Frontier program, in this exclusive Nation's Business interview he reveals his alarm that this pet spending project may become law. Mr. Day has extensive experience in the insurance field. He served as legal and legislative assistant to former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and from 1950 to 1953 was Illinois insurance commissioner. He also served with the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, rising to vice president in charge of operations in 13 Western States. Now practicing law in Washington, he has no insurance connection. But his interest in welfare programs continues.)

Question. Mr. Day, what do you think of the administration's health care plan for the aged under social security?

Answer. It is a program that has tremendous political appeal, but it is extremely difficult for the rank and file of the public—or even for fairly informed Members of Congress—to appreciate the implications of getting into an expensive medical care plan of this type.

Question. How expensive would it be?

Answer. To begin with, we should bear in mind that social security benefits now being paid total over $13 billion a year and it is estimated that by 1980 just the present program will cost as much as $25 billion a year.

For the health care plan, they talk in terms of more than $1 billion the first year and then going up to $2 billion, without taking into account the inevitable future liberalization of benefits.

In my opinion it is inevitable that once this program is enacted there will be the same pattern of liberalization every couple of years that there has been with the original social security law. These liberalizations are bound to add enormously to the expense and I feel would make the total load of financing the social security program completely out of hand.

The program as outlined in the administration bill contains a great many cost reduction features such as a deductible, which the beneficiary would have to pay before getting Federal payments; time limits on the period in the hospital; limitation of the benefits to people 65 or older; no benefits for surgery or doctors bills, no benefits for drugs.

The reason I am a dedicated Democrat is because I think that the Federal Government should use its resources and its powers to promote the greatest good for the greatest number—but only to the extent it can afford it.

And we have reached the point where we can no longer judge new programs purely on the basis of whether they are desirable. We have to judge them on the basis of whether they are feasible within the budget squeeze and the deficit spending pattern we are up against.

It doesn't make sense to me to have a large Federal deficit in peacetime and in time of prosperity, and I think that this type of new departure in social security commitments may bring on deficits in the future such as we have never even thought of in peacetime before.

Question. Did you have these same views before you became a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet?

Answer. I definitely did. As a result of having been insurance commissioner of Illinois and having a top responsibility in the insurance industry, I became concerned some years ago about the eternal extensions of social security financial commitments.

In early 1960 I expressed in a published article this same type of concern as to the medical care for the aged plan which was pending then, and I have never felt differently about it.

Of course, when I was Postmaster General, the social security program was no part of my direct responsibility. I had plenty of problems of my own to worry about, and while I was in office I, of course, supported in general all of the President's program.

But, as a person with some degree of special knowledge in this area, I have been concerned that there has been so little attention to the two points I am emphasizing here: First, that because of the political appeal of social security liberalizations this health program is bound to be extended way beyond what is being proposed now. This is shown by the patterns of the old-age benefits that have been extended many times in the past. It is shown by what has happened to private health insurance plans.

The second thing I think isn't recognized sufficiently is that the tax base for social security comes out of the same payroll check that has to pay for local taxes, for the defense effort, for the space program, and everything else. Just because it is called a payroll tax doesn't mean that it is something that is available above and beyond all our other demands for public revenue.

Question. Mr. Day, you mentioned a pattern of liberalizations in private health insurance. Could you elaborate on this?

Answer. Most private health insurance plans worked out by negotiations with employee groups start out, for example, with a very substantial contribution by the employees to the cost. In each round of bargaining there are efforts, often successful, to get the employees' contribution reduced or entirely eliminated, which greatly increases the cost to the employer.

I think that the precedent of what has happened to the private plans is something that I have not seen discussed in alerting the public and the Congress to the implications of this Federal health program.

Now that sort of thing might happen, too, as your total social security cost increases. We are the only country that has this 50–50 employer-employee participation in paying the cost of our social security plans. There have been suggestions already that a larger proportion of the cost should be loaded on to the employer.

Question. Is there ample private health insurance for people over 65?

Answer. There is plenty of insurance available for people who have the money to pay for it. But I don't think anybody can say there is adequate private health insurance for people who don't have the money to pay for it. Health insurance for old people costs substantial money. And many of the people who would be most in need of medical care are people who would be very poor risks from the insurance point of view because of their poor health.

Question. Do you feel that the introduction of a Federal health care plan changes the basic philosophy of social security?

Answer. It is a distinct departure in that, for the first time, it provides service. Until now the social security program has provided dollars. But this health care plan provides, for example, after the deductible, whatever a semiprivate hospital room costs.

Now we all know that the costs of hospital care have been going up quite markedly in recent years. They have been going up at a faster rate than the cost of living or than average wages.

There is, therefore, a new departure right there in that the Government is taking on an obligation which is not necessarily keyed to the revenue that is coming in.

Assuming $37 a day cost for a semiprivate room, long-term hospital care is a benefit that is very valuable. Then there is a nursing home benefit that can follow that, and home visits besides. That would be a very generous private insurance plan and the premium would be substantial.

If we could afford it, this is a program with a great deal of human appeal. But there are many things that have great human appeal which we simply can't afford to do in view of our Federal budget crisis, which is tied in with our balance-of-payments gap and our pressing needs for urgent purposes such as defense.

Question. Would the addition of health care endanger the rest of the social security structure?

Answer. I don't think it will endanger it in the sense that it will cause any part of social security to be discontinued, but one of the big troubles is that people are inclined to think because social security is financed by a payroll tax that it has some separate source of financing from the rest of Government activities.

There is only 100 percent of the Nation's payroll available as a source of tax revenue for Federal Government, State government and local government, and as the percentage of the payroll tax continues to go up, as is already scheduled and in the law now on the books, that increases the total tax load.

The social security plan is often mistakenly thought of as an insurance plan, but it is in fact a pay-as-you-go plan. The present trust fund would pay only the benefits now being paid for about a year and a half. So it is in no way comparable to the reserves that are held by an insurance company to pay pension benefits.

As the benefits are liberalized they have to be taken care of on a pay-as-you-go basis by either increasing the tax take at the present time from increased payroll taxes or else going through the pretense of keeping the payroll tax low but paying for it out of general revenues. But in either case it comes out of people's incomes.

The President has stated in connection with his support of the tax cut bill that he intends to take every feasible step to keep down spending and to avoid having the tax reduction cause a long-term increase in the deficit.

But an obligation such as is taken on by a new social security benefit is an obligation for all time.

Question. Isn't the disability portion of the social security fund in danger of running out of money?

Answer. Yes; the disability fund—which is a separate trust fund—is running lower than predictions, and Representative Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has already been proposing that the taxable wage base be increased for the purpose of supporting that trust fund.

The very same proposal for practically the same amount in the taxable wage base is part of the administration's proposal for financing the health benefit. And you can't finance both things from the same source.

What has happened to the disability benefit is a glaring example of what I am talking about. It was started only in 1956, and at that time was available only to disabled people who were 50 years old or older. In just the short time since then, that age floor has already been taken out and it is available to anyone of any age.

I feel absolutely certain that the health care program, even though it starts out at 65, would inevitably be extended before long to all people receiving social security benefits, which include many dependents under 65. It would be lowered as far as the actual principal beneficiaries are concerned to lower ages, and probably eventually the age limit would be off entirely. The financial implications of that are incredible.

Question. Do you have any specifics as to financial implications?

Answer. The medical care plan which is being proposed by the administration is similar to a plan that was proposed for several years by Representative Aime Forand. Known as the Forand bill, it would have provided the hospital benefits to anyone receiving social security benefits, including dependents, and it was estimated that in just 10 years the Forand bill would be costing $8 billion a year.

Question. Would it be likely that the health plan would be broadened to pay for even more of the cost of people's sicknesses?

Answer. Definitely yes. It has been customary in private health insurance plans, no matter how modest a scale they started on, to extend them to cover surgical and medical benefits. There is no surgical benefit in this plan at all.

There is also a tendency to extend them to drug benefits. There is no provision for providing drugs except as they might be an incidental part of the hospital care.

We are all familiar with the controversies they have had in England over paying for false teeth and for wigs, but these aren't ridiculous items at all as far as what is probable in extending this plan.

Many private health insurance plans as a result of many rounds of negotiations now include psychiatric care. If you begin getting that sort of thing into a publicly financed plan the sky is the limit as to what it might cost.

This matter of the deductibles is something I feel is likely to last a very short time if the bill passes because there will be highly publicized cases of individuals who are not able to come up with that $50 or $75 or something of that kind.

The same thing is true on the time limits on the stay in the hospital. People may be glad to have any benefit at all at the start, but when you have highly publicized cases of people who have to be moved out of the semiprivate rooms that they are entitled to under the bill, have to be moved out because they are sick longer than their benefit lasts, there will be demands that those time limits be extended or eliminated.

Question. How do you account for the fact that the social security program is liberalized so frequently and so consistently?

Answer. To begin with, it is a bipartisan type of phenomena. It is done both in Republican and Democratic administrations. I think it is because people are getting an immediate benefit which is, in fact, going to be paid for later.

Question. Are the social security trust funds in danger of going bankrupt on the basis of the tax structures that are programed now?

Answer. They are not in danger of going bankrupt in any sense that should be a matter of concern to the participants. There is no reason for anyone to be panicky about receiving his future social security benefits. But the trust funds are very small in relation to the obligations that have been incurred.

If you take the total amount of obligations that are already incurred for social security payments and subtract from those the amount of revenue which is to come in from payroll taxes now provided for there is a deficiency of over $300 billion.

Now if it was an insurance operation you would say that the reserve fund was short by more than $300 billion.

But because of the fact that social security is supported by the general revenues of the Government and they are bound to provide the revenues to pay for it, the danger is not that people won't get their benefits; the danger is that this is another enormous commitment which is competing for the already overloaded Federal budget.

Question. Mr. Day, you used the term "budget crisis." What do you mean by that?

Answer. I think that the Federal Government has reached the point where we must consider whether we have borrowing leeway in large amounts in the event we need it for genuine emergencies such as war or a major depression. We all hope and expect that neither one will take place. But back in the 1930's when we went into a deficit spending program to try to do something about crushing unemployment we had a relatively small Federal debt.

Now we have the Federal debt up to a level where it is really questionable whether we have unlimited borrowing leeway that we have had in the past in times of crisis.

I consider it is crisis when the Federal deficit is running at $6 or $7 billion a year in times of relative peace, as much peace as we have known since World War II.

The fact that the deficit is continuing as high as it is in peacetime I don't think can be explained away by thinking that we are going to reach some point in a few years when our problems will be over and we won't need all this Federal money. There is no indication that there is going to be a sudden end to the cold war, and almost all of the commitments that the Federal Government has are of a type that continue to grow automatically.

So, I think that we have come to the point long since where we should stop thinking in terms of whether these things are desirable from a human point of view, and make the same hard decisions that city and State and county governments have had to make for years.

They generally cannot borrow money without a vote of the public on a bond issue, and as a result they have to get along with services, with facilities that are less than what it would be nice to have.

One of the odd results is that we are constantly told that cities and States and counties can't afford to do certain things such as pay for rapid transit systems, but that the Federal Government can.

In my opinion it is least able of all to pay for them because it is living strictly on borrowed money, and there is no firm program for paying off that debt.

### WHAT HEALTH SCHEME WOULD AND WOULDN'T DO

Here are the major features of the health care program now pending in Congress:

Eligibility: Anybody 65 or over could be eligible, including more than 1 million persons covered by social security but not drawing it because they are making too much money. Also included: about 2.5 million aged not covered by social security.

Services: Bed and board, nursing care, drugs, diagnostic and therapeutic work, and doctors' services while in the hospital and out-patient diagnostic services; nursing care, bed and board, medical services and medicines while in nursing home; part-time nursing care in the patient's home.

Choices: Patient would have choice of three plans ranging from 45 days in hospital or nursing home at no cost to 180 days of hospital and nursing care but with the patient paying about $92 toward his care.

Once chosen, the plan could not be changed.

How financed: Both the social security taxable wage base and the tax rate would be raised. The tax would go up another one-half of 1 percent of $5,200 on employers and employees and four-tenths of 1 percent on self-employed.

Services not covered: The proposed legislation would not pay for surgery, doctors' bills, private nurses, drugs, or medicines outside hospital or nursing home, or dental or psychiatric care.

## DESIGNATION OF DECEMBER 17 EACH YEAR AS WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 124) designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 124) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the 17th day of December of each year is hereby designated as "Wright Brothers Day", in commemoration of the first successful flights in a heavier than air, mechanically propelled airplane, which were made by Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903, near Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920, WITH RESPECT TO TRANSPORTATION OF LUMBER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2100) to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, S. 2100 would extend the law now in existence with respect to shipments by foreign-flag cargo carriers to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. For the past year, the law has provided that the Secretary of Commerce may, upon certain terms and conditions, allow such shipments of goods to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The main reason for the exception to the law is that no American cargo carriers, prior to the enactment of the bill last year, expressed any interest in the shipment of goods to Puerto Rico, particularly lumber, as one item, although the bill includes all types of shipments. Congress allowed the Secretary of Commerce, under certain conditions, to permit other bottoms to transport lumber destined for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill merely extends the present law for 2 years.

The departments are in agreement concerning the bill. For the purpose of further explanation, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD in full, including the views of the departments and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (Rept. No. 568) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SENATE REPORT NO. 568 TOGETHER WITH MINORITY VIEWS

(To accompany S. 2100)

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2100) to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

### THE AMENDMENTS

Page 1, line 9, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "During the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, the".

Page 2, line 4, before the period, insert ", and inserting in lieu thereof ', or upon the expiration of the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, whichever first occurs' ".

Amend the title to read as follows:

"A bill to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber."

### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 2100, as reported with amendments, would continue for 2 years, from October 24, 1963, the current temporary authority of the

Secretary of Commerce (which would otherwise expire on October 23, 1963) to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from any ports or terminal areas in the United States whenever he determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that there is no domestic vessel reasonably available to serve such ports or terminal areas for the transportation of such lumber. Section 4 of the act of October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1200), which S. 2100 would amend, provides that the Secretary's determination of nonavailability of domestic vessels shall be made within 45 days after application for suspension, that it shall be final and conclusive, and that he shall establish such terms, conditions, and regulations with respect to operations under such suspension as he determines to be in the national interest. The act of October 24, 1962, as now proposed to be amended, would further provide that any suspension under its provisions shall terminate whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines that conditions required for such suspension no longer exist, or upon the termination of the 2-year period beginning October 24, 1963, whichever first occurs. The provision of the act of October 24, 1962, that S. 2100 would not amend, provides that no Federal laws shall apply to any water carrier because of operations under a suspension provided for in that act if such laws did not apply to such carrier prior to such suspension.

### DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

The amendment incorporated in Public Law 877 of the 87th Congress, to permit suspension of the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to shipments of lumber to Puerto Rico in other than U.S.-flag vessels, marked the culmination of a long series of discussions and public hearings aimed at improving depressed conditions in the great softwood lumber industry of the northwestern States.

Due to a number of causes, among which domestic shipping costs ranked high, the industry had seen its onetime domination of the Atlantic coast-Puerto Rico market whittled down year by year, over a period of little more than a decade, to practical extinction. In 1951 the Washington-Oregon area supplied 92 percent of Puerto Rico's lumber needs. Inroads by Canadian producers cut that percentage successively, and by 1962 Canada had taken over the market completely. Meanwhile Puerto Rican requirements had tripled and quadrupled to 73 million board feet, all being obtained from Canada.

To meet this situation, the Committee on Commerce held numerous hearings, here and in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, over a 3-month period in the spring of 1962. Many remedies were discussed, some were attempted, and at least one was achieved; namely, the elimination of the 15-day freehold privilege permitted Canadian lumber shippers by the Canadian railroads but denied to American lumber shippers. Ocean shipping costs however were still a massive obstacle which, in addition to high stumpage costs and other burdens, blocked most efforts of the Northwest producers to compete for the Puerto Rican market.

Enactment of Public Law 877 brought results sufficient to indicate the real possibilities of the Puerto Rican market if the burden of high ocean freight rates was equalized vis-a-vis Canada. In spite of the several months required for Commerce to work out rules and procedures, the time necessary for filing of applications for suspension and ensuing hearings, and approach of the October suspension termination date making operators wary of placing orders that might not be delivered, in the less than 6 months between February 7 and July 19 more than 5 million board feet were shipped from Washington-Oregon ports. That was 5 million feet that would not have been shipped if the Jones Act provisions had not been suspended, and 5 million feet more than were shipped in 1962. Actually, it was the largest total of west coast shipments to Puerto Rico since 1956.

The witness of the leading shipping association testified at the hearing that, to the best of his knowledge "no one has genuinely been hurt among the carriers * * * the truth of the matter is that * * * no U.S.-flag operator, operating with his present equipment, can outquote the foreign-flag operator, considering his costs and the status of his equipment."

Witnesses from west coast ports and mills are confident that extension of the suspension would make possible more thorough penetration of this once-rich Puerto Rican market, and the committee is similarly confident that the results achieved in the abbreviated period of selling activity give promise of much greater returns in the 2-year period the bill now proposes. The results achieved have not only made a welcome dent in unemployment in this important industry, but the psychological effect has been most salutary throughout the whole Northwest area.

Representatives of shipping associations and of maritime labor opposed enactment of S. 2100, on the ground that it would further breach the 1920 statute provisions which reserve the domestic trade to vessels built in U.S. shipyards and owned by citizens of the United States.

The Department of Commerce, through its General Counsel, Robert E. Giles, recommended enactment if the bill were amended to provide for a 2-year extension. The Department report stated:

"Suspension of the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, with respect to lumber shipments to Puerto Rico, appears to be necessary if Pacific coast lumber is to have any place in the Puerto Rican market. * * * In view of the effect on west coast lumber shipments resulting from section 4 of Public Law 87-877, it would appear desirable that a thorough reappraisal be made during the next 2 years of the effect of the Jones Act on the present state of the U.S. merchant marine and the domestic economy generally."

### AGENCY COMMENTS

Reports from the agencies and departments follow:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., September 20, 1963.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce concerning S. 2100, a bill to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber.

S. 2100 would provide an indefinite extension of section 4 of Public Law 87-877. Section 4 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to waive, under certain circumstances the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 which require lumber shipped from the United States to Puerto Rico to be carried in U.S. built and owned vessels. Section 4 is now scheduled to expire October 23, 1963.

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of S. 2100 if amended to provide for a 2-year extension of section 4.

Since enactment of section 4 there has been a resumption of shipments of lumber from the U.S. west coast to Puerto Rico. According to our information waterborne shipments of lumber from the west coast to Puerto Rico, since enactment of section 4, have totaled approximately 5.5 million board feet. For the same period of 1961-62, there were no such shipments.

It is clear that the Canadian competitors of the domestic lumber industry enjoy many advantages other than those relative to shipping costs with the result that they are able to market lumber at a lesser cost than U.S. producers. It appears that steps must be taken to improve the position of U.S. producers with respect to their Canadian counterparts in matters other than ocean shipping costs if domestic lumber is to be fully competitive. Until such time as these improvements are achieved, suspension of the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, with respect to lumber shipments to Puerto Rico, appears to be necessary if Pacific coast lumber is to have any place in the Puerto Rican market. However, when equality is achieved on other costs, the American producers should be in a better position to meet competition while utilizing U.S.-flag ships to transport the cargo as would be required in the absence of section 4 of Public Law 87-877.

We believe, therefore, that it would be undesirable to provide for indefinite suspension of section 27 as S. 2100 proposes. A 2-year extension of the present suspension would enable the Pacific coast producers to continue to compete in the Puerto Rican market and would assure reexamination of the entire situation after a suitable period.

It should be noted that under the procedures established by the Secretary of Commerce in administering section 4, American-flag carriers are given full opportunity on a first referral basis to handle all lumber shipments from the United States to Puerto Rico, if their shipping rates are competitive with foreign carriers. We believe that these procedures assure that due regard is given to all domestic interests involved.

In view of the effect on west coast lumber shipments resulting from section 4 of Public Law 87-877, it would appear desirable that a thorough reappraisal be made during the next 2 years of the effect of the Jones Act on the present state of the U.S. merchant marine and the domestic economy generally.

For the foregoing reasons the Department does not believe that it would be desirable to provide an indefinite extension of section 4 of Public Law 87-877 and recommends that S. 2100 be modified to provide for a 2-year extension of that section.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES.

---

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
*Washington, D.C., September 20, 1963.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on S. 2100, a bill to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber.

This bill has been examined, but since its subject matter does not directly affect the activities of the Department of Justice, we would prefer not to offer any comment concerning it.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
*Deputy Attorney General.*

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*September 10, 1963.*

B-148057.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,*
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of August 29, 1963, acknowledged on September 3, requesting the comments of the General Accounting Office concerning S. 2100, 88th Congress, 1st session, entitled "A bill to continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber."

We have no special information or knowledge as to the desirability of the proposed legislation and, therefore, we make no recommendation with respect to its enactment.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Public Law 87-877
87th Congress, H.R. 11586
October 24, 1962

* * * * *

SEC. 4. (a) [During the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, the] *During the two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, the* provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883) shall be suspended with respect to the transportation of lumber to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from any ports or terminal areas in the United States whenever the Secretary of Commerce, after notice and opportunity for hearing, determines that there is no domestic vessel reasonably available to serve between such ports or terminal areas for the transportation of such lumber. Such determination shall be made within 45 days after application for suspension and shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such determination. Upon making the determination provided for in this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish such terms, conditions, and regulations with respect to operations under such suspension as he determines to be in the national interest.

(b) Any suspension under the provisions of this Act shall terminate whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines that conditions required in the subsection (a) of this section for such suspension no longer exist [, or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs], *or upon the expiration of this two-year period which begins on October 24, 1963, whichever first occurs.*

(c) No Federal laws shall apply to any water carrier because of operations under a suspension provided for in this Act if such laws did not apply to such carrier prior to such suspension.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR BEALL

I am opposed to S. 2100, because it represents another effort to weaken the Jones Act. In 1920, the Jones Act was passed to protect domestic shipping by requiring that only U.S. vessels be used in the trade between U.S. ports and territories. Since that time, our domestic shipping fleet has declined. Enactment of S. 2100 can only bring further hardship to our domestic shipping industry. Each year, Congress is asked to approve various suspensions of the Jones Act. If we approve a suspension with respect to lumber, there will be little justification for opposing similar treatment for other commodities.

Much has been said in Congress regarding the need for strengthening our domestic shipping fleet. This legislation is in direct conflict with our domestic needs and should not be approved.

---

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR THURMOND

S. 2100 provides for a 2-year extension of section 4 of Public Law 87-877 which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to waive, under certain circumstances, the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. The Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly referred to as the Jones Act, requires shipments between two domestic ports to be made in U.S. built and owned vessels. This exemption would allow shipments of lumber between domestic ports and Puerto Rico in foreign vessels. I opposed Public Law 87-877 when it was originally enacted, and I am opposed to any extension of this exemption.

The merchant marine industry in the United States is perhaps the most heavily subsidized segment of our entire economy. The industry suffers from innumerable economic difficulties, including high wage costs, construction costs, and other operating expenses. The Jones Act was adopted for the purpose of assuring to the domestic industry all the waterborne traffic between domestic ports. It has served a very useful purpose and should not be subject to waiver except under the most unusual circumstances. I do not believe that the circumstances in this case warrant the perpetuation of this rupture in the laws relating to coastwise shipping which our domestic carriers now rely upon and must rely upon in the future.

During the year since the adoption of Public Law 87-877, waterborne shipments of lumber from the west coast to Puerto Rico have totaled approximately 5.5 million board feet. These shipments were made in foreign vessels and comprise approximately two shiploads of lumber. This small quantity does not justify an extension of this exemption.

I am well aware of the difficulties which are facing our lumber industry in the United States. I am sympathetic to any suggestion designed to bring about meaningful remedies to their economic difficulties. However, I feel that the transportation costs are but one small factor to be considered. Canadian lumber producers have the advantage of lower stumpage costs, lower wage costs, and generally lower operating expenses than do our domestic lumber producers. In attempting to remedy the problem of transportation costs in this manner, I fear that we are creating an even greater problem in our maritime industry. There is evidence that the delivered price of American lumber to Puerto Rico, even with the advantage of low-cost shipping, is not competitive with Canadian prices due to these other factors.

This exemption could be the first step toward a further waiver of the Jones Act between domestic ports on the west coast and ports on the east coast. If this were cited as a precedent and the further exemption approved, southern and southeastern lumber producers would be placed in dire economic straits. They would be unable to meet the competition from west coast shipping, having the advantage of low transportation costs. Congress would be continuing a dangerous precedent to extend this exemption, and therefore should reject S. 2100.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I notice that the report contains the endorsements of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Comptroller General, without their making any recommendations one way or the other.

Because the report has been ordered to be printed, I should like to say that I have received, under date of October 31, 1963, a copy of a letter sent by Charles S. Murphy, Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has just explained the purpose of the bill. The letter endorses the proposed 2-year extension of the act. So the Government departments and agencies are unanimously in support of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. Murphy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D.C., October 31, 1963.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,*
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of August 29, 1963, for the Department's comments on S. 2100, a bill "To continue certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber.

S. 2100 would make permanent the temporary authority of the Secretary of Commerce to permit the use of foreign vessels in the transportation of lumber from ports or terminal areas in the United States to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico whenever he determines there is no domestic vessel reasonably available to serve between such ports or terminal areas for the transportation of lumber. Enactment of this measure would permit lumber shippers in the States of Washington and Oregon, for example, to ship to Puerto Rico under essentially the same conditions as now enjoyed by shippers in British Columbia. It would thus help to insure conditions of reasonable competition within the lumber industry of the United States and Canada.

This Department favors the objective of the bill, and we concur in the recommendation of the Department of Commerce that the present legislation be extended for 2 years.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES S. MURPHY,
*Acting Secretary.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] desires to make some remarks about the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to the enactment of S. 2100, which is designed to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of the Jones Act with respect to the transportation of lumber to Puerto Rico. The original 1-year exemption authority was enacted in 1962 and expired on October 24 of this year. S. 2100 would continue for 2 years this very bad precedent of allowing an exception to our coastwise shipping laws and regulations.

The testimony on S. 2100 reveals that the previous 1-year exemption authority did not prove to be as useful to the lumber industry as had been anticipated. Also, the enactment of this measure would bring about the possibility of irreparable harm to our domestic maritime industry.

Mr. President, this measure constitutes a first foot in the door for an exemption authority for lumber shipments in foreign bottoms from the west coast to the east coast. The Jones Act presently prevents shipping from one port in the United States to another port in the United States in other than a domestic vessel. Earlier this year, the Senate Commerce Committee held a series of three hearings in the South inquiring into the economic conditions of the southern lumber industry. Without exception, all the witnesses who testified in these hearings were opposed to exceptions of the Jones Act for either Puerto Rico or for eastern seaboard ports with regard to shipments of lumber. If a further exemption were allowed, using this measure as a precedent for such an act, the southern lumber industry would suffer dire economic injury.

There is little or no chance of this measure being approved by the House of Representatives, especially this year. Since the previous 1-year exemption expired on October 24 of this year, I believe that it would be a useless act for the Senate to give its approval to S. 2100.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my minority views as contained in the Senate Commerce Committee report on S. 2100 printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the minority views of Senator Thurmond (Rept. No. 568) were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Minority Views of Senator Thurmond

S. 2100 provides for a 2-year extension of section 4 of Public Law 87–877 which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to waive, under certain circumstances, the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. The Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly referred to as the Jones Act, requires shipments between two domestic ports to be made in U.S. built and owned vessels. This exemption would allow shipments of lumber between domestic ports and Puerto Rico in foreign vessels. I opposed Public Law 87–877 when it was originally enacted, and I am opposed to any extension of this exemption.

The merchant marine industry in the United States is perhaps the most heavily subsidized segment of our entire economy. The industry suffers from innumerable economic difficulties, including high wage costs, construction costs, and other operating expenses. The Jones Act was adopted for the purpose of assuring to the domestic industry all the waterborne traffic between domestic ports. It has served a very useful purpose and should not be subject to waiver except under the most unusual circumstances. I do not believe that the circumstances in this case warrant the perpetuation of this rupture in the laws relating to coastwise shipping which our domestic carriers now rely upon and must rely upon in the future.

During the year since the adoption of Public Law 87–877, waterborne shipments of lumber from the west coast to Puerto Rico have totaled approximately 5.5 million board feet. These shipments were made in foreign vessels and comprise approximately two shiploads of lumber. This small quantity does not justify an extension of this exemption.

I am well aware of the difficulties which are facing our lumber industry in the United States. I am sympathetic to any suggestion designed to bring about meaningful remedies to their economic difficulties. However, I feel that the transportation costs are but one small factor to be considered. Canadian lumber producers have the advantage of lower stumpage costs, lower wage costs, and generally lower operating expenses than do our domestic lumber producers. In attempting to remedy the problem of transportation costs in this manner, I fear that we are creating an even greater problem in our maritime industry. There is evidence that the delivered price of American lumber to Puerto Rico, even with the advantage of low-cost shipping, is not competitive with Canadian prices due to these other factors.

This exemption could be the first step toward a further waiver of the Jones Act between domestic ports on the west coast and ports on the east coast. If this were cited as a precedent and the further exemption approved, southern and southeastern lumber producers would be placed in dire economic straits. They would be unable to meet the competition from west coast shipping, having the advantage of low transportation costs. Congress would be continuing a dangerous precedent to extend this exemption, and therefore should reject S. 2100.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Dark Days for the Merchant Fleet," written by Helen Delich Bentley and published in the Baltimore Sun of October 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Dark Days for the Merchant Fleet

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

The future of the remnants of the domestic shipping fleet literally hangs by a thread. A bill now pending in Congress could wipe it out, although the bill's supporters would deny this.

Introduced by Senator Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, the bill would permit on a permanent basis the free movement of lumber from the United States to Puerto Rico aboard foreign-flag ships. If that is enacted, the maritime industry feels it is useless even to try to apply the Jones Act any longer. The Jones Act was passed in 1920 to protect domestic shipping by permitting only American-flag ships to carry cargoes between American ports and from the States to territories such as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The effect of the Jones Act was weakened last year when Senator Neuberger squeezed through a provision that lumber could move to Puerto Rico on foreign-flag ships for a 1-year period if American ships could not meet the low freight rate of the foreign vessels. The pending legislation has no proviso which would give American ships an opportunity even to express a desire for the lumber.

Ironically, American ships which have been converted abroad, but which are still operated under the American flag and manned by American seamen cannot compete against the foreign vessels because the Jones Act excluded them from the domestic trade.

Yet these are the only American ships—primarily bulk type carriers—which could approach the low freight rates of the foreign ships, which are built abroad, registered abroad, and manned by foreign seamen.

Once the lumber industry breaks completely through the Jones Act with the "free movement" doctrine, then the orange, steel, chemical, and oil companies are going to fight for their rights. Who can say that the lumber industry should have any more preference than the others?

Shipping circles feel strongly that the administration is selling the American domestic service short—or "cannibalizing" it—in behalf of the lumber industry because of the power in Congress of the Pacific Northwest congressional delegation.

The same shipping groups point out that many of the lumbermen who are screaming that they cannot compete against Canaadian lumber which moves in foreign bottoms are stockholders and part owners of many of the same Canadian lumber concerns. In other words they are competing against themselves and the domestic fleet is being sacrificed—that is the feeling in the maritime world.

Although the railroads seemingly would support any attack against the domestic shipping lines, they may well beware of some of the far-reaching implications. Competition against American-flag water transportation has been stiff and the railroads have complained. But what will it be if lower cost foreign ships are given a wide open field in which to operate?

Great concern has been expressed by many responsible sources about the decline—from 700 ships before World War II to less than 100 today—of the domestic fleet, but thus far only negative action has taken place.

When he was running for the Presidency, the then Senator Kennedy wrote: "The depressed condition of our country's once-flourishing domestic shipping industry should be a matter of deepest concern to everyone interested in our country's economic progress and national security. Unless strong measures are taken, promptly, to preserve and strengthen the dry cargo fleet now operating coastwise and intercoastal, one of the great bulwarks of our Nation's defense may soon be a thing of the past."

Since that letter was written in 1960, at least eight domestic—intercoastal, coastwise, and offshore—steamship lines have suspended. Only seven are left.

Summarizing in his letter, Mr. Kennedy wrote: "If the domestic merchant fleet, so strategic to the Nation's economy and to its defense, is to be kept alive—and it must be—Government must lend a hand. Steps must be taken to insure fair treatment of domestic shipping vis-a-vis other forms of transportation. Beyond that Government has real and long neglected responsibility to assist in the formulation of a rational overall transportation policy in which intercoastal transport has a vital position."

Among the problems cited by the "deceased" lines as they went out of business was that of rates—that they were unable to get rate increases approved fast enough by the Federal agencies.

At the Propeller Club Convention held in Baltimore last week, former Senator John Marshall Butler, who was considered outstanding in his contributions to maritime legislation while serving on the Senate Commerce Committee, spoke on "Domestic Water Transportation and the National Interest."

He said among other things, "Unless something is done about the ratemaking situation, a rejuvenation of domestic water shipping would be impossible, according to the experts, even if the cost of the ships were zero. It is in the area of ratemaking, on a wholly coordinated national transportation basis, that Under Secretary Roosevelt and his associates may find the real solution."

Most—if not all—of the remaining segments of the domestic shipping industry have filed for rate increases to compensate for increased costs. Some of these cases have been pending before the Federal Maritime Commission for a year—some even longer. The length of time it takes the Commission to act on a rate petition has been disturbing to the shipping industry for some time because of the mounting losses in the interim. Some lines have collapsed altogether while waiting.

Some shipping people have suggested subsidizing the domestic industry. Subsidy payments would support both the construction of new vessels and their operation. Matson Navigation Co., the biggest domestic nonsubsidized line, has taken a neutral stand on the issue of subsidy for its Hawaii freight trade. In a memorandum issued some time ago on this subject, the company said:

"As the principal carrier in the trade, it is Matson's fundamental responsibility to keep the total cost of moving Hawaii's commerce at the lowest possible level consistent with the maintenance of adequate service and a fair return to the stockholders on their investment in Matson. This responsibility does not include the determination of who is to pay this cost.

"Under the present system, the users of the service pay directly for it through freight charges. This is the normal way of doing business. Under a subsidy arrangement, part of the cost would be shifted, either to the taxpayers of the State or the Nation. Whether or not the cost burden should be shifted is a matter of public policy, to be decided by the public and those appointed or elected to serve the public interest."

More recently, Matson has said that if it could get its requested freight rate, the rate of return would put it on solid operating grounds now—without any subsidy of any kind.

Alcoa Steamship Co. has requested a freight rate boost to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and emphasized that it was urgent. That was nearly 18 months ago. The plea is still pending.

Another bill even bolder than the Neuberger proposal and now before Congress would permit foreign-built ships to be used generally on the domestic routes. Mr. Butler referred to this as obtaining ships from "bargain basement shipyards in foreign countries. This is another artifice of inert expediency, unworthy of those who resort to it."

If the argument is that lower cost foreign procurement should replace domestic shipping, he said, "you might as well suggest that we import lower salaried legislators from West Germany, Japan, France, or wherever, to sit in the Congress of the United States and enact laws to bring about the complete demise of all of U.S. industry."

"This type of attitude, if not nipped in the bud, could pollinate or be catching—and might even lead to the demise of our merchant marine completely or to the demise of the domestic, legal profession—or what have you. Where then would we be with the balance-of-payments problem? Where would they find [the shipping quota] of the 35 million new jobs which the Department of Labor has warned our economy must create in the next decade?"

The Senator blamed both Republican and Democratic administrations for the sad plight of the domestic merchant marine today. Many agree that the weakness of the domestic merchant marine doesn't trace to the Jones Act, but to long-continued default of suitable action, leadership, and coordination within the responsible—the executive—agencies of the National Government. No administration has made a real attempt to salvage any segment of the domestic shipping industry.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] in opposition to S. 2100.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL IN OPPOSITION TO S. 2100

S. 2100 would extend for 2 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to waive the provisions of the Jones Act with respect to the shipment of lumber to Puerto Rico. In this way, we are asked to assist the lumber industry by means of a device which penalizes the merchant marine industry.

I sympathize with the difficulties facing our domestic lumber industry. But, I am even more concerned over the weak condition of our domestic shipping fleet. Before World War II, our domestic fleet numbered 700 vessels. Today, this number has dwindled to less than 100. This decline of our shipping industry has been a matter of concern to Congress for some time. I am pleased that the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has been most sensitive to the need for action in this field.

Yet we are asked today to grant a preference to foreign vessels in the shipment of lumber. I am unable to understand the wisdom of this course of action. There are many domestic commodities which must meet foreign competition. In each case, wage differentials and other cost factors place the American product at a disadvantage. On what basis are we to deny Jones Act exemptions to these products if we approve S. 2100?

And make no mistake about it—there will be other requests for exemptions.

I sincerely believe that section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 is essential to the maintenance of our domestic fleet. Certainly, the Jones Act is not a cure-all. It is but one means of assuring that we will not lose all evidence of a domestic fleet.

International trade developments in recent years have brought difficulties to many domestic industries. The future will probably bring additional problems of competition. These problems are not going to be solved by helping one industry to the detriment of another.

I oppose S. 2100 just as I intend to oppose any other requests for exemptions under the Jones Act.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in view of the statement I have made, the article that substantiates that statement, and my minority views, which are a part of my statement, I feel it is not in the best interests of the American maritime industry or of the country as a whole that S. 2100 be passed.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in early March of this year a cargo vessel docked at the port of San Juan, Puerto Rico, to discharge 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber—lumber from Oregon forests—lumber cruised, logged, hauled, sawed, and loaded by Oregon lumbermen.

This event would have raised little interest a decade ago when Oregon, California, and Washington forests supplied the entire Puerto Rican market for northwest softwood. Yet, the cargo discharged in March 1963 was the first shipload of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico in over 2 years.

This shipload, and others that followed, carrying a total of 6.4 million board feet, were made possible when Congress, nearly 1 year ago, accepted the amendment which I offered on the floor of the Senate to permit the suspension of Jones Act restrictions on shipments of lumber to Puerto Rico. There will be such shiploads in the future only if Congress extends and makes permanent the Puerto Rican amendment to the Jones Act, by acting favorably upon S. 2100.

The sales recorded by the northwest lumbermen in Puerto Rico were achieved despite obstacles which did not exist in any other market in which northwest mills do business. They were made despite the cost and delay of processing the first Jones Act suspensions through the Maritime Administration. They were made despite the need for inducing Puerto Rican customers to abandon their established pattern of dealing with British Columbia. They were made despite the unwarranted graft of a first-refusal requirement upon the basic legislation by the Maritime Administration; and they were made despite the rational fears of the Puerto Ricans that upon the expiration of the Puerto Rican Jones Act amendment they would be forced to return to the Canadian mills subject to possible retaliatory measures.

It is essential then that the Puerto Rican amendment be extended so that commercial relations between northwest shippers and Puerto Rican customers can be stabilized and that Congress make manifest its intent that no "first refusal" handicap was ever intended to be made a part of this legislation.

The Maritime Administrator, charged with the implementation of this amendment, made the following crucial finding in granting the first of several suspensions under the terms of the amendment:

> We have here two segments of American enterprise both of which are sorely beset by foreign competition. The record of this proceeding shows that under the preexisting legislation banning the use of foreign-flag vessels in domestic shipping, no lumber from the Pacific Northwest has moved to Puerto Rico during the last 2 years, due in some part to the lower foreign-flag transportation rates which have assisted Canadian producers in capturing this formerly American-held market. Thus, the Congress decided to lift the ban under certain conditions in order to relieve the distress of at least the lumber industry. To have continued the prohibition would have had the effect of perpetuating the depression in both industries.

Mr. President, I desire to read the following from page 3 of the report:

> The witness of the leading shipping association testified at the hearing that, to the best of his knowledge: "no one has genuinely been hurt among the carriers."
>
> Witnesses from west coast ports and mills are confident that extension of the suspension would make possible more thorough penetration of this once-rich Puerto Rican

market, and the committee is similarly confident that the results achieved in the abbreviated period of selling activity give promises of much greater returns in the 2-year period the bill now proposes. The results achieved have not only made a welcome dent in unemployment in this important industry, but the psychological effect has been most salutary throughout the whole Northwest area.

The Department of Commerce through its General Counsel, Robert E. Giles, recommended enactment if the bill were amended to provide for a 2-year extension. The Department report stated:

"Suspension of the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, with respect to lumber shipments to Puerto Rico, appears to be necessary if Pacific coast lumber is to have any place in the Puerto Rican market. * * * In view of the effect on west coast lumber shipments resulting from section 4 of Public Law 87-877, it would appear desirable that a thorough reappraisal be made during the next 2 years of the effect of the Jones Act on the present state of the U.S. merchant marine and the domestic economy generally."

In short, the Puerto Rican amendment to the Jones Act has not plugged the dyke, but it has helped. And if it is extended, the new Puerto Rican market for American lumber will continue to grow and flourish.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would be derelict in my responsibility if I did not suggest that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] deserves to be complimented for her fine work in connection with the problem of lumber shipments from the west coast. It is she who was primarily responsible for the original bill. I compliment her for her diligence in connection with this matter.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I associate myself with all that the Senator from Washington has said. The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] inaugurated this program, and she has been very greatly interested in it from the outset, and has worked diligently and effectively to aid the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate the very kind words of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2100) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

### PRIVATE RELIEF BILLS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following bills were considered and, after being passed through the required parliamentary procedures, were passed.

### DR. MARGOT R. SOBEY III

The bill (S. 1760) for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Margot R. Sobey III shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

### ANTONIO CREDENZA

The bill (S. 1781) for the relief of Antonio Credenza, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Credenza may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Antonio Credenza by Mr. and Mrs. John A. Nufrio, United States citizens, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

### JAN AND ANNA SMAL (NEE DWORZANSKI)

The bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski).

### PASQUALE MARRELLA

The bill (H.R. 1432) for the relief of Pasquale Marrella.

### TRICIA KIM

The bill (H.R. 4862) for the relief of Tricia Kim.

### MRS. CONCETTA FOTO NAPOLI AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 6624) for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli.

### MRS. INGRID GUDRUN SCHRODER BROWN

The bill (H.R. 7268) for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown.

### WINSLOW, ARIZ.

The bill (H.R. 7601) for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

### GEORGE ELIAS NEJAME (NOUJAIM)

The bill (S. 1951) for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Elias NeJame (Noujaim) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

### ERWIN A. SUEHS

The bill (H.R. 2238) for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs.

### CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, Mr. President, I wish to state for the RECORD that it is my purpose—and I have discussed this with the majority leader and the minority leader—to have the Senate take up, on Monday, the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill—a very large measure on which we completed, yesterday, the work of the conference committee. It includes several items in which Senators are much interested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Washington has said; and we shall bring up not only the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, but also the public works appropriation bill, which will be considered de novo.

Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to ask whether I correctly understand the intended parliamentary procedure. I understood the Senator from Montana to indicate that he would have the Senate adjourn, rather than take a recess, this afternoon. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senate adjourns this afternoon, instead of taking a recess, following an adjournment, when the Senate convenes on Monday, will the question now pending automatically have been displaced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now pending will automatically die when the Senate adjourns.

Mr. CLARK. Then I ask the majority leader at what time he has in mind moving that the Senate adjourn, this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At any time that is convenient.

Mr. CLARK. I have suggested—although the majority leader has rejected my suggestion—that the Senate remain in session late tonight and tomorrow, in the hope that this filibuster could be broken.

Since the majority leader unquestionably controls the power to adjourn—for I have never known an instance when, after the majority leader asked the Senate to adjourn, it did not yield to his will—and since the majority leader, for reasons which I am sure seem adequate to him, is unwilling to attempt to break this filibuster, but since I have alternate plans, I shall appreciate his courtesy if he will tell me at about what time he intends to move that the Senate adjourn this afternoon, so that I can make my plans accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would 3:30 p.m. be acceptable to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe so, but that matter is within the jurisdiction of the Senator from Montana. I hope he can wait until 4:45 p.m.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the requested order been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

---

## CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a Joint Committee To Study the Organization and Operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending question—which is the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1—is one which I wish to discuss now briefly, for two purposes: First, to make some relatively brief comments on the remarks made yesterday afternoon by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], whom I see in the Chamber at this time, and whose remarks appear in yesterday's issue of the Congressional Record at page 23580. It is indeed sardonic that during the more than 11 months Congress has been in session, we have succeeded in charging the taxpayers with more than 22,500 pages of the Congressional Record.

I read with interest the comments which the majority leader made for the Record, last week, about the achievements of this session—which I agree are not inconsiderable. However, it has taken us a very long time to accomplish these things; and all of us know that the three major responsibilities of Congress during this session—namely, to pass the appropriation bills before July 31, at the latest, and preferably by June 30; to pass the civil rights bill; and to pass the tax bill—have not been met.

I return to my comments on the remarks made yesterday by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge]. He made some criticism of my statement that a unanimous-consent request by the majority leader was rarely objected to for any other purpose than delay. I reiterate that statement. Objection is frequently raised to a unanimous-consent request by the majority leader but it is always for delay. Usually the objection is raised to provide for a brief delay in order to afford time to agree upon an acceptable procedure on matters in which the objecting Senator is interested. Sometimes the purpose is to negotiate an agreement to dispose of business expeditiously when Senators can be in the Chamber.

But I reiterate my statement of yesterday that an objection to a unanimous-consent request made by the majority leader to take up a bill is always made for the purpose of delay. In this case it was made for a delay which was intended to be as long as necessary to prevent the concurrent resolution from being considered on its merits.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the contention of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania that a unanimous-consent request made by the majority leader should not be objected to?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is not.

Mr. TALMADGE. I fail, then, to follow the logic of the Senator's argument. A unanimous-consent request, of course, requires the unanimity of 100 Senators. Any Senator has the right to object at any time he sees fit, if his opinion differs from that of the majority leader. He would be subordinating his judgment to that of the majority leader if he failed to object.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. I never said anything to the contrary.

I said, and I reiterate, that any objection to a unanimous-consent request made by the majority leader to take up a measure which is on the calender—and in this case, the concurrent resolution has been cleared by the policy committee—is never made except for purposes of delay. In the present case objection was made not only for purposes of delay, but a delay for as long as might be necessary to prevent the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto from being considered on their merits.

My second point, in reply to my good friend the junior Senator from Georgia, is to agree with him that the filibuster started by his senior colleague is the shortest one of recent record. Two words can start a filibuster if those two words are "I object." They started a filibuster yesterday.

I reiterate that I have been reliably informed by absolutely unimpeachable sources that this filibuster will continue as long as necessary—until Christmas, if necessary—unless the motion to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 is either withdrawn or the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and I—as cosponsors of the amendment which we discussed yesterday—agree, under duress, to withdraw the amendment.

My third point is that it is, of course, within both the legal and the moral right of the junior Senator from Georgia to object to the Clark-Case amendment, to oppose it if he wishes to oppose it, to bring his undeniable powers of eloquence to bear on his colleagues, and, if he wishes to do so, to lobby them in the cloakroom to oppose the amendment. But I suggest that the proper time to do that is when the resolution is before the Senate for action and the amendment has been offered. I suggest, with all deference, that under normal parliamentary procedure—which I hope in due course will become the rule in the Senate—an improper time to do it is before the resolution has been called up and is under debate.

My fourth point is that I am amazed that so good a lawyer as the junior Senator from Georgia—and he is a good lawyer; he is known as such not only in his own State but also in the Senate Chamber during the almost 7 years he has been a Senator—should suggest that the concurrent resolution as submitted—and I now refer to the resolution as submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration by 31 Senators—is unconstitutional.

The 31 Senators who cosponsored the resolution were not even remotely thinking of interfering with the right of the House of Representatives to make its own rules.

All that the Case-Clark amendment provides is that the House and Senate rules shall be studied by a joint committee which shall make recommendations thereon.

The constitutional right of the House to pass on its own rules remains inviolate. The Senator from Georgia said that it does not require much education to understand that provision of the Constitution. I agree. It does not even take a law degree to understand that the constitutional argument of the Senator from Georgia is not worthy of serious consideration. I ask him if he does not know it himself.

Mr. TALMADGE. In response to the distinguished Senator, I repeat what I inserted in the RECORD last night. Article I, section 5, paragraph 2, of the Constitution states:

> Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

That means what it says. Nothing can be gained, and no useful purpose can be served, by authorizing a joint committee, involving Members of the House of Representatives, to study Senate rules. In the first place, they would be unfamiliar with the procedure. In the second place, they would be utterly powerless to act. For all practical benefits, we might as well authorize some people on Mars—if we ever discover that there be any there—to study rules of the Senate, because they would have as much control over Senate procedure as has the House of Representatives. The able Senator knows that.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my friend from Georgia that when bills and resolutions are introduced in the House or in the Senate, it is customary to take testimony on those measures to determine whether they should be reported to the House or Senate.

Could not the proposed joint committee take testimony on the question of which, if any, of the House rules should be changed?

Why should Senators who are on the committee merely to make recommendations and to investigate refrain from listening to the testimony or even from expressing their opinion as to its validity?

Mr. TALMADGE. For the very reason I have stated. The Senator begs the question.

Of course, when bills are introduced in either the House or the Senate, affecting legislation which both bodies must enact or reject, testimony is taken before the respective committees of each body. But I have never known any instance in the history of our Republic in which Members of the House tried to determine the rules of the Senate or when Members of the Senate tried to determine the rules of the House. Clearly they are without authority to do so.

Any study commission along that line would serve no useful purpose.

I, for one, believe the 100 Members of the Senate are capable of discharging their own constitutional responsibility, and I do not believe we must go outside the Senate, to the House, or to any commission anywhere. The responsibility is ours and ours alone.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator may be correct that Members of the Senate should not participate in hearings on the validity of the House rules.

Mr. TALMADGE. In fact they cannot. The Senator knows that the Constitution gives them no such powers.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite incorrect as to what I know. In fact, I know exactly the contrary.

I say, if I may finish my statement, that the Senator may be correct, that it would be unwise to permit Members of the Senate to sit on a joint committee to consider, among other things, changes in the rules of the House, many of which changes would have a vast effect on procedures in the Senate. I ask the Senator again—and this will be my last effort to engage in colloquy on this point—does he really believe this proposal is unconstitutional? I cannot believe that he really considers it to be unconstitutional.

Mr. TALMADGE. Of course it is not unconstitutional for any person to study the rules of the Senate, but the group would have no power to act. No useful purpose could be served by bringing in the two bodies to try to review and appraise each other's rules. They would have no power to act. The Constitution gives them no power to act. It would be an absurd situation if they were to consider something they were powerless to resolve.

Mr. CLARK. I assume my friend from Georgia withdraws the argument that the original resolution, as submitted by 31 Senators, was unconstitutional, an argument on which he laid such stress before the Senate yesterday. I am not passing on the question of whether it is wise or not. I only say there are plenty of precedents, and I believe it is wise. Does not the Senator agree, as he said a moment ago, that there is nothing unconstitutional about it?

Mr. TALMADGE. Let me read my argument, rather than take the Senator's word for it. I quote from what I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday:

> My objection is based on the Constitution of the United States of America. I read:
>
> "Article I, section 5, paragraph 2: Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and with the Concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member."
>
> Mr. President, that language is written in plain English. It does not require much education to understand that provision of the Constitution of the United States. It merely states that each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. That means that the Senate may determine its rules and the House of Representatives may determine its rules.
>
> The Constitution does not authorize the House of Representatives to study and determine the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, it does not.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is the language used by the Senator from Georgia. The Senator from Pennsylvania tried to insert language into what I said, which was not there.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator from Georgia for the last time, Does the Senator agree with me that there is nothing unconstitutional in the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, as originally submitted by the 31 Senators who cosponsored it?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator asked that question prior to this time, and I responded thereto.

I say again, no. It is not unconstitutional to create a joint committee to study the rules of the House or of the Senate, either, but it would be an exercise in absurdity, because they would be studying something which, in the first place, they know nothing about; and which, in the second place, they were powerless to resolve.

We might as well create a Senate committee to study the political situation in Patagonia. We would be as much authorized to act in Patagonia as the House of Representatives would be authorized to act on the rules of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that in due course, if it has not done so already, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will study the political situation in Patagonia.

Mr. TALMADGE. But Congress will not pass laws for Patagonia.

Mr. CLARK. No. Nobody is suggesting that Congress pass such laws.

I believe the colloquy has been developed adequately so that the clash of opinion—and it is a very deep clash—between the Senator from Georgia and me is perfectly clear to all who are listening—unfortunately, only three other Senators—and to those who are in the visitors' gallery and in the press gallery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four other Senators.

Mr. CLARK. So I wish to proceed to my fifth point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have enjoyed the colloquy between him and my distinguished friend from Georgia; and I confess that I find myself aligned on the side of the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK. I say to my good friend from North Carolina that my feelings are not hurt by his comment, and I am far from surprised.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Had the Senator from North Carolina said anything else, I fear the Senator from Pennsylvania would have been quite suspicious.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to my fifth point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if I may make a comment in that connection, sometimes I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania is unduly suspicious.

Mr. CLARK. What was the phrase my dear departed father used?

> I deny the allegation and defy the allegator.

Mr. President, my fifth point is that the junior Senator from Georgia stated that Members of the Senate could shed no light on House precedents. Forty Members of this body have previously served in the House, including the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], who became an expert on the procedures and rules of the House during his service in that body as cochairman of the LaFollette-Monroney Reorganization Committee, which was largely responsible for the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the 40 Members of the Senate who previously served in the House may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senators With Previous House Experience

Forty Senators in the 88th Congress, 1st session, had previous experience in the House, including Senator Bartlett, who had been a delegate from Alaska:

Anderson, Bartlett, Beall, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Carlson, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dodd, Dominick, Engle, Fulbright, Gore, Hayden, Hill, Hruska, Inouye, Jackson, Javits, Keating, McCarthy, McClellan, McGovern, Magnuson, Mansfield, Metcalf, Monroney, Morton, Mundt, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Robertson, Scott, Smathers, Sparkman, Williams of New Jersey, and Young of Ohio.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the contention of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that Senators—either former House Members or those who have never had the privilege of serving in the House—ought to make recommendations to the House as to its rules?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it also the contention of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that the Members of the House ought to make recommendations to the Senate as to its rules?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the contention of the Senator, then, that those rules ought to be put into effect, after the recommendations are made?

Mr. CLARK. In my opinion, the recommendations should be carefully considered by each body which, under the Constitution, has an exclusive right to be the judge of its own rules.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator believe that legislators in Pennsylvania ought to make recommendations about Senate rules or House rules?

Mr. CLARK. I have the feeling that it would be wise for the committee to call before it one witness, and possibly two witnesses, from Pennsylvania, in order to give testimony as to how infinitely superior are the rules of the house of representatives and the State senate of Pennsylvania to the pratices, procedures, rules, and floor practices of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

I would also like to see a couple of expert witnesses called from the State of Georgia, where my distinguished colleague served with such eminence as Governor, because I have information which leads me to believe that the procedures in the Legislature of Georgia are infinitely superior to those in the Senate and in the House of the U.S. Congress, particularly in that they provide for the moving of the previous question and termination of debate after a reasonable time if a majority of the State senate desires to terminate debate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is the position of the distinguished Senator that Senators ought to make recommendations to the legislature in Pennsylvania or the city council in Philadelphia or board of alderman of Atlanta as to what their rules should be?

Mr. CLARK. My own view is that we have so big a mote in our own eye that we had better not complain about the beam in anybody else's eye—at least, not for the present. So the answer to the Senator's question is "No."

Mr. TALMADGE. In other words, the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks those experts ought to tell the Senate how to conduct its business, but the Senate ought not to tell other legislative bodies how to conduct their business. Is that it?

Mr. CLARK. No, that is not it. Once we get the Senate and House modernized, up to date, with 1963 rules, procedures, practices, and floor action as a result of recommendations by a joint committee, with prayerful consideration by 100 of our own Members, we should be willing, time permitting, to go to State legislatures or city councils which might want the benefit of our recommendations—which might very well be few.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senate rules have been in existence ever since 1787, the first Congress——

Mr. CLARK. Since 1789.

Mr. TALMADGE. Since 1789, and have been modified from time to time as the Senate, and the Senate only, saw fit. During that period the alltime great men in the history of our country served in this body. There served in this body Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Bob LaFollette, Henry Clay, Bob Taft, and John F. Kennedy. I do not recall that they ever stood on the floor of the Senate day after day and berated it and its rules and held it up to scorn and ridicule. I am at a complete loss to understand why the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to serve in this body, which he holds in such utter contempt.

Mr. CLARK. The last time anybody acted as such a maverick as I appear to be was when Vice President Charles G. Dawes tried to persuade the Senate to revise its rules. Unlike the House, the Senate has never engaged in a comprehensive revision of its rules of procedures. The House comprehensively revised its rules in 1890, when the so-called Reed rules were adopted, which sought to eliminate the filibuster rule from the House procedures. It was done again in 1910, when Speaker Cannon was stripped of most of his powers. Generally speaking, the procedures in the House are democratized, as a result of the Reed rules, in the floor procedure in the House, for which I have the greatest admiration. It is true that some reforms are needed in certain House rules which impinge on its ability to do its business there. Of these, the most important I think are the undue powers of the Rules Committee.

I do not know whether that answers the Senator's observation.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator has made his statement clearly.

Mr. CLARK. Finally, I should like to make the point—and I make it without animus, but in all good humor, but, nonetheless, I make it strongly—that it appears to me that the outward and visible signs—and I know nothing about the inner convictions or motivations of the two Senators from Georgia, but the outward and visible signs—as to the basic reason for the present filibuster, and every other filibuster I have seen on the floor since I have come here, is fear of democracy, fear of a republican form of government, fear to put the validity of their contentions to the test of the votes of their colleagues—in short, fear of the American system of government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire only to make very brief remarks. The Senator from Pennsylvania has spent approximately 2 hours charging my senior colleague with a two-word filibuster——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I tried to time myself. I think the two speeches I made yesterday and today consumed a total of 49 minutes.

Mr. TALMADGE. I do not think the Senator is considering the time utilized in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CLARK. I thought I did. The Senator's judgment is as good as mine. It is generally understood that it takes about 3 minutes to deliver a column in the Congressional Record. I shall be glad to check and put the figure into the Record Monday.

Mr. TALMADGE. I did not hold a stopwatch on the Senator to keep time, but it seemed like 2 hours.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. Certainly. If the Senator says it was 49 minutes, I will take his word.

Mr. CLARK. It must have seemed like 6 or 7 or 8 hours to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. No. I enjoyed it. I am certain, if he says it took 49 minutes, it was so. I will accept that statement.

The senior Senator from Georgia uttered two words. I spoke about 5 minutes. We have both been accused of filibustering. It seems to me the only speech of any length that has been made on the Senate floor since the motion to consider was made has been that made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I made known my views very clearly last evening. I do not think they require much addition. I had inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the constitutional provision which I read into the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that article I, section 5, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the United States be inserted at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Article I, section 5, paragraph 2: Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

**Mr. TALMADGE.** I further ask unanimous consent that the composition of the study committee recommended by the Rules and Administration, appearing on page 4 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, line 6, through the middle of line 17, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of six Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The chairman and vice chairman shall be selected by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from among the members of the committee, and shall not be members of the same political party.

**Mr. TALMADGE.** I further ask unanimous consent that the original concurrent resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and other Senators, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of seven Members of the Senate (but not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives (Not more than four of whom shall be members of the majority party) to be appointed by the Speaker of House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. No recommendation shall be made by the committee except upon a majority vote of the Members representing each House, taken separately.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying and expediting its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; the structure of, and the relationships between, the various standing, special, select, and conference committees of the Congress, the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and/or precedents of either House, the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House, and the consolidations and reorganization of committees and committee jurisdictions.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report from time to time to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study, together with its recommendations, the first report being made not later than four months after the committee is established. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. All reports and findings of the committee shall, when received, be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on Rules of the House.

**Mr. TALMADGE.** Mr. President, I point out that the original resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and his associates was stricken after the resolving clause, and new language, in its entirety, added as a substitute to the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania was dissatisfied with the action of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and he attempts to bring back in substance what the Rules Committee of the Senate rejected.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], lines 8 through 10, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 6, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new paragraph:

"(11) The rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House."

**Mr. TALMADGE.** Mr. President, I point out that what the Senator from Pennsylvania sought to achieve in his original resolution was to establish a joint committee of the Senate and of the House to make certain studies. Many of such studies might be helpful.

However, the portion of the resolution that was stricken, which is the portion that the Senator from Pennsylvania seeks to achieve by amendment, is an authorization for a joint committee of the House and the Senate to study the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House.

I have not the slightest idea what the consideration of "any matter on the floor of each House" may be. I do not know whether it refers to language used in speeches by Senators or to the cuspidors, the wastebaskets, the carpets, or the chairs in the respective bodies.

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. TALMADGE.** I am glad to yield.

**Mr. CLARK.** Among other things that the floor action has in mind is the filibuster presently being engaged in, and rule XXII, which permits it.

**Mr. TALMADGE.** I point out that the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress are matters which, under the Constitution, are vested solely in each body.

It takes many years of service in the Senate to become familiar with the Senate rules and precedents.

Finally, adoption of our rules, modification of those rules, and amendment of those rules, address themselves solely to the Senate and to no other power on the face of this earth.

The rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, and precedents of the House of Representatives, address themselves solely to the House of Representatives, and no other power on the face of this earth can change that fact.

That is a matter that was vested purely in each branch of Congress by the Constitution. No commission can change it. No study commission would be anything but an exercise in futility, and would serve no useful purpose.

Those were the points I made last night. Those are the points I repeat today.

Now, in accordance with the opinion of the distinguished and able Senator from Pennsylvania, I have spent approximately 10 minutes on his alleged filibuster.

**Mr. HART.** Mr. President, whether I am joining a filibuster or fighting one is a matter almost of academic interest only to me.

Before the record closes on the effort to permit the Senate to act on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New Jersey, to make the rules more responsive to the calendar of history, I should like to say a word.

There is no Member of the Senate who is not expendable, no matter how in his secret heart he views himself. However, the institution itself is not. It is an instrument for self-government. When the day arrives that the people of the United States feel we are inept—no, it is worse than that, because they have felt about us in that way many times—if they conclude finally that we are unable to respond in time to the pressures of a new, very tiny world, some historians will note that that was the day when free society began to die. That oversimplifies it a little, but not grossly.

Therefore, I rise, because of the appropriateness of the resolution the consideration of which is sought, to urge in our own consciences a review of the entire subject matter.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] has remineded us that this Chamber housed Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. However, those men lived in a day when time ran more slowly. They were active in public life when this Nation's decisions affected relatively few people, and when there were few things in the Nation to decide.

The sea was a happy barrier, and other nations were not too much interested in us. What was done in Washington affected very few people in America.

We were remote geographically. The telephone was, initially, not in existence, and for a long time thereafter it was not very satisfactory.

The giants of the past had time available to understand the few major measures which confronted them.

I say this in no disrespect to their capacity or contribution. However, if one knew where one stood on the development of the West, how one would handle the public domain, what one's position was with respect to tariffs, and, by the time Andrew Jackson arrived on the scene, if one had a feeling for patronage, he was in business.

It is true that slavery confronted the Nation, but that problem was slow in maturing. I shall not suggest that we might have avoided a bloody war if the Senate had been more responsive. Historians disagree. However, I believe it a fair statement to suggest that whether the Senate rules made sense or did not make sense at that time was of virtually no concern to the people of America, because what happened here affected few people intimately.

The picture we see today is vastly different. What we do here affects intimately the lives of virtually every American. It affects importantly the lives of everyone in the free world. Each of us has the power to destroy the other, and therefore it affects intimately the lives of every soul on earth.

Sixty seconds still make up a minute, but the seconds run faster. A whole litany of problems confronts this body. If our rules are not as good as we can make them, it is critically important that we improve them.

There is eloquent testimony in the Record of the past months that our rules are not as effective as they could be. I should not like to think that the congressional institution could not function more effectively. It is only with that assumption that one could conclude correctly that the rules could not be improved.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]—and I was glad to join with them—are seeking an opportunity to do something about the rules. This is not a very dramatic subject for debate unless we talk about rule XXII. Even then it is a very complex subject for the average person, busy with his own affairs, to understand.

It has been suggested that those of us who criticize the rules and suggest a need for improvement are somehow or other disloyal to the institution, and that we subject the Senate to ridicule, or that we would pull down the stones that make this temple.

I respectfully suggest that the only bad parent is the parent who does not care what the children are doing. The only person who is indifferent to the values and virtues of the Senate and the singular place it plays in our society and Government is the person who does not care whether the rules can be improved or not. If we were indifferent to this institution, we would not be here on a Friday afternoon, talking about the rules, because it does us no earthly good at home, politically.

I would hope that as Senators consider the effort of the leadership to permit the Senate to move on this proposal to change the rules, they will understand, whatever they feel about the specific rule proposal made by their colleague, that Senators who urge it do so in the deep conviction that this institution is not expendable; that it is essential in the functioning of the free kind of society that we have; and that the people of America are persuaded—and I think correctly so—that as a body we have permitted ourselves a luxury that cannot be afforded or justified, living with a set of rules that most of us in our hearts know could be improved. Time will run out on us if we do not move on this proposal.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his conspicuous contribution and the leadership he provides in this effort.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his eloquent support. I hope that all Senators will read his speech in the Record tomorrow.

Mr. President, I suggest that the question be put.

Mr. TALMADGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a quorum?

Mr. TALMADGE. I withhold it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw my request made to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Minnesota, a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 and a strong advocate of rules reform, realize that now that he has the floor, he is participating in a filibuster?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not realize that. But when the Senator from Pennsylvania hears what I am about to say, I am sure he will want to withdraw his statement from the Record.

## FAREWELL TO A GREAT AMERICAN—HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to comment on the life and works of a great American, an outstanding U.S. Senator, a highly significant personality in American public life, and a very dear friend of mine and of the Humphrey family. I refer, of course, to our former colleague, now departed from us, Herbert Lehman, of New York.

The death of Herbert Lehman has taken from us one of the most gracious, dedicated, and effective men I have ever known. If ever a man deserved to be admired, respected, and loved for his good works and his compassion for his fellow men, Herbert Lehman deserved that tribute.

His friendship and his leadership have meant much to me personally. The friendship of Herbert Lehman and that of his lovely and charming wife, Edith Lehman, have been a source of pride and great richness for Mrs. Humphrey and me.

Herbert Lehman's friendship and leadership not only have meant much to me personally, but also have meant much to the State of New York, to the Nation, and, indeed, to the entire world, because Herbert Lehman was truly a citizen of the world.

At the time when I was privileged to become acquainted with this remarkable man, he had already lived a full life of public service, having served as Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York, then as Governor of that great State, and then as Director of UNRRA, where he made an outstanding record for international service and leadership; and he served in many other posts of civic and public responsibility—and, in each case, with honor, integrity, and distinction.

I am sure that his habits and traits of character were very well set at the time when I became acquainted with him. I remember his tremendous courage, perseverance, patience, determination, and almost stubborn persistence in battling for any cause which he embraced. He was absolutely fearless. He seemed to give little or no consideration to the political consequences of his actions. Frequently, he championed what appeared to be unpopular causes; but he always took the lead in the causes which were related to the welfare of human beings.

When I speak of his courage and his lack of concern in regard to the political consequences of his actions, I mean that he did not consider himself. He considered the purposes of the objective for which he was working. He threw himself into the battle with almost reckless abandon; yet he was a seasoned, experienced political leader who knew the rough and tumble of political strife.

When he engaged in debate, frequently he would move into the center aisle in the Senate Chamber and would face his colleagues; and as the debate became more heated, he would slowly walk down the center aisle, into the well of the Senate. He was always on the move forward, like a warrior moving fearlessly and relentlessly to the attack.

His every effort was dedicated to the strengthening of our great Nation and to promoting in the world the conditions that eased international tensions and would provide an environment conducive to peace.

Herbert Lehman was a fearless democrat—spelled with a small "d"—and a loyal Democrat, in terms of his partisanship.

The vitality and vigor of Herbert Lehman were amazing. After retiring from the Senate—and I know this from personal conversations—at the request of his lovely and remarkable wife, Edith Lehman, he went to work harder as a private citizen than he ever had done as a public official. He was in every battle for good government. Imagine a man giving up his seat in the Senate—one which was given to him by overwhelming majorities of the voters of New York—and then returning to his home State when he was in his late 70's and leading the reform movement in the Democratic Party. If ever a man qualified for the phrase "young of heart," it was Senator Lehman.

In a sense, Herbert Lehman was an aristocrat—an aristocrat by reason of his dedication to ideals, his basic decency, and his humanitarianism. He was my idea of a real gentleman—always having good manners and always speaking and acting responsibly. Yet, with all his gentlemanly qualities, he was a hard fighter; but he always fought cleanly.

What always amazed me about Herbert Lehman was that he had been described to me many times as a relatively middle-of-the-road man in his political views, during the terms of his service as Governor of New York; yet when he became a Member of the Senate, he was a flaming liberal. He was the youngest at heart of any of us. I do not know of a single member of the so-called liberal group in Congress who could keep up with him in terms of real dedication to progressive principles and to liberal thought. He had the honor, the strength, and the confidence which came from having lived a very rich and full life.

Mr. President, this great American served his country courageously and faithfully, in peace and in war. He served his State with dignity and significant achievements. He served the world in trying to bring people to a better understanding of their mutual interests for peace and for freedom.

At a time when our Nation is faced with an important decision in terms of the broader protection of human rights and of constitutional and civil rights, it is fitting and appropriate that it honor Herbert Lehman, who lived a life of championing the cause of human rights. His entire life was a living tribute to equality of opportunity, the dignity of the individual, and freedom of conscience.

Herbert Lehman was essentially and basically a religious man, without being doctrinaire or dogmatic. He was a student of government, as well as a practitioner of politics. He was a political leader, as well as one who cooperated with his leaders.

He was the partner of Albert E. Smith, the great progressive Governor of New York in the 1920's. I happen to know that he loved Al Smith. I know how they worked together, because I have spent many hours in the Lehman home, talking to Herbert Lehman.

Herbert Lehman was the working partner of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He admired the late and beloved President Roosevelt, and on many occasions strengthened the hand of that great President.

Herbert Lehman was one of the closest friends that Mrs. Roosevelt had among all the citizens of the United States. He respected, admired, and honored her; and she felt the same way about him.

Mr. President, today the President of the United States presented medals to outstanding persons for their great contributions to American life and American security. The medal is known as the Medal of Freedom. It is the highest honor that can be given by this Nation to any person in peacetime for peacetime service and peacetime activity.

Herbert Lehman was preparing to leave New York City yesterday on the 1 o'clock plane to come to Washington to meet the President of the United States and to accept this singular honor that was to be given to him.

I wonder how many of us in this body remember that when our present President was stricken with a heart attack, it was Herbert Lehman who rose to request that the Senate stand in prayer for Lyndon Johnson, our then majority leader and a U.S. Senator.

There was a deep bond of friendship between the President and Senator Lehman. How ironical it is that at the very time President Johnson would have made this presentation the good Lord, in His infinite wisdom, has taken Herbert Lehman from us.

This great man, like our late and beloved President Kennedy, lives on even in death. His is an immortality of the spirit and an immortality of good works. I, for one, feel that the rarest privilege I have had—the greatest gift that has come to me in my service in Washington—was the privilege of knowing Herbert Lehman. He graced this body with his mind, his personality and his ability. He added strength and stature to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials and articles which have been published about Herbert Lehman in some of the Nation's press may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### Herbert H. Lehman

There was so much simple goodness, generosity and grace in Herbert Lehman that one rarely thought of him as suited to the rough realities of American political life. He neither looked nor talked like a politician. Nevertheless the roster of public offices which he won, and filled with nobility and effectiveness, testified to a powerful political appeal rooted in the extraordinary qualities of conviction and courage which he brought into public life.

Entering politics at 50, after a notable career in business and banking, Herbert Lehman teamed with Franklin D. Roosevelt to become Lieutenant Governor of New York, then Governor for 4 terms when F.D.R. went to the White House, and finally U.S. Senator. In between, he served as director of the wartime Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation and as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Help for those whom the war had made helpless could not have been entrusted to more devoted hands.

A product of Wall Street and a multimillionaire, Herbert Lehman was an unreserved champion of underdogs and of progressive political ideas through the whole of his public career. If he ever became a power in the Senate or a member of its inner circle, he exercised influence nonetheless because, for the country at large, he symbolized sincerity. The dauntlessness with which this quiet, unpretentious little man challenged Joe McCarthy, the Senate's bully, illuminated the murkiness of a shabby decade in American politics. The country owes much to Herbert Lehman for its recovery from McCarthyism.

Senator Lehman's efforts to infuse charity and reason into American immigration policy may well constitute his most significant contribution. He was an implacable foe of the national origins quota system. That system has not yet been extirpated from the immigration statutes; but a proposal for abandonment of it was sent to Congress not long ago by John F. Kennedy. Its enactment would be Herbert Lehman's best monument.

Had he lived and held his health, Herbert Lehman would have been among those to be given the Presidential Medal of Freedom at the White House today. No one deserved it more. No one could have defended freedom more fervently.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### Herbert H. Lehman

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the Governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and the Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and national Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

## LEHMAN'S LONG CAREER EMBRACED THE FIELDS OF POLITICS, BANKING, AND PHILANTHROPY—SERVED IN ALBANY AND WASHINGTON—EX-GOVERNOR AND SENATOR CLOSELY IDENTIFIED WITH LIBERAL LEGISLATION

The death of Herbert H. Lehman ended a political career that spanned half a century and linked political generations from Alfred E. Smith to the new young Manhattan reform group.

As Governor of New York and as a U.S. Senator he was identified with liberal and humanitarian legislation.

In private life, he was a leader in countless philanthropies and one of the foremost members of the Jewish community.

Reared in New York's banking world, he became one of the Nation's most ardent exponents of social reform.

Harold L. Ickes, the late Secretary of the Interior, wrote of him: "When a measure is proposed to promote the public welfare or protect our cherished form of government, he will fight for it, even if he is on the losing side. He has convictions and the courage of them."

### SAYS WHAT HE THINKS

Mr. Lehman himself once declared: "People like a man who says what he thinks and does what he says."

His philosophy made him a power at the polls. Successively, as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of New York and as U.S. Senator, he was one of the State's most formidable votegetters.

When, in August 1956, at the age of 78, he announced that he would not seek reelection to the Senate, he had established a long record of achievement.

As Governor, Mr. Lehman obtained enactment of a State labor relations act, minimum wage and unemployment insurance statutes and the creation of a board to bring about the rapid liquidation of defaulted mortgage certificates.

He also sponsored numerous measures for low-cost housing, the improvement of public utilities regulation and the regulation of holding companies.

Among his greatest achievements in Albany was the conversion of a State budget deficiency of $106 million, which he found when he took office, into a surplus of $80 million by the time he left the State capital.

### DEFENDER OF RIGHTS

In the Senate, Mr. Lehman was a forceful defender of the rights of the individual. In 1954, he was one of a small number of Senators who did not fear to clash with Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, the Wisconsin Republican whose controversial Communist-hunting methods and whose refusal to explain certain aspects of his personal finances were under Senate discussion.

During the height of the McCarthy era and on the eve of a crucial senatorial contest, Mr. Lehman was one of the few to oppose a piece of anti-Communist legislation.

"I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold," he declared. "My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people."

In 1961, he denounced the John Birch Society as a "force for evil in our country which in its potential harm is certainly equivalent to McCarthyism."

### CONSCIENCE OF SENATE

Honored by liberals as the "conscience of the Senate," Mr. Lehman carried his zeal for democratic processes and humanitarian causes into other fields when he left public office.

As a founder of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, he prodded Mayor Wagner into declaring war on the Democratic county leader, Carmine G. DeSapio, and on the party's State chairman, Michael H. Prendergast.

The "bossism" issue, which reached its climax in the 1961 primary and election, sent Mr. DeSapio to political limbo, stripped Mr. Prendergast of his power and resulted in Mr. Wagner's election by a plurality of nearly 500,000 votes.

Mr. Lehman regarded the defeat of the old-line party leaders and the reelection of Mr. Wagner—who was honorbound to reform the party organization—as his last major political mission. He resigned as adviser to the Democratic reform group after the 1961 election, saying he would continue to support its principles.

The former Governor had led the fight against Mr. De Sapio and the Tammany organization with characteristic vigor.

He described the organization as "a kind of glorified soup kitchen at which the party faithful stand in line and wait their turn to be served." He termed Mr. De Sapio the leader of forces made up of "political conscripts."

By rising regularly at 6:30 a.m. and keeping on the go until 11:30 p.m., with only a brief nap in the afternoon, Mr. Lehman managed even after his 83d birthday to campaign vigorously for philanthropic and civic causes as well as on political platforms and on the sidewalks of the city.

It was usual for him to receive 200 to 300 letters daily. He kept three stenographers working in relays.

Mr. Lehman's manner and dress usually were reserved. He was short and stocky. He read his speeches in a low voice, his nose buried in the manuscript.

There were many who believed that Mr. Lehman had no sense of humor and others who thought he did have a sense of humor but that he cloaked it in gravity. Allan Nevins, in his biography of Mr. Lehman, tells the following story.

Early in Mr. Lehman's governorship, a meeting of legislative leaders was discussing the large State deficit when Assemblyman Irwin Steingut of Brooklyn said:

"I know an absolutely sure winner at 5 to 1 at the Saratoga races next Saturday. If the Governor will authorize the State treasurer to give me $1 million to bet, I will turn it into $5 million and bring us out of our troubles."

All eyes turned to Mr. Lehman.

### FROM LARGE FAMILY

"I do not believe that this would be a judicious employment of the State's financial resources," the Governor said gravely.

The next week, Mr. Steingut reported that his horse had won.

Mr. Lehman was a member of a large family that had been allied by marriage to other distinguished and public-spirited families that did much to shape the life of the city and State.

Herbert Henry Lehman was born March 28, 1878, in a brownstone house in the east sixties. It was a quiet, solid home, in which the atmosphere was one of restraint and dignity.

When he was a child, if he came to dinner without turning down the gas in his room, he had to go back and lower the flame before he could eat. His father took him to see the free ward of Mount Sinai Hospital to show him the goals to which much of the obligations of wealth and liberal government were to be directed.

As a boy of 6, Herbert was still in curls, a fact that caused his mother pleasure but was painful to him. But while he was on a visit to Europe, a strong-willed aunt in Liverpool, England, took matters into her own hands and won a debt of gratitude from the boy. As soon as his parents had left him with her alone, she took him to a barber and had the thick black curls cut off. After his mother's death, Mr. Lehman found a small box labeled "Herbert's curls."

### A SPRINT IN SECRET

He attended Dr. Sachs' Collegiate Institute in New York, beginning in 1891. Years later he recalled how he and his classmates took part in a mile-long walking race in competition with other schools.

At one point the course ran behind a billboard. "When we got to that billboard," Mr. Lehman recounted, "we all sprinted a little."

"Quick tempered and razor tongued, he (Sachs) kept the boys in terror of his wrath, particularly as he tweaked their ears sharply for poor work," Mr. Nevins wrote in his biography, telling how Mr. Lehman had become a bad penman.

"If boys broke the rules, the doctor kept them after school to copy out some maxim several hundred times. Herbert was thus frequently corrected, and being in a hurry to get out to play, got into the habit of writing with more haste than finish."

He went from Dr. Sachs' school to Williams College in 1895. Although he was a rather shy young man, he was chosen president of his class one year. He managed the track team, was acting manager of the football team and was a fact-assembling, rather than oratorical, member of the debating team. He was graduated from Williams with a B.A. degree in 1899.

"Ever since then, I have written extremely fast but with complete illegibility," Mr. Lehman said later.

Herbert's father, Mayer Lehman, was a partner in the large investment banking firm of Lehman Brothers. The elder Lehman, with his brothers, Emanuel and Henry, had come to the United States from Bavaria in 1849.

The brothers settled in Montgomery, Ala., where they set up a general merchandise store and later entered the cotton trade.

By the beginning of the Civil War, Mayer and Emanuel had become widely known businessmen in the community. Henry had died. During the war, Emanuel went to Britain and arranged certain credits for the

Confederate Government. The Confederate President, Jefferson Davis, sent Mayer to New York under a sort of flag of truce to negotiate the exchange of prisoners of war.

The brothers' fortune was bound up with the Confederacy, and when the cause was lost, they burned the cotton in their warehouses to keep it from falling into Yankee hands.

A year or two later, they left Montgomery for New York, where Mayer Lehman became a founder and member of the first board of managers of the New York Cotton Exchange, established in 1871.

The tradition of welfare work and religious leadership was strong in the Lehman family. Emanuel became president of Congregation Emanu-El, and Mayer a trustee of Mount Sinai Hospital. There has been a Lehman on the hospital board ever since.

During his lifetime, Herbert Lehman carried on this tradition. He was a busy and highly successful fund-raiser for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, the United Jewish Appeal, and other causes.

As early as 1914, he helped to organize movements that later became the American Joint Distribution Committee, the major channel for American aid to Jews throughout the world.

In support of the movement to create a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, he organized the Palestine Loan Bank and the Palestine Economic Corp.

Altogether, Mr. Lehman served with more than 25 other philanthropic and educational organizations, displaying special interest in those dealing with child welfare.

This interest became apparent when Mr. Lehman left college and took his first job, selling cotton goods for the J. Spencer Turner Co. He spent much of his spare time in the evening supervising a club for boys at the Henry Street Settlement, where he coached basketball and debating teams. In 1908, he entered the firm of Lehman Brothers.

Mr. Lehman recalled this period as a particularly happy time. When someone suggested to him at the time that he should frame his first earnings—his first week's salary of $5—Mr. Lehman prudently changed the $5 bill for singles, framed two singles and use the three others for lunches and carfare.

He remembered with pleasure the dances and outings of the Harmonie Club and the pleasant round of entertainment enjoyed by the young men of his class. He also traveled in Europe.

He acquired a beginning interest in politics and became a delegate from his assembly district to the 1910 Democratic State Convention. Mr. Lehman was a serious citizen who approached the democratic process of party nomination with careful deliberation.

When the United States entered World War I, Mr. Lehman was turned down for infantry officer training because he was about 10 years over age.

He worked in the office of Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, for several monthhs, then obtained a direct commission as a captain in the Army.

When the war ended, he was a colonel, handling procurement and transportation on the general staff. He received the Distinguished Service Medal, the highest award for noncombatant service.

APPOINTED BY SMITH

In the early twenties, probably in connection with a charity in which they were mutually interested, Mr. Lehman met Gov. Alfred E. Smith. These two men, the banker's son from the East 60's and the teamster's son from Oliver Street, formed a friendship that was to exert a great influence on New York State.

By this time, Mr. Lehman's banking and philanthropic activities had made him widely known. Governor Smith first appointed him to a few relatively minor tasks, such as membership on the Governor's mediation committee for garment workers.

In 1926 he was named chairman of a finance, budget and revenue committee formed by Mayor James J. Walker. He wrote an exhaustive report on city finance, which the mayor never bothered to read.

In 1926 Governor Smith persuaded Mr. Lehman to manage his reelection campaign. It was assumed that beyond making a substantial campaign contribution, Mr. Lehman would not participate actively. There was astonishment when he appeared at the Biltmore Hotel campaign headquarters and assumed personal direction.

In 1928, he was mentioned as a possible gubernatorial candidate, but Mr. Roosevelt was selected. He picked Mr. Lehman for Lieutenant Governor. It was said at that time that Mr. Roosevelt planned to spend considerable time at Warm Springs, Ga., to regain his health after his polio attack and wanted Albany in the hands of a strong and reliable man in his absence.

In the election, Mr. Roosevelt defeated Albert Ottinger and Mr. Lehman defeated Charles C. Lockwood, his Republican rival for Lieutenant Governor, 2,074,921 votes to 2,064,882.

From his Park Avenue apartment, Mr. Lehman moved into two rooms in an Albany hotel to take up his duties.

From then on, it was Mr. Roosevelt's habit to refer to Mr. Lehman as "my good right arm."

A year after the election, during one of Governor Roosevelt's absences, Acting Governor Lehman was called on to deal with the failure of the City Trust Co., a New York institution with more than 20,000 depositors, most of them persons of limited means. A State official involved in the bank failure subsequently was sent to prison.

Early in the investigation, when Mr. Lehman learned that the official was about to go abroad, he told him on the phone:

"You stay here, or I'll keep you here."

He won reelection as Lieutenant Governor, again with Roosevelt heading the ticket, in 1930. He increased his plurality from 14,000 in 1928 to more than 565,000 in 1930. This marked him as a good votegetter and a likely candidate for Governor in 1932.

WON OVER DONOVAN

He was nominated for Governor in 1932. The Republicans selected William J. Donovan of Buffalo to oppose him. This was "Wild Bill" Donovan, World War I commander of the "Fighting 69th" Infantry, a man brimful of political color.

Mr. Lehman polled 2,659,519 votes to Colonel Donovan's 1,812,080. Although this was the year that Governor Roosevelt obtained the Democratic Presidential nomination, which former Governor Smith had sought, it was characteristic that Mr. Lehman retained the friendship of Mr. Smith while having backed Mr. Roosevelt at the convention.

Mr. Lehman became Governor in January 1933. On March 2, he started for Washington to attend Mr. Roosevelt's inauguration. He never got there.

In New York, he met with a delegation of bankers who asked him to issue a proclamation closing the State's banks to prevent the banks from foundering in the crisis that was sweeping the country.

Not wishing to be accused later of having overdramatized the situation, Governor Lehman requested the signature of the bankers on a document stating that if he closed the banks, it would be at their request. All signed.

When the Republican-dominated legislature convened, Governor Lehman presented an extensive program of liberal legislation for its consideration. Before he left the executive mansion 10 years later, much of this legislation, together with other proposals that he sponsored later, had become law.

In 1934, the Republicans selected Robert Moses to run against him. Mr. Moses, with his reputation as a planner of parks and other civic improvements, conducted a vigorous and somewhat personal campaign against Mr. Lehman, who replied with statistics.

Mr. Lehman received 2,201,729 votes to 1,393,638 for Mr. Moses. This was the greatest defeat ever inflicted on a candidate for statewide office in New York until Thomas E. Dewey bettered the figure in a governorship race some years later.

Working with the first Democratic-controlled legislation since 1913, Governer Lehman hastened to push through as much liberal legislation as he could. Quarrels among Democratic factions, however, prevented him from fully realizing his program.

In 1936, when President Roosevelt overwhelmed Alfred M. Landon of Kansas, Governor Lehman defeated his Republican opponent, Judge William F. Bleakley of Yonkers, who had based his campaign on an attack on Mr. Lehman for his support of the New Deal.

The Governor got 2,970,575 votes to 2,450,104 for Judge Bleakley, a considerable reduction of Mr. Lehman's previous pluralities.

Governor Lehman was a conspicuous backer of the New Deal, and his program of liberal legislation for New York became known as the Little New Deal.

But Mr. Lehman did not follow Mr. Roosevelt blindly. He opposed the President's plan to pack the Supreme Court to win approval for New Deal legislation, and he was in general disfavor with some of Mr. Roosevelt's supporters who were oriented more to the left.

On the Supreme Court question, Mr. Lehman wrote to the President: "I share your disappointment that many important measures have been declared unconstitutional by a narrow and unconvincing vote of the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, however, I feel that the end which you desire to attain does not justify the means which you recommend."

During his terms as Governor, Mr. Lehman on several occasions had to intervene in law-enforcement problems, usually in this city.

When a Brooklyn truckdriver was beaten to death in 1934 and the Kings County grand jury did not indict three suspects, the cry was heard that "murder is safe in Brooklyn."

After a long hearing, Governor Lehman decided against removing William F. X. Geoghan, Kings County district attorney. But he appointed Hiram C. Todd as special prosecutor. The three suspects finally were convicted.

In 1935, because of worsening vice and racket conditions in New York County, Mr. Lehman got Thomas E. Dewey appointed as special prosecutor. Mr. Dewey's brilliant antiracket campaign began a political career that took him to the governorship and almost to the White House.

By 1938, Mr. Lehman had had enough of Albany. His eye was on the U.S. Senate seat left vacant by the death of Royal S. Copeland.

But the New Deal's popularity had waned and when it became virtually certain that Mr. Dewey would run for Governor on the Republican ticket, Democratic Party leaders advised Mr. Lehman that he was the only candidate who could beat Mr. Dewey.

It was a close race. Governor Lehman was reelected with the aid from the American Labor Party. Mr. Lehman got only 1,971,307 Democratic votes, while Mr. Dewey received 2,302,506 Republican votes.

But Mr. Lehman obtained 419,979 votes on the American Labor Party line, while Mr. Dewey won 24,387 Independent Progressive votes. The Governor's total vote was 2,391,-286 to 2,326,893 for Mr. Dewey.

His last term was in many ways his best. He won his fight for State aid to public housing and New York City won a bigger share of State revenue.

### NOT ON FAMILIAR TERMS

Governor Lehman was never on really familiar terms with the leaders of the legislature because "familiarity was not in his nature," Mr. Nevins wrote in his biography. "He almost never went out to public restaurants in Albany; never was seen in a bar; never cracked a joke in his speeches, and almost never elsewhere."

One night, according to the account, a group of leaders gathered at the bar of an Albany hotel and grew "mellower and mellower." Finally, one of them made his way falteringly to a phone and got Mr. Lehman out of bed, inviting him to come down and have a good time with "some of the boys."

"It is somewhat late," the Governor said, although he said it affably. "I must ask to be excused."

The next morning the embarrassed leader made his way to the Governor's office to apologize. He was assured by an aid that Mr. Lehman had enjoyed the incident and had told everyone of it.

When Mr. Lehman left Albany--he did not run in 1942 and Mr. Dewey was elected—he retained an affection for the governorship. Even after he had left the State capital, and even after his subsequent service in the U.S. Senate, he liked to be called—and was called—"Governor Lehman."

He did not return to Wall Street. President Roosevelt drafted him to become director of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, which had been set up in anticipation of the burden that would evolve on the United States at the end of World War II. Mr. Lehman established his office in Washington. It was not long, however, until it was merged into a greater enterprise, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which was established in 1943.

Named the first director of UNRRA, Mr. Lehman faced tasks that were totally different from those to which he had been accustomed in public office, where his powers had been defined and he had had the backing of powerful political factions. He had to combat personal and international jealousies. His new duties were vaguely defined, and he had to be constantly on the alert to prevent Communists from sabotaging the work of the organization.

He resigned when he found it impossible to work out an arrangement with the World Famine Commission, headed by former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Lehman declined to accept the $15,000 salary for his UNRRA post, and paid his own expenses.

In resigning, Mr. Lehman described the endeavor as "the greatest and most far-flung program of practical human relief the world has ever known."

The first political defeat of his career came in 1946, when he sought election to the Senate. His opponent was Irving M. Ives, of Norwich, former majority leader in the assembly and coauthor of the Ives-Quinn Act, which protects minority groups against discrimination in employment. The measure was popular in New York City, and Mr. Ives received many city votes that ordinarily would have gone to Mr. Lehman.

Mr. Ives received 2,559,365 votes, all on the Republican line. Mr. Lehman got 1,688,887 votes on the Democratic line, 435,846 from American Labor and 174,694 from the Liberal party, for a total of 2,308,112.

### DEFEATED DULLES

The opportunity to erase this defeat came to Mr. Lehman in 1949. Governor Dewey had appointed John Foster Dulles—who later was Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration to succeed to the U.S. Senate seat that had been vacated by the resignation of Senator Robert F. Wagner, Mayor Wagner's father. In the election that fall, Mr. Lehman won by 2,753,934 votes, to 2,227,641 for Mr. Dulles.

Much of Mr. Lehman's prestige had derived from the fact that he seldom hesitated to put his political career in jeopardy when directed by his conscience to take a certain stand. In the summer of 1949, a brief but politically explosive controversy arose between Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cardinal Spellman over a newspaper column written by Mrs. Roosevelt in which she had opposed the use of Federal funds for parochial schools.

In a letter to Mrs. Roosevelt, Cardinal Spellman, charged her with a long-standing prejudice against his church.

Although Mr. Lehman's stand imperiled his long-sought chance to represent his State in the U.S. Senate, Mr. Lehman issued a statement saying he was "deeply shocked" by Cardinal Spellman's accusation. Mr. Lehman emphasized in his statement that Mrs. Roosevelt had dedicated her whole life "to a constant fight for tolerance."

In the Senate, Mr. Lehman became one of the principal supporters of the Fair Deal of President Harry S. Truman. He was one of the 10 Senators who voted to sustain President Truman's veto of the McCarran internal security bill.

### CRITIC OF M'CARTHY

It was as an outspoken critic of Senator McCarthy that Senator Lehman attracted the most attention. The two Senators clashed violently on the Senate floor over a friendly letter that Senator Lehman had written to Alger Hiss, a former official of the State Department who was convicted of perjury in connection with matters involving espionage.

Senator Lehman's letter was written long before evidence was made public involving Hiss with a Communist spy ring. At the time Senator Lehman's letter was written, Hiss enjoyed the respect and friendship of many highly placed persons.

Senator Lehman frequently introduced or backed legislation to relax immigration restrictions. His act providing for the admission of 214,000 additional immigrants was passed in 1953, but a year later he reported that delays and redtape had hampered the arrival of all but a handful of the authorized immigrants.

Senator Lehman voted for several bills designed to make it impossible for the Communist Party to operate in the United States. These votes of Senator Lehman included one cast to make membership in the Communist Party a felony. This proposed legislation was modified before it was sent to President Eisenhower for signing.

### FACED HANLEY

Having served out the remainder of Senator Wagner's term, Mr. Lehman again faced the electorate in 1950. His Republican opponent was Joe R. Hanley, former Lieutenant Governor.

Polling 2,319,719 Democratic votes, Mr Lehman would have been beaten if he had not received 312,594 Liberal Party ballots to swell his total to 2,632,314 votes. The American Labor Party had run its own candidate, Dr. William B. DuBois, who polled 205,729 votes.

When Mr. Lehman announced in 1956 that he would not seek reelection to the Senate, he threw his support to Senator Wagner's son. The younger Wagner was defeated by State Attorney General Jacob K. Javits in the election that swept President Eisenhower into office for a second term.

Mr. Lehman was a member of the Army & Navy, Bankers, Williams, Century, and Harmonie Clubs, all of New York. He was also a member of the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity. He received honorary degrees from many colleges and universities.

Mr. Lehman and Miss Edith Louis Altschul, daughter of a San Francisco banker, were married on April 28, 1910. They adopted three children. They were Peter Gerald Lehman, a lieutenant in the Army Air Force, who was killed in active service in Britain in 1944 after having flown 57 missions; John Robert Lehman, who became a lieutenant colonel in the armored forces; and Mrs. Edward Wise, who served with the Women's Army Corps in World War II.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to express my own deep appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota for the sincere words of gratitude, appreciation, and affection which he has spoken with reference to our mutual friend the late Senator, the late Governor, and the late great American—Herbert Lehman.

When I was serving as Governor of my own State, I attended my first Governors' conference and Governor Lehman was the nestor of all the Governors. He was the leading figure to address the Governors, many of whom, like myself, had recently come to that position of responsibility in our respective States. But at that time he himself had had the responsibility for almost 10 years in one of the greatest States of our Nation—the State of New York. We were all deeply impressed with him.

Mrs. Holland and I came to know him well and also to know Mrs. Lehman. Later, during their term of service—because, as the Senator knows, they worked together closely on everything—they lived in the same apartment-hotel with us in Washington. We were exceedingly fond of them.

I do not have to say to the Senator that the philosophy of Senator Lehman and my own frequently differed. That made no difference. We were good friends. He was frequently kind enough to include us in invitations of one kind or another, and, of course, we attempted to reciprocate.

I wish the RECORD to show as a reasonably conservative-thinking Senator, I appreciate, agree with, and find myself very much in common with the kind words which have been spoken by the Senator from Minnesota.

Senator Lehman, together with his lovely wife, frequently came to the State which in part I represent. They seemed to enjoy their visits. They were always welcomed with extreme hospitality, because the people of Florida were fond of him and of Mrs. Lehman. We shall miss him.

I remember that during World War II he had a son who was in a difficult position in the services. My recollection is that he was in the Air Force, and that he lost his life during the war. I remember the way in which Senator Lehman and Mrs. Lehman stood up to that crushing blow—of course, it was just that—and how out of the greatness of their characters and their spirits they found the means to withstand the blow and to come out of it with their chins up, ready to continue to serve their country.

His service as Governor, his service in Europe in the two different capacities when he was administering to those who were in need, his service in the Senate and in innumerable other activities—because he was always serving in one way or another—will speak for itself in the history of our Nation.

He made a great record. He was a great American. Mrs. Holland and I would like to express our very deep sympathy to Mrs. Lehman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for his gracious, sincere, and kind remarks. I know that the Lehman family will be most grateful.

I should like to add a word on a lighter note. About a year ago, I visited with Herbert Lehman when he was in the Southwest. I believe at that time he was in New Mexico. Prior to that, he had had an accident in which he fractured his hip. As he fell and fractured his hip, there was a moment of shock; and when Mrs. Lehman came to help him, the first thing he said was: "Now, don't you cancel my birthday party."

It was the privilege of Mrs. Humphrey and myself, together with many Senators and others in public life, to attend the 85th birthday party of Herbert Lehman. He was there at his birthday party, feeling good, still with the old spirit and energy, that sharp eye, and that happy countenance.

I like to add that personal note because when we lose a good friend it is not only a time for mourning but also a time for remembering some of the happy moments and some of those priceless experiences which friendship gives to us.

Allan Nevins, the great historian, has written a biography of Herbert Lehman. It is my privilege to have a copy of that biography. It is very good reading because it is not only the story of an exciting and an interesting life but also a powerful history of this great Republic.

---

## TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by one of our former colleagues, a former Governor and a former president of a great university, Hon. Frank P. Graham, who addressed the 139th annual commemoration of Thanksgiving Day by the B'nai Jeshurun Congregation in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### IMPRESSIONS OF THE MEANING OF JOHN F. KENNEDY IN AMERICA AND THE WORLD IN THIS AGE OF PERIL AND HOPE FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE

(By Frank P. Graham)

#### INTRODUCTION

It is with a deep sense of appreciation and opportunity that I find myself speaking at the 139th annual commemoration of Thanksgiving Day by the B'nai Jeshurun Congregation in this majestic temple of religion and learning and liberty and hope. With your permission, I have changed the subject of my talk, which was to have been on the meaning of the United Nations in the Atomic Age, to the meaning of John F. Kennedy in America and the modern world of peril and hope. In the thoughts just expressed by your distinguished Rabbi, William Berkowitz, who has so generously introduced me, we find ourselves today in the mood of sorrow for the memorable life that has gone and thanksgiving for the noble meaning of that life in the hopes of tomorrow.

#### THE TRAGIC PARADOX OF OUR HUMAN PREDICAMENT

In the assassination of a brave man, a great American President and a leader of the people of the world for freedom, justice and peace, suddenly hate and violence have done their worst. The best in American heritage and hope, whose meaning he had grown greatly to fulfill, was stricken down last Friday and the people across this land and beyond are desolate today. A courageous champion of the difficult steps toward universal human rights, universal humane well-being and universal disarmament, was cruelly and recklessly killed by an assassin's bullet. From the warm and broken hearts of the people of this and other lands around the earth have come universal expressions of shock and sorrow that a noble man and a preeminent leader, who had committed his life and his country to overcoming prejudice, hate and violence, should be paradoxically done to death by hate and violence.

In this American Nation of people of general and generous good will, prejudice and poison, seemingly organized and subsidized, have been spreading unreasoning and hate-filled charges against the President, the Chief Justice of the United States, and the United Nations. Hate, on its reckless way, provokes and enlists more hate, and violence begets violence in defiance of the judicially determined law of the land for the equal freedom of all people under the law. Prejudice and hate, aroused by monstrous opposites, develop a threatening climate for hate and violence. The tragic assassination of the President, who stood steadfast for obedience to the law as a moral right and a legal duty, was wrongfully avenged by a man, who, in contempt of law, counter-assassinated an accused man, who, at the time was in the hands of the law, awaiting his day in court as the due right of all accused under the law as a precious provision of the American Bill of Rights.

The deep and almost universal grief in the death of our gallant, gracious, and great leader and in the death of the brave sergeant of police in his line of duty, and our shame in this other violation of due process of law under the Bill of Rights, dear to our people, have brought home to the American people the responsibility to seek and find the meaning of it all. They mourn the loss of their leader in this hour of the world's need of him. They experience in this free society the several shocks of violations of due process of law at a time of urgent need of obedience to the law of the land as the responsibility of all the people in the land.

#### RECENT EXAMPLES OF HATE AND VIOLENCE

Prejudice and violence in our fair land, in mainly unusual instances, have been finding increasing expression in recent years by unbalanced individuals and highly vocal minorities in such vicious activities as the bombing of a church, a synagogue, and offices of the AAUN; the killing of little children while in Sunday school learning the lessons of brotherhood; the murder of a fearless Negro leader on his lawful way to his home; the spitting on the gracious and valorous Mrs. Lyndon Johnson in a recent campaign; the strangulation and murder in a few cities, North and South, East and West, of innocent and defenseless women who had the human right to live; the hidden murder of a southern "freedom walker" on his lonely pilgrimage to stir the consciences of his people; the rousing of prejudice and hate against white people in reverse racism; the smearing as un-American loyal Americans who are authentically American; the picketing of rallies for the United Nations in several States; the blow on the devoted head of the eloquent U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, where a misinformed hate group shamelessly misrepresented the rank and file of the people of their city.

All these expressions of misinformed and unreasoning hate and violence, proceeding from different and even opposite directions, tend to build a climate which adds to the twisted spirit of a frustrated youth, who, as an individual had rejected the team spirit of his high school team, the U.S. Marine Corps, his country, the Soviet Union, and, upon his return home, the Government which brought him home, and then became accused of striking down one of history's noblest exemplars of religious tolerance, social and racial justice, and international cooperation and good will for freedom and peace on earth. This dastardly deed occurred against the deeper currents and the general life of the community, whose people, in spite of cruel previous misrepresentation and hate, responded to the firsthand impressions of the electric presence and the dynamic and joyful personality of a great leader of their higher selves, and took him to their own heart and were giving his an almost universal ovation.

If we sow the winds of prejudice, hate, violence, contempt for the law, equal rights under the law, and the Government of the United States itself as a hated foreign power, we may, if our people are not aroused for obedience to law and the meaning of the Bill of Rights, reap the whirlwind of national disaster at the very time the world needs most the continuing leadership of America and the best which America has to give in an hour of a possibly receding old peril and a rising new hope for all mankind.

#### WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

In this land where, as a general rule, unpopular and opposite opinions are free, forums are open for the contest of ideas, courts are uncorrupted, and governments are responsive to the needs and the aroused will of the people, the answer is not the countersmear, unsound censorship, State gag laws against academic freedom, or repression, which are the ways of frightened power, but light and liberty under the law, which are the ways of enlightened faith in the robustness and power of an open society and a free, responsible, and responsive American democracy.

That these things have happened in widely separated regions of our beloved country, involves us all as a people. We have not provided equally and adequately for the sound education, health, fair employment, well-being, and mental therapy of youth and the people and their perspective in the meaning of the Bill of Rights and the fulfillment of our spiritual heritage and the hopes of the American dream. All these and more are needed to carry on Kennedy's valorous leadership and sincere bipartisan partnership in the battles against prejudice, hate, and violence and for the equal freedom, human dignity, and fair opportunity of all people.

The American dream, for the progressive fulfillment of the equal rights of all people, which was immortally declared by Jefferson, bravely and wisely fathered by Washington, heroically embodied by Abraham Lincoln, universally proclaimed by Woodrow Wilson in his New Freedom and prophetic internationalism, was deepened and widened in the saving power of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the United Nations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, conserved and enriched in the Modern Republicanism of Dwight D. Eisenhower, and has been carried further to the New Frontier of America and the World by John F. Kennedy, now personally and deeply mourned in the homes of the people of America and the world.

Born in the middle of the First World War, he risked his life and saved a companion on the farthest hazardous fronts of the Second World War, and dedicated his life and the mission of our Nation to saving the world from a third world war, which might bring to an end both the accumulated heritage of the ages and the hopes of the human race, long evolved in physical descent and spiritual ascent for survival and progress under God on this planet.

### OUR THANKSGIVING FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

As we all mourn for him on this Thanksgiving Day, we recall with gratitude his initiative and struggles for the test ban treaty, whose possible meaning for relaxation of tensions is shared by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. Its ratification by 107 of the 111 nations of the United Nations, though a small step, was followed by another small but meaningful unanimous resolution for the nuclear disarmament of outer space. Rejections would have been most negative in their moral effects around the world. The values of these steps are not measured now by the length but by the direction of the steps, and, we hope and pray, in Kennedy's spirit, for more and more steps toward ultimate effective universal disarmament.

We recall with gratitude both his continuing effort for the Alliance for Progress to help the people of Latin America to lift now the level of their own lives and their own hopes for a better day in the generations to come, and also his unceasing efforts to carry forward programs mutually to share our freedom and abundance, not for waste, exploitation, or aggression, but wisely, responsibly, and creatively with people in all lands in need of food and opportunity, compassion, and brotherhood.

On this day devoted to national thanksgiving to God for this land of freedom and plenty, we are grateful for Kennedy's concern for slums, the depressed areas and their redevelopment, the unemployed millions, medical care for the aged, provision of food and the intelligent sale of wheat to people in need, equal rights of women, of labor and management, of men and women, white and colored, on farms and in cities, and all disinherited and handicapped people. We are appreciative of the timely proposal for a real cut in taxes to give an impetus to the wheels of industry and the free dynamics of reciprocal trade in national and international society in need of more investment, more purchasing power, more production, more jobs for the people out of work and for the hundreds of thousands of youth going annually into the labor market, annually being reduced by technological automation in our modern industrial society.

### CONCERN FOR AND HOPE IN YOUTH

The youth of American are grateful to him, himself a young man of the mid-20th century, in his concern for youth in the schools, the dropouts, the delinquents, those unemployed, the mentally disturbed, and those despairing in a young land historically built on the hopes and the opportunities of youth.

To the good will and venturesome spirit of youth he made his bugle call to youth for enlistment in the Peace Corps in the "moral equivalent of war" against poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease, to help the youth and people of educationally and technically developing lands on the march toward new frontiers of plenty, progress and peace of peoples in all the world.

### UPDATING THE IDEALISM OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

In this age, confronted with the social dynamics of the Communist revolution, the ideals of the American Revolution have gone around the world. With its reverberations in the world revolution against colonialism and racism, the youthful Kennedy committed himself unreservedly against colonialism in the world and against racism in America, as a contemporary part of the updated American Revolution and a local expression of the world revolution of the colored, colonial, and exploited peoples of the earth for a fairer chance for themselves and all their children.

He found, I believe, in the march on Washington of Negro and white people from all sections moving together in good order and good spirit toward the Lincoln Memorial, something of the majestic rhythm of the history of a movement whose hour had come. He found, I also feel sure, that the present movement of youth, white and colored, for equal rights, had two of its most pervasive origins in Montgomery and Greensboro in the Old South, its historic origins in revolutionary Philadelphia, and its farther headwaters in the Judean hills of the prophetic Judiac-Christian heritage and redemptive hope for the sacred worth and equal freedom of all persons as children of one God and brothers of all people on the earth. These gallant young people, with the Bible and Constitution in their hands, prayers and songs on their lips, and nonviolence and brotherhood in their hearts, were to the gallant, youthful, and hopeful Kennedy, I venture to say, the most authentically spiritual and most American of us all.

We shall always recall with thanksgiving the ideas, challenges, and programs of his great addresses, such as his eloquent inaugural, his timely speech at the American University and his two noble addresses before the General Assembly: The first, in commemoration of the sacrificial death of Dag Hammarskjold, as a call, in his spirit, to the continuing and higher mission of the United Nations; and the second, as a call to the United Nations and people everywhere for survival, peace, and a common and better life on this planet.

### THE UNDERSTANDING OF ABLE OPPONENTS

He gave the tribute of friendly respect to his able opponents, who sought, and seek, in historic custom, to obstruct and delay the updating of the idealism of the American Revolution by quoting the outworn shell of Jefferson's theories—adapted to an agrarian and local handicraft society fearful of the new and exploitative industrialism and the urban concentration of financial power—against the very substance and purposes of Jefferson's ideas for the equal freedom and justice of all people. After Jefferson's time there developed a national industrial society and an international commercial society which expanded beyond the competence of States rights—with all their valid and needed values in State and local responsibilities—to guide us in behalf of the freedom and well-being of all the people in America and the world. In honest fears, many of the opponents of Kennedy and of this recent distinguished predecessors, and the continuing opponents of his able, eminent, and devoted successor, belong to a nostalgic age that has gone or is going with the fresh winds now blowing across America and the world.

The gathering in Washington at a fateful hour, of an unparalleled number of heads of states, prime ministers, leaders of delegations, and representatives of nations to the side of the stricken leader of the most powerful Nation in our world of bipolar power, and the moving and warm addresses in the General Assembly of the United Nations in memory of his martyrdom by the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary General, the delegations of every region of the world, the chairman of all the committees of the General Assembly, and six former Presidents of the General Assembly, symbolized not only the worldwide appreciation of John F. Kennedy as a person and a leader of a great nation, but also indicated their knowledge of the unprecedented awful power which historic circumstances, modern technology, and the democratic choice of a free people had placed in his youthful but wise and sometimes lonely keeping. Worldwide was also the tribute to the high intelligence, the steel will, the unshakable faith, the indomitable courage, the humane insight, and the blessed restraint with which he used the power of his people for the well-being and peace of all people on the earth.

### THE MAN

With rootage in depth of spiritual heritage and American hopes; handsome in endowments of resilient body and capacious mind; winsome in wit, gay and gallant in spirit; natural in dignity and enthusiasm; generous in the face of calumny; brave in all the hazards of war and strenuous in all the battles of politics and peace, instant in acceptance of full responsibility of a mistake in which others may have shared; tireless in homework and masterful in the precise knowledge and understanding of issues, large and small; unpretentious in the fun and opportunities of the press conference, President Kennedy, with the flashing smile of a charming, cultured, and gracious person, a great leader of the people, got through to the people in their homes, on the streets and in the places where they worshiped, played, and did their day's work. The people of the world will never lose the grateful memory of him in the midst of a great confrontation of mighty powers in our bipolar world of power, unprecedented in human history, whose menace of events converged upon him for immediate decisions as Commander in Chief in those fearful hours when the heart of the world almost stopped beating. In that awful predicament he stood steadfast on that lonely pinnacle of power for the freedom of his Nation and this hemisphere, and yet used the terrible power of his people with humane concern for the lives of all the people on this earth.

On an earth shrinking in time and distance, spiraling in the power for either the annihilation of all people or the international cooperation in the opportunity for the plenty, humane progress and peace of all people, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as man, President, and leader of the people of the world, living in a generation and a world in which he made his national and global home, grew to the stature of the times, the immensity of his burdens, and the nobility of his opportunities to interpret the issues of the day and help lead the people of his generation to the higher levels of their better selves and away from an age of war and violence toward an era of relaxing tension, humane hopes, and peace on earth.

The meaning of the sacrificial death of Lincoln, Gandhi, and Kennedy grows and will grow in spiritual power from generation to generation.

### THE MEANING OF THE FAMILY IN A FREE SOCIETY

We are also grateful on this day of family prayer and thanksgiving, that the Kennedy family, in their close ties of love and loyalty, reverence and play, wholesome and strenuous in the zest for life and adventure, whether on the farthest fronts of war or the farthest frontiers of equal freedom and peace, have given a renewed meaning and a higher dimension of the values of the family as one of the main moral foundations of a free society in our complex modern world.

### THE MEANING OF LIFE, MOTHER, AND WIDOW

Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, in her own right as wife, mother, and companion, was one of the sources of his joyful and devoted life and helped the President to give a new and authentic recognition to the meaning of the arts as among the noblest expressions of the national life and the human spirit. Amid the hosannas of the hundreds of thousands of people who acclaimed their President, sudden shots rang out and struck him down. As his youthful and surging life ebbed away from his great heart, she gathered him in her arms and abides in the strength of his sustaining love and immortal spirit in these days and all the days to come. The blood which fell on this heroic woman, fell on the people of America and the world with the warm uniting power which binds together in our common humanity all people who love greatness and sacrifice in the midst of life, and faith and courage in the midst of death. The people across America and around the world, who witnessed her contained love and sustained fortitude, will be nobler for the purity and beauty of the inner spirit which shone forth in the sublimity of the light on the face of the widow and the mother as she carried in strength and dignity the overwhelming grief which had so suddenly come to her. Her constant love and calm thoughtfulness also sustained her children, who, responding in the spirit of their beloved father and fun-loving companion, and in the faith and valor of their devoted mother, became themselves little soldiers of the spirit beyond their years.

### THE TIPPIT FAMILY, THE OSWALD FAMILY, AND THE QUAKER LADY

We mourn with the courageous widow and children of the brave police sergeant and are thankful for the integrity and nobility revealed in a simple American home. When Mrs. Tippit, in her home, unaware of her husband's death, heard that President Kennedy had been desperately wounded, she immediately expressed her shock and then her concern and compassion for Mrs. Kennedy and the children. The older son, 11 years of age, said he remembered that his father had often said he wanted all of them to do their best for a better time for them all. We mourn also for the mother, the widow, and the little children of the man accused of two dastardly crimes and are thankful for the Quaker lady, who, in the unconsciously brave spirit of her religion, offered them the haven of her home, as John Kennedy himself in spirit would want her to do in these days of bewilderment.

### THE RALLY TO THE SIDE OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

In our sorrow for the death and our appreciation of the noble life and great leadership of him who has gone from us, we are grateful that our Nation goes on stronger in the immortal spirit, ideas and programs of John F. Kennedy and in the life and unreserved commitments of his chosen successor and trusted, loyal, and creative partner in great undertakings to carry forward the high combat against hate and violence and his all-out commitment for a strong bipartisan civil rights program and a strong bipartisan program in support of freedom, self-determination of peoples, the United Nations, and peace. By his side, as wife and teammate, stands Lady Bird Johnson, a woman of high intelligence, grace, and courage, who will inspire and uphold him in his immense burdens and adventurous hopes. The torch which has been passed from Kennedy to Johnson will be lifted high and carried on to the new frontiers of America and the world. His faith in America, his political baptism by Roosevelt, his stomach for strenuous battle and all its blows, his courage in the face of death, his highly perceptive mind, his driving will, his political skill in the effective congressional achievement of a bipartisan foreign policy and the first civil rights act passed in almost a hundred years under Eisenhower, promises the forward movement under President Lyndon Johnson of the people of the United States on the home front and the leadership of America on the earth as the God-given home of the family of man in this age of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our good friend, Dr. Graham, who is to my mind one of the saints of our time—another rare and wonderful individual—spoke to the congregation on "Impressions of the Meaning of John F. Kennedy in America and in the Modern World of Peril and Hope."

I have read this address. I visited the other day with Dr. Graham when he was in Washington. I mentioned this address to him. He was kind enough to send me a copy. I wish all Senators to have an opportunity to read it, if they have the time. It is one of the finest tributes to our late President Kennedy that I have read, and I wish to share it with all other Senators.

---

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN ITS STUDY OF "INTERAGENCY COORDINATION IN DRUG RESEARCH AND REGULATION"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from time to time, I have reported to the Senate on the activities of a Senate Government Operations subcommittee of which I am chairman. The Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has been studying "interagency coordination, economy and efficiency," pursuant to Senate Resolution 27, 88th Congress, as amended.

In previous statements, I have mentioned some of the subcommittee's many concrete achievements in such diverse fields as: First, overall coordination of scientific research; second, strengthened collection, dissemination, and evaluation of information; third, better coordination of international technical assistance programs; fourth, improved coordination of Federal programs in the field of pesticides; and in other areas.

Today, I should like to cite what we have done in fulfillment of our responsibilities for improving interagency coordination in Federal drug regulation and research.

### FOUR OF OUR OBJECTIVES

There have been many such improvements.

The subcommittee, it should be noted, has aimed at helping the American taxpayer:

First, get more for his money—that is, for the $150 million which the U.S. Government spends for drug activities.

Second, get better coordination among the half-dozen Federal agencies involved in these programs,

Third, get better efficiency within each agency,

Fourth, get better drugs—safer, more effective drugs—for advancement of the public health.

The record is not all in, as yet, of course. But the record does show that we have had successes in all four objectives and on more than a dozen major fronts.

The record does not include as many successes as I would wish—nor have they always occurred as promptly, nor as completely, but they do represent substantial progress.

When the history of this effort is finally written, I believe that the American people will see even more clearly than is now possible that the subcommittee has repaid manifold the relatively small amount which was appropriated to it.

### WELCOME LETTER COMMENDS SUCCESS IN HELPING TO CURB ADDICTION

I was reminded of the fruitfulness of some of our efforts by a fine letter which I have just received from one of the great State officials in this Nation, the Honorable Stanley Mosk, attorney general of California. Attorney General Mosk expressed his gratification at information which we phoned to him in Sacramento on a welcome decision by the Narcotics Bureau of the U.S. Treasury Department. The decision is to transfer a pain-relieving drug known as Percodan back to what is known as the class A list of narcotics. This list requires written prescriptions.

Heretofore, Percodan has been available on what is known as an oral refill basis.

The Bureau's action follows a survey which was made by the Narcotics Bureau on widespread abuse of this drug. And this survey resulted directly from messages which I sent not only to the Bureau, but to the Food and Drug Administration. I did so following protests which I had received from Attorney General Mosk and from numerous physicians over heavy abuse of the drug by addicts.

The forward step of taking Percodan off the oral RX list is, however, but one relatively "small" byproduct of our subcommittee's study. I say it is a "small" byproduct, because there have been much larger achievements involving not a single drug, but entire categories of drugs and, in some respects, all new drugs—as they are evaluated by FDA. But, according to Attorney General Mosk, as many as 3,000 narcotic addicts may be misusing this one drug—Percodan—in one State—California—and many of these addicts are teenage youngsters. So this "small" matter is a very big matter in the lives of these unfortunates and in the lives of their loved ones.

Month after month, I have corresponded with law enforcement officers, basic scientists and physicians on this one drug. Similar correspondence, as well as phone calls and personal meetings have involved literally scores of other drugs.

### BEHIND-THE-SCENES WORK TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH

I mention this correspondence because sometimes people get the idea that a subcommittee is "busy" only when it is holding hearings, particularly headline-making hearings. Our subcommittee has, of course, held public hearings, and they have been, I submit, important and responsible hearings.

But in between these hearings, not a day has gone by in which we have not been in touch with drug experts by phone and by letter, working quietly, behind the scenes to protect the public health.

Our correspondence effort has been one of the most important phases of the subcommittee's drug study. We have corresponded, I believe, with virtually every major pharmacological organization in the United States with departments of clinical pharmacology in every U.S. college of medicine which has such departments and with every school of pharmacy, with pharmacologists in the World Health Organization, the section on pharmacology of the International Union of Physiological Sciences, with drug experts in England, France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Japan, and other countries.

### LETTERS ARE ACTION-ORIENTED

Our correspondence is action-oriented. We have sought improvements in international drug cooperation. We have sought to make sure that never again does a thalidomide-type tragedy recur, if human ingenuity can possibly prevent it. We have sought to foster the highest professional excellence.

### MANY LETTERS TO BE PUBLISHED

Our correspondence has included literally dozens of letters with the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense and other agencies. Many of these letters are, I believe, so helpful that they will be made a matter of public and permanent record in our forthcoming hearing-exhibit volumes.

### SCORES OF LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

Literally scores of appreciative incoming letters from the United States and foreign countries attest to the fruitfulness of our efforts. Our outgoing letters, our public and private appeals and suggestions—are, our correspondents tell us, "paying off." We have served as a catalyst, we are told, so that the momentum for drug reform which followed the shock of the thalidomide tragedy is not lost. Too often a tragedy has occurred and has then been quickly forgotten until the next tragedy has taken place.

### OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS A NATION

This Nation is the world's drug leader. It has the highest drug standards in the world. It has the most dynamic pharmaceutical industry and the strongest university teaching hospital system, not to mention great drug contributions by Federal agencies.

Our aim is to accentuate the positive and minimize the negative.

Drugs, after all, are not just a matter of dollars and cents, but of life and death. Drugs relieve pain; drugs reduce disability, postpone and literally defeat death.

So, too, drugs can have hazards—just as most of man's other great instruments for progress can.

But now let the subcommittee's record speak for itself.

It is not an individual's record; it is a subcommittee record. Our subcommittee has functioned in harmony and unanimity. As in the case of our pesticide study, under the able acting chairmanship of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], we work as a team.

The record is in two parts—(a) actions, (b) letters about our actions.

The record consists not of what we have said about ourselves, but of what others have said about the results of our efforts. They are in a more objective position than we to evaluate our success or our limitations. The record, too, includes quotations from but a handful of the many publications which have commented favorably on our program.

The subcommittee does not claim credit for anything not deserved. In some instances, it should be clearly noted, many other constructive forces have been at work for drug reform; no one source can properly claim to have been the sole source responsible for some particular improvement.

The Food and Drug Administration, for example, has made many internal improvements on its own initiative, and I commend the agency for them. The medical profession and industry has also made many improvements on their own and are to be commended. But infinitely more, in my judgment, must be done. And that is no mere figure of speech. There is not the slightest basis for complacency—pride, yes, in past achievement, but not complacency.

### ONLY A BRIEF SAMPLING OF ACTIONS LISTED

The record which follows is just a brief sampling; it is not intended as a complete list. It does not include, for example, the actions which have been taken on many specific drugs, at our request, other than on Percodan, as mentioned earlier. The reason is that any such complete list—itemizing drug by drug, action by action—by FDA or by individual drug companies—would have to be far longer than the memorandum which follows.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Attorney General of California Stanley Mosk and the memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Los Angeles, November 27, 1963.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The subcommittee staff has informed me of the action taken this week by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics to remove the drug Percodan from the oral prescription list.

This is a long-needed administrative order and undoubtedly will give impetus to the effort by California law enforcement and medical groups to bring Percodan under the triplicate prescription procedures of this State.

Commissioner Giordano's action, coupled with the advertising directive issued by the Food and Drug Commissioner, gives promise that Percodan abuse will not continue to grow unchecked. California, unfortunately, already has a sizable addict group involved with the drug. It is hoped that in time these individuals may be located and treated.

We continue to develop evidence on the abuse of Percodan by heroin addicts, who find it an effective and easily obtained substitute narcotic. More recently we have received reports of teenage involvement with the drug. For these reasons, as well as for those I previously have outlined to the subcommittee, I believe that Commissioner Giordano's action this week indeed is in the public interest.

May I express my appreciation for the interest which you and the subcommittee staff have taken in this matter. Your efforts have done much to bring the Percodan problem to the attention of Federal agencies in a clear and constructive manner. I should hope that the subcommittee will be able to continue to study the circumstances under which this drug became a public health problem. As new drugs steadily continue to be developed and placed on the market, it is imperative that the regulatory machinery be sensitive to problems that may evolve and judiciously swift in instituting corrective measures. The public interest must be paramount.

Again, my appreciation for your interest and that of your subcommittee staff.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY MOSK,
*Attorney General.*

### PART 1: OUTLINE OF 12 STEPS FORWARD

### 1. NEW FEDERAL INTER-AGENCY COUNCIL SETUP

There has now been formed for the first time an Interagency Procurement Advisory Council on Drugs. Rear Adm. C. A. Blick is chairman. The Council consists of representatives of the Executive Office of the President; Office, Secretary of Defense; Defense Supply Agency; Department of the Army; Department of the Navy; Department of the Air Force; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Veterans' Administration; and the General Services Administration.

I had pointed to the absence of an interagency coordinating mechanism in a letter of December 1962 to the President's Science Adviser, Dr. Jerome Wiesner[1] and had urged the establishment of a suitable basis for intragovernmental teamwork.

---

[1] Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, hearing on "Interagency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 2, exhibit 112, p. 692.

When the Council (IPAD) was finally established, I learned that, unfortunately, its initial charter was far from complete. It concentrated so exclusively on the matter of interagency policy on drug purchases as almost to deemphasize the significance of information on the safety and efficacy of what is to be purchased.

I suggested, therefore, that specific revisions in the charter be made; this, I am glad to say, was promptly done.[2] The new charter includes provision for meeting problems, such as relate to "drug information, adverse reactions, reporting systems, etc."

A trade publication summed up[3] the situation as it saw it:

"Post-Humphrey: F.D.A. transmitting warnings and recalls to Defense Department for use in drug purchasing; monthly interagency meetings anticipated."

### 2. IMPROVED COLLECTION OF INFORMATION ON ADVERSE REACTIONS TO DRUGS

One of the most important efforts of the subcommittee has been to improve the collection of adverse reactions to drugs. Most of this crucial, often life-and-death information has, unfortunately, never been collected, never been published, never been evaluated, never been disseminated. This is confirmed by article after article in medical journals and by our own findings.

Yet, unless this information is made available, medical science may needlessly repeat drug mistakes instead of promptly learning from them and correcting them.

On August 6, 1963, the late Senator Estes Kefauver said[4] on the Senate floor:

"I am glad your Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations is going further into the question of intergovernmental relations in connection with the exchange of information on drugs, particularly drugs with potentially serious side effects."

Later, in a statement which I presented in the Senate in October 1962, I said:[5]

"All sorts of sources do attempt to compile reactions—pharmaceutical companies, the FDA, hospitals, the VA, NIH, and other sources.

"None particularly talks with the other; none cooperates to any real extent with the other. One might just as well try to scoop out the Atlantic Ocean with a leaky Dixie cup as to collect drug reactions in the hit-or-miss manner which has been going on for so long."

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts, the Food and Drug Administration took a new look at its tiny, weak program for adverse reaction reporting. At the time the subcommittee began its study, only 44 of the Nation's over 6,000 hospitals were participating in the FDA program.

The U.S. Government spends billions of dollars on its own three hospital systems. Yet, their cooperation, as indicated above, with FDA ranged in description from "fragmentary" to "not existent."

No Veterans' Administration hospital, no Department of Defense hospital, and only 8 of the 15 Public Health Service hospitals participated in the FDA program.[6] Since then, some improvements have been made in all of these respects.

On June 14, 1963, I received a letter from Maj. Gen. Joseph McNinch, retired, the able new Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, advising as to a new internal VA effort:

"We have now developed procedures for reporting adverse drug reactions by all Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics, with provisions for exchanging summaries of such information with our field stations" (and, subsequently, with other agencies).

This was a specific recommendation which I, for one, made at our hearings in August 1962.

VA conducts, as we know, the world's largest clinical program.

It has always collected reactions on its excellent cooperative clinical testing programs. But the mass of its nonexperimental drug therapy had not been subject to centralized information gathering.

Meanwhile, the American Medical Association has proceeded in its own plans, formulated over a number of years, to expand its limited but valuable "Registry on Blood Dyscrasias" into a comprehensive program on reporting all types of adverse reactions. It is our hope that there will be a maximum coordination between the public and private program; i.e., the FDA and the AMA efforts.

### 3. IMPROVED SYSTEMS FOR ALL TYPES OF DRUG INFORMATION: PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED

The Subcommittee has concentrated on the improvement in systems of scientific information and communication. This has been one of our specialties for all the sciences—the physical, mathematical, and engineering sciences, in particular—over the last 5 years.

As a result of our effort, with respect to drug information in particular, there have been improvements in internal information systems within each of the major Federal agencies, as well as improvements in interagency information systems.

A drug trade publication has referred[7] to our efforts to "spark a revolution in mechanized scientific communication and an international network for the exchange of drug information" as meriting "high honor."

Earlier, it had stated,[8] "doubters have little chance to stem the revolutionary tide being swept up by Senator Humphrey from the flood of research data."

I should like to state very frankly that some of the "doubters" still doubt, and still tend to drag their feet. The fact is that information improvements have come much more slowly than I would wish. The Federal agencies still tend to indulge in the habit of stalling—of making endless studies about information improvements, instead of getting busy to put into practice the studies which have long since been made. I believe that a few of these recent new studies are significant and helpful. But the time is long overdue to act on information reforms.

Many such reforms were suggested at the Surgeon General's Conference on Communication held at Airlie, Va., in November 1962. This conference resulted directly from our efforts.[9]

I am glad to say that the Surgeon General has an able Assistant for Scientific Communication in the person of F. Ellis Kelsey, Ph. D. I do not have the slightest doubt but that if Dr. Kelsey is given a "green light," this country will get a National Clearinghouse on Drug Information, such as he and we have proposed. For that matter, I hope we will have a system of national clearinghouses on cosmetic information, on food information, on pesticide information and on other scientific information. Only thereby can we end the serious unintentional duplication of research which has been going on. The fact that such unnecessary, unwanted, and wasteful duplication is still going on cannot be doubted. This disturbing fact was pointed up in a recent report[10] to the U.S. Public Health Service, which I shall mention further a little later on. The report recommended what it called "Cabin"—a chemical and biological information network. This is a new acronym for the very type of concept to which I have just referred above, namely, a clearinghouse or network system.

Such a system should, in my judgment, be based on a network of specialized centers throughout the Nation for the careful evaluation of drugs, working in close conjunction—on a voluntary basis—with Federal agencies, the National Library of Medicine, industry, teaching hospitals, researchers, practitioners, and most important, professional organizations of medicine and allied sciences.

### 4. IMPROVED TEAMWORK BETWEEN NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The subcommittee quickly determined at the very start of its study that, unfortunately, the "right hand" of the Federal Government—in drug research—has not known what the "left hand" of the Federal Government—in drug regulation—has been doing or could contribute. The American taxpayer has been spending more than $70 million a year through the National Institutes of Health for the support of drug and drug-related research. It is spending—in the very same Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—around $12 million a year through the Food and Drug Administration for drug regulatory purposes. Yet, in the past, relationships between these two organizations have been cool, minimal, haphazard, fragmentary, and ineffective. Fortunately, as a direct result of the subcommittee's efforts, there has been signed between NIH and FDA a new memorandum of agreement.[11] For the first time, there will be genuine systematic, organized mechanisms for interagency exchange of information, for representation by FDA experts on NIH study sections, for systematic FDA participation in NIH-sponsored seminars, conferences, etc. Far more must still be done along this line.

FDA needs to have the closest ties with NIH and, I might add, with the department of clinical pharmacology in teaching hospitals throughout the Nation.

### 5. IMPROVED COORDINATION BETWEEN FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

On the first day of its hearings, the subcommittee learned that there was, unfortunately, minimal systematic cooperation between the National Library of Medicine and the Food and Drug Administration.[12] FDA has desperate, urgent, and continuing needs for the widest variety of drug information. Yet, NLM had organized no special arrangements to afford FDA the information which it so vitally needs. Even the planners of the National Library's great computer program, Medlars "Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval Service," had not made advance provision for meeting FDA's particular drug requirements.

Now, fortunately, steps have been taken to service FDA on an improved basis through NLM.

In my judgment, however, FDA still is not getting a fraction of the information which it needs, when it needs, in the way it needs—promptly and easily, so as to discharge its tremendous obligations.

---

[2] Ibid. The revised charter will be published in a forthcoming hearing-exhibit volume, pt. 4.

[3] FDC reports, "The Pink Sheet," June 17, 1963.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 12, p. 15692.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 16, p. 22056.

[6] Pt. 1, p. 31.

[7] Drug Research Reports, Nov. 28, 1962, vol. 5, No. 47, p. 12.

[8] Ibid., Nov. 14, 1962, vol. 5, No. 45, p. 1.

[9] Medical Tribune, Oct. 15, 1962, p. 4.

[10] Spring, William S., Jr., M.D., and Honicker, Frank, Jr., "Drug Information for the Bio-Medical Community," "A Report of a Preliminary Study of the Needs for a National Drug Information Clearinghouse," report for the Public Health Service under Contract No. PH 86-63-130, Institute for Advancement of Medical Communication, Bethesda, Md., October 1963, pp. 78-82.

[11] To be published in pt. 4.

[12] Pt. 1, pp. 155-156.

### 6. STRENGTHENING INTERAGENCY COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES, INCLUDING U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Our subcommittee has examined, agency by agency, relationships between the Food and Drug Administration and numerous other organizations within the executive branch of the U.S. Government, over and above those which I have already mentioned.

I will cite but a single additional example—improving the relationship between the Department of Agriculture and the FDA. These 2 agencies work together on many difficult issues, such as pesticides. The relationship is not always as smooth as it should be. But things are looking up. One aspect of the situation was summed up by another recent writeup in a trade publication: [13]

"The Department of Agriculture has proposed that a formal 'memorandum of understanding' be reached with the Food and Drug Administration, but has conceded that efforts to work out such arrangements have been difficult.

"USDA's efforts were revealed in correspondence from Agriculture Secretary Freeman's office to Senator HUMPHREY'S (Democrat, of Minnesota), Reorganization Subcommittee. The subcommittee's interest was sparked by complaints from a drug firm which markets a drug that is also used as a larvacide and is subject to regulatory control by USDA's Pesticide Division. The company complained that it must deal 'with each agency independently' on problems of mutual concern.

"USDA told HUMPHREY that it is 'common practice' for USDA and FDA to exchange information informally, and noted that these 'exchanges of information are normally carried out by telephone.' Formation of a 'formal committee' to handle such matters 'would be difficult,' USDA said, adding that it has proposed a formal 'memorandum of understanding' to guide both agencies.

* * * * *

"The Humphrey subcommittee is expected to oversee the establishment of a 'memorandum of understanding' between USDA and FDA."

### 7. IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL TEAMWORK ON DRUGS

On September 20, 1963, the late President John F. Kennedy, in a historic address before the United Nations, proposed the establishment of a World Center for Health Communication, including adverse reactions to drugs.

It had been my privilege to urge such an effort on several occasions:

(a) In addresses [14] in Canada in March 1962;

(b) in a letter [15] to M. G. Candau, M.D., Director General, World Health Organization.

In the wake of the thalidomide tragedy, WHO had begun an effort along this line.

This year, in May, at the 16th World Health Assembly, WHO adopted two drug resolutions, one of which pertained to more "rapid dissemination of information on adverse drug reactions."

On November 5, 1963, Dr. Candau, in an informal response to my letter of encouragement, October 18, 1963, advised that in January 1964, the executive board of the World Health Organization will consider further steps for international drug cooperation.

It is my hope that the great World Center concept, so well advanced by the late President Kennedy, will be realized. I feel confident that President Lyndon B. Johnson will do everything within his power to help advance this concept into reality.

### 8. INFORMING THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND THE PUBLIC

In a special message [16] to the Congress last year, the late President John F. Kennedy emphasized the public's "right to be informed"—"to be given the facts it needs to make an informed choice." The scientific community must likewise be informed, as it, alone, can evaluate the technical details of scientific issues on behalf of the American public.[17] In connection with the rights of the scientific community, a trade publication recently commented [18] on another of the subcommittee's results:

"One result already apparent from the Humphrey study is a beginning of the loosening of the so-called confidentiality safeguards of FDA. * * * FDAers indicate now that in one area at least, methods of analysis for NDA's and petitions will be supplied interested parties."

But members of the medical profession have protested to the subcommittee that they are still denied elementary information to safeguard the lives of their patients. Their views are reflected to some extent in a recent report to the U.S. Public Health Service. In this report, William C. Spring, M.D. (who is, incidentally, a former research director of a distinguished pharmaceutical company and a former secretary of the Council on Drugs of the American Medical Association) wrote [19] with Mr. Frank Honicker, Jr. (also a former drug company staff member):

"We understand that the Food and Drug Administration would not at present notify anyone of such reactions (to investigational drugs—Ed.) reported to it, but some in the agency staff recognize that this is not in the best public interest. It is justifiable only so long as the public does not suffer too badly. But must one company duplicate iatrogenic deaths or serious illnesses when another has demonstrated that these occur? Must they even remain unaware of suspected casual relationships before confirmation?"

This, then, is an area for continuing subcommittee effort. We still have a long way to go toward giving the medical staffs of the pharmaceutical industry and of the scientific community, generally, the information they need.

### 9. PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS

Just as the subcommittee is interested in giving the scientific community information to which it is legitimately entitled, so we are interested in protecting genuine "trade secrets" which, under the law, are entitled to the full protection of confidentiality. I, therefore, called FDA's attention to weaknesses in the security of trade secrets, as held in files within the Division of Microbiology. FDA took steps to improve protection there.[20]

Later, when masses of investigational drug applications descended on FDA, as required under the new law, security measures were likewise taken by FDA. A drug trade publication stated: [21]

"FDA, at the urging of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, set up special security measures to protect the confidentiality of information submitted."

(I may say that, in general, FDA's security protection is still far from optimal; only a small portion of new drug applications file material does consist of genuine trade secrets, but it is not satisfactorily safeguarded.)

### 10. THE KEFAUVER-HUMPHREY AMENDMENT ON ANIMAL TESTING IN PUBLIC LAW 87-781

The provision of the Kefauver-Harris law with which the subcommittee and I are most closely associated, is the amendment offered by Senator KEFAUVER, with our support, to require that human beings not be used as guinea pigs; that new drugs be tested in animals before being tested in humans.

I had personally cosponsored the amendment. Later I prepared the modification of the amendment, which was enacted into law 2 months earlier, in August 1962, Senator KEFAUVER stated [22] in an address in the Senate:

"The distinguished Senator from Minnesota, chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, has just held informative hearings pointing up the urgency of doing something about such problems, so that unsafe drugs will not get on the market, so that the Food and Drug Administration will have better controls over testing, and so that tests will be made on animals larger than mice and more resembling man before a drug is distributed to physicians for testing.

* * * * *

"I know that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is particularly interested in (the) amendment making clear and precise the protection of the public against drugs which caused a near disaster, like thalidomide. * * *

"I want to commend the President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and others who are interested in getting corrective legislation for the protection of the health of the people of the Nation to correct serious abuses in the prescription drug field passed as soon as possible.

* * * * *

"This amendment (on animal testing) the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will discuss later, and he has shown fine leadership on it."

On the general effort to strengthen testing, George F. Archambault, D. Sc., Pharm. D., past president, American Pharmaceutical Association, has written: [23]

"Senator HUMPHREY * * * has rendered a most valuable service to the American people by his interest and attention in this vital health problem and legislation."

### 11. FOSTERING ACTIONS ON SPECIFIC DRUGS

As indicated earlier, I will not attempt to list all the many actions which we have fostered as regards specific drugs. Suffice it to say that physician after physician has contacted us so as to spur FDA to take some particular action on some particular drug. Many physicians had previously been disappointed in the relative lack of attention paid by FDA to prior medical appeals.

These private physicians have expressed the view that the Senate subcommittee has served as a form of lay spokesman—to help in interceding with FDA so as to make sure that expert professional judgment is carefully considered.

---

[13] Food Chemical News, Dec. 2, 1963, p. 14.

[14] Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 4, pp. 5116–1521.

[15] Pt. 2, exhibit 113, p. 696.

[16] "Consumers' Protection and Interest Program," H. Doc. 364, 87th Cong., Mar. 15, 1962, p. 2.

[17] See excerpts from report by President's Science Advisory Committee on Pesticides, reprinted in pt. 3, exhibit 169, p. 1193.

[18] Food Chemical News, Sept. 10, 1963.

[19] "Drug Information for the Bio-Medical Community," op. cit.

[20] Pt. 3, p. 810.

[21] Drug Trade News, July 24, 1963, p. 1.

[22] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, p. 15529.

[23] "A Drug Moves Into Human Trials: A Close Look at Drug Testing on Human Beings and at the Controls and Safeguards," presented before the Federal Service Pharmaceutical Seminar, American Pharmaceutical Association, Section on Military Pharmacy, at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., "Hospital Management," April 1963, p. 88.

I shall illustrate with but a single case. It involves a drug now on the market—a drug called to my attention literally within the past few days—a drug associated with several deaths. I shall not name the drug because it is still in the process of review by FDA.

An M.D. in one of America's great teaching hospitals called this drug to our attention. The M.D. is the coauthor of an article on this drug in the Journal of the American Medical Association. I promptly took up his letter with FDA. I am now awaiting the agency's reply.

What does this data say? Let me read from his unsolicited letter of December 2, 1963, because it so well illustrates the types of problems we have encountered:

"Let me suggest that a review of the history of (name of drug) will reveal weaknesses at many points in the accepted methods of insuring drug safety. As the facts are known to me, mistakes have been made at the following junctures:

"1. The preclinical data was not encompassing, insufficient emphasis being placed on the physiology of (type of function—ed.).

"2. Prior to unrestricted distribution, no controlled clinical tests were performed in humans on the effect of the drug on either (type of physiological function).

"3. Clinical case reporting as a means of collecting information on drug toxicity, has shown itself to be inefficient and unreliable. It is distressing that 17 cases with 11 deaths are reported from two hospitals. Extrapolation from these figures suggest that the nationwide incidence of acute (type of function) failure and death following (name of drug) must be in excess of one hundred.

"4. The manufacturers have been remiss in their responsibilities of informing the medical profession accurately of the evidence against their product. Further, by continuing to market (name of drug) in face of the mounting evidence against it, they demonstrate a shocking but apparently legal disregard for the public safety.

"5. Once data was accumulated, no responsible party has taken the decisive step to cause the drug to be removed from the market."

There this particular matter now stands. I do not presume to know what the final outcome will be.

I do know that the subcommittee has served to encourage the American medical community into speaking up for its own rights—including its right to have FDA take prompter action than heretofore.

### 12. FOSTERING INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

In the final analysis, the future of drug regulation rests, in large part, on the internal excellence within the Food and Drug Administration—excellence in administration, excellence in science. I am glad to state that FDA has been making some progress toward these ends.

The subcommittee's watchful interest has been a factor, we are told. For the first time, a congressional committee has devoted sustained attention to the agency's needs—an agency which tended to be forgotten except in time of some great crisis or tragedy.

But let this point be clear. The most important factor in FDA's improvement is that, for the first time, it is being given the necessary resources to do the job. We should never forget that for many years the executive branch did not request adequate funds for this vital agency. As late as 1956, a mere $6 million was the highest amount that had ever been requested of the Congress. Today, six times that figure is being made available and even that may be insufficient.

As I have stated time after time, it is not fair to expect the impossible from a relative handful of overworked, underpaid, underequipped, underappreciated professional personnel.

On August 23, 1962, I stated [24] in the Senate with respect to FDA's new drug division:

"We cannot expect 12 trained doctors who are overworked, none of them getting more than $15,000 a year—one could make more than that by treating ingrown toenails" (to do the impossible). "Here are professional doctors working their heads and hearts out."

The task of doctors in the Bureau of Medicine is fraught with difficulty. They face the dilemmas of too much regulation or too little regulation, of being too cautious or not being cautious enough, of being too fast to curb use of a drug with serious side effects but some benefits, or too slow.

Unfortunately, FDA has not backed up its own scientists sufficiently. But neither did the Nation back up FDA sufficiently. It is the Nation's achievement that this is now beginning to be corrected.

One of the important factors for FDA progress was the report by the second Citizens Advisory Committee on FDA. It made its report in October 1962. As a result of that report, FDA has made a modest reorganization of its structure, including a reorganization within the Bureau of Medicine. I do not agree with some of the elements in that CAC report, as it is known. But I do regard it as containing many useful suggestions.

Unfortunately, FDA has not been prompt about carrying out many of these suggestions. Even with the subcommittee's constant prodding the agency did not reorganize until as late as 13 months after the report. It has still to establish a National Advisory Council. Such a Council was recommended not only in the 1962 report, but in a series of reports [25] which have been made virtually every single year since 1955.

Here, again, such forward steps as have been taken represent achievements—not on the part of any one source—but on the part of all those interested in a better, stronger FDA. Yet the achievements in certain respects are quite limited. And there is danger in some future steps. A National Advisory Council—if "packed," for example, if filled with self-seeking influences, could become an instrument for reaction and for self-interest, rather than for progress and the public interest. So could specialized advisory panels. "Achievements" must not, therefore, be turned into instruments for turning the clock back to drug abuses.

### PART 2. SAMPLING OF LETTERS RECEIVED DURING A SINGLE MONTH—COMMENDING SUBCOMMITTEE'S AND SENATOR HUMPHREY'S DRUG EFFORTS

Chauncey D. Leake, School of Medicine, Department of Pharmacology, San Francisco Medical Center, University of California, San Francisco, Calif. (October 1, 1963): "You are doing so many things of great importance for the health professions and on behalf of the good health of our people that it is increasingly difficult to keep up with you. Congratulations on what you and your committee are accomplishing.

"I have just been able to get around to a study of the committee print entitled 'Drug Literature,' which was issued on August 30, 1963, and which is based on the admirable survey of the nature and magnitude of drug literature, by Winifred Sewell of the National Library of Medicine. With the important appendixes, this is a very helpful and important survey and clearly focuses attention on the magnitude of what confronts us with regard to satisfactory information on drugs."

Paul A. Bunn, M.D., professor of medicine, State University of New York, Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, N.Y. (Oct. 8, 1963): "You and your committee have done a fine job of organizing and investigating the problems of new agents to be used for the treatment of human ailments. I personally am grateful for that interest."

Harry F. Dowling, M.D., professor of medicine, College of Medicine, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill. (Oct. 14, 1963): "May I take this opportunity to express my high regard for your zeal in promoting good administration within the Federal service and to wish you success in your efforts."

C. M. Connelly for the editors of the Journal of General Physiology, published by the Rockefeller Institute Press, New York, N.Y. (Oct. 28, 1963): "We commend and support your efforts to improve standards of drug testing."

Scientist (name withheld) in Richardson Merrell Co. (Oct. 11 and 23, 1963): "Your memorandum, code No. H 9–1–63, A, entitled "Correct Drug Weaknesses, Senator HUMPHREY Urges FDA" puts a great deal of emphasis upon MER–29 which was marketed by * * * Richardson-Merrell * * * insofar as I can draw inference from my personal and extensive experience in this corporation I must approve completely everything that you have said about MER–29. Believe me, Senator, you have said some things that I did not know existed."

* * * * *

"I saw a discussion of your remarks to Congress concerning the recent grand jury action in the District of Columbia in which a Maryland physician who has allegedly committed fraud during the testing of certain drugs. The discussion and reproduction of your remarks were in the 'Blue Sheet.' I wish to express complete approval of the sentiments which you placed before Congress. Even the questions which you raise are pertinent, and I do not see how you could honestly have done a better job."

Arthur A. Stein, M.D., professor of pathology, the Albany Medical College of Union University, Albany, N.Y. (Oct. 10, 1963): "The work of the subcommittee is to be seriously and heartily congratulated."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is, in a sense, an annual report. I have submitted it with my remarks, because I can think of no field which more directly affects the health and well being of our people than the efficacy, the safety, the purity, and the therapeutic effects as well as the side effects of drugs and modern drug therapy.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move, according to the previous order——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If Senators will pardon me 1 minute, I had another matter to present.

## DESIGNATION OF DECEMBER 17 EACH YEAR AS WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House

---

[24] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 13, page 17388.

[25] Pt. 3, exhibit 138, p. 978.

Joint Resolution 335, to designate the 17th day of December each year as Wright Brothers Day.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the resolution to the desk?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if he wishes me to do so, but I should like to maintain my right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I did not relinquish the floor. Have I the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I should like to let the Senator from Florida know that I merely wish to clarify this point and then I shall yield the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. Is my understanding correct that when the Senator finishes it is his intention, as majority whip, to move the adjournment of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. So there would be no need for a quorum call, unless my friend the Senator from Florida insists.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator for that purpose. I am merely trying to get the Senate through its business with the least difficulty from now to the time of adjournment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there objection to my request that the committee be discharged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 335, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 335) designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on line 9, page 1, after the word "issue" to insert the word "annually".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 335) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 124 was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what is the Senator's request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To reconsider the vote on Senate Joint Resolution 124.

Mr. HOLLAND. On what subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 124 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am gratified by the Senate's action in passing House Joint Resolution 335, which would designate December 17 as Wright Brothers Day in commemoration of that historic first flight 60 years ago.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I was one of the cosponsors some years ago of a resolution establishing August 19, the anniversary date of the birth of Orville Wright, as National Aviation Day. It seems most fitting that December 17 now be set aside in special commemoration of the imagination and pioneering spirit of the Wright brothers.

It would be appropriate at this time, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent letter from the National Aeronautics Association to President Johnson requesting that he proclaim December 17 as Wright Brothers Day.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 4, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: December 17, 1963, marks the 60th anniversary of powered flight. An extensive program is being planned for December 16 and 17 at Kitty Hawk, N.C., to commemorate the historic achievements of the Wright brothers there in 1903. In addition, there will be special commemorative events held in major cities across the country, honoring the Wright brothers, climaxed by the Aero Club of Washington's memorial banquet here on December 17.

In March of this year House Joint Resolution 335 was introduced in the House of Representatives, calling for the designation of December 17 each year as Wright Brothers Day. This bill passed the House on October 7 and was forwarded to the Senate for action. It was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, where it now is. There is a question as to whether the bill will be acted on by the Senate before the historic date of December 17.

In view of the above, and the importance of flight to our Nation's cultural and economic development and to our security, we would appreciate very much receiving a message from the President regarding the historic significance of this 60th anniversary and the impact of the Wright brothers' achievements at Kitty Hawk in 1903.

We have taken the liberty of attaching a suggested statement for reference. In waiting for Senate action on House Joint Resolution 335, we have only a short period of time remaining before December 17 to distribute a statement by the President. Therefore, it would be greatly appreciated if such a statement could be received at an early date. Thank you for your consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
RALPH V. WHITENER,
*Chairman, 60th Anniversary of Flight Program Committee.*

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. CLARK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

## CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now obvious that it will be impossible to bring the motion to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 to a vote before the leadership exercises its unquestioned right to move to adjourn the Senate this afternoon. This I deeply deplore. I am confident that if the motion to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 could have been brought to a vote it would have been approved by a substantial majority of the Senate.

I see no point in continuing the obvious condition in which we find ourselves. It is clear to me, for reasons which I understand, although certainly I do not approve, that the leadership has no stomach for an effort to bring the motion to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 to a vote; and, without the support of the leadership, it obviously will be impossible for those of us who feel deeply about this matter to bring the matter to a vote or even, as I suggested earlier today, to keep the Senate in continuous session, to see if we could not break the filibuster against considering the resolution.

A word should be said about that filibuster. It has not been very obvious, either yesterday or today. That was because it need not be. There was never a time when some business did not have to be transacted in the national interest, or when some Senator did not wish to speak, on a variety of other subjects. Since there is no rule of germaneness in the Senate, that is within the purview of the Senate rules.

I am about to relinquish the floor, defeated again—not for the last time.

Someday—I hope before I die or leave the Senate—we shall beat this vicious custom of preventing a majority of the Senate from acting when a majority is ready to act. That is not today.

Yesterday I committed myself to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to place in the RECORD today those rules, practices, procedures and floor actions other than rule XXII which I thought should be the subject of consideration by the joint committee envisioned in Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 and which I believed it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the joint committee to consider if the amended resolution as brought to the floor by the Committee on Rules and Administration instead of the original resolution cosponsored by 31 Senators were enacted.

These are the Senate rules which I believe should be studied, amplified, amended, and probably changed, as a result of the consideration of such a joint committee: Rules IV, V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XIX, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXXII, XXXIV, XXXV.

There are a number of other matters which I fear, as a lawyer, would come within the prohibition for the joint committee to consider in dealing with the rules, practices, procedures, or floor action of either body. Among them would be an appropriate answer to the conflict-of-interest problem; an appropriate reorganization of the practices of the Senate which result from the actions of the Republican and Democratic steering and policy committees and the Republican and Democratic conferences; the 21-day rule in the House; the question of the power of the House Rules Committee; questions which I have raised as to whether we should not, as has been done in the judiciary, impose a limitation on the age at which Members of the House and of the Senate could continue to serve as chairmen of committees; a new procedure or practice, or rule, which would require recommendations of the President of the United States to be passed upon by both Houses of Congress within 6 months of the date of their submission to Congress, hopefully by July 4 or shortly thereafter.

I say passed upon. I do not mean adopted. I mean adopted, rejected, or passed with amendment.

The conduct of committee business is another matter, I fear, which would not be within the purview of the committee, as it too involves a question of rules, practices, and procedures.

With respect to floor action, I would strongly advocate, as a timesaver, the installation of voting machines in this body and in the House, as has been done in so many other legislative bodies.

I would like to see, for the benefit of Senators with a somewhat less foghorn-type voice than I have, the installation of microphones. Many of our beloved colleagues on the other side of the aisle, being unused, perhaps, as Republicans, to roaring at the hustings, as we Democrats are accustomed to do, have difficulty in making themselves heard across the center aisle.

This is an entirely incomplete list. I insert it in the RECORD only because I promised the Senator from Oklahoma I would.

I thank the Senator from Florida, with his invariable courtesy, for yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator made reference to a filibuster. This is the first word the Senator from Florida has had to say on the matter. He has not been conscious of a filibuster, but to the contrary, almost every time the Senator from Florida has been on the floor, a Senator has been speaking who has no relation to that minority of the Senate which is supposed to indulge from time to time in filibusters, which it has not done this year.

The Senator is in error in believing that a majority of the Senate is in accord with what he is trying to do, because I cannot conceive of any majority of the Senate being willing to submit to having its rules, practices, precedents, and matters of that kind decided in part by Members of the other body, which has entirely different format for the handling of its business, and needs to have a different set of rules.

So I think the Senator is in error in believing that a majority of the Senate is with him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The question now before the Senate is a motion to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution 1. The Senator from Florida may well be correct—I do not know whether he is or not—as to whether or not a majority of the Senate would support the amendment jointly to be offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself. I have no doubt that on a motion to take up, a majority of the Senate, if permitted to vote, would vote in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is an honest difference of opinion on that question. There is a serious question as to whether a majority of the Senate would want the rules, practices, and procedures of the Senate determined in part by Members of the other body. The traditions, the background, and the organization of the two bodies serving at opposite ends of the Capitol are so different that it is inconceivable to me that a majority of the Senate would agree to have Members of the other body redraft or recast its rules, or that Members of the House would agree to have Members of this body redraft or recast its rules, procedures, and precedents.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I say again, with all deference and the utmost respect, that the Senator's argument is irrelevant and immaterial to the issue before the Senate, which is whether the Senate shall take up consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has not incorporated in it the amendment to which the Senator from Florida refers. The question of whether the Case-Clark amendment shall be adopted is not before the Senate. The question is whether the motion to take up the resolution, made by the majority leader, shall be granted.

The point the Senator from Florida makes becomes pertinent only if that motion is approved, and only if the Case-Clark amendment is called up for discussion. It is not now relevant.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recognize the accuracy of that statement from the standpoint of the immediate situation, but lying on the desks of Senators is the printed amendment which would accomplish the Senator's purpose. So notice is given in advance that it will be proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania and his colleague the Senator from New Jersey. We all know that this particular amendment would restore a large part of the philosophy of the original proposed concurrent resolution which was submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from New Jersey, and the other Senators, and which was considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate. A resolution in amended form was reported by that committee, and it was that resolution with respect to which a motion to take up was made.

I believe that all Senators considering this question have complete knowledge of the fact that the real point at issue is the matter contained in the original resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators, and to which I think a large majority of the Senate strongly objects—to which certainly the Senator from Florida objects—that is, of allowing Members of the other body to have any part in formulating the rules of the Senate or Members of the Senate to have any part in formulating the rules of the other body.

That is the real issue as I see it, and it is before the Senate because of the presence on the desk of each Senator of the printed amendment and because of the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania at the beginning of the debate to the effect that he intended to try to have the resolution restored as he originally submitted it, rather than as it was reported by the committee.

I quote from the amendment as printed and as it lies on Senators' desks:

> (11) The rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, precedents of each House of Congress, and the consideration of any matter on the floor of each House.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator is so sure that he is correct, and if he is so sure that a majority of the Senate would reject the amendment, why are he and his colleagues unwilling to allow the Senate to vote on the matter, but, instead, resort to the filibuster?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, I have not been resorting to any filibuster, nor have I heard of any. In the second place, we are wasting a great deal of time which we cannot afford to waste. We are trying to dispose of the business of the Senate and of the Congress by December 20. We have all we can say grace over to do that. As the Senator from Florida said the other day on the floor, he has been busy literally day and night in appropriation's conferences, in the Committee on Agriculture, and in other important matters, in trying to carry on the work of the Senate, and as a result has been only rarely able to come to the floor of the Senate.

He believes that most Members of the Senate are just as busy in the effort to dispose of the business of the Senate in the short time remaining before we adjourn.

The Senator from Florida feels that there would be no justification in plunging into a long discussion, which apparently would take place when the Senator from Pennsylvania called up his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield. Before I do so, I wish to say that the Senator from Florida has in his mind a memory of some of the long discussions on their matter that were had during this session and during the last session of Congress by the Senator from Pennsylvania and by his colleagues who joined him.

Every Senator is entitled to his convictions in joining in the presentation of this particular concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1. The Senator from Florida felt, however, that, instead of there being a filibuster now, there would have been in the offing a filibuster if we had permitted this matter in which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and his associates are really interested, which is represented in the amendment which lies on Senators' desks, to be brought up now.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. All that the Senator has to do, if he thinks he is right, is, when the amendment is called up, to move to table the amendment, and in 10 minutes he can have the validity of his conviction tested.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Florida does not believe in dealing in such a summary fashion with matters with respect to which Senators have a great interest or strong convictions such as in this matter.

I do not believe I have ever made a motion to table, except on one occasion, and that was during the debate on the tidelands bill, when the Senator from Alabama, a friend of the Senator from Florida, had an amendment which had been pending for several days. I went over to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, and asked him if he would have any objection if I made a motion to table the amendment. He said, "No; it is probably a very good way to bring it to a head."

I do not remember making any other motion to table. That is not my way of transacting the business of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure that it would be possible to have a Senator on this side of the question move to table the amendment if it offended the sensibilities of my good friend from Florida to do so. If the worse came to worst, I would be glad to make the motion to table myself.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not accustomed to being on both sides of an issue. It never occurred to him that the Senator from Pennsylvania would wish to be in that position.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator may remember that at the request of the then majority leader, now President of the United States Johnson, I had no hesitation in moving to table the civil rights bill, because I thought it was in the best interest of the Senate to find out whether there were votes enough to pass it. I would be glad to do the same thing now.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Pennsylvania is certainly forthright.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to say only a word with respect to the matter that was discussed by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Florida. I have been unable to be in the Chamber this afternoon because I have been engaged in other matters. I was not present yesterday.

I now find that I have been charged with conducting a filibuster. I have long since become insensitive to any great pain as a result of that charge, and I do not object to it particularly in this instance. But it is rather strange that I should be charged with a filibuster when I had not been able to be on the floor and unable to be on Capitol Hill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was not able to be on Capitol Hill, yesterday afternoon and even this afternoon. Therefore, any filibuster in which I have been engaged must have been conducted by remote control.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is one of seven members of the Commission named by the President of the United States, which performs the very important duty for the Nation of finding out and announcing to the public everything that can be discovered in connection with the assassination of our late, beloved President.

I know that he has been in two of those meetings. I cannot conceive of anyone having charged him with filibustering, when everyone knows that attending those meetings has been his preferred duty on those 2 days.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I have no apology to make to anyone, anywhere, at any time for my position that the Senate of the United States through its own legislative machinery is perfectly capable of amending its own rules and that it is not necessary to seek a guardian or someone in loco parentis on the other side of the Capitol to compose rules for the operation of the Senate.

I realize that there are those who believe that parliamentary bodies are outmoded and no longer have any place in the scheme of government, and that, instead, a group of intellectuals should sit down and decide what is best for the people, and issue flaming edicts or ukases that would have the effect of law and which every person would immediately have to follow, under pain of some dire penalty being inflicted.

I do not believe that democracy has failed or that our republican system of government has failed, or is about to fail. I believe it is strong and vigorous today. I believe it is the light of hope that shines throughout the world for all men.

We have had an illustration of it in the past few days. Where else, Mr. President, can the power of government be transferred without the slightest confusion, without any chaos, without any controversy, or without shedding the blood of many people?

There are very few countries on this earth where the power of government can be transferred, either in the wake of some great tragedy, such as has befallen our country, or as the result of an election, as can be done in these United States.

It is done in Great Britain, but it has not always been the case there. There have been many times in Great Britain when the power to transfer the government resulted in internal wars, dissension, and misbehavior; but there has never been a time when the transfer of the power of government in Washington has caused any confusion. That is a great tribute to the American people.

It is a high tribute to the majesty of our form of government that even in the pain and sorrow that follow the assassination of a President or the bitterness that remains in the wake of a political campaign, the power of the government in this country is transferred from one hand to another without any war, without any death, without multitudes in the streets or troops firing on the people or students demonstrating, as is the case in so many other countries. Why is that so? It is because of the wonderful system of government that was devised by the Founding Fathers.

Here we have a legislative body that gives to every person, even in the most remote part of our land, a feeling that he has a voice in Washington. There is no need for him to get his shotgun or to go into the streets to protest, because he can write a letter to his Senator or Representative. He is represented in the legislative branch, in the executive branch by the President, who has been elected, and by the judiciary, as well. He is protected by the balances of our system of three equal and coordinate branches of government.

Mr. President, if ever that system should be struck down, if ever Congress should be emasculated and made a mere figurehead, it would not be possible to transfer the power of government in this country without bloodshed, without confusion, not only in Washington, but throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Georgia is saying. It should be in the record. The public should think along the lines that he is suggesting.

I should like to have the Senator recall, if he will, that as far back as 1877, when there was trouble over the question of who had been elected in this great country, and when each party claimed it had won the election—the contest, as will be remembered, was between Tilden and Hayes, inauguration day was approaching, and the question still had not been cleared up—Congress appointed a commission to hear the evidence. The evidence was taken, and the commission, not by a unanimous vote, but by a simple majority, decided that one of those two men, Rutherford B. Hayes, was the duly elected President. Everyone accepted the decision. The inauguration took place without incident. The Government passed from one President to another.

That was at a time shortly after the great division in our country which is referred to as the War Between the States or the Civil War. Yet even in those days and at that time the decision of that commission was respected and was followed, and a peaceful government immediately took office following the inauguration on March 4. Does the Senator from Georgia recall that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do. The occurrence the Senator describes graphically illustrates the value of Congress. Congress had to provide the machinery for determining the election. If the President had undertaken to do so on a purely partisan basis, without both parties being represented, there would have been war at that time throughout the country. Already men were gathering around the courthouses, so our histories tell us, bringing their weapons with them and preparing to move on to Washington to fight for their respective nominees, both of whom claimed the election.

But the fact that Congress was present and had the same rules that some Senators want to have abolished made it certain that every person was represented by a Member of Congress who took part in that decision, thus avoiding a great calamity—not merely a sectional strife, but an internal civil war that might have resulted in bloodshed on the streets of every community in the land where the two parties were represented.

I have no apologies whatever for my insistence that the Senate is capable of making its own rules. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He can submit resolutions, to be referred to that committee, world without end—and he has almost done that. He has done so in every form, shape, and fashion; but few of them have come to the floor of the Senate.

Yet anyone who opposes his own peculiar ideas about how Congress should be regimented and made over completely servile to the executive branch or totally innocuous as an organ of Government is, in his eyes, either a reactionary or a filibusterer.

For my part, I would be ashamed to charge filibustering to anyone after the little discussion that has taken place on the motion made late yesterday afternoon. This is merely a powderpuff effort to bring up a resolution. It is not even a "pillow fight."

I noticed that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania said he was getting ready to publish another book, to be entitled "Congress, the Withered Branch." I suppose he will point to this resolution as a glowing illustration of the complete ineffectiveness of Congress and its inability to serve the people of the United States. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will make a more determined effort than that before he undertakes to use this kind of speech as the wellspring for a book that would prove that Congress is merely a withered branch.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Georgia recall that the new President, President Johnson, in his able, eloquent address before the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress last Wednesday, found opportunity to express his belief in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch, and stated he would never do anything to destroy either?

Mr. RUSSELL. The President showed a fine comprehension of where the great strength of our Government reposes—namely, in the division of powers through the system of checks and balances, under which none of the three branches can run roughshod over the others, but where there must be a coordination of effort and of understanding under, praise God, a written Constitution. Even if we depart from it at times, the Constitution stands like a beacon light, to which we can return when we have seen the error of our ways. We can come back to the landmarks that our fathers have set.

Congress is serving its purpose. If the time ever comes when Congress thinks it is functus officio, that it has no other purpose or meaning, and abolishes itself, we will see the saddest day that has ever arrived, because when we destroy any of the three branches of Government, it will mean the complete destruction of the American way of life and the death of liberty and the privileges of the American citizen.

## ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after listening to the remarkable addresses that have been delivered today, I wish to place in the RECORD an admirable address delivered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Arkansas delivered the address on the occasion of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards to those persons who had gained distinction in the career of government service. Chairman FULBRIGHT was present to honor five distinguished award winners for 1963: Mr. Weber, Mr. Loomis, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Wessenauer, and Mr. Astin, all career government servants.

I wish to note in particular, for special emphasis, that Dr. Carl Marcy, chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was one of the recipients of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards. Dr. Marcy is a gifted, talented man. He is an extremely able individual and has given wonderful service and guidance to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is highly respected by every member of the committee, regardless of party.

I invite the attention of Senators in particular to Senator FULBRIGHT's message in reference to some of the developments in our social and political structures in the United States. He made an eloquent plea for tolerance and understanding, and a fearless attack upon the voices of hatred, bigotry, and intolerance. His was a remarkable address—not merely a speech. It was a scholarly approach to the complex subjects of this nature, and was most characteristic of the Senator from Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

(Address by Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, at Rockefeller public service awards presentation luncheon, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C. December 5, 1963)

It is an honor and a privilege for me to participate in this presentation of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards for 1963. These awards are the highest and most valued honor accorded by a private source for career Government service. The recipients, both past and present are outstanding public servants who have served their country with intelligence and dedication. We are all indebted to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, III, for making these awards possible and to Princeton University for its administration of the award program as a national trust.

I am indeed pleased to join in honoring the five distinguished award winners for 1963: Mr. Weber, Mr. Loomis, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Wessenauer, and Mr. Astin. If I may inject a personal note, I should like to express my pride and pleasure—which I know is shared by every member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that one of the winners is Mr. Carl Marcy, our committee chief of staff.

As we mourn the death of President Kennedy, it is fitting that we reflect on the character of our society and ask ourselves whether the assassination of the President was merely a tragic accident or a manifestation of some deeper failing in our lives and in our society.

It may be that the tragedy was one which could have occurred anywhere at any time to any national leader. It may be that the cause lies wholly in the tormented brain of the assassin. It may be that the Nation as a whole is healthy and strong and entirely without responsibility for the great misfortune which has befallen it. It would be comforting to think so.

I for one do not think so. I believe that our society, though in most respects decent, civilized, and humane, is not, and has never been, entirely so. Our national life, both past and present, has also been marked by a baleful and incongruous strand of intolerance and violence.

It is in evidence all around us. It is in evidence in the senseless and widespread crime that makes the streets of our great cities unsafe. It is in evidence in the malice and hatred of extremist political movements. And it is in evidence in the cruel bigotry of race that leads to such tragedies as the killing of Negro children in a church in Alabama.

**We must ask ourselves many questions about this element of barbarism in a civilized society. We must ask ourselves what its sources are, in history and in human nature. We must ask ourselves whether it is the common and inevitable condition of man or whether it can be overcome. And if we judge that it can be overcome, we must ask ourselves why we Americans have not made greater progress in doing so. We must ask ourselves what, if anything, all this has to do with the death of our President. Finally, and most important, we must ask ourselves what we must do, and how and when, to overcome hatred and bigotry and to make America as decent and humane a society as we would like it to be.**

**I do not pretend to be able to answer these questions. I do suggest, however, that the conditions of our time call for a national self-examination although the process may be a long and difficult and painful one. I further suggest, and most emphatically, that if such a national self-examination is to be productive it must be conducted in a spirit of tolerance rather than anger, serenity rather than guilt, and Christian charity rather than crusading moralism.**

**We might begin our reflections about ourselves by an examination of the effects of crusading self-righteousness, in the history of Western civilization and in our own society.**

**Moral absolutism—righteous, crusading, and intolerant—has been a major force in the history of Western civilization. Whether religious or political in form, movements of crusading moralism have played a significant, and usually destructive, role in the evolution of Western societies. Such movements, regardless of the content of their doctrines, have all been marked by a single characteristic: The absolute certainty of their own truth and virtue. Each has regarded itself as having an exclusive pipeline to Heaven, to God, or to a deified concept of history—or whatever is regarded as the ultimate source of truth. Each has regarded itself as the chosen repository of truth and virtue and each has regarded all nonbelievers as purveyors of falsehood and evil.**

**Absolutist movements are usually crusading movements. Free as they are from any element of doubt as to their own truth and virtue, they conceive themselves to have a mission of spreading the truth and destroying evil. They consider it to be their duty to regenerate mankind, however little it may wish to be regenerated. The means which are used for this purpose, though often harsh and sometimes barbaric, are deemed to be wholly justified by the nobility of the end. They are justified because the end is absolute and there can be no element of doubt as to its virtue and its truth.**

**Thus it is that in the name of noble purposes men have committed unspeakable acts of cruelty against one another. The medieval Christians who burned heretics alive did not do so because they were cruel and sadistic; they did it because they wished to exorcise evil and make men godly and pure. The Catholic and Protestant armies which inflicted upon Europe 30 years of death and destruction in the religious wars of the 17th century did not do so because they wished anyone harm; on the contrary, they did it for the purpose of saving Christendom from sin and damnation.**

In our own time the crusading movements have been political rather than religious, but their doctrines have been marked by the same conviction of absolute truth and the same zeal to perpetuate it. Thus the German Nazis, with their fervent belief in a primitive racial myth, murdered 6 million Jews in their zeal to elevate mankind by ridding it of a race that they deemed venal and inferior. Similarly, the Russian Communists under Stalin, who, as Djilas writes, was a man "capable of destroying nine-tenths of the human race to 'make happy' the one-tenth"—killed millions of their own people and consigned countless others to the slave labor camps of Siberia in order to pave the way for a society in which all men should be equal and happy and free. And the Chinese Communists of the present are able to contemplate with equanimity a nuclear war in which hundreds of millions would be killed because of their conviction that such a war would destroy capitalism and lead to a higher and nobler civilization.

The strand of fanaticism and violence has been a major one in Western history. But it has not been the only one, nor has it been the dominant one in most Western societies. The other strand of Western civilization, conceived in ancient Greece and Rome and revived in the European age of reason, has been one of tolerance and moderation, of empiricism and practicality. Its doctrine has been democracy, a radically different kind of doctrine whose one "absolute" is the denial of absolutes and of the messianic spirit. The core of the democratic idea is the element of doubt as to the ability of any man or any movement to perceive ultimate truth. Accordingly, it has fostered societies in which the individual is left free to pursue truth and virtue as he imperfectly perceives them, with due regard for the right of every other individual to pursue a different, and quite possibly superior, set of values.

Democratic societies have by no means been free of self-righteousness and the crusading spirit. On the contrary, they have at times engaged in great crusades to spread the gospel of their own ideology. Indeed, no democratic nation has been more susceptible to this tendency than the United States, which in the past generation has fought one war to "make the world safe for democracy," another to achieve nothing less than the "unconditional surrender" of its enemies, and even now finds it possible to consider the plausibility of "total victory" over communism in a thermonuclear war.

It is clear that democratic nations are susceptible to dogmatism and the crusading spirit. The point, however, is that this susceptibility is not an expression but a denial of the democratic spirit. When a free nation embarks upon a crusade for democracy, it is caught up in the impossible contradiction of trying to use force to make men free. The dogmatic and crusading spirit in free societies is an antidemocratic tendency, a lingering vestige of the strand of dogmatism and violence in the Western heritage.

Although no Western nation has completely dispelled the absolutist spirit of the crusades and the religious wars, some have been more successful than others. The most successful of all, I believe—at least among those nations which have had an important impact on the world beyond their own frontiers—has been England. For a number of complex historical reasons, while most of Europe remained under absolute monarchs and an absolute church, England evolved very gradually into a pluralistic society under a constitutional government. By the time of the establishment of the English colonies in the new world, the evolution toward constitutional democracy was well advanced. The process quickly took hold in the North American colonies and their evolution toward democracy outpaced that of the mother country. This was the basic heritage of America—a heritage of tolerance, moderation, and individual liberty that was implanted from the very beginnings of European settlement in the new world. America has quite rightly been called a nation that was born free.

There came also to the new world the Puritans, a minor group in England who became a major force in American life. Their religion was Calvinism, an absolutist faith with a stern moral code promising salvation for the few and damnation for the many. The intolerant, witchhunting Puritanism of 17th-century Massachusetts was not a major religious movement in America. It eventually became modified and as a source of ethical standards made a worthy contribution to American life. But the Puritan way of thinking, harsh and intolerant, permeated the political and economic life of the country and became a major secular force in America. Coexisting uneasily with our English heritage of tolerance and moderation, the Puritan way of thinking has injected an absolutist strand into American thought—a strand of stern moralism in our public policy and in our standards of personal behavior.

The Puritan way of thinking has had a powerful impact on our foreign policy. It is reflected in our traditional vacillation between self-righteous isolation and total involvement and in our attitude toward foreign policy as a series of idealistic crusades rather than as a continuing defense of the national interest. It is reflected in some of the most notable events of our history: in the unnecessary war with Spain, which was spurred by an idealistic fervor to liberate Cuba and ended with our making Cuba an American protectorate; in the war of 1917, which began with a national commitment to "make the world safe for democracy" and ended with our repudiation of our own blueprint for a world order of peace and law; in the radical pacifism of the interwar years which ended with our total involvement in a conflict in which our proclaimed objective of "unconditional surrender" was finally achieved by dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Throughout the 20th century American foreign policy has been caught up in the inherent contradiction between our English heritage of tolerance and accommodation and our Puritan heritage of crusading righteousness. This contradiction is strikingly illustrated by the policy of President Wilson in World War I. In 1914 he called upon the American people to be neutral in thought as well as in their actions; in early 1917, when the United States was still neutral, he called upon the belligerents to compromise their differences and accept a "peace without victory"; but in the spring of 1918, when the United States had been involved in the war for a year, he perceived only one possible response to the challenge of Germany in the war: "Force, force to the utmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force which shall make right the law of the world, and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust."

The danger of any crusading movement issues from its presumption of absolute truth. If the premise is valid, then all else follows. If we know, with absolute and unchallengeable certainty, that a political leader is traitorous, or that he is embarked upon a course of certain ruin for the Nation, then it is our right, indeed our duty, to carry our opposition beyond constitutional means and to remove him by force or even murder. The premise, however, is not valid. We do not know, nor can we know, with absolute certainty that those who disagree with us are wrong. We are human and therefore fallible, and being fallible, we cannot escape the element of doubt as to our own opinions and convictions. This, I believe, is the core of the democratic spirit. When we acknowledge our own fallibility, tolerance and compromise become possible and fanaticism becomes absurd.

Before I comment on recent events, it is necessary to mention another major factor in the shaping of the American national character. That factor is the experience of the frontier, the building of a great nation out of a vast wilderness in the course of a single century. The frontier experience taught us the great value of individual initiative and self-reliance in the development of our resources and of our national economy. But the individualism of the frontier, largely untempered by social and legal restraints, has also had an important influence on our political life and on our personal relations. It has generated impatience with the complex and tedious procedures of law and glorified the virtues of direct individual action. It has instilled in us an easy familiarity with violence and vigilante justice. In the romanticized form in which it permeates the television and other mass media, the mythology of the frontier conveys the message that killing a man is not bad as long as you don't shoot him in the back, that violence is only reprehensible when its purpose is bad and that in fact it is commendable and glorious when it is perpetrated by good men for a good purpose.

The murder of the accused assassin of President Kennedy is a shocking example of the spirit of vigilante justice. Compounding one crime with another, this act has denied the accused individual of one of the most basic rights of a civilized society: The right to a fair trial under established procedures of law. No less shocking are the widespread expressions of sympathy and approval for the act of the man who killed the accused assassin. Underlying these expressions of approval is an assumption that it is not killing that is bad but only certain kinds of killing, that it is proper and even praiseworthy for a citizen to take justice into his own hands when he deems his purpose to be a just one or a righteous act of vengeance. This attitude is a prescription for anarchy. Put into general practice, it would do far more to destroy the fabric of a free society than the evils which it purports to redress.

The mythology of the frontier, the moral absolutism of our puritan heritage, and of course other factors which I have not mentioned, have injected a strand of intolerance and violence into American life. This violent tendency lies beneath the surface of an orderly, law-abiding democratic society, but not far beneath the surface. When times are normal, when the country is prosperous at home and secure in its foreign relations, our violent and intolerant tendencies remain quiescent and we are able to conduct our affairs in a rational and orderly manner. But in times of crisis, foreign or domestic, our underlying irrationality breaks through to become a dangerous and disruptive force in our national life.

Since World War II times have not been normal; they are not normal now, nor are they likely to be for as far into the future as we can see. In this era of nuclear weapons and cold war, we live with constant crises and the continuing and immediate danger of incineration by hydrogen bombs. We are a people who have faced dangers before but we have always been able to overcome them by direct and immediate action. Now we are confronted with dangers vastly greater than we or any other nation has ever before known and we see no end to them and no solutions to them. Nor are there any solutions. There are only possibilities, limited, intermittent, and ambiguous, to alleviate the dangers of our time. For the rest, we have no choice but to try to live with the unsolved problems of a revolutionary world.

Under these conditions, it is not at all surprising that the underlying tendencies toward violence and crusading self-righteousness have broken through the surface and become a virulent force in the life and politics of the postwar era. They have not thus far been the dominant force because the Nation has been able to draw on the considerable resources of wisdom, patience, and judgment which are the core of our national heritage and character. The dominance of reason, however, has been tenuous and insecure and on a number of occasions in these years of crisis we have come close to letting our passions shape critical decisions of policy.

American politics in the postwar period has been characterized by a virulent debate between those who counsel patience and reason and those who, in their fear and passion, seem ever ready to plunge the Nation into conflict abroad and witch hunts at home. As the years of crisis have gone on, the politics of the Nation have been poisoned by the increasingly irresponsible charges of those zealots who, as President Kennedy would have said in his undelivered Dallas speech, assume that "words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory, and that peace is a sign of weakness."

The voices of suspicion and hate have been heard throughout the land. They were heard a decade ago when statesmen, private citizens, and even high-ranking members of the armed forces were charged with treason, subversion, and communism, because they had disagreed with or somehow displeased the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy. They are heard today when extremist groups do not hesitate to call a former President or the Chief Justice of the United States a traitor and a Communist. They are heard in the mail which U.S. Senators receive almost daily charging them with communism or treason because they voted for the foreign aid bill or for the nuclear test ban treaty.

If I may, I should like to read a section of a letter which I recently received from a person called John Haller of Greenville, Pa., who writes on stationery carrying the letterhead, "In Defense of the Constitution." The letter is not atypical. It reads, in part, as follows:

"Just heard on the news that you are defending the wheat sale to Russia and are for giving them credit at the American taxpayers' expense.

"For some time now I have been checking your record and find that you would make a better Communist than you make an American. Any proposals that would protect America or our free-enterprise system are opposed by you and any proposals that would help our enemies are given your whole hearted support. Your famous memorandum is a disgrace and you are a traitor to the Constitution."

This malice and hatred which have become a part of our politics cannot be dismissed as the normal excesses of a basically healthy society. They have become far too common. They are beyond the pale of normal political controversy in which honest men challenge each other's judgment and opinions but not each other's motives and integrity. The excesses of the extremists in our country have created an intolerable situation in which we must all guard our words and the expression of an unorthodox point of view is an extraordinary act of courage.

It was in this prevailing atmosphere of suspicion and hate that the murder of the President was spawned, whatever its immediate causes may have been. In an atmosphere in which dissent can be regarded as treason, in which violence is glorified and romanticized, in which direct action is widely preferred to judicial action as a means of redressing grievances, assassination is not really a radical departure from acceptable behavior. As Chief Justice Warren said in his eulogy of President Kennedy: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by the forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

What is to be done? What must we do to overcome hatred and bigotry in our national life?

For a start, we can call forth the basic decency of America in the wake of the tragedy which has befallen us. Again, in the words of the Chief Justice:

"If we really love this country; if we truly love justice and mercy; if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us and the bitterness that begets violence.

"Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?"

It is to be hoped, profoundly to be hoped, that there will be some redemption for the death of our President. That redemption could issue from a national revulsion against extremism and violence, from a calling forth of the basic decency and humanity of America to heal the wounds of divisiveness and hate. We will, and should, continue to have controversy and debate in our public life. But we can reshape the character of our controversies and conduct them as the honest differences of honest men in quest of a consensus. We can come to recognize that those who disagree with us are not necessarily attacking us but only our opinions and ideas. Above all, we must maintain the element of doubt as to our own convictions, recognizing that is was not given to any man to perceive ultimate truth and that, however unlikely it may seem, there may in fact be truth or merit in the views of those who disagree with us.

On another level, we must do more than we are now doing in the way of organized public effort to explore the depths of human motivation. We must learn more than we now know about the pathological roots and the therapeutic treatment of violence and unreasoning passion in human behavior. "Passions," writes Eric Hoffer, "usually have their roots in that which is blemished, crippled, incomplete, and insecure within us. The passionate attitude is less a response to stimuli from without than an emanation of an inner dissatisfaction."[1] We must seek the means, in our homes and in our schools and in community programs of mental health, of overcoming that which is "crippled, incomplete, and insecure within us" and of bringing meaning, fulfillment, and dignity into the lives of all Americans.

Furthermore, if we are to overcome violence and bigotry in our national life, we must alter some of the basic assumptions of American life and politics. We must recognize that the secular puritanism which we have practiced, with its principles of absolute good, absolute evil, and intolerance of dissent, has been an obstacle to the practice of democracy at home and the conduct of an effective foreign policy. We must recognize that the romanticized cult of the frontier, with its glorification of violence and of unrestrained individualism, is a childish and dangerous anachronism in a nation which carries the responsibility of the leadership of the free world in the nuclear age.

Finally, we must revive and strengthen the central core of our national heritage, which is the legacy of liberty, tolerance, and modernization that came to us from the ancient world through a thousand years of English history and three centuries of democratic evolution in North America. It is this historic legacy which is the best and the strongest of our endowments. It is our proper task to strengthen and cultivate it in the years ahead. If we do so, patiently and faithfully, we may arrive before too long at a time when the voices of hate will no longer be heard in our land and the death of our President will be redeemed.

---

[1] "The Passionate State of Mind," p. 1.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AT NOON

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, December 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of December 5), 1963:

#### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

William Jack Howard, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

#### U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as indicated:

*To be lieutenant general*

Maj. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

*To be general*

Gen. James Francis Collins O16819, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as indicated:

Lt. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris O18518, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

#### U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

*To be lieutenant generals*

Maj. Gen. Cecil M. Childre 1551A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin J. Webster 974A, Regular Air Force.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men.*

O Thou spirit of the living God, grant that a longing for obedience to Thy divine will may be woven into the very texture and fabric of our human nature.

May we guard ourselves against the temptations and dangers which threaten to undermine our loyalty to those moral ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained.

Deliver us from selfishness and self-seeking and may we daily bear testimony by doing good unto all the members of the human family that we are seeking to bring unto mankind the spirit of brotherhood.

Show us how we may enlarge the areas of fellowship and cooperation among the nations of the earth, with none seeking its own advantage and welfare.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord, who came to show us the way to the more abundant life. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 927. An act to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title;

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; and

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week.

### THE LATE SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise with profound sorrow and great grief to inform the House of the death yesterday at the age of 85 of Herbert H. Lehman, a great American.

Today at this hour President Johnson was to present to him the Presidential Freedom Medal awarded to him by President Kennedy. The citation accompanying that medal reads:

> Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of the Government and has made politics the highest form of public service.

Governor Lehman had one of the most remarkable and distinguished records of public service in the history of our country, including a political career spanning the period from Alfred E. Smith to John F. Kennedy. Time and again the voters of New York elected him to high office—twice as Lieutenant Governor, four times as Governor, and twice as U.S. Senator. Few men have been held in such esteem and affection by the people. I can think of no one more deserving.

Governor Lehman was a compassionate and humane Governor. The 10 years of his administrations are unexcelled in the annals of New York State.

Senator Lehman will be remembered as the voice of liberalism in the Senate during the hysteria of the 1950's. A courageous fighter for civil rights, civil liberties, and a fair and just immigration policy, he was rightly known as the conscience of the Senate.

His retirement from the Senate in 1956 did not mean rest from political combat. Rather his deep concern for the welfare of New York motivated him at the age of 80 to lead another cause, the cause of political decency and reform within the Democratic Party. He fought fiercely against the boss system, inspiring thousands of amateurs to become active in grassroots politics.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to work closely with Governor Lehman during the past 5 years in our fight for political reform. I knew him as a man of deep conviction—an idealist and humanitarian who believed in the essential worth and dignity of every individual.

To know him was to love him. I will always cherish the memory of the hours I spent with him, talking with him in his study about issues close to his heart or campaigning with him on the street corners of New York.

Only last weekend he described to me his deep feeling of sorrow at the tragic loss of President Kennedy. As usual, he was looking forward, concerned about his country but confident in the ultimate triumph of reason and tolerance.

Governor Lehman will serve always as a guiding spirit in the everlasting fight against bigotry and tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his career Governor Lehman relied completely upon his beloved and devoted wife, Edith. She was his constant inspiration. In this hour of her grief, I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lehman and their children.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD several editorials about Herbert H. Lehman.

The New York Times editorial of December 6:

#### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the Governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and national Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

The New York Herald Tribune editorial of December 6:

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired, and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was then already 50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehrman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National, and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime votegetter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity, and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

The Washington Post editorial of December 6:

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

There was so much simple goodness, generosity, and grace in Herbert Lehman that one rarely thought of him as suited to the tough realities of American political life. He neither looked nor talked like a politician. Nevertheless the roster of public offices which he won, and filled with nobility and effectiveness, testified to a powerful political appeal rooted in the extraordinary qualities of conviction and courage which he brought into public life.

Entering politics at 50, after a notable career in business and banking, Herbert Lehman teamed with Franklin D. Roosevelt to become Lieutenant Governor of New York, then Governor for four terms when F.D.R. went to the White House, and finally U.S. Senator. In between, he served as director of the wartime Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation and as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Help for those whom the war had made helpless could not have been entrusted to more devoted hands.

A product of Wall Street and a multimillionaire, Herbert Lehman was an unreserved champion of underdogs and of progressive political ideas through the whole of his public career. If he never became a power in the Senate or a member of its inner circle, he exercised influence nonetheless because, for the country at large, he symbolized sincerity. The dauntlessness with which this quiet, unpretentious little man challenged Joe McCarthy, the Senate's bully, illuminated the murkiness of a shabby decade in American politics. The country owes much to Herbert Lehman for its recovery from McCarthyism.

Senator Lehman's efforts to infuse charity and reason into American immigration policy may well constitute his most significant contribution. He was an implacable foe of the national origins quota system. That system has not yet been extirpated from the immigration statutes; but a proposal for abandonment of it was sent to Congress not long ago by John F. Kennedy. Its enactment would be Herbert Lehman's best monument.

Had he lived and held his health, Herbert Lehman would have been among those to be given the Presidential Medal of Freedom at the White House today. No one deserved it more. No one could have defended freedom more fervently.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying public tribute to the memory of the late Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, whose death December 5 has saddened the Nation.

Senator Lehman was a kindhearted and modest man who never retreated on basic principles in his devotion to progressive and humanitarian causes. He was one of the great champions of the New Deal and a close associate of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Without question he was one of the most popular and beloved men who ever represented his State in public office. I join with my colleagues in Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and other members of his family.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts of an article which appeared recently in the Washington Post:

### LEHMAN'S RECORD FOR PUBLIC SERVICE UNRIVALED

NEW YORK, December 5.—Herbert Lehman, 85, who died here today, was the only man in the past century to hold all the highest elective posts in New York State.

Few can match the Lehman record for public service—4 years as Lieutenant Governor, 10 years as Governor, 7 years as U.S. Senator, and the first Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

He came from a background of great wealth, but Mr. Lehman was one of the great liberal voices of the Democratic Party for a generation.

In the State he carried on the social reform programs of former Govs. Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the Senate in Washington he was a strong advocate of international cooperation with friendly countries and was one of the early opponents of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

It was not until 1928, when he was 50 years old—a time when many begin to think about eventual retirement—that Mr. Lehman gave up a $2-million-a-year investment banking career to seek public office.

He was elected to two 2-year terms as Lieutenant Governor under Mr. Roosevelt. In 1932, when Mr. Roosevelt was elected President, Mr. Lehman won the first of four consecutive gubernatorial elections. (The Governor's term was extended to 4 years with his last election in 1938.)

He lost only one election. That was in 1946 when he ran for the Senate and was defeated by Irving M. Ives, a Republican. But in 1949 he won a special election to the Senate and the next year was reelected to a full 6-year term. He did not seek reelection in 1956.

Although he lacked the flamboyance of an Al Smith or Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Lehman was an impressive votegetter in his own right. He defeated such persons as Robert Moses (for Governor in 1934), Thomas E. Dewey (for Governor in 1938), and John Foster Dulles (for the Senate in 1949).

Mr. Lehman was born in a brownstone house on East 62d Street on March 28, 1878. His father, Mayer, a German immigrant, was a founder of the Cotton Exchange and of Lehman Bros., investment banking firm.

The youngest of eight children, Mr. Lehman attended Dr. Sach's Collegiate Institute and Williams College and joined J. Spencer Turner Co., a textile firm. He became vice president and treasurer in 1906 and 2 years later he joined Lehman Bros. as a full partner.

In World War I, Mr. Lehman was first a civilian aid to Mr. Roosevelt, who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In August 1917, although he was several years over the age for military service, he entered the Army as a captain assigned to the General Staff. He became a colonel, assigned to supplying oversea troops. After the armistice he served as assistant to the Secretary of War, supervising the return of supplies, and received the Distinguished Service Medal.

A man always interested in the community around him, Mr. Lehman was caught by the humanitarian approach to government displayed by the then Governor Smith. In 1924, at Governor Smith's request, he successfully mediated a threatened garment strike.

In 1926, he managed Mr. Smith's gubernatorial campaign and 2 years later became finance director of the Democratic National Committee and worked for Mr. Smith's presidential campaign.

**It was Al Smith who conjured up the team of Roosevelt and Lehman to help carry New York State in the 1928 election.**

**Mr. Roosevelt's health and his national activities caused frequent absences from Albany and Mr. Lehman found himself Acting Governor on the average of 3 months a year. Mr. Roosevelt referred to Mr. Lehman as "my good right arm."**

**Although presidential maneuverings caused estrangement of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Smith, both united to force Mr. Lehman's gubernatorial nomination in 1932 over the opposition of Tammany Hall.**

**Mr. Lehman occupied the Albany executive mansion during most of the troublesome depression years. As Governor, he inherited a $114 million deficit from Mr. Roosevelt. When he left office 10 years later, he reported a $54 million surplus in the State accounts.**

**With Mr. Roosevelt in Washington and Mr. Lehman in Albany, the State administration became known as "the Little New Deal."**

**Mr. Lehman promoted municipal powerplants and armed the public service commission with greater rate-cutting powers. Cities were permitted municipal housing authorities—the pioneer for public housing. The State made housing loans. Unemployment insurance was introduced. Self-liquidating public works were advanced. Workmen's compensation was broadened.**

**In November 1942, President Roosevelt named Mr. Lehman director of a new office of foreign relief and rehabilitation set up in the State Department to aid war victims in liberated areas. On December 2, when his Albany term had less than a month to run, Governor Lehman resigned.**

**In 1949 the Democrats again nominated Mr. Lehman for the Senate to fill the term of the late Robert F. Wagner. This time he won, defeating Mr. Dulles. He was elected to a full 6-year term the next year over Joe R. Hanley.**

**Mr. Lehman, at age 78, declined to seek reelection when his Senate term expired in 1956.**

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

**Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.**

**The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?**

**There was no objection.**

**Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that on Monday next several bills will be considered, one involving a matter here in the District of Columbia, and another a conference report, which will probably mean several record votes.**

**I want the Members to know the situation, and I would appreciate it if the offices of the Members who are absent will see that they are notified, so that they will know of the program.**

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

**Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.**

**A call of the House was ordered.**

**The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:**

[Roll No. 222]

**Abbitt**
**Abele**
**Addabbo**
**Albert**
**Ashbrook**
**Ashley**
**Ayres**
**Barrett**
**Bass**
**Battin**
**Becker**
**Boland**
**Bolling**
**Bolton, Oliver P.**
**Bray**
**Brooks**
**Broomfield**
**Brown, Calif.**
**Broyhill, Va.**
**Buckley**
**Burke**
**Burton**
**Cahill**
**Cameron**
**Carey**
**Casey**
**Celler**
**Clark**
**Clausen, Don H.**
**Clawson, Del**
**Conte**
**Cooley**
**Corman**
**Curtis**
**Daddario**
**Dague**
**Daniels**
**Davis, Ga.**
**Davis, Tenn.**
**Dawson**
**Delaney**
**Derounian**
**Derwinski**
**Diggs**
**Dingell**
**Donohue**
**Dorn**
**Downing**
**Dwyer**
**Edwards**
**Elliott**
**Ellsworth**
**Everett**
**Fallon**
**Farbstein**
**Fascell**
**Fino**
**Flynt**
**Fogarty**
**Fountain**
**Fraser**
**Frelinghuysen**
**Friedel**
**Fulton, Pa.**
**Fulton, Tenn.**
**Gallagher**
**Garmatz**
**Gilbert**
**Gill**
**Glenn**
**Gonzalez**
**Goodell**
**Grabowski**
**Gray**
**Green, Pa.**
**Griffin**
**Griffiths**
**Grover**
**Gurney**
**Hagan, Ga.**
**Halleck**
**Hanna**
**Hardy**
**Harsha**
**Harvey, Mich.**
**Hawkins**
**Hays**
**Healey**
**Hébert**
**Hemphill**
**Henderson**
**Herlong**
**Hoffman**
**Holland**
**Hosmer**
**Jarman**
**Jennings**
**Jensen**
**Joelson**
**Jones, Ala.**
**Kastenmeier**
**Kee**
**Keith**
**Kelly**
**Keogh**
**Kirwan**
**Knox**
**Kornegay**
**Lankford**
**Latta**
**Lindsay**
**Long, La.**
**McClory**
**McDowell**
**Macdonald**
**Madden**
**Mailliard**
**Martin, Calif.**
**Martin, Mass.**
**Martin, Nebr.**
**Matsunaga**
**Matthews**
**May**
**Michel**
**Miller, N.Y.**
**Milliken**
**Minish**
**Monagan**
**Montoya**
**Morrison**
**Morse**
**Morton**
**Moss**
**Multer**
**Murphy, Ill.**
**Nedzi**
**Nelsen**
**Nix**
**O'Brien, Ill.**
**O'Brien, N.Y.**
**O'Hara, Mich.**
**Olson, Minn.**
**O'Neill**
**Ostertag**
**Passman**
**Pepper**
**Philbin**
**Pike**
**Poage**
**Powell**
**Purcell**
**Quie**
**Quillen**
**Randall**
**Reid, Ill.**
**Reid, N.Y.**
**Rhodes, Ariz.**
**Rivers, Alaska**
**Roberts, Ala.**
**Rodino**
**Rooney, N.Y.**
**Roosevelt**
**Rosenthal**
**Roybal**
**Rumsfeld**
**Ryan, Mich.**
**St Germain**
**St. Onge**
**Schwengel**
**Scott**
**Senner**
**Shelley**
**Sheppard**
**Sibal**
**Sickles**
**Sikes**
**Smith, Va.**
**Snyder**
**Staebler**
**Staggers**
**Stephens**
**Stinson**
**Stratton**
**Stubblefield**
**Taft**
**Thompson, La.**
**Thompson, N.J.**
**Thompson, Tex.**
**Thornberry**
**Trimble**
**Tuck**
**Tupper**
**Ullman**
**Utt**
**Van Deerlin**
**Vanik**
**Waggonner**
**Wallhauser**
**Watts**
**Whalley**
**White**
**Whitten**
**Wickersham**
**Willis**
**Wilson, Charles H.**
**Wright**
**Wydler**

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 226 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX ACT OF 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Monday, December 16, 1963, to file a report on the bill H.R. 8000, the "Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1963," as amended, along with any separate and/or minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, LATE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, he lies now unmoved by tears, yet still we weep. Tears of sadness to give relief for deep felt grief too strong to be contained. Tears of bitterness surging with the sense of loss. Loss of that spirit, that leadership, that promise of a young and gifted President. Tears of sympathy streaming the cheek at thought and sight of friend without this friend, family without this son or brother, wife without this husband, child without this father. So we weep for this man who lies beyond the reach of grief.

He lies now and knows no more of pomp and pageantry, yet still we parade. Moving compulsively in long lines, we mark the loneliness of our loss. Marching in the ways devised by man to render homage. Marching in massive tribute to testify, we adjudge this life to have been both good and great. He sees no flag and yet they are unfurled. Do honor to his loyalty to this our land. For he paid the highest price that from a patriot devotion to duty can extract. His fellow citizens, therefore, call for pageant recognition. He misses the cadence of the count and still we move in mournful, measured steps. We come finally to that last resting place where other gallant men occupy the hallowed ground, Arlington National Cemetery. So we parade for him who lies but does not see the banner blow or hear the bugles' final blast.

He lies now and hears no praise, yet still we raise our voice to laud him. Praise to assure his friends and family that the good he did will not be interred with his remains but will live on to do him, them and his country great and lasting credit. Praise to assure the widow and the orphan that we support and share a pride that will last longer than the sorrow of his tragic passing. Praise to assure ourselves and all the world this life now gone was lived rich in service; fruitful both of promise and performance. So we praise this man who lies beyond the sound or pleasure of our voice.

He lies now untouched by prayer, yet still we pray. Prayers of strength for those touched personally by this passing. Seeking support for that majestic lady who now must stand alone and those little children who yet must learn the measure of their loss. Prayers of anguish wrung from the universal guilt that none escapes. Painfully knowing in this tortured hour that we are members of the family of man and that we are, indeed, our brother's keeper. Prayers of mercy, supplications for the forgiveness, the understanding, and the peace we did not offer when they were ours to give and which now only a gracious Father can extend. So we pray for this man whose judgment is of his own making and whose mercy lies above our small powers.

It is then for us the living, rather than for him who lies in death, that tears are shed, pageants pass, praises are pronounced and prayers are patterned. We hope that our tears assuage some human grief, our pageantry deepens with dignity the impact of this life upon the living, our praises warm those left cold by this cruel loss, our prayers win us some mercy from Him who is most merciful. No weeping we do, no pomp we show, no praise we sing, no prayer we lift can affect the judgment to which our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, now has passed. It is for us the living to learn from our tears, to be motivated by our marching to do more, to realize the hope that sings through our praises and to find in our prayers that the strength of our tomorrows lies within us. With God's help that strength can be summoned, and with His help it will be summoned. Then perhaps we can truly reach this man in that place where now he lies.

## DAVID B. STRUBINGER

**Mr. GARY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

**Mr. GARY.** Mr. Speaker, Mr. David B. Strubinger, the Assistant Commissioner of Customs, will retire on December 30, 1963. Mr. Strubinger was born in York, Pa., on July 3, 1901. He was educated at George Washington University, Benjamin Franklin University, and National University. He holds the degrees of bachelor of science and bachelor of law. He is married to the former Sarah M. Boyle, of Shenandoah, Pa. Mr. and Mrs. Strubinger have been residents of the Washington metropolitan area for many years.

Since July 28, 1949, Mr. Strubinger has served as Assistant Commissioner of Customs, the highest level career position in the customs service, and he has frequently served as the Acting Commissioner of Customs. The duties of the Assistant Commissioner include line and staff responsibility to the Commissioner for all aspects of the management, control, and technical guidance of the U.S. customs service.

Mr. Strubinger embarked on his Government career in June 1920, serving as a clerk in the Department of Commerce. From July 1922 to January 1923, he was employed as a clerk in the Bureau of Pensions, Department of the Interior. He transferred to the Bureau of Internal Revenue on February 1, 1923, serving in a clerical capacity until 1931 when he received a promotion to assistant accountant and auditor. In 1936 he was promoted to administrative investigator and in 1938 to chief investigator, in which capacity he served until August 1, 1939, the date of his transfer to the Bureau of Customs. He began his service with customs as liaison officer. From 1945 until 1949 he served as budget officer and administrative officer in the Bureau of Customs. On July 28, 1949, he was promoted to the position of Assistant Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. Strubinger represented the U.S. Government in the United Nations Conference on Far East Economics in Bangkok, Thailand, in 1958, 1960, and 1962. He also has served on a number of occasions as a member of the U.S. delegations to international conferences on customs procedures, travel and tourism held in Europe, South America, and Mexico.

Out of 80 nominees, Mr. Strubinger was one of 22 executives selected by the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C., to attend the Brookings Institution's Second Conference for Executives in Federal Service in 1958. Mr. Strubinger received a commendation from Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for his splendid contribution to the Conference and especially for his able representation of the Treasury Department.

He has also received many commendations for his service to the Government from congressional sources, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the Department of State and other key Government officials. In 1961 his exceptional ability and service to the customs service were recognized by an outstanding performance rating and a superior work performance award. This week he will receive the Exceptional Service Award, the highest award that can be made under the Treasury Department's incentive awards program, in recognition of his long and distinguished service in the public interest and for the Treasury Department.

Mr. Strubinger is one of the most capable, effective, and dedicated public servants it has ever been my pleasure to know. He has a comprehensive and practical working knowledge of government and is indeed a credit to his profession. He has appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, in connection with appropriations for the Bureau of Customs for many years. He is a very cooperative and effective witness. He knows the programs and understands the practical aspects of discharging the Government's business. In his capacity as Assistant Commissioner of Customs, he has assisted in mapping policy and in the implementation of many important programs of the Federal Bureau of Customs. He has been most cooperative with members of the subcommittee in explaining Bureau programs, showing the committee firsthand the workings of the Bureau of Customs and accompanying the subcommittee on visits to installations in the field. The Government will lose a valuable man on his retirement and I extend to him my heartiest wishes for a well-earned retirement at the conclusion of 43 years of public service—he deserves the best.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

**Mr. OLSEN of Montana.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

## STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM—TRADE AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

**Mr. LIBONATI.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

**Mr. DENT.** Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a bill I have introduced today which I feel can have a most beneficial impact on our economy. The bill would establish a system of loans to assist students to attend trade and technical schools.

We are all too familiar with the highly motivated youngster who, because he is the child of an unemployed father, finds it impossible to acquire the kind of training required by today's technologically oriented economy. To those who may suggest that there exist programs to assist students to pursue higher education let them know that not all of our youngsters are academically oriented. In fact, the vast majority of young people complete academic training at the high school level. Are we to ignore the needs of such boys and girls who wish to acquire the vocational skills required by the economy? Surely, such proposals as would attempt to encourage young people to prepare themselves for a productive future should receive serious consideration from appropriate committees of the Congress.

In addition, I wish it known that the assistance proposed in the bill is in the nature of repayable loans. No forgiveness features are proposed nor will they be recommended. Finally, the program recognizes the ability of the vast number of excellent trade and technical schools to offer training programs appropriate to the needs of business and industry. To qualify for participation in the program a school must have been in existence for at least 2 years and must be either licensed by the State or by an appropriate and nationally recognized accrediting association. This requirement should serve to preclude the sudden establishment of numerous fly-by-night operations.

## VISIT OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLA.

**Mr. LIBONATI.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

**Mr. LIBONATI.** Mr. Speaker, on November 21 a congressional group comprising the gentleman from Michigan, Harold M. Ryan; the gentleman from Illinois, Kenneth Gray; the gentleman from Missouri, Richard Ichord; the gentleman from Florida, Edward J. Gurney; the gentleman from Texas, Bob Casey; the gentleman from New York, Otis G. Pike; the gentleman from Vermont, Robert T. Stafford; the gentleman from Illinois, Roland V. Libonati; and Herbert Lineberger, administrative assistant to the gentleman from North Carolina, Basil Whitener, also including our genial and considerate escort officers Col. Bruce Arnold and Maj. Harry Funk, invitees of the Air Force arrived at Patrick Air Force Base at 6:05 p.m. We were met by Maj. Gen. L. I. Davis, commander, and second in command, General Sands. Our briefing started the next morning—8:30 a.m., e.s.t.—at center headquarters by Lieutenant Colonel Tisdale—the organization and mission of the Air Force Missile Test Center, and the Atlantic Missile Range, and Colonel Whiteside as escort, accompanied us to other areas.

The Centaur, since our visit, has been successfully launched into orbit, and in its performance and behavior has met the expectations of its scientific purposes and tests.

Welcome to the Air Force Missile Test Center. We trust your visit will be both pleasant and enlightening.

Attached you will find the itinerary we have prepared, and a general information sheet. Also included in the brochure are several inserts which may be of interest to you during your visit.

For further information and assistance, please feel free to call the individuals listed at the bottom of the general information sheet.

Again, may I wish you a very pleasant visit.

Sincerely,

L. I. DAVIS,
*Major General, USAF, Commander.*

### WHY SPACECRAFT STAY UP

The basic laws governing satellites and other spacecraft are fascinating in their own right. And, while they have been well known to scientists ever since the time of Sir Isaac Newton, the 17th century English scientist, they may still seem a little puzzling and unreal to many of us. Our children, however, will understand them quite well. In fact, some of them do so already, to our occasional embarrassment. It is difficult for those of us who are now the "older generation" to appreciate why an object having no wings or other visible means of support, and not even particularly "streamlined" as we accept the term, can perform the way it does.

All of us know that Sir Isaac Newton discovered the laws of gravity, and, if we were asked what caused a stone dropped from our hand to fall to the ground, we would unhesitatingly say "gravity," although we might not be sure exactly what that is. We also know that the harder you throw a stone away from you, the farther it will travel before falling to the ground. For a short while its speed and direction are sufficient to overcome the force of gravity.

If you could imagine your strength so fantastically multiplied that you could throw a stone at 15,000 miles per hour, it would travel a great distance. It would, in fact, easily cross the Atlantic Ocean before the earth's gravity pulled it down. Now imagine being able to throw the stone just a little bit faster—say about 18,000 miles per hour—what would happen then?

The stone would again cross the ocean, but this time it would travel much farther than it did before. It would travel so far that it would overshoot the earth, so to speak, and keep falling until it was back to where it started. Its horizontal speed would tend to keep it moving straight ahead. The attraction of the earth's gravity would try to make it fall to the ground. The interaction of these two forces would nearly balance each other. From the stone's point of view it is continuously falling, except that its very slight downward arc exactly matches the curvature of the earth. Since in this imaginary example, there is no atmospheric resistance to slow the stone down, it would still be travelling at its original speed, 18,000 miles per hour, when it got back to its starting point. So, around the earth it goes again. It would stay aloft—or as the scientists would say, "in orbit"—indefinitely.

Here, then, are the first two requirements for placing a spacecraft in orbit—it must be raised to a speed of approximately 18,000 miles per hour; it must be placed in a horizontal flight path relative to the place from which it started.

Since the earth has an atmosphere, of course, neither stones nor spacecraft can be sent whizzing around the earth at treetop level without encountering considerable resistance, or "drag," from the atmosphere. Should sufficient power be used to force an object into an orbital path close to the surface of the earth, the friction caused by overcoming this drag would generate a great deal of heat—enough, in fact, to completely burn up most known materials. The third requirement, therefore, for placing a spacecraft in orbit is that it must be lifted beyond the reach of atmospheric resistance. It is absence of atmospheric resistance, plus speed and flight direction, that makes this type of space flight possible.

Such a spacecraft, rotating in orbital flight around the earth, is called a satellite—the term used in astronomy for any attendant body revolving about a larger one.

It may seem odd that weight and size (mass) has nothing to do with maintaining a satellite's orbit. If a feather were released from a 10-ton satellite, the two would stay together, following the same path in the airless void. There is however, no clear-cut line making the upper limits of the atmosphere. Even a few hundred miles above the earth some slight vestige of atmosphere remains, and its resistance will eventually cause the feather to spiral inward toward the earth sooner than the satellite.

It is atmospheric resistance, however slight, that has set limits on the life of most satellites launched to date. Beyond a few hundred miles the remaining trace of atmosphere fades away so rapidly that higher satellites should stay aloft thousands of years, and, perhaps, indefinitely. The higher the satellite, incidentally, the less speed it needs to stay in orbit once it gets there (thus, the earth's largest satellite, the moon, has an orbital speed of only a little more than 2,000 miles per hour). But, to launch a satellite toward a more distant orbit requires a higher initial speed and greater expenditure of energy.

In practice, a satellite does not maintain a flight path that is always equally distant from the earth's surface. Even minute variations between planned and actual speed and flight direction will affect orbital path. Once the rocket engines of the launch vehicle that has given the satellite its initial speed cease functioning, the satellite is coasting just as is the stone once it leaves the thrower's hand.

The resistance of the last vestiges of atmosphere, however slight, and the attraction of the earth's gravity cause the satellite to slow down, until it rises no higher and begins to fall back toward the earth. This point, at which the satellite's flight path is at the farthest distance away from earth, is called the "apogee." When the satellite begins to fall back toward the earth, the attraction of the earth's gravity causes it to increase its speed, until it once more is traveling slightly above the ideal orbital speed, and the arc of its flight path is slightly less than the earth's curvature. This point, where the path of the satellite is closest to earth, is known as the "perigee." The increased speed causes the satellite to once more head away from the earth, until it is again slowed down and begins to fall back. This sequence is repeated again and again, each time at a speed a little bit slower than the time before, and each time a little bit closer to the earth, until finally the resistance of the atmosphere becomes great enough to slow the satellite to a point where it can no longer maintain an orbit.

Colonel Tisdale's briefing is as follows:

### CAPE CANAVERAL NOW KNOWN AS CAPE KENNEDY

Halfway down Florida's east coast, between Jacksonville and Miami, is America's most complete space testing laboratory.

Much of the cape terrain consists of thick undergrowth and palmetto scrubs, not too unlike the earlier days when Indians and the early settlers made their home on this arrow-shaped sandy spit jutting into the Atlantic Ocean. New growth, greater than that of the national environment, started with the signing of a bill authorizing a launching range at Cape Canaveral on May 11, 1949. On June 13, 1950, the Department of Defense assigned the responsibility for the operation of this long range proving ground at Banana River, Fla., to the Air Force. The Atlantic Missile Range (AMR) presently extends across the South Atlantic and into the Indian Ocean. However, it might be more aptly said to have its ending in infinite space.

Land acquisition by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) will increase the cape area from its present 15,000 acres to approximately 95,000 acres by mid-1963. This increase in land mass is required to carry out the program for the peaceful exploration of space as outlined by the Congress.

The present cape boundaries are Port Canaveral to the south, the Atlantic Ocean to the east, and with the acquisition of land on Merritt Island, the Indian River will form the western terminus. The area will connect to the Florida mainland in the north.

Since AMR was established 12 years ago, it has been a research and development test facility. Design work now underway will alter this mission to one which is primarily operational, capable of routine, rapid launching of large payloads. Physical appearances of the launch areas will change along with their mission character. The skyline will be dominated by massive assembly sheds where Saturn C–5 and Nova vehicles can be prepared for launch simultaneously.

The first vehicle launching at Cape Kennedy took place on July 24, 1950. Bumper No. 8 was a combination V–2 and WAC Corporal that attained 25 miles in a horizontal distance test. From this early launching and the many hundreds that followed, came the technology that has enabled this Nation to undertake the challenging program of building large vehicles with the objective of landing a crew of astronauts and scientists on the moon in this decade.

The cape is served by a channel from the Florida inland waterway, with docking facilities for Saturn barges and other craft. Road and air are other means of direct transportation. A network of over 65 miles of paved roads within the cape provides access to the presently developed areas.

Total employees at AMR number approximately 23,000. By the summer of 1963 it is expected to increase to 33,000 persons. NASA employees at Cape Kennedy in mid-1962 number about 2,000, including contractors and construction personnel; the personnel projection through 1966 indicates a rapid growth to more than 16,000. This large influx of people will have a noticeable impact on Brevard County which has already attained the status of the fastest growing county in the United States during the 1950's.

Cape Canaveral has an average temperature of 72.5°. August is the warmest month and a rainy season exists from May through October. High humidity is prevalent through most of the year.

The average rainfall is 41 inches, and the water table varies from 2 to 6 feet. The highest point of natural elevation is 10 feet on the cape.

An abundance of wild life inhabit the cape, the largest being deer which are frequently sighted. During a recent surveying operation by a contractor firm, one particular area received a minimum of scrutiny; it was known a 10-foot alligator inhabited this particular marsh.

### CENTAUR PROGRAM

The Centaur space vehicle consists of a modified D series Atlas booster stage and a Centaur second stage. It is being developed by General Dynamics/Astronautics for NASA.

Centaur is the first U.S.-launch vehicle using liquid hydrogen, liquid oxygen as propellants. Because of its high energy yield, this propellant combination is superior to other conventional propellants.

Centaur will be used as the primary launch vehicle for unmanned lunar and planetary missions. The primary mission for Centaur at this time is surveyor lander, a spacecraft designed for a soft lunar landing and subsequent transmission of data from the surface of the moon to earth.

#### ATLAS

The first stage vehicle (Atlas) is powered by a Rocketdyne MA-5 propulsion system composed of two booster engines, one sustainer engine, and two small vernier roockets.

The main engines and vernier rockets are gimbaled for directional control during the booster and sustainer phases of the launch. These five engines are ignited simultaneously on the ground, providing a liftoff thrust of more than 367,000 pounds.

#### CENTAUR

The second stage vehicle (Centaur) is a high specific impulse vehicle that carries the payload. Thrust is obtained from two Pratt & Whitney RL10A-3 engines generating 15,000 pounds of thrust each. These engines, which burn liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen, are capable of re-ignition during flight. Ten small hydrogen peroxide engines, mounted on the aft periphery of the air frame, provide additional thrust for propellant settling and attitude control during transition and low thrust coast periods. The Centaur main engines are also gimbaled to provide directional control after Atlas separation.

All electronic packages, guidance equipment, and scientific payloads, are mounted on equipment and payload support rings on the forward bulkhead of the Centaur liquid hydrogen tank. This equipment is protected during launch by a jettisonable Fiberglas nose fairing. In order to minimize effects of aerodynamic heating during ascent, the liquid hydrogen tank is protected by jettisonable insulation panels. (The nose fairing and insulation panels will not be jettisoned for this flight.)

Guidance during first and second stage powered flight is controlled by the Centaur guidance system. This guidance system is all inertial and is designed to accommodate both orbital and deep-space missions. This unit consists of an inertial platform and associated electronics designed by Minneapolis-Honeywell, and an airborne digital computer built by Librascope.

#### CENTAUR-2 MISSION

The Centaur-2 space vehicle will fly a one-burn mission, ending in an elliptical orbit with a 300-nautical-mile perigee and 900-nautical-mile apogee. The primary objectives of this flight are to:

(a) Demonstrate the ability of the Atlas/Centaur structure to withstand the loads encountered in the slow pitchover type of trajectory ascent.

(b) Verify the adequacy of the Atlas/Centaur separation system.

(c) Demonstrate the ability of the propulsion system to start successfully and achieve steady-state operation.

(d) Evaluate the accuracy of the guidance system's inertial measuring unit in respect to velocity and position.

#### F-O DAY MAJOR EVENTS

(All times in minutes unless stated otherwise)

T–280: Terminal countdown begins. Start C-Band and Azusa tests. Start telemetry tests.

T–250: Install hypergols. Install destruct box.

T–215: Initiate range safety command test.

T–160: Activate batteries. Start tower removal preparations.

T–120: Clear service tower and move tower to service area. Start GAP (guidance autopilot) test preparations.

T–110: Start GAP test.

T–90: Complex roadblock set.

T–80: Start Centaur liquid oxygen and liquid hydrogen tanking preparation.

T–70: Start Centaur liquid oxygen tanking.

T–60: Start helium airborne bottle storage.

T–45: Start liquid hydrogen tanking. Seal blockhouse door.

T–35: Start Atlas liquid oxygen tanking.

T–30: Start Centaur and Atlas auto-pilot final checks.

T–25: Start liquid helium final chilldown and Centaur engines. Final Azusa and C-Bank checks.

T–22: Start final range safety command tests.

T–20: Start telemetry system warmup.

T–6: Secure liquid oxygen tanking.

T–5:30: Range safety AGC check.

T–3:45: Atlas telemetry to internal. Centaur telemetry to internal.

T–3:15: Guidance to flight mode.

T–3: Atlas inverter on.

T–2:15 Start flight pressurization.

T–2: Range safety command to internal and arm.

T–1:30: Secure liquid hydrogren tanking.

T–60 (seconds): Pressurization to internal, shape charge armed. Programers armed.

T–18 (seconds): Momentary hold.

T–3 (seconds): Vernier engine complete.

T–0 (seconds): Main stage. Centaur umbilical ejected. Release vehicle.

T–4:45: Hydrogen peroxide tanking.

T–3:45: Centaur attitude engine firing.

T–3:15: Centaur boost pump firing.

T–3: RF silence. Start igniter, shape charge and retrorocket mechanical installation.

T–1:45: Start shape charge initiator installation.

T–1: Start electrical connection of Atlas Conax valve.

T–0: End of F–1 day operations.

#### MAJOR FLIGHT EVENT TIMES

1. T+O: Liftoff (2-inch motion).
2. T+150.4: Booster engine cutoff (Beco).
3. T+153.4: Booster engine jettison.
4. T+229.0: Sustainer engine cutoff (Seco).
5. T+234.0: Atlas vernier engine cutoff (Veco). T+234.9: Atlas/Centaur separation. T+235.0: Fire Atlas-stage retrorockets.
6. T+245.0: Centaur vernier rocket cutoff. Centaur main engine start.
7. T+625.0: Centaur main engine cutoff (Meco) and Centaur vernier rockets start.
8. T+637.0: Centaur vernier rocket cutoff.
9. T+637.0: Unstabilized drift in orbit.

#### F–1 DAY MAJOR EVENTS

(All times are in hours)

T–10: Begin nose fairing installation.

T–7: RP–1 sample analysis returned.

T–6: Begin F–1 countdown. RF checks (Azusa, C-Band Beacon, TLM readouts). Radiation clearance for 1 hour.

T–5:30: Prepare hydrogen peroxide transfer unit fill.

T–5: Hydrogen peroxide transfer unit fill.

#### F–2 DAY MAJOR EVENTS

(All times are in hours)

13:00E: RP–1 tanking preparation.

13:30E: Begin RP–1 tanking.

15:30E: RP–1 tanking complete. Fuel sampled.

End of F–2 day operations.

#### CENTAUR 2

Atlas vehicle number, 126D.
Centaur vehicle number, 2B.
Vehicle designation, R. & D.
Payload, instrumentation.
Launch complex, 36A.
Launch azimuth, 100.5°.
Pitchover program, lofted.
Number of Centaur burns, 1.
Apogee, 900 N. miles.
Perigee, 300 N. miles.
Inclination from Equator, 30°.
Period, 114.6 minutes.
Orbital weight, approximately 5 tons.

### LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER—LAUNCH COMPLEX 34

Since man first conceived the idea of rocket propulsion, he has concerned himself with launch operations. The early launch methods reflected the simplicity and primitiveness of the first rockets.

Concurrent with the advances in rocketry, more complex and sophisticated launch procedures have been developed since the early attempts to hurl an object toward the stars.

The first Saturn vehicle was successfully launched in October 1961 from a massive launching site at Cape Kennedy known as Launch Complex 34 (LC–34). It is the largest launching site in the free world and is probably the first built expressly for the peaceful exploration of space. This 45-acre, multi-million-dollar facility is one of several launch complexes operated by the Launch Operations Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Approximately 3 years were required for the development and construction of LC–34 from concept to the initial Saturn launch. The complexity and size of the launching site is illustrated by the characteristics of its major functional elements.

#### LAUNCH CONTROL CENTER

The launch control center has approximately 10,000 square feet of protected floor space on two levels and an additional 2,150 square feet of unprotected space in an equipment room which is not occupied during launchings. It is a domed building, 120 feet in diameter. The inner dome is of reinforced concrete, 5 feet thick.

On top of the inner dome is an earth fill which varies from 7 feet in the center to 14 feet at the edges. The final layer is 4 inches of concrete. The main entrance door weighs 23 tons. The building is designed to withstand a blast pressure equivalent to the explosion of 50 kilotons of TNT at a distance of 50 feet.

The first floor of the building is used by booster and upper stage contractor personnel involved in tracking and telemetry operations.

Launch supervision and various monitoring and recording panels are located on the second floor. A small observation room is separated by glass from the operating area. Prelaunch activities in the area can be viewed from an observation balcony on top of the control building.

### SERVICE STRUCTURE

The service structure is used to erect and check out the vehicle on the launch pedestal. The structure is 310 feet high and weighs 2,900 tons. The center opening in which the vehicle is situated is 56 feet wide.

Each leg of the service structure houses a two-floor building containing operating and checkout equipment. In addition, each leg has a work deck, seven fixed platforms at various elevations, and five movable horizontally retracting platforms which can be adjusted to embrace the vehicle at any desired level.

Said to be the world's largest wheeled structure, it is mounted on four carriages which are powered by four, 100-horsepower electric motors. Anchored to steel piers by hydraulically operated steel pins, the structure and protected vehicle can withstand wind forces up to 125 miles per hour.

After completion of checkout, the structure is moved to a parking area approximately 600 feet from the launch pedestal. Its movement can be controlled by a single operator situated in a cab at the 27-foot level. It is capable of moving from 1½ to 40 feet per minute.

### *Launch pad*

The launch pad, 430 feet in diameter, is constructed of reinforced concrete, 8 inches thick. In the vicinity of the flame deflector the pad is paved with refractory brick to protect it from heat. The pad has a perimeter flume for drainage of surface water and possible propellant spillage.

### *Pedestal*

Located in the center of the launch pad, the pedestal is used to support and retain the vehicle during checkout and firing. It is 42 feet square and 27 feet high. Bolted to the structure at the top of the pedestal are eight steel arms, four for support only, and four to support and restrain the vehicle until proper engine operation has been achieved. The arms are automatically controlled during the launch sequence.

The foundation of the pedestal is a concrete block 106 by 160 feet; 4 feet thick at the outer edges and 8 feet thick at the center.

### *Deflector*

The rail-mounted, two-way blast deflector is constructed of steel. During launch, it is used to deflect the engine flame into controlled directions. While not in use it is parked on rails adjacent to the pedestal.

### *Umbilical tower*

The umbilical tower adjacent to the launch pedestal is used to provide electrical, hydraulic, and pneumatic lines to the vehicle. It is 24 feet square at the base and 240 feet high. Hydraulically controlled swing arms connect the umbilical tower to the vehicle, and swing out of the way during launch.

### *Automatic ground control station*

Beneath a large portion of the launching pad is the automatic ground control station which serves as a distribution point for all measuring and checkout equipment, power, and high-pressure gas. It is 215 feet long and 38 feet wide. Cables from the automatic ground control station are fed to the launch control center through a roofed cableway.

### *Fuel facility*

The RP–1 fueling facility consists of storage and transfer equipment, protective revetments, foundation, and partial weather protection. In the event of a tank rupture, the revetments and wall will retain the fuel.

Two 30,000-gallon cylindrical tanks are used for fuel storage. The transfer system and associated plumbing consists of two 1,000-gallon-per-minute pumps, a circulation pump, filter-separator unit, eductor system, miscellaneous valves, piping, controls, and support pad. The transfer system is automated and is controlled from the launch control center.

### *Liquid oxygen system*

There are two liquid oxygen (lox) storage tanks approximately 650 feet from the launch pedestal and well removed from the fuel facility. The main tank has an inner and outer sphere with an outside diameter of 43 feet. The spheres are separated by 4 feet of "perlite," a mineral insulating powder. A smaller liquid oxygen tank is used for replenishing the oxygen which boils off during the latter stages of launch preparation. Vacuum insulation insures low evaporation loss.

An earth revetment protects the lox facility on the side facing the launch pedestal.

### *Liquid hydrogen facility*

The liquid hydrogen facility consists of a vacuum jacketed spherical tank, pneumatic and electrical consoles, and necessary plumbing and valves.

Liquid hydrogen with a very low boiling point and high flammability, requires special handling and storage techniques.

### *High-pressure gas facility*

High-pressure helium and nitrogen gases are required for the vehicle. Helium is procured at 3,000 pounds per square inch pressure and boosted to 6,000 per square inch. Nitrogen is procured in liquid form and is converted to gas before it enters the vehicle. Helium is used for bubbling the lox tanks of the booster to keep the lox from forming strata of different temperatures. Nitrogen is used for purging fuel and lox lines, engine, and instrument compartments, and operating certain pneumatic components.

### *Skimming basin*

The skimming basin, located about 300 feet from the edge of the pad, is a concrete paved vat 104 feet by 180 feet. It is used to collect fluids spilled on the pad, thus preventing them from entering normal cape drainage canals.

### *Water system*

Primarily as a safety measure, a water system is installed on the pad and throughout the service structure. Water is available at all work levels on the tower for fire protection. There is a pad flush system to wash away any spilled fuel. At the pedestal there is a quenching system for use in case fire occurs accidentally in the launch vehicle "boattail" or engine compartment. This system is also used to extinguish flame in the engine compartment if engines are cut off immediately after ignition and before liftoff. Four 3,500-gallon-per-minute nozzles are installed at the pad surrounding the vehicle as a general protection measure.

### *Operations support building*

The operations support building contains about 30,000 square feet of floor space. It is used for general shop and engineering activities in direct support of launch operations.

### *Camera stations*

Camera stations are located around the launch pedestal to permit remote controlled photographic coverage of launch operations.

### *Communications systems*

A comprehensive voice communications network, consisting of approximately 200 stations, has been installed throughout the 45-acre site. A closed-circuit television loop is also used for monitoring, checkout, and observing launch.

---

### DR. KURT H. DEBUS, DIRECTOR, LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER

Dr. Kurt H. Debus heads the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Launch Operations Center, Cape Kennedy, Fla.

The Launch Operations Center (LOC) was established to provide overall planning and supervision in the integration, checkout, and launch of NASA space vehicles at the Atlantic Missile Range and the Merritt Island Launch Area. Under Dr. Debus' direction, the Launch Operations Center is planning and constructing facilities for the 7.5-million-pound-thrust Saturn V that will launch astronauts to the moon within this decade. LOC is responsible for all Saturn launch operations.

The Debus team has launched more than 140 rockets and space vehicles from Cape Kennedy since the first U.S. ballistic missile, the Redstone, was fired by the Army in August 1953. The record of successes includes the launch of Explorer I, the first U.S. satellite; Pioneer IV, the first U.S. probe to orbit the sun; 1.5-million-pound-thrust Saturn I launch vehicles; and support of manned orbital flights in Mercury spacecraft.

Born in Frankfort, Germany, on November 29, 1908, Dr. Debus was the son of a member of the management team of the I. G. Farben Co., prewar German industrial complex. He attended high school at the Liebig Oberreal Schule, then Darmstadt University, where he received his initial and advanced degrees in mechanical and electrical engineering. After receiving his doctorate in 1939, he served as assistant professor at Darmstadt. While at Darmstadt he became involved in rocket research programs conducted at Peenemuende, including development of the V-2.

He was a member of a group of 120 German rocket scientists who, with Dr. Wernher von Braun, arrived at Fort Strong, Boston, Mass., in November 1945. The group later transferred to Fort Bliss, El Paso, Tex., where they worked in development of ballistic missiles for the Army. All are now U.S. citizens.

With Dr. von Braun, Dr. Debus transferred to the Army Ballistic Missile Agency in Huntsville, Ala. He received his first assignment at Cape Canaveral in 1952. Many members of the original Debus team that manned the blockhouse for the first Redstone launch in 1953 are at the Launch Operations Center today.

Dr. Debus, who has participated in more than 600 rocket launches during his career, was cited by the Army with its most outstanding civilian award, the Exceptional Civilian Service Decoration, in April 1959. He is a fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics.

Dr. Debus and his wife, Gay, reside at Patrick Air Force Base, Fla. They have two daughters, Sigrid, who resides at home, and Ute, who was married after her graduation from Vanderbilt University in 1962 and now resides in Baltimore, Md.

---

### JUPITER–C

The Jupiter–C, America's first successful space vehicle, launched the free world's first scientific satellite, Explorer I, on January 31, 1958.

The four-stage Jupiter–C measured almost 69 feet in length.

The first stage was a modified liquid fueled Redstone missile. The liquid oxygen and fuel tanks were lengthened to increase burning time. This main stage was about 56 feet in length and 70 inches in diameter.

Fifteen scaled-down Sergeant solid propellant motors were used in the upper stages. A "tub" configuration mounted on top of the modified Redstone held the second and third stages. The second stage consisted of 11 rockets placed in a ring formation within the tub. Inserted into the ring of second stage rockets was a cluster of three rockets making up the third stage. A fourth stage single rocket and the satellite were mounted atop the third stage. This "tub," all upper stages, and the satellite were set spinning prior to launching. The complete upper assembly measured 12½ feet in length.

The Jupiter-C was originally conceived as a satellite launching vehicle in 1954.

The first launching of this hybrid vehicle was on September 26, 1956. In this first test flight, an inert payload was hurled more than 600 miles high and some 3,300 miles over the Atlantic, setting altitude and distance records.

### JUNO II

The Juno II vehicles were developed and all launches were conducted by a team of personnel now associated with the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center.

The Juno II was basically a Jupiter missile with extended tankage to increase burning time. Other changes included a modified guidance system and the addition of upper stages to form a four-stage vehicle. During the powered portion of first stage flight, pitch and yaw control was accomplished by swiveling the gimbaled rocket engine. The roll was controlled by a movable turbine exhaust nozzle.

Specifications:
Length: 72 feet.
Diameter: 8¾ feet.
Dry weight: 10,800 pounds.
Thrust: 150,000 pounds.
Propellants:
Oxidizer: Liquid oxygen.
Fuel: RP-1.

The three upper stages of the Juno II were covered with a shroud for protection against aerodynamic heating during the powered portion of the first stage flight. The upper stages were clustered solid propellant rockets with 11 rockets placed in a ring formation making up the second stage. Inserted into the center of this ring was a cluster of three rockets making up the third stage. The fourth stage, which sat atop the third stage, consisted of a single rocket with the payload resting on top. This configuration of shroud, upper stages, and the payload was set spinning and after shroud separation, the stages were fired in succession to attain the necessary speed for orbiting the payload.

Successful Juno II launchings include the following: Pioneer III on December 6, 1958, Pioneer IV on March 3, 1959, and Explorer VII on October 13, 1959.

### MERCURY-REDSTONE

On May 5, 1961, at 9:34 a.m., the Mercury-Redstone lofted Astronaut Alan Shepard to an altitude of 115 miles and a distance of 302 miles down the Atlantic Missile Range. The vehicle performed as planned. A second, manned, suborbital flight was conducted on July 21, 1961, with Astronaut Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom aboard. This flight was also successful.

The Mercury-Redstone vehicle is a modified and elongated version of the Redstone missile presently deployed overseas with U.S. forces. In redesign, the 70-inch diameter tank section was lengthened about 6 feet, adding more than 20 seconds to engine-burning time. Approximately 800 other changes were required to transform the "old reliable" Redstone into a man-carrying booster. The selection of the Mercury-Redstone as a vehicle for the manned suborbital phases of the Mercury program was made because of its excellent reliability record and performance capability.

Specifications:
Height: 58 feet.
Height (including spacecraft): 83 feet.
Diameter: 70 inches.
Weight: 33 tons.
Thrust: 78,000 pounds.
Propellants:
Fuel: 75 percent alcohol and 25 percent water.
Oxidizer: Liquid oxygen.

After reviewing data obtained from the two successful man-carrying suborbital flights, the decision was made by NASA officials that further manned suborbital flights were unnecessary and the program moved on to the orbital flight phase. Thus, the Mercury-Redstone may be said to be "the booster that worked itself right out of a job."

### LAUNCH COMPLEX 37

A huge new launch complex is the newest launch site for Saturn vehicles. The 120-acre tract is officially named "Launch Complex 37."

Launch Complex 37 has two launch pads and associated launch facilities served by a single group of ground support facilities. Pads A and B are similar, with each having a launch pedestal, umbilical tower, and automatic ground control station (AGCS). The two launch pads are served by a single launch control center (LCC), operations support building, and mobile launch service structure. A central propellant storage and transfer system also serves the two launch pads.

AGC buildings: Located directly beneath a portion of each umbilical tower is a 50- by 122-foot structure. The buildings, which are unoccupied during launch operations, are multitiered, with three above-ground stories.

Umbilical towers: Each of the umbilical towers is 268 feet high, with a base 32 feet square. The umbilical towers are designed to be extendable to 320 feet for future use with nuclear-powered upper stages of Saturn vehicles.

Launch pedestals: Each launch platform at Complex 37 is 47 feet square, with a 12-sided, 32-foot-diameter cutout in the center for engine exhaust escapement. Triangular platforms are mounted on top of the pedestals to enlarge the work area.

Launch control center: The launch control center interior measures 110 feet in diameter and 37 feet high. The blast-resistant dome is 12½ feet thick. A total of 3,290 cubic yards of concrete and 400 tons of steel were used in its construction. The main firing functions, tracking operations, observations, and test supervision are conducted from within this structure.

Storage and transfer: The liquid oxygen system includes two tanks, one a 125,000-gallon spherical storage unit, the other a 28,000-gallon cylindrical replenishing tank. A 43,500-gallon cylindrical tank stores RP-1 kerosene fuel. A 125,000-gallon spherical tank stores liquid hydrogen. A high-pressure gas facility provides gaseous nitrogen and helium to Complex 37 and nearby Complex 34.

Launch service structure: Completely dominating the scene at Launch Complex 37 is a 7-million-pound service structure that moves betwen launch pads A and B on steel rails. The tall structure—it measures 328 feet to the base of a stiff-leg derrick boom, trunnion mounted, on its top—is probably the largest movable structure in the world. The derrick mast, extending a maximum of 60 feet above the structure, can lift weights of 60, 40, and 10 tons with hooks extended at various distances from the trunnion. The 120-square-foot base structure rides on 72 3-foot diameter wheels. The variable speed drives moves the structure at speeds up to 40 feet per minute. A 1,000 kilovolt-ampere power source is installed in the structure.

Fixed platform levels and adjustable service platforms provide access to the space vehicle at all levels. All levels are served by two high-speed elevators.

When the service structure is in its operational position at the launch site, the load is removed from the wheels by hydraulic equalizer arms, then the structure is lowered onto foundation anchor assemblies and locked into place. The process is reversed prior to moving the service structure, with the entire unit being lifted about 3 inches from the ground and the load being reapplied to the wheels.

### LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER

The "shooting end" of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is handled by the Launch Operations Center at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Directed by Dr. Kurt H. Debus, veteran of more than 600 launchings, the Center is responsible for the overall planning and supervision of systems integration, checkout, and launch of NASA space vehicles at the Atlantic Missile Range.

The Center (and its predecessor, the Launch Operations Directorate of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center) has been responsible for the launching of all space vehicles developed by Dr. Wernher von Braun's famous space team since the formation of NASA in July 1960. More than 125 vehicles have been launched at Cape Canaveral during this time. Previously, many of the launch personnel, including Dr. Debus, were employed by the Missile Firing Laboratory of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency.

Dr. Debus and his team are charged with launch operations for the powerful Saturn and the larger multimillion-pound thrust space vehicles required for the manned lunar landing program. In this program NASA has the mission of landing astronauts on the Moon and returning them to earth. The first trip is scheduled for completion before the end of 1970.

Four launch complexes and associated electronic and optical tracking stations presently are assigned to LOC at the Cape. These are Complexes 56 (two Redstone pads), 26 (two Jupiter-Juno pads), 34 (Saturn), and Complex 37 (two Saturn pads).

The Center is also charged with planning and establishing future launch sites for the multimillion-pound thrust advanced Saturn and Nova space vehicles.

### LAUNCH COMPLEX 34

The first Saturn vehicle was successfully launched in October 1961 from a massive launching site at Cape Canaveral known as Launch Complex 34 (LC 34). It is the largest known launching site in the world and is the first built expressly for the peaceful exploration of space.

The main features of LC 34 are the launch pedestal, umbilical tower, blockhouse, and propellant facilities.

The launch pedestal consists of a large steel and concrete platform from which the space vehicle is launched. It is constructed on heavily compacted soil and is equipped with a huge flame deflector.

Erected next to the pedestal, the umbilical tower maintains the link between the space vehicle and ground equipment up to shortly after the first motion of lift-off.

The launch service tower is used to assemble, service, and shelter the space vehicle. After its job is completed, it is moved by its own power approximately 600 feet away on rails. This is the minimum distance necessary to protect the service tower from the explosive power of the vehicle propellants should an explosion occur at launch time.

The blockhouse houses the launch control center and is the complex nerve center that contains the equipment required to checkout and launch the space vehicle.

The fueling facilities consist of propellant storage tanks and pipes connecting these tanks to the pedestal.

The camera stations are used for automated, remote, photographic coverage of launch operations.

## SATURN V

With a declaration by our lamented President Kennedy in May 1961, of a national goal to land men on the moon and return them to earth by 1970, the United States undertook what is perhaps its most ambitious peacetime scientific program.

To launch a manned spacecraft that will carry men to the moon and return them to earth, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is developing Saturn V, a launch vehicle that will have the capability of injecting a 200,000-pound payload into low earth orbit and boosting 90,000 pounds to escape velocity. Saturn V will also have the capability of serving as a launch vehicle for circumlunar and lunar orbital missions, lunar logistics missions, establishing manned space stations, nuclear reactor-in-flight-tests, and launching spacecraft for interplanetary probes.

Saturn V will be a three-stage space vehicle. With an Apollo spacecraft, such as will be used in the manned lunar landing program, on top, it will be 360 feet high. Loaded with fuel it will weigh 3,000 tons.

The first stage of the Saturn V, the S–IC, will be 138 feet long and 33 feet in diameter. Its cluster of five F–1 engines, fueled by RP–1 (kerosene) and liquid oxygen, will develop 7,500,000 pounds of thrust.

The second stage of the Saturn V, the S–II, will be 82 feet long and 33 feet in diameter. Its cluster of five J–2 engines, fueled by liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen, will develop 1 million pounds of thrust.

The third stage of the Saturn V, the S–IVB, will be 59 feet long and 22 feet in diameter. Its single J–2 engine, fueled by liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen, will develop 200,000 pounds of thrust. It will have restart capability and attitude control for lunar and orbital flights.

On a manned lunar landing mission, burn of the first and second stages and partial burn of the third stage will be required to inject the Apollo spacecraft into earth orbit. After the first burn of the third stage with the Apollo attached, the space vehicle will coast around the earth in a parking orbit. The third stage will be reignited to put the space vehicle in a trajectory to the moon. The third stage will be jettisoned and the Apollo will continue on to an orbit around the moon. The Apollo command and service modules, with one astronaut, will remain in orbit. The lunar excursion module, with two astronauts, will land on the moon. After exploration, the lunar launch module will be launched to rendezvous with the other modules. Then, the Apollo will carry the astronauts to a landing back on earth.

## SATURN I—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, LAUNCH OPERATIONS CENTER

Saturn is the largest space vehicle under advanced development in the United States, and is the first large rocket vehicle expressly designed for scientific space programs and manned space flight. It is capable of sending large payloads into earth orbit, to the moon, and into deep space.

Saturn I is an early configuration, designed for vehicle qualification and development of the Apollo spacecraft system. The initial flight of Saturn I was conducted on October 27, 1961.

Launches of standard nose cones and boiler plate models of the Apollo spacecraft atop Saturn I will be conducted to confirm aerodynamic stability of the configuration. Later, Saturn I will boost Apollo spacecraft into earth orbit.

The first stage of Saturn I is identified as the S–I. Its cluster of eight H–1 engines develops 1.5 million pounds of thrust. The engines burn RP–1 (kerosene) and liquid oxygen.

The second stage, identified as S–IV, is powered by a cluster of six RL10–A3 liquid hydrogen-liquid oxygen engines, capable of developing 90,000 pounds of thrust.

*Saturn I statistics*

| | Diameter | Height |
|---|---|---|
| S–I stage | 21.5 feet | 82 feet. |
| S–IV stage | 18.0 feet | 41 feet. |
| Saturn I/Apollo | | 171 feet. |

Saturn V is the name selected by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the vehicle that will launch a manned spacecraft and inject it into a trajectory that will enable manned lunar landing.

Apollo is the name selected for the spacecraft that will carry a three-man crew of astronauts to orbit around the moon, land two of them on the lunar surface, launch them from the moon, and return them with the third crew member, safely to earth.

Saturn V/Apollo will be launched on its historic flight from NASA's new Merritt Island Launch Area under direction of the Launch Operations Center.

The complex operation of landing men on the moon and returning them to earth, perhaps may best be understood by following the sequence of events in a typical Saturn V/Apollo mission.

The five F–1 engines of the S–IC stage will provide 7½ million pounds of thrust to lift the 6-million-pound space vehicle off its launch pad.

After burnout, the S–C stage will be jettisoned and the five J–2 engines of the S–II stage will ignite.

The S–II stage engines will provide 1 million pounds of thrust.

After ignition of S–II stage engines, the escape tower atop the Apollo spacecraft will be jettisoned.

The Saturn V/Apollo's S–II stage engines will continue to burn.

After burnout, the S–II stage will be jettisoned and the single J–2 engine of the S–IVB stage will ignite. The S–IVB engine will provide 200,000 pounds of thrust.

Partial burn of the engine of the S–IVB stage will inject the Saturn V/Apollo into an earth orbit. Then, engine burn will be cut off. The engine will later be restarted to boost the space vehicle into an earth-to-moon trajectory.

After burnout, the Apollo's command and service modules will separate from the rest of the vehicle, leaving the lunar excursion module attached to the S–IVB stage.

Then, fairings surrounding the lunar excursion module will be separated and the joined Apollo command and service modules will turn around in space.

After turnaround, the command and service modules will dock with the lunar excursion module. The astronauts will still be in the command module.

The S–IVB stage will be jettisoned. A midcourse correction will put the spacecraft in a corridor that will enable lunar orbit. Some 60 hours after launch it will near the moon.

The service module's rocket engine will burn, retrofashion, slowing the spacecraft and injecting it into orbit around the moon. The orbit will be on an equatorial plane, about 100 miles above the lunar surface.

Two astronauts will transfer to the lunar excursion module. The lunar excursion module will separate and descend to an altitude of 10 miles for visual selection of a landing area by the astronauts.

Meanwhile, the command and service modules, with one astronaut aboard, will continue to orbit the moon.

The lunar excursion module will descend to a hovering altitude of 100 feet for selection of the point of landing. Then it will land on the moon.

After the mission is accomplished during a stay of 1 or 2 days, the lunar launch module will be launched. Empty fuel tanks and the landing gear, which will serve as a launch pad, will be left on the moon.

The lunar launch module will be injected into an orbit that will enable it to rendezvous and dock with the command and service modules that will have remained in orbit.

During the rendezvous and docking operation, both of the craft will have visual and radar contact. Either craft may direct the operations.

After docking, the two astronauts in the lunar launch module will transfer to the command module, already occupied by the third astronaut.

The lunar excursion module will be jettisoned and left in lunar orbit. The service module's engine will burn to inject the spacecraft into a moon-to-earth trajectory.

During the return trip to earth, midcourse corrections will be made to bring the spacecraft into the earth reentry corridor. The service module will be jettisoned and the command module will return to earth.

After the module reaches the earth's atmosphere, a drogue chute will slow its descent. Then, its main chutes will slow it to a safe impact speed.

At last, some 7 days after starting on their exploratory trip to the moon, the astronauts will again be back on earth.

## TITAN III—BRIEFING BY MAJOR SPEAKER

The Space Systems Division (AFSC) is developing Titan III, a new and versatile space launch system. The Titan III vehicle and its supporting ground environment, the integrate-transfer-launch (ITL) facility, will provide the Air Force with an economical booster system designed from the ground up to fulfill military space requirements.

Titan III is under urgent development in two vehicle configurations.

The Titan IIIA configuration has a structurally modified Titan II two-stage liquid-fueled core with an added liquid-fueled third stage called the transtage. Lift-off thrust of Titan IIIA is 430,000 pounds.

The Titan IIIC configuration employs the Titan IIIA with two additional 120-inch diameter solid rocket boosters for additional thrust. The Titan IIIC configuration will have more than 2 million pounds thrust at lift-off.

As an integral part of the Titan III system, the integrate-transfer-launch (ITL) facility is being developed. Early research and development flights of the Titan IIIA will be from Complex P–20 at AMR, a rebuilt Titan I launch complex. As a system, the program embraces both the space launch vehicle and the ITL. The ITL gives the system its flexibility and economy. Significant components of the ITL are the Vertical Integration Building (VIB), Solid Motor Assembly Building (SMAB) and launch complexes 40 and 41. Titan IIIA vehicles are readied in the VIB. If a Titan IIIC is scheduled the core is transported to the Solid Motor Assembly Building (SMAB), where the solid motors are attached prior to movement to the launch complex. Launch complexes are not tied up by prolonged assembly and checkout of the vehicle. The net result is minimal pad time, rapid pad turn-around, high reliability and the capability of performing a variety of space missions.

### OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TITAN III SYSTEM

1. Mission flexibility: Orbital payloads up to 25,000 pounds—orbital maneuvers made possible by the restart capabilities of the transtage.
2. Launch flexibility: The vehicle delivered to the pad may be launched immediately or "held" indefinitely. Ability to react rapidly to mission changes with in toto replacement of one vehicle by another ready to be fueled and launched.
3. Flight flexibility: The transtage incorporates multiple restart capability. This permits orbital plane changes and maneuvers.
4. Economical launch rate capability: The ITL with its two launch pads allows launch rate of one vehicle per 6 days.
5. Reliability: Use of "within the state of the art" missile methods and hardware plus the advanced operational procedures in the ITL.
6. Storable fuels (no cryogenics): Both liquid and solid.
7. Environment: Assembly and checkout in factorylike environment in the ITL buildings.
8. Off pad assembly of booster-payload.
9. Simultaneous preparation of several complete booster-payload combinations.
10. Dynamic program management techniques: Cost plus incentive fee contracts with major missile hardware suppliers and rigid application of program evaluation review technique (PERT) management methods to control Titan III development program costs and schedules.

### ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN TITAN III DEVELOPMENT

Space System Division (AFSC): Program management.

Martin-Marietta Corp.: Titan III liquid core vehicle and integrating contractor.

United Technology Center: Solid motor contractor.

A. C. Spark Plug: Guidance contractor.

Aerojet-General Corp.: Liquid engine contractor.

Ralph M. Parsons Co.: Architectural engineering and design contractor for ITL complex.

Aerospace Corp.: General systems engineering and technical direction.

6555th Aerospace Test Wing (SSD): Launch agency.

Air Force Missile Test Center: Range support.

U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers: Construction agency.

### ADVANCED MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES USED IN TITAN III DEVELOPMENT

I. Cost plus incentive fee (CPIF) contracts: A management policy by which involved contractor's fees are varied depending on how well the contractor performs with respect to target costs, program schedules, and system performance.

II. Program evaluation review techniques (PERT): Program cost, program schedules.

### TITAN III RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TEST PROGRAM

The Titan III program was given Department of Defense approval in August of 1962 and provided for a 45-month R. & D. schedule. Hardware development started in December 1962.

Five Titan IIIA vehicles are to be launched from pad 20 starting in 1964.

Twelve Titan IIIC vehicles are to be launched from the ITL facilities starting in the spring of 1965.

The Titan III development program will be completed by the middle of 1966.

---

### Air Force Missile Test Center—Operational Highlights

July 24, 1950: First missile launch from Cape Kennedy. (V–2 with an Army WAC Corporal second stage.)

August 1, 1950: Patrick Air Force Base, administrative headquarters of AFMTC, dedicated. Named in honor of Maj. Gen. Mason M. Patrick, former chief of the Air Service.

June 20, 1951: First launch of the USAF Matador tactical missile from Cape Kennedy.

September 10, 1952: First launching of the Air Force Bomarc interceptor missile.

September 19, 1956: The first Jupiter–C launched from Cape Kennedy.

January 25, 1957: First launch of the USAF Thor IRBM.

April 13, 1957: First launch of the Navy Polaris at Cape Kennedy.

June 11, 1957: First test flight of the USAF Atlas ICBM.

August 8, 1957: Nose cone from Jupiter "C" vehicle recovered from the Atlantic marking first recovery of a reentry body at long range.

January 31, 1958: Explorer I, the free world's first earth satellite, launched by a Jupiter–C.

October 11, 1958: Pioneer I, the Nation's first successful space probe, boosted by Air Force Thor-Able.

February 6, 1959: First test launch of the USAF Titan I ICBM.

April 23, 1959: First flight test of the Air Force "Hound Dog" (GAM–77) at the AMR.

May 28, 1959: Two monkeys, Able and Baker, launched on a Jupiter missile to an altitude of 300 miles were recovered alive 1,500 miles down the Atlantic Missile Range.

September 9, 1959: First launch of a model of the Mercury capsule on an Air Force Atlas.

October 29, 1959: First launch of a USAF Mace missile.

February 25, 1960: First test launch of the U.S. Army's Pershing missile.

September 21, 1960: First launch of the Air Force Blue Scout, Jr., on a space probe mission.

January 31, 1961: Ham a chimpanzee, took a suborbital ride 155 miles into space and was retrieved safely 420 miles down the AMR.

February 1, 1961: First test launch of the Air Force's solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM.

May 5, 1961: The Nation's first man in space, Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr., flew a suborbital trajectory 302 miles down the Atlantic Missile Range on a Mercury-Redstone vehicle.

July 6, 1961: Atlas sets new distance record 9,050 miles.

July 21, 1961: America's second man in space Air Force Capt. Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom, flew the second suborbital space flight aboard the Mercury-Redstone vehicle.

August 23, 1961: Ranger I spacecraft placed into low earth orbit by Atlas-Agena B.

October 27, 1961: First launch of the NASA Saturn space vehicle with a live 1.3 million pound thrust booster stage.

November 21, 1961: First all-Air Force crew launch of USAF Titan ICBM.

November 29, 1961: Enos became America's first chimp to orbit the earth. A 3-hour flight took him twice around the world.

February 20, 1961: America's first manned orbital flight. Lt. Col. John Glenn, USMC, orbited the earth three times in the NASA Mercury spacecraft boosted by the Atlas.

March 16, 1962: First launch of a USAF Titan II, most powerful U.S. ICBM to date.

April 19, 1962: First launch of U.S. Air Force Skybolt airlaunched ballistic missile in drop test from B–52.

April 23, 1962: First U.S. payload to impact the moon, Ranger IV, launched by Atlas-Agena B.

April 26, 1962: Thor-Delta rocket boosted world's first international satellite (United States-United Kingdom) "Ariel" into orbit to study ionosphere.

May 8, 1962: First launch of the NASA Centaur. Structural failure of second stage caused explosion 55 seconds after launch.

May 24, 1962: Second manned orbital flight in the Mercury program. Pilot was Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott Carpenter, USN.

June 29, 1962: An all-Air Force crew successfully launched a USAF Minuteman ICBM for the first time from a Cape Kennedy silo.

July 10, 1962: First international communications satellite "Telstar" launched into orbit from Cape Kennedy by a Thor-Delta rocket.

August 13, 1962: An all-Air Force crew successfully launched an Atlas missile for the first time from Cape Kennedy.

August 27, 1962: Mariner II launched by an Atlas-Agena. After a flight of 182 million miles and 109 days, passed within 21,000 miles of Venus.

September 19, 1962: The 100th Atlas launch from Cape Kennedy. Launched by an all-Air Force crew.

October 3, 1962: Third manned orbital flight in the Mercury program and first to achieve six orbits. Pilot was Lt. Comdr. Walter M. Schirra, Jr.

October 18, 1962: Ranger V moon probe launched by an Atlas booster.

October 31, 1962: ANNA, a triservice geodetic research satellite, successfully launched by an Air Force Thor-Able Star.

December 5, 1962: Last research and development (R. & D.) flight of Atlas, America's first ICBM, from Cape Kennedy. Launched by an all-Air Force crew.

December 13, 1962: Relay, a second-generation active communications satellite, achieved orbit. Launched by a Thor-Delta.

February 6, 1963: An Air Force Titan II was launched 6,500 miles down the AMR to deliver heaviest military payload ever fired that distance by a U.S. ballistic missile.

February 15, 1963: Construction began on new Air Force Titan III integrate-transfer-launch facility.

March 22, 1963: Maj. Gen. L. I. Davis, AFMTC commander, named Department of Defense (DOD) representative for Gemini support operations.

May 1, 1963: First AFMTC advanced range instrumentation ship (ARIS), the USAFS Gen. H. H. Arnold, dedicated at Port Canaveral.

May 7, 1963: Telstar II successfully put into orbit by a Thor-Delta launched from Cape Kennedy.

**May 15, 1963: In America's fourth manned orbital flight, Air Force Maj. L. Gordon Cooper completed his 35-hour, 22-orbit mission by manually executing reentry to land right on target.**

August 21, 1963: First use of the Air Force Titan II as space booster. Carried malfunction detection system to be used in later Titans that will boost Gemini spacecraft into orbit. Also carried two other experiments.

September 18, 1963: First Air Force Asset vehicle successfully launched to an altitude of 40 miles by a single stage Thor. Asset was designed to explore the glide of reentering the atmosphere from space.

*Rockets and missiles being launched at Cape Kennedy*

| | Atlas (Air Force) | Hound Dog (Air Force) | Minuteman (Air Force) | Pershing (Army) | Polaris (Navy) | Thor (Air Force) | Titan II (Air Force) | Saturn (NASA) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type | Ballistic missile (booster). | Air-to-ground guided missile. | Intercontinental ballistic missile. | Surface-to-surface | Subsurface to surface. | Ballistic missile (space booster). | Intercontinental ballistic missile. | Space vehicle. |
| Prime contractor. | General Dynamics (Convair Division). | North American Aviation. | Boeing Airplane Co. | Martin Co | Lockheed, Sunnyvale Calif. | Douglas Aircraft Co. | Martin Co | NASA-MSFC/DAC. |
| Speed | Over 15,000 miles per hour. | Supersonic | Over 15,000 miles per hour. | Supersonic | Hypersonic | Mach 15 | Over 15,000 miles per hour. | Orbital (depends upon mission). |
| Ceiling | Approximately 500 miles. | | | | | | | Orbital/deep space. |
| Range | Over 5,500 miles | Over 600 miles | Over 5,500 miles. | 100 to 400 miles | 2,500 nautical miles. | Beyond 1,500 miles. | Over 5,500 miles | Do. |
| Length | 82 feet | 42½ feet | 55 feet | 34 feet | 31 feet | 65 feet | Over 100 feet | 171¾ feet. |
| Diameter | 10 feet | 28 inches | 5½ feet | 40 inches | Approximately 4½ feet. | 8 feet | 10 feet | 21½ feet without fins; 41 feet with fins. |
| Launch weight. | Approximately 269,000 pounds. | | Over 50,000 pounds. | 10,000 pounds | 35,000 pounds | 90,000 pounds | Approximately 330,000 pounds. | 1,106,800 pounds. |
| Power system. | North American liquid rocket engines (2 booster and 1 sustainer). | Pratt & Whitney J-52 jet engine. | 3-stage solid propellant rocket. | 2-stage solid propellant rocket. | 2-stage solid propellant rocket. | North American liquid rocket engines with over 150,000 pounds. | Aerojet-General liquid rocket in both stages. | 8 H-1 LOX/HP-1 Eng 1st stage; 6 RL10A-3 LOX/$LH_2$ engines 2d stage. |
| Warhead | | Nuclear | Nuclear | Nuclear | Nuclear | | Nuclear | Not applicable. |
| Guidance system. | Radio inertial or all inertial. | All inertial | All inertial | Inertial stable platform. | Inertial | All inertial | All inertial | Inertial stable platform. |
| Remarks | America's first ICBM. Operational in early 1960 at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. Presently used as booster on AMR. | Operational | Wing I operational December 1962 at Malstrom Air Force Base; wing II in research and development test stage. | Development | A-2 series. Operational. Launched from submarines at AMR for sub qualification. A3 series in research and development test stage. | IRBM. Operational. Delivered to United Kingdom in 1958. Used as booster for orbital payloads. | Development stage; 3 bases selected as launch sites. | Space vehicle for large orbital satellites and deep space probes. Checkout of Apollo. |

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 29, 1963]

### SPACE AIDS EXPECT JOHNSON TO PUSH MAN-TO-MOON FLIGHT

CAPE KENNEDY, FLA., November 29.—Cape Canaveral today bears the name Cape Kennedy in honor of John F. Kennedy, who designated it as the blastoff point for trips to the moon.

President Lyndon B. Johnson also named this Florida east coast promontory's vast facilities for rocketry "the John F. Kennedy Space Center."

The surprise action last night drew mostly favorable comment here, but it posed some problems for businesses which have capitalized on the Cape Canaveral name.

Some officials, including Gov. Farris Bryant, of Florida, and missile-space program executives, drew heartening inference that Mr. Johnson's action means full speed ahead on the man-to-the-moon flight and other projects the late President Kennedy pushed.

Mr. Johnson told a nationwide television and radio audience in his Thanksgiving message that "Station No. 1, Atlantic Missile Range, will hereafter be known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center."

He added that Cape Canaveral "shall hereafter be known as Cape Kennedy."

Mr. Bryant said Mr. Johnson telephoned him Wednesday night that he was planning to rename the facility.

"I concurred freely," Mr. Bryant said. "Cape Canaveral is uniquely President Kennedy's. While it was there before, it was his because of the emphasis he placed on space."

Dr. Kurt H. Debus, Director of the Launch Operations Center for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said Mr. Johnson's action was very fitting. He added that it might help NASA obtain funds for making space travel a reality.

At Cocoa Beach, closest civilian community to the Cape, Bernard Fischer, a restaurant operator, said he thinks renaming the center is a "wonderful idea."

"I don't know about renaming the cape—it's been Cape Canaveral since it was named anything," he added.

Fred Boyer, map consultant for the Rollins College library, said that name appears on a 1598 war map. "Canaveral" is a Spanish word meaning cane or reed field.

The cape was a sandy, scrub-grown 15,000-acre site when the Government bought it about 1950 for missile experimentation. The tract was bought partly because it was isolated. It also was inexpensive.

Steady development of the cape into a facility that sent first monkeys, then men, into space brought a boom to the whole area.

The missile space complex now includes adjacent 88,000-acre Merritt Island, site of the prospective moonport, and employs about 32,000 persons.

Cocoa Beach had about 300 residents before the space age. Now it has 12,000. Ninetenths of them work in the missile field or hold jobs that wouldn't exist without it.

Renaming of the cape posed a few problems. A "Cape Canaveral City" recently was founded. There is a Canaveral toll bridge and causeway. And the cape's seaport is Port Canaveral.

#### MEMORIALS MULTIPLY

The cape is located on the Atlantic Coast about halfway between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach. It lies between the Banana River and the Atlantic Ocean and is roughly 10 miles long by 3 miles wide at its broadest point.

---

HEADQUARTERS, AIR FORCE MISSILE
TEST CENTER, AIR FORCE SYSTEMS
COMMAND, U.S. AIR FORCE,
*Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.*

Itinerary: Congressional group, party of 12.

#### NOVEMBER 21, 1963

[All time eastern standard]

At 1730 arrive Patrick Air Force Base. Proceed to officers club for cocktail hour. (Luggage will be taken directly to the Cape Colony Inn by stewards.) After cocktail hour, party will proceed to Cape Colony Inn. Remainder of evening free.

#### NOVEMBER 22, 1963

Breakfast available at motel.

At 0820 depart motel by Air Force bus (baggage to be placed in lobby for loading aboard aircraft by stewards).

At 0830 arrive Center headquarters.

At 0830–0855 General orientation briefing on the organization and mission of the Air Force Missile Test Center and the Atlantic Missile Range. Briefing officer: Lieutenant Colonel Tisdale. (Coffee available in briefing room.)

At 0855–0910 Titan III briefing. Briefing officer: Major Speaker.

At 0910–0915 discussion.

At 0915 depart Center headquarters. Escort officer: Lieutenant Colonel Tisdale.

At 0935 enter south gate, Cape Kennedy.

At 0935–0945 drive by Thor.

At 0945 arrive Complex 31, Minuteman, Briefing officer: Major Planinac.

At 1010 depart.

At 1010–1020 drive by Mace Hardsite.

At 1020 arrive Complex 36A, Centaur. Briefing officer: Mr. Brandt.

At 1040 depart.

At 1040–1050 drive by Atlas and Titan II.

At 1050 arrive Complex 37, Saturn. Briefing officer: Lieutenant Colonel Petrone.

At 1120 depart.

At 1130–1155 visit Titan III construction area.

At 1155 depart.

At 1215 depart south gate.

At 1235 arrive officers club.

At 1235–1320 lunch.

At 1320 depart officers club.
At 1325 arrive base operations.
At 1330 depart Patrick Air Force Base.

M. P. PARSONS,
*Executive Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, after our briefing at the foot of the Saturn at Complex 37—by Lieutenant Colonel Petrone our group then visited the Titan III construction area. We were proud of the revolutionary advancement made by our Nation's scientists, engineers, and military specialists in the space-missile field.

We arrived at the officers' club, Cocoa Beach, for lunch. After having exchanged felicitations and voiced our appreciative sentiments with the officers of the command we arose from our tables to return to Patrick Air Force Base. At that very moment we received the news of the shooting of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The reaction was terrible—some cursed, others were afflicted with nausea, still others wept—all were stunned by the tragic news. We retired to a television set in another room hoping against hope that he would survive. But alas the fates decreed otherwise—our President, having received the Catholic sacrament of extreme unction from two priests at the hospital—later he was pronounced dead.

Our place was in Washington at this grave hour of our Nation's bereavement.

We departed at 2:35 p.m. for Patrick Airfield to board our planes for Washington—arriving there at 5:05 p.m. In flight we learned of the President's plane bearing his body and that it would arrive at Andrews Airbase at 6 p.m. And so we waited at Andrews Field to stand in humility before the remains of our friend and Commander in Chief—an American President martyred in the cause of freedom and liberty. This ignominious day will go down in the history of the Nation as one of the darkest days of our Republic. May God bless his soul and welcome him to one of His sacred mansions.

## POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the assassination of President Kennedy, there is vital need for the American people to gain perspective on the facts surrounding what President Johnson has called the foulest deed of our time.

The national interest can only be served by most thorough investigation into the facts surrounding the assassination. Pending the complete results of this investigation, it would seem to be the duty of every American, especially our political leaders and public figures, to direct their energies toward helping the Nation acquire perspective and insight into the tragic events of November 22.

In this regard, I regret to note that much has been said in recent days that both blurs the salient facts known about the President's death and does disservice to the overriding cause of national unity at this critical time. This is no time for any American to seize upon the incident of national tragedy in order to further the political philosophy of one group against another.

Nor is the grim circumstance of an American President's tragic death to be used as a political propaganda weapon by any one group against another.

I, for one, resent deeply the frantic and unreasoned effort on the part of some spokesmen to issue a mass indictment against a city, a State, and a region for what occurred at Dallas, Tex., that fatal Friday afternoon.

To lay the responsibility for this foulest deed upon any city, State, region, or group of Americans is to sow the seeds of national distrust and division. It is also demagogic nonsense.

There is reason to believe that the President was assassinated by a demented personality acting on his own. At the same time, we cannot overlook the fact that the mind of Lee Harvey Oswald by his own admission had been poisoned at an early age by the propaganda of the most malevolent enemy of our American system—the forces of international communism.

Our Government has said that it has no indication that the Soviet Government or any other foreign government was involved in the assassination of President Kennedy. Though this be true, there is no overlooking the fact that before he himself died, the assassin Oswald, told the world that he had first developed his hatred for this country and our system after reading an inflammatory Communist tract at the age of 15.

If therefore it can be said that an atmosphere of hate surrounded the mind of Oswald, let us remember that this poison did not emanate from Dallas, New York, or any other American community but from the alien capital city of the Communist world.

Indeed, it is not surprising to find the Communist propaganda apparatus today—such as the Worker—looking for a purported "ultraright" scapegoat to cover up Oswald's political past, which led from the Soviet Union to the place of assassination. The history of communism is one of social criminality and violence, and Lee Harvey Oswald, whether or not acting as a Communist agent on November 22, was certainly acting in the bloody political tradition of his Communist mentors. But Americans, especially American leaders in politics and communications, should not be misled—nor should they mislead others—in fixing the moral responsibility for the death of our President.

For if there is a lesson to be derived from this painful moment in our history, it is that we cannot permit ourselves to fall victim to the illusion that the way of the Communist is the way of peace, unity, or tolerance. The assassination of President Kennedy was an act of violence and intolerance—it was an act in the Communist tradition.

## OAS ACTION AGAINST CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Organization of American States recently in an unusual show of unity voted to establish a committee to investigate the charges by Venezuela that the hidden cache of arms discovered on her coast had its origin in Cuba. The Venezuelans have indicated they have undeniable proof that their charges are true, and President Betancourt has called on all the nations in this hemisphere to impose an air and sea blockade of Communist Cuba to prevent further exportation of arms and revolutionaries.

It is past time for the OAS to act as a united body, especially when Communist aggression is threatening the whole Western Hemisphere. The only black mark in the 16-to-0 vote in favor of investigating the Venezuelan charges was Mexico's abstention. The OAS to be an effective arm of freedom for all the Americas must be 100 percent united in her fight against communism. Unless the member nations of the OAS act quickly, forcefully, and with unity against any forms of further Communist aggression in this hemisphere, then we may suffer Communist terrorism throughout the Americas. The United States for one cannot and must not allow this to happen at our own back door.

I urge the United States to stand firmly against the exportation from Cuba of arms and revolutionaries to terrorize and foster communism in the nations of this hemisphere. The United States and all the nations of the Americas should join together in economically isolating Castro, and in doing so effectively bring about an end to communism in Cuba.

## STATE DEPARTMENT IS ASKED TO CHECK REPORT THAT AN AMERICAN EMBASSY DRIVER IN MOSCOW TOOK PART IN FRAMEUP OF PROFESSOR BARGHOORN

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the State Department to investigate a report that the American Embassy in Moscow has fired its Soviet chauffeur who was serving as a personal driver for Ambassador Foy D. Kohler and will replace him with an American citizen to drive the American Ambassador around. This report appears in the December 9 edition of Newsweek magazine, which states that this Soviet national was fired because he drove Professor Barghoorn to the scene in Moscow where the professor was arrested, and

**that this employee of the American Embassy actually took part in the frameup of Professor Barghoorn. The entire Newsweek article follows:**

> **Executive wing: The State Department plans to replace all of its Russian drivers in Moscow with American citizens. Reason: A Russian who had been serving as personal chauffeur to U.S. Ambassador to Russia Foy Kohler took part in the frameup of Yale Prof. Frederick Barghoorn. The chauffeur (who was promptly fired) drove Barghoorn to the scene of his arrest, stood by while the incriminating papers were thrust into his hands, never reported the incident to the Embassy.**

**Mr. Speaker, if this report is indeed true, then I submit that the conduct by this Soviet national employed by the American Embassy in Moscow is incredible. His failure to report the arrest to his employer for 3 days is indefensible. I further submit that if this report is true I hope that the dismissal of these Soviet nationals from the staff of the American Embassy in Moscow marks the beginning of a new sensible policy on the part of our Department of State to stop employing foreign nationals for employment in our American embassies in countries behind the Iron Curtain.**

**It is my hope that even if this report proves to be unfounded, our State Department will recognize certain realities and hire only American citizens in these very sensitive outposts.**

I have objected for a long time to our policy of hiring foreign nationals in our embassies in these Communist-dominated countries. Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind that foreign nationals employed by American embassies behind the Iron Curtain must first be cleared by the Communist Party in their respective countries? Who is so naive to think otherwise?

The State Department explains that it hires foreign nationals for nonsensitive jobs. I submit that every job is sensitive in our embassies and the Barghoorn incident may very well prove this.

The State Department also says that it hires foreign nationals to save money; that it would cost vastly more to hire American citizens. I am confident we can trim expenses somewhere else to make up the extra cost to provide maximum security for our diplomatic outposts in these Iron Curtain countries.

There are also those who say that if we insist on hiring only American citizens in our embassies behind the Iron Curtain, the Soviet Union will insist on hiring only Soviet nationals in their embassy here in Washington. This argument appears to me to be completely insane. Has anyone except a Soviet national ever set foot in the inner sanctums of the Soviet Embassy here in Washington? Why, they don't even let our firemen enter the Embassy when there is a fire, and you will recall that only recently there was a fire at the Soviet Embassy. Both our firemen and policemen were prohibited from entering.

Mr. Speaker, if the Barghoorn incident, as reported in Newsweek is correct, I believe we should immediately dismiss all foreign nationals employed in American embassies behind the Iron Curtain and replace them with American citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may revise and extend their remarks on the life and character of the late Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of the State of New York, immediately following my remarks and that they may have 5 legislative days in which to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## OUR MAN, THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been written in memory of our beloved President John F. Kennedy. One of the most moving tributes I have read appeared last Sunday, December 1, in the Corpus Christi Calendar, the weekly bulletin published by Corpus Christi Church which is located in the Morningside Heights section of the district which I have the honor to represent. Msgr. Arthur A. Campbell is the pastor.

Father John Dwyer captured the spirit of John F. Kennedy when he observed:

> One of the many amazing things about John F. Kennedy was that for our people he bridged the gap between the remote abstract thing, "the Government," and ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will read the following:

> OUR MAN, THE PRESIDENT
>
> So many words have been written about our poor late President, and yet all of us realize that words are not adequate to express fully our sorrow and our shock. This is why so many grown men have shed tears once or several times in these last days. There are thoughts that lie too deep for words and yet must find expression; thus tears mixed with inadequate words brought forth the way we thought and felt about "our man," the President.
>
> One of the many amazing things about John F. Kennedy was that for our people he bridged the gap between that remote abstract thing, the Government, and ourselves. When he walked into the White House, we walked in with him and it became our Washington residence, a place we maintained for our representative. When he spoke sharply or persuasively to foreign governments or to big business, he spoke for us, telling them how we felt.
>
> Oh sure, we disagreed with some things he said or did even as we disagree with some of the things the other members of our family say and do. But even when we disagreed, we felt he was sincere, that he had his reasons, and that maybe he knew something he couldn't yet tell us which influenced his decision. Being human, we gave him room and allowed for his differences with us. Only the editorial writers of the Daily News, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal are infallible and all knowing, so only they could be so consistently critical and harsh in their judgments of almost everything the President said or did. Fortunately we didn't elect them to represent us; we did elect "our man." He spoke for us, and when he died we lost part of our ability to express the way we think to the world.
>
> The outpouring of affection at his death proved that although many of the high and the mighty opposed him because he opposed their self-centeredness, the vast majority of his fellow citizens loved him and respected him as a good man, aligned with his God, with his fellow man and with us. Perhaps we did not deserve him, so that God allowed him to be taken from us, that we might better appreciate a man like John F. Kennedy, if He should deign in His mercy to send us another to be "our man."

## HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH of the Eighth District of Virginia is a distinguished patriot, gentleman, and great American. Imbued with wisdom, dedication, and devotion, he has been the spearhead in the move for economy in the House for many years. As chairman of the Committee on Rules, and working through its members, reckless spending authorizations have been greatly minimized. The Washington Post on Friday, December 6, 1963, said this, and I quote:

> In its Committee on Rules, the House of Representatives has created a tyranny; the tyrant who heads that committee, HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, has held up an imperious hand forbidding the House to act on civil rights legislation which, if it came to the floor, would certainly be endorsed by a majority of the Members.

Judge SMITH's announcement of yesterday stated:

> The civil rights bill is the most controversial and emotional bill that Congress has had to deal with in my recollection. It is one that requires sober reflection and careful consideration in a calmer atmosphere than exists at present.
>
> However, I realize the great national interest that has been aroused on both sides of this controversy and it is my purpose and intent, with the approval of the majority of the Rules Committee to hold hearings on this bill reasonably soon in January after the Congress reconvenes.

Honorable, just, courageous, he believes in fairplay and the time-honored American principal of majority rule. He needs no words of praise or defense. The people of the country know the man. He believes in sound governmental policies and the integrity of the dollar. His hair has thinned and his footsteps less brisk in the service of the country he loves so well.

Could this be the man who was referred to as a tyrant? When evaluation is made by historians of the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's, the name of Howard Worth Smith will be embossed in distinct letters and his virtues extolled to a grateful Nation.

## HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules needs no defense at my hands. But I want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for his remarks in answer to the tirade by the Washington Post against this distinguished Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Howard W. Smith is a dedicated Member of this Congress. He may not agree with the philosophy of the Washington Post, but many of us agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules that this is no time to legislate in an atmosphere charged with emotion on a legislative proposal as highly controversial as this miscalled civil rights bill.

As one humble Member of this body, I do not go along with the Washington Post and others who would rush this controversial bill through the Congress without proper and adequate consideration because of the unfortunate, lamentable and reprehensible assassination of President Kennedy. This great tragedy has no bearing whatever on the merits of the bill. If it was a meritorious bill before the tragedy it is still meritorious, but conversely, if it was bad legislation before that unfortunate event, it is still bad. The distinguished and able chairman of the House Rules Committee has appropriately taken the position that the Congress and the country should have the benefit of ample hearings before the Rules Committee on a proposal that vitally affects the civil rights and liberties of all of the people, not merely one minority group. This is especially true in view of the undisputed fact that the members of the of the House Judiciary Committee were not even given an opportunity to read the bill, much less consider it, before it was voted upon.

I think the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules has conducted himself in a most appropriate manner and I want to be associated with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings], who I think expressed the feeling of a great majority of this body.

## THE TWO-PARTY POLITICAL SYSTEM IS A NECESSARY PART OF LEGISLATION

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, out of respect to the memory of our late President and out of respect to the institutions which make this Nation the world's greatest, I strongly recommend that the Congress adjourn sine die to reconvene in early January 1964.

Our Nation has derived its greatness from the two-party political system. Legislation that is hammered out on the anvil of controversy by reasonable men has made the United States an institution unique in the history of the world.

Politics is vital to the passage of any legislation. Certainly, no legislation can be passed in a nonpolitical atmosphere and should not be. If we have no differences on legislation, then what reason is there for the Congress to exist?

Yet, this is what we have forced on ourselves in recognizing the human tragedy that befell our Nation on November 22d when the late President John F. Kennedy was so despicably murdered.

Reacting to this loss to our Nation, our leaders agreed to a moratorium on politics for a stated period of time. Yet, we are being pressed from all sides to make political decisions in a forced atmosphere of no politics.

This is simply not possible. There can be no Government without politics and no politics without Government. Since we are bound to observe this moratorium, we should go the next step and recess the Congress for the remainder of the 30-day period that has been set up by our leaders.

## FOREIGN AID

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, radio station KGBX in Springfield, Mo., broadcast an editorial on November 23, 1963, on the subject of foreign aid. The editorial calls attention to the fact that we have been dispensing aid from a shotgun instead of from a rifle. I commend the station for its interest in public affairs and urge all to read their comments:

### Foreign Aid—KGBX Editorial Broadcast November 23, 1963

The United States has been spending our posterity's money all over the world so fast that even a computer has trouble figuring out how much and where it has gone. Let's look at just one spot for a moment—Brazil. In March this year foreign aid Director David E. Bell announced a new $400 million Brazilian aid program. How did this affect the Government of Brazil? President Goulart immediately raised all government and military pay by another 70 percent. Brazil now owes the United States over $2 billion. Their currency verges on being worthless. The nation is torn with dissension. So what should we do? The State Department figured out a quick answer through our foreign aid program—give Brazil another $500,000 for a study of what Brazil really needs to spend more money on.

The American taxpayer is the softest touch in the world. Through our foreign aid programs we have given away over $106 billion to over 100 nations including several Communist countries. For instance, Yugoslavia, to date over $2.4 billion in U.S. aid. The result? Tito rejoined the Russian orbit. We even paid 40 percent of a U.N. aid project to furnish Yugoslavia with a nuclear reactor.

Now, all of this came from America's taxpayers. We are a Nation that can't possibly ever get out of debt in the lifetime of anyone now living. Our national debt is over $309 billion. We will spend $10 billion more than we will take in this year.

Before you decide that this a purely partisan editorial against the present administration, let us say that our massive foreign aid giveaway has been going on for over 16 years and that 8 of those years were under a Republican administration. The United States of America seems to be addicted to playing Santa Claus regardless of who is in the White House.

The most pitiful part of it all is that much of our aid goes to underdeveloped countries, many of them barely beyond the tribal stages, who are incapable of absorbing the massive amount of funds sent them. Foreign aid thus becomes a narcotic instead of a stimulant. That is why we read and hear about foreign dignitaries using American money to purchase expensive yachts or build jet airports in countries with no jet planes or build showcase colleges in nations with 95 percent illiteracy that need grade schools. Congressman Durward Hall said it well when he stated:

"We should not have to bribe other countries into choosing freedom over despotism. Foreign aid cannot provide a short cut from poverty to riches without proved responsibility. Today's underdeveloped nations must be willing to work, to learn, to build, step by step, upon their present knowledge. They cannot leap from motor scooters to jets without leaving cracks in their foundation. Let a man use a pair of crutches long enough, and he'll soon forget how to stand on his own two feet. The same applies to emerging nations which have become addicted to our foreign aid."

The question KBGX asks today is, How long can America continue to prop up one half the world with tax dollars we don't have?

## I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, a 16-year-old high school girl, Elizabeth Ellen Evans, has written one of the most stirring tributes to America that I have seen in many a day. Those groups who, for one reason or another, have left the mainstream of American democracy should reflect upon this summation of our history and our hopeful future. I commend Miss Evans' poem to my colleagues:

### I Speak for Democracy

(By Elizabeth Ellen Evans)

I am an American.
Listen to my words, Fascist, Communist.

Listen well, for my country is a strong country, and my message is a strong message.
I am an American, and I speak for democracy.
My ancestors have left their blood on the green at Lexington and the snow at Valley Forge—
On the walls of Fort Sumter and the fields at Gettysburg;
On the waters of the River Marne and in the shadows of the Argonne Forest;
On the beachheads of Salerno and Normandy and the sands of Okinawa;
On the bare, bleak hills called Pork Chop and Old Baldy and Heartbreak Ridge.
A million and more of my countrymen have died for freedom.
My country is their eternal monument.
They live on in the laughter of a small boy as he watches a circus clown's antics and in the sweet, delicious coldness of the first bite of peppermint ice cream on the Fourth of July;
In the little tenseness of a baseball crowd as the umpire calls, "Play Ball!" and in the high school band's rendition of "Stars and Stripes Forever" in the Memorial Day parade;
In the clear, sharp ring of a school bell on a fall morning and in the triumph of a six-year-old as he reads aloud for the first time.
They live on in the eyes of an Ohio farmer surveying his acres of corn and potatoes and pasture, and in the brilliant gold of hundreds of acres of wheat stretching across the flat miles of Kansas;
In the milling of cattle in the stockyards of Chicago;
The precision of an assembly line in an automobile factory in Detroit;
And the perpetual red glow of the nocturnal skylines of Pittsburgh and Birmingham and Gary.
They live on in the voice of a young Jewish boy saying the sacred words from the Torah: "Hear O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is One * * *."
And in the voice of a Catholic girl praying: "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee * * *."
And in the voice of a Protestant boy singing: "A mighty fortress is our God, a bulwark never failing * * *."
They live on in the hearts of 190 million Americans—mechanics and farmers and housewives and coal miners and truckdrivers and chemists and lawyers and plumbers and priests—190 million Americans free to work and speak and vote and pray and love and dream and live as they desire, as they believe.
And those 190 million free Americans have more roast beef and mashed potatoes—
The yield of American labor and land;
More automobiles and telephones and safety razors and aureomycin—
The fruits of American initiative and enterprise;
More public schools and life insurance policies—
The symbols of American security and faith in the future;
More laughter and song than any other people on earth.
This is my answer, Fascist, Communist—
Show me a country greater than our country, show me a people more energetic, creative;
Progressive, bigger hearted and happier than our people.
Not until then will I consider your way of life.
For I am an American, and I speak for democracy.

## JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, THE LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, since the unbelievable and incredible tragedy on November 22, 1963, took place, the Nation and the world have been stunned and cannot seem to realize that our young and vigorous leader has been taken. As one, the people of our country have united in their grief. It was a tragedy that touched all our homes and caused a soul-searching reappraisal of our lives.

President John F. Kennedy symbolized the vitality and youthful vigor of what has been called the American experiment. He saw a country 188 years young, and sought to move it forward to a greater maturity, both at home and abroad. It was his sense of history and his belief in the destiny of this country, that provided him with his guidelines for action, and stimulated his eloquent appeals for peace and progress.

By now, many words have been spoken of our late President's abilities, virtues, and accomplishments. Little more can be added to the eulogies and the beautiful tributes that have already been expressed. If there is little left unsaid, there is still much to be done.

We can all take comfort, in our hour of grief, that the constitutional framework remains, and that it has functioned so well in the face of adversity. In the years ahead as America moves forward, as it must and will, each of us has a part that can be played in helping to fulfill the great promise of our Nation.

In the future, the means with which we choose to pursue our common goals will not always correspond with those proposed by our late President. Yet there can be no greater living memorial to John F. Kennedy than an America tolerant of differences, strong in its ability to wage meaningful debate on the nature of society without resort to violence or demagoguery, and confident that the democratic process he used and helped us to perfect will carry this Nation to its true destiny.

## VISION, COURAGE, AND FAITH

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, educating our youth has long held my interest. And like most of you I like to speak to graduating classes even though it takes much preparation for we try to give our youth something they will remember.

Always I want to know what is being said to our young men and women in the Armed Forces. I was glad when my attention was called to the address of Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Pritchard, U.S. Air Force, to the pilot undergraduate class at Craig Air Force Base, Ala., on October 22, 1963.

The young men in the class had just completed a year's training in jet flying. So General Pritchard did not tell them how to fly, but he told them some things about life that will give them courage and strength whether they are on the ground or in the air. I like what he said.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include General Pritchard's address:

### VISION, COURAGE, AND FAITH

The frequency with which two words are used today in this country, "peace" and "security," make me believe there are few other words which drive people so persistently. All other things we want seem to hang on the maintenance of these two words.

They are the foundation of the heritage, handed us by our forefathers, under our Constitution and Bill of Rights. A heritage—which assures us as individuals—more freedoms than all the Communists in the world, individually or collectively, can ever hope to have.

Freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religion, freedom of the press. Hidden freedoms as well, which permit us to vacation when and where we please, to own our homes, to wear the kind of clothing we like best, to go and come as we please without having to show identification papers or explain our mission.

Freedom to change jobs when we want, to enter any type of work that appeals to us most, to send our children to the college of our choice, and yes, freedom to express any opinion we have even if such opinion might be uncomplimentary to our Government.

No member of the Armed Forces will quarrel with the propriety of these urges. We are, in fact, in being only to insure their continuance. We are also often the arbitrators of proper balance between the two words "peace" and "security"; they are mutually dependent, not mutually exclusive.

Although our country has fought in many wars we have never been a warlike nation. Because of this, we rebound from each of these mortal struggles with a wish for peace so all engrossing that better judgments are sometimes clouded with emotion and peace becomes pictured as something to be had on the basis of want alone.

History has shown us repeatedly throughout the years that fervency of desires is not enough; that even the most skillful preparation in defense only reduces but can't eliminate the danger of war.

This desire for peace and security certainly has grass roots in every American home.

This is natural because it is from each of these homes that peaceful men go forth to become fighters; it is to these homes that, inevitably, some of them fail to return. Whether they return or not it is from these homes that prayers for father, for husband, or for son are sent daily in their behalf; some prayers to be answered and some not. The letters of condolence to families of members of my command lost in Vietnam, Ecuador or other isolated countries are grim reminders.

Let us take those two words again, "peace" and "security." Very simple words. Peace—if we can set it apart—doesn't seem to cost anything. Yet, on the other hand, security costs the moon. It costs in men, it costs in effort, it costs in sacrifice, and it costs in determination.

From earliest childhood we have learned that wishes are granted only when we work hard, endure, persevere; and yes, even fight to attain them.

Today we face a determined adversary who is as energetic and dynamic as we in the United States were 150 years ago. This adversary has an objective—a plan—leadership and determination directed toward one goal: Communist domination of the entire world.

This is no idle threat—militant communism, frankly and openly dedicated to the conquest and regimentation of all mankind, has made major progress toward this goal. It has actually seized control of 15 nations—more than 5 million square miles of territory, and one-third of all the people on earth.

This is a real threat to the heritage of freedom established and preserved for us by the sacrifices and dedication of our forefathers.

Now, how do we guard against erosion of this heritage? First of all, its defense must be a corporate responsibility for each of us—not the isolated responsibility of our political, spiritual, or military leaders—but rather one of each of us as an individual. In my mind, this confrontation poses a separate and distinct challenge to us in three specific areas: vision, courage, and faith.

Vision to see through the masquerade of those elements fomenting unrest and distrust—to evaluate and discriminate between selfish objectives and selfless service—to anticipate possible and probable inroads on this heritage—the vision to recognize where our primary efforts must go—yes, it is really going to require a crystal ball of the highest effectiveness.

Then, we are going to have to demonstrate courage. Courage to stand up and be counted; not just when the issue is popular but when our vision has clearly identified it as right. Courage to exercise our freedom of speech and worship and courage to fulfill our related responsibilities such as voting and discharging our community obligations. Courage to develop and practice intellectual honesty and integrity as unpleasant as the subject or logic processes may be. Courage to cope with the issue as it arises rather than pushing it aside for another day. Yes, it is going to take courage on a par with the highest demonstrated in any military action.

Our heritage, our way of life, our children's future and our country's future, are the stakes. There are none higher and there can be no compromise. Compromise may make a fine umbrella, but there is no question but what it makes an unacceptable and worthless roof.

Finally, it is going to take faith. Faith regardless of disappointments or frustrations. Faith in our fundamental principles, particularly the rights and dignity of the individual, faith in our forefathers' wisdom as they identified and recorded man's inalienable rights. Faith in our democratic way of life which permits each of us to participate directly in guiding our country's destiny. Faith in our judicial system which says a man is innocent until proven guilty, and finally faith in the Almighty for his watchfulness, guidance, and comfort. I think that we military men, though we often stray from the blueprint of a true Christian, and here I definitely include myself, have on occasions been considerably closer to the Lord than most people. War is impersonal and heavy flack and fire even more so, I can recall several times when it seemed only natural when things quieted down to look up and say "Thanks again."

Yes, faith in the only Supreme Power will help in giving us vision, help in supporting our courage, and belief in the things we hold sacred, dear, and right. But let's not forget He cannot do it alone, for us, it has got to be a team effort with His contribution being to help us help ourselves.

This certainly was not intended to be a sermon, nevertheless, it has been a privilege to share these thoughts with you.

## JOHN F. KENNEDY

**Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues in expressing my personal shock and sorrow over the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. When I heard the report on the radio I was aware that it was my President who had been the victim of this diabolical deed. The right hand of Christian fellowship and love of my family is added to mine as it is extended to Mrs. Kennedy and the bereaved family.

The office of the President of the United States stands as a symbol of law and order before the world. It is the image of a country committed under faith in God to the preservation and extension of the dignity of the individual. The death of our President, tragic as it is for the family and for our Nation, will not be in vain if we are determined to bring to reality the ideals of which he so forcibly spoke. Let us labor to keep America strong in the cause of right as we see it. This is the only fitting memorial for one who has served our country in its highest office and died while in the service of his country.

## THE 23D COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, knowing me to be an old Marine have asked me about the new commandant-designate, Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

I have told them with a great deal of personal pleasure and no small amount of pride that I have known him for a long time and served with him during World War II. I also take pleasure in telling them that he impressed me the first time I ever saw him as an exceptionally fine officer.

The events of the succeeding years have proven that my idea was entirely sound.

Because of the interest shown in the new Commandant, I am glad to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 1963 issue of Shipmate, the official publication of the alumni association of the Naval Academy.

### THE 23D COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

A favorite and oft recurring criticism of our Armed Forces and their military leadership is typified by the term "battle ship admiral" or perhaps, in more recent times, disparaging references to the protagonists of aircraft carriers. Such expression as "unimaginative" and "inability to adapt to modern concepts and conditions" are not uncommon in the salvos fired at military officers in high position. As long as there are military services, as long as there is progress, such criticism must continue, but there will be times when critics in this field find themselves with much less to say.

On January 1, 1964, Gen. Wallace Martin Greene, Jr., USMC, will become Commandant of the Marine Corps and a four-star general.

In a press conference following the White House announcement, General Greene is reported to have said that he is thinking of using space rockets to fly marines to distant areas where in emergenices their presence might be required. "It may be possible," he said, "to launch a 1,200 man battalion from Camp Lejeune, N.C., to a trouble spot in Africa in a matter of 80 minutes."

If any of the reporters present at that September 24 conference thought that General Greene was no more than reaching for a dramatic pronouncement by which he might establish himself in his newly appointed post they had failed to size up the general and had certainly not recalled an address delivered by him at the MCROA Military Conference in Atlanta, Ga., on May 11, 1963. On that occasion, some months before it was known that he was to be selected as Commandant of the Marine Corps, he had said, "Within the space of 5 years I believe that we shall be moving small troop units, ammunition, and supplies in suborbital trajectories across the surface of the earth by rocket. Vehicles will travel at tremendous speeds of up to 4,000 miles an hour. At first we will be limited to short distances, but as our capabilities increase we shall be able to depart a rocket launching base in Camp Lejeune and land in the center of Africa in about 80 minutes."

General Greene is not a dreamer; he is an officer with a fine sense of the practical. He like his predecessors, knows that the accomplishments of the Corps are the accomplishments of its officers and men. To this end his credo is one of planning and preparation, effective training and constant readiness. His record is testimony of his ability in these areas.

Wallace Martin Greene, Jr., was born in Waterbury, Vt., and there completed his early education. Following a year at the University of Vermont young Wallie entered the U.S. Naval Academy in the early summer of 1926. A glance at the 1930 Lucky Bag might indicate that his 4 years as a midshipman presented no unusual difficulties for this young man. A good Marine would instantly note that in each of those 4 years Midshipman Greene qualified as an expert rifleman.

At graduation in June 1930, Wallace Greene was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps after which there followed the required year of additional training at Marine officers' basic school. As in the case of most young Marine officers the ensuing years were a succession of barracks duty, more schools, sea duty and duty with combat units of the corps.

The start of World War II found Major Greene in London, England, assigned as a special naval observer. During that assignment he attended the British Amphibious Warfare School at Inverary, Scotland, and the Royal Engineer Demolitions School at Ripon, York.

Back in the States in February 1942, Wallace Greene was soon named Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, of the 3d Marine Brigade with which he sailed for the far Pacific in April. After a year and a half on the island of Upolu he joined the V Amphibious Corps, Tactical Group One, in Hawaii, again as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3. For outstanding service in this capacity during the planning and execution of the Marshall Islands invasion he was awarded his first Legion of

**Merit. Following disbanding of the group in March 1944, he joined the 2d Marine Division as G–3, where, for equally meritorious performance on Saipan and Tinian, he won his second Legion of Merit.**

**Successive duty assignments since the war have amply demonstrated the general's exceptional capabilities in planning, operations, and training, and his ability as both executive and commander. In September 1955, he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and became assistant commander of the 2d Marine Division. Ordered to the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C., in May 1956, he served as commanding general, Recruit Training Command, until March 1957, when he became commanding general of the recruit depot.**

**In August 1958, while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff, G–3, in Headquarters, Marine Corps, Washington, he received his promotion to the rank of major general. The following March he was named Deputy Chief of Staff (Plans), remaining in that assignment until January 1, 1960, when he became Chief of Staff with the rank of lieutenant general. In this office General Greene has remained up to the present date, and it is from this office that he will become the 23d Commandant of the Marine Corps.**

**He follows in a long line of illustrious predecessors, officers whose first commissions in the corps have been from many sources. General Greene will be the sixth Commandant to have graduated from the Naval Academy, the last having been Maj. Gen. John H. Russell, Jr., class of 1892, who was Commandant from 1934 to 1936.**

**In wishing the new Commandant all success as he enters office, perhaps the time-honored sailors' blessing, "a fair wind and a following sea," should give way to the times; to General Greene "a smooth blast off, a true flight, and a cool reentry at the calculated point."**

## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have frequently shared in condemning Government agencies for failing to give adequate access to important information to the Congress and to communications media. We have been eager to protect this freedom of access to significant information as a guarantee of the liberties of our citizens.

By the same token, we should not hesitate to call attention to situations where liberty has become license and our institutions are imperiled by permitting to representatives of the communications media a freedom which is unreasonable and tends to destroy the liberties we seek to protect.

It is generally agreed that the kowtowing of the police in Dallas to the communications media was a substantial factor in the death of Lee Oswald, and I believe that it is incumbent upon us to condemn the abuses of liberty as well as its denial, and to record our fervent hope that the normal processes of police investigation and judicial prosecution will not be perverted in order to pander to a morbid curiosity that has neither reason nor justification.

In this connection, I want to call to your attention a pertinent letter by several prominent professors which appeared in the New York Times of December 1, 1963, and an excellent editorial in the same issue of that newspaper:

### CONDUCT OF OSWALD CASE—OBSESSION WITH PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO BE INFORMED IS CONDEMNED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The undersigned, teachers of the administration of criminal justice at the Harvard Law School, would like to commend the New York Times for its excellent editorial of November 25, commenting on the deplorable incidents in the Dallas police station ending in the death of Lee Oswald.

From Friday, November 22, through Sunday the shocking manner in which our processes of criminal justice are often administered was exhibited to ourselves and to the world. Of course, there was a legitimate concern of the public to know promptly that investigations had been completed and a single suspect apprehended, and that responsible authorities had sufficient evidence to justify his arraignment and indictment.

But surely this could have been satisfied without turning the process of investigation and accusation into what can only be described as a public spectacle, carried on in the Dallas police station with its halls and corridors jammed with a noisy, milling throng of reporters and cameramen.

#### ACCESS TO NEWS MEDIA

Precisely because the President's assassination was the ultimate in defiance of law it called for the ultimate in vindication of law. The law enforcement agencies in permitting virtually unlimited access to the news media, made this impossible.

Not only would it have been virtually impossible to impanel a jury which had not formed its own views on those facts which might come before it, but much of the information released, such as statements by Mrs. Oswald, might have been legally inadmissible at trial.

It is ironic that the very publicity which had already made it virtually impossible for Oswald to be tried and convicted by a jury meeting existing constitutional standards of impartiality should, in the end, have made such trial unnecessary.

We cannot comfort ourselves with the notion that this could have happened only in Dallas. It is too frequently a feature of our process of criminal justice that it is regarded as a public carnival. And this reflects our general obsession that everybody has a right immediately to know and see everything, that reporters and TV cameras must be omnipresent, that justice must take a second place behind the public's immediate "right to be informed" about every detail of a crime.

#### INCOMPATIBLE WITH JUSTICE

For the fact is that justice is incompatible with the notion that police, prosecutors, attorneys, reporters, and cameramen should have an unlimited right to conduct ex parte public trials in the press and on television.

As long as we adhere to that notion, and as long as our legislatures and courts are unwilling to protect the processes of justice, we must recognize that the lamentable behavior of the Dallas law enforcement agencies and of the communications media reflect a flaw in ourselves as a society.

PAUL M. BATOR.
RICHARD R. BAXTER.
CHARLES FRIED.
ROBERT A. GIRARD.
HENRY M. HART, Jr.
LOUIS L. JAFFE.
JAMES VORENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *November 27, 1963.*

### THE RUBY TRIAL

The late Robert Jackson once said that excessive publicity surrounding the accusation and trial of criminal suspects was "one of the worst menaces to American justice." Too often in this country we see a criminal trial become a circus, providing titillation to the public instead of the quiet search for truth that should characterize judicial proceedings.

These thoughts come to mind with reports that television cameras may be admitted to the Dallas trial of Jack Ruby on the charge of murdering Lee Harvey Oswald, alleged assassin of President Kennedy. In a letter printed on this page today, seven Harvard law teachers tellingly criticize the whole handling of the criminal process in Dallas to date for its excessive emphasis on publicity. These grave errors would be compounded by televising the trial, as can easily be judged in considering just one fact: that the faces of the jurors would be displayed to millions day after day on television. A juror whose conscience pointed to an unpopular position might well be dissuaded by fear of public contempt or worse.

The press and other media of communication have their great duty to seek the facts by all decent means. The events of the last grim week have demonstrated how effective television, in particular, can be in giving every American a sense of direct participation in history—in all its majesty and all its terror. But officers of the law have their responsibilities, too, and one of them is to assure fair trials. When these two duties conflict, we have no hesitation in saying that fair trial should take precedence over publicity.

Judges and prosecutors and lawyers have the obligation to put the interests of justice first. Courts, as Justice Dougles has put it, are not designed "to provide the public with recreation or with instruction in the ways of government."

All these considerations are the more compelling in the case of Jack Ruby. Even should he welcome television cameras, they ought to be rigorously excluded. The reputation of American justice has already been damaged enough in our own eyes and in those of the world as a result of the degrading events in Dallas without suffering the further indignity of the Ruby trial becoming a national show.

## SHEVCHENKO PROJECT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the confusing and misleading information that has been disseminated by the Washington Post, the more one can be convinced of the urgent and pressing need for a Shevchenko Champion of Liberty stamp and a Shevchenko Freedom Library section in our Library of Congress. I have submitted resolutions to realize both of these objectives because the entire Shevchenko project is intimately tied up with the greater issues of national security and the freedom and independence of all the captive non-Russion nations in Eastern Europe and Asia.

This lack of understanding on the part of a reputable newspaper clearly shows that it is high time that we propagate more the truths about Shevchenko and the captive nations. Both a stamp and a library section would be two effective means of overcoming such inexcusable intolerance.

We know from experience that where ignorance prevails, smears are resorted to. The editor of the Washington Post has done a grave injustice to Shevchenko and his historic works. One need only read chapter V, title "Shevchenko and the Jews," in House Document No. 445; "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shevchenko 1814–61," to understand how absurd and immoral these charges are.

### ALBERT EINSTEIN, MEMBER OF THE SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY

The absurdity of the reckless charges made by the Post's editor is further magnified when one pauses to consider the fact that outstanding Jewish scholars, like the world renowned Albert Einstein, have been members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, an intellectual body that bears the great poet's name and perpetuates his spirit and works. Einstein was elected to the society on March 17, 1929, and remained a member to the day of his death.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution on the Shevchenko Freedom Library calls for the cooperation of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. I should like to include background material on the society and also a list of some of its world scholarly members—Jewish, Russian, Polish, and others, who surely have known what anti-Semitism means, and whose names in themselves certify to the universal stature of Shevchenko:

### THE AIMS

The aims and purposes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Inc., are:

First. To organize and support research on Ukraine and eastern Europe in the United States.

Second. To assist in the integration of exiled Ukrainian scholars and scientists, educators and writers, into American society.

Third. To serve as an American-Ukrainian publishing center, especially in the fields of humanities, social sciences and economics.

Fourth. To organize academic conferences, public lectures and discussion meetings on eastern European problems, especially Ukrainian.

Fifth. To maintain a library and archives to facilitate research on Ukraine and eastern Europe.

Sixth. To sponsor in the United States activities in the field of culture and civilization—organization of museums and archives, book and art exhibition—which illustrate the contribution of Americans of Ukrainian descent to American culture.

Seventh. To promote mutual understanding of Ukrainians and Americans in order to establish permanent bonds between Ukrainian and American scholars, and sincere friendship between America and an eventually free Ukraine.

Eighth. To act as a headquarters of the fight for academic freedom behind the Iron Curtain and to defend America against creeping Russian communism.

Ninth. To raise and collect funds, grants, donations, and gifts for these purposes.

### THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the past several years the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Inc.:

First. Organized research on Ukraine and Eastern Europe through continuous work of its philological, historical-philosophical and mathematical, physical and medical sections, and of the Committee for American Encyclopedias.

Second. Members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society are teaching at Columbia University, Georgetown University, Harvard University, Marquette University, University of California, University of Notre Dame, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin, University of Miami, University of St. Louis, the Catholic University of America, Seton-Hall University, and other similar institutions, and they participate in the annual meetings of American learned societies, like the American Modern Language Association, American Historical Association, and so forth.

Third. To the more than 600 volumes published before World War II, the society has added in English, "Proceedings, Philological Section," volumes I, II; "Proceedings, Historical-Philosophical Section," volume I; "Proceedings, Mathematical, Physical and Medical Section," volumes I, II.

In Ukrainian: "Memoirs," volumes 11, 162, 165; "Collected Papers, Philological Section," volumes 24, 25, 26.

In addition, the society has published works of Ukrainian writers who were murdered by the Soviet regime or works of writers which are forbidden in the Soviet Union: Yurij Yanovskyj; "The Shipmaster"; Eugene Malaniuk: "Poems"; Bohdan Lepkyj: "Mazepa—From Poltava to Bendery"; "Broken Strings—An Anthology of Poems of Ukrainian Poets, Killed or Deported Between 1920 and 1945."

Three more volumes are being printed. The society also has manuscripts of 14 volumes of scholarly works which, because of lack of funds, have not yet been published.

Fourth. The society has organized, up to August 1, 1955, 135 meetings of its sections and committees; 4 semesters of Ukrainian university studies; conference at Columbia University commemorating the 80th anniversary of the foundation of Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Fifth. The library of the society is being organized, having already collected 4,830 books; it has also valuable historical archives.

Sixth. The society has sponsored cultural activities in many cities of America, and the "Ukrainian National Museum" in Ontario, Calif., is under its auspices.

Seventh. Its members are standing in the forefront of the fight for academic freedom behind the Iron Curtain, and have published on this topic, books and articles, and have delivered talks over the Voice of America.

Eighth. The work of the society has been greatly helped through the understanding and generosity of our fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent and through subsidies from the East European Fund, Inc., headed by Prof. Philip Mosely, of Columbia University, and Director David Munford.

East European Fund, Inc., granted the Shevchenko Society a subsidy of $10,000 and $30,000 for a special "book project"—the publication of works of Ukrainian writers murdered by the Soviet regime and works of writers that are forbidden in the Soviet Union. This grant is operated jointly with a similar grant to UVAN, under the chairmanship of Prof. Philip Mosely, of Columbia University.

### SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, INC.

The Shevchenko Scientific Society was founded in 1873 in Western Ukraine, Lviv, then under Austrian rule, on the initiative of Ukrainians from East Ukraine, then part of the Russian Empire, in which the Ukrainian nation, culture and language were persecuted by the Russian Tsarist Government and their very existence negated.

The Society bears the name of the great bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61, who, in one of his poems proclaimed: "When will our waiting for Washington with the new and just law be at last fulfilled?" To cultivate the traditions of academic and political freedom represented by Washington and Shevchenko, is also the ideological program of this society.

It is the oldest Ukrainian learned society which, before World War I, developed into a Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and Liberal Arts, with the largest library for eastern Slavic studies in central Europe, a museum, and a printing and publishing plant.

Under the leadership of the distinguished historian, first President of the Ukrainian National Republic, M. Hrushevsky, the Society achieved before World War I, a very respected and esteemed rank among learned organizations of Europe and prior to World War II published over 600 volumes.

After the Russian Bolshevik occupation and annexation of Western Ukraine to Soviet Ukraine, the Shevchenko Society was proclaimed by the Soviet Government a branch of the Ukrainian Soviet Academy in Kiev. A majority of members escaped to the DP camps, and many migrated overseas, re-establishing this Society in Western Europe, in the United States, Canada, and Australia.

The Shevchenko Scientific Society upholds the idea of academic freedom and freedom of research and is a leading organization of resistance to communism of Americans of Ukrainian descent and of Ukrainian exiles the world over. The Society which has in the United States over 100 members is aiming also at the enrichment of American culture with the cultural heritage and scholarly contributions of Ukraine.

### EXECUTIVE BOARD

President: Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, Ph. D., Marquette University.

Vice presidents: Prof. Konstantin Kysilewskyj, Ph. D.; Prof. Matwiy Stachiw, LL.D.

Treasurer: Volodymyr Kalyna, Ph. D.

Secretary: Jurij Fedynskyj, LL.D.

Members: Prof. Joseph Andrushkiw, Ph. D., Seton Hall University; Prof.

Wasyl Lew, Ph. D., St. Basil's College; Prof. Yaroslaw Padoch, LL.D.; Michael Pezansky, S.E.; Prof. Roman Osinchuk, M.D.; Prof. Volodymyr Sichynsky, Ph. D.; Prof. Nicholas Zajcew, diploma in engineering

Librarian: Volodymyr Doroshenko.

### THE ROLL OF HONOR

Among the members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society were or are the following great scholars:

Austria: Prof. Theodor Gartner, Prof. Joseph Strzygowski, Prof. Raimund Kaindl.

Bulgaria: Prof. Michael Arnaudof, Prof. George Bonchef, Prof. Stephen Petkov.

Canada: Prof. George Simpson, Prof. Watson Kirkconnell.

Croatia: Prof. Vatroslav Yagic, Prof. Milan Reshetar.

Czechoslovakia: Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, Prof. Liubomir Niederle, Prof. Cyryl Purkine, Prof. Joseph Zubaty, Prof. Jan Machal, Prof. Yaroslav Bidlo, Prof. Yiri Kral.

France: Prof. Andre Mazon.

Germany: Prof. Erich Berneker, Prof. Albrecht Penk, Prof. Max Planck, Prof. Max Vasmer.

Norway: Prof. Olaf Broch.

Poland: Prof. Alexander Bruekner, Prof. Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Prof. Ludwik Kubala, Prof. Przemyslaw Dabkowski.

Russia (pre-World War I): Prof. Vladimir Bechterev, Prof. Abram Yoffe, Prof. Fedor Korsh, Prof. Alexander Pypin, Prof. Alexey Shachmatov.

Serbia (pre-World War I): Prof. Alexander Belic, Prof. Liubomir Miletic, Prof. Bohdan Popowic.

Sweden: Alfred Jensen, Sven Hedin.

United States of America: Prof. Albert Einstein, Prof. Clarence A. Manning.

### SHEVCHENKO KEYNOTES WORLD FREEDOM

The coming Shevchenko statue will in every respect be a statue symbolizing world freedom. This is the most important aspect of the Shevchenko project. Shevchenko keynotes world freedom, especially for the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. Here are only a few of the countless excerpts from the poetry of Taras Shevchenko, stressing freedom and liberty. I submit these excerpts from translations made by a Canadian Shevchenko scholar and an American writer:

[Excerpts from the poetry of Taras Shevchenko]

From "The Neophytes" (1857):

"Ye sons of night,
Insensate dogs, deprived in truth of sight,
You cannot see at all. Flat on the ground
Your greasy, praying carcasses are found;
Behind a cross from devils you would hide,
And then beneath your breath a prayer of pride
Asks God to send the worst adversity
And every kind of plague in high degree
Upon your fellow-Christians, doomed your foes—
May God appoint your condign overthrows,
All ye new pharoahs with your hearts of clay,
Rapacious Caesars of this later day."

(Translated by Watson Kirkconnell.)

From "God's Fool" (1858):

"You were not fit,
Clad in laced liveries, toads, Pharisees,
You were not fit to raise in the defense
Of justice and our sacred liberty!
You have been taught to torture your own brothers,
And not to love them! Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man!"

(Translated by Watson Kirkconnell.)

From "O My Thoughts, My Heartfelt Thoughts" (1839):

"There is Ukraina;
From end to end, there, it is broad
And joyful like freedom
Which has long since passed away;
Broad as a sea, the Dnipro,
Steppe and steppe, the rapids roar,
And gravemounds high as mountains.
There was born the Kozak freedom,
There she galloped round,
With Tartars and with Polish lords
She strewed the plain about
Till it could take no more; with corpses
All the plain she strewed.
Freedom lay down to take her rest;
Meanwhile the gravemound grew,
And high above it, as a warder,
Hovers the Black Eagle,
And Minstrels come and sign about
The gravemound to the people."

(Translated by Vera Rich.)

From "The Dream" (1844):

"The desert wilderness has stirred
As from a coffin's narrow girth
For the Last Judgment day of doom,
The dead are rising for the truth.
These are not the dead, the slain,
They come not seeking Judgment day;
No! They are people, living people,
Put in irons, they draw
Gold up out of holes, to pour it
Down the Glutton's maw,
Among them, the old lags, in chains
Is the King of freedom,
The King of all the world, the King
Wearing a brand for crown.
In torment, in hard labor, he
Pleads not, nor weeps, nor groans.
Once the heart is warmed by goodness,
Cold it will never grow.
Where, then, are your thoughts, your rosy-pink flowers?
Well-cared-for and brave, these dear children of yours?
To whom, then, to whom, my friend, did you give them?
Or perhaps in your heart for all ages you hid them?
Do not hide them, my brother! But scatter them far!
They will germinate, grow—and go into the world."

(Translated by Vera Rich.)

From "The Caucasus" (1845):

"Mountains beyond mountains, crags in stormclouds cloaked,
Wild heights sown with sorrow, soil that blood has soaked.
From the dawn of time, Prometheus
Hangs, the eagle's victim;
All God's days, it pecks his ribs,
Tears the heart within him.
Tears, but cannot drink away
The blood that throbs with life,
Still it lives and lives again
And still once more he smiles.
For our soul shall never perish,
Freedom knows no dying,
And the Glutton cannot harvest
Fields where seas are lying;
Cannot bind the living spirit;
Nor the living word,
Cannot smirch the sacred glory
Of Almighty God."

(Translated by Vera Rich.)

From "Days Are Passing, Nights Are Passing" (1845):

"Terrible to fall into chains,
Dies in captivity,
But worse, far worse, to sleep, to sleep,
To sleep in liberty,
Fall asleep for evermore,
So that the remains
Not a trace: He lived or perished?
It is all the same. . .
Where are you, my fortune, where?
There is none, is none!
Lord, if good fate Thou would'st grudge me,
Grant an evil one."

(Translated by Vera Rich.)

### SHEVCHENKO AGAIN

Mr. Speaker, the various editorials of the Washington Post on this subject appeared in the November 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with apt replies, some of which were not published by the paper. As an ardent believer in open and responsible discussion, I should like to add to that list another editorial in the November 12 issue of the Washington Post, titled "Shevchenko Again," along with a reply to that editorial written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University:

### SHEVCHENKO AGAIN

Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., has very rightly asked his colleagues on the National Capital Planning Commission to review that body's approval of a site for the Shevchenko memorial. The Commission clearly was not well informed about the memorial and it ought to reexamine its decision.

Congress, the Planning Commission, and the Interior Department have been misled by one of the most artful and arrogant lobbies ever operated by a minority group. This lobby has maneuvered the Government into the ridiculous position of approving a memorial to a 19th-century Ukrainian poet, known to few Americans, one who has little or no connection with this country's past, with a reputation for intense Ukrainian nationalism curiously mixed with various other ethnic passions. The real irony of the matter, of course, is that Shevchenko is a hero in the Soviet Union where his name is memorialized in literally hundreds of place names. His monuments there are annually the object of Communist adulation. The advocates of an American memorial to him labor under the strange notion that by putting up a statue to him in Washington they will somehow kidnap a Communist hero and make him into their own hero.

This dispute over the soul of a Ukrainian poet is a quarrel within the ranks of Ukrainian nationalists in which Americans in general and Washingtonians in particular have no proper interest. Even Americans of Ukrainian descent do not share universally in the enthusiasms of the clique which has agitated for the Shevchenko memorial.

All the public agencies that had anything to do with this proposal ought to reexamine their decisions. The Ukrainian group that has raised money for the memorial might more appropriately honor some Ukrainian-American whose genius reflects the success of their countrymen in embracing the cause of this country and in leaving the quarrels of their ancestral homeland where they originated.

NOVEMBER 16, 1963.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST.

Your November 12 editorial on "Shevchenko Again" reads like a neurotic summary of your three previous editorials. It appears that you have exhausted your supply of fantastic opinions, though your motivation of ignorant intolerance still runs high.

Mr. Louchheim expressed his fantastic opinions long before you did. A year ago he exceeded the technical jurisdiction of the National Capital Planning Commission to register his unfounded notions about Shevchenko. He, too, labored under the illusion that Moscow would relish a Shevchenko statue here, but, like you, he was way out of his depth in the face of concrete evidence and fact. I strongly advise you to read a piece of honest journalism, Robert J. Lewis' November 10 article on "The Status of a Statue" in the Sunday Star, in which he rightly states that "Washington would be graced by a memorial to a significant figure in the continuing battle for liberty."

Again, it's a pity that your 6-week expertness on this vital subject hasn't even begun to scratch the surface of available facts. Mr. Wiggins, truly one shudders to think of the assumed factual bases of your other editorials that are supposed to guide your readers on a variety of important issues. I assure you that responsible officials in all three of the mentioned governmental bodies were properly informed about Shevchenko and have a far greater understanding of this project than you can hardly acquire in another 6 weeks. They at least bothered to read House Document No. 445. Really, for a man who by his own admission "never read a line of Mr. Shevchenko's verse" (September 23 editorial "Poetic Injustice") you're alone at the summit of editorial irresponsibility in accusing our legislators of being "gullible" and others of "being misled."

Again, it is also a pity that in the darkness of both your arrogant ignorance and intolerance you cannot possibly see eye-to-eye with our President on the universal significance of this poet and courageous freedom fighter. It is pitiful, too, that your abusive anti-Semitic charges—much like those fabricated in Moscow—have blinded you to the fact that Albert Einstein, one among the many other outstanding Jewish scholars, was a member to the day of his death in the Shevchenko Scientific Society which perpetuates both the name and works of the universal poet. Indeed, the brazenness of your charges is an affront to all intelligent Jews, both here and abroad.

Again, you're in the realm of self-satisfying fantasy when you write about some "lobby," "a minority group," Shevchenko as "a Communist hero," some "quarrel within the ranks of Ukrainian nationalists," and some "Ukrainian group" raising the money for the memorial. It is both interesting and amusing to witness the lengths you have gone to in your groping for argumentative points to justify your basic intolerant motivations. Strangely enough, some of these imagined points have been used consistently by Moscow and its puppets in their opposition to the statue here. Have you been reading the right sources? Again, where have you been these past 3 years when all of this was openly discussed?

For the public record, prove that this lobby exists. Are you suggesting that citizens have no right to exercise their power of ideas because some intolerant and unknowledgeable editor might not find these ideas in accord with his burning bias? As to "a minority group," in the name of simple logic, pray, do tell us what private American organization is a majority group? The editor of the Washington Post, perhaps? Where basic and tolerant American ideas are expressed, their exponents are of the majority. Simply in point of readable fact, the substance of your editorial fiction have found ready expression in the Soviet Union these past 3 years.

Once again, the patent nonsense of Shevchenko being "a Communist hero" can be easily dispensed with. Aside from the published distortions of Shevchenko by Moscow and its puppets, you might advance your cold war education by beginning to ponder over the many good things the Soviet Russian totalitarians have abused and exploited to further their own ends; such as democratic forms, past treaties, the U.N., etc. Or haven't you heard about political Russian cunning and treachery? How nonsensical this characterization is, one needn't go beyond your own editorials. This one contradicts your first two and is even contradictory in itself. In the same paragraph Shevchenko is painted as "a Communist hero" and one "with a reputation for intense Ukrainian nationalism." And so a circle is squared. Haven't you heard about the crime of bourgeoise nationalism in the U.S.S.R.? Again, your intellectual gap will take some time to overcome, not just 6 weeks.

Your comments about some quarrel among Ukrainian nationalists and some money-raising Ukrainian group are really reflective of self-inflicted hallucinations. We Americans, who for your information were also born here, would appreciate knowing about this alleged quarrel and the specific identity of these "nationalists." Again, you've fabricated your statements, support them with concrete fact. The people supporting this statue in the cause of our own national interests are as American—if not more so, judging by your intolerant and mendacious editorials—as you are. This smear technique is a Russian specialty, not American; and you can't get away with it.

As to what we should do with our money, your advice is scarcely needed; nor do we heed the insularities of a few "Americans of Ukrainian descent." Many objectives of educational and scholarly import will be served by our accumulating funds—in itself a solid measure of the generally enthusiastic response to the statue project. The statue will, of course, be your monument of sorely needed enlightenment. In the meantime, as a self-acclaimed American, have you the integrity of substantiating factually the opinions expressed in your contradictory editorials and the honesty of revealing publicly the names of the "scholars" who regard Shevchenko as "a minor poet" and "the local planning officials" who are grumbling about the statue? My sense of fairness and justice compels me to underscore again the request made in my previous letters, along with the challenge of permitting an American Shevchenko scholar to write an article in your paper and also your publishing the scores of letters I am informed you have been receiving in protest to your editorials. Or, again, is your protracted silence in these respects "American?"

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

## STATEMENT OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee today approved the following statement of policy. The statement was prepared by a three-member special subcommittee, appointed at the committee's regular meeting on Tuesday, December 3, consisting of Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican of New York, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, Republican of Arizona, and myself serving as chairman.

The text of the statement reads as follows:

> There is a proper time, even during national mourning, to assure that suspicion, distrust, and unwarranted accusations do not divide and confuse our people.
>
> We issue this statement now in sincere belief that this is such a time and calls for such an action. We must not lose sight of why we are mourning. But neither should we permit the tragic event and the mourning period it signaled to be used as a device to cloud the future of honest debate and dissent.
>
> "Our American unity does not depend on unanimity." In these words, our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, placed in focus a cardinal principle that has and must continue to guide our people.
>
> We are united in our grief at the tragic assassination of our 35th President. This unity of grief, however, is not—nor should it be—the seedbed of a unanimity on all of the legislative proposals put forward by our late President.
>
> Dissent and debate are the touchstones of the American experience. We are not unanimous in our philosophy of government. We never have been; nor will we be so long as we are a free nation governed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. For this we thank God.
>
> We are told that hate was the assassin that struck down our President. If it was hatred that moved the assassin, that hatred was bred by the teachings of communism. All the evidence so far presented affirms this.
>
> Efforts to make Americans generally feel guilty of the crime now are obscuring the nature of the crime. Rather than setting American against American, as easily could happen if guilt is misplaced and doubt becomes a device of political debate, the tragic event should serve to set the face and heart of all Americans firmly against the warped and alien doctrine which, alone in the world today, preaches destruction of societies and freedoms, employs murder as a tool, and threatens violence around the globe from a base of major national power. That doctrine is the doctrine of communism.
>
> Critics, well meaning and otherwise, have chosen to take this time to revile the Republic and to decry its weaknesses. Let Americans take this time to recognize the strength of institutions which permit us to proceed beyond tragedy. It is this strength which is our living memorial to all those who, in high places or humble, give their lives in the cause of freedom.
>
> Now there is the present and the future to face. We have our Nation's business to do and we have our Nation's proved and constitutional ways to do it. It is from debated dissent that we develop consensus. There must be no inhibition of that dissent or quieting of the debate through fear of seeming to disregard the memory of the late President. The denial of discussion would do the greatest disservice to his memory, and to the living Nation. National unity must not mean national conformity and no sense of sorrow should distort the good sense of this Nation to make it mean that.
>
> There is guilt. But it is not American guilt. It is the guilt of the murderer. There is hatred, fanaticism, and bigotry in the world but America is not its source or loyal Americans its practitioners. America, instead, has worked hard against these forces and continues to do so. It can be proud of its progress and prouder yet of its promises of still more progress. No nation has given more to mankind. No nation has asked less. We do not say this in pride or arrogance. We say it because our Nation's self-respect demands it.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

Mr. VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. BONNER), for today, on account of official business.

### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 60 minutes, on December 7.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 60 minutes, on December 10.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 927. An act to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1415. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to stating that the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," for fiscal year 1964 had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1416. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 65th quarterly report on export control covering the third quarter 1963, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1417. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1418. A letter from the national adjutant paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting copies of reports of the national officers and committee chairman which were presented to the delegates at our 40th annual convention held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 21–25, 1963; also financial report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8929. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region; with amendment (Rept. No. 1005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 7885. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1006). Ordered to be printed.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9374. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 9375. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9376. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to the construction and maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9377. A bill to establish a system of student loans to assist students to attend trade schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 9378. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide that certain tax information statements be defined as third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 9379. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 9380. A bill to provide that National Guard officers, appointed, designated, or detailed as U.S. property and fiscal officers shall not be counted against the authorized active duty strength of the Army or Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9381. A bill to provide for leave of absence for members of the National Guard who are officers or employees of the United States when called or ordered to Federal or State military service in aid of civil authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9382. A bill to provide for the extension of certain rights and protections contained in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9383. A bill relating to sick leave benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 9384. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 847. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 9385. A bill for the relief of Marija Matijevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9386. A bill for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9387. A bill for the relief of Ernesto J. Sacerio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

488. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George R. Rodericks, secretary, National Association of State Civil Defense Directors (Director, Office of Civil Defense, Government of the District of Columbia) relative to commending the House of Representatives for its action in the approval of H.R. 8200; to the Committee on Armed Services.

489. Also, petition of John Myles Kennedy, care of American Express, Cadiz, Spain, relative to a redress of grievance relating to demanding social security payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

490. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., urging a Joint Kennedy Committee on Automation and Jobs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

491. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to appropriate $10 million for the President Kennedy Peace Temple; to the Committee on House Administration.

492. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to remember the Alamo by legislation calling for forming the the Alamo National Historic Site, in San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

493. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to form the Joint Kennedy Committee on Automation; to the Committee on Rules.

494. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a resolution congratulating President Johnson for changing the name of Cape Canaveral to Cape Kennedy, Fla.; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

---

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Decreasing Tariff on Foreign Dairy Products Would Further Complicate Domestic Dairy Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON**
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, December 6, 1963*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Tariff Commission opened public hearings this week in preparation for the sixth round of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—scheduled to begin in Geneva next May. Under the basic negotiating authority contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the President is permitted to lower duties on imports by as much as 50 percent of the July 1962 rate.

However, in keeping with our democratic traditions, the Tariff Commission hearings are being held in order to give interested parties an opportunity to testify about the economic effects of possible tariff reductions on American industry. Final decision as to the articles on which the United States will negotiate will not be completed until the testimony presented at the hearings has been thoroughly reviewed and analyzed, and the President has received the views of the special representative for trade negotiations, the Tariff Commission, and other Government agencies.

Because of my longtime interest in and work with the problems and programs affecting dairy farmers, I submitted a statement to the Commission on the adverse effect which lower import duties on foreign dairy products would have on domestic production. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LESTER JOHNSON, OF WISCONSIN, AT U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION HEARINGS

The dairy problem has been with us for a long time. It can be summarized as a situation in which the amount of milk produced exceeds the amount of milk which can be sold on the commercial market at prices that result in an adequate return to dairy farmers for their labor and investment. In 1961, net income for seven groups of commercial dairy farms in different parts of the country averaged nearly $2,500 less than the average annual wages of $4,802 for factory workers.

While the number of milk cows has declined more than 2 percent annually during the past decade, this decrease in milk cow numbers has been more than offset by the increase in milk production per cow. Milk output has increased at an annual rate of about 200 pounds per cow during the past 10 years.

The current national production level of 7,370 pounds per cow is well below the inherent potential of cows to produce. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the present annual increase in milk production per cow will do anything but continue. Matter of fact, with dairy income in such a depressed state, increasing numbers of farmers are likely to exploit the potential of their dairy herd in order to improve incomes.

The rise in milk production and the subsequent increase in our supply of dairy products has been going on at an irregular pace for the past four decades. Since 1924, this increase has averaged around a billion pounds per year, or about 1 percent. Milk production rose dramatically from 1960 to 1962 following a period of decline. The increase totaled about 1 billion pounds in 1960 and nearly 2.5 billion pounds in 1961.

To further complicate an already complicated situation, the per capita consumption of dairy products has been on the decline since the 1930's, with the exception of the wartime period in the early 1940's. In 1962, consumption of dairy products per person was only 76 percent of the peak in 1931 and 86 percent of the 1957 level. This downward trend in per capita consumption is expected to continue, thus eliminating the possibility that our growing population will take care of the dairy surplus and the dairy problem.

Various Federal programs designed to improve the dairy situation have been in effect since the early 1930's. Following the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up to carry out the Government price-support purchase and loan operations. This was the first major effort to improve milk prices through Government purchases of surplus dairy products.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 made support prices for milk and butterfat mandatory at levels between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture was given discretion to establish the parity price level within that range for each marketing year. The Government buys surplus butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk to maintain the established parity prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat.

Prior to 1949, Government purchase of dairy products under the price support programs were relatively small. In fact, they amounted to the equivalent of a billion pounds of milk in only 1 year during this period.

However, since 1949, the picture has changed drastically for the worse. Purchases have exceeded the equivalent of a billion pounds of milk in 13 of the past 14 years. In the 1953–54 marketing year—and again in 1961–62 and 1962–63—these dairy price-support purchases were equivalent to more than 10 billion pounds of milk. The sudden upturn in purchases in the 1961–62 marketing year reflected both the increase in milk production and the decrease in milk consumption.

During the 1962 fiscal year, the Commodity Credit Corporation spent a record $602.9 million on dairy price support programs. This figure does not include the $89.2 million spent that year for the special school milk program. Preliminary figures for the 1963 fiscal year indicate a $471.6 million expenditure for dairy support activities, plus the $93.9 million which were spent for the special school milk program.

At the U.S. Department of Agriculture's 41st Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, held last month here in Washington, D.C., the economists painted an equally unpromising picture for the dairy industry for the coming year. According to the report titled "Outlook for Dairy Products in 1964 and Beyond," dairy production will equal 1963 levels, commercial demand will increase less than the population, and excess dairy products will continue to move to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In other words, the dairy problem will still be with us in 1964 and beyond. Frankly, I cannot see any sense in compounding that already complex problem by lowering the import duty on cheese and other dairy products, thus opening the door to a flood of dairy imports.

The heart of the problem is summed up neatly by Truman Graf of the University of Wisconsin, Glynn McBride of Michigan State College, and Robert Story of Cornell University, in their excellent publication, "An Investigation of the Dairy Problem and Analysis of Selected Program Alternatives."

They point out: "Since the demand for milk and dairy products is relatively inelastic, increases in aggregate supply would cause sharp reductions in farm prices in the absence of Government supports. For example, an increase in supply of 1 percent would be expected to reduce the farm price of milk by 3 or 4 percent in clearing markets."

If a housewife who is shopping for a pound of cheese picks an imported cheese, she is not going to buy a second pound of domestic cheese. The domestic cheese which has been displaced by its imported counterpart must find a home somewhere.

Under the provisions of our dairy price support program, that home will likely be a Government warehouse. There the displaced domestic cheese, which has been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation with Federal funds, will be housed at the taxpayers' expense. I see no reason why our tax dollars should be spent to subsidize foreign dairy production.

As chairman of the House Dairy Subcommittee, I have held extensive hearings this year on various proposals aimed at raising the income of our dairy farmers, reducing our dairy surpluses and cutting the cost to taxpayers of the purchase and storage of surplus dairy products. If you have ever milked a cow, you know that the left hand has to work with the right hand in order to get the desired results. Lowering the tariff on dairy products would be a perfect example of the left hand working against the right hand.

In June of 1961, my colleague in the House, Congressman JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania, brought his Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment to Wisconsin for emergency field hearings on a proposal then before the U.S. Tariff Commission to increase the import quotas on cheddar and blue-mold cheese. As I pointed out at those hearings, the importation of more foreign cheese would have a very harmful effect not only on the farmers who supply the milk to the cheese factories, but on the number of dairy plants and their employees as well.

Since 1950, the number of dairy plants and cheese factories in Wisconsin has dropped sharply. In 1951, a total of 2,102 dairy plants were in operation in my home State. By 1960, this figure had dropped to 1,302. Likewise, the number of cheese factories declined from 1,279 in 1950 to only 823 in 1959. Unfortunately, this trend is continuing.

We all know what happens to the small-town businessman when farmers and dairy plant employees do not have money to spend for groceries, clothing, automobiles, gasoline and so forth. The cash registers ring less frequently and less merrily on Main Street, U.S.A.

I have gone to considerable lengths to detail the dairy problem—past, present, and future—for I feel that this background information is essential for a clear understanding of how adversely a cut in import duties would affect our Nation's dairy industry. That it is an important industry is underlined by the fact that about 14 percent of the Nation's total cash farm receipts comes from milk and dairy products, providing a leading source of agricultural income which is spread throughout virtually every State in the Union.

Thank you.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1963

**The House met at 12 o'clock noon.**

**The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:**

**Isaiah 26: 4: *Trust ye in the Lord forever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.***

**O God, our heavenly Father, who art of all counselors the wisest and of all companions the nearest, we humbly worship and adore Thee.**

**Grant that we may count it our noblest obligation and highest privilege to obey Thy holy will and to walk in Thy ways.**

**Help us to sense Thy presence among us and may we be inspired by the assurance that Thou art willing and able to give us wisdom and understanding as we plan and labor for the welfare and good of all mankind.**

**May we be eager to be partners with Thee in leading men and nations out of bondage into freedom, out of darkness into light, out of sorrow into joy, out of despair into hope.**

**Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.**

### URBAN CULTURE

**Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.**

**The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?**

**There was no objection.**

**Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, though I was not on the floor of the House yesterday for the eulogy to our late President, I was in southwest Missouri when the assassination occurred and expressed at that time, my shock at this crime. A few days later on November 26 it was my privilege to be present at the regular meeting of the Springfield, Mo., Rotary Club. The speaker was Father William H. Magill, rector of St. James' Episcopal Church, of Springfield. The assassination of the President was still fresh in our minds. The impact of Reverend Magill's remarks was that this tragedy must redound to the people's growth; and that the loss of the Chief of State need not, indeed cannot, foreshadow a complete overthrow of our system. I commend his remarks to the attention of all:**

### URBAN CULTURE

(By Father William H. Magill, rector, St. James Episcopal Church, Springfield, Mo.)

It shall be my purpose today to expose the facts of urban culture within which we all live. I shall attempt to show you how our urban culture affects you.

There was a time in the history of this great Nation of ours when men lived their entire existence in one community. There were no large cities, only small settlements where a man's survival was, to a large degree dependent upon others' concern for him. This was love. There are many definitions for love, the Greeks have seven words for love. Our understanding of the word is dependent upon our own particular definition. I shall give you the meaning I am thinking of as I use the word in this context. I mean being vitally concerned for another person's welfare. To be concerned for the destiny of his soul. This definition permits me, you see, to love even the persons whom I do not like. And there are some. This definition permits people to love me even though they do not like me. There are some of these persons too. I am sure it is in this sense that God wants us to love our neighbor. I would like to ask each of you to stop and think for a moment—What do you know of your neighbor next door? You may know that he is a good gardener, or a poor one. He may leave his garage door open, or his trash barrels out, he may have an attractive wife, his children may bother you. But these are things which you know about him. What do you know of him? To know about a person is one thing. To know the person is quite another.

Unlike a few generations ago, we today live in more than a single community. We live in many communities, each one quite separate from the others. We live in the communist of our home, where we work, in the community in which we buy, and we live in that very large community in which we play.

This existence in several communities, rather than just one, has developed in us a very real feeling of lack of responsibility toward our neighbor. We don't really know him, we are not concerned for him, and we really couldn't care less.

In addition to these points we have lost our sense of public morality. We are told, and we believe, that moral codes have changed. We are led to believe that things which used to be wrong are now right. We are told that America must accept a new moral code. We have lost something very precious. A deep sense of moral responsibility.

Another force is at work which affects us, directly in the community of our work, and indirectly in all the other communities. We shall call it automation.

The machine is doing the job faster than the man did. It doesn't get sick or take a vacation. It doesn't make nearly so many mistakes as the man. It is not necessary, for the machine's sake, to work it only 8 hours a day.

Through automation we will be able to produce more and produce it better. For example, I have been told that steel production for the year 1962 showed an increase of 17 percent, while as an industry employing 19,000 fewer men.

I am not attempting here an evaluation, I am merely stating the fact that all these points are contributing to our urban culture.

So what of the result of these observations, and there are many more which have not been noted. The result, as I see it, is a culture boom. We have more time, extra time, now than ever before. We have an ever-increasing employment problem. The available jobs are decreasing as the population is increasing. I am told that we need 12,000 new jobs each month just to break even with the population increase. Work is becoming less and less the determining factor in life. We used to put a premium on hard work and long hours. A man was judged by how hard he was willing to work. Now, it appears that the premium may be upon leisure time, which would be a complete shift of emphasis.

So here we are in the midst of life. And life is like a river. We are inclined to drift along, following the channel, until we reach the sea where we become lost in this great expanse. The fresh water being completely destroyed by the salt.

However, it is possible to build a dam on the river. The best place for this dam is at the narrowest point. We can then harness the power of something which is already available. Our river of life was in existence when we become a part of it. The water of humanity had long been forging a channel through which to flow. The Creator of the river, therefore, should be that for which we are the most thankful; for everything else depends upon this creation.

Let us look for a moment to our heritage. We live in a rich land. A land which is full of beauty. We have the greatest degree of mobility about the land. We abound in natural resources. So many in fact that we can supply many other nations as well as ourselves. And in this heritage many persons have died that we might live.

All the way through history we can see many points at which all of this could have been lost to us, forever, if the people of that time had been as apathetic as we sometimes are. If they had decided that the price was too great to pay. If they had refused to trade comfort for discomfort. But they didn't. Thank God. They have passed on to us a heritage which has been built upon the strongest foundation possible—God. We can dismiss God from our thinking, and we have. But this does not mean that His existence is dependent upon our believing in Him or thinking of Him. It isn't.

The man can say, "I am a self-made man." He can claim full responsibility for his success, but whether he can see through his "little gods" or not does not deny that his life, his particular talent, the time he was to employ this talent, all this is a gift from God. A pure gift from God which he did not earn, and maybe, a gift which he might not deserve. How the man sees this tells us what kind of man he truly is.

We can—and do—warp our soul through rationalization. Through our attempts to justify a selfish position.

To be truly thankful then is to recognize the source of the gift. This has been made very hard for us in today's culture. We have become so concerned for the fabric of life. We are so engulfed in and surrounded by materialism.

Every human creature must have a God. He must have something outside of himself or he turns in and dies. If we, in our apathy and culture, lose sight of the true God we will settle for something less. The professed atheist worships himself, his own selfish interests, the fabric of life not the life itself.

So, in today's world, in the culture which we ourselves have created from the gifts which God has given us, we begin to see, if we will open our eyes to see, and if we then open our minds to truly understand that which we see, we begin to see certain danger signs. These danger signs have been in man's sight before. This is nothing new. Each civilization which has perished before this one has been preceded by these same signs. But, you say, we are smarter than they. We certainly should be. We can profit from their experience. We can use the knowledge which they have handed on to us.

This Nation, this world, has just witnessed a supreme tragedy. Not a "shot that was heard around the world," but a shot that was felt around the world. And just as death, when viewed from this side of the veil appears to be the end, and when viewed from the other side is seen to be a birth into a new life, so this tragedy must be turned into something more. We cannot sit idly by and permit this death to teach us nothing. We cannot sit idly by and permit death to continue a human feeling of hate. We have an obligation to ourselves, to the world, to the yet unborn and to God to see in this our means of salvation as a civilization. We must be eternally thankful that this man lived. We must be eternally thankful for the pure and noble witness made by a woman. A witness to the truth that strength can, and will come from faith in God. Today we must be thankful that our forefathers have handed us a government so strong, a government so right, that the loss of the chief of state need not, indeed cannot, foreshadow a complete overthrow of the system.

We must be thankful that we have been shown that party loyalties and differences can dissolve themselves in pure Americanism. That denominationalism cannot erect a barrier over which love and concern and prayer cannot pass. That our denominationalism is quickly dissolved in the strong light of God.

In these past few days where are the people who told us not to pray? Where are the ones that warned us of the terrible dangers in a wedding of church and state? The church is people. The state is people. And we are people.

People make the culture in which they live. We had created a culture which nourished bigotry, defiance against authority, hatred, malice. Nourished it and fed it. Words such as apathy, materialism, selfishness, unconcern, are the food which has the power to destroy us.

But this is a new day. The night has passed, and the day must dawn clear and bright in determination.

The day has passed when we can support the bigot, the segregationalist, the hater. The day is here when we must meet these problems person to person. Me to you. You to you.

All the tinsel must be torn away that we may be permitted to behold the tree. The clouds which have covered this land of ours must give way, that we may be permitted to see the endless sky with its bright sun of truth and morality which have the power to melt all the lesser gods.

We must, because Thanksgiving Day 1964, Thanksgiving Day 2064 depend on you and on me.

**Mr. VAN PELT.** Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Mr. MOSS.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 9023. A bill to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1007). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8070. A bill for the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7967. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 9388. A bill to regulate agricultural and forestry imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H.R. 9389. A bill to provide that the flag of the United States of America shall be flown for 24 hours of each day at the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 852. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

495. By Mr. MAILLIARD: Petition of the Reverend Lane W. Barton and 26 parishioners of St. Barnabas Episcopal Church in San Francisco for action on the civil rights bill during this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to Members of the Congress holding reserve commissions in the U.S. armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

* * *

# SENATE

### MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, who art the light behind life's shadows, the love behind life's sorrows, shine, we pray, in morning splendor upon these darkened lives of ours, groping in a maze of uncertainty and perplexity.

We cannot lean upon our own unaided might—our flesh is too fragile, our hearts too evil, our wills too wayward.

At the beginning of another week of deliberation, coming for this noontide tryst to this altar of a nation under God, we would not catalog the sins and shortcomings of others. We come as those who have missed the mark of our high calling and who, standing in the white light of Thy searching, pray for Thy forgiveness and Thy cleansing. Then as we go forth to face tangled and unpredictable days that tax our human resources and understanding, we ask only for light enough for the next step, courage enough to face the present duty, and truth enough for today's decisions, as into Thy hands we commit the welfare of our Nation.

We make our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D.C., December 9, 1963.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1963, was dispensed with.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 726, House bill 9140, the public works appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### Report on Loan to United Power Association, Elk River, Minn.

A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on a loan to the United Power Association of Elk River, Minn., in the amount of $39,230,000 for financing certain transmission and generation facilities (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### Amendment of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, To Provide for Retroactive Qualification of Certain Pension Funds

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the retroactive qualication of certain union-negotiated multiemployer pension funds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

#### Report on Uneconomical Management of Commercially Available Items, Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical management of commercially available items, Department of Defense, dated November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### Amendment of Act Relating to Exploration Program for Discovery of New Minerals

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### Clarence L. Aiu and Others

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### COMMUNICATIONS FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate certain communications from foreign governments concerning the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### PETITIONS

A petition was laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter from Chesterfield Jackson, New York, N.Y., making certain comments relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; ordered to lie on the table.

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on December 2, 1963. The resolution would establish a President Kennedy Memorial Day, and directs that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to, among others, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

The 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was a day of sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President: Therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C., as well as each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution Serial No. 9, introduced by Senators William J. Lane and James S. Berger on behalf of the entire membership of the senate and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 2d day of December 1963.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 751); and

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 2064. A bill to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund (Rept. No. 754); and

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code (Rept. No. 755).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period (Rept. No. 753).

### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated December 4, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **KEATING** (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2371. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **HART**:

S. 2372. A bill for the relief of Ramon Carlos Bayana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTION

### DESIGNATION OF SENATOR METCALF AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE DURING THE REMAINDER OF PRESENT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD** submitted a resolution (S. Res. 232) to continue during the remainder of the present session of the Congress the designation of Senator METCALF as Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

### HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR U.S. ALLIES WHO FOUGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II. This legislation would make hospital and medical care available to persons who have been lawful residents of the United States for at least 10 years and who served during World War II as members of the armed forces of Allied nations which actually participated in armed conflict against an enemy of the United States. Such a person would derive benefits—as hospital and domiciliary care and medical services—to the same extent as if his service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Allied cause during the Second World War was a common effort of peoples of many nationalities. Many nations which succumbed to the barbarism of Hitler and the Axis Powers never ceased to aid the Allied coalition through their national armies in exile or through organized underground resistance. These brave men and women of partisan forces gave their lives and fortunes to rid, not only their homelands of the tyranny which had descended upon them, but for the restoration of freedom to the children of all mankind.

The gallant history of the Polish people during World War II serves to illustrate the fierce determination of a nation which, though shattered by overwhelming military force in the first days of the war, regrouped its men and resources to fight an underground resistance at home and an all-out effort on the long road back across the battlefields of Europe.

The people of Poland were firm in their resolve to reassert their position as a sovereign and Allied country that would continue the war in the ranks of the Western coalition. There were no quislings among the leaders of the Polish nation. Poland never ceased to be a fighting ally. She contributed to the common effort as a great country, and the efforts of her brave men played a decisive role in the success of the Allied cause.

The remnants of the Polish Army escaping across dangerous German- and Russian-held territory made their way first to France. There, under the leadership of General Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland and commander in chief of the armed forces, four infantry divisions joined with the French Army. It is reported that "in the last period of the campaign in France, the Polish troops fought as if they were defending their own country." The heroic defense of the French airfields by the Polish Air Force is a stirring chapter in the records of the Battle of France.

When France capitulated, 24,000 members of the Polish armed forces were evacuated to Great Britain where 2,300 airmen and 1,400 sailors were already serving. Here, based in this island fortress which stood the "sole fury and might of the enemy" for 2 full years before the United States entered the war, the land, sea, and air forces of Poland played a gallant and efficient part in winning the Battle of Britain and extending the war to the German homeland. British Air Marshal Sir Sholto Douglas, in speaking of the participation of Polish air forces in the battle waged against the German Luftwaffe stated, "When Mr. Churchill spoke his famous words—'Never in the field of human conflict has so much been owed by so many to so few'—he spoke of the Polish fighters as much as of our own pilots."

In the House of Commons in 1945 Winston Churchill expressed the gratitude of the British nation to the Poles who had fought side by side with the English.

> His Majesty's government will never forget the debt they owe to the Polish troops who have served them so valiantly, and for all those who fought under our command, I earnestly hope it will be possible to offer the citizenship and freedom of the British Empire * * * we should think it an honour to have such faithful and valiant warriors dwelling among us as if they were men of our own blood.

As the Polish armed forces fought with the Allied armies on all European fronts to restore the freedom and independence of their country, the Polish home army, personally directed by General Sikorski, "maintained," in the words of Winston Churchill, "a ceaseless warfare against the German oppression in spite of as heavy sufferings as any nation has ever endured." The home army, the Armia Krajowa, was "unrivaled by any underground movement in any part of Europe."

The inscription on the monument in the cemetery of Polish soldiers at Monte Cassino serves best to exemplify the dedication of the Polish people throughout history to the cause of human freedom spurred on always by the deep love of their homeland:

> For your freedom and ours we gave our lives to the world, our souls to God, our hearts to Poland.

We as Americans know, better than any other nation, that the Polish willingness to fight for freedom has often extended beyond the boundaries of Poland. Sons of Poland served with our forebears as the midwives of America during the Revolutionary War. The names of Kosciuszko and Pulaski are nearly as familiar as the name of Washington. Upon Kosciuszko's death, Gen. William H. Harrison spoke of him as follows:

> His fame will last as long as liberty remains upon the earth * * * and if a temple shall be erected to those who have rendered most service to mankind, if the statue of our great countryman, Washington, shall occupy the place of the "most worthy," that of Kosciuszko will be found by his side.

Polish patriots served in American ranks during the War of 1812 as well as the Civil War. Poles also took part in the Texan revolt against Mexico in 1835 and in the war with Mexico between 1846 and 1848. To the Poles the struggle for freedom and independence is universal and Poles have fought for the sanctity of hearth and home far from their native soil and their own kith and kin. It is ironic, perhaps that a people so passionate in their love of freedom should have fought so hard against the Nazi tyranny only to have passed under a tyranny today which, in some ways, is far more sinister and protracted.

A glimmer of hope for the people of Poland is reflected in the words of Churchill:

> Poland is like a rock which the tides may submerge for a while, but nevertheless remains a rock.

Poland's historic example as a fighter for the freedom of others might well be said to have strengthened the commitment of the Allies in the face of the common enemy. It was Poland who at last accepted the German challenge and brought an end to the peaceful conquest of Europe. It was to Poland's defense that the British and the French rallied. The cause of each nation became intimately bound to the victory of all. An excerpt from a Churchill speech to Commons in 1944 pointed out the common effort which was being exerted:

> What an extraordinary army it is (8th Army in Italy). There has never been anything like it, and there is nothing which could so bring home to one how this is a war of the United Nations. You have the British and United States troops, the New Zealanders, the American-Japanese troops, who have fought with great vigor, the Greeks are coming—some are already there—a Brazilian force is already beginning to take its place upon the field; the French are there; the South Africans are there; the Poles have greatly distinguished themselves.

Every American who fought during World War II is, of course, an American veteran. But in a larger sense he is a veteran of the Armed Forces of every nation which fought under the Allied banner. General Eisenhower was not only the Commander of the American forces, but the commander of all European Allied forces; the British, the French, the Danes, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Poles, the Belgians, all who dedicated themselves to the Allied cause.

Those of our citizens who were members of the armed forces of governments allied with the United States and who participated in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States, should, it seems to me, be the recipients of some of the benefits which are accorded veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States. Let me point out, that this would include those Americans who, recognizing the Nazi danger before December 7, 1941, joined the armed forces of a nation already engaged in war against the Axis Powers. The British and Canadian Royal Air Forces each had notable American contingents.

Mr. President, there is a pressing need to make the facilities of veterans hospitals available to the brave men of other national armies which served the cause of the free world and are now residents of the United States. Many of these hospitals are not used to their full capacity and could easily accommodate those who would benefit from this legislation.

This bill encompasses a small measure of our gratitude to those who fought with us, though in a different uniform, for the preservation of our ideals and institutions and who are now building their future in the United States. This legislation deserves the favorable consideration of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2371) to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War II, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and Mr. Scott), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 109 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Any person who served in the active service in the armed forces of any government allied with the United States in World War II who has been a lawful resident of the United States for at least 10 years, and who during such service was a member of forces which actually participated in armed conflict with an enemy of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, be entitled to hospital and domiciliary care and medical services under chapter 17 of this title, and to the benefits of chapters 31 and 37 of this title, to the same extent as if such service had been performed in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection, World War II shall be deemed to have begun on September 1, 1939."

## AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 193, 83d CONGRESS, RELATING TO CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION — AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 345)

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

## REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments (Nos. 346, 347, and 348), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BENNETT submitted an amendment (No. 350), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 349)

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS AND AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2345) to amend the Federal Firearms Act to further restrict the use of instrumentalities of interstate or foreign commerce for the acquisition of firearms for unlawful purposes, introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment (No. 335), intended to be proposed by Mr. Dodd to Senate bill 1975, to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of November 26, 1963:

S. 2332. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, and Members of the Congress, and for other purposes: Mr. Allott, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Holland, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

Authorities of November 26 and 27, 1963:

S. 2341. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center: Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Symington, Mr. Tower, Mr. Walters, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

Authority of December 3, 1963:

Senate Joint Resolution 136. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Keating, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, Mr. Walters, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article in the December 1963 issue of the Rotarian magazine, "Education: Answer to Unemployment," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

---

## STATUS OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished majority leader.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Certainly.

**Mr. CLARK.** There are on the calendar certain measures which—in view of the fact that the Senate adjourned on Friday, and did not take a recess at that time—should, I should think, in due course be called up.

I did not object to the request of the majority leader for a 3-minute rule; but I ask him whether he would now be willing to make whatever motion he has in mind with respect to the resolutions which I sponsor, and which are on the calendar, so that they may be disposed of in accordance with an informal agreement which he and I have reached.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania—and I should note, for the attention of the Senate, that he has been most cooperative—ask unanimous consent that the "Resolutions and Motions Over, Under the Rule," namely, Senate Resolution 209, Senate Resolution 226, and Senate Resolution 227—which are placed in that category, be transferred to page 12, under "Subjects on the Table."

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wonder whether the majority leader will indulge me long enough to permit the clerk to read the title of each of the resolutions, in order, and so that I might have an opportunity to make a brief statement on them.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Certainly.

**Mr. CLARK.** I ask that the clerk be instructed to read each of the resolutions sufficiently to identify it—perhaps by title; I refer to the resolutions which have been referred to by the majority leader.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, I shall be glad to read them.

The first is Senate Resolution 209, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] authorizing Labor Subcommittee meetings during Senate sessions.

**Mr. CLARK.** That resolution was submitted on October 3. It called for action by the Senate on a motion, made under rule VII, to permit the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the month of October and for all of November.

There was a parliamentary dispute as to the propriety of that motion. The then Vice President of the United States—now the President of the United States, who then was in the chair, ruled that it was improper, under parliamentary practice, to bring such a motion to a vote. What I shall describe as an "elementary school" filibuster—not a "senior high school" filibuster—was briefly engaged in, to prevent the taking of a vote on that motion and to sustain the ruling made by the Vice President.

Since that motion was made by me, and thanks to the cooperation of the majority leader and other Senators, the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment was able to meet on a number of days while the Senate was in session; and now it has completed its hearings, I am happy to say; that occurred last Friday. Therefore, the resolution is moot; and I join in the request of the majority leader that it be laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** The next resolution is Senate Resolution 226, to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of House bill 8363, the so-called tax bill. That question was raised on November 21.

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, in view of the fact that the President of the United States is reported in the newspapers—and, I have no doubt, correctly—to have entered with the chairman of the Finance Committee into an informal agreement that hearings on the tax bill will be concluded in the quite near future, on the condition that the chairman of the Finance Committee is afforded an opportunity to examine next year's budget, and since it now appears that a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of that bill would not only be vigorously resisted by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, but also in all likelihood would accomplish no useful result, in view of the agreement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee and the President of the United States—which agreement will, I hope, result in bringing the tax bill to the floor some time in the barely discernible future—I have no objection to having this resolution also laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

**Mr. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, for purposes of the RECORD, I think the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania should be a little more precise in the language he uses. As I understand, there was no agreement. The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee did have an informal session with the President of the United States. I, also, had an informal session with the President of the United States; and at the time, we discussed the same subject. I believe that, generally, if there is any agreement at all, it is an agreement to be diligent in pursuit of the tax bill. That, of course, the committee has done, because tomorrow it will have heard its last witness.

Incidentally, I may say that after tomorrow the Finance Committee will have heard 129 witnesses. Thirty witnesses finally agreed to submit their statements. In addition, 250 additional statements were submitted for the record. So the committee has fulfilled its promise to be diligent, and I am sure it will continue to be, but I can hardly call that an agreement. I wished to make sure that even though the chairman and the ranking minority committee member got a peek at the 1965 budget, that still does not constitute an agreement.

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, I do not withdraw anything that I said. I take not the slightest objection to anything that my friend, the Senator from Illinois, has said. In view of the spirit of peace, good will, amity, and comity which hovers over the Senate today, I shall say no more.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table Senate Resolution 226? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**Mr. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the spirit of Christmas is hovering over the Chamber?

**Mr. CLARK.** So long as the Senate is determined to remain in session until Christmas Eve and pass the rest of the appropriation bills.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the next motion referred to by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has to do with Senate Resolution 277 to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from consideration of H.R. 7063, the so-called Departments of State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill, which will be called up on Thursday of this week. I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be laid on the table.

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, in view of the fact that the bill has progressed so far and so expeditiously since I filed that motion, and will, as the majority leader says, be brought before the Senate on Thursday of this week, I am quite content to have that motion also laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

**Mr. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, only to observe that patience is a virtue and time is a great healer.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

---

## THE CONGRESS

**Mr. CLARK.** Mr. President, over the weekend there came to my attention two provocative articles. One is entitled "The Failure of Congress," written by Stewart Alsop and published in the Saturday Evening Post for December 7, 1963; the other is entitled "It Is the People Who Face the Test," which was published in yesterday's New York Times magazine section and written by Tom Wicker.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 7, 1963]

### THE FAILURE OF CONGRESS

(By Stewart Alsop)

The Congress of the United States is in deep trouble. More than ever before, the public attitude toward Congress is a mixture of indifference, amusement, and contempt. It is time to ask why this is so, and whether anything can be done about it. For when the citizens of a democracy begin to hold their legislature in contempt, democracy is itself in danger.

There is an obvious reason why the reputation of Congress is—to use a favorite phrase of a great Congressman, the late Sam Rayburn—"lower than a snake's belly." Never before in history has Congress talked so long to accomplish so little.

Only once before in peacetime—in Woodrow Wilson's first term—has Congress remained in session from opening day right around to the next December. That first Wilson Congress accomplished a great deal. Here is what the second Kennedy Congress has accomplished, as summed up by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

"Of our four major objectives of this session, a tax cut, a civil rights bill, a general aid-to-education bill, and a medicare bill, none has a real chance of enactment this year."

There is plenty of other evidence to support DODD's charge that this congressional session is a shambles. Appropriations are supposed to be approved by the end of July each year, to provide money for the next fiscal year. As of late fall, the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments are still living hand-to-mouth, because Congress has never got round to voting funds for them.

"The Hill has gone to hell," says an old hand on Capitol Hill, "since the Speaker died and Lyndon left." "The Speaker," of course, was Sam Rayburn, of Texas. "Rayburn's personal power and prestige," says Democratic Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, "made the institution appear to work. When Rayburn died, the thing just fell apart." Rayburn's successor, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, an elderly, earnest man who looks like an exhausted monk, has little or none of Rayburn's power and prestige.

MCCORMACK's opposite number in the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, succeeded Lyndon Johnson as majority leader when Johnson became one of history's unhappiest vice presidents. MANSFIELD—who also looks like an exhausted monk—is universally liked in the Senate, something that could not be said of Johnson. But DODD tactlessly spoke what was in the minds of many of MANSFIELD's colleagues when he said, in effect, that MANSFIELD was not tough enough to be a good leader.

MANSFIELD himself, when asked by this reporter whether he thought this criticism of his leadership was justified, removed his pipe from his mouth, thought for a moment, and characteristically replied with a monosyllable: "Yes."

"The leadership," MANSFIELD says, 'has no special powers to lead." This theory of leadership is markedly at variance with the Johnson theory. The Johnson theory of leadership, in short, involved the lavish and even ruthless use of "special powers." Johnson's influence on key committee assignments was one of his most important special powers. MANSFIELD insists that committee assignments are no business of the leadership. In so doing, he has discarded the leadership's biggest stick and sweetest carrot.

The departure of Johnson and the death of Johnson's immensely rich and immensely powerful ally, Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma, has left a power vacuum in the Senate. MANSFIELD is like a King of France in the period when the King was merely primus interpares—and not all that primus either—among a fiercely competing throng of dukes and barons. MCCORMACK, because the House is so huge and so unmanageable, has even less real authority than MANSFIELD.

Fate and the accident of character have thus contributed to the decay of Congress. The same elements played a part in the fall of Bobby Baker, secretary to the Democratic majority. The downfall of poor Bobby—actually a likable country-slicker type—has contributed to the widespread notion that most Senators spend their time cavorting with call girls in luxury hotels and making big money on the side. This is not true, but it has hurt the reputation of Congress at least as much as its do-nothing record.

But the real trouble with Congress is deeper and more permanent than MIKE MANSFIELD's excessive amiability or Bobby Baker's slickness. Representative BOLLING, a Democrat and the foremost student of congressional history in the House, went to the heart of the matter in one sentence: "The trouble with Congress is not Congress but the Democratic Party in Congress."

The Democrats in the Senate have a crushing majority over the Republicans—67 to 33. There is also a big Democratic majority in the House. But these majorities are wholly deceptive, because the party nomenclature is deceptive.

There are two parties in Congress. But in reality they are not the Democratic and Republican parties. They are the generally liberal presidential party and the generally conservative party of the congressional establishment. On major issues—if the issue can be brought to a vote—the presidential party usually has the edge. There is no doubt, for example, that the President's tax cut and civil rights bills would be enacted if they could be brought intact to a vote in in both Houses. But the machinery of Congress is controlled by the establishment party. So bills the establishment party does not like either do not come to a vote at all, or come to a vote after endless delay and in emasculated form.

The establishment, which has also been called the club, the inner club, includes most of the southerners. It also includes most senior Republicans and a scattering of conservative Democrats from outside the South. But the southerners dominate it. Since the establishment controls the machinery, the southerners representing less than a sixth of the voting population dominate both Houses of Congress.

A neat trick. How do they do it?

To understand the answer to that question, you have to understand something about the atmosphere and something about the real power structure of Congress. The Congress—the Senate especially—has a curious atmosphere, at once cozy and awe-inspiring. The Capitol is the last place in Washington—except perhaps for the Treasury, and not excepting the gutted White House—with an authentic smell of the past.

The place is almost palpably populated with the ghosts of Clay and Calhoun and Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens and Vandenberg and Taft and Rayburn. At the same time, with its overstuffed leather chairs and its Brumidi frescoes and general aura of camaraderie, the place is also wonderfully cozy and clubbish.

This combination of history and coziness has its effect on men. Senators, especially, adore being Senators. "This is the most wonderful job in the world," says freshman Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. "Only 99 other people in the world have as good a job, and no one has a better one."

A Senator or Representative soon gets emotionally caught up in the wonderful world of Capitol Hill. He wants to shine in that world, as well as in the larger world outside. The way—almost the only way—to shine in both worlds is to get on good committees. The committees are where the work of Congress is done, and where reputations are made or unmade. There are 16 standing committees in the Senate, 20 in the House. Of the 36, about half are considered good. A man who wants to get on good committees had better not alienate the establishment.

One great key to the power of the establishment is the seniority system. Because of political longevity in the one-party South, this system gives the southerners a near monopoly of the most important committee chairmanships. The committee chairmen are the dukes and the barons of Congress—in the words of the first Robert La Follette, "they report, shape, or suppress legislation at will."

But that is not all. The establishment in both parties controls the party committees which meet once every 2 years to make new committee assignments. For example, the Democratic steering committee in the Senate is solidly controlled by the establishment. As Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has pointed out, 7 of the 15 members are from the South, and 9 of the 15 are stanch conservatives, whereas two-thirds of the Democrats in the Senate are nonsoutherners and Kennedy men.

This careful weighting of the steering committee—which most people outside Congress have never heard of—in turn makes it possible for the establishment to maintain numerical control of the really key committees, notably the purse-strings committees, Appropriations and Finance.

Nor is this all. To the establishment, the rule of seniority is sacred—when it suits the establishment. But when it does not suit, the sacred rule can be broken. For example, Senator CLARK, who is considered ungentlemanly and unclubbable for openly attacking the establishment, has been trying to get on the Foreign Relations Committee for years. He has repeatedly been passed over in favor of more clubbable types junior in service to him. For another example, in the current session, of 14 nonfreshman Senators who voted against the South on the filibuster issue, only 1 got his first choice committee assignment—and in several cases seniority was disregarded. Not wholly by chance, six out of eight of those who voted with the South on cloture got their first choice.

Bucking the establishment, in short, is what is known in the Pentagon as counterproductive. Moreover, it is one of those things that is, in the British phrase, "not done." The atmosphere of gentlemanly camaraderie is carefully nurtured by the establishment members, most of whom are men of considerable personal charm. When Senator DODD attacked the Senate leadership, he was made to feel, by his own account, like a skunk at a lawn party. A clubbable club member simply does not attack the people who run his club.

What is more, the southerners and their conservative allies are by and large a lot abler and smarter and more unified than the liberals.

"The damn liberals," says Majority Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, himself the Senate's leading liberal, "they just don't understand power—all they understand is sentiment. After all, politics is just the way you spell power, but the liberals think power is sinful."

Another liberal Senator agrees with HUMPHREY: "Power is like sex, if you think it's sinful, you don't enjoy it and you're not much good at it." Again and again the liberals of the Presidential party, mistaking sentiment for power, play straight into the hands of the establishment party.

The relentless verbosity of Senator WAYNE MORSE in the foreign aid debate, for example, dovetailed nicely with the anti-civil-rights strategy of the southerners. And the liberals on the House Judiciary Committee very nearly scuttled all chance for civil rights legislation by insisting on an ultraliberal bill which could not possibly pass.

There is another element in the equation, and that is the power of the Presidency. At the beginning of his first term President Kennedy had a key decision to make. Should he try to lick the establishment, or should he try to "jine 'em"? He decided on the latter course. In terms of the political mathematics, this was a sensible strategy—the administration badly needed southern votes, especially in the House.

An essential if unspoken part of the strategy was to rise above the principles expressed in the Democratic platform and skirt the civil rights issue. Even before the Negro revolt last summer, the congressional machinery was slowing down. When the Negroes took to the streets, the President decided that their revolt could be contained only by giving the Negroes a strong civil rights bill. When the civil rights bill was accordingly introduced last summer, the southerners reacted like Samson in the temple. To defeat civil rights they risk bringing the whole structure of the congressional institution crashing about their ears.

No southerner will admit it for the record, but the southern strategy is to delay not only the civil rights bill itself but anything else that can be delayed. Since the South dominates the establishment, and the establishment controls the congressional machinery, the machinery has come almost to a dead stop.

The machinery cannot be absolutely halted. Larry O'Brien, the President's able chief of staff for Congress, is no doubt right when he predicts that Congress will eventually pass both the tax cut and civil rights legislation. But when? And what kind of legislation?

The President first proposed a tax cut in August 1962. No doubt he will get some sort of tax cut in 1964. But it will be short of virtually all the administration's proposals for closing tax loopholes, and in other ways it will bear only a distant family resemblance to the original Kennedy tax program. And something is obviously wrong with our system of Government when it takes the legislative branch 18 months or more to get around to voting on the basic program of the executive branch.

The power of the establishment is, in fact, an essentially negative power. Since World War II only a single piece of really major legislation—the Taft-Hartley law—has originated wholly in Congress. To be sure, when the President and the establishment agree, as in the case of the railroad crisis or the nuclear test ban, Congress can act expeditiously. When they do not agree, the establishment has the power to stage what Walter Lippmann has called a furtive and degenerate form of the filibuster. The establishment's power is the power to delay and emasculate.

The result is a catatonic Congress and a frustrated Executive. No doubt there are those who like it that way. They may even be a majority. "We're in the era of physiological politics," says HUBERT HUMPHREY. "Empty stomach, full head; full stomach, empty head." As long as most stomachs are full, people don't want to think about politics. "The country's fat, dumb, and happy," says another Senator. "Most people would just as soon we did nothing but talk."

Among those who see no need for any major change in the way Congress operates is Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, the most important establishment Republican. "The American Congress is like an old waterlogged scow," says DIRKSEN, paraphrasing Fisher Ames, a Congressman of an earlier era. "It doesn't go far. It doesn't go fast. But it doesn't sink."

Maybe so, but the feeling is beginning to be widespread in Congress that the old scow is getting altogether too waterlogged for comfort, and that something has got to be done to make sure it doesn't sink. There are more proposals for reforming Congress than there are Congressmen. Most of them originate with the liberals, and most are concerned with changing the rules in such a way as to break the grip of the establishment on the congressional machinery.

The more sensible liberals themselves agree that in the way Congress operates there is much that is either admirable or unavoidable. Most Senators see no practical substitute for the seniority system. There is even much to be said for the filibuster. And it is surely better to have the Senate operate like a club than like a snakepit. "One thing I didn't realize when I came here," says HUBERT HUMPHREY. "You have to have rules. You have to have tradition."

This is true. But rules and tradition should help Congress to function, not prevent it from functioning. MIKE MANSFIELD, in his mild-mannered way, states the heart of the matter. "A President has a right," says MANSFIELD rather plaintively, "to expect reasonably prompt consideration of any major proposal." In short, if the reputation of the Congress is to be restored, the power to delay and emasculate must be limited.

Obviously the southerners have every right to fight like tigers against the President's civil rights program. For that matter, Democratic Senators like GORE and PROXMIRE have every right to fight like tigers against his tax program, on the grounds that it is a "rich man's tax bill." But the duly elected representatives of the people, after due consideration, should also have a right to vote, one way or the other. What is needed is to find some way to make certain that Congress will vote within a reasonable time limit—60 days? Ninety days? Six months?—on major Presidential proposals.

The establishment will fight to the death any change in the rules which would limit its powers. But unless he is willing to accept frustration and deadlock for as long as he is President, Kennedy is going to have to rally the Presidential party and fight back. What is at stake is not only the power of the President to lead but the respect of the country for its Congress. That respect is being rapidly eroded, and for good reason. Like a nonfighting soldier, a nonlegislating legislature is inherently contemptible.

---

[From the New York Times Magazine, Dec. 8, 1963]

### IT IS THE PEOPLE WHO FACE THE TEST

(By Tom Wicker)

"Before my term has ended," John Kennedy told Congress on January 30, 1961, "we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain."

Mr. Kennedy could not know then how soon his term would end. But the test he foretold, the uncertainty he foresaw, may now be upon us. That is not just because an assassin's unspeakable deed has placed the Presidential Government of the United States in the hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas.

It is because the shots fired that day in Dallas have not altered by one iota the 20th-century alienation between Mr. Johnson's office and a Congress that has steadily lost its status as a coequal branch and become more nearly an opposition.

Can Lyndon Johnson make Presidential Government work in tandem with that opposition? Can any man? Will Government and opposition grind together in inevitable deadlock, as they seemed to be doing the last months of John Kennedy's Presidency?

To our grandfathers, in what the French called La Belle Epoque of 50 years ago, the question might have seemed absurd. In the 19th century upon which their lives and views were built, the President and Congress were roughly compatible partners in Government. Operating in constitutional equality and in a democracy that was raw, vigorous, expanding, and self-assertive, their problems produced at worst alternating periods of supremacy and balance.

When strong Executives like Jefferson and Jackson, or national emergencies, made the Presidency paramount for a time, the natural suspicions and asserted interests of the people forced Congress swiftly to reassert itself. If lackadaisical Presidents left the field to Congress and to colliding interests and parties in the melancholy twilight of the 1850's, national interest made it necessary for Abraham Lincoln to emerge in the 1860's as the strongest, most assertive President the Nation ever has had.

Overall, popular self-government through an elected Congress was not far from a fact. Landmarks of national policy—the Homestead Act, for instance, or the Sherman Antitrust Act or the Missouri Compromise—originated more often in Congress than in the White House. The great issues of that century—slavery, secession, the tariff, currency, industrial development, the westward expansion—were internal and personal. They immediately touched the people, who could respond vigorously and directly to a Congress capable of comprehending these problems.

But in the 20th century, matters largely have been taken out of the hands of the people and their Congress. Popular self-government is no longer a fact; it only remains a faith. Presidential government has taken its place.

No longer is this a country of isolated pockets of population, each reasonably self-sufficient, united only for external protection and internal convenience, sheltered behind its oceans. Giant industries and giant transportation have linked it into an economic whole and such giants require equitable control that only powerful national government can exert. The wealth and power of the Nation, of necessity, have had to be projected into a world made small by communications, and particularly into the power vacuum left by the decline of the old European empires.

Four massive crises in this century—two World Wars, the great depression, the cold war—have had to be met with national power. The colossal concerns of modern technology, from superhighways to space exploration, demand colossal government, both for financing and execution; what private interests are capable of developing, say, communications satellites or a supersonic passenger aircraft? A Military Establishment capable of exerting conventional and nuclear power in two hemispheres and across all oceans dwarfs the biggest of private combines.

Congress, hierarchically managed, responsible to hundreds of jealous constituencies, cumbersome in organization and procedure, heir to the conflicting claims and prejudices of numerous lesser interests, is not the body to manage such affairs. For these are matters of national power, and that is preeminently the President's to wield. He alone has the direct responsibility and the autonomy to view such problems in a national light. He alone has the ability to mobilize the national force, determine priorities, expend while preserving the national resources—all with a view to the national interest.

As a result the President has become Commander in Chief, the military director of foreign policy, chief legislator, chief appropriator (the national interest he defines determines whether the budget shall be $50 billion or $90 billion; it is left to Congress only to say whether it shall be $90 billion or $89 billion), strongest influence on revenue and taxes, most effective shaper of public opinion, chief architect of the practical forms of its expression, chief administrator, even, in a sense, chief justice. For as the President devises means to act as necessity requires him to, as he shapes a public climate that affects the judicial attitude, he gives the Constitution itself much of its contemporary meaning—and its contemporary meaning must change as the times change.

But what has this left for Congress? As the national power—the power of the Presidency—has increased, it has inevitably imposed itself upon the local powers, the local interests, the local beliefs and attitudes, of which the National Legislature is made up. And as those local interests and powers have resisted the growth of national power, their opposition has become centered in Congress.

Thus the great shift in American government that came to a climax in the 20th century can be stated with some precision. The proponent forces of all major governing steps are the President and the administration, with some impetus from the courts; the opponent force is Congress.

Since Congress retains its constitutional powers and has armed itself with formidable institutional weapons over the years, the contest is by no means one-sided. In Mr. Kennedy's years Congress thwarted him often—on farm policy, aid to education, and important phases of foreign aid, to mention a few. On tax reduction and civil rights, battles yet to be won or lost, Congress had become, at his death, a powerful, glacial resistance.

What basically has happened is a 20th-century magnification of the split personality of the American system, reflected in the dual roles of the American voter. He is a member of the President's national constituency, a citizen of the Nation. He is also one of the people, a resident along the Wabash, or the Columbia or the Suwannee, a member of one of the 535 local constituencies of Congress. There is in him an impulse to follow the President, the leader; there is in him also an equal and sometimes opposite impulse to assert the mystic power of the people to define their own immediate interests and guide their own destinies—to resist the creeping control of their lives and affairs that they sense the national power to be assuming.

It is easy to fix the blame for the resulting deadlock and delay upon Congress. It is speckled with men of irresponsible power, provincial ideas, baseless suspicions. Besides, the idea of national interest expressed by the President has the ring of patriotism and selflessness; the notion of local interest, so often acted upon by Congress, smacks of the pork barrel and the gravy train. So the case against Congress is being passionately made, these days, in something like the following overall terms:

Senescence: The deadly conjunction of the seniority system with the large number of one-party districts and States. Only about 125 congressional districts are truly competitive between the parties. In 1962 only 67 new Members were elected to any of the 435 seats in the House of Representatives. The retention of the same old faces, year after year, session after session, makes the seniority system a deadening institution, a guarantee that youth of the physical, mental, or spiritual varieties shall not often be served.

In 1961 President Kennedy, with his great charm, recalled amusingly his early indoctrination into the hierarchical life in Congress. At a banquet in Phoenix honoring the indomitable Senator CARL HAYDEN, who at 84, was getting ready to run again, Mr. Kennedy recalled his first talk with the Arizonian as follows:

"After I had been in the Senate about 2 months in 1953, I got up to take part in the debate as a new Member. And, after speaking for a few minutes, I sat down near Senator HAYDEN and said, 'Senator, what's the difference between the Senate as you knew it and now?'

"And the Senator said, 'New Members did not speak in those days.'

"So I went back to my seat."

Localism: The charge that Members are too bound to their own localities and its needs, too intent upon taking home a Federal grant or a new space center, too callous—as a result—of the national interest to recognize the President's greater ability to define that interest, and the necessity for him to act upon it.

Trickery: The charge that congressional rules of procedure (constitutionally sanctified only by the founders' laconic statement that each House may determine its own) are designed for more Machiavellian purposes than that of insuring order.

One is to permit delay of a piece of proposed legislation until it can be watered down, buried, torn to shreds or caused to lose its effectiveness. The other is to give single Members, or power blocs or coalitions of them a fighting chance to defeat it, even when there is majority sentiment for it.

These specific charges against Congress blend into one basic indictment—that it fiddles while Rome burns, that it is not responsive to the Nation's needs, that it prevents or harasses the passage of needed national legislation.

Congress undoubtedly is guilty on all counts. But the reason—perhaps as sweeping and as oversimplified as the charges—is not that Congress is a deliberate structure of ignoble congressional potentates, but that it is a natural outgrowth of a political system that rests on States and districts and their less-than-national interests, all clamoring to be heard, protected, advanced.

For instance, as huge urban areas in an increasing number of States come to dominate senatorial (statewide) elections as well as presidential elections, the Senate, like the giant of national power, increasingly is influenced by the same urban areas and their interests; in current political jargon, the Senate becomes more "liberal." And, as the Senate moves more nearly into line with the Presidential wish and the national power, the House, its local districts less reflective of urban growth and national trends, becomes the bulwark of congressional opposition to national power.

As if to multiply its resistance, the districts that make it up are turning more and more in upon themselves and sending the same old faces and attitudes to the House. An average of 96 new Members entered it after each election from 1940 through 1948, but in 1960 and 1962 an average of only 65 new Members was elected.

The night before President Kennedy died, he heard Democratic Representative ALBERT THOMAS go to the heart of the matter. At a dinner meeting of his Texas supporters, Mr. THOMAS, one of the most powerful men in the House, told them buntly, "You are my boss." Mr. Kennedy thereupon paid homage to Mr. THOMAS for his services to the Nation, but Mr. THOMAS had left no doubt where lay the real power over his actions and attitudes.

Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia expanded on the point in a House debate in 1961:

"When I am asked to pledge aid to the passage of any resolution or bill in this House that I am conscientiously opposed to, I would not yield my conscience and my right to vote in this House to any person or any Member or under any conditions. If there is any other Member here who thinks he ought to yield his conscience and the views of his constituency to the will of somebody, then he ought to vote the other way."

It is not only that the typical Member of Congress often feels impelled to reflect his constituency; it is more nearly that his own views, interests and prejudices are shaped largely by the nature and environment of that constituency.

Moreover, that constituency in modern times makes appalling demands upon him as its personal servant as well as its political representative. One example is the insistent demand that he produce the goods of prosperity—defense contracts, power projects, Government installations. Another is the astronomical volume of correspondence that spews daily upon his desk, dealing with everything from private immigration bills to his latest remarks on farm prices. These demands derive directly from the vast power and influence of the Federal Government upon private life in America. As a result, only the most able, conscientious Member can be an enlightened legislator after he has performed all his constituent services.

Thus, localism is built into Congress and is only exacerbated by the rapid growth of the giant of national power. Similarly, seniority (which, to give it its due, can produce committee chairmen of skill and effectiveness, like WILBUR MILLS and J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas) has its natural causes; even if there were in Congress no hard-and-fast seniority system, senior men, as they do in every organization, would arrogate leadership and privilege to themselves. And seniority can only become a powerful factor when one-party States and districts give it to their Representatives.

Granted that congressional rules give great power to minorities and individuals; so does the Constitution of the United States, which is built on the principle of limited powers. The less-than-national interests of a democracy surely should have means, at least a fighting chance, to make their case against a national interest that could swallow them. And if any man or section wants its interests protected in Congress, it must acquiesce in a system that will permit at one time or another, the protection of all members and sections. Big-city members who fume when, say, urban renewal is hamstrung, do not hesitate to fight farm subsidies, with any weapon at hand.

It is, finally, oversimplification to say that Congress prevents—irrelevantly, because callous Members want to do so—the passage of legislation demanded by the country. More often, that legislation is being demanded by the national interest, a palpably different thing.

The case of Federal aid to education is instructive. A recent poll showed that 59 percent of the population favored such aid, as a general proposition. When the proposition begins to be examined in Congress, however, that sufficient majority falls rapidly apart. Should the aid go to Catholic schools, too? Should it go to segregated schools, too? Should poor Mississippi or populous New York get more per child? Should the money go for teachers' salaries or just for buildings? Who controls it? Who, then, controls the schools?

In 1960 the House Committee on Rules killed an aid-to-education bill after differing versions of it had been passed in both House and Senate. Outrageous? Maybe—but there is no evidence that if the committee had stood aside, southern Senators would have accepted the House version, which would have prevented aid-to-segregated schools; or that the House would have dropped its insistence on that provision; and if either had happened, President Eisenhower might well have vetoed the bill, anyway.

In such complex situations, Congress—malapportioned as it is, burdened with seniority, bound by procedures and provincialism—may represent the divisions and hesitations of the people rather accurately. When the national power demands an action, a strong and vocal opposition almost always arises among varied less-than-national interests of the country and it is not always the same opposition. Today's proponent of one action often is tomorrow's dedicated opponent of another; one man's obstructionism is another's fearless stand for the right as he or his constituency sees it.

Congress, like the people, does learn and grow slowly. The social security bill was enacted in a terrific struggle in 1935, to the accompaniment of cries of Socialist doom. In 1962 a far-reaching modernization of welfare state procedures attracted almost no attention as it whizzed through both Houses

When a Kennedy bill to permit voluntary limitation of feed-grain production reached Congress in 1961 it was damned as dictatorship; by 1962 when mandatory limitation was proposed the former critics of the voluntary plan rapidly discovered its considerable merit. The thalidomide scandal revived a drug control bill that had been bogged down. Even the southern Senators, in 1957 and 1960, found reason to compromise around the edges of the civil rights controversy; they may well do so again in early 1964. And the reluctance of Congress to act on that issue may well be reflective of the plain hesitation and fears of the people themselves.

It is true that some means ought to be found to lighten the deadening hand of seniority, and that the rules of procedure ought to be simplified. Apportionment of the House ought to be more equitable. But those are mere truths, not solutions.

For to reform the institutions of Congress, assuming that could be done, would be to change its way of functioning, but not the reasons it functions that way. If that happened, a Congress still based on States and districts and local interests, many of them one-party, would have to find means to function differently to the same end—the representation of the less-than-national interests of the country against the growth of national power.

After a jungle of outmoded committees was cleared away by the La Follette-Monroney Act of 1946, it was not long before a jungle of subcommittees arose. If unlimited debate were destroyed at a stroke, the necessity for State and local representatives to protect their own interests and that of their constituencies by allowing others the means to protect theirs would eventually result in a new usage or rule to replace the filibuster. The revolt against the dictatorship of Speaker Cannon in 1910 produced the autocracy of the House Committee on Rules. To improve apportionment would be to send to the House a somewhat altered set of local interests, only marginally more representative of the cut and shape of the whole people—and blending them not at all into some kind of national whole.

Thus the real test that approaches, which John Kennedy foresaw, is not a test of the Presidency. It is not a test of Congress. It is not Lyndon Johnson who is on trial, nor the men of the House and Senate. It is not only the executive and the legislative branches that are approaching deadlock.

It is the people of the United States who face the test. It is their ability to resolve, in a sprawling and immensely varied continent, in a system that was designed to limit all forms of power, the underlying clash of national interest and less-than-national interest—of national power and local resistance.

This does not mean that local interest or resistance to the national power should disappear; often that resistance is needed, and in any case local interest is inevitable. It means that if the American people are going to make their form of government work, in a land so full of conflicting interests and diverse beliefs, they will have to develop a sharper and surer sense of what is truly important in American life, of what the real national necessity is, of what is fundamental to their local interests and what is meretricious.

Certainly Presidential leadership, wise and articulate, will be vital to that task. Probably congressional reform would lessen the conflict. But if Americans would reach the "new American greatness" Lyndon Johnson has envisioned, they will have to begin at home—right where the trouble lies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to several of the statements made by Mr. Wicker. The first statement is as follows:

> Thus the great shift in American Government that came to a climax in the 20th century can be stated with some precision. The proponent forces of all major governing steps are the President and the administration, with some impetus from the court; the opponent force is Congress.

Mr. President, that statement has been my observation, which I have reiterated many times on the floor of the Senate. I hope that in the foreseeable future some progress will be made in changing the Congress from an opponent force of the President of the United States to a cooperative force.

The second statement to which I should like to call attention in Mr. Wicker's article is as follows:

> Congress is speckled with men of irresponsible power, provincial ideas, baseless suspicions. Besides, the idea of national interest expressed by the President has the ring of patriotism and selflessness; the notion of local interest, so often acted upon by Congress, smacks of the pork barrel and the gravy train. So the case against Congress is being passionately made, these days——

Mr. Wicker continues with a series of reasons why he feels a case is being made against Congress, the first of which follows:

> Senescence: The deadly conjunction of the seniority system with the large number of one-party districts and States. Only about 125 congressional districts are truly competitive between the parties.

In my judgment, there are only 77. I believe this is a very serious matter. Returning to the quotation:

> The retention of the same old faces, year after year, session after session, makes the seniority system a deadening institution, a guarantee that youth of the physical, mental, or spiritual varieties shall not often be served.

There are other pertinent quotes in Mr. Wicker's stimulating article. I do not agree with all his comments, but I suggest that there is in them, meat for further study by all Members of both Houses. I urge all Senators to read the articles.

One more thought and I shall have concluded. I do hope that all who hear and read my words will take note of this fact: I love the Senate. I have been happier in this body than I have ever been in my life. I hope to stay for at least another 5 years—and, who can tell, perhaps more. My efforts to urge all Senators to take steps to reform the rules, practices and procedures of the Senate are being made, not because I wish to tear the Congress down, but because I wish to build it up. I love this body, and I wish to see it better than it is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I feel that we have reached a constitutional crisis. Each Senator has a responsibility to the institution of which he is a part. Senators exercise that responsibility in different ways, which is not only our right but our duty.

I close by reiterating the strong feeling that I love this body. Anything I say against it is merely a result of that love. I cannot say that I come like a parent for the parents were the Founding Fathers. But any criticism I make of this institution is made because I love it so much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who is the Mr. Wicker to whom the Senator referred?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Wicker is a reporter on the New York Times. I am sure the Senator would recognize him if he saw him. He has been covering events in Congress for a good many years. In my opinion, he is quite an able man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no quarrel with his competence or with his ability. His article stands as the opinion of one individual.

Mr. CLARK. It is an opinion which is shared by one Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. But insofar as I could determine, I do not share that viewpoint at all.

Mr. CLARK. I would not expect the Senator from Illinois to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do share with the Senator from Pennsylvania a deep affection for this body, and in the same proportion that he criticizes, I find myself impelled to defend the Senate. I shall do so on every possible occasion.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator does so with great eloquence, if not with complete conviction, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

## AUTHORITY TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE COMMISSION TO REPORT ON ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 12 of the calendar of business there is listed Senate Joint Resolution 137, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 137 be taken from the table and be laid before the Senate for immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

**Mr. RUSSELL.** Mr. President, it develops that the joint resolution is almost identical in verbiage with one introduced earlier by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Therefore, I deem it appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent, that his name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) was passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission appointed by the President by Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any member of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from anyplace within the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(d) Process and papers of the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

## TRIBUTE TO HERBERT H. LEHMAN

**Mr. JAVITS.** Mr. President, yesterday in the Temple Emanu-El, New York City, some 2,200 people mourned the death of Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York, a former Member of this body, and an outstanding American.

But in a larger sense, the death of this man was mourned by thousands not only in the State he served so well but also throughout the country and the world. Herbert H. Lehman was many things—millionaire, banker, Governor, Senator, philanthropist, reformer, and religious leader. But most of all, he was a humanitarian in the best and most noble sense of this word.

He was a rich man who, throughout his political career, was the champion of those who had no money, no status, and virtually no chance of gaining either. He was the kind of man who could retire from an extremely vigorous and fruitful business career only to take up an extremely vigorous and fruitful career as Governor of his beloved State and finally, as a Member of this body. When he left the Senate, for a much-deserved rest, he proceeded to bring his many talents and his vigor to countless philanthropic and religious causes. In the intervening years, he guided United Nations relief efforts after World War II. In the last days of his life, he still found time and strength to undertake a crusade for reform of his own political party in New York.

These organizations and his fellow-reformers will miss him. We will all miss him, for a man like Herbert Lehman comes all too seldom to the center of the stage of the American life.

Mr. President, I believe it is fair to say that Governor and Senator Lehman earned the love, affection, respect, high distinction, and regard of the people of New York and the people of the United States through his long and fruitful life, and that this was shown in a most appropriate way yesterday in the solemn services conducted by Rabbi Julius Mark, at which the eulogy was delivered by U.S. District Court Judge Edward Weinfeld.

I believe all Senators will be interested in the events which took place, and the history of the life of Governor and Senator Lehman, who was extolled as a great humanitarian and public servant, quite properly, at the solemn services. I ask unanimous consent that various newspaper articles and editorials in tribute to Senator Lehman be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT H. LEHMAN

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and a public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HE SERVED THE PEOPLE WELL

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was then already

50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime vote getter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

## HERBERT LEHMAN, 85, DIES; EX-GOVERNOR AND SENATOR

(By Robert Alden)

Herbert H. Lehman, a towering figure in the liberal political movement in the United States and a noted philanthropist, died yesterday morning at his home after suffering a heart attack. He was 85 years old.

Mr. Lehman served as Governor of New York for 10 years and as a U.S. Senator for 8. President Franklin D. Roosevelt referred to him as "that good right arm of mine."

Mr. Lehman also was Director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration after World War II. The organization aided more than 500 million war victims.

Governor Rockefeller proclaimed a 30-day period of mourning to mark the death of Mr. Lehman. Flags on all State buildings, already flying at halfstaff because of the death of President Kennedy, will remain at halfstaff until January 5.

Mr. Lehman was stricken as he was about to leave his apartment at 820 Park Avenue to go to Washington to receive the Nation's highest peacetime award to a civilian—the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

With 30 others, he had been chosen for this honor by President Kennedy. The award was to have been presented by President Johnson at a White House ceremony today.

Yesterday, President Johnson praised Mr. Lehman as a "distinguished leader who ably and effectively served his State and Nation."

He said that perhaps the best words that he could use to describe him were contained in the citation that was to have accompanied the award: "Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of the Government and has made politics the highest form of public service."

In preparing for the trip to Washington yesterday, Mr. Lehman, always an early riser, was dressed and packed and had finished breakfast when he was stricken in his bedroom at 9 a.m. He had had no history of heart disease.

Although he had suffered a broken hip in a fall last February, members of his family said that he had been recovering well from that accident and had appeared to be in generally good health.

President Johnson's tribute was one of the first of a multitude of tributes to Mr. Lehman—tributes that cut across partisan politics.

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said:

"Senator Lehman was one of the kindest men I have ever known. I'm sure that one of many tributes members of the two parties can pay to him, is that he had the quality of never growing old."

Governor Rockefeller said: "He was truly a beloved figure in the affairs of our State and Nation, an outstanding Governor and U.S. Senator, a humanitarian whose works spanned oceans and continents to reach the hearts and raise the hopes of men and women throughout the world."

Mayor Wagner called Mr. Lehman "a father to our whole city and State."

"I have never known a better man, a kindlier man, or a more courageous man," the mayor said.

### BODY TO BE AT CHAPEL

Mr. Lehman's body will lie at the Universal Funeral Chapel, Lexington Avenue and 52d Street, today and tomorrow. The public will be able to pay their last respects from 1 to 10 p.m. on Friday and from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on Saturday.

A funeral service will be conducted at Temple Emanu-El, Fifth Avenue and 61st Street, on Sunday at 1 p.m. Burial will be private.

Mr. Lehman's family asked that floral tributes be omitted and donations made instead to charitable works.

Although best known because of his career in public service, Mr. Lehman was a philanthropist whose charitable activities encompassed a broad spectrum of human needs.

A cofounder in 1914 of what later became the American Joint Distribution Committee, Mr. Lehman gave generously and often anonymously to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of charities around the world.

The money involved probably ran into the millions, but even close members of the Lehman family would not venture a guess as to how much.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

## EX-GOVERNOR ONE OF KEY FIGURES WHO SHAPED IMAGE OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN STATE—REFORM MARKED 35-YEAR CAREER—SPENT ACTIVE RETIREMENT LEADING FIGHT AGAINST ORGANIZATION IN CITY

(By Layhmond Robinson)

Herbert Henry Lehman was one of the master builders of the Democratic Party in the State.

After Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was one of three men who wielded the greatest influence in shaping the philosophy and course of action of State party affairs in this century.

The others were Alfred E. Smith and Senator Robert F. Wagner.

Though born to wealth, Mr. Lehman was a powerful instrument in creating the image of the Democratic Party as the champion of the little man.

His career was linked inseparably with that of Mr. Roosevelt. In 1928 he first won election to office as Lieutenant Governor on the ticket that put Mr. Roosevelt in the Governor's mansion.

In 1932 he was elected Governor at the same time his old friend, Mr. Roosevelt, was elected President. As Mr. Roosevelt ushered in the New Deal Governor Lehman ushered in the little New Deal in the State.

He remained in Albany for 14 years, 10 as Governor, during which he greatly expanded the role of the State government as Mr. Roosevelt had revolutionized it on the Federal level.

### PRESSED SOCIAL REFORM

He pushed through the legislature a broad program of social reform, including measures creating unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, public housing, regulation of utilities, the State labor relations board, and laws to protect the workingman.

The Lehman political career is studded with paradoxes.

He entered politics as a wealthy man, yet his name became a synonym for the rights of the common man.

He was a dull, austere campaigner, yet he was elected to more high offices in the State than anyone else, serving two terms as Lieutenant Governor, four as Governor, and 8 years as U.S. Senator.

He came from a family with a southern background, yet he was a champion of Negro rights, and was the most persistent civil rights advocate in the Senate when he served there from 1949 to 1956.

He had the "handicap" of being a Jew when he ran for public office in his early career. Yet, in 1934, he piled up the greatest plurality—800,000—ever achieved by a victorious candidate for Governor in the State's history.

### ACTIVE RETIREMENT

He "retired" from active politics at the end of his Senate term in 1956, but was in the thick of the State's political battles almost to the day of his death, as organizer and strategist of the citywide reform movement.

Two things explain Mr. Lehman's popularity with the voters over the last four decades. One was his link to Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal, which gave him an almost mystical voter appeal.

The other was what one of his political opponents once described as his absolute sincerity.

He was an unprepossessing man who spoke in a deliberate, unemotional voice. Yet he established instant communication with his audiences, a communication that caused him to win every office he ran for except one—his first bid for the Senate in 1946 against Irving M. Ives.

Such spectacular moves as appointing Thomas E. Dewey, a Republican, as special prosecutor in 1935 to clean up rackets in Democratic Manhattan, further marked Governor Lehman in the minds of the voters as a man sincerely devoted to the public interest. He later defeated Mr. Dewey in the gubernatorial race in 1938.

His background as a successful investment banker was no handicap during the depression.

Applying tough, business techniques to the management of State government, he converted a State budget deficit of $106 million which he found when he took office in 1932 into a surplus of $80 million when he left in 1942.

His stock as the principal liberal spokesman in the Senate went up each time he clashed with Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and other apostles of the right wing, and he often found himself a lonely crusader on the civil rights issue. In this period he was often called the conscience of the Senate.

His death casts a cloud over the future of the Democratic reform movement, whose guiding genius he had been. Even at the age of 83, his vigorous campaigning as reform chieftain played a major role in Mayor Wagner's upset victory 2 years ago over the regular Democratic organization. His influence in party affairs and his appeal to the voters never waned.

---

### Lehman Is Extolled as Humanitarian and Statesman

(Following are tributes to former Gov. Herbert H. Lehman that were expressed yesterday:)

President Johnson: "Perhaps his best epitaph can be the citation on the Presidential Medal of Freedom which he was to receive here tomorrow: 'Citizen and statesman, he has used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.' "

Governor Rockefeller: "He was truly a beloved figure in the affairs of our State and Nation, an outstanding Governor and U.S. Senator, an humanitarian whose works spanned oceans and continents to reach the hearts and raise the hopes of men and women throughout the world. Mrs. Rockefeller joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Lehman and the family. We hope the knowledge of Governor Lehman's extraordinary contributions to humanity in a long and fruitful life will bring consolation to all who loved him."

Mayor Wagner, who was attending the Conference on Automation, Education, and Collective Bargaining in San Juan, P.R.: "He was a father to our whole city and State. I have never known a better man, a kindlier man, or a more courageous man. The people have lost a dedicated and brilliant champion, a spokesman for all that is best in our Nation. His like will not come this way soon again. His figure will loom like a mountain in the history of our city—a landmark of greatness for the future to steer by."

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS: "I think it fair to say that Mr. Lehman, as Governor, Senator, and leading citizen of the State of New York, was one of the most distinguished New Yorkers, not only in his own time but in the history of our State."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING: "He was really a towering figure in the life of our State and Nation, truly a spokesman for all people."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate majority leader: "We missed him when he left and we miss him even more now."

Richard M. Nixon: "Senator Lehman was one of the kindest men I have ever known. I knew him when I served in the Senate and later as Vice President. I'm sure that one of many tributes members of the two parties can pay to him is that he had the quality of never growing old."

Cardinal Spellman, upon being told of the news as he arrived at Idlewild Airport from Rome: "I am terribly sorry."

Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El: "Innumerable men, women and children of all faiths in many countries suffer the loss of a truly wonderful human being. He was one of the great men of our times because he was an innately good man. He walked with kings but never lost the common touch. He was confirmed in Temple Emanu-El with the class of 1892 and often referred to this experience as one of the high points of his life."

Paul R. Screvane, president of the city council: "As Governor, Senator, philanthropist, and humanitarian there was no task too lowly or too difficult for this kind and phenomenally energetic man. History will record him also as a friend of all people."

Stanley H. Lowell, chairman of the city commission on human rights: "The passing of Herbert H. Lehman, like the death of John F. Kennedy, has taken from each of us a bit of our collective conscience. Equality for all, regardless of race, color, or religion, was Herbert Lehman's lifelong passion."

Abraham D. Beame, city controller: "Our city, State, country, and the entire world have lost a great statesman, an outstanding humanitarian and one who fought until his last breath for good and humane government. Whatever is progressive in New York State government is due largely to the work and effort of Herbert Lehman."

Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair: "He set a standard to which the younger generation may repair and an example to people everywhere of the best in our Nation."

Timothy W. Costello, State chairman of the Liberal Party: "He was a tireless champion of humanitarian ideals. His courage and full measure of devotion to the public good will be solely missed by all Americans concerned with progressive government."

Rev. Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations: "Herbert Lehman was a giant of social justice. He was a humanitarian, an idealist and a champion of the noblest ideals of a free society."

William M. McKeon, State Democratic chairman: "The impact of this great man will be felt for generations to come, in the United States and in every part of the world where freedom is cherished and the betterment of the lot of peoples in every way is of deep and primary concern."

Joseph Zaretski, minority leader of the State senate: "Here was a humanitarian unselfishly devoting all of his energies to the welfare of the people. He sought nothing in return."

James R. Dumpson, city welfare commissioner: "The little people have lost another great leader."

Fred A. Young, Republican State chairman: He was one of the great public servants of our time and a powerful influence for good long after he lay down his burdens of office.

Edward N. Costikyan, Democratic leader of New York County: Governor Lehman lived a life of happy and devoted service to his community, his State, his country, and to the entire world. He was another of God's unique creatures whose place here on earth will never be filled.

Russell Hemenway, president of the Lexington Democratic Club: We deeply mourn the death of our trusted adviser and friend and our only honorary member.

Harry Van Arsdale, Jr., president of the New York Central Labor Council: We can ill afford the loss of another great humanitarian such as Herbert H. Lehman.

Charles Poletti, former Governor: Forgetful of self-interest, sincere in his modesty, he wished only to serve his fellow man. We are grateful that God blessed him with a long life of service.

Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University: He served both his Nation and the world with wisdom, compassion, and understanding. The Jewish community in particular has lost a great leader.

Edward M. M. Warburg, chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee: He was perhaps the only Jewish leader around whom all sections of the American Jewish community could rally. Many are the causes, both Jewish and nonsectarian, which he aided. The world has been greatly enriched by his presence.

The Reverend Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress: He was a great American and noble Jew who combined in his life and works the thunder for justice and the love of his people reminiscent of the prophets of Jewish history.

Arthur Levitt, State controller: Those of us fortunate enough to know him were inspired by his brilliant leadership, his incisive mind, and his abiding spirit.

Louis J. Lefkowitz, State attorney general: I have never known any man who gave so much of himself to the cause of peace, justice, and mercy.

Edward R. Dudley, Manhattan Borough president: Herbert Lehman has died only today. But his monument long since has been built. It was a monument of legislation he sponsored and encouraged for the benefit of the underprivileged and the oppressed.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League: We share with other citizens a deep sense of loss in the passing of a great humanitarian. By his untiring efforts in the cause of equal opportunity and better interracial understanding, he has performed a lasting service to the Nation.

Rabbi Uri Miller, president of the Synagogue Council of America: In his lifetime his record for unswerving devotion to Jewish causes made him the beloved of his people. His courage in battling for the rights of the disadvantaged and persecuted will ever serve as an eternal light for world democracy. Revered by all, his memory will live on to inspire us for generations to come.

A. M. Sonnabend, president of the American Jewish Committee: This giant of social and international justice enriched the entire human family by his presence among us. His public career and private life were supreme witnesses to his belief in the sacredness and divine worth of each human life and in the inalienable rights of every human being. Our most meaningful eulogy would be a rededication to those principles he held so dear.

Joseph F. Carlino, speaker of the State assembly: When Herbert Lehman became New York's 49th Governor he pledged to "give the best that is in me * * * to serve my State and its people well." Before he died, Herbert Lehman redeemed that pledge.

Rev. Dr. Abraham N. Avrutick, president of the Rabbinical Council of America: His passing leaves a void that cannot be filled.

Dore Schary, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: We can never forget his fight for civil liberties when he stood virtually alone in the Senate against the nightmare of McCarthyism, or his eloquent advocacy of human rights all the years of his life.

Abe Stark, Brooklyn Borough president: He could have lived a life of relative ease and comfort enjoying the admiration and respect of his fellow citizens in a successful business career. Instead he decided to dedicate his life to help the unfortunate among us.

John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman: Senator Lehman worked all of his life to strengthen the fabric of American life.

Rabbi Mordecai Kirshblum, president of Religious Zionists of America: The American Jewish community joins with the entire Nation in mourning the passing of one of the greatest statesmen of our century, Senator Herbert Lehman. Senator Lehman was not only a great American citizen, but also an outstanding Jew, as he helped to establish the State of Israel.

Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, president of the New York Board of Rabbis: The New York Board of Rabbis mourns Governor Lehman. America and the world mourn a great statesman, a wise leader, a man of the people, and devoted proponent of human rights. Governor Lehman gave added stature and new dimensions to the arena of politics. Through his many years of service, through his integrity and selflessness, through his profound humanitarian impulses he renewed our faith in the human potential for good. He was a loyal son of the Jewish faith whose philosophy of life was rooted in Hebraic soil and nurtured by prophetic tradition.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### JOHNSON AT LEHMAN RITES; 2,000 GUARD HIM ON VISIT—SERVICE IS AT EMANU-EL

(By Robert Alden)

Final tribute was paid yesterday to Herbert H. Lehman at a funeral service attended by President Johnson and other high officials of the Federal, State and city governments.

As Mr. Lehman was being eulogized as a "kind and gentle man, fearless in meeting head-on the forces of hate and bigotry," Secret Service agents stood on the mezzanine level of Temple Emanu-El, their figures silhouetted against the towering stained glass windows of the largest Jewish house of worship in the world.

President Johnson and his wife, along with a large party of public officials from Washington, arrived at the temple, Fifth Avenue and 65th Street, just before 1 p.m., the hour at which the service was to begin.

#### NEARLY 2,200 IN TEMPLE

Fifteen hundred guests of the Lehman family and 700 members of the public were already seated when the President and Mrs. Johnson were escorted to their seats by David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America and a trustee of the temple.

In the first pew, with President and Mrs. Johnson, sat Governor Rockefeller, Senator Jacob K. Javits, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Mayor Wagner, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Adlai E. Stevenson. Just behind President Johnson sat Chief Justice Earl Warren, Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman.

The copper coffin containing the body of Mr. Lehman, former Governor of New York State and former U.S. Senator, was in the sanctuary under a blanket of yellow roses. Sprays of pom-poms and chrysanthemums—yellow, orange and red—were placed to the side and below the coffin.

To the right of the coffin and behind it was an American flag, to the left the flag of the Governor of New York State. Behind each of the flags were the Menorahs, seven-branched candelabra symbolizing the creation of the world in 6 days and the 7th day, the Sabbath, on which the Lord rested.

Directly behind and above the coffin was the Ark containing the Torah, the scrolls of the five books of Moses. Above it burned a perpetual light, known as the Ner Tamid, a symbol of the traditional Jewish belief in the truths contained in the Torah.

Mr. Lehman's widow, Edith, sat in a pew to the left of the Presidential party. With her was her son, John Lehman; her daughter, Mrs. Hilda Jane Wise, and other members of the immediate family.

In addition to the 2,200 persons seated in the main temple and chapel, an overflow of about 1,500 heard the service over a loudspeaker in the Isaac Wise Hall directly below the temple floor.

#### DR. MARK PRESIDES

The Reverend Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El, entered the sanctuary from the right to preside over the services. He took his place in the pulpit and intoned the 15th Psalm:

"Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in Thy holy hill?

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.

"He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour * * *"

Rabbi Mark then turned to Mr. Lehman's favorite prayer and read it in a deep and sonorous voice to the hushed congregation:

"Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, O Thou eternal source of peace, and enable Israel to be its messenger unto the peoples of the earth. Bless our country that it may ever be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations.

"May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among the inhabitants of all lands. Plant virtue in every soul, and may the love of Thy name hallow every home and every heart.

"Praised be Thou, O Lord, Giver of peace."

#### TELLS OF LETTER

Dr. Mark then spoke of a letter Mr. Lehman had written to a boy who had asked whether being Jewish had been a handicap in public life.

"My answer," Mr. Lehman had written, "is that I think any man who is seeking public office and allows his ambition to affect his religious affiliation is not worthy of the confidence of his fellow citizens.

"* * * My advice in a word, is: Never be ashamed of being a Jew. Never try to hide it. Never try to compromise with your convictions because they may not agree with those of the group in which you find yourself."

Rabbi Mark next turned to a favorite poem of the late Governor, a poem titled "Some Time at Eve" and written by Elizabeth Clark:

"Some time at eve when the tide is low
I shall slip my moorings and sail away,
With no response to a friendly hail
Of kindred craft in the busy bay.
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,
When the night stoops down to embrace the day,
And the voices call in the waters' flow—

"Some time at eve when the tide is low,
I shall slip my mooring and sail away.
A few who watched me sail away
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,
Some loving souls that my heart held dear,
In silent sorrow will drop a tear—
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail
In moorings sheltered from storm or gale,
And greeted the friends who have sailed before
O'er the Unknown Sea to the Unseen Shore.

After the reading of the poem, Judge Edward Weinfeld of the U.S. district court stepped to the pulpit to eulogize the late Governor. He said:

"Herbert Lehman had no doubt of the answer to the taunting biblical inquiry—Am I my brother's keeper?

"His life was a decisive affirmative response—man does have a responsibility to his fellow man. * * * The range of his interests in the cause of social justice and the betterment of mankind was without limit. His actions were rooted deeply in his belief in the worth of each individual.

"He knew of no distinction of race, color, or creed. A devoted son and leader of his own faith, he respected all faiths and religions."

Judge Weinfeld made a direct reference to Mr. Lehman's vigorous opposition to the tactics employed by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in his Senate investigations. Judge Weinfeld said:

"He deeply felt the responsibility for our freedoms—that whenever those freedoms are threatened, they can be preserved only by forthright and vigorous action, no matter what the personal or political consequences.

"In the dark, suspicious days of our Nation—well within the memory of us all—when fear seemed to have paralyzed most of our leadership, Herbert Lehman dared to stand alone, fighting those that would have destroyed the meaning of our democratic way of life.

"His courage inspired courage in others, and gradually America came back to her senses.

"In those years it was not easy to be a lonely fighter; yet this kind and gentle man was fearless in meeting head on the forces of hate and bigotry."

#### WIFE'S ROLE LAUDED

Judge Weinfeld told of how the close and loving relationship that Mr. Lehman enjoyed for 54 years with his wife had buoyed him up in time of trouble.

"The soul-trying experiences when he so often fought against ruthless opponents were made more bearable because of Edith's encouragement and support," he said. "This beautiful relationship not only meant everything to them, but was the joy of their friends.

"His works and deeds, the love and affection of a grateful people, remain his lasting tribute. Because of him and his achievements, the world is a better place in which to live.

"This shall be a comfort to his family and friends. Herbert Lehman is forever enshrined in our hearts."

Following the eulogy, Dr. Mark read Tennyson's poem "Crossing the Bar" and then his own prayer-eulogy.

In it he described Mr. Lehman as this "modest, courteous, gallant, dedicated public servant, whose great heart was on fire with a passion for human freedom and who could not countenance prejudice and injustice regardless of who might be the victim."

The rabbi also spoke of the Lehman family's association with the temple, an association of more than a century. Mr. Lehman was confirmed at Temple Emanu-El in 1892; he died last Thursday at the age of 85.

#### GOD IS ENTREATED

"May God's comfort bring healing," Dr. Mark said, "to his beloved Edith, a devoted companion and a wise counselor who was always at his side; his children, grandchildren and all others bound to him by the golden ties of blood and kinship and precious friendship."

The service ended with Dr. Mark's recitation of the 23d Psalm followed by four lines from "Hamlet":

"Now cracks a noble heart.
Good night, sweet prince, and
Flights of angels sing thee
To thy rest."

Mr. Lehman's coffin then was lifted out of the sanctuary and carried slowly down the long center aisle. Directly behind them walked the members of the immediate family and, behind them, President and Mrs. Johnson and the line of mourners.

In front of the temple, Mrs. Lehman paused and President Johnson joined her, the President embraced and kissed Mrs. Lehman as did Mrs. Johnson. President Johnson talked privately for several moments with Mrs. Lehman.

Then President and Mrs. Johnson walked from the Fifth Avenue entrance to 65th Street where they turned the corner and entered their car.

Mrs. Lehman and the immediate family followed the coffin to the family plot in Kensico Cemetery, Valhalla, N.Y., for the private burial, at which Dr. Mark presided.

---

[From the New York Tribune, Dec. 9, 1963]

### LEHMAN MOURNERS LED BY PRESIDENT

(By Robert S. Bird)

Herbert H. Lehman was laid to rest yesterday after a funeral service at Temple Emanu-El which was distinguished by the presence of President and Mrs. Johnson and Attorney General Robert Kennedy, representing the family of the late President, and by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, and a great throng of public figures and other friends whose names are known to most Americans.

Despite an extraordinary security shield set up to protect President Johnson both inside the temple and all around its site at 5th Avenue and 65th Street, the service was one of impressive dignity and warmth for the former Governor's memory. There wasn't an intruding note to mar any part of it.

Mr. Lehman, four times Governor and for two terms U.S. Senator, died of a heart attack Thursday at his home, 820 Park Avenue, at the age of 85.

He was interred in Kensico Cemetery in Westchester after a private burial service.

More than 2,200 persons filled all pews in the temple except those of the side and rear balconies, left empty for security reasons. And another group of 1,500 persons overflowed into the downstairs Isaac M. Wise Hall, where they heard the service over a public address system.

Outside the temple the streets and sidewalks were cleared during the service on 5th Avenue from 64th to 66th Streets, and from East 65th Street from 5th to Madison Avenues, but a crowd of 2,000 people gathered behind the police barricades that blocked off those areas.

During the 32-minute service, Mr. Lehman lay on a catafalque in the sanctuary of the synagogue, and at the head of the casket, covered by a blanket of yellow roses, stood an American flag on one side and the Governor of New York's personal standard on the other. This last flag had been sent to the temple by Governor Rockefeller especially for the funeral service to honor the former Governor.

The immediate members of the Lehman family sat in the left front pew, with other relatives numbering 120 persons sitting behind them.

The President and Mrs. Johnson and other dignitaries of government sat in the center front pew.

These included Attorney General Kennedy, Governor Rockefeller, and State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz; the two U.S. Senators from New York, Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating; Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Chief Justice Earl Warren, who remained with the President throughout his entire trip yesterday; Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, and Senators Mike Mansfield, of Montana, and Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

### NOTABLES

Behind them in a score of pews were an assortment of persons famous in affairs of the Nation, State and city.

These included such a diversity of persons as former Govs. Averell Harriman and Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, Bernard Baruch, Representative John Lindsay, of New York, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, along with numerous city officials, judges of many different benches, leaders of industry and finance, and the like.

On the right front section of the pews were a number of labor leaders, and Circuit Court Justice Thurgood Marshall and Mrs. Constance Motley, who was his associate in earlier legal battles waged by the NAACP, together with a large delegation of officials and legislators from the State capitol at Albany.

Except for members of the Presidential party, including those who came with the President from Washington and those who met him at the airport and rode with him in the motorcade to the temple, the synagogue was filled long before the service started.

### UNOBTRUSIVE

Persons bearing the blue invitation card which was the necessary credential for admission to the temple were passed through the doors by dozens of security men who worked quietly, almost unobtrusively. Other security men, including Secret Service and police detectives in plain clothes, were all around the interior of the place but they, too, were almost undistinguishable from mourners.

Uniformed police were guarding doors and entry passages but they were not visible to those inside the synagogue.

President Johnson was solemn-faced when the motorcade drove up to the temple and he stepped out to be greeted by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and a trustee of the temple. General Sarnoff acted in behalf of Alfred R. Bachrach, president of the temple, who was ill and confined in a hospital.

There was some slight turning of heads when the President and his party came in, at 12:50 p.m., but otherwise hardly a ruffle. They were quietly escorted to the front section where Preisdent Johnson doffed his dark coat and put on his glasses and looked quickly around. Governor Rockefeller was already in his seat and the two men shook hands.

Mayor Wagner and the others who were to sit in the front pew with the President slid into their places and within moments everybody was seated, still and lost in contemplation in the majestic byzantine tile and marble decor of this sumptuous temple.

Attorney General Kennedy came in separately and alone after the Presidential party was seated. He walked down the center aisle and joined the others, apparently having come to the temple alone.

A few moments later Mrs. Lehman and the members of her immediate family entered from a side door and took their places in the front on the left. She was accompanied by her two adopted children, John Lehman and Mrs. Edward P. Wise, and her sister and brother-in-law, Mrs. Arthur Master and Dr. Master.

### PSALM 15

At 1 p.m. the Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi, opened the service with the reading of Psalm 15, which tells of the man who "walks uprightly, works righteousness, and speaks truth in his heart."

Speaking from a pulpit on the President's right, Dr. Mark next read from the prayer book a favorite selection of Mr. Lehman which begins, "Grant us peace."

Then Dr. Mark touched arrestingly on a subject dear to the heart of Mr. Lehman—his stalwart and lifelong affirmation of his religion.

In 1961 a young boy who was not publicly identified wrote to Mr. Lehman, asking if he had ever been handicapped by his religion. The busy man took time out from his work to write the boy a thoughtful reply which summed up his conviction on this subject. Dr. Mark read the two-page letter in full as a part of the funeral service.

After this, Federal Judge Edward Weinfeld, a friend of Mr. Lehman for many years, took the pulpit to deliver a eulogy. Judge Weinfeld said at the outset that Mr. Lehman was "an exceedingly modern man and perhaps he would not quite approve of what we do here.

"One can almost hear him say, 'Dear family and friends, do not trouble yourselves,'" Judge Weinfeld said, "'I have had a full and rewarding life. I saw the fulfillment of many of the ideals and principles that I believed in and fought for. And when my time came, it came quickly. And even now I am with you in spirit.'"

The judge then traced Mr. Lehman's long and broad range of activities in the cause of social justice and the worth of the individual, and as one who respected all faiths and religions, and gave unstintingly in a career of service to the city, State, Nation, and the world.

The judge said that Mr. Lehman's career was "without parallel in our times for its duration, its dedication and devotion, and for its impact upon millions of people here and throughout the entire world.

"No one, and certainly no one in this assembly who has ever been aware of movements concerned with the dignity of man—the very essence of the democratic process—need be reminded of Herbert Lehman's passionate devotion to those movements," he continued.

"This was a man who outwardly appeared reserved, but who always left those who he had just seen feeling warmer than before. This was a man who was modest in bearing and who brought distinction to every venture he joined.

### MAN OF PEACE

"This was a man of peace, yet he met every assault on democracy with an iron will and an inner fire that carried the day. This was a man who cared for and loved people, yet his capacity for righteous indignation was never dulled by the years."

The judge touched on Mr. Lehman's feeling of responsibilities for the Nation's freedoms and his lonely stand in fighting forces which would destroy democracy in this country. He mentioned his service as Director General of UNRRA—"the greatest relief organization the world has ever known."

Judge Weinfeld noted how the tributes to Mr. Lehman "cut across all political, religious, racial, and national lines," and he told of the former Governor's intense devotion to family and to friends.

He closed with a reference to the thoughts which animated Mr. Lehman on the last day of his life.

"On the final morning of his life," said the judge, "he looked forward so eagerly and enthusiastically to the trip he was about to make to the White House to receive the Medal of Freedom—the highest American civilian honor for service in peacetime, from the President of the United States, who is with us today in tribute to our friend.

"The now posthumous award reads:

"'Citizen and statesman, he used wisdom and compassion as the tools of government and has made politics the highest form of public service.'"

### BETTER PLACE

In closing, the judge said:

"Because of him and his achievements, the world is a better place in which to live. This shall be a comfort to his family and friends. Herbert Lehman is forever enshrined in our hearts."

After the eulogy by Judge Weinfeld, Dr. Mark read another favorite selection of Mr. Lehman, Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar," and then he offered a prayer and eulogy in which he expressed gratitude to God for this "modest, courteous, gallant, dedicated public servant, whose wise and understanding heart was literally on fire with a passion for human freedom and whose soul revolted against everything of prejudice and injustice regardless of who might be the victim."

### THE 23D PSALM

He recalled his love of country and pride of Jewish heritage and faith, and his long association with Temple Emanu-El, and the rabbi concluded the service with recitation of the 23d Psalm, followed by the quotation of Horatio from Shakespeare's "Hamlet":

> "Now cracks a noble heart.
> Good night, sweet prince, and
> Flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

During the service, Associate Rabbi Nathan A. Perilman sat in the sanctuary.

The impeccability of the security arrangements was never better demonstrated than in the emptying of the temple at the end of the service.

The bearers at a signal lifted the coffin and carried it slowly from the sanctuary and the march began down the aisle to the front door on Fifth Avenue. Mrs. Lehman, heavily veiled, and her son, John, followed the casket, along with other members of the immediate family; and then the President and Mrs. Johnson, the President walking on the right of his wife and holding her right hand in his left.

The rest of the family and Presidential entourage party followed behind, while the other dignitaries and distinguished friends debouched out on side aisles minutes behind the President.

### EMBRACES

On the sidewalk outside the temple President Johnson walked over to Mrs. Lehman and embraced her, kissing her on the cheek and cupping his hands as he spoke something into her ear. When he turned away Mrs. Johnson also embraced the widow and chatted for a moment with her.

**Mr. JAVITS.** Though I have not asked my colleague [Mr. KEATING] I know he would wish to join with me in this tribute. I should like the RECORD to show very clearly that both of us attended the services. It is an honor for us as Senators from New York to have the record spelled out so completely upon the life and achievements of this very great man.

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. JAVITS.** I yield.

**Mr. KEATING.** I appreciate the thoughtfulness of my colleague in allowing me to join in this tribute. The ceremony was moving and impressive. It struck one with a sense of the great loss New York and the Nation suffered on the death of Governor and Senator Lehman.

Last Friday I placed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post. I now ask unanimous consent to include today editorials from the New York Journal-American, the World-Telegram and Sun, and the New York Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York-Journal American, Dec. 6, 1963]

### GOVERNOR LEHMAN

The Nation's public life has suffered an ill-afforded loss with the death of former U.S. Senator and New York Governor, Herbert H. Lehman.

He was a valued elder statesman of the Democratic Party, a grand old gentleman of American politics, a famed humanitarian and philanthropist.

Governor Lehman, it will be remembered, quit his large investment and banking interests more than 30 years ago to devote himself to public service. During the remainder of his 85 years he earned the esteem and friendship of all honorable men, regardless of their political persuasion.

He brought quiet dignity to his calling, yet fought wtih determination and effectiveness for his ideals. And shortly before his retirement in 1956, at the age of 78, he was accorded the following tribute:

"Few men in our history have had such a distinguished career."

The speaker was the then Senate majority leader, now President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Few indeed have served their country so honorably and well, and the loss suffered by his wife, son and daughter is shared by us all.

[From the New York World-Telegram and The Sun, Dec. 6, 1963]

### LEGACY OF DECENCY

Herbert H. Lehman leaves a rich political legacy.

He was warm and human in a field where it is sometimes easy to become aloof and imperious.

Veteran reporters remember him for his availability, his constant willingness to talk, even when under attack. Voters remember his folksy approaches on streetcorners and sidewalk.

He was decent, a fine person, with honest instincts—and politics can so easily compromise such instincts. There was never a breath of scandal attached to him.

He was a humanitarian. This spirit was stamped on every piece of legislative progress he touched, particularly in his later years as a Senator in Washington.

He was very serious, especially about the various offices he held. Some said he was so serious he was stuffy and humorless. But that's overstating it.

He was unique. He succeeded Governor Roosevelt when the latter went to the White House. From then until December 1942, he was Governor. He resigned after such an unprecedented time in office to take a Federal position as director of relief for war-torn Europe.

He later continued such humanitarian work with the U.N. He returned to political office in 1949, when he was elected Senator.

He was a fighter. He fought Tammany Hall on the streets of New York and he won. He fought to keep Mayor Wagner in office and he won.

He fought in the U.S. Senate for the causes he believed in. These causes always had humanitarian overtones.

Yet he was not born to politics. He came from a wealthy background and enjoyed working for a Wall Street banking house. He shunned the kind of politicking he eventually grew accustomed to.

For a man who was such a reluctant politician, he succeeded marvelously.

---

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### HERBERT LEHMAN: A PROFILE IN COURAGE

John F. Kennedy, in July of this year, designated 31 recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom—the highest honor a President can bestow for peacetime service to the country. One of those selected for such distinguished recognition was Herbert H. Lehman; the awards were to be presented this weekend.

It is a cruel accident of history that neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Lehman will be present when the ceremony is held.

Herbert Lehman will be remembered with affection and esteem for many things. What is perhaps most memorable is the extent to which his fighting spirit grew and his convictions deepened with the passage of time.

He was an able, enlightened Governor who carried forward the spirit of humane government—he called it "government with a heart"—that had pervaded the Smith and Roosevelt eras in Albany. A reserved man with no special gift of oratory and a congenital dislike for demagogy, he was nevertheless elected Governor four times—more often than any other man in the annals of the State. His quiet, sometimes hesitant voice communicated both a sense of compassion and integrity that confounded the political rabble-rousers. The son of a wealthy man, his concern for the dispossessed was never patronizing.

After Albany came his leadership of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—a post in which all the human debris of a war-ravaged world became his burden.

He was 71 when he was elected to the Senate in 1949; a record of large achievement was already written, and this seemed destined to be the serene twilight of a life of distinction. Instead it produced his finest hours and when, it might be said, he crossed the bridge from virtue to greatness. It was in those hours that he met the critical test that places him in the company of Norris, La Follette, and others in that small band of Senate figures who have dared to stand almost alone against the furies of the day.

The portent was there during his Senate campaign. In that interval Cardinal Spellman issued his lamentable assault on Mrs. Roosevelt over the aid-to-education bill. Most of the local politicos suffered acute political lockjaw; Herbert Lehman rose to Mrs. Roosevelt's defense in dignity and solitude. There were those who said he had committed political suicide, but the electorate had a larger wisdom.

In Washington, almost at the moment of Lehman's arrival, the age of McCarthy began. Cowardice and evasion dominated the Senate; Lehman refused to be intimidated. In the summer of 1953, many Senate liberals, in a dubious effort to affirm their own patriotism, sponsored a so-called anti-Communist bill more damaging to the Bill of Rights than any legislation McCarthy had proposed. Herbert Lehman, with Estes Kefauver, stood up defiantly, declaring:

"I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people."

Lehman's passion for freedom had been abundantly revealed in these trials; his dedication to equal rights was the other major preoccupation of his Senate career, and again he was ahead of his time. Long before the civil rights movement had won political allies in many high places, Lehman was fighting the battle for effective legislation to end the degradation of second-class citizenship and give American Negroes the equity and equality so many of them had so long been denied.

Finally, when he decided in 1956 that he could no longer meet the physical ordeal of conscientious Senate service, he returned to New York. Again it was assumed that his political lifetime was nearly over; instead he plunged with implausible fervor into the Democratic reform movement and became, with Mrs. Roosevelt, not merely its spiritual leader but a street-corner activist. Who will ever forget the pictures of him pounding the hot pavements of a sweltering summer for the Wagner reform ticket that eventually staged one of the unforgettable upsets in our political annals? Perhaps the reform crusade was the hardest effort of all; it required open conflict with machine men Lehman had long known, and he was a sentimental man. But he did not shrink from it, and his example stirred the conscience of a city.

And so, until the day he died, Herbert Lehman was fighting the good fight for the basic American decencies.

His voice and his name were identified with a thousand efforts to help those born less fortunate than himself, to safeguard our tradition of freedom, to fulfill the dream of the Emancipation Proclamation.

He was never a thunderer, but his voice was heard; he was a gracious man, even in dealing with his adversaries, but he could fight hard and resolutely for the things in which he deeply believed; he was blessed with humility, but he scorned obsequiousness; he knew there were times when compromises were inevitable, but his incorruptibility was always clear. He endured personal tragedy with gallantry and stoicism.

Above all, he imparted a quiet nobility to all the causes he espoused, and to the lives of all who knew him. For his wife and others close to him there can only be the consolation that he lived long enough to become not merely a beloved resident of New York, but a revered citizen of the world.

## CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE NEEDED—NOT THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times devotes considerable attention to a problem I have discussed on the floor of the Senate on several occasions; namely, the need for a capital issues committee to deal with the problem caused by large U.S. capital exports.

In my view, the interest equalization tax would not be an effective instrument in dealing with the problem of capital outflows. Its apparent success during the third quarter is clearly attributable to the uncertainty caused by the proposed measure while Congress debates over it rather than to the actual tax that is to be imposed. While foreign borrowing in the United States has dried up, partly as a result of this proposal, it also succeeded in shutting down the U.S. capital market as a center of world finance. I believe that is not in our interest. While I fully endorse the Treasury's efforts to urge the Europeans to develop their own narrow capital markets, it is rather doubtful that all the capital markets of Europe added together can supply within the foreseeable future even a part of the capital needed for a prosperous and viable free world, and which heretofore has been obtained in the United States.

As a far more effective alternative I have proposed that a capital issues committee be created, composed of representatives of the Government, Federal Reserve banks, commerce and industry and banking as well as of the public. Their job would be to approve or reject proposed capital issues on the basis of criteria laid down by the Federal Government.

The interest equalization tax is discriminatory as far as the countries affected, as well as the type of securities involved, are concerned. It is in no sense less of a "capital control"—which the Treasury ostensibly abhors—than the capital issues committee I propose, but with one major difference. The capital issues committee could be a truly temporary arrangement. It could be an instrument which is known to our European allies and is not new in our own history—the Voluntary Credit Restraint Committee of the Korean War has served our country effectively. Such a committee could determine between capital issues which would be beneficial to our balance of payments in the long run—that is, those which may produce U.S. exports, and those which are considered nonproductive. It is a proposal which is gaining strong support from the responsible press and among the financial community.

The New York Times in an editorial this morning endorses the creation of a capital issues committee. It has previously endorsed this idea in editorials on September 1 and November 18. I urge the Treasury to give this alternative its serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from this morning's New York Times, a letter to the editor on the same subject, and an article entitled "Equalization Tax," both from the same newspaper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### CONTROLS OVER CAPITAL

The administration wants quick congressional approval of its request for taxing American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds because the proposal itself has caused a virtual embargo on foreign borrowing. This was not intended by the Treasury, which recognizes that Wall Street's capital market must be kept open to foreign borrowers. Now with the House Ways and Means Committee giving its blessing to the proposed tax, the prospects for speedy passage have been enhanced.

The Treasury should reconsider this dubious measure. Unquestionably, the outflow of long-term funds into foreign securities has been a serious drain. Yet there is real doubt that the Treasury's proposal, which the Investment Bankers Association aptly describes as not a tax at all but rather a new protective tariff discriminating against foreign securities and American investors, is the best way to deal with the problem. For once the tax is passed, the way will be open for a renewed dollar outflow as borrowers and lenders devise loopholes of varying size and extent to avoid paying the levy.

In a letter to the Times, a major underwriter of foreign issues suggests that a more effective solution for holding down the outflow would be the formation of a capital issues committee to pass on prospective borrowings. Mr. Walker thinks that a committee made up of investment bankers who handle most of the foreign borrowings, in cooperation with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, would work in the national interest to curb foreign borrowings without harming Wall Street's position as the leading international capital market.

A capital issues committee is a much more honest and direct form of control than the proposed tax. But an industry committee would be less effective than a Government committee, composed of Treasury and Federal Reserve representatives, who would be less subject to the accusation of favoring Wall Street's interest over the national interest. If temporary control over capital outflows is required, the Government itself must take the responsibility.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### MARKETING FOREIGN ISSUES—REMEDY FOR PRESENT STANDSTILL RESULTING FROM TAX PROPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I assume it is now generally known that the issuance of foreign securities in the United States has been brought to a complete standstill. This is the consequence of the Treasury Department's so-called interest equalization tax proposal. Insofar as foreign capital is concerned, we have completely disrupted the operation of the only important international market in the world; and there is no other market or combination of markets upon which the free world can depend.

The Treasury Department appears to have assumed that as we leave off supplying foreign capital, the capital markets of Europe will be able to fill the vacuum created by their tax proposals. This is not so.

The Swiss market, centered in Zurich, has been available and used right along, probably to its full potential, because Swiss rates are lower than ours in New York.

#### LIMITED MARKETS

Zurich, London, and Brussels are the only international markets in Europe and they are all small. The other markets are essentially local, even Paris, Amsterdam, and Frankfurt. All of the capital markets of Europe added together, both actual and potential, can supply no more than a mere fraction of the requirements of a viable and prosperous free world.

The administration of this proposed legislation would seem incredibly difficult. Consider the cases of Canada and Japan. Our trade with these two countries is the largest of any in the world; and we sell somewhat more to them than they sell to us.

The interdependence of Canada and the United States and the importance of Japanese solidarity with us in the Far East are obvious. Both countries have need of our financial markets. We have told Canada that she will be exempt from the provisions of the proposed legislation; we have told Japan that she will not be.

I believe that a better way to meet this problem can and must be found, and that there is a quite simple way. I propose that the Government make an arrangement whereby the investment banking community will consult a Government agency and together, on an ad hoc basis, informally but effectively conclude whether each proposed piece of foreign financing is or is not in our national interest at that time and under the then existing circumstances.

#### COOPERATIVE EFFORT

Apart from Canadian financing, practically all foreign financing in the United States, either publicly issued or privately placed, has been managed by a limited number of investment banking housing, all in the top flight of American issue houses. Thus a cooperative effort between the Government and the investment banking community would be a readily managed, concentrated operation.

In my opinion the consultative agency of the Government most effective in this situation would be the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. They obviously are fully informed of all problems relating to balance of payments.

If the Government will take the lead in bringing about a consultative arrangement with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York I am satisfied that the plan will be effective.

BURNETT WALKER.

NEW YORK, *December 4, 1963.*

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 9, 1963]

### EQUALIZATION TAX—WALL STREET CRITICISM EVOLVES ALTERNATE PLAN TO CONTROL STOCK BUYING OVERSEAS

(M. J. Rossant)

Few measures have been so roundly criticized as the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign bonds and stocks; yet it had a relatively smooth passage in gaining the approval of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The administration is eager to get the measure on the books because it has proved overly effective in its present state as a mere proposal.

The suspense is killing Wall Street, which is condemning the proposal in unusually harsh language. It is convinced that the tax would damage Wall Street's preeminent position as a financial center quite aside from what it will mean to underwriting profits.

In fact, investment bankers have gone to the extent of contemplating an alternative form of controlling foreign issues. They think the job could be accomplished through a committee especially selected to examine new foreign demands for funds.

### SOME SUPPORT EVIDENT

The idea of a committee does not enjoy unanimous support, but many investment men think it is better than the administration's plan, particularly in the proposal's present uncertain form of being a tax that is not yet a tax.

Since the tax was first proposed, there has been a dearth of foreign borrowing in the United States. This is understandable. There is little interest in making deals as long as both prospective borrowers and lenders are uncertain about the provisions allowed under the proposed tax, which is to be retroactive.

This drying up of borrowing has helped the Nation's balance of payments, but it has embarrassed the Treasury. It does not want to see Wall Street shut down as an international capital market. Nor does it want to create economic anemia in foreign countries by cutting off access to American funds so drastically.

### QUESTION OF LOOPHOLES

The Treasury is prepared to countenance a reasonable outflow of dollars. Whether passage of the proposal will keep the outflow reasonable is open to question, for loopholes are bound to be employed if and when the measure becomes law.

Evidently, Wall Street is willing to give up potential business for a while longer in its effort to defeat or water down the administration's proposal. The majority wants business as usual, while a minority is plugging for the idea of a committee.

At the annual meeting of the Investment Bankers Association last week, Andrew N. Overby, vice president of First Boston Corp. and a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, spoke for the majority in attacking the administration's proposal as discriminatory and administratively complex.

Mr. Overby observed that investment in foreign securities was an asset-creating expenditure, producing income in the form of interest, dividends and return of capital. In his view, limiting the sale of issues might bring a small reduction in the current outflow, but at the expense of future income.

### OVERSEA SALES ARE CITED

Another argument made by Mr. Overby was that most of the dollars raised by foreign borrowers were spent in the United States. He implied that denying foreigners access to the market would disrupt traditional trading relations and hurt export sales.

Investment bankers at the IBA meeting who agreed with Mr. Overby also pointed out that the tax might lead to increased issues by riskier and less desirable foreign companies. They reason that most of the blue-chip firms will have comparatively little trouble in getting funds in the limited markets abroad, leaving the remainder to tap Wall Street.

While most investment bankers admit that they have a pocketbook interest in opposing the proposed tax, they insist that they are not motivated primarily by the loss of business that they may suffer.

In support of their position, the financial community is fond of quoting a recent speech by Allan Sproul, former head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He declared that "whatever success it has had in checking an outflow of capital, despite its many loopholes, and while favored by its uncertainty concerning its adoption by Congress, this is a form of tinkering with a problem which should be attacked in the total context of capital incentives in the United States and in foreign countries."

Mr. Sproul added, "We need to avoid experimenting with direct controls, whatever they may be called, which in times of strain may be interpreted as a forerunner of stronger controls of capital outflow, or even of all dealings in foreign exchange, which in turn would heighten the danger of anticipatory withdrawals of foreign funds from our markets."

. Yet a growing minority within the investment banking fraternity is talking in terms of establishing a capital-issues committee, made up of Wall Street underwriters, with responsibility for approving or rejecting proposed issues.

This would be a form of direct control, but some underwriters consider it preferable to the two-price system for capital that the proposed tax would establish.

The advantage of a capital-issues committee is that it would avoid the creation of loopholes that are bound to accompany any new tax. Moreover, it could approve issues considered beneficial, meaning those of blue chip companies or others, which may produce a rise in exports, while turning thumbs down on high risks of nonproductive investments.

Proponents of this approach believe that Wall Street can act responsibly in policing issues. It would require the cooperation of a relatively small number of investment banking firms, which manage the bulk of foreign underwritings.

But there is considerable skepticism about the formation of a voluntary committee. According to one authority with extensive experience in the underwriting field, the notion of permitting a group of underwriters to pass on the propriety of issues is like "putting parolees on a parole board."

Others question whether voluntary cooperation would work. It could open the door to Wall Street firms that are not now competing for foreign business and who would not feel bound by any restraints imposed by the leading houses.

The only effective form of a capital-issues committee is one that is in the hands of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. However, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon has made clear that he does not want to take on the job of passing on issues.

But the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Securities and Exchange Commission possess the expertise and the power to exercise effective control.

---

## THANKSGIVING—1621 AND 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the finest discussions of the meaning and message of Thanksgiving was recently penned by Henry W. Clune, the legendary columnist of the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. Mr. Clune, who is known around the world for his novels, has been the beloved author of the "Seen and Heard" column in Rochester's morning newspaper for years.

As he has done so often on so many subjects, Mr. Clune's comments about Thanksgiving cut to the heart of the subject and say eloquently what is in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans. Because of the significance and beauty of his words, I commend them to the attention of all Members of this body, and ask unanimous consent that his column, from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of November 28, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Nov. 28, 1963]

### WE SHOULD BE THANKFUL

(By Henry W. Clune)

Winter, creeping and encroaching, is upon us.

People emerge from their warm homes and look up at the gray sky and shudderingly anticipate the first blizzard. We climb into our heated cars and drive to our places of employment, inveighing against the climate and wishing that we might pass the next few months in some halcyon land of sunshine and blooming flowers.

We work for the most part in steam-heated factories, offices, and stores, but we long for spring and feel that our lot is a hard one in the inclemencies of the North Temperate Zone. We forget the things for which this day we might be thankful.

We might be thankful for the example of fortitude made by the common little men and women who left the Mayflower at Plymouth 343 years ago and a year later dedicated the Thanksgiving which we celebrate today, perhaps loosely, and with very little sense of the day's true meaning.

There was no steam heat in the Plymouth Colony, no motor cars, no gadgets of domestic convenience, and little food in the boiling pots. There was no roof to shelter the colonists until such was made by their own hands from logs cut, with great labor, from the primitive forest. But there was a dream, and surely a faith; and below these a tacit, earthy dictum: "Root, hog, or die." And many of the colonists did die in that first dreadful winter on the rugged coast of the New World.

Their bulwark and their pillar of wisdom was William Bradford. He said, "It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage or small discontentments cause to wish themselves home."

So they hung on, their numbers diminishing, huddled in their small clearing, until reinforcements came; and perhaps in this desperate interlude they took strength from the words of the Psalm, "Be ye of good courage, and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord."

Historically, it may be that we have overstressed the significance of this small settlement of Pilgrims, for surely had they not reached the New England shore, other expeditions soon would have begun the settlement of that land.

Yet they, more than any of the other early American settlers, stirred our imagination, and they established themselves in our tradition as the first seekers of freedom in America, though their notion of freedom was considerably different than the interpretation we put upon that word today.

Inhibited by Old World restraints, narrow in vision, limited in learning, it was not the Pilgrim Fathers who envisaged the true American ideal, but men of greater stature who came into prominence in the latter years of the 18th century. And to these men, it seems to me, we should be particularly grateful today, for it was they who wrote these words into the newborn Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

And these:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

And again, these:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any Criminal Case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

There are other amendments to the Constitution, and the first 10 are known as the Bill of Rights. At the time of their composition they guaranteed a freedom for men that no other men in the history of the world had previously enjoyed. They still stand as the hallmark of our liberties.

We may be thankful that we live in a land where the rap does not come to men's doors in the dark of night and men are led out peremptorily to the dungeon, the rack, or the block for failure to subscribe to a state religion or for a whispered criticism of a despot.

We may be thankful that the noble writ of habeas corpus, denied today to millions of the earth's population; for a land that abounds in natural resources; for the privilege of the referendum; for the constitutional decree that allows us life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The world is not in sound health in all its parts; there are vast areas of it where freedom is unknown. In our midst there are men who would abrogate our rights and jettison our Constitution. We should be thankful that they are a dissident minority, not a party of power. We should be thankful that our cities have not been destroyed by enemy bombs or our lands devastated by invading armies.

We should be thankful for our democracy, and at once keenly sensible of the fact that it is not a spontaneous gift; and that if we fail to hold it zealously, administer it wisely, and defend it stanchly, one day it may slip from our hands and chaos and darkness and suffering, and the dissipation of our freedom, will ensue.

The founders of our Nation came here to escape the social cruelties and political injustices of Europe and we, if we have real faith, and wisdom, will make very sure that these same evils shall not descend upon our land. It is well, it seems to me, this day of Thanksgiving, to take check of ourselves, to strengthen our faith, to straighten the disorders of our own house, and to prove that we deserve the great heritage that has been given us.

---

## HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, while we are very much concerned these days about civil rights, tax legislation, and the impending Federal budget, the other matters also lie ahead and cannot be avoided. One of the most urgent of these is the need to provide help to our aged in meeting the cost of health services. The fact that an adequate solution has not yet been enacted does not mean that we can continue to avoid meeting this challenge. I believe this Congress will do so in the next session, and those who would say that the late President Kennedy and President Johnson were not strongly committed to a program for the aged are totally wrong. They should examine the record. They could go back to August of 1960 when the then Senator Kennedy and the then Senator Johnson actively worked in this Chamber to secure hospital insurance for the aged under social security.

Last February 21, President Kennedy again submitted his proposal for a social security approach to this problem. In a nationally televised press conference later that day, the President said that—

> Only 10 to 15 percent of health costs of senior citizens today are reimbursed by private insurance. Hospital costs have quadrupled since the war and now average more than $35 a day. And since a great many retired workers have little more than $70 a month on social security, prospects of the two or three bouts in the hospital after age 65 confront them with an impossible choice.
>
> They have to either ask their children or grandchildren to undergo financial hardship or accept poverty and charity themselves, or suffer their illness in silence. I think this Nation can do better than that. Social security has shown for 28 years that it is a logical first line of defense in this field.

This summer the late President Kennedy addressed the Second Annual Conference of the National Council of Senior Citizens. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. Fitzpatrick, Secretary Celebrezze, Secretary Nestingen, Senator Bayh, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you very much for a warm welcome, and I want to express my appreciation to all of you for having come to Washington and having once again brought to the attention of the Congress and the Government and the people of the United States the necessity of passing in this 88th Congress this very vital piece of legislation for hospital insurance for our older citizens.

The distinguished doctor, Dr. Rusk, of New York, told me that in making an analysis of the health of people over 65, he found that people who were engaged in great activities, such as this, experienced better health than those over 65 who stayed home, and did not concern themselves with the public business. I would not like to think that your only reward for this effort has been the better health that you enjoy because you are part of it. I would like to think that your reward is not only the feeling of a job well done, but the well-being of millions of your fellow citizens who, in the years to come, will themselves move across the threshold of age 65 and will benefit because of the actions that you have taken.

I must say I do not know why it is necessary for Senator BAYH or for any of the rest of us who believe in this program to have to come and make speeches about it, because I do not know any problem or any remedy more obvious, which now faces the Congress of the United States. The average older person living alone has about $20 a week. There is no room in that budget for a serious illness. Yet 1 in 6 will require hospitalization every year. The hospitalization will average 2 weeks, and will cost over $900. A $20 a week income, $1,040 a year, is hardly enough to pay for a $900 illness.

The person who has no resources—he gets a kind of treatment. He indicates that he is needy and he gets some sort of help. But there is another person who I think is one that concerns us a good deal, and that is the person who may have $3,000 or $4,000 saved up, or who may own their own house with a mortgage, and may have two children who may be in their 40's. If that person gets sick, the husband or the wife, they are in the hospital for more than 2 weeks, maybe 2 or 3 months, and there isn't anyone in this room who has not had a member of his family in the hospital at one stage or another of his life for a long time, and who does not know how much it can cost. So it may run up to $1,000 or $2,000, or even higher.

And then he sells the home or he goes to his children, he exhausts his savings, he has nothing left.

Now, the program we suggested will provide that he will set aside during his working years an average of $13 a year, not a burden for anyone employed, $13 a year. And that man and woman will know when they are over 65 that they will never be a burden upon their children and never be a charity case upon the National Government because they will have earned their way, and that is what we want.

We are not asking for anybody to hand this out. We are asking for a chance to have the people who receive the benefit to earn their way, the same principle established under the social security system in the 1930's. You would not believe it necessary, 30 years later, after we have seen the extraordinary success of the social security system, even though it was passed over the most vigorous objections—you would not think it necessary to say that hospital insurance shall be covered in the same manner.

There isn't a country in Western Europe that didn't do what we are doing 50 years ago or 40 years ago, not a single country that is not way ahead of this rich, productive, progressive country of ours. We are not suggesting something radical and new or violent. We are not suggesting that the Government come between the doctor and his patient. We are suggesting what every other major, developed, intelligent country did for its people a generation ago. I think it is time the United States caught up.

I don't think we ought to be second any place. I think this bill will pass. We were defeated by 4 votes 3 years ago. We lost it by 2 votes in the Senate more than a year ago. My prediction certain is that if the Members of the Congress, House and Senate, have an opportunity to vote on this, that this bill will pass in the 88th Congress, and when it does, every man and woman in this room will know that it was not a victory merely by the Members of the Congress or the executive branch, but this was one piece of legislation that was carried on the backs of the elder citizens of this country.

Ladies and gentlemen, I congratulate you all, and after looking around the room, I look forward with some anticipation to being over 65.

Thank you.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, one of the highlights of the convention was an informal talk to members of the executive board of the national council by the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Seated with the board around a large table in the Adams Room of the Willard Hotel, the then Vice President recalled that a quarter century ago, as a young Congressman, he was embroiled in a fight for a minimum wage of only 25 cents an hour.

The then Vice President continued:

> Such a small amount seems ridiculous now, and somehow I feel that we will have a similar reaction in the future to our present struggles for a hospital insurance program. Later on we are going to wonder why it took us so long to get so little. I know we are going to enact this vital and necessary program and thereafter we will continue to improve on it.

The Vice President said that in the 1960 campaign he made some 400 speeches in 43 States and that all of them were recorded. He said that in replaying many of those recordings it was abundantly clear that those which brought the greatest public interest and sympathetic response were those dealing with health care for older people through social security.

Admitting that there was powerful opposition to the suggested program from the American Medical Association, Vice President Johnson commented:

> Why anyone would want to deny a person the opportunity of putting in a dollar a month, along with his employer, to insure himself through social security against the staggering costs of hospitalization, simply amazes me. We ought just to say "God forgive them for they know not what they do."

Mr. President, I believe that these remarks will serve to keep the record straight as to the position of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson on hospital insurance for the aged.

---

## CONSERVATION AND WISE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UDALL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on October 28 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in an address to the Fifth American Forestry Association Congress held in Washington, D.C., announced a new program of interest to all those who are concerned with the conservation and wise use of our public lands.

The new program consists of a series of resource conservation areas—85 in number—to give practical demonstration of what can be done with public range and forest lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Secretary Udall be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE FIFTH AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 28, 1963

At the end of his conservation trip last month, President Kennedy, in Las Vegas, summarized his impressions of the state of American resources and called for a "third wave of the conservation movement" to tackle the unsolved problems of the 1960's.

This conference is, I think, a fitting followup to the President's challenge, for if we can generate the insight and enthusiasm that will be needed to mount a fresh attack on the many pressing problems that confront us it will take strong leadership from such organizations as the American Forestry Association. It is fitting, too, that the AFA should step forward to provide such leadership as this organization almost singlehandedly held the torch of conservation aloft in the dark days when waste and plunder were our unspoken national policies and the forces were gathering that led to the first wave of the conservation movement under Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

Your association has stated that this conference will include a "double-barreled salute" to the Interior and Agriculture Departments for improved cooperation in conservation.

Let me look down the other end of one of these barrels and tell you that we in the Department of the Interior salute you in return for your continuous efforts on behalf of conservation. This return salute comes from all parts of our farflung Department.

The opportunity for many of our officials and employees to participate in this Congress and the events leading up to it is appreciated. We commit ourselves here and now to follow up on the conclusions and recommendations of the Congress as they affect our programs and work.

To begin with, let me say that the American Forestry Association is no stranger to me and I am not a stranger to it.

In 1961 I addressed your annual meeting at Santa Fe. I am glad to report that most of the conservation programs outlined at that time are under way.

A chapter from my book "The Quiet Crisis" appears in this month's issue of your magazine. It is a chapter on Carl Schurz and John Wesley Powell—part of my effort to place into perspective the conservation problems of today.

Schurz has been justified time and time again in his famous statement that "destruction of the forests of this country will be the murder of its future prosperity and progress."

We can well add many more items to the category of resources that we cannot afford to destroy.

Your editor in the May issue of American Forests said, "AFA believes that this decade's so-called 'quiet conservation crisis' has become all but inaudible. It needs an explosive booster shot."

As one who has popularized the term "quiet crisis of the 1960's," I hope that this "national town meeting" will touch off such shots as are needed now in the never-ending job of conservation.

I am glad that much of the time of the Congress is being given to Department of the Interior land management problems. I want to give most of my time today to a discussion of those problems. Specifically, I want to emphasize management of public lands under the Bureau of Land Management.

First, however, I think we should examine briefly progress or lack of it since the last forest congress.

The past decade has seen more progress in forest control than any previous period in history. We have made advances in equipment, tools, and chemicals.

Public education in fire prevention has been accelerated each year in an attempt to reduce the number of man-caused fires. The Department has developed coordinated fire prevention in cooperation with the Forest Service, the States, and the forest industry.

We have done much to reduce fire hazards in recent years.

Fire control facilities, especially detection facilities, have been improved and expanded from the Southwest to the Arctic. There are many more airplanes, more lookouts, more and better equipment of all kinds.

Training of fire control personnel has been increased fivefold in the past 4 years.

An almost direct product of the Fourth Forest Congress was Public Law 167, the 1955 Multiple Use Mining Act. Under this law, the Department has cleared surface rights on 7 million acres of unpatented mining claims.

The Fourth Forest Congress advocated broader application of multiple-use principles to land management. In practice, multiple use is an established policy in the Department. However, such a policy has not received full congressional recognition. This is one of many conservation issues, unresolved for decades, which we should highlight.

Some of us who grew up in the freedom of the "wide country" of the West have a special duty to take leadership in its conservation. The Bureau of Land Management lands are a strong factor in that effort, but they are not well appreciated or understood.

Few people other than those who enjoy grazing privileges, have mineral leases, operate mining claims, or have purchased timber know of the exact location and condition of these public lands. Few people outside of Government and the advisory board know or understand in any detail the many duties and responsibilities of public land management. Unlike national parks and national forests, these lands have no easily identified or well marked boundaries because of their intermingled nature.

Yet many other people are vitally affected by the condition and use of these lands and their resources. Public lands make up much of the watersheds of great rivers—the Missouri, Columbia, Yellowstone, Colorado, and thousands of tributaries—to mention only one consideration. The use of these lands for outdoor recreation is another. They have always offered substantial recreational opportunities—particularly for hunting and fishing.

We must not underestimate the interests of these other people when we take into account the interests of commercial users who are more directly concerned with certain public lands. Without general public awareness of these lands, however, the particular interests of the direct users are apt to be overpowering.

One would think that an agency like Interior, with respect to its 466 million acres of so-called "vacant" lands, would have a clear and current directive from Congress for their management.

It does not.

You would think that we operate under comprehensive up-to-date laws. We do not.

You would think that such a large and complex real estate operation would be organized under long-range projects with definite financial commitments for improvements over a period of years. It is not.

Our statutory setup for administering these lands reminds me of a ghost town that time has passed by. We are being forced to use horse-and-buggy statutes in a guided missile age.

One of the current notions leading to some friction is that there is extensive flexibility in administrative authority regarding public land. In other words, many assume that all deficiencies or hardships concerning public lands can be overcome in the Bureau or the Department. It is too great an administrative burden to absorb all the shock when the fault derives from the status of the legislation.

I am glad that some of the discussion being heard here will emphasize reform of the public land laws. My Department and other departments have endorsed the proposal to establish a land law review commission. I am sure that the recommendations of this Congress will be highly valuable to the work of the commission if it is established.

**To their credit, many Members of Congress have acknowledged a long period of inaction in public land law reform. They have been relatively moderate in their criticism of executive action that had to be taken to fill in the breach. Let us hope that leadership will be exerted now to overcome these inadequacies.**

Specific kinds of inadequacies in our public land laws have been well documented in our appearances before congressional committees.

The Homestead Act of 1862 is out of step with today's conditions. The mining law of 1872 needs supplementation in the interest of modern mining itself as well as some kind of adjustment in relation to other uses.

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 is not necessarily immune from reform considerations.

The laws governing sales of public lands are as strikingly obsolete as any. It is ironic that the same Government officials who have sought permission for years to sell lands for use in rapidly growing western communities are charged with wanting to lock up these lands and throw away the key.

When the laws themselves are out of date and bring about unconscionable results, usually the Government employee close at hand is blamed.

Some of our citizens may ask, "Aren't these just wastelands? Can't they simply be turned over to the stockmen or the States? Why bother with them at all?"

These are questions that we are trying to answer. We believe that investments under appropriate circumstances, for example, for range rebuilding, are very much in order on a large scale.

In most cases the public lands I'm talking about are a residue. They are what was left after the homesteaders and the miners passed; after the national parks and national forests were carved out of them. But as I said earlier—times have changed. Our economy has changed. Our population and its patterns of settlement have changed. Our methods of transportation have changed. Where these lands were of little value yesterday, they are often of great value today.

In monetary terms these values have been apparent for years, but they have received very little public attention. Revenues from public lands have exceeded the costs of administration by a ratio of 8 to 1 during the past 150 years. Gross receipts for all years through 1961 totaled more than $2.5 billion; of that total, the receipts of the last 15 years accounted for $1.5 billion. The cost of managing the public domain during the same 15-year period was $185 million.

The memory of man is short. We tend to forget how generous the land has been to us, and what bountiful wealth it still has to offer, if treated decently in return. We forget that the public lands are a national treasure, one which belongs to future generations as much as it does to us.

On the other hand, much has been accomplished in some public land areas. Under the Taylor Grazing Act, many successful range conservation projects have been carried out in cooperation with local people. Several projects like the Vale project in Oregon have been placed on full schedule.

Projects under the Accelerated Public Works Act have been a recent means of speeding conservation work and at the same time relieving unemployment.

A major potential of public lands is timber. There are 155 million acres of public domain forests and woodlands under Bureau of Land Management management. This approaches the size of the national forest system.

In western Oregon there is another class of public forest land under BLM management. The O. & C. Sustained Yield Act of 1937 was the first Federal sustained yield law and in effect the first Federal multiple-use management law. Many public and private forest managers have adopted forestry techniques pioneeded on the O. & C. O. & C. revenues are shared with local counties and are an important source of funds for local governmental services.

The savvy of the Department of the Interior's foresters and the efficiency of the O. & C. operation are presently being illustrated in connection with the gigantic timber salvage operation resulting from the Columbus Day 1962, hurricane which swept through the Pacific Northwest. The point I want to make is that we have the forest management know-how and efficiency which could and should be extended to those vast public domain forests and woodlands—those 155 million acres capable of producing nearly 3 billion board feet of timber every year.

I am not going to say that there is a complete apathy toward Bureau of Land Management lands. Organizations such as yours have done too much too long for that to be said.

I will say that there is too much heat and too little light in public discussions on many of the problems. The hard crust of traditional thought and practice about these lands is almost impenetrable in some parts of the West.

This is not to say that we are not making much good progress under the handicap of delayed legislative action. Some outstanding advances have been made in Bureau of Land Management administration in a very short period of time.

To mention only a few things: We eliminated an entire echelon of administrative overhead bringing decisionmaking closer to the land and the people. The chaos of excessive land applications and appeals was brought under control. State and national advisory boards have broader representation. Forest administration was strengthened. Grazing users were assisted and protected in tenure privileges during difficult periods of adjustment to capacity. Wildlife management on public lands was strengthened. And a series of legislative drafts have been presented to Congress.

Recognizing a need for greater mutual understanding, we in the Department are launching today, through the Bureau of Land Management, a program of resource conservation areas. The individual areas—some 85 in number—will give practical demonstration of what can be done with our public range and forest lands. If you have not seen the striking result of range and forest land rehabilitation, you are in for a pleasant surprise.

The public lands within these areas will be developed and managed in cooperation with soil conservation districts, private landowners, State and county governments, local clubs and conservation groups, and youth organizations. The program will help perfect techniques. It will provide accurate, up-to-date information. It will give the public an accurate picture of the diversity of the lands and resources they own and the many benefits that can come from scientific management.

An exhibit featuring these demonstration projects is available to those participating in this Congress. Full details are available in the Bureau of Land Management. I know that you will work with us in making these demonstrations a success.

If enough of our people care enough about the natural resource values of our Nation to join in a fight to protect those values with a balanced conservation program, then this generation can proudly put its signature on the land for future generations to see and enjoy.

Through this Fifth Forest Congress, the knowledge of qualified persons will be brought to bear and the will of the general public will further come to light. It is for us who have positions of executive or legislative responsibility to heed and take notice. To the fulfillment of these obligations, let us all commit our imagination, skills, and talent.

## NO MEAN CITY—AN OBSERVATION BY DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, our beloved Senate Chaplain, Dr. Harris, has added his profound insights to the growing ranks of Americans hastening to defend the good people of Dallas, Tex., from collective guilt in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Dr. Harris in his "Saturday sermon" carried in the Philadelphia Bulletin, December 7, also draws a clear distinction between the tragic happenings in Dallas November 22 and the race question and other issues which center in the South.

> Let it be remembered that what happened there (Dallas) could happen in any city in America * * * surely in America the exhortation we are now hearing against bigotry, hatred, and violence we need to have preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged assassin is the wrong text for the sermon.
>
> There is no evidence that he (Lee Oswald) was the product of any political agitation gripping the political life of America.

Dr. Harris also notes that Oswald had:

> Immigrated to Russia * * * he had endeavored by way of Cuba to go back to Moscow.

Our Chaplain continues:

> To make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America, is to blunt the preachments which need to be made.

The "real Dallas" is strongly defended by Dr. Harris, who recalls some of his own experiences in the Texas metropolis.

> To me it is not a city of spites but a city of spires. * * * Dallas is justly proud of its great metropolis * * * but most of all Dallas glories in its churches * * * its citizens have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him "we are citizens of no mean city."

Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have this magnificently penned column by our Chaplain printed in the Congressional Record as a fitting corollary to the Chaplain's eloquence on that unforgettable Friday last month, when he reminded:

> God lives and the Government at Washington still stands.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Dec. 7, 1963]

### No Mean City

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

WASHINGTON.—Almost 2,000 years ago there lived and wrought a man whom the centuries have called St. Paul. His name is cut deeply on the record of the ages.

In defending himself from certain unfair charges, he declared "I am from Tarsus, Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city."

In this dread day that proud assertion might well be on the lips of those whose home city has had turned upon it the searchlight of the world scrutiny.

That city, of course, is Dallas, Tex. And since the dastardly act which set the world aghast, it has been the target of vituperation and blame.

There are those, examples of the very hate they verbally deplore, who assume this metropolis forevermore will be a byword for hissing. Such conclusions are of course not warranted. In the face of the fateful happenings, mourned nowhere with more poignancy than in Dallas, its citizens have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him, "We are citizens of no mean city."

Let it be remembered that what happened there could happen in any city in America. The Secret Service corps would readily agree to that. Surely in America the exhortation we are now hearing against bigotry, hatred, and violence we need to have preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged assassin is the wrong text for these sermons. There is no evidence that he was the product of any present agitation gripping the political life of America.

This sinister person was so un-American that he emigrated to Russia before John F. Kennedy became President. He had endeavored, by way of Cuba, to go back to Moscow.

To make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America is to blunt the preachments which need to be made. To suggest that all Americans, in a sort of mass guilt complex, belong in the dock which awaited him is to arraign those who refuse to be stigmatized by what one Senator on the floor of the Senate called "wrongly placed recriminations."

Another Senator, on the other side of the aisle, commented, "It is an injustice to thousands of hospitable, cheering persons in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not tortured with a guilt that is undeserved."

#### FALSE ACCUSATIONS

Those who assumed that the heinous crime could be linked to the so-called race question found that they were grasping at something that was not there. Those who jumped to the conclusion that the murder was the bitter harvest of radical rightwingers were compelled to confess that the alleged perpetrator's leanings were in the opposite direction.

What happened in Dallas was not the result of any aspect of the moral malignancy from which America, in her grasping materialism, is suffering. Much could be said about that. What happened simply grew out of the twisted mind of one deluded young man.

There will never be a utopia where dangerous warped individuals, antisocial, will not be at large, ready to wrap their venom in a bullet. It may be from a window in Dallas, from a reception line in Buffalo, in a theater or a railroad station in Washington, or in like attempts in Milwaukee or Florida. Assassinations or foiled attempts do not damn the cities involved.

#### ALL-OUT EFFORT

In spite of sharp divisions in the minds of people as to any administration's policies—and that is a precious prerogative of U.S. citizens—Dallas has gone all out to put differences aside and to give the President an enthusiastic welcome.

The wounded Governor of Texas bears witness that Mr. Kennedy's last words expressed his gratitude and delight at the warmth of the reception the city was according him—magnificent was the word between the President and the Governor.

Then the unbelievable happened. The death weapon was held by one who had but recently come to the city and who, within minutes after the shots were fired, killed without hesitation a police defender of law and order.

#### TELEVISION PORTRAYALS

The cries rending the air against acts of violence involving gunplay ought in large degree to be aimed at the constant television portrayals before the sensitive eyes of young America, pictures involving guns with telescopic sights, and boisterous depictions where people are shot down in cold blood. This is a daily pictorial diet of millions of children and youth. What monstrous ideas vicious scenes can plant in young minds.

And what about the real Dallas? I know it well. To me it is not a city of spites but a city of spires. It has been my high privilege to join the outstanding church and civic leaders there on various occasions. The religious life of the city is an inspiration to those who have felt its uplift in the dedication of its laymen and the potency of its prophetic pulpits.

Nowhere in America have I experienced evidences of benevolence and care more closely binding all segments of a city's life; United Givers crusades there have the fervor of oldtime revival meetings. In hospital projects, Catholics and Protestants work together in beautiful fraternity.

#### A PROUD CITY

Dallas is justly proud of its great metropolis rising on the plain, of its boulevards and parks, its office buildings and hotels, its cultural institutions, its newspapers, its palatial banks and world famous stores. But most of all Dallas glories in its churches, great and small, and Dallas has some of the largest in the land; and of its schools and colleges, including a famed theological seminary training prophets for the years that beckon.

One of the prized photographs among my own mementos is that of a young lad, dressed as Uncle Sam, presenting to me a certificate making me an honorary citizen of Dallas. Gazing at that certificate, even while writing this, I say with Paul, "I am a citizen of no mean city."

---

## JOE VALACHI TALKS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have just opened the drawer of my desk. Somewhat to my surprise, though no mice jumped out at me, I did find four documents which, quite a while ago, I had committed myself, by promises to friends, to insert in the RECORD. With all apology to them for the delay, I should like now to do so.

The first came to me from my good friend, and a friend of many Members of this body, the mayor of New York City, Robert Wagner, who requested me to insert in the RECORD a fine editorial. He asked it both in his capacity as mayor of New York City and as a member of the Democratic National Committee.

The editorial, which he correctly describes as being so meaningful today, appeared in the Sons of Italy Times on October 7, 1963. It is the official organ of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania Order, Sons of Italy in America. It is entitled "Joe Valachi Talks."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sons of Italy Times, Oct. 7, 1963]

#### JOE VALACHI TALKS

A known murderer by the name of Joe Valachi has in recent days been testifying before an open session of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, better known as the McClellan committee, named after the Senator from Arkansas who heads it. It is a lurid tale that Valachi has been unfolding under questioning before the committee, and to many it is very sickening.

Joe Valachi, according to his own testimony, was a member of a vicious underworld organization in New York going back as far as 1930. It was and is common practice in this organization to commit murder, particularly when its secrets are exposed to outside parties by inside members of the organization.

The men who make up the organization to which Valachi belonged are Americans, going back a whole generation or more. They are not Italians, or more particularly, Sicilians, although to be sure they are of Italian and Sicilian descent. They have perpetuated certain practices which are old in Sicily, and have Americanized them, so to speak. They operate as Americans on American soil, and they have exploited conditions which are peculiar to life in our large metropolitan centers. They have made a prosperous business out of racketeering, and they do not shrink from extortion and even murder to gain their ends.

According to Valachi, an organization called Cosa Nostra does exist, and has existed for many years. In his testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Valachi declared his purpose was to destroy the Cosa Nostra bosses and leaders, because they have been very bad to the "soldiers," of whom Valachi was one for many years. Thus he has a motive of vengeance as one of his motives. But he may have other motives, too, good and bad, which will probably become clearer as the hearings proceed.

There is little or nothing new in Valachi's testimony, as far as our law enforcement agencies are concerned. Various details are perhaps new, but the general pattern, and indeed most, if not all the individuals in the picture have been well known to law enforcement agencies for decades. The question may well be asked what those agencies have been doing all these years. How has it been possible for all these criminal organizations and individuals to flourish in the face of our laws? We do know that connivance by law and police officers has been a very considerable factor in making it possible for them to carry on their nefarious business. And, of course, the apathy and the low moral tone of such a large segment of our metropolitan populations have enormously contributed to the success of those who make a business of crime.

We cannot morally condone the criminal activity of any organized criminal group, whether it be the so-called Cosa Nostra organization, or any other that carries an Italian, or any other kind of name. We absolutely condemn crime and criminals. As far as it is humanly possible they must be rooted out of our national life. That is a colossal job, which requires the help of all of us from the President down to local government heads. But where government officers themselves are corrupt, where then is our salvation? We have a national sin which is called getting something for nothing, and it reaches everywhere.

Cosa Nostra, which has had and still has many counterparts, represents an intolerable type of organized viciousness within our American society of law and order. It

**should be stamped out, and any responsible official who aids it, or covers it up, should also be punished.**

**The Sons of Italy as an organization cannot and will not defend known criminals, no matter what their names are. At the same time we ask for the kind of fairness from the public which does not accuse Italian Americans of exercising a monopoly in crime in this country.**

## IS CONGRESS MEETING ITS SPACE-AGE TASKS?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning to another subject, more than a month ago—almost 2 months ago now—the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, sent to his constituents in Massachusetts a newsletter entitled "Is Congress Meeting Its Space-Age Tasks?" in which he strongly contends for a revision and updating, a modernization, of the rules of the Senate and of the Congress generally.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid newsletter, which relates to matters which I have been urging on the Senate for a long time, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### IS CONGRESS MEETING ITS SPACE-AGE TASKS?

**Has Congress kept pace with the changing role of our Government in world and national affairs? Just as petitions are being circulated in Massachusetts to bring about much needed modernization of our State constitution, I believe that here in Washington the Congress organization and operation need an overhaul.**

**Congress last modernized its rules over 17 years ago when we passed the La Follette-Monroney Congressional Reorganization Act in 1946. Since that time our country has assumed the leadership of the free world and crossed new frontiers in science and military technology. New laws have greatly increased our Government's responsibility in domestic affairs. As a result, Members of Congress are receiving more and more requests for direct services to their constituents.**

**Mr. Roscoe Drummond, the noted columnist, has stated, "Congress is not handling its workload because it has not organized its time, its talents, and its resources to meet the space age tasks which today's world imposes upon it." To tackle this problem I have cosponsored legislation to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.**

**This year Congress convened on January 9 and, by law, was supposed to have completed its work and adjourned by August 1. However, we have not met that date since 1956. The Senate was not even organized until the end of February, and today, in early October, we have passed just a few bills, mostly of a minor character. To date Congress has completed action on only 4 of the 11 regular appropriations bills, all of which are supposed to be passed before July 1.**

**This delay in authorizing Federal programs and passing appropriations to run the Government makes it extremely difficult for the various Government agencies to plan their programs efficiently. For example, construction projects are delayed into the winter months. I receive inquiries in August from students who have applied for National Defense Education Act scholarships who do not know whether money will be available by September.**

**The major work of a Member of Congress is supposed to be directed to legislative tasks. Yet today with the increasing centralization of Government programs, we find ourselves spending more and more time responding to problems of a nonlegislative nature. My mail averages 300 letters a day through the congressional session. Only about one-half the letters relate to legislation;** the others request services ranging from Agriculture Department pamphlets to assistance on difficult immigration or military service cases. I must meet frequently with numerous Federal and State officials on problems of concern to Massachusetts. Then there are the numerous outside activities, both during the day and in the evenings, such as the recent luncheon for the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie. My trip to Moscow is another example. Also I receive many requests for speaking engagements and only wish I had time to accept more of them. All of these other activities must be fitted into a busy congressional day.

I think Congress must find ways to speed up its committee work and accelerate debate in the Senate. When legislation reaches the Senate floor, final action is often delayed while Senators speak on a variety of matters not germane to the pending business. This does not happen in the House of Representatives because of strongly controlled time limitations and a germaneness rule. The Senate Rules Committee has reported a proposal which I cosponsored providing that 3 hours a day be devoted strictly to consideration of the pending legislation. The Rules Committee has also recommended that the Senate committees be permitted to meet while the Senate is in its morning hour. Today, without special permission, committees cannot meet after the Senate meets.

Congress conducts about 90 percent of its legislative work in its committees. There, members study legislative proposals and make recommendations for action, so it is most important that the committees be organized to work effectively. The 1946 Reorganization Act reduced the number of standing committees to prevent overlap and duplication of function and control. But by 1962, Congress had a total of 303 committee units, including 36 standing committees, 3 special and select committees, 11 joint committees, and 253 subcommittees. The columnist Henry J. Taylor has suggested, "In the New England vernacular, the * * * committees gum up the sap works."

Each of the 535 Members of Congress is certainly entitled to a committee assignment. In the House of Representatives, each Member is entitled to one, but in practice about one-third of the Members serve on two committees. In the Senate, a Member gets two major committee assignments and usually one or two minor ones. For instance, I am a member of the Senate Armed Services, Appropriations, and Small Business Committees. Within the Appropriations Committee, I am a member of six subcommittees. I recall one day when I had six of my committees all meeting at the same time.

Also, there still tends to be duplication of work between similar committees of the House and Senate, and between committees within each body. Often officials from the executive departments have to justify the same program before four separate Congressional committees. Only under exceptional circumstances, such as in the recent nuclear test ban treaty hearings, do several committees sit jointly to take testimony on a pending proposal.

I have heard the seniority method of selecting the chairman and members of committees questioned, too. Should committee members be selected for knowledge of a particular subject rather than just seniority?

I have found the longer a Member stays in Congress, the more he becomes wedded to the seniority system. Personally, I have tried many times to think of a way to improve on the seniority system, but so far neither I nor any other Member has come up with a wiser method. The seniority system avoids jealousies, eliminates personal controversies as to merit, and permits Members to gain valuable experience and wisdom in their specialties.

Should chairmen have exclusive authority to schedule subjects for consideration? Under committee rules, a majority can always override the chairman to bring up a matter for consideration but in practice, Members hesitate to take this step. Good committee chairmen will always provide an opportunity for consideration of an important problem.

The resolution which I have cosponsored to establish a joint House-Senate committee to study the congressional machinery was reported recently to the Senate for action. In reporting this bill, the Senate Rules Committee specifically excluded any review of the rules and floor procedures of the two Houses of Congress. This, of course, excludes consideration of the controversial House Rules Committee or any change in Senate rule 22 relating to cloture (the means of cutting off filibuster). I agree with this action because I believe that to include the cloture rule in a general study would certainly jeopardize the chance of obtaining much-needed reform in other important areas. The cloture rule is a highly emotional issue because of its use in civil rights legislation. I have personally worked to improve rule 22 since 1947, and support the use of cloture after sufficient debate so that Members can have the opportunity to vote on the pending measure. But I believe that any clôture rule change should be considered by itself.

I do not agree with those who contend that Congress has abdicated its constitutional and historical responsibility of conducting the public business to the executive and judicial branches of the Government. Congress has a coequal responsibility with the executive and judiciary to make our system of Government function. Congress must be sure that it is meeting this responsibility.

LEVERETT H. SALTONSTALL.

## THE NATION'S PRIORITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on October 27 an excellent editorial appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Nation's Priorities," commending the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for an address he had made on the space program, pointing out that what is needed is an overhaul of the manner in which Congress makes decisions. I could not agree more thoroughly with the editorial, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 27, 1963]

### THE NATION'S PRIORITIES

Senator FULBRIGHT's recent address on the space program went far beyond the issue of whether the United States should devote an inordinate amount of resources to a "crash" effort to land a man on the moon before the Russians do.

"The real question before Congress," he said, "is one of priorities, of how we are to allocate our great but not unlimited resources among many important national programs." Is the Federal Government spending too much on space or armaments or payments to farmers or veterans benefits and too little on education, on medical care, or on housing? More generally, does the entire Nation's spending pattern really reflect a rational allocation of resources? Are we, as a people, spending too much, say, on cosmetics, cigarettes, or liquor and too little on capital investment, education, the prevention of juvenile delinquency, or cleaning up slums?

The available national mechanisms for considering such questions are inadequate. The executive branch of the Federal Government has, in the Bureau of the Budget, perhaps the nearest approach to an organization for rational consideration of priorities, and its conclusions are embodied in the President's budget message annually. But even the Bureau of the Budget finds itself hemmed in by encrusted legal provisions and by political considerations which are often inconsonant with decisionmaking on the basis of true national interest.

In Congress the situation is much worse. Except in an occasional speech like Senator FULBRIGHT'S, it is difficult to see an approach based on a concept of priorities and of the intelligent weighing of alternatives. Instead, the various appropriation bills tend to be considered in isolation from each other, and decisions on quite important individual items often reflect the predilections or prejudices of particularly influential individuals or small groups.

What is needed is an overhaul of the manner in which Congress makes decisions. New organizations and new modes of procedure are required to guide the country into an intelligent scale of priorities and to make sure that we are weighing the competing demands of alternative needs.

## A CALL FOR STUDENT ACTION

**Mr. CLARK.** Finally, Mr. President, I committed myself, on October 10, to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a "Call for Student Action," which was published by the U.S. National Student Association, a Philadelphia-based national student union, which deals with the subject of civil rights.

Signatures to this call have come in from all over the world. Guatemala, New Zealand, Basutoland, Malaya, Australia, Mexico, Morocco, and Lebanon are all well represented in this petition. I do not ask that all these names be printed, and I trust that the signatories will understand the practical considerations which compel that. But I would like to venture this observation: These petitions are concrete evidence that the eyes of the world are on the Congress of the United States as it comes to grips with the civil rights problem, and the image of America will be either brightened or tarnished by what we do here.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the call be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR STUDENT ACTION

We, the following students, desiring a world where there are differences without hate and where each man has the freedom to struggle for freedom, urge the people of the United States and their Congress to fulfill their historic promise of full rights for all men. We join the U.S. National Student Association in petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass into law the notable proposals for human rights currently before Congress.

## CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR METCALF AS ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 232), as follows:

*Resolved,* That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3 of rule I, the designation of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] today as Acting President pro tempore shall continue in effect during the remainder of the present session of the Congress, unless otherwise ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

## GIUSEPPE MAIDA AND OTHERS

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 729, House bill 6975.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 6975) for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Giuseppe, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## ENCOURAGEMENT TO CERTAIN PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS TO SERVE IN AREAS HAVING A SHORTAGE OF THEM

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, several weeks ago, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] made known his views on S. 2220, a bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists.

Because of the understanding of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the Senate was able to pass the bill which was then under consideration.

In view of the fact that he was so deeply interested in this matter—and legitimately so, because his reasons were all sound and good—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], kept their pledge. Hearings have been held. The bill has now been reported.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 728; that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (S. 2220) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "740" and insert "741"; on page 2, line 3, after the word "health", to strike out "authority" and insert "authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary,", and in line 17, after the word "interest", to strike out "thereon" and insert "thereon, except that regulations prescribed pursuant to clause (1) may also provide for a minimum period of service as a condition to application of this subsection"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 741 of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by redesignating subsections "(f)", "(g)", and "(h)" thereof as subsections "(g)", "(h)", and "(i)", respectively, and (2) by adding immediately after subsection (e) thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part—

"(1) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy, in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; and

"(2) the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times at the Secretary may prescribe that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians or dentists in the area where the practice occurs; then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date of such practice begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon, except that regulations prescribed pursuant to clause (1) may also provide for a minimum period of service as a condition to application of this subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. COTTON.** Mr. President, I have learned from long years of practicing law never to make a speech when the court is with an advocate, and always to stop when one is ahead. Therefore, I shall not discuss this bill, but I do not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation first to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, who expedited the consideration of the bill in the committee, in accordance with his promise or pledge to me at the time I offered the provisions of the bill in the form of an amendment to the scholarship bill; to the members of the committee; to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and to the many other Senators, some of whom felt compelled to oppose this measure when it necessitated returning the scholarship bill to the House, but who at the same time believed, as I believe, that this provision is highly essential to many rural communities, for their assistance in expediting the passage of the bill.

I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of my people back home, to whom this subject is exceedingly important.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed to the bill, H.R. 12, which was passed several weeks ago, to provide assistance to medical, dental, and osteopathic students, would have been adopted by the Senate at the time the amendment was before it except that it was felt to be the better course of wisdom and prudence to pass the bill as the House had passed it, thus obviating the necessity for a conference, and avoiding further delay in the enactment of that meritorious bill.

I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for offering the amendment and for his diligent and devoted interest in behalf of writing the amendment into law.

The committee unanimously reported the bill. I hope very much that the Senate will now confirm the wisdom of our friend from New Hampshire and pass the bill without further delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the Senate does today will be a monument to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, who is entirely responsible for this action. He has performed a worthy service in behalf of areas which all too often are forgotten.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this will not only be a monument to the Senator from New Hampshire in his own State, but it will be something of a monument in all the 50 States of the Union. I can hardly think of one State where there does not exist a situation comparable to that which was so eloquently and dramatically placed before the Senate when the earlier bill was before it.

We can readily understand the difficulty of a student, after having completed a medical education, facing the problem of establishing an urban practice.

What the Senate is doing today will go a long way toward directing medical talent into areas where it is so badly needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, having heard the testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I agree wholeheartedly with all that the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished Senator from Illinois have said. This legislation will indeed be a monument to the diligence, the work, and the dedication of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. It will be a monument in all the 50 States, because there is a compelling need in all the States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in erecting a monument to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire while he is still with us to enjoy it in full strength and vigor. That is the time to erect a monument to an outstanding statesman like the Senator from New Hampshire. I am happy to be a part of this endeavor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## PROPOSED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (AMENDMENT NO. 349)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as so often happens when any matter relating to civil rights is before the Senate, it is opposed by those who say, "We have enough laws on the books now. We do not need any more laws. All we have to do is to enforce the laws that are on the books."

There will be coming before the Senate this week the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice.

As so often happens, it requires a considerable amount of digging to find out what the Committee on Appropriations has done in connection with a particular bill. However, as far as I have been able to determine in the limited time available, it appears as of now that the committee has completely eliminated the budget request for additional staff lawyers for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The committee has recommended an appropriation of $18,657,000 under the item, "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities," which is $84,000 above the House allowance, but $516,000 under the budget request.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which has been very active, and which, from all indications, will experience no letup in its activities—indeed, its activities will probably increase—had in 1963 only 81 lawyers to carry on its program both here in Washington and throughout the United States in enforcing civil rights legislation which is on the books.

In the current budget, the President requested funds for 38 additional lawyers to handle an immense caseload of civil rights and race relations litigation.

The House allowed funds for the employment of less than half of the additional lawyers requested. It was the hope of the Department of Justice that the Senate, as so often is the case, would be somewhat more generous than the House, and would allow all or nearly all of the additional lawyers requested.

This time, after consideration in the Senate committee, as far as can now be determined, the committee disallowed the employment of any additional lawyers by the Civil Rights Division, and has hampered in a very effective manner—perhaps more effective than by defeating some minor measure—the administration of laws relating to civil rights.

At page 17 of the bill the committee makes provision for an appropriation of $6,600,000 for expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws. I have no quarrel with that. I assume that amount is needed. However, this amount is made specifically applicable only to the Antitrust Division; therefore it will not be available for use in any other division of the Department.

It will be my intention, when the bill is called up for consideration in the Senate, to offer an amendment to add to the appropriate item in the bill whatever sums may be necessary for the employment of additional lawyers in the Civil Rights Division, which are said by the Attorney General to be indispensable for the proper enforcement of the civil rights laws.

Those who oppose civil rights legislation certainly should not be allowed by the Senate to have it both ways, so to speak. There are those who continue in their opposition to civil rights legislation—and indeed such opposition comes not only from the diehard opponents of civil rights, but sometimes also from those who are less interested in this problem for a variety of reasons—and say, "Why do we need any more laws? We have enough laws now. All we need is to enforce the laws now on the statute books." Senators who take that position will be given an opportunity to provide sufficient funds for the enforcement of the laws now on the books.

I am perfectly willing to be convinced that there is not a need for all the additional lawyers requested, if that be a fact, but so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, it has stated that need. It seems to me that the request is relatively modest. I know something about the workload of that office, headed by Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall. It has performed outstandingly in this field, and is deserving of our full support.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which would make appropriate provision for the salaries and expenses necessary for the enforcement of the civil rights laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would agree to my name appearing on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to include the distinguished Senator from

New York as a cosponsor of the amendment.

**Mr. JAVITS.** Like my colleague from New York, I was impressed with the facts as they came to my attention through an article published in the New York Times this morning under the byline of Anthony Lewis, a Times reporter who is quite knowledgeable on civil rights questions. I feel, with the Senator, that the situation must be corrected.

I should like to point out to my colleague from New York and to the Senate as a whole that at one time we settled, in my opinion, for an emasculated bill, a civil rights bill which included the establishment of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which was established by law. When that was done, it was clearly contemplated that the Division would not be starved; that, on the contrary, it would be fortified and enabled to do its work.

It is by now almost a cliche in civil rights matters that all we are fighting for—people like my distinguished colleague from New York, typically, who has seized upon this issue, as he should, and others of us in the civil rights field—is the assertion of the right of law; and if the public interest cannot be protected by an adequate staff of lawyers, then, truly, it will fail.

We have made a solemn commitment that this division shall not starve. We knew very well, when we examined the bill, that it would die for lack of adequate provision. It is especially important for the Senate to be vigilant that this does not happen at a time when we may not have our gaze fixed upon this particular agency, assuming that it is doing the job it must do for civil rights.

I appreciate the remarks of my colleague.

**Mr. KEATING.** I appreciate the statement of my distinguished colleague from New York. This situation was called to my attention by the excellent article written by Mr. Anthony Lewis and published in the New York Times today. When I read it, I could hardly believe it. It did not seem possible that this could have slipped by the Committee on Appropriations. So far as I can now determine, the article is entirely accurate.

The same problem arose previously with respect to the Civil Rights Commission. An effort was made to cut off the funds of the Commission. If we intend to make the civil rights laws effective, we must not allow this additional appropriation to be eliminated.

I sincerely hope that the President, who has indicated a deep interest in this problem, will use his extremely persuasive and influential efforts with members of the Committee on Appropriations, to the end that they will be willing to accept an amendment to make adequate provision for the additional lawyers needed by the Department of Justice.

### CLASSIC NIXON STATEMENT ON PRINCIPLES OF U.S. GOVERNMENT

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, Richard Nixon, a former Vice President of the United States, was recently required to explain what he thought the principles underlying the form of Government of the United States to be, before he could win admission to the New York State bar. His concise 500-word answer is a classic description of our governmental principles.

Mr. Lowell C. Wadmond, chairman of the New York appellate court's committee on character and fitness, told the court that the former Vice President's statement was the finest he had seen in 28 years as a member of the committee.

Mr. President, Congress has been under heavy attack for impeding the executive; for general foot dragging. The dignity and integrity of the legislative branch has been sadly misunderstood.

Because Mr. Nixon's statement represents the conception of our Government that is held by millions of Democrats as well as Republicans, and especially because it provides an assertion of the coequal power of Congress with the executive and the judiciary at a time when this coequal status is under heavy assault, and because it is a model of concise exposition of the principles on which our Government is founded, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The principles underlying the Government of the United States are decentralization of power, separation of power and maintaining a balance between freedom and order.

Above all else, the framers of the Constitution were fearful of the concentration of power in either individuals or government. The genius of their solution in this respect is that they were able to maintain a very definite but delicate balance between the Federal Government and the State government, on the one hand, and between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, on the other hand.

By contrast, in the British system, the Parliament is supreme. In the present French system the primary power resides in the executive, and in some older civilizations the judges were predominant. Throughout American history there have been times when one or the other branches of Government would seem to have gained a dominant position, but the pendulum has always swung back and the balance over the long haul maintained.

The concept of decentralization of power is maintained by what we call the Federal system. But the principle is much broader in practice. Putting it most simply, the American ideal is that private or industrial enterprise should be allowed and encouraged to undertake all functions which it is capable to perform. Only when private enterprise cannot or will not do what needs to be done should government step in. When Government action is required, it should be undertaken if possible by that unit of government closest to the people. For example, the progression should be from local, to State, to Federal Government in that order, In other words, the Federal Government should step in only when the function to be performed is too big for the State or local government to undertake.

### RUSSIA'S DESPERATE NEED FOR U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, I have consistently argued that no wheat or other grain transactions should be made with the Soviet Union unless substantial concessions are obtained in return from the Soviet Union.

On Sunday, December 8, the Washington Post carried an excellent analysis of the problems which face the Soviet Union in its agricultural sector. I ask unanimous consent that this article, written by Stephen S. Rosenfeld and entitled "A Red Crisis In Topsoil," be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, this article points out repeatedly that the Soviet problem in agriculture is essentially one of scarce economic resources. They have not allocated enough chemical fertilizers, enough machinery and equipment or even enough manpower. Rather, the allocation of resources has been in the direction of armaments and heavy industry.

The effect of this malallocation of resources has been to accentuate a shortage of agricultural products, products which the nation must have in adequate supply in order to live and prosper.

The result of this malallocation of resources is that the Soviet Union is now in a position where it must either divert resources back to agriculture or obtain these vital commodities from outside sources. As I have said before, under these conditions, I believe that we should extract substantial concessions from the Soviet Union before any grain is delivered to Russia in addition to that which may be shipped under any agreement to sell.

Instead, however, we seem to be providing the concessions ourselves in the form of waivers of shipping contracts, subsidized prices and so on.

#### Exhibit 1

#### A Red Crisis in Topsoil

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

The wheat disaster which errant nature and human error inflicted upon the Soviet Union this year also brought a harsh policy dilemma to the surface.

The day of reckoning is Monday, when the Soviet Communist Party's elite central committee will open a plenum—a session of all its 320 members—in Moscow.

The target of its deliberation and hoopla will be chemicals used in agriculture. The bull's eye in that target is fertilizer.

Fertilizer may seem a strange concern for the full array of a country's policymakers. In the United States, it could hardly evoke such official fervor. Obviously, the Soviet Union is a different land.

The heart of the matter is the fact that the Soviet Union's and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's abilities and appetites are out of whack. He wants, in his terms, prosperity, but he lacks the resources to attain it now.

It is not that, as in the United States, the resources available to the Government are limited. The Soviet Government commands all Soviet resources and they are simply not up to the tasks imposed upon them.

The customary Soviet reaction to this bind is to set priorities; to feed the top (armaments, heavy industry) and starve the bottom (agriculture, consumer goods).

But, to right this imbalance, the Soviets cannot simply switch off resources from a high pocket of the economy to a low. Reality is too complex to permit an easy and automatic move from guns to butter.

Over the long run such an exchange might be made possible by disarmament or true peace or by completion of the country's heavy industry plant facilities.

But in the short run of current policy, swaps are more likely to be made inside priorities, not between them. Hence the alternative to a missile is a space capsule; to a cannon, a machine tool.

Changes in these upper reaches don't much help farmers or the consumers, who vie not with marshals or space scientists but with each other for investment funds, building materials, skilled personnel and the like.

Like his czarist and Soviet predecessors, Khrushchev has tried to get farm progress on the cheap and to siphon money, men and materials from the farms to other parts of the population and economy.

Here is another fundamental squeeze. Collectivization was undertaken as a solution to the political problem of bringing the spread-out ornery peasantry under central control.

This solution created an economic problem since collectivized peasants simply have not produced. Proof lies in the fact that on their own uncollectivized garden plots, the peasants produce like mad.

Khrushchev might solve the economic problem by decollectivizing. But this is unthinkable; it would recreate the original political problem of an uncontrolled peasantry.

Enter fertilizer.

In recent years the Kremlin has sought to improve agriculture without spending money. It has concentrated on administrative manipulation and exhortation, as though the right organization or slogan would unlock the door to bounty.

This worked well enough for Khrushchev until this year's wheat catastrophe, only now being seen in all of its awesome scope.

Authoritative American estimates of the wheat crop run as low as 40 million tons, down from a 1958 peak of 62 million.

In the key new lands of Khrushchev's personal pride and favor, Soviet sources put some yields as small as three bushels per acre, barely enough to cover next year's seed requirements. The American average in 1961 was 24.

This was the plight that cornered Khrushchev and forced him to offer more than a billion dollars for foreign wheat and to consider spending substantial sums on his farms.

To a man who 2 years ago told his people that "the Soviet Union will soon occupy a position on the international grain market which will demonstrate to the gentlemen imperialists how our agriculture is growing" [Stormy applause], the grain purchases must have hurt pride as much as pocketbook.

But, a victim of the rising consumer expectations which he himself has cultivated, Khrushchev went ahead and shopped. He had promised too much to the Russian people to pull in their belts in Stalin's old style.

The grain purchases, he realized, were only an expedient designed for an emergency. To spare Russia the need to dip wheat from foreign wells in future seasons of cruel weather, he undertook to increase the fertilizer supply. Weed and pest killers are also on his list.

Last year the Soviets produced 17 million tons of fertilizer; for fewer acres in a kinder climate, the United States produced 35 million.

Khrushchev said 35 million tons would be produced in 1965 (last year a Soviet expert said 45-47 million tons would be needed then) and for 1970 he set a target of 100 million tons with a price tag of 20 billion rubles. That is more than 20 billion dollars, a colossal sum.

Specialists feel that Russia's fertilizer situation is worse than the figures imply. Soviet writers continually tell inspirational horror stories about fertilizer lost through faulty production, slipshod distribution, or misuse. Khrushchev recently noted a typical atrocity: children were tobogganing on hills of unused fertilizer.

Nor is the panacea tone of preplenum Soviet discourse on fertilizer shared by the specialists here. Even if the immense amounts of money and materials for building fertilizer plants, bags, spreaders, and the like are found, other hurdles remain.

Incentives may be the highest. The record is plain that peasants won't work for nothing. Incentives don't mean just more rubles in the peasant's pocket. They mean goods to spend those rubles on.

These are consumer goods and if the Kremlin is to supply them in the quantities and qualities demanded, great expenditures are required.

Russia's farmers have been called "Soviet Negroes." Their purchasing power, social benefits, and individual opportunities are—by official policy—below those of the favored urban workers. The cost of changing this policy, in a country where six or seven times as many people work on farms as in the United States, is staggering to contemplate.

There is the problem of "cadres," the noncoms and officers of Soviet agriculture. They are often the country's least able personnel. If they were good, they would not be sent to the low-priority countryside.

It is hard to keep the farmers down on the farm. They want the relative comfort, culture, and pride of city living. Older people and women make up a disproportionate share of the rural population. The young, the able, and the ambitious flee to the cities, and no number of Hero of Labor Awards can hold them back.

Monday's plenum, it is clear, has its work cut out for it.

---

## ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SERIOUSLY QUESTIONS TAX CUT AS UNEMPLOYMENT SOLUTION

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, a casual look at the general economic indicators would suggest that the economy is booming along at an adequate rate. Improvement seems, in general, across the board. However, this is a strange type of economic recovery. One economic indicator, namely, the level of unemployment after remaining at unfortunately high levels significantly deteriorated last month while the rest of the economy is booming. I think this strange circumstance requires much more examination that we have given it to date. It represents a serious social and economic dilemma.

Let us take a look at some figures. In the third quarter of 1963 gross national product was at a level of $588.7 billion, up some $9 billion, a 1½ percent increase in one quarter. If this continues, the annual increase would be 6 percent.

Industrial production was at a high rate of 126.6 in October, using the 1957–59 figure as a base of 100. This represents a half of 1 percent increase in 1 month since September.

National income in the third quarter was at a rate of $481.9 billion, an increase of 1½ percent since the second quarter. Consumer expenditures were $374.9 billion in the third quarter, up roughly 1½ percent since the second quarter.

The Consumer Price Index is already beginning to move up. In October the Consumer Price Index was at 107.2, using the 1957–59 period as a base. This represented an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in 1 month from September.

Certainly this prosperity has extended to the business sector. Corporate profits after tax in the third quarter were $27.4 billion, up some $600 million since the second quarter. This represented an increase of almost 3 percent. Investment was at an annual rate of $3.7 billion in the third quarter, up $3 billion or nearly 3 percent since the second quarter of this year.

Yet look at the employment figures. The number of unemployed rose between October and November by half a million to 3.9 million in November. This is close to the level of a year ago. Seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment was 5.9 percent in November, up from 5.5 percent in October. The rate in November was larger than it was in November a year ago.

Mr. President, we will shortly be considering the vocational education bill.

The bill is in conference. I hope and pray that it will be reported this year, because it could make a positive, direct contribution to the kind of bottleneck unemployment we are suffering in our economy.

Listen to some of these recent figures on unemployment. November the job rise was somewhat more than in recent years, both for teenagers and for adult men. Much of the increase in unemployment came from an increase in the number of teenagers looking for part-time work. The teenage unemployment rate rose in November to 17.2 percent, close to the record May 1963, figure. Among these young workers, unemployment has continued substantially higher than a year earlier throughout 1963. Mr. President, these statements are based upon the most recent news issuance dated Friday, December 6, from the U.S. Department of Labor. Mr. President, a more complete breakdown of the unemployment figures for November is not yet available. However, a more finite breakdown is available for October of 1963. In that month unemployment of boys between 14 and 19 was at a rate of 12 percent. This group alone, Mr. President, accounted for a larger number of the total unemployed, 408,000 people, than any other component age group in the economy.

The same thing can be said with respect to girls. In October the unemployment rate of girls under 20 was 14.4 percent. They accounted for 378,000 people more than any other component group of women in our economy.

Vocational education can also be used for groups against whom economic discrimination is practiced. Again, referring to the October unemployment figures we see that while whites had an unemployment rate of 4.1 percent, nonwhites had an unemployment rate which was more than double, namely 9.2 percent Where white males had an unemployment rate of 3.5 percent, nonwhite males had an unemployment rate of 8.1 percent.

The importance of such policies as vocational education can also be seen in terms of the duration of unemployment. Twelve and eight-tenths percent of the total unemployed have been unemployed between 15 and 26 weeks. An even larger number, 13.8 percent, have been unemployed for 27 weeks or more. These figures, incidentally, are larger than they were in October of 1962.

Mr. President, a number of economists throughout the country are becoming increasingly concerned about the nature of this general structural unemployment problem. I have mentioned the work done by Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth, of the University of Michigan. Others, such as Prof. William Felner, of Yale, and Prof. Rendigs Fels, of Virginia, have in recent weeks also commented on this same phenomena.

I also wish to refer to the recent work of Mr. Michael E. Levy, staff economist of the National Industrial Conference Board. Mr. Levy, writing in the Business Management Record, a publication issued by the NICB in November 1963, provides an excellent assessment of the retarded growth hypothesis and the policy implication which stems from that hypothesis.

Mr. President, the philosophy that a tax cut is the real answer is based upon what I believe is a mistaken notion which overlooks the nature of our unemployment problem.

Mr. Levy points out that there is considerable doubt that the economy has actually tapered off in its general economic growth. At the same time he well recognizes that the unemployment situation is not improving, and perhaps is actually getting worse. As he then indicates:

> These conclusions certainly do not follow from any simple gap analysis. Part of the gap may reflect an overestimate of potential supply within the current institutional framework, rather than real deficiencies in demand. Clearly this problem would call for more complex remedies than monetary or fiscal demand reflation.

Of course, the tax cut is the model for that.

Mr. Levy then points out that the Council of Economic Advisers has supported the growth hypothesis by comparing the period of 1947 to 1957 with the period of 1957 to 1962. This comparison indicates that growth rates change from 3.8 to 2.9 percent in the latter period. However, as Mr. Levy points out, a simple change in the base period gives far different conclusions. Thus, if the comparison is made between 1948 to 1958 and 1958 to 1962, the corresponding growth rates are 3.2 and 4.1 percent. In other words, the economy has been growing much faster in the past 4 years than during the previous period.

Mr. Levy's own conclusion is:

> The record shows unusually high growth during the early fifties, followed by very slow growth during the midfifties, and a steady acceleration during the late fifties and early sixties to date.

What does all this mean from the standpoint of policy? Mr. Levy concludes:

> Expansionary fiscal policies, in particular, carefully timed and structured tax reductions, may succeed in eliminating the remaining pockets of purely cyclical slack and unemployment. But—

He continues—

> the evidence of the past decade, as I see it, adds up to more than mere cyclical slack caused or aggravated by restrictive policies.

He emphasizes that our unemployment rates are a result in major part of resources not readily employable because of sectoral, institutional, and other so-called structural imbalances and rigidities that may be deeply embedded in our present markets, costs, and price structures. Until recently, Government policy emphasized mainly the former problem, which is more readily amenable to solution; but the structural problem, which may be more deep seated and intractable, is likely to demand increasing attention of policymakers in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time granted the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my own conclusion is that instead of placing so much faith and hope in the effectiveness of a general aggregative approach, such as the present tax bill in the Senate Finance Committee, we should concentrate much more attention upon specific policies designed to meet particular types of unemployment. A classic example of such a specific policy is the vocational education bill. I think this bill should be enacted, and it may well be that we shall have to look at this legislation again and consider a substantial expansion in the program in the future.

I believe this is necessary in view of the nature of our unemployment problem—the fact that it is concentrated among the unskilled and the young, those who desperately need to have vocational education before they can qualify for jobs in our booming economy. I believe this is the heart and soul of our problem. Therefore, although a tax cut may increase profits and personal income, and has great popular appeal—for everyone like to have his taxes cut—in my opinion a tax cut is not a sensible way for Congress to act in view of the nature of our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Levy printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### U.S. GROWTH RATES: THE KINK IN THE CURVE

(By Michael E. Levy)

(NOTE.—A slightly abridged and edited version of an address by Michael E. Levy, the conference board's specialist in public finance, at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, Cleveland, Ohio, September 5, 1963.)

During the end of the 1950's and early in 1960 business leaders and economists alike shared great expectations for the next decade, which was commonly referred to, at the time, as the "soaring sixties." Of the many projections of real economic growth for this decade, virtually none assumed an overall growth rate of less than 3.5 percent, and estimates ranging as high as 4.2 percent or even 4.7 percent were by no means uncommon.[1]

#### FROM "SOARING SIXTIES" TO "NEW STAGNATION"

By the end of 1960, the outlook among economists had changed drastically. At congressional hearings in December 1960, Joseph Pechman voiced considerable concern over the slow rates of growth of the economy during the business cycles of 1953–57 and 1957–60, and Charles Schultze diagnosed the recent economic performance as "high-level creeping stagnation."[2]

Early in 1961, the new Council of Economic Advisers presented for the first time a coherent and integrated analysis of what Arthur Burns, in his critical review, subsequently termed the "new stagnation theory."[3] Since that time, phrases such as "stagnation," "economic slowdown," and "deficient economic performance" have become part of the standard vocabulary used by economists, business leaders, and politicians alike, in describing the performance of the U.S. economy during recent years.

#### NEW STAGNATION: THE BUILDING BLOCKS

This new stagnation analysis may be viewed as consisting of three major building blocks. The first of these consists of a set of four aggregate statistical measures designed to substantiate the nature and timing of the economic slowdown. These are: (1) The actual rate of growth of real GNP, (2) the comparison of this growth rate with long-term historical norms, (3) data on excess capacity and unemployment, and (4) the GNP gap, that is, the difference between potential and actual GNP, where "potential GNP" is defined as total output that could be produced at "full employment" with reasonably stable prices.[4]

A second building block is more detailed and specific information bearing on the probable causes of our present economic deficiencies. This type of information stresses two major recent developments: (1) a slowdown in the rate of capital formation and consumer demand, or a decline in the ratio of investment and consumer demand to GNP, and (2) an increase in, and an unusually high level of, the full employment budget surplus.

---

[1] E.g., see National Planning Association, "Long-Range Projections for Economic Growth: The American Economy in 1970," a staff report (Washington 1959); Gerhard Colm and Manuel Helzner, "Financial Needs and Resources Over the Next Decade: At All Levels of Government," and Dick Netzer, "Financial Needs and Resources Over the Next Decade: State and Local Governments," in "Public Finances: Needs, Sources and Utilization," published for the National Bureau of Economic Research (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961); also Martin R. Gainsbrugh, editor, "American Enterprise: The Next 10 Years" (the Macmillan Co., New York, 1961), esp. pp. 145, 179, 198, 208, 309, 354–55, and 395.

[2] U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, "Current Economic Situation and Short-Run Outlook," hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, Dec. 7–8, 1960, 86th Cong., 2d sess., January 1961.

[3] U.S. Council of Economic Advisers, "The American Economy in 1961: Problems and Policies," in U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, January 1961 Economic Report of the President and the Economic Situation and Outlook, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961; Arthur F. Burns, "Examining the New Stagnation Theory," the Morgan Guarantee survey, May 1961.

[4] Most estimates of potential GNP have taken a 4-percent unemployment rate to represent full employment. For a detailed discussion of the conceptual and measurement problems of "potential GNP" and for alternative estimates, see Michael E. Levy, "Fiscal Policy, Cycles and Growth" (National Industrial Conference Board, New York, 1963), ch. 5, pp. 59–81.

The following set of inferences and prescriptions derived from the preceding body of information completes the structure of the new stagnation analysis: (1) the deficient economic performance of recent years was the result of insufficient aggregate demand in general, and of low levels of investment in particular; (2) this lack of adequate demand was either caused or aggravated by excessively restrictive high-saving budget structures; and (3) greater fiscal incentives to private investment and consumption are, therefore, appropriate and effective remedies.

The following analysis focuses mainly on the first of these three building blocks, the evidence of recent stagnation. This so-called stagnation, which reflects a flattening of the U.S. growth curve, on the one hand, and a deterioration in the rate of utilization of economic resources, on the other, will be termed hereafter—somewhat inaccurately—the kink in the growth curve.

The second set of data, those reflecting on the causes of stagnation, will be scrutinized briefly, and I shall conclude with a few comments concerning current inferences and prescriptions.

### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE KINK

Four statistical measures have been used to substantiate the economic deficiencies of recent years. Two of these measures are growth rate comparisons; the other two are measures of unused productive capacity or loss of potential output. These two pairs address themselves to two distinct questions that have frequently been fused, or even confused.

Actual observed growth rates are the direct result of the interaction between aggregate demand and potential supply. Thus, a slowdown in the observed growth rate may reflect any one of three possible developments: (a) a balanced slowdown in the growth of both aggregate full employment demand and supply, (b) slackening growth of aggregate demand, or (c) slower growth of potential supply due to smaller increases in labor force, capital, or productivity. Without additional independent information, a comparison of actual growth rates cannot reveal whether the observed slowdown is due mainly to lackluster demand for goods and services, or to sluggish increases in labor, capital, and productivity.

This does not imply that the comparison of observed growth rates is trivial. It is of considerable interest whether real total, or per capita, GNP is rising less rapidly at present than during some previous period. But such information is informative rather than diagnostic in character.

One must turn to data on productive capacity and potential supply in order to determine whether a slowdown is caused mainly by limitations of "potential" supply or by lack of effective demand. Abnormally low unemployment rates and negative GNP gaps—that is, an excess of actual over "potential" GNP—combined with price pressures are indicative of limitations on the supply side. High unemployment rates and large and increasing positive GNP gaps apparently point to limitations on the demand side.

In fact, some economists have interpreted high unemployment rates and large positive GNP gaps as "proof" of "lack of effective demand" in the traditional Keynesian sense of the term. Hence they have prescribed the expansion of demand for goods and service by means of easy monetary and fiscal policies—as described in any standard principles textbook—as the effective cure against these ills.

These conclusions certainly do not follow from any simple "gap" analysis. Our current measurements of unemployment and "potential GNP" cannot properly differentiate between that part of unused resources or lost potential output which is due to plain "lack of demand" and that part which, though "revealed" by our measures, is not readily available to the economy because of sectoral demand-supply imbalances, rigidities in the institutional setting or in cost-price relations.[5] In other words, part of the "gap" may reflect an overestimate of "potential supply" within the current institutional framework, rather than real deficiencies in demand. Clearly, this problem would call for more complex remedies than monetary or fiscal demand reflation.

### MEASURING THE KINK

In measuring the kink in the growth curve, I shall focus first on growth rate comparisons, and then on measures of resource utilization and potential supply.

#### *Comparison of short-term growth rates*

By far the most popular comparisons in recent discussions have been those of short-term growth rates. Such comparisons, however, pose several serious problems that arise from the uneven pace of economic growth during the business cycle: an initial decline is usually followed by a rapid recovery and an expansion which tends to slow down as the cyclical peak is approached. Hence, any arbitrary selection of starting and terminal points—or slight shifts in the time periods selected—may have a spectacular effect on the observed short-term growth rates. For example, if the recent 1947–57 and 1957–62 comparison of the CEA is replaced by one of 1948–58 with 1958–62, the corresponding growth rates change from 3.8 percent and 2.9 percent, respectively,[6] to 3.2 percent and 4.1 percent.

Clearly, peak-to-peak measurements should be used for the computations of reasonably useful short-term growth rates.[7] Moreover, computations based on quarterly peaks—as used here—seem far superior to those based on peak years that may already contain a significant part of the following recession.

The comparison of quarterly peak-to-peak growth rates reveals a very different picture from that of the widely advertised "economic slowdown." An unusually high growth rate of 5.2 percent during the 1948–53 cycle was followed by a disappointing growth rate of 2.3 percent during the 1953–57 cycle. Since then, however, the growth rate has improved significantly. It amounted to 2.7 percent during the 1957–60 cycle and rose to 3.4 percent during the interval from the 1960 peak to the second quarter of 1963, the latest available date. (See table 1.) Granted that the peak of the present cycle has not yet been reached and that the ultimate peak-to-peak growth rate may dip below 3.4 percent, it is nonetheless very likely to remain well above the 2.7 percent rate of the last cycle.

The industrial production index tells a similar story. After growing by an impressive 7 percent during the 1948–53 cycle, it edged up by merely 2.2 percent during 1953–57. The corresponding growth rates for the 1957–60 cycle and the most recent period were 2.8 percent and 4.1 percent; the average growth for the entire 1948–63 period amounted to 4.2 percent.

In conclusion, the record shows unusually rapid growth during the early 1950's followed by very slow growth during the mid-1950's and a steady acceleration during the late 1950's and early 1960's to date.

#### *Short-term rates and historical norms*

How do these postwar intracyclical growth rates compare with the long-term historical growth record of the U.S. economy? The long-term real growth rate of gross national product for 1889–1957 was 3.5 percent.[8] More rapid growth during the early decades of this period was offset by somewhat slower growth during most of this century. Real GNP grew by only 2.9 percent from 1909 to 1957, or by 3.1 percent from 1919 to 1957.[9]

TABLE 1.—*Peak-to-peak real growth rates of actual GNP, industrial production and potential GNP during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Actual GNP | 5.2 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Industrial production | 7.0 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| Potential GNP: | | | | | |
| Knowles [1] | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| Okun I [1] | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Okun II [2] | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 |

[1] For sources, discussion of estimating methods, and listing of quarterly data, see Levy, op. cit. For Knowles estimates, 1st 2 quarters of 1963 were derived from preliminary extrapolations. Okun data from 1960 to present were revised to take account of the July 1963 GNP revisions of the Department of Commerce.

[2] Okun II is the same as Okun I, except that growth rates were derived from semilogarithmic least-squares regressions rather than from peak-to-peak compound-interest formula. (The striking differences between Okun I and II are a result of the fairly irregular growth rates o. the Okun estimate.)

NOTE.—All GNP computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data are available but is not an established cyclical peak.

Sources: Federal Reserve Board; James W. Knowles; Arthur M. Okun; U.S. Department of Commerce; U.S. Department of Labor.

---

[5] For an elaboration of this point and a discussion of "direct" attempts to separate these two elements, see Levy, op. cit., esp. pp. 42–45, 60–61.

[6] Council of Economic Advisers, Annual Report, 1963, printed together with the Economic Report of the President (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1963), table 4. The figures shown there are 3.9 percent and 3.0 percent. For consistency, I have substituted the figures from table 2 of William B. Franklin's "The Postwar Cycles" (National Industrial Conference Board, New York; 1963).

[7] 1948 and 1957 (but neither 1947 nor 1958) were peak years.

[8] E.g., see John W. Kendrick, "Productivity Trends in the United States," published for the National Bureau of Economic Research (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961), p. 62, table 2.

[9] Edward F. Denison, "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States and the Alternatives Before Us" (Committee for Economic Development, 1962), pp. 17–19; Kendrick, op. cit., p. 60, table 1.

TABLE 2.—*Unemployment rates and real relative GNP gaps during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quarterly unemployment rate: | | | | | |
| At initial peak | 3.7 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 5.2 | ---------- |
| At trough | 6.8 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 6.8 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | 2.6 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 5.8 | ---------- |
| Cycle average | 4.2 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.0 |
| Relative GNP gap: | | | | | |
| Knowles estimate: [1] | | | | | |
| At initial peak | −1.0 | −5.8 | 3.4 | 6.1 | ---------- |
| At trough | 4.7 | 2.4 | 9.3 | 9.9 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | −5.8 | 3.4 | 6.1 | 7.0 | ---------- |
| Cycle average [2] | −2.2 | .4 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 2.9 |
| Okun estimate: [1] | | | | | |
| At initial peak | −1.0 | −4.7 | 1.0 | 3.7 | ---------- |
| At trough | 8.2 | 6.0 | 9.8 | 8.2 | ---------- |
| At terminal peak | −4.7 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 5.4 | ---------- |
| Cycle average [2] | .4 | 1.3 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 3.2 |

[1] For sources, discussion of estimating method, and listing of quarterly data, see Levy, op. cit. For Knowles estimates, 1st 2 quarters of 1963 were derived from preliminary extrapolations. Okun data from 1960 to present were revised to take account of the July 1963 GNP revisions of the Department of Commerce.

[2] Cycle averages were computed by dividing cumulative quarterly GNP gaps for each cycle by cumulative quarterly potential GNP. The initial peak was excluded; the terminal peak, included.

NOTE.—Relative GNP gap equals actual GNP gap (i.e., potential minus actual GNP) divided by potential GNP. All GNP gap computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data were available but is not an established cyclical peak. All peak and trough values refer to the quarterly dates established by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Sources: James W. Knowles; Arthur M. Okun; U.S. Department of Commerce; U.S. Department of Labor.

**The 5.2-percent growth rate during the 1948–53 cycle was thus well above the historical norm. It was supported first by high liquidity and a backlog of demand for durable goods inherited from World War II, and subsequently by the Korean boom. Most economists believe that this abnormally high growth rate could not have been sustained.[10] In fact, it may well have included some "borrowing of growth" from the 1953–57 cycle. The intracyclical growth rates of both the 1953–57 and the 1957–60 cycles were clearly below the historical norm. But the performance of the latest cycle to date leads one to believe that its growth rate may well remain above the 1919–1957 norm.**

**To conclude, economic growth during the 1960's to date, when compared with the historical growth record, does not give rise to any undue alarm over stagnation.**

**At this point, a word of caution is in order. The comparison of short-term with long-term historical growth rates does not provide any information as to the level of gross national product. The short-term rate may fall short of, or exceed, the long-term rate while GNP is either below or above its long-term growth path.**

**Independent evidence suggests that in 1957 actual GNP fell approximately on its long-term growth path.[11] The fact that the real growth rate from the 1957 peak to the present has averaged 3.1 percent suggests that the economy has continued to grow more or less along its historical growth path, falling below it in 1957–60, but recovering during the early 1960's.**

### *Excess capacity—Unemployment rates*

**The discussion so far has focused on comparisons over time of the interaction between aggregate demand and supply. We now turn to measures of unused capacity and potential supply in order to determine to what extent our productive potential has been utilized. When viewed from this angle, the recent economic performance leaves no room for complacency. During the present cycle, the unemployment rate has averaged 6.1 percent; it averaged 5.9 percent during the 1957–60 cycle. These figures are disturbingly high in absolute terms as well as in comparison with a 4.4 and 4.2 percent averages for 1953–57 and 1948–53. (See table 2.) Comparison of the latest quarterly unemployment rate with those of the preceding cyclical peaks is equally discouraging: 2.6 percent (1st cycle), 4.3 percent (2d cycle), 5.2 percent (3d cycle), 5.8 percent (current cycle).**

**Further insight may be gained by comparing the growth rate of the civilian labor force with that of civilian employment for successive cycles (see table 3). During the 1948–53 cycle, employment grew more rapidly than the civilian labor force, resulting in the unusually low unemployment rate of 2.6 percent at the end of the economic expansion. Since the 1953 peak, the labor force has grown faster than civilian employment, but the gap between these two growth rates has narrowed considerably during recent years. Specifically, after a sharp acceleration in the rate of growth of the labor force during 1953–57, accompanied by a much more modest rise in the growth rate of employment, both rates have declined during 1957–60 and 1960–63, the former more rapidly than the latter.**

**In conclusion, unemployment statistics point to a steady deterioration of resource utilization ever since the 1953 peak. The initial deterioration during 1953–57 received little attention and was of no great concern because it started from an exceedingly high—perhaps excessively high—basis. Recently this deterioration has been almost arrested, but public concern has been greater than before, because even slight additional slippage is very painful at present, when increased resource-utilization is so clearly desirable.**

### *Lost output—the GNP gap*

**In addition to the unemployment statistics, estimates of potential GNP and of the GNP gap have frequently been used to measure the magnitude of unused economic resources and lost output. The use of these measures poses many intricate conceptual and estimating problems, which were analyzed in a recent study.[12] This analysis reveals that alternative estimates of potential GNP yield sizable variations in short-term potential growth rates and are, therefore, of only limited usefulness for growth-rate comparisons. Nonetheless it is of some interest to note that—according to most existing estimates—potential GNP grew at a slower rate than actual GNP during 1948–53, but has grown at a faster rate ever since the 1953 peak (see table 1).**

**More useful and reliable is the pattern of change in GNP gaps. During most of the expansion phase of the 1948–53 cycle, the quarterly GNP gaps were negative, that is, actual GNP exceeded potential GNP. (This implies overutilization of resources at that time.) Since the 1953 peak, however, the quarterly GNP gaps have been positive most of the time, indicating an output loss that has steadily increased at successive cyclical peaks as well as over each successive cycle as a whole (see table 2). The cycle average of the relative GNP gap, that is, the cumulative (quarterly) real GNP gaps divided by cumulative (quarterly) potential GNP, may serve as a crude but convenient summary measure of the average loss of output during the business cycle. These cycle averages (computed from James Knowles' estimates of potential GNP) deteriorated from a 2.2 percent excess of actual over potential GNP during the 1948–53 cycle to a 0.4-percent deficiency during the 1953–57 cycle, a 6.8-percent deficiency during the 1957–60 cycle, and a 7.4-percent deficiency for the period from the 1960 peak to the present. Cycle averages of the relative GNP gap computed from Arthur Okun's estimates of potential GNP differ somewhat in magnitude but yield the same overall pattern of increases over successive cycles. (See table 2.)**

TABLE 3.—*Peak-to-peak growth rates of civilian labor force, employment, and unemployment during the postwar cycles, 1948–63*

[In percent]

| | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1953 (1st cycle) | 2d quarter, 1953 to 3d quarter, 1957 (2d cycle) | 3d quarter, 1957 to 2d quarter, 1960 (3d cycle) | 2d quarter, 1960 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4th cycle) | 4th quarter, 1948 to 2d quarter, 1963 (4 postwar cycles) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Civilian labor force | 0.8 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Employment, all industries | .9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | .9 | 1.0 |
| Unemployment | −4.2 | 13.6 | 9.5 | 3.9 | 5.1 |

NOTE.—1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which data were available but is not an established cyclical peak.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

---

[10] E.g., Pechman, loc. cit., p. 113.

[11] See Denison, op. cit., pp. 18–21; also Levy, op. cit., pp. 61–64.

[12] Levy, op. cit., ch. 5, pp. 59–81.

Thus, the GNP gap analysis leads to the same conclusion as the analysis of unemployment data. A significant and persistent decline of resource utilization has taken place since the 1953 peak. This decline, which was most severe during the 1957–60 cycle, has been almost arrested recently. But it has left the economy with a large backlog of unused resources.

### CAUSES OF "STAGNATION"

Insufficient private demand, and in particular insufficient private investment, has been considered the primary cause, not only of the slowdown of our economic growth, but also of the underutilization of resources. Excessively restrictive economic policies have been termed the "ultimate cause," because of their drag on private investment and consumption.

The scope of this paper rules out a full consideration of "causes." It may be worthwhile, however, to examine briefly some of the more relevant facts and figures.

First, let us compare the percentage distribution of the major GNP components at the postwar business cycle peaks and at the second quarter of 1963, the latest data for which this information is available. The share of personal consumption expenditure, at 66.8 percent of GNP, is slightly below the levels of the 1960 and 1948 peaks and slightly above the 1957 peak; it is well above the low 63.3 percent of the 1953 peak. (See table 4.) Apparently, the share of personal consumption has not varied systematically with either the rate of economic growth or the degree of resource utilization.

The share of gross private domestic investment declined sharply from 16.6 percent at the 1948 peak to 14.2 percent at the 1953 peak, held its own at the 1957 peak, and has since declined, falling to 13.6 percent in the second quarter of 1963. This pattern—clearly dominated by parallel changes of investment in producers' durables—may lend some support to the lack-of-investment theory. Yet the sharpest peak-to-peak decline, from 1948 to 1953, occurred at the time of the most rapid postwar growth of the U.S. economy and its highest rate of resource utilization. The more recent declines need not necessarily have been the cause of our stagnation; they may as readily have been one of its results. This view receives some support from the observed changes in the share of gross private demand: a decline from about 85 percent of real GNP at the 1948 peak to around 77 percent at the 1953 peak, a rise to 82 percent at the 1957 and 1960 peaks, and a subsequent decline to around 81 percent at present. Thus, the share of private demand declined during postwar cycles of good growth and rose to higher levels during cycles of sluggish growth.

TABLE 4.—*GNP and its major components at the postwar peaks, measured as a percent of actual and of potential GNP*

| | IVQ 1948 | | IIQ 1953 | | IIIQ 1957 | | IIQ 1960 | | IIQ 1963 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP | Percent of actual GNP | Percent of potential GNP |
| Actual GNP | 100.0 | 101.0 | 100.0 | 105.8 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 93.9 | 100.0 | 93.2 |
| Gross private demand [1] | 84.8 | 85.6 | 77.2 | 81.7 | 81.8 | 79.0 | 81.9 | 76.9 | 81.0 | 75.4 |
| Personal consumption expenditures | 67.5 | 68.1 | 63.3 | 67.0 | 66.5 | 64.2 | 67.7 | 63.6 | 66.8 | 62.3 |
| Gross private investment [1] | 17.3 | 17.5 | 13.9 | 14.7 | 15.3 | 14.7 | 14.2 | 13.3 | 14.1 | 13.2 |
| Gross private domestic investment | 16.6 | 16.8 | 14.2 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 13.1 | 13.6 | 12.6 |
| New construction | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 7.1 |
| Producers' durables | 7.8 | 7.9 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Government purchases | 15.2 | 15.4 | 22.8 | 24.1 | 18.2 | 17.6 | 18.1 | 17.0 | 19.0 | 17.7 |
| Federal | 8.6 | 8.7 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 9.7 |
| State and local | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 8.0 |

[1] Includes net exports.

NOTE.—All computations are based on constant (1954) dollar series. 1963 2d quarter is the latest quarter for which all the required data were available but is not an established cyclical peak. All cyclical peaks as established by the quarterly business-cycle dating of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Potential GNP as estimated by James W. Knowles (see Levy, op. cit., pp. 124–125, table A–2); 1963 2d quarter potential GNP based on preliminary extrapolation.

Sources: James W. Knowles; U.S. Department of Commerce.

The interpretation of this evidence is problematic in view of the rapidly changing postwar environment. The Korean boom with its large defense outlays and inflationary pressures and the post-Korean cutback in defense spending have deeply affected the evidence during the first two postwar business cycles that are considered here. Thus, they differ in some important respects from the subsequent cycles. But when these two special cycles are linked with the more recent ones, the resulting changes in GNP shares of investment and private demand do not generally support the lack-of-investment thesis of the stagnationists.

This conclusion is not merely the result of the method of GNP-share analysis. A comparison of peak-to-peak rates of growth (chart 3 not printed in the RECORD) yields similarly inconclusive patterns of investment and private demand.[13] Yet one component, personal consumption expenditure, has displayed a significant systematic pattern; its growth has slowed down continuously during successive postwar cycles. This slowdown is apparently related to the decline, until recently, in the rate of growth of real disposable personal income. Conceivably, an income tax reduction may reverse this trend by increasing the level and the growth rate of both disposable personal income and consumption expenditure.

What can be said concerning the stagnationists' final proposition? Does the evidence support the contention that an excessively restrictive Federal budget structure, as reflected in high full employment budget surpluses, has been a drag on our economy? This question has been considered at length in a recent study.[14] The two major relevant conclusions can be summarized briefly here.

The full employment budget surpluses since the mid or late 1950's do not appear excessively large when compared with those of 1947–48, 1950, or the first half of 1951. But their restrictive impact looms much larger in view of the more restrictive monetary policy of the late 1950's and the less vigorous private demand during much of the last decade.[15]

"During the second half of the 1950's the structural relationship among gross private investment, gross private saving, and Federal Government saving appears not to have been inconsistent with full employment equilibrium, in contrast to 1960–61, when a higher saving Federal budget structure resulted in a pronounced excess of full employment saving over full employment investment. In 1962 the budget structure apparently reverted to its previous lower saving level."[16]

### REEVALUATING THE KINK

By now it has become clear that the landmarks of our "new stagnation" are varied and complex. But the main contours have—I believe—become discernible.

An unsustainably fast pace of early postwar growth was followed by an unsatisfactory, sluggish pace during the mid- and late-1950's. Slow growth, substantially below historical norms, and a steady deterioration in resource utilization appear to have originated after the 1953 peak. This conclusion seems generally valid, but the poor 1953–57 performance should probably be viewed, in part, as the result of a "borrowing of growth" by the preceding cycle.

The 1960's, so far, have brought an increase of the rate of economic growth to its long-term level and the near cessation of the earlier progressive deterioration of resource utilization. But the large gaps between economic potential and economic achievement that developed during the 1950's have not been closed, nor even narrowed.

The diagnosis of the causes of our current economic ills—as put forth by adherents of the "new stagnation thesis"—is not readily supportable from the statistical evidence on shares of GNP components or their growth rates. Variations in the rate of Federal expenditures for goods and services, associated with the Korean war, post-Korean disarmament, and the growing demands of the cold war, have deeply affected the evidence, both directly and through feedbacks to the private economy.

Restrictive budgetary policies may explain, in part, the mildness and short duration of the 1958–60 expansion, but they cannot readily account for either the earlier or the most recent deficiencies. Expansionary fiscal policies, in particular carefully timed and structured tax reductions, may succeed in eliminating the remaining pockets of purely cyclical slack and unemployment. But the evidence of the past decade, as I see it, adds up to more than mere cyclical slack caused, or aggravated, by restrictive policies.[17] As indicated earlier, our unemployment rates and our GNP gaps measure a mixture both of resources unemployed because of insufficient effective demand, and resources not readily employable because of sectoral, institutional, and other so-called "structural" imbalances and rigidities that may be deeply embedded in our present markets, costs and price structure. Until recently, Government policy emphasized mainly the former problem, which is more readily amenable to solution; but the "structural" problem, which may be more deep seated and intractable, is likely to demand increasing attention of policymakers in the future.

---

[13] In contrast, the share of government purchases of goods and services, and their rate of growth have risen and fallen together with the overall growth rate during the past postwar cycles.

This convariation—partly the result of special circumstances mentioned in the text—should, of course, not be mechanically extrapolated into the future.

[14] Levy, op. cit., esp. pp. 23–27, 32–45.

[15] Ibid., pp. 25–27.

[16] Ibid., p. 42.

[17] See also op. cit., ch. 3, esp. pp. 42–45.

## FREELOADERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last October, we celebrated the 18th birthday of the United Nations. At that time, I recall many Members of this body recounted the achievements of the world organization. During its 18 years of service to the world, the United Nations has grown from a handful of hopeful nations working with an untried charter and untested organization to a body of 111 members—virtually all the nations in the civilized world—exercising proven authority and responsibility in the interest of peace and progress.

In a short period of time, we have watched with satisfaction and pride as the United Nations Security Council resisted the paralysis-causing perpetual Soviet veto. We have seen the General Assembly override the proposed "troika" and turn a deaf ear to the pugnacious pounding of Mr. Khrushchev's shoe, and we have seen peacekeeping and peacemaking action bear fruit in the Congo, and elsewhere.

Satisfaction with the many successes of the United Nations is clouded, however, by the not-so-bright financial future which looms for the world organization. The United Nations is in dire financial straits, and is facing imminent bankruptcy. This is in large part due to the failure of many member nations to meet their financial obligations to the organization.

The United States has paid in full its official assessment of 32 percent of the total United Nations budget. In addition, the United States has purchased $72 million worth of United Nations bonds, to help the organization treasury. I supported the purchase of these bonds, because of our vital interest in the continuing success of the world organization. Unlike the United States, most other members have a poor record. The Soviet Union, quick to exercise its rights in the world forum with its frequently used veto power, has been slow to exercise its responsibilities. At present, the Russians owe $71 million. In addition, our close ally, France, owes $16 million. Smaller nations, such as some of the newer African states, are similarly in debt. Yet all take full advantage of the organization at every opportunity. Actually—and this is a startling figure—only 45 of 111 member nations are paid up.

Mr. President, we all recognize the tremendous achievements of the United Nations and its contribution to peace and security. We recognize that it is the best hope for lasting peace and self-determination in this world. However, the United States alone should not bear the entire burden or continue adding money to make up deficits due to the failure of other nations to meet their obligations. If the United Nations is to survive, it is time for freeloaders who freely use the facilities and forum provided by the United Nations to pay up or shut up.

On December 17, President Johnson will address the United Nations in New York. I am confident he will again renew the commitment of this Nation to that organization, as he did in his inspiring message to the joint session of Congress. I am hopeful that our renewed commitment will bring forth a similar response from all other member nations. This response should include not only words indicating hope for the success of the United Nations, but also deeds indicating responsibility for its solvency and recognition that each nation should, from now on, pay its indebtedness and continue to meet obligations previously acknowledged as being fair.

## NATIONAL WATER POLICY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the Senate passed S. 1111 last Wednesday, it completed the enactment of legislation by this body to implement all of the major recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. The select committee was created by the 86th Congress, reported to the 87th and—hopefully—will have had its policy recommendations adopted by the 88th.

We have provided for a State planning aid program, nationwide river basin planning, research, a biennial report on water supply and demand by regions, and every sort of encouragement of improved water management practices.

One of these days, students of political science will be studying and writing papers about the evolution of national water policy in the 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses. In order to assist them, and to be sure that the history they write is reasonably accurate, I want to take the time to dictate a memorandum to the files—and the file in this instance is the Congressional Record—about some of the unrecorded history of this water policy evolution, and those who have particitpated.

It has been said that when someone claims sole responsibility for accomplishing something in Washington, you can put him down for exaggeration, if not something worse. Many people are invariably involved in policy and decisionmaking in our democratic process. This is certainly true in regard to the water policies and programs which have been approved by the Senate and are now being considered in the House.

Shortly after the 86th Congress convened in 1959, Western Democratic Senators met in the office of the late Senator James E. Murray of Montana to canvass the problems of the Western States. During that meeting, Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, now our majority leader, suggested that we could render a great service to the West, and to the whole country, by initiating a review of the national situation in regard to water resources.

In his terse way, the Senator from Montana reminded us that New York City as well as Los Angeles has serious water supply problems. He pointed out that the much-publicized pollution of the Potomac here in the National Capital was a manifestation of a growing nationwide problem. He suggested that as westerners long concerned with water problems, we might well take the lead in stimulating action in this increasingly crucial resource field.

There was unanimous agreement to Senator Mansfield's suggestion. He prepared and introduced a resolution which several of us cosponsored. It was promptly reported and adopted. It created a Committee on National Water Problems which included Senators from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Public Works Committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Commerce Committee, the policy committees which are concerned with various aspects of our water problems.

The Senator from Montana was on the floor last Wednesday as action on S. 1111 was completed. He congratulated Senator Gordon Allott and me on the explanation and discussion of the measure, giving no hint that its passage represented the fruition of a farsighted and constructive suggestion he made 4½ years ago.

The Senator from Montana is entitled to as much or more credit than any one of us for what is being done to meet the Nation's water problems. But he would be the last to claim such credit, and his role ought to be in the record.

We have been nearly 5 years translating Senator Mansfield's proposal to focus attention on water problems into Senate-approved legislation. But in the process we have involved officials and citizens the length and breadth of the land in the decisionmaking process. There has been created widespread recognition that the old phrase "free as water" is now a misconception. There are officials all across the land who have a new appreciation of the critical nature of water problems.

It might have been possible to get some water programs started by the process of what Mr. Mansfield has called wheeling and dealing among Washington leadership. Instead, water bills have been developed in the democratic way our majority leader advocates. The water resources research program has been fashioned in collaboration with water research agencies in all of the States in the Nation. The Interstate Conference on Water Problems, representing all 50 States, has participated in developing S. 1111, and officials of more than 40 States have commented on it directly in the hearing record. The participation has been exceptionally widespread.

This is the essence of democratic Government—widespread participation in policymaking. The hearings and debates which precede the enactment of legislation are an educational process which improve the quality of our legislation and bring agreement and understanding which make the laws effective after they are adopted. Tens of thousands of citizens who had an uneasiness about water problems 5 years ago now have a clearer understanding of the nature of water problems, of their urgency and of the necessity of Federal and State programs in the field.

The late Senator Robert S. Kerr is entitled to a great deal of the credit for the breadth of participation. As chairman of the select committee, he conducted hearings from coast to coast, assembling a firsthand record of water problems in every area.

The vice chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Problems was the minority whip, Mr. Kuchel, who has become an authority not only on his own State of California's water problems, but the whole Nation's. He was Senator Kerr's strong right arm, as he has become mine in advancing water legislation.

The minority members of the committee—Senator Milton Young of North Dakota, Senator Thomas E. Martin of Iowa, Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and the late Senators Andrew Schoeppel of Kansas and Francis Case of South Dakota—all made an effective contribution to the committee's work.

Partisanship was forgotten in a constructive effort to diagnose and prescribe remedies for the Nation's water ills.

The chairmen of the four committees involved brought many years of experience to bear on the problems involved—Senator James E. Murray as an ex officio member, the late Senator Dennis Chavez by virtue of his chairmanship of the Public Works Committee, Senator Allen Ellender as chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and Senator Warren Magnuson as chairman of the Commerce Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this point does the Senator from New Mexico desire to request more time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. In addition to the chairmen, we had four Democratic members serving their first terms in this body who were among the select committee's most diligent and valuable members.

Senator Clair Engle, of California, brought to the committee his years of experience as a member and chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senator Phil Hart, of Michigan, surprised those of us from the West with his appreciation of the subject with which we were concerned. It was largely through his insistence that the select committee conducted as many hearings as it did in the Eastern States and found—as the report and studies made by the committee indicate—that the problems of usable water supply in the great industrial area stretching from Boston to Norfolk on the East, and then sweeping in a band west to St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux Falls, is going to be just as acute, and probably more expensive to meet, than the absolute shortages of water in the West.

As a westerner who has of necessity been concerned with resources development throughout all of my public life, my hat is off to Senator Phil Hart, of Michigan, an already heavily industrialized State, for his unusual understanding of the key role of resources development—minerals, forests, water, and recreational opportunities—in the economic welfare of the Nation and of his own State.

The now senior Senator from Wyoming, Gale McGee, was our economics department. He gave constant emphasis to the importance of water resources development not only to the economic development of his own State, but to the economic development of the Nation and the maintenance of this country's world leadership. We were not allowed to forget that the 7 percent of land in Carbon County, Wyo., which is irrigated, pays nearly 50 percent of the taxes, and that growth in Carbon County, multiplied by the growth of other counties throughout the land, is what makes national growth and keeps this country foremost among the nations of the world.

Wyoming need have no fear that her welfare will be neglected so long as Gale McGee is in the U.S. Senate. He can prove irrefutably in 5 minutes, to the satisfaction of any openminded audience, that America's world leadership depends on the prosperity of Wyoming.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to mention two members of the Select Committee on National Water Resources who have succeeded to tasks which were once mine, and who have made magnificent records in the present Congress—the junior Senator from Washington, Henry M. Jackson, now chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Senator from Utah, Frank Moss, chairman of the Irrigation Subcommittee of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Both of these men served on the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Both of them have followed through to see that the work and the recommendations of the select committee was not forgotten and the effort wasted.

As chairman of the full Interior Committee, Senator Jackson directed hearings on the water resources research bill, S. 2, got the measure to the floor early in the present session of the Congress and made it possible for a companion bill to be well advanced in the House of Representatives at the present time.

Under Senator Jackson's chairmanship, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported more major policy legislation in 1963 than in any year in my experience. During 1963, the committee has reported one major measure after another, starting early in the spring when S. 4, the Wilderness Preservation Act, and S. 20, the Organic Act for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, were reported and passed overwhelmingly by the full Senate.

The Senate has approved the recommendation of Mr. Jackson's committee for an Indian heirship bill, the great Garrison irrigation project, a new Canyonlands National Park, a vast national recreation area at Lake Mead, the Ozark National Rivers, the water resources research program, S. 1111, implementing the select committee recommendations on river basin planning, State aid, biennial water resources inventories, and a great many lesser measures. The record of the committee for the 1st session of the 88th Congress will be an outstanding one.

Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, who relieved me as chairman of the Irrigation Subcommittee, conducted the hearings on S. 1111 and steered it through the subcommittee, the full committee and to the floor.

One day not only the citizens of the State of Utah, but citizens throughout the Nation are going to have an appreciation of Senator Frank Moss that he is not now fully accorded. When the Canyonlands National Park is finally established, developed, and opened to the public, it is going to be one of the great attractions of the West. It is a geological fantasyland, strewn with petrified wood, petrified dinosaur bone, Indian ruins, natural arches, unbelievable and brightly colored rock formations, canyons and cliffs which defy description. No member of the Senate Interior Committee who has seen it, if only from the air, has failed to exclaim at its grandeur and its unquestionable worthiness for national park development.

The Senator from Utah has persisted in his determination to bring about the creation of the Canyonlands National Park in face of many difficulties. I am personally grateful to him for it, as well as for his constructive service on the Select Committee on Water Resources, his coauthorship of the implementing legislation, and his competent management of legislation for me when I was away.

The implementation of the Water Resources Committee's report is not yet complete. The House has yet to act on the Senate measures. When that has been done, we actually will have only made a start on the solution of water problems. They will have to be met by each succeeding generation of Americans as long as this planet persists.

Mr. President, one of the very gratifying experiences I have had in the U.S. Senate, has been working on this task which the Senator from Montana made the order of business for some of us back in 1959, before he became majority leader.

In the course of the hearings, the executive sessions, and the subsequent development and Senate passage of legislation in the water resources field, I have had an opportunity to be closely associated with fellow Senators of great ability in a constructive, democratic undertaking.

I have especially valued the encouragement and support which the majority leader has provided, and the energetic and intelligent participation of those younger Senators like Henry Jackson, Phil Hart, Gale McGee, and Frank Moss.

I have a great deal of confidence in the democratic system of government which brings the ability of many to bear on the Nation's problems and will work better than any other form of government as long as there are leaders like MIKE MANSFIELD who have the understanding and the patience to make it work.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico for his generous comments.

Whatever record the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been able to make this year in respect to overall resources development stems from the able leadership of the former chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. Senator ANDERSON has long been identified not only with development of water resources, but also with the broad area of natural resources development.

I had the privilege of serving with the Senator in the House of Representatives. The distinguished majority leader had a similar experience. In that body, Senator ANDERSON served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. During all his service in the House of Representatives he was one of the most able and effective advocates in the field of water resources development and in respect to all matters relating to the sound development of the resources of this country.

Later, as Secretary of Agriculture, he provided outstanding leadership, especially for the Forest Service, in guaranteeing that the various important resources programs within that agency and the Department of Agriculture were accomplished.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, he made an outstanding record. We would not have been able to move the bills this year if it had not been for the groundwork previously laid by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate what the Senator has said. My purpose today was to compliment and to commend the Senators who did the work, not to receive compliments myself.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate that. In all humility, the progress cannot be separated from the previous efforts of the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators who care to participate in this colloquy are granted adequate time.

Mr. MOSS. The senior Senator from New Mexico has shown the greatest of consideration in singling out Senators who have worked with him in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the water resources problems. I am grateful indeed to have had the things said which have been said about me.

The leadership, the driving force, the preparation behind the bills which have been discussed by the senior Senator from New Mexico really have come from his efforts, his knowledge, and his background. Senators who have had the opportunity to serve with him have the greatest of appreciation for his leadership and help.

I could not let this opportunity pass without pointing that out. I share the pride of the senior Senator from New Mexico in the many accomplishments which have been made in this field in the present session of Congress. I agree with the Senator that this is one of the greatest records ever made. It has been made in large measure as the result of the leadership of the senior Senator from New Mexico. Tribute should be paid to him today.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. As the Senator from New Mexico suspects—and no doubt wishes he did not have to suspect—I, too, would like to add a little correction for the record to the memorandum he put in.

It is true that the Senator from New Mexico is the recognized leader across the Nation in these efforts, and all of us are in his debt for the ability and steadfastness which he brings to the task.

I am grateful for the kind words the Senator spoke about me and about the efforts I have made in behalf of water resources as well as conservation in the Great Lakes region and the eastern section of the country. Again, his has been the leadership—his and that of the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and our own kind and effective majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The remarks of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] occur at a time when we have received word from the Bureau of the Budget that at last it has released the planning money for the Midwest Water Pollution Control laboratory at Ann Arbor. I very much hope that construction can proceed next year. This is an example of the kind of reaction which occurs as a result of the findings of the select committee and the leadership given by the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I believe it will be interesting to all Senators to know that since the years 1959 and 1960, when we traveled throughout the country, the people in the Great Lakes Basin have become quite water conscious. They know that their jobs and environment—whether life is worth living, even if one has a job—are dependent importantly on usable water. The people of the West have long been concerned about changing sand to green stuff, but we have begun to realize that the green stuff can turn into sand and that we should be as concerned and busy as those people in the West who, understandably, have long had a concern about water.

The Senator from New Mexico has properly said that the select committee never permitted partisanship or preconceived notions about the proper function of the Federal Government to affect its considerations and ultimately it conclusions.

I thank the Senator for his kind words about me—and I mean every one I said about him.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall that when I first came to the House of Representatives 21 years ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico was also a Member, as was the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I recall further that there were 16 Members from the Rocky Mountain States at that time, and the recognized leader of that group was the man who later became Secretary of Agriculture—one of the best this country has ever had. At that time he was serving as a Representative from the State of New Mexico.

I must say, in all honesty, that the inspiration for the committee to organize a group to look into water problems was furnished by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico himself. He may not recall it, but many years ago we were discussing water and its importance in relation to oil. At that time he told me the day was not far distant when—because of our increased population, the upsurge in industry, and other factors, all of which cause an increase in the use of water; plus the fact that our water table was declining—the people of the country would begin to recognize the importance of this problem not only in our part of the country, where the problem is endemic, but also in other parts of the country which had given little consideration to problems of water through the decades and centuries.

So it is my pleasure, and it is a personal pleasure, at this time to salute the leader from the Rocky Mountain States who has given us such sound advice over the years in both Houses of Congress and as Secretary of Agriculture, and who has joined in paying tribute and in giving due credit to the Senators he mentioned—the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], who has performed outstandingly in this body in the field of western resources; the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who took upon himself leadership in this most important problem in the Great Lakes area; the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] who faces the same problems we have in Montana, and who has worked long and hard to try to bring about a rectification of differences in that area; the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is now chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has followed in the footsteps of the Senator from New Mexico, as he himself has said, and who, like the Senator from New Mexico, during the second year of the 88th Congress is performing outstandingly as chairman of the committee.

The amount of good legislation coming out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, having to do with the resources of this Nation, for the benefit of our own people, is, I think, unrecognized in the country today; but all one has to do is look at the record of the 87th Congress, under the chairmanship in the committee of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], who is now the ranking Democrat of that committee, and the record this year of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who has kept alive the traditions and policies laid down by his predecessor, and who has added his own individual touches as well.

May I say also that what the distinguished Senator has said about the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], and other Senators, is well said, because all these Senators from the West have worked together as a unit in this particular problem. In this area there has been little activity in the field of partisanship, because what happens there happens to the whole region. What benefits that region benefits us all and the people who live there.

I again commend the Senator from New Mexico, who is now chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, for the unflagging efforts he has made over the years and the many contributions he has made toward making that area and the country a better place in which to live, and making the Rocky Mountain region a better place to raise families, to live, and to prosper.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

## POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 661, H.R. 5945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 19, after "Puerto Rico", to insert "unless prohibited by other law"; on page 3, after line 21, to strike out:

> (c) The Commission, acting through the President, is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency, to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authroized and directed to furnish such information and assistance without reimbursement.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> (c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under other law, without reimbursement.

And, on page 4, line 18, after "Puerto Rico", to strike out "at" and insert "no later than".

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill, as proposed to be amended, is to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico to study all factors which may have a bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico.

For many years considerable doubt has been expressed about the status of Puerto Rico. Various proposals have been made to change, modify, or clarify the relationship between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The burden of the effort here is to appoint a Commission which will report its findings to the Congress, the President, the legislature of Puerto Rico, and the Governor, without any binding obligation on the part of the executive branch or the Congress to carry out such recommendations.

I believe it is a sensible and reasonable proposal. The bill was reported unanimously from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I urge its approval.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I rise in support of the proposed legislation. It is a very desirable bill. It is purely an investigatory bill. Its aim is to straighten out some of the confusion which exists as a result of previous legislation giving the island of Puerto Rico a special political status.

There is a good deal of controversy on the island as to just what the status means. In English the status of Puerto Rico is described as a commonwealth. That is not an exact translation of the Spanish equivalent, in which it is described as an associated free state.

A great many people in the island feel that this status is highly desirable. Others feel it is enshrouded with much doubt.

The proposed Commission would be properly constituted, with representatives of both the Senate and the House, to be appointed by the respective authorities in those two bodies, with three Presidential appointees. In the future there will be some representatives from Puerto Rico according to a method of selection which the Puerto Ricans will approve. That is proper. The legislation would not commit Congress to accept the findings, but it would be in a better position to take appropriate action after the Commission had reported.

Puerto Rico has made gratifying gains—economic, cultural, spiritual—in the last quarter of a century. Every effort should be made to see that that progress is facilitated and not impaired. This legislation aims to help resolve questions which believers in democracy should desire to resolve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the committee amendments en bloc? If not, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## HATE IMAGE IS BLACKENING THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at a time of national crisis and tragedy such as we are now passing through, I am disturbed to find the action of a psychopathic fanatic being used to blacken the American character with the stigmas of hate inspired and violence oriented. Our reputation abroad as the leader of the free world, and our morale at home can only suffer from this unwarranted national character assassination that has been taking place in the news media and even in some of our churches.

The Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, in making this same point, quotes an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which clearly dispels the illusion that violence and hate are characteristic of American life, and recalls our attention bluntly to the fact that Lee Oswald was not a spokesman for antiadministration forces of the far right, by any stretch of the imagination, but was a professed Marxist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Dominion-News article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Let's Put Hate Where It Belongs

We rarely find ourselves in complete agreement with the unofficial spokesman of economic royalists'—meaning the Wall Street Journal, but in attempting to get this hate business into proper measure as it applies to our American people we couldn't be more in agreement in what it says so exceptionally well. We, therefore, quote this business journal as follows:

"From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all our unharnessed hates.

"The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

"The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place, how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great Civil War, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

"Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a varity of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

"In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

"No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

"It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

"In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

"Such qualities are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

"And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

"To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow."

## HATE IMAGE IS MISLEADING

**Mr. BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, a great injustice is being done toward this country in the press and even in some pulpits where sermonizing is taking place on the subject of hatred in America. The assassination of President Kennedy has touched off a virtual orgy of self-accusation which seeks, by an absurd type of reasoning, to blame this tragedy on an imaginary vicious streak in our citizenry.

An editorial in the December 1, 1963, issue of the Washington Star shows clearly the absurdity of such reasoning and the harmfulness of promulgating it at a time when national solidarity and coolheadedness are called for. It is the outpouring of genuine love and grief that deserves attention now, as a reflection of the true spirit of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Star editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HATRED AND HYSTERIA

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of hatred. The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the radical right—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our bloodstream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simple-minded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1900 years after the crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac, where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to reverence the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

## DANGERS OF VENEREAL DISEASE

**Mr. HILL.** Mr. President, Dr. George James, commissioner of health for the city of New York, has written me describing a revolutionary program which has been successful in alerting the people of his city to the dangers of venereal disease, a serious health menace. Dr. James' excellent letter graphically details the manner in which the Federal Government, the city of New York, and the advertising and television industries worked together to effectively, yet discreetly, deal with a subject about which the public had dangerously little information. I feel certain my colleagues will be interested in Dr. James' comments, and that this information may well be of help to other cities and States desirous of utilizing our mass communications media in the fight for a healthier America. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. James' letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH,
*October 29, 1963.*

Senator LISTER HILL,
*Senator Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HILL: Because of the alarming rise in the incidence of venereal diseases in our Nation and throughout the world, your Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be interested in how New York City is making known this dangerous situation.

The story I have to tell you is one of cooperation among Federal Government, a city government, and the communications industry.

As those concerned with the public welfare know, venereal diseases are easily cured if detected early. But most cases go unreported either through ignorance or shame. And most of the victims are teenagers. Untreated, these diseases ravage, and even kill.

About 2 years ago the Surgeon General discussed with New York City's Commissioner of Health the need to communicate the serious facts about venereal disease to the greatest number of people, with the impact necessary to bestir them to action. Television could do this, it was felt, if an advertising agency prepared the messages. New York City was envisaged as a test area. If it could be done here, it could be done anywhere.

Mr. Lawrence Valenstein, chairman of the executive committee of Grey Advertising, Inc., was asked if he would help with this project. He was most willing for Grey to participate in this worthwhile battle against disease.

The words "syphilis" and "gonorrhea" had not often been heard on commercial television stations previously. But we were convinced that television was a major medium to use for reaching teenagers and their parents. Grey quickly designed public service messages for TV. The words told what ("syphilis, gonorrhea"), who ("The victims? Mostly teenagers"), and how to get help (a special telephone number was set up by the Department of Health to give information to callers). The visual material was strictly symbolic—a dewy rosebud whose petals open, wilt, fall, and finally blow away. Television stations that were squeamish about the subject when approached changed their minds after seeing the finished film. Today, all but one of the seven TV stations in New York City are using the messages an average of 10 times weekly.

It is interesting to note that this venereal disease commercial was honored at the American film festival in New York as being best in the public service category. This fact has helped create acceptance with TV stations across the country.

The agency's work and the stations' time have of course been contributed as a public service.

Since the messages went on the air, health departments in Philadelphia, Chicago, and California, have requested copies in their cities. Other cities have made preliminary inquiries. Arrangements are being completed to make these prints available to stations all over the country.

It is yet too early for a full result story, but in 1962 there was just a slight increase in VD cases in New York City, compared with the 10.3-percent increase of 1961 over 1960. Still an increase, but a declining one.

We are convinced that the information

campaign will soon turn the figures into annual decreases. We hope the same happens in every city of our great Nation.

Thank you, Senator HILL, for your continued efforts on behalf of the public welfare.

Sincerely,

GEORGE JAMES, M.D.,
*Commissioner of Health.*

## VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

**Mr. McGOVERN.** Mr. President, I have learned this morning that four additional State Wheat Growers Associations last weekend endorsed the voluntary certificate approach to a wheat program effective on the 1964 crop.

The State associations in Idaho, Texas, South Dakota, Colorado, and Oregon passed resolutions endorsing the voluntary certificate approach at statewide meetings last week. The convention in Oregon acted to endorse a resolution previously adopted by the State association's board of directors. Other State wheat organizations previously endorsing the plan are: Missouri, Washington, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Oklahoma.

I am gratified to note that Chairman GRAHAM PURCELL of the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee is resuming hearings Wednesday on a wheat program for 1964 and subsequent years.

Mr. President, the wheatgrowers of the Nation have clearly demonstrated, by resolutions at one State convention after another and at the National Grange convention, that they want a wheat program, and that they are pretty well united behind the voluntary certificate approach.

I interpret Congressman PURCELL's resumption of hearings as a response to the growing demand and unity among wheatgrowers and I want to commend him for the timeliness of his action.

I am greatly encouraged that legislation on wheat may be finally enacted well in advance of spring planting, and that a prospective $600 million decline in farm income for next year as a result of a disastrous decline in wheat prices may be averted.

## NEBRASKA—WIDE-ANGLE STATE

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, it is well known that from time to time Senators, no less than Members of the other body, manage to overcome their modesty on behalf of their home States or districts and call the attention of their colleagues to certain virtues inherent therein.

It is in that tradition that I today offer an article which appeared in the Sunday New York Times travel section, entitled, "Wide-Angle State." It is in praise of Nebraska in the fall.

Written by William Stockdale, the article describes "the land of the big view, where there is no place for a sunrise or sunset to hide, and so there seem to be more and bigger sunrises and sunsets than almost anywhere else."

Mr. Stockdale describes the friendliness of Nebraskans, the quality of Nebraska beef, and frets only about the coffee, which he finds weaker than that served in the East, but concedes "it is always offered generously and cups are replenished endlessly for the same dime."

Those of us who love Nebraska are gratified at Mr. Stockdale's discovery of this fine State and are in full accord with his closing observation that "seeing Nebraska at this time of year is like warming oneself before a fireplace; and the glow lingers on."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Stockdale's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WIDE-ANGLE STATE—NOW THAT THE CORN IS GONE, NEBRASKA'S GREAT PLAINS ARE A STUDY IN BROWN

(By William Stockdale)

OMAHA, NEBR.—Where can one find a romantic, escapist land, one that is convenient, yet off the accustomed routes, and with friendly natives in interesting dress, fascinating night life, exotic food, and a relaxed way of life?

The South Seas? Uncharted islands in the Caribbean? No. Instead, one should note that at this very moment, planes are waiting at Idlewild and other airports, to whisk people to this magic land in a few hours. The place? Nebraska.

To have seen Paris in April, or Rio at carnival time, is to have done well. But no one can say he has truly lived until he has seen Nebraska in late fall.

#### LEGENDARY LAND

One arrives in this romantic land at the moment he crosses the broad, rolling Missouri. This is where the West begins. This is the legendary land of the overland trails, the intrepid pioneers, the Pawnee and Otoe, the pony express and names like Buffalo Bill and Wild Bill Hickok.

This is the land of the big view, where there is no place for a sunrise or a sunset to hide, and so there seem to be more and bigger sunrises and sunsets than almost anywhere else. And when the sun rises at the sensible hour of 7 o'clock at this time of year, there is a blast of color stretching from one side of the horizon to the other; it starts as deep orange and turns to gold just as the sun peeps dreamily over the flat sea of land.

This land is flat, yes. It is flat with hills, as the ocean is flat with waves. And from the crow's nest of a hotel window, one looks out over the broad expanse and feels as alone and apart as if he were at sea, many days from shore.

#### EMPTINESS STARTLING

Motoring over this land, one's first impulse is to be startled by the vast emptiness. Nothing to see, but the view of it is terrific.

This is due to nervous eyes, which are accustomed to taking in simultaneously auto junkyards, filling stations, billboards, traffic lights, highway signs, construction barriers, buildings, stores, people, stray dogs, children on bicycles, and flying pigeons.

It takes a little time to develop lazy eyes, which can drink in an endless expanse of land, broken only occasionally by a ranch house and some cattle. Even the creeping dinosaurlike combines have retreated into winter hibernation.

Still, there is much to see. This is a land of many colors—all of them brown. The thrill of Nebraska in late autumn is in the shades of brown to be discovered.

How different from New England. When the glorious colors of autumn there have died, the word "brown" becomes a term of reproach. In Nebraska, brown is a glorious color.

#### AUTUMN EVERYWHERE

It is not a dead brown, nor a mournful brown as one native described the brown of the west coast. It is a rich, warm, living brown. Brown is a restful color. Brown is autumn, and brown is everywhere.

Counting the shades of brown is an enterprise. There is the yellow-brown of the corn stubble on the fields, and there is the reddish brown of the stalks of sorghum left remaining after the harvest; these are best seen in the fading light of an afternoon sun.

There is the golden brown of the wheatfields, and the dark brown of plowed fields, revealing the richness of the soil.

There is the gray brown of the tree trunks and the lighter brown of the branches. Trees are to this landscape as islands are to water. Their branches in the autumn are naked, since relentless winds of the Great Plains have taken the leaves on long journeys.

#### RED-BROWN CATTLE

There is the weathered brown of the ranch buildings nestled in hollows, and the red brown of the cattle standing motionless over the rangeland, as if lost in thought. To an easterner, it might appear that they do have a faraway look and he might even wonder how they like living so far away from everything.

In the soil and in the crops are many shades of brown, each blending with the others in quiet harmony. There is nothing to break this restful expanse—no farmer's fruit stand, brilliant with orange pumpkins or baskets of dazzling red and yellow apples; no hanging jugs of orange cider suspended near a sign proclaiming antiques for sale.

No patient steeple pierces the brown landscape. All is brown, all is serene, all is calm as Christmas morning.

Towns break upon the scene as distinct surprises. They are found like a pendant at the end of a long chain of telephone poles.

On stopping, one finds friendly natives unspoiled by tourists. There is no language barrier, although natives may tell the stranger to go north, south, east, or west, instead of going right or left. This is because most roads and city streets are laid out on a straight north-south and east-west basis.

The talk of the natives at this time of year often runs to shooting deer and pheasant. "Got your freezer full of pheasant?" is a common question.

The native dress is colorful with the male sporting the flashier and more flamboyant attire. Some ranchers and cattle buyers wear light tan, broad-brimmed cowboy hats and boots, while other farmers appear in blue denim overalls with engineers' hats.

If he is watchful, the visitor may see an Indian. Colored, feathered headdress and war paint are no longer in fashion, and may not be counted on to give the Indian away. Actually, he tends more toward conservative dress in the Madison Avenue style. He can best be distinguished by his quiet manners and unobtrusive bearing.

The tourist will find the food midcontinental. Specialties of the region are fine steaks and thick slices of roast beef. The Nebraska car-license plate proclaims itself "The Beef State," and not a single restaurant menu is likely to let guests forget it.

"Nebraska beef" is a headlined item, and a good steak in this bargain haven costs half what a comparable steak might cost in Boston or New York. Pork chops from local corn-fed pigs are another native dish.

#### GOURMET DINING

Seafood is available, as is gourmet dining. A leading hotel in Grand Island, third largest city in the State with about 25,000 people, advertises a Sunday evening "continental supper smörgasbord" at $2.85. It includes shrimp, lobster, and exotic delicacies.

Most good cafes and restaurants feature inexpensive dining, and a restaurant in

Kearney offers a Sunday night smörgasbord of beef, ham, and fried chicken for $1.25. Sometimes a restaurant will feature home-baked pastries, and one little cafe serves doughnuts that the owner makes herself.

The tourist visiting this region may find that the coffee is generally weaker than that served in the East. However, it is always offered generously, and cups are replenished endlessly for the same dime.

The tourist looking for some little souvenir distinctive of the region can visit a saddle shop, where saddles can be purchased for anywhere from $80 to $300. Saddle shops also sell cowboy boots, lariats, halters, spurs, and similar items that would make good conversation pieces for anyone not owning a horse. One shop features a window display of electric branding irons, the perfect Christmas gift for the man who has everything.

Seeing Nebraska at this time of year is like warming oneself before a fireplace. And the glow lingers on.

## THE CATTLE INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, among the items listed for possible duty reductions during the forthcoming "Kennedy round" of international tariff negotiations are cattle and beef.

These items are on the list in spite of the recent phenomenal increase in beef imports at the present low rates, and in spite of the impact of these imports on our domestic prices for cattle. On many occasions I have spoken out against our policy of permitting these mounting imports. In my opinion, it is ridiculous even to consider additional reductions in the tariff rates on cattle and beef.

Hearings on the cattle and beef tariffs are to be held this afternoon by the Trade Information Committee and tomorrow morning by the Tariff Commission, at which it is my intention to make a personal appearance. The case against the reductions is expressed briefly and well in statements submitted by Robert H. Howard, secretary-treasurer of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and by C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. I ask unanimous consent to have these two statements inserted in the RECORD at this point, and also to have inserted my own statement which I have prepared to be submitted to the Tariff Commission tomorrow.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To: The Tariff Commission, the Trade Information Committee.

From: The Nebraska Stock Growers Association, Alliance, Nebr.

This association represents cattle producers throughout the State of Nebraska. It was organized in 1888 principally as a deterrent to cattle theft. Later in its tenure, new phases of interest became a part of its service to the cattle industry of Nebraska.

A matter of great importance to the cattle producers of this State is the present situation regarding beef imports and tariffs. Nebraska is particularly a large cattle producing and feeding State. Statistics show it to rank third in the Nation in total cattle numbers as well as in beef cattle numbers.

While the United States is the greatest meat producer in the world, we are working toward becoming the greatest meat importer. According to our best statistics, the United States holds second place next to the United Kingdom among meat importers and we are about eleventh among the exporters. We are not suggesting the importing of meat and meat products be discontinued entirely but we feel that there should be more quota controls and fair tariffs to help the American livestock industry recover to a level where decent profits may accrue to the producers and feeders.

More than 10 percent of our domestic consumption of beef is now made up of foreign imports and we maintain that this 10 percent could be cut, whereas it seems that it is increasing each year.

Information has been released indicating that, with our growing population, we will need 25 million more beef cattle by 1970 than we now have on hand. We feel assured that the livestock industry will be able to provide enough beef cattle to meet the growing population, here in the United States, the same way the farmer has been able to increase his production of feed grains on reduced acreage, through improved efficiency and techniques. Such information has been misleading to foreign countries who are not familiar with our markets and ability to produce livestock and feeds.

We further believe that industrial and agricultural tariffs ought to be considered as a package, if and when negotiation is made with any foreign country. Any percentage decrease in our beef imports today would tend to stabilize and stimulate the present livestock markets in the United States.

Attest:

ROBERT M. HOWARD,
*Secretary-Treasurer, Nebraska Stock Growers Association.*

---

### SUMMARY BY C. W. MCMILLAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

The position of the American National Cattlemen's Association is that fresh, chilled, frozen, cooked, and preserved beef and beef products as well as live cattle (100.40, 100.43, 100.45, 100.53, 100.55, 106.10, 107.20, and 107.25) should be taken off the preliminary negotiation list for a cut of the present existing tariffs on these products by 50 percent or elimination entirely of the duties now in effect.

The above position is based on the following points which are covered in detail in our brief:

1. The economic importance of the cattle and beef industry and the interdependence of agriculture and a dynamic American economy.

2. The phenomenal growth and potential of the cattle industry can provide ample quantities of high-quality beef for the immediate- and long-range future needs of our discerning customers, the consumers of the United States.

3. The present tariff levels for the United States are among the lowest of any of the world trade community.

4. Current levels of imports are having extremely adverse economic impact on our domestic beef cattle industry and further reductions in the present existing tariff would prove catastrophic to the major source of income for the ranchers and farmers of this country.

5. The beef cattle business does not lend itself to the concepts of free trade since there is no other alternative use for the major resources utilized by the beef cattle business—the harvesting of grasses and roughages.

6. This country must maintain a steady and ready source of food and fiber for both peace and war. Our dynamic agriculture is a most effective tool in supporting our world leadership.

7. The American National Cattlemen's Association in summary would recommend that the opposite position be taken of tariff cutting proposed in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as it affects the domestic cattle and beef industry. We recommend that a quota system be established whereby the exporting countries could continue to participate in our market, but that the world supplies of beef and live cattle would not be continually "dumped" on the U.S. market. There is ample precedent for such action.

#### INTRODUCTION

My name is C. W. McMillan. I am executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo. The American National Cattlemen's Association represents 37 State cattlemen's and cattle feeder's associations, thousands of individual members and over 100 breed, regional and local associations throughout the country. We are pleased to have an opportunity to present their views before both the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission on the economic implications on the domestic beef cattle industry of the upcoming negotiations in Geneva.

#### ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE CATTLE AND BEEF INDUSTRY

The very basis for a sound, prosperous agriculture is the livestock industry, and more particularly the beef cattle business. Twenty out of every $100 in sales in 1962 for agriculture were derived from cattle and calves. The gross income from live cattle and calves has increased from $1.4 billion in 1940 to $8.3 billion in 1962.

Agriculture is a huge customer for the output of the U.S. industries. It invests more than $26 billion in goods and services, and the average farm family expenditure is almost $10,000 annually. Agriculture as a whole grosses in excess of $37 billion annually and its equity in assets is in excess of 90 percent.

Quoting from a research program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in its Agricultural Economic Report No. 28, entitled "Agriculture and Economic Growth":

"The United States provides an outstanding example of what an efficient agriculture can do for the economic growth of the country.

"A marked increase in food supplies helps to set in motion the whole process of economic development. A rapid advance in agriculture productivity means increased food supplies at relatively lower prices. Because wage earners need less of their income to buy food, the effective money demands for other goods increases. This makes it possible for entrepreneurs to expand output of nonagricultural goods and to make additional investments in their production. At the same time the increase in farm productivity releases workers to industry which can afford to hire them because of the expanded demand for its products."

This study also pointed out the high relationship of the decrease in percent of a labor force in agriculture and the increase in per capita income. This decrease in labor force is due to increased use of capital by agriculture.

Item 1 in the Appendix graphically points out the importance an efficient agriculture has on the total economy. For example, the percent of disposable income spent on food and nonalcoholic beverages has decreased from an approximate average of 27 percent in 1912–16 to the present level of 19 percent thus realizing more disposable income for other goods and services.

Since the raising and feeding of beef cattle is the major factor in agriculture, the data as well points out its importance to the economy. Therefore, any decision which might be made by our Government adversely affecting the beef cattle community would be felt throughout the entire structure of our economy.

It should be noted also that any action that damages the efficiency of the cattle industry also adversely affects the economic life of thousands of communities the country over. To permit this through even further reduction in our tariffs on cattle and beef, would also directly affect employment on the thousands of ranches and related segments of the industry to the extent of millions of man-hours.

### GROWTH OF THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

In 1948 cattle on hand numbered a little over 77 million head, whereas on January 1, 1963, we had over 103 million. In 1940 we consumed 8.23 billion pounds carcass weight and in 1962 we consumed 17.3 billion pounds (civilian consumption). Per capita consumption of beef was increased from the 1940 level of 54.9 pounds to an estimated 95 pounds in 1963. (See item 2 in appendix.) It has been determined that approximately 70 percent of the total tonnage of all harvested crops were fed to livestock. Beef cattle and calves account for more than 42 percent of the consumption of all feedstuffs produced, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture studies.

The most recent agricultural census found there were roughly 4 million farms and 2.5 million had cattle and calves. Over 1 billion acres of land are involved either in cropland used for pasture, open permanent pasture, woodland pasture, open grazing, and woodland grazing, indicating the tremendous utilization by cattle and calves of this important economic resource.

With this huge production plant, plus the potential that will be realized as production on the land increases (an increase of 80 percent from 1950 to 1975 is estimated in "Long-Term Production Prospects for Western Agriculture," an Economic Research Service publication, May 1963) together with improved breeding, it is evident that our domestic beef plant will be able abundantly to supply domestic demand. All the industry needs is economic incentive.

### TARIFF LEVELS FOR THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES

It is pertinent, we believe, to review briefly the present tariff levels on the items of primary interest to the beef cattle producers. These items in Agricultural Handbook No. 143, fall under schedule 1, 100.40, 100.43, 100.45, 100.53, 100.55, 106.10, 107.20, and 107.25.

In 1930 the tariff on beef and veal was 6 cents per pound and this was reduced in 1947 to the present 3 cents per pound. The United States reduced the tariff on cattle under 200 pounds from 2½ to 1½ cents a pound on the first 200,000 head coming into this country annually. The rate on cattle weighing 200 to 700 pounds is 2½ cents; on those weighing over 700 pounds it was reduced from 3 to 1½ cents per pound for not over 400,000 head entering in a 12-month period with not more than 120,000 head entering in any one quarter. Cattle entering in excess of this number carry a duty of 2½ cents per pound. Preserved meats and those not otherwise specified were reduced from 20 to 10 percent on an ad valorem basis.

Since general price levels in the United States have more than doubled since 1930, the tariff reduction from 6 to 3 cents on beef and veal actually amounts to less than 1½ cents in terms of 1930 prices as compared with present price levels. Cow prices are now at about $14 per hundredweight as compared with only $7 in 1930, reflecting the general inflation. The present tariff has become insignificant as a deterrent to imports of beef and live cattle. To give the same degree of protection as we had in 1930, the present tariff level would have to be increased more than 550 percent. We call your particular attention to item 3 in the appendix, figures by the U.S. Department of Commerce dealing with ad valorem equivalents in 1930 and the 1962 rates of duty on live cattle, beef and veal—fresh, frozen, canned and preserved.

Based on a study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service, the United States has steadily been reducing its duties on agricultural imports since enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act some 30 years ago. The study found that the average tariff rates on dutiable agricultural imports have been reduced from 88 percent in 1932 to 10 percent in 1949, with slight reductions since that period. The average duty imposed on U.S. agricultural imports is lower than those on U.S. nonagricultural imports.

Paralleling the reductions in our duties on agricultural imports has been a tremendous increase in cost of production for the domestic industries, particularly in agriculture. Although total farm income has increased slightly since the midforties, the production expenses have increased at a much more rapid rate (see item 4 in appendix). Along with increasing cost of production and slight increase in net farm income, there has been a drop in the purchasing power (see item 5 in appendix). More particularly and perhaps more discouraging, as an example, is the income and expense figure indicating relationship between gross income and net ranch income for cattle ranches in the Southwest (see item 6 in appendix).

Concurrently with the increased cost of production and decreases in duties on agricultural imports, we find that other countries have either maintained or increased their nontariff import controls as well as their import duties (see item 7 in appendix). It is obvious from these supporting data that the direction that the United States has been going, both in their tariffs and other import requirements, is in the opposite direction from the members of the world trade community with whom we deal.

The United States is the envy of the world in agricultural production. No other country produces the abundance of food and fiber with only 8 percent of its population engaged in primary agriculture. No other country has the supplies of healthful and nutritious food that the United States has been fortunate enough to attain. No other country in the world has the enviable health status of domestic animals as well as row crop agriculture.

It is imperative, therefore, that nothing be done in the upcoming negotiations in Geneva to jeopardize the present quarantine procedures protecting our agriculture. This is an animal health problem exclusively and not related to the economics of foreign trade. Any relaxation of quarantines imposed by other than scientific facts could prove absolutely disastrous to the domestic livestock industry.

### PRESENT TARIFF LEVELS NO DETERRENT TO PROTECTING OUR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

The United States consumes one-third of the total world's supply of beef and veal. We have pointed out earlier the potential of the domestic beef cattle industry, based on past history, having the capabilities to provide the consuming public with a continuous supply of a high-quality product.

In 1957 the imports of live cattle and beef and veal amounted to 3.9 percent of our domestic production. In 1962, a record year, imports amounted to approximately 11 percent of our total production. For the first 8 months of 1963, on a carcass weight basis, beef and veal imports were 22 percent above the first 8 months of 1962.

On a carcass weight equivalent basis, the United States in 1953 imported 9.3 percent of the total world meat imports. This amount jumped to 24 percent in 1962, due mainly to increased imports of beef and veal and live cattle. According to the Foreign Agriculture Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the United States is now the largest importer of beef in the world (see items 6a and 7a in appendix).

As a matter of fact, a major concern to the domestic beef cattle producer is that the U.S. market is becoming the dumping ground for the world supplies of meats, particularly beef and veal. Unless corrective measures are taken, additional burdensome amounts will continue to flood our domestic market.

The two best examples of two countries which have shared materially in the expanded export market to the United States are Australia and New Zealand (see item 8 in appendix). These two countries currently are responsible for approximately 80 percent of our beef and veal imports. On a recent trip to these countries, we learned that their cost of production is roughly half that of ours. Also these countries are actively encouraging an expansion of their world trade in beef and veal particularly to the U.S. market. Such things as rapid write-off on investment for improvements, allowing these investments also to be handled as operating expenses, and other factors have greatly accelerated their beef production potential.

In combination with our high U.S. prices for beef, those two nations have added incentive for additional exports. Another reason that both New Zealand and Australia have so materially increased their exports to our market is the fact that these countries now have a modified commitment to the United Kingdom for meat. This has allowed them to divert more of their exportable beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to the U.S. market. To accomplish this, they have decreased their own per capita consumption of beef—mainly because the export market has raised the price to the consumers in those countries. It is fitting to note the high degree that these two countries protect their agriculture from foreign competition: 100 percent for New Zealand and 41 percent for Australia.

With investments in the United States of $700 to $1,000 per cow unit, it is difficult for us to compete without some degree of protection from excessive imports.

A further disadvantage is that imports of cattle, beef and beef products amount to 12 times the value of exports of like products. The figures for 1962 were: exports $34.6 million, imports $412 million.

### CONCEPTS OF FREE TRADE NOT APPLICABLE TO THE BEEF CATTLE INDUSTRIES

When the Trade Expansion Act was initiated in the Congress, a theory of free trade was proposed to justify its enactment. In essence, it said that countries should produce those products in which they are most efficient and trade with other countries for other needed items in which they are not as efficient. However intrinsic to this assumption is that those countries involved can make the necessary shifts from one product to another for maximum productivity and efficiency. That is to say that the productive unit needed to put out products is a variable one easily adapted to changing circumstances. This cannot be the case with beef cattle. Beef cattle in the main depend upon using a resource, grass, that has no other alternative economic use. The cattle industry cannot relocate or retool for an alternative use for its plant.

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

In our judgment, the commodities to which we refer, now on the preliminary list for possible negotiation in cutting the tariff by 50 percent or to zero must be removed from such consideration. The current level of imports at over 11 percent of our consumption is serving as a severe economic depressant in the cattle industry. This is particularly true in combination with record supplies of domestic cattle and beef and the outlook for rather wide areas of drought with the possibility of forced liquidation. Using the conservative figure of 10 percent of our total production of beef and veal as being imported on a carcass weight equivalent basis then it is evident, based on the judgment of many economists, these imports are reducing the average price of our beef cattle between $3 and $4 per hundredweight alive. And further, if we compare imports for 1962 to the domestic production of manufacturing type beef, we find imports approach 40 percent of our total consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has pointed out in numerous of their publications that beef is its own worst competitor or that increase in supplies of beef or veal have more effect on price than changes in supplies of pork, chicken, lamb, etc.

Further the argument has been put forth that the present imports do not compete with "block" beef. This assumption ignores two facts: (1) Beef is its own worst competitor and (2) that a large percent of the imports of beef and veal are used for hamburger.

Rather than removal or reduction of the present tariffs, the American National Cattlemen's Association proposes that a system of quotas be established based on an average of imports over a period of time. This, in our judgment, would give the exporting countries of the world access to our market, and an opportunity to share in our expanding market. This as well would give some degree of stability to the domestic beef cattle market. There are many existing precedents for taking such an approach.

No other country has a more casual attitude toward its food supplies than the United States. It is taken for granted by the consumer that it will be there when they want it. Only in the case of a national emergency, such as the Cuban crisis, is the public interested in stockpiling food. Under normal conditions this is the responsibility of the producer, processor, transporter, and retailer complex.

Many people assume because fewer and fewer people are actively engaged in primary agriculture, it is playing a smaller and smaller role in our total economy. Not many years ago the responsibility of producing the food and fiber for this country rested on the shoulders of the many. Today this responsibility is on the shoulders of the few. However, with the increased population the task is even more formidable and the responsibility even greater with many additional industries and workers involved.

The following, among the points covered in the body of our brief, is justification to support the recommendation of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

1. This country should never find itself in the same position as did Great Britain during the early stages of the Second World War. They were largely dependent on imports of food products from countries of the United Kingdom as well as the United States, but these sources were virtually cut off. Will America profit by history, or will we too become dependent upon outside sources for food and fiber?

2. It is necessary to maintain primary agriculture as well as associated industries; for example, one strong reason is the responsibility of agriculture to maintain local government, particularly schools. This source of support is the ad valorem property tax. To help pay this tax means you must have profits in agriculture.

3. The Trade Expansion Act and the entire trade position of the United States has been directed toward more liberal trade policy. Many countries have taken the opposite tack; for example, the European Common Market is establishing common tariff walls, thereby increasing many of their food products so that they may become more self-sufficient. These barriers to trade are rather subtle, taking the form of import licenses, special taxes that affect only products produced outside of the European Common Market and high subsidies within these countries are to encourage maximum food production, as well as higher aggregate tariffs on some items. Is it logical for the United States to move in the opposite direction in our trade policies?

4. Are U.S. industries and our Government willing or able to find other markets to replace the loss of domestic agricultural use of such products as petroleum, steel, machinery and many other items because of dislocation in agriculture resulting in our "free" trade policies?

5. The United States, particularly since the post-World War II period, has exported technology and tools to many countries. This technology and the tools to apply it have materially increased the world expansion of meats, particularly beef. The United States is the world's best cash market for these increasing supplies of beef entering world commerce, and in many cases those countries will literally "take the meat from the mouths of their people" to export beef to satisfy their demands for gold by shipping it to the United States.

We hope the expedient of simply gaining some temporary trade advantage will not prevail at the expense of a continuing sound domestic cattle industry which is basic to an efficient agriculture.

---

### Statement by Hon. Roman L. Hruska, U.S. Senator From Nebraska, to the U.S. Tariff Commission, in Opposition to Proposed Duty Reductions on Cattle, Beef, and Hides, December 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my appearance here today is for the purpose of objecting to any reductions in the tariffs covering cattle, and all beef and veal and products thereof. Of these, the most important are live cattle (items Nos. 100.40 through 100.55); beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen (item 106.10); and canned beef (items 107.20 and 107.50). These items are mentioned specifically without intending thereby to imply, by omission, that I am not opposed to reductions in tariffs on other beef and veal products.

Tariffs on cattle and particularly on certain types of beef are already low, and imports are already flooding in, each year more than during the year before. In 1962, beef and veal imports reached an alltime record of 1,445 million pounds (carcass weight equivalent). As recently as 1957 they were less than 400 million pounds; thus, in 5 years the increase was more than 3½ times. Imports during the first 9 months of 1963 have run almost 200 million pounds ahead of the corresponding period of 1962.

Thus, we seem to be headed for another record year on imports. Meanwhile, we are also close to a record low price for cattle, at least for the postwar period. As imports have gone up, prices have gone down.

During November of last year the price of choice steers in Chicago averaged $30.13 a hundred. In November of this year, the corresponding average price was $23.51. That is not a decline in price—it is a total collapse.

Your attention is particularly invited to the fact that the November 1963, average—$23.50—is the lowest November average since cattle and meat were taken out from OPA control in 1946, with the exception of a single year.

The cattle industry is simply up against it, gentlemen, and I do not believe you are justified in imposing further serious injury on it by additional reductions in duty. Duties are too low already.

Furthermore, in my judgment the present structure of tariff rates is illogical and "out of kilter" to such a degree that the rates still in effect fail to provide even the limited degree of protection they are supposed to.

The great volume of beef is entering under the rate of beef or veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, 3 cents a pound. The rate is 3 cents a pound whether it is beef with the bone in, or boneless beef. The foreign packinghouse can save on the duty by taking the bone out and removing excess fat and other waste before shipping the beef. Thus the weight of the shipment is sharply reduced while little of value is removed.

We are told by the Agriculture Department that 1 pound of boneless beef is equivalent, on the average, to 1.45 pounds of beef carcass. In other words, by performing the boning operation before shipment the shipper in effect pays the equivalent of only 2 cents a pound in tariff, compared with the tariff he would have had to pay if he had shipped whole carcasses, from which the bone would be removed in this country.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture figures that the carcass weight of imported cattle is equivalent, on the average, to only about 53 percent of the live weight on the animals. Thus, figuring back to the tariff equivalent on the live cattle, 3 cents a pound duty on boneless beef corresponds to only a little over 1 cent a pound on the live animal.

The duty on feeder cattle is 2½ cents a pound and on heavy cattle (over 700 pounds) is 1½ or 2½ cents. These duties on live cattle don't give the protection they should, since the product comes in anyhow in the form of boneless beef and takes away the market of the men who raise the cattle and operate the feedlots.

In other words, the low duty on boneless beef is a loophole in the tariff structure, since it is lower, relatively speaking, than the rest of the scale of duties on cattle and beef. It operates as a sort of gigantic funnel through which these tremendous and increasing imports of beef have been poured into this country from abroad.

Now we have reached the ridiculous point where more than 10 percent of our beef supply comes from abroad, although we could certainly increase beef production here to an almost unlimited extent—to whatever level the market would absorb.

If any duty is to be changed, therefore, it is suggested that the duty on boneless beef be increased, instead of decreased, and thereby the tariff structure will at least be restored to a more logical form.

While I am about it, I will also register a protest against any reduction in the duty on cattle hides (item 120.13). This duty is only 4 percent ad valorem now and can hardly be called a serious impediment to trade. I realize that we export a great deal more cattle hides than we import, but those exports go chiefly to countries that have serious deficits in their domestic sources of hides. They must import because they cannot produce enough for their own needs. With us the case is different, and in my opinion this very moderate production given to a byproduct of the meatpacking industry tends to strengthen the general cattle market to a degree. We sorely need any source of strength we can find.

It is not my purpose today to go into an extended analysis of markets, prices, competitive factors, and the like. However, I have one general recommendation to put before you covering the whole field of tariffs on agricultural products.

In this country we employ few quantitative restrictions and other nontariff restrictions against imports. On most agricultural imports we apply only our rather low scale of tariffs.

With most other countries this is not so. According to a study recently made by the Department of Agriculture, every single important trading country included in the study made far greater use of nontariff barriers—quotas, licensing systems, variable levies, state monopolies, and the like. For example, 93 percent of the farm production of West Germany is protected against imports by nontariff barriers, 94 percent of that of France, 63 percent of that of Italy, 76 percent of that of Japan, and even for the United Kingdom, 37 percent. I introduce in evidence a table, taken from the Department of Agriculture publication entitled "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," showing the percent of domestic agricultural production protected by nontariff trade barriers for each of the following countries: the United States, France, West Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Belgium, Greece, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

Also, I ask to have included in the record at the conclusion of my remarks a similar table making the same kind of comparison, but for livestock and meat only. Again, the United States is conspicuous by the fact that we do not resort to nontariff trade barriers to protect our American livestock and meat producers, whereas almost all other principal foreign countries do. For example, France, Germany, and Italy all use some form of nontariff barrier to protect their own domestic livestock and meat industries, to the extent of 95 to 100 percent. We do not utilize any form of protection except a tariff, for this country, and the only other countries in this study of which the same statement can be made are Canada and Australia.

Third, I present as evidence a tabulation of "Quantitative restrictions maintained on imports by certain foreign countries," compiled by the State Department and reprinted in a joint committee print of the Joint Economic Committee entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments—Perspective and Policies." This tabulation lists all the commodity imports on which quantitative restrictions are imposed by the following countries: Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and several other countries. The lists of imports thus controlled through quotas or licensing systems by these countries are lengthy. Not all of such items are agricultural products, but most of them are. These lists thus reinforce what the Department of Agriculture has also discovered—that, by and large, quantitative or other nontariff devices are major instruments of policy in restricting agricultural imports by many of the principal commercial countries of the world.

The point is simply this. There is no use talking about "tariff bargaining" on farm products if other countries rely primarily on import restrictions other than tariffs.

This country needs a wholly new approach to the subject of foreign trade policy in farm products. Other countries again and again have given us reductions in their tariffs on our farm products, then nullified those reductions by imposing some different type of barrier. Meanwhile, we have steadily reduced our own tariff rates on agricultural products along with manufactured goods. We have given the farmer empty promises of the foreign markets we would secure for him, while simultaneously cutting away the protection which in the past at least preserved for him his market at home.

Until we find some effective way to breach these foreign nontariff trade barriers against our agricultural exports, I urge that we cease making reductions in our own tariffs on agricultural products. Instead of continuing with indiscriminate tariff cutting, I recommend that the administration devote itself to finding some means of inducing foreign countries to get away from their systems of variable levies, import licenses, and the like.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of the proportion of agricultural production benefiting from nontariff import controls in the United States and selected important agricultural countries*

| Country: | *Percentage* |
|---|---|
| United States | 26 |
| France [1] | 94 |
| West Germany [1] | 93 |
| Netherlands [1] | 79 |
| Italy [1] | 63 |
| Belgium [1] | 76 |
| Greece [1] | 82 |
| Austria [2] | 91 |
| Denmark [2] | 87 |
| Norway [2] | 97 |
| Portugal [2] | 100 |
| Sweden [2] | (3) |
| Switzerland [2] | 94 |
| United Kingdom [2] | [4] 37 |
| Canada | 41 |
| Australia | 41 |
| New Zealand | 100 |
| Japan | 76 |

[1] European Economic Community countries.

[2] European Free Trade Association countries.

[3] Neither total output in terms of value, or representative prices for majority of commodities are available.

[4] Because this analysis is limited to direct restrictions on imports it does not take into account the operation of the United Kingdom deficiency payment system, extent or manner of payments to farmers, or impact of the system on prices and imports.

Source: "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS–Foreign–60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Livestock and meat: Proportion of the value of domestic production protected against imports by nontariff trade barriers, selected countries*

[In millions of dollars]

| Country | Total value | Protected value | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| France | 2,479 | 2,355 | 95.0 |
| West Germany | 2,349 | 2,231 | 95.0 |
| Netherlands | 475 | 452 | 95.2 |
| Italy | 1,136 | 1,136 | 100.0 |
| Belgium | 341 | 156 | 45.7 |
| Greece | 109 | 109 | 100.0 |
| Austria | 310 | 310 | 100.0 |
| Denmark | 560 | 560 | 100.0 |
| Norway | 112 | 106 | 94.6 |
| Portugal | 102 | 102 | 100.0 |
| Switzerland | 242 | 232 | 95.9 |
| United Kingdom | 1,355 | 456 | 33.7 |
| Canada | 854 | 0 | 0 |
| Australia | 531 | 0 | 0 |
| New Zealand | 312 | 311 | 100.0 |
| Japan | 618 | 355 | 57.4 |
| United States | 9,255 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Compiled from data in "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS-Foreign-60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture. See that publication for precise statements of coverage and of use of terms, limitations of the data, and original sources.

## DAVID LAWRENCE PAYS TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report of December 2, 1963, published an article, "The Incredible Tragedy," by David Lawrence, worthy of preservation in the permanent archives of this Nation. This is a fine tribute to the memory of our gallant fallen leader, the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE INCREDIBLE TRAGEDY

(By David Lawrence)

The American people and the peoples of the whole world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy.

For the assassin's bullet ended the life of a young man whose sincerity of purpose, dedication to duty, and devotion to what he believed was right characterized his service to the United States. Even as he had responded to the cheers of the crowds and had ridden happily in an open automobile through the streets of Dallas, Tex., he reflected the confidence of a man with faith in his fellow citizens.

What shall we say of the insane impulse which caused a despicable individual to destroy the President of this great country? Americans, regardless of party or faction, believe in morality and in respect for human life.

Three times before in American history a President has been killed while in office—Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley. In each instance, individuals, of an erratic or unbalanced mentality were responsible. This strange hand of fate has taken from the White House four men of dedicated character. It is difficult to understand these tragic events in our history. For as a President is removed from this mortal life in a few minutes, there emerges a feeling that life and sudden death, even in high office, are beyond the comprehension of our finite minds.

We do know that every year the number of crimes committed by deranged individuals is increasing. Can we not devise some means of detecting in advance the symptoms of such behavior in our society?

The Secret Service has grappled with this problem for decades. Observation of the houses and buildings along a parade route, inspection in advance, and a multitude of bodyguards close at hand have evidently provided no sure preventive.

It was during a theater performance in Washington, on the night of April 14, 1865, that Abraham Lincoln, sitting in the Presidential box, was shot by an erratic individual, who was subsequently killed for his crime by soldiers in pursuit of him.

James A. Garfield was shot by a disappointed officeseeker as he was entering the railroad station in Washington on July 2, 1881. His assailant was hanged.

William McKinley was shot by a man who came up to shake hands with him after a Presidential speech at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 6, 1901. The revolver was concealed beneath a big handkerchief and thus escaped notice. The assassin, an anarchist, was electrocuted.

These happenings cast a cloud of gloom over the whole of our country. But somehow we do not seem to be able to forestall such incidents.

One wonders whether Presidents will venture hereafter to make public appearances except in halls and auditoriums under tight security guard. But our Presidents have been brave men who seem to feel that they must go before the people and take the risks that come with the duties of high office.

John F. Kennedy had that spirit of bravery and felt that he must see the people frequently, without regard to danger. On these pages in 1959 there was printed a detailed story of Lieutenant Kennedy's heroic exploits as commander of a PT boat in the Pacific during World War II. He was never governed by fear. His personal courage has been demonstrated on more than one occasion.

Mr. Kennedy came into office at a crucial time in world history when emotions ran high and differences of opinion on domestic and foreign questions were deepseated. But no President has tackled as many problems and such a variety of delicate and difficult issues as those into which John F. Kennedy delved so deeply during his 34 months in office.

President Kennedy listened patiently to his advisers and showed a remarkable familiarity with detail. Perhaps his outstanding characteristic was his readiness to listen to the arguments of those who disagreed with him. If a resolution of differences were possible so as to lessen friction and bring about an agreement, he conscientiously sought such a solution. He had shown the same attitude when he was in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. Kennedy manifested, in other words, a spirit of mediation and a desire to attain out of every controversy the maximum good for the public. For he adopted again and again the maxim that "half a loaf is better than none."

In world affairs, Mr. Kennedy exhibited a rare quality of patience and restraint. Whatever setbacks his administration may have encountered around the world, the fact remains that he tried his utmost to preserve peace for his country while maintaining the military strength so necessary to deter an enemy.

It is hard to believe that our President is dead at 46. It is hard to believe that this man who sought so earnestly to serve his country should be cut down in the prime of life.

This is an incredible tragedy.

## FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS VETERANS' NURSING HOME CARE BILL

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senate to a very important bill, H.R. 8009, which is presently before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. This bill is designed to provide nursing home care and nursing home care facilities to deal with the problems of our aging veterans population. I would like to announce at this time that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs will hold its second day of hearings on this bill, tomorrow, December 10, at 10 in room 4232 of the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. R. A. Means, the national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association, in which he states his organization's support for the goal of H.R. 8009.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.*

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I have read with great interest your newsletter of Thursday, November 21. I hope and pray you will keep behind this most serious problem.

The need for a solution of these nursing home care cases is mounting daily, as you know. I have just today had a case of one of our members in Georgia who is dying of cancer. He needs no further hospitalization per se at this moment but his aging wife is unable to help take care of him. This is just one of many we receive constantly.

In the very near future the Fleet Reserve Association will forward to you a study concerning the medical problems and hospitalization in particular for retired career men which we are preparing. I know you will be interested in the way we see the problem and our recommended solution.

I just wanted to let you know that the more than 53,000 career Navy and Marine Corps enlisted personnel of the Fleet Reserve Association appreciate your interest in our problems.

My very best wishes for a happy holiday season.

Yours in loyalty, protection, and service,
R. A. "BOB" MEANS,
*National Secretary.*

## FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, I have received in my office a copy of the official messages of tribute from France to the late, beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In addition, there are comments from French newspapers and other expressions of public opinion. These touching tributes from our great sister republic in Europe, and from the first nation to come to the aid of the embattled colonies in our War of Independence, move the American people with all our old sentiments of love for our ally, France.

General de Gaulle, by coming to the funeral of our late President, and leading the march of foreign dignitaries behind the casket of our late President, won new esteem and affection from the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the following publication from Ambassade de France, entitled "France's Tribute to the Late President Kennedy," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY—GENERAL DE GAULLE'S STATEMENT—OFFICIAL MESSAGES—GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS THE FUNERAL—FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

General de Gaulle's statement on the death of President Kennedy:

"President Kennedy died like a soldier, under fire, in the line of duty, and in the service of his country.

"In the name of the French people, ever the friend of the American people, I salute his great example and his great memory."

### OFFICIAL MESSAGES

Message to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy from General and Madam de Gaulle: "The great sorrow that has just befallen you distresses my wife and myself to the bottom of our hearts. Rest assured that we are with you in our thoughts and in our prayers. President Kennedy shall never be forgotten."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from General de Gaulle, President of the Republic:

"The death of President Kennedy is a source of deep sorrow to the French people, who held in the highest esteem this great head of State, illustrious servant of freedom and of the destiny of mankind.

"In the face of a misfortune which so profoundly affects your country and which concerns all the peoples of the world, and at a time when fate bestows upon you the highest responsibilities, rest assured, Mr. President, of the more than ever loyal and confident friendship of France for the United States of America."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from M. Georges Pompidou, Premier:

"Deeply moved by the tragic loss experienced by the United States on the death of President Kennedy, whose courage and great gifts as a statesman were admired by all, the French people wish to convey to you the grief felt by all my fellow countrymen.

"Rest assured that at a time when under such cruel circumstances you take up your high office, my colleagues of the French Government and myself join with you in a feeling of most grieving and most loyal friendship."

Message to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"Profoundly shocked by the news of the act which has just cost the life of the President of the United States, may I assure you that I deeply share in your mourning and in that of the Government and the American people. Mindful of the welcome that President Kennedy extended to me only a few weeks ago, I can appreciate the extent of your sorrow.

"All my countrymen join with me and share in the feelings of friendship toward your country which have existed for two centuries."

Message to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara from M. Pierre Messmer, Minister of the Armed Forces: "Upon hearing of the tragic death of President Kennedy, I ask you to accept the condolences of the French Armed Forces and also my own personal, sincerest and grieving condolences."

Message to Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces:

"May I express to you, and request that you convey this message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the shock and the indignation of the French armed forces on hearing the news of the outrage against President Kennedy.

"May I also express to you my deepest personal sorrow at the death of the President of the United States who welcomed me such a short time ago with so much friendliness and warmth."

Statement by M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representative of France to the United Nations, before a plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly, held on November 27, 1963, to pay homage to the memory of the late President Kennedy, M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representative of France to the United Nations: "All my compatriots, for whom the visit in Paris of Mr. and Mrs. John Kennedy remains a bright memory, turn toward the people of the United States, our everlasting friend. We wish them to know that their trial is our trial, their sadness our sadness, their mourning our mourning. Ours also is, despite the heavy loss they must bear, their steadfast faith in the future as is steadfast our confidence in their great destiny."

Statement by the French Premier, M. Georges Pompidou (the statement by the French Premier was broadcast over French television and transmitted to the United States by satellite via the Pleumeur-Bodou relay station):

"The stupefaction engendered by a despicable assassination, the indignation at seeing President Kennedy struck down by the side of his young wife in the fulfillment of his duties as a humane and liberal head of state, is accompanied by a great sadness also felt in our hearts: sadness because, once again, blind violence has triumphed; sadness because a great and friendly people is plunged into mourning; sadness because the free world has lost one of its surest guides.

"In these tragic hours, all France is at the side of the United States in anger, in grief, and, despite everything, in confidence also for the future."

Statement by French Foreign Minister, M. Maurice Couve de Murville (the statement was carried over the three major American television networks. It was transmitted by the communications satellite Relay):

"It was with the most grievous impression of shock that we all, in Paris and in France, heard the appalling news of President Kennedy's cold-blooded murder. Many elements combined in our thoughts: the terribly premature disappearance of a statesman of the first magnitude, the death of a man who was the incarnation of youth and vitality, the awful tragedy that hit a glamorous and lovable family, the general feeling of a blow inflicted to a great country for which France has, from the beginning, felt the closest friendship, further reinforced by comradeship in three wars.

"For me, who had the privilege of long talks with President Kennedy, the memory will not pass of his friendliness, his eagerness, his wisdom and his courage.

"Believe me when I say that we, the French people, today all grieve and pray together with the American people."

Statement broadcast over American television by M. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States:

"The tragic death of President Kennedy has deeply moved the French people, forever the friend of the American people. Your sorrow is our sorrow and this sorrow we share with Mrs. Kennedy and her family, tonight we pray with them.

"The President had always displayed toward my country a great fondness, particularly on the occasion of his visit to Paris in 1961.

"For me it was also a personal friend who always showed me a profound affection and understanding.

"As General de Gaulle said today, he died as a soldier. We shall never forget his example or his memory, the memory of a great man."

### GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FUNERAL

The Presidency of the Republic issued a communique on November 23 announcing that General de Gaulle, President of the Republic, would attend the funeral of President Kennedy. He would be accompanied by M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces; and M. Etienne Burin des Roziers, General Secretary of the Presidency of the Republic.

### FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

#### *France mourns President Kennedy*

On the personal orders of General de Gaulle, all flags on public buildings were flown at half staff from 9 a.m. on November 23.

In paying this respect to the memory of President Kennedy, General de Gaulle departed from French tradition, which requires flags to be flown at half staff only during the funeral of a head of state of an allied or friendly power.

On November 23, the Paris Municipal Council sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy in which it told her that the city of Paris was in mourning. In addition, a member of the council proposed that the name of John F. Kennedy, defender of the fundamental freedoms of man and who fell for these freedoms, be given to a street in Paris. The council unanimously adopted this proposal on November 28.

In addition to messages of condolence addressed by official French circles to Mr. Charles Bohlen, many people from all walks of life, veterans' associations, French-American associations, and others sent messages of sympathy to the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

Among many expressions of sympathy, mention should be made of a group of between 2,000 and 3,000 students of all nationalities who went to sign the register of condolence in the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

A service in the memory of President Kennedy was held on November 25 in the cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris. It was attended by the U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. Bohlen and by Madam Charles de Gaulle. M. Georges Pompidou, French Premier, the President of the Senate and Madam Gaston Monnerville, members of the Government and members of the diplomatic corps in the French capital were also present in the great cathedral which was unable to hold the crowds of Parisians who wished to attend the service and who overflowed into the square in front of the cathedral, where members of the Garde Républicaine, swords unsheathed, formed an honor guard.

#### *The French press*

The entire French press without exception reflected the feeling of affliction among the French people at the death of President Kennedy. Raymond Aron in Le Figaro of November 23 wrote: "The assassination of J. F. Kennedy affects all mankind. * * * He wanted to be one of those statesmen whom history remembers because they accomplish their task. * * * He will leave a memory which will not be unworthy of the grandeur which he dreamed of achieving."

In an editorial of November 23, Combat wrote: "The crime committed yesterday is the worst one can imagine, since the man it struck down was a symbol in the eyes of hundreds of millions of our contemporaries."

Also on November 23, France-Soir wrote: "Like lightning, anguish and grief have hit the world. The hearts of men and women sank, at the same moment, in every country and on all continents. * * * All peoples weep also and above all for this man who, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'defended the liberty of peoples and the peace of the world.' "

La Nation of November 25 published the following editorial comments: "He was one of the great men in this world. * * * A man with a personal fortune for whom it was possible therefore to have narrow views and yet he was more aware than millions of others of man's fate, a man above all who had the courage to direct his actions in tune with his heart."

Paul Bastid, in l'Aurore of November 25, wrote: "There was in the personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a kind of lucid fire in the service of liberty and peace which commanded admiration and sympathy. He devoted himself entirely, with the energy of his temperament and of his age, to causes that are dear to us."

Le Monde, in an editorial in its November 26 issue, said: "He leaves an inspiration, a style, a line from which America will not easily stray." In the same issue, the French poet and Nobel Prize winner Saint John Perse wrote: "Kennedy * * * was an athlete running in a race against fate. He fought fairly and squarely always and his encounter with death came with his face uncovered."

The next day Le Monde published an editorial containing the following comment: "The gesture by the President of the Republic who, right at the outset, decided to be present at the funeral of a man whom many considered his rival, has come opportunely to show that, in difficult time, he intends to behave as a loyal friend of the United States. He had already proved this during the Cuban crisis."

#### *Eulogy pronounced by M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly*

At the opening of the November 26 sitting, in the presence of Mr. Charles Bohlen, U.S. Ambassador to France, M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly, pronounced the following eulogy of the late President Kennedy:

"John F. Kennedy was not only the world's most powerful head of state. He was also an exceptional man.

"The murder of this hero, who fell in the flower of his youth, who knew what power and glory was, this murder in which the fate of the ancients finds expression has already taken on an historic amplitude and its echo will never die away. No, we shall not forget John F. Kennedy.

"Yesterday, in Washington, France expressed her grief through the presence of the most famous of her citizens, he who, without a doubt, already belongs to history and continues to forge the future.

"Today, the National Assembly shares as one in the mourning of the United States and of its Congress. It participates with emotion in the sorrow of the Kennedy family. Deeply shocked, it pays its respects before the anguish of this charming, worthy, and courageous young woman who brought a little of the gentleness of France into the harsh existence of America's first citizen.

"Tomorrow it will be up to each and every one to pursue his task in defending and expounding the great principles shared by our two countries, principles in whose respect President Kennedy lived and also died."

M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, associated the Government with the words of the National Assembly: "The homage paid by the National Assembly marks the share taken by the French people in the mourning of the American people and shows the esteem and affection for the President who died in the line of duty."

More than 400 Deputies stood and observed 1 minute's silence. Meetings were suspended for 1 hour as a sign of mourning.

## STOPGAP LEGISLATION NO ANSWER TO COTTON PROBLEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as the needs of the cotton and textile industries become more and more apparent to all, there is increasing recognition of the fact that nothing short of a totally new approach will alleviate the problems now confronting cotton farmers and textile manufacturers.

It is my contention that the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill is the needed approach and it is my earnest hope that this bill can be substituted for the one passed in the other body.

Mr. President, there appeared on December 6 and 7 four excellent editorials in the Atlanta Constitution, the Augusta Herald, and the Augusta Chronicle discussing the merits of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill, as compared to the other bill, and I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Dec. 6, 1963]

### COOLEY COTTON BILL IS STOPGAP MEASURE—TALMADGE PLAN OFFERS EFFECTIVE SOLUTION

The Cooley cotton bill, passed by the House of Representatives with the support of President Johnson, will not solve the problem of either the cottongrowers or the textile industry. It does help to remove an unfair competitive disadvantage under which textile manufacturers are placed under the present system. It does add another subsidy to manufacturers on top of that already paid to growers.

Under this plan there will be no lessening of the burden now borne by taxpayers in this business of the Government's buying and storing cotton in spite of a lowering of support prices. The latter will hit the small producer hardest. It will eliminate, however, the Government-created differential between the cost of cotton in this country and on the world market by a subsidy to cover the differential.

The cotton textile industry has been losing in the competitive race because of this differential. Cotton has been losing out to synthetics at an accelerated pace, compounding the Government's problem of buying and storing cotton. There are now more then 8 million bales in storage and this is growing.

Trouble with the Cooley bill is that it does not attack the basic problem. It prolongs it. The plan proposed by Senator Herman Talmadge, with support of Senator Hubert Humphrey and many others, is much more sensible and offers hope of eventual solution. It would end this double-subsidy system and end the Government program of buying and storing cotton.

Briefly, Senator Talmadge's plan would end price-supporting purchase by the CCC and substitute income subsidies to farmers which are equal to the difference between the world cotton price and a percentage of the domestic parity price. Income subsidies would vary with individual farm production, thus protecting the small producer and end the paying of millions to large producers under the present system. Payments on the first 15 bales would be on a basis of 80 to 90 percent of parity. Payments for production in excess of 30 bales would be scaled down to 70 percent of parity.

Senator Talmadge's plan would be based on a national acreage allotment. Lightening the taxpayers' burden, it would lower prices for consumers and increase consumption. It would help the small farmer to survive until he can make a transition to other work and would end the huge payments to the big, efficient producers who now enjoy a windfall.

The Talmadge plan reportedly is gaining support in the Senate. The stopgap Cooley bill, which does relieve an injustice to textile manufacturers, is no permanent solution. Gradual abandonment of the present system for the Talmadge program offers a way out.

---

[From the Augusta Herald, Dec. 6, 1963]

### Georgian's Plan Is Better

With passage by the U.S. House of Representatives of the Cooley bill—of limited merit—to relieve the plight of the American cotton industry, it is up to the Senate to decide whether to go along or to insist on the much better Talmadge bill.

The bill passed Wednesday night by the House, 216 to 182, is the one introduced by Representative Harold D. Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina. It provides a subsidy to U.S. textile mills for purchase of cotton. The proposed new subsidy of 8½ cents would be in addition to a subsidy in the same amount paid by the Government in order to put surplus American cotton in the export market at the world price of 24 cents, without which no U.S. cotton would be sold abroad. It also is in addition to the parity payments to producers, thus creating a triple subsidy system.

It cannot be denied that the use of American cotton in American mills is in jeopardy unless something is done. Japanese and other foreign industries can buy our cotton so much cheaper than American mills that they can—with the further assistance of cheap labor—ship back the same cotton in finished form and undersell our own manufacturers. Such imported cotton fabrics now constitute 8 percent of our own national consumption.

Without relief, the textile industry in this country will turn to synthetic fibers, as much of it already has done, or will simply cease operations. In either event, U.S. cotton producers or U.S. millworkers or both are the losers. At a time when President Johnson insists that the national economy must be built up to support the creation of 5 million new jobs, we cannot afford to remain idle while the cotton industry is wrecked.

An alternative to the Cooley bill, however, promises a better and less expensive remedy. That is the bill introduced by Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge. Instead of loading still a third cotton subsidy onto the backs of the U.S. taxpayers, it would remove one of the two already in force.

The Talmadge bill would give each cotton farmer an allotment of a certain number of bales, rather than a certain number of acres. The total number of allotted bales would be based on domestic consumption. For the allotted bales, the farmer would be paid a subsidy to guarantee a minimum per-pound return. Each farmer would be permitted to grow as much cotton over the domestic allotment as he wished, but the overage would sell at the world price—almost certain to be a lower price, in view of production costs in Egypt and other cheap-labor countries.

The Talmadge bill would retain most of the protection now given the cotton producer, would relieve the American textile industry of its present unfair burden of discriminatory costs and would take much of the subsidy cost off the back of the public. It would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would permit the big mass-production cotton planters of California with their mechanized low-cost methods to compete on the world market if they could economically do so.

The advantages of the Georgia Senator's bill so far outweigh those of the Cooley bill that the Senate should take a good, hard look at the consequences of each.

If the Senate also should approve the triple-subsidy Cooley proposal, however, it should be accepted only as an interim solution to give immediate relief to the textile industry, with the Talmadge plan remaining as a permanent and sensible system to be adopted as soon as possible.

---

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1963]

### More Than One Beneficiary

The House-passed cotton bill is far more than merely the windfall to domestic textile mills that it was charged with being during debate on the measure. It may be—or at least lead to a bill that will be—the redeemer of domestic cotton.

Undeniably, the bill will prove to be a boon to American mills in their continuing economic battle with foreign competition. It will, if finally approved, enable the U.S. mills to purchase American cotton at the same price charged foreign mills. Currently, the differential is 8½ cents a pound, or about $46 a bale.

But that the domestic mills are going to gain 8½ cents on each pound of local cotton they buy does not, by any stretch of the imagination, mean that they are going to boost their profit by any fabulous amount.

What it means is that by purchasing American cotton at a price comparable to that paid for it by foreign mills, the local mills can reduce the cost of manufacture, price their cotton goods cheaper—and become more competitive on both the domestic and world market with foreign made goods.

Principal beneficiaries, however, are not just the mill owners. The consumers and, perhaps even more so, the cotton farmers themselves stand to be directly aided when the present two-price cotton system is replaced by a more equitable order.

For the consumer, the benefits will derive, obviously, from the reduction in the retail price of cotton fabrics and made-up garments.

The advantage to the farmer will be more subtle.

The loss he has been daily facing comes from the fact that in recent years the mills, all of which have been hurt unnecessarily by the two-price system, have been striving to overcome their losses by turning from cotton to synthetics. The situation, instead of easing, has continued to grow more acute.

By its action therefore, the House at long last has given recognition to the dismal fact that continuation of the two-price system is going to result in an increasing decline in the use by domestic mills of cotton. It is becoming less profitable to them with almost every passing day.

This reduction in the consumption of American cotton by American mills is bound to have its effect on cotton as a farm commodity. It could, conceivably, lead to its elimination as a major crop.

Therefore, while the House bill—named for Representative Harold Cooley of North Carolina, its sponsor—leaves much to be desired, it is, we think, a step in the right direction. Left to the Senate now, if cotton is to be saved, is the job either of placing its stamp of approval on the Cooley measure, or coming up with its own ideas of what a cotton bill should be. It might very well, in fact, turn to the Talmadge farm plan as that best serving the interests of the Nation.

It will be interesting to see if that develops in the Senate.

---

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Dec. 7, 1963]

### Talmadge's Plan Is Better

In moving toward elimination of this country's two-price cotton system, the House Wednesday passed what is commonly known as the Cooley bill. Named for its sponsor, Representative Harold Cooley, of North Carolina, the measure in essence, is, while better than none at all, an agricultural hodgepodge and a political expedient designed to please all cotton interests and do everything for everybody.

In the main, as we explained yesterday, the measure provides some surcease for the American textile mills. Under terms of the bill, they would be permitted to purchase domestic cotton at the world price and thereby become competitive with foreign concerns which currently are permitted to buy American cotton at some $46 a bale cheaper than do the American firms. We firmly believe they should be permitted this privilege.

In order to do this, however, the Cooley bill provides what foes claim is a triple subsidy. There already is an 8½-cent-a-pound subsidy given cotton shippers in order that they may meet the world price of 24 cents and permit the sale of American cotton abroad. In addition, the Government aids the cotton farmers by way of parity payments. Now, say opponents, the assistance to the domestic mills would amount to another 8½-cent subsidy.

Stiff opposition for the measure, which passed the House by a vote of 216 to 182, is seen when it is called up in the Senate. In fact, Senator Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has expressed open antagonism. "I can't support a cotton bill which would greatly increase costs of the farm program * * *," he said.

The additional increase has been estimated to be some $600 million in 3 years, although COOLEY insists the figure is nearer $118 million for the first year, and less in succeeding years.

As we said yesterday, this opposition in the Senate may cause that body to turn to the farm plan of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, as one that is better for the Nation.

We think it would be.

In the first place, the Talmadge plan, while also helping the domestic mills, would be more economical, both as a program for the Government and as a burden for the taxpayers than will be the Cooley bill.

It calls for domestic prices to drop to world levels—some 8½ cents less—and then provide Government payments to farmers to bring them up to the U.S. support level. The subsidies would be designed to bring farmers' income up to figures comparable to workers, in other fields of endeavor.

Primarily, however, the Talmadge plan would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would eliminate all acreage controls and would assign each farmer a domestic production quota based on bales. The latter number would be based upon domestic consumption. For his allotment, the farmer would be paid a subsidy guaranteeing to him a minimum per-pound return. He could grow as much cotton as he wished, but would be compelled to sell the overage at the world price, which, in light of cheaper production costs overseas, could be expected to be well below the price guaranteed under his production quota.

Additionally, it would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, transporting, storing and selling all farm commodities. A savings of $8 billion for the storage of farm surpluses has been estimated by Senator TALMADGE as one of the advantages accruing to the taxpayers if his bill is ultimately adopted.

Support for the Cooley bill came from the administration, which saw it as the best bill possible to please all interests in the cotton business. It has had the support of the mills because they, by and large, didn't feel the Talmadge bill could be enacted, even though they may have preferred it.

Farm groups, ironically, have been the chief opponents to the Talmadge plan. Because it would provide direct subsidies to them, many farmers have felt—especially those who would receive large amounts—that the Government would take a look at the payments—and then vote to place a lower ceiling on them.

Under the Cooley bill the Government support prices are in the form of loans on cotton placed in Government warehouses.

## TRIBUTE TO MATHIAS F. CORREA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning in Arlington National Cemetery was buried Mathias F. Correa, a great contributor to the public and military life of our Nation for the past quarter of a century.

He was appointed, prior to World War II and at just past 30 years of age to the office of U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

He sought to put on the uniform as soon as he could, leaving that job to become a lieutenant in the Army and was sent to the Mediterranean theater. He transferred to the Marine Corps, and became special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. He gave strength and depth to Secretary Forrestal's office and contributed a great deal to the success of the Secretaryship of Mr. Forrestal.

Following the war, he continued to be interested in public life, playing a definitive role in setting up the present Central Intelligence Agency as one of the three citizens, along with William H. Jackson and Allen W. Dulles, who drafted the original blueprints for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Over the years, along with his demanding private work, he retained an interest in our Government.

In fact, if the ideas he had advanced and believed in in 1948 had been fully carried out and implemented by the Central Intelligence Agency, many problems could have been avoided.

He also continued in the Marine Corps, which enjoyed his loyalty and affection throughout his life.

This grand gentlemen was buried today in the national cemetery of the Government he served so well.

His lovely widow, his devoted mother, his three wonderful daughters, and his many friends are and will be immensely sad at his loss.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order agreed to this morning, the Chair now lays before the Senate H.R. 9140, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate has for consideration today the public works appropriation bill. I am very hopeful that consideration of the bill can be concluded this afternoon, so that, as soon as possible, we may go to conference with the House on the disagreeing amendments.

I regret that again this year the public works appropriation bill is being considered at the tail end of the session. The bill passed the House on November 19, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on November 20. The bill was reported to the Senate on December 5.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of the bill. The report on it is on the desks of the Senators, and I believe it quite clearly sets forth the action of the committee.

Except with respect to title IV, I believe the bill is noncontroversial. I expect that amendments will be offered to decrease or strike from the bill amounts recommended for public works acceleration.

At the conclusion of my statement, I will ask that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, so that the Senate will have ample opportunity to work its will on the bill.

Mr. President, as is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three subcommittees for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, and the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The hearings on this bill started on May 7, and continued through November 20, 1963. The subcommittee held 54 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and 4 executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 1,059 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations; 908 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army; all but 16 of the remaining witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The hearings comprise 4 volumes, which contain 4,540 pages of testimony. Senators have a complete set of them on their desks. They constitute the basic information upon which the subcommittee based its recommendation to the full committee.

It is my belief that in the future the committee should, in a measure, curtail much of the repetitious testimony that is given from year to year on the continuing projects. Before hearings are started next year on the 1965 appropriation bill, I shall, in advance, ask witnesses to confine their testimony, more or less, to new matters that may be presented to the committee. So far as the testimony on projects that are in the process of being constructed is concerned, I believe it is repetitious for the committee to take the same testimony from year to year.

As Senators can see on their desks, the size of the printed record of hearings conducted this year is huge. All of that is costly. It is my belief that in the future it might be possible to curtail some of that expense. I do not believe the projects would suffer thereby.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, before marking up the civil functions portion of this bill, we reviewed every project that was presented to the subcommittee, budgeted or unbudgeted. We examined into every single request made of the subcommittee for planning or construction. After all the requests were made, Engineers were called back to obtain their views on the projects presented to the subcommittee. The purpose of this recall was to find out whether the Engineers could economically and efficiently utilize the additional funds requested by the local witnesses, and whether the Corps of Engineers had the capability to undertake the unbudgeted new starts requested.

As in the past, the subcommittee heard all the witnesses who desired to present testimony on unbudgeted projects, and also on budgets for which more funds were asked than were budgeted. The same is true of surveys and new planning starts. As in the past, there is not a single project that has been recommended by the subcommittee or by the committee as a whole for which there is not justification in the hearings before the Senate.

I am proud to say that the subcommittee has not included, either in this instance or in the past, any projects that were not completely justified by the Corps of Engineers, and as to which their capability was not clearly shown.

As to projects that were requested and that were budgeted, the subcommittee spent considerable time reviewing them with the Engineers.

The Senate has before it a complete justification for all planning and construction projects that were included in the bill by the Senate committee, and for all projects that were recommended by the House as well.

In order to balance the bill, and in order to take care of worthy areas not previously included in the bill, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects that had been requested by witnesses from all over the country, and by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Senate will agree to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be possible to retain the majority of the projects in the conference with the House.

As in the past, the committee has recommended some of the new projects, both construction and planning; and in a moment, I shall place in the RECORD, for the information of the Congress, a list of the new additions proposed by both the House and the Senate.

The House committee added, as I have just stated, 19 unbudgeted construction projects and 17 unbudgeted planning items. The House sent us a bill which on its face showed that title I was under the budget; but in order to attain that goal, the House reduced the budget for construction, general, by $32,318,300; of which $19,672,000 was an increase in the item reduction for savings and slippage, and $6,033,300 was a general reduction in estimates for recreation facilities.

I am not surprised by the action taken by the House, because the House has exercised that privilege in the past, by adding more for slippages than was provided by the Corps of Engineers. As we all know, many projects are delayed because the Engineers or the local people may have difficulty in obtaining sufficient land on which to build projects, or rights-of-way to construct roads. It is normal that over the years this slippage has amounted to from 4 to 5 percent of the overall amount provided by the bill. The House increased, percentagewise, this amount from a little under 5 percent to between 6 and 7 percent. In so doing, the House was able to accomplish what appears to be a more or less balanced budget; that is, the House bill was actually a few dollars under the budget. But that was accomplished by cutting 2½ to 3 percent further on slippages.

Restoration of the budget estimates accounts for $28,845,300 of the $51,573,300 increase recommended for construction generally.

The Senate committee recommended $2,143,000 for 28 unbudgeted planning items and $6,879,000 for 23 unbudgeted construction projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table explaining the committee action on title I printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the new Senate committee items, both planning starts and construction starts, and also the unbudgeted items of the House, for both construction and planning.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

| Project | Total cost estimate | Appropriations to date | Amount allowed by House | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maniece Bayou, upstream extension, Arkansas | $673,000 | $60,000 | $200,000 | $413,000 |
| Redwood City Harbor, Calif | 670,000 | 10,000 | 660,000 | |
| Tahchevak Creek, Calif | 1,110,000 | 160,000 | 200,000 | 750,000 |
| Savannah River below Augusta, Georgia and South Carolina | 3,824,000 | 3,554,000 | 270,000 | |
| Coralville Reservation, Mehaffey Bridge, Iowa | 1,220,000 | 82,000 | 150,000 | 988,000 |
| Rathbun Reservation, Iowa | 23,600,000 | 555,000 | 400,000 | 22,645,000 |
| Saylorville Reservation, Iowa | 36,500,000 | 700,000 | 400,000 | 35,400,000 |
| Narragus River, Maine | 507,000 | 7,000 | 500,000 | |
| Gloucester Harbor, Mass | 1,120,000 | 20,000 | 500,000 | 600,000 |
| Muskegon Harbor, Mich | 660,000 | 10,000 | 100,000 | 550,000 |
| Chariton River, Iowa and Mo | $4,300,000 | $1,184,000 | $400,000 | $2,716,000 |
| Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. | 7,520,000 | 120,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,400,000 |
| Buffalo Outer Harbor, N.Y | 3,240,000 | 33,000 | 250,000 | 2,957,000 |
| Ithaca Cayuga Inlet, N.Y | 4,480,000 | 223,000 | 300,000 | 3,957,000 |
| Swift Creek, N.C | 915,000 | 76,000 | 250,000 | 589,000 |
| Conneaut Harbor, Ohio | 9,170,000 | 118,000 | 225,000 | 8,827,000 |
| Swinomish Slough, Wash | 910,000 | 22,000 | 150,000 | 738,000 |
| Washougal area | 1,718,000 | 75,000 | 100,000 | 1,543,000 |
| Kenosha Harbor, Wis | 710,000 | 23,000 | 200,000 | 487,000 |
| Total | 102,847,000 | 7,032,000 | [1] 6,257,000 | 89,560,000 |

NEW PLANNING STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Buchanan Reservoir, Calif | $14,600,000 | $115,000 | $125,000 | $14,360,000 |
| Dana Point Harbor, Calif | 3,760,000 | 30,000 | 95,000 | 3,635,000 |
| Dubuque, Iowa | 5,650,000 | 50,000 | 35,000 | 5,565,000 |
| Boston Harbor, Chelsea River, Mass | 2,516,000 | 16,000 | 40,000 | 2,460,000 |
| Plymouth Harbor, Mass | 1,230,000 | 10,000 | 35,000 | 1,185,000 |
| Oswego Harbor, N.Y | 1,260,000 | 42,000 | 60,000 | 1,158,000 |
| Rosendale, N.Y | 2,450,000 | 37,000 | 100,000 | 2,313,000 |
| Salamanca, N.Y | 1,520,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 1,450,000 |
| Caesar Creek Reservoir, Ohio | 14,410,000 | 23,000 | 75,000 | 14,312,000 |
| East Fork Reservoir, Ohio | 17,215,000 | 86,000 | 75,000 | 17,054,000 |
| Manchester (deferred), Ohio | $1,330,000 | $10,000 | $8,000 | $1,312,000 |
| Copan Reservoir, Okla | 26,500,000 | 22,000 | 100,000 | 26,378,000 |
| Raystown Reservoir, Pa | 32,150,000 | 153,000 | 150,000 | 31,847,000 |
| Narragansett pier, Rhode Island | 1,172,000 | 20,000 | 50,000 | 1,102,000 |
| Point Judith hurricane barrier, Rhode Island | 2,458,000 | 44,000 | 50,000 | 2,364,000 |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Palacios, Tex | 829,000 | 11,000 | 30,000 | 788,000 |
| Kickapoo River, Wis | 16,800,000 | 158,000 | 50,000 | 16,592,000 |
| Total | 145,850,000 | 877,000 | 1,098,000 | 143,875,000 |

---

[1] Includes $18,000 in budget for planning Muskegon Harbor, Mich.

*New construction starts added by the Senate*

| Project | Total cost | Appropriated to date | Budget estimate | House amount | Senate amount | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sitka Harbor, Crescent Bay Basin, Alaska | $965,000 | $44,000 | | | $921,000 | |
| Garland City, Ark | 948,000 | 230,000 | | | 250,000 | $468,000 |
| Noyo River and Harbor, Calif | 13,500,000 | 75,000 | (P) $150,000 | (P) $150,000 | (P) 150,000<br>(C) 100,000 | 13,175,000 |
| Trinidad Reservoir, Colo | 21,000,000 | 379,000 | (P) 86,000 | (P) 86,000 | (P) 86,000<br>(C) 300,000 | 20,235,000 |
| Connecticut River below Hartford, Old Saybrook, Conn | 581,000 | 3,000 | | | (C) 578,000 | |
| Palm Beach Harbor, Fla | 5,120,000 | 110,000 | | | 250,000 | 4,760,000 |
| Pensacola Harbor, Fla | 447,000 | 23,000 | | | 299,000 | 125,000 |
| Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee, Illinois | 1,180,000 | 55,000 | | | 150,000 | 975,000 |
| Rend Lake Reservoir, Ill | 36,000,000 | 499,000 | (P) 501,000 | (P) 501,000 | (P) 501,000<br>(C) 10,000 | 34,990,000 |
| Tri Pond levee, Illinois | 1,260,000 | 60,000 | | | 300,000 | 900,000 |
| Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | 61,300,000 | 425,000 | (P) 20 ,000 | (P) 200,000 | (P) 200,000<br>(C) 750,000 | 59,925,000 |
| Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier, Louisiana | 3,240,000 | 90,000<br>9,000 | (P) 103,000 | (P) 103,000 | (P) 103,000<br>(C) 47,000 | 3,181,600 |
| Campti Clarence levee, Louisiana | 1,320,000 | 70,000 | (P) 23,000 | (P) 23,000 | (P) 23,000<br>(C) 100,000 | 1,127,000 |
| Gladstone Harbor, Mich | 812,000 | 15,000 | | | 200,000 | 597,000 |
| Natchez, Miss | 368,000 | 34,000 | | | 115,000 | 219,000 |
| Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo | 140,000,000 | 1,155,000 | (P) 650,000 | (P) 650,000 | (P) 650,000<br>(C) 350,000 | 137, 45,000 |
| Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic River, North Reach Channel | 1,532,000 | | | | 400,000 | 1,132,000 |
| Fort Macon Atlantic Beach, N.C | 410,000 | 5,000 | | | 54,000 | 351,000 |
| Bowman Haley Reservoir, N. Dak | 2,810,000 | 195,000 | | | 300,000 | 2,315,000 |
| Missouri River bank stabilization below Garrison Dam, N. Dak | 3,000,000 | | | | 300,000 | 2,700,000 |
| Tacoma Harbor, Wash | 2,480,000 | 21,000 | | | 150,000 | 2,309,000 |
| East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va | 14,000,000 | 120,000 | (P) 280,000 | (P) 280,000 | (P) 280,000<br>(C) 220,000 | 13,380,000 |
| Snagging and clearing | 750,000 | | | | 750,000 | |
| Total | 313,123,000 | 3,527,000 | | 1,993,000 | 8,887,000 | 300,709,000 |
| Senate increase | | | | | 6,894,000 | |

*New planning starts added by the Senate*

| Project | Total cost | Appropriated to date | Budget estimate | Senate amount | Balance to complete |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss | $263,000,000 | $1,494,000 | | $225,000 | $1,269,000 |
| McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas | 251,000 | 5,000 | | 44,000 | 302,000 |
| Village Creek, White River and Mayberry Levee District, Arkansas | 1,371,000 | 45,000 | | 75,000 | 1,251,000 |
| Corte Madera Creek, Calif | 5,780,000 | 78,000 | | 20,000 | 5,682,000 |
| Mormon Slough, Calif | 2,060,000 | 40,000 | | 50,000 | 1,970,000 |
| Santa Barbara Harbor, Cali | 3,080,000 | 40,000 | | 50,000 | 2,990,000 |
| New London barrier, Connecticut | 2,431,000 | 30,000 | | 50,000 | 2,351,000 |
| Kaunnakakai Harbor, Hawaii | 7,970,000 | 44,000 | | 100,000 | 7,826,000 |
| Chicago Harbor (1962 act), Ill | 1,560,000 | 15,000 | | 27,000 | 1,518,000 |
| Island levee, Indiana and Illinois | 1,780,000 | 12,000 | | 50,000 | 1,718,000 |
| Big Hill Reservoir, Kans | 4,100,000 | 35,000 | | 35,000 | 4,030,000 |
| Kansas City, Kans | 19,100,000 | 17,000 | | 50,000 | 19,033,000 |
| Merriam, Kans | 992,000 | 10,000 | | 50,000 | 932,000 |
| Eagle Creek Reservoir, Ky | 10,700,000 | 20,000 | | 100,000 | 10,580,000 |
| Ontonagon Harbor, Mich | 5,070,000 | 29,000 | | 75,000 | 4,966,000 |
| Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev | 2,840,000 | 40,000 | | 100,000 | 2,700,000 |
| New Hope Reservoir, N.C | 25,293,000 | 150,000 | | 180,000 | 24,963,000 |
| Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 48-foot depth (1962 act), North Carolina | 6,400,000 | 28,000 | | 135,000 | 6,237,000 |
| Cleveland Harbor, deepen east basin, Ohio | 1,580,000 | 43,000 | | 27,000 | 1,510,000 |
| Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 68,600,000 | 50,000 | | 150,000 | 68,400,000 |
| Hugo Reservoir, Okla | 4,900,000 | 5,000 | | 100,000 | 4,795,000 |
| Gate Creek Reservoir, Oreg | 19,400,000 | 98,000 | | 100,000 | 19,202,000 |
| Shelton Ditch, Oreg | 1,860,000 | 6,000 | | 10,000 | 1,844,000 |
| Muddy Creek Reservoir, Pa | 7,640,000 | 49,000 | | 25,000 | 7,566,000 |
| Lake Kemp Reservoir, Tex | 8,600,000 | 52,000 | | 50,000 | 8,498,000 |
| North Fork Reservoir, Tex | 13,100,000 | 10,000 | | 50,000 | 13,040,000 |
| Beech Fork Reservoir, W. Va | 11,400,000 | 19,000 | | 150,000 | 11,231,000 |
| Green Bay Harbor, Wis | 4,420,000 | 14,000 | | 50,000 | 4,356,000 |

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table explaining the committee action on title I.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

*Title I—Civil functions, Department of the Army*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cemeterial expenses | | | $10,800,000 |
| The House amount, and $46,000 below the budget. | | | |
| No restoration requested. | | | |
| Corps of Engineers: | | | |
| General investigations | | | 20,625,000 |
| Above the budget | | $565,000 | |
| Above the House | | 2,625,000 | |
| Above 1963 | | 2,525,000 | |
| Construction, general | | | 849,856,000 |
| Restoration of House cut, including $25,705,000 for slippage | $28,845,300 | | |
| 28 new planning starts | 2,143,000 | | |
| 23 new construction starts | [1] 6,879,000 | | |
| 18 budgeted construction items raised | 13,731,000 | | |
| 2 budgeted planning items raised | [2] 175,000 | | |
| 1 House increase reduced | −200,000 | | |
| | 51,573,300 | | |
| Above the budget | | 30,370,000 | |
| Above the House | | 51,573,300 | |
| House compared with the budget: | | | |
| 17 New planning starts | 1,098,000 | | |
| 19 New construction starts | [3] 6,257,000 | | |
| 2 Increases in budget planning | 100,000 | | |
| 3 increases in budget construction | 3,900,000 | | |
| 9 Budget items reduced | −32,318,300 | | |
| | −20,963,300 | | |
| Corps of Engineers—Continued | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | | | $157,368,000 |
| The budget estimate— | | | |
| Above the House | | $7,368,000 | |
| General expenses | | | 15,000,000 |
| Below the budget | | 252,000 | |
| The amount allowed by House— | | | |
| Above 1963 | | 834,800 | |
| Mississippi River and tributaries | | | 80,406,000 |
| Above the budget | | 5,546,000 | |
| Above the House | | 5,906,000 | |
| U.S. section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers | | | 10,000 |
| Not included in the budget this year, since it was expected that the Board's work would be concluded in fiscal year 1963. The full amount is reimbursed to the United States by the New York State Power Authority. | | | |
| Canal Zone Government: | | | |
| Operating expenses | | | 25,725,000 |
| Below the budget | | 740,000 | |
| Above the House | | 725,000 | |
| Above 1963 | | 2,319,350 | |
| Capital outlay | | | 7,250,000 |
| The budget estimate— | | | |
| Above the House | | 750,000 | |
| Above 1963 | | 4,130,000 | |

---

[1] New future construction commitment, $300,709,000.

[2] Budget estimate received Dec. 4, 1963, for 1 item covering $150,000 of this increase, S. Doc. No. 45, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] New future commitment, $89,560,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimates provided for 27 new planning starts and 34 new construction starts. I commend the administration for taking such action. The projects recommended are all necessary, and it is essential that each year an adequate number of new planning and construction projects be added to the program if the national needs for the development of our water resources are to be met in an orderly and efficient manner.

Mr. President, the House inserted language in the bill this year requiring the Panama Canal Company to obtain approval of the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate prior to the disposal or transfer by license, lease, or otherwise, except to another agency of the U.S. Government, any real property or rights to the use of real property.

A bill intended to accomplish essentially the same purpose, H.R. 3999, passed the House of Representatives and is now pending consideration in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. The House report on that bill, Report No. 363, states in part:

> It is not the intent of the bill to interfere with the ordinary functioning of the Panama Canal Company as a business enterprise, but it is intended solely to prevent discontinuance of activities or divestment of assets which will have a major impact upon the operations of the company as a business enterprise.

In recommending retention of the House language, we contemplate an interpretation of the language which would be consistent with the position taken by the legislative committee of the House which reported H.R. 3999. Certainly, neither the Governor of the Canal Zone nor the legislative committees referred to want to have the language interpreted in such a strict sense that the approval of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House would be required in order to grant a permit for the Elks to erect a clubhouse in the Canal Zone. It is not intended that the language in the bill apply to churches, recreational and fraternal organizations, employees' organizations, or other similar entities authorized to conduct their activities in the Canal Zone.

### TITLE II

Mr. President, title II deals primarily with reclamation projects. As I have said, it was handled before the committee by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The budget estimates in the amount of $455,285,000 were considered by the committee for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee recommends an appropriation of $420,290,200 for these purposes. This is $8,580,500 over the House allowance of $411,709,700, but is $34,994,800 less than the budget estimates. The committee recommendation exceeds appropriations for fiscal year 1963 by $16,661,900.

The bill, in conformity with the budget proposals, includes the following new reclamation starts: Arbuckle project, Oklahoma; Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; Rio Grande project recreational facilities, New Mexico; Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oregon; and Spokane Valley project, Washington-Idaho. In addition these new starts in the Colorado River storage project are provided: Lyman, San Juan-Chama, and Silt participating projects. And provision is included for commencement of an extra-high-voltage electrical interconnection between the Columbia River Basin and the Hoover Dam powerplant. Construction of this line will not begin until the Northwest power preference bill is enacted into law.

Budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation totaled $370,347,000. The committee recommends $356,223,200, which is $14,123,800 less than the budget and $8,076,500 more than the House allowed. Over $4,500,000 of the amount above the House allowance is accounted for by a restoration of the increased slippage reduction made by the House.

There is a small increase of $204,000 over the House allowance, in the amount approved for Bonneville Power Administration construction. This is accounted for primarily by adjustment of proposed construction items. Most of the reduction from the budget estimate—$20,283,000—was either suggested by the Department, or was not appealed by the Department from the results of the House action.

The Southeastern Power Administration, under the committee recommendation, will receive the full amount of the budget estimate; and only $588,000 less than the budget request is proposed for the Southwestern Power Administration.

### TITLE III

Mr. President, the committee recommended $2,868,658,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission. The committee recommendation is $102,334,000 above the House allowance, $61,427,000 below the budget, and $331,047,610 below the appropriation for 1963.

### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For operating expenses, the committee recommended an increase of $61,355,000, of which $18,500,000 was for the reactor development program; $12 million was for physical research; $7 million for biology and medicine; $1,500,000 for training, education, and information; $500,000 for the isotopes development program; $3,500,000 for civilian applications of nuclear explosives; $1,355,000 for program direction and administration; and $17 million for change in selected resources. For plant and capital equipment, the committee recommended an increase of $38,695,000, including a restoration of $20 million for slippage, and $17,945,000 for weapons construction projects in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty; and the remaining $750,000 was for the community building at Los Alamos.

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, the committee restored the House cut in the budget estimate.

The committee recommended no change in the amount provided by the House for the Delaware River Basin Commission.

### TITLE IV

A moment ago, I referred to title IV. The committee recommended $45 million for the public works acceleration program.

It will be recalled that last year Congress passed an authorization bill for $900 million for a public works acceleration program; and last session $450 million was provided in order to make a start on this program. In the supplemental bill passed early this session $400 million was added, leaving a total of $50 million, under the authorization bill, that was not appropriated. Last month Mr. Batt, who heads this agency, appeared before the committee and asked that $45 million be included in this bill, in order to continue this public works acceleration program. Hearings were held; and as I have said, the committee recommended the appropriation of $45 million.

The Bureau of the Budget was a little late in sending its recommendations to Congress. When the matter was presented to the House committee, it did not hold hearings on this item. I do not know whether that was because of lack of time, or just what the reason was. However, the House considered it without having held any hearings, and decided to eliminate it from the bill and not to provide any funds whatever for it.

The Senate committee did the reverse; and after holding hearings, the Senate committee voted to provide for the $45 million requested. The request was justified on the basis of allocating $28,200,000 to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; $3 million to the Bureau of Land Management, $4 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, $4 million to the National Park Service, and $3,100,000 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—a total of $14,100,000 to these bureaus in the Department of the Interior. The balance of $2,700,000 has been reserved for administration.

The all Federal programs were proposed because of the short leadtime required in placing these programs underway. During the hearings it was also stressed that projects of this type could be carried on during the winter months when other types of construction work could not be performed. The committee felt, however, that half of the funds provided should be allocated for community facilities where the Federal funds are augmented by the utilization of local funds for the construction of urgently needed community facilities; and the committee so recommended. I am sure that we are all aware of the large backlog of requests made and applications pending with the Community Facilities Administration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that while the $45 million would be apportioned almost entirely, if not entirely, to Federal projects, those projects do lie in depressed areas in which there is heavy unemployment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that would be the purpose. As Mr. Batt testified, the idea was to provide funds for projects which could immediately be used to relieve unemployment in the areas where the funds would be used.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the burden of the testimony given by Mr. Batt. The committee went on record as suggesting to Mr. Batt that at least half the amount should be used for community facilities projects in the various localities in which public works had been authorized—that is, the construction of various projects in cities, such as sewer systems, water projects, and so forth. But we did not include such a provision in the law itself. It is really optional with Mr. Batt to do what we suggest, or to proceed as he said he would—that is, to use the entire amount for projects that will relieve unemployment in many areas in which there is a serious situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that half the total sum would be used for what are called community facilities in depressed areas?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. As the Senator knows, there is a formula in the bill which directs how the funds should be used. I asked Mr. Batt specifically whether he would be in violation of the act by proposing to do what he contemplated. His answer was that he could use all the funds as he proposed, because, as the Senator knows, the main purpose of the program is to relieve unemployment in places where it is acute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the $45 million would come out of the unappropriated balance remaining under the act that was passed last year, and there would still be left about $5 million unappropriated out of the authorization?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in reference to the $45 million item which has been under discussion. I am grateful, also, for the understanding of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who has been patient, diligent and cooperative with Members in his management of this important measure. He has been thorough. His advocacy of this appropriation for the accelerated public works program is appreciated.

That the RECORD may be perhaps supplemented at this point, I wish to say that not only has the need of this item to further the attack on unemployment been great, not only has the need been met only in part, but we feel that the effort to meet the needs of the economy and the people of eligible areas must be continued in the months ahead.

Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock a special subcommittee of the Public Works Committee will begin hearings on legislation to authorize extension and further expenditures under the accelerated public works program.

I bring this to the attention of Senators to indicate that there will be in Washington this week officials and citizens from municipalities and from other political subdivisions who will testify concerning the need for a continuing program. There is still too much unemployment and too many unmet public facility needs in many sections of the country.

Again I compliment the committee, and I commend its chairman and the managers and diligent and efficient staff members who have brought to the Senate a meaningful and vitally important measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what the Senate will do in the future, but I was more or less interested in carrying out what Congress undertook to do in the past. I believe we should appropriate the balance of the authorization in the measure enacted last year. As to what Congress will do in the future, I do not know. But from past experience, we know that when programs start, there is a demand to continue them. The testimony revealed that the total of the applications which have been made to Mr. Batt exceeds $1 billion. Many communities bonded themselves and raised money in order to be able to contribute and be eligible for money under the program. I believe they went far afield in doing so without the Congress having voted the necessary additional funds.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator for bringing before the Senate the appropriation bill. It is an important part of the public works program, and represents a capital investment in the future of our country.

I should like particularly to refer to title IV. I notice that the Department of Agriculture would receive $28,200,000. Will the Senator tell me in what type of projects the Department of Agriculture intends to engage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That amount is for reforestation in parts of our country in which there is a good deal of unemployment. We were told that it would be used for that purpose and in areas where it will also serve to relieve unemployment.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The report states that Federal funds will be augmented by utilization of local funds. Would that statement also be true in respect to Department of Agriculture projects?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; that would not be true, because the agriculture projects are all Federal.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I commend the Senator for his usual painstaking task. I was interested in what he said in the earlier part of his remarks about the voluminous hearings, and his intention to try to bring a cessation to the redundant hearings which have been held on projects underway.

I am afraid that I have been as guilty as some other Senators in bringing delegations before him. I sympathize thoroughly with his position. The chairman has been most patient. In many cases he has probably known the subject better than many witnesses whom we brought in as proponents of the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because I listened to them so often that I learned something.

Mr. MORTON. I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation in the future on this subject. I believe his point is well taken. As one who has had the privilege of appearing before the chairman, both as a Member of the House and as a Member of this body, I have always found him to be fair, thorough, and perhaps the most painstaking man in this important area who has ever served in Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very kind to make that statement.

Mr. MORTON. I mean it.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago, when I made the statement about curtailing the size of the hearings, I did not mean to cut off anyone, but I am certain that——

Mr. MORTON. Even Job's patience was finally exhausted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that if last year's and this year's hearings were analyzed, the Senator would find a great deal of repetition.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. A short while ago there was a colloquy between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in which it was developed that from the $45 million, if appropriated for accelerated public works, $28 million would be allocated for the Department of Agriculture. If the language in the Senate report will have any efficacy at all, there will be a proportionate adjustment in that $28 million, I presume.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. As was suggested by the Senator, one-half of the $45 million should go for community facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to place that correction in the RECORD at this time.

The amount will have to be apportioned. If the money were apportioned, half of it would be spent on a more or less matching basis.

**Mr. CARLSON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I yield.

**Mr. CARLSON.** I appreciate very much the explanation which has been made. I caught this item as I glanced through the report, and I wondered how it would be handled.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** When Mr. Batt appeared before us, he was desirous of spending the money through the Federal Government in places where unemployment could be relieved and where many people could be employed directly so that the unemployment could be relieved.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I yield.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Has the Senator completed his remarks?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** No; I have not concluded them yet.

**Mr. McCLELLAN.** Then I will wait until the Senator has concluded his remarks.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I yield.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I should like to discuss with the Senator the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and especially the testimony dealing with that subject which appears on pages 1408 and thereafter on part I of the testimony.

Tomorrow hearings will begin to ascertain the situation prevailing in the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I observe from the hearings that the Senator asked the St. Lawrence Seaway representatives certain questions. Am I correct in my understanding that the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway is less, in terms of tonnage, than was originally estimated?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Yes, indeed.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** On page 1408 of the hearings the statement is made:

> According to the original Tolls Committee estimates, our tonnage for 1962 should have been 37 million as shown on this chart. The cumulative yearly total lag of actual tonnages in comparison with the estimated tonnages amounts to 34 million.

So the actual tonnage was 3 million less than anticipated.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** The Senator is correct.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Since the tonnage was less than anticipated, there was an adverse impact upon the ability of the corporation to pay not only the amount needed for amortization of the bonds, but also the interest.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** That is correct.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I turn now to page 1408 of part I of the testimony. It shows that for the year 1963 Mr. Jose testified that the revenues would be about $3.8 million, with an interest obligation of $4.4 million.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I am following the Senator. That is in the record.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** So there is $600,000 less than is needed to pay the interest obligation.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Yes. Of course, that is bound to come about because of a lower tonnage going through the canal than was anticipated.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** How is the deficit made up? Is it made up through an appropriation bill?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** No; no money is appropriated for this purpose. The funds required to pay the interest, at the normal rate, and to pay whatever interest amount is due each year comes from corporation funds.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** How is that done? Does the Government guarantee the bonds?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** It is paid out of tolls. I am sure the Government supports the bonds; otherwise, they would not be purchased. I presume in time, if the revenues for the project continue to decrease, or are not sufficient to pay the outstanding bonds or interest, Congress may have to do something about it. Not only will our Congress have to do something about it, but Canada will have to do something about it.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Canada is in the same position. Canada's engineering estimates were overoptimistic, and the income now is less than was anticipated.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** The Senator is correct.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** So if this Government is $600,000 in arrears in the payment of interest, the United States, owing only three-tenths of the debt, and Canada owing seven-tenths of the debt, Canada would be approximately twice as much in the red on their interest payments.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I would not be able to state the facts with respect to Canada. Canada may have had some traffic in the interior which resulted in higher revenue to her than we received. As the Senator knows, all the traffic that passes through our part of the Canal comes from abroad. It is possible that inside Canada there is some traffic for which Canada receives tolls, and the United States does not. I have no knowledge of that.

If the same pattern is followed in Canada as in the U.S. part of the canal, there is no doubt that Canada's lack of funds will be in the same proportion to her investment as the deficit on the U.S. portion has been.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I direct the Senator's attention to page 1414, which sets forth the narrative statement—I read from the second paragraph under the subhead "Capital outlay":

> The total construction cost of the U.S. share of the seaway is estimated at $132.4 million. Work in place at the end of the current year 1963 is estimated at $131.2, and the budget year 1964 program to complete the project is estimated at $1.2 million.

That $132.4 million equals three-tenths of the cost of the seaway. Is that correct?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Yes. That is my information.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Am I substantially correct that the total cost was $400,410,000?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Yes; for the navigation portion. As the Senator knows, there is a power project on the river. I think it was constructed jointly by the State of New York and the power entity of the Province of Ontario, Canada. The cost the Senator has mentioned does not cover that power feature of the project. It is being financed through the sale of electricity that is sold from the hydroelectric plant constructed by the State of New York and Ontario Hydroelectric.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Can the Senator give me an estimate of the cost of building the navigable system on the Arkansas River through Arkansas and into Oklahoma when it will be fully completed?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** The estimate at the moment, including the power dams, and storage for flood control as well as the locks for the purpose of navigation is in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** It is not intended to have tolls charged to ships that will use that navigable stream.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** That is correct. That has been the policy of this Government from time immemorial, so far as I know.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Is there any other river or river basin in the United States where tolls are charged to ships that use the river, except in the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I do not know of any. As I stated a moment ago, that is so because of the agreement between the United States and Canada. I assume that if the canal were totally within the United States, tolls would not be charged. In accordance with past policy, that project would have been constructed by the U.S. Government and be toll free.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** For probably two decades efforts were made to have the Congress improve the St. Lawrence Seaway so it would be navigable, but the proponents were unable to muster the necessary votes. Is that correct?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** When does the Senator mean?

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Prior to the time it was decided to build the Seaway on a self-liquidating basis.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Yes. Prior to that time I think the reason the Senate rejected the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway was that the cost was to be in excess of $1 billion, and the United States was to have borne most of the cost, while most of the Seaway was to be located in Canada. That is why there was so much opposition to construction of the project. It would have been almost totally in Canada, but financed entirely by the United States.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I was interested in the statement made by the Senator to the effect that if the revenues were not adequate to pay off the obligations of interest and principal, eventually something would have to be done, especially if increasing the rates did not produce revenues necessary to amortize the debt.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I am certain that if the tonnage increases, it will not be necessary to do anything. The past history of all these navigation projects has shown that the tonnage always increases. I could cite the Senator any number of projects constructed in the United States with respect to which that was true.

So far as Canada is concerned, I do not know that she uses the same yardstick we do. As the Senator knows, a very small part of the canal itself is in the United States. I do not want to criticize what the Canadians have done, but they may have been overoptimistic as to the tonnage that would pass through the waterway. If the tonnage does not increase, I believe it will be incumbent on the Canadian Government and the United States to get together and increase the tolls, so that revenues will be sufficient to meet principal and interest on the outstanding bonds. I believe the Canadian Government will do so. In the past I do not believe she has been as liberal as we have in providing toll-free projects in that country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason why I asked the question is that I have received letters complaining of the huge sums of money that are being spent in the development of navigable streams all over the United States, without tolls being charged; but on this river, serving the Midwest and the Great Lakes States, tolls are charged. It seems to me there is logic in the question. Why tolls only on the St. Lawrence Seaway when everywhere else there are no tolls? I refer especially to the Arkansas project, which is to cost $1.1 billion, which will go through Arkansas and into Oklahoma, and on which no tolls will be charged.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend that the Arkansas River navigation system is wholly within the United States. With respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Canada was unwilling to put up the money in order to make it toll free. As I remember, the only way in which the program could be constructed was to agree to the proposal of Canada that it be self-liquidating.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that to be the fact. Canada insisted that the St. Lawrence Seaway be self-liquidating.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not destroy the feeling of many people in the Midwest that they are compelled to pay tolls in other places while they have free use of their navigable streams.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the attention of my good friend from Ohio to the fact that in addition to the money spent jointly by Canada in constructing that part of the Seaway at Masenna, N.Y., and in the St. Lawrence area, the U.S. Government is engaged in building connecting channels in the Great Lakes totally within the United States. The cost of such construction is currently estimated at $125,300,000, and will be spent to make that part of the route entirely toll free.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; that refers to the dredging of harbors, and things of that kind, I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of that will be done at the expense of the Federal Government, without any charge being made to the users of the completed projects. The reason is that the projects are wholly within the United States, and they follow a pattern that has been followed almost from time immemorial in constructing navigation projects, entirely with Federal funds, without any tolls being charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. President Eisenhower recommended that the moneys expended to make inland waterways navigable should be recouped to the Treasury through the imposition of user charges. Some day that will have to come about, especially in connection with projects of the type we have described, costing $1,100 million on the Arkansas River, for example.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out—and I am not saying this boastfully—that for the past 10 years, ever since I became chairman of the subcommittee, the subcommittee was instrumental in providing funds to reconstruct the locks on the Ohio River.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember, 10 locks have been built without a budget estimate. We were opposed at the time by the railroads, because it was felt by the railroads that a large part of their business would be taken away from them. However, the railroads are now finding out that the cheapest method of transporting bulk products or commodities is by water. There are developing in the Senator's State, in Ohio, as well as in Indiana and in Kentucky, industries, which are taking advantage of the pools of water which are being formed upstream from these dams, which furnish a great deal of fresh water. It is my information that many new industries have been established in those areas. The railroads find now that they are benefiting greatly by being able to transport the finished products, which, as the Senator knows, pay higher freight rates than do the bulk products.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are getting into another subject. I should like to discuss it, but that is another subject. The point is that the railroads have been asking for the right to carry bulk products without regulation in the same manner as carriers on the inland waterways are now permitted to do. Congress, however, has refused to give the railroads the same right.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not my intention to discuss this program. The only thing I was trying to point out to the Senator was what our policy was, what it has been, and what it is hoped it will be in the future. I believe it would be a grave mistake to place tolls on all our navigable rivers and streams on which we have constructed projects to aid navigation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My own belief is that there is no justification for subsidizing inland water carriers at the expense of other carriers. I concur in what President Kennedy recommended, that efforts be made to recoup the subsidies that were being granted to the airlines and inland water carriers, and to truckers on the basis of building highways for truckers, to which purpose the general taxpayer is contributing and to which the owners of passenger cars are contributing. I believe an effort should be made to revise the entire program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The railroads were subsidized to the *n*th degree when they were first constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Federal Government gave millions of dollars worth of property to the railroads, which has since been sold in many instances. Much of the revenue was used in the construction of railroads. I do not believe the railroads have lost anything. Some of them still own a good deal of land.

I do not want to go into that program, but it strikes me that it is essential to our future development to continue the program of utilizing the water resources of the Nation for navigation and for many other purposes, such as for hydroelectric power, and things of that kind. We have been neglecting that resource too long. That is why I have given so much time to trying to continue these studies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has been very generous in recommending funds for the Ohio River. I appreciate it. Of course there is money in the bill for other States, such as Pennsylvania, for example, as well as for Ohio along the river.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for all the States. The Senator knows that land and water are among our greatest resources. The only way to improve such resources is by building the dams that are now being constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that it should be done. However, I repeat that someday there will have to be a review of all the subsidy programs, not only with respect to ships on navigable streams, but also with respect to the airlines. The trucks have already been compelled to pay a share through excise taxes on accessories and tires, for example. The general taxpayer ought not to pay for the purpose of subsidizing these operations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. To supplement the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I say to my good friend from Ohio that there is much to be said in support of the program that is underway in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In the first place, those who advocated it most actively in the form in which it was adopted came from the very area of the country which is now being served by it; namely, the Midwest.

The Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the authorization and, later, he handled in the Appropriations Committee the items affecting the seaway.

He attended the dedication of the Seaway, representing the Senate. He is strongly for it.

But I call attention to the fact that there would not have been a St. Lawrence Seaway if it had not been for the very strong advocacy of the program by Senators and Representatives speaking for and representing the people of the great Midwest, who, in effect, were placed upon the Atlantic by means of its construction.

The second point I wish to make is that the Seaway provides a two-way movement. Those who were for it were not only speaking in behalf of moving their products, notably grain, but were speaking in support of their need for iron ore from Labrador, in order that the great steel centers should not have to be displaced. They were extremely anxious, in view of the approaching depletion of the great ore fields in Minnesota, to have the St. Lawrence waterway completed for that purpose.

As a third matter—and I have been down along the St. Lawrence since the seaway was opened—they were very anxious to have winter travel. I visited one of the great granaries at Baie Comeau, in Upper Quebec Province, where grain is taken down the seaway and stored during the warm portion of the year. Ships can now come to Baie Comeau all year because the river is not frozen below that point. So the people of the Midwest were very active in behalf of that program, and accomplished it.

This was truly an international project. To have constructed a canal either all in Canada or all in the United States would have cost billions of dollars. The way to do it reasonably was to construct that part in the United States where relatively cheap construction was possible, and to do the same thing in the larger mileage which lies within Canada. Canada insisted upon tolls not only because Canada was not able to meet its proportionately greater investment without having some repayment, but also because it had a competing canal or canals, as to a part of the route of the Seaway, on which tolls were charged.

So every aspect of this project was carefully thought out in the legislative committees and on the floor of each House. The Senator from Florida did not support the program when he first came to the Senate, but after thorough consideration of it, he concluded that it was the right thing to do, changed his position, and became a strong advocate of it. He is well familiar with what happened at that time. He supports the chairman of the committee now in his statement that it was a good arrangement. It was the only arrangement that could be devised that was practical. It was reasonable then, and is still reasonable.

The Senator from Florida hopes that the distinguished Senator from Ohio will review the subject before he presses for the removal of any tolls.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I am not pressing for the removal of tolls; I am arguing that tolls ought to be imposed everywhere. Let us be clear about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood from the latter part of the Senator's remarks, but not from the early part, that he was complaining because there were similar streams in the United States, wholly navigable or canalized streams, on which no toll was charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. I contend that it is wrong to spend $1 billion in the building of a navigable stream and not charge tolls, and to spend $130 million on the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway and charge tolls.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the existence of an international agreement makes a great difference. In the case of the Panama Canal, there is an international agreement, without which the canal could not have been built. Not only our own ships but the ships of all nations are allowed passage, and allowed passage on similar terms.

Also there is an international accord concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is not required in other cases.

So far as I am concerned, I believe excellent work was done by all those who negotiated this project.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was constructed in the cheapest way possible and brings the most advantages that are possible to be had. It is a wonderful thing for the whole country to have the great Midwest, in effect, placed upon the Atlantic. I hope there will not be a lack of accord as to the very splendid nature of this fine project.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, there is no question in my mind that the Seaway will require the expenditure of millions of dollars more than I indicated, for the deepening of the major harbors on the Great Lakes. This will be necessary to accommodate drafts of at least 25 feet.

If the Senator will examine the record concerning the applications that have been made by the various ports along the Great Lakes, he will note that millions of dollars will be spent there, with no tolls to be charged. That will be done in order to carry out a policy that has been ours for a long time.

I am hopeful that in the future it may be possible to have Canada pay off its bonds without tolls. I am sure in that event the United States would reciprocate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I cannot agree, and I will point out why I cannot.

If tolls were not charged on the Seaway, the taxpayers would have had to pay this year $4,750,000 for interest alone. But $3,300,000 in tolls was collected. So the general taxpayers, for this 1 year, on interest alone, were saved $3,300,000. I anticipate that the tolls will increase; and as they do, the taxpayers will have to pay nothing. The cost will be paid by the people who use the Seaway, and that is how it should be.

I was one of the proponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was then Governor of Ohio. I said that tolls should be charged. I have not changed my view on that subject.

But if tolls are helping to spare the taxpayer his obligation on the St. Lawrence Seaway, tolls can spare the taxpayer on the Arkansas River, on the Ohio River, on the Mississippi, and everywhere else. That is my point. This very case demonstrates that tolls can be charged and can pay off the interest, and probably later pay off the principal.

I wish an answer would be given to the situation concerning the $3,600,000 that is now available, through tolls, to pay interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Ohio must realize that the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway has been of great benefit to all the States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it has. It has brought about a great increase in business. Except for the fact that Canada did not choose to put up the money as we did, a canal would not have been constructed. As the Senator from Florida has said, the only way to have had this waterway built was to make it self-sustaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Canada was smart in doing so. If Congress began doing things in that way, by insisting that such projects be self-liquidating, the taxpayers of the country and the fiscal position of the United States would be better off.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then fewer and fewer projects would be constructed, and our country would lag behind, because the entire country benefits through such a system of transportation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio hear this statement, also.

At the time when Congress acted, the Dominion of Canada served notice that if the United States did not act on this much cheaper program, whereby a part of the canal would be in our country and the major part in Canada, Canada proposed to build one by its own means, which would have been much more expensive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recalls that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The canal would have been constructed through Canada and would have called for much higher tolls. From every point of view I can think of, the arrangement made was the most economical one possible and the most helpful possible to that great area of the country which the Senator from Ohio represents, in part, with such great distinction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman about an item under the "Mississippi River and tributaries," $50,000 for the Cache River project, listed under the heading of "Construction." The item was in the budget estimates.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The House did not allow it. The House omitted it. I did not realize it had been restored in the bill until the report was printed.

I ask my distinguished friend if the $50,000 item in the present bill is intended to start construction on the drainage project which is known as the Cache River project.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I refer the Senator to page 3273 of the hearings. Mr. McRae appeared. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, as you recall, the 1963 Appropriation Act directed the corps to make a study to determine whether additional

protection for lands in this area should be provided. The report of the division engineer has been completed and is now under review in the Chief's office. Until that report is completed, Mr. Chairman, we are not in a position to initiate construction of this project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished chairman. That was my recollection of the matter.

Mr ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For that reason, it would be inadvisable to initiate an appropriation for construction of the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the House had reasons for deleting the item. As my good friend from Arkansas knows, our subcommittee has seldom rejected budgeted items.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that. I do not know that I am opposed to the project as such.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a belief among the people in the lower area of the river—what is called the White River backwater area—that construction of the project would only increase the backwater height and thus cover lands not now subjected to being inundated. For that reason, there is strong opposition in that section. In the upper reaches of the river, the landowners are quite eager to have the project approved, to have appropriations made, and to have the project constructed.

I believe I am correct in saying that the appropriation in the bill now under consideration is intended to cover the Federal Government's contribution on bridges involved in interstate highway construction in that area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the bridges are not constructed to make allowance for the improvement, the cost in the future would be much higher.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is not intended to construct the project the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The money is intended to help in the construction of highway facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be a part of the Federal Government's contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. As I said, the House struck out the amount. I do not know the reason for that. I do not attempt to look behind the House action for a reason.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked with members of the House committee, but I believe the reason was that they were waiting for a full report. There is an unsettled and uncertain situation as to what the improvement would do in respect to landowners in the lower end of the valley.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Arkansas that if the amount is left in the bill—as it will be in all probability—this item will be taken up in conference with the House conferees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish at this time to move to strike it. Ultimately, I may support the overall project and appropriation for it. I understand that the money is for the Federal Government's contribution to highway construction, rather than to start an overall drainage project. I am not certain I would oppose the project.

Since the bill must go to conference, I shall make further inquiry about this matter and be more certain later as to whether I feel the item should be left in or whether the Senate should yield in conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the interest and cooperation of my good friend the chairman on these matters. I know how he feels about such projects. He is enthusiastic, as I am, when good projects are presented which show a proper ratio of benefits to cost. I appreciate that. I especially appreciate his interest in projects in my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress has shown its interest. This is not merely my interest.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know. The Congress has.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are times, with respect to such improvements, when one group of landowners is greatly benefited and another group of landowners suffers property damage. Until that question can be resolved, I would not wish to have the project started.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that what he is discussing now is not peculiar to the Cache River project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is true with respect to many projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. A similar situation faced the committee with respect to a project in the State of Kansas. There had been a lot of opposition. Today I believe everybody is happy, because the dam in question has proved to be better than was anticipated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the people of Arkansas will be happy about this project if the Corps of Engineers can find a solution to the backwater problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope they can do so. I hope that a satisfactory solution will be set forth in the report which is now in the process of being reviewed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I would not attempt to provide construction money which would do damage to a great many people.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had no doubt about that. I merely wished to make the record clear. Although the report does not discuss the project, the record will be clear as to what the money is for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, for yielding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 18, after the word "construction", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$20,625,000".

On page 4, line 11, after the word "constructure", to strike out "$793,282,700" and insert "$849,856,000".

On page 5, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$157,368,000".

On page 6, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$74,500,000" and insert "$80,406,000".

On page 6, after line 7, to insert:

"UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

"For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity."

On page 8, line 5, after the word "transfusions," to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$25,725,000."

On page 8, line 15, after the word "assets", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,250,000".

On page 9, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,285,000"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "sixteen" and insert "twenty-one"; in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which sixteen are", and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,300" and insert "$7,800".

On page 10, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "$9,894,000" and insert "$10,442,000"; in line 24, after the word "which", to strike out "$8,621,000" and insert "$8,902,000", and on page 11, line 4, after the word "That", to strike out "$340,000" and insert "$388,000".

On page 11, line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "$180,190,000" and insert "$187,425,000".

On page 13, line 5, after the word "program", to strike out "$12,217,000" and insert "$12,367,000".

On page 13, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "$97,845,700" and insert "$97,989,200", and in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "$3,809,000" and insert "$3,952,500".

On page 16, line 23, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath Project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944, and Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956."

On page 19, at the beginninng of line 5, to strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$36,204,000".

On page 19, line 10, after the word "energy", to strike out "$13,200,000" and insert "$13,500,000".

On page 22, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,308,169,000"' and insert "2,369,524,000".

On page 24, at the begininng of line 9, to strike out "$380,000,000" and insert "$418,695,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$46,000,000" and insert "$48,284,000".

On page 28, after line 10, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV

*"Funds appropriated to the President*

"Public Works Acceleration

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress."

On page 28, line 23, to change the title number from "IV" to "V".

On page 28, line 25, to change the section number from "401" to "501".

On page 29, line 6, to change the section number from "402" to "502".

On page 30, line 14, to change the section number from "403" to "503".

On page 30, line 21, to change the section number from "404" to "504".

On page 31, line 3, to change the section number from "405" to "505".

On page 31, line 14, to change the section number from "406" to "506".

On page 32, line 6, to change the section number from "407" to "507".

On page 32, line 19, to change the section number from "408" to "508".

On page 32, line 24, to change the section number from "409" to "509".

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate has been favored with a very lucid and detailed characterization of the civil functions bill for the fiscal year 1964. That statement was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I offer my congratulations to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, for the competent and conscientious way in which he has handled the time-consuming and—at times—somewhat thankless task in the appropriation of funds contained in the Public Works Appropriation bill.

Senator ELLENDER has been in charge of this bill for approximately 10 years. He has earned a deserved reputation as an expert in the field of water resource conservation and related subjects. He is familiar with the problem faced by each State in the Union. Every project request is given a thorough examination by him and his subcommittee before consideration can be given to appropriation of funds. This is evident in the fact that we started hearings on the Corps of Engineers budget on Tuesday, May 7, and concluded on November 20. The vastness of the job is demonstrated by the fact that 3,328 pages of printed testimony are before Members of the Senate for reference to Corps of Engineers requests.

The subcommittee heard over 900 witnesses. All told, the hearings on the overall public works bill comprise more than 4,500 pages of testimony, and more than 1,000 witnesses were heard.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that, after having participated in many of the numerous sessions of the subcommittee, I not only sympathize with the suggestion he made for curtailing the repetitive parts of the hearings, but also assure him of my cooperation in every possible way.

While the amounts in this bill are large, it must be remembered that America's problems in this area are here and now. They cannot be shunted off to some future years. Members of the Committee on Appropriations are very much aware that they cannot and should not provide all the funds requested for all the projects urged by many thousands of individuals and organizations in the country. Senator ELLENDER has always taken pride in the fact that no projects are approved by our subcommittee unless adequate hearings have been held on them. The subcommittee shares in this pride.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, it is a continuing pleasure for me to work with Senator ELLENDER. I also welcome this opportunity to congratulate him, publicly, as I have already done privately.

Other distinguished Senators have played a major part in this important bill—although perhaps in lesser degree, because the number of items dealt with in other parts of the bill are lesser in number. For example, our respected President pro tempore and Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator HAYDEN, has performed his usual valuable service in handling another difficult phase of the bill, the funding of requirements of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation. This is also a major water resources program. We are fortunate to have Senator HAYDEN as chairman of this subcommittee. As an Arizonian and as a Member of the Congress since 1912, he knows more about the great water problems faced by much of the Nation than virtually any other Member of the Congress. He is also responsible for the financial requirements of the several power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

My close friend and distinguished colleague on this side of the aisle, Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, is the able ranking Republican member of the same subcommittee. He has done an excellent job in the examination and sifting of testimony for the great many requests for funds.

Senator HILL is another devoted member of the Committee on Appropriations and it is my privilege to serve as ranking minority member on his subcommittee on the important section of the bill dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. He, too, deserves our gratitude and congratulations.

Mr. President, let me also state that, in common with other Senate committees, we are particularly favored by our excellent staff. Ken Bousquet, the clerk of the subcommittee, has done an excellent job. It is a delight to work with him, not only in the committee room in the hearings, but also in executive sessions and in the field. It has been my privilege to do all those things. On the minority side, Ed King has rendered similar fine service.

Mr. President, most cities and towns in America at one time or another have had problems which came within the purview of this national program: Floods, ravaging property and human life, hurricanes, beach erosion, navigation, multiple-purpose river basin problems, locks and dams and canals are just a few of the great many problems involved.

In my own State of Nebraska, like all other States and especially those in the West, water is literally a life-or-death matter. We Nebraskans, working with the Federal Government, have spent large sums over the years in a massive effort to conserve our natural resources and to prevent the ravages of natural disasters. And we will spend a great many more millions in the years ahead.

In the area of the rivers and harbors, flood control, and navigation program, an estimated $85,000 will be spent this fiscal year on general investigations of projects pertaining to Nebraska. There is the Big Blue River, Nebraska and Kansas, for which $30,000 has been programed; the Elkhorn River, $10,000; the Nemaha-Little Nemaha River, Nebraska and Kansas, $15,000; and the Platte River, $30,000.

Advance engineering and design for projects in my State will amount to $120,000, with $80,000 scheduled for the Little Papillion Creek and $45,000 for Norfolk River.

Two large construction projects are underway and funds have been earmarked to the extent of $650,000 for the Gering Valley project, and $4,200,000 for the Salt Creek and tributaries.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated an expenditure of $685,000 for operation and maintenance requirements of existent Nebraska public works projects.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a program identified as small authorized projects. A serious flood control problem exists in the vicinity of Clarkson, Nebr., which comes within the provisions of section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act. This project has been fully investigated and found to be eligible under the provisions of the act. It is expected that the Corps of Engineers will find it possible to allot construction funds from the appropriation allowed for small authorized projects for which the Senate committee provided a modest increase.

Completion of this work will enable Clarkson to proceed with public works of its own financing, including a sewage disposal plant.

The people of Nebraska are also especially interested in the Missouri River channel stabilization program which covers the States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, as well as Nebraska. The Senate has approved an amount of $6 million for the project ranging from Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr., and $2,700,000 for the part of the program extending from Omaha to Kansas City, with a like amount from Kansas City to the mouth of the Missouri River—including a 9-foot channel.

The latter item is of particular interest to Missouri River navigation from Kansas City to Omaha. It will eliminate the "bottleneck" of a less-than-9-foot channel between Kansas City and St. Louis which has imposed upon river traffic upstream from Kansas City, the lesser channel depth. This action will make possible fully loaded barges heretofore barred, thus bringing about a lesser per-unit freight cost.

### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the vast natural resources of the 17 Western States and Alaska are being conserved and developed for the welfare of the Nation. This is accomplished through the planning, construction, and operation of facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supplies, and develop related hydroelectric power and flood control.

An estimated $18,927,000 will be used in fiscal 1964 on reclamation construction and rehabilitation projects in and around Nebraska. For example, $8,100,000 has been programed for the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; another basin program, the Farwell unit, has been allocated $5 million. There is also the Frenchman-Cambridge division, $1,787,000.

The Senate and the House Appropriations Committees allowed $23 million for the Transmission division of the Missouri River Basin, a $956,000 reduction from the budget estimate. Of this reduction, $641,000 is to be absorbed by the several States involved in this program. Both committees agreed that this cut could readily be absorbed since funds for new construction will be available for only about 6 months.

The Bureau of Reclamation had earmarked $2,578,000 as the amount for Nebraska.

An estimated $805,000 will be expended for drainage and minor construction on the Bostwick division of the Missouri River Basin project in Nebraska and Kansas. Another item for which $657,000 has been approved is the rehabilitation and betterment program for the North Platte project in Nebraska and Wyoming.

### RECLAMATION—PROJECTS INVESTIGATIONS

The Bureau of Reclamation's project investigations include the following items:

Elkhorn division, $64,000; Little Blue unit, $10,000; Mirage Flats extension unit, $56,000; North Loup division, $8,000; O'Neill unit, $10,000; Wilber unit, $158,000.

Basin surveys which affect Nebraska include the comprehensive framework plan covering Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming, $522,000.

Advance planning funds for basin projects include Cedar Rapids division, $195,000, and the North Republican unit, Colorado and Nebraska, $84,000, for a total of $1,174,000.

Mr. President, my colleague, Senator Curtis and I are appreciative for the favorable consideration the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations gave to our request for an item of $100,000 for continuation of the preauthorization investigations on the Nebraska midstate unit. Taxpayers in the midstate district have spent a great many thousands of dollars of their own money to pursue this project; in fact, more than $300,000.

Mr. President, the Senate can consider the first three titles of this bill with the confident knowledge that they have been carefully considered by both the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee.

The projects represented in this measure may lack the glamour of the space program or weapons tests or exotic medical research, but they are of vital importance in terms of saving lives and providing for a brighter future for generations to come.

### ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

Title IV of the bill, Mr. President, is quite a different matter.

Accelerated public works, for which title IV appropriates, like so many crash programs, was launched with a great fanfare and with extravagant claims of potential reductions in the unemployment market. The facts have never borne out the claims.

The program has been roundly criticized as one of the most poorly administered in Washington, in many cases putting even our foreign aid bungles to shame.

In addition, one of the most respected Members of the Senate, and a member of the Appropriations Committee, has publicly charged that the program has been administered with willful discrimination and with glaring discrepancies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at this point in my remarks there be printed excerpts from the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which contain the exchange between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] and the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, Mr. Batt.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### MISSISSIPPI PROJECT

Senator Stennis. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter now that I have had to deal with for months and months regarding projects in my State out of the money that has already been appropriated through the previous two appropriations. My office dealt with them on these matters for a long time, and they were told that there was a long construction season envisioned in the South and a short construction season envisioned in the North, and that they would get to Mississippi later.

Later, the tone changed. They said that all of these projects in Mississippi were under review—under review.

And, in the meantime, I have had people in Mississippi call me, they were calling me, and they were calling Senator Eastland and the other members of the Mississippi delegation. I advised them to go to Atlanta, the area office, and to talk about this project and they did, and finally the projects came on into Washington.

I then got into the picture myself by calling about these projects and was told that they were under review, and so forth.

### PROJECTS IN OTHER STATES

Now, I gather from press releases from Mr. Batt's office that the figures would run like this—and I am talking about the second appropriation. In the first appropriation, I think that Mississippi fared all right. But we pieced together from the agencies press releases facts like this:

Alabama received 67 projects—and I am sure they are worthwhile, for a round sum of $13 million.

Arkansas, a number of projects. I don't have the exact number, for $8,500,000.

Georgia, 65 projects, for $8,067,000.

Louisiana, 45 projects, with a total of $14 million.

Now, I mention these because they are in areas in the country similarly situated and with similar unemployment.

### TWO PROJECTS APPROVED FOR MISSISSIPPI

Now, of all those sums and this great number of projects, only two projects were approved for Mississippi, two small ones, totaling $242,000, instead of $10 or $12 million, as for the other States, we had received only $242,000.

Now, I took this up with Mr. Batt and later I took it up again with Mr. Roosevelt and the chairman of the full committee. I also talked on the telephone with Secretary Hodges about it. And I charged that there is a willful, deliberate, and purposeful discrimination against Mississippi, for some reason. I don't know what.

Now, I voted against this original program. I was not convinced that it was needed. But when this appropriation came up the last time for the second $450 million, I took issue with the members of the committee arguing against it and said that I thought it had been fairly and properly administered, which I did. I will have to withdraw those remarks now. I cannot say that.

### COMMITTEE INVESTIGATORS

Now, I talked to Mr. Batt and I have talked to others and, when this thing came to a head, the committee investigators went into it. I think that Mississippi under any fair rule would have been entitled to $10 or $11 million in projects of like kind. Now, that is not just a guess, it is by comparison with other States similarly situated.

Now, what is a man going to do when his State is treated that way? What is the man going to think? What is the committee going to do?

Now. I have asked for the name of the person that is guilty of this discrimination. Mr. Batt said that he is responsible for it. That is not the question. I have asked Mr. Roosevelt and he talked about something else—no answer to my question.

I asked Mr. Hodges to look into this matter personally. They say now that there are no more funds.

There are 80 projects, I understand, gentlemen, on this list from Mississippi, that have been approved at the Atlanta regional level and they have come up to Washington. Some of them have been lying on the desks for a long while, while I was being told they were "under review, under review."

Now, I don't want to embarrass anyone unnecessarily, but I feel compelled to bring this out. I am only asking for just treatment for my State.

So, I am ready to prove by witnesses from this staff all of these allegations that I have made here, plus more—but I do want the committee to go into it, and I raise that point now after months and months of being patient and being put off.

### RELEASE OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS

Now, after this came up, they did release 12 projects in the total amount of $1,472,000 in Federal money—but that was after this disclosure and later confrontation and after this charge was proven and after the committee investigators went into it.

Now, later—those releases were about 3 weeks ago—later they released some small forestry projects, totaling in all, I believe, about $325,000. Stretching that figure a little, you can say about $2 million worth has been released.

### ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

Now, they say the money is all gone in the community facilities program. And a lot of these projects in Mississippi were in community facilities. I understand there is no money in this $45 million for the community facilities. I don't know how to meet that situation, but the point I raise is the administration of these funds.

How can the Congress go along with this if these facts are true? And they are true. They are proven, every one of them. I think they are admitted. As I say, I don't want to be unjust or unfair to anyone, but the whole representation to my staff and to me has been misleading and evasive, and these matters were not under review, except there has been a black mark put on them, and somebody in this Department did it. I don't know who did the dirty work. I am not laying any charge against Mr. Batt, not at all, I don't know. I doubt if he is the one, and I don't have any reason to believe he is the one, except he wants to assume responsibility.

I want to thank the chairman of this committee, too, for his consideration to me in this and say to the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator Ellender, I just thought that the chairman of the full committee handled this project when it was up last time, in a supplemental, but I did mention it to you, as soon as I learned it was within your jurisdiction.

Senator Ellender. Well, I remember, Senator, your mentioning this problem to me.

Senator Stennis. Yes.

Senator Ellender. I contacted someone in the Department, and requested certain information.

Mr. Batt, do you have anything to say for the record regarding the charges made by Senator Stennis?

### STATEMENT REGARDING CHARGES

Mr. Batt. Well, sir, I think it is the only case I know of, the only State I know of, where the allegation has been made that they have gotten less than their fair share.

I was as distressed as the Senator when it was brought to our attention, and we immediately looked into it. We found, as the Senator pointed out in all fairness, that the State has fared rather well on the first appropriation and that they had not done as well on the second appropriation and had not gotten as much as their neighboring States or, indeed, as much as they had every reason to expect.

Senator Ellender. Well, who is responsible for that?

### RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

Mr. Batt. I will assume full responsibility for it, Senator.

Senator Ellender. That doesn't do any good. You must have had somebody under you who didn't keep his eye on this.

Mr. Batt. No, I'll assume all responsibility. As the President said, you know, in another connection, failure is an orphan; success has a thousand fathers.

When the Senator first brought this to our attention, the program was not complete and the situation has changed from week to week. We have succeeded in ameliorating some of that underage.

### HEW PROJECTS

As the Senator pointed out in all fairness, we have succeeded in getting 12 HEW projects—these are the hospital projects and the sewage disposal plants which are all that the State of Mississippi has submitted that are not interlinked with CFA projects, we have gotten all that the State submitted approved. We were fortunate in having funds still unallocated in HEW.

### FOREST SERVICE PROJECTS

On the Forest Service side, we have done better. As the Senator has pointed out in all fairness, we have gotten in 11 projects with $325,000. The Forest Service tells me incidentally, Senator, that if this additional funding would be approved, we can again do better, although, in the one national forest that I understand you have there—we ought to be able to put in about $700,000 worth.

### COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

The CFA has been out of funds. That has been our big problem. We never, of course, could fund the 80 projects. No State got all the projects they asked for. We have a backlog of $700 million——

Senator Stennis. By CFA, you refer to the Community Facilities Administration?

Mr. Batt. CFA is Community Facilities Administration—Housing and Home Finance.

Senator Stennis. Yes.

Mr. Batt. So, we never could in a million years fund all the projects that are in. We have a backlog of $700 million of State and local projects.

We can, we feel, fund some of those from Mississippi, the most pressing ones, if and when some of the projects under CFA that have already been approved are not accepted, don't come through. There will be some fallout there. There is some slippage, and we hope to be able to improve the CFA picture in Mississippi, and that, I think, is the one that looks the worst. It looks good in Forest Service, it looks good in the HEW, and it looks very bad in CFA.

Senator Stennis. May I ask you a question? You are talking about it looking good. Now, how did it look before this thing was exposed?

Mr. Batt. I think it was, I am still——

Senator Stennis. What is your evaluation of that?

Mr. Batt. I think, sir, in the first appropriation, as you pointed out, it looked fair. In the second appropriation, Mississippi was very severely under what they should have received, no doubt about it.

Senator Stennis. May I ask some questions, Mr. Chairman?

Senator Ellender. Surely, proceed.

### CHARGE OF WILLFUL DISCRIMINATION

Senator Stennis. I charge that this is a willful discrimination. What is your response to that, that this was deliberately done and willfully done and it couldn't have been any other way. What is your answer?

Mr. Batt. Well, sir, I would personally accept the responsibility for the——

Senator Ellender. But that is not the question.

Mr. Batt (continuing). Unwisdom or poor wisdom. I don't believe it was willful discrimination, and I think that our efforts at the direction of Secretary Hodges and Under Secretary Roosevelt, to improve the situation and bring Mississippi up much closer to their—to what they have every reason to expect—is an indication that we have no—that as soon as it was brought to our attention, we have done all that we can to repair it.

Senator Stennis. But may I go back to that question?

Mr. Batt. I would be the first to say, though, Senator, however, that we have made a lot more mistakes than this.

### FUNDS FROM RECORD APPROPRIATION

Senator Stennis. Well, go back to my question. Before it was disclosed here by me, before I contacted and confronted you with these figures, there were only $242,000 given Mississippi.

Mr. Batt. Out of the second appropriation.

Senator Stennis. Out of the second appropriation. Do you say that that was a willful discrimination or not?

Mr. Batt. Well, sir, I would not—I would say that the evidence is that we then pitched in and did our best to make up that underage that was evidence of our—it was our indication of desire on the administrative part to——

Senator Stennis. That is certainly not the question. I am sure that the Chair and the committee understand it.

Looking at that picture as it was, when I confronted you with those pictures, $242,000 had been allotted for Mississippi and these other figures for the other States, do you say that that was a willful discrimination or not?

### ADMISSION OF MISTAKE

Mr. Batt. Sir, I would call it a mistake. Obviously, this is a matter of semantics——

Senator Stennis. A willful mistake?

Mr. Batt. I would say it was a mistake.

Senator Stennis. Just a plain mistake?

Mr. Batt. I would say it was a mistake and I say we have made many other mistakes and we have tried to repair them when they were brought to our attention——

* * * * *

### GLARING DISCREPANCIES IN ADMINISTRATION

Senator Stennis. Do you expect this committee to give you more money in view of such glaring discrepancies here in the administration of this fund? Do you expect us to accept your statement here that it was just a mistake?

Mr. Batt. Well, what the committee does, sir, is of course, entirely up to the committee, but I do feel that this is an opportunity to make up for some of this shortfall in Mississippi and other States through the Forest Service. We also hope that we can put some 15,000 or 20,000 people to work as the result of this proposal.

Senator Stennis. May I ask you to get back to the subject. Were you directed by anyone above you to withhold these projects from Mississippi?

Mr. Batt. No, sir.

### CRITICISM WITHIN DEPARTMENT

Senator Stennis. Have you reprimanded or criticized anyone under you for doing this act?

Mr. Batt. I think it is true to say that when you brought this to the attention of the Secretary and myself and Mr. Roosevelt that we thoroughly criticized everybody that had anything to do with it, including ourselves.

Senator Stennis. Well, have you done anything about it? Have you investigated to find out how it happened?

Mr. Batt. I think we know the facts, and I think they are as I represented them to you, Senator.

* * * * *

### QUESTION RE ARA-APPROVED PROJECTS

Senator Stennis. Just one more question, it might shed some light on these Mississippi projects being declined out of the second appropriation. Isn't it true that a number of these projects were approved by ARA, but never were approved and therefore fell by the wayside by what you call the CFA, the Community Facilities Administration—there was no money came out of that part of it. Weren't they the ones that were holding up?

Mr. Batt. I would have to check that back on a project-by-project basis, I do not know, Senator.

Senator Ellender. Well, I think that we shed light on who is really responsible.

Mr. Batt. I take complete responsibility for it, sir—if I also get credit for the success of the program.

Senator Stennis. Well, I understand that. I think that that answer is just a little too clever, if I may say so. We have been over that many times. What I am trying to get at is the facts.

> Now I want to know who did this dirty work, and I don't think that you originated it, frankly.
>
> Mr. Batt. Well, sir; I think that——
>
> Senator Stennis. But I do want to know if the CFA had approved any of these, whether it was left on their desk or not. I think the committee is interested in who did this.

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, this testimony makes out a convincing case of unfair and discriminatory treatment. Factors unrelated to the guidelines and standards adopted for allocation of such funds were allowed to govern. If the regular processes and channels of congressional action had been followed, no such inexcusable results would have occurred.

In view of the showing of willful discrimination in Mississippi, it stands to reason that there is high probability of similar abuse by the executive department in other areas, though proof thereof might be difficult. At any rate, the testimony quoted above shows clearly how foolhardy it is for Congress to abdicate its power over the purse strings in favor of difficult-to-control administration of another branch of government. We should not extend such abdication. The $45 million provided in title IV of this bill should be deleted on this ground alone; and in due time it will be my intention to submit an amendment which will have for its purpose the achievement of such a deletion.

Mr. President, the Congress had authorized $900 million for accelerated public works. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated, and, as I understand, has already been spent or earmarked. What we are being asked to approve now, in the closing days of this session, is that last final bite.

This demand is completely unrealistic and premature, because the policy of the Congress toward this program is far from clear. The Public Works Committee has before it two bills to increase the authorization to $2.4 billion and $3.9 billion for this accelerated public works program—but not a single hearing has yet been held.

Earlier this afternoon, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] made an announcement that hearings would commence in a day or so on these bills. At long last. After all the weeks and months that have passed during the pendency of these bills, we have not yet arrived at the point of establishing the current sense and the current thinking of the Congress, in either body, in regard to continuation of the accelerated public works program.

I would hope and expect that in the course of those hearings, information will be developed on which the Congress can make a considered judgment. We have already seen the maladministration which inevitably accompanies a crash program such as this one. Let us not fall victim to more of the same disease. Let us concur in the action of the House of Representatives which denied the entire $45 million.

Mr. President, the failures and mistakes of the accelerated public works program are well known. In many cases the projects cannot properly be called public works; they are more in the nature of the WPA-type leaf raking, makework. Specific examples that have appeared in the Record are cemetery maintenance, archeological research, exotic plant control, and pasture improvement.

But there are many other examples of mismanagement. One of our colleagues could recite the case of a town in a certain Southern State which inquired of the Administrator as to whatever had happened to its application. The reply was that the county in which the community was located had received its quota and hence the request was denied. Further inquiry showed that the Area Redevelopment Administration had sent some funds to another county of the same name, but in a totally different State.

There is the example of the town to which the Administrator sent glad tidings that its project had been approved. It developed that a year earlier it had withdrawn its request because the community had voted against the necessary local bond issue by a vote of some 9 to 1.

Congressman Kyl, of Iowa, on April 9 of this year regaled his colleagues in the House with a hilarious comedy of errors involving projects in his State where, again, the aid went to the wrong county for the wrong project by the wrong agency.

I could go on, Mr. President. Perhaps it is enough to recall the loan to reopen a closed coal mine in Utah where another mine had just laid off 125 miners because of the drop in the coal market. Or the vast number of motels which have been built in areas already overburdened with hundreds of unused motel rooms. Or the sewage work done in the poor little suburb of Detroit known as Grosse Point. Anyone who has ever visited that part of the Detroit area knows that it is not a rundown area.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress several days ago promised us that "the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar value for a dollar spent."

Mr. President, the record of the accelerated public works program clearly demonstrates that its falls far short of yielding a dollar value for a dollar spent.

These funds of $45 million were originally requested for direct Federal activities, namely, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, with $2.7 million skimmed off the top for "administration"; that is, to pay for salaries and paper shuffling.

These were not to be community projects in which the local areas shared. They were to be work in the national forests and parks over the winter. They were designated as short leadtime projects whose effect on unemployment would be immediate.

But the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, recommends that half of the amount be allocated to projects of the Community Facilities Administration which, with a much longer leadtime, will not be able to reduce unemployment in the immediate weeks and months ahead.

Thus, the argument for this special $45 million has been cut precisely in half.

Mr. President, page 7562 of the Congressional Record for May 1, 1963, contains some rather lengthy remarks by me on the efficacy of this whole accelerated public works program. In that statement, I made the point that the whole effort amounted to only about a drop in a 5-million-man bucket of unemployment—a drop of about 2 percent of that figure. Unless one counts the additional Federal employees who are at work administering—or maladministering—this program, the effect on unemployment is insignificant. To solve the unemployment problem by this means and at this rate would require 30 billion of tax dollars.

But that is still not the major objection to this bill, Mr. President. Nor is the principal defect in this proposal its poor timing, before the Public Works Committee has held hearings on new authorizations.

The really fatal flaw is the fact that it is a poorly conceived, hastily devised scheme to crash our way to a solution of the unemployment problem.

Sometimes crash programs are justified, as in war or other times of national peril. But we have seen the folly of the waste and extravagance that inevitably accompany such all-out assaults on any national program. I would call to the Senate's attention the series of recent reports by the General Accounting Office of the millions upon millions of dollars that have been lost in the space program because of its crash character.

What is required is an orderly system for the allocation and expenditure of these funds, through the regular congressional process, by appropriation to existing and established agencies of the Government. There is neither need nor justification for a superagency like the Area Redevelopment Administration, sitting atop the old-line agencies like Agriculture and Interior in the running of this program. There is no need for the appropriation of these funds to the President for reallocation to the ARA and then for re-reallocation to Agriculture. It is a perversion of the traditional and accepted system of our governmental routine.

Mr. President, the evidence is overwhelming against the accelerated public works program. It is entirely outside the limits of congressional control.

The merit of handling an additional $45 million to the accelerated public works program has not been demonstrated. In fact, the hearings before our subcommittee would suggest the opposite.

But if there is a case to be made for this program, then the place for it to be made is before the Public Works Committee which can then recommend a course of action to the Senate.

Until then, Mr. President, I strongly urge that we withhold the $45 million.

Mr. President, I repeat my remarks as to the quality of the hearings that were held, the patience of the chairman, and the very fine work that was done by all of the staff and members of the committee. This bill is worthy of serious consideration by the Senate, and, with the exception of title IV, I commend it.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma providing that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for giving me this opportunity, so that I may thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the spectacularly fine work he has done in considering all the great public works projects that have been laid before his committee. He has done so with fairness, with care, with discrimination, and I believe with a careful view as to their utilization and their effect on our entire national program. I do not believe there is a portion of the United States that has not benefited from the work which has occupied so much of the chairman's time. The work has been handled with great care.

I wonder if I may ask the Senator from Louisiana a question, in order to clarify some of the language on page 41 of the Senate committee report on the bill. I refer to a part of title II of the bill, dealing with Interior Department agencies—specifically, the Southwest Power Administration.

The Southwest Power Administration is a 20-year-old institution which was established to help deliver the power generated at multipurpose flood control dams to various REA's within the State of Oklahoma. The Administration has been cognizant of the fact that its job of delivering power should be beneficial not only to the cooperatives but also, where possible, it should assist in distribution of power and the sale of peak power to private utilities, thereby eliminating the need for costly extra generating plants that would have to be built by private companies to serve a 2- or 3-hour peak load. Trading peak power for regular power has been helpful in the entire region. Many friends from whom I have heard since the report was made are fearful that the language appearing in the second paragraph relating to the continuing fund for the Southwest Power Administration might result in severely hampering it in its duty to supply the public power generated at dams to the preference users.

They have no fault to find with the first phrase which reads:

> The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

They are anxious, and hope that this language would not prevent them from delivering the power, when subsequent dams in this region have been completed and the power is ready to be delivered to the preference users—namely, distributing co-ops of the REA.

I interpret the language as being merely a restatement of the Flood Control and Power Marketing Acts.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if that is not generally the meaning of the Flood Control Act?

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion it is a restatement of the law. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma recalls that in the budget for fiscal 1947, there was a request made by SPA for $23 million to begin construction of a system of generation and transmission facilities. After this request was denied, REA began making loans to co-ops for generating facilities to produce power which would be purchased by SPA and for transmission facilities which would be leased to, and operated by, SPA. The committee interpreted this arrangement as meaning that the Department of Agriculture was being asked to put up the money to establish co-op generating and transmission facilities for use by SPA and which depended for their feasibility on these arrangements with SPA. The committee then thought it was wrong to have one department put up the money to construct generating and transmission facilities and then have another Government department use them in order to make the loans feasible.

The committee took positive action on that and Congress amended the law on the committee's recommendation. The Senator read only a portion of the statement in the current report to which he referred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement attempts to reiterate what is the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the lines were necessary, there would be no objection, in the language of the committee report, to the construction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. MONRONEY. When the dams are ready to produce power, the cooperative arrangement with any group building the lines would be permissible, under the Flood Control Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to read a short statement which was prepared, to indicate the reasons why this was done, and when it was done.

The committee report contains the admonition on page 41 that no part of the Southwestern Power Administration's continuing fund is to be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. This, of course, amounts to a restatement of the law.

The Southwestern Power Administration was created to market surplus power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the Department of the Army. The projects were constructed for flood control and for other purposes. The electrical energy was only a byproduct, and there was no intention of putting the Government into the power business, except to the extent necessary to market the surplus power from these reservoirs. When the Southwestern Power Administration sought funds for a steamplant to firm up the surplus hydroelectric power, those funds were denied—those are the funds to which I have referred—in order to prevent the gradual buildup of a tax-supported public power industry against which private power could not compete.

In 1949, the continuing fund was increased and its use to cover costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and rentals for transmission facilities was authorized. The purchase of power was justified at that time as a necessary adjunct to the marketing of the hydroelectric power. In an opinion dated July 15, 1949, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior stated that the marketing of the hydroelectric power, in accordance with section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, necessitated interchange agreements under which the Administration might during certain accounting periods purchase more than it sold.

In 1950 Congress learned that the continuing fund was being used indirectly to finance the construction of generating and transmitting facilities. The Rural Electrification Administration made $66 million worth of loans for generating and transmitting facilities, the feasibility for such loans being dependent on agreements with Southwestern Power Administration. As soon as Congress learned that Southwestern Power Administration funds were being used indirectly to finance these facilities, Congress in 1951 amended the continuing fund law to limit expenditures therefrom to amounts authorized annually by Congress. Congress thereby sought to reassert control. Congress has at all times tried to limit SPA, as nearly as possible, to the use of existing facilities in marketing the hydroelectric power, and to prevent the construction of a great public power project.

The hearings on the bill now before us disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee therefore felt it necessary to restate the law and the congressional policy.

That is what is involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend. However, the language which continues, from the first of the paragraph, arouses a fear in the minds of REA leaders and users that it would, in effect, make a change in the law.

Picking up the language:

> The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used—

And adding the words—

> to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility——

Mr. ELLENDER. "If."

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes—

> if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration.

It is said that the language might cause an adverse effect on contracting which must be done with an ordinary distributing REA cooperative. These must contract for the use of power, and by contracting they make the loan more feasible, if they expect an extension of their distribution system or the "heavying up" of their lines.

The use of the words, "feasibility of a Federal loan" particularly works against distribution cooperatives, which feel that this would severely hamper their opportunity to make contracts necessary in the normal course of their operations.

The language is not subject to amendment on the floor. I hope the language can be discussed in conference with the House conferees and the conclusion reached, after careful study of the language, that it would not be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power, as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. If the language needs to be modified, I hope it will be so reported when the bill comes back from conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knows that I have always been for REA.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has been a pioneer in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am a great advocate of the REA. It is handled by the committee of which I am the chairman.

At the moment we are seeking to prevent any increase in the agitation now going on throughout the country in respect to REA loans being made on a commercial basis. Several bills are now pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Up to now hearings have not been held on them.

It is my belief that the REA has been doing a good job; and I should like to have that continue.

In the budget for fiscal 1947 $23 million was asked by the Department of the Interior to begin construction of a system of powerplants and transmission facilities to firm the power generated at various dams. A program was presented which indicated that a grid would be established throughout various parts of the country. Congress rejected this plan, since SPA was created only to market surplus power from Federal reservoirs, not to build a public power empire. In 1949 and 1950, SPA and REA tried to develop such a system without coming to Congress and obtaining its approval. Instead they worked out an arrangement whereby REA was to loan the money to build the grid and facilities and the SPA was to lease and operate the transmission facilities and purchase all the power. We amended the continuing fund law in 1951 to prevent this type of arrangement by making SPA come to Congress for annual approval of expenditures from the fund.

What we are doing now is to restate what is the law.

As the Senator knows, this language in the report would not change the law. It is only a suggestion that REA follow the law as we understand it. In my opinion, it would not in any manner affect the ability of the cooperatives to proceed to do what they desire, provided that in obtaining loans they would not be entirely dependent on the Southwestern Power Administration in order to be able to make sufficient funds to repay the loans.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true, but I think the entire dependency would be a matter that should be established. They are, of course, dependent upon the amount of power that is distributed. The extension of the benefits of the SPA power to cooperatives many miles away is important to the existence of cooperatives, particularly in places such as the western part of my State, where there is what has been called a power desert.

The need for power generated at those dams, which can also be interchanged between the power-generating facilities and certain REA's to feed into the southwest power network, gives a balance of potential that makes for better service in areas where that power would not otherwise be available.

Mr. ELLENDER. This provision would not have any effect on that situation. The committee report reiterates the preference to be given to cooperatives in the sale of power generated at those dams.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are very anxious to be sure of that. If the Senator, as he goes to conference, will discuss this matter, I am certain that, from his record of help to the REA's from the beginning, it will be most helpful to us if he makes sure there is to be adequate power and an adequate sharing of the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. I give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in praise of the REA. I consider it one of the great achievements of the last quarter of a century, created by the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt. As a result, electricity was brought into remote areas, rural areas, which never had had it at prices its people could afford to pay. The REA has been of great value to my State of Alaska where we have a dozen REA cooperatives and I know to other States. I hope nothing will be done to interfere with its efficient functioning.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I thought that would happen, I would never have consented to this provision.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in regard to rural electrification, having served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the Senator from Louisiana when this matter was before us many times, and knowing of his attitude toward rural electrification, I am sure he will see that nothing is done to injure rural electrification in any way.

Personally, I feel very close to rural electrification. It may be of interest to know that South Carolina was made a guinea pig, so to speak, in regard to rural electrification. South Carolina was given $100,000 to make a survey for rural electrification, before the Rural Electrification Act was passed from a national standpoint. Naturally, we feel very close to rural electrification. I know the Senator from Louisiana will do nothing that would injure it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his remarks. I return the compliment to him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 18, to strike the figure "$20,625,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,600,000".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would reduce the amount of appropriations for general investigations by $25,000, from $20,625,000 to $20,600,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate the Skunk River and Squaw Creek engineering survey itemized on page 5 of the House report.

I feel dutybound to offer this amendment on the basis of information which I shall present to the Senate, so that the Senate may decide whether or not this item should be approved.

The only trace of justification which can be found for this survey is that the dams on the upper reaches of the Skunk River would allegedly provide flood control. However, there appear to be no supporting data and information indicating a need for such a flood control project. For example, I am reliably advised that the industrial development area of Ames, Iowa, which is supposed to be primarily concerned, has not had a flood since 1944, and that this was not serious.

In 1951 a study was made by the Corps of Engineers of this proposed project.

The corps made a preliminary recommendation that two reservoirs be constructed—one on the Skunk River and the other on Squaw Creek. However, the corps advised that before any final determination would be made regarding the feasibility of the project, seven questions would have to be answered; namely:

First. Feasibility and probable cost and benefits for transmittal channel rectification and other practicable local flood protection measures, including levees in downstream areas and possible use of small automatic discharge dams on important tributaries.

Second. Siltation above and below the possible dam sites, including such information as is available on the source of silt and the influence the dams would have on channel silting with reference to downstream water supplies, particularly at Oskaloosa.

Third. Land and property values in the flood plan where benefits from reservoir operation are granted.

Fourth. Flood frequencies and benefited reaches.

Fifth. Stage-area inundated curves and supporting data for the estimates of losses and benefits.

Sixth. Effect of reservoir modification on specific floods and on flooded area.

Seventh. Amount of land enhancement and the proportion of cost that local interests should bear.

These questions have not been answered, and it would require a study by the corps to provide the answers. Meanwhile, because of an apparent lack of local interest, nothing has been done to authorize such a study until now.

Of major concern to the city of Ames is prompt completion of Interstate 35, and of major concern to Iowa taxpayers is that this completion be without undue cost. Should one or more reservoirs be constructed under the Skunk River or Squaw Creek project, the grading elevation for Interstate 35 would have to be increased by from 10 to 14 feet, thus entailing considerable additional expense.

Moreover, if this project goes forward, it will mean delay in completion of Interstate 35. Within 60 days the Iowa State Highway Commission is scheduled to commence right-of-way acquisition. It will take months for the Corps of Engineers to complete its survey and for Congress to determine whether or not the project is to be approved and appropriations provided—possibly years. If Interstate 35 is to go forward on schedule, rights-of-way acquisition must proceed on schedule.

If it be suggested that the Iowa State Highway Commission can proceed in its acquisition of rights-of-way, it should be called to the Senate's attention that these will entail payment of severance damages; whereas, later on, if this project should ever be approved, the Corps of Engineers would acquire whole farms, so that the previous payment of severance damages would have been wasted—thus increasing the cost to taxpayers unnecessarily.

Because of the apparent lack of danger from recurring floods or from serious floods, it would appear that the cost-benefit ratio on such a proposed flood control project would not be favorable.

There has been no initiation of this flood control project for further study by the city of Ames, the Ames Chamber of Commerce, the Ames Industrial Development Corp., or Iowa State University; and I have received not one telephone call, letter, or conversation requesting support for it; but I have received some objections.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Iowa relates to survey funds. In the past our committee has followed the policy of not earmarking any of the moneys provided for navigation or flood control surveys. But the House follows the practice of earmarking quite a few surveys. In this instance the House, as I recall, earmarked money for 30 unbudgeted surveys. It is a practice the Senate does not follow.

Since there is opposition by the Senator from Iowa on the subject matter, I would be willing to accept the amendment so as to put the matter in conference, and present it to the House conferees.

As I said, the money the Senate committee recommended for surveys is not earmarked for any particular project. We leave it for the engineers to do that. It may be that we can do something about this matter on which the House has acted. Perhaps the House will agree to strike the survey to which the Senator has referred, or, if there is sufficient evidence produced showing how the money is to be used. I assure the Senator that we will use all the information necessary to insure that the subject is adequately treated in conference.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that statement by the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Iowa has undertaken to do a conscientious job, on rather short notice, in trying to ascertain the full background of information on this project, and in searching through the hearings for an answer which justifies inclusion of this item in the bill. I thought the Senate should be apprised of the information, or, I should say, lack of firm data to support this item, and also the information which I have presented.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, with respect to surveys, very little justification is submitted to the subcommittee of either the House or the Senate. The reason for that is that the engineers are usually provided with whatever funds are necessary so that they can investigate the feasibility of the project. When it comes to providing money for planning or construction, the committees require detailed justifications before recommending the funds, must be fully justified. That is not true and every dollar that is appropriated with respect to surveys.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that fact. However, I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not understand during the hearing on this particular item that there was a problem regarding Interstate 35, which might be delayed, and is of great concern to the people of this community, plus the fact that it was looked at first more than 12 years ago, and nothing has been done since that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the Senate adopt the Senator's amendment, I suggest that he furnish me as much information as he can, and I will take the matter up in conference and do whatever I can.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 through 22, as follows:

TITLE IV

*Funds appropriated to the President*

Public Works Acceleration

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this amendment is calculated, as was suggested a little earlier this afternoon, to strike from the bill the $45 million which is proposed to be appropriated for the final installment of the accelerated public works program.

Congress originally authorized $900 million for this program. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated. What we are being asked to do now in connection with the $45 million is to appropriate the balance of the authorization, less about $5 million, which presumably is being withheld at this time to defray administration costs which may be encountered at a later time.

It will not be my purpose to go into much detail in arguing the merits of the amendment, because in my opening remarks on the bill as a whole, I went into great detail; nor will it be my purpose to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

By way of review, the record of the accelerated public works program is anything but brilliant. Certainly it has been one of some confusion. It has been a record that is often made in connection with a crash program, when a superagency is superimposed upon regular agencies to which the allocation of money is usually made.

The program has been administered in a discriminatory way. That has been demonstrated. The record, as it will be printed, including the remarks I made earlier this afternoon, will demonstrate that to be the fact. It has been discriminatory in at least one instance. It will be discriminatory in similar instances, and certainly can be expected to be discriminatory in other instances. It is a program which bypasses Congress and the regular congressional procedures in connection with the appropriation of funds. It certainly is an abdication of the power which Congress holds most dear, namely, the control of the purse strings.

The final argument that I suggested a little earlier in my remarks is that it would be premature to make an allocation and to appropriate at this time for this purpose. Not more than 30 minutes before I rose to be recognized to discuss the bill, an announcement was made that hearings would commence tomorrow or the next day on two authorization bills for additional authorizations for the accelerated public works program. One of these bills has been pending since March of this year; the other bill has been pending since July. Neither branch of this Congress has acted on authorizations for additional funds for this program, indicating that in all fairness to ourselves Congress should await the hearings on the merits of the appropriation bills for this program as of now. If the sense of Congress, following those hearings is that we should proceed, very well; that will be the decision. It might be said that we should do this and await the hearings for the additional appropriations. It is anticipated that there will be a deficiency appropriation bill brought up some time in January, and that the funds could be considered at that time, if in the meantime the hearings have been completed and a decision made on the merits of the authorization bill.

The hearings on the pending bill indicated, furthermore, that as of the end of October, there was actually obligated $245 million of the $450 million appropriated in the second appropriation, and all of the first part had been obligated. It is not as though they were without funds, although a great many applications have been made for community facilities which the administration of these funds is not reaching.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted, and the $45 million be deleted, which would consist of striking title IV of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. A good case was made for the expenditure of the $45 million. This appropriation should have no connection with any pending legislation authorizing the expenditure of additional funds for this purpose.

As I indicated earlier this afternoon, the money will be used primarily to generate work in areas which have a great deal of unemployment. It is true that the committee has written into the report a hope that half of the funds should be used for community facilities, but it is left to the Administrator to use the money where he can best take care of unemployment.

Inasmuch as Congress has already enacted the authorization, which was done last year, and since the remaining $45 million is authorized, and in accord with the basic authorization, I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I merely wish to second the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana and to say, regretfully, that I find myself in total disagreement with the points raised by the Senator from Nebraska. I know of no program which is more vital in the United States today than the program of putting people to work. Accelerated public works is one means of doing that.

The Senator from Nebraska raised the objection that somehow or other Congress was being circumvented by having projects go through without an authorization and by the accepted and established congressional procedures. That is precisely the criticisms I have made against the foreign aid legislation, where it is done on a gigantic scale, with billions of dollars being voted with no control by Congress.

Here we are dealing with a program for the benefit of the American people. It is about time that we considered the importance and the interest of the American people as first and foremost. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 344 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 18, it is proposed to change "$187,425,000" to "$182,425,000" and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: "*Provided:* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not expect to ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment. However, following the disposition of this amendment, I shall call up another amendment, very closely related to it. On that amendment, I shall ask for a rollcall vote.

I have offered the amendment because I think this project is the most wasteful I have seen since I became a Member of the Senate. Last year I went into great detail about the project. I shall not detain the Senate at any length today, because on Friday I spoke at some length and explained my position on the project. This afternoon, I shall briefly summarize my position and ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

The amendment would eliminate from the public works appropriation bill $5 million proposed to be spent for the construction of the Glen Elder project in Kansas.

The Glen Elder project is primarily for flood control, and secondarily for irrigation, in western Kansas. The project is justified based on a 2½-percent discount ratio and a fantastic 100-year life. Of course, when these two components are brought together, almost anything can be justified. In spite of that advantage, this project has only a 1.34 benefit-cost ratio, with an extraordinarily low 2½-percent discount, as I have said. If the discount were a little higher—if it were, for example, at a level at which the Government actually had to pay for the money it borrows—4 percent—the benefit-cost ratio would be negative. The benefit would be substantially less than the cost.

The project was authorized in 1944 in a one-line authorization that authorized several hundred projects. At that time it was estimated that the Glen Elder project would cost $17 million. Last year the estimate was that it would cost $60 million. This year, the estimate is that it will cost $76 million.

The President spoke eloquently and convincingly when he addressed Congress a few days ago on the importance of economy in Government, particularly the difficulties which he has referred to as the built-in spending provisions in the law.

What this item would do if we proceed with the appropriation would be to "build in" over the next several years many millions of dollars the President would be compelled to ask and the Congress to give for the construction of a project which is about as wasteful as can be imagined.

The flood control benefits of this project are marginal, at best. They would provide control over a relatively small proportion of the water that endangers an area some 200 miles away from where the dam would be located. But if the flood control aspects of the project are questionable, the irrigation aspects are frankly ridiculous. The Glen Elder project would provide for the irrigation of land which would bring into production $1 million of additional feed grain surpluses. At present we have approximately $3 billion—three thousand million dollars—worth of feed grain in surplus. We are spending $1.3 billion a year on our feed grain program. The Glen Elder project would aggravate and increase that cost at the rate of $1 million a year. This is really Alice-in-Wonderland economics. We would spend scarce dollars to use scarce water to bring into production an additional surplus of feed grains that we do not need.

I recognize that there is courtesy in the Senate and a respect for other Senators; and that when a project develops in the State of a Senator, we honor that project whenever we can. I also recognize that the two Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON] are not only distinguished and popular Senators, but are two of the finest, most able Members of this body. I know they have fast friends on both sides of the aisle. But I believe this is not a matter of friendship; it is a matter of realism. It makes absolutely no sense for the Senate, if it believes in economy at all, to spend $76 million, much of which will be used to bring into production feed grain that is not needed.

To put the icing on the cake, the farmers in the area which would be irrigated have made sworn affidavits, which I have seen and which I have, including their names and addresses. These I have placed in the RECORD. Ninety percent of the farmers in this area who own 85 percent of the land that would be irrigated have indicated their opposition to the project. Eighty percent of the farmers

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

who own land that would be irrigated have indicated that under no circumstances will they join the irrigation district or irrigate their land. The farmers must think Congress has gone mad if it plans to go ahead with a project which they do not want, and of which they would be the only beneficiaries; a project which would cost an enormous amount of money, bring additional land and additional crops into production, and impose a heavy cost on the Treasury and the taxpayers over a long period.

Finally, if Congress proceeds with this $76 million project by appropriating $5 million today, the case on this project will be closed and locked tight. We won't be able to stop it. Last year Congress appropriated a few hundred thousand dollars to begin the planning. I think that amount has not been completely spent; certainly it is not lost. It would be a relatively modest loss if Congress decided not to proceed with the project. But once we spend $5 million and start construction, the expenditures for construction will be irrevocably and permanently committed for the project; there will be no turning back.

I hope that my amendment No. 344 will be accepted. I ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Senator from Wisconsin spoke last year for a period of 10 hours concerning the Glen Elder project. At that time, the committee had recommended the project.

I admit that the benefit-cost ratio is rather low; but by the expenditure of the additional sum beyond that appropriated last year, to which the Senator has referred, the program would be one to hold back water, and would increase the benefit-to-cost ratio to 1.34 instead of 1.18. Most of the money would be spent for flood protection, especially in the vicinity of Kansas City.

This is a worthwhile project. From all I can understand, it comes under reclamation, which is handled by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. The cost to the Government will be for flood control only, which amounts to about $56 million of the entire $76 million. The rest of the sum would be reimbursable to the Federal Government on a long-term basis.

I hope the Senate will maintain the same position it took last year on this proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana said that the irrigation part of the program would be repaid to the Federal Government on a long-term basis. Would the irrigators pay interest on this money?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would pay no interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When would the repayment be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. Within 40 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Government would have to pay interest on the money it borrowed to put into the project. The interest would be calculated on the amount the Government would pay of the $17 million cost of the irrigation aspect of this project more than $15 million or about 90 percent of the cost listed in the bill would be the cost to the Federal taxpayer, the general taxpayer, because the interest would accrue to that extent over the long period during which the payment would be made on the principal, and that interest would never be repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The policy the Senator is talking about was determined by Congress many years ago. Many projects were constructed in that manner. The revenues that have come to the Federal Government because of the development of the land by way of income taxes have been great—much more than the cost of building the projects. It is my belief that the entire irrigation program has in the past paid off very handsomely; and I believe the program should be continued.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the issue presented by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was raised, I believe, some time last year, on the occasion when we had before us the authorization bill which included this project. At that time the facts in this connection were brought out in great detail—including the philosophy in regard to the reimbursable features of reclamation advances of this kind, as well as the engineering part, consisting of flood-control protection. Economic justification was made at that time, and has improved since then.

On the strength of the authorization, certain actions have been taken, as I understand, by some of those living in the area.

Mr. President, in connection with such matters there must come a time—after due debate, discussion, and showing—when a decision will be made, and there must come a time when it will be made firmly.

It is submitted that that time has passed, and that Congress has committed itself to construction of the project, after due deliberation and the submission of many pertinent facts, all of which have stood up well under the standards which were established long ago for such projects.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on this amendment.

I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and the remarks of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] in reference to this project, which has been authorized by Congress, and has been studied by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation and by the engineers of the Corps of Army Engineers. This project has been approved continuously, and last year an authorization was made for an appropriation by Congress.

At this time, I should like to read into the Record a telegram I have received in regard to the amount of work done on the project:

Beloit, Kans., *December 7, 1963.*

Senator Frank Carlson,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Senator: As of November 30, 1963, on Glen Elder project, latest Bureau of Reclamation data shows they have spent $1,018,000 for construction, $720,000 for investigation. They have 22 signed contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres fee land and 800 acres easement land. These 22 contracts represent a commitment of $572,000 about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have made financial commitments to purchase other properties. Impossible to estimate economic disruption to this community if funds are held up as it would touch almost everyone.

Dean D. Haddock,
*Executive Secretary, Solomon Valley Flood Control Association.*

I mention this because this project is underway; this is not the first appropriation for it. There is a $5 million item to carry on this project; and extensive plans have been made by the Bureau to carry it on.

The Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned the increased production of feed grains which might result. However, he failed to state that the project will take out of production the most fertile areas there, located above the dam. In short, the construction of the dam would take out of production a number of very productive acres of land located within the site of the reservoir.

I would be less than frank if I did not state that this argument is causing great concern in that area. I know the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is familiar with that situation.

On page 48 of the report the following is set forth:

Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

I wish to comment briefly on that point, because I hold in my hand a letter from Representative Robert Dole, who represents that district in the House of Representatives. In his letter he expresses some concern in regard to possible changes in the plans in regard to the fish and wildlife area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the Record, in addition to the statement I have read, which is a part of the committee report, because I, too, share the same feeling in regard to the land purchased in fee simple for this project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
*Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.*

Re Glen Elder unit.

Hon. Frank Carlson,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Senator Carlson: The committee report (p. 48) accompanying H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill for 1964, contains the following language: "None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes." I requested this language, as there were plans to acquire 13,527 acres in consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning, some to be acquired in fee and some covered by flowage easements. This is attributed to a revised interdepartmental policy agreed upon by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of the Army in February 1962.

Frankly, I could see no reason for removing this much acreage from local tax rolls, nor devoting this much acreage for fish and wildlife purposes. I would point out that those persons affected are not opposed to negotiating an easement in most instances, but do oppose the land being taken in fee.

At any rate, I felt inclusion of the above language in the report, along with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 22263, November 19, 1963, would clarify any question which might arise; and just as an additional precaution I directed a question to Congressman CANNON, and he affirmed my position that none of the land in the Glen Elder project would be taken in fee for fish and wildlife purposes.

On Tuesday of this week I asked Bill Kats to make certain the Bureau of Reclamation was in accord with what I still consider to be the proper interpretation of the legislative history. In his discussions with Mr. Casey and Mr. Palmer of the Bureau of Reclamation, he was advised of many things, including a statement by Mr. Casey that still another revision in policy had been made late this summer; hence, all the land I had referred to except 1,400 acres would now be needed in fee for flood control. In other words, simply by changing the designation of what the acreage would be used for, my efforts had been completely circumvented.

So you may be fully informed, I am enclosing and attaching hereto copy of a statement prepared earlier this year which contains the following: "From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres." Also attached is a copy of the report containing the language I have referred to on page 48, a copy of my comments in the RECORD, and a letter signed by William I. Palmer, Acting Commissioner, dated December 5, which, in my opinion, is a weak attempt to avoid the clear intent of my efforts.

Let me make it clear there is no misunderstanding on my part, but because of the interpretation contained in Mr. Palmer's letter, it would be appreciated if you would make additional legislative history when the Senate bill is debated on the floor. If this is not feasible, I certainly intend to do whatever may be necessary to clarify the unwarranted interpretation when the bill goes to conference.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in regard to this project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas explain to me how it is possible to have any irrigation benefits from this project? Yet the irrigation benefits are said to constitute over $500,000 a year. How can there be irrigation benefits if, as I think the Senator said, the land taken out of production is more fertile than the land which would be irrigated? If this is true, there is no justification, none, for the $17 million the Federal Government would invest; none.

Mr. CARLSON. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin was arguing that the production of feed grains would be greatly increased.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wisconsin should give some thought to the thousands of acres which would be taken out of production in the reservoir area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have available some tables which show the acreage both before and after the project is completed. I think the production of wheat would be somewhat decreased, but there would be a great increase in the production of virtually every other feed grain.

Mr. CARLSON. I know this area. I live within 25 miles of it, and I know the production of this land. When 21,000 acres of land below the dam are irrigated and when approximately 20,000 acres of land above the dam are taken out of production, it will not be possible to avoid damaging the production, at least in the overall, total view.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then is it correct to state that there will be no irrigation benefits from the project?

Mr. CARLSON. Not until the people establish an irrigation area by voting for it. When they do, of course there will be irrigation. This project is no different from other irrigation projects in the Nation, and I hope we do not today change the established policy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the people do not vote for it—and I think the Senator knows they will not vote for it—it is foolish to spend this amount of money, $17 million of which is for irrigation.

Mr. CARLSON. But all this money is for construction of the dam and reservoir.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am speaking now about my second amendment, which relates to the technical aspects.

But I am delighted to hear the Senator say that advantage would not be taken of the irrigation opportunities. It fully confirms my argument and makes the irrigation expenditures of this project senseless.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I compliment my senior colleague [Mr. CARLSON] and the majority of the committee and the minority of the committee for the fine work done.

Certainly no one appreciates more than I do the great effort and great dedication displayed and the work done by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], in behalf of his convictions in connection with this matter. Last Friday, he made a speech in which he presented his point of view and set forth in great detail his arguments. As I read that speech, I think the presentation he made may be reduced to three points, as follows:

First, that the project was improperly authorized.

Second, that the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project.

Third, that the project does not meet with the will of the people of Kansas and the governmental authorities affected.

I have set forth as concisely as I could a response to those arguments by the Senator from Wisconsin, as follows:

The Senate has before it two amendments to the public works appropriations bill which relate to the Glen Elder Reservoir project in north-central Kansas. This is a project to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Solomon River, a tributary of the Kansas River. I wish to comment briefly on these two amendments offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

The first amendment proposes the deletion of the entire appropriation. The second would prohibit the use of any funds appropriated to provide irrigation capacity in the reservoir.

Mr. President, I oppose both of these amendments. In the course of the Senate's consideration of this proposition in the 87th and now in the 88th Congress, the able Senator from Wisconsin has discussed the details of the Glen Elder project extensively on the Senate floor. In addition, his arguments were forcefully made to the Appropriations Committee and the Reclamation Subcommittee. They have been thoroughly presented with great conviction but rejected by the Senate and the appropriate committees.

It is not my intention to discuss the points raised in detail. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I feel compelled to reply in general to the Senator's contentions. The arguments in support of the amendments may be reduced to three in number. First, the project was improperly authorized. Second, the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project, and third, the people of Kansas do not want the project.

First, the validity of the authorization: The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin correctly stated that the Glen Elder project was originally authorized for construction by the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946. This is the same basic legislation which has resulted in the initiation of more than $3 billion in water resource development by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. In spite of this fact, however, and in order to satisfy the very question which the senior Senator from Wisconsin has now raised, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate conducted an exhaustive inquiry into the adequacy of this authorization in 1962. The committee, then under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], heard detailed testimony and, by its final disposition, indicated its satisfaction with the original authorization.

Further, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Congress satisfied itself as to the question of authorization last year when it approved a $750,000 appropriation for Glen Elder in the face of this same argument. I might point out that as of November 30, 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation has spent over $1 million on Glen Elder. I am advised the Bureau has signed 22 contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres of fee land and 800 acres of easement land. These contracts represent a commitment of $572,000, about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have already made financial commitments to purchase other property. A failure to proceed with this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

project at this point would impose considerable hardship on many persons in the area and an expensive loss to the Federal Government.

Next, with respect to the validity of the cost-benefit ratio calculation: I recognize with the Senator from Wisconsin that there are many questions which can be raised about the soundness of the present method of calculating costs and benefits by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Last year I offered to join the Senator in supporting a review of this yardstick. I repeat my statement of last year, however, that there is no justification for singling out this one project for deletion or for modification on these grounds while all other projects approved on the same method of computing the cost-benefit ratio are permitted to proceed.

Finally, it is contended that the people in Kansas, and especially those in the immediate area of the Glen Elder project, do not want the reservoir constructed. Mr. President, the Glen Elder project was reviewed by the Kansas Water Resources Board and was approved by the Governor of Kansas. I have discussed this project with many people in the area and downstream from the damsite as far as the junction of the Kansas River with the Missouri. There is opposition, there is qualified support, and there is endorsement. The range of opinion parallels that associated with any similar project in Kansas or any State. Every Senator here has had experience with these same circumstances.

In the final analysis one must judge the merits of the program along with the desires of the people directly and indirectly affected. In this light, it is my judgment that this project has the support of the people of Kansas and it should go forward unencumbered by the proposed amendments.

I would like to make one concluding point in urging the rejection of the amendment to prohibit the inclusion of irrigation capacity in this reservoir. The natural terrain of Kansas does not lend itself to the construction of a large number of water retention facilities. We must, therefore, be certain that when a site is chosen, the construction is planned so that it will be put to the greatest possible use. I would emphasize that there is no present plan to use the irrigation capacity which is designed into the Glen Elder project. However, to exclude the irrigation capacity from the reservoir would be to underutilize the site and in all likelihood prohibit any future utilization of this resource.

In this connection it is important to note that since the original Bureau studies on this project were submitted to the Congress, the Corps of Engineers has completed and the Congress has approved a revised Kansas River Basin plan which has enhanced the benefit factor of this reservoir for flood control purposes. The availability of this reservoir as a retention dam for floodwaters will permit downstream reservoirs, four of which are still to be built, to be drained and their capacity restored as protection for heavily populated areas. This function of Glen Elder will be taken into consideration in the preparation of plans for the reservoirs yet to be built by the Corps of Engineers and I think we can safely assume will be reflected in their costs. Thus, even if the irrigation factor was eliminated as the amendment proposes, the cost would not be reduced as significantly as my friend and colleague from Wisconsin contends since the flood control function now assigned the reservoir would require substantially the same design.

In conclusion, this project is economically justified for flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and other legitimate purposes even if no benefits are ever realized from irrigation. Further, on this basis and in view of the extensive review and the present commitments already associated with this project, I would urge that the Senate reject the two amendments which would, in effect, destroy the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

### AMENDMENT NO. 343

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 343, as follows:

On page 12, line 5, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no funds in this bill for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes."

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment I have called up provides that none of the funds included in the $5 million appropriated for the Glen Elder project shall be spent for irrigation purposes. There is some question about the flood control aspect of the dam. Congress has approved it, and, although I disagree vigorously, most Senators seem to agree that it is worthy.

However, there can be no question that it is almost an inconceivable waste of money to appropriate funds for the $17 million for irrigation to bring more feed grain into production. The Senator from Kansas has said that in his judgment the project would not do that because land which is fertile and productive will be taken out of production. If that is the case, it seems to me that adoption of the Proxmire amendment would provide a golden opportunity to save $17 million. If the amendment were agreed to, it would mean that $17 million of the $76 million project would not, in the future, be expended.

It is true the senior Senator from Kansas feels that the irrigation money may not be spent for several years, but unless the amendment is written into the law, a commitment to spend the irrigation money could be made quite promptly. Some of the expenditure that will be made in the coming year may be for the purpose of eventual irrigation.

I repeat my argument because it pertains, one for one, to my argument against appropriating or permitting any money to be appropriated for irrigation.

First, the farmers whose lands would be irrigated are opposed to it. Perhaps some governmental authorities are not. Perhaps a mayor or the Governor of the State are for the project. Perhaps they have good reasons to be for it. But the fact is that the farmers whose land would be irrigated are against it. They oppose it. They have made their position as clear as they possibly can. I challenge the Senator from Kansas or anyone else to show any evidence that the people whose land would be irrigated want this project. The fact is they cannot do so because there is no such evidence. They know that farmers have not only signed affidavits against it, but 80 percent of the farmers have affixed notarized signatures to petitions opposing the formation of an irrigation district which is necessary in order to provide for irrigation.

As I have said, if the land were irrigated, it would increase the production of feed grains by a million dollars a year. I have indicated how big the surplus is—and it is fantastically big.

This farm program is one of the most frequently objected-to programs of the Federal Government. The project is the kind of project that makes the farm program even more criticized and even more vulnerable. On the unlikely assumption that the Solomon Valley farmers will take advantage of the irrigation, a realistic appraisal of the irrigation benefits of the Glen Elder project on the American economy as a whole must be zero.

This irrigation will impose a million dollar burden on the taxpayer to buy additional feed grain surpluses, plus heavy additional storage and interest costs.

I wish to make it clear that adoption of the amendment would not kill the project. The irrigation benefits would constitute only 20 percent of the calculated benefits. The irrigation costs are separable. The Bureau of Reclamation has made it clear that they are separable. If Congress permits no irrigation, the benefit-cost ratio would drop from 1.34 to 1 to 1.25 to 1. But in fact the benefit-cost ratio with irrigation banned would be far more honest and far more realistic because the benefits would not contain wholly unreal benefits of the full value of the surplus feed grain production.

Mr. President, on any basis the amendment certainly makes sense. I recognize that the people of Kansas—and certainly their Senators—should be the authoritative experts in the Senate on the full project and not merely on the flood control aspect of it. But when the farmers whose land would be irrigated do not want the project, have opposed it, and have gone to the trouble of going on record publicly against the project, and when we have a surplus of feed grains already, it makes no sense for us to increase that surplus.

So, in order that we might save $17 million, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

If any vote this year can be said to be an economy vote, it seems to me that the vote on the amendment will be one. On most of the economy votes, at least spending proponents could show some kind of service of some value to some group. Perhaps it has been a private group or perhaps a group that may or may not deserve the service. But in relation to this particular proposed expenditure of $17 million, service would result to no one.

The people who would presumably benefit would not. The taxpayer would have a triple burden. First, he would have to pay for the irrigation part of the project; second, he would have to pay for the procurement of $1 million a year of additional feed grains, and third, he pays additional storage costs and the interest costs forever.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator stated that the adoption of the amendment would not destroy the project. It is my understanding that the appropriation does not include funds for irrigation canals or for an irrigation district, but includes only funds relating to the capacity of the reservoir to handle irrigation demands if and when the need arises.

The question I wish to put to the Senator from Wisconsin is as follows: Although funds would be provided for construction of a reservoir which would have capacity for irrigation purposes, if the language to which the amendment refers is eliminated, would not its elimination conceivably raise a technical and legal point as to the jurisdiction of the bureau to continue work?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the answer would be in the negative. I have talked with Reclamation people and with officials in the Department of the Interior and they indicate that if Congress decided they did not want any money to be provided for irrigation, then there would be no reason why they could not continue the project. The project in the future would be a flood control project almost exclusively. Not exclusively, because there are some other benefits such as the recreational and the wildlife benefit, which are all minor, but the lion's share of the benefit is in flood control, as the Senator knows.

According to the word I have received from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, there is no reason why the proposed action should in any way inhibit the continuation of the project. Frankly I wish it would, but I am told there is no question that it will not.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to direct that same question to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the saving would not be $17 million, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated. My information is that around $6 million would be spent at the damsite to make irrigation possible. If, as, and when an irrigation district is created, then $11 million more would be required in order to build canals and related irrigation facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that what the Senator from Louisiana has said is correct, and I agree. My argument was not that there would be a saving of $17 million in the near future but eventually if we provide that in the future no money should be spent for irrigation, and that were a policy which would be accepted by our Government, then we would save $6 million now and $11 million in the future—a gross saving of $17 million. The $76 million project would be reduced to a $59 million project.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, whether the irrigation project is not the basis of jurisdiction of the bureau to start and continue work on projects such as the one about which we are speaking?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is; but as I said earlier, most of the money being spent is for flood control.

Mr. PEARSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I advocate preservation of our precious water resources.

This proposal is one way to do it. I believe it would be foolish for the project to continue without placing at the damsite the necessary facilities to provide for irrigation, if, as, and when the people desire them.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have nothing further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 265 Leg.]

YEAS—9

Byrd, Va.
Dodd
Gruening
Lausche
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—74

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Hayden
Humphrey
Javits
McGee
Mechem
Mundt
Pastore
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Symington
Tower
Walters

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a colloquy which occurred a short while ago, by mistake, I made the statement that President Eisenhower recommended

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

recoupment of expenses incurred in making inland waterways navigable. It was not President Eisenhower; it was President Kennedy, in his message of April 5, 1962. He specifically stated:

> The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's cost in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a portion of President Kennedy's message of April 5, 1962, on this subject.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 3. Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will alow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.
>
> The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade, and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intercoastal waterways, should also be exempted.
>
> This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, title III of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill, 1964, provides appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. It is noted that our Appropriations Committee recommends restoration of $61,355,000 of cuts made in the bill by the House. Included are $18,500,000 for "reactor development."

The House Appropriations Committee report which accompanied H.R. 9140 noted that it had deleted $33,548,000 of reactor development funds, including $3 million "budgeted for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors."

In a Senate speech November 18, 1963, and in a letter of the same date to the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, I supported the position of the House in accepting the report and recommendations of its Appropriations Committee. I question the advisability of our Government subsidizing the design and construction of investor-owned private nuclear powerplants which actually are commercial ventures.

I emphasize that I am not opposed to experimental work on reactors which the Atomic Energy Commission conducts as part of the valid national research effort.

My objection is to the AEC program of subsidizing the design, construction, and operation of large, nonexperimental identical nuclear powerplants, especially when such plants include already proven water type reactors.

We read in the report of our Appropriations Committee that included in its AEC fund restoration recommendations are:

> Three million dollars in operating costs for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. In restoring these funds, it is not the intention of the committee that such funds would be used for arrangements under which additional light-water reactors of already proven type could be constructed. On the contrary, the intention of the committee by this restoration, together with $12 million of funds budgeted under the "selected resources" program of the (Atomic Energy) Commission, is to provide an availability of $15 million for the purpose of entering into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types.

Perhaps this is justified as research. But the House report stated that these funds had been omitted by the House Committee on Appropriations from H.R. 9140 because—

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost.

Our Appropriations Committee not only recommends restoration of $3 million to apply on the operating costs of cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers; it would provide a fund of $15 million in this fiscal year "for the purpose of entering [AEC] into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types." Thus it disagrees with the House which took the position that "this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors."

And our Appropriations Committee disagrees with the House position that nuclear power reactors "are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost." In contradiction, the Senate Appropriations Committee report includes this language:

> The committee is advised that competitive nuclear power, in any area of the country, is an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time.

The language of the Senate report has been expertly prepared in rebuttal to the House report. Competitive nuclear power may be "an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time." But civilian nuclear power industry spokesmen and those for equipment manufacturers are not as guarded in their evaluations of the competitive "expectation" and the status and future of the nuclear power program. They are ultraoptimistic.

In this connection, Mr. President, I pointed out in my November 18 letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a position statement by the president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. He has been quoted as having asserted that two of the large nuclear power plants listed to be built, with the aid of Government subsidies of over $12 million each for design assistance and fuel waiver, "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil fuel plants in the same location." And he further declared: "On a nonsubsidized basis, nuclear kilowatts will be competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States" by the time these subsidized nuclear power plants on the east coast and west coast go into operation in 1967–69.

In light of these conditions, and considering the tremendous potential for change inherent in them, it is distressing that the appropriations committees of the two bodies of Congress apparently are a considerable distance apart in their interpretations of the advice they have received concerning the status of the civilian nuclear power program.

Certainly, Mr. President, we are cognizant of the fact that advances in technology bring changes—sometimes drastic and very far-reaching ones. Perfection of a civilian nuclear power industry would indeed create vast changes in the fundamental fuels and energy fields. In the drive for this perfection, with the Federal Treasury and a Federal agency spearheading the action, it seems to me that we must manifest a keener degree of interest in and understanding of the impacts and changes which will be brought about.

What of the impact on the fossil fuels industries, coal, oil, and gas; on investments in fossil fueled electric generating plants; on the railroad industry; on investments in TVA and numerous public and private hydroelectric facilities; and on millions of citizens and whole regions of our country?

There is an obligation on the part of the Congress to have answers—specific and detailed answers—to these questions while the data would have meaning and applicability.

We are told by some persons when we speak of these conditions that we are talking in terms of the past and not of the future—that we are "against progress." I emphatically disagree.

Mr. President, there is no real progress unless we meet the challenges and side effects of technological changes at each step along the way.

One of the difficulties which has plagued our country has been the inability or unwillingness to identify changes in the offing. Another has been failure to take positive and necessary counteractions after we have identified the problems induced by change. These difficulties and failures have contributed to human misery and economic dislocation in inordinate degree in some regions. Sometimes, as we have noted, a number of areas become so involved that we have recessions. And some of them linger as chronic problems which we often accentuate, rather than solve, by actions on such national legislation as that which embraces the civilian nuclear power activities.

We are at another of the crossroads. In this matter of appropriations for the civilian nuclear power program we find identification difficulties. We must act on the basis of diametrically opposite interpretations of foundation facts and assumptions; one interpretation by the House, a differing one by the Senate as reflected in the Appropriations Committee report.

I am not disposed to complicate this dilemma by offering amendments. There doubtless will be a conference on this measure. I hope the conferees will find answers and provide the Congress with helpful interpretations and guidelines on the issue of Government financing for the civilian nuclear power program.

Frankly, Mr. President, there are far-reaching questions of policy involved which transcend the immediate matter of fiscal year 1964 appropriations now before us.

There is a need in greater degree than ever existed before that there be evolved by the Congress a national fuels and energy policy.

The complication is not merely a matter of divergent efforts involving competition between the fossil fuels for markets, nor is it only a question of private power versus public power forces in contention over where or whether hydroelectric projects shall be authorized and financed by the Congress.

The new force—civilian nuclear power—is coming more prominently and more sharply into focus, and perhaps with far more rapidity than had been anticipated and predicted. This poses problems as well as potential benefits for the Nation and its citizens.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been one of the most outstandingly aggressive, useful, effective and successful instrumentalities of the Congress and, in fact, of the whole of our Government structure, in this century. Its energetic and knowledgeable chairman—the current chairman—the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and its former chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] both have provided positive leadership.

It is a model which I would have had the Congress emulate when I offered on January 9, 1961 a concurrent resolution for the creation of a Joint Committee on National Fuels Study. I regret that the concurrent resolution approach did not endure and that we settled on nothing more than a committee study by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After a brief flurry, that study seems to have perished.

Now the picture of the need for developing pertinent facts and forecasts on fuels and energy has a new dimension. There is, in my judgment, a real urgency that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be expanded into or supplemented by a Joint Committee on Fuels and Energy. This is not the time to discuss this subject in detail, but I will do so in the near future.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] for his kind comments about the work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It has always been a cornerstone of Joint Committee policy that the atomic energy program should be viewed objectively and in perspective. In this connection, over the past several months we have received correspondence from Mr. Joseph E. Moody, President of the National Coal Policy Conference. In his letter of August 30, 1963, addressed to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and in a later letter of September 16, addressed to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee, Mr. Moody raised a number of questions concerning the civilian nuclear power program.

In order to obtain a complete picture of the facts, the Joint Committee asked the Atomic Energy Commission to comment on both letters, in the interests of presenting a complete record on this matter.

Again, I commend my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], for his continued attention to this important subject, not only from the standpoint of his State, but in relationship to the country as a whole.

I would like to insert in the Record the correspondence received from the National Coal Policy Conference, and the comments of the Atomic Energy Commission on these letters.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Coal Policy
Conference, Inc.,
*Washington, D.C., August 30, 1963.*

Hon. John O. Pastore,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Senator Pastore: The National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the great industrial federation built around bituminous coal—the coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, the coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities, and manufacturers of coal mining machines and equipment. Members of this organization have invested more than $32 billion in plants and facilities, and provide a livelihood for more than 2.5 million Americans.

We, as an organization speaking for this vital force in our economy, are deeply concerned over the civilian nuclear power program as it is presently being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The private electric utility industry is now by far the largest single market for bituminous coal. The AEC program, the heart of which is massive subsidies, is directed toward replacing coal with nuclear power as the major source of the Nation's electric power supply. If all charges of a nuclear plant are fully applied we have reason to believe that the cost of making electricity would still be higher than making it with the basic fuels in spite of Government subsidization.

Therefore, we must speak out in opposition to the expenditure of taxpayers' funds on a program which cannot be justified and which, if not checked, could very well have the ultimate effect of wiping out this great American industry to the detriment of the national security.

For some reason, this massive subsidy program has not received the attention it rightfully deserves. We respectfully ask that you keep these following considerations in mind in connection with legislation which will authorize and appropriate funds for this program:

1. The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400- to 500-megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high-fuel-cost areas.

2. There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadruple by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels, particularly coal, to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations.

3. To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants.

4. There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear powerplants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, "What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an accident associated with coal-fired generation plants."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy powerplants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of $500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12 or $13 thousand per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation.

Thus, it seems to us, in carefully reviewing the nuclear power program that the massive Government subsidies which have been, and are continuing to be spent, on the building of large non-experimental commercial plants cannot be justified.

The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear powerplants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program.

We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
*President.*

---

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Only one of the many forms of subsidy used by the Federal Government to encourage the development of a civilian nuclear power industry could have the effect of wiping out a market for 173 million tons of coal by 1980, a spokesman for the coal industry declared today.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, said this one subsidy—the providing of nuclear fuel to private utilities under Government financing rather than requiring the utilities to own, process, and reprocess their own fuel under more expensive investor financing will have a profound effect upon the growth rate of this new industry which will compete with coal as a fuel for the generation of electricity.

"The Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that under the present Government subsidy program, nuclear power will develop to the point where it will be the source for up to 20 percent of the Nation's electricity needs by 1980," Mr. Moody declared.

Dr. Theodore Baumeister, Stevens professor of mechanical engineering at Columbia University, has estimated that this 20-percent share would be reduced to only about 2 percent if Government financing is discontinued and the utilities are required to go into the private money market to provide their own financing.

It is easy to see what this means to the coal industry.

By 1980, it is estimated that total consumption of electricity will amount to 3,000 billion kilowatts.

If Government financing of nuclear fuel is continued and nuclear power meets 20 percent of this expanded requirement, as AEC predicts it will, this means a potential market for 192 million tons of coal will be replaced.

If this Government subsidy in the form of cheap financing is removed and the nuclear power share of the market is held to 2 percent, as Dr. Baumeister believes it would be without the financing subsidy, the replacement of coal markets would be 19 million tons.

Thus, the difference this one Government subsidy for nuclear power would make in the potential market for coal in the electric utility industry by 1980 amounts to 173 million tons.

The president of NCPC, which represents coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities and manufacturers of coal-mining equipment, also pointed out that other Government subsidies used to encourage development of nuclear power in competition with private industry's fossil-fuel plants include reimbursement by AEC for design costs on large, nonexperimental plants, waiver of all costs for the use of Government-owned fuel during the first 5 years of a plant's life, continued renting of Government-owned fuel at charges far below what it would cost the utility to provide its own fuel, and Government-sponsored indemnity insurance at a fraction of what this insurance would cost if bought from private insurers.

"The Government has spent to date $1.275 billion on its civilian nuclear power program and it is continuing to spend at the rate of $216 million a year," Mr. Moody said.

"The sole purpose of these massive Government subsidies is to try to make nuclear power competitive with coal. We think it is wrong to use taxpayers' funds in this fashion.

"If nuclear power is needed, and if it can be produced economically, the necessary plants will be built by private enterprise without the necessity of vast Government subsidy.

"We have yet to see persuasive evidence that the plants are needed or can be made competitive with coal-fired plants.

"This is one vast Government expenditure that should be ended."

---

NATIONAL COAL
POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
*Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.*

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: A few days ago you received a letter which we addressed to every Member of Congress raising several pertinent questions relative to the wisdom of continued enormous Federal expenditures in an attempt to develop nuclear power to compete with coal. These subsidies become even more inexcusable in view of claims now being made by the industry that plants soon to be built will be competitive even without subsidies.

Naturally, the coal industry, which at present provides more than 200 million tons of coal annually to generate 67 percent of the Nation's steam-generated electricity, is alarmed over the threat posed by this Government subsidy to its future existence and to the 2.5 million persons dependent upon coal and allied industries for a livelihood.

In the beginning, Government subsidy for this new industry was justified on the grounds that only with Federal funds could the development of workable, practical reactors be achieved. Therefore, Congress authorized large appropriations for research and development work on reactor prototypes.

Unfortunately, the nuclear power program now has gone far beyond this original concept. Today the modified "Round Three" of the Atomic Energy Commission's cooperative power reactor demonstration program is concentrated for the most part on subsidizing the building of proven, large-scale projects to produce electricity for commercial sale, and which are economic to build only because of the size and extent of the Government subsidy. New experimental, prototype reactors are now being largely neglected.

This is happening even in the face of claims by a prominent electric utility official that nuclear plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. Mr. Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Company, has stated that two commercial-size nuclear plants to be built on the east and west coasts "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil-fuel plants in the same location."

In a speech entitled "Nuclear Kilowatts Become Competitive" before the electric companies' public information program in Chicago recently, Mr. Roddis contended that water-cooled reactors slated for operation in 1967–68 will be "competitive with fossil fuel at 30 cents per million B.t.u.'s, indicating that nuclear kilowatts are competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States." He stated that this cost is "on a nonsubsidized basis."

In view of such an assertion by a respected and capable leader in the utility industry, there can certainly be no justification whatsoever for any additional expenditures of Government funds to build nuclear plants to produce power at the expense of a major existing industry.

And yet, even in the face of such claims from the industry that competitiveness has already been reached, the Atomic Energy Commission is pushing ahead with determination to see that additional large capacity nuclear plants, paid for in part by Government money and sustained in operation by Government subsidy, will be built. Dr. Glenn Seaborg, AEC Chairman, in testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy this year, declared that the AEC proposes to "stimulate and support the utility industry in the construcion of 10 to 12 full-scale powerplants during the next dozen years to demonstrate the competitiveness of reactors of increasingly improved design." Please note that these reactors referred to are not experimental prototypes, which have, in the past, been the Government's justification for being in the atomic energy business in competition with private industry, but are merely larger and perhaps more efficient plants of a type already built. The only excuse used for this major continuing program is that the Government wants to prove that they can be competitive with fossil fuels—in other words that they can take over the utility market from coal.

Even if these plants fail to prove themselves competitive, it is important to recognize that they will be actual production plants, and not demonstrations, and will produce power to fill a market need which otherwise would be filled by plants burning fossil fuel. Twelve plants of about 500,000 kilowatts capacity, which is the size contemplated, would burn, during their estimated 20-year lifetime, the equivalent of 280 million tons of coal.

Many experts have predicted that by 1980 as much as 20 percent of the Nation's electric power needs will originate in nuclear plants. As the enclosed press release, which we recently issued, points out, this will be the equivalent of 190 million tons of coal annually.

The present AEC practice of subsidizing large, non-experimental and identical nuclear plants must be ended. The huge Government expenditures involved in the subsidies are not necessary. There is ample coal and other fossil fuels to generate increasing amounts of electricity to meet the Nation's needs for electric power. And certainly, if Mr. Roddis is correct, there can be no further justification for the Government continuing, by financial contributions, to stimulate the building of private nuclear electric plants. On behalf of the coal and allied industries, and the millions of people dependent on them, we earnestly urge you, as Members of Congress, to oppose any further appropriations to provide subsidies for the nuclear power reactor development program, and to reject the AEC's request for an extension of time in which to accept proposals to build plants under its so-called third round program with the help of Government funds.

I would appreciate any comment you might care to make.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Moody,
*President.*

---

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
*Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.*

Mr. John T. Conway,
*Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.*

Dear Mr. Conway: In response to your request of October 2, 1963, the following comments are furnished on the points raised by Mr. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in his letter of August 30, 1963, to Chairman Pastore, and his letter of September 16, 1963, to Vice Chairman Holifield.

### LETTER TO CHAIRMAN PASTORE

1. "The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400 to 500 megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high fuel-cost areas."

Comment: It is assumed that Mr. Moody is referring to the modified third round program which has resulted in assistance agreements with Connecticut Yankee and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The maximum amount of Government assistance agreed upon for these two project totals $14,050,000 for engineering design (about 8 to 9 percent of the costs to the utilities for plant construction) and $15,345,000 in the form of waiver of the normal AEC charges for the inventory of special nuclear material in the possession of the utilities through 5 years of plant operation. This inventory charge is frequently referred to by the AEC and others as a use charge, but it is important to note that all material used up, or consumed, in the operation is paid for in full by the utility. The inventory charge waiver for a limited period is granted only upon authorization by Congress and on the basis that the Government would obtain valuable information from the licensed activity in terms of research and development data and operating experience. Such information is, of course, made generally available to the public. However, after 5 years the reactor owner begins to pay the lease charge for this material in inventory. In contrast to the scope of the modified third round, the amount specifically directed to central station civilian power development included in the fiscal year 1964 budget requested of the Congress by the President is $153,763,000. (An amount of $244 million included in the President's budget message includes research and development programs contributing technical results to other Commission programs, in addition to the referenced amount of $153,763,000 which is specifically directed to the development of central station civilian power reactors.) A major portion of the Commission's annual expenditures on civilian power has been, and continues to be, devoted to research and development during the successive stages up to and including the design, construction and operation of prototype nuclear powerplants. The relatively small incremental assistance to first, large-scale commercial plants is considered as the last step in the chain of development for the specific reactor type concerned. Commission adoption of the modified third round program was based on the belief that without Government assistance these plants either would not be built or that their construction would be delayed beyond the time considered desirable.

2. "There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadruple by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels—particularly coal—to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations."

Comment: With respect to Mr. Moody's remarks on the availability of coal reserves to meet future growth in power demands, may I refer you to the discussion on this subject beginning on page 16 of the Commission Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear Power. On the basis of data obtained from several authoritative sources, the report concludes that if no supplemental forms of energy are utilized, we will exhaust our readily available, low-cost supplies of fossil fuels in from 75 to 100 years, and total supplies in from 150 to 200 years. However, long before the point of exhaustion of the fossil fuels, we would be obliged to taper off their use.

There are additional significant factors affecting the future use of fossil fuels. For example, as the report points out, fossil hydrocarbons are essential in the iron and steel industry and, furthermore, they represent a priceless heritage of complex molecular substances, the possible uses for which are only beginning to be realized. There is no presently known practical substitute for fossil fuels to power automobiles and aircraft, which will no doubt continue to increase in numbers. For these reasons we conclude that fossil fuels should be conserved. This can best be done through reasonably prompt efforts to supplement the use of fossil fuels in those applications for which technically satisfactory and reasonably economic substitutes can be utilized on a significant scale.

3. "To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants."

Comment: The maximum Commission assistance agreed upon for the Connecticut Yankee atomic project is actually $13.195 million of which $6.05 million is for design assistance and the balance for waiver of inventory charges on special nuclear materials. Perhaps the higher figure used by Mr. Moody includes an assumption of the difference between what it would cost the utility, over the plant lifetime, to maintain an inventory of special nuclear material under private ownership and the cost under the present system of lease from the Government at an annual inventory charge of 4¾ percent. (The value assigned by the Commission to special nuclear material, and the level of inventory charge, are based on full recovery of costs by the Government.) Lease is presently necessary since the Atomic Energy Act requires Government ownership, but there is legislation recommended by the Commission and now under Congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible immediately, and mandatory after a transition period.

Incidentally, inventory charges represent only a small portion of the overall nuclear fuel cycle cost. Other items of cost which are borne by the utility include fabrication of fuel elements, burnup of fissionable material, reprocessing of spent fuel, and transportation.

4. "There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear powerplants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, 'What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an accident associated with coal fired generation plants.' "

Comment: The Atomic Energy Commission is responsible under the law for regulation of the use of atomic energy, including consideration of applications for nuclear powerplant construction permits and operating licenses. Processing of applications involves review by up to as many as three different and independent groups: the AEC's hazards staff, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and a Safety and Licensing Board which conducts public hearings and is made up of three members, two of whom are technically qualified and one of whom is experienced in administrative proceedings. No such plants may be built or operated until we are convinced, by all the evidence on plant design, site and environs, method of operation, etc., that such construction and operation would not endanger public health and safety. The subject of safety was discussed in considerable detail by Commissioner Haworth in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on April 5, 1963, in the course of its hearings on the development, state and growth of the atomic energy industry. I refer you to his testimony beginning on page 827 of the record of the hearings.

5. "The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy powerplants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

$500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12,000 or $13,000 per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation."

Comment: The private insurance industry has placed a limit on the amount it will cover per project partly because of the level of coverage but also because it does not have a mass of accumulated statistical data on commercial reactor plant operation comparable to that on which it bases insurance conditions for other industrial activities. It is hoped that, with the growing accumulation of nuclear powerplant operating data, the insurance industry will not only increase its coverage but also reduce rates.

The magnitude of the Government indemnity is not an admission of the "colossal danger" of a nuclear plant. The Price-Anderson Indemnity Act was adopted in order to assure that funds would be available in order to satisfy third party liability claims which might exceed the amount of insurance required in the event of a theoretically possible, but highly unlikely, accident. It is true that there is potential of considerable damage if, in spite of all safeguards and controls, a nuclear plant should suffer a severe accident, but (as mentioned above) the Commission's requirements for safety of plant design, methods of operation and site conditions are designed to render the possibility of such an accident extremely remote. The Commission's accident record over the many years it has built and operated numerous reactors is excellent, better than that of most conventional industries.

6. "The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear powerplants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program."

Comment: We agree with Mr. Moody that without Government assistance first-of-a-kind, large-scale commercial nuclear powerplants would probably be constructed less promptly than they would be with such aid. It is because of this that we sought and obtained legislative authorization to proceed with the modified third round program. We believe that the best interests of the American people are served by a continual search for reliable and economical ways to harness energy, and that nuclear power has the potential to meet these criteria.

Although special nuclear material is presently made available to the nuclear power industry through Government lease, legislation has been recommended by the Commission for congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible immediately, and mandatory after a transition period.

7. "We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property."

Comment: In the process of preparing its Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear Power, the Commission performed a detailed analysis of the projected impact of nuclear power on the potential production and consumption of fossil fuels. The conclusion reached is that, "the projected growth of nuclear power will merely supplement and not supplant coal and other fossil fuels for many decades. The fossil fuel industries and particularly the coal industry can expect a period of continuously expanding production." This forecast is illustrated by the table on page 7 of appendix 5 to the report which shows a rise in energy supplied by coal from the equivalent of 416 million tons in 1960 to 3,343 million tons in the year 2000. During the same period the energy obtained from nuclear sources, expressed in equivalent tons of coal, is estimated to be 15 million in 1970, 100 million in 1980, 410 million in 1990, and 1,260 million in 2000. As a matter of interest, it should be noted that the AEC purchases very substantial quantities of coal and in fact is the coal industry's best single customer.

### LETTER TO VICE CHAIRMAN HOLIFIELD

In this letter Mr. Moody again refers to AEC concentration on commercial nuclear powerplants with concurrent neglect of the development of advanced technology, and to the ample reserves of fossil fuels. Please refer to my comments, above, on these points.

Mr. Moody introduces a new argument against further Government assistance to large-scale, proven concept nuclear plants by contending that such plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. He quotes Mr. Louis Roddis in support of this contention. However, in his letter to Chairman PASTORE, Mr. Moody supports his position by stating, "The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operation these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even with the so-called high fuel-cost areas." It is therefore not clear to us whether Mr. Moody believes that such plants would or would not be competitive. The Commission's position is that large nuclear plants built at this time could produce electricity at costs no greater than those from conventional plants in areas where the delivered cost of fossil fuel is 35 cents per million B.t.u.'s or greater.

I would like to add a final comment regarding Mr. Moody's statement in his letter to Chairman PASTORE that the National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the industrial federation built around bituminous coal, including, "coal-consuming electric utilities." In view of the more than half a billion dollars already spent by the utility industry on nuclear powerplants, plus the commitments for several hundred million dollars more, it is obvious that at least a large segment of the utility industry believes that nuclear energy has the potential to serve as a reliable and economic alternative, supplemental source of electric power.

I trust the above comments will be of assistance to you. We would be pleased to furnish any additional information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. LUEDECKE,
*General Manager.*

### THE PORTSMOUTH, N.H., HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Appropriations and the diligent chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works for presenting to the Senate for its approval the first of several appropriations that will be required to complete the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project. The committee has acted in a most farsighted manner, because the estimates for this work of harbor improvement were made final too late for their inclusion in the budget submitted by the President in January of this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the national significance of this project, which testifies to the work of our National Government in creating the basis for economic improvement in every region of our country.

### THE PORTSMOUTH PROJECT DEPENDS ON CIVIC IMAGINATION

The city of Portsmouth stands today as a community confirmed in its courage to plan ahead. The proud name of the "Port City," inherited from our oceangoing forefathers, has recently become a touchstone for progress throughout the seacoast region of New Hampshire. A dozen years ago, Portsmouth Harbor handled only 863,000 short tons of ocean cargo. Rapid currents in a tortuous channel bordered with rocks have made entry into the harbor an unacceptable risk for all but the most skilled navigators. The present depth of the channel in its upper reaches prevents the use of large modern tankers, also preventing full use of the harbor. But the obstacles to be overcome in fulfilling the port city's bright future were not those of nature alone. A slumbering tradition had to be revived. Businessmen had to be convinced that the prospects for progress were commercially sound. Public interest had to be awakened. It is a tribute to the city fathers, business and civic leaders of Portsmouth and many farsighted men and women throughout New Hampshire that our State legislature created the New Hampshire State Port Authority in 1957. Our best brains turned to problems of transportation by rail and highway, coordinating harbor improvements with the needs of the military at nearby Pease Air Force Base and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and laying plans with interested busines firms. An enlightened local press and radio helped to build a solid public understanding of maritime commerce and the plans for the port. The story is an inspiring one, in which the public-spirited imagination of our whole seacoast region was brought to bear on the needs of the harbor and its commerce. It is now confidently planned that the port will handle almost 2 million tons annually in a few years.

### CONVINCING THE CONGRESS

In 1958 and 1959 resolutions were passed in the Public Works Committees of each House of the Congress, asking the Corps of Engineers to explore the desirability of harbor improvements. The report to the chief of the Corps of Engineers was transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army on July 5, 1962. By summer of 1963, local support for the project had become virtually unanimous. Gov. John W. King drew attention to the State's plans to begin construction of a $3.8 million harbor terminal capable of handling the newest type of container ship and all but the very largest supertankers. Mr. John Rowe, State commissioner of resources and economic development, observed that recent Supreme Court decisions had cleared the way for more competitive overland freight rates to our northern ports and that the new facilities "are believed to be the first in the Nation engineered from the ground up to handle rail and truck tonnage for the new class of container ships." Mayor John J. Wholey stated his belief that the project is "essential to the present and future economic welfare of the city of Portsmouth." The diligent chairman of the New Hampshire State Port Authority, Mr. Eugene P. Soles, wrote as follows:

> The fact that larger ships must navigate the harbor and river at partial draft is obviously an economic detriment, which affects not only the ship operators, but the economy of the local area. I firmly believe that the completion of the proposed project will permit the safe and orderly passage of deeper draft vessels, and consider the project to have a vital bearing upon the economic welfare of the State of New Hampshire.

Rear Adm. C. J. Palmer, U.S. Navy, commander of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, stated that "improvements in the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River will substantially improve the facility of handling modern submarines and Navy tankers in this area." Lt. Col. John S. Robinson, U.S. Air Force, acting commander of Pease Air Force Base pointed out that harbor improvements would "permit fuel delivery by larger tankers and thereby assure an adequate backup supply and flow of aviation fuels for day-to-day operations as well as for unforeseen national emergencies." Mr. Thomas M. Prentiss, president of the Greater Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, foresaw that the project "would assist such interests as may be desirous of locating in tidewater areas of the State as well as benefiting existing businesses." Such local businesses as the Portsmouth Navigation Corp., C. H. Sprague & Son Co., the Atlantic Terminal Sales Corp., New England Tank Industries of New Hampshire, the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, and the Simplex Wire & Cable Co., presented excellent statements of the benefit the harbor project would provide for their operations. Out-of-State firms such as the Central Maine Power Co., the National Gypsum Co., the Keystone Shipping Co., the Trinidad Corp., and the Socony Mobil Oil Co., welcomed news of the project and most said they would consider expanding their operations into and out of the Portsmouth Harbor.

Mr. President, it was my pleasure to contribute what I could to consideration of this important project in the Congress. On June 13 of this year I testified in its favor before Senator ELLENDER's subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER PROJECT

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. MCINTYRE before the Public Works Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, June 13, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to discuss the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River Navigation project.

The 1962 Rivers and Harbors Act authorizing this project, for which the total estimated cost is $7½ million. Its principal purpose would be the widening of the tortuous channel that winds upstream through Portsmouth Harbor and to extend that channel some 1,700 feet above the Newington dock facilities.

In 1956 several ledges were removed, deepening the present channel to 35 feet, enabling tankers of some 25,000 deadweight tons to reach the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, while the upper reaches of the river remain limited to ships of some 17,000 deadweight tons. The project would widen the channel and eliminate submerged ledges, permitting tankers of up to 35,000 deadweight tons to use the entire channel.

Fast tidal currents, sharp bends, and difficult bridge approaches make the existing channel a hazardous one. The fact that this danger has not led to serious collisions, groundings, and perhaps even fires is a tribute to the skill of the Portsmouth Harbor pilots.

The high cost of petroleum deliveries from smaller, less efficient vessels constitutes a heavy burden upon our State, which must rely upon coastal shipping to neutralize the effect of unreasonably high rail and motor freight rates. These high costs have contributed to the fact that New Hampshire's residential electricity rates are the highest in the Nation. It has been estimated that annual savings of some $600,000 would result from the channel improvements described by the Corps of Engineers.

The project has been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. The 2-mile extension to Newington and the upper turning basin have been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 6.5 to 1. But in terms of the urgent hopes of the citizens of Portsmouth, I believe this project bears even more significant merit. On the Piscataqua channel the city of Portsmouth, in cooperation with the State Department of Resources and Economic Development, hopes to locate a foreign-trade zone. The University of New Hampshire hopes to develop a deep sea marine science program which would require docking facilities for oceanographic vessels. The Port Authority hopes to develop commercial fishery docking facilities that must await the widening of the channel. So this project, if it is provided, will set off a whole chain reaction of harbor improvements of definite commercial and research significance. In the final analysis, it is for this reason that I strongly urge the members of this subcommittee to approve the expenditure of the first $1½ million for the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project.

**Mr. McINTYRE.** Mr. President, I am a convinced supporter of New Hampshire's booming seacoast region. The proposals for harbor improvements, new port facilities, a foreign-trade zone, and a marine science center have had my full support since I began my service in the Senate. I have joined in offering bills to provide for the development of new stern-ramp trawlers and fishing vessel construction subsidies to help expand our lagging commercial fisheries fleet. I have joined in offering legislation, which has since passed the Senate, to provide for commercial fisheries research and water resources research in our State universities. I have repeatedly stressed the importance of maintaining a strong national establishment of naval shipyards, whose readiness and skills are so essential in times of challenge. I have repeatedly urged that restrictions be lifted from trade in residual fuel oil, the only fuel available in New Hampshire at a nationally competitive price. It would be my conviction that citizens of New Hampshire's seacost region and port city should lend their support to these efforts and to local efforts to make the most of our short but historic seacoast. The recent report of the National Academy of Sciences on marine resources, as well as many studies by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and other farsighted groups remind us that the resources of the sea are truly inexhaustible. They represent a new frontier for our port city in times of constant change and I am fully confident that our citizens will prove more than equal to the challenge.

### TEAMWORK FOR PROGRESS

Mr. President, projects such as the Portsmouth Harbor project mean hard work. Hard work by a Senate subcommittee that heard literally hundreds of witnesses. Hard work by Government agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Coast Guard, and many others. Hard work by local leaders and State government. Hard work by the New Hampshire State Port Authority.

It has been charged that government funds spent for public works belong to some particularly irresponsible class of public waste. I would not deny the need to obtain full value for such funds, but I wonder if the critics have any idea of the scrutiny that such projects receive. Four committees of the Congress examine them. The Corps of Engineers and all related Federal agencies examine them. The States weigh them with a critical eye. No project is authorized unless benefits outweigh costs. The very best talent that the Nation enjoys helps to plan these projects and helps the Congress enact them into law. The use of public funds for public works constitutes an investment in public progress, not merely for one region or area, but for the country as a whole. Manufacturers all across the Nation will find in Portsmouth a new shipping point for their goods. The beltways of maritime commerce that encircle the Nation will be strengthened. Our foreign trade will be expanded. This is true not just because Uncle Sam lays out funds for harbor improvement, but because local groups and private citizens match these ideas with their own, and make investments which more than match the value of Federal works of improvement. Without such local cooperation, there would be little value in the Federal projects. But planning and building together, our local communities and the Federal Government can each supplement the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

strengths of the other and lay the foundation for enduring progress. That is what has happened in the Port City of the Granite State on this occasion and, I am confident, many more to come in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent publication of the New Hampshire State Port Authority entitled "Newest World Port" be reprinted as a conclusion to my remarks.

There being no objection, the publication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### NEWEST WORLD PORT

New Hampshire State Port Authority: Eugene P. Soles, chairman; Carl M. Lougee, vice chairman; Hugh G. Hamilton; Frank W. Fate; John F. Rowe; John E. Seybolt; Ralph T. Harris; Cap. Woodbury S. Adams, director.

#### AN INVITATION

State construction of modern terminal facilities at Portsmouth Harbor marks the rebirth of one of the Nation's oldest seaports.

Through the efforts and foresight of former Gov. Wesley Powell, and his executive council, this became a reality.

The port and its terminal are being developed to take advantage of the transportation industry's ever increasing growth.

New Hampshire and Portsmouth invite your consideration of the port's ability to meet your requirements, with these new facilities added to other advantages—a deep, 35-foot channel, proximity to principal ocean routes, a growing network of modern highways, adequate rail service, a stable industrial climate, plus thrifty and progressive government.

At Portsmouth, where the first naval vessel to fly the U.S. flag was launched, site of an important naval shipyard since colonial days, for many years one of the Nation's leading ports for merchant shipping, New Hampshire looks forward to renewed maritime activity and welcomes your participation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. KING,
*Governor.*

#### A NEW ERA IN NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMERCE

"Portsmouth has the important advantage of being a completely ice-free port. The major program of expansion and improvement now underway clearly indicates that Portsmouth is entering its most successful era in seaborne commerce."—EUGENE P. SOLES, chairman, New Hampshire State Port Authority.

#### *A new world port for New England*

Portsmouth, N.H., is a completely ice-free year-round port. It is also the only natural deepwater harbor between the ports of Boston and Portland. The modern port and marine terminal at Nobles Island in the Piscataqua River will save money and time—in importing raw materials and exporting finished products—for industrial firms extending outward from the Portsmouth area.

The first stage plans for the marine terminal include the construction of a concrete wharf superstructure and decking, 450 feet in length and 50 feet in width, which will accommodate oceangoing vessels. A 27,000-square-yard reception and storage area adjacent to the wharf will lead to access areas built to tie in with existing roadways.

Second stage plans call for the addition of two more berths, a much enlarged staging and storage area, and a complex of buildings for warehousing, inspection, maintenance, and administrative purposes.

A $7,500,000 Federal project to widen and deepen certain areas of the Piscataqua River is presently being undertaken by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This will facilitate navigation of even larger oceangoing ships in the river.

#### *The growth of New Hampshire industry*

Manufacturing industry in New Hampshire has grown enormously since 1940. This growth has been carefully programed by the State's department of resources and economic development, the industrial park authority, the New Hampshire Business Development Corp., and a number of regional development corporations.

The results? Today New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation, despite the fact that it ranks second among all the States in the percentage of its population employed in manufacturing industries.

There is still, however, virtually unlimited room for new industry close to the area of the new port and marine terminal. Yours, for example.

#### *New Hampshire and the world's markets*

The European Common Market is gradually easing tariffs, quotas, and import duties at home and abroad. This is already increasing America's share in world trade. And so Portsmouth becomes an increasingly important link between the commerce of Europe and our northern tier of States.

The new port and marine terminal will make Portsmouth the most convenient shipping and importing point for many companies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Ohio, and northern New York. Completion of New Hampshire's modern and efficient highway system will provide a tie-in with important midwestern ports that are icebound during the winter.

#### *Foreign trade zone potential*

There is ample available land close to the new port for development of a foreign trade zone. Should any companies settling in the Portmouth area require the benefits of a foreign trading zone, the New Hampshire State Port Authority is authorized to establish such a zone under existing regulations.

#### THE NEW AND THE TRADITIONAL OF PORTSMOUTH HARBOR

#### *Birthplace of the American Navy*

Founded in 1623 at the mouth of the Piscataqua River, Portsmouth is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is New Hampshire's most important seaport. "Birthplace of the American Navy," Portsmouth was a thriving port and shipbuilding center in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Timber and other goods from inland communities were shipped down river in gundelows to Portsmouth and loaded into oceangoing vessels for shipment abroad. In 1777, the famous *Ranger* was built in Portsmouth for John Paul Jones. In 1782 the first ship of the line built in America, mounting 74 guns, was completed and presented to France by Congress in gratitude for French aid during the American Revolution.

#### *The clipper ship era*

During the War of 1812, commerce in Portsmouth all but disappeared, but shipbuilding became an important industry once more by 1840. Men of all nations went down to the sea in the famous Portsmouth clipper ships such as the *Typhoon, Chocorua* and *Witch of the Wave*. These ships gained worldwide fame as the fastest vessels afloat in the heyday of the gold, tea, and opium trade. But with the coming of steam and steel ships, Portsmouth's greatest commercial era drew to a close. Even before the arrival of the 20th century, Boston and Portland had surpassed Portsmouth as the centers of seaborne commerce in New England.

#### *The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard*

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has always been an important Government installation, building warships of all types for the U.S. Navy. But commerce in the port dwindled away during the first 40 years of this century. This very lack of activity finally encouraged private industries to establish loading facilities along the south bank of the Piscataqua for the quick movement of coal and fuel oil to users throughout the State by means of the excellent highway system.

#### *Increasing commerce*

During the last two decades, this activity has grown considerably. From 1955–60 an average of 1,300,000 short tons of materials have been shipped through the privately owned facilities along the river.

The New Hampshire Port Authority, created by the legislature in 1957, advocated the establishment of a State port and marine terminal to give further stimulus to the New Hampshire economy. In 1962, Gov. Wesley Powell and his council authorized $800,000 toward the first stage of construction of the port.

Located at Nobles Island, adjacent to the Interstate Highway Bridge across the Piscataqua River to Maine, the new port has facilities for handling containerized as well as general cargo. With an authorized $7,500,000 Federal program for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to deepen and widen the river and harbor, oceangoing ships of any size may be accommodated at the new marine terminal.

#### *A new era dawns*

Thus Portsmouth, a busy seagoing community 300 years ago, looks forward to the revival of her past glory. With industry throughout the State increasing at a rapid rate, the new marine terminal will soon make the waters of the Piscataqua busier than they have been since Portsmouth clipper ships ruled the seven seas.

#### NEW GATEWAY TO NEW ENGLAND AND THE WEST

#### *Year-round port service for the Midwest*

Portsmouth is geographically the gateway to northern New England and to many points in the Midwest bordering the Great Lakes. With ports such as Toledo and Cleveland icebound during the winter months, Portsmouth can serve as a shipping point for goods normally sent to and from these ports in warmer weather.

#### *New highway system*

Serving the State's industry as well as industrial firms in Vermont, New Hampshire's excellent new highway system is rapidly being expanded and soon will be one of the finest in the Nation. Already it provides express connections from Portsmouth north to Portland and Canada and south to Boston, Providence, and New York City. More than 25 major trucking companies serve New Hampshire, assuring direct service to all points within the State.

#### *Rail connections good and economical*

The Boston & Maine Railroad services New Hampshire with both passenger and freight service. Freight trains leave all principal cities daily for Boston and New York. Connections with Canadian railways via the Boston & Maine Railroad afford New Hampshire shippers the advantage of cheaper differential rates to Canada west of Kingston, Ontario, and to destinations in the United States between central Ohio and the Rocky Mountains, and north of a line through the central part of Kentucky, Missouri, and Kansas.

#### *Harbor traffic tripled since 1940*

Despite the lack of a State port and terminal facilities in Portsmouth, traffic in the harbor has more than tripled since 1940. In that year, 405,553 short tons of cargo moved through the private docking facilities in the Piscataqua River. By 1955, tonnage had risen to more than 1,200,000 short tons, and from 1956 to 1960, the average yearly tonnage approximated 1,300,000 short tons.

The majority of this tonnage consisted of imports, including petroleum products of all classes, gypsum or plaster rock, bituminous coal and lignite, electrical machinery and raw salt.

### NEW IMPETUS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE'S STEADILY RISING IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE

*New Hampshire exports*

Total value of exports from New Hampshire in 1960 is estimated at $54.7 million. Most important exporting industries in the State are nonelectrical machinery, including special industry machinery, primary metals, textile mill products, paper and allied products, leather, and leather products, and electrical machinery. These six industries exported more than 90 percent of the estimated totals of manufactured goods from the State in 1960.

*Imports to New Hampshire*

The nonelectrical machinery industry, largest exporter of manufactured goods (almost 50 percent of the total exported), is also indirectly dependent on imports for its high volume of production. Large quantities of ferroalloys are produced by the primary metals industries from imported ores and concentrates of manganese, chromite, nickel, cobalt, and columbite-tantalite, and tungsten. Other indirect import requirements include nonferrous ores or metals, such as antimony, copper and tin.

The primary metals industry, textile mill products, leather and leather products, electrical machinery, and agriculture in New Hampshire are all steady importers of foreign made products.

A good percentage of these imports, as well as the finished goods in which they are used, will flow through the new State port.

### TAKE A NEW HARD LOOK AT THE VITALITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S ECONOMIC CLIMATE

*Healthy economic climate*

In addition to the import-export advantages of the new Marine Terminal, the State of New Hampshire offers an economic climate second to none.

*No corporate income tax*

The State has no corporate income tax and no general sales tax. It depends more upon ad valorem property taxes for tax revenue than most other States. Approximately 60 percent of all taxes collected for support of State and local government come from this one source. And industry pays only 13 percent of the total property taxes.

*Large female labor market*

Although New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, there is a substantial female labor market. Our women are industrious, adaptable, and imbued with the Yankee concept of "an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

*Loyal, intelligent workers*

The New Hampshire worker is intelligent, loyal, and hard working. Wage rates throughout the State are reasonable by big city standards. Fringe benefits too are well within sensible standards.

*Adequate water supply*

Water supply throughout the State is more than adequate and electric power and fuel rates are reasonable. The Public Service Co. of New Hampshire services about 80 percent of all users of electric power in the State. Fuel oil, brought into Portsmouth by tanker, is naturally cheaper than anywhere else in the State. Natural gas is also available in Portsmouth, brought in by one of the two transmission pipelines running through the State.

*Excellent educational facilities*

New Hampshire has top-notch public schools and colleges ranging from excellent small institutions to nationally famous centers of learning such as the University of New Hampshire and Dartmouth College.

*Enjoyable living*

Executives and workers alike can enjoy living in one of the Nation's finest vacationlands. Skiing, hiking, golf, swimming, boating, camping, hunting, fishing and a host of other outdoor sports can be enjoyed in the most beautiful surroundings in the eastern part of the United States.

*Economic analysis available*

There is a complete analysis of population and labor supply, wage rates, taxes, transportation facilities, and other factors affecting New Hampshire as an industrial location. We would like to place a copy of this study in your hands to convince you that locating your plant in New Hampshire, with the added bonuses of a new port designed to your needs, is worth looking into. Just drop a line to: Director, New Hampshire State Port Authority, Post Office Box 295, Portsmouth, N.H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 9140) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

## TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I take this occasion to thank the members of the subcommittee and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their assistance in handling the bill. I particularly wish to thank and compliment the competent clerk of the committee, Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, who sits with me here, and who is really and truly my right-hand man in the handling of this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has shown his usual skill in handling legislative matters, whether they be from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Appropriations. This has been a most difficult bill to deal with. It is an intricate bill. It is a bill that very few Members of the Senate understand, and understandably so. However, it is a bill which has received the constant attention of the Senator from Louisiana.

I compliment him and the ranking minority member of the committee the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the other members of the committee, and the staff for the outstanding work they have done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in paying respects to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the committee. As the Senator from Montana knows, public works are of vital importance to my State and to the entire Pacific Northwest. We have never received any gratuity from the Senator from Louisiana, and we would not have deserved it if we had requested it. We always receive a fair hearing from the Senator from Louisiana in making our presentation. On behalf of the people of my State, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the fairness and justice that he has shown us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana goes infinitely further than merely giving a fair hearing to a Senator who comes before him on this detailed bill. He knows the problem that every Senator faces. He goes over and beyond the call of duty in cooperating with Senators in order to make certain that full justice is done.

Once more, I salute the distinguished and efficient clerk of the subcommittee. I have occasion to know how generous and kind he has been to my own office force and my staff members. I publicly thank Ken Bousquet for his cooperation and his every kindness. This has been a consistent attribute of his over a long period of time, including the years when I served on the Committee on Appropriations. So I salute him and thank him.

Likewise, I thank the minority clerk, who has been a tower of strength in this matter. We salute him, as well.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of my State of Texas, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his patient hearings. The record shows that nearly 4,500 pages of testimony were taken. I was present this year, as I have been in past years, and I know that every delegation that has appeared has been courteously treated by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. We have waited our turn in line, as have delegations from many other States. All of them, from every State, have received unfailing courtesy. That reflects credit on the Senate and all its committees. The chairman has remained in the committee day after day, and personally knows what the record contains.

Mr. Bousquet and all the other members of the staff who worked with the chairman are diligent in furnishing opportunities for witnesses to be heard. They cooperate by answering correspondence. They are knowledgeable and understand the requests of the people of my State who appear before the committee on matters on which they desire to be heard.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his efficient work.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is due an explanation of the procedure that will be followed this afternoon. It had been anticipated that the conference report on the Independent Offices appropriation bill would be available this afternoon. We find that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

this is not so. However, the House has agreed to the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, and that will be the business following the disposition of the military construction appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been asked by several Senators to announce what the position will be of Senators who are opposed to the conference report on the foreign aid bill. The House having agreed to the conference report this afternoon by a vote of some 190 to 164, while we cannot move to recommit, we shall move to reject the report and ask for a further conference. We intend to analyze the conference report section by section.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H.R. 9139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this measure brings before the Senate the military construction appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964. There are no particular innovations or far-reaching new programs provided in the bill. The program is a continuation of what might be called the regular military construction program.

There is one unusually large item of $185 million for the construction of additional ballistic missile sites. The next largest item is for military housing, which the Senate will remember is now handled by direct appropriations, rather than under the old system of what was called Capehart housing.

I shall give some summary figures in the beginning, and then present a complete statement for the RECORD, covering the entire bill. Then I shall be glad to answer questions that any Senator may wish to ask.

This matter was first considered by the Senate in the authorization act, and considerable reductions were made in the original request for military construction. The total amount that was reduced in the authorization act, itself was for $176,149,000 in the regular construction program. That left an amount authorized for construction in the main military program of $1,055,851,000.

To be added to that amount in the authorization act was $685,312,000 for Defense family housing. Also included in that figure is a sum that the committee will try to have transferred to the other appropriation bill, because it has nothing to do with construction.

The large item in the housing program is for the payment of interest on the old housing program, including Capehart housing; this sum is $167 million. Another large item is for the operation and maintenance of the approximately 200,000 units already completed; this amounts to $306 million. This debt payment and operation maintenance should not be included in this bill, because it is misleading, and will cause Senators and the press to believe that that large amount of military construction is provided in the bill, when it is not construction in any sense of the word.

Returning to the $1,055,851,000 of authorized construction, that amount was decreased to $917,793,000 by the House Appropriations Committee action. The Senate committee reports a figure of $978,083,000.

The bill contains some items that the House deleted and the Senate committee eliminated. There are some items that the House approved that the Senate committee has taken out. There are a few items that came to the Senate committee, not having been submitted to the House, because they were not completed and not ready for submission to the House.

Broadly speaking, we have included four hospitals and have included operating facilities that go with the hospitals, such as nurses' quarters and corpsmen quarters.

Roundly, we have included in the bill money for 7,500 military family housing units. The budget requested 12,100 housing units; authorization action by the Congress reduced the number to 10,140 units. The House allowed 7,755 housing units. The Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced the number to 7,500 and placed money in the bill to build this number.

We included, as eligible for construction, the entire 10,140 unit list as submitted by the Department of Defense, including houses overseas deleted by the House. I shall repeat that for emphasis. All military housing in this budget is included in the bill as being eligible for construction; but the bill provides money to construct only 7,500 of these units. That is exactly the pattern that was followed last year. It has worked very well.

Last year the Senate committee tentatively recommended, and the Senate adopted, a program of military construction of family housing of 7,500 units for a period of a few years at least.

At the end of the fiscal year just closed, 5,000 of those houses were under construction. Now all 7,500 have been started. But all the 7,500 new starts in the bill, plus the 2,500 that have been started since July will total, in round numbers, 10,000 units for the current fiscal year.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as always, has been very active in the preparation of the bill and in attending the hearings. He has rendered his usual highly valuable service in connection with the bill. He may wish to obtain the floor; and if he wishes to do so, I shall be glad to yield now to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield now to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to state that I believe that under his able leadership, this is a good bill; and I believe that the method of allocating the housing is an excellent one, because we included provisions for funds for the 7,500 housing units, but we voted to allow the Department of Defense to decide they shall be built, so the Department can decide on the top priorities—which is very much better than to have Congress decide where and when they shall be built.

As for the general appropriation items for the various services, I believe our subcommittee voted to include the necessary items. We voted to delete some of the items voted by the House, but we voted to include some which the House did not include.

So, in the overall view, I believe the bill as reported by the Senate committee is a good one; and I hope the Senate will support the committee's decisions. Under the leadership of the able Senator from Mississippi, the same conscientious attitude displayed in previous years was again displayed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that when the Secretary of Defense was before the subcommittee, of which I am a member, I raised with him the question of the 200 additional family housing units requested for Malmstrom Air Force Base, at Great Falls, Mont., which at the present time is 1,200 units short. Is the chairman of the subcommittee in a position to explain the situation in regard to Malmstrom Air Force Base and the 200 additional family housing units requested?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The Senator from Montana made a very strong case for the Malmstrom houses. The housing units for the Malmstrom Air Force Base are included in the bill.

As I have already pointed out, the bill does not provide sufficient funds for the construction of all the housing we have approved for priority allocation by the Department; but the Malmstrom base units are very high on the priority list supplied to the committee; and now it will be up to the Department of Defense and the various services to decide, according to their discretion, where these funds will be spent, within the limits provided by the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi; that is fair enough.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I also thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his valuable contributions.

In further regard to the housing situation, let me say that the committee followed, in proportion between the various services, the same general percentage proportions which were in the bill to begin with.

Second, the overseas housing is, for the most part, not to be in Western Europe. The only major item in Western Europe is in Spain. The items for oversea housing which are included in the bill will receive consideration and treatment along with the others, but there will be less. The House deleted those items, largely on the ground, so our committee understands, of the balance-of-payments question. We took further proof on that matter, and we have voted to include in the bill the oversea construction items, which we are told will not materially or substantially affect the balance-of-payments problem, because these housing units, or, at least, most of them, are to be prefabricated and built to that extent in the United States, and then shipped in pieces overseas, and put together overseas. At any rate, that item will be worked out in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for the careful attention he has given to the entire field of our defenses and the necessary facilities to be built, particularly in the State which I represent in part.

However, I wish to ask about one item which I understand is in the bill, although not shown as a line item, because it is of the gravest concern in Florida. It has to do with the air defense system extending from the Homestead SAC Base down to Key West. Although it is not a line item, do I correctly understand that it is completely covered by a substantial allowance in the bill?

Mr. STENNIS. That matter is covered in the bill. Incidentally, the Homestead Base was one of the key ones used in the Cuban crisis a little over a year ago, and certainly proved its value.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the Boca Chica Base, which also was used by the Air Force, was the other of the two bases which became so critical at that time; was it not?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Let me say that the matter mentioned by the Senator from Florida is fully taken care of in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senater from Mississippi.

### SUMMARY OF BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the total appropriation recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee amounts to $1,617,489,000. This is an amount of $54,525,000 over allowances provided by the House and $348,911,000 under the budget estimate of $1,966,400,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Army, the committee has approved an amount totaling $207,070,000. This is an increase of over $6,777,000 approved by the House, and a decrease of $42,430,000 from the budget estimate of $249,500,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Navy, the committee has approved an amount totaling $202,223,000. This is an increase of $8,223,000 over the $194 million allowed by the House and a decrease of $67,677,000 from the budget estimate of $269,900,000.

For military construction for the Active Forces of the Department of the Air Force, the committee has approved an amount totaling $487,090,000. This is an increase of $36,090,000 over the $451 million allowed by the House, and a decrease of $141,110,000 from the budget estimate of $628,200,000.

For the Reserve forces the committee recommends the budget figure, with the exception of the Army National Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Reserve | $4,500,000 |
| Naval Reserve | 6,000,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | 4,000,000 |
| Air National Guard | 16,000,000 |

For the Army National Guard, the committee recommends an appropriation of $5,700,000, which is $2,200,000 more than the House allowance of $3,500,000 and is $2,200,000 more than the budget estimate. Later in my remarks I will explain this increase and the reason therefor.

For the Department of Defense agencies, the committee recommends an appropriation of $50,096,000. This is $2,900,000 below the budget estimate and $9 million over the amount allowed by the House. The appropriation breakdown is as follows:

Defense Atomic Support Agency, $1,861,000; Defense Intelligence Agency, $225,000; Defense Communications Agency, $1,260,000; Defense Supply Agency, $1,035,000 and classified projects, $20 million. This appropriation recognizes a saving of $381,000 from prior years funds for which an adjustment has been made. The committee also recommends for the Department of Defense general support program, including planning, design and minor construction, $3,000,000, and for housing $2,596,000. The committee has approved an appropriation of $20,500,000 for loran stations. This is the same as the budget request.

For the Department of Defense family housing account, the committee recommends an appropriation of $637,406,000. This appropriation consists of the following: For the Army, construction $34,681,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payment $183,396,000; for the Navy, construction $68,248,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payments, $93,944,000; for the Air Force, construction $61,027,000, operations, maintenance, and debt payments $193,514,000; for the Defense Agencies, construction $50,000, operations, maintenance and debt payments, $2,546,000.

The breakdown of construction for housing units on a basis of an allowance of 7,500 units is computed as follows: Army, 1,366 housing units costing $26,664,000; Navy, 3,142, costing $55,649,000; and Air Force, 2,922 costing $53,750,000. This provides a total of $136,063,000 for the construction of 7,500 housing units.

The House allowed $645,171,000 for the Defense housing program. The Senate allowed $637,406,000. This is a reduction of $7,765,000. The Department of Defense requested $685,312,000 of the Senate. Reductions made by the Senate from this request amounted to $47,906,000.

Mr. President, by way of explaining the total reductions made by the committee, included is $225,238,000 made as a result of the reductions in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964—Public Law 88-174. The authorization reductions for the services amounted to, and these include the Defense Housing, Army, $47,107,000, Navy, $59,612,000, Air Force, $116,022,000, and Defense Agencies, $2,497,000.

### FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. President, a further explanation of the Defense housing section of the bill is needed at this point. One of the complex problems faced by the committee in deciding the appropriations for this bill was the number of family housing units to provide. A very extensive review of the housing was made by the committee. Secretary Robert S. McNamara appeared before our subcommittee accompanied by Gen. Curtis LeMay. We went extensively into service housing requirements for the present and the future.

Within the next 5 years, including fiscal year 1964, the Defense Department expects to request appropriations for 62,100 housing units at a cost of approximately $1,148,000,000. It is the opinion of the committee that such a large program, when taken into consideration with our sharply climbing Federal budget, places a rather heavy fiscal burden on the taxpayer.

The Department of Defense requested approval of a family housing program for fiscal year 1964 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Department of Defense, amounting to 12,100 housing units and costing $734,000,000. This amount was reduced by the Congress in the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1964—Public Law 88-174—to $685,312,000, providing for 10,140 housing units.

House appropriations action approved $645,171,000 for 7,755 housing units, deleting all oversea construction, except Okinawa. This was the situation when the bill came before your committee.

Before describing our recommendations, I would like to review briefly what the committee action was in fiscal 1963. The services had proposed the construction of 14,475 family housing units and the improvement of 2,884 substandard units to public quarters standards, requesting a total of $289,810,000.

The committee conducted a thorough review of family housing for all the services and decided that the 14,475-unit program was too large an undertaking. Accordingly, the program was reduced to 7,500 units, costing a total of $143,742,000. The funds and units were distributed as follows: Department of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Army, $29,865,000 for 1,600 units; Department of the Navy, $43,880,000 for 2,195 units; Department of the Air Force, $69,997,000 for 3,760 units. The units for each of the services include both housing for the Continental United States and overseas, and the money for improvement of substandard quarters was not disturbed.

Mr. President, the committee has taken similar action this year and recommends that $136,063,000 be appropriated to provide for 7,500 units. However, no specific projects have been deleted from the program. Instead, the Department of Defense is charged with the responsibility of selecting from the authorized 10,140 units, those which they will build on a basis of priority within each of the services. Thus, if the Department deems it necessary to construct authorized houses overseas, it may do so under the provisions of the committee bill, but only within the overall ceiling for each service.

Before I leave the family housing situation, I have one more comment to make. The committee has taken notice that in the fiscal year 1964 military construction budget, the operation, maintenance, and debt payment accounts for housing have become a part of the construction budget request. It is the opinion of the committee that these costs properly should be returned to the Department of Defense appropriation bill. The Department of Defense should give a detailed study to this request and report to the committee its findings. It is to be noted that there is in this bill the amount of $167,000,000 for debt payment service for family housing as well as $306,003,000 for operation and maintenance; making a total of $473,400,000.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. President, to review briefly, the committee approved an appropriation of $217,270,000 for military construction within the Department of the Army. This represents an appropriation of $207,070,000 for the Active Forces, $4,500,000 for the Army Reserve, and $5,700,000 for the Army National Guard. This is a reduction of $40,230,000 from the budget of $257,500,000.

I would like you to note, regarding construction for Army Active Forces, that almost three-fourths of the appropriation is for construction inside the United States and almost one-half of the total appropriation will be devoted to replacement of deteriorated temporary facilities, mostly World War II mobilization structures. I will elaborate on this in a moment.

The $22.6 million in continental air and missile defense forces will enable the Army Air Defense Command to strengthen our air defense in the Homestead-Miami and Key West, Fla., areas by installation of additional Nike-Hercules and Hawk facilities. The other major expenditure in this program is for protective construction at existing Nike-Hercules sites.

The $35.1 million in general support forces will provide facilities to support general purpose combat units and their direct support elements stationed in the United States or deployed overseas—organized, equipped, and trained for a wide range of potential combat operations. This part of the appropriation will provide significant additions at Fort Carson, Colo.; Fort Hood, Tex.; and additional ammunition storage facilities in Europe.

The $14.5 million in research and development program will provide additional facilities in support of the Army's research and development pogram, notably a laboratory for environmental medicine at Natick, Mass.; and additional facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; and White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.

The largest program, general support, amounts to $134.9 million, and provides the broad base to meet the Army's training, supply, maintenance, medical services, communications and Army Security Agency requirements. The following are some of the larger items: a special forces complex at Fort Bragg, N.C.; a signal school building at Fort Gordon, Ga.; a hospital at Fort Rucker, Ala.; worldwide communications facilities and troop housing at Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Jackson, S.C.; Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and Fort Myers, Va.

Earlier in my remarks, I stated that almost one-half of this appropriation will be devoted to replacement of deteriorated temporary facilities. The Army is energetically pursuing a replacement program aimed at permanent housing for the troops stationed at our permanent stations. Both the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees have endorsed the Army's objective. I am happy to tell you that, within this appropriation, over $28 million will be spent to provide 12,500 permanent barracks spaces and $10 million will be spent to provide almost 1,350 bachelor officer quarters spaces.

### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The committee has approved $5,700,000 for the Army National Guard. This will enable the National Guard, because of carryover funds of $2,590,000 from prior years, to accomplish 35 armory projects, 3 nonarmory projects, minor construction, advance planning and design. The National Guard with the additional funds will be able to construct in fiscal year 1964, projects that would otherwise have to wait for a period of 1 to 2 years.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The committee recommends an appropriation of $208,223,000 for military construction for the Department of the Navy. This amount is composed of two parts—$202,223,000 for the Active Naval and Marine Corps forces, and $6,000,000 for the Reserve forces. It is $68,667,000 less than the budget estimate of $275,900,000 and $8,223,000 greater than the appropriation approved by the House of Representatives.

This year's program of the Navy is a continuation of a long-rang program for the orderly development and modernization of its shore installations. The primary aim is to improve fleet readiness. This objective will be achieved by providing proper facilities to support modern ships, aircraft and weapons, updated training programs and adequate personnel accommodations.

This Navy program consists of 10 interlocking facilities classes. The first of these is designed to permit the Bureau of Ships to carry out its mission for the construction, repair, and overhaul of modern surface ships and submarines and for general fleet support. The committee recommends an appropriation of $30,306,000 for these purposes. Approximately 40 percent of this amount is required for the nuclear, and, in particular, the Polaris, submarine program. Major improvements at naval shipyards will include, for example, a portal crane at the carrier repair site at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and a classified facility at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Training facilities for fleet personnel will be provided at Pearl Harbor. Proper living accommodations will be constructed for bachelor officers of Polaris submarine crews home ported at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn., and for enlisted men assigned to headquarters of the commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet at Norfolk. A replacement pier will be built at the Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, New London, which is needed for research in sonar and related fields.

The committee recommends $11,546,000 for the second of the facilities classes, fleet base facilities. These funds will be assigned for construction of various structures at naval stations inside the United States. For instance, a barracks is needed to house enlisted men of the alternate crews of Polaris submarines assigned to the Fleet Ballistic Missile Training Center at Charleston. At the Naval Station, San Diego, pier utilities and dredging are required to accommodate the larger, deeper draft ships of the modern fleet.

The third facilities class of the Navy, naval weapons facilities, is the largest. It includes a wide variety of structures for personnel, for training of naval and Marine Corps officers and enlisted men in various aspects of naval aviation, for operation of modern jet fixed wing and helicopter aircraft, and for naval ordnance and for research and development related to aviation and ordnance functions. The committee recommends an appropriation of $65,827,000 for this class. Facilities to be built include target ranges for the Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi; extension of the runway at the Naval Air Station, Key West, Fla., which is needed for safe operation of frontline jet aircraft of the Navy and Air Force operating in the Caribbean area; a helicopter aircraft systems training building at the Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field at Camp Pendleton; an underwater tracking facility at the Naval Torpedo Station, Keyport, Wash.; a composite propellant facility at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake; and airfield lighting at the Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland.

For supply facilities, the committee recommends an appropriation of $352,000 for the single project in this class. This will provide administrative space for the Fleet Material Support Office, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Funds in the amount of $9,251,000 are provided for construction of various facilities required for the operational training and readiness of Marine ground forces. These include, for example, combat training support at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, and the gamut of facilities, totaling $6,445,000, at Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, ranging from headquarters buildings to barracks, warehouses, shops and training buildings to replace typhoon-damaged tents, quonset huts, and Butler buildings.

The sixth facilities class in the Navy program is service school facilities. These are needed, in general, for the education and training of officer and enlisted personnel of the Navy. This need has been generated by the continuing advancements in science and technology which have considerable impact on naval ships, weapons systems, tactics, and strategy. The committee recommends appropriations of $12,783,000 for this group of facilities. Typical examples of construction for this purpose are an instruction building at the Naval Schools, Mine Warfare at Charleston, and a technical school at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill., for training enlisted men in such critical rates as advanced electronics technician.

For the next class, medical facilities, the Navy has included a single project in its program. This is for construction of a barracks to house the corpsmen assigned to duty at the new naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif. This project will cost $336,000.

The Navy requires specialized facilities for reliable, secure, and rapid communication for control of the operating forces, to perform security functions, and to facilitate administration of the Naval Establishment. The projects for communication facilities, the eighth facilities class in the naval program, are reviewed thoroughly by the Defense Communication Agency and are integrated fully with the systems of the other military departments. The amount of $41,602,000 is provided for this group of facilities. Among those approved by the committee are the relocation of radio receiving facilities from Cheltenham, Md., to Sugar Grove, W. Va.; a messhall and sewage treatment plant at the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine; and a communication center at the Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, North Ireland.

The committee also recommends that $6,730,000 be appropriated for a project at the Naval Research Laboratory in the District of Columbia. This Laboratory is engaged in essential scientific research in the physical sciences and related fields, directed toward improving materials, equipment, techniques, and systems for the Navy. It has, through the years, developed a very high degree of technical competence which can only be maintained by providing modern research tools. One of the three line items included in this project is for a sector focusing cyclotron building. It will be utilized in fields not now covered or planned in the scientific community, such as the simulation of high energy radiation encountered in outer space.

The final Navy facilities class is yards and docks facilities for which the committee has approved an appropriation of $23,490,000. This class provides general, Navy-wide support of the shore establishment. It includes, for example, utility projects at the Navy Public Works Centers at Newport and Norfolk, reconstruction of a World War II-built wharf at the Seabee Center, Port Hueneme, Calif. It is the single Navy source of funds in limited amounts for minor construction which may be urgently needed during the ensuing year at various naval and Marine Corps installations, for access roads, and for preparation of plans for the military construction program.

To the $6,000,000 in new obligational authority which the committee has recommended for the Reserve forces program, the Navy will add $1,069,000 from savings from previously appropriated funds; $2,113,000 of the $7,069,000 program total is for rehabilitation of World War II messhalls, barracks, and bachelor officers' quarters at naval air stations in 7 different areas of the country; $3,232,000 is for training centers at 16 various communities throughout the United States for training officers and enlisted men of the Ready Reserve in ship operation; and $1,304,000 is for construction of training centers for Marine Corps ground forces. Practically all of these activities are used jointly by two or more of the services.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. President, the committee has approved an appropriation of $487,090,000 for the Active Forces, Department of the Air Force. This is an increase of $36,090,000 over the $451,000,000 allowed by the House and a decrease of $141,110,000 from the budget estimate of $628,200,000.

The $487,090,000 program for construction of facilities for the Active Forces includes projects at 58 worldwide major Air Force installations. Of these, 104 are in the 50 States and 54 are elsewhere. In addition, the program provides facilities at a number of other minor sites and locations, including those of the air control and warning networks, communications sites, missile range stations, and sites of classified activities.

A major portion of the Air Force construction program, or 34 percent of the total, provides facilities in direct support of the forces of the Strategic Air Command. This amount consists of facilities for the intercontinental ballistic missiles, for manned bombers and their supporting tanker aircraft, and for control and support.

A total of $155,800,000 is for facilities for the three major intercontinental ballistic missile systems—Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman. Most of the major construction problems associated with the earlier phases of this huge and tremendously complex, first-of-a-kind program have been resolved.

As a note of interest I might say to the Senate that construction of operational facilities to support the 13-squadron Atlas weapon system and the 12-squadron Titan weapon system has been completed. Nineteen of these twenty-five squadrons are operational. Assembly and checkout are in progress on the remaining six Titan II squadrons.

Projects in this bill for Minuteman facilities amount to $145.8 million. Of this total, $140.7 million is for major work on the sixth Minuteman wing of three squadrons to be located at Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak. This will be the first base for the "improved Minuteman," which has been designated the Minuteman II. The additional $5,100,000 is for test and training facilities to support the Minuteman II.

The major construction projects to initially base the Strategic Air Command bomber and tanker forces have been provided in prior construction programs. However, $18,000,000 is provided in this bill for improvements to these bases. The projects included for this purpose largely involve alterations and additions to existing facilities to provide for increased efficiency and utility.

The appropriation for continental air and missile defense includes $71,700,000 for facilities which will reduce the vulnerability of the defense systems and provide them with increased capabilities.

The major portion of the defense program package consists of projects totaling $41,500,000 which are directly associated with fighter interceptor aircraft. Of this amount $39,000,000 is for construction of a minimum complement of operational facilities at a number of bases to increase survivability of the air defense command fighters by dispersing them in small unit increments.

The other $2,500,000 for interceptors principally provides additional operational and maintenance facilities at certain present locations of fighter units in the United States.

Control and warning are essential elements of the air defense system. To enhance capabilities in these areas, $19,000,000 was requested.

A major project in the control and warning group, at a cost of $6,500,000, is for the North American Air Defense Combat Operations Center, Colorado Springs, Colo. A total of $22,400,000 for construction of the North American Air Defense Combat Operations Center was authorized and financed in fiscal years 1960 and 1962. The excavation work is essentially complete and the contract for the basic interior structure was awarded in February 1963. The additional $6,500,000 in this program is needed to complete this facility. The correction of rock faults discovered during excavation requires additional construction money.

Another major item in the control and warning group is back-up interceptor control—BUIC—and passive detection facilities at a total cost of $4,000,000. These will be at a number of air control and warning sites in the United States.

Various support facilities for the Continental Defense Forces not related to specific defense systems are in this bill in the amount of about $12,400,000. Projects are included at 14 bases of the Air Defense and Alaskan Commands. Of the total, $5,100,000 is for special mission support at Shemya Air Force Station, Alaska.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The increased emphasis on capabilities for conduct of conventional war operations under possible conditions of several simultaneous contingencies is reflected in the Air Force construction request of $69,100,000 for support of the general purpose and airlift forces. The committee has reduced the foregoing overall figure to $55,900,000. A large reduction of $6,000,000 was made in the fighter dispersal program. Of this total, $42,400,000 related to the general purpose forces of the Tactical Air Command and the oversea theater commands. Facilities requested to support the airlift forces of the Tactical Air Command, Military Air Transport Service, and the oversea commands amount to $13,500,000.

Two-fifths of the construction provides for the General Purpose Forces, in direct support of tactical fighter and reconnaissance aircraft units of the Tactical Air Command and the Pacific and European Commands.

The rapidly advancing technology in military systems requires concurrent emphasis and timely provision of supporting facilities. The unique nature and technical requirements of many approved research and development programs necessitates new construction or major alterations of existing facilities. This is particularly true of missile and space applications which today receive a major share of the research and development effort. The committee has approved projects in the amount of $44,000,000 for research and development. Included for research and development are projects supporting specific major missile and space development programs, including missile test ranges, test facilities for the mobile midrange ballistic missile, test complex for support of the Titan III space booster program, and facility expansion and improvement on the Atlantic Missile Range.

Major technical items in the research support package include a high thrust rocket research facility and a toxic research facility at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., in the total amount of $9,400,000; alteration of the hypersonic gas dynamics wind tunnel and construction of a propulsion instrumentation test laboratory, totaling $3,300,000, at Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.; and construction of a vacuum telescope at a cost of $2,900,000 at Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, N.M.

In the area of general support programs the committee has approved $148,000,000. This portion covers general support services and various activities and missions not included in the primary systems and programs previously discussed. As new weapons, aircraft, and equipment enter our inventory, new training programs are developed to support them in an endless evolution brought about by our research and development.

Facilities for flying training and the increasingly important technical training programs constitute the bulk of the training request. The important project in the technical training package is for replacement of World War II mobilization-type dormitories housing 600 airmen at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill. The buildings to be replaced are badly deteriorated and in addition are located in the approach zone of the primary runway.

For various logistic support activities of the Air Force logistics command, and depot maintenance facilities, a number of projects are included. These projects consist almost wholly of alterations to existing buildings to adapt them for maintenance work on new systems and equipment. An additional $2.7 million is included in the program for alteration of existing facilities at five Air Force logistic command bases to house automatic data processing and logistical control functions. The improvements requested are essential for efficient supply and maintenance management of the weapons systems assigned to those bases for logistical support.

Communications facilities, including major system nets, base communications and telephone facilities, and related electric power projects, are included in the bill. Construction supporting six major communications systems amount to $14,600,000 of the $19,900,000 total. These systems are part of the overall defense communications system. They will provide additional capabilities and increased reliability of communications systems in North America and in the Far East, European, and Mediterranean areas.

Appropriations in the amount of $6,100,000 are approved for navigational aids for air traffic control and landing. These projects consist principally of area search radars, radar approach control facilities, runway approach and taxiway lighting, and control towers.

Medical facilities in this Air Force program include hospitals, dispensaries, and dental clinics.

New hospitals are approved at three bases: Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex.; and Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. A major addition to the existing hospital is approved for Keesler Air Force Base, Miss. A major alteration project also is included for Travis Air Force Base, Calif. The committee also added a hospital at Warren Air Force Base, in the amount of $2,000,000.

The committee has approved $25,000,000 for planning, $15,000,000 for minor construction, and $10,200,000 for access roads, for a total of $50,200,000.

### CONCLUSION

Mr. President, this concludes my presentation of action on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1964. The Appropriations Committee made a very extensive review of every line item in this bill, both classified and unclassified. The reductions in this bill have, in some instances, been extensive, particularly in regard to the family housing program. However, it is the opinion of the committee that this bill furnishes for the Department of Defense and the services the funds necessary to carry on a successful construction program and to meet all necessary service requirements.

Mr. President, unless there are questions to be asked, I believe that covers my presentation in connection with the bill, except for a comparative statement in regard to the appropriations for the year 1963 and the bill for the fiscal year 1964, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964*

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | Recommended in House bill for 1964 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill |
| MILITARY CONSTRUCTION | | | | | | | |
| Military construction, Army | $181,272,000 | $249,500,000 | $200,293,000 | $207,070,000 | +$25,798,000 | −$42,430,000 | +$6,777,000 |
| Military construction, Navy | 193,355,000 | 269,900,000 | 194,000,000 | 202,223,000 | +8,868,000 | −67,677,000 | +8,223,000 |
| Military construction, Air Force | 847,810,500 | 628,200,000 | 451,000,000 | 487,090,000 | −360,720,500 | −141,110,000 | +36,090,000 |
| Military construction, Defense agencies | 35,677,000 | 29,900,000 | 24,000,000 | 27,000,000 | −8,677,000 | −2,900,000 | +3,000,000 |
| Loran stations, Defense | 20,000,000 | 20,500,000 | 14,500,000 | 20,500,000 | +500,000 | ------------ | +6,000,000 |
| Military construction, Army Reserve | 8,000,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | −3,500,000 | ------------ | ------------ |
| Military construction, Naval Reserve | 7,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 6,000,000 | −1,000,000 | ------------ | ------------ |
| Military construction, Air Force Reserve | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | −1,000,000 | ------------ | ------------ |
| Military construction, Army National Guard | 7,000,000 | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | 5,700,000 | −1,300,000 | +2,200,000 | +2,200,000 |
| Military construction, Air Guard | 14,000,000 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | 16,000,000 | +2,000,000 | ------------ | ------------ |
| Total, military construction | 1,319,114,500 | 1,232,000,000 | 917,793,000 | 980,083,000 | −339,031,500 | −251,917,000 | +62,290,000 |

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964*—Continued

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | Recommended in House bill for 1964 | Amount recommended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill |
| FAMILY HOUSING [1] | | | | | | | |
| Family housing, Army: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | $57,400,000 | $41,364,000 | $34,681,000 | +$34,681,000 | −$22,719,000 | −$6,683,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 188,290,000 | 183,396,000 | 183,396,000 | +183,396,000 | −4,894,000 | |
| Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 94,700,000 | 80,036,000 | 68,248,000 | +68,248,000 | −26,452,000 | −11,788,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 95,981,000 | 93,944,000 | 93,944,000 | +93,944,000 | −2,037,000 | |
| Family housing, Air Force: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 97,850,000 | 50,321,000 | 61,027,000 | +61,027,000 | −36,823,000 | +10,706,000 |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 197,583,000 | 193,514,000 | 193,514,000 | +193,514,000 | −4,069,000 | |
| Family housing, Defense agencies: | | | | | | | |
| Construction | (1) | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | +50,000 | | |
| Operation, maintenance, and debt payment | (1) | 2,546,000 | 2,546,000 | 2,546,000 | +2,546,000 | | |
| Total, family housing | (1) | 734,400,000 | 645,171,000 | 637,406,000 | [1] +637,406,000 | −96,994,000 | −7,765,000 |
| Total | 1,319,114,500 | 1,966,400,000 | 1,562,964,000 | 1,617,489,000 | +298,374,500 | −348,911,000 | +54,525,000 |

---

[1] For fiscal year 1963, funds for new construction of housing were included under "Military construction" accounts of the departments. Funds for operation and maintenance were included in the Defense Appropriation Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to submit a brief statement, following and supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, once again it is my pleasure to rise in support of the remarks of our subcommittee chairman who has again so ably directed the bill this year. I shall not attempt to make a detailed analysis as he has done but I feel it important to underline some of the things he has said. We recognize that this bill has had careful attention in the Armed Services Committees of both Houses in the authorization process and again in the Committees on Appropriations these items have been combed over and evaluated. It is safe to say that this bill has had at least four detailed hearings and reviews by the time we are through with it today. It is for this reason that I do not feel it necessary for me to go back over what our chairman has said.

Our initial goal was to stay as close to the House figures as we possibly could. This meant that we would of necessity be very strict in our considerations of reclamas, and we only made restorations where the proof was convincing. Let me touch on these in summary form.

First, we restored money which had been cut from the House in unobligated balances. Here the cuts were too deep and to compensate for these the departments would have had to cut approved items. This amounted to $14.7 million.

Next, the services made what we believe to be a valid case for restoration of items such as barracks, messhalls, utility provisions, and the like. I shall not enumerate these items other than to say they were well justified. In some instances, the committee position may not seem consistent where we have denied a wind tunnel to the Navy at White Oak, Md., whereas we grant $2.4 million for a gas dynamic wind tunnel at the Arnold Engineering Center in Tennessee. The need for Navy device was not as critical as the Air Force facility which will have a bearing on our development of advanced military flight vehicles. The Navy tunnel seemed to the committee to duplicate, to some extent, NASA facilities already in operation.

Let me now direct the attention of the Senate to the problem our committee faced in the matter of military hospitals. We were impressed that money should be allowed for construction of three hospitals and in addition $2 million was added for a hospital at Cheyenne, Wyo. It is my feeling that there are firm needs for all of these hospital additions.

The final class of additions I should touch on is for the Army National Guard where we exceeded the House and the budget estimates by adding $2.2 million to raise the total to $5.7 million.

It should be pointed out here that the Senate committee has made some cuts in this bill. These cuts involve for the most part of reduction of some repetitive items such as motor repair shops, air, and naval facilities.

Now, let me recap what Senator STENNIS has said about military housing. Secretary McNamara and General LeMay appeared before our committee and made a strong appeal for additional units of military housing—of the 10,141 requested units, the House allowed 7,755 units. Last year the committee appropriated funds to build 7,500 housing units, and only in the very recent past has this money been committed for the purpose for which it was voted. For this reason it was felt that it would be adequate to fund the construction of the same number of units this year. Our committee felt that it should not state where these should be built, nor did we attempt to say what types of houses should be constructed. The services and the Defense Department have made a strong appeal for transportable or relocatable homes to be used in remote areas or for use overseas. It has been said these can be constructed here and shipped to oversea bases without having a harmful affect on our balance of payments with other nations. In summary, what we have done is to fund the construction of 7,500 housing units without designating which of the 10,141 units requested should be built. This has the effect of putting both the amount and the number of eligible homes in conference with the House.

In closing let me say I feel this bill compares very favorably with the bill we passed last year which I hope will be a high water mark. As has been pointed out, this bill carries the funds for maintenance and operation of these facilities. Last year this item was carried in the defense bill, and we earnestly hope it will be carried in the defense bill in fiscal year 1965. It has had the effect of inflating this bill. The bill we favorably commend to the Senate is still 348.9 million under the budget estimates. The total amount is $1.6 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, provided that no point of order be considered to have been waived by reason of the agreement to this proposed order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "$200,293,000" and insert "$207,070,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "expended", to strike out "$194,000,000" and insert "$202,223,000".

On page 2, line 24, after the word "expended", to strike out "$451,000,000" and insert "$487,090,000".

On page 3, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$5,700,000".

On page 5, line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$20,500,000".

On page 5, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$645,171,000" and insert "$637,406,000"; on page 6, line 4, after the word

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"Construction", to strike out "$41,364,000" and insert "$34,681,000"; in line 8, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$80,036,000" and insert "$68,248,000", and in line 12, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$50,321,000" and insert "$61,027,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 9139) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was pass be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings for today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the report has been taken up at this time merely for the purpose of having it laid before the Senate, so that the conference report will be the business tomorrow.

Unless some Senator desires to proceed to debate the conference report tonight, it will not be debated now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. In connection with the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, I wish to file a caveat with respect to the composition of the Senate conferees, for not one of the Senate conferees was selected from the group of those of us who opposed the bill and not one of the Senate conferees was selected from the group of those of us who advocated various policy changes in the bill.

It is interesting to note that the conference report which has come to the Senate guts the policy changes proposed by those of us who opposed the bill.

So it will be necessary for the American people to be informed of our point of view in opposition; and tomorrow we shall proceed to debate the conference report for such length of time as we believe necessary in order to present our case. We shall point out that the conference report is a shocking one which should be returned to conference. The Senate will have an opportunity to send the report back to conference.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 19: 26: *With God all things are possible.*

God of majesty and mercy, in this brief moment of communion with Thee, may we be richly endowed with a greater capacity and ability to discharge faithfully the many duties that confront us.

We acknowledge penitently that at times we are tempted to yield to those debilitating and devastating moods which make us feel that our vision of a better world is merely an illusion.

God forbid that we should allow our faith to become eclipsed by those days of darkness when many nations are still speaking the language of hatred and hostility instead of the language of friendship and fraternity.

Grant that we may go onward and forward with faith and courage, confident in the spiritual ideals and principles, which our Lord proclaimed in the long ago, but which humanity seems so reluctant to accept and still so unwilling to try.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1963, was read and approved.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 7, 1963, was read.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar.

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin;

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Bettey Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6001. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia;

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa;

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli.

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown; and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; and

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 633. An act for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im);

S. 689. An act for the relief of Lila Everts Weber;

S. 692. An act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 949. An act to amend the "United Nations Participation Act," as amended (63 Stat. 734–736);

S. 1169. An act to authorize a per capital distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation;

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Pietro Maggio;

S. 1466. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla;

S. 1757. An act to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation;

S. 1760. An act for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III;

S. 1781. An act for the relief of Antonio Credenza;

S. 1822. An act for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes;

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha;

S. 1951. An act for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim);

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar;

S. 1976. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez);

S. 2040. An act to amend title 35 of the United States Code to perimt a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate;

S. 2085. An act for the relief of William Mauer Trayfors;

S. 2100. An act to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber;

S. 2213. An act to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency;

S. 2218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for the purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; and

S. 2242. An act for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati).

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "an act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–7.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I request a point of information for the benefit of the House as to whether or not the House was convened on December 7, 1963, and, if so, assuming the absence of a quorum and knowing the adjournment in face of objections, and parliamentary inquiries, did it constitute a legislative day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman, in response to the parliamentary inquiry, that last Saturday did constitute a legislative day. The House was called to order at 12 o'clock and adjourned at approximately 2 minutes after 12.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in that event I have two further requests. I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD as of that date and, second, I reserve the right to object to the Journal as read today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has submitted two separate requests. Will the gentleman submit his first request?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include an extension of my remarks in the RECORD as of that date, which did constitute a legislative day.

The SPEAKER. That is, the permanent RECORD of last Saturday?

Mr. HALL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to the Journal as read for Saturday, December 7.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to approval of the Journal?

Mr. HALL. I reserve that right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to approve the Journal of last Saturday.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Journal of last Saturday stands approved.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 88–138, the Chair appoints as a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island the gentleman from California, Mr. COHELAN.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COLMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I am sure the gentleman is going to have some very valuable and wise remarks to make here. There is so much confusion in the well I think the gentleman is entitled to be heard. Therefore I ask that the well of the House be cleared.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might observe that apparently the present Members are attempting to exercise the rights they have under the rules of the House. There is nothing that is taking place that the Chair thinks contravenes the rules of the House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Is it in order for a Member of the House, regardless of how humble he may be, to request that the well of the House be cleared at any time?

The SPEAKER. In the event of disorder the Chair would clear the well. As to the question of humbleness, every Member in this body is not only great, but the Chair also knows they are humble.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order and ask that the well of the House be cleared.

The SPEAKER. The Chair observes no disorder, and the Chair observes only one gentleman in the well at the present time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of the imperative need to pass the civil rights bill, every weapon available must be used. Thus I have filed today a discharge petition, with the hope that a goodly number of Members will sign it immediately. Passage of this bill must be above personality, above any power play, above any solicitude for so-called regular procedure. It must be above partisan advantage, above the charge of infringing upon the prerogative of anyone.

A discharge petition is not ultra vires, it is not something unholy or untouchable. It is part of our rules. It should cause no eyebrow lifting.

Judge SMITH, for whom I have profound regard, has promised a hearing on the bill, but in Delphic language; namely, reasonably soon in January. How soon? Will the hearings be short or long and protracted? We have had 6 months of hearings. All that need be said has been said. If the hearings become a "furtive

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

filibuster" we shall beat the bushes and secure the required signatures.

President Johnson said the bill is "above all" necessary—"above all" necessary, I will say, in importance and in point of time.

### CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, during the last week, some Members who have said they support the civil rights bill have opposed signing a discharge petition to bring it to the floor.

They have indicated they would prefer to use Calendar Wednesday. For this reason, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] last week objected to the usual unanimous-consent request to dispense with Calendar Wednesday.

I suggest to the House that Calendar Wednesday is an impractical, if not impossible, method by which to consider the civil rights bill.

First, Calendar Wednesday is subject to an abundance of dilatory tactics which give a determined opposition great opportunity for delay. For example, unless unanimous consent is granted, this 72-page bill would be read in full. Furthermore, in 1960, during consideration of the depressed areas bill, nine rollcalls were had before the House began general debate on the bill.

Second, 11 committees must be called before the Committee on the Judiciary is called—a potential 11-week delay.

Third, if the previous question is not ordered on the day on which the bill is brought up, it may not be considered again on Calendar Wednesday until the committee is again called—an additional potential delay of 19 weeks. This is because, under rule XXIV, section 7, no motion for a recess is in order until the last 2 weeks of a session. Since a resolution fixing an adjournment date, and thus determining the last 2 weeks of a session, is subject to a filibuster by Members of the other body, a motion to recess is unlikely ever to be in order.

Finally, the Calendar Wednesday rule provides for only 2 hours' general debate.

By contrast, if a majority of the Members of the House sign the discharge petition before Christmas, they will be assured that the civil rights bill will come to the floor on the second Monday in January, and that an adequate time for debate will be had.

I urge all those who seek prompt consideration of H.R. 7152, without the potential dilatory tactics and extended delay which Calendar Wednesday provides, to sign the discharge petition today.

### SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Select Committee on Small Business may be allowed to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

### PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON: THE FIRST 15 DAYS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marked the 15th day that President Lyndon B. Johnson has been in office.

These 15 days have demonstrated the durable strength of the American system of government. These 15 days have revealed the people of the United States of America in their finest hour, unified and united in the face of the events which so profoundly shocked every human being.

But beyond everything else, these 15 days have shown the qualities of a great and good President. In the entire history of our Nation, no Vice President succeeding to the presidency has so quickly and firmly grasped the reins of leadership, so completely articulated the mood and wishes of the American people, nor so thoroughly demonstrated his high prestige and influence among the leaders of the world. In fact, few Chief Executives in American history elected to office in their own right have accomplished as much in the first 15 days.

Upon the firm foundation of these 15 fabulous days, I am confident that President Lyndon B. Johnson will continue to build the inner strength and spirit, the great resources, the power, and the world leadership of the United States of America.

### CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the line to the right and was No. 33 to sign the discharge petition to get the civil rights bill onto the floor of the House for a vote. I heard the gentleman from Mississippi object to this line on the ground that it created confusion. I just want to assure the gentleman that when I was standing on that line, I was never less confused in my life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

### CIVIL RIGHTS DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to sign the civil rights discharge petition today. There is no more important legislation before the Congress than H.R. 7152—the civil rights bill.

President Kennedy told the Nation on June 11 of this year:

> We face, therefore, a moral crisis as a country and as a people. It cannot be met by repressive police action. It cannot be left to increased demonstrations in the streets. It cannot be quieted by token moves or talk. It is time to act in the Congress.

Following this eloquent address, President Kennedy sent to Congress the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever proposed by any administration. That was in June. It is 6 months later; the end of this session is approaching; as a body we have not considered this measure.

After 100 years of emancipation without freedom, American Negroes have a right to question whether redress can be found in the legislative process. Every day of delay strengthens the argument that it is not possible.

The American people have a right to ask whether Congress is obsolete, inherently incapable of meeting the great problems of our times. Every day of delay impairs the confidence of the American people in Congress.

The people of the world have a right to ask whether the United States is sincere in its professed principle of equality for all men. Every day of delay impairs the prestige of the United States around the world.

Mr. Speaker, above all we should ask ourselves whether we can conscientiously permit any further delay.

The American people and people everywhere are looking at the Congress of the United States to see whether or not this institution is capable of constructive action on the great moral issue of our time—equality for all our citizens. Let all of us this morning line up to sign the discharge petition.

### EXTENSION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on my special order on the 12th the time be extended to 30 minutes instead of 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

### NINE OUT OF TEN FAVOR NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. FINO.** Mr. Speaker, a recent poll conducted by McCall's magazine reveals that 9 out of 10 Americans favor a national lottery.

The survey, taken of McCall's magazine readers, asked: "Should the Government establish a national lottery?"

The magazine conducted the poll in connection with an article by veteran racket buster, Edwyn Silberling. Mr. Silberling urged a national lottery as the only way to deal organized crime a crushing blow.

The extra heavy gambling activity this past weekend at our New York racetracks provided further proof that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings.

Over 90,000 persons pushed through the gates to pump almost \$8½ million through the windows at Aqueduct racetrack and Roosevelt raceway last Saturday which was the last day of the horseracing season.

This recordbreaking attendance and wagering on the last day helped to bring this year's New York total parimutuel betting to \$1,235,404,012, an increase of over \$108 million over last year.

What about the billions bet illegally around this country? Who benefits?

As Mr. Silberling said:

> Just as the profits from bootleg liquor financed organized crime back in the days of prohibition, so the profits from illegal gambling are financing it now.

Mr. Silberling, a former head of Attorney General Kennedy's top priority anticrime project, declared attempts to curb gamblers have failed, and that not even the FBI has been able to make a dent in the gambling racket.

Why not be sensible and realistic about this issue? Especially in these days when the gambling problem keeps growing and the Government's need for additional revenue becomes more urgent.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr. CUNNINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

**Mr. CUNNINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of stating that I was present at the session which was called on Saturday last, December 7. I understand this Saturday session, the first one this year, was called for the purpose of filling the legal requirements for the 7-day notice period having to do with the discharge petition on civil rights. Because no opportunity was afforded those of us who were in attendance to be recorded as being present through a formal rollcall, I wish the fact that I was present to be noted and recorded in this way.

## THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AND BIPARTISAN ACTION

**Mr. LINDSAY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. LINDSAY.** Mr. Speaker, it may well be that a discharge petition is the best way to force the Rules Committee into early and positive action on civil rights. That has been true in the past and undoubtedly we should have action in this December and not wait until January.

I have every intention of signing the discharge petition for that reason, but it ought to be remembered that most of the Members on the majority side who have talked rather piously today about signing the discharge petition had nothing to do with putting together and developing a very important bipartisan measure of civil rights, and a very good bill. Most of them sat on the sidelines, and probably most of them to this day have not taken the trouble to read it. It ought to be remembered, too, that, that was a delicate bipartisan coalition that was formed in October and November. It was a very important bipartisan legislative effort and it is entitled to a very high degree of respect. The Republicans who developed this civil rights bill, along with representatives of the Justice Department, were not consulted in advance of the decision by one or more majority Members to use discharge petition procedures. Failure or refusal to consult is a poor way to go about advancing the cause of civil rights in the United States today. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has just spoken in opposition to the use of Calendar Wednesday in order to bring up the civil rights bill next week. Well, is he right? Calendar Wednesday may well be a far better way. It definitely would bring the bill before the House far sooner than any other procedure. We would have the bill passed in the House this year. As I recall, the gentleman from Missouri warmly approved of the use of Calendar Wednesday to bring the education bill to the floor 2 years ago. That, also, was a complicated bill. But the point is, why was not all this discussed across the table? Where is the good faith? Why is it necessary now to go in separate directions? I intend to sign the petition, and I hope other minority Members will sign, but it is time for a warning: either we—those who care about civil rights—stay together on this subject or we will lose. Many majority Members have been charged in the past with preferring an issue to a bill. They should take care lest they give further credence to the charge.

## DEMAGOGUERY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

**Mr. JONES of Missouri.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

**Mr. JONES of Missouri.** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to a great deal of talk here today about the urgency of the civil rights bill and the discharge petition. But I have been wondering about this matter of urgency in this connection. I have checked the record and I find that on the first day of this session, on January 9, and the days following there were a lot of so-called civil rights bills introduced. What I have been unable to understand is why the chairman of the Judiciary Committee waited until May 8 before he even began hearings, and why he waited until October 29 to steamroller, after 2 minutes of quote debate, unquote, the bill out of committee. If they did it on October 29, they could have done it on January 29.

Then I also note that the report was not made until November 20. In other words 10½ months elapsed between the time that this session convened until the Judiciary Committee filed its report. The same people who reported this bill out at the end of October, could have done it in the same manner last January. The record does not support the claims being made by many, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that there is such urgency. If it took the Judiciary Committee 10½ months to report a bill which was not even discussed in the committee, certainly it is not unreasonable to suggest that some responsible group take a few days to learn what is in the bill and to acquaint the public with the issues involved and this should not be done in an atmosphere of emotion. I think there is a lot of demagoguery going on around here that the public ought to know about.

## PENDING RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN F. SHELLEY

**Mr. SHELLEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

**Mr. SHELLEY.** Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House of Representatives, I thank you for your reception of my request today.

After 14 years of service with you, this will probably be the last time that I shall stand here in the well of the House to address you.

I have been honored by the voters and the people of my native city of San Francisco in having been elected mayor of that city, which office I assume on January 8.

I have enjoyed every minute of my service with each of you. I have enjoyed my committee work. I leave you with a sense of having made friends and established friendships which I know I shall hold forever.

I want you to know that when any of you, either individually or as members of committees, come to San Francisco, you will no longer get the red-carpet treatment. You will get the green-carpet treatment with Irish pipers on each side.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the majority I should like to express, first, the sincere congratulations of all of us to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley].

Secondly, I wish to express our profound regret over the fact that his success means that he must leave us.

Mr. Speaker, having the gentleman here has been a pleasure to all of us. He has made a great contribution to this body and to our country.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I also say, Mr. Speaker, as one who has sat on this side of the center aisle, I am looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to welcoming the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] and his party to their convention in San Francisco next summer.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman wish us success in electing our candidate after we nominate him at that time in the gentleman's city?

Mr. SHELLEY. I shall wish you all the success in the world in choosing a real good nominee, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that we shall look forward to seeing him out there, as we have always been pleased and happy to be with the gentleman here.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. Halleck. It has been a pleasure to work with and against my friend, the minority leader, but always on the issue and not on a personal basis. We are still friends I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some heaviness in my heart, even though I was elated at the election, but saddened by what happened 2 weeks later. Nevertheless, even today it is with some hesitancy that I say, Mr. Speaker, goodby, good luck, God bless you and our country.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1964, the great city of San Francisco, Calif., will install the Honorable John F. Shelley as mayor. San Francisco is indeed fortunate to have a man of such high caliber and ability to be its chief executive. I congratulate both Congressman Shelley and the city of San Francisco, but I cannot completely suppress a twinge of sadness when I contemplate his absence from this body.

I have known John Shelley personally since the day he first came here to serve his district in the U.S. House of Representatives. Over the years I have come to appreciate and admire his diligence and dedication with which he has served his district, his State, and our great country. A deep friendship has developed between us, which I greatly value.

John Shelley has made his mark here in the Halls of Congress. He has the respect and admiration of all his colleagues for his honor and his talents. The U.S. House of Representatives is a better institution for his having served here.

For myself and indeed for the membership of the House it is evident that we shall miss him. I wish for him every success as mayor of San Francisco, and I congratulate the people of the great city of San Francisco for having elected John Shelley as their mayor. They have chosen a man who has every attribute of courage, dedication, and devotion to public service.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, San Francisco, the "jewel of the west coast," will shortly gain a splendid mayor. Congress will shortly lose a splendid champion of human rights. The cause of social justice owes more than we can reckon to John Francis Shelley. The establishment of fair labor standards, the organization and improvement of labor-management relations, the enhancement of equal opportunity regardless of race in apprenticeship training, in employment, and in education, employment opportunities and medical care for the aged—these are more of the aims to which John Shelley has devoted his mind and heart.

John Shelley has always left the impression of a keen, analytical mind in labor and legislative policies. His perceptive intelligence made possible the solution of difficult issues when, as president of the San Francisco Central Labor Council, he helped to forestall 96.4 percent of threatened strikes by labor-management adjustments. The same perceptive intelligence has shown us the way through many problems faced by the Appropriations Committee, and I can witness to this from my own experience of serving with him on this committee.

But even more admirable than his power of analysis is John Shelley's utter devotion to objective aims beyond labor union and party. As A.F. of L. leader, he fought long and hard to achieve labor unity and to overcome jurisdictional disputes which weakened labor's effort. As State senator, he helped establish a model of labor-management cooperation in apprenticeship-training programs. His utter devotion to the public interest as a U.S. Congressman is attested by the unusual measure of bipartisan support for his election last November.

I know that I speak for members of both parties when I wish John Shelley a brilliant and memorable career as mayor of the city of his birth.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House, I want to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity to have served with the distinguish gentleman from California, the Honorable John F. Shelley, during the past 9 years.

As a representative of an urban community, we have had many common interests in legislation and in legislative programs, such as urban renewal, the mass transit bill, and civil rights legislation.

San Francisco is to be congratulated on its choice of mayor, and the loss of Jack Shelley to this body will be to the gain of the city of San Francisco. With his abundant experience, he should be able to provide the city of San Francisco with an aggressive program which will insure its leadership among the truly great American cities.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed an honor and privilege to have served in this body for the past 15 years with the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable John F. Shelley.

My fellow freshman in the 81st Congress, John Shelley rapidly grew in stature as a wise and able legislator. He leaves behind him significant achievements in many areas, particulary in labor-management relations and equality of employment opportunity.

John Shelley will long be remembered too for his unfailing courtesy, his happy, engaging personality and his generous spirit. He is a living refutation of that cynical adage that "Nice guys do not win."

Our loss is San Francisco's gain, for there can be no doubt that he will serve that city as mayor with the same ability and high sense of responsibility that he has shown during his years in Congress.

Our best wishes go with you, Mayor John Shelley, as you take up your new duties in the "Golden Gate City."

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 223]

Albert
Ayres
Becker
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Dingell
Edwards
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fulton, Tenn.
Gill
Grant
Gurney
Hanna
Harding
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Jarman
Kee
Kelly
Kornegay
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pirnie
Quie
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal

St. George
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

---

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

**Mr. MORGAN.** Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Pennsylvania plans to take ample time to explain what transpired in the conference. Rather than spending the time on reading the statement, that time could be devoted to a discussion of what happened at the conference.

**Mr. MORGAN.** I agree with the gentleman. I expect to use the full hour, if necessary.

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1006)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Assistance Act of 1963'.

### "PART I

### *"Chapter 1—Policy*

"SEC. 101. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the chapter heading strike out the words 'SHORT TITLE AND'.

"(b) Section 101, which relates to short title, is repealed.

"(c) Section 102, which relates to statement of policy, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert between the fourth and fifth paragraphs the following additional paragraph:

" 'It is the sense of the Congress that the institution of full investment guaranty programs under title III of chapter 2 of this part with all recipient countries would be regarded as a significant measure of self-help by such countries improving the climate for private investment both domestic and foreign.'.

"(2) In the last sentence of the seventh paragraph, strike out 'should emphasize long-range development assistance' and insert in lieu thereof 'shall emphasize long-range development assistance'.

"(3) Immediately after the tenth paragraph insert the following new paragraph:

" 'It is the sense of the Congress that, in the administration of programs of assistance under chapter 2 of this part, every possible precaution should be taken to assure that such assistance is not diverted to short-term emergency purposes (such as budgetary purposes, balance-of-payments purposes, or military purposes) or any other purpose not essential to the long-range economic development of recipient countries.'

"(4) The first sentence of the last paragraph is amended by striking out 'Finally, the' and substituting 'The', and by inserting '(including private enterprise within such countries)' immediately after 'countries'.

"(5) Immediately after the first sentence of the last paragraph insert the following new sentence: 'In particular, the Congress urges that other industrialized free-world countries increase their contributions and improve the forms and terms of their assistance so that the burden of the common undertaking, which is for the benefit of all, shall be equitably borne by all.'

"(6) Immediately after the last paragraph, add the following new paragraph:

" 'It is the sense of the Congress that assistance authorized by this Act should be extended to or withheld from the government of South Vietnam, in the discretion of the President, to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return to their homeland of Americans involved in that struggle.'

### *"Chapter 2—Development assistance*

### "Title I—Development Loan Fund

"SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the development loan fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 201, which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In the second sentence of subsection (b), which relates to considerations to be taken into account in making loans from the development loan fund, strike out clauses (1) and (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following: '(1) whether financing could be obtained in whole or in part from other free-world sources on reasonable terms, including private sources within the United States, (2) the economic and technical soundness of the activity to be financed, including the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest,'.

"(2) Subsection (d), which relates to interest rates on development loans, is amended by inserting immediately after 'in no event' the following: 'shall such funds (except funds loaned under section 205 and funds which prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 were authorized or committed to be loaned upon terms which do not meet the minimum terms set forth herein) be loaned at a rate of interest of less than 2 per centum per annum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than three-fourths of 1 per centum per annum, nor'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection (f):

" '(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this title for a project unless the President determines that such project will promote the economic development of the requesting country, taking into account the current human and material resource requirements of that country and the relationship between the ultimate objectives of the project and the overall economic development of the country, and that such project specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise.'

"(b) Amend section 202(a), which relates to authorizations for the development loan fund, as follows:

"(1) Strike out 'and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years,' and insert in lieu thereof ', $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, $925,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964, and $1,500,000,000 for each of the next two succeeding fiscal years,'.

"(2) Immediately before the period at the end thereof insert the following: " ': *Provided further*, That, in order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 201, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966 respectively shall be available for loans made to encourage economic development through private enterprise'.

### "Title II—Development Grants and Technical Cooperation

"SEC. 103. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development grants and technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 212, which relates to authorization, strike out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and substitute '1964' and '$220,000,000', respectively.

"(b) Amend section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a) strike out 'use, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, funds made available for the purposes of section 211 for' and substitute the word 'furnish'.

"(2) In subsection (b) strike out 'to use' and 'foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act, for purposes of subsection (a) of this section and for' and substitute 'to furnish' before the word 'assistance'.

"(3) Add the following new subsection:

" '(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, for the fiscal year 1964, $19,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, not to exceed $2,200,000 shall be available for direct dollar costs in carrying out subsection (b) and $4,700,000 shall be available solely for the purchase of foreign currencies accruing to the United States Government under any Act.'

### "Title III—Investment Guaranties

"SEC. 104. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 221(b), which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence after 'wholly owned' insert '(determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by persons other than the parent corporation)'.

"(2) In paragraph (1) strike out '$1,300,000,000' in the proviso and substitute '$2,500,000,000'.

"(3) In paragraph (2) strike out '1964' in the fourth proviso and substitute '1965'.

"(b) Amend section 222(a), which relates to general provisions, by striking out 'section 221(b)' and substituting 'sections 221(b) and 224'.

"(c) Amend section 222(b), which relates to general provisions, by striking out 'section 221(b)' in both places it appears and substituting 'sections 221(b) and 224'.

"(d) Amend section 222(d), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

" '(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of this part, sections

202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of informational media guaranties), shall be paid first out of fees referred to in section 222(b) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payments made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as such funds are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds heretofore appropriated for the purpose of discharging liabilities under the aforementioned guaranties, and thereafter out of funds realized from the sale of notes issued under section 413(b)(4)(F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(c)(2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to section 222(f).'

"(e) Amend section 222(e), which relates to general provisions, to read as follows:

"'(e) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and all guaranties heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to this title shall be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States of America. Funds heretofore obligated under the aforementioned guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) together with the other funds made available for the purposes of this title shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims in accordance with section 222(d) of this part.'

"(f) Amend section 222 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) In making a determination to issue a guaranty under section 221(b), the President shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States.'

"(g) Amend section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (b) strike out '$60,000,000' and substitute '$150,000,000'.

"(2) Strike out subsection (c).

### "Title V—Development Research

"SEC. 105. Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to development research, is amended by inserting '(a)' after the section heading and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of population growth.'

### "Title VI—Alliance for Progress

"SEC. 106. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 251, which relates to general authority, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (b), amend the next to the last sentence thereof by inserting immediately after 'reasonable terms' the following: '(including private sources within the United States), the capacity of the recipient country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest,'.

"(2) In subsection (e) strike out 'economical' and substitute 'economically'.

"(3) In subsection (f) strike out 'Agency for International Development' and substitute 'agency primarily responsible for administering part I'.

"(4) Add the following new subsection (g):

"'(g) In order to carry out the policies of this Act, the President shall, when appropriate, assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward the strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.'

"(b) Amend section 252, which relates to authorization, as follows:

"(1) In the first sentence, strike out 'fiscal years 1963 through 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year' and insert in lieu thereof 'fiscal years 1963, 1965, and 1966, not to exceed $600,000,000 for each such fiscal year, and for use beginning in the fiscal year 1964, not to exceed $525,000,000'.

"(2) Immediately after '1963' the second time it appears therein, insert the following: 'and not to exceed $100,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for us beginning in fiscal year 1964.'.

"(3) At the end thereof add the following new sentence: 'In order to effectuate the purposes and provisions of sections 102, 251, 601, and 602 of this Act, not less than 50 per centum of the loan funds appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966, respectively, shall be available for loans made to encourage economic development through private enterprise.'

"(c) Amend section 253, which relates to fiscal provisions, by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'All receipts in foreign currencies from loans made under this title or for nonmilitary assistance purposes under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, shall be available, in addition to other funds available for such purposes, for loans on such terms and conditions as the President may specify to carry out the purposes of subsection (g) of section 251 of this title, and the President may, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, reserve such currencies in such amounts (not to exceed $25,000,000) as he shall determine to be necessary to provide for the programs authorized by said subsection (g).'

### "Title VII—Evaluation of Programs

"SEC. 107. Chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

### "'Title VII—Evaluation of Programs

"'SEC. 261. The President may appoint a committee to review and evaluate the economic development program under this Act, and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings.'

### *"Chapter 3—International organizations and programs*

"SEC. 108. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$148,900,000' and substituting '1964' and '$136,050,000', respectively.

### *"Chapter 4—Supporting assistance*

"SEC. 109. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to supporting assistance, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$415,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$380,000,000', respectively.

### *"Chapter 5—Contingency fund*

"SEC. 110. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the contingency fund, is amended by striking out '1963' and '$300,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$160,000,000', respectively.

## "PART II

### *"Chapter 1—Policy*

"SEC. 201. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) In the chapter heading strike out the words 'SHORT TITLE AND'.

"(b) Section 501, which relates to short title, is repealed.

### *"Chapter 2—Military assistance*

SEC. 202. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

"(a) In section 504(a), which relates to authorization, strike out 'the fiscal years 1962 and 1963' and '$1,700,000,000 for each such fiscal year, which sums' and substitute 'fiscal year 1964' and '$1,000,000,000, which', respectively.

"(b) In section 505(a), which relates to utilization of assistance, change the period at the end thereof to a colon and add the following proviso: '*Provided,* That, except (1) to the extent necessary to fulfill prior commitments or (2) to the extent that the President finds, with respect to any Latin American country, that the furnishing of military assistance under this Act is necessary to safeguard the security of the United States or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against overthrow of a duly constituted government, and so informs the Congress, no further military assistance under any provision of this Act shall be furnished to any Latin American country.'

"(c) In section 510(a), which relates to special authority, strike out '1963' in the first and second sentences and substitute '1964'.

"(d) In section 511, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Latin America, strike out '$57,500,000' and substitute '$55,000,000, of which a part may be used during each fiscal year for assistance in implementing a feasible plan for regional defense'.

"(e) Add the following new section:

"'SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries in fiscal year 1964, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, shall not exceed $25,000,000.'

## "PART III

### *"Chapter 1—General provisions*

"SEC. 301. Chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions, is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 601(b), which relates to encouragement of private enterprise, is amended as follows:

"(1) At the end of paragraph (3), strike out 'and'.

"(2) In paragraph (4), strike out 'wherever appropriate' and insert in lieu thereof 'to the maximum extent practicable'. and strike out the period at the end thereof and substitute a semicolon.

"(3) Add the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"'(5) take appropriate steps to discourage nationalization, expropriation, confiscation, seizure of ownership or control, of private investment and discriminatory or other actions having the effect thereof, undertaken by countries receiving assistance under this Act, which divert available resources essential to create new wealth, employment, and productivity in those countries and otherwise impair the climate for new private investment essential to the stable economic growth and development of those countries; and

"'(6) utilize wherever practicable the services of United States private enterprise (including, but not limited to, the services of experts and consultants in technical fields such as engineering).'

"(b) At the end of section 601 add the following new subsection:

" '(c) (1) There is hereby established an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. The Advisory Committee shall carry out studies and make recommendations for achieving the most effective utilization of the private enterprise provisions of this Act to the head of the agency charged with administering the program under part I of this Act, who shall appoint the Committee.

" '(2) Members of the Advisory Committee shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from the business, labor and professional world, from the universities and foundations, and from among persons with extensive experience in government. The Advisory Committee shall consist of not more than nine members, and one of the members shall be designated as chairman.

" '(3) Members of the Advisory Committee shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for travel and other expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Advisory Committee.

" '(4) The Advisory Committee shall, if possible, meet not less frequently than once each month, shall submit such interim reports as the Committee finds advisable, and shall submit a final report not later than December 31, 1964, whereupon the Committee shall cease to exist. Such reports shall be made available to the public and to the Congress.

" '(5) The expenses of the Committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from funds otherwise available under this Act.'

"(c) Section 611(b), which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended by striking out 'circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget' and substituting 'the Memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962,'.

"(d) Section 612, which relates to use of foreign currencies, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' after the section heading.

"(2) Add the following new subsection (b):

" '(b) In order to provide for the foreign currency needs of United States citizens for travel or other purposes, the Secretary of the Treasury may make available for sale for United States dollars to such citizens, at United States embassies or other convenient locations, foreign currencies acquired by the United States through operations under this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or any Act repealed thereby, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, which (1) he determines to be in excess of the needs of departments and agencies of the United States for such currencies, and (2) are not prohibited from such use or committed to other uses by agreement heretofore entered into with another country. United States dollars received from the sale of foreign currencies under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.'

"(e) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to Cuba and certain other countries, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

"(A) Insert '(1)' immediately after '(a)'.

"(B) At end thereof add the following new paragraphs:

" '(2) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any government of Cuba, nor shall Cuba be entitled to receive any quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States or to receive any other benefit under any law of the United States, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

" '(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

" '(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

" '(i) any items of economic assistance,

" '(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

" '(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities,

so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

" '(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.'

"(2) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

" '(e) The President shall suspend assistance to the government of any country to which assistance is provided under this or any other Act when the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—

" '(1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

" '(2) has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or

" '(3) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,

and such country, government agency, or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action, or, in the event of a referral to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States within such period as provided herein, not more than twenty days after the report of the Commission is received) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, equivalent to the full value thereof, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be; and such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

" 'Upon request of the President (within seventy days after such action referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (established pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, 68 Stat. 1279) is hereby authorized to evaluate expropriated property, determining the full value of any property nationalized, expropriated, or seized, or subjected to discriminatory or other actions as aforesaid, for purposes of this subsection and to render an advisory report to the President within ninety days after such request. Unless authorized by the President, the Commission shall not publish its advisory report except to the citizen or entity owning such property. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to enable the Commission to carry out expeditiously its functions under this subsection.'

"(3) Add the following new subsections:

" '(i) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

" '(1) the United States,

" '(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

" '(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

" '(j) No assistance under this Act shall be furnished to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The President shall keep the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed of any assistance furnished to Indonesia under this Act.

" '(k) Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

" '(l) No assistance shall be provided under this Act after December 31, 1965, to the government of any less developed country which has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1).

" '(m) No assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis under this Act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burden and economic growth, except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under part II hereof during fiscal year 1964 in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.'

### *"Chapter 2—Administrative provisions*

"Sec. 302. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend section 621, which relates to exercise of functions, by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting the following: 'In providing technical assistance under this Act, the head of any such agency or such officer shall utilize, to the fullest extent practicable, goods and professional and other services from private enterprise on a contract basis. In such fields as education, health, housing, or agriculture, the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies shall be utilized when such facilities are particularly or uniquely suitable for technical assistance, are not competitive with private enterprise, and can be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.'

"(b) Amend section 624, which relates to statutory officers, as follows:

"(1) In subsection (a)(2) strike out 'two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries' and substitute 'one shall have the rank of a Deputy Under Secretary'.

"(2) In subsection (a)(3) strike out 'nine' and substitute 'ten'.

"(3) In subsection (b) strike out 'paragraphs (2) and' and substitute 'paragraph'.

"(4) In subsection (d)(1) after the words 'Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance,' where they first appear insert 'who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,', and strike out '$19,500' and substitute '$20,000'.

"(c) Amend section 626(b), which relates to experts, consultants, and retired officers, as follows:

"(1) Strike out the entire first sentence.

"(2) In the second sentence strike out 'Nor shall such service' and substitute 'Service of an individual as an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not'.

"(d) Amend section 631, which relates to missions and staffs abroad, by adding the following new subsection (c):

" '(c) The President may appoint any United States citizen who is not an employee of the United States Government or may assign any United States citizen who is a United States Government employee to serve as Chairman of the Development Assistance Committee or any successor committee thereto of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development upon election thereto by members of said Committee, and, in his discretion, may terminate such appointment or assignment, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such person may receive such compensation and allowances as are authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, not to exceed those authorized for a chief of mission, class 2, within the meaning of said Act, as the President may determine. Such person may also, in the President's discretion, receive any other benefits and perquisites available under this Act to chiefs of special missions or staffs outside the United States established under this section.'

"(e) Amend section 635, which relates to general authorities, by adding the following new subsection (k):

" '(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.'

"(f) Amend section 636, which relates to provisions on uses of funds, by adding the following new subsection (h):

" '(h) In carrying out programs under this Act, the President shall take all appropriate steps to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, (1) countries receiving assistance under this Act contribute local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services rendered in conjunction with such programs, and (2) foreign currencies owned by the United States are utilized to meet the costs of such contractual and other services.'

"(g) Amend section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, by striking out '1963' and '$53,000,000' and substituting '1964' and '$54,000,000', respectively.

"(h) After section 637 add the following new section:

" 'Sec. 638. Peace Corps Assistance.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to prohibit assistance to any country pursuant to the Peace Corps Act, as amended; the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended; or the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; or famine or disaster relief, including such relief through voluntary agencies, under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.'

### *"Chapter 3—Miscellaneous provisions*

"Sec. 303. Section 644(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to definition of defense services, is amended by inserting 'including orientation' after 'training' the first time it appears.

"Sec. 304. Section 645 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to unexpected balances, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 645. Unexpended Balances.—Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to this Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or Public Law 86–735 are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may at any time be consolidated, and, in addition, may be consolidated with appropriations made available for the same general purposes under the authority of this Act.'

### "PART IV—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

"Sec. 401. The Act to provide for assistance in the development of Latin America and in the reconstruction of Chile, and for other purposes (Public Law 86–735, 22 U.S.C. 1942 et seq.), is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert following the enacting clause 'That this Act may be cited as the "Latin American Development Act" '.

"(b) In section 2 strike out '$500,000,000' and substitute '$680,000,000'.

"Sec. 402. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794, approved October 11, 1962) is amended as follows:

"(a) Insert '(a)' before the words 'The President shall'.

"(b) Add the following new subsection:

" '(b) The President may extend the benefits of trade agreement concessions made by the United States to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of a country or area within the purview of subsection (a) which, at the time of enactment of this subsection, was receiving trade concessions, when he determines that such treatment would be important to the national interest and would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism, and reports this determination and the reasons therefor to the Congress.'

"Sec. 403. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.), is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 101(f) is amended to read as follows:

" '(f) obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable from the Government or agencies thereof in the respective countries.'

"(b) Section 105 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The President shall utilize foreign currencies received pursuant to this title in such manner as will, to the maximum extent possible, reduce any deficit in the balance of payments of the United States.'

"(c)(1) Section 106 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'For the purposes of this title and title IV, the term "surplus agricultural commodity" shall include any domestically produced fishery product (not including fish flour until approved by the Food and Drug Administration) if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such product is at the time of exportation in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars.'

"(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be effective for purposes of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, until January 1, 1965.

"(d) Section 202 is amended by striking out 'economic development' and inserting in lieu thereof 'economic and community development'.

"Sec. 404. (a) Section 571(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided,* That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made.'

"(b) Section 911(2) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after 'on authorized home leave;' the following: 'accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment, but in no case to exceed one member of his family;'.

"(c) Title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; as amended, is amended by striking out section 921(d), relating to use of Government vehicles, and by inserting immediately after section 913 the following new section:

### " 'USE OF GOVERNMENT OWNED OR LEASED VEHICLES

" 'Sec. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available.'

"(d) Title X of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

### " 'PART I—EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

" 'Sec. 1081. Whenever the Secretary determines that educational facilities are not available, or that existing educational facilities are inadequate, to meet the needs of children of American citizens stationed outside the United States engaged in carrying out Government activities, he is authorized, in such manner as he deems appropriate and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to establish, operate, and maintain primary schools, and school dormitories and related educational facilities for primary and secondary schools, outside the United States, or to make grants of funds for such purposes, or otherwise provide for such educational facilities. The provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended, and of paragraphs (h) and (i) of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170h(h) and 170h(i)), may be utilized by the Secretary in providing assistance for educational facilities. Assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, hiring, transporting, and payment of teachers and other necessary personnel.'

"SEC. 405. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State', approved August 1, 1956 (5 U.S.C. 170f–170t), is amended by inserting immediately after section 12 the following new section:

"'SEC. 13. There is hereby established a working capital fund for the Department of State, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses (including those authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended) and equipment, necessary for maintenance and operation in the city of Washington and elsewhere of (1) central reproduction, editorial, data processing, audiovisual, library, and administrative support services; (2) central supply services for supplies and equipment (including repairs), and (3) such other administrative services as the Secretary, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, determines may be performed more advantageously and more economically as central services. The capital of the fund shall consist of the amount of the fair and reasonable value of such supply inventories, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order, pertaining to the services to be carried on by the fund, as the Secretary may transfer to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations, together with any appropriations made for the purpose of providing capital. Not to exceed $750,000 in net assets shall be transferred to the fund for purposes of providing capital. The fund shall be reimbursed, or credited with advance payments, from applicable appropriations and funds of the Department of State, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law, for supplies and services at rates which will approximate the expense of operations, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the fund. The fund shall also be credited with other receipts from sale or exchange of property or in payment for loss or damage to property held by the fund. There shall be transferred into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as of the close of each fiscal year, earnings which the Secretary determines to be excess to the needs of the fund. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to provide capital for the fund.'

"SEC. 406. The first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization', approved July 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 523), is amended to read as follows: 'That not to exceed eighteen Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and annually with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
(P.N.H.)
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for clarifying clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

### *Introduction*

The House bill (H.R. 7885) contained an authorization of $3,499,050,000, excluding certain administrative expenses for the Department of State for fiscal year 1964. This included a reduction in amounts previously authorized for fiscal year 1964 as follows: (1) for the Alliance for Progress, a reduction from $600 million to $450 million, and (2) for the Development Loan Fund, from $1.5 billion to $900 million. The House bill also included a new authorization of an additional $200 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund (Public Law 86–735).

The Senate amendment to the bill contained an authorization of $3,699,340,000, excluding such administrative expenses for fiscal 1964, which included a reduction in the amount previously authorized for the Development Loan Fund for fiscal year 1964 from $1.5 billion to $950 million and deleted the authorization in existing law for the Fund for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. It did not reduce, as the House did, the amount previously authorized for the Alliance for Progress, and included a new authorization of an additional $155 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund (Public Law 86–735).

Neither the House nor the Senate made any change in existing law for Department of State administrative expenses, which is for "such amounts as may be necessary from time to time." The Executive appropriation request includes an amount of $3,025,000 for this purpose.

The difference between the amount in the House bill and in the Senate amendment is $200,290,000. The committee of conference adjusted the differences in amounts as shown in the following table and agreed on a total authorization of $3,599,050,000. This total is a reduction by the Senate of $100,290,000 and an increase by the House of $100,000,000.

| Section | Executive appropriation request (1) | House bill (2) | Senate amendment (3) | Conference agreement (4) | Adjustment against House bill (5) | Adjustment against Senate amendment (6) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 202(a). Development Loan Fund | [1] $1,060,000,000 | [1] $900,000,000 | [1] $950,000,000 | $925,000,000 | +$25,000,000 | −$25,000,000 |
| 212. Development grants | 257,000,000 | 217,000,000 | 225,000,000 | [3] 220,000,000 | +3,000,000 | −5,000,000 |
| 214. American schools and hospitals abroad | 22,000,000<br>[2] [26,290,000] | [2] 12,000,000 | [2] 26,290,000 | [3] 19,000,000 | +7,000,000 | −7,290,000 |
| 252. Alliance for Progress | [4] 600,000,000 | [4] 45 ,000,000 | [4] 600,000,000 | 525,000,000 | +75,000,000 | −75,000,000 |
|  | [5] 50,000,000 | ([5]) | ([5]) | ([5]) | ([5]) | ([5]) |
| 302. International organizations | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 | 136,050,000 |  |  |
| 402. Supporting assistance | 435,000,000 | 380,000,000 | 380,000,000 | 380,000,000 |  |  |
| 451. Contingency fund | 300,000,000 | 150,000,000 | 175,000,000 | 160,000,000 | +10,000,000 | −15,000,000 |
| 504. Military assistance | 1,405,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 | 1,000,000,000 |  |  |
| 637. Administrative expenses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) AID | 57,250,000 | 54,000,000 | 52,000,000 | 54,000,000 |  | +2,000,000 |
| (b) State | [6] 3,025,000 | ([6]) | ([6]) | ([6]) | ([6]) | ([6]) |
| Public Law 86–735, sec. 2, Social Progress Trust Fund | 200,000,000 | 200,000,000 | 155,000,000 | 180,000,000 | −20,000,000 | +25,000,000 |
| Total | 4,525,325,000<br>[7] [4,529,615,000] | [6] 3,499,050,000 | [6] [7] 3,699,340,000 | 3,599,050,000 | +100,000,000 | −100,290,000 |

[1] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides authorization of $1,500,000,000 for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 for the Development Loan Fund. The House bill cut the fiscal year 1964 authorization to $900,000,000 (col. 2); the Senate amendment cut the fiscal year 1964 authorization to $950,000,000 and deleted the authorizations for fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

[2] The Executive communicated additional estimated requirements for American schools and hospitals abroad and increased the original request for $22,000,000 to $26,290,000. House consideration was based on the $22,000,000 figure.

[3] Of this sum, not to exceed $2,200,000 is available for direct dollar costs in connection with U.S. founded or sponsored hospitals abroad and $4,700,000 is available solely for the purchase of U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

[4] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides an authorization of $600,000,000 for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966. The House reduced the fiscal year 1964 authorization (col. 2); the Senate made no change.

[5] The Executive proposed an amendment authorizing the appropriation in any fiscal year 1963 through 1966 of the unappropriated balance of the authorization for any prior fiscal year during that period. The appropriation request for fiscal year 1964 for this unappropriated balance was $50,000,000, which neither the House nor the Senate approved.

[6] The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, provides for State Department administrative expenses "such amounts as may be necessary from time to time." The amount requested to be appropriated is only included in col. (1) because neither the House nor the Senate took any action to change the continuing authorization.

[7] This total (col. 1) includes the larger amount requested for American schools and hospitals abroad, which is also included in the total amount of the Senate amendment (col. 3).

### *Investment guaranty agreements (Sec. 101 (c) (1) and Sec. 301(e) (3))*

The House bill prohibited assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act after December 31, 1964, to the government of any less developed country which failed to enter into an agreement to institute an investment guaranty program providing protection against inconvertibility and expropriation or confiscation.

The Senate amendment stated the sense of Congress that institution of the full investment guaranty program under the Foreign Assistance Act would be regarded as a significant measure of self-help of an aid recipient country, improving the climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign.

The committee of conference agreed to the provision of the House bill with an amendment, changing the date on which this provision would go into effect from December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1965. The managers on the part of the House also accepted the provision of the Senate as constituting a statement of policy entirely consistent with the requirements of the House bill.

In agreeing to the postponement of the effective date of the House provision from December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1965, the managers on the part of the House accepted the argument that giving 2 years' notice would provide ample time for the completion or the initiation of the negotiation of investment guaranty agreements with governments interested in receiving U.S. aid in the future, as well as permit an orderly closing out of U.S. assistance to governments unwilling to enter into such agreements.

### *Purposes, objectives, and priorities*

The House bill contained a congressional declaration that the authorization requests for funds to carry out economic assistance programs shall be accompanied by a detailed statement setting forth the purposes, the objectives, and the priorities of such programs.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of the House provision. The committee of conference recognized that the executive branch presentation of proposals for foreign assistance is made on a country basis. The material so presented includes in each instance on a country basis the items listed in the amendment, including consideration of our foreign policy objectives.

### *Consideration to countries which do not divert their own resources to military or propaganda efforts*

The House bill amended paragraph 8 of section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act to state that it is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of funds under the act great attention and consideration should be given to those countries (1) which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and (2) which do not, as a result of U.S. assistance, divert their own economic resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States or against other countries receiving aid under the act whether or not supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. The House bill (sec. 307) and the Senate amendment (sec. 301) had identical language related to this subject. Since this language was not in conference, the managers on the part of the House recognized that this new language of the bill, plus the provisions of existing law, adequately reflected the views of the House.

### *Short-term emergency assistance (sec. 101(c)(3))*

The House bill added after the 10th paragraph in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act a statement of the sense of Congress that in the administration of development assistance every precaution should be taken to avoid diversion of assistance to short-term emergency purposes or other purposes not essential to long-range economic development. The House bill also expressed the sense of Congress that short-term emergency purposes should be met to the extent possible through international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund which are equipped to condition assistance "on immediate economic and monetary reform."

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the House language with an amendment deleting the reference to meeting short-term emergencies through international institutions. The committee of conference believed it was not desirable to specify the alternative sources which might be available for these purposes.

### *Aid to South Vietnam (sec. 101(c)(6))*

The Senate amendment expressed the sense of the Congress that assistance authorized by this act should be extended to or withheld from the Government of Vietnam at the discretion of the President to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return to their homeland of Americans involved in that struggle.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House, recognizing the fluid situation in Vietnam, accepted the Senate language which provides the President with flexibility in order to achieve our national objectives.

### *Interest rates (sec. 102(a)(2))*

The House bill amended section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that in no event should development loans be made at interest rates less than 2 percent per annum. By reason of section 251(b) of the act, this provision also applied to Alliance for Progress loans.

The Senate amendment amended section 635(g) of the act, which relates to general authorities, by adding a new paragraph (6) requiring that the President in making any loan under part I of the act (i.e., an economic assistance loan), except a loan to the International Development Association under section 205, establish an interest rate of 2 percent or more, except during an initial grace period on principal repayments which could not exceed 5 years. During the grace period, interest could be as low as three-fourths of 1 percent. The Senate amendment also placed a maximum term on loans of 35 years.

The committee of conference accepted the language of the House bill with two modifications: (1) authorizing a grace period of not to exceed 10 years during which the rate of interest is not permitted to be lower than three-fourths of 1 percent per annum, and (2) exempting loans of developing assistance funds made available to the International Development Association from the requirements of this section as to interest rates and also exempting from the requirements of this section loans authorized or committed prior to the effective date of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

### *Private enterprise participation in economic planning (sec. 102(a)(3))*

The House bill added a new clause (7) to section 201(b) of the act. The new language required the President to take account of the economic development plans of the requesting country. Such plans should specifically provide for appropriate participation by private enterprise and include an analysis of current human and material resources and a projection of ultimate objectives of the plans with respect to overall economic development.

The Senate amendment added a new subsection (f) to section 201, prohibiting assistance under the development loan title unless the President determines that the project for which assistance is requested is taken into account in the country's economic development, including analysis of current human and material resources and a projection of the ultimate project objectives with respect to the country's overall economic development, and specifically providing for appropriate participation by private enterprise.

The committee of conference agreed to an amended version of the Senate language. The new subsection (f) added to section 201 by the substitute agreed to in conference prohibits the furnishing of assistance for a project from the Development Loan Fund unless the President determines that such project will promote the economic development of the borrowing country and only after account is taken of the relation of the project to the country's resources and overall economic development, as well as specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise in the project.

### *Additional development grant criteria*

The House bill amended section 211(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act to require the President, in furnishing assistance in the form of development grants and technical cooperation to take account of whether the activity could be financed through a development loan.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. They accepted the argument that section 635(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act already gives emphasis and direction to the making of loans rather than grants wherever possible, and that since most of the development grant funds would be used for technical assistance, loan financing would not be feasible in most instances.

### *Population problems (sec. 105)*

The Senate amendment included a provision that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control."

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the Senate provision so that it provides that "funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of population growth."

The managers on the part of the House accepted the language as modified in the belief that in view of the population problems in the less developed countries, research on such problems appears to be warranted.

### *Extended risk guaranties*

The House bill authorized an increase in the ceiling from $180 million to $300 million for the general extended risk guaranty program. (A separate authorization for extended risk guaranties of housing projects in Latin American countries was not affected by this provision.)

The Senate contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this increase in the ceilings. The slow progress which has been made in the issuing of guaranties under the existing ceiling of $180 million indicates that there is no immediate need for an increase in the ceiling, and, should such an increase become necessary, legislative action should be possible during the next session of the Congress.

The managers on the part of the House are convinced that the general extended risk investment guaranty program should be expanded and want to make clear that the action of the committee of conference should not result in any diminution of effort in pushing this program.

### *Fifty percent of development loans for development through private enterprise (sec. 102(b)(2) and sec. 106(b)(3))*

The House bill added to sections 202(a) and 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act identical provisions requiring that not less than 50 percent of the funds appropriated for development lending for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 should be available only for loans made for economic development through private enterprise.

The Senate amendment did not contain a comparable provision.

The committee of conference accepted the House provision with an amendment, substituting for the words "for purposes of" the words "to encourage" and eliminating the word "only."

The managers on the part of the House regard this amendment as in no way diminishing the significance of the House provision as a policy directive. They accepted the argument that the revised language would impose fewer administrative problems on the Agency for International Development than would the provision of the House bill.

### *Encouragement of the cooperative movement in Latin America (sec. 106(a)(4))*

Section 106(a)(3) of the Senate amendment contained language directing the President, when appropriate, to assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward strengthening the Alliance for Progress.

The House bill did not include a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision. The development in Latin America of a cooperative movement comparable in scope to that which has emerged in the United States could make a major contribution to the attainment of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress and should be encouraged.

### *Reservation of loan repayments for cooperative movement (sec. 106(c))*

The Senate amendment provided that the President might use foreign currency receipts from loans under the Alliance for Progress title or from nonmilitary assistance loans under the Mutual Security Act or predecessor legislation for the promotion of cooperatives in Latin America. The authority was also provided to reserve up to $25 million of local currencies for such purposes.

The House bill did not contain a similar provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision with an amendment to establish the fact that the $25 million ceiling was cumulative relating to the aggregate amount which could be reserved for this purpose rather than authorizing an annual reservation of $25 million. It was the understanding of the committee of conference that none of the foreign currencies made available under this authority, including any amounts reserved for future years, may be expended unless specifically appropriated for this purpose. The committee of conference was informed that there is no excess currency available in any Latin American country at present and none is likely to become excess in the foreseeable future.

The House managers believe that if excess currencies become available in Latin America in some subsequent period in significant amounts, the reservation of such currencies authorized by this provision, as well as any other reservation of foreign currencies for future use, should be reexamined in order to evaluate the relationship of such reserved currencies to current U.S. requirements.

### *Evaluation of programs (sec. 107)*

The Senate amendment added a new title VII to chapter 2, part I, of the Foreign Assistance Act requiring the President to appoint such committees as are necessary to review and evaluate the economic aid program in each country, receiving economic aid in fiscal year 1963. Such committees, except those for Latin America, are to be composed of three to five members, a majority of whom would be representatives of the public and report to the President and the Congress their findings with respect to:

1. The performance of the recipient country in working out a development program and in carrying out self-help and reform measures;

2. Whether specific projects are contributing to the development of the recipient country and to the purposes of this program; and

3. Such other matters as the committees believe may be of use to Congress in its consideration of the fiscal year 1965 foreign aid legislation.

In addition, the President was to appoint such committees of such size as he might find necessary to review, in accordance with the above criteria, the economic assistance programs for the countries in the Alliance for Progress.

Advisory committees were first to be appointed to review the Alliance for Progress and the programs in those countries which received one-half of the total assistance extended by the United States in fiscal year 1963. These committees were to report not later than January 1, 1965. Reports of committees for other countries were to be made not later than June 1, 1965.

The provision also prohibited any legislation authorizing or appropriating funds to carry out economic development programs for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent years, until Congress received and considered the above-mentioned reports. The amendment also provided for reimbursement of public members for travel and other expenses incurred in carrying out their functions and for the diversion of program funds to meet such expenses.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment. In lieu of specifying the organization, operations and organization of the committees provided for in the Senate amendment, the new language permits the President to appoint a committee to review and evaluate economic development programs carried out under the Foreign Assistance Act and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings. The language is permissive. It is not a directive to the President that he must appoint a committee. The managers on the part of the House are not convinced that a study by such a committee would serve any useful purpose at present. While the committee of conference recognized that evaluation of the aid program by individuals outside the executive branch might contribute to the improvement of such programs, it was felt that detailed and specific language on the scope of their work would deny them the flexibility necessary to achieve the objectives sought by an independent assessment.

### *Restrictions on military assistance to Latin America (sec. 202(b) and sec. 202(d))*

The Senate amendment reduced the ceiling on grant programs of defense articles for the American Republics from $57.5 to $50 million and provided that $25 million of such amount may be available during each fiscal year for assistance to an international military force under the control of the Organization of American States. The amendment also provided that military assistance could be made available to American Republics only (1) to the extent necessary to fulfill prior commitments or (2) to safeguard the security of the United States or to safeguard the security of a country associated with the United States in the Alliance for Progress against military overthrow of a duly constituted government.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to an amended version of the Senate amendment, eliminating the word "military" in reference to the overthrow of a duly constituted government so as to provide that military assistance could be made available to safeguard a duly constituted government against overthrow, whether by military or by other means (as distinguished from a change in government by constitutional process). The committee of conference recognized that a large part of the military assistance program to Latin America is directed toward (1) internal security projects to combat Castro-Communist inspired subversion and (2) civic action projects that promote stability and strengthen national economies. It regarded a continuation of these programs as important to the stability of the hemisphere and, therefore, increased the figure recommended by the Senate to $55 million, a reduction of $2,500,000 from that previously authorized. Should the American Republics devise a regional program of defense, the United States may contribute to the implementation of such a program from the funds made available under this section.

### *Restrictions on military assistance to African countries (sec. 202(e))*

The House bill prohibited grant military assistance to African countries except for (1) internal security requirements or (2) civic action programs authorized by section 505(b) of the act.

The Senate amendment placed an annual ceiling of $25 million on grant programs of defense articles for African countries. It also prohibited assistance for internal security requirements unless the President determined otherwise.

The committee of conference accepted a compromise between the two versions. Grant programs of defense articles for African countries for fiscal year 1964 shall not exceed $25 million. This ceiling does not apply to any defense articles that may be sold to such countries pursuant to the authority contained in section 507 of the act. Grant military assistance may be furnished to African countries only for internal security or for civic action programs unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Speaker of the House and to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

### *Encouragement of free enterprise and private participation (sec. 301(a)(2))*

The Senate amendment amended section 601(b)(4) of the act by deleting the words "wherever appropriate" and substituting the words "to the maximum extent practicable".

The House bill contained no comparable change.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate language as more expressive of the intent of the section.

### *Advisory committee on private enterprise in foreign aid (sec. 301(b))*

The Senate amendment provided for a 9-man Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid to make studies and recommendations to the Administrator of the foreign aid program for achieving the most effective utilization of the private enterprise provisions of the act. Members would be selected from the business, labor, and professional world, universities, and foundations, as well as from among persons with extensive experience in government. They would receive only necessary expenses. The Committee would submit its final report no later than December 31, 1964, after which it would cease to function. Provision was made for an authorization for an appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to permit the Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

The House bill had no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment that limits the expenses of the Committee to a maximum of $50,000 which sum shall be derived from funds appropriated for other parts of the act. It is not an additional authorization.

### *Application of Federal standards to construction contracts*

The House bill added a new subsection (c) to section 611, relating to completion of plans and cost estimates, requiring the President to establish such procedures as he determines necessary to assure that to the maximum extent practicable all contracts for construction outside the United States made in connection with any agreement or grant subject to the requirements of section 611(a) shall be made in accordance with the same standards applicable to the contracts made by the Federal Government for similar construction within the United States.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision. They accepted the argument that the present bill emphasizes greater use of U.S. consultants and engineers in providing assistance to other governments and that the attainment of the objectives of U.S. standards with respect to construction contractions can and will be attained without imposing the rigid requirement contained in the House bill.

### *Sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens (sec. 301(d))*

The Senate amendment added a new subsection (b) to section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell U.S.-owned foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate language.

The currencies authorized to be sold are those acquired through operations under the Foreign Assistance Act, the Mutual Security Act, and any act repealed thereby, or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480). In order to be available for such sale, the currencies must be in excess of the needs of U.S. Government agencies and departments and not prohibited from such use or committed to other uses by agreements heretofore entered into with another country. The dollars received from the sale of the foreign currencies under this subsection would be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The House managers accepted the Senate provision in the belief that every effort should be made to find uses for excess foreign currencies owned by the United States, which cannot be used to alleviate the burden on the U.S. taxpayers, whenever such use might diminish the drain on the U.S. balance of payments.

The committee of the conference recognized that the sale to U.S. citizens of excess currencies for tourist and other expenditures under this provision is not likely to be large in view of the fact that there are only a few countries where currencies in excess of U.S. requirements are available and, in addition, there are limitations imposed on the use of such currencies, contained in Public Law 480 sales agreements from which most U.S.-owned foreign currencies are currently derived.

It is understood that the term "U.S. citizens" as used in this provision includes U.S. corporations operating abroad and U.S. voluntary agencies (such as CARE), as well as U.S. religious groups.

It is the understanding of the committee of conference that this provision does not require the unilateral abrogation of existing agreements with countries concerning the use of currencies derived from them. In view of the unforeseen difficulties in negotiations, the managers on the part of the House note that Public Law 480 expires next year. Should any problems arise in carrying out operations under that act or should difficulty be encountered in making sales of surplus agricultural commodities because countries fear that such sales might reduce their income from U.S. tourists, necessary corrective action may then be possible.

### *Restriction on assistance for projects in Cuba through international organizations*

The House bill contained an amendment to section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act requiring that no funds provided under the act be used to make any voluntary contributions to any international organization or program for financing projects of economic or technical assistance to the present Government of Cuba.

The Senate amendment had no comparable provision.

The committee of conference agreed to the elimination of this provision of the House bill. The committee of conference recognized that in many international organizations there is no authority to accept contributions subject to political restrictions on the countries for which they may be used. U.S. policy has been directed toward stimulating other nations to increase their contributions through multilateral channels for programs in the less developed countries. The attachment of political conditions by the United States to such contributions would serve as a precedent for other countries to follow a similar policy in making their contributions, whether assessed or voluntary. Further, the Communist countries contribute more to such international programs than they receive in the form of assistance. For these reasons, the managers on the part of the House receded.

### *Nullification of contracts (secs. 301(e)(2) and 302(h))*

The Senate amendment included a requirement that assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act or of any other act be suspended if a foreign government take steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with U.S. citizens and fails to take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations under international law to such citizens.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision with an amendment to the language of the Senate amendment specifically excepting assistance to any country through the Export-Import Bank in addition to the Peace Corps, and assistance under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and famine or disaster relief under Public Law 480 from the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.

The managers on the part of the House considered that this was a matter of principle to be followed.

One of the factors which the administrators of foreign assistance are required to consider before aiding other countries in their economic development is the self-help measures which the recipients of our aid undertake. No government can expect private investment, either from abroad or on the part of its own citizens, if it fails to show its respect for property rights and contract obligations.

Unless a country recognizes the importance of private investment to its economic development and is prepared to maintain policies favorable to such investment, it should not be regarded as having taken adequate self-help measures. Furthermore, U.S. loans or grants to promote economic development will fail to achieve their purpose under such circumstances.

The continuation of U.S. development assistance to a government which is unwilling to face fundamental issues is unfair both to the U.S. taxpayer and to those leaders of recipient nations who commit their own careers, as well as the future well-being of their countries, to the success of economic development programs which we help to finance.

### *Valuation of expropriated property (sec. 301(e)(2))*

The Senate amendment authorized the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, upon request of the President, to determine the value of property taken by a foreign government for the purpose of administering section 620(e). Referral to the Commission, if any, had to be within 70 days of the country's action, and the Commission was required to report within 90 days of referral. The Senate version provided also that in the event of referral to the Commission, the country must take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations to U.S. citizens within 20 days after issuance of the Commission's report.

The House bill did not include a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision.

H.R. 7885 as approved by both the House and Senate amends existing law, requiring termination of assistance to countries expropriating property owned by U.S. citizens by adding an additional provision that compensation for expropriated property must be "equivalent to the full value thereof."

The Senate provision authorizes, but does not require, the President to use the services of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to advise him on the value of expropriated property.

Because the question of the valuation of expropriated property is important to the proper administration of section 620(e), expert advice on valuation, in appropriate cases, can measurably assist the parties in settling their difference and also assist the Department of State in the effective use of section 620(e) to protect the legitimate interests of U.S. investors. For these reasons, the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment, noting that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has a skilled staff, experienced in the valuation of foreign property, and apparently is better equipped to advise the President on property valuations than any other agency. Should the President prefer to have some other agency assume this function, he is free to do so.

The managers on the part of the House recognize that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is not a permanent agency of the Government and that it exists only to settle certain claims assigned to it by law. They do not want the assignment of this responsibility under the Foreign Assistance Act to serve as justification for keeping the Commission in business after its other functions expire.

Consideration must be given, however, to the fact that the valuation services called for by this provision will impose a cost on the Federal Government regardless of the agency that does the job. Whenever the other work assigned to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission comes to an end, the managers on the part of the House recommend that the President determine what agency can most effectively and economically assume this responsibility and submit his recommendation to the Congress.

### *Restrictions on assistance to Communist countries*

The House bill included an amendment to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act by redefining the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the list of Communist countries to include the captive constituent countries thereof.

The Senate amendment did not include this provision.

It was recognized that the language of existing law was sufficiently inclusive to encompass the amendment proposed in the House bill. For this reason the managers on the part of the House receded.

### *Assistance to Indonesia (sec. 301(e)(3))*

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act that prohibits the furnishing of assistance under the act to Indonesia except pursuant to a Presidential determination and notification to the House and Senate of such assistance.

The House bill made a Presidential determination to furnish assistance contingent upon a finding that it was in the national interest, whereas the Senate amendment made such a determination contingent upon a finding that it was essential to the national interest.

The committee of conference accepted the Senate version as more restrictive in its application. Hence the managers on the part of the House receded.

### *Assistance to productive enterprises competing with U.S. enterprises in world markets*

The House bill added a new subsection (m) to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act providing that no assistance should be furnished under that act for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise abroad unless the President determined that similar productive enterprises within the United States were operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and such assistance would not result in depriving such U.S. enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the elimination of this provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the arguments (1) that section 620 (d) of existing law already requires the administrators of the foreign assistance program to make arrangements with countries where U.S. assistance is provided for the construction or operation of productive enterprises to limit the competition of such enterprises with U.S. industry and (2) that the House provision would seriously impede the administration of foreign aid without being of significant benefit to U.S. industry.

### *Review, inspection and audit*

The House bill prohibited development loans, grants, and Alliance for Progress loans and grants to the government of any country which does not permit such reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States as are required to determine whether assistance is being administered to carry out the purposes for which it is furnished.

The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference was advised that the standard form of loan agreements and of grant project agreements includes an explicit statement that the United States may make such reviews, inspections, and audits as it deems necessary. For this reason the managers on the part of the House receded.

### *Limitation on grant assistance (sec. 301(e)(3))*

The Senate amendment added a subsection to section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act that prohibited the furnishing of assistance on a grant basis under that act to any economically developed nation capable of sustaining its own defense burdens and economic growth except (1) to fulfill firm commitments made prior to July 1, 1963, or (2) additional orientation and training expenses under part II of the act not amounting to more than $1 million during fiscal year 1964. The term "economically developed nation" included, but was not limited to, any nation listed as an exception to the definition of "economically developed nation" contained in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1875 of June 28, 1963, plus Switzerland and the German Federal Republic.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision with an amendment deleting the definition of "economically less developed nation." The committee of conference believes such a determination is one of reasonable judgment. It is intended that the countries of Western Europe, among others, will be included. In view of the specific U.S. base rights in Spain and Portugal, the committee of conference does not intend that the amendment will be immediately applicable to those two countries. Nor is it intended to apply to NATO cooperative enterprises involving the furnishing of military and technological information, licenses of Government owned and controlled inventions, and liaison by members of the Armed Forces.

### *Use of private enterprise for technical assistance (sec. 302(a))*

The Senate amendment contained a provision that in providing technical assistance under this act, the head of any such agency or such officer shall utilize, to the fullest extent practicable, goods and professional and other services from private enterprise on a contract basis, and that in such fields as education, health, housing, or agriculture, the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies should be utilized when such facilities were particularly or uniquely suitable for technical assistance, were not competitive with private enterprise, and could be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate provision in the belief that it clarified the language in existing law, requiring that in providing technical assistance the facilities of Federal agencies equipped to give technical assistance should be used to the fullest extent practicable, by indicating that Federal agencies should be used in rendering technical assistance only when their facilities are particularly or uniquely suitable for a particular purpose, are not competition with private enterprise and can be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.

### *Deputy inspector general (sec. 302(b)(4))*

The Senate amendment added to existing law the requirement that the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, authorized by section 624 of the act, should be subject to Senate confirmation and increased his salary from $19,500 to $20,000 per year.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the argument that the duties and responsibilities of the Deputy Inspector General justified the requirement for Senate confirmation and the small increase in salary.

### *Exceptions of certain acts from the prohibition of assistance (sec. 302(h))*

The Senate amendment added a new section 638 to the Foreign Assistance Act stating that no provision of the act should be construed to prohibit the carrying out of programs under the Peace Corps Act or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, as respectively amended.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment that added to the two acts cited above, programs under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 as amended and foodstuffs supplied under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480). In the case of the latter act, the exception is limited to those programs of famine or disaster relief carried out under title II of Public Law 480 since some of those programs might be considered programs of assistance to countries. This exception does not preclude programs to meet famine, disaster relief or other extraordinary relief requirements or feeding programs carried out by registered voluntary agencies.

These four acts have been separately authorized by Congress as instruments of foreign policy, as well as to serve other U.S. objectives. Such assistance as they provide is of a kind different from that envisioned by the Foreign Assistance Act. Hence prohibitions on assistance provided for in the latter act should not embrace assistance that is different in character and has different objectives. Nor was it the intent of the committee of conference to preclude programs of the USIA, U.S. oversea defense activities, research or other programs undertaken primarily to serve nonforeign policy objectives of the United States but which may have an ancillary benefit for a foreign country.

### *Title of Latin American Development Act (sec. 401(a))*

The House bill gave to Public Law 86–735 the short statutory title "the Latin American Development and Chilean Reconstruction Act."

The Senate amendment titled that law "The Latin American Development Act."

In view of the fact that the Chilean reconstruction phase of our assistance has been completed, the act is more properly designated the "Latin American Development Act." For this reason the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment.

### *Presidential discretion to place trade with certain Communist countries on nondiscriminatory basis (sec. 402)*

The Senate amendment amended section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to authorize the President to extend to certain Communist countries trade agreement concessions on a nondiscriminatory basis. The exercise of this authority would have been permitted only upon the President's determination and report to Congress that extending such treatment to a country (1) was important to the national interest and (2) would promote the independence of such country or area from domination or control by international communism.

The House bill did not contain a corresponding provision.

The managers on the part of the House agreed to an amended version of the Senate provision which continues the prohibition in existing law against extending most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries with the exception of those countries under Communist control which received such favored treatment prior to the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The effect of the agreed language is to authorize extension of most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia but to no other Communist-dominated countries.

The committee of conference was convinced that major issues dealt with by this amendment are related to foreign policy rather than to the impact on the U.S. economy or the Federal revenue.

The managers on the part of the House regard the opportunity to continue most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia as of fundamental importance to the United States in its effort to encourage the trend already manifest among the countries of Eastern Europe to maintain their national identity and assert, to a limited degree at least, attributes of national sovereignty.

The liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe from Soviet domination has the overwhelming support of the American people and of their elected representatives. We cannot avoid facing the problem of what action it is possible for the United States to take today that will contribute to the attainment of the desired objective.

The new administration regards the authority contained in the bill agreed to by the conference committee as vital to the implementation of its efforts to bring about the liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe.

The managers on the part of the House are convinced that this is a fundamental issue which cannot be avoided and that delay would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

*Inclusion of domestically produced fishery products under Public Law 480 (sec. 403 (c))*

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 106 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) to include in title I and title IV programs any domestically produced fishery product if the Secretary of Interior determines that the product at the time of export is excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The amendment was not effective with respect to title I until January 1, 1965.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

There have been occasions when foreign governments have asked for canned fish products under the food-for-peace program to supply protein deficiencies. This amendment will make it possible to meet those requests to the extent that fishery products may be in surplus. The amendment will put fish on the same basis as frozen beef, canned pork, canned hams, variety meats, and fruit. The effective date for purposes of title I is January 1, 1965, because the present authority under that title extends through December 31, 1964, and was intended to include only surplus agricultural products at the time it was enacted. For these reasons the managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, the conference report and statement are printed above. I ask unanimous consent that further reading thereof be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House report today the results of a long and difficult conference, and I am sure that no one is satisfied with our work.

A reading of the press would seem to indicate that there are only a few major and relatively simple issues involved. Let me point out that there were 80 points of difference between the House and Senate bills to be resolved and that most of these had an important bearing on our foreign policy or overseas operations in some part of the world.

While I say that I am sure no one is satisfied, I am convinced that the House conferees have brought back a report which represents the best we could do under the circumstances and which preserves as much of the House bill as possible.

In one respect, the conference on the foreign aid bill this year has been different than any other conference in which I have ever participated. Most of the pressure brought to bear on me by my House colleagues has not been pressure to defend provisions of the House bill to the last ditch but has, instead, taken the form of arguments to accept various provisions of the Senate bill.

Now, I am sure that the House realizes that we had to go to conference to defend the House bill and that our primary concern throughout our negotiations with the representatives of the other body was to maintain the position of the House. There was no way that we could do anything else. I would like to point out that the statistics show that the Senate receded on a substantially larger number of items of difference than the House.

With respect to money, we succeeded in splitting the difference between the House and the Senate bill. The bill as it passed the House authorized $3,499,050,000, and the Senate bill authorized $3,699,340,000—a figure $200,000,000 higher than that in the House bill. We bring back a bill which authorizes $3,599,050,000; the House went up $100,000,000, and the Senate went down $100,290,000.

The details with respect to money are shown in a table on page 22607 of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on page 17 of the conference report.

Some of the newspaper reports that I have seen make it appear that the conference devoted itself primarily to eliminating restrictions on the administration of the foreign assistance program. Anyone who examines the facts will see that this has not been the case.

Let me cite major provisions of the House bill which are still in the bill as reported by the conference.

The House language restricting aid to countries permitting their ships to carry cargoes to or from Cuba has been retained without change. The Senate bill had a somewhat similar provision which was not quite as restrictive and which was preferred by the Department of State, but the House conferees fought for the House language and prevailed.

The bill as it passed the House included a provision putting not only the Castro government, but any future government of Cuba, on notice that the United States would not give assistance to Cuba or grant a quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar until appropriate steps had been taken to compensate American citizens for property taken by the Castro regime. There was no such provision in the Senate bill, and the language of the House bill has been preserved without change.

The conference also approved without change the provision of the House bill which prevents the construction of the Indian steel plant without congressional approval.

The House conferees were able to retain in the bill also the House language requiring that no assistance may be given to the government of any less developed country unless that country is willing to agree to institute an investment guaranty program, although the conference postponed the effective date of this requirement from December 31, 1964, as provided in the House bill to December 31, 1965. It was our belief that those foreign governments who were sincerely interested in economic development should be willing to enter into investment guaranty agreements and that a 2-year period would provide ample time for them to make up their minds and take necessary preliminary action. We felt also that countries which were unwilling to enter into investment guaranty agreements should be put on notice of our intention to cut off aid and that a 2-year period would be ample for the closing out of our programs in such countries.

I would like to mention also one major provision of the Senate bill which we did not accept. The Senate bill included language requiring the President to appoint a series of committees to evaluate the economic program in each country which received economic aid during fiscal year 1963. These committees were given rather detailed guidance as to how they should carry on their work.

The House conferees were convinced that the last thing the foreign aid program needs is additional studies by distinguished citizens. It was our feeling that what the foreign aid program needs is to have the Secretary of State himself and those primarily responsible for our foreign policy take a new look at foreign aid as a tool for the attainment of our foreign policy objectives and decide whether we are really getting our money's worth and whether it is really producing the intended results. We see no point in sending a lot of people traveling around the world to produce a series of reports which will be scanned by the Executive to find comments favorable to foreign aid and which will be ignored in other respects.

We accepted language which merely says that the President can appoint one committee to study foreign aid if he wants to.

I want to take time to deal with one more matter before making myself available for questions. This is the acceptance by the House of a restricted version of the provision in the Senate bill authorizing the President to continue most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries.

The foreign aid message sent to the Congress last spring, requesting an authorization for fiscal 1964, included a request for an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which would, in effect, repeal the provision included in that act as originally passed requiring the termination of most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries.

After consultation with the leadership of the House and with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee eliminated this provision from the bill, and the House bill contained no language dealing with this matter. The bill which passed the Senate included language authorizing the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to Communist-dominated countries at the discretion of the President.

Now, I feel that I, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and my fellow House conferees owe the House an explanation as to why we have changed our position and have brought back to the House legislation dealing with this matter, even though the provision we have accepted is much more restrictive than that contained in the Senate bill and is not what the Executive asked for.

In the first place, let me point out that a lot has happened since the President sent his foreign aid message to the House on April 2, 1963, and even since the House passed the foreign aid bill on August 23, 1963. Among the things that have happened has been the accession of a new President. We find ourselves in the closing days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress when it is clearly too late to initiate new legislation, and we are told by the new President that the continuation of most-favored nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia is the very foundation of our policy toward the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe and that the President regards this particular legislation as of vital importance.

The managers on the part of the House do not go to conference as representatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, they go to conference as representatives of the House of Representatives. In the conference they found themselves in this position.

The Senate had passed a bill giving the President the authority he regarded as essential for the conduct of his policy for dealing with the nations of Eastern Europe. They recognized that there was no possibility of obtaining House action on this matter unless they agreed to bring a provision dealing with this subject back from conference. We fully recognized the position taken by the House in 1962, and because of that fact, we insisted on a modification of the broad discretion authorized by the Senate language. The provision we have brought to the House today gives the President discretion to grant most-favored-nation treatment to only two Communist-dominated countries—Poland and Yugoslavia.

The issues involved are primarily those of foreign policy and not economics. Whether we increase or decrease our trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, although it undoubtedly would affect a number of individuals, would have very little impact on the economy of the United States as a whole.

I am sure that every Member of the House believes that we ought to assist in the liberation of the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe. I doubt if there is any Member of the House who believes that we should go to war with the Soviet Union today in order to attain that objective, and I doubt that the enslaved peoples of these countries, when they think of the devastation which atomic war would involve, want us to do so.

We are faced with the situation then of doing the unspectacular things which apply pressures in various ways to bring freedom to these people. It is the judgment of the present administration, just as it was the judgment of President Kennedy and of President Eisenhower, that the best thing we can do is to encourage the people of the Communist-dominated countries to maintain their national identities and to develop their economic independence from the Soviet Union. This is the basis of our policy, and this is why this legislation is needed.

I urge the House not to forget the basic issue involved and its importance to our foreign policy.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The thing that disturbs me is that in acceding to the Senate amendment, although you made changes in it, was not so much a matter of policy involved as it was a matter of the jurisdiction of the committee.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made a representation, as I understand it, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman now in the well of the House, as you point out, and it was on that basis, I understand, your committee did not ask, even though it was requested to do so in the first authorization, this further authority. I am concerned not so much about the merits of whether we extend the most-favored-nation treatment to the two countries involved, Poland and Yugoslavia, but the issue of whether or not we are going to use the foreign aid bill to usurp jurisdiction of other committees. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has no jurisdiction in this area whatever. I think the gentleman recognizes that. Yet we went along, even after representations were made by the chairman of our committee, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in accepting the amendment. I would like to have some explanation as to why that was done.

Mr. MORGAN. The statement of the gentleman is basically correct. The provision was in the original foreign aid bill sent up to Congress in April. After the foreign aid bill had been under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs for several weeks, I received a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means requesting jurisdiction over this section 402 in the foreign aid bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs immediately conceded jurisdiction to the great Committee on Ways and Means.

When we went to conference, since the other body operates under a different system of parliamentary rules, the most-favored-nation provision was inserted in the foreign aid bill in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. When this arrived on the floor, not one single question was raised about this by any Member of the Senate, including the members of the Senate Finance Committee who had jurisdiction over this item. This, of course, was a strong argument used by the Senate conferees, plus the fact that the new administration urgently requested this authority. The House conferees were convinced that the right thing to do under the circumstances was to accept the provision as modified in conference.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think it is fair to point out also, Mr. Chairman, while there is no argument about the jurisdiction under the rules of the House a broad general argument can be raised that this is not only a matter for the Ways and Means Committee but also a matter of foreign policy in the application. As the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee pointed out, this matter was brought up in the Senate and there was no objection over there. If I recall correctly, in the conference committee we were told they had a letter from the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee saying he had no objection to putting it in. So we were relying upon that particular phase of the question, and we stood firm as long as we could, and finally got some modification, but we did feel that was the best we could do under the circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the argument that the House Foreign Affairs Committee is entitled to deal with most-favored-nations clause simply because it affects foreign policy is valid because the same thing could be said for the whole Trade Agreements Act; that it affects foreign policy. Yet the Trade Agreements Act was and is properly within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. The Foreign Affairs Committee should never, as in this case, attempt to usurp the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. I do not see how you can differentiate between the line of action now being taken in this bill with respect to Yugoslavia and Poland and still divorce that action from the exclusive jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As one of the House conferees, I might point out that this discussion demonstrates the difficulties we had on a number of points with our colleagues in the other body. Of course there are foreign policy implications about this provision. No one can argue that. Nor can anyone argue that there is sometimes competing jurisdiction between committees. However, as a matter of fact the Senate conferees pointed out there had been no disagreement on their side, and they made a very good case for the language as it was incorporated in the Senate bill. We finally accepted their provision, but we tightened it up very considerably by extending the most-favored-nations clause to these two countries only. Admittedly there was originally some argument, and then agreement, in the House as to where the jurisdiction lay. But this did not mean we did not have a problem which had to be solved. I hope the House will accept this as a reasonable compromise. It is only one of several. It is one on which Members may disagree, but I think we had no choice but to come up with language along these lines.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. First, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his excellent statement. Second, I would like to ask this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania has quoted indirectly the new President, President Johnson, in stating that this particular provision is vital to U.S. foreign policy and the favored-nation treatment for Poland and Yugoslavia. Could you tell us how the word was received and give us a direct quote on it rather than an indirect statement?

Mr. MORGAN. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was not called directly by the President. I did, however, receive an urgent communication that he regarded this legislation as of greatest importance.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Do you not think, if we are going to have the administration behind this and have unidentified members of the executive department quoted, that we should have a direct quote from the President because I feel this is something of vital interest, too.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we do have a direct quote from the President on this very subject in his speech to the Congress in which he asked for early enactment of this authorization without crippling amendments which would destroy his flexibility. I would point out to the House that there is nothing in this language which says he has to give the most-favored-nation treatment to either one of these nations, but he does have the flexibility to do so, if it is in the national interest of the United States to do it. So I think you cannot have a much more direct quote from the President than you have right there in that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this conference report. That is not by any means to be taken as an indication that I think the conferees have been less than diligent in their efforts. On the contrary, I would say they have worked hard and effectively. The conferees made a real effort, with considerable success, to represent the position of the House. I think the efforts of the conferees, with the exception of the present speaker, in this case are to be commended.

On balance I would feel that the position of the House was represented more successfully than was the position of the other body. My objection to this report is rather a basic and longstanding one to the aid programs themselves and for that reason as I said I shall vote against the report.

There are some figures that might helpfully be kept in mind, and I shall speak in round numbers only. Members will recall that when the proposal on this year's bill was first brought to the Congress, the request was for $4.9 billion. After the report of the Clay Committee, the late President Kennedy reduced the request to $4.5 billion.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out a bill carrying approximately $4.1 billion. Then on the floor of the House this body reduced the authorization to $3.5 billion. Thereafter the other body brought out a bill which provided about $4.2 billion in authorization. The other body on the floor reduced its figure to $3.7 billion. In the Committee of Conference the conferees split almost exactly those two figures to bring before you now a bill at $3.6 billion or very slightly thereunder. It is $3.6 billion on authorization.

Upon the matter of dollars and cents your conferees had little trouble. I think anyone who studies the table to which reference has been made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the conference report will observe that there was a very real give and take.

As I said a few moments ago, the division was almost directly down the middle. Dollarwise, therefore, there is little to be said.

Reference has been made, heretofore, to the matter of the amendment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1962. Unless Members have questions upon that, it is not my intention to go further into it at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. On that point—and I think the record has been made, but I do want to express my concern that this conference report should contain an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act. The most-favored-nations treatment is peculiarily a part and a basic part of our trade negotiations. It contains a great deal beyond just the relationship that might exist between countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia. It relates to our entire trade relationships. I trust that the Senate went in depth into the subject matter as it would bear on the possible trade negotiations act.

I think this is a very bad procedure, but if the majority party which, after all, controls this wants to vote that kind of procedure, there is very little that the minority can do other than to register an objection. However, I would remind everyone that the only way to preserve government by law is by following correct procedures or, if you think the procedures are wrong, then change the procedures. Do not, just in order to get through some substantive matter—and the administration felt substantively that they wanted to change our attitude toward Yugoslavia and Poland in this respect—do not violate good procedures for this momentary benefit. We are seeing entirely too much of this in these days, and I am afraid we are undermining our entire system of government in this kind of irregular process.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Another point on which there was considerable controversy, and I believe a great amount of concern in this Chamber, is the question of the interest to be charged upon loans. Members will recall that by amendment on the floor of this House we established a 2-percent rate on interest. The other body established also a 2-percent rate on interest with certain additional modifications. First, it provided a 5-year grace period. Secondly, it provided that there should be a limitation of 35 years with respect to any loan. Out of these two provisions the conferees bring in today a proposal which gives a 10-year grace period with interest during that period at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent and then thereafter a rate of 2 percent, excepting matters already now negotiated, with no time limit at all upon loans. Therefore, Members will immediately see that upon this rather important point there was a very great relaxation over the position which had been taken previously by this House.

Next there was a group of amendments relating generally to the area of private enterprise and its encouragement. Some of those had been added on the floor, some of them had been added in the committee. As to those, generally, there was not much controversy. Some rather small modifications were made but by and large I think it can be said that the conference report treats rather well the private enterprise sector of our economy and notes by its action in presenting this report that we do have a concern not only for the private sector of our economy but also for the fact that if such programs as the Alliance for Progress are to be successful great reliance must be placed upon the participation of the private sector. Government alone cannot carry the burden which will be required there.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees for accepting the Senate provision for an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in foreign economic development.

I remind the gentleman that during the consideration of the bill on the floor of the House I offered an amendment to establish a commission with that same general purpose.

I hope this Advisory Committee will be able to make some recommendations which will move us in the direction of having economic development abroad carried on by private capital investment rather than Government grants and loans.

Mr. ADAIR. There were certain amendments which have had, again, a wide interest, which were put in by the other body. I know that some Members in this House have a concern over those. There were two which were sponsored by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. These amendments relate to the use of funds derived from repayment of Alliance for Progress loans and of development loans—these amendments did go out. They are not now in the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding on this point because, as he knows, I have been urging the House conferees to accept the Senate amendments which would have eliminated these back-door spending revolving funds and place them on an annual appropriation basis.

Mr. ADAIR. I am aware of the efforts of the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. There were two amendments by the Senator from Colorado in this regard. I was very hopeful from conversations I had had that the House conferees would see their way clear to accepting them. I want to say that by the deletion of these amendments I think that the independence and integrity of the legislative branch of the Government has suffered greatly, and I regret it deeply.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, then there was an amendment relating to the freedom of the seas or, as some say, the "fisheries amendment." This concerned some of our west coast colleagues particularly and related to our relations with certain of our Latin American neighbors. Under it aid would have been denied to countries that extended their jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States. After a great deal of consideration that amendment which was placed in the bill by the other body was removed in its entirety. So there is no provision of that sort in the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. I associate myself with the constructive comments of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] in describing the weakening of the 2-percent interest rate amendment, which the House vigorously adopted. I feel retreat on this principle one of the basic weaknesses of the bill as approved by the conferees. However, since emphasis has been placed on this section by previous speakers, I direct my most extensive remarks to the restoration of the favored-nation tariff treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia.

First, to clarify the issue, one must remember that in 1962 under the Tariff Act this favored-nation treatment was removed but never implemented by the Executive Branch of the Government. Actually, in complete defiance of the 1962 Tariff Act, steps were never taken to remove this favored-nation treatment and, as a result, preferential tariff treatment has continued to be extended to Poland and Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that the favored-nation clause extends preferential tariff treatment, and this is the issue.

The language which appears on page 32 of the conference report discussing this section is, I believe, an insult to the intelligence of the Members of the House and the American public. It refers to liberation:

> The liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe from Soviet domination has the overwhelming support of the American people and their elected representatives.

However, the report cannot say that it has the support of the State Department and the support of anyone in the executive branch of the Government. The foreign policy in the last 3 years has been to repudiate the desire for freedom evidenced by the captive nations under communism, and the insistence of the administration to give preferential tariff treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland is dramatic proof.

Mr. Speaker, the granting of preferential tariff treatment to Communist countries merely maintains the status quo of Communist control over Eastern Europe. It does not aid the liberation of these countries.

When we extend this favored tariff treatment to these countries, we are perpetuating communism, not fighting or defeating communism.

Why Poland and Yugoslavia? If one has read the newspapers during the last month, they will find in Poland that the recent trend has not been toward liberation or moving toward a pro-Western position. It has been a trend of increased persecution of religion, increased persecution of the economy of the country and increased persecution of the people.

Mr. Speaker, at the very time when the Polish Communist government is persecuting the people of that country, we are going to give it the benefit of the favored-nation tariff treatment, while at the same time the Communist government of Yugoslavia is directly participating in subversive activities in Latin America, Asia, and Africa in the Communist international conspiracy, we are extending preferential tariff treatment to them.

Incidentally, Marshal Tito is not a mild, nonalined Communist. He has been part of the Communist conspiracy since 1917. He fought in the Spanish Civil War on the side of the Communists.

Also, during the war years of 1942 to 1945 he spent more time eliminating political opposition than he did fighting the Nazis who controlled his country.

Mr. Speaker, Marshal Tito is about as free from the Communist conspiracy as is Gus Hall.

There is no logic to justify providing preferential tariff treatment to any Communist country.

I would suggest to the House that the very acquiescence of the conference committee to this clause is enough evidence to reject this entire conference report. I urge that we reject the conference report on the basis of respecting the Committee on Ways and Means, or on what I consider a more effective argument, that we have no business whatsoever in extending preferential tariff treatment to any Communist country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the conference report on this basic issue, as well as on the valid objection to the retreat the House conferees made on the 2 percent interest rate amendment.

The authorization bill must be stronger in expressing public views concerning the inadequate and dangerous administration of the foreign aid program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 minutes allotted to me, let me say that I am opposed to this conference report on the foreign handout bill, first because it is $100 million more than was authorized by the House of Representatives. I am also opposed to it because of its emasculation of the 2-percent interest rate on foreign loans, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] has just pointed out. That provision, wisely written into the authorization bill by the House, has been mangled to the point that it is of no effect. I am opposed to the conference report because it wipes out the prohibition to give the most-favored-nations trade treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland. I am opposed to it because it does not deal realistically with the expropriation of American investments, particularly in South America. The Congress of the United States will one of these days have to come to grips w'th this situation. It does not mean very much in the matter of halting expropriations to say to a foreign government that "you must indemnify American investors," then use money appropriated for foreign aid so that they can go through the motions of paying for the properties they have stolen. That is what is happening today, and it is a shameless use of our taxpayers' money.

I know of no reason for the creation of an advisory committee on foreign aid and private investment. We have had the Grace report and all kinds of other reports dealing with the matter of private investments in foreign countries. I see no reason for spending more money for another advisory committee or commission.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending conference report, and I join our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in assuring Members that the House conferees worked to the fullest extent possible to maintain the House version.

I want to commend our chairman, Dr. MORGAN, as he has shown in this conference unusual forcefulness and determination. His efforts are reflected in the fact that of the 80 points of difference between the House and Senate versions the House conferees come back with nearly 75 percent of the differences resolved in favor of the House.

This record speaks very well of the efforts of the House conferees led by our able chairman.

Further, I do want to comment on the most-favored-nations treatment provision. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], I, and all of us want to see countries under Soviet domination liberated. There may be several ways of accomplishing this development. No one advocates war. In my opinion a desirable way is to prevent their dependence on the Kremlin. One way of liberating them, is to bring the satellite countries on a trade basis closer to the free world. The discretionary authority provided in the conference report is vital to the implementation of the efforts to bring about the liberation of the countries of Eastern Europe. That is the reason the House conferees acceded to the Senate version as amended by the House conferees to limit trade concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it has been urged that the House vote against this conference report because there is an increase of $100 million. I should like to point out that the money difference amounted to $200,290,000. The Senate receded in an amount of $100,290,000. Thus the House conferees have done better than splitting the difference 50-50. Therefore, the House conferees, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the House conferees have done very well.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to request of the conferees clarification and definition of the language of the report dealing with title 5 of the bill, and the commitment of funds thereunder for research and development on the question of population growth. It is my understanding the language replaced dealt with the matter of population control. The new language deals with research. I am anxious to get a clarification of that statement.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The Senate version included a provision that—

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research in the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The House conferees were adamant in their opposition. After much debate the managers on the part of the House agreed to a modification of the Senate provision so that it provides that—

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into problems of population growth.

We are all concerned with the problems of population growth. The conferees, however, did not want this House or the Congress to go on record favoring disseminating information and the means of controlling population.

Mr. CAREY. Then we are not going into propaganda for dissemination of information or devices in this field? It is restricted to research into problems of population growth?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is right. The gentleman's understanding is absolutely accurate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the discussion we have had up to now indicates at least one area of fairly general agreement. I refer to the amounts under discussion in this bill. I think the agreement on the dollar figures between the House and the Senate is a reasonable one. It represents a very substantial reduction from what the executive branch suggested, and deems of great significance to this country. I hope it will not again be cut substantially when the appriation committee starts to operate on this program.

As has been said, the House receded on 21 items out of a total of 80, the Senate on 36, and 23 of the differences between the two bodies were modified in the course of the discussion.

The gentleman from Iowa has suggested that we have not been specific enough with respect to expropriation. May I point out that the language on the bottom of page 9 and at the top of page 10, of the conference report indicates very clearly our efforts to tighten up the existing language. It makes clear provision against what is known as creeping expropriation. This language should certainly provide additional weapons to fight against actions of the sort described by the countries which are receiving our assistance.

For reasons already mentioned by the chairman of the committee, the Peace Corps was specifically excluded from this flat prohibition. The language with respect to this appears on page 12 of the conference report; also excluded are the cultural exchange program, the Export-Import Bank, and famine and disaster relief provided under Public Law 480. All these exceptions seem to me to be reasonable. Even with these exceptions there is no question but that the program is very significantly tightened.

Mention has been made of the modification in the interest rates which recipient countries must meet. I should like to point out that the compromise which was reached provides for a 10-year grace period after which there is the imposition of a 2-percent floor. The executive branch pointed out to the conferees the very real importance of conducting this kind of operation with the abilities of the recipient countries in mind. They pointed out that development loans are repayable in dollars. Because most less developed countries are short of foreign exchange, their capacity to service their debt obligations to the United States will depend on their achieving an improvement in their foreign exchange earning capabilities.

Therefore, a most important feature in any loan repayment obligation of a recipient country is the grace period on principal repayments. It is because we do not wish to unduly burden these countries with unrealistic interest rates that we have felt it wise to continue a grace period for 10 years.

This is the principle we have been trying to get other lending countries to accept. It seemed to us wise to authorize this amount of grace period, rather than to have a rigid prohibition, and a requirement of the immediate installation of a 2-percent-interest floor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any other foreign nation that is making loans at less than 2 percent? Is it not true that other nations, if they make foreign loans, charge the Treasury rates of their particular governments plus a premium, if there is any significant risk involved?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course, the countries that are involved in various consortium agreements are obliged to go along with the terms agreed upon. That is one reason we have the provision saying that existing agreements cannot be tampered with.

To answer the gentleman, there are other countries that are lending money on terms comparable to ours. It is not that we are seeking to provide unrealistic terms for repayment. However, if we provide assistance to these countries, I think we must recognize we must give them some time to put their own house in order. Only by giving them a grace period can they generate enough from the loans to provide them with the wherewithal to meet these payments. Otherwise, we might just as well say we are not going to provide assistance of any kind. I recognize, of course, there are some who feel that we should not.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Was the point ever considered in conference that, perhaps, a slightly more practical return might permit us to stimulate the additional investments or even additional aid to those countries, if for no other reason than that we would be revolving our fund with greater money?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, we were not in a position to look into anything beyond the scope of what was in disagreement between the House and Senate, so there was no possibility of considering any new arrangement. Perhaps the gentleman feels higher interest rates are more practical, but if they kept underdeveloped countries from making arrangements with us, or increased the likelihood of their defaulting on obligations assumed, no one would be helped.

**Mr. MORGAN.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

**Mr. HAYS.** Mr. Speaker, I favor this conference report. I sat on the committee, and I want to say that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Morgan, was adamant in maintaining the position of the House. I think the fact that when you go into conference with as many items in disagreement as were in disagreement between this body and the other body, and with the House maintaining its position on almost a 2 to 1 ratio, it speaks well for the conferees and especially for the chairman whose leadership we follow.

There were some objections made to the money items. But, it has been my observation here that when money items are in disagreement between the two bodies, the usual procedure is to split the difference 50–50. We did a little better than that and the other body came a little farther our way than we went theirs. Again I think that speaks well for the chairman because he did endeavor at all times to maintain the position of the House.

The other area in which there has been some controversy is the most-favored-nation matter. I did point out that we agree this, under the rules of the House, belongs to the Committee on Ways and Means. But it was put in by the other body under their rules and it had to be disposed of.

I think it is fair to point out too, Mr. Speaker, although it has been said here that Yugoslavia is part of the monolithic Communist conspiracy that this is a debatable question. Just because it was said on the floor does not necessarily make it so. I think it is also fair to point out that the Communists in Russia have never felt quite sure of this themselves. I think that the advantage to our side has been that they have never known quite where Tito has stood. I have never thought that he was particularly our friend, but it has been worth something through the years to us to keep the Communists in Moscow in doubt as to where Tito and his numerous military divisions stood.

**Mr. BARRY.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. HAYS.** I yield to the gentleman from New York.

**Mr. BARRY.** I want to say that I am not a member of the conference committee, but I followed almost daily the accomplishments of the committee and I wish to commend the House conferees for the excellent job that they did. I feel that the will of the House has prevailed in the conference report and we should be proud indeed to vote for final passage of this bill.

**Mr. HAYS.** I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker I hope the conference report will be adopted.

**Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina.** Mr. Speaker, although I did not support this legislation in its final passage by the House earlier this year, I feel strongly that it was much more desirable than the compromise legislation presented to us today as a result of the conference with the Senate.

In its present form, H.R. 7885 abandons many of the long-overdue reforms called for in the bill as it originally passed the House. In fact, much of the original insistence by the House that the foreign aid program be tightened up has been watered down. There is little or no hope in this bill that meaningful congressional control will be reasserted.

Basically, the broad powers of the administrators of the foreign aid program, which were under such deserved attack on this floor, are now quietly sustained. The old arguments that "flexibility of policy" is required, have been used to cover a complexity of maladministration in the past. In acceding to the Senate's larger grant of authority and discretion to the White House and the administrators of this program, we are perpetuating the same powers which have existed so long. I still believe the Congress should demand reasonable standards of administration and that the discretionary powers should be sharply limited. These restrictions should certainly include a statement of congressional policy with respect to trade and aid with and to Communist countries. The compromise which perpetuates most-favored-nation treatment to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia is, in my opinion, unsupportable.

This bill adds $100 million to the funds originally authorized by the House. Important as this issue is, of even greater importance is the fact that in so many of its details, the bill concedes too much and recedes too far from the principles that guided the House a few months ago. If we agree to this report, we will be evading again the responsibilities that are clearly ours to force the reforms in foreign aid that we know must be made and which we know the American people are demanding.

**Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.** Mr. Speaker, careful study of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 reveals the compelling need for extensive reevaluation and revision of the use of these concepts by the United States as an instrument of foreign policy. Historically, I have generally supported our mutual security programs, although I have consistently voted to strip from these measures many of the wasteful and fiscally unsound features which have plagued these plans, particularly in recent years. It is readily apparent that many of my colleagues share this concern in that both Houses of this Congress have seen fit to sharply curtail certain aspects of the program originally sent up by the administration.

It is my opinion, however, that these revisions are somewhat random in nature and strike only at the most flagrant and obvious abuses that have perverted the intent of Congress in this respect. These revisions have been aimed at the symptomatic manifestations of the problem and not at the core or cause of the trouble.

Since the inception of the foreign assistance program, following the Second World War, the United States has undertaken to assist some 110 countries and territories. Eighteen years later we are presently assisting some 95 countries and territories. It therefore seems obvious, this aid must of necessity be thinly spread and increasingly dilute. How long can we continue to subsidize a majority of the nations on the face of the globe, regardless of our strength and wealth?

I believe that we must survey each recipient of our aid, nation by nation, program by program. Guidelines must be layed out and qualifying requirements should be rigidly established. Goals and objectives should be spelled out carefully and progress reports to the Congress should determine whether or not a nation should continue as a recipient of our aid.

I feel that we would be far wiser to concentrate our efforts toward realistic and practical goals involving fewer countries, than continuing to compound the evils of the scatter-gun techniques we continue to employ.

The military assistance aspect of this program should be thoroughly reappraised. The objectives of this undertaking should be redefined and the capabilities of such alinements weighed against the costs. The United States provides, in my opinion, a completely disproportionate share of the security requirements of our prosperous allies. The time has come to reassess these alinements.

In other instances these funds have been needed to build up military establishments in countries whose leaders have used such forces to perpetuate their own undemocratic regimes. Some of these governments have been frankly communistic and frequently antagonistic to the Govenrment of the United States. I seriously question the wisdom of continuing such programs until completely reevaluated.

The foreign assistance program is fraught with excessively poor administrative practices. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reports that in some instances funds obligated for projects were subsequently diverted to other uses when the projects did not materialize. This practice circumvents congressional control and should be terminated at once.

The committee declares that it is impossible to determine the true extent of foreign aid personnel costs because they are obscured by the diversity of sources from which they are paid and the practices of AID charging some employees to program costs. There are references by the committee to the expanding practice of "contract foreign aid" indicating that in excess of $435 million is administered under contract to AID. These private concerns in essence provide aid to various nations for a fee and in many instances this fee has been exorbitant. The cost for administration of some such contracts has exceeded $50,000 per man per year. I feel these practices demand a complete investigation and revision.

It should be emphasized the executive branch has participated in a number of additional administrative practices which are extremely reprehensible. Among these are the commitment of the

United States to future programs without the consent or approval of the Congress, misuse of our aid dollars to create government-owned installations to compete with free enterprise in various nations.

These practices must be halted.

In conclusion, I subscribe to the views of those members of the House Committee on Foreign Aid when they signed the minority views on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963:

> We believe it is high time for the Congress to pause and take a hard, realistic look at this entire program. We must put away the carrot and lay the facts of life before our allies. We must enunciate specific objectives which are within our means to achieve through foreign aid. And we must concentrate and sharpen our effort to secure those objectives.
>
> Most of all, we must not fool ourselves that the bill accompanying this report will accomplish any of these long overdue reforms.
>
> In the public interest, this is the course which we should follow. Until we do, the public interest demands that this legislation be defeated.
>
> To sum up—
>
> The aid program must be completely revised.
>
> The aid program must be brought, in all its financial aspects, under the unfettered control of the Congress.
>
> The aid program must be limited to the actual amount which the recipient countries can absorb effectively, and deobligated funds must immediately revert to the Treasury.
>
> The aid program must be withheld from countries which use it for the purpose of territorial expansion.
>
> The aid program must have stricter administrative supervision, and all "featherbedding" practices must be terminated.
>
> The aid program must require specific congressional authorization for each project exceeding $50 million.
>
> The aid program must be limited exclusive to non-Communist countries.
>
> The aid program must contain stronger safeguards to prohibit the use of our aid to finance government-owned productive facilities which compete with private enterprise in the recipient countries.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—195

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Brademas
Broomfield
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McFall
McIntire
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Minish
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Thornberry
Toll
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—164

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews,
  N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen,
  Don H.
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McLoskey
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Mills
Moore
Morris
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rich
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Scott
Secrest
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuten
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bell

NOT VOTING—74

Ayres
Bolling
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del
Cooley
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Dingell
Edwards
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Gill
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gurney
Hanna
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Jarman
Kee
Kelly
Kornegay
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Quie
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
St. George
St Germain
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.
Wright

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hemphill against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Edwards for, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Shriver against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Burton against.

Mr. White for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Jarman against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Stinson against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Michel against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

**Mr. BELL.** Mr. Speaker, on this vote I am recorded as voting "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN]. Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

**Mr. MORGAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

**The SPEAKER.** This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

**Mr. McMILLAN.** Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] for the purpose of calling up two bills.

## MAINTENANCE OF PERPETUAL ACCOUNTS

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 2054) to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in any case in which any money has been held in trust for, or for the account of, any person by the government of the District of Columbia pursuant to statute or otherwise, and no communication, in writing or otherwise as indicated by a written memorandum, has been received by the government of the District of Columbia concerning such money from the person entitled thereto, for a period of not less than ten years, the Commissioners shall send notice by registered or certified mail to the last known address of the person for whom such money is being held. Such mailed notice shall contain a statement that money is being held for such person and if no written claim for the return thereof is submitted to the Commissioners within sixty days of the date such notice is mailed, any future claim therefor will, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, be forever barred.

SEC. 2. (a) Not less than sixty days after the mailing of any notice pursuant to the first section of this Act the Commissioners shall publish notice once each week for two successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia. Such published notice shall be entitled "Notice of Names of Persons Appearing to be Owners of Unclaimed Money Held by the District of Columbia" and shall contain:

(1) The names and the last known addresses, if any, of the persons for whom moneys are being held (listed in alphabetical order of their surnames).

(2) A statement setting forth the substance of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) If no written claim for the return of any such money is submitted to the Commissioners by the date specified in the published notices, which date shall be not less than ninety days from the date of publication of the second notice, such money shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia and all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 3. In any case where any money held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia for the period of time and under the same circumstances as specified in the first section of this Act is in an amount less than the cost, as estimated by the Commissioners, of giving notice as required by the first two sections of this Act, such money may be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia without the necessity of complying with the notice requirements of sections 1 and 2 hereof, and after such deposit all claims for such money shall be forever barred.

SEC. 4. Upon the return of any money deposited with the government of the District of Columbia to the person making such deposit after notice has been given such person pursuant to this Act, the Commissioners are authorized to deduct from such returned money the costs of mailing and publishing notices required by this Act, and shall deposit the amount so deducted in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act, the word "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

May we have just a brief explanation of this bill?

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** Mr. Speaker, under existing law, the District of Columbia is required to hold in perpetuity funds paid into certain accounts under the custody of the District of Columbia. These include the juvenile court, the Highway Department, and other departments. This legislation will merely require that the District of Columbia hold these balances for a period of 10 years before they are covered into the general treasury.

**Mr. GROSS.** Since the funds for automobile insurance go into a specific fund—and I realize it is a comparatively small amount—but since this is an earmarked fund, would it not have been better to have provided that the unclaimed funds which have been paid in for the purpose of providing auto insurance should go to this earmarked fund? Does the gentleman agree that the funds that are paid in for a special and particular purpose, which are unclaimed, should go to the fund for which they were collected rather than into the general fund of the treasury or the general funds of the District of Columbia?

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** I would say to the gentleman that the average amount of these funds is only $20.

**Mr. GROSS.** But what is the total amount?

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** The funds involved amount to only $30,000.

**Mr. GROSS.** The average is not in excess of $20 in each account?

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** The average amount is only $20.

**Mr. GROSS.** That may be, but the cumulative amount of the funds is in excess of $20. If I remember correctly the unclaimed auto insurance funds total some $7,000. This would pay the damages in a number of accidents.

**Mr. HUDDLESTON.** There would be a few items that would be in excess of it. The average is only about $20 and the total amount is only $30,000 in all of the various accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, S. 2054, as set forth in the report—House Report No. 1001—is to provide procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved after a period of 10 years of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government.

Examples of such unclaimed accounts are moneys received from inmates of the Department of Corrections, juvenile court, patient coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Welfare, and money on deposit in the motor vehicle owners' and operators' financial responsibility fund.

The vast majority of these accounts are for small amounts, averaging less than $20 per account. However, we are advised that there are presently more than 1,000 such dormant accounts, totaling some $25,000. Following is a letter from Hon. Walter Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, addressed to Chairman JOHN L. McMILLAN under date of September 30, 1963, itemizing these accounts of unclaimed moneys.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, D.C., September 30, 1963.*

Re H.R. 8377, a bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: With further reference to your letter dated September 11, 1963, there is shown below an itemization listing the various types of deposits of unclaimed moneys. This listing is based on a study of the past 3 years.

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Highways and Traffic; unclaimed funds deposited for driveway construction, crossing sidewalk with trucks, tree removal, driveway construction | $2,422.35 |
| Department of Highways and Traffic, unclaimed funds deposited for plumber's guarantees | 1,331.97 |
| Department of Highways and Traffic; unclaimed funds deposited for building operations, damage to curb, sidewalk, roadway, and property damage, heavy hauling | 2,321.04 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of Corrections; unclaimed funds of inmates released or deceased, District of Columbia jail and Lorton, Va. | $1,141.81 |
| Juvenile court; unclaimed funds, support and restitution | 4,341.45 |
| Bond deductions of employees separated from the service of the District of Columbia and could not be located | 291.25 |
| District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (formerly municipal court), Civil Division; unclaimed funds over 6 years old, received by the court for cash bond, security cost, and deposits in the registry of the court | 4,543.26 |
| District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (formerly municipal court), Civil Division; unclaimed funds over 6 years old deposited for civil and landlord and tenant cases | 724.42 |
| Department of Motor Vehicles, Safety Responsibility Division, motor vehicle owners and operators financial responsibility fund, District of Columbia; moneys deposited by uninsured drivers or owners who were involved in accidents and being held by the District for the benefit of other parties involved in accidents for the period August 1955 to September 1963 and depositors cannot now be located | 7,748.93 |

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Under the terms of the bill, it is provided that after 10 years from the date of deposit of the money with the District government, or after 10 years from the date of the last communications received about such deposit, the money will be transferred to the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia, and all claims shall be forever barred where the persons entitled to the return of such money have failed to submit a written claim for such return after having been afforded notice by registered or certified mail, and newspaper publication of their right of reclaim.

The bill also provides that the costs incident to notification by mail and publication would be deducted from any amount claimed by a depositor. In instances of where the costs of notification exceeds the amount on deposit, then notification would not be required and the amount could be immediately transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

The actual saving to the District of Columbia in terms of man-hours and of space is difficult to estimate, but according to District officials it would be substantial.

A public hearing was held on October 4, 1963, on H.R. 8377, a bill which is identical to S. 2054. At this time, a representative of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and an official from the District of Columbia Finance Office testified in support of this legislation. No opposition to its passage was expressed.

The following letter was addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting this legislation:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, August 7, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve the District of Columbia of the administrative burden of maintaining from year to year indefinitely accounts of money deposited in trust with the District but not reclaimed by the persons depositing it. Examples of this type of account are unclaimed moneys in the dormant acounts kept in juvenile court, in the Department of Corrections (funds of inmates), in the Departments of Public Health and Public Welfare (funds of patients), and moneys in the motor vehicle owners' and operators' financial responsibility fund. The bulk of these accounts are for small amounts averaging less than $20 per account. Since the District of Columbia may have had no inquiries or claims concerning them for at least 10 years, the presumption is strong that the depositors who have not completely forgotten about their deposits have moved away, died, or otherwise abandoned all claims to the funds. However, audits of these accounts are made each year and records relating to the moneys must be maintained. Conceivably, the expense of maintaining any such record could, over the years, exceed the amount of money being held.

The bill provides that after 10 years from the date of the last communication received about any such unclaimed moneys held by the District of Columbia, they will be transferred to the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District, after the persons entitled to the return of such moneys are afforded notice, either by publication or by registered or certified mail sent to them at their last known address, of their right of reclaim. The costs of such notification would be deducted from any amount claimed by a depositor. In cases where the costs of notification would be more than the amount on deposit, such notification would not be required and the amount could immediately be transferred to the Treasury to the credit of the District. Currently, the cost of publishing notice is approximately $1.40 per name and address listed and the cost of sending a registered or certified letter is 25 and 65 cents, respectively.

It is estimated that more than 1,000 accounts could be closed out if this legislation were enacted. The saving to the District in man-hours and space in the maintenance of these accounts in the future is difficult to estimate, but undoubtedly would be substantial. Therefore, the Commissioners strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

Legislation somewhat similar to that proposed by the Commissioners is in effect in other jurisdictions, and, to a certain extent, in the District of Columbia, in that under existing District law the property clerk of the Police Department is authorized to dispose of unclaimed personal property which he has held for at least 6 months (R.S.D.C., sec. 417, as amended; District of Columbia Code, 1961 ed., sec. 4-160).

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to relieve the District of Columbia of the necessity of maintaining indefinitely accounts of money deposited in trust with the District but not reclaimed by the depositors. Such moneys accumulate in dormant accounts kept in the juvenile court, funds of inmates in the Department of Corrections, patients' money in the possession of the Department of Public Health and Public Welfare, and funds in the Motor Vehicle Owners' and Operators' Financial Responsibility Fund.

The vast majority of such accounts are in small amounts, less than $20, and although no inquiries or claims may be made for many years and it may reasonably be presumed in such cases that the depositors have forgotten about their deposits, died, or moved away and that no claim will ever be made, yet the District is required to make annual audits and maintain records of these accounts.

This bill would alleviate this situation by providing that when 10 years have elapsed since the last communication received about any such unclaimed moneys, such funds shall accrue to the credit of the District. Prior to this transfer of such funds, however, a final effort must be made to notify the persons entitled to the return of these moneys.

It is estimated that approximately 1,000 such accounts, totaling in the aggregate some $25,000, could be closed out immediately if this legislation is enacted, with a substantial saving in man-hours of clerical work and badly needed recordkeeping space.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## D.C. TRANSIT FRANCHISE ACT, DETERMINATION OF NET PROFITS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1533) to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That part 1, title I of the Act entitled "An Act to grant

**a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1956, is amended by striking therefrom "Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission".**

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HUDDLESTON**. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, S. 1533, as set forth in the report—House Report No. 1000—is to amend existing law—act of July 24, 1956, 70 Statutes at Large 598—so as to authorize the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of the D.C. Transit System's net operating income, and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes. Under the terms of D.C. Transit System's franchise, it is exempt from payment of these taxes to the District of Columbia, to the extent that its net earnings are less than 6½ percent of its gross operating revenues.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and approved by Congress on September 15, 1960 (Public Law 86-794, 74 Stat. 1031), for the purpose of regulating mass transportation within the Washington metropolitan area. With the exception of the District of Columbia fuel and real estate tax exemption certification, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has assumed all the regulatory functions pertaining to the D.C. Transit System which were originally performed by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission. The authority to perform this audit function was granted to the Public Utilities Commission by the act of 1956, which granted to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., a franchise to operate a public transportation system in the District of Columbia.

Subsequently, the Congress, in enacting legislation relating to school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia—act of June 28, 1962, Public Law 87-507, 76 Stat. 113—imposed upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the audit function of certifying to the District of Columbia Commissioners annually, the earnings of transit companies for purposes of computing school fare subsidies. Basically, this audit process is comparable to that used in arriving at a certification to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners required by fuel and real estate tax computations. Thus, under existing law, both the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission and the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission are required to make separate, yet duplicating audits. Enactment of this bill would eliminate such duplication and provide the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission with authority to make certification of the net operating income of D.C. Transit System, Inc., on the basis of data acquired through its overall regulatory operations and functions.

Under the terms of the compact which created the Transit Commission, the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia each have one member. The compact provides also that the member representing the District of Columbia—presently the Engineer Commissioner—maintains a veto authority over all decisions relating solely to the District of Columbia. Inasmuch as the certification of net operating income of the D.C. Transit System for the purpose of determining exemptions from the several District of Columbia taxes would affect only the District of Columbia, the concurrence of the District's representative on the Transit Commission would be required. Your committee is of the opinion that this provision in the compact is sufficient to assure that the interests of the District of Columbia will be adequately considered and protected, and that the enactment of this bill will in no way jeopardize those interests.

Our Subcommittee No. 5 held a public hearing on this bill on December 3, 1963, at which time enactment of the bill was recommended by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, and the D.C. Transit System, Inc. Opposition to its enactment was expressed by the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

The passage of this legislation will involve no additional expense to the government of the District of Columbia.

The letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives under date of May 7, 1963, requesting this legislation, follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, May 7, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.

The public transportation of passengers within the District of Columbia historically was regulated by the Public Utilities Commission (title 43, District of Columbia Code). In 1956 the Congress granted a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc., to operate a system of mass transportation of passengers for hire within the metropolitan area (Public Law 757, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 598 et seq.). Section 9 of the franchise act grants certain tax exemption to D.C. Transit System, Inc., and requires the Public Utilities Commission to make an annual determination of the company's net operating income and to certify the same to the District Commissioners for purposes of computing exemptions from taxes.

Section 12 contemplates the possible future transfer to another agency of any of the functions granted to or imposed on the Public Utilities Commission by the franchise act.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission was created by an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and approved by the Congress (Public Law 86-794, 74 Stat. 1031, Sept. 15, 1960), to regulate mass transportation of passengers for hire within the Washington metropolitan area. All of the regulatory functions of the Public Utilities Commission over D.C. Transit System, Inc., were transferred to the Transit Commission. The tax exemption certification was the only major function which was not transferred.

Legislation relating to school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia, was approved on June 28, 1962 (Public Law 87-507). It imposed on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission responsibility for the required certification incident to the computation of the amounts of the subsidies.

At the present time the Transit Commission is engaged in continuous regulation of D.C. Transit System and the WMA Transit Co., the only carriers presently transporting schoolchildren within the District of Columbia. The books of account of the companies are required to be kept according to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Transit Commission. Their fares are regulated by the Transit Commission. As noted above, the school fare subsidy certification is made by the Transit Commission. To carry out its functions, the Transit Commission must make detailed audits of the records of the companies. Under the terms of the compact, the District of Columbia representative on the Transit Commission has a veto over all matters relating solely to the District of Columbia. Thus, the interests of the District of Columbia are adequately considered and protected. It is presently necessary for the Public Utilities Commission to make an independent audit of D.C. Transit System, Inc., in order that it may lawfully render its own certification as to the motor vehicle fuel tax exemption. Thus, two Commissions are to this extent performing the same function.

The Commissioners recommend the enactment of this legislation which would transfer from the Public Utilities Commission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the function of making the annual determination of the net operating income of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and certifying the same to the District Commissioners.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
*President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.*

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the act of July 24, 1956, which granted a franchise to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., specified that this company should be exempted from payment of District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes to the extent that its annual net operating income does not exceed 6½ percent of its total gross operating revenues. All regulatory functions governing the operation of the D.C.

Transit System, including the annual determination of the company's net operating income and the certifying of the same to the District of Columbia Commissioners for the purpose of computing the above-mentioned tax exemptions, were of course vested in the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, created by a compact between Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, was approved by act of Congress on September 15, 1960, for the purpose of regulating mass transportation within the Washington metropolitan area. This Transit Commission then assumed all the regulatory functions pertaining to the operation of the D.C. Transit System, except for the annual certification of net operating income as a basis for computing exemption from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes, which has remained the responsibility of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission.

Public Law 87-507, approved June 28, 1962, granted a school fare subsidization to transit companies transporting school, children within the District of Columbia, and imposed upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the function of certifying annually to the District of Columbia Commisioners the net earnings of such transit companies for the purpose of computing the school fare subsidies.

Thus, at present both the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission are required to determine and certify to the District of Columbia Commissioners annually the net operating income of the D.C. Transit System—one for the purpose of computing the company's exemption from District of Columbia fuel and real estate taxes, and the other to determine the amount of the school fare subsidy.

S. 1533 would eliminate this duplication of time, effort, and expense by transferring from the Public Utilities Commission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the audit function of certifying the D.C. Transit System's net annual earnings to the District of Columbia Commissioners for the purpose of determining the company's exemption from motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes.

This transfer of function is logical also because the Transit Commission, by virtue of its responsibility for regulating the fares charged by D.C. Transit, is obliged to audit the financial operations of the company in detail and on a continuing basis.

The District of Columbia's representative on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, who at present is the District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner, is provided by the terms of the compact with a veto authority over all decisions of the Commission which relate solely to the District of Columbia. This veto power would extend, of course, to the certification of net earnings for the purpose of computing the D.C. Transit System's exemption from District of Columbia taxes; and thus, there appears to be ample assurance that the interests of the District of Columbia in this respect will be adequately protected.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8929) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that debate may be limited to 2 hours, that time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8929, with Mr. Holifield in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holifield). Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 8929, which we have before us today has elicited a great deal of comment on the floor already. I have observed that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about some of the content of this legislation, as well as the effect of some of the amendments which I understand will be offered.

Mr. Chairman, in the time that I shall take, I would like to complete my statement and then if anyone desires to have me yield to them, I shall be happy to do so at that time.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 8929, a bill authorizing the construction of a rapid transit system for Washington. This program was originally initiated by President Eisenhower. The present bill was supported by President Kennedy and is supported by President Johnson. It has the overwhelming support of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and it has the backing of every Federal agency concerned and of hundreds of citizens groups throughout the National Capital region.

At the outset, I would like to commend the members of Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District Committee for their careful consideration of the program and for their patient efforts to improve the transportation situation in Washington. They have devoted a great amount of their time to the problem and have given it a good deal of consideration.

Mr. Chairman, while sitting as a member of the House District Committee over the past several years, and listening to the statements of residents of the Nation's Capital about their problems, I have come to realize that this is a program of tremendous importance to Washington. The issue is a very simple one. Are we going to permit the National Capital to be engulfed in the growing congestion that pours more and more automobiles into the downtown area each day? Or will we take the step that must be taken, the step that the Congress had been leading up to for over 10 years now, to insure that our Nation's Capital will continue to be an attractive, vital city of which all our citizens can be proud. I say, our committee says, and three Presidents have said, that as the legislative body for the District of Columbia, we owe it to the people of the District and the people of our Nation to take that step—to authorize the construction of the rapid transit system that is essential if we are to solve the traffic congestion crisis in the Nation's Capital.

All of us are aware of the transportation problems of the Nation's Capital. Every day we see additional evidence of the wave of new development taking place throughout the northern Virginia and Maryland suburbs and in downtown Washington. The forecasts show that this growth will steadily continue. Each day we experience the inevitable product of this growth—the steady increase in traffic congestion brought about by more and more people making more and more trips in the metropolitan area.

It is plain to all that an expanded system of highways is necessary to help ease this congestion. And it is just as plain that new highways alone will not answer the problem. The conclusion is inescapable: we need a rapid transit system which can transport thousands of people into the city each morning and evening underground, free of surface congestion. With a rapid transit system we can solve the congestion problem; without one, there can be no hope for solution of this problem.

Our committee and the Congress have been very conscious of this problem for many years and we have taken a long series of steps leading toward the development of a rapid transit program. Some of the best engineering firms in the country, and a number of outstanding men in the transit field, have helped prepare the necessary plans. Experts in finance, and a committee composed of some of the Nation's leading businessmen, have assisted in the development of the proposed financing program for the rapid transit system. All that could be done to develop a sound and economic rapid transit system has been done. The work has been carefully scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget and by our committee. We have every reason to believe that the rapid transit system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is an excellent one, that it is economically sound and that it will do the job that is needed.

H.R. 8929 would authorize construction of a 23-mile rapid transit system including a subway in downtown Washington that will connect the Capital with the major employment and commercial centers within the city. Modern, attractive, high-speed trains will provide fast service within the downtown area and from the downtown area to several points immediately outside the physical borders of the District of Columbia.

The system will provide the dramatic improvement in public transportation in Washington that is needed if we are to encourage additional people to use public transportation and thus free our streets and highways of the present congestion. For example, during the rush hour it takes 23 minutes to travel by bus from the State Department to the Capitol. That trip could be made in 5½ minutes by rapid transit. The rapid transit running time between Takoma Park and downtown Washington will be approximately 14 minutes whereas it takes three-quarters of an hour to make the trip by bus today.

It is important to emphasize that the rapid transit system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is not designed to supplant highways, nor is it designed to replace bus operations. Its purpose is to complement these other facilities so that Washington will have a carefully balanced system of highway, bus, and rail rapid transit facilities. Large-scale bus operations provided by private enterprise will continue to be an important part of the region's transportation network.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the system is needed and our committee feels very strongly that the system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 is the best answer.

Furthermore, the financing program appears to be a sound one, placing the main burden of paying for the system on the rider and not on the Federal Government. Over 3 years ago, when our committee and the Congress were considering legislation to establish the National Capital Transportation Agency to prepare plans for a rapid transit system, we felt that such a system could be financially sound. Accordingly, the National Capital Transportation Act instructed the Agency to prepare a financing plan which would provide as far as possible for the payment of the capital and operating costs of the system by the users—with as little burden as possible upon Federal and local taxpayers. We believe the Agency did just that.

The system that would be authorized by H.R. 8929 will be financed in major part by the sale of revenue bonds. The forecasts are that revenues of the system will meet all operating costs and approximately 65 percent of the capital costs. The total Federal grant contribution to the system will be $120 million, and the contribution of the District of Columbia $21.7 million. The rest will be raised by the sale of revenue bonds underwritten as to principal and interest by the Federal Government. When you consider the fact that the Federal Government is spending in the neighborhood of $75 million a year on highway construction in this region alone, and that without a rapid transit system more highways will have to be built—for the most part with Federal dollars—than the highway departments of the region want to build, and that these additional highways still won't provide the answer, it seems clear to me that the proposed Federal contribution to the rapid transit system is entirely reasonable. To put it another way, the cost to the Federal Government of not building a rapid transit system will be greater than the cost of building one. And again I want to say that it will be the riders of the system—the people of the National Capital region—who will bear the heaviest part of the cost of the system.

I want to make one point clear. I regard this bill as entirely unrelated to the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, the presently pending bill to provide Federal matching grants to cities throughout the country for the construction of mass transportation systems. The bill before you today applies solely to the District of Columbia and it is before you solely because of the unique Federal interest in the District and the fact that the Congress is the District's legislative body. Without our action and support no rapid transit system can be built in the District. I, for one, consider the national mass transit bill to raise issues of Federal financial and administrative involvement in local matters that are completely unrelated to the issue at hand. In contrast, under the Constitution, the Federal Government is very deeply involved in the affairs of the Nation's Capital, for these affairs were rightly considered by the framers of the Constitution to be matters of national concern. It is for these reasons that I support the bill presently before you. The national mass transit bill is a completely different question that must be decided on its merits at another time.

The committee has faced two issues which I believe require comment.

First, there has been a proposal that the present legislation include the provision that private enterprise would construct and operate the rapid transit system. Insofar as construction is concerned, our committee feels very strongly that a public works program of this magnitude requires the constant scrutiny of the Congress and I believe it should be undertaken by the responsible Federal agency that is already charged with this task. Insofar as the question of operation of the system is concerned, it is the view of our committee that this is an issue that requires further attention and study before a decision can be made. The system will not begin to operate for at least another 4 or 5 years and while construction goes forward the Congress will have ample opportunity to consider the question of how the system should be operated. There is no reason to consider this matter now or to delay construction of the system while the matter is being decided.

Second, it has been proposed that the present bill include a rather complicated labor relations policy covering such matters as collective bargaining, arbitration of disputes and protection of job rights. A very similar provision was proposed 3 years ago when the Congress was considering the legislation establishing the National Capital Transportation Agency and the Congress included in the act a provision stating in the clearest of terms that before an operation could begin, Congress would enact a bill establishing such a labor relations policy. It was the feeling of the committee that a bill establishing a labor relations policy at the present time would be premature and that this matter should be considered at a later date when we consider the matter of who should operate the system. The key point is that in the interim, labor will be completely protected by the present provision of the National Capital Transportation Act, which remains in force; that no operation can begin until a bill setting forth a labor relations policy for the Agency has been enacted.

Mr. Chairman, many people, including the members of our committee, have spent much of their time and energy for over 10 years to develop this program. In the meantime, the very problem that this program is designed to solve—the traffic congestion problem in our Nation's Capital—has grown worse and worse. The time for action to solve the problem has arrived, if it is not in fact overdue.

I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 8929.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. As a member of the subcommittee, and I attended most of the hearings of the subcommittee, I do not recall that there was any testimony that private interests would construct this proposed subway system. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITENER. I remember no such testimony and I can say the gentleman from New York was present faithfully and I am sure that one of us would have heard it if it had been said.

Mr. HORTON. The question has been asked of me, whether or not private interests or private enterprise would construct this system, and I have made the statement no such interest has been shown even in such construction and I also think it should appear in the RECORD that this proposal is only for the authorization of construction and does not pertain to the operation of the system as such.

Mr. WHITENER. That is correct. May I say in response to what the gentleman has just said that I understand this so-called private enterprise proposition that will be offered merely means the taxpayers of the United States and of the District of Columbia will still do what this bill requires and turn it over to some nameless individuals who want to take the taxpayers' money and try to build the system.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the House now has before it for action H.R. 8929, a bill to authorize the construction of a rail rapid transit system in the District of Columbia and, to a limited extent, to its immediate environs. It comes to the floor with the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and against a background of some 10 years of careful study and preparation.

Passage of the bill is absolutely essential to the health, well-being, and beauty of our Nation's Capital.

During the 10 years that have gone into the development of this program, the efforts of the Congress to improve transportation in Washington have been entirely bipartisan. The program was begun during President Eisenhower's administration, it was continued during the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, and it has the strong support of President Johnson.

As the representative of the 10th District of Virginia, and as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I, for one, have devoted much of my time and effort during my 11 years in the Congress to this program. I have done so because I know that an improved transportation system is of vital importance to the many thousands of people in northern Virginia who have to cross the Potomac River each morning and evening on their way to or from work and to the millions of citizens in our country who take pride in our Nation's Capital. I believe, therefore, that passage of this bill is of the greatest importance.

The bill before us calls for a major innovation in National Capital transportation, the introduction in Washington of a modern, high-speed, high-capacity rail rapid transit system. It represents a major undertaking to preserve the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital, and to enhance the economic health and vitality—and the livability of the National Capital community. And it is directly related to the efficient and effective performance of the work of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I have often stated my conviction that the District of Columbia is a national trust, and that all our citizens have a direct interest not only in its day-to-day government, but in all decisions respecting its welfare. I can state without hesitation that at no time during my years of service in the House and on the District Committee have we brought forth legislation more important to the welfare of the region than this. The transportation problems of the National Capital region have grown ever more serious with the passage of years. In this age of jets and rocketry, Washington is beset by a creeping paralysis of its transportation system during the critical periods of the day. The influx of visitors on special occasions makes downtown Washington a place to be avoided. In bad weather, traffic comes to a complete standstill. And the forecasts show that the region will steadily expand and this problem will steadily get worse unless we act promptly to construct a rapid transit system. If Washington is to remain the beautiful, spacious, exciting city it is today; if our Capital is to be free to develop and enhance its resources in a manner befitting its position of leadership in the free world; if we are to accommodate the tremendous growth and development anticipated for the National Capital region in years that lie ahead, action is needed now to bring present relief and to gear our transportation facilities to the future.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has long recognized that because of their inevitable impact on the life and development of the community, decisions on major transportation improvements in Washington had to be carefully weighed. Consequently, under the aegis of the District Committee and the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems of the 85th and 86th Congresses, steps were taken by the Congress to obtain comprehensive studies of the region's transportation problems and requirements. The National Capital Planning Act of 1952 called for the formulation and adoption by the National Capital Regional Planning Council of a coordinated areawide development plan—including plans for land use, major thoroughfares, and mass transportation. From 1955 to 1959, more than $400,000 was appropriated to the Commission and Council for the performance of special transportation studies, and the preparation of a plan for regional transportation improvement.

This study was one of the most exhaustive transportation investigations ever conducted in any American city. It took 4 years to complete. While it was underway our joint committee conducted a number of independent research projects on transportation and other metropolitan problems. We kept close watch over the major study and held hearings to check its progress. When it was completed in 1959, President Eisenhower forwarded it to the Congress for consideration, and in November of that year the joint committee held 6 days of public hearings on its content and recommendations.

The 1959 study was an examination in depth of the transportation problems faced by the region. It made clear that if Washington and the National Capital region are to continue to thrive and grow in an orderly manner, a balanced, coordinated areawide transportation system is essential. This study made it absolutely clear that an improved system of highways is necessary but that highways alone cannot meet the region's critical congestion problem. To move the huge number of people that enter and leave downtown each working day, and to relieve the pressures on the highway system, a vastly improved network of public mass transportation facilities is essential. The 1959 study concluded that a system of rail rapid transit, operating on exclusive rights-of-way, should be developed for this purpose, and it was evident from our hearings that this approach had the enthusiastic support of virtually every public and private agency, organization and individual whose views were heard. There was then, and there is today, widespread public demand for the establishment of a rail rapid transit system.

On March 14, 1960, Mr. Chairman, I introduced in the House a bill, H.R. 11135, which was later enacted as the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. The 1959 transportation study had shown us the way. It had identified the problems. It had not, however, produced a program for rapid transit development in sufficient detail of design, preliminary engineering of routes, cost estimates, traffic studies, recommendations on financing—and we needed an organization qualified and equipped to do the job. My bill was calculated to move us forward to the point of action. The organization created by the 1960 Act—the National Capital Transportation Agency—has given us 2½ years of detailed preparation. We now have the engineering, cost, traffic, and financial information needed for an action program. The Agency's work has weathered the tests of official and public scrutiny. I am satisfied that it has performed its job well, and am confident that the Congress has a sure footing for the action now requested of it.

The bill before us now would authorize the construction of some 23 miles of rail rapid transit within the District of Columbia and to terminal points short distances beyond the District line in Virginia and Maryland. It also authorizes the establishment of an up-to-date commuter railroad service from Union Station through much of Prince Georges County to Bowie, Md., on the existing facilities of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Under the bill a downtown subway line will be constructed along G Street NW., from 12th Street east to Judiciary Square to the Capitol. Radial rapid transit lines will extend to Van Ness Street NW., to Columbia Heights NW., Pentagon City and Rosslyn in Arlington, Woodside near Silver Spring in Montgomery County, and Anacostia in Southeast Washington. Except for the line to Montgomery County and the one to Bowie, both of which will occupy existing railroad right-of-way, the service will be in subways within the District. Operations will be conducted with the most modern high-speed, high-capacity transit equipment available. The total estimated cost of constructing and equipping the facilities will be $400.6 million.

A key feature of the program is that its costs are to be met primarily by the users and not by the taxpayers. This amount will be raised by a combination of grants from the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, and proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds in the private market underwritten as to principal and interest by the Federal Government. The direct outlay of Federal funds will total $120 million. The District's contribution will be $21.7 million. The balance of $258.9 million plus interest requirements during construction will be repaid out of the revenues of the system. It is anticipated that the system will repay its bonded debt over a period of 36 years, and that we may reasonably expect a refunding of government grants during later years.

I want to emphasize that these forecasts are based on a fare structure that is very similar to presently prevailing fares; that is, a 25-cent base fare within the 10-mile square and a maximum of 55 cents to the farthest point, which is Bowie, Md.

Mr. Chairman, under the very able leadership of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the District Committee has examined this system and its proposed financing with the utmost care.

In view of my own deep concern for the transportation problem over the years, I have taken special pains to assure myself that the program now proposed to the Congress is a correct solution. I am pleased to be able to say that in my opinion the proposal before us now is sound in every respect.

The construction cost estimates have been carefully developed. The Agency's forecasts of operating costs, traffic, and revenues have been expertly prepared, and are reasonable. I am convinced that every effort has been made to treat these factors conservatively. In my judgment there is every reason to expect that the proposed transit system will be an economically viable, self-sufficient operation. When the Congress enacted the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, we recognized that if major transportation improvements are to be undertaken in the National Capital region, financial participation by the Federal Government is a prerequisite. In the 1960 act, we called for a plan of finance which would place the principal financial burden on the persons benefiting from transportation improvements. The present bill does just that. The bulk of the expense will be borne out of the farebox, and the direct Federal and District contributions are, I think, appropriate and reasonable.

The facilities to be constructed under the bill will be confined largely to the District of Columbia, the area of special interest to the Congress. They will go far toward relieving surface traffic congestion in the central city, and will bring to Washington the type of fast, efficient mass transportation that presently exists in all of the other major capitals of the world. This bill will fulfill the Federal Government's obligation for transportation improvement in the National Capital region. It will establish a system which may later be extended throughout the region by the Agency in cooperation with the local governments. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, of the soundness of the present investment. The financing of this program has been handled in a clear-headed, businesslike manner. For an immediate outlay of $141.7 million in Federal and District of Columbia funds, the National Capital will obtain a $400 million rapid transit system—with reasonable expectation of a recovery in full of the expenditure. I commend this to the House as good business.

I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that the bill before us now leaves many important questions unanswered. This legislation is designed to enable us to begin. It is limited to the construction of the needed facilities. This will be a time-consuming proposition, should move forward without delay, and can get started with the grant funds called for by the program. Additional legislation will be required to authorize the required revenue bond financing, and the operation of the facilities. This will be prepared as construction progresses. It will involve complex questions concerning the nature of the organization which is to control and operate the system, the rights of the private transportation companies that are presently serving the region, labor relations, and many others. I agree completely with the committee's judgment that these are matters which require more study and investigation than has been possible to date. We are dealing here with a major construction program. Transit operations cannot reasonably be anticipated before 1970, and there is no reason to rush decisions on many subjects of major importance. At the same time, it would make no sense at all to delay construction until all matters have been resolved. This program has been 10 years in the making. The Congress has before it all the information it needs to launch the construction phase. H.R. 8929 is the first order of business, and it should be enacted without delay.

All have recognized that major transportation improvements such as that authorized by the bill before us today are essential if the beauty, the dignity, and the economic vitality of the National Capital are to be preserved and enhanced. This is indeed a matter which transcends party lines, and has a strong appeal to all Americans. I want to commend all of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee for the years of devoted effort it has taken to produce today's bill.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of my district, the people of the District of Columbia, and the citizens of the Nation as a whole, I urge the enactment of H.R. 8929.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. May I say by way of preliminary remarks that I am not hostile to this legislation. I am trying to find out something about it. I have not made up my mind as to how I shall vote and I intend to listen to the discussion.

I recognize this city needs a rapid transit system, but I would like to have someone explain the formula or the basis on which the committee justifies recommending that all of the taxpayers of the United States pay 30 percent of the cost and that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay only 5 percent of the cost. If the gentleman will go into that and give us the thinking of the committee and the formula that was used to arrive at the apportionment I would appreciate it.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I will confess that the formula came originally from the formula in the originally proposed national transit bill. I should like to point out to the gentleman from North Carolina it is provided in that bill that two-thirds of the costs in the various metropolitan areas of the country be paid by the Federal Government, and 33.3 percent by the local communities; that is, in the original $800 million recommendation which I referred to. It was provided that the local communities, the District of Columbia, and the suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia should each contribute $60 million, and the Federal Government $120 million.

When we cut the program in half, it eliminated the suburban communities from the program, but it left in the $20 million for the District of Columbia and the fully recommended Federal contribution.

It is not too important whether the Federal contribution is $120 million or $60 million or $20 million. Sixty-five percent of the total cost will be financed by revenue bonds. This is the Nation's Capital. I am not going to be facetious, but this is the Nation's Capital. If we do anything in improving the transportation situation here in Washington, or solving any other problems which it might have, whether it be in education or police protection, whatever it may be, we are going to have to spend money, and we are going to have to provide the financing. We could tax the District of Columbia to a point of disminishing returns but this would accomplish no useful purpose. We have just finished deliberating a bill for the District of Columbia in which we provided an increase to $50 million in the Federal contribution to the Nation's Capital and also an increase in its borrowing authority. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] pointed out that the District last year had borrowing authority which could be used for financing $21 million for the District of Columbia's portion. But again, we are hoping that the $120 million can ultimately be repaid. But it is up to the Congress to make the grant as recommended in the bill or in the form of a loan. I do not think we can shirk our responsibility to see that the Nation's Capital is properly financed or properly run.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I pointed out that a member of the committee staff in conference with Mr. Schuyler Lowe, Director of Finance of the District of Columbia, states that Mr. Lowe has expressed the opinion it will not be necessary to resort to this extra borrowing authority that we granted to the District. He feels that since this is to be paid out over a period of years to the District of Columbia it could be taken care of through current revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the very fine presentation he has made here today. I want to commend both him and my other distinguished colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee for the sustained and careful interest and effort they have devoted to the preparation of the program now before us. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, every Member of the House can and should take great pride in today's accomplishment, for the transit development program before us today is the product of many years of planning and preparation which have had the continuing and enthusiastic support of the whole Congress from the beginning.

As the National Capital, the District of Columbia is the showplace of our Nation. It symbolizes our heritage of democratic freedom and progress, and it is from within its precincts that the power and prestige of the Nation is exercised. Its public buildings and monuments memorialize our national traditions and institutions and stand as living expressions of our history of freedom and democratic government. Washington is the reception place of the Nation. It is the mecca of millions of visitors every year from throughout the Nation and the world. Every American has a direct interest in preserving its beauty and dignity as a city and seeing to it that conditions are right for its orderly growth as an economically healthy and vital community. The passage of H.R. 8929 is of tremendous importance to the National Capital and all of our citizens have a stake in what we do here today.

Mr. Chairman, unless the Congress takes prompt action to improve transportation in Washington, the physical integrity of the city will be endangered and its cultural and economic life will be stifled. Since 1940 the population of the Washington metropolitan area has increased from some 970,000 people to over 2 million. By 1980 3½ million are expected, and by the year 2000 this may be a community of 5 million. These past years have been ones of ever-increasing street traffic congestion. Automobiles have multiplied so that movement in the Nation's Capital is agonizingly slow during critical hours. Weather hazards bring everything to a standstill. Who of us can forget the snows and traffic problems of the last inauguration day. This will be repeated time and again unless corrective action is taken now.

Our distinguished colleague from North Carolina has given us the history of the bill before us now. It is the product of 10 years' preparation. We recognized long ago that major transportation improvements are required. The transit development program authorized by this bill has weathered the test of public scrutiny and examination. The construction of subway rail rapid transit for Washington has the strong support of the administration, of all interested Federal agencies and of the local governments and planning bodies of the National Capital region. This solution to the transportation problem has been endorsed by some 500 citizens, professional, trade, and political organizations. The public demand for a rapid transit system is unmistakably clear.

I have said that passage of this bill is important to the Nation because the future of our Capital City is involved. I think Mr. Chairman, that we should also ask ourselves just what this program will mean for the people of the community whose welfare is the peculiar and unique concern of the Congress. If we do so it becomes apparent that in addition to preserving and enhancing the beauty of the National Capital, the program will produce many desirable benefits for the community.

For example, consider the benefits to labor and business. Preliminary estimates of the labor and materials required for construction of the facilities indicate that average manpower requirements for construction over a 5-year period will amount to some 3,800 jobs, including the employment of miners, engineers, teamsters, carpenters, electricians, and many other skills. More than 1,700,000 cubic yards of concrete involving over 2 million yards of sand and aggregate and almost 2½ million barrels of cement will be needed. Lumber requirements will approximate 175 million board feet and some 400 tons of steel will be needed. The program will mean major opportunities for business and labor. It will relieve unemployment and open a new market for materials. In short, Mr. Chairman, this program will be a significant contribution to the economic well-being of the region.

Furthermore, by relieving traffic congestion the facilities created will do much to infuse new life in the commercial areas in Washington. Property values along the routes of the system will increase and the tax base of the District will be enhanced. The time saved in travel alone can be measured in the millions of dollars.

By facilitating movement into and through downtown the proposed transit facilities will do much to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Government operations. This bill will bring to Washington a modern system of transport of the type already available in every other major capital of the world. Indeed, we can expect that the system created for Washington will be a substantial improvement over these others. After 10 years of planning and faced with the prospect of paralyzing traffic congestion in the years ahead our responsibility and opportunity today is to get on with a solution.

I have said that this legislation has the overwhelming support of the people. I should like to point out, however, that concern has been expressed over the failure of this legislation to include any provision dealing with the rights of labor and that an amendment was proposed before our committee providing that private enterprise would operate the system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure each and every Member of the House that all of these matters have received the careful and studious attention of the District Committee. We did not treat these matters in the bill because we felt they were premature. This legislation involves no attempt to dispose of or pass judgment on these questions. The facilities authorized by H.R. 8929 will require many years to construct. Transit operations cannot reasonably be anticipated before 1970. In the judgment of the committee, the most pressing task at hand is to get on with the construction phase of this program. Action in this direction is already long overdue. The concerns I have just mentioned involve very complex issues, the resolution of which will require careful decisions in order to achieve a proper balancing of the public and private interests involved. In view of the overriding public demand for immediate action on construction and the fact that several years remain during which such judgments can be reached, it would make no sense at all to delay this phase of the program. Instead, it is the considered opinion of our committee that the time available before transit operations can commence should be devoted to careful study and investigation of such issues so that the ultimate decisions on them will be correct ones.

In the meantime the rights of the private transportation companies in the area and the interests of my good friends in the labor movement will be undisturbed. In fact, as I have pointed out earlier, the bill by providing new jobs here and throughout the country will be a very great help to labor. The activities of the National Capital Transportation Agency under this bill will continue to be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. Section 205(a)(2) of that act provides that the Agency shall not operate any transit facilities or provide by agreement for the operation of transit facilities, until the Congress shall establish for the Agency a labor relations policy, defining labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to arbitrate disputes, and to safeguard job rights. Transit labor is thus assured that its concerns will be met before operations can begin.

By the same token section 205(a)(2) of that act also provides that the Agency shall not acquire facilities, property, or rights-of-way of private motorbus companies and persons; or operate buses or similar motor vehicles or make agreements for the provision of motorbus service competitive with private transit companies. The question of operation of the rapid transit system can be dealt with by the Congress while construction moves ahead.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the 1960 act and the present bill constitute reasonable protection for both labor and industry. All we are being asked to do today is to get on with the work of construction. Additional legislation will be required before transit operations can begin and I want to assure any who may be concerned over the matters we leave open today that the rights of labor and industry will be protected in such subsequent legislation.

I might say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] proposed an amendment which is sponsored by labor to the bill which I supported in committee. I might say I expect to support his amendment today, but I do want to make it clear that I shall support this bill whether or not this amendment is offered, believing there is ample time to settle this issue at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation as a whole and the people of the National Capital region have waited long for action by the Congress on this important and critical subject. Transportation relief in Washington can come about only if the Federal Government commits itself to the task and takes the first step. Passage of H.R. 8929 is that step. I commend the bill to the House. The future welfare of our Capital City hinges on its passage.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on a very fine statement and also to take this opportunity to urge the House to give favorable consideration to the amendment referred to by the gentleman when it comes up later this afternoon.

May I say as a fellow member of the committee that I concur in everything that the gentleman has said. I feel it is most important that this legislation come to grips with the amendment dealing with appropriate labor provisions today. This can be done. As the gentleman has pointed out, they are reasonable, and I only hope that we will act favorably upon it in the Committee today.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 225]

Ayres
Bolling
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Carey
Celler
Clawson, Del
Cooley
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Edwards
Fogarty
Gill
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gurney
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Jarman
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Leggett
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Powell
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Roybal
St. George
St Germain
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Stephens
Stinson
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Holifield, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8929 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 345 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8929. I sat on the subcommittee and I listened to hours of testimony concerning this legislation. When a vote was taken to report this bill, I was one of the members who opposed its being reported.

For the life of me I am unable to differentiate between a system of this type as proposed by this legislation and those systems to be proposed in the so-called mass transportation legislation.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose that legislation and with the same vigor that I am opposed to this. This bill provides for a so-called bobtailed rapid transit system. It will be paid for in the following manner—$21.7 million by the District of Columbia, by a direct contribution, and $120 million by the taxpayers of the U.S. Government, because this is a Federal contribution, and $258.9 million by a bond issue carrying 4.5 percent interest and which is subject to tax.

The assumption has been advanced that the cost of this system will be borne by the riders themselves. First, I would like to point out that the $121 million proposed as the initial Federal contribution will not be repaid under this act to the Federal Government. What if this curtailed system does not pay off financially? What if some of these fine estimates that we have been given today go wrong? It looks to me as though the Federal Government will not only lose its $121 million contribution but will be saddled with requirement that we make good the $258.9 million in bonds and possibly be on the hook for the $21.7 million for the District contribution.

I would like to say that I have talked to many people on both sides of this issue. Certainly my objection to rapid transportation, if I can use that description, in the District of Columbia is exactly similar to my opposition to this type of transportation system in any other city in the United States, if the Federal Government is required to pay for it.

It is my understanding a motion will be made to recommit this bill. I shall support the motion to recommit and urge the Members of this body to do likewise.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I read this morning, I think, in an editorial in one of the local newspapers that this $121 million was not very much but was just a starter and that later on more Federal funds could be obtained. Could the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I think the point is well taken by the gentleman from Washington. I think $121 million is a lot of money. However, I did read the same editorial he refers to, and it is apparently a feeling among some of the people in the District that they will come back and see the Federal Government at some future time and ask them for additional funds to carry out this system.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman tell us how realistic are these figures, and how they were compiled, that appear in table 12 on page 39 of the report, these very heavy net revenues after depreciation? How were those estimates compiled?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I compliment the committee on securing the very best witnesses and the very best authority possible on those figures. We received those figures which appear in the hearings, and while I cannot give all the names of all the different organizations and individuals who testified, we did secure the most knowledgeable information possible from the leading transit authorities and experts in the Nation. We did have those people before our committee and they presented the figures that appear in the table.

Mr. JONAS. They were not based on comparisons with other rapid transit systems—for example, the one in New York City?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Yes, sir; they do compare, some of their basis is a comparison with other cities' transit authority.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. I take it the gentleman from Washington was referring to an editorial in the Washington Post this morning. If so, I fail to see anything in that editorial to support the gentleman's position. I do know that the editorial said that.

I did see the following sentence:

> To those who find the bill's subway system too small, the answer is that it can be expanded later.

That does not imply any additional Federal funds. I think that should be made abundantly clear.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] that I appreciate his diligent service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I also appreciate his candor in his statement that he is opposed to any mass transportation system anywhere; that he is not saying that this one is not a sound sysem that we are proposing in this legislation. As I interpret what he says he is just "agin" it, period.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. That is a pretty good summation of my position. I oppose the building of public transportation systems at the expense of the taxpayers for the use of a limited few.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I think rather than the item to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred as being in the Washington Post, he may have had in mind the editorial in the Star over the weekend in which they said that this is just a little bite as a beginning for massive expenditures.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. It was in one of the Washington papers; which one, I do not recall.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to start talking sense, and dollars and cents, about transportation in Washington and to do something about it.

I recently stated that I consider the rapid transit bill presently pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia a must item. And, so far as I have been able to determine, it is the sense of the Congress that a rapid transit system is urgently needed.

The only fly in the ointment appears to be the apparently useless debate over the so-called highway-transit issue. I use the phrase "so-called" advisedly because if there is a real issue involved I am not aware of it.

We need the Interstate Highway System in Washington and we need it as soon as we can get it. We need a rapid transit system in Washington and we need it as soon as possible. I cannot believe that anyone can seriously question the need for either of these facilities.

The only portion of the Interstate Highway System in Washington that I understand to be in question consists of two projects: An additional bridge across the Potomac and the north leg of the inner loop. These have been temporarily deferred to see if there is not a way to construct them so as to avoid injury to parklands and undue displacement of people. It is my further understanding that rapid progress is being made on means of constructing these projects in such a way as to avoid or minimize the taking of parklands and the displacement of people and that in a short time the President will announce the results of the study so that these important projects can move forward promptly.

It is essential that construction of a rapid transit system in Washington move forward with equal speed. Indeed, the usefulness of the Interstate Highway System depends to a very large extent on the existence of a companion rapid transit system. For if there is any question concerning the future of the highway system in Washington it is the question of whether the highway system will suffer the fate of so many other urban freeways around the country which are intolerably congested with automobiles almost from the moment the ribbon is cut. Is this system, originally designed to speed interstate travel through and around Washington, to become just another huge artery clogged with suburban commuters many of whom would prefer to use rapid transit?

This may seem to be a gloomy forecast, but, unfortunately, it will come true all too soon unless we take steps now to build a rapid transit system capable of easing the load on our highways.

The trucker who wants to move around Washington faster than he does today is in for a rude awakening if we do nothing more than finish the Interstate Highway System. The fact that his trucks can use a new highway will be little consolation to him if the highway is so jammed with commuters that traffic moves no faster on the highway than it does on today's streets.

The motorist who hopes that the highway system will provide him a fast means of traveling around downtown in the rush hour also has some sad news in store for him if no rapid transit system is built. He will find himself slowed to a crawl by other motorists, many of whom are destined downtown and would be glad to leave their cars at a suburban parking lot and use rapid transit into town.

Introduction of fast, comfortable, convenient transportation to downtown via rapid transit would lure thousands of drivers from congested streets and highways. Most local traffic would thus be diverted, leaving Washington's new freeway system available for its intended purpose—swift passage to and through downtown by motorists, buses, and trucks.

We can insure that these planned freeways serve their intended purpose by acting favorably upon H.R. 8929. The recent hearings on these bills by the House District Committee showed wide ranging bipartisan support for rapid transit in Washington.

We owe it to all citizens of this country to maintain an efficient transportation system for our Nation's Capital. It is imperative that we support this vital legislation.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill for several reasons.

No. 1, I think we must put first things first and that we should, if we had only as little as $20 million of District money to spend in the District, spend it on education and educational facilities first.

No. 2, this bill completely ignores the rights of labor.

No. 3, I think the planners who came in with the plan are utterly incompetent as planners, and if they are incompetent as planners, they are more incompetent as builders and operators of a subway system.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little amused as I stand here and recall that for many years I have advocated the enactment of bills which have come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency and have been accused of driving private enterprise out of our system, out of our economic system, and replacing it with Government.

Here I find today practically all of the people who have charged that against me are now advocating public ownership and operation of a new transit system in the District of Columbia. I am standing here again advocating private enterprise.

I say if this system is to be built, it is going to be built, owned, and operated by the District of Columbia, if this bill is enacted. The overall mass transportation bill we have been trying to get enacted calls for a half-billion dollars for the whole country, including the District of Columbia.

This bill, you are told, will call for $400 million just for the District of Columbia. Is that all? Read the bill and you will find this is a blank check. There is no limitation of amount as to what this Agency may spend, but it does provide that every dollar that is going to be spent will come out of the District of Columbia revenues by grant or out of the U.S. Treasury by grant or it will be guaranteed by the U.S. Treasury. In other words, every dollar will be Government money or Government guaranteed.

I said that the planners were incompetent. The charge should not be made unless it can be sustained. Originally the bill that is now the law, to which this bill is to be an amendment, was enacted on the representation that it was to set up an agency to do some planning and come back with a plan. It provided, after they brought the plan back, the Congress would enact further legislation authorizing them what to do.

Take a look at the original law now on the books and you will find it also provides that the Agency may build, own, and operate the system. There have been some statements made that when they get to operating 2 or 3 years from now they will then talk about whether private enterprise will be brought in. It is my opinion that this Agency, if authorized to build will operate also.

What did this Agency do, if anything, about inviting private enterprise in?

Mr. Chairman, the question was asked earlier in the debate whether or not private enterprise indicated any interest in doing this job. The job must be done, of course, but it should be done privately. As I have said, whenever private enterprise can do the job, the Government should not do it.

If you will look at the supplemental hearing, pages 40, 41, 42, and 43, you will find proposals by private enterprise to do part of this job. They tell you they can do a job of improving transportation in the District of Columbia by spending $103 million of their own money. They also tell you after improving surface transportation that they propose to provide for a realistic test project, a rail rapid transportation system, in an area most suitable for such a system. Such "an experimental project will provide an opportunity for extensive operational study prior to expending what would inevitably be a minimum of $1 billion on an areawide subway system."

Those of you who spend your weekends here in Washington know you do not have too much of a traffic problem here on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. You have your traffic problems the other 5 days a week.

If you want to correct your transit situation here in the District of Columbia, arrange for people to get into the District by rapid transit, so they do not come in by automobile. Let them leave their automobiles in parking lots around the periphery of Washington as we do in New York City and then use the subway system in the city.

These planners are going to compound the difficulty by building a subway first, the experimental part right in the heart of the city. How are you going to get there except by bringing the automobiles to the heart of the city in order to use the subway? That is why I say the planners were incompetent. This bill should be returned to the committee and further study given to it, and a proper plan brought in so that we can get a rapid transit system that will do the job.

I say private enterprise should first be asked to do it. If they cannot do it, then let the Government step in and do it for the public.

I repeat, there is not a single limitation dollarwise in this bill or in the original act. It is true it is only an authorization. The original act authorized them to spend as much as they may need. The Agency will decide what they need, and there is no further limitation on it in this bill. We are being told today it needs about $400 million, provided 5 percent by the District, 35 percent by grant from the Federal Government, and 65 percent by revenue bonds to be paid over 36 years. The last dollar of that 36-year payment will have earned 144 percent if it carries only 4 percent interest. You will find this $400 million, as people who know have told us, to be only a small bite, a little bite, just a little beginning. I am in favor of a beginning and spending a little money if we can see the end and know where we are going and know that as a result of this we will get a system we can be proud of and that will do something to relieve the conditions here in the District. This bill will do nothing to relieve those conditions. It will compound them and make them worse. After we have put in the first $400 million we will be asked to put in another $500 million and another billion on top of that. Like the city of New York, you will have your streets torn up for 20 years. The businesses on both sides of the street will be driven into bankruptcy. You will not be correcting the situation; you will be making it worse.

If you really want to do a job here in the District, when the time comes you will recommit this bill for further study and action by the District Committee. This is no time to start this kind of an experiment, with this large amount of money as a mere beginning, when we do not have a proper plan. These people have not studied the situation. They have not called on the best engineering and the rest railroad brains in the country to support it. Sure you have a lot of clamor from all around the city and all the agencies to do something about transit. I want to do it now, but I want to do it correctly.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman implied this opens the door wide open for the National Capital Transportation Agency to just spend the taxpayers' money at will. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to leave that impression, since he must know this will be subject to the action of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress from time to time as expenditures are made.

Mr. MULTER. There is no doubt about that. This is an authorization, and the Appropriations Committee will have to take a good look at it.

Mr. WHITENER. So the gentleman does not mean to leave the impression with the Members of the House that the Agency has carte blanche to just spend money?

Mr. MULTER. No; but I am trying to impress on this body that we should not pass an authorization so that anybody can go before the Appropriations Committee and say "Well, the Congress has approved this plan; now give us all the money we need to carry on."

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has mentioned the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, and said that this act gives unlimited authority to the Agency to operate a transit system. I will ask the gentleman if it is not correct that that cannot be done until the matter is reviewed by the Congress, and the Congress must review and approve any operating plan which the National Capital Transportation Agency might suggest.

Mr. MULTER. They cannot begin to operate until they determine a labor policy for operation, but they can begin to operate as soon as they have that labor policy laid down. But the labor policy is not laid down in this bill for building this subway. Certainly we do not want labor to be left at the mercy of this Agency in the building of the subway system.

Mr. WHITENER. That is exactly the point I hoped the gentleman was making, because I am sure the gentleman knows there is an established labor policy so far as construction of this project or any other project is concerned under the Davis-Bacon Act, and that the gentleman's amendment, which I understand he will offer, relates to the operation of the transit system and not to the construction.

Mr. MULTER. And the gentleman, I am sure, must agree that the Davis-Bacon Act has many omissions. We have been trying for years to correct them. As a matter of fact, in the city of New York we have today government jobs being let to nonunion contractors and the Davis-Bacon Act does not protect their employees and it will not protect them here in the District of Columbia either.

Mr. WHITENER. But the gentleman is not saying to this House that the Davis-Bacon Act is not applicable to the construction of the transit system under this bill; is he?

Mr. MULTER. It is applicable—it is applicable but I repeat—it does not give union people and the worker the protection he is entitled to whether he is a member of the union or not.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to ask the gentleman about a third point. He has mentioned the so-called private enterprise proposition offered to the committee. Of course, the gentleman is not a member of the subcommittee and did not hear the testimony.

Mr. MULTER. But I have read the testimony taken in the hearings.

Mr. WHITENER. I will ask the gentleman if anyone has offered in behalf of any private company to build the proposed rapid transit system embraced in this legislation and, if so, who were they?

Mr. MULTER. Beyond the extent of the D.C. Transit System, Inc., offer, which is contained in the supplement of the hearings, I know of no other. But I say again, it was the duty of this Agency that brought in the report to have consulted with all the private railroad builders or subway builders and operators in the country to find out whether or not private enterprise was willing to do this. It was the duty of this Agency to have invited them in to find out if private enterprise was willing to do it. There is not a single word here anywhere in the hearings to the effect that private enterprise will not do this job.

Mr. WHITENER. I will ask the gentleman if the same gentleman you say made this proposition did not send a telegram to every Member of this House or to at least most of us a few days ago, in which he said the proposal was a proposal of an outmoded system, but he wound up saying he wanted to operate it.

Mr. MULTER. I did not see the telegram that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman can come to the desk, and I will show it to him.

Mr. MULTER. At the proper time I will offer an amendment to at least invite in the private enterprise people, whether it be the D.C. Transit Co. or anybody else, and ask them to do this job and, if they do not want to do it, then let the Agency do this job. But let us try private enterprise first.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not speak today on the technical aspects of this bill. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee have already covered these points very competently. Nor shall I attempt to argue that opinion within the Washington metropolitan area is unanimously in favor of this bill with or without some suggested amendments. The debate you have already heard would indicate there are many conflicting opinions on the bill. But I will address myself to the urgency of making a decision in the area of transportation in the Nation's Capital—and making that decision now.

In the first place, you have to accept the premise that there is congressional responsibility for the transportation difficulties and for their solution. We have reserved to the Congress virtually all of the authority contemplated by the Constitution to control practically everything that happens within the District of Columbia. With that authority goes responsibility. It is that responsibility which we are being called upon to discharge today.

If you would have this Capital live—if you would prevent the danger of strangulation in this city of Washington, then you have to give serious consideration to this bill.

The fact that an area now delimited by the borders of the District of Columbia was set aside almost 2 centuries ago is not sufficient to limit the Federal interest and the congressional interest to the legal limits of the District of Columbia.

Washington, as a modern city, includes the Washington metropolitan area, and I would propose that there is a congressional responsibility which is coterminous with the metropolitan area.

The major reason why I am advocating the passage of this bill is because it is a sheer necessity. There is not a Member of this House that does not have firsthand knowledge of the difficulties and problems involving traffic and transportation in the Washington metropolitan area. There is not one of you who does not know, because you have traveled the streets and the highways of this city yourselves, that we are not current in resolving our existing transportation difficulties. If we are not current today, I ask you, what will be our situation tomorrow?

On the 23d of August of this year I inserted in the RECORD an article written by Jack Eisen published in the Washington Post in which he stated that it was predicted that the area population by the year 2000, in a little more than 30 years, would be 5 million. This is more than double the current population. Mr. Eisen in his article stated that "a metropolis of nearly 5 million persons with a possible range of 3.7 million and 6.3 million compared with the 1960 census total of 2 million" was considered a certainty.

I ask my colleagues in the House, if this does not represent a situation which is urgent to the point of emergency. We have to move faster than we are moving to resolve the problems of today, and we have facing us a population explosion which will double and perhaps triple the population of the metropolitan area within 30 years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree, perhaps, if this situation is as critical as we are told it is, it might be well in the future to disperse some of these agencies that are being contemplated out of the Washington area, such as the environmental health center and others, where they can go out over the country. Thus we would relieve a great deal of this situation if we would have them scattered throughout the country rather than having a concentration of them in the capital area.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. Just a minute and I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

I believe the gentleman from Ohio is very sincere, and I am sure that he would like to have the environmental health center located somewhere in his great State of Ohio. I would point out, however, that the need for this center and similar Federal agencies in the Washington metropolitan area exists because this is the seat of the Government of the United States. This is the place designated under authority of the Constitution of the United States for the Government to establish its major facilities. The fact that the executive Departments are here and the great Federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health are here and the existence of an academic community of enhancing reputation and other unique assets here makes it necessary that new facilities of the character of the environmental health center be established here to operate with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree that the Cabinet officers and others should be here. This is the Government. However, there are many of these things that can be done that have no connection at all with the actual operation of the Government. There is research and many other things that could be done elsewhere, and I think there is no question but what they could be sent out over the country.

Mr. MATHIAS. As a matter of fact, the record shows that already is the case, because 90 percent of the Federal Government employees today are located in places other than the Washington metropolitan area.

Mr. BOW. There should be more of it.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think that the projection of the population figures for the next 30 years points to a doubling or perhaps a tripling of the population in the metropolitan area of Washington, and I would say to the gentleman from Ohio this is not entirely due to the proliferation of Government agencies, but it does mean that we have to make an urgent decision now.

In the first place, it should be clear that this bill is not in any way meant to be in derogation of surface transit in the metropolitan area. When we bring into the metropolitan area by subway a number of people who concentrate at some central point, they are going to need surface transit within the downtown area to their ultimate point of destination. This subway bill may affect the business of the surface transit system, but it is not intended to destroy it.

Secondly, I think that the objections of those who are primarily highway proponents are not well founded in opposing this bill.

This bill is not to be in conflict with the highway needs of the metropolitan area. There is need for more highways and also for mass transit. I think this bill underscores rather than minimizes the need for rapid progress on a highway program for the Capital metropolitan area.

I urge passage of this bill because it is so definitely a bill which is designed to meet a growing problem which the Nation's Capital faces. As we have responsibility for the welfare of this Capital we have a responsibility to consider this bill seriously and sympathetically. I hope Members will vote for passage.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, we ought to put this in its true perspective. To give you an idea of the enormity of this undertaking proposed in this bill, the other body some time ago passed a bill providing for $325 million in grants and loans for mass transport systems throughout the entire United States—a measly $325 million. That passed the other body. The House in its wisdom has even refused to consider a Government grant and loan mass transit aid program for the whole country in the amount of $325 million. Here you have a bill that calls upon the taxpayers of the United States of America to underwrite in one way or another $406 million for just one little speck on the map of the United States; namely, the District of Columbia. The House in its wisdom refused to act on the other bill because we cannot afford it. We are going into a field that needs further study and we have refused to take it up. Yet you are confronted with a proposition that calls for much more than $325 million; namely, $406 million for just one city. That is the enormity of this project. Of course, they say, "Well, of this $22 million will be a grant from the District of Columbia." Make no mistake about it, when the District of Columbia in its great feeling of good will says that they will donate $22 million they will just come to us and ask for $22 million of the taxpayers' money as their share because they are using that money for this purpose.

They say to begin with that the Federal grant is only going to be $120 million and then $259 million will be bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government. The very fact that this bill calls for bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government is an admission of the fact that the bonds could not be sold on the open market; nobody would buy a dollar's worth unless they were backed up by the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, it was not very long ago that we had some experience along those lines, when we built the $17 million District Stadium.

Mr. Chairman, we have had facts and figures here showing how the stadium was going to pay off, how they were going to make lots and lots of money on the stadium. Well, the members of the Committee know what happened. The stadium is operating at a deficit, the bonds are in default, and the Government which guaranteed those bonds, the Government and the taxpayers of the United States of America, are paying off those bonds.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who knows anything at all about transportation systems knows that the rule rather than the exception throughout the United States of America is that the transportation systems in all of our major cities are operating in the red.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the Committee comes here with findings and tries to tell the Congress of the United States that this is a public transportation system, or private, that is going to make money in the Nation's Capital, they do not know what they are talking about. They are merely guessing at the figures, because the rule rather than the exception throughout the United States is that transportation systems of major cities are operating at a deficit and not at a profit.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who thinks that I am naive enough to swallow the notion that this $259 million is going to be paid back, I am not that naive, because I have been in this body for 22 years and not once has anyone ever come up who made a proposition of this kind has the Federal Government recouped any of its money.

Mr. Chairman, there are people who know what is going on, and I want to emphasize that.

All of the members of the Committee should read the editorial which appeared in the Washington Star. These people know what is going on because it is the business interests and what they call "downtown Washington," who are really the promoters of this project.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the editorial said:

> The District Committee by an 11-to-2 vote authorize a start on Washington's rail transit system.

Notice that the words were "a start." This involves $406 million. That is a start?

Now, listen to the last paragraph:

> The whole point is to approach the transit program in small bites rather than in an attempt to swallow the whole thing in one gulp. The first bite is endorsed by the District Committee. Let us go ahead with the first bite.

This is just the first bite, my friends, and remember that, when I propose a motion to recommit to send the bill back to the District Committee for further study.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURKHALTER].

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I rise in support of H.R. 8929.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], and all of the members of the gentleman's committee for all of the time and effort and hard work which they have put into this bill and in bringing to the floor a bill that in my opinion is deserving of the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, in California we are spending $1,250,000 a day, 240 days a year, on a highways and freeways program, and have been doing that since about 1947.

You can build highways and freeways and major city streets, primary and secondary roads, but that is not the answer to the traffic problems in the urbanized cities today.

Many people are saying—it was mentioned here this afternoon—why private enterprise does not become interested in mass transportation and its problems and financing throughout the country, since it is a problem in every urbanized community in America which has a population in excess of 50,000 people, of which we have 212 such communities today.

I think most of the members of the Committee know that all statistics and all reports will prove that there are only three metropolitan cities in America where mass transportation pays its own way, without some kind of subsidy from some governmental agency.

Those cities are Cleveland, Ohio; San Diego, Calif.; and Chicago, and some of them are going in the red, I have been told recently.

So it is very simple, and the question is very easy to answer, why private enterprise does not finance mass transportation systems in urbanized areas, because private enterprise is not going to throw money into a losing venture. We all know that.

The time, in my opinion, is fast approaching when in order to take automobiles off the streets and to provide for movement of more people between two designated points, you are going to have to provide fast, economical transportation. You cannot stay on the surface. You can spend $100,000 for a bus and street car and put it on the surface but it is bogged down in its own tracks. It can move no faster than the flow of traffic in the traffic lanes in which it is moving. Therefore, you are going to have to go overhead or underground by either subway or elevated, such as the monorail, or any kind of mass transportation, as long as it is elevated or underground. You are going to have to provide off-street parking facilities in all of the urbanized cities.

You are going to have to provide a transportation system, not a line, but a system, that will clear all railroads, buses, or vehicular traffic, and all pedestrian traffic. You cannot have any interference whatsoever.

Air pollution is another problem when you begin speaking about mass transportation. I refer to air pollution in mass transportation because they are closely related. All of your scientists, chemists, your medical profession, will tell you the motor vehicle is discharging into the air 60 percent of all the polluted air coming from the exhausts of motor vehicles. One advantage of this system is it is electric. In future transportation systems that are built I urge them to go electric.

You may not have the problem today in your metropolitan cities, but the time is coming, and fast approaching, when air pollution in every city is going to be a major problem.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKHALTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think the House should know about the gentleman's experience as a member of the governing body of the city of Los Angeles, and his particularly being assigned to study this problem.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, we have spent millions of dollars in the city of Los Angeles and we have not come up with a solution yet. Many experts say that private industry would do the job, we do not have to put any of the taxpayers' money into this program; private enterprise will do it, let them do it. We have been talking about that for 25 or 30 years, but we are no further ahead than at the beginning. People demand action, and they demand action now.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I would recommend its passage.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice in support of H.R. 8929 and to urge that it be passed. I also want to make mention of the fact that as a member of the subcommittee I attended most of the hearings and might indicate to the other Members that we had a great number of hearings and many hours were spent in receiving testimony from various witnesses interested in this matter.

I think at the outset it should be indicated that some people have tried to make it appear there is a conflict of interest between users of the highways, bus companies, and users of other modes of transportation, but it seems to me this rapid rail or subway type of transportation will supplement the present means of transportation in this area. So I do not believe there is conflict between this and other modes of transportation.

I want to say first and foremost that I am absolutely convinced that unless immediate action is taken by the Congress to create the kind of high-speed, high-capacity transportation facilities called for by this bill, in a very few years rush hour traffic in downtown Washington will grind to a halt. In many sections downtown today traffic is already at a standstill.

Public transportation facilities have not kept pace with the growth of the National Capital region. Today's transit system is itself mired in the traffic snarls that beset all of us as we fight our way to and from the office every day. It is imperative that part of the job of moving rush hour commuter traffic be done by a high-speed rail rapid transit system operating on exclusive rights-of-way.

As a member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and of the subcommittee which considered H.R. 8929, I have devoted much attention during the past several months to the rapid transit legislation proposed here today. I have sat through the lengthy hearings that were held to consider the problem and heard the countless witnesses—Federal officials, transit experts, and representatives of civic and governmental organizations throughout the National Capital region—who testified in support of the legislation. I have examined the voluminous studies that have been prepared. To me, it is beyond question that rapid transit is needed right now in our Nation's Capital.

The city is engulfed in traffic congestion. Twice a day, for 2 hours each in the morning and evening long lines of cars form to enter or leave the city. Each day the lines grow longer. Worse still, the National Capital Transportation Agency and the highway departments of the region forecast that between now and the late 1970's there will be a 40 percent increase in the number of trips to and through the downtown area in the morning and evening peak hours. Existing streets and programed new highways cannot conceivably accommodate the new loads that will come, much less ease the situation that now exists. There is no other answer but the construction of a rapid transit system that will move people underground and relieve the pressures on our streets and highways.

I am convinced that without such a system, the future of the Nation's Capital will be grim, indeed. We can look forward to a steady increase in congestion, to more and more prime downtown land being used for parking—I think this is important to emphasize—and to a decline in the vitality of the downtown area. The net result will be serious injury to the health and appearance of the National Capital and costly losses in time and money to the truckers, the motorists, and all others who must use the city's streets and highways.

I point to the city of New York and ask you to consider the cost to the truckers, motorists, and other users of the highways in the city of New York if they did not have a subway system.

We cannot permit such a situation to occur here. We must act now to meet and alleviate Washington's traffic congestion problem, and I believe H.R. 8929 is the answer.

The rapid transit legislation originally proposed would have provided a regional system that would cost some $800 million to construct and place in operation. That system would have provided 83 miles of rapid transit service throughout the region, with lines extending deep into the suburbs and would have provided a very large downtown subway distribution system. Under the original proposal, the Federal Government would have contributed $120 million, the same amount called for by the present bill, the local governments would have contributed $60 million, and the rest—over $600 million—would have been paid for by the users of the system and would be raised by the sale of revenue bonds.

I reviewed the original proposal including the many, comprehensive studies that were made in support of it. I was convinced then, and I remain convinced now, that the original $800 million system was a necessary and desirable one, and made good business sense.

On the other hand, it was the view of the other members of the committee that it would be undesirable to commit the Federal Government to so large a rapid transit system. Those members felt that a smaller system would do much to relieve congestion, would be economically feasible, and that such a system could be extended at a later date if this were found necessary. I think it will be found necessary. I think it is very important to extend it at a later date. Accordingly, our very able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], introduced H.R. 8929, the bill presently before us, to authorize construction of a smaller system incorporating many of the features of the larger plan but reducing the size of the downtown subway system, shortening the suburban lines and reducing the total investment involved. Despite my own belief in the desirability of the larger system, which would cost the Federal Government no more, the smaller system represents a compromise which I can readily support. I have no hesitation in saying that the system that would be authorized by the present bill represents a bare minimum and that the size of the originally proposed system has been reduced just as far as it is feasible to reduce it. To me the all important point is that construction of a rapid transit system must begin at the earliest possible date.

I should also mention that subsequent to the introduction of the bill, H.R. 8929, we canvassed all of the organizations that appeared before the committee.

There is a supplement to the report of the hearings which includes the reaction of various organizations and businesses indicating their approval of this so-called bobtail system.

As a minority member, to me one of the most appealing features of this rapid transit program is that its financing has been made as businesslike as possible. I do not hold with the view that merely because a public facility is needed it should, therefore, be supported entirely by taxation. My view is that since a rapid transit facility is needed, the people who need it ought to pay for it as directly as possible. This was certainly the view of Congress when it directed the National Capital Transportation Agency to prepare a financing plan placing the major burden of paying for the facilities upon the users of the system. I know that in some cities this is an unpopular view and that low fares and high subsidy are considered to be desirable. But Congress established a contrary policy for the Nation's Capital and, it seems to me, a far wiser one.

The Agency carefully adhered to the instructions given it by the Congress. The result is that while Federal assistance for this program is necessary, the amount of Federal funds required has been kept to a reasonable minimum. All of the operating costs of the system and the predominant portion of its capital costs will be met from revenues. The remaining costs have been equitably distributed between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. Furthermore, the estimates show that while a $120 million Federal grant is required for this system, there is good reason to anticipate that this outlay may be repaid after the retirement of bonded debt.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] and our colleages on the other side of the aisle have referred to the time it has taken to bring this bill to its present posture. Many years of intensive and exhaustive planning and preparation have been spent. I daresay that the House has never considered any piece of legislation with greater preparation behind it. Before this program was transmitted to the Congress it was the subject of searching examination and analysis by several Federal agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget. Throughout the year that has passed since the transit development program was published in November of 1962, a rapid transit system for Washington has been the subject of wide public debate. Our subcommittee hearings revealed not only a virtually unanimous enthusiasm for the creation of such a system, but a remarkable degree of understanding by the people of the details of the transit development program. In addition to the days spent in public hearings, under the tireless and dedicated leadership of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], the members of the committee have held numerous conferences and executive sessions to evaluate the evidence, and to fashion an action program which will serve the best interests of the District of Columbia and the National Capital region. I am satisfied that H.R. 8929 accomplishes this end. The improvements it would authorize are long overdue. I have no reservations at all regarding the soundness or the necessity of the investment it entails. This rail rapid transit system will be an asset that we can ill afford to do without. This legislation is imperative for the well-being of the Nation's Capital, and I strongly urge its enactment.

I also want to point out, I certainly agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] when he said he is for private enterprise operating this system. But, as was pointed out earlier in the debate, the question of the operation of the system is not here involved. All we are involved with is authorization for construction. It seems to me, the point the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] made with regard to private enterprise operating this system should be taken up later since it is not involved in regard to the question we have here before us now.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York and express my appreciation to him for his diligence throughout the hearings and in the deliberations of the subcommittee and say to him that while I am in sympathy somewhat with his views that we should have gone into a bigger original project which would involve $800 million, I am sure that the gentleman will agree particularly after moving about the floor of the House today, that the better part of wisdom was to proceed with this revised or limited version. We felt it was a very practical minimum approach to this problem.

Mr. HORTON. I would certainly agree with the gentleman and I have certainly indicated in my statement that I am completely in accord with the bill, H.R. 8929.

I also want to emphasize again I feel that the proposal here before us can be amplified at a later date and thus give an opportunity to the suburban communities to become integrated in this system.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make a statement and ask a few questions.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is admittedly a first step or a bobtailed bill. Apparently with respect to some of the opposition to the bill, this is a bad thing. With respect to those who live in the community, we faced this with some concern at first, but this does not appear to be fatal to us because we feel, as we know you feel, that the needs of the community will not be met satisfactorily until a complete system is adopted. Although this is a first step, it is a necessary step and, of necessity, more will come. The original proposal was for a $800 million bill, and this has been cut to $400 million. However, the additional $400 million, you must understand, does not include any additional Federal contribution but, rather, the additional moneys are to come from the neighboring jurisdictions, that is, my own Maryland and neighboring Virginia, and the balance from increased bonds which must be floated.

However, even while this system is being constructed it will be necessary to plan for the final system. I would like to state for the Record that the Agency, the National Capital Transportation Agency, should consult with the various agencies both in Maryland and Virginia well in advance of their decisions. One of the biggest problems we have had with respect to this program was the failure on the part of the Agency adequately to deal with and meet with the agencies in Maryland and Virginia.

Again I want to state for the Record that the people of Maryland do not want future planning and development to be managed and controlled solely by a Federal agency through the development of this mass transit system out in Maryland and Virginia. We want to be consulted. I want to emphasize that when you look at this bill, the first impression is that it is only for the District of Columbia. Nothing could be further from the truth. Not only are there at least three spurs that go into the adjoining jurisdictions but ultimately a complete system must service all of the jurisdictions in this area.

Now, if the chairman of the subcommittee will yield for two questions, I would like to ask this:

First I have been told by representatives from the Agency—and I want to be correct in assuming that—that nothing in H.R. 8929 authorizes the Agency to issue bonds and that further legislative authority will be necessary before bonds may be issued. Am I correct in this?

Mr. WHITENER. Of course, I am not aware of any conversation the gentleman may have had with another person. The only thing I can say is that it is my information that the bonds will not be issued until the Appropriations Committee has spoken on the matter.

Mr. SICKLES. It will take further legislative authority?

Mr. WHITENER. I say that is my information.

Mr. SICKLES. Am I correct also in stating that this is a bill only for construction and that there is no authority for the agency to operate either under this bill or any other law on the books?

Mr. WHITENER. This bill relates only to construction. There is a difference of opinion as to the content of the act of 1960.

Mr. SICKLES. As to whether they can proceed with construction?

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman will yield to me a moment further, I have just been looking at the record of the hearings and I want to express to the gentleman my appreciation of the support he gave this program and of his testimony before the committee. I hope that it indicates his undying support here on the floor of the House.

Mr. SICKLES. Well, I do not propose to die at this point, but if I have any further time remaining I would like to address myself to a discussion of the labor provisions of the bill. Let me point out to you ladies and gentlemen that pursuant to the act of 1960 there are in progress negotiations between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia to establish a compact agency for the operation of the system which is finally established.

Under that act a Federal negotiator has been appointed. This Federal negotiator is meeting with us. I say with us because I represented the State of Maryland on this commission for some time. We are just at the point of considering the issue of the labor policy with respect to the operational employees of the system. It would be extremely helpful to us if we knew the congressional policy on this matter.

We cannot realistically handle our compact on a piecemeal basis but must produce an all-inclusive document considering all issues.

Earlier in the testimony, it was stated that the labor provisions to be offered were first suggested to the committee in 1960. I have reviewed these proposed amendments, and for the life of me, I cannot see the reason for the delay in their consideration. I have talked to many of the employees of the transit system in operation now, who are my constituents, and they are concerned, deeply concerned, about their future. They are concerned about their seniority rights, and pension benefits, and they are concerned now.

I for one intend to vote for this amendment when it is proposed, and I urge you to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the additional time.

It has been said that the financing of this program is sound, but I submit to you that the financing authority of this program is sound only if an adequate number of people patronize the transit system. At best the soundness is based on estimates. At this point I would like to ask the distinguished chairman how many commuters there are in the District.

Mr. WHITENER. If the gentleman had mentioned that to me earlier I could have furnished him the information. It is here in the files. If the gentleman will proceed with his statement, I will endeavor to find it.

Mr. HARSHA. Also I would like to know how many of these commuters were surveyed, if the gentleman can tell me that, and what percentage those surveyed are to the total number of commuters? I add that for the reason that during the hearings I asked the same question, and I want my colleagues to know what type of survey was permitted. Here is the answer that was given as it appears on page 69 of the hearings. There were only 2,005 commuters surveyed.

> First, the question was asked: Considering bus and rail vehicles, with no difference in cost, time, or convenience, which would you prefer?

I place special emphasis on the word "convenience" because this is an age of convenience. I think it is readily admitted by everyone that there will not be the same convenience in this system as in the original system. One of the main objections to the original system was the number of transfers that would have to be made.

> Again the question asked assumed you could make the two facilities just as fast, and just as convenient.

But it is obvious that this will not be as convenient as the present bus system. It will not be as convenient as the present use of automobiles by the commuters. It is unrefuted that you will have to make a number of stops. First, you will have to locate a bus that will take you to a subway station. You will have to disembark from that bus and then get on the subway. Or you will have to drive to a point on the rail system and park your car. Disembark and board the transit.

Then, when you are brought into a central point, you will again have to disembark and, depending upon the location of your work, you may have to walk some 8 to 10 minutes in order to get to your destination. In all kinds of weather, rain or shine.

Now, in this age of convenience, this is not equivalent to the convenience of a commuter's automobile.

Certainly, with this bobtailed system where the transfers are going to be multiplied by a great deal more, the convenience is lacking. With the lack of convenience the patronage falls far short of the estimates.

If the patronage is not available to the system, then its financing program is not sound and, of course, it will fail and Congress will have to provide the necessary funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the members of the Committee a portion of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission's report, the Agency charged with the responsibility of alleviating traffic congestion and regulating and improving transit within the Washington metropolitan area. I think it is generally conceded by all that this is only a forerunner or a step in the door to expand to the $1 billion program. Here are the views of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission:

> The Commission, by a majority vote, voices the same objections to the bobtailed version of the original plan because the new version is a forerunner of and, apparently, was submitted in anticipation of the eventual expansion to the originally planned full system. However, if the assumption is made that the bobtailed version will constitute the ultimate rail system for the region, the major objection to the original plan has been aggravated even more by the new proposal. The transfer requirement has been multiplied manifold under the modified plan. From a patronage standpoint, it would not be used; from an investment point of view, it would be disastrous.

Further quoting from the comments and views of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission is the following:

> Indeed, if the bobtailed version is approved and constructed, it will be so unattractive from a passenger-convenience standpoint and consequently, so economically unsound, that the resulting exigencies will demand almost immediate completion of the original proposed system in order to salvage something from the tremendous investment. Because of the major fallacies of the original proposed rail system a smaller part of that same system should not be allowed to be constructed, even at a proportionately lower cost, for the purpose of establishing a lever to bring into existence the original plan. The only attractive feature of the new proposal may be compared to installment buying—the downpayment (one-half of the cost) is made attractively low in order to sell an otherwise unsalable commodity. Once the downpayment is made the point of no return will have passed and no other result can be reached.

One of the major objections to the original system as proposed by NCTA was the requirement, inherent in the system, that a great majority of passengers would have to transfer in traveling from origin to destination; at least one-half of the passengers would have to transfer at least twice. Under the bobtailed version this deficiency is magnified tremendously as only a handful of people would be offered through service from origin to destination. No rail system can be reasonably expected to meet the minimum criterion with respect to passenger volume if the great majority of passengers are required to transfer at both ends of the line.

This boils down to simply this, that if the convenience is not there the patronage is not there—when the patronage is not there the financial soundness of the program is not there and then the taxpayers have to subsidize the program.

Under this legislation the Federal Government will eventually pick up the tab for over $400 million.

How then can you justify voting against the mass transit bills if you support this bill?

I urge the defeat of this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in these remaining 2 minutes I would like to again urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to this legislation which we believe is vital to the orderly development of this Federal city.

It has been said by one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amount of money involved exceeds the amount involved in another bill which would apply nationally.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the members of the committee that it is estimated by the Agency that the revenue bonds will be readily paid by the proceeds of the farebox. They also express the view that the farebox could very well repay the grants which come from the District Government and the Federal Government. It has been said by this same gentleman that transportation systems throughout the country are losing money. This is one of the bright spots of this legislation, as we heard the discussion of it by the Agency, and that is that the ridiculous fare structure which is bringing about losses in other areas is not contemplated here. The minimum fare will be 25 cents here in the District of Columbia. The fare will increase as the amount of mileage traveled increases.

So it is reliably, we think, projected by financial experts that this operation will be able to support itself through the fare box and retire the original debt as represented in the form of these revenue bonds.

The Agency people further tell us that they feel there is a possibility that the farebox will repay the grants which are made by the local people and the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we urge the enactment of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, in accordance with section 204(c) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 664(c)), the National Capital Transportation Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency") is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations and other funds, to undertake the construction and acquisition of the following rail transit routes, including the facilities pertinent to such routes, as described in the report of the Agency entitled "Summary Report of the Transit Development Program, May 1963": (1) The Northwest-Bethesda Route from Twelfth and G Streets Northwest to Van Ness Street Northwest, (2) the Columbia Heights-Petworth Route in the District of Columbia from Seventeenth Street and Columbia Road Northwest to the junction with the Northwest-Bethesda Route, (3) the Springfield-Alexandria and Henson Creek-Anacostia Routes from Pentagon City in Arlington County, Virginia, to Anacostia Southeast in the District of Columbia, (4) the Route 66-Rosslyn Route in Arlington County, Virginia, from Rosslyn to the junction with the Alexandria-Springfield Route, (5) the Rockville-Silver Spring Route from Woodside in Montgomery County, Maryland, to the junction with the Springfield-Alexandria, Henson Creek-Anacostia Route near Union Station in the District of Columbia, (6) the Bowie-Cheverly Route from Union Station in the District of Columbia to Bowie in Prince Georges County, Maryland: *Provided,* That no portion of any such routes shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

Sec. 2. The work authorized by section 1 shall be subject to the provisions of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) and substantially in accordance with the schedules and plans contained in the aforesaid report with such modifications thereof as may be advisable in the discretion of the Administrator of the Agency.

Sec. 3. The Agency is authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, whether owners of land or tenants thereof, to reimburse them for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the acquisition of lands or interests therein by or for the Agency. Such relocation payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator of the Agency, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payments to individuals and families, of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property. Where the land is acquired for the Agency by another Federal agency or by State or local agency or authority, the Agency may reimburse the acquiring agency for relocation payments made by it, up to the amounts specified herein.

Sec. 4. The Agency shall submit to the President in December of each year for transmittal to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report of its operations under this Act.

Sec. 5. Section 205(e) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (40 U.S.C. 665(e)) is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words "without fiscal year limitation."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 17, insert the following:

*Provided,* That no portion of any such routes shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Multer: At page 3 line 2 after the word "Agency" strike out the period (.) and insert a comma (,) and insert the following words:

"*Provided,* That the Agency shall undertake the performance of none of such work until it has given private enterprise at least six

**months in which to submit offers to build, own and/or operate such routes and no such routes after being built by the said Agency shall be operated by it unless and until permission to do so has been obtained by further legislative enactment of the Congress."**

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a private enterprise amendment, and it provides very simply for doing what the Agency that brought in the report has not done yet; that is, to call upon private enterprise to come forward and indicate whether or not they will build this system. If they will and can build it, then give them the opportunity to do it. Obviously, we have to have some time limitation in the amendment. It does not matter to me whether it is 4 months, 5 months, or 6 months, but we must give them an opportunity to say whether they can or want to build this system. If this Congress is ready to approve this plan and call for the building of this subway system, despite all that has been said against it, I say take the plan and call on private industry to see whether they can build this, and are willing to do it, if they have the finances to do it, and, if so, let them do it. If they do not, then let the agency proceed to build it.

I have a second provision in this amendment. After it is built they must give private enterprise an opportunity to operate it. I say that while it is all right to let the Agency in the first instance determine whether or not private enterprise can and will build, when it comes to operation, you have an entirely different problem. I say when it is built or almost built, then let the committee come before the Congress and say whether or not the Government should run this system or private enterprise should be given an opportunity to do it. I am certain there can be no doubt that the system once built can be operated by private enterprise. As a matter of fact, we have been told it is the intent of the Agency to let private enterprise operate this system if and when it is built. If that is so, let us put it right in the bill, put it in the act, and require them to do it, and do not permit them to change their minds, as they can do under the existing statute because the existing statute gives them the right to build, own, and operate, all with Government money. I say let us give private industry every opportunity to do so on its own.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment would go to this point, that they have to finance as well as physically operate the railroad?

Mr. MULTER. That is what it does.

Mr. GROSS. Or the transportation system?

Mr. MULTER. That is what it does.

Mr. GROSS. The bill provides for financing and operating it?

Mr. MULTER. That is the intent of my amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I understand the gentleman is saying this private group he must have in mind would pay for this without any cost to the taxpayer in building or operating the system?

Mr. MULTER. I want to be frank with the gentleman and the rest of this body. I have in mind that we have a mass transportation bill pending in the Rules Committee which calls for money for the entire country, grants and loans, including the District of Columbia. If private industry comes forward after that bill is enacted into law, and is law, we should not exclude private enterprise from coming in and qualifying if they can. If we do not have such a bill they will have to build it on their own.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman mentioned one private organization earlier as being the one he had in mind. I ask the gentleman if he does not know that organization is now receiving substantial subsidies from the Federal and District taxpayers. Is that the type of free enterprise the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MULTER. No. Let us get this clear. I did not say, and I am sure the record will bear me out, that this is intended to cover the D.C. Transit System, Inc. The D.C. Transit System, Inc., is not the only private enterprise that is willing to do this job. This does not limit it to D.C. Transit and does not say D.C. Transit will do it.

I think the gentleman is mistaken when he says that the D.C. Transit System gets a subsidy. They get a certain tax exemption if their net income does not give them a 6-percent return. They have never yet earned that 6 percent. They get no subsidy from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my good friend from New York talks in terms of:

> Offers to build, own and/or operate such routes and no such routes after being built by the said Agency shall be operated by it unless and until permission to do so has been obtained by further legislative enactment of the Congress.

I rather think the gentleman has put down a proviso in his amendment that appeals to many of us, certainly to me, because I think that everyone knows that I am a strong advocate of private enterprise and an opponent of excessive Government intervention. But the hard, cold fact is that no private enterprise in the 7 or 8 days of the hearings we had appeared to talk on this situation here in the District of Columbia. I further make the statement that they did not do it because they know it is not feasible.

This amendment is offered by my good friend in such a way that to adopt it would be to try to anticipate both propositions, that the Agency will build this system and then, as he calls it, private enterprise will take over.

Then as to the proposition that you cannot build or own or operate, I am sure every Member of this body knows the problems that any private operator would have in financing and getting rights-of-way and all of the other property. This is one of the areas in which it is peculiarly a matter for the Government through an agency to operate. I am sure my friend would not recommend that the D.C. Transit Co., Inc., or some other corporation take over the streets and highways of the District of Columbia or the sewer systems of the District of Columbia or other services which are peculiarly Government functions. I know that my good friend from New York has had an opportunity to observe the operation of the transit system in his city of New York, and he knows that no private operator could operate that system nor could they have built it originally. So that is why I say that this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia Of course, as the gentleman pointed out, all of us are for private enterprise doing the job if they can and will do it. We did discuss this at length in the committee. In fact, when the joint committee was meeting, considering the creation of a National Capital Transportation Agency, we directed the agency to explore means of private enterprise doing the job and to check with existing privately owned public utility companies to see if they could expand their operation procedures and solve the problem without the Federal Government getting into it.

During the hearings, privately owned companies had every opportunity to come before the committee with a plan or with a program to set up this system themselves. The only proposal that was offered, I understand, was one which called for Government loans and Government subsidies. If we are going to underwrite this program, I do think we ought to construct it and make certain that private enterprise can operate it properly before we undertake to turn it over to them. I think, frankly, that what the gentleman proposes here is not necessary or it is not necessary to have this bill at all for private enterprise to come in and construct a subway system. They have refused to do it.

Mr. WHITENER. This subcommittee heard from 104 different official agencies, groups and organizations in the District of Columbia, including business interests, labor and civic groups, and every type of Government agency that had any interest in this project. I am sure no one would deny those people are just as much interested in private enterprise as is my good friend, the gentleman from New York. The only people who have opposed this legislation were those people who operate two bus systems and some of the labor groups, if it was not amended, and this regulatory agency, W.M.A.T.C., or some such agency which is directly associated with the bus operators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 56, noes 35.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MULTER and Mr. WHITENER.

The committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to find a basis to justify a vote for this bill, but I have some reservations and would like to have them cleared up. I direct this question to some member of the committee. As I read the bill, for example, I find absolutely no limitation whatsoever on the amount of money authorized to be appropriated. It is absolutely wide open and the Committee on Appropriations could appropriate $2 billion or $3 billion or any amount of money. There is no limitation. Am I correct in my understanding of the bill so far as that is concerned? Since no member of the committee wishes to respond to it, I make the assertion that there is no limitation.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I made that statement during general debate and I repeat it now. In specific and categorical answer to the gentleman I say there is no limitation either in the bill or in the act being amended by this bill. The only provision in the act is that as much as may be required by this agency is authorized, and there is no limitation on it in the bill now before us. It is wide open.

Mr. JONAS. Subject only, of course, to funds that may be appropriated.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. But is it not unusual to have an open-end authorization bill?

Mr. MULTER. I believe it is unusual and it gives a blank check.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, because I am seeking enlightenment here.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Knowing he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I think he would be pleased to know in our deliberations the subcommittee and the Committee on the District of Columbia expressed full confidence in the Committee on Appropriations and felt that that branch of the Congress would see to it that money was used judiciously. We recognized the uncertainty of the expenditures. Therefore, it must be left to the discretion of the Congress.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman to the Committee on Appropriations, and think the chairman of the subcommittee is correct in assuming that the Committee on Appropriations will give careful consideration to requested appropriations, but I just wanted to be sure that I had not overlooked something in the bill.

I could not find any limitation of any sort. We usually look to a scrutiny of these bills by two committees.

The Authorization Committee fixes a ceiling and the Appropriations Committee is required to operate under that ceiling.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure that the gentleman understands that under this bill there would be probably more than one subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee looking into the various aspects of it, and then the full committee would get the recommendations of those subcommittees.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman. I have one other question on which I would like clarification. I am not asking these questions to indicate hostility to the bill. I recognize the need for improving transportation facilities in the District of Columbia. I am involved in this bumper-to-bumper traffic every morning and every evening. I recognize that this is a growing community and that the problem will get worse before it gets better. I think we ought to do something about it. However, I would like to have some statement from the committee which would justify me in voting to tax all of the taxpayers of the United States or subject them to liability on 95 percent of the cost of this system while the taxpayers of the District of Columbia are required to ante up only 5 percent. I recognize that some formula should be used. I recognize that the Federal Government has a responsibility for part of this financial obligation. But is 95 percent against 5 percent a fair separation of the respective liabilities? It strikes me that the committee is subjecting the taxpayers of all the United States to too great a share of this financial burden.

I would like somebody to explain to me and to justify that kind of an overbalance in Federal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has expired.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULTER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: At page 3, after line 2, insert the following new section to be numbered section 3, and renumber all subsequent sections accordingly, to wit:

### LABOR PROVISIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Employees of Agency shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. The Agency, its officers, or agents shall not deny or in any way question the rights of its employees to join, organize, or assist in organizing the labor organization of their choice, and it shall not interfere in any way with the organization of its employees.

"(b) Representatives designated or selected for the purpose of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees of the Agency, or any appropriate unit thereof, shall be the exclusive representative of all such employees for the purposes of collective bargaining: *Provided*, That any individual employee or a group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to the Agency and to have such grievances adjusted, without the intervention of the bargaining representative, as long as the adjustment is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining contract or agreement then in effect; *Provided further*, That the bargaining representative has been given opportunity to be present at such adjustment.

"If any dispute shall arise among the Agency's employees as to who are the representatives of such employees designated and authorized in accordance with the requirements of this title, or between the Agency and its employees as to the determination of appropriate bargaining units and the parties are unable to reach agreement through conference and negotiation, it shall be the duty of the National Labor Relations Board to resolve such disputes in accordance with section 9(c) of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 159, 160, and 161 and the rules and regulations of the said Board thereunder.

"(c) The Agency shall bargain collectively with and enter written contracts with the duly authorized labor organization or organizations representing employees of the Agency concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment including, but not limited to, health and welfare, insurance, vacations, holidays, sick leave, schedules, seniority, and pension and retirement benefits, *Provided*, That the Agency shall not recognize or bargain with any employee representative who, or representatives of any labor organization which, (a) advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States, or (b) discriminates with regard to the qualifications, terms, or conditions of membership because of race, religion, color, creed, or national origins.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, or of any other statute or law of the United States, or of any State, the Agency and the labor organization duly designated and authorized to represent the employees of the Agency in accordance with the requirements of this title shall be permitted to make agreements providing for the deduction by the Agency from the wages of its employees and payment to the labor organization representing such employees, of any periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments (not including fines and penalties) uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be effective with respect to any individual employee until he shall have furnished the Agency with a written assignment to the labor organization of such membership dues, initiation fees, and assessments, which shall be revocable in writing after the expiration of one year or upon the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner.

### DISPUTES

"(e) In the case of any dispute between the Agency and any employee or employees of the Agency arising out of the interpretation or application of agreements between the Agency and such employees, properly accredited officers of the Agency shall meet and treat with properly accredited representatives of such employee or employees (who may be themselves employees of the Agency or officers of a labor organization duly authorized to represent such employees) on any such grievance. Any dispute that cannot be amicably adjusted by conference shall, upon the written request of either party to the other, be submitted to a Board of Arbitration. Such Board shall be composed of three persons: one to be chosen by the Agency, one to be chosen by the employee or the employee representative, and the two thus selected shall select a third disinterested person who shall serve as Chairman of the Board. The party requesting submission to arbitration shall name its arbitrator in its written request. The other party shall name its arbitrator within five days after having received written notice from the other of the appointment of its arbitrator. If either party fails to name its arbitrator it shall forfeit its case. If, after a period of ten days from the appointment of the two arbitrators representing the Agency and the employee, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, the third arbitrator has not been selected, then either arbitrator may request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to furnish a list of five persons from which one shall be selected to act as the third arbitrator. No later than five days after receipt of such list, the arbitrators appointed by the parties shall determine by lot the order of elimination, and thereafter each shall in that order alternately eliminate one name until only one name remains. The remaining person on the list shall be the third arbitrator. The findings and award of a majority of the Board of Arbitrators shall be final and binding on the parties. The agreement(s) between the Agency and its employees under which the dispute arose shall remain unchanged during the arbitration proceeding. Each of the parties shall bear the expense of its own arbitrator and the parties shall share equally the expense of the third arbitrator.

### FUTURE AGREEMENTS

"In the event that the Agency and its employees, or the Agency and the duly authorized representatives of its employees, are unable through conference and collective bargaining to reach agreement on the terms of any agreement relating to rates of pay, hours, and working conditions, including health and welfare, insurance, and pension and retirement provisions, to be applicable in the future, the Agency shall offer, in writing, to submit such dispute to a Board of Arbitration composed of three persons, one to be chosen by the Agency, one to be chosen by the employee or employee representative, and the third to be chosen jointly by the two persons thus selected. The third, disinterested arbitrator shall be a person experienced in labor arbitration and shall be the Chairman of the Board of Arbitration. Each party shall name its arbitrator within five days after the agreement to arbitrate. If, after a period of ten days from the appointment of the two arbitrators representing the Agency and its employees, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, the third, disinterested arbritrator has not been agreed upon, then either arbitrator may request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to furnish a list of five persons from which the disinterested arbitrator shall be selected. No later than five days after receipt of such a list, the arbitrators appointed by the parties shall determine by lot the order of elimination, and thereafter each shall in that order alternately eliminate one name until only one name remains.

"The agreement(s) between the Agency and its employees under which the dispute arose shall remain unchanged during the arbitration proceeding. Each party shall bear the expense of its own arbitrator, and shall share equally the expenses of the disinterested arbitrator.

"The award of a majority of the Board of Arbitration, which award shall be final and binding on the parties, shall be rendered within sixty days, or such additional period as the parties may agree in writing, after the appointment of the disinterested arbitrator, and shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the bargaining agreement.

"(f) If the Agency acquires any existing facilities from any public or privately owned transportation utility operating within the National Capital region, all employees of the transportation utility except corporate officers shall, upon application therefor, be transferred to and appointed as employees of the Agency, subject to all the rights and benefits of this title. Such employees shall be given seniority credit, sick leave, vacation, insurance and pension credits in accordance with the records of the acquired transportation system, and shall be protected against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment under conditions not less beneficial than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"If there is in effect at the time of the acquisition by the Agency of such existing transportation system a collective bargaining agreement covering the terms and conditions of employment of such employees, such terms and conditions shall remain in effect until the expiration of such collective bargaining agreement or until such time as both the Agency and the labor organization representing such employees agree to modify such terms and conditions of employment, whichever first occurs.

"All employees of the Agency shall be covered by a sound pension and retirement system, adequate to provide for all payments when due under such established system or as it may be modified from time to time by agreement or arbitration. The rights, privileges, benefits, obligations, and status of members and beneficiaries of any pension or retirement system established by any acquired transportation system shall be protected and not diminished in any way in the establishment of the pension and retirement system herein provided for. The Agency and its employees, through their representatives for collective bargaining purposes, shall take whatever action may be necessary to have pension trust funds under the joint control of any acquired transportation system and the participating employees through their representatives transferred to the trust fund to be established, maintained, and administered jointly by the Agency and the participating employees through their representatives. No employee of any acquired transportation system who is transferred to a position with the Agency shall by reason of such transfer be placed in any worse position with respect to rates of pay, hours and working conditions he enjoyed as an employee of such acquired transportation system, including but not limited to workmen's compensation, pensions, seniority, sick leave, vacation, health and welfare insurance he enjoyed as an employee of such acquired transportation system.

"(g)(a) It is hereby declared as a matter of legislative policy that the institution of transportation service by the Agency, whether through services operated by the Agency, by a private transit company through contract with the Agency, or by a private transit company conducting any competing transit operations established pursuant to a development plan adopted by the Agency, shall be accomplished with a minimum of adverse effect on the employees of the existing transportation service employers serving as common carriers of passengers in the National Capital region. To this end, prior to the inauguration by it of any transportation service, the Agency shall enter into an agreement with the duly authorized labor organizations representing such employees for collective bargaining purposes, providing for the fair and equitable treatment of any such employees who are adversely affected by such institution of transportation service. Such provisions shall be reduced to writing, shall be binding on the parties thereto, and may include, but need not be limited to, provision for the protection of the seniority rights of displaced and separated employees, provision of severance pay or protective payments for separated employees, provision of programs and facilities for the retraining of such personnel (including paid training and qualifying programs for continuing employment with the mass transportation system by which such employee was employed or by its successor) and shall establish procedures for the administration of such protective provisions, and for the resolution of disputes arising thereunder by arbitration or otherwise.

"In no event, however, shall such protective provisions for any employee, whether he is directly or indirectly adversely affected as a result of technological or other developments resulting from such institution of transportation service, receive benefits less beneficial than the protective conditions and benefits provided under the Washington Job Protection Agreement of May, 1936, including the schedule of allowances and benefits set forth in sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of that agreement.

"For purposes of enforcement of the rights, privileges, or benefits provided by any agreement entered into hereunder, any person claiming the same shall be entitled to the remedies provided under the National Labor Relations Act for employees covered by such Act, and the National Labor Relations Board and the courts of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction and power to enforce such rights, privileges, and benefits in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of enforcement of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"(h) Employees of the Agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be subject to the following laws and parts of laws:

"(1) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved May 17, 1928 (45 Stat. 600).

"(2) Title XV of the Social Security Act, 68 Stat. 1130, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1961.

"(3) Section 9 of Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, and related statutes affecting the reemployment rights of persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(4) Section 6 of the Act approved May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 66, 120), as amended, relating to double salaries.

"(5) Section 212 of the Act approved June 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended, relating to the retired pay of members of the Armed Forces.

"(6) The second sentence of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended, relating to dual employment.

"(7) Section 29 of the Act approved August 10, 1956 (70A Stat. 632), as amended (5 U.S.C. 30r. (a)). *Provided, however,* that the provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to mean that employees of the Agency are subject to any other statutory provision applicable to employees under the Federal civil service system or the municipal government of the District of Columbia personnel system.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such employees of the Agency shall not be subject to the following laws:

"(1) The Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 403), as amended.

"(2) The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended.

"(3) The Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 708), as amended.

"(4) The Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 468), as amended.

"(5) The Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended.

"(6) The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 295), as amended.

"(7) The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679), as amended.

"(8) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain employee benefits for employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1105), as amended.

"(9) The Performance Rating Act of 1950, approved September 30, 1950 (68 Stat. 1098).

"(10) The Veterans Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended.

"(11) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916 (39 Stat. 742).

"(i) The insurance program established by title III of the Social Security Act is hereby extended to service performed in the employ of the National Capital Transportation Agency and such service shall be deemed to constitute 'employment' as that term is defined in section 210(a) of such Act and section 3121(b) of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

"(j) Except as clearly inconsistent with its context, the term 'employee' as used in this title means any person employed by the Agency in connection with the operation of transportation services and facilities. Said term does not include the present employees of the Agency, nor shall it include such other employees as may from time to time be appointed by the Agency, for purposes other than the operation of transportation services and facilities. With respect to such existing and additional employees, the provisions of sections 205(a)(10) and 205(a)(11) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 and of all other presently applicable statutes and regulations, shall remain in effect. Prior to commencement of any transportation service or operations by the Agency, including any successor agency, corporation, or other organization, there shall be established a personnel system independent of the Federal civil service system and the personnel system governing employment in the municipal government of the District of Columbia. Such personnel system shall cover all of the employees of the Agency, or of any successor agency, corporation, or other organization; shall incorporate the principles and substance of the labor relations policy contained in this title, and shall be made effective prior to the employment of any employees pursuant to this Act."

**Mr. MULTER** (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. MULTER.** Mr. Chairman, may I first attempt to very briefly answer the last question which was propounded, but which went unanswered because the gentleman's time expired.

There is nothing in the act or in the bill that calls for any allocation, percentagewise. The percentages we have been talking about are the percentage contribution of 5 percent by the District government and a 35-percent grant by the Federal Government and a 65-percent guarantee by the U.S. Treasury which are found only in the report. If you are going to follow the act, the Congress when it comes to appropriating may appropriate every last dollar that is needed for this project and ignore every word about percentages.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment that I have just offered, this is the labor provision amendment. Very frankly I say to you, this was prepared for me by the labor unions of the District of Columbia and is supported by them and by the AFL–CIO. It is the same amendment which was submitted to the subcommittee and then to the full committee, but rejected by both of them.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will preserve for the workers of the District of Columbia as well as for union members the right to bargain but not to strike. It will preserve for them the right to bargain as to wages, fringe benefits, and all of the other things that a worker should be entitled to bargain for. It contains this further provision that in any dispute—and I emphasize "any dispute"—the matter must be submitted to arbitration and the determination of the arbitrators is final and binding on all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this is a little unusual, but this is what the unions are willing to take, and I think it is the least we ought to give to them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize also that while this goes to the operation of the system once it is built—and the argument then might apply, "Let us wait until it is built," and under the existing act we will then make labor policy—it also goes to what will happen the day after this bill is enacted into law. It will apply to anybody and everybody who is working in connection with the construction of this system.

Mr. Chairman, the Davis-Bacon Act does not protect the workers, except to give them a prevailing wage rate. Now, what the prevailing wage rate may be in the District of Columbia when you come to building a subway, I do not know. I doubt whether anyone else knows. But it is important that in addition to giving them the prevailing wage rate, we guarantee to them the fringe benefits and also the right to go in and bargain and present their grievances and obtain whatever remedy they may be entitled to.

**Mr. FULTON** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. MULTER.** I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

**Mr. FULTON** of Pennsylvania. On this compulsory arbitration matter, why would this not be a precedent for other industries or other parts of the transportation industry that the whole contract shall be subject to compulsory arbitration?

**Mr. MULTER.** I would rather not get into the question of whether or not this is precedent or bad precedent or good precedent. We are dealing with a peculiar situation in the District of Columbia. The people in the District of Columbia are workers represented by union representatives, both locally and nationally, and they say this is a good amendment and they would like to have it.

**Mr. FULTON** of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, what unions approve this amendment?

**Mr. MULTER.** The transit workers' unions, the AFL–CIO, and the various subsidiaries of the AFL–CIO who are dealing with transit problems or have contracts with transit companies in the District of Columbia.

This also covers construction workers and the unions which represent them in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

**Mr. HALLECK.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. MULTER.** Yes.

**Mr. HALLECK.** I understand that in this amendment of the gentleman from New York the gentleman provides for compulsory arbitration?

**Mr. MULTER.** I do not want to quibble about words. This provision, if enacted, requires that both sides, if they cannot agree after negotiating in good faith—if they cannot agree—that they must submit to arbitration. Each side appoints their arbitrators and they then must hear both sides and their determination is binding on both sides, and that is what the unions recommend for this bill.

**Mr. HALLECK.** If the gentleman will yield further, is not that compulsory arbitration?

**Mr. MULTER.** I suppose it is.

**Mr. BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that in discussing this amendment here today that it need be said that we are speaking for or against labor or for or against unions. I do not believe it is necessary to consider the prolabor amendment or prounion amendment to this legislation at this time.

In the act that created the National Capital Transportation Agency, it specifically provides that no system will be created or put into operation until the Congress itself establishes a policy insofar as labor is concerned. This bill here today merely authorizes the construction of a subway but does not put the system into operation.

The gentleman's amendment is much longer than the language of the bill itself. The gentleman asked unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read. This is a far-reaching amendment that the gentleman has offered. It was not offered or discussed fully in the committee. The gentleman brought up the subject of arbitration or labor agreement but did not have an amendment before the committee. Therefore it was not properly discussed or considered by the committee.

**Mr. MULTER.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. BROYHILL** of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

**Mr. MULTER.** I want to make the statement that instead of reading the amendment I was asked to have it considered read and to explain it. I explained the amendment paragraph by paragraph.

**Mr. BROYHILL** of Virginia. The operators will have to take a proper course in this matter. They can come back and get legislation providing for proper protection of labor. This matter was not particularly discussed in the committee. I think the amendment is too far reaching to be considered in the closing hours of the debate when the House did not have the benefit of hearing the language of the amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman if there is anything in the existing bill that will protect people who are put out of work under the amendment? I believe the amendment does take care of this.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It provides for the Agency.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It provides for protection of the people?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Insofar as organizing is concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not mean that. Suppose the building of the subway displaces people in the present system, what rights do those people have?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The same as they would have under the Highway Act, and the Urban Renewal Act. There is provision for removal of those people the same as in other acts.

I have just learned this amendment is 15 pages long. If for no other reason it should be rejected for that reason alone.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and I concur in what has been said by my colleagues on the committee in support of the bill. I feel, however, that it is most important to perfect the bill by adopting the pending amendment.

As the gentleman from New York explained to us, this amendment—and I want to make this perfectly clear—has been endorsed by the interested labor organizations.

In addition to that, I understand there has been some question about the application of the Davis-Bacon Act. There has been some confusion on this question. I have been informed by my colleague from California [Mr. Roosevelt] that the Davis-Bacon Act does apply in connection with any expenditure of Federal funds.

I also want to say something about this type of labor provision for those who have doubts. In the State of California we have legislation dealing with this subject as they have in other States. I cite chapter 1056, California Statutes, 1957.

Here we have similar but not identical labor provisions in every rapid transit act which has been passed since 1957 by the State Legislature of California. There are labor provisions, in the rapid transit field, applying to the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the Alameda Countra Costa Transit System, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority, and so forth. So what we are doing here is acting in an area that requires attention.

This amendment would merely provide protection for work rights which employees of Washington's transportation system have already earned—standard protection for seniority and pensions, for the right to organize and bargain collectively, and machinery for the settlement of disputes.

The majority of the committee in reporting this otherwise meritorious legislation have argued that provision for these rights can be taken care of after the system is ready to operate. This clearly begs the question. The time to provide these important work safeguards is now when all other general provisions are being considered. Indeed, as the report indicates, under existing law, Congress is required to act in this field—section 205(a)(2) of the 1960 National Capital Transportation Act.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. When the gentleman spoke of California rapid transit systems, was he speaking of private systems or public systems?

Mr. COHELAN. These are public systems.

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, under the theory of the amendment which has been previously adopted, the proposed system, if this bill is passed, may be a private system. Is the gentleman advocating compulsory arbitration of labor disputes between employees and management of a private system?

Mr. COHELAN. I do not want to get into that part of the bill because I think that probably can be worked out. I indicated to my good friend and colleague, with whom I have worked so closely on so many occasions, that so far as the private part of this is concerned, I think this is not going to help this bill. This bill is badly needed. I am talking solely about the labor provisions of the bill. I think the committee chairman, with whom I have differed on many other occasions on the District Committee, should be warmly commended for doing an excellent job. I want you to know as a member of the committee that I have reviewed the hearings very carefully. He has done a fine job and should be publicly commended for it. But I do believe at the same time that he erred in not dealing with the labor provisions, and I believe this House at this time, in this Committee, should adopt the pending amendment which deals with this important subject.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will yield, the very arbitration provisions in this amendment are also in the contract between D.C. Transit and the city.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore given my views on the presentation of this amendment when we were discussing the bill in general debate. I merely state to my colleagues in the House that this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] consists of 14 typewritten pages. I daresay there are not over four Members of this body who have read it. I would, therefore, say that it seems to me no one should expect you as Members of a deliberative legislative body to vote in the dark on a matter offered in this manner.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very simple solution to this transportation problem in the District of Columbia. Everyone knows that in the past 30 years Federal employees have flocked into the District of Columbia and adjacent areas by the hundreds and hundreds of thousands, which has caused this transportation problem, the one that now exists, and is being debated here today, pro and con.

This problem could be solved and should be solved by the decentralization of the U.S. Government out of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, by reducing the number of Federal employees here in the District of Columbia by not less than 50,000 the need for even this proposed first bite of $406 million or any part thereof would be completely eliminated.

I would suggest that this bill be recommitted to the committee and this House henceforth do the thing that we should do and that is—bring about a decentralization of these Government boards and by so doing we will solve a lot of problems including the problem of these great and unnecessary expenditures that are being carried on today and have been for a number of years.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Would not my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, agree with me that a very good place to start this would be to locate the environmental health center down in North Carolina's research triangle where free land has been offered to the Government?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Multer) there were—ayes, 61, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

### AMENDMENT BY MR. O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'Hara of Illinois: Amend section 1 by adding following the word "Capitol" and the period thereafter on line 20, page 2, the following:

"*Provided further,* That no land on which a residential structure is standing and presently occupied shall be acquired by condemnation, purchase or otherwise for the purpose of this Section until prior provision has been made for the relocation of individuals and families whether tenants or owners dislocated from their homes by reason of such acquisition of land for the construction of the rail rapid transit and commuters lines as contemplated."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is in the field of local transportation to which I gave 10 years of my life. That was during the period when local transportation in Chicago had gone bankrupt and we had to reorganize our local transportation system. We started a program after the reorganization of building the subways and the superhighways. We had many problems. One of those problems we met in this way—whenever we condemned property, and we condemned many properties, and there were many homes and many people put out from the protection of a roof over their heads, never did we acquire a property and start the work of wreckage until we had provided a new home for the displaced tenants.

There was not one case. Thousands of families were uprooted, but not a family was left without a new home. It is because of that that I suggest we put in, in the acquiring of a plot of land for this public improvement that where we take a plot of land that is occupied by a resident, before it is taken over we be sure we have made provision for the dislocated tenants in a new home. That is my simple amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Not that I am lacking in sympathy with his thoughts, but section 3 of the bill, on page 3, has a very extensive relocation provision which we gave particular attention to, and I think it is adequate. As I understand the gentleman's amendment—and I am not being facetious—he has offered an amendment to the committee amendment. It would appear to me the only area affected by his amendment would be the Capitol Grounds. I do not believe there are many residents on the Capitol Grounds. Our relocation provision, section 3, we think is fair and in line with the Public Roads Act. Therefore, we believe this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. Yes; I will.

Mr. GROSS. I have been sitting here all afternoon looking at this longer segment of this proposed transit system. I see this segment to which I refer runs to Bowie, Md. I have never been out to Bowie, Md., but I wonder why this longer segment goes there. If the gentleman will bear with me, I do understand there are some ponies out at Bowie, and I just wondered if you have to have a special system to get people out there to beat the ponies.

Mr. WHITENER. I might say to the gentleman that not only are there ponies at Bowie, but there are some iron horses that have been running out there for many years, which are required to fix tracks owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad, which this agency can use under a contractual arrangement and not require any capital investment in tracks. We are just sorry that there were not more available fixed tracks running in other towns in the area. Maybe even Laurel or some of these other places like Charlestown, W. Va., and others. But this just happens to be the biggest bargain in the whole package—the Bowie run. I might say that the agency will have a daily double each day.

Mr. GROSS. That takes care of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8929) to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that that amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8929, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 76, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—278

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boland
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Short
Sickles
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Ullman
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—76

Albert
Aspinall
Bell
Betts
Boggs
Bolton, Frances P.
Brademas
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burkhalter
Cohelan
Conte
Dague
Diggs
Edmondson
Elliott
Fascell
Fraser
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Horton
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Landrum
Lindsay
McClory
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Moorhead
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Nelsen
Olson, Minn.
Pilcher
Poage
Purcell
Rains
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Sullivan
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thornberry
Tupper
Udall
Van Deerlin
Weltner
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—80

Auchincloss
Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del
Cooley
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Dingell
Duncan
Edwards
Everett
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Gill
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gurney
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Jarman
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Leggett
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Morrison
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.

Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
St. George
St Germain
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Thompson, Tex.
Utt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hemphill against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mrs. Hansen against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Duncan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Edwards against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Forrester against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Nix with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Sibol.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Clawson.

Mr. Dingell with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Quie.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Michel.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. White with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Senner.

Mr. BURKHALTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## PROVIDING OFFICE SPACE, AND SO FORTH, FOR MRS. JACQUELINE KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, free of postage during her natural life.

"Sec. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this statute, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied and equipped as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section which in the aggregate shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this section to a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $5,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $55,000 to remain available until June 30, 1965: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Albert moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment insert the following: "That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year, out of the general funds of the Treasury, in an amount equivalent to the postage which otherwise would be payable on such mail matter.

"Sec. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied, and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked 'Postage and Fees Paid' to be used for international mail. For the same period, the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section. Such compensation, in the aggregate, shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each person employed under this section in a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, but shall not be held or considered to be an officer or employee of such Government for any other purpose.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time, not in excess of two years, immediately following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

"Sec. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $15,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $65,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965. No payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition in support of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when the original version of this bill was before the House 1 week ago today I raised some questions in connection with it. I pointed to language that was defective, completely unworkable language. The bill, however, was passed by the House and sent to the other body. I regret to say that the other body did not remedy all of the defective language. Members should know that the House has before it today an almost completely rewritten bill. I am pleased to say that apparently the language now makes the legislation workable.

A week ago today I stated my regret that the legislation had not been considered by the committee to which it was supposed to be referred. At that time I stated that I had no objection to paying all proper expenses in connection with the death of the late President Kennedy and in making proper provision for his widow and family.

Had this legislation been properly handled in its inception it would not have been necessary to consider it twice in the House and twice in the Senate.

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an explanation of the amendment.

**The SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment will amend H.R. 9291 by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting a new text.

The first section of the amendment adds a sentence providing reimbursement of postal revenues for franked mail authorized by the section, in order to correct an omission from the bill as passed by the House and the Senate. This is a technical amendment.

Section 2 of the amendment provides a 12-month period during which the widow of the late President Kennedy will be furnished office space, equipment, and staff, in lieu of the 6-month period provided in the House-passed bill. The amendment retains the limitation of $50,000 on aggregate staff salaries as passed by both Houses, but adds a clause at the end of the section spelling out that no person employed on such staff shall be considered an officer or employee of the Government, except as to civil service retirement, disability compensation, and Government life insurance coverage. This clause is a clarifying amendment.

Section 3 of the amendment authorizes Secret Service protection for the widow and minor children for not over 2 years after enactment, in lieu of the 1-year limitation contained in the House-passed bill and the omission of any limitation in the Senate-passed bill.

Section 4 of the amendment appropriates $65,000 to carry out the purposes of the act, of which not in excess of $15,000 may be applied to expenses incident to the death and burial of former President Kennedy; prohibits any payment from such appropriation to any Government officer or employee for personal or professional service; and makes regular appropriations of the U.S. Secret Service available for protection of the widow and minor children under section 3. The $15,000 maximum for funeral expenses replaces the $5,000 provided in the Senate-passed bill.

Advice from the administration is to the effect that an appropriation is needed, rather than an authorization, because of the urgent necessity for immediate facilities to dispose of the heavy volume of correspondence and other business which will be the widow's responsibility.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9140. An act making appopriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Hill, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, and Mrs. Smith to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ADDITION TO PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I take this time because the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills], has advised that the committee hopes to bring up under unanimous consent at a later day in this week Senate Concurrent Resolution 19.

I should advise Members also that the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill probably will be called up tomorrow.

**Mr. AVERY.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

**Mr. ALBERT.** I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

**Mr. AVERY.** Will the gentleman from Oklahoma explain to the Members of the House whether this is a Senate joint resolution or a concurrent resolution and with what it deals?

**Mr. ALBERT.** It is a Senate concurrent resolution dealing with the labeling of "Bourbon whisky" as a distinctive product of the United States.

**Mr. AVERY.** I see. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

## CIVIL RIGHTS PETITION

**Mr. DORN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

**Mr. DORN.** Mr. Speaker, I regret to see my colleagues in this great institution form this long line to desperately and hastily sign this civil rights petition. This, to me, is indeed a sad day in the history of this House. In my 15 years here, I have never before witnessed such frantic efforts to discharge a great committee of revered and respected men. This is simply another of these recurring attacks on the Rules Committee headed by that great American and distinguished lawyer, Howard W. Smith.

Mr. Speaker, this is a period of national mourning. It is a time when our thoughts should be on the Prince of Peace. This should be a time of reflection, meditation, and brotherly understanding. It is my earnest hope that a majority of the Members of this House will refrain from signing this petition. This is no time to arouse hatred and passion which may again erupt into unlawful demonstrations and violence in the streets of the Nation. This is not the time for strife and bitterness. If ever our Nation needed a rest period from agitation, it is now. We can be peacemakers and promote harmony and tranquility in our land by rejecting through this Christmas season any consideration of this ill-timed effort to stampede this bill through the House. The far-reaching effects of this bill on the lives of the American people is little known and little understood. We should have complete hearings before the Rules Committee and extended debate on this floor. Our greatest lawyers are alarmed and in doubt about some of its provisions. It needs study and clarification.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has set aside December 15 as Bill of Rights Day. The very foundation stone of our private enterprise system is the property rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. The difference between our great American civilization and that atheistic order which would destroy us is the right of ownership of property. To be free in our homes and businesses from unwarranted search and seizure. This so-called civil rights bill will curb property rights, individual liberty, and our free enterprise system—that great system which provides for the American workingman the highest standard of living in history.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly plead with my colleagues not to sign this petition. If this legislation must be considered by this House, then we should do so next year in a calm, cool, cautious atmosphere of true deliberation, becoming the greatest representative body in the world.

## SOME RESTIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

**Mr. ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, practically all the data have been assembled on the fifth Captive Nations Week observance held last July. Since that month I, along with the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI and other colleagues, have furnished overwhelming evidence showing the keen and deep interest of our people across the country in the captive nations and the necessary creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. There can be no question that even the material appended at the conclusion of my remarks in itself establishes the fact that the fifth observance was the greatest and most impressive one yet.

### SOME RESTIVE QUESTIONS

As this interest in the captive nations deepens and expands, uncounted Americans are asking themselves some restive questions about the apparent pigeonholing of our measure to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Their well-grounded conviction that the captive nations in toto are both a noble end of world freedom and also a powerful means for the security of the free world causes them to ask: "Why this dragging of feet on a subject that has not yet been fully explored and is so vital to our own security in the cold war?" Is it perhaps because Khrushchev would be displeased by such an exploration of the subject?

But, Mr. Speaker, there are many other questions that deserve honest answers. Permit me to enumerate them as they are constantly being posed to our Members:

> First: How is it that 40 resolutions for a special committee are before the Rules Committee and they have been ignored entirely in this Congress?

This is a fair question which deserves an honest answer.

Second:

> Isn't it rather mystifying that almost a majority of the Rules members have expressed their written support of the measure and several others orally, which makes up a majority, and yet the measure hasn't been brought up for a vote?

This, too, is a fair question that deserves an honest answer.

Third:

> In August 1961, Secretary Rusk offered the Berlin crisis as his excuse for opposing the formation of a special committee at that time. What crisis prevents it now?

Here, too, a fair question deserving of an honest answer.

Fourth:

> Isn't the complete inactivity of the Subcommittee on Captive Nations, which was set up in the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1962 as a fourth deflecting maneuver, evidence enough of the need for a special committee?

Also, a fair question demanding an honest answer.

Fifth:

> In the face of broad, popular support for a special committee, as evidenced by nearly 3 years of accumulated letters from all sections of the country and the ever-increasing annual Captive Nations Week observances, who or what is preventing this first implementation of the Congressional Captive Nations Week resolution?

Still another fair question seeking an honest answer.

### MORE EVIDENCE

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the pressing questions being asked of us. We can answer all of them swiftly and satisfactorily by creating now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations regardless of how Khrushchev and those few Americans who fear his displeasure may feel. There are areas of facts, truths, and data to explore in behalf of our own national security and action for the future. Only the concentrated efforts of a special committee can make this possible.

In the meantime, until we receive satisfactory answers to these questions, until we establish this necessary special committee, the full evidence of America's mounting dedication to the freedom of all the captive nations shall be offered to reconfirm the complete validity and soundness of the 40 resolutions now in the Rules Committee and to reflect the grave error and narrowness of outlook of the few who have been opposing the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

I, therefore, include in further support of our measure the following items at this point of my remarks:

First. An authoritative editorial on "The Five Presidential Proclamations of Captive Nations Week" which appeared in the summer issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly;

Second. An incomplete list of nationwide press items on the fifth Captive Nations Week; and,

Third. Additional examples of captive nations resolutions unanimously passed at rallies in Boston and Los Angeles.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly]

### The Five Presidential Proclamations of Captive Nations Week

The fifth obeservance of Captive Nations Week, held across the Nation in the week of July 14–20, 1963, was the most successful yet. In fact, by virtue of its results, the fifth observance represents a significant turning point in the rapid development of this American institution. For despite the fanfare surrounding the Chinese-Russian imperialist rift, the limited nuclear test ban treaty, and premature talk about a nonaggression treaty between the Warsaw Pact members and NATO, the 1963 Captive Nations Week evoked more interest on the part of our citizens and officials than ever before. The high plateau of interest attained in 1963 provides a solid basis for resounding Captive Nations Week action in 1964—a presidential year and the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week (July 12–18, 1964).

It isn't possible here to describe all the events and activities of the fifth observance. Most of them appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues of July and August 1963. Nevertheless, a fair view of the scope and depth of the annual observance can be formed on the basis of the following highlights. In addition to the President, Governors of over half the States and mayors of three dozen major cities in the country formally proclaimed the week. Internationally, the Republic of China observed the week with festivities conducted from one end of Taiwan to the other. In Turkey, Senator Fetki Tevetoglu submitted a resolution in the Turkish Senate for a similar observance. In time, there is no question that other countries will formally observe the week.

Marked by various activities and ceremonies, the week was observed in the United States in every section of the country. Concord, Boston, Hartford, New York, Rochester, Syracuse, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Tampa, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, San Francisco were only a few of the centers staging the observance. On radio and TV, particularly in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Washington, the week and its meanings were discussed over various stations, for example, the 285, in the Georgetown University Forum network, WPIT in Pittsburgh, WCAU in Philadelphia, WTOP in Washington and so forth.

In news and editorial coverage the 1963 week surpassed all previous ones. Before, during, and after the observance accounts appeared in such papers as the Manchester Union Leader, the New York Times, New York Daily News, New York Herald Tribune, New York Journal American, New York Post, Philadelphia Inquirer, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Miami Herald, Indianapolis News, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Dallas Times-Herald and scores of others. The National Catholic Welfare Conference press gave full coverage to the week, and papers such as the West Virginia Register, the Tablet of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Washington Standard and numerous others carried many interesting reports.

The UPI story by Neil Martin and the syndicated columns by John Chamberlain, Robert S. Boyd, Victor Lasky, Roscoe Drummond, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, and others constructively directed public attention to the week. Drummond, for example, in his column dealing with the change of atmosphere in Moscow, pointed this out: "All this makes it the more welcome and timely that President Kennedy just issued his proclamation calling for observance of Captive Nations Week as provided by a congressional resolution. It was a similar proclamation by President Eisenhower in 1959, upholding the 'just aspiration' of the peoples of Eastern Europe to recover their freedom, that caused Premier Khrushchev to turn with such fury on Vice President Nixon in the famous 'kitchen debate.' "[1]

### THE ANNUAL TOTALITARIAN SQUEAL

Since 1959, Moscow and its partners in totalitarian crime have harshly denounced the resolution and the week. The fifth observance was no exception to this. In fact, early in the year a Soviet Russian weekly showed concern about the fifth observance and asked, "Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question'."[2]

Reacting immediately to the President's proclamation of July 5, Moscow added a new twist to its attack. An article in Pravda asserts, "The President of the United States, losing his sense of reality, has declared a 'Week of Captive Nations' and is trying to turn attention away from the struggle of the Negroes for their liberation."[3] While Harriman was preparing for his trip to Moscow, the Russian imperio-colonialists hitched the week onto the race issue and stated that "racism is an inseparable part of the contemporary American system," in which they also see the "closest interconnection between racism and fascism." [4]

---

[1] Drummond, Roscoe. "When Khrushchev Smiles," New York Herald Tribune, July 10, 1963.

[2] The New York Times, Moscow, Jan. 23, 1963.

[3] Pravda, Moscow, July 8, 1963.

On the first day of the 1963 week, Izvestia ran a lengthy editorial deriding the annual observance. Here are a few spicy excerpts. The week "is a propagandistic trick of the American enemies of the freedom and independence of nations." In another paragraph it says, "We well know that it is American imperialism itself which is at present the basic supporter of the decaying colonial system, which is a world gendarme. While Washington propaganda is filling the air with words about freedom, 'realists' of that very country are waving bombs and shuffling dollars in order to strangle that freedom." Now the new twist again, "When President Kennedy proclaimed Captive Nations Week, we celebrated our own week, beginning it by the publication of an article of the Negro writer James Baldwin which spoke of the tragedy of American Negroes." [5]

In this fraudulent parallel Moscow went even so far as to present over Radio Moscow supposed American Negroes who claimed that the only captive nation in the world is the "Negro nation" in the United States. It broadcasted this theme night after night at the beginning of our observance. Apparently, Moscow's own arguments of the past do not seem impressive to itself now. In desperation it has sunk to this ludicrous level of trying to confuse issues of national independence and freedom with those of internal civil liberties; indeed, to the level of de-Americanizing the American Negro.

Elsewhere in the Red jungle similar rantings against the 1963 week were heard. For example, in North Korea, which is in Peiping's "ideological" camp, the President was smeared as a "third-class clown" for proclaiming the week. Pyongyang radio aired broadcasts to this effect and quoted the newspaper Rodong Shinmoon as calling Captive Nations Week "a despicable annual campaign of the U.S. ruling circles." [6]

### SPIRITED CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

Now, the exceptional aspect of the fifth observance was the deep interest shown in it by Congress. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 2 weeks of July 15–26 is replete with addresses and statements on the event. More, nearly 3 dozen Congressmen and Senators joined the National Captive Nations Committee as honorary members soon after the week had been completed.

The congressional observance of the week was, to be sure, impressive in every respect. However, what concerned many legislators was the toned-down character of the President's proclamation, which significantly was the earliest issued on record—on July 5, a week before the start of the observance. This was not the first time that criticism was registered against the President's proclamations. In both 1961 and 1962 the White House was chided for weak proclamations. As one publication put it, "For the third year in a row, President Kennedy threw cold water on the hopes of eventual freedom held by peoples behind the iron and bamboo curtains by issuing a Captive Nations Week proclamation which studiously and admittedly evaded reference to communism." [7]

How valid this and other criticisms are, naturally requires a careful reading and analysis of the five Presidential proclamations, not only comparing them with each other but relating all of them to the Captive Nations Week resolution itself. In the judgment of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who authored the resolution and has been chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington since 1959, each of the five has strong points but still falls short of what Congress called for. Too often critics give evidence of not having read the resolution and all the proclamations.

### THE FIVE PROCLAMATIONS

Before turning to the proclamations the reader would do well to scan the ordered contents of the Captive Nations Week resolution, which was originally cosponsored by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS and later by 17 other Senators. As Senate Joint Resolution 111, it became Public Law 86-90. Briefly, the resolution scared Khrushchev for these major reasons: (1) It was the first time our Government officially recognized the existence of numerous captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union itself; (2) it pointed directly to the source of the threat to world peace, namely, Russia, and Russian imperialism; (3) it also cited the deceptive threat of communism; and (4) the resolution is self-renewing and requests the President "to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." The last is an impediment to Moscow's cold war zigzags, as evidenced by the test ban treaty maneuver.

President Eisenhower's first proclamation on July 17, 1959—2 days before the week—did stress "the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism" and referred to "the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations." However, as related to the resolution, this was somewhat confusing. State Department pressure was exerted to get the President away from any specific reference to Soviet Russia and imperialistic Russian communism. "Soviet communism" and "Soviet-dominated" are terms which conveyed the impression that the captive nations are only those aggressed by the Soviet Union. But what about the greater number of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself, and as enumerated in the resolution? This strategem definitely weakened the proclamation.

The second proclamation issued by President Eisenhower on July 18, 1960, was almost a word-for-word replica of 1959. The proclamation was made a day after the week had begun. Since the law is permissive rather than mandatory, it required some prodding to obtain this proclamation, and at that, in a presidential campaign year. To be perfectly objective, the Kennedy record shows no such tardiness in proclaiming the week.

In 1961 President Kennedy issued his first proclamation. Like the Eisenhower proclamations, his skirted not only points 1 and 2 mentioned above, but also any reference to communism; that is, point 3. His whereas clauses were fewer, and on the whole, his proclamation was weaker than the two previous ones. The 1962 proclamation was substantially no different. Both proclamations were issued 2 days before the week commenced.

The President's 1963 proclamation, however, represented a departure from all the preceding ones in two respects. First, it was issued 11 days before the observance began, on July 5. This time span is not much of a measure of Presidential inspiration, but on record it represents a difference, a departure from "established procedure." And, second, the proclamation strikes twice on "the principle of national self-determination" and "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

Aside from the differences indicated, the five proclamations are based on parts of the congressional resolution. Indeed, their existence is predicated on Public Law 86-90. The Kennedy proclamations have eliminated the confusion created by the two Eisenhower proclamations which contained the Soviet communism and Soviet-dominated phrases. On the other hand, they have needlessly overlooked the weapon of ideological deception inherent in the term "communism" as manipulated by imperialist Moscow. They have failed, too, to bring out the imperialistic aspects of Moscow's aggression, which at least were alluded to in the Eisenhower proclamations. In short, then, all five Presidential proclamations have fallen short of the spirit and content of the resolution.

Is this fact a cause for despair? By no means. The proclamations have hewed close to the line of policy pursued by the State Department. The naive belief that the Russian totalitarians will change their stripes, that evolution will make for a transformed Soviet Russia, and that we must not irritate or provoke the Russian imperio-colonialists runs fundamentally through all these proclamations. Yet, the President, whoever he may be, legally need not issue a proclamation, and if he does, he must bend a bit toward the premisal resolution.

The significant fact is that since the institution of Captive Nations Week both Presidents have annually made their proclamations. This has reinforced the institution itself. Moreover, each year the Russian imperio-colonialists have reacted to the observance in a highly critical way. As the above belief withers away, there can be no doubt that the Presidential proclamations will reflect more poignantly and strikingly the spirit and contents of the resolution itself. This is only a matter of time—time for greater American understanding of Russian cold war maneuvers, time for the development of our own cold war strategy for victory, and time for adequate preparations toward a resounding Captive Nations Week in 1964.

### COVERAGE PRIOR TO CNW

New York Daily News editorial entitled: "Fine Words in Frankfurt":

"'Unless liberty flourishes in all lands,' said President Kennedy yesterday in an eloquent speech at Frankfurt, West Germany, 'it cannot flourish in one.'

"Mr. Kennedy was building on a remark by the Hungarian statesman F. L. A. Kossuth (1841–1914), and the statement came as close to being true as does the average generalization.

"So how about a loud, forceful and prompt proclamation by the President of Captive Nations Week—July 14–20—of the kind President Eisenhower got out?

"Let's shout again from the White House, so that all the world may hear, for the liberation from Moscow and/or Peiping of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, Rumania, Tibet, and the Ukraine. And this time—most fittingly—let's add Cuba to the list of captive nations that we hope to see freed some day soon."

New York Herald Tribune (syndicated), editorial entitled: "A Look at Past Record Deflates Summit Hopes":

"Now Mr. Khrushchev has indicated that he will accept a nuclear test ban (excluding underground) if we will get NATO to sign a nonaggression pact with the Eastern European nations and Russia. Well, we could accept such a pact—if the Soviets on their part would agree to free elections in all the captive nations and permit them to have governments by the consent of the governed.

"This could be the time for some real two-way negotiations."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin (syndicated), editorial entitled "We Hold These Truths":

"The one sure criterion of the reality of our own commitment to freedom is the agony we feel for those who are under a foreign taskmaster's lash.

---

[4] UPI, "Pravda Raises Red Herring Cry," Washington Post, July 9, 1963.

[5] "The Captive Nations and Peoples," Izvestia, Moscow, July 14, 1963.

[6] UPI, Tokyo, Japan, July 15, 1963.

[7] "No Profile in Courage—J.F.K. Again Shuns Red Captive Nations," Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter, No. 27, Washington, D.C., July 12, 1963.

"That is why America insists on uncovering the damning truth in Captive Nations Week. It is an accursed spot which will not out that the bandits desire the world to dismiss with, 'Oh, let bygones be bygones,' as, knocking on the door of moral integrity, they now seek the recognition of respectability."

Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"If the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signs a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Treaty states, our solicitude for the captive nations will fly out the window.

"Such a pact, demanded by Soviet Premier Khrushchev as the price for a nuclear test ban treaty, would imply acceptance of the regimes in power in the Soviet satellite states. The captive nations would be assigned to permanent captivity.

"* * * Khruhschev has been trying to persuade the United States to abolish Captive Nations Week since 1959. Our answer is that we should continue to observe Captive Nations Week as long the Soviet Union continues to renege on its pledge to hold free elections in the nations it has enslaved."

Boston (Mass.) Pilot, editorial entitled "Love of Liberty":

"For some time past, the Soviets have not been happy with America's preoccupation with oppressed peoples. Now they want to see the abolition of Captive Nations Week because they feel that it is as much a 'dead horse' as the Hungarian question. This opposition to even the call for liberty should help to rededicate our efforts in behalf of the ideas of Captive Nations Week."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Cold War Key":

"Feighan (Ohio Congressman) cited that President Kennedy has repeatedly reaffirmed our Nation's historic commitment to the right of self-determination and governments of their own choice, but that the 'Russian experts' in the State Department 'who hold the dubious distinction of misguiding no less than four national administrations, hold that the Russians are mellowing and given time will evolve out of tyranny into freedom.' Feighan pertinently asks:

" 'Will the policy pronouncements of President Kennedy be put into practice, or will the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the State Department defeat these policies with their countermeasures which I have described?' "

Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet (syndicated), editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"In short, Captive Nations Week is an excellent way to tell the Communists that we refuse both burials, the fast one a la Mao and the slow one a la Khrushchev; that we shall not compromise our innermost principles; that we intend to preserve peace and insure the victory of freedom."

Williamsport (Pa.) Grit, editorial entitled "Red Captives Big Challenge to Americans":

"Says Representative Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio: 'It is obvious that our national interests and the cause of peace are best served by nurturing the hopes for freedom and national independence among the peoples of the captive nations. Russia is sitting on a volatile human powder keg of several hundred million captive non-Russians.' "

Muncie (Ind.) Star:

"The Star is proud that it has always been—and that it will always be—among the strongest and most persistent American voices raised in defense of freedom and democracy in Soviet enslaved East Europe. For us world freedom has always been indivisible. We take the fight for European freedom as seriously as we would take a fight for American freedom. That's why we shall never approve of any 'deals' with Russia made by any U.S. administration, which would 'recognize' the Soviet conquest of East Europe.

"That's why we shall always oppose all and any tendencies, displayed by any U.S. administration, toward 'cooperating' with the murderous East European, Soviet-controlled Communist regimes."

St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Thousands and thousands of Americans have relatives living in these occupied lands. Until they are all free, the cold war is not won; and we cannot put down our arms or the same fate will be ours."

San Antonio (Tex.) Express and News editorial entitled "Captive Nations Are Cited Again": "The fact a captive nations proclamation can cause Khrushchev to squirm is sufficient reason to continue the practice. It lets him know we are not forgetting his past misdeeds."

Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "There is evidence that Captive Nations Week observance is a 'bone in the throat' of the Communist leaders. The Soviet propaganda weekly, the New Times, asked early this year: 'Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? This is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question.'

"Obviously the Communist leaders want the oppressed people of the captive nations to feel that we are no longer concerned about their fate and are no longer willing to encourage them to hope for eventual freedom from Communist domination."

Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings editorial entitled "No U.N. Captive Nations Week?": This editorial quoted from an article by Dr. Emil Onaca, president of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations: "If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars on it.

"A more reasonable suggestion could scarcely be made in the name of freedom, and yet not the slightest gesture in this direction has been taken by our delegates in the U.N., whereas we continue to suffer the humiliation of Soviet abuses and denunciations at every session of the U.N.

"And we fear it will always be thus so long as we pursue a policy of accommodation with the Soviets. Meanwhile more freemen will fall under the Red yoke."

Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal editorial entitled: "Will 'Captive Nations Week' Hurt Moscow Peace Talks?":

"The Russians, of course, bristle at the very thought of Captive Nations Week. A Soviet Embassy spokesman in Washington refused even to speak the word 'captive'."

Boise (Idaho) Statesman editorial entitled "In Quest of Peace":

"It's been plainly evident for a long time that peace of a sort can be obtained anytime we're ready and willing to accept it on terms prescribed by Communist imperialism.

"The way to an enduring peace through compromise which safeguards the 'principles of self-determination and human freedom'—which is the way the President seems to be trying to find and follow—is one that's fearfully beset by uncertainties, enshrouded by darkness that could lead to irreparable disaster."

Enid (Okla.) Eagle, editorial: "Our answer to the Red propaganda weekly's question should be that we shall continue to observe Captive Nations Week so long as the Soviet Union reneges on its pledge to hold free elections in the nations it has enslaved. We can best answer the question by deeds in refusing to ink the nonaggression pact as proposed by Mr. Khrushchev in exchange for a nuclear test ban."

New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, editorial: "If the Soviets really want peace, all they have to do is go home and stay there, leaving other nations to choose their own forms of government.

"Until they do, the United States will champion those they enslave, as President Kennedy has forthrightly affirmed."

Spokane (Wash.) Chronicle, editorial entitled "Kadar Goes Calling": "Kadar was a busy, two-faced operator when Russian guns were crushing the struggle of Hungarian people to gain freedom. Time and words and clever makeup have not changed either face convincingly.

"More than ever, Captive Nations Week will serve a great purpose in reminding of what happened to many Europeans, and of what has yet to happen."

Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and freedom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

"And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom."

San Angelo (Tex.) Standard Times, editorial entitled "Goading Is Good": "Of course, there is an effort to relieve the tensions existing between the West and the East, but for our part we think Russia should never be allowed to forget the bloody crimes committed in the name of communism."

Macon (Ga.) Telegraph: "The Soviet Union depends heavily on keeping East Europe in its camp. The satellite nations are forced to contribute heavily to the Soviet industrial machine.

"Many of the 800 million people in East Europe comprise a stumbling block to the Soviet goal of overtaking American industry. It is vitally important to us that the East Europeans hold on to whatever spirit of freedom and resistance they have left."

Dallas (Tex.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Call for Help":

"When we see the general acceptance of the pronouncement of our highest policy papers here that we should not be critical of the captors of the enslaved peoples, or give any hope to the people in bondage, we wonder about the genuineness of the crusade some people profess to be waging. The concern they express involves only certain people and then only selected actions of discrimination.

"Liberty and freedom should be for all men. That should be our goal, clearly expressed during Captive Nations Week."

Warsaw (Ind.) Times-Union, editorial entitled "Khrushchev's Maneuver":

"Perhaps the Soviet Union wants to end the cold war, as Anastas I. Mikoyan, First Deputy Premier, said in explaining Khrushchev's offer. But the price is too high if it freezes the frontiers of central Europe, and confirms Communist conquest there. It runs afoul of sentiment in this country, that the captive nations should be freed."

Other newspapers which ran features and editorials on Captive Nations Week before the week actually began included Los Angeles Tidings; Saginaw (Mich.) Catholic Weekly; Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic; Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun; Grand Rapids (Mich.) Times; Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News; Trenton (N.J.) Times; St. Louis (Mo.) Review; Scranton (Pa.) Times; Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal; Oneida (N.Y.) Dispatch; Grandville (Mich.) Star; Rockville Centre (N.Y.) Long Island Catholic; Albany (N.Y.) Evangelist; Palo Alto (Calif.) Times; Casper

(Wyo.) Tribune; Hartford (Conn.) Catholic Transcript; Athens (Ohio) Messenger; Oil City (Pa.) Derrick; Lancaster (Pa.) News; Miami (Fla.) News; St. Albans (Vt.) Messenger; Elkhart (Ind.) Truth; Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader; Haverhill (Mass.) Journal.

### COVERAGE DURING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

New York Journal American, editorial entitled "The Captives":

"This is Captive Nations Week, and in conjunction with the talks now going on in Moscow the timing could not be better.

"It serves to remind us that—

"1. While Premier Khrushchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation has ever accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

"2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime—that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

"A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the captivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

"Further, as 'Editor Report' by W. R. Hearst, Jr., said Sunday, such a treaty would imply a parallel between the two blocs, where none actually exists. NATO is a voluntary association of free nations. 'The Warsaw Pact is a dragooned clique of puppet governments whose regimented populations are kept in submission under threat of Soviet troop action.'

"We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger."

(This editorial also appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Record American; San Antonio (Tex.) Light; Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald Examiner; Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer.

The Indianapolis Star, editorial entitled "They Know":

"Congressman WILLIAM G. BRAY urged that the United States try to obtain some relief for the imprisoned people of central and eastern Europe. He said that no nonaggression pact should be signed between Khrushchev and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization unless free elections are held in the captive nations.

"The people in the captive nations also have a better grasp of the truth about Soviet communism than our envoys. They know the Reds moved in behind the guns of the Soviet Army, and have stayed for nearly 20 years. They are captives by any definition of the term.

"The people in the captive nations also know that President Kennedy was right when he said, in Berlin, that it is not possible to work with the Communists. They know it from bitter experience.

"The captive nations and the people of those nations work with the Communists every day—with a gun at their backs. Our Indiana Representatives know this and have pointed it out.

"What a pity for the enslaved people of Europe that others in our Government should choose Captive Nations Week to ignore the unpleasant but obvious facts of international life."

Chicago Tribune, editorial entitled "An Ill-Advised Junket":

"Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, took the Senate floor to denounce Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's current junket to Russia and four other Communist countries as ill advised and poorly timed.

"At a time when millions in Communist slavery are being told that the United States is renewing a pledge for their liberation, it will come as a shock of brutal proportions when they see an American Cabinet member, replete with wife and entourage, as the feted guest of their masters," said Senator SIMPSON.

Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Stirs Flame of Freedom":

"The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot muster the necessary determination and decisiveness to dare stand up against our aggressive enemy, which measures its present success in intimidating and softening up the Western World.

"Captive Nations Week provides one opportunity for Americans to recognize the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle and to add to the flame of freedom which must be kept burning in the souls of the oppressed.

"The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. Let us not dim the image of the Uncle Sam who rolls up his sleeves and speaks and acts courageously."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, editorial entitled "Khrushchev, What Now?":

"It is impossible at this time to know if Khrushchev fancies he is using the West as a counterweapon against his mutinous ally, China, but it is entirely possible that for home as well as foreign reasons the Kremlin boss really is ready for a meaningful thaw in the cold war. While we decline to be used, we can ourselves make good use of such a thaw for the extension of freedom and world security."

Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, editorial entitled "Today's Freedom Lesson: Again We Observe Captive Nations Week":

"The vast areas of formerly independent but now subjugated peoples which are controlled by Moscow are perhaps its greatest weakness.

"Captive Nations Week expresses the sentiment of the American people that these peoples should have the opportunity to decide their own political destiny. Holding it is a sound practice which should be continued in the future until they have had that opportunity."

The Boston Globe, editorial entitled "Lest We Forget":

"It means that their voices are not like a drowner's cry 'lost on the desolate wind' of indifference; and that other men and women have not forgotten them. It is a reminder that no genuinely free elections have ever stamped with popular approval the regimes now dominating Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba, or the Baltic States whose cultural leaders were subjected to genocide by the Russians. Freedom does not coexist with the sepulchre."

New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"This is Captive Nations Week, a cold war exercise intended to show this Nation's continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination. It is aimed, of course, at Communist rule in two dozen nations including Poland, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and even the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. such as Armenia, Ukraine, and Georgia.

"Hardest for the Soviet leaders to take has been the suggestion that various states in the U.S.S.R. are captive nations. Even Secretary of State Rusk has argued that the U.S.S.R. is 'a historical state' and that Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine are 'traditional parts' of that state. Imagine American reaction if the Soviets should suggest that the U.S. Government was holding captive the States of the old Confederacy."

(This editorial also appeared in the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News; the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic; the Ironwood (Mich.) Globe; Harrisonburg (Va.) News-Record; the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian; St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press; Burlington (Vt.) Free Press; Wilkes-Barre Record; Camden Courier-Post; Aberdeen (Wash.) World; Danville Evening News; Danville Commercial News * * *.)

Indianapolis (Ind.) News, editorial entitled "A Good Suggestion":

"Congressman DONALD BRUCE, speaking at the opening ceremonies for Captive Nations Week, noted that the defeat of communism 'requires total dedication and understanding of free peoples everywhere now, before it is too late. As long as we are willing to countenance and make deals with the Communists,' we stand in danger of defeat."

Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, editorial entitled "One Day in the Life of a Captive European":

"Nuclear war would be catastrophic. But the necessity of peace does not mean that free men and women must accept as permanent so bleak a life for the hundreds of millions under the Red thumb in Europe and elsewhere.

"The annual proclamation always infuriates Nikita Khrushchev. So be it."

Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News-Telegram and Deseret News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Works":

"The truth is the Captive Nations Week serves some very useful purposes—and evidently is making itself felt where it counts.

"First, the observance acts as a thorn in the side of the Communists. Only recently the Soviet propaganda weekly the New Times complained, 'Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States?' The Soviets likely wouldn't raise this querulous question unless Captive Nations Week were giving them some difficulties. As long as that's the case, the observance is worth the little effort it takes."

Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune Dispatch, editorial entitled "Can This Be Victory?":

"In telling the captive peoples that all we do is to hope to improve their lot slowly through contacts with the regimes they detest, we are in danger of forfeiting their friendship. In fact, we are lending credence to Communist assertions that the West is doomed to impotence.

"Captive Nations Week provides the American people with a chance to show the peoples of Eastern Europe that they are not forgotten."

Indianapolis (Ind.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"To win the cold war, the West must adopt a strategy of the offensive. This means pushing back the frontiers of slavery, and extending the boundaries of freedom.

"As with every great accomplishment, this one must begin with a firm and unwavering commitment to the ultimate goal. Captive Nations Week, obviously, is only a beginning point in a Western strategy of victory over communism. But it is a beginning fraught with hope—for freedom and for the security of our Nation."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, editorial entitled "A Dead Horse?":

"In 1963, we are more mindful than ever of the double standard that has come to govern the world's view of the captive peoples and their problems.

"* * * The upshot of these circumstances is that South Africa and the United States stand before the world as the principal violators of human freedom, while the murderers of freedom in Hungary and East Germany and all the other captive states stand before the world as accusers."

The Toledo Times, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"There is no point in President Kennedy or anybody else mincing words when facts are facts. The rest of the free world, much of it just emerging into the light of freedom, needs reminding every now and then the true nature of colonialism today and exactly who the real colonial power is. And if the words injure Premier Khrushchev's tender sensitivities, so much the better—and all the more reason why they should be uttered."

San Diego (Calif.) Union editorial entitled "Freedom Is Still the Goal":

"Men and women forced to live behind the crude Iron Curtain drawn by dictators always are peering. They hope to see freedom. We have it. They don't. Unfortunately, you can't buy it at a supermarket.

"Freedom must be created. This is the land in which such creation is possible. Its very concept can break the strongest bonds ever thrown about it.

"The captive nations, victims of ruthless Red oppression, will not remain captive. The millions who live there one day will reject the slave status that has been forced on them. This country and all the free world meanwhile will continue the campaign to loose the bonds of captive nations."

The New Haven Register editorial entitled "Freedom Still Burns Behind Iron Curtain":

"This is Captive Nations Week. In this period the courage of those who refused to remain captive to political ideologies repulsive to them is admired by all men who are free."

The Arizona Republic editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"This year Captive Nations Week will continue until Saturday. No one is likely to contend that it is much more than a symbol. But it remains a symbol which acts as a bone in the throat of the Communist world, as evidenced by the fact that the Soviet propaganda weekly, the New Times, asked a few months ago, 'Is it not high time to discontinue the "Captive Nations Week" in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question.'

"The Hungarian question is indeed a dead horse, insofar as officials of the New Frontier are concerned. But sweeping that question under the diplomatic rug does not end the suffering, the oppression, the violation of human dignity and liberties.

"John F. Kennedy, during the 1960 Presidential campaign, said, 'We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.'

"Captive Nations Week gives us a unique opportunity to demonstrate our fealty to those words and to the unfortunate captives of communism."

Lafayette (Ind.) Journal and Courier editorial entitled "Freedom for All":

"So far the West has neglected to utilize this potent weapon. Russia's suggestions and demands keep the West on the defensive. The Soviets are endlessly calling upon the West to negotiate, always demanding but never yielding on an essential point.

"It is important to challenge Russia to allow captive peoples the rights guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter and in the Yalta Declaration, both of which Moscow accepted. As pointed out by WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana Congressman, 'the demand for free elections is one that Russia cannot openly refuse and yet can never accept and keep these people under her dictatorship.'

"Here is a golden opportunity to put the Kremlin on the defensive, and to keep it there, giving the West an advantage in the cold war which it seldom has experienced and which it sorely needs.

"The captive nations deserve their freedom. Their people are entitled to the same liberty and dignity enjoyed by people of the free West. The world, and Russia, in particular, should never be permitted to forget that millions are being kept enslaved under communism."

Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald Journal, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week: Psychological Weapon":

"Captive Nations Week is more than a sentimental gesture. It is a national declaration that these nations, are, in effect, our allies behind the Iron Curtain."

Williamsport (Pa.) Sun-Gazette, editorial entitled "U.S. Position Reaffirmed":

"We reaffirm our opposition to the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism. More than this, however, we should do.

"As a free people ourselves, we should retain the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations. We should remind the world in all our dealings with the Kremlin that the Soviet has not yet fulfilled treaty pledges to conduct free elections in Eastern Europe. And we should declare to both Khrushchev and Mao that in the forum of the United Nations we will act ceaselessly to insure the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe—those millions whom communism treats as faceless satellites."

Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, editorial entitled "Advancing Cause of Freedom":

"Captive Nations Week should provide Americans with a chance to show the oppressed peoples of the world that they have not been forgotten. Advancement of legislation calling for the creation of a Committee on Captive Nations would serve to reaffirm this Nation's intention to preserve the peace and insure the victory of freedom for all peoples of the world."

Roanoke (Va.) World News, editorial entitled "Don't Forget Them":

"It is well to remind the world that, despite the continuing camouflage, communism, as represented by Moscow and Peiping is the real 'imperialism' and 'colonialism' of our day.

"But our protest would ring just a bit more true had not the U.S. Government only recently abandoned the brave people of Hungary by giving up opposition to the Communist government of that satellite becoming a member of the United Nations in good standing."

Martinsville (Ind.) Reporter, editorial entitled: "Now It's Our Fault":

"What has happened to the United States is that its leaders have lost confidence in their own Nation's integrity, and instead of acting from strength they put their trust in some kind of a deal. It is immoral for one nation to bargain away the freedom of another; and being immoral, it can lead only to disaster."

San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Observance Should Kindle Freedom Hope":

"We believe Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, sums up the feeling of most Americans with his comment. DOUGLAS was the principal sponsor of the 1959 resolution designating the observance for the third week in July.

" 'If we slacken our stand against the Communist usurpation of power,' DOUGLAS said Monday, 'or recognize the present Communist domination as either permanent or right, we really deny both our heritage and our ideals.'

"This is the voice we hope carries behind the Iron Curtain."

Springfield (Mass.) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"The week is intended to demonstrate our continuing commitment to the principles of national self-determination. Captive Nations Week brings to world attention the fact that many countries are still under the Communist yoke, but it also may remind us that even outside the Iron Curtain, the principle of self-determination is not always respected."

Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Russia's East European satellites are deviating from their rigid Soviet orbits in unprecedented ways. East Europeans are traveling, talking, and trading in Western Europe particularly as never before in the post-World War II era.

"It does seem that if the special enthusiasts for Captive Nations Week could stress such things more and leave off emphasis on some of the admittedly dramatic but really unhelpful themes struck in the past, their cause would be better served both at home and abroad."

Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune:

"The United States remains honorbound by terms of the unanimous resolution of Congress to let those peoples know that its citizens still are vitally concerned with their eventual freedom. President Kennedy has proclaimed this to be the official American attitude.

"It is a week again to emphasize that word 'captive' with its connotation that sometime the 'captive' shall again be free. It is a week to scoff at Nikita Khrushchev's statement that 'history is on our side.' History, slowly as it sometimes operates, is on the side of freedom."

Chicago Sun-Times editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

This week is being celebrated as Captive Nation Week. The recognition of the nations held in captivity by communism is a cold war exercise to show the world that the United States is committed and dedicated to the principles of national self-determination.

"On Sunday the flags of 25 captive nations flew before the Grant Park bandshell to honor the fifth Captive Nations Week. Chicago has many citizens of the countries represented by those flags. They are good citizens and we are proud of them. We pray, with them, that the day will soon come when those 25 flags will fly in freedom over their own land."

Indianapolis (Ind.) Times editorial entitled "Fair Winds and Foul":

"The winds of freedom, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has noted, are blowing throughout the world.

"The winds of tyranny sweep the Latvian lowlands, the winds of oppression whistle through the Carpathians, the winds of colonialism sweep the lower Danube valley.

"We in Indianapolis must always remember that no man is fully free till all are free."

San Diego Union editorial entitled "Grapevine: It Hops Iron Curtain":

"Any type of effective foreign policy effort involves some risk. And the risk in allowing hope to die in Eastern Europe is that the Iron Curtain will become a permanent barrier.

"Feeding truth into the grapevine which covers the oppressed nations is but a small effort. But it is one which must not be overlooked."

Raleigh (N.C.) Catholic editorial entitled "Right or Wrong—Our Captive Brethren":

"But it is our conviction that, like fascism, racism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Catholicism, communism must be abolished from the face of the earth. And it can be done, just as we did away with slavery in the United States. We may have jim crow here and there, but there is no buying and selling of flesh in the pubic square.

"As Khruschev well knows, our most effective allies in this conflict are the captive peoples themselves. They will hear of our sympathy and of our revulsion for the system that enslaves them, expressed through Captive Nations Week, and it will keep alive in their hearts the ideal of liberty."

Port Arthur (Tex.) News editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week"

"Captive Nations Week, as ineffectual as it may appear, provides our Government with a peg on which to hang exploitation of Soviet cynicism and barbarity.

"It can do so by (1) retaining the issue of Hungary on the agenda of the United Nations, (2) raising the question of Soviet treaty pledges to hold free elections in Eastern Europe in all negotiations with the Kremlin, (3) placing the question of the denial of the right of self-determination to the peoples of East-Central Europe on the docket of every session of the United Nations."

Long Beach (Calif.) Independent-Press Telegram editorial entitled "Where Is the Answering Voice?"

"How important it must be to people living as virtual slaves in their own countries to believe that the free world outside recognizes their plight and offers at least moral support to their resistance. And how important to the free world that those enslaved people continue to resist. Should Khrushchev ever decide that his colonial empire is completely subdued, the West would discover how mischievous a confident and powerful Communist dictator actually can be.

"Yet, Hungary is strangled without a finger being raised in the West, and it's not even nice to talk about that episode; millions are under the Communist yoke in Eastern Europe, but free nations continue trading and treating with the captors; Cuba is throttled by Reds, but loyal Cubans in exile are not permitted to harass them; the captives cry 'Help,' but the answering voice is not heard."

Redondo Beach (Calif.) Breeze editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Can Serve a Purpose":

"The Soviets would like nothing better than for the United States to abandon Captive Nations Week, because it would remove another obstacle to their goals. They have achieved remarkable success by championing 'peaceful coexistence'; they are openly supporting Communist aggression in Laos, they are continuing the buildup of Cuba as a base for aggression and subversion in the Western Hemisphere, they are moving strongly into Italy."

The Houston Post editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Neither President Eisenhower nor President Kennedy has been too enthusiastic about issuing the annual proclamation required in the congressional resolution, although they have complied. Whoever is President naturally feels that it his prerogative and that of the executive branch to conduct this country's foreign affairs and to set its policies. They instinctively object to any attempt at congressional intrusion in this field. It must be admitted that the Captive Nations Week resolution was just that. But there is no doubt that it expressed the overwhelming sentiment of the American people."

Rockford (Ill.) Star editorial entitled "Still Captive":

"It is discouraging to people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains when the United States recognizes Communist regimes which have committed brutal atrocities against their people.

"Elevation of the Russian-dominated regime of Premier Kadar of Hungary to a position of international respectability through U.N. membership would serve as a tremendous blow to the freedom aspirations of the other captive nations of Eastern Europe, which have long counted on moral support from the United States.

"The United States could offer new rays of hope for the millions of Communist-enslaved peoples if, during this week's observance of Captive Nations Week, legislation calling for a special committee on captive nations could be advanced in Congress."

Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, editorial entitled "This Observance Sends Them Into a Rage":

"Hardest for the Soviet leader to take is the truth: That various states in the U.S.S.R. are captive nations."

Meadville (Pa.) Tribune, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"Captive Nations Week is alive and kicking. Its significance now is more important than ever with the existence of a captive nation, Cuba, on our very doorstep. But our concern for the people of captive nations should not be limited to 1 week a year. The observance has meaning only if Americans continue to support a stern policy that resists the surrender of freedom anywhere."

Dayton (Ohio) News, editorial entitled "Captive Nations":

"People as brave as these can live for a long time on hope that is genuine, even if deferred. They will lose heart only if they are betrayed once too often by false promises."

New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Is 'Watered Down' ":

"There are 17 million Americans born behind the Iron Curtain, plus additional first generation Americans from Eastern Europe who are anti-Communist. Not to stand fearlessly for freedom of captive nations in this annual observance robs millions of people behind the Iron Curtain of their hope and faith in America. During Captive Nations Week, let's fly the Stars and Stripes, and have every mayor in Indiana proclaim Captive Nations Week observance."

Petersburg (Va.) Progress Index, editorial entitled "Cold Comfort for Captives":

"The official problem has been described as one of trying to keep hope and spirit alive among the peoples of such countries, but without stirring them to attempt revolts which would be brutally crushed. The facts being what they are, any comfort which the captive nations may derive from the observance of Captive Nations Week may be on the cold side. They are remembered, and that is about it."

The Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, editorial entitled "A Constant Reminder":

"The existence of captive nations in the Soviet bloc is a constant reminder of the only face which the Russian Communists have worn in dealing with the rest of the world. This cannot be forgotten, and Captive Nations Week is assurance that it will not be."

The Evening Press (Binghamton, N.Y.), editorial entitled "Captive Nations Total Grows":

"The peoples of the captive nations look to the United States to find a way to free them some day. But Hungary, deserted by the West and the United Nations in its anti-Communist revolt 7 years ago, is still in Communist chains. And current administration policies hold little consideration for the principles of self-determination as they may apply to Cuba, the latest of Communist conquests. Other Latin countries may be added to the total of captive nations."

Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, editorial entitled: "No Satisfying Substitutes":

"The city commission has asked the people of Kalamazoo to observe a minute of silence Tuesday at 11 a.m. in the hope that all will participate in the commemoration.

"It is fitting that all lovers of liberty—those now enjoying it and those aspiring to it—mark this week with a renewed pledge of support for the preservation or restoration of those political, personal, and religious freedoms for which there are no satisfying substitutes."

Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, editorial entitled: "Remember the Captive States":

"While it is true that the chance of freeing any of these states is not great at the moment, much is to be gained by keeping the world aware of the Communist perfidy and terror which brought about their enslavement.

"The world needs a frequent reminder of the way the Communists operate and their regard for their pledged word. The people in the captive lands need to be shown that they aren't forgotten. If the truth can arrest the advance of communism, it can eventually liberate the victims. We need the support of these people in event of hostilities between Russia and the Western World. They would be a thorn in the Russian flesh from the beginning. Indeed, knowledge of the trouble they could expect in captive lands is one of the leading deterrents to Soviet aggression in Western Europe."

Features and editorials on captive nations of the world also appeared in the following newspapers: Newport News (Va.) Times Herald; Scranton (Pa.) Tribune; Woonsocket (R.I.) Call and Reporter; Cut Bank (Mont.) Pioneer Press; Buffalo (N.Y.) News; New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times; Mamaroneck (N.Y.) Times; Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier; Corpus Christi (Tex.) Times; Rutland (Vt.) Herald; Troy (Ohio) News; New Iberia (La.) Daily Iberian; Sharon (Pa.) Herald; Bradenton (Fla.) Call; New York Journal American; Spokane (Wash.) Inland Catholic Register; Huntington (Ind.) Messenger; Detroit (Mich.) News; Boston (Mass.) Record American; Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times; Chicago's American; Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle; Lafayette (La.) Advertiser; Times Union of Albany, N.Y.; Austin (Texas) American; Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune; The Courier-News (Plainfield, N.J.); Freeport (Ill.) Journal-Standard; The Bridgeport (Conn.) Post; Los Angeles Evening and Sunday Herald Examiner; San Francisco Examiner; Des Moines (Iowa) Register; the Jersey (N.J.) Journal; Poughkeepsie (N.Y.) Journal; North Tonawanda (N.Y.) News; Chicago (Ill.) News; Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press; Niagara Falls Gazette; Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal; Oswego (N.Y.) Palladium-Times.

---

### Resolutions Adopted at the Freedom Rally Held on the Occasion of the Fifth Observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963—Sponsored by the American Institute, Inc., and the New England Captive Nations Committee, Milton, Mass.

Whereas President Kennedy and Governor Peabody proclaimed the week of July 14 to 20 as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the Captive Nations Week resolutions passed by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas the Soviet Government continues to annihilate the national, cultural, and political identities of the captive non-Russian nations through Russification and deportations; and

Whereas Russian communism made its way to Cuba, making Cuba an armed outpost in the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas many millions of citizens of the United States of America are linked by family and cultural bonds with those who live in the captive countries under the tyranny of communism; and

Whereas the United States has failed to develop effective policies toward the captive nations to regain freedom and independence: Now, therefore, we assembled at the fifth observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963, do hereby

*Resolve*—

1. Urge the U.S. Government to declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, its support on the right of self-determination of all peoples held in Communist captivity and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern in all negotiations with the Soviet Government; and

2. Urge the House Rules Committee to speed action on the pending Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), Derwinski resolution (H. Res. 15), and other resolutions calling for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations which will advocate a progressive program to aid captive nations to restore their historical freedom and independence; and

3. Compliment all Congressmen for their resolutions and support; we commend all

Americans who voiced their support for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee; and we urge those who did not lend their support to do so now; and

4. Deplore the State Department for not supporting the establishment of the said committee and urge our State Department to endorse and support the passage of the Flood resolution in its entirety.

---

RESOLUTION AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY, JULY 10, 1963, LOS ANGELES

Whereas Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, mainland China, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others have been deprived of their national independence by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the tyranny and oppression of the Communist regime have enslaved the peoples of these captive nations and suppressed their individual liberties and freedom; and

Whereas the subjugation and domination of these peoples by an alien power constitutes a denial of their fundamental human rights and is contrary to the charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the captive peoples have never ceased to strive for freedom and the right of self-determination; and

Whereas it is vital to the security of the United States and the free world that the desire for freedom on the part of the peoples of the captive nations be steadfastly preserved; and

Whereas the people and the Government of the United States share the aspirations of the captive peoples to be free and independent: Therefore be it

*Resolved by all those assembled here,* That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations the issue of the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Cuba, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others, with a view toward assuring—

1. That all Communist troops, agents, colonists, and controls are withdrawn from these countries;
2. That all exiles from these countries are returned from Siberia and released from prisons and slave labor camps;
3. That free elections are held in these countries under United Nations supervision.

---

## FORMER PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INTEREST IN THE RECLAMATION OF THE ARID REGIONS OF OUR LAND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of John F. Kennedy has had an influence on all we do or say here in Congress, and his spirit will forever be with us. One of President Kennedy's growing interests was in the reclamation of the arid regions of our land. Just last October I was with him on a tour of some of the great projects in the Pacific Northwest which will produce wealth for my region and the country, and he saw clearly the ever-increasing need for full development of all our land and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the constantly expanding demands upon our food and water supply did not die, or even hesitate, when we lost our great leader. We are blessed that President Johnson is also a longtime friend of reclamation. His Western background and his long service in the Congress have given him a full appreciation for our Nation's dependence on the wise use of our natural resources.

Much is being said about the President's determination to eliminate all unnecessary expense, and to keep the Federal budget within tight limits, and I wish to state my full support for his efforts to end waste and extravagance. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that in our attempts to economize we avoid the temptation to cut back on our present minimum program of investment in resource development. We sometimes hear charges that these investments, in the form of dams, irrigation projects, reforestation, soil conservation and so on, are saddling future generations with a great debt. How completely opposed to the truth that is, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that if we neglect our duty to conserve our resources today, tomorrow's generations will look at depleted forests, needless wastelands, and undeveloped river systems, will see the tragic poverty that could so easily have been avoided, and will rightfully condemn us for our neglect and shortsightedness.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want my grandchildren to say of me that I let their heritage go to waste. For that reason I will continue to support to the best of my ability every sound program of resource development, be it a dam in the West, a research center in Georgia, a forest laboratory in Wisconsin or a project to harness the tides in New England. I have confidence that our President, in his drive for economy, will realize the necessary place of national investment in any true effort to get full measure from Federal dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third in a series of speeches calling attention to the great benefits of reclamation. Previously I have spoken of the Columbia Basin project of California. Today I wish to call attention to the Yakima project in the State of Washington.

### YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

The reclamation program has proved its worth to the Nation many times and in many places, near and distant. You need only go to the corner grocer or the supermarket down the next block, and you will find fruits, nuts, or vegetables which were produced with irrigation water furnished by a reclamation project. If you want to see the projects which make this production possible, however, you will have to travel west with the sun.

It is the West which has the sun. But it is the West also which barely sees a raincloud when the sun is hottest. Without the rains, or without artificial means to bring water to the soil, the crops will wither and die. Here lies the value of irrigation and of reclamation works which make such irrigation possible. It is only through irrigation that most of the West can have agriculture at all. And public expenditure in this field of water conservation produces results, not just promises.

To acquaint you with some of these results, let me cite the experience on a project in the State of Washington, the Yakima project. The American public owns nearly $63 million worth of project plant, property, and equipment on the Yakima project. The irrigation water furnished by these facilities to 382,000 acres of prime land in 1962 produced crops valued at nearly $81 million. Since 1907, the year in which production was first reported on, the project has grown more than $2,028 million of crops, or 32 times the $63 million of stock held by the taxpayer.

In addition, this $63 million taxpayer asset is itself being repaid by the water and power users on the project. As of June 30, 1962, $17.3 million, or more than than one-fourth of project costs, had been repaid to the U.S. Treasury; about 95 percent of the sums repaid to date has come from project irrigators, the remainder from net revenues accruing from the sale of project-produced hydroelectric power.

Construction of the Yakima project began in 1906, and continued on through several decades, with the last major division being authorized for construction as recently as 1948. Project facilities include 6 major storage dams and reservoirs, 5 diversion dams, 2 powerplants, 30 pumping plants, and hundreds of miles of canals, laterals, and drains. These works make it possible to provide irrigation water to thirsty lands extending 175 miles on both sides of the Yakima River. Highly fertile lands in the four Yakima Valley counties of Benton, Franklin, Kittitas, and Yakima receive either a full or supplemental supply of irrigation water, whenever it is needed.

Also known as the Fruit Bowl of the Nation, the Yakima Valley area has taken tremendous economic strides through irrigation farming. At the turn of the century, the four-county area produced only about 40,000 bushels of apples, cherries, peaches, pears, and plums and prunes. In 1959, Yakima County alone ranked 1st in the Nation in the production of apples, 3d in pears, 8th in plums and prunes, 9th in peaches and cherries, and 11th in sugarbeets. Overall, in terms of value of fruits and nuts sold, the county ranked sixth in the Nation in 1959.

The irrigated lands served by the Yakima reclamation project facilities in 1962 alone produced apples valued at more than $13 million—enough to furnish a full year's fresh supply to about 25 million people. The project also produced a full year's fresh supply of pears for 56 million people, peaches for 11 million, and cherries for 55 million people.

Many other important high-value specialty crops are produced on the Yakima project year after year. In 1962, these included almost a million crates of asparagus, 25,800 tons of sweet corn for processing, 267,000 tons of sugarbeets, 6,257 tons of hops, and 1.2 million pounds of peppermint and spearmint.

By making irrigation water available to these wealth-producing lands, reclamation has made important contributions to the prosperity and economic growth of the Pacific Northwest in particular, and the Nation and the West in general. If these lands had not received the water to render them truly productive, alternative patterns might well have included the production of wheat and other crops presently in surplus.

Without irrigation, these lands could not support the nearly 67,000 persons who derive their living directly from Yakima project farms; nor could economic opportunities be found for approximately double that number of persons in nearby towns and communities whose livelihood depends directly on the demand for trade and services generated by the project.

Without irrigation or without the project, the four-county area could not have supported—much less induced—the population increase of 153,000 additional persons who came to settle there since 1920. Nor would there have been the demand for project water service to the urban, suburban, residential, commercial, and industrial lands which satisfied the water needs of nearly 64,000 persons in 1962. Indeed, in the absence of the project, it is doubtful if area retail sales would even have reached any significant level—much less the $356 million estimated for 1963.

Reclamation encourages intensive local agricultural land use. The result is increased productivity and a high degree of flexibility in the choice of crops. Intensive irrigation farming also creates economic opportunities in distant areas and States by stepping up the demand for tools and machinery used in the crop production process. Untold millions of dollars of business thus have found their way from the Yakima project to States whose citizens have never seen an irrigation ditch.

But the benefits accruing to reclamation water resource development do not stop there. The development of recreational resources and the enhancement of fisheries and wildlife are an important adjunct of the multipurpose reclamation program. Reports for 1962 indicate that almost half a million days of recreational use were made of the 31,000 acres of water and land surface devoted to outdoor recreation on the Yakima project. Project-constructed storage reservoirs have created nearly 100 miles of shoreline for recreational pursuits. Rapid population growth and increased demands for recreational opportunities throughout the Nation will translate into substantial new business for the Washington recreation industry.

---

## RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ISSUE STAMP HONORING THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1963, the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., adopted a resolution which was introduced by the Honorable Daniel A. Buczynski, memorializing Congress to issue a stamp honoring our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Supervisor Buczynski was an active participant in the Casimir Pulaski Day parade which took place in Buffalo, N.Y., October 14, 1962. After President Kennedy had concluded his very inspiring address, the supervisor asked the President to sign one of the brochures. The President in his gracious manner complied with the request, and today Supervisor Buczynski and his wonderful family cherish the brochure as a remembrance of the President.

The above-mentioned resolution follows:

> Whereas on November 22d of this year this Nation and the entire world was shocked and horrified by the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and
>
> Whereas there are actually no words with which to describe the sorrow and grief which we all feel about this tragedy; and
>
> Whereas it seems only fitting and proper that the U.S. Post Office Department publish a memorial postage stamp in honor of our deceased President John F. Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That this board forward a certified copy of this resolution to Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI in order that appropriate action may be taken for the adoption by the U.S. Post Office Department of a memorial stamp honoring our late President.
>
> DANIEL A. BUCZYNSKI,
> *Supervisor of the 10th Ward.*
>
> Attest:
>
> WALTER A. HOLZ,
> *Deputy Cerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.*

---

## THE STUDEBAKER CORP.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a joint statement of Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, and myself, today with respect to the news that the Studebaker Corp. will end automobile and truck production in its plant in South Bend:

> We are disappointed to learn that Studebaker Corp. has decided to terminate the production of automobiles and trucks at South Bend. We are concerned about the thousands of Studebaker employees and their families. We are concerned as well about the serious effect this decision has on the economy of South Bend and the many other Indiana communities whose local industries serve as suppliers to Studebaker's automotive division. And finally, we are concerned that this fine old producer of cars and trucks is leaving the automotive field.
>
> This curtailment of Studebaker production comes despite every effort on our part to secure assistance in the form of Government contracts.
>
> Since 1961 Studebaker has received more than 80 contracts from the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the Post Office Department which have an aggregate value close to $200 million, according to Studebaker. Studebaker's present backlog of Government orders to be produced is close to $90 million.
>
> We have been highly pleased with Studebaker's phenomenal record of success as a Government contractor. The firm has become a major supplier in just 2½ years. Unranked on the Army's list of top 50 producers until 1962, Studebaker made that list in 43d position that year and jumped all the way to 12th on the Army procurement list in fiscal 1963. There was every indication that Studebaker would continue to be one of the Army's top procurement companies.
>
> Three reasons for this success stand out. First, Studebaker had an excellent record of production and on-time delivery for the Government, a tribute to the skilled labor force and operating management in South Bend. Second, Studebaker seemed to have a complete understanding of defense procurement and, in bidding and agency contact work, was able to do a better job than competitors. Third, Studebaker obviously received sympathetic consideration on the part of the present administration.
>
> We have been proud to do all in our power to assure that Studebaker has received fair consideration in Government procurement work.
>
> Studebaker has been an outstanding supplier of trucks to the Army and to the Post Office. Their work in development and design led to their selection as prime supplier of the Post Office Department's most important new mail delivery truck. In the Department of Defense they have been a leader in the field of heavy duty trucks. They have supplied 2½-ton trucks to the Army for 3 years. They have been successful in securing a contract to produce 8,000 5-ton trucks with production scheduled to begin in May of 1964. Defense Department sources suggest that, because of experience and thorough production ability, Studebaker could well have been the successful competitor for a procurement of 28,000 2½-ton trucks being purchased on a 3-year procurement in late winter.
>
> This Government work has been an important factor, not only to Studebaker, but to the Indiana economy as well. It is estimated that nearly 2,000 Studebaker employees have been working and are scheduled to work on contract with the Department of Defense and General Services Administration.
>
> All three of us have worked very closely with Studebaker Corp. officials and have assisted them in every possible way. Only last Friday, for example, Congressman BRADEMAS invited Studebaker President Byers Burlingame to confer with Senators HARTKE and BAYH and himself as soon as possible in an effort to assist Studebaker.
>
> We must now turn our attention to the problems of these thousands of Studebaker employees who are out of work because of this decision.
>
> We are in touch with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and other Government officials, and they assure us of their complete cooperation in our efforts to help solve these problems. We share a great confidence in the people of the South Bend area. We are determined to work with them to meet this new challenge.

## ACTION POLICY NEEDED IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the kidnaping of American citizens and officials by a group of Castroite Communists in Bolivia, following as it does a similar kidnaping in Venezuela, calls for the strongest action on our part. The President has already offered to the local government our full cooperation by any means necessary. This quick action is in keeping with the traditional American policy of speaking softly but carrying a big stick. It now may be time to use that stick and to do so with the determination that will impress all those who might have similar ideas about using our people as hostages for their own political motives.

The outcome of the election in Venezuela was a bitter defeat to the Communist cause, particularly Castroism. They may become more desperate in the days ahead. The United States must be ready to meet any challenge and must be ready to protect our citizens. U.S. citizens must be safe to travel abroad, and our Government officials must be safe to work in countries which they are trying to assist. If these governments are not willing or able to provide for their safety, then that responsibility rests with us.

We hope that President Johnson, in offering our help, is foreshadowing an important turning point in our foreign policy toward Latin America. There has long been a need for treating each problem in Latin America as an individual case, rather than the tendency to lump them all together as one. They may, in fact, be interrelated, but they are also separate and distinct, which often can best be met with separate and distinct moves on our own part. Individual action, in cooperation with one government or on our own, is the only decisive way to meet problems demanding immediate solution.

We can hope to see a further development of this policy in the days ahead. Of course, the immediate problem is the safety of our people being held in Bolivia. To the President's pledge of assistance we can only add that we should not wait too long for a call from the Government of Bolivia if they are unable to guarantee the safety of our citizens.

## BLAME AND GUILT FOR THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been, since the hideous, tragic, and outrageous moment in Dallas, a gathering of voices which say that the Nation as a whole and especially the city of Dallas must share the blame and the guilt for the assassination of our President. The rationale for this theory is a premise that hatred, suspicion, and bigotry pervade the land. And there is, on the part of some, a tortured attempt to equate it all with rightwing extremists. There are rightwing fanatics and there are leftwing fanatics and both ignore the responsibilities of freedom while indulging themselves in all its privileges. Hatred, suspicion, and bigotry are no doubt a part of their affliction, but I do not believe that that affliction is indicative of the mind of the American people and neither do I believe that the affliction pervades the Nation.

Thousands upon thousands of Dallas citizens thronged the streets—as have the citizens of other American cities—to see and to cheer and to wave at the President and the First Lady, and hundreds at the Dallas Airport crowded closer hoping for the rare privilege of a handshake. When the populace of the city crowds the streets to honor their President, it seems to me that this more accurately reflects the temper and character of that city than does the evil act of an evil mind of one solitary individual.

Virtually the entire population of 180 million Americans was filled with shock, dismay, and revulsion by the assassination of the President. These are the same Americans who join together in United Fund and Community Chest drives for the purposes of aiding the unfortunate and making their respective communities better places to live; who respond quickly in times of disaster and hardship at home and abroad with voluntary donations of food, clothing, money, and helping hands; who support a broad variety of charities, schools, churches, and worthwhile community projects and programs; who join labor unions, service clubs, and fraternal organizations to work for the betterment of all; who undertake to sponsor pageants, ceremonies, and testimonial dinners to honor their heroes, compatriots, contemporaries, and neighbors. These are common, everyday characteristics of American people.

The list could go on and on, and it most certainly does not suggest that hatred, suspicion and bigotry pervade the Nation. To insist that the American people themselves must share a portion of the guilt for the act of one madman suggests, I think, a lack of faith in the decency and integrity of the American people. It is a mystery to me how anyone can rationally turn the assassination into an assault on the whole character of the American people. It is also puzzling why so many of those who speak so self-righteously about hate and bigotry seemingly seek to lay it all at the door of the far right—as if they refuse to believe that the accused assassin was, from the time he was 15, an extremist of the far left, a loner and misfit who had gone to Russia where he renounced his allegiance to the United States.

If it is necessary to seek someone or something to blame, let us not forget that it has been, from the beginning, Communists and communism who have preached and dealt in hatred and violence; who have conspired in treachery, subversion and lies; who have sought to thwart justice and to disrupt law and order wherever they have seen an opportunity.

No one would deny that there are haters and bigots at work in our country. They stand on the outer fringes of both sides of the civil rights question, on both sides of ideological cold war issues and on inconsequential things that have nothing whatsoever to do with political thought or philosophies. But this is only a small eddy, and not a part of the mainstream of American life. And so I do not think it serves the Nation to insinuate that our people are consumed with hate and rancor. Indeed, I wonder if it does not help but to confuse.

When our new President called for unity and support, the people everywhere responded immediately and willingly—and I am sure they would have done so even in the absence of such an appeal. As free Americans we hold a right to our individual convictions, opinions and judgments, but we also stand first for our flag and country.

Perhaps it may prove a special blessing that we are moving into that season of the year when talk and thoughts of hate fade away and good will fills hearts and minds. Christmas, 1963, will find a nation conscious of its sorrow. It will also find the Nation blessed with a renewal of our faith and a reemphasis of good will toward others, and I would like to believe that we will go forward, strengthening and fulfilling the ideals that other generations have fostered and preserved for us.

## FEDERAL EXPENDITURES: EVALUATING THE ISSUES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record a speech delivered at the Tax Foundation Conference, Roosevelt Hotel, New York City, December 3, 1963. A companion speech was delivered 2 days later which I am also placing in the Record.

So much effort has been spent in post-World War II years debating governmental monetary and fiscal policies as they might relate to economic growth that governmental expenditures policies have been neglected. Yet, unlike monetary and fiscal policies, there seems to be no dispute that expenditure policies should be used affirmatively to effect economic health and growth even though there is great dispute over the specific governmental expenditures proposals.

I guess the promoters of the thesis that governmental monetary and fiscal policies should be used, beyond their primary functions, directly to promote economic health and growth, think they have found an axiom. Otherwise, how can they conclude they do not have to prove their thesis or rebut the points of those who disagree with it?

In this kind of intellectual climate I find it necessary to at least restate for the purposes of clarification, and to let the scholiasts know there is dissent, the opposing thesis about monetary and fiscal policies, even though I wish to discuss expenditure policies in this paper.

It is my belief that monetary policy should be directed exclusively to establishing and preserving a weight and measure, if you please, of economic values of goods, services, labor, and savings. In this way it can best be a medium of exchange and an accurate base for economic statistics to tell us what is happening in the economic crucible. Anything that distracts monetary policy from achieving this most difficult and, like an ideal, unattainable goal, in the long run, is detrimental to the economic health and growth in the society.

It is likewise my belief that fiscal policy, taxation and governmental debt should be directed exclusively to raising as efficiently as possible the revenue necessary to pay for the goods and services demanded by and for the society through governmental expenditure policies. Anything that distracts fiscal policy from achieving this difficult goal in the long run is detrimental to the economic health and growth in the society.

However, in the proper use of these two great governmental powers one constantly sees economic health and economic growth being affected. It is a great temptation to conclude that this is a simple operation of the law of cause and effect, so that all we have to do is reach in to produce immediate effects which seem so clearly to be in the interest of economic welfare. This is like assuming we can gain the moon because we can see it. Self-discipline accompanied by a bit of humanity is necessary to resist this temptation. I suppose this human temptation to tinker with things we do not fully understand has come to us in economics as the result of the newly emerging science of economic statistics. It is my judgment that this new science is at the stage of development astronomy and chemistry were as they were emerging from astrology and alchemy.

I think governmental expenditure policies should be determined by forthright political decision after proper congressional study and debate of the needs and desires of a society. Governmental expenditures should be limited by fiscal policy only, and hopefully, on a temporary basis, when these needs and desires exceed the fiscal abilities of the society. A society should consider well in establishing expenditure policy that it has available for the purpose two basic mechanisms, the marketplace mechanism and the mechanism of political government. After all, the base for governmental revenues is the nongovernmental sector, unless we are to have a totalitarian state in which the political and the economic powers are merged.

Let me digress a bit to stress that while the proper economic goal of a society is to free its people as fully as possible from the physical laws of nature, this is of no avail to the majority of them if the shackles of the physical world from which they have been freed are replaced by social shackles. It is my faith, because I cannot yet prove otherwise, from history or logic, that sustainable economic advancement is dependent upon men cooperating with each other and not being shackled by other men. Some people think they can prove that a society of freemen is more productive and advances further than a society where the aristocrats are free but the bulk of the people are slaves, in the public meaning of the word "slave." Others think they can prove the opposite.

At the latter part of the 18th century, our political philosophers, believing in the importance of human freedom to social advancement, if not for religious reasons, sought to guard it against the social shackles from which it had recently emerged in certain parts of Western Europe. Herein lies the idea set forth in the U.S. Constitution for the separation of the powers of government into legislative, executive, and judicial, and into the three tiers of government—local, State, and Federal. Herein lies the idea for the separation of those two great social powers, government and religion, and our Bill of Rights protecting the individual in certain areas from any political action whatsoever of the majority.

Economic power had not been greatly developed at the end of the 18th century. There were only about seven corporations in all America at the time of the Constitution. Eli Whitney had not yet developed his guns with interchangeable parts which became the essence of mass production and human specialization. Steampower had not yet replaced waterpower. Electrical power was a parlor trick and atomic power was not even a fantasy. There being no mass production, there was no need for mass advertising. In other words, economic power was so diffuse and so weak it was not thought of in terms of a dangerous social power, as were governments and religions, so long as the main source of economic wealth—land—was diffused, which it was in the Thirteen Colonies and in the untamed wilderness to the North, West, and South.

However, today with our intimate knowledge of the existence of what we call totalitarian states, wherein economic and political powers are merged, we should be acutely aware of the importance of keeping separate these two great social powers—economics and government—in order to protect human freedom.

So governmental expenditure policy, although directed to social needs and desires, must be limited by a basic regard for the importance of the separation of economic and political powers in order to preserve freedom even at the sacrifice of efficiency. I happen to believe that freedom and economic efficiencies go hand in hand and are not in conflict, but I leave that debate with those who seek that will-o'-the-wisp efficiency of totalitarian states, for another time.

To get back to the question of the limitation of governmental expenditure policy by fiscal policy, I have suggested that whatever limitation there may be should be temporary. In other words, if a governmental expenditure has been deemed needed or desired and it is most efficiently attained, with a proper regard for the balance of economic and political power through the Federal political mechanism, then it is just a question of how and when we most efficiently finance this expenditure. In other words, fiscal policy should be based upon the needs expressed in expenditure policy.

Fiscal policy must be based upon long-term considerations. The economic and social impact of a particular tax structure and tax take upon the tax base must always be a matter of concern to those who set tax policy. If the tax structure and tax take weakens the economic structure upon which it is based, then the economic impact of the total expenditure picture must be weighed with this economic impact and the net result calculated. In order to reach total Government policy it may be necessary to establish priorities among desirable expenditures, even needed expenditures, so as not to overburden the tax and debt structures.

I am happy that today the neo-Keynsian economists have joined the tax neutralists who have been saying for many years that our Federal income tax structure is undermining our economic structure and damaging economic health and future economic growth.

However, tax policy is only one part of fiscal policy. When we fail to obtain the revenues necessary to meet our governmental expenditures we must then resort to deferred taxation, issuing Government bonds.

It is important when considering the soundness of a tax structure and its economic impact to consider it in its entirety, which is debt and taxation, both the present and future abilities of the tax structure to produce revenues. So, although the neo-Keynesians have reached the same conclusions which the neutralists reached sometime before them, about the deleteriousness of the amount of revenue take by means of our Federal tax structure, they are by no means in agreement with the neutralists' conclusions that the amount of Federal debt is equally, if not more, deleterious to our economy.

I believe our Federal debt, our debt, policy is seriously undermining our economic health and economic growth. It is my thesis that probably it is more economically damaging than our immediate tax take. If this is true, it does no good, and does great harm, in seeking to relieve the damage being created by our immediate tax take to reduce the taxes of today and defer the amount of the reduction to be paid out of future tax revenues.

In other words, I have contended that it is necessary for those of us in the Congress who are charged with studying and evaluating fiscal policy to advise that our tax structure and the amount of accumulated debt (deferred taxation) is at a point where we cannot provide revenues through taxes or Government bonds to meet the President's total expenditure estimates for fiscal 1964 without creating serious economic damage.

The administration can attempt to refute this conclusion in one of two ways, or in a combination of both. (It has abandoned a third possible refutation that our Federal tax structure is not undermining our economic health and growth. The administration spokesmen have agreed that it is, and like many a new convert, have become more zealous in seeking the reform more massively and quickly than the original believers.)

The administration could argue that the amount of accumulated debt, deferred taxation, along with the increases of debt which will result in the interim period while we are reaching a balanced budget, under its economic theory, will not create greater economic damage.

Or the administration could argue that the Federal expenditures which it advocates will create economic benefits sufficient to counteract the deleterious economic effects stemming from the amount of the debt.

The administration has not sought to debate the first point. Indeed, every attempt to have its spokesmen debate the economic impact of the present debt, let alone the economic impact of the increased debt resulting from the planned deficits, has met with no response. The most I have been able to get out of Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is that he agrees that to the extent the new debt securities to replace the revenues lost from the tax cut are sold to the private sector the beneficial effects sought from the tax cut will be diminished. And that to market these securities through the Federal Reserve System will not create inflationary pressures which cannot be contained because there is a high incidence of unemployment and underutilized plant capacity which will sop up any new money and increased purchasing power resulting therefrom.

To resolve this latter part of Dr. Heller's thesis, we must analyze the consistency of the unemployed and of the so-called underutilized plant capacity. If the unemployed are largely those with limited and obsolete skills, which I believe to be the case, and the underutilized plant capacity is largely obsolete, inefficient, and unwanted plant capacity, which I believe to be the case, then inflationary forces would not be contained. We would have to evaluate the effect of these forces upon our economy at this time, troubled as it is with an unfavorable international balance of payments, an already relatively high incidence of unemployment, and unusually high investment liquidity.

Neither Dr. Heller nor anyone supporting his thesis of planned deficit financing through tax cutting unaccompanied by Federal expenditure cuts has undertaken to make this analysis. Not one person spoke on the House floor during the debate on the recent tax cut bill in favor of any aspect of this economic theory. Indeed, all who spoke paid great respect to the immediate need for expenditure reform. The debate centered on whether the Congress should or should not rely on the Executive's statements that expenditure reform was to occur. In other words, the theory that aggravating the problems already existing in the field of debt measurement by increasing the debt would create more economic loss than the tax cut could provide in gains was uncontested.

In this respect, the administration has even abandoned its second point of possible refutation, that the affirmative expenditure policies would produce sufficient economic gains to counteract whatever deleterious effects came as the result of increasing the Federal debt.

However, even though the administration has had no advocate in the Congress willing to defend its policy of tax cuts and planned deficits by arguing the benefits it claims will be gained from its expenditure policies, some of the spokesmen in the administration and many of its outside supporters who have access to the public relations media have sought to advance this thesis, albeit obliquely.

Obliquely in two senses of the word. In the first sense, through the use of speeches and press releases which are not subjected to rebuttal or the affirmative case against them. In the second sense, by creating strawmen to demolish and so avoid the real points of disagreement.

It is very difficult for any audience outside the Congress to comprehend what I have been saying. The congressional world is limited to 535 Members and the limited audience the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might reach. When we contrast this audience with the audience reached by the national media of newspapers, weekly magazines, the syndicated columnists, radio and television with its national networks of news commentators and editorialists which has carried the administration's one-sided presentation and buried the congressional debate and the opposition's syllogisms, it is understandable how the popular picture can be just the reverse of the true one. The retreat from the forum which the Congress provides where equal debate may be had, with rebuttals available to both sides, has been on the part of the administration theorists, not the neutralists.

The administration has sought only cursorily to point out the economic benefits it claims will be derived from the components making up its total expenditure package. It is these components which should be debated and resolved. Many Federal expenditure programs, of course, can be justified and some of them will bring economic benefits. Others, which may be beneficial for other than economic reasons, may not bring economic benefits. Certainly the whole must be evaluated on the basis of its component parts.

However, the administration has sought to win its point on expenditure policy in terms of aggregate economics, not on the basis of the sum of the components. Here the administration theory is even more vulnerable to refutation.

The administration bases its case upon the need for increased total expenditure in the society. Total expenditure is composed of private plus governmental expenditures. According to this theory, and in opposition to the theory which the administration congressional supporters settled for with the administration's approval in obtaining passage of the tax bill in the House, we cannot cut back on Federal expenditures to make up for the tax revenues lost from the tax cut. The net increase in total expenditures would be nil.

It is interesting that the administration spokesmen do not make the point which seems to be true that the multiplier effect which they talk so much about is greater in private spending than it is in Government spending and that, therefore, a mere shift of spending power from the governmental sector to the private sector through a tax cut accompanied by Federal expenditure cuts would be beneficial even if total spending power remained the same. Perhaps the administration economists do not agree that the multiplier effect is less in Federal Government spending than it is in private spending. This is a fair subject for debate. To resolve it we should get into the components which go to make up governmental spending—expenditure policy—and private spending.

One of the many difficulties of the administration's total spending theory in these times is that consumer purchasing power and consumer credit have never been higher. Furthermore, corporate liquidity and investment money to deter it from going abroad. plentiful. So plentiful is corporate investment liquidity that for other reasons, balance-of-payments reasons, the administration is seeking to impose an excise tax on investment money to deter it from going abroad.

Our problem today in the private sector is not ability to spend, but motivation to spend. Our primary problem in motivation to spend is not consumer spending, which still seems to be amply motivated by the new goods and services in the market, but rather in motivation to invest.

It is important to stress that investing money is spending money. Investing is spending money for buildings and machinery, in training manpower and putting manpower together into an economic team and for research. This kind of spending has the highest multiplier effect of any expenditure. It is this kind of spending which creates jobs, maintains economic health, and promotes sustainable economic growth. This kind of spending encourages consumer spending, not only by increasing consumer purchasing power through creating jobs, but by creating consumer spending motivation through developing new goods and services in the marketplace. This is the kind of spending that promotes real economic growth which is increased standard of living, more leisure time, greater skill and knowledge of the people, lower costs for goods and services and of higher quality. This is the kind of expenditure, however, which is made only when it is anticipated that real economic growth will result based upon realistic cost accounting. This kind of expenditure must anticipate an economic return in interest and dividends for the investment. This kind of return can only come if new wealth has been created by the expenditure.

There is one point on which I would agree with the administration economists if they would ever seek to make it; hoarding retards economic growth. I have never heard the administration theorists speak out against hoarding, but when they complain about inadequate total spending in our society I would think that they would be concerned about the amount of hoarding that presently exists and that they would wonder about its causes. Certainly they should have some theories about the high incidence of investment capability today, even if they do not agree that the cause lies in dampened motivation to invest.

Economic hoarding is not limited to gold in a sock. If we are to understand it, we must relate it to the failure to use assets and available credit. Economic hoarding encompasses loafing instead of working. Unemployment can result from lack of sufficient motivation as well as from lack of sufficient jobs.

What stimulates the motivation to hoard rather than to invest? What creates the motivation to save a dollar rather than to spend a dollar? After all, investment expenditures comes from someone's savings, one's own and what one is able to borrow from others.

The motivation to save and then to invest the saving rather than to hoard it comes essentially from the security of the investment and the return that one anticipates from the saved and invested dollar. It is saved if it receives interest for exercising this discipline, this denial to spend on oneself. It is invested, spent at risk with the hope of creating economic wealth, if it can anticipate a return for the risk in proportion to the risk.

Governmental monetary and fiscal policy have more to do with creating the climate for saving and investing and, conversely, the climate for hoarding than any other factors. If the administration, through pursuing a policy of deficit financing, creates an incentive to hoard, rather than to invest, its own theory of stimulating increased total spending in the society is, of course, defeated. This is exactly what I believe is the case.

I suggest that the key to the debate on the novel theory of deficit financing we find embodied in the administration fiscal policy, which includes tax cutting without expenditure cuts, lies in the answer to this question of what makes men hoard.

Inflation may make consumers spend money and even borrow money where they can at whatever price and investors to acquire and hold tangible assets, and it may cause money to move more rapidly, but it certainly doesn't make men sell or utilize tangible assets, particularly real estate, which is still the basic item of economic wealth. The hoarding of physical assets during times of great inflation, of course, makes the monetary inflation feed on itself. Or we can have that which is possibly worse—deflation—where hoarding is more obviously the base.

I would be happy to discuss debt. The administration has created a strawman when it says those who oppose its novel fiscal policy of deficit financing just don't understand that debt can create wealth. Of course, borrowing someone else's savings to spend them in the hopes of creating wealth can create wealth. No one has ever disputed this fact. On the contrary, the private enterprise system is based upon creating wealth by spending savings, one's own combined with others. The key question is—what is the money realized from the debt to be used for?

Investing in creating wealth can be financed from one's own savings and from borrowed savings. So an important ancillary question about debt is: What should the optimum mix be? Most financing of new economic ventures is a composite of one's own savings and the borrowing of other's savings. Our country was built upon our own savings and some borrowing from outside our own society, but it was all invested in relation to specific expenditures. Hence, we come right back to expenditure policy.

Now, let us see why Federal debt is not like private debt or even like local and State governmental debt. Private debt, whether personal or corporate, is related to specific expenditures. The debt itself is related to two things singly or composite: security of the asset itself, earning capacity of the asset or the borrower to repay the debt and to pay the charge for the loan. In other words, it is directly related and, indeed, based upon the assumption that it is going to create economic wealth.

Local and State debt is similar to personal and corporate debt. Most municipalities and counties float bonds for capital improvements, schools, roads, bridges, sewers, and what have you. All increase the wealth, measured in real estate values, if nothing else, of the community which is the primary tax base for local governments. These debts relate to specific assets; they relate to the tax base, the ability to pay. State debt is quite similar.

Only Federal debt differs. It relates primarily to the defense of this country—a service which we badly need, but a service which is economically barren. Defense expenditures do not create wealth in the assets purchased; the missiles, the aircraft carriers, the atomic bombs, etc.—even military buildings have little asset value. They are mostly single purpose, nor do they bring in revenue. That portion of the Federal debt which does relate to creating economic wealth except for the traditional public works projects relates to the very area where most of the debate lies as to whether the Federal governmental mechanism is the best mechanism in our society to direct this expenditure. Indeed, I would argue that where a wealth-creating expenditure is involved the presumption is quite strong that the expenditure would be better and more efficiently handled by the private sector through the marketplace mechanism, and if other factors suggest that the mechanism of Government be used, by one of the other two tiers of government, State or local, rather than by the Federal Government.

The Congress has developed the mechanism for dealing with only one phase of expenditure policy. Congress, though its authorization process of the legislative committees and its appropriation process of the Appropriation Committees, passes upon the desirability and the need of the components which go to make up total spending. The mechanism needs to be improved and better policy guidelines need to be established. But at least Congress has the necessary machinery.

Congress does not have the machinery to make policy decisions on the optimum size of the Federal debt. Congress makes little effort to establish priorities between needed programs when the tax revenues and the optimum bonded indebtedness are exceeded by the total of expenditures. Some of us have tried to develop the debt ceiling legislation into a mechanism whereby the Congress can make such judgments. We also tried to use the recent tax cut bill as a vehicle for expressing congressional judgment on expenditure levels.

Let me illustrate my points by reference to the Federal budget for fiscal 1964, presented to the Congress in January of this year. The administration requested new obligational authority to spend of $108 billion. However, only about 40 percent of this new obligational authority is scheduled to be spent in fiscal 1964; the balance is scheduled to be spent over the next three or four ensuing fiscal years.

The 1964 budget set out that on July 1, 1963, the beginning of fiscal 1964, there would be a carry-over balance of unused authority to spend granted by the Congress in previous years of $87 billion. In other words, if the Congress through its appropriation bills granted to the President his request for $108 billion of new obligational authority, he would have a pool of $195 billion of authority to spend in fiscal 1964. Of course, the President had no plans to spend this amount of money in 1 fiscal year. Nonetheless, he alone has the discretion to set the expenditure level for fiscal 1964. In his 1964 budget he set that level at $98.8 billion.

All Presidents have properly frozen programs, accelerated programs, and decelerated them in accordance with changed circumstances occurring after the authority to spend had been granted and scheduled in the congressional appropriation bills.

Congress has an obligation to express its judgment on total fiscal policy, and to do this, it must make its determination of what the expenditure rate should be in light of the revenues anticipated for each fiscal year. Failing to do this, Congress has no way of expressing its judgment on the debt aspect of fiscal policy.

The most the Congress has been doing to set budget and policy is through its control over grants of new authority to spend, but this has a very limited effect upon the expenditure level of the current fiscal year.

The slowdown of the present Congress may be attributed to its making one further effort to cut the expenditure rate for fiscal 1964.

Fiscal year 1964 began on July 1, 1963. With 5 months of fiscal 1964 already passed, the bulk of the fiscal 1964 appropriation bills are not yet law.

Congress has kept the Government bills paid by passing each month what are called continuing appropriation resolutions. The popular congressional notion is that under continuing resolutions of this sort the Executive can spend only at the level of the preceding fiscal year, which was $92.6 billion for fiscal 1963.

If these continuing resolutions achieve what they are believed by most Congressmen to achieve, the expenditure level for 6 months of fiscal 1964 will be $92.6 billion and not the $98.8 billion in the President's budget.

Regretfully, I am afraid my colleagues are due for a rude awakening about the real import of continuing resolutions. I fear that the rate of spending for the past 5 months has not been kept to a $92.6 billion annual rate. I suspect it will turn out to be about $97 billion annual rate.

However, out of all this turmoil I believe the Congress will develop adequate machinery whereby it can pass judgment upon the budgetary policy.

The art of budgeting on the expenditure side of the ledger, I have often remarked, is not so much concerned with cutting out waste, extravagance, and inefficiency, as much as it is with establishing priorities between needed and efficient programs. Cutting out waste, extravagance, and inefficiency is a matter of identification. Establishing priorities between good programs requires judgment and political fortitude.

I hope Congress will get on with the job.

## GOVERNMENT TAX POLICY INCLUDES DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the companion speech to the one I previously placed in the Record entitled "Federal Expenditures," delivered before the California State Chamber of Commerce, on December 5, 1963, in Los Angeles, Calif.:

It should not be necessary to point out that the Federal debt is a part of our system of Federal taxation. It is merely deferred taxation. Certainly the members of the House Ways and Means Committee are acutely aware of the fact that when sufficient tax revenues are not provided to meet the Federal expenditures it is necessary to print and market additional Federal bonds to make up the deficit.

From time to time the Congress is called upon to raise the limitation on the amount of Federal bonds that may be issued at any given time because the Federal Government rather consistently has failed to live within the limits of its tax revenues in the past decades.

Now economists and political scientists of all shades of belief have joined to say that even this amount of tax take although it is inadequate to meet expenditures is causing economic damage and we must cut Federal taxes in order to allow the economy to grow. The theory is that as the economy grows the tax base is expanded and the tax revenues will increase, making up for the additional deficit caused by the immediate cut in revenues.

This theory certainly requires us to take a hard look at the economic impace of the Federal debt. Is it possible that the present size of the Federal debt is causing economic damage equivalent to the damage the economists see resulting from our Federal tax system?

I think so. Indeed, I maintain that the present level of the Federal debt is causing even greater damage to our economy than the much heralded damage being caused by our Federal tax structure.

If my thesis is anywhere near correct it is foolhardy to follow a fiscal policy of cutting taxes and increasing the Federal debt to make up for the deficit. Whatever the soundness of the theory may be that we gain increased economic growth by decreasing Federal taxes it must be weighed with whatever economic damage may result from increasing the Federal debt.

Now why has the administration failed to consider and discuss the debt management aspects of its novel theory of planned deficit financing designed to increase economic growth? Why have some eminent businessmen notably those on the Ford Committee allowed their names to be used to help push through the tax cut bill without facing up to the important consideration of debt?

I can understand economic theorists becoming bemused with their economic models to the extent that they fail to deal with the entire aspect of tax policy and leave out debt management. I can even understand politicians following the economic theorists in this half-baked approach to things, but I cannot understand businessmen who have to deal with realities doing so.

One economic reality about our present Federal debt that is hard to ignore is that it costs almost $11 billion a year just to pay the interest charges. This is one-tenth of our total annual expenditure budget.

Another ever-present economic reality about our Federal debt is the need for the Federal Government to go into the capital market each year to refinance the debt and finance the additional increments to it to the tune of about $70 billion. It is hard to calculate the effect this has on our capital markets, but it is considerable.

Another important fact about the Federal debt is that it has become an integral part of our Federal monetary machinery. This has direct bearing on both our domestic business operations and our international business operations.

We have failed to discuss even the basic question of Federal debt policy. Should our optimum policy be to have no Federal debt at all? This is perhaps excusable, inasmuch as it seems to be such an academic question. The Federal debt has become such a basic part of both fiscal and monetary policy of the Federal Government.

However, we certainly should be discussing what the optimum Federal debt should be and in this discussion certainly it helps to consider whether there should be any Federal debt at all.

In this discussion we should be searching for the criteria we should use as guidelines in order to determine the optimum Federal debt.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers in its endeavors to allay any fears on the part of the Congress and the public about the size of the Federal debt has suggested some of the criteria we might utilize, albeit most of these suggestions are advanced in a defensive or negative way rather than in a positive manner.

It has said that we need not worry about the size of the Federal debt because it is a less ratio of gross national product than it was in 1946. Using the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product seems to be one good criterium for evaluating the optimum size of the debt. Accordingly, let's determine what the optimum ratio might be. Does the administration think that the ratio of 1946 is the optimum on which we should set our sights?

I doubt very much if they would argue such a point; 1946 was the year at which the ratio of Federal debt to the gross national product was the highest in our history, having reached that point after the massive deficit financing we employed in order to win World War II. Even the peacetime ratio of Federal debt to gross national product immediately preceding World War II is a questionable optimum to shoot for, inasmuch as the period from 1929 to 1940, when this ratio was rising so fast, was a period of negative economic growth.

If we review our history, we find that economic growth was the greatest during periods when the Federal debt was below 20 percent of gross national product, a far cry from the 53 percent we have today, 17 years after the end of World War II, and the 40 percent we had at the beginning of World War II, after the great deficit financing engaged in during the Roosevelt depression.

Furthermore, it is important to consider that 70 percent of the decline in the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product, which has occurred since the high water mark at the end of World War II was reached, occurred in the first 5 years immediately following the war. This resulted neither from decreasing the debt nor increasing the gross national product, but almost entirely from the heavy devaluation of the dollar. The debt, of course, was measured in terms of the 1946 dollar, while the gross national product was measured in terms of the inflated dollar of 1951. Since 1951, the decline of the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product has been very slow. Since 1961, it has been less than one full point per year.

We can always lower the ratio of Federal debt to gross national product through inflating the dollar, but I trust that this is not the policy that anyone would seriously advocate.

The administration has suggested another criterium for evaluating the size of the Federal debt. It is completely negative and so questionable I hesitate to mention it. It is the argument that the Federal debt may be bad, but other debts are worse.

However, the point has been advanced and therefore it should receive some discussion. The administration has said that the Federal debt has grown less than State and local governmental debt and less than corporate and private debt since 1946. Well, let me ask the question again, Is the ratio of the year 1946 the optimum we should seek if we are to use the ratio between these various kinds of debt as a criterium? I hardly think so. During World War II we deliberately directed as much of our national effort as we possibly could through the Federal governmental mechanism in order to win World War II. Indeed, we deliberately stunted the private and other governmental sectors. We imposed credit controls on the private sector and through material and manpower controls, not to mention price controls, further diminished the efforts of the private sector and slowed down the activities of local and State governments. The ratio of Federal debt to local and State debt and to private debt was the highest in our Nation's history in 1946. If we are going to use this ratio as one of the criteria in determining our optimum Federal debt we should examine the ratios in peacetime years and particularly in those years when our country advanced the most rapidly economically, and in peace and in freedom. When we make such an examination we find that the ratio which exists 17 years after the unfortunate peak we reached in 1946 as the result of World War II is far short of the optimum peacetime ratios. The adjustment of the ratio of State and local governmental debt and corporation and private debt to Federal debt back to the optimum years of peace and growth which has been going on in the 17 years since the end of World War II should have been much greater than it has been. The better way and quicker way to get back to our optimum ratios is not as we have been doing, to increase the other debts more rapidly than the Federal debt, but rather to decrease rather than increase the absolute size of the Federal debt.

Another criterion suggested by the administration is to relate Federal debt to the creation of wealth. This suggested criterium has also been advanced by the administration in an oblique and negative fashion. Instead of pointing out specifically where the Federal debt has created new wealth so there can be forthright consideration of the allegation, it points out that local and State debt and corporate and private debt creates wealth and by inference so does the Federal governmental debt. Certainly the creation of new productive wealth is a splendid criterium in evaluating debt.

And it certainly is true that most State and local debt and corporate debt is for the purpose of creating new productive wealth. Indeed a great deal of private debt also might very properly be said to create new wealth particularly as it relates to homeownership and purchase of automobiles and other labor saving consumer durables.

However, almost the exact opposite is true of Federal debt. The bulk of Federal debt occurred to provide for the defense of the country. Military hardware and installations are not wealth-producing resources. Their book value must be set at $1 not at the billions of dollars they cost, inasmuch as they are single purpose and purely governmental items of little or no economic value in the marketplace.

Some Federal debt has been incurred for the purpose of creating new productive wealth, but it is a very small portion of the total debt. As a matter of fact, the areas where this kind of Federal debt has been incurred are those where most political controversy occurs today over whether the Federal Government is outside its field of proper activity, constitutionally and from the standpoint of efficacy.

However, it is in this area of purpose of the debt where we should find our basic criteria for deciding how much and what Federal debt should be created. This is the area of governmental expenditure policy which has been so neglected in public debate in recent years.

When we get into discussing the purposes for which debt is created we find our best criteria. If debt helps to create new productive wealth it has a plus factor. However, new productive wealth can be financed by current income and one's own savings; it need not be financed by debt, although almost invariably it is created through the capital expenditure of society's aggregate savings.

The administration has endeavored to create its own strawman to attack and to demolish in order to distract the public's attention from the real debate. The administration says how foolish is our opposition when they say all debt is bad.

Well, I have never heard anyone argue that all debt is bad even though it isn't as good as one's own savings. Quite the contrary, most people who deal with the economic mechanism of debt either as a creditor or debtor, and that is most of us, are almost totally concerned with the purpose for which the debt is to be created. A good bit of debt is simply a method to provide liquidity and is secured by present rather than assets to be created. It is the expenditure purpose for which the debt is incurred that reveals whether new productive wealth will be created so that (1) the debt can be paid off; (2) that the interest charges of the debt can be met.

In using savings to create new productive wealth we are usually concerned with a mix between current income, savings of our own, and savings borrowed from someone else. The optimum mix of current income, one's own savings and borrowed savings varies greatly with the purpose of the debt. Yet it is the mix that becomes the focal point of much of the economic evaluation of debt. This focal point has been ignored by the advocates of planned Federal deficit financing except to dogmatically state that the proposals they make have the optimum mix.

Furthermore, debt is a mechanism for spreading the payment of the cost of a capital asset over its usable lifetime. Both Government and private institutions find debt to be a very helpful economic device to accomplish this purpose. Federal debt policy like any debt policy must be set to some degree upon the policies set for the component borrowings that go to make up the total debt. However, Federal governmental debt has an important policymaking factor unlike any other that goes beyond the whole of the parts.

Only the Federal Government has a power beyond fiscal policy, immediate taxation and debt creation, which can be used to assist it in meeting its expenditures. It alone has the power to create new money. By creating new money beyond the earned needs of the economy it can pay for some of its expenditures.

However, I believe that monetary policy should never be used for this purpose, because in so doing Government defaults on one of its basic obligations to the people to establish and to preserve that basic weight and measure of the marketplace, a medium of exchange to measure the value of goods, services, labor, and savings. Tampering with this weight and measure strikes at the very heart of the process of economic stability and growth.

The administration is really advancing no novel theory when it presents planned deficit financing. It is merely advancing the old and discredited theory that inflation creates growth in new and sophisticated economic phraseology. The administration theory is based upon the assumption that if total purchasing power in the society is increased total spending will increase. If total spending increases axiomatically we will have increased gross national product. Increased gross national product is assumed by these theorists to be the equivalent of true economic growth, which it may or may not prove out to be. Increased gross national product means increased Federal revenues.

There are many flaws in this syllogism supporting the theory of planned deficit financing aside from the fact that the increased purchasing power is merely printing more money. The basic assumption is that increased purchasing power means increased spending. However, interlying between the ability to spend and actual spending is the motivation to spend.

I do agree that the failure to spend, to hoard, does dampen and damage economic growth. The point that investing is spending, not hoarding, needs to be emphasized. However, investment spending, to create new plant and machinery, to train men in new skills, to weld together a business organization, to conduct research and the development of the results of the research, is the type of spending that has the greatest multiplier effect of all spending.

What is the impact of using monetary policy either through creating more money than the size of the economy warrants or manipulating the cost of borrowed money in the marketplace, in order to pay for Federal expenditures—what is the impact of this upon the motivation to save and to invest, not hoard, the savings in capital expenditure? I believe it has a most deleterious impact. It does more to encourage hoarding than any single factor or a bundle of other factors.

The size of our Federal debt today is such that it already is encouraging hoarding among many of our enterprising people. It seems clear to me that the Federal income tax is taking so much out of our economy that it is encouraging hoarding. The administration economists, though agreeing that the Federal income tax is creating economic damage may not agree that this is the reason. However, I would point out to them and all of us that consumer purchasing power and corporate liquidity has never been higher than it is today. Obviously it is not ability to spend that is holding us back but motivation to spend. Then I would further point out that it is not motivation to spend the consumer dollar, but motivation to invest the investment dollar which is lagging.

Let us look into the impact of the Federal debt and I believe we will see that pulling the tablecloth to cover the bare spots caused by tax policy merely reveals more and uglier bare spots caused by deferred tax policy, Federal debt.

The way out of our seeming dilemma is really quite simple. Get our Federal expenditures down to a level that is less than the tax revenues we can derive from a sound Federal tax system. This means aside from moving in more vigorously on waste and extravagance, which President Johnson now keynotes, we must begin to establish priorities for some of our desirable and possibly some of our needed Federal programs. We can't afford all the goodies we may desire at the same time.

My own judgment is that in the long run we may not have to establish priorities but only establish proper criteria of what programs the Federal governmental mechanism most efficiently and constitutionally can handle and then stick to this criteria. The real debate which should be going on in Washington today is over expenditure policy. Correct expenditure policy could solve our monetary, tax, and debt policies quite readily. If we were to establish these proper Federal expenditure criteria, I think we would also find great economic gains derived from the greater efficiencies the marketplace has over any political bureaucracy in allocating our resources.

However, those who have proposed the novel theory of planned deficit financing seem to be more interested in increasing Federal governmental expenditures, not decreasing them, as a method of increasing overall spending in our society, than they are in fiscal or monetary reforms.

They argue that the Federal Government will spend the money when the private sector might not, even if given the power to spend through a tax cut. They see no danger signals in the lack of motivation to spend in the private sector. They seem to have no regard for how efficiently the money might be spent and for what social purposes other than to imply without justification that the private sector would buy "tail fins" while the bureaucracy would buy education.

Note the ominous note in the Presidential message early this year advocating the tax cut as a method to stimulate our economy. If this method does not succeed, if the private sector does not respond by spending, then we will have to go to the governmental sector and increase Federal spending.

This is a basic quarrel between those in our society who think that the Federal governmental mechanism utilizing civil service employees with a veneer of politically selected supervisors can more wisely allocate our economic resources than can the people themselves through the mechanism of the marketplace and those who believe the other way around.

I disagree with these neofederalists fundamentally. Economically this will not further free our people from the shackles of physical laws, and socially it will result in more shackles being imposed upon them by their fellowmen through the powers of government.

Now is the time for all men who believe in the private enterprise system and in the system of representative government to come to the aid of whatever party or those within any party who will espouse this cause.

---

## HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Governor of New York, Director General of UNRRA, U.S. Senator, and above all, as a fine human being, Herbert Lehman served his country and the American people well and nobly.

His sense of principle—always actuated by personal humility and public courage—will long serve as an inspiration to all who knew him. His character was illuminated by a warmth of heart—shown to men and women in all walks of life and most especially in his love of children.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lehman and the family and join my colleagues in expressing our sincerest condolences.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that editorials in the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune—well characterizing Herbert Lehman—be included in the body of the Record following my remarks.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

### Herbert H. Lehman

A second riband of mourning now hangs on the American flag. For the death of Herbert H. Lehman closes the active career of an indomitable national and international servant. As Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, his life and activities soared in example and significance far beyond the borders of this, his native city.

He lived a private and public life that moved in a straight and true line. In the richest sense of the words, he was a liberal and humanitarian. Against the enemies of the Republic, he saw service in the U.S. Army in the First World War and resigned from the Governorship in the Second World War to direct foreign relief operations for the State Department. Wherever human distress existed, all over the globe, there could be found Herbert Lehman, saving lives as a representative of the best instincts of the United States and the United Nations.

Reform, sound administration, and courage marked his political career. He entered politics at the side of Alfred E. Smith and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, serving one as campaign chairman and the other as Lieutenant Governor. As Governor for 10 years from 1932 until America's entry into the war, he brought the State distinction and honor during difficult years for the people and Nation. All this time he was a stalwart New Deal Democrat, closely affiliated with the programs of President Roosevelt.

The refinements of the Fair Deal nationally saw him in the service of New York as U.S. Senator, often as a quiet but not small voice speaking for legislation favoring all Americans. In Washington, he became the conscience of the Senate. When others quavered before the onslaught of McCarthyism, it was Herbert Lehman who offered the resolution for the removal of the Wisconsin demagog from his committee chairmanships. On matters close to his heart—immigration to continue the American dream and civil rights to uphold the American Constitution—he battled relentlessly against the troops of evil.

Together with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman continued to stand for the reform movement in State and National Democratic politics. After he had passed his 80th birthday, he could be found in rain and cold carrying on his crusade for political decency in every section of the city. At the end of his life he was still standing in the forefront of many charitable, welfare, and humanitarian causes. This great man of private heart and public courage was not just a symbol, but an activist of noble aims and accomplishments to his last moments. These live on.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 6, 1963]

### He Served the People Well

The death of Herbert H. Lehman leaves all of us poorer. For in our time there have been few public servants so universally respected, admired, and beloved.

The life of the former Governor and Senator was a long one. It is hard to remember now that he was first elected to office as long ago as 1928, as Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor. But he was than already 50, a man of great wealth turning from private pursuits to new and broader arenas.

In this career Mr. Lehman was four times elected Governor of New York, and later twice chosen to the U.S. Senate. During the war he served as the first head of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. And in recent years, when he was already in his eighties, Mr. Lehman led the reform storm in the local Democratic Party.

Thus he covered more than a third of a century in city, State, National, and international performance, all of it done with courage and competence.

The strength of Herbert H. Lehman was in character. Few public figures were so consistently on the right side of the great issues. He was a social idealist, yet also an industrious man of action. He stirred few antagonisms, but in his undramatic way he got things done. This is perhaps why one hardly thinks of Mr. Lehman as a politician, although he was this State's prime votegetter.

There was about him the assurance of nonpartisanship, of quiet but determined conscience, that made for popularity. He knew what was right, and did it. That he did it so unspectacularly is probably the true mark of Lehman quality, although in later years he became increasingly a bold crusader.

But the important thing is that at all times Herbert H. Lehman served the public interest well. By spirit, integrity, and efficiency, he inspired trust and devotion. And he gave of himself in many ways to the very end of his admirable life. This is an example to cherish.

## NEW PROPOSALS FOR MEMORIALS TO THE LATE PRESIDENT

**Mr. MOSHER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**Mr. LINDSAY.** Mr. Speaker, we read every day of new proposals for memorials to the late President. They vary in nature, but most of them take shape in tangible forms, in concrete or steel. Some are good proposals, some are less good. It seems to me that the greatest memorial that can be created to the memory of John F. Kennedy would be the bettering and strengthening of institutions and processes by which this Nation may conduct itself under the rule of law, by which justice is done, by which tyranny is shut out, and bigotry and hatred erased.

It is difficult, and in many ways distasteful, to reconstruct in one's mind the whole incredible miasma of police behavior in Dallas. What happened following the awful event of President Kennedy's assassination was a stain on our system almost as indelible as the shattering and shameful act that preceded it. When injustice is done to anyone, no matter how high the crime of which he stands accused, our society is degraded and injustice is done to all.

I can think of no more fitting memorial to the late President than a national rededication to the rule of law and to the strengthening of institutions which embody and safeguard basic concepts of justice.

I wish to bring to the attention of this House and the country an extraordinary memorandum opinion handed down on October 8, 1963, predating Dallas, by the justices of the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court, first department, Presiding Justice Bernard Botein and Justices Charles D. Breitel, Benjamin J. Rabin, Samuel W. Eager, and Aaron Steuer.

The memorandum opinion decided a petition for removal to another jurisdiction of a case involving an indictment of two 16-year-old men for murder. The brief memorandum opinion reads as follows:

> Defendants have been indicted for murder in the first degree. They move this court (Code Crim. Proc., sec. 346(2)) for a change of venue. It appears by affidavit without contradiction that both defendants, 16 years of age, were arrested and brought to the 24th precinct, where they were booked. The proceedings before the police lieutenant were filmed and the film was continued as the defendants were taken to the patrol wagon. On the way to the patrol wagon both defendants were questioned by reporters of the American Broadcasting Co. and both the films and the questioning were telecast over channel 7. It further appears that a deputy police commissioner had directed the police officers of the precinct to give as much cooperation to the press and television reporters as possible and specifically authorized the filming. Detectives engaged in the arrest were authorized to submit to interviews. While the exact figures of the number of people who saw the telecast is in doubt, there can be no doubt that it was a very large number and that the potential for influence on possible talesmen is significant. The effect of the telecast cannot but be prejudicial. The deputy police commissioner defends his action on the ground that the police should keep the public informed through the various news media; and further that the police should not prevent defendants from giving any statement to the representatives of these media that they might care to give. As applied to this case, the explanation is ingenuous. Here two very young men, after first being conditioned by being photographed without their consent, are allowed to be subjected to the insistent questioning of reporters bent on getting sensational details. Defendants far more experienced than these two would get the impression that their inquisitors were approved by those that had them in custody and that to rebuff them would not be advisable. To call this giving them an opportunity to state their version is an exercise in naivete. The practice defeats the very purpose of police work. People are not arrested to provide news stories or telecasts. They are arrested to be brought to justice. Any police conduct that prevents a fair trial could allow the guilty to escape conviction. Good public relations have their importance but being on good terms with the press at the exepnse of a scrupulous performance of the department's functions is hardly commendable. The motion is granted. Settle order on notice. If defense counsel and the district attorney can agree on a county for trial, the same may be inserted in the order.

Mr. Speaker, bar associations and citizens groups through the country should take a close look at their local police procedures and at their machinery of justice. I suggest also that this subject is of sufficient importance as to be entitled to a White House conference. There have been White House conferences on narcotics, conservation, problems of the elderly, and other important subjects. In our entire Anglo-Saxon heritage there is nothing of greater importance or which more needs watchful review than our police and judicial processes and our commitment to principles of equal justice under law.

Cities and communities must examine the nature of police procedures in their areas. So must the Federal Government in those areas where it has jurisdiction. But as the foregoing memorandum opinion indicates, there has been an erosion of an ancient heritage in our country. This has occurred even in jurisdictions which have always prided themselves on "the finest." In New York City we do have the finest, and yet it was necessary for the Court to hand down this opinion. Whether this erosion comes from a failure of our citizens to be vigilant, whether from compromise—a bending to the pressures of a modern day and mass media—or whether from other causes, it makes no difference. The fact is that it has happened, and it has happened to our shame. "No government can stand," said Aristotle, "which is not founded upon justice."

The best memorial, then, to John F. Kennedy, would be a recommitment to and a reaffirmation of our determination to build a society based on firm and tested principles of justice and on the rule of law, for which men of earlier generations also gave up their lives.

## THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

**Mr. ZABLOCKI.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

**Mr. ZABLOCKI.** Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the response I have received from the State Department on questions I asked on Vietnam in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, November 4.

Regrettably, the letter does not represent a satisfactory reply to my questions, but is largely an exercise in State Department gobbledygook. In all fairness it must be understood, however, that all the facts could not be made public at this time.

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.*
>
> HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: I am writing you in response to the questions you raised regarding Vietnam on the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, November 6.
>
> I shall list in sequence each of the questions and then provide a response based on the Department's best knowledge and judgment of recent developments in Vietnam.
>
> 1. "Was the advisability of a coup against Diem and the U.S. role in such a development the subject of high level discussions subsequent to the August 20 raid of Buddhist pagodas?"
>
> Coup reports have been endemic to the Vietnam situation for at least 3 years; their frequency increased in the period of tensions between the GVN and Buddhists leaders. The U.S. Government has regularly sought—even at the highest levels—to evaluate the credibility of such reports.
>
> The coup d'etat of November 1, 1963, was a thoroughly Vietnamese affair. Although we were well aware of increasing Vietnamese dissatisfaction with repressive measures taken by the Diem regime and had received reports of various coup plottings, we had not reached a determination on the basis of available information as to whether any of these reports would prove to be correct.
>
> 2. "When the decision was made to curtail U.S. economic and military assistance to the Diem regime, was consideration given to the effect such action might have in encouragaging the military to perpetrate a coup?"
>
> Following the visit of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor to Vietnam, certain of our aid programs were put under review. The purpose of these actions was to carry out President Kennedy's declared policy of

support for those things that furthered the war effort against the Communists and of opposition to those things that impeded the war effort; and to indicate to President Diem the increasingly urgent need to use our aid more effectively and to take measures to regain the dangerously waning support of his own people in order to pursue the war effort successfully. To be sure, our aid curtailment involved a calculated risk that our actions might encourage coup plotters. Given the circumstances, however, this was a risk that we were obliged to accept in the light of the greater risk that the war would be lost if we took no action.

3. "How can our policies toward the ruling junta in South Vietnam be squared with our policies toward ruling juntas in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?"

There is little similarity between the situation we face in Vietnam, where an active war against communism is in progress, and that prevailing in Latin America, where our relationships are influenced by our commitments as a member of the Organization of American States.

The Revolutionary Council in South Vietnam displaced an increasingly authoritarian regime; it has committed itself to free elections, religious liberty, a free press, and constitutional government. The new Cabinet is essentially civilian in composition; it is made up of 11 civilians and 4 military personnel. In addition, the Revolutionary Council has established a "Council of Sages" which will act as an advisory group in the political field. Martial law has been lifted, the press has been given greater freedom, and the curfew restrictions have been ended. Immediately after the coup all Buddhist prisoners and most other non-Communist political prisoners were released.

On the other hand, the coup d'etat in the Dominican Republic involved the overthrow of President Juan Bosch who had been elected President by the Dominican people in December 1962. These elections were remarkably free of violence and fraud, according to OAS observers. As the constitutionally elected President, Bosch had the full support of the U.S. Government. He had been in office only 7 months when his administration was overthrown by a military coup on September 25, 1963. On October 4, Secretary of State Rusk stressed the importance of representative democracy in the attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress and as a requirement for normalization of relations between our two countries. As reported by the President in two recent news conferences, we have been in consultation with authorities in the Dominican Republic with a view toward their taking steps to bring about more representative government which would enable the United States to reconsider its position on nonrecognition. To date, these conversations have not yielded results that would make it possible to reconsider our position.

In the case of Honduras, the military deposed a civilian representative government which had been in office since December 1957, and under which there had been substantial progress, particiularly since the initiation of the Alliance for Progress. The military action was taken to prevent the elections scheduled for October 13, 1963.

As you may know, in his statement of October 4, 1963, Secretary Rusk pointed out that the events in the Dominican Republic and Honduras had created a situation in which there is no opportunity for effective cooperation with the United States under the Alliance for Progress or for normalization of diplomatic relations.

We are now engaged in an extensive dialog with the principal elements in Honduras in order to develop a reasonable basis for restoring normal relations.

4. "Is it not the policy of the United States to extend asylum to save those whose lives are in danger? Why was Ngo Dinh Can surrendered to the military after the Diem-Nhu experience?"

When an individual is granted refuge in an American Embassy or consulate, he is not released until adequate assurances have been received regarding his personal safety. In the case of Ngo Dinh Can, Vietnamese authorities gave assurances to Ambassador Lodge guaranteeing Can's physical safety and promising to deal with him "legally and juridically." On the basis of these assurances Can willingly departed from the American consulate in Hue and was flown to Saigon in an American military aircraft, where he was released to Vietnamese authorities.

5. "Did Ambassador Lodge go to Vietnam with any instructions which might have made him sympathetic to a coup attempt?"

Ambassador Lodge did not go to Vietnam with any instructions to show sympathy toward a coup attempt.

6. "What effect will these developments in Vietnam and U.S. involvement in the coup have on our allies in SEATO, in Europe, and most particularly in Central and South America?"

So far, all of our allies in SEATO and in Europe, as well as in Central and South America, have shown a positive response to the assurances that the new regime in South Vietnam will strive to set up a democratic form of government. Some of these countries recognized the new government before the United States did, and almost each day brings official statements of recognition from other countries which recognized the preceding government in Vietnam.

7. "Is there any evidence that the CIA and the DIA might have been working at cross purposes, with one of the agencies favoring a coup and the other opposing?"

No.

8. "Does there not seem indeed to be a need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence to look into these matters?"

The Department of State has previously expressed its views on this matter. In our judgment, recent events in Vietnam provide no basis for altering these views.

I hope that this information will be of assistance to you. Please let me know if we can be of further help on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
*Assistant Secretary.*

Concerning the situation in Vietnam itself, I regret to see that recent developments tend to confirm the fears I expressed in early November after the military coup and brutal assassination of President Diem.

My major concern at that time was that the new military government in Vietnam, by its initial acts of violence, had jeopardized its chances of obtaining the broad popular support so necessary if it is to rule effectively and carry forward the campaign against the Vietcong.

Let me assure those of my colleagues who have expressed to me their own concern over this issue that the Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will continue to study the situation in Vietnam. In that regard, the subcommittee will, from time to time, hold hearings beginning tomorrow with 2 days of executive hearings. It is my hope that the testimony received in these hearings ultimately can be made public.

As in the past, press comments on Vietnam are conflicting. There does seem, however, to be rising criticism of the policies of the new military government. Therefore, I requested permission to include articles from the Milwaukee Journal, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, and the New York Times at this point in the RECORD and commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Dec. 6, 1963]

### DICTATORSHIP LIVES ON

When the Vietnamese regime of Ngo Dinh Diem was overthrown, people danced in the streets of Saigon. The jails were emptied and political prisoners who had been held and tortured for months and even years rejoined their families and friends. To most it seemed like the dawn of a new era.

But the jails are fast filling up again. The new regime, backed strongly by a section of the military, has been making numerous and arbitrary arrests. People are being seized without warning and held without charge. Under Diem, most prisoners were allowed visitors twice a week. Under the new regime, visitors are not allowed.

Some arrests were to be expected. Some are usually necessary when a junta ousts a regime—for those who remain loyal to the old regime could be dangerous to the new. But what troubles the Vietnamese people and foreigners is that the new regime doesn't even pretend to follow any rule of law. It just jails people—without formal charge, without chance of obtaining a lawyer, without any opportunity for defense. And most arrests are purely political.

In the meantime little progress is being made by the Government in its attempt to rid the countryside of Communist guerrillas. The Communists have increased their activity and have won several recent engagements. The new Government seems chiefly interested in keeping itself in power. It has taken no steps to liberalize itself or to plan for elections as it had promised. The hopes that were so high after the fall of Diem are all but gone. Tragedy is still the fate of the Vietnamese.

---

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 8, 1963]

### IRONY IN VIETNAM

Last month, when President Diem and Mr. Nhu were brutally slain in South Vietnam's military coup, there was much talk among the starry-eyed about a new birth of freedom and a new birth of democratic order. Well, let us take note of the realities: (1) There is continuing tension in Saigon and surrounding areas. (2) There is continuing political repression. And (3) there is continuing danger of a great internal blowup. Supporting evidence includes the fact that hundreds of individuals are being held as political prisoners under grim conditions. And the grisly rite of self-immolation still goes on.

The so-called Buddhists, of course, are happy. Mr. Diem is dead. Mr. Nhu is dead. And Madam Nhu, whose sharp tongue has sometimes spoken truths that should have been listened to more attentively, is in exile. But the affair is not ended. Trouble and intrigue still plague South Vietnam, and few things could be more foolish than to shrug off that fact. Ironically enough, the day may come when the Diem regime will be remembered as a relatively enlightened one.

---

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 7, 1963]

### NEW VIETNAM MESS RISING

(By Marguerite Higgins)

President Johnson is faced with a new and ugly mess in Vietnam. And it is going to become increasingly to light despite the apparent determination of some American officials in Saigon to brush it under the rug.

The newest situation causing concern is the police terror that the military junta has launched, and that has already reached hundreds of hapless Vietnamese. They have been thrown into jail without notification to their families, without benefit of lawyers, without even being told the charges against them.

With few exceptions, the only apparent reason is the suspicion that the imprisoned Vietnamese did their duty in carrying out, prior to the coup, the orders of the then duly constituted authority, the late President Diem. In a word, they had been loyal.

On a tour of Vietnam in November, this reporter talked to a half dozen persons who had lost relatives to the military junta's jails. And such was the atmosphere of fear, that in every single case, this reporter was asked not to write about it, until she was out of Vietnam.

### ISN'T HELPING MAN

Quite apart from the principles involved, the junta's wave of political repression isn't helping the war against the Vietcong. For the persons loyal to Diem were—like their chief—deeply committed to fighting the war against the Communists.

A case in point is the chief of Quangnai Province in north central Vietnam, Nguyon Van Tat, who has been fired and jailed. But look at Mr. Tat's record. In 18 months as province chief, he turned Quangnai, which for 20 years had been overwhelmingly pro-Communist, into a model and prosperous area in which the peasant population joined the military in beating off Communst attacks.

At the height of the Buddhist crisis last summer, the leaders of the Quangnai pagoda approached Mr. Tat and informed him that the Buddhist leaders at the Xaloi pagoda in Saigon had ordered them to go on a 72-hour hunger strike. The local Buddhists added, that while they had nothing against Mr. Tat, they could not very well disobey an order from their religious higher-ups in Saigon.

### AIDED HUNGER STRIKERS

After a hurried conference with Maj. John Kelly, American sector adviser in Quangnai, Mr. Tat told the Buddhists that while he regretted their determination to go on a hunger strike, he would do everything possible to make their experience as painless as possible. With Major Kelly's help, he brought in blankets, fruit juices, and medical attendants. And the hunger strike went off without incident in Quangnai city hall, where Mr. Tat had made arrangements for the comfort of the Buddhists.

In a country starved for good administrators, Mr. Tat's purge scarcely seems in the national interest of Vietnam.

Many of the firings and purges has been based on hysterical denunciations in the newly "friend" Vietnamese press, or even on plain rumor. This seems to have been largely true in the case of Ngo Dinh Can, the elder brother of President Diem.

Mr. Can was handed over to Vietnamese authorities even though he sought refuge at the American consulate at Hue, and even though English-speaking persons heard the American consul promise Mr. Can that the American Embassy would "assure him his safety."

When a Catholic priest got William Trueheart, deputy chief of mission, out of a dinner party to ask why the promise had not been kept, he was told there had "been a misunderstanding." But there has been a curious silence on the part of the Embassy concerning the military junta's promise to assure Mr. Can of "due process of law." At the end of November, Mr. Can had not yet seen charges against him, and the American Embassy had shown no visible sign of trying to pressure the junta into living up to its word.

### QUERY U.S. SILENCE

There are many Vietnamese who ask why the Embassy and the State Department, who were so vocal about Mr. Diem, have been so quiet about the newest wave of repressions.

This is a question that President Johnson is entitled to press—even if it is embarrassing to those Americans in Saigon and Washington who feel a certain sense of responsibility for the military junta because it is in power by their encouragement.

Indeed, in leaving Vietnam, this reporter gained the impression that the three persons most anxious for the coup d'etat—Ambassador Lodge, Under Secretary of State Harriman, and Far Eastern Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hilsman—had unleashed forces that are turning out far different than they foresaw.

One thing is clear. The American image in Asia is not going to profit from a kind of double standard that helps get rid of one government in the name of ending police repression and then stays silent as the new government invokes the same tactics.

---

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

## Persecution of Catholics Vexes Saigon

Saigon, December 7.—Reports of anti-Catholic persecution and Communist agitation among students today were causing serious concern to the new South Vietnamese Government.

The Roman Catholic newspaper Living Religion said that 600 Catholics in northern Quang Nam province were terrorized and six arrested and tortured since the November 1 coup that ousted the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

At the same time, reports from all over the country said authorities were worried about Communist subversion among students.

The Catholic newspaper said Catholics were afraid to go to mass and were taking down altars in their own homes. Catholics are outnumbered five to one by the majority Buddhist population.

It also said that a Catholic leader has been arrested and others have been forced to attend indoctrination courses. At the same time, rumors were spread that Catholic priests kept guns and that Catholics had planned to murder Buddhists before the coup.

---

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

## Dinh Ends Viet Tour in Triumph

Hoi An, South Vietnam, December 7.—In this remote coastal town, the man who is fast becoming South Vietnam's most popular figure made a spectacular finish today to his stumping tour of villages and hamlets near the Communist border.

His swashbuckling manner captivated villagers. His words came through forcefully. He answered catcalls with a joke. Students paraded him on their shoulders.

Some saw potential danger in him; others said he is just what South Vietnam needs.

He is Maj. Gen. Ton That Dinh, 37, a leader of the coup that toppled the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem in November.

Dinh gave his final speech of the tour from a balcony at provincial headquarters in Hoi An, 150 miles southeast of the Communist North Vietnamese border.

### PARADING ENDS TALK

Finishing with his characteristic flurry of gestures, Dinh stood back as 5,000 students burst into cheers. Then the students charged up the steps, hoisted him to their shoulders and carried him off.

As he passed through the crowd, he called out:

"I am not a politician as some of you newsmen seem to think."

But the fact is that this boyish-looking military officer is emerging as the strongest national figure in Vietnam.

Since the deaths of President Diem and his brother Nhu, the country has been under the control of a revolutionary junta headed by Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh and Maj. Gen. Tran Van Dong.

In the junta, Dinh is a second vice chairman, Minister of Security, and commander of the Vietnamese 3d Army Corps.

He led the army units that stormed Diem's palace during the coup and is credited with engineering the revolt, despite the fact he had served as the military governor of Saigon under Diem and Nhu during the Buddhist religious crisis.

### QUESTIONED ABOUT NHU

During his speech at Hoi An, a handful of students heckled him on his relationship with Nhu. One shouted:

"You supported Nhu before the revolution, but then you overthrew him. Why?"

Dinh beamed and replied: "Changing circumstances require changing actions."

At Quang Tri near the Communist border, Dinh strode through a wildly cheering crowd without guards or security and mounted a platform. Students grabbed him and put a garland of flowers around his neck.

"One of the most fatal mistakes the Diem regime made was that it did not have any contact with the people. We mean to change that," he said

American military advisers, who watched some of Dinh's speechmaking, were startled, and reactions were mixed.

"What the hell is this?" one said. "This man can whip up a crowd to anything. I think it's dangerous."

But another American adviser said, "It's like the shrewd politicians who used to stump the American countryside. This is exactly what's needed here, and I'm all for General Dinh."

Rumors have circulated recently that a split had developed between Dinh and Minh and Dong. There is no open evidence of a split, and Dong and Dinh often are seen together at Saigon night spots.

Nevertheless, Dinh's power and prestige have surged upward since the coup, and it is doubtful the junta would do anything at this point to oppose him.

---

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1963]

## Saigon Faces Critical Battles—There Is No Certainty New Regime Can Rout Communist Guerrillas

(By Hedrick Smith)

Saigon, South Vietnam, December 7.—This is time of flux and uncertainty in Vietnam when the only sure thing is the critical state of the war against the Communists in the rich and fertile farmlands of the Mekong River Delta rolling south from Saigon.

There is little disagreement here that the war in the delta is in serious shape—more serious than officials in Washington have let on—and that during the next gruelling 6 months the new Government faces an uphill struggle simply to regain initiative.

Nor is there any doubting that the generals who deposed President Ngo Dinh Diem have inherited an incredibly difficult task. Several Americans who work and travel regularly in the delta claim that if there had been no coup, virtually the entire area outside of the provincial centers would have slipped into Vietcong hands by spring.

In the months before the coup and in the 5 weeks since, Communist forces have grown more brazen and powerful. They attack more often in broad daylight. Their marauding units are larger, often company or battalion size.

### CAPTURED WEAPONS

With the capture of U.S. weapons the Communists have proven more dangerous for American helicopters—the weapons once expected to give anti-Communist forces uncontestable advantage over the guerrillas. Now rare is the day when helicopters flying combat missions in the delta do not report their planes have been hit by Communist groundfire.

The situation in the delta stems largely from the cumulative effect of a year of neglect and bad military tactics and Diem's political interference with the military. At the same time the Vietcong have built up a steady progression of strength and have extended their popular influence with a propaganda compaign which was more than a match for the Government.

This has created a vicious circle of problems for the Government now. "We have the problem of convincing the people that the Government will win this contest," one U.S. Army adviser said. "Until we do we won't have good military intelligence. Until we have good intelligence we won't have good military operations. And if we don't have them we con't convince people that we will win."

Many Americans hoped the impact of the November coup and the prospect of more responsive government would help break this cycle. Some feel the generals now ruling South Vietnam have so far failed to capitalize adequately on the popular good will generated by their coup.

But even now in Saigon and in provincial cities the new Government is well received. The high crest of enthusiasm has abated but the honeymoon period is not yet over. There is still a widespread sense of relief that the oppressive Diem regime is gone.

The change in the National Government has meant most to the people in areas where austere and often corrupt local officials of the Diem regime have been removed. This has given the coup immediate impact to the peasants. For this reason the new regime has steadily been replacing all province and district chiefs despite the inevitable disruptive impact on the Government machinery of such a move.

### MOVES TO FREEDOM

More important, however, is that the widespread sense of oppression under Diem has eased. The new Government has gradually moved toward political and religious freedoms.

The press and former opposition politicians have emerged from hibernation or rigid control to test the freedoms guaranteed by the new junta. Admittedly these have only been the first baby steps toward democracy but, as one Westerner put it, "the people don't want politics they just want to breathe."

About 400 officials and businessmen closely connected with the Ngo family have been arrested since the coup. But most Westerners have been surprised at the new Government's restraint and the absence of a vindictive bloodbath. Of those arrested about half have been released, a few charged and roughly 200 are still under detention.

Although some arrests have undoubtedly been made to settle political accounts and most are illegal in the Anglo-Saxon sense, Saigon is not cringing from a reign of terror nor do the people complain of police state tactics. Arrests have been publicized and the treatment of political prisoners is far more humane than under the Diem regime which had 18 different security apparatuses seizing people at any time of the day or night.

If anything, Saigon's current malaise is uncertainty about the Government's future course. The power of President Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, was so pervasive that the new power structure is filling the political vacuum slowly.

### AT THE TOP

The generals have added to the uncertainty by their own bickering and indecisiveness. Only last week the junta decided to shift three top field commanders and reversed itself within 24 hours. Some administrative agencies seem almost paralyzed awaiting orders "from the top."

But there have been encouraging signs. Americans are convinced that there is a far greater awareness of the difficulties of war than under Diem, greater candor in discussing problems and more willingness to heed American advice.

"The price in blood is now much greater than it would have been a year ago," one American military adviser remarked grimly. "The great unanswerable question is whether the new Government leaders are aware and are willing to accept the price it takes to win the war."

## THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, the day our beloved President John F. Kennedy was buried in Arlington Cemetery, memorial services were held in the synagogues and churches throughout the land. The overwhelming grief of our people was reflected in the words spoken that day.

On November 25, 1963, at Congregation B'nai Jeshurun in New York City, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the congregation, delivered a moving address at memorial services for John F. Kennedy. I include that address at this point in the RECORD.

### ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER

Our land has endured an agonizing nightmare that even the most insane narrator of fiction could not conceive.

Unfortunately, it is no wild dream from which we can awake to comforting reality, nor a disturbing novel whose cover we can close with a sigh of relief.

Dark, indeed, is the glass through which we look back on the events of the past few days.

The President is dead. Even as we mourn the loss of America's first citizen, we lament, as well, the loss of a part of our national self-respect.

All we have left are the bitter dregs of our bereavement—a chance to examine the heartbreak and error of yesterday—the fault and sorrow today. Out of these, perhaps, we can somehow build a path to a brighter tomorrow.

But we must not forget. We must remember these things. We must remember these momentous days of dread and resolve—in the sight of our Creator—to make amends, to seek the truth, and, with sanity, justice, and mercy, to wipe this abomination from the blighted pages of history.

The first news came like a bolt from the sky. This, it truly was—shocking and numbing in its impact on people in their homes and offices—workers in factories and shops—children in their classrooms.

With moist eyes, unable to move from our television sets, we have watched, stunned and confounded by a series of unbelievable scenes, consumed by a sense of horror and disbelief.

As the original fact of the cowardly attack on our President struck home—and then struck again with the dreadful tidings of his death—the whole world came to a sudden shuddering halt. The crowded streets froze into screaming silence.

In every fearful heart there came a piercing grief, a pang of sorrow for Mrs. Kennedy and the children. In every city, freedom held its breath.

The day of infamy that was born in Dallas began to spread its darkness at noon across the tortured face of the earth.

From every farflung land, even from behind the Iron Curtain, where compassion seemed to have fled, there came a sound of sobbing. Humanity could not stem its tears.

The bleeding flesh of our heroic dead became a symbol of mankind's shame that civilization could breed the evil hand and eye that aimed that fatal shot.

Was this the terrible price of too much freedom?

Are the borders of constitutional protection too broad for those who despise our laws and desecrate our liberty?

Has our own lazy loyalty and indifferent Americanism played a part in this incredible pattern of events?

It is not easy to answer.

Our hearts are too heavy with the knowledge that our noble young warrior has been cut down in the prime of his days, in the very procession of his triumph, at the very beginning of his most notable achievements.

He can no longer lead us in the struggle for justice and decency. And yet, somehow, he leads us still.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a way of telling us his plans for the New Frontier that made the soul of America stand taller. There was deep conviction in his voice and intellectual authority in every glowing phrase.

His was a bold, uncompromising call to truth—a call to arms against injustice and oppression that keeps on ringing in our aching hearts.

We hear him yet. We see him as he stood before us, smiling, self-assured, and, oh, so tragically young. He is there—head high, waving to the cheering crowds, rushing forward to shake a friendly hand.

Such a man cannot be eliminated by a madman with a gun—no, nor by the madness that walks abroad in the world. Such a man lives in the hope of every citizen, growing with the growth of the great country he served, alive and indestructible in our memories of those few short years when his own stature grew to match those other great Americans to whose ideals John Kennedy devoted his life.

Time erects his monument and history will build it high. We weep that Israel has lost this cherished friend. We are outraged at the disgrace that befell our land and took away our leader.

But we are proud that our beloved President, in death as in life, stamped the profile of his magnificent courage across the conscience of mankind.

He asked not what his country could do for him. He asked only what he could do for his country—and no man could have done more.

On this untimely day of atonement, as we sit in the synagogue along with all the generations of Israel, we pay homage to our sacred dead.

We honor the image of his remembered glory, his wisdom, wit, and eloquence. Our spirit is warmed again by the fire that lighted his love of America.

In his name, let us resolve to strengthen the sinews of our national integrity, to protect the principles of liberty, justice, and equality for which he gave his life.

That is the greatest tribute we can pay our fallen hero in eternal gratitude for his ultimate sacrifice, while our hearts follow him, along with our fervent prayers, to that further New Frontier he is entering tonight.

Let us rise, beseeching eternal peace and the blessing of Almighty God, as we join in a minute of silent prayer, for the immortal soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

In the last paragraph of the last speech he ever wrote, he expressed some of this philosophy for himself, for his country, and for the world:

"We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve for our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength."

## THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM: SUBJECT OF INTENSIVE STUDY AND DEBATE

**Mr. MOSHER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**Mr. LINDSAY.** Mr. Speaker, the American banking system has recently been the subject of intensive study and debate. Such groups as the Commission on Money and Credit, the Advisory Committee on Banking to the Comptroller of the Currency, the President's Committee on Financial Institutions, as well as several committees of Congress, have given serious attention to our financial structure both in its broader aspects and in detail. They have considered whether the dual banking system, with its complex of State and Federal laws and overlapping jurisdictions of State and Federal supervisory agencies, remains an effective mechanism for the allocation of capital and credit. They have addressed themselves to the question whether existing statutory and administrative restrictions upon banking—many of which have their origin in the economic collapse of the thirties—are suitable in the light of present-day conditions. They have examined the organization of the Federal agencies responsible for monetary regulation and the supervision of our banking institutions.

Out of these manifold inquiries have come many proposals for change. Some of the proposals are embodied in bills pending before committees of the Congress, others are not.

I do not intend to speak of the merits of these proposals. I will address myself instead to the circumstances which, in the opinion of many informed observers, have made legislative action upon the more far-reaching proposals—and even upon the more modest suggestions—unlikely, if not impossible at this time. These circumstances arise in the main out of sharp conflicts in policy among the various Federal banking supervisory agencies—conflicts further aggravated by the absence of procedures for consultation and coordination among these agencies. The absence of broad agreement within the banking industry upon the need for many of the proposals, or the form in which particular proposals should be cast, is a further factor inhibiting legislative action.

The proceedings of the American Bankers Association annual convention held in Washington during the week of October 7 revealed in harsh outline the conflicts in policy and approach on the part of the several Federal banking agencies exercising jurisdiction over major portions of the banking industry.

The Congress is not unfamiliar with inconsistent policies on the part of agencies of the same Federal Government, and conflicting aspirations on the part of segments of the same industry. Indeed, informed legislative action is built in large part upon judgments shaped by the clash of competing interests and contradictory views both within and outside the Government. However, Congress has a right to expect that agencies of the executive branch will ultimately compromise their differences so that the legislative branch may proceed with some assurance that its action is acceptable to those upon whom it relies for expert advice. There is no evidence at this time that such a consensus is even a remote possibility. On the contrary, the relationships among Federal agencies exercising coordinate or related jurisdiction over banking have deteriorated steadily. Inevitably, such deterioration has been accompanied by an unfortunate polarization of their policies on matters of vital importance to the banking community.

Intervention by the President, in my judgment, is long overdue. While, concededly, the President lacks direct control over some aspects of Federal monetary and banking regulation, the very substantial measure of control which he does have, together with the prestige of his office, afford a proper basis for his immediate action. The President, in my opinion, should designate a high ranking Federal official—perhaps an Undersecretary or Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—as the coordinator of relationships among all the Federal agencies concerned with bank regulation. These Federal agencies include the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, with jurisdiction over national banks; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with jurisdiction over State-chartered member banks; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with jurisdiction over State-chartered insured nonmember banks; and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, with jurisdiction over federally chartered savings and loan associations and member State-chartered savings and loan associations. Also involved in banking regulation to a growing degree is the Department of Justice, which has advisory responsibilities to some of the agencies mentioned heretofore, as well as direct responsibility for the enforcement of the antitrust laws as they relate to banks. Finally, there is the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has recently asserted jurisdiction over certain of the fiduciary functions of banking institutions.

It should be the responsibility of the President's designee, in concert with the agencies concerned, to work out a detailed procedure for their continuing consultation, and for coordination of their major policies. That official should be responsible for seeing to it that the procedure so formulated is adhered to. It may well be that such action, if taken promptly and vigorously, will obviate in the long run any need for a drastic legislative overhaul of the structure of Federal banking supervision. In any event, intervention by the President would serve as a useful, indeed a necessary, interim measure to ameliorate existing discord, and to prevent further impairment in significant intragovernmental relationships. Most importantly, it would serve to end the present uncertainty in the banking industry and elsewhere as to whether the administration has a banking policy, and if so, what that policy really is.

## OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

**Mr. HALL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

**Mr. HALL.** Mr. Speaker, I have today resubmitted a bill which, if passed, will in effect outlaw the Communist Party of the United States. I have done so after over 2 years' careful study of the issues involved and because I believe that no other action, however well intended, will rid this country of the menace of an organization whose objective is the ultimate overthrow of our representative form of government.

Only a few days ago, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, in a speech before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation had this to say about the Communist Party, U.S.A.:

> We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Here, in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks. Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within.

So spoke FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover about the Communist Party, U.S.A. He spoke only 2 weeks after the life of the President of the United States was taken by an avowed Communist.

It has now been over 2½ years since the Supreme Court upheld on June 5, 1961, the law creating the Subversive Activities Control Board which authorizes the Attorney General to require Communists to register.

Although some 20 cases have been initiated under the law, none of these cases has been culminated, and indeed the probability that they will be effectively prosecuted becomes more remote with each passing day. Furthermore, a reading of the Supreme Court decision raises the distinct possibility that when the present proceedings reach the Supreme Court on appeal—another delay of 12 years—the Court may very well rule that the registration requirement is a violation of the fifth amendment and that Communists may not be forced to register. Indeed the Chief Justice, Mr. Earl Warren, in his dissenting opinion stated that "the act does constitute a violation of the fifth amendment."

It seems highly possible that all the efforts and cost now being directed toward the registration of members of the Communist Party may ultimately be of no avail; assuming the majority of the Court concurs with Chief Justice Warren, and this does not seem an unreasonable assumption today.

I am aware that some will say that a law to outlaw the Commuist Party, U.S.A., will merely result in the members of that party going "underground" or will merely result in the Communist Party adopting a different name to avoid the letter of the law.

I do not believe either of these arguments valid. So long as members fail to register they are already underground for all intents and purposes. And I do not mind in the least if we cause the members of the Communist Party some discomfort in having to select a new banner under which to parade.

I believe the time has come when we must call a spade a spade, and when we must recognize the Communist Party, U.S.A., for what it is in the words of the FBI Director "a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin." It does not deserve the cloak of legality. I urge its support of all Members for this bill and hope the Un-American Activities Committee of the House will hold hearings at the earliest feasible date.

---

## PROJECT HOPE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, amid the jolting happenings of the past 2 weeks, few if any Americans have considered any events, other than those that have dealt with the untimely loss of the late President.

Though for most of us, the world stood still on that terrible Friday afternoon, the 22d day of November, and for many the day-to-day routine that encompasses us all is just now returning to normal, nevertheless events continued to happen in many places around the world.

On November 22, Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project HOPE, announced that the teaching-training hospital ship SS *Hope* which began a medical mission to Guayaquil, Ecuador, on the 20th of this month, will visit the Republic of Guinea at the conclusion of its mission to Ecuador. The former U.S. hospital ship, staffed by more than 80 members of the medical profession who will remain with the vessel for the duration of her voyage, will be away from the United States for approximately 2 years. Most of the permanent staff is expected to serve aboard the *Hope* for the duration of its journey to Ecuador and Guinea, a tribute indeed to the selflessness and humanitarianism of this group of dedicated Americans who will be away from their families and friends until late in 1965.

With its forthcoming voyage to Guinea, the SS *Hope* will have visited three continents—Asia, South America, and Africa. In 1960 and 1961 the ship spent 12 months in Indonesia and South Vietnam, and last March she concluded a 10-month visit to Salaverry in northwestern Peru. As my colleagues well know, the *Hope* visits only those nations to which it has been invited, and Dr. Walsh has received invitations from more than 30 nations urging him to dispatch the hospital ship to other lands.

Of particular interest to us is the fact that the *Hope* arrived in Guayaquil, Ecuador, December 2 to begin a medical mission which is expected to last 10 months. Staffed by 83 physicians, dentists, nurses, nurse anesthetists, pharmacists, dental hygienists, dietitians, X-ray technicians, medical technicians, physical therapists, a Protestant minister, and a Catholic priest, the *Hope* will anchor off Guayaquil where she will be joined by an additional group of 30 American physicians and dentists who will work alongside the vessel's permanent staff for approximately 2 months until replaced by another complement of some 30 to 35 doctors. This group is the rotating staff and is comprised of top-flight members of the medical profession who serve without pay. The permanent staff members receive salaries far below what they could earn were they to practice their profession in the United States.

I recall the arrival of the SS *Hope* in Salaverry, Peru, last March. The "Hopies," as the staff have come to be called, quickly established outpatient clinics ashore, set up an examination and immunization program, and distributed milk to the children, many of whom had never tasted it before.

On the afternoon of February 28 of this year, 10 months after the ship's arrival in Salaverry, over 45,000 people stood where once there were but a dozen, waving farewell to the ship and the "Hopies." The ship had been decorated from stem to stern with garlands of flowers by the townspeople; bouquets of flowers and small gifts were placed in the hands of the departing "Hopies"; weeping mothers stood on the shore and thrust healthy infants, once sick, or undernourished, into the arms of the doctors and nurses who had made them well. As the ship began its journey northward, people wept unashamedly on the shore and a complete and deathly silence enveloped the crowd until the ship disappeared from view.

Such is the impact of the SS *Hope*.

This fine symbol of America's compassion for others began another medical mission this week and Americans everywhere may be proud of the selfless devotion of these "Hopies" who work tirelessly to bring medical teaching as well as care to those in need in the far-distant corners of the world.

---

## ACTION IN KENTUCKY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tragic murder of our former President and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the telegram sent by Associated Industries of Kentucky to the Kennedy family:

### In Memoriam—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 1917–1963; 35th President of the United States

(The following telegram was sent to the Kennedy family at the White House.)

The members, officers, directors, and staff of Associated Industries of Kentucky join me in extending to the Kennedy family this expression of condolence in a trying hour.

Mr. Kennedy's untimely death, apparently at the hands of a Marxist, should bring home to all of us the dangers that lie in coddling the many appendages of this vile conspiracy, and it demonstrates convincingly where our Nation's real enemies are spawned.

That the Nation should thusly lose its President and you a beloved member of your family, is a matter of grief to us all.

William M. Horn,
*President, Associated Industries of Kentucky.*

I further feel that the following front page editorial from the newspaper Action In Kentucky is worthy of the attention of all Members:

### The Bitter Fruit of Apathy

They have told us there is no danger from the radical left—that it is small and inconsequential. Only idiots, neurotics, and right-wing extremists worry about it.

They have aimed literary and personal venom in the direction of concerned conservatives. They have smeared their organizations and labeled the legitimate protest of insane policies as the Nation's biggest threat.

Today, John Fitzgerald Kennedy lies buried in Arlington Cemetery while a shocked Nation is joined by the rest of the civilized world in mourning, nostalgia, and chagrin.

The 35th President of the United States was brutally shot to death by a sniper on Friday, November 22, 1963—a new day of infamy.

The prime suspect was a leading propagandist for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. This is one of the many Marxist-oriented groups calmly ignored by those who withhold their pastoral and journalistic acid for use against organizations seeking less government, more responsibility, and a better world.

In the pattern of other organizations spawned by the left and protected by the "liberal" establishment, a tint of respectability has been provided from the cloistered stained glass windows of religious institutions—down to and including Louisville. And all the while, the "liberal press" looks the other way and damns their critics.

The bigotry of the big press has never been more evident. Had this evil deed been perpetrated by someone with conservative leanings, or even an infiltrator into some conserative group, is there any doubt what would have happened? The names of all conservative leaders and organizations would have been raked through the mud in the biggest guilt-by-association campaign in history. There would have been cries to "hang them all." The flood of anonymous phone calls had already started before Lee Harvey Oswald's apprehension.

Now that a Marxist leader of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and a member of the American Civil Liberties Union is implicated, a truly fair and impartial attitude would now dictate a similar probing analysis of the leftist network. Nothing like this is happening. It has been played down, willfully suppressed to the extent possible.

An investigation and listing of the names of Kentucky leaders who have lent their endorsement to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and similar fronts might be expected. But the voice of the monopoly press, so eager to use the names of conservatives in bad light, is woefully silent. Yet they are here and they are known.

The devious (or inept) minds of self-styled liberal writers and commentators and preachers have even managed to twist this thing into an equal preachment against groups trying to counter the force of the murderous left. Rather than calling for a recognition of right from wrong, they urge against such decision.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee is but one left front to achieve a sort of misguided acceptance through such serpentine logic. Members of this group were behind the recent youth tour to Communist Cuba in defiance of the United States.

The same sorry crowd of beatnik types spent 2 spectacular days harassing the House Committee on Un-American Activities when it sought information about the odorous affair.

The incident smacked of earlier Communist-incited riots against the committee at San Francisco, which local seminary professors and liberal newspapers said were merely the vigorous expressions of healthful American youth. Meanwhile, the liberal rank and file, armed with cocktail glasses raised on high, were busy defending them at parties all over the better side of town.

The purpose of abusing this honorable arm of the Congress was identical in each instance—to discredit and destroy it if possible. This is in harmony with a standing policy of the Marxist conspiracy, which immediately got busy trying to disassociate itself from any connection with Lee Harvey Oswald.

Oswald's death at the hands of another killer on Sunday, November 24, like the death of the President, was tragic but not surprising except to those who have been closing their eyes and minds to the clear reality around them. Tragic in a different way—and for a different reason.

Conservatives in Louisville were predicting it would happen, for the purpose of silencing him and preventing a trial that would focus page 1 attention on a long string of Communist-supporting organizations that have been given silent and tolerant condonement by the establishment press.

For his defense, Oswald significantly had sought the help of a Communist-protecting New York attorney by the name of John Abt, whose own record in the evolution of the conspiracy in the United States is detailed in 13 different parts of James Burnham's revealing and almost suppressed book, "Web of Subversion." Especially pertinent information about his involvement in cell activity in his own apartment is delineated on pages 95 and 96. The ACLU was his second choice.

The Marxists and their fellow travelers had everything to gain from Oswald's death. The conservatives, along with the ordinary uninformed or misinformed American incensed at the Kennedy tragedy, at this point had everything to lose.

Oswald's death was therefore the logical expectation to anyone who has observed even casually the pattern of the Marxist mind in operation—all the way from semantics to murder. And it wouldn't do to have Oswald dispensed with by another identified Marxist or leftist. That would put things right back where they stood. It would have to be done by an untagged, unexpected, unaffiliated person.

His death came at the hands of a girlie-show operator, Jack Rubenstein, who was so well known to Dallas police and had offered free drinks to so many reporters that nobody bothered to check when he violated security and went to the basement of the Dallas jail. The buildup of Rubenstein as a good citizen is already well underway.

The shot that killed Oswald also killed the impact a national demonstration of the Marxists mind would have had on the American public during a spectacular trial in which every word would be weighed and evaluated. It undoubtedly shut off the flow of additional information about the leftist network that could have been brought to light in such a trial.

Fortunately, there is every indication that Federal, State, and local authorities are cooperating in a deeper probe to uncover as much related information as possible.

All this is not to imply that the murder of President Kennedy was part of a plot beyond the brain of one misguided individual. But it perfectly illustrates the eagerness with which establishment networks leap at every opportunity to castigate conservatives and protect, when they can get away with it, the agencies of the left.

Before Oswald was picked up, the insinuations were running fast, firm, and clear. In keeping with the best tenets of propaganda, they were repeated often.

Those who have been leaping at rash conclusions in the past, without any basis of fact, independent study or analysis, now have cause for self-examination. When people blindly respond to herd instinct and group opinion, as most middle-roaders do almost instinctively, they lend credence to the cause of the enemy.

This occurs when a vengeful public press gives only one side of a story and its gullible readers leap for the bait. I have seen it happen in Louisville frequently during the last 3 years, with "good people" using their tongues to mouth blind, unreasoned "planted opinion" while letting their brains take a protracted vacation.

It is a case of bitter irony indeed, that the late President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, declared there was practically no danger from the left. To the dismay of thoughtful and knowing conservatives, he ordered a major curtailment of FBI activities in the very area of our national shame that ultimately produced his brother's death.

Such mistaken judgment can occur on both ordinary and sophisticated levels—for leader and layman alike are subject to whim and to human error. Whatever motive may be ascribed, the cold figures reflect a 500-percent advance of Communist enslavement of people since World War II—without the use of a single Russian platoon. With American endorsement, in most cases, of policies that encouraged the development. Bad actions, based on bad advice, fostered this ignoble retreat from freedom.

Our late President went to his grave with an undelivered speech criticizing the very conservatives who have been warning about groups that foster Oswald-type thinking. It is now too late for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Ignoring the real enemy while worrying about the real (although critical) friend, cost him his life. But it is not too late for our Nation to mend its erring ways of abandoning God, helping the enemy, and punishing those who evidence genuine concern about the collectivist spiral which threatens to engulf us all.

The memory of this handsome, energetic young man, struck down at the peak of his career, should remind us again of the price of national apathy. The only thing extreme about those who have been sounding the clarion call about the Marxist apparatus is that they have been, and remain today, extremely right.

While the Nation prays for its departed leader, let it also pray that our pulpit, press and national policy will reap some germ of truth and understanding from this disaster. This is expecting a great deal—this opening of closed minds. Especially powerful prayers seem to be in order from those men of the pen and the cloth who preach doctrines of peace and understanding, while simultaneously advancing such evil conglomerations as the leftwing apparatus that produced an Oswald.

Out of the Nation's mourning may come a new dedication. And from it may flow a victory for freedom, for God, and for the awakening Republic. Let us work to that noble end.

---

## HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great political leader and statesman. Herbert H. Lehman will be sorely missed. Devoting his life to good causes, he fought consistently for principle and for practicing the ideals of our democracy. Governor Lehman's distinguished career has been noted in editorials and articles throughout the country.

I include in the RECORD editorials from the New York Post and the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

HERBERT LEHMAN: A PROFILE IN COURAGE

John F. Kennedy, in July of this year, designated 31 recipients of the Presidential Medal of Freedom—the highest honor a President can bestow for peactime service to the country. One of those selected for such distinguished recognition was Herbert H. Lehman; the awards were to be presented this weekend.

It is a cruel accident of history that neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Lehman will be present when the ceremony is held.

Herbert Lehman will be remembered with affection and esteem for many things. What is perhaps most memorable is the extent to which his fighting spirit grew and his convictions deepened with the passage of time.

He was an able, enlightened Governor who carried forward the spirit of humane government—he called it government with a heart—that had pervaded the Smith and Roosevelt eras in Albany. A reserved man with no special gift of oratory and a congenital dislike for demagogy, he was nevertheless elected Governor four times—more often than any other man in the annals of the State. His quiet, sometimes hesitant voice communicated both a sense of compassion and integrity that confounded the political rabblerousers. The son of a wealthy man, his concern for the dispossessed was never patronizing.

After Albany came his leadership of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—a post in which all the human debris of a war-ravaged world became his burden.

He was 71 when he was elected to the Senate in 1949; a record of large achievement was already written, and this seemed destined to be the serene twilight of a life of distinction. Instead it produced his finest hours and when, it might be said, he crossed the bridge from virtue to greatness. It was in those hours that he met the critical test tha places him in the company of Norris, La Follette, and others in that small band of Senate figures who have dared to stand almost alone against the furies of the day.

The portent was there during his Senate campaign. In that interval Cardinal Spellman issued his lamentable assault on Mrs. Roosevelt over the aid-to-education bill. Most of the local politicos suffered acute political lockjaw; Herbert Lehman rose to Mrs. Roosevelt's defense in dignity and solitude. There were those who said he had committed political suicide, but the electorate had a larger wisdom.

In Washington, almost at the moment of Lehman's arrival, the age of McCarthy began. Cowardice and evasion dominated the Senate; Lehman refused to be intimidated. In the summer of 1953, many Senate liberals, in a dubious effort to affirm their own patriotism, sponsored a so-called anti-Communist bill more damaging to the Bill of Rights than any legislation McCarthy had proposed. Herbert Lehman, with Estes Kefauver, stood up defiantly, declaring:

"I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. * * * My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I shall cast my vote for the liberties of our people.

Lehman's passion for freedom had been abundantly revealed in these trials; his dedication to equal rights was the other major preoccupation of his Senate career, and again he was ahead of his time. Long before the civil rights movement had won political allies in many high places, Lehman was fighting the battle for effective legislation to end the degradation of second-class citizenship and give American Negroes the equity and equality so many of them had so long been denied.

Finally, when he decided in 1956 that he could no longer meet the physical ordeal of conscientious Senate service, he returned to New York. Again it was assumed that his political lifetime was nearly over; instead he plunged with implausible fervor into the Democratic reform movement and became, with Mrs. Roosevelt, not merely its spiritual leader but a street-corner activist. Who will ever forget the pictures of him pounding the hot pavements of a sweltering summer for the Wagner reform ticket that eventually staged one of the unforgettable upsets in our political annals? Perhaps the reform crusade was the hardest effort of all; it required open conflict with machine men Lehman had long known, and he was a sentimental man. But he did not shrink from it, and his example stirred the conscience of a city.

And so, until the day he died, Herbert Lehman was fighting the good fight for the basic American decencies.

His voice and his name were identified with a thousand efforts to help those born less fortunate than himself, to safeguard our tradition of freedom, to fulfill the dream of the Emancipation Proclamation.

He was never a thunderer, but his voice was heard; he was a gracious man, even in dealing with his adversaries, but he could fight hard and resolutely for the things in which he deeply believed; he was blessed with humility, but he scorned obsequiousness; he knew there were times when compromises were inevitable, but his incorruptibility was always clear. He endured personal tragedy with gallantry and stoicism.

Above all, he imparted a quiet nobility to all the causes he espoused, and to the lives of all who knew him. For his wife and others close to him there can only be the consolation that he lived long enough to become not merely a beloved resident of New York, but a revered citizen of the world.

---

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Dec. 6, 1963]

### LEGACY OF DECENCY

Herbert H. Lehman leaves a rich political legacy.

He was warm and human in a field where it is sometimes easy to become aloof and imperious.

Veteran reporters remember him for his availability, his constant willingess to talk, even when under attack. Voters remember his folksy approaches on streetcorners and sidewalks.

He was decent, a fine person, with honest instincts—and politics can so easily compromise such instincts. There was never a breath of scandal attached to him.

He was a humanitarian. This spirit was stamped on every piece of legislative progress he touched, particularly in his later years as a Senator in Washington.

He was very serious, especially about the various offices he held. Some said he was so serious he was stuffy and humorless. But that's overstating it.

He was unique. He succeeded Governor Roosevelt when the latter went to the White House. From then until December 1942, he was Governor. He resigned after such an unprecedented time in office to take a Federal position as director of relief for wartorn Europe.

He later continued such humanitarian work with the U.N. He returned to political office in 1949, when he was elected Senator.

He was a fighter. He fought Tammany Hall on the streets of New York and he won. He fought to keep Mayor Wagner in office and he won.

He fought in the U.S. Senate for the causes he believed in. These causes always had humanitarian overtones.

Yet he was not born to politics. He came from a wealthy background and enjoyed working for a Wall Street banking house. He shunned the kind of politicking he eventually grew accustomed to.

For a man who was such a reluctant politician, he succeeded marvelously.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Wershba of the New York Post has written with deep feeling of the lasting mark which Herbert H. Lehman has left. I include his excellent article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

### HERBERT LEHMAN: THE MARK HE LEFT

(By Joseph Wershba)

And now he joins Eleanor Roosevelt.

Like Mrs. Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman had his roots in well-to-do, upper middle class society. He could easily have led the quiet, contented, gracious life.

But even after he was 80 years old, he was walking the boardwalk of Coney Island under broiling summer sun or touring street corner rallies on cold, rainy, windswept autumn nights, exhorting his fellow citizens to drive out bossism and vote for reform.

The exertions did not wear him down. They kept him young in heart till the last moment.

If he had been a conservative standpatter all his life, it would not have occasioned much surprise. If he had spent the days of his years pursuing his business and augmenting his wealth, people would have marked him a success and given him the respect due his station.

But like Eleanor Roosevelt and her husband before her, Herbert Lehman was living witness that economic determinism often falls apart when applied to human personality: Poor people are not always radical and rich people are not always conservative. Sometimes, the greatest ideologues for the advancement of the underprivileged may have risen from the class of the favored few.

Herbert Lehman was not an ideologue, a theorist or a creative thinker. He was an activist, a doer.

In one of the greatest moments of his country's peril—the period of McCarthyism almost triumphant—Herbert Lehman stood virtually alone among public officials in fighting McCarthy head on. That is his greatest glory.

Herbert Lehman sought to save his country from going down the dark road, and his example served as a rallying point for millions of his fellow countrymen who finally found their tongues. And that is the greatest mark he leaves in history.

The journalists and historians say Herbert Lehman was a colorless man and they are probably right—in terms of "public image." Search the thousands of clippings on his 50 years of public life; search the hundreds of pages of his biography by Allan Nevins. There are hardly any anecdotes. There is hardly any "color."

He had dignity. He had self-respect. He had respect for others. That was his color.

He had all the material prospects of life for himself and his family and he did what he could to improve the living conditions of millions of human beings at home and abroad. That, too, was his color.

The older people would lean out to touch him as he came amongst them on his Manhattan campaigning for the reform movement; they'd lift their hats or comment solicitously that he looked well that day—or maybe that he wasn't looking as well as the last time. This was a patriarch who moved among them. And on them he had left his mark of 50 years of service.

He left his mark, too, on various sections of the middle class, including the upper portion which was persuaded by his example to accept liberalism as a fundamental way of American life. As a banker, he was a bulwark of American capitalism. He believed without question in the merits of free enterprise. He was a millionaire, many times over. Yet withal he was the essence of modern-day liberalism.

In his years as Governor of New York, his liberalism was embodied in a broad program of social reform. Every worker who loses his job today and is tided over a while with unemployment insurance has Herbert Lehman to thank in part. Every elderly person who draws public benefits and assistance today, has Herbert Lehman to thank in part. Every worker and employer who have been able to settle their differences before the State labor relations board—instead of by lockout or strike—also owe Herbert Lehman a debt—and many other advances, like public housing—are some of the marks he left.

In his World War II years as director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), Lehman fed and clothed as many European civilians as he could—despite the enormous problem of international suspicions. There was always a huge monkey wrench in the machinery—but many Europeans alive today have Herbert Lehman to thank. And that too is a mark he left.

All these are important legacies of a man. And yet, one keeps coming back to his later years for the marks that will last the longest. It was after he became a Senator, a man in his seventies, that he threw himself into the great struggles of the day—and became the conscience of liberalism in public office.

He fought for civil rights for the Negro. He fought for liberalized immigration laws. He fought against the tidelands oil giveaway. He fought those who wanted to expand the Korean war into a certain thermonuclear World War III. He had to defend himself against the know-nothing charges that he was a Communist in disguise.

And always the fight against McCarthyism. He was not the only voice against the McCarthyites in those terror-reigning days of 1953–54 when the junior Senator from Wisconsin had browbeaten most of Washington into silence. But always, on the floor of the Senate, there was Herbert Lehman.

And then the period in which he is most vividly remembered—as the active partner of Eleanor Roosevelt in spearheading the reform movement within the Democratic Party of New York City. There were many victories in that fight: Robert Wagner taking on Tammany and Carmine DeSapio—and winning; DeSapio defeated by a reformer for district leadership; DeSapio losing a second time in his comeback attempt; reform Democrats victorious in a number of local elections.

The reformation of the Democratic Party in New York City is another mark of Herbert Lehman. Whether it will be a lasting one never really depended on him anyway. He and Mrs. Roosevelt gave it their blessings and their fullest effort—but the staying quality of a reform depends on the newcomers who take over. And they will always have the Lehman-Roosevelt example to remind them that what is hard earned must be hard kept.

Herbert Lehman could just as easily have been a Republican instead of a Democrat. It was an accident of history that his father and uncle had settled in the South, where they became Democrats, instead of in the North, where they most likely would have allied themselves with the Republican Party.

The Lehman brothers came from Germany in the 1860's and settled in Montgomery, Ala. They supported the Confederacy during the Civil War, then moved to New York after the war was over. The joys of history are never more rewarding than when it produces such ironies as a father in Montgomery supporting the Confederacy, followed by a son in New York who would be one of the leaders in the movement for Negro rights a century later.

The German Jews who migrated to America in the 1840's allied themselves, in the main, with the Republican liberal tradition that stretched from Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt. In the case of Herbert Lehman, his political background was Democratic. But over and above the party consideration, his outlook was in the liberal tradition.

Lehman did not merely inherit a tradition of liberalism and good works. He developed it. He opened his eyes to the less affluent world outside his door and he saw there were children and parents in the Lower East Side who would not share in the bounty of America unless people like himself helped them. He always said that the person who did the most to show him the social problem was Lillian D. Wald, of Henry Street Settlement fame. They had been brought together by a member of the Jacob H. Schiff family in the 1890's. Lehman became an ardent volunteer worker with the Henry Street Settlement—and that, too, is one of the marks he leaves.

He and his wife Edith had three adopted children—and their feeling for children never left them. It was Lehman who gave the Children's Zoo at Central Park. That, too, is a lasting Lehman mark.

In his last year, Lehman was deeply disturbed by the rise of rightwing movement in America. He sensed their essentially anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti-liberal nature. He saw them as a revival of American style fascism and he warned that they were a new peril to the freedom of this Nation. That warning, too, is a mark Herbert Lehman left.

How sum up this kindly, courteous, persistent, gallant—and "colorless" man?

"He was a great American and noble Jew who combined in his life and works the thunder for justice and the love of his people reminiscent of the prophets of Jewish history," says Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

And perhaps that is the lasting mark left by Herbert Henry Lehman, 1878–1963.

Mr. Speaker, during his years in the U.S. Senate, Senator Herbert H. Lehman became popularly known as the conscience of the Senate. The columnist, William V. Shannon, writing in the New York Post of December 6, describes the Senate years of Herbert H. Lehman. His discerning article follows:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### SENATE YEARS

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—Herbert Lehman was a pilgrim who never stopped seeking the good society.

He early learned that cleverness and political guile were not his forte. A native wisdom told him that, when in doubt, he should trust to his own instinctive reactions. He made of his integrity a shining shield that enabled him to go unafraid and uncompromised into scores of angry controversies. He had the enormous strength and durability that come from a serene conscience and an open, uncomplicated response to life.

Those of us who cover Washington met him late in his pilgrimage. We did not at first expect that we would be witnesses to some of its most exciting and meaningful episodes. It was just this season of the year in 1949 when Herbert Lehman arrived as a freshman Senator having just defeated John Foster Dulles in an unexpectedly bitter campaign. Lehman thought his victory had put all harsh emotions behind him, and he looked forward to constructive work in the company of the sober, thoughtful men he expected his fellow Senators would be. But the rancor and innuendo of that campaign were the true harbingers of his 7 stormy years in Washington.

Lehman had few opportunities to achieve positive accomplishments. Almost all of his energies had to be expended in combating folly, rebutting bigotry and reaffirming basic principles.

No one in the press gallery anticipated this Horatio-like role for the new Senator. He was 71, dignified, seemingly rather solemn, an ex-banker, and best-known as a competent, thrifty Governor. But in less than 3 months, Joe McCarthy began his rampage against the State Department.

Like many others in those early days, Lehman innocently believed McCarthy could be argued with and refuted with facts and logic.

At one point in an early debate, McCarthy flourished a document which he said would prove his charges. Lehman challenged him to read it aloud. McCarthy said he could not do so, but added: "I will show it to the Senator and allow him to read it for himself."

Lehman promptly walked across the floor and stretched out his hand. McCarthy refused to give up the paper.

That was Lehman's first instruction in the real nature of the "world's most exclusive club." The Senate, during most of his years in it, was at a historically low ebb, both in its moral atmosphere and in the quality of its leaders and prominent Members.

Equally revealing for Lehman was a radio debate in which he took part in the spring of 1951 after Truman fired General MacArthur. The other participants were Homer Capehart, Robert Taft and Hubert Humphrey. The discussion grew unusually heated. Just as the program was going off the air, Capehart denounced Humphrey and Lehman as pro-Communist China. They denied it. Capehart began to push Humphrey. When Lehman tried to intervene, Capehart shoved him. Lehman held his own during 30 seconds or so of clumsy sparring before the fight was broken up. He suffered no damage except a broken pair of glasses.

Reflecting on it the next day, he shook his head in bemusement. "Nothing like that ever happened to me before. You know, before I came down here, I honestly used to think the Senate was the greatest deliberative body in the world."

He lightly emphasized the word "deliberative."

Lehman, shortly afterward, tried during a long night session to save the price control bill—this was during the Korean war—against crippling amendments. The official Democratic leaders had, for all practical purposes, abandoned the bill to its fate. But Lehman kept plugging away, speaking against almost every amendment and demanding rollcall votes. When the badly mauled measure finally came to a vote on final passage, he voted "present." Under the Senate rules, a Member can vote "present" only with the consent of the Senate. But it is a rule that is honored only in the breach. No Senator had been forced to explain a vote of "present" in over 50 years.

That night, however, during an angry half-hour of gavel pounding and shouting, the Republicans insisted that Lehman vote "yea" or "nay" on final passage. They won their point on a roll call, 39 to 35.

Lehman asked what the penalty was for not voting. Told there was none, he said, "The Senator from New York does not wish to disregard the rules of the Senate, and therefore reluctantly votes 'yea.'"

Was it merely personal vindictiveness that impelled Taft, Wherry, Hickenlooper and the other Republicans to extract a vote from Lehman that night? Or did they feel his vote would serve as a kind of moral seal attesting that the bill they had concocted was not as bad as he had said it was?

Whatever the reason, Lehman was increasingly forced into the lonely role of critic and crusader during his Senate years. This was a paradox because he was not by temperament a rebel or a dissenter.

A man such as WAYNE MORSE positively enjoys being a nay-sayer and a minority of one. But Lehman, although shy, was potentially a good club man. He was easygoing and friendly by nature, and years of experience as a Democratic Governor with a Republican legislature in Albany had taught him the necessity for tact and compromise. But the Senate during his years there repeatedly outraged his fundamental moral instincts. He just could not find any common ground with the McCarthyites, the reactionary Republicans such as Capehart, and the hardshell southerners.

The public rarely caught a glimpse of this conflict between congeniality and conscience since conscience so regularly won.

The Washington record was not wholly one of battles gallantly fought and lost. In his first year, he almost singlehandedly forced the substitution of a more liberal displaced persons bill for the measure originally reported out by Pat McCarran. This victory which opened America's door to thousands of additional refugees was one very close to Lehman's heart.

This report would not be complete without a word about Mrs. Lehman. They had a beautiful marriage. One reason Herbert Lehman could be so strong in the public's service was that he was so secure and happy in his private life.

They shared a deep love of children and of animals. The delightful Children's Zoo which they recently gave the city in Central

Park unites these two interests. It is a happy memorial to a warmhearted and high-minded man.

Mr. Speaker, the children of New York—the future generations—owe deep debts of gratitude to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, not only for his legacy of a sterling example of public service, but for his keen appreciation of their childhood pleasures.

In 1960, at the time of their golden wedding anniversary, Governor and Mrs. Lehman generously donated funds for the establishment of a children's zoo in Central Park. The Children's Zoo has been a source of great delight to countless children.

Nora Ephron, writing in the New York Post for December 6, captured the wonderful spirit of Governor and Mrs. Lehman as they took pleasure in the enjoyment of the children who visit the zoo. Her moving article follows:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

### FOR LEHMAN: THE LAUGHTER OF CHILDREN

(By Nora Ephron)

He was an old man with that special kind of wisdom—he knew there was nothing like children to keep people young. He stood, resting against his cane, near the enchanted castle of the Children's Zoo, and he watched the youngsters laughing and playing with the animals.

After a while his wife turned to him, "I think you'd better go now," she said.

"Not just yet," he replied.

That was 2 months ago, the last time Gov. Herbert Lehman was able to visit the Central Park Zoo he and his wife gave to the children of New York. Yesterday, he died just a few blocks from the fairy village over 1,600,000 persons have seen since its dedication 2 years ago.

#### THE ENCHANTED ACRE

There were a few children, bundled up in windbreakers, at the zoo, yesterday. They ran through the Enchanted Acre, Lehman and his wife designed, through Noah's Ark, the witch's house in Hansel and Gretel, the castle; they fed the ducks in the Dee. They were shouting and laughing and playing, unconsciously, what was probably the only tribute the grand old man would have wished.

In Old MacDonald's Farm, Stockyard Keeper John Adornette was consoling a goat, who was watching a 4-year-old named Thomas eat the cracker he was supposed to feed the livestock. "The children and the animals have a better time here," said Adornette, who transferred from the main zoo 2 weeks ago. Thomas looked at the cow and said "moo" several times, which is the only thing children seem to be able to say to cows.

#### LOVED TO WATCH THEM

In the stainless-steel kitchen inside, a man was slicing up hundreds of carrots. In the office, a keeper named Fitzgerald was ordering bales of hay. Mrs. Autumn Smith, a clerk who knew Lehman for 14 years, tried to express what most the employees felt yesterday:

"Lately he hadn't been here too much," said Mrs. Smith, "but they used to be here almost every day on the weekends. He loved children. He wanted the children to have fun and he really loved to watch them." Mrs. Smith is married to Lehman's chauffeur and first met him in Washington in 1949.

"I remember the first time I was introduced to him, in the Senate Office Building," she said. "He couldn't have been nicer if we had been the President and First Lady. He was a man with so much heart."

#### GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY GIFT

The Lehmans presented the zoo to the city on their golden wedding anniversary. "But the best reason," the Governor said at the time, "is that it will give pleasure to all those little ones."

When the zoo was opened, adults could enter only if accompanied by a child; last year, with the approval of the Lehmans, the rule was changed to allow anyone to come in. Yesterday, a young couple looked through the swiss cheese holes in a large box that holds a number of fast-multiplying mice. "It's just wonderful," said the woman. "I wonder whose idea it was."

---

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, December 7, I was one of the few Members of the House present when a legislative day was established in about 1 minute for the purpose of qualifying a discharge petition to be filed today on the civil rights bill now pending before the House Rules Committee. On Saturday I heard the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] attempt to make a point of order that a quorum was not present. It is my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that had the gentleman from Florida been recognized, his point of order would have prevailed and the House would not have been duly constituted and a legislative day would not have passed. It is my further belief that had a quorum call been placed in effect, the list of absentees would have included ardent supporters of the discharge petition who contend that the duty of Congressmen is to stay in attendance until the civil rights bill is passed.

Despite the events of last Saturday, the reality of today's situation is that the required number of legislative days have elapsed and a discharge petition on H.R. 7152 has been filed.

It is ironic that the committee to be discharged is the Committee on Rules which was "liberalized" earlier this year after a heated controversy. Proponents of this "liberalization" claimed that adding three Members to the Rules Committee would assure the fact that all legislation would be brought to the House floor for a vote. Now, even with a Rules Committee which is to their liking they are urging us to bypass it just 10 legislative days after a bill was officially reported to it.

The dual standards for what constitutes delay for the Rules and the Judiciary Committees is difficult for me to understand. The Judiciary Committee considered and debated and compromised this bill from May 8 to November 20 of this year, a period of more than 6 months. Even the honorable chairman of the Judiciary Committee required from October 29 to November 20, a period of almost 3 weeks, to officially report the bill after his committee had ordered it reported.

Mr. Speaker, can we say with any degree of honesty that the 10 days which have elapsed since the Rules Committee assumed jurisdiction of the civil rights bill is any more of a delay than the almost 7 months which the Judiciary Committee consumed in considering this bill? Is the 10 days which have elapsed since the liberalized committee assumed jurisdiction of the bill any more of a delay than the 2½ years which were needed before an administration civil rights bill was even proposed to this Congress?

Mr. Speaker, it has been conceded that this discharge petition cannot possibly bring the civil rights bill up for House consideration during the current year.

The leadership plans to adjourn by December 20 and under House rules the bill could not be considered under the discharge petition until December 23. There is little question, therefore, that the bill cannot be debated until next year.

The discharge petition will not bring about earlier consideration by the Rules Committee.

The gentleman from Virginia, Chairman HOWARD SMITH, has announced that he will hold hearings early in January. Despite what some may say of the gentleman from Virginia, there is no one who would even imply that his word is not good.

Mr. Speaker, since the civil rights bill will be considered in January if the Democratic leadership truly wants it considered, today's discharge petition is a meaningless gesture. It will accomplish nothing for the cause of civil rights.

What, then, is the purpose of the discharge petition?

This is a question, Mr. Speaker, which I cannot answer nor would I attempt to answer. Some have suggested that it is politically motivated but I would not presume to sit in judgment of another Member's motivation.

Those who suggest political motivation say that the discharge petitioners expect public confusion to serve the partisan purpose of harming Republicans who believe that in a government of law we must preserve legal and orderly procedure. They say the American public is unfamiliar with the complexities of legislative parliamentary procedure and will immediately interpret failure to sign a discharge petition as opposition to civil rights. They contend that the public will forget the fact that 49 Republican House Members have introduced comprehensive civil rights bills as against 37 Democrats, an impressive comparative figure when Democrats outnumber Republicans in the House approximately 3 to 2. They feel the public will not remember that Republicans furnished the bipartisan support at President Kennedy's request which was responsible for favorable Judiciary Committee action on civil rights and that the long-established voting record of Republicans in Congress is overwhelmingly in favor of justice and equality under the law. They feel the public will forget these things and jump to the conclusion that Republicans are opposing civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what may have motivated it, many Members of the House find themselves on the horns of a

**difficult dilemma. On one side they must defy orderly procedure or on the other stand falsely accused of being against a civil rights bill.**

Having confidence in the intelligence of the American people, it is not difficult for me to decide what to do in this dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I am for equal rights under the law and I expect to vote in favor of a civil rights bill during the month of January 1964. And I expect to vote for it after orderly legislative procedure has been followed.

The test of my sincerity will come with my vote on the civil rights bill. I will not demagog by signing this petition today.

If I were to sign, I would not be helping the cause of civil rights. Though the petition has been misrepresented, causing many well meaning individuals and organizations to temporarily misunderstand, this petition will not hasten House consideration of the bill.

To sign it would, in my opinion, violate and prostitute the legislative process because of pressure.

Mr. Speaker, a Congressman who is worthy of the name is expected to be able to withstand pressure and to do what he knows is right as his mind and heart see the right.

Though it is not the easiest way, I believe the right way is to follow orderly procedure.

## PROCUREMENT METHODS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the necessity of taking your time and that of the Members of the House to call attention again to the haphazard, inefficient procurement methods of our Defense Department.

Sometimes I wonder "Why should it be necessary for me to carefully scan hundreds of procurement documents each week in order to show those in authority how millions of dollars can be saved?"

My staff is limited and so is the time of a few expert volunteers. It is necessary for us to work long and hard in order to ferret out the deplorable and inexcusable procurement methods by which tax dollars are being wasted.

Thank goodness, some of the military authorities appreciate what I have done in pointing out these gross mistakes and have pledged their full support and cooperation. Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman, Head of the Army Electronics Materiel Command, and Brig. Gen. Wesley Franklin, Head of the Army Electronics Material Agency, have done just that in the recent past. I believe they are sincere.

With their help, I know millions can be saved.

One case where a tremendous saving can be effected is in the purchase of an autopilot known as the AN/ASW 12. Back on June 7, 1963, the Los Angeles Procurement District of the Electronics Command issued a sole source bid document for 1,100 of these equipments. In the past, I have discovered, this item cost about $20,000 each.

When this document came to my attention on June 13, I noted that there was a stipulation of "no drawings available." I immediately asked the Army to supply me with copies of past contracts for the equipment, feeling I would discover drawings had indeed been bought and paid for. On June 19, 1963, copies of five past contracts for the equipment were mailed to me, and I was advised that five more contracts were currently active.

One glance at those five old contracts almost made me lose my Hoosier temper. The Army had bought drawings and specifications as a part of all five contracts, dating back to 1958. As a matter of fact, it had spent $450,000 for this material on the five old contracts alone.

In separate letters to Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commander of the Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia; and Col. Burleigh B. Drummond, commander of the Los Angeles Procurement District of the Army, I said in part that:

> It appears to me that drawings should, indeed, exist in a quantity sufficient to provide enough information so that practically anyone with a reasonable degree of competence could manufacture this set. I think this equipment should now be removed from the expensive shelter of sole source and put out on the street for competitive bidding.

On June 26, 1963, General Stanwix-Hay informed me by phone and by wire that the procurement had been canceled and said, "Many thanks for your help."

On July 2, 1963, General Stanwix-Hay told me a complete investigation was going forward.

When I had no report by September, I wrote General Moorman, the new commander, and asked for results of the probe. Two days later, the general called to assure me he was in sympathy with the accomplishments being made in my procurement study and was pleased with the victories being scored in behalf of responsible competitive procurement.

On September 24, 1963, a letter from the Electronics Command reporting on the ASW 12 case said, in part:

> As indicated in your letter, manufacturing drawings and changes thereto for the AN/ASW 12 have been procured on previous contracts. In order to expand competitive procurement, the U.S. Army Electronics Command plans to buy a procurement data package suitable for this purpose.

The letter claimed manufacturing drawings on hand were but 60 percent complete and mentioned that proprietary items were invoked in the other 40 percent.

This surprised me, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the Army paid 100 cents on the dollar and the people had every right to expect delivery of 100 percent drawings. I conveyed my feelings to the Army, and on October 4, 1963, received a telegram from General Moorman assuring me the Army had approached the contractor about a procurement data package and stating the next purchase of the equipment would be by competitive bidding.

The fact that procurement of this set will be competitive in the future is good news, Mr. Speaker. It is my prediction this procurement will drive the cost down by 50 percent under the past average price of $20,000 per unit.

The bad news here is that again Army civil and military servants have done their work in the past in such an inefficient and slipshod manner. The Army paid out tax money on at least 5 of 10 past contracts—and I imagine on all 10. Yet, and this would have been unbelievable to me years ago until I learned of all the waste in military purchasing, it got only 60 percent of what it paid for and no one seems surprised.

Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence that the Army is altogether too free and easy with our tax dollars. Here is concrete evidence of the superficial way in which much procurement work is done. Here is proof that the time is here and now to completely fumigate the procurement areas of the military and let in the fresh air of efficiency and hard work.

## ECONOMY DRIVE PROGRESSING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few days in the press and on the air of a new wave of economy in the executive branch of the Federal Government. This is welcome news to many of us.

The new budget will be before us in January. This will give us the answer to whether or not the President has been able to translate his welcome words into facts and figures.

Having served with President Johnson when he was a Member of the Senate on conference committees on appropriation bills, I know he is knowledgeable as to the budget and can recognize waste as well as areas where economy can be practiced. It is hoped that this knowledge will be useful to him in his present efforts.

I am sure the American taxpayer hopes that the 1965 budget will be sharply reduced as the result of the new President's review.

But, Mr. Speaker, these efforts to effect economy in Federal spending are not new, nor have they been the concern of only one political party.

May I remind my colleagues that on March 4 of this year, announcement was made of the formation of a task force from among the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee. The task force was organized to study the President's budget and to make recommendations as to where reductions could be made without curtailing or eliminating any essential service. I have the privilege of serving as chairman of this task force. The task force was conceived and appointed by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman from Iowa has long been an advocate of economy in the Government and has been successful in years gone by in saving millions of dollars for the American taxpayers. The other Members of the task force, in addition to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself, are the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

The minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] has been most helpful to the task force in counseling with us and in joining with us in the study of the budget.

The task force has had the advantage of meetings with and advice from former President Eisenhower.

Maurice Stans, director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Eisenhower administration, gave great assistance to our task force.

### TASK FORCE GOAL

We concluded that budget reductions were not only feasible but essential to the national interest. Our conclusion was that new spending authority could be cut by a magnitude of from $10 to $15 million.

We were chided and ridiculed.

The President, in his March 6 press conference, doubted our ability to make substantial reductions and stated that he had submitted a hard budget.

The distinguished majority leader took the floor to chastise us verbally, suggesting that the economy move was impossible unless we deprived our children of education, took food from their mouths. He complained that we threatened the security of the aged and ignored the ill. He gave a long list of projects throughout the United States which he said would be lost forever if we had our way. In fact, after hearing all of the things the gentleman charged us with, I did not want to look in the mirror for several days.

I call your attention to the majority leader's speech. You will find it in the RECORD of April 2, 1963, from page 5492 to page 5525, 33 pages, and I may say that even the printing bill for the speech was no small item. I call your attention to the fact that we have cut the budget, without inflicting the hardships or bringing about the catastrophes the gentleman envisioned.

We welcome the suggestions that President Johnson will urge reduced spending, and we hope that his suggestions will not receive the vitriolic reception accorded those of our task force.

### ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE

What have we done? Here is the record of achievement thus far.

Of the 11 appropriation bills for fiscal year 1964 already passed by the House, the budget request was $91,817,407,145. When these bills were acted upon by the House, the amount passed was $86,397,074,119, or a total reduction at this time of $5,420,333,026.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I can confidently estimate an additional reduction of the original budget requests of $2 billion, and that when this session of the Congress adjourns, I estimate that the House will have made savings of $7½ billion.

The President has been talking of budget cuts in the new 1965 budget. Let us recall that we are still working on the 1964 budget, and his influence would be welcome here, as well. I would hope that President Johnson would use his great influence in the other body to help us hold down appropriations in several forthcoming conferences where the House figures are below those of the Senate. And in those cases where the other body has found means of reducing the House figures, I hope that we will recede and accept their judgment in the interest of economy.

By reason of the continuing resolution, this is possible.

### MORE CAN BE DONE

Mr. Speaker, we have not reached the goal set by our task force, but there has been a real accomplishment. Who will deny $7½ billion is not a real accomplishment? Much of it has been bipartisan. The distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made a number of hard-hitting speeches in which he pointed out exactly where we are heading with our extravagance and our planned deficits.

More should have been done and more can be done.

The task force will continue in the next session, and we will continue to count on bipartisan support.

We plan to make a minute study of the new budget, as we did of the old. And I can say now that we will again refuse requests for our detailed worksheets—the "bill of particulars" as they were called. We shall not furnish the spenders with our figures nor give them the opportunity to use our figures in their propaganda to build a case against us.

We shall continue to work for economy and we shall welcome help from any source. We shall strive for a balanced budget. We shall rely heavily on the economy pledges of those who urged the tax cut bill last summer. We will do everything in our power to avoid planned deficits, or deficits of any kind. We believe that planned deficits are not in the bests interests of the Nation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman first of all for the statement he has made. We are apparently coming to the end of a long, drawn-out first session of the Congress. We have not finished the work on the appropriation bills, as we should have finished, but we have gotten some of them passed.

I agree with the gentleman completely that when the task force which he headed began its work, when it was announced that on the Republican side of the aisle here in the House of Representatives we were going to make a determined effort to try to reduce Federal spending, to do away with waste and extravagance, many scoffed. We were subjected to ridicule. Scare stories of all sorts were being published in the press and spoken here in the House of Representatives. Predictions were made as to the dire things that would happen if we were able to cut some of these appropriation bills. We have been able to cut them, and I have not discovered where any real damage has been done to any essential function of the Government. On the contrary, I think the Government is still spending too much money. But may I say parenthetically, that is not the fault of the gentleman from Ohio and those who served with him on the task force, our members on the Appropriations Committee, and those of us on our side who have been struggling for some sense in Government spending.

There have been times when we just have not had enough help. We are in the minority. Without help from the other side of the aisle we cannot prevail. I think the gentleman spoke very well when he said that of course in some instances we have had help from the other side of the aisle, and certainly I would be the first to commend this business of putting fiscal responsibility ahead of what otherwise might in some degree be a matter of party responsibility.

I would agree with the gentleman that the fight has just begun. As we go into the next session to wind up the affairs that should have been disposed of before now, we should continue our efforts for some sort of fiscal responsibility, for restriction of our spending and for taking care of the financial affairs of our Government.

I would express the hope that we will have support not only here in the House of Representatives but throughout the country from people who say to us, "Why do you not do something about excessive Federal spending?"—but who do very little to try to stimulate public interest in that direction. If we could get that sort of help, then in my opinion we will be much more successful than we have been. But, certainly, so far the operation headed by the gentleman from Ohio has been a great success, and again I commend him and his colleagues for it.

Mr. BOW. I thank the distinguished minority leader. May I again say on behalf of the task force that the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, has been most helpful not only in his counsel but in other activities in helping the task force and we appreciate his counsel and his help very much.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa who is the minority leader on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] for a job well done as chairman of the Republican budget cutting task force. It was my privilege, and I might say my great honor, to appoint the members of that task force. In naming the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] as chairman, I was quite sure that I was naming as the man to chair this important committee, a man who had great knowledge of the functions of Government and of almost every agency of the Government as a result of his long experience both as an investigator and as a Member of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has measured up and more than measured up to the task which I delegated him to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that never in all the 25 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives have I seen a more dedicated group of people, members of the Committee on Appropriations and especially the minority members on that committee as well as a number of the majority members of the committee, do a job more effectively and more diligently than has been done on the President's budget by reducing that budget to the tune of about $7½ billion which is no small task. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will agree with me that the Members of the House whom I have just named will be satisfied with nothing less than a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter at least in peacetime. I hope even though it be a shaky peace that it will be a long lasting peace.

So again I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and I also want to compliment our great and distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for the fine cooperation he has given us, and also I feel it my duty to mention the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] as well as Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Stans and his assistants. You know $7,500 million as we say out on the farm just is not hay. It amounts to a lot of dollars for every American family. We propose to keep on fighting and working diligently for a balanced budget. I know the gentleman will agree with me that we intend not just to save money, but we intend to have a balanced budget and possibly in 1965 to have a little surplus if it is at all possible to do so. I am sure the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman and I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution to the discussion today.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] who has served so many years and so diligently on the committee and has been one of the members who has joined in effecting great savings over the years to the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in complimenting the task force on at least setting a goal for us to shoot at in the matter of wise spending of the taxpayers' dollars. They are not easy to come by. We work at times in a confusion of budget systems and not always with the full cooperation of all the powers of the Government in the United States. Certainly we can be aided in our labors with the right attitudes emanating from the White House. I was heartened when I heard our new President taking action to try to effect some economies in the expenditure of dollars, and I want to accept that as a challenge to us to work with him. We can assume that he is sincere in his determination. With a determination on the part of the Congress, working through the Committee on Appropriations, and the cooperation of the White House, I know that wise spending can be effected and that wholesome and truly constructive savings can be had. I am sure that the toboggan that the dollar has been on for so many years can be slowed down and that the value of the dollar that the American people do business with and in which their savings are and which is really, in a sense, somewhat sacred to them as they move on into their old age will be protected by the work that we are here and now trying to do.

Again I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio and his coworkers, one of whom is here and served on this task force, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his contribution.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], a member of the task force committee.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is being subjected to an extensive campaign of criticism and vilification. A principal complaint is the delay in the passage of the fiscal 1964 appropriation bills.

Up to now, the House has reduced the $98.8 billion Presidential budget by $5.6 billion. There is one more appropriation bill to be acted upon—foreign aid.

It is reasonable to assume the foreign aid item will be reduced by about $1.5 billion. We can reasonably anticipate a total reduction in the Presidential budget, made by the House of Representatives, of about $7 billion.

Taking into consideration Senate restorations and final conference agreements, I expect that the total congressional budget appropriations will result in a final net reduction of more $5 to $5.5 billion below the Presidential budget recommendations of $98.8 billion submitted last January.

Instead of condemnation, this House is deserving of the highest praise for its conscientious examination of, deliberation upon, and consideration of the appropriations bills. Based upon an estimate of 50 million families in this Nation, each family is saved from an eventual average tax imposition of $100 per year.

That saving alone justifies the delay in the passage of the 1964 appropriations bills.

Yes, it would have been easier and more pleasant to rubberstamp the 1964 Presidential budget after a cursory examination.

It is no easy task to examine and cross-examine thousands of witnesses—to review thousands of programs and activities in detail—to confer and negotiate at length with subcommittee members upon hundreds of items—to reduce appropriations without decreasing our military power—to reduce programs without curtailing essential public services.

I want to categorically state that this House has fully and most capably discharged its constitutional responsibilities in the fiscal management of this Government.

Some newspapers have stated that there is a dark, secret plot in this House of Representatives to obstruct our legislative process. Others have charged this House with incompetence and incapability.

If the elimination of $5 billion of unnecessary spending is a dark conspiracy, if the saving of $100 per year in taxes to every family in this Nation is a conspiracy or a crime, then we should proudly plead guilty.

The distinguished Speaker of this House, the majority leadership of this House, the chairman and the majority members of the Appropriations Committee, the membership of the majority party of this House are all deserving of this Nation's highest praise for their contributions to the legislative processing of this year's appropriations bills.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] deserves special mention. He lent his chairmanship, his prestige, his wisdom, his patience, his encouragement toward the maintenance of fiscal responsibility on the part of this House of Representatives, and toward the restoration of fiscal sanity and solvency in this Nation.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to mathematically apportion the credit due to the many, many Members of this House for their part in this long year of appropriations legislation. But, it is safe to say that these substantial spending reductions would not have materialized without the unified support of the Republican Party Members of this House.

For the first time in my memory, the Republican members of the Appropriations Subcommittees worked as a team with specific appropriation reduction targets.

The greatly admired ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], conceived and inspired the joint effort that finally realized, in a large measure, our party's goals of prudent fiscal management and a minimum tax liability for the Nation's taxpayers.

He appointed a Republican appropriations task force to carry out the task of examining the budget and setting out goals for budget reductions. He exercised his usual sound judgment and perception in appointing the highly respected gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to direct and coordinate the work of the subcommittees. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] did an outstanding job.

The Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, after a careful scrutiny of this year's $98.8 billion budget, set a target for reducing it by $10 billion.

Specific reductions were agreed upon for each appropriation bill. These reductions were given unified and coordinated support by the Republican members of the subcommittees.

A reduction of $7 billion by this House is a magnificent achievement.

The establishment of specific targets, the unity of the Republican Party behind these targets, has resulted in a greatly improved and favorable relationship with the Senate Appropriations Committee. We no longer split the difference between the House and Senate appropriations as a matter of course. The House has been able to maintain a much greater percentage of its reductions in conferences with the Senate than in former years.

The Republican policy committee and the Republican conference of this House gave its wholehearted support to this program.

And, Mr. Speaker, this has been a gigantic effort. It has been a magnificent start toward restoring fiscal soundness.

The Republican Members of this House can justifiably point with pride to their substantial contributions toward producing for the people of this Nation a $5 billion reduction in unnecessary Federal spending.

The Republican Party Members of this House furnished the inspiration and the persistence needed to do the job.

The target for this year of the Republican Members of this House has been substantially realized.

Fiscal policies and fiscal management will be a most controversial issue that will arise immediately upon the convening of the next session of this Congress. I trust that the Republican Members can again unite among themselves, and then work in cooperation with the majority party toward a realistic, frugal, and economical fiscal program in the next year—toward a balanced budget, a sound economy, a stable currency.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and wish to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with the gentleman and a great edification.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from New York and wish to say how much the task force has appreciated the fine work which the gentleman did and how much it appreciated his counsel and hard work, often late into the night, on these budget figures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who has been very much interested in the work which the task force has been doing and has been very helpful in his aid to us and advice to the committee in many instances.

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the time to add my commendation to the task force conducted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Indeed it has done significant work, I too recall the catcalls and jeers that were received at the time this task force was set up to the effect that significant cuts in the budget could not be accomplished. The argument was that those who were concerned about getting our expenditure side of the budget down were just taking on an impossible task. I must say that it was a very difficult task that the gentleman undertook, and that there was not all the cooperation that possibly we might wish there had been. Had there been such cooperation I am satisfied that this budget would be much lower on the expenditure side than it now is.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Committee on Ways and Means deeply understand the necessity for this work to go forward. If we do not raise the money in current taxes that has been voted for expenditures, we on the Committee on Ways and Means have to provide it in what amounts to deferred taxation, which is issuing more Government bonds. The economic impact on our economy to issue and try to sell more bonds on top of the tremendous sums of money that we already owe evidenced by the Federal debt is reaching a point that is nigh unbearable.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been arguing for tax cuts for years long before the neo-Keynesian economists woke up and found out that our Federal tax structure was undermining our economy, have tried to point out that we must earn this tax cut before we can have it.

We can only cut taxes economically and beneficially if we do not shift over to Government bonds the deficit created by the cutback in the revenues.

The work that the gentleman's committee has been doing has more bearing on whether we can give a tax cut and really hope to achieve the economic gains from cutting our Federal taxes. The gentleman's committee has done more in that direction than any group I know of.

I would like to point out that among other things there are three accomplishments your committee can claim. They are the reestimations downward of the expenditure rate for fiscal year 1963 estimated in January of this year, as required under the Budget and Accounting Act to be $94.4 billion. The budget-cutting move started in January is the first time since I have been observing these figures closely in recent years that the estimate made in January was greater than what turned out to be the actual figure. The expenditure rate for 1963 turned out to be $92.6 billion, a cut of $1.8 billion, directly attributable, I may say, to the work that this committee engaged in.

The second point has already been made. The budget for the fiscal year 1964, estimate of expenditure levels was $98.8 billion. This level has been reduced by $1 billion, to $97.8 billion, by the administration. This figure was given to the Committee on Ways and Means a month or so ago the last time we increased the Federal debt, to $315 billion. But, as the gentleman from New York has been pointing out, we have been operating this Government for 6 months, we are going into the 6th month, of fiscal 1964 under continuing resolutions to a large degree. These resolutions relate to the expenditure levels of fiscal year 1963, which is $92.6 billion, not the $98.8 billion of fiscal year 1964.

I asked the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury what was the impact on expenditure levels for fiscal 1964 as a result of these continuing resolutions. To my shock and surprise they did not have the figures. Those figures have still not been made available to the Congress, but we will see in the budget to be presented to the Congress in the coming January the estimates. The estimates have to be made under the Budget and Accounting Act for the expenditure level of fiscal 1964. I am very hopeful they will be down around $94 billion. If the administration can reach that figure and we can hold fiscal 1965 to around $94 billion, then in the judgment of at least the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee, as we expressed ourselves in the minority views in last January, on the President's economic report, we can have a tax cut of around $10 to $11 billion right away and we can look forward to real benefits of our economy.

Again, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the gentleman and his committee have done more to make this a reality than any other group.

Third, and probably more important as we look into the future, is the work that you have done in the area where Congress can be most effective and where your committee can be, which is new obligational authority. I have been talking about expenditure levels. The real control over expenditures the Congress has retained is over new obligational authority. The budget for fiscal year 1964 suggested $108 billion of new obligational authority. Only about 40 percent of that will be spent in the fiscal year 1964, but it has a direct impact on fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1966, and a considerable impact on 1964 too.

It is in this area that the gentleman's committee has been most effective and the reason why it is so important that this good work you have started be continued. I hope those on the majority side of the aisle join with you in your efforts to further this end.

Now, if I might make a final comment, and I do not know why as a Republican I should make this comment, but it seems to be fair game around the country to refer to this Congress as a do-nothing Congress. As a Republican I might say, Why should I defend against the castigation of this Congress, inasmuch as it is under Democratic leadership?

Let me say that a Congress that has passed new obligational authority of $100 billion, the highest in our history and one that raised revenues of $89 billion, is hardly a do-nothing Congress. In my judgment, it is doing too much.

But this is what Congress goes about, the business of authorizing programs that will justify expenditures of $100 billion, and then passing appropriations bills that go with the programs, and the tax legislation necessary to raise the revenues to pay for them. There is no Congress in history that has reached this kind of level in budgets. Talk about a Congress that has done that as "do nothing" is ridiculous. It actually has been doing too much. Those who have been complaining about doing too little are complaining because the Congress rejected an authorization bill of another billion dollars here or another billion dollars there. They are complaining because of the 1 percent, or whatever it is, they have been interested in, in the judgment of the Congress was not added to the vast sums already approved in these gigantic budgets.

In my judgment, this Congress has been doing entirely too much. A great deal more attention needs to be paid to those times on the floor of the House when, without proper study in our committees and without proper debate on the floor of the House we authorized programs and appropriated money. Those were the times Congress should have received criticism, not when they rejected bills.

So I do want to commend the gentleman again for his fine work and the work of his committee. In my opinion, you have done more for the good of this country than any group that has been working in the past two Congresses.

**Mr. BOW.** I thank the gentleman from Missouri. He has made his usual fine contribution to the debate on the floor of the House. I thank him for the remarks he has made as far as spending in this Congress is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an address by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The address referred to is as follows:

### A FEDERAL EXPENDITURE POLICY FOR 1964–65

(Remarks by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics at Barnard College, Columbia University, before the Conference on Federal Expenditure of the Tax Foundation, Tuesday, December 3, 1963, New York City)

I have argued on an earlier occasion, about 1 month ago, that the prospect of large-scale tax reduction in 1964 and again in 1965 called for a basic reshaping of Federal economic policy.[1] In particular, I have argued that it calls for a cessation, at least during the period of tax reduction, of increases in aggregate Federal expenditures. Accordingly, I shall try in this brief paper to describe the expenditure policy which in my judgment would serve us best at this time and to make certain suggestions for putting it into effect. Before I undertake to do so, however, let me describe the circumstances which, as I see it, call for a revision of Federal expenditure policy.

Briefly, Federal expenditures will have to be brought under very much closer control because it would be excessively expansive to allow them to continue to rise at the $5 to $7 billion rate that has obtained in the last 2 years at a time when the economy is operating at a high level and making further advances, when there is already a large deficit in the budget, and when the economy is about to receive the stimulus of large-scale, demand-increasing tax reduction.

There is only one condition under which we might accommodate a policy mix of large-scale tax reduction concurrent with large-scale increases in Federal expenditures. That would be if we were to pursue a monetary and credit policy, supported by appropriately noninflationary debt management policies, which would restrain activity in the private and State and local sectors of the economy by means of significantly higher interest rates. But economic and social priorities at this time argue against any further shift of resources to the public sector. We have already had 2½ years of exceptionally rapid increases in Federal spending. Federal cash payments were being made to the public in July through October of this year, for example, at a seasonally adjusted rate that was 30 percent higher than in 1960. Although Federal purchases of goods and services accounted for only slightly more than 10 percent of GNP in 1960, they have accounted for 15 percent of the GNP increase since that date. And in the fiscal year 1963 the rate of increase of civilian employment in the Federal Government was about one-third again as fast as the growth of civilian employment as a whole.

Moreover, would it not be inconsistent to strive with one hand to stimulate demand through tax reduction—and especially the demand for consumer goods typically purchased on credit terms—and with the other hand to raise the cost and limit the availability of credit by tightening monetary and credit policy? But the continuation of aggressively expansive Federal spending would force us into precisely this inconsistency. Under the circumstances, therefore, close expenditure control is obviously essential.

But it is not sufficient to say merely that there should be a close control over Federal expenditures. A definite policy target is needed. A reasonable target, I suggest, would be to hold aggregate Federal spending constant at its current level through the remainder of this present fiscal year and during the fiscal year 1965. Two aspects of this policy suggestion require comment: first, its economic merits; and, second, the question whether it is feasible, as a practical matter, to hold aggregate expenditures constant.

The economic repercussions of a change in the rate of Federal spending can be critically important, of course, if the change is sizable and especially if it is abrupt. But in the present instance the chance of any unsettlement being caused by a hold-the-line spending policy is minimized by the fact that although Federal outlays are currently very high they have tended to level out in the last few months. The Federal Government's purchases of goods and services, as reflected in the national income and product accounts, actually were lower (less Government sales) in the third quarter of 1963 than in the second quarter; and in July through October the monthly rate of total cash payments, seasonally adjusted and annualized, flattened out at about $123 billion. I do not know what the November figures will show, but I think we can safely assume that they will not differ sharply from those for July through October. If this is so, then the economy has already had 5 months to adjust itself to constant as contrasted with very steeply rising Federal expenditure rates. Obviously, this reassures one a good deal in making the suggestion that expenditures be held constant at current levels.

An additional observation is called for on the matter of holding Federal expenditure rates constant at present levels. I cannot be entirely sure of this, but as I read the figures on Federal cash payments to the public, it looks as if there is actually no alternative within present budgetary limits to holding expenditures at their current level. To put it differently, it may be that to hold the line on Federal spending is not so much a policy suggestion as a policy imperative.

The point is this: Last January's budget document projected cash payments to the public in fiscal 1964 of $122.5 billion. That rate was not only reached but actually exceeded a bit in the first 4 months of this fiscal year. What is more, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recently stated that, as a result of a congressional scaling down of appropriations requests, and because of a miscellany of other factors affecting expenditures, administrative budget spending in fiscal 1964 will be about $1 billion less than what was projected last January. This estimate suggests the need for a roughly equivalent scaling down in the projection of cash payments to the public. If this is the case, then we have, indeed, already reached our budgetary ceiling for the fiscal year 1964. And any appreciable increase over the October spending rate would require a cutback during the second half of this fiscal year. There is flexibility in the backlog of earlier authorizations and in the possibility of supplemental appropriations to permit such an increase; but, all things considered, it seems unlikely that there can be any appreciable further increase in expenditure rates in this fiscal year. As I have said, a hold-the-line policy may prove to be inescapable.

A shift in policy from very rapid spending increases to strict expenditure control is also indicated as a necessity by the trend of Federal cash payments to the public in the first half of calendar 1963. The plain fact of the matter is that Federal cash payments increased in the first 6 months of 1963 at a rate which if projected through the rest of this calendar year and into 1964 would bring them by mid-1964 to something like $130 billion a year. This would be roughly $15 billion higher than the rate obtained in early 1963. Such an increase would mean that Federal spending had, I would think inadvertently, gone far beyond anything currently contemplated. The only way to prevent this from happening is to institute a rigorous expenditure control program at once, throughout the Federal Establishment. This is another reason why I say that a hold-the-line expenditure policy is not so much a policy suggestion as a policy imperative.

Let me turn, then, to the second question; namely, to the feasibility of holding outlays in fiscal 1965 at the fiscal 1964 level.

For anyone familiar with Government financial housekeeping it will be evident, of course, that because expenditures under some programs increase more or less automatically from one fiscal period to the next, aggregate expenditures cannot be held constant as between two adjoining fiscal periods without making counterbalancing reductions in other programs. This is the well-known problem of the "built-in" expenditure increase.

* * * * *

We can move from this to an estimate of built-in expenditure increases for the budget as a whole. This should be done, of course, on an item-by-item basis, but it would be impractical for me to undertake to do so. If we do it roughly, by assuming an equivalent amount of built-in increases in other major (nondefense) divisions of the budget, we reach an estimate of $1.8 billion. I would prefer, however, to use a round figure of $2 billion. It pays to resolve all questions regarding budget figures on the liberal side, in any case, and the $2 billion figure falls within the $1.75 to $2.25 billion range which is favored by many budget experts. Finally, a $2 billion figure is confirmed by estimates made by Maurice Stans during his period of service as Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In an address to the Tax Foundation on December 1, 1959, Mr. Stans estimated built-in budgetary increases between the fiscal years 1960 and

---

[1] In a paper, "Policies to Accompany Tax Reduction," read before the dinner meeting of the 11th Annual Economic Outlook Conference sponsored by the Department of Economics of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Thursday, Oct. 31, 1963.

1961 as falling within the range of $2 and $2.5 billion. It would allow for mandatory expenditure increases, in addition to the $900 million in defense, of up to $500 million for additional public debt interest costs, $100 million for veterans' programs, and $500 million for specific items in the space, agriculture, public works, and other sectors of the budget.

So, we may formulate the expenditure control problem as follows: Is it possible to reduce discretionary expenditures in specific programs by $2 billion between the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 in order to offset built-in or mandatory expenditure increases of equal amount in other programs?

It is impossible for me to answer this question on the basis of an item-by-item commentary on the whole Federal budget, though I want to state with all the emphasis I can that this is precisely the way it should be answered. To do so would be more than any single individual could possibly accomplish, working alone, and in any case could not be described in the time available to me on this program. What I shall try to do is to show, by citing several areas within which large economies could be effected, that it is perfectly feasible to counterbalance built-in increases of roughly $2 billion and thus to hold aggregate expenditures constant. I want to show that it is wrong to be defeatist about the uptrend of Federal expenditures: in short, to defeat defeatism. In addition I will refer to several comprehensive budget analyses that have been made by others and which reveal possibilities, on an item-by-item basis, for expenditure reductions that go far beyond $2 billion.

Let me turn first to an area that I have had occasion to comment on several times in the past; namely, Federal credit programs.[2] They are prime candidates for expenditure reduction because they have expanded at an exceptionally rapid rate in the last few years. Also, they have reached such a size that even a small percentage cut in them would produce a very large saving. And, finally, cuts can be made in this budget area with no net deflationary effect because credits that would otherwise be handled in the public sector can, if the programs are conducted to this end, be extended privately. Retrenchment would be effected by a more realistic interest rate policy (it must be conceded, I think, that the demand for long-term Federal credit at 2 percent, as it is currently available through the Rural Electrification Administration, is well-nigh unlimited), by more rigorous application of the rule that potential borrowers show private credit is unavailable on reasonable terms, and by a greater effort to enlist private participation in loans and to substitute Federal loan insurance (or guarantees) for direct advances.

The January 1964 budget document estimated that at the end of the fiscal year 1964 the U.S. Government would have loan assets of $31.5 billion. It showed that disbursements under the various direct loan programs in fiscal 1964 would total $8.1 billion, and that their net budget cost would be $1.2 billion. There is, of course, a great variety of programs represented in these totals, including the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Agency for International Development, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Some of them would be far less reasonable subjects for retrenchment than others. It is instructive to observe, however, that if disbursements for all programs combined were held to 90 percent of those projected for fiscal 1964, the net budget saving would be $800 million. In other words, in Federal credit programs alone it would be possible to counterbalance nearly half of the built-in expenditure increase estimated for the Federal budget as a whole. And this would be no austerity program. Even after an average 10-percent cutback from the fiscal 1964 levels, disbursements for Federal credit programs would still be $300 million more than they were in fiscal 1962.

Alternatively, one might approach the problem of Federal credit program retrenchment by putting specific programs on a revolving fund basis. This could not be done for all programs, but it could be done for a significant number of them. Indeed, a reading of table E-2 in the January 1963 budget document shows that net budget expenditures would be reduced by over $900 million if only four programs—those of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Community Facilities Administration, and the direct lending activity of the Veterans' Administration—were operated as revolving funds.

By either of these approaches or, what would be more sensible, by a combination of the two, expenditure reductions of $800 to $900 million would be accomplished.

Next, consider the variety of programs embraced under the heading, "Civil Public Works." Like Federal credit programs, they have grown very rapidly of late: from $1.7 billion in fiscal 1955 to an estimated $7.2 billion in fiscal 1964. And new authorizations of $8.2 billion were requested last January.

There are also two approaches to expenditure reduction in this budget area. First, projects already underway could be stretched out over a longer period of time than was originally planned for their completion, thus reducing annual outlays. Second, a moratorium could be declared for a period of time, say for a year or two, on the initiation of new projects. A stretchout of average completion periods from 3 years, which seems to be the present average, to 4 years would produce an annual reduction in disbursements of around $700 million. And it appears that a temporary no-new-starts policy would yield an expenditure reduction of nearly $250 million a year. A combination of the two would reduce budget expenditures for civil public works by close to $1 billion. Again, this would not be austerity: civil public works expenditures in the fiscal year 1965 would still be about $1 billion a year more than they were in fiscal 1962 and not much less than in fiscal 1963.

Third, we may consider Federal expenditures for research and development. Not only have these grown at a more rapid rate in recent years than outlays in any other major category of the Federal budget, but I think it is fair to say that nowhere is there more need for a reevaluation of priorities. As it stands, the program as a whole, which has increased from $3.1 billion in fiscal 1953 to $14.9 billion in fiscal 1964, is predominantly defense and space oriented. These two categories of expenditure—$9.2 billion on defense and $4.2 billion on space—dwarf everything else. For example, the fiscal 1964 budget of the National Science Foundation, where research assistance is predominantly nondefense, was $116 million; $44 million was allocated to the Office of Education and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; and the Office of Saline Water, where research is directed to finding ways of transforming vast stretches of the earth's surface to arable and livable space, received $11 million. Whatever one may think of the overall size of the Federal Government's research and development budget, it is clear that its scale of priorities has gone seriously askew.

I leave it to you to estimate what expenditure reductions might be effected in this area of the budget. Projects of only marginal interest might be eliminated; a more rigorous test of the need for new undertakings might be insisted upon; and there might be some extension of completion dates. In a budget category involving expenditures of close to $15 billion, an overall 5-percent reduction would result in savings of $750 million annually. And even this would leave outlays $2 billion higher than they were in fiscal 1963.

Of course, to hold the total of all budget expenditures in fiscal 1965 at the fiscal 1964 level will require doing more than reducing specific discretionary programs by $2 billion. First, spending must be held for a time at an unchanged level in all discretionary programs not scheduled for a reduction. Second, it rules out the possibility of introducing, at least for a time, any new programs without making reductions in existing activities beyond those needed to offset mandatory spending increases. The examples I have given by no means exhaust the possibilities for expenditure reductions, but they suffice to show that reductions well in excess of those needed to counterbalance built-in increases can be found in three budget areas alone. And they show that this can be done without recourse to anything that could be regarded, even remotely, as an austerity program.

And the argument can be carried one step further. Not only can aggregate expenditures be held constant at present levels; it is possible to reduce them substantially below current levels. This conclusion has been reached in one independent budget study after another. The business committee on tax reduction in 1963, for example, stated on May 31, 1963 that "* * * a reduction in the 1964 budget is reasonable and practicable"; others have given detailed suggestions for reductions. Let me cite five such blueprints, all dealing with the fiscal 1964 budget.

First, an item-by-item budget analysis was made early in 1963 by the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee with the assistance of Maurice Stans. It concluded that new obligational authority (NOA) requests in the fiscal 1964 budget could be reduced by $10 to $15 billion and that projected expenditures could be cut by $4 to $6 billion.

Second, in a report issued earlier this year entitled "The Federal Budget for 1964" the Government Economy Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers concluded, also after an item-by-item analysis, that the fiscal 1964 budget should and could be revised so as to reduce NOA by $12.4 billion and expenditures by $6.8 billion.

Third, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a statement issued on May 13, 1963 entitled "117 Ways to Cut the Budget," itemized NOA reductions of $9.1 billion and expenditure reductions of $4.5 billion.

Fourth, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, in a bulletin issued February 25, 1963 entitled "Proposals for Cutting the 1964 Federal Budget," identified actions that would reduce NOA by $9.8 billion and expenditures by $5.8 billion.

Fifth, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in a statement issued March 29, 1963 entitled "The Federal Budget Could and Should Be Cut," specified—by department or agency and by program—reductions in requested NOA of $12 billion and expenditure reductions of $7.1 billion.

Finally, on the feasibility of expenditure reductions, let me cite statements by three prominent citizens, each with extensive governmental experience: (1) Mr. Ellis Briggs, a retired U.S. Foreign Service officer of ambassadorial rank, stated recently (Esquire,

---

[2] See, e.g., "The Strategy of Economic Policy" (Fordham University Press, New York City, 1963), pp. 68–74.

September 1963) that a majority of the 100 U.S. Embassies around the world could operate twice as efficiently with half their current personnel; (2) in a recent speech (an address to the Eighth Annual Career Service Awards dinner in Washington, D.C., on March 13, 1962, and reproduced in Administration of National Security, a collection of papers prepared by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations) Senator HENRY M. JACKSON made the following statements: "The size of many Government offices has swelled beyond any real requirement. Some offices would operate more efficiently with one-third or one-half as many people;" and (3) Senator HARRY BYRD has reported that in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee the incumbent Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Luther Hodges, stated that 10 percent of the Commerce Department employees were doing unneeded jobs.

Two things should be clear: First, that expenditure control is necessary; second, that expenditure control is feasible. What is needed is action. As steps are taken there will be a need, also, for guidelines to direct the effort along truly effective lines and to insure its effectiveness. In this connection it is pertinent to recall the broad headings under which President Eisenhower made recommendations in his January 1959 budget message on ways to reduce expenditures. Reductions could be made, he pointed out, through (1) greater non-Federal participation in a wide variety of Federal assistance programs; (2) substitution of private credit for Federal loans through flexible interest rates; (3) revision of agricultural price support laws; (4) modification of the laws pertaining to veterans' benefits; (5) reappraisal of ship subsidies; and (6) wider use of user charges.

Referring specifically to the fiscal 1964 budget proposals, the study alluded to earlier by the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee was based on the following principles:

"1. Limitation of personnel additions in 1964 to [the] requirements of nondeferrable workload increases such as may be caused by recent new legislation, or for law enforcement or protection of property, or high priority objectives;

"2. Absorption by all agencies of the half year payroll increases effective January 1, 1964, even though this necessitates personnel attrition or other expense economies (as contemplated in the pay legislation);

"3. Postponement of a considerable portion of new nonemergency construction, both civil and military, and some stretch-out of previously authorized capital outlays;

"4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not fully essential for the national welfare or security; [and]

"5. Conscious reappraisal of ongoing programs and services, with a view to reducing those of low priority and leveling out temporarily those (like research) which have enlarged substantially in recent years."

On October 18, last, the incumbent Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Kermit Gordon, in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, outlined the general principles on which the fiscal 1965 budget is being constructed as follows:

1. Provision will be made for "* * * only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of satisfying pressing national needs";

2. Efforts will continue "* * * to identify existing Federal programs which could, more appropriately and more effectively, be carried out by the private sector or in which non-Federal interests could bear a larger share of the costs" and, in the case of Federal credit program, "* * * a policy of substituting private for public credit wherever feasible" is being instituted;

3. "Where Federal expenditures convey special benefits or privileges to particular groups or individuals beyond those accruing to the public at large, the beneficiaries ought to bear a fair share of the costs involved;"

4. "In every department and agency [action is being taken] to insure that the objectives of Federal programs are achieved at the lowest possible cost;" and

5. "Hand in hand with control over expenditures goes control over [Federal] employment."

You will note similarities running through these three statements of principles. All knowledgeable students of the Federal budget come in the end to pretty much the same conclusions on how to contain and possibly to reverse an upward spending trend. The results of congressional action on the fiscal 1964 budget, which are so far encouraging, and the shape of the fiscal 1965 budget which President Johnson will soon be presenting to the Congress will tell how much progress on this critical fiscal problem is being made.

## METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent national tragedy the city of Washington received unprecedented numbers of visitors who came to pay their respects to the late President Kennedy. These hundreds of thousands of visitors imposed heavy responsibilities upon the Metropolitan Police Department. It is gratifying to note that the way and manner in which these men under the leadership and guidance of Chief of Police Robert V. Murray brought the plaudits of many grateful people throughout the Nation.

This was the second time in recent weeks that Washington has been the host to great masses of visitors. In both instances the courteous and efficient performance of the men of the Metropolitan Police Department has been of the highest quality and has reflected great credit upon the Department and the Capital City.

It has been my pleasure to be closely associated with Chief Murray and a great number of his men because of my assignment as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia. This has been a rewarding experience for me in that I have had the privilege to become so intimately acquainted with this outstanding law enforcement officer and many of his colleagues and have thereby had an opportunity to closely evaluate the manner in which they perform their most important duties. They have at all times measured up to the highest traditions of the law enforcement profession.

It has also been my privilege to talk to high police officials throughout our Nation about some of the problems of law enforcement which confront Chief Murray and the law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia. Without exception these leaders in the field expressed commendation of Chief Murray and his Department. They also express great concern that this splendid law enforcement organization must labor under such handicaps as exist by reason of court decisions applicable only to the District of Columbia. They feel, as do I that this undue burden should be lightened by the enactment of corrective legislation such as was approved by the House of Representatives earlier this year in an omnibus crime bill.

There are those who resist the legislative changes which many of us feel are necessary if we are to unshackle the Metropolitan Police Department from these unrealistic court decisions which constitute chains about the Department's wrists. Chief Murray has expressed a desire to have the Congress cooperate with him in bringing about a statutory situation which will be consistent with good law enforcement and protection of the law-abiding public, as well as the rights of those who are accused of the commission of crimes. For his enlightened interest in these subjects I expressed to him my gratitude, which I am sure is the same as the sense of gratitude held by most law-abiding citizens.

I recognize that there are those who sincerely disagree with the position which the majority of the House has taken on this subject as well as with the position taken by Chief Murray as head of the local police department. In our system sincere disagreement in matters of philosophy and procedure are not unusual and should not be condemned. To those who disagree in a wholesome and intellectual manner we are indebted because of their advocacy of their views in a way which insures that both points of view will be laid before the Congress. This is as it should be.

There are others who would seem to go beyond the area of sincere disagreement and seek to castigate and harass those whose views differ from their own. Fortunately, they are not in a position to harass Members of Congress and others charged with legislative decisionmaking because of the nature of our system. Not being able to do so, they seem to seek to harass and harshly criticize Chief Murray and the members of his Department who are trying to bring order out of the judicial chaos now prevailing in the area of law enforcement in the District of Columbia. I express the hope that those who persist in this type of conduct will see the error of their ways.

In the Congress we are frequently reminded that the city of Washington holds a unique position among the cities of our Nation. This unique status comes about by reason of the wisdom of the authors of our Constitution and the Congresses which have preserved this unique system of municipal government through succeeding generations. Because of its position as the Federal City and the Nation's Capital every citizen of America has a special interest in the administration of affairs of this municipality. I believe that this is particularly true in the matter of law enforcement since unseemly conduct in the District of Columbia is a cause of concern by every American.

In like manner, excellence of law enforcement and the prevention of crime by our outstanding Metropolitan Police Department should be a source of much satisfaction to all of the people of America. Under the leadership of Robert V. Murray the citizens of our Nation have had continuing reasons to have great pride in the performance of duties by the Police Department which serves the Nation's Capital so well.

I was pleased recently to observe that one of the distinguished news commentators of Washington, Joseph McCaffrey, of WMAL-TV took note of the splendid performance given to the people of Washington by Chief Murray and his men. In this broadcast Mr. McCaffrey said:

> It might be well at this time to take note that the Metropolitan Police Department here in Washington, D.C., is one of the best in the Nation.
>
> Under the leadership of Chief Robert Murray this Department has been charged over the years with protecting the lives of the great and the near great during their official and semiofficial visits to Washington. They have done an excellent job and, it should be pointed out, the men of the Department have worked 34 and 38 straight hours during emergencies without a whimper. They deserve much praise.
>
> Those of us who remember too well the morale of the Department when Robert Murray was named Chief, know how much he has done for the Department and for the people of this city and the Nation. It might be well, reviewing what has happened during the last several days, to call a halt to the pillorying of Chief Murray, and an end to the harassing of the Chief and let him continue to do the good job he has done, is doing, and will continue to do.

I agree heartily with Mr. McCaffrey that the Metropolitan Police Department is one of the best in the Nation and that under the leadership of Chief Murray they have done an excellent job at all times without whimpering or complaining. I would also join with this distinguished newsman in expressing the hope that the "pillorying of Chief Murray" will come to an end and that he will not be interfered with in the good job that he has done, is doing, and will continue to do so long as he serves in his important position.

I have taken this time today to express these sentiments because of the deep appreciation that I have for one of the Nation's outstanding law enforcement officers, Chief Robert V. Murray. In expressing this feeling of appreciation for this splendid man I would also include in my thoughts those loyal and devoted members of the Metropolitan Police Department who are so ably carrying on their important duties as guardians of the peace of this community under Chief Murray's leadership.

## A TRIBUTE TO METROPOLITAN POLICE CHIEF ROBERT V. MURRAY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, before speaking to the subject matter before us, I would like to express my grateful appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for both his sense of propriety in reserving this time and his generosity in inviting me to be among those participating in these special orders.

I have the privilege to serve on Subcommittee No. 6 of the House District of Columbia Committee, which is so ably chaired by the gentleman. Through this relationship and other frequent official and personal contacts with him, I have come to respect considerably his abiding interest in legislative matters affecting our Capital City. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel the gentleman's concern for the welfare of the Metropolitan Police Department and those who administer the vital process of law enforcement in Washington should be of concern to all of us.

Policemen and police officials are too frequently the target of unjust public criticism. This doubtlessly occurs since some of the jobs our free society entrust to them are not the most popular. However, the citizen who may be annoyed at having to pay a parking violation fine should not allow himself to become an unwitting soldier in the army of vice that is dedicated to the destruction of law and order in the United States. Let us remember that a breakdown of our legal processes is a goal of the totalitarian threats to our democracy.

The lot of a law enforcement officer is never an easy one. His duty summons him to spend difficult and long hours under unusual conditions, at best, in peril, at the worst. If, on top of these burdens we heap uncalled for and malicious criticisms, we do an extreme disservice to the corps of men and women whom we employ to protect our lives and property.

For some time, I have had the fortune to be associated with many officers of the law. As a city councilman of my home community in Rochester, N.Y., I was a member of the public safety committee and there gained deep understanding of the problems that beset police agencies the country over. While no two cities are the same, all face the similar barriers of public indifference to the many achievements of their law enforcement departments and usually exaggerated reaction to the rare occasions when the misdeeds of a single individual are allowed to stigmatize an entire department.

I have yet to see evidence, Mr. Speaker, of a police department where the taxpayers served by it did not get more than a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent in its operation. Washington, D.C., is no exception.

At the helm of Washington's Metropolitan Police Department there is an able chief, Robert V. Murray. Chief Murray enjoys the respect of his men, his fellow law enforcement officers across the United States, and the citizens of this unique American city. This results from the dedicated service he has rendered as a professional policeman for many years.

I know Chief Murray and I know the intensity of his devotion to making Washington and Washingtonians safe and secure. Their welfare is his daily mission.

During consideration of H.R. 7525, the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill, I was especially impressed with the strength of Chief Murray's arguments to restore adequate enforcement measures so that the police in Washington could perform effectively. Obviously, Chief Murray and others who advanced similar arguments made a distinct impression on the Members of the House of Representatives, based on the convincing vote for its passage.

That Chief Murray should be the target of any criticism for his support of providing the Metropolitan Police Department with the same "tools" available to virtually every other police department in the country is nothing short of ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, please let my remarks stand as a vote of confidence to Chief Murray and the Metropolitan Police Department. For as long as they demonstrate their competence as they have to date, they shall continue to have my unfailing support.

## NAVY NUCLEAR SURFACE VESSEL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, has a solemn responsibility to act as a watchdog over the national atomic energy program, including the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense. The purpose of our watchdog function is to assure that adequate progress is being made in our research and development programs and that public funds authorized for these purposes are being spent wisely and well.

In the majority of situations, we are convinced that our research dollars have been spent wisely. We point with pride to the development of such things as the nuclear submarine with its unique and unmatched characteristics.

The committee has also been vitally interested in the extension of our naval nuclear propulsion technology to surface vessels. Last month the committee held executive hearings in order to review progress in the Navy nuclear surface vessel program. The evidence presented by the AEC, the Department of Defense, and the Navy demonstrated the outstanding success of this program.

Fine naval officers, such as Vice Admiral Hayward and Captains Wilkinson, Peet, and dePoix, who are responsible for the operation of our three nuclear-propelled surface vessels, were unanimous in praising the superiority of these warships. Moreover, they, and personnel of the AEC, testified that important technical strides have been made since the first nuclear surface vessels were built.

Still, for some unknown reasons, the Department of Defense refuses to apply the results of this outstandingly successful development effort. Without question, the United States is preeminent in the development of these nuclear propulsion systems and yet the Department of Defense refuses to permit the Navy to capitalize on this superiority.

During our recent hearings, we inquired in great detail as to plans for utilizing nuclear power in the next aircraft carrier, CVA 67.

As you know, the Secretary of Defense, on October 25, after delaying for 10 months the construction of the carrier which was authorized in the fiscal year 1963 program, suddenly decided to install a conventional powerplant in CVA 67. This will be the second aircraft carrier built since the *Enterprise* and neither will be nuclear propelled.

The principal argument in support of this decision was economic—nuclear power costs more, or so they say. However, every witness who testified before our committee, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Naval Operations, agreed that nuclear power was superior for warship propulsion.

This view of the superiority of nuclear power was not given to us by armchair strategists. One naval officer who was involved in the operations of the nuclear carrier, *Enterprise*, for 2 months during the Cuban blockade, told us of his experiences. He described how the superior performance of the *Enterprise* exceeded anything possible with conventional carriers. He described the ship's superior speed, maneuverability, reliability, and more efficient aircraft operation.

It appears that the opinions and views of those with firsthand experience, and other experts in this field, were simply not considered in arriving at this decision against the use of nuclear power in the next aircraft carrier. Apparently, the "cost argument" won the day at the Pentagon.

And this brings me to the other sad part of this story. The cost comparisons used by the Department of Defense in evaluating a nuclear versus a conventional carrier were specious and involved a considerable amount of "jockeying" of cost figures. For example, the Department of Defense testified that a nuclear carrier can carry a greater number of aircraft—a clear advantage. Then, to support its contention that nuclear power is not economical, the Department of Defense charged the cost of the additional aircraft to the nuclear carrier and indicated that this was a detriment to the use of nuclear propulsion.

In addition, the ability of a nuclear carrier to carry more aircraft fuel and more armament was also presented as a cost factor adverse to nuclear propulsion. Finally, the cost of the nuclear reactor cores, which would provide fuel for 7 years of carrier operation, was also charged against the nuclear carrier, while no equivalent fuel charge was made against the oil-fired carrier.

In summary, it appears that important factors were not weighed by the Department of Defense in deciding against the use of nuclear power for CVA 67. More tragically, it appears that we are now ready to settle for second-best propulsion systems in our first-line warships.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are now faced with the immediate problem of deciding if research and development in this field of atomic energy should receive continued financial support from the Government. Frankly, I believe it will be difficult to justify such continued support in the face of the refusal by the Department of Defense to utilize the superior product of this program.

I understand that the chairman of the Joint Committee is now arranging to have the classified portions of our hearings on the nuclear surface vessel program deleted in order that the hearing record can be made public. I am glad that this will be done because I am sure that the record of these hearings will assist the Congress in evaluating the important factors involved in this decision, which may have a profound effect on the future national security.

When the Members of Congress have reviewed this record, they will see that the Department of Defense has underestimated the military advantages and overestimated the cost of a nuclear carrier. Moreover, any objective observer will have to conclude that the increased cost of nuclear power is more than offset by the military advantages of a nuclear carrier.

When the Congress of the United States appropriates $3 to $4 billion every year for foreign aid, there is something wrong when we will not spend the small amount necessary to equip this aircraft carrier with the advantages of nuclear propulsion throughout its expected lifetime of about 30 years.

According to the testimony received by the committee, this aircraft carrier is the only major warship included in construction plans for a 3-year period—1963–65. We should make it the best warship we can.

---

## THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join with many of my colleagues in both the Senate and House of Representatives in sponsoring the proposal to rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center "as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States."

Legislation for this purpose has been sent to the Congress by President Lyndon B. Johnson and has been introduced in both the Senate and House with bipartisan support. The change in name has been approved by the family of the late President.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy symbolized the vitality and youthful vigor of what has been called the American experiment. He saw a country 188 years young, and sought to move it forward to a greater maturity, both at home and abroad. It was his sense of history and his belief in the destiny of this country, that provided him with his guidelines for action, and stimulated his eloquent appeals for peace and progress.

By now, many words have been spoken of our late President's abilities, virtues, and accomplishments. Little more can be added to the eulogies and the beautiful tributes that have already been expressed. If there is little left unsaid, there is still much to be done.

In a moving editorial urging that the National Cultural Center be enhanced at the time it is rededicated as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, the Washington, D.C., Post says that before ground is broken, surely there ought to be time to reconsider the function and purposes of a memorial center:

> A wise first step would be to consider supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. Perhaps, as Congressman McDOWELL also suggests, the Memorial Center might appropriately sponsor national prizes for excellence in the arts.
>
> Moreover, the adaptability of the Center to important noncultural events—including, conceivably, national political conventions—could also be weighed and discussed. A related question is location. Above all, the Center should be accessible, and although the present site near the Potomac has palpable scenic virtue, the question of alternate location should be reconsidered. These are matters that warrant informed discussion when hearings take place on a memorial center that ought to preserve the spirit as well as the memory of President Kennedy.

There is much food for thought in this editorial. The Washington Post reported on December 22, 1962, that a plan to locate the proposed National Cultural Center downtown instead of in the site along the Potomac was being pushed by the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Committee was set up by President Kennedy to develop plans for making Pennsylvania Avenue the showcase thoroughfare envisioned by Pierre L'Enfant more than 150 years ago. At its meeting on December 13, 1962, according to the Washington Post, the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue considered these criticisms of the Center's present site and design plans: First, the site is so far from the center of Washington that it could do little to enrich the city's cultural life; second, the present location is not served by major public transportation facilities; third, housing all performing arts stages in a single building might result in a structure so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the city.

Both the full Committee and the subcommittee are headed by Nathaniel A. Owings, and present at the December 13 meeting were such close friends of President Kennedy as William Walton, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and Paul Thiry, chief architect of the Seattle World's Fair. It can be assumed, I think, that they knew what President Kennedy had in mind.

It would seem fundamental that if this is to be the great memorial which all of its sponsors want, then it should have a site second to none. The present site was adopted as a compromise after an ideal site opposite the National Gallery of Art on the Mall was denied the National Cultural Center in favor of a National Air Museum.

The New York Times on December 4, 1963, published an article on the National Cultural Center and declared:

> There have been numerous protests over the site, which is bounded by a freeway, a parkway, and a bridge approach—a "spaghetti maze" of streets, according to critics. A location somewhere along Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol has been suggested.

The present site is overshadowed by highways and bridges, and is hampered by traffic, as has long been recognized by the Commission of Fine Arts, the Washington Building Congress, the Washington Post, many individual civic and cultural leaders, and President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Some of the trustees of the National Cultural Center have tended to oppose a better site for the National Cultural Center on the grounds that a better site would make fundraising from private sources more difficult. This reasoning is extremely difficult to follow. Whether this position ever had merit may be doubted. However, now that the Congress is considering renaming the National Cultural Center, and making it a memorial to President John F. Kennedy, whatever merit this position of the Center's trustees had originally completely vanishes.

The Congress simply cannot afford to spend millions of dollars on a memorial, and permit it to be located in an inferior site, and the Congress must take steps at this time to see to it that the best possible site in the Nation's Capital is set aside for this great memorial. The least we can do is to study the matter, to see what the pluses, if any, of the present site are, and see if there are better sites.

President Kennedy was interested, and deeply interested, in the establishment of an American Music and Art Prize. Pierre Salinger spoke of this interest of President Kennedy's in a speech to the National Symphony Orchestra report luncheon on March 8, 1961, and wide publicity was given to it at that time, only a very few months after the President had assumed office. National prizes are well known abroad, where they make major contributions to the discovery, encouragement, and advancement of young artists and thus serve important national purposes.

Young American artists should be similarly encouraged, and it is to the great credit of President Kennedy that he confidently looked forward to the day when festivals and competitions for young artists would be held in the National Cultural Center.

Our Nation's young artists have won top places and prizes in the national competitions in European countries. Van Cliburn came to international attention when he won top prize in such a competition in Moscow a few years ago.

President Kennedy welcomed young artists to the White House and he often spoke of young artists performing in the National Cultural Center. With his help the National Cultural Center and the American Educational Theater Association have invited some 15 university theater groups to participate in a national university theater festival in the Nation's Capital in May 1964.

It has been announced that a tent will shelter the festival participants and audiences. The shelter tent would be erected on the site of the National Cultural Center.

So here was President Kennedy supporting an area of our national life which he understood, encouraged, and assisted, and so festivals and competitions should be a part of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center when it is finally built in the Nation's Capital, for it would give a national focus and importance to such a memorial center.

The Washington Post editorial suggests supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. The National Gallery of Art, which is largely devoted to European art, has had major financial support on an annual basis from its very beginning. Therefore, in the measure I have introduced I have provided that the Congress shall meet the operating deficit of the Memorial Center by an annual appropriation of a sum equal to, but not more than, the sum appropriated each fiscal year by the Congress for the National Gallery of Art. The funds so provided would be available for all purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, including festivals and competitions. Certainly the Memorial Center must be as important to our country as the National Gallery of Art.

Second, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia would be directed, under the terms of my measure, House Joint Resolution 851, to include an annual appropriation of not less than $300,000 in the District of Columbia budget to help meet the operating deficit of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center including the cost of presenting in it the National Symphony Orchestra and other groups and individual artists resident in the Nation's Capital who are qualified.

Washington, D.C., one of the country's major cities, does less than any other major city to aid the arts. It spends each year about $25,000 at the present time for the arts, whereas such cities as Baltimore, Newark, Detroit, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and New York spend from 20 to 40 times as much. The amount other cities annually spend for the arts was the subject of a study by the Library of Congress some time ago, and I include it as part of my remarks. Certainly, the Nation's Capital, like the capital cities of other great nations of the world, and like major cities in our own country should aid the arts. President Kennedy understood this, for he was a keen student of history, and he understood the place of the arts in our national life.

I am certain that our citizens, in all of the States of our country, and in all of our cities, would more willingly contribute to the Memorial Center in Washington if the City of Washington, D.C., itself would make a major contribution to it. For this reason, I have provided for such a contribution in my joint resolution.

With the major contribution by the Federal Government to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center envisioned by the bills which have been introduced in the Congress new factors must be taken into account in the appointment of trustees.

Trustee appointments must be made of a stature which will assure the Nation that the importance of this great project will be maintained, and its status as a presidential memorial, on a level with our other presidential memorials, will be fully recognized.

A living memorial has special problems and hazards unknown to the monument type of memorial.

I would urge the appointment of our past Presidents as trustees of the Memorial Center. President Truman was and is deeply interested in music and the National Cultural Center, and President Eisenhower signed the National Cultural Center Act into law.

The Congress should now require, by amendment or otherwise, that the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Last August, when the life of the National Cultural Center was extended for 3 years by a vote of 10 to 1, the Congress authorized the appointment of 15 additional trustees.

Fortunately, few of the newly authorized trustees have been appointed, so a unique opportunity is present to President Johnson to appoint as trustees persons who are well known to the country at large, who have the confidence of all of our citizens, and so will fully represent the Nation and the new and vital concept of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Furthermore, since Federal funds are involved, steps must now be taken, as in the case of other Federal projects, to provide for an annual audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

I include as part of my remarks the Washington Post editorial, to which I have referred, and the text of my House Joint Resolution 851.

I include also some remarks by one of the country's leading concert managers, Mr. Patrick Hayes, who was one of the earliest friends and supporters, and one of the most vigorous proponents, of the National Cultural Center, and a close, personal friend of President Kennedy as well.

Finally, I include the Library of Congress study of what other cities of our country do to aid the arts financially.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 7, 1963]

### A MEMORIAL CENTER

The rededication of the National Cultural Center to the memory of John F. Kennedy can be considered an accomplished fact. The trustees of the Center have approved this obvious and spontaneously generated proposal; President Johnson has submitted to Congress a bill providing for a Federal contribution to match private gifts. Since about $13 million has been raised in cash and pledges, the $30-million goal will be within easy reach once Congress has approved the needed legislation.

But before ground is broken, surely there ought to be time to reconsider the function and purposes of a memorial center. A wise first step would be to consider supplementing construction funds with an endowment to support performing companies and to keep ticket prices within the reach of all. Perhaps, as Congressman McDOWELL also suggests, the Memorial Center might appropriately sponsor national prizes for excellence in the arts.

Moreover, the adaptability of the Center to important noncultural events—including, conceivably, national political conventions—could also be weighed and discussed. A related question is location. Above all, the Center should be accessible, and although the present site near the Potomac has palpable scenic virtue, the question of alternate location should be reconsidered. These are matters that warrant informed discussion when hearings take place on a memorial center that ought to preserve the spirit as well as the memory of President Kennedy.

---

### BROADCAST BY PATRICK HAYES, WGMS, SUNDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1963, 1 P.M., WOODWARD & LOTHROP

Good afternoon. The groundswell was instantaneous and total for the idea that the National Cultural Center be named after President Kennedy. Who first had the idea may never be known, and it does not matter. It was in everyone's heart. We first heard it from a neighbor up the street with whom we visited during that lonesome weekend—would it not be fitting to rename the Cultural Center after the late President? Early in the week both the Star and Post ran editorials in favor of doing this—the Star put its editorial on the front page, upper right fold, just under the day's headline. The next day there appeared a poll of the Board of Trustees of the Center itself, all in favor. It was, of course, discreetly revealed that the plan had been discussed with Mrs. Kennedy, who approved of it. Then still later in the week bills were introduced in Congress which would make the change of name legal, and also provide for matching funds from the Government to insure the Center's completion.

Ordinarily, the perspective of time is wise before building or dedicating monuments to statesmen who have died. The Washington Monument was many decades in the making, and the Lincoln Memorial was not begun for a few decades after Lincoln's death. There is still no memorial in Washington to Woodrow Wilson, or to Franklin D. Roosevelt, although they are being planned. Decades of perspective, however, could not have improved upon the immediate opportunity of having the National Cultural Center dedicated to and named after John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Center was already a part of his life, and as the late President's friend, William Walton, points out this morning in a full-page article in the outlook section of the Post, President Kennedy will be remembered for three specific achievements in the arts among others—the rebuilding of Lafayette Square, the eventual improvement of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Cultural Center. Plans for all three are underway, with the Lafayette Square project ready for immediate action.

The overwhelming ground swell of approval for the renaming of the Cultural Center should not overwhelm reason as to the project itself. Originally conceived as a National Center for the Performing Arts, it is now proposed that it be a memorial to the late President. Should not all of the original questions be asked again in light of this development? Is the present location the exact and perfect one? Is the present design the exact and perfect one? If the upgrading of Pennsylvania Avenue is to become one of the late President's monuments, might an idea expressed a year or so ago be considered now—to locate one of the components of the Cultural Center along the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue; or all three components? The river site along the Potomac is still an idyllic one, but not overly large for the size of the present design, and a smaller building is worthy of serious consideration. The best imagination of architects and planners should be invited for informal or even public expression.

There is to be a meeting in mid-January of the Board of Trustees of the Cultural Center, together with as many of the Advisory Committee as can attend. This meeting was set well before the tragic event of 9 days ago, and now with radically new developments in the Cultural Center movement, this meeting will be a critical one. What is decided upon and built will last for a hundred years or more. It must be right—nothing less than perfection and excellence will do to memorialize a man who practiced the arts of perfection and excellence so constantly and so well.

*Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire*

| City | Amount of municipal financial support | Source of municipal financial support | Type of activity supported |
|---|---|---|---|
| Akron, Ohio | $36,000 | General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility). | Art museum. |
| | $5,000,000 | Direct tax construction cost | Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena." |
| | 1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program. | General fund (part of "recreation program") | Band concerts. |
| Atlanta, Ga | $7,500 | General fund | Atlanta Symphony Guild. |
| | $6,000 | do | Atlanta Pops Concert. |
| | $5,000 | do | Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars. |
| | $10,000 | do | Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art. |
| Baltimore, Md | 1959 appropriations: | | |
| | $25,594 | do | Municipal Museum. |
| | $119,994 | do | Bureau of Music. |
| | $288,000 | Endowment funds (estimated income) | Walters Art Gallery. |
| | $15,000 | General funds (pensions) | |
| Birmingham, Ala | $90,000 (this year's appropriation) | General funds | Birmingham Museum of Art. |
| Buffalo, N.Y | Appropriated in 1958–59: | | |
| | $73,430 | Real estate tax and other current revenues | Albright Art Gallery. |
| | $30,000 | do | Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc. |
| | $27,300 | do | Kleinhans Music Hall. |
| Chicago, Ill | Calendar year 1958: | | |
| | $232,405.87 | Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago. | Art Institute of Chicago. |
| | $232,369.11 | do | Museum of Science and Industry. |
| | $232,405.92 | do | Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum). |
| Dallas, Tex | $80,000 | General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax." | Fine Arts Museum. |
| Detroit, Mich | 1959–60 gross appropriation, $543,081 | Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues | Arts Commission. |
| Evansville, Ind | 1959 contribution, $9,200 | Civil City of Evansville | Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences. |
| | Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400 | | |
| | 1959 contribution, $9,200 | School City of Evansville [1] | Do. |
| | Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400 | | |
| Hagerstown, Md | $12,500 (provided for in annual budget) | General revenues | Washington County Museum of Fine Arts. |
| Houston, Tex | $19,500 | do | Museum of Natural History. |
| | $20,000 | do | Museum of Fine Arts. |
| | $3,000 | do | Civic Theater. |
| | $25,000 | do | Houston Symphony. |
| Providence, R.I | Current appropriations: | | |
| | $24,877 | General revenue | Museum in Roger Williams Park. |
| | $1,500 | do | Band concerts. |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire*—Con.

| City | Amount of municipal financial support | Source of municipal financial support | Type of activity supported |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reading, Pa. | $140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959). | General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs). | Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.). |
| | $3,028 (1959) | do. | Bureau of parks weekly band concerts. |
| Richmond, Va. | $5,000 | Direct appropriation | Valentine Museum. |
| Rochester, N.Y. | 1959–60 expenditures: | | |
| | $10,000 | General revenues or real estate taxes | Civil Music Association. |
| | $20,000 | do. | "Opera Under the Stars." |
| | Not indicated | Not indicated | Museum. |
| Sacramento, Calif. | 1959–60 budget amounts: | | |
| | $4,500 | General ad valorem taxes | Philharmonic Orchestra. |
| | $4,000 | do. | Park band concerts. |
| | $66,866 | do. | Crocker Art Gallery (city owned). |
| | $17,000 | do. | Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department). |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 1958 revenue: $320,007.53 | Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907). | St. Louis Art Museum. |
| St. Paul, Minn. | 1959 city budget appropriations: | | |
| | $13,500 | Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget." | St. Paul Gallery and School of Art. |
| | $10,000 | do. | St. Paul Civic Opera. |
| San Antonio, Tex. | $81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year). | Supported primarily by general fund | Witte Museum. |
| | $81,000 | do. | 2 municipal auditoriums. |
| | $1,500 | do. | San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions). |
| San Diego, Calif. | 1959–60 city budget: | | |
| | $57,159 | General revenues | Fine Arts Gallery. |
| | $19,289 | do. | Serra Museum (local history). |
| | $48,715 | do. | Natural History Museum. |
| | $45,949 | do. | Museum of Man (anthropology). |
| | $10,000 | do. | San Diego Symphony. |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 1958–59 budget: | | |
| | $158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other $37,700) | Budget of the city and county of San Francisco. | Art commission. |
| | $35,493 (taxes) | do. | War Memorial Art Museum. |
| | $255,456 (taxes, $254,856; other, $600) | do. | California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art musuem). |
| | $367,942 (taxes, $367,692; other, $250) | do. | De Young (art) Museum. |
| Scranton, Pa. | An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years. | General funds | Everhart Museum. |
| Seattle, Wash. | $233.37 | City's annual budget funds without regard to income source. | Art commission. |
| | $34,097.55 | do. | Art museum. |
| | $18,000 | do. | Public music. |
| | $62,743.57 | do. | Art division of the library department. |
| Springfield, Mass.[2] | $33,127.93 | General tax revenues | Museum of Natural History. |
| | $31,092.45 | do. | George Walter Vincent Smith Museum. |
| | $18,161.40 | do. | William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum). |
| | $1,267 | do. | Springfield Museum of Fine Arts. |
| | Not indicated | do. | Fine arts department of library. |
| Syracuse, N.Y. | $25,000 appropriation annually | General tax levy | Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution). |

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

[2] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Source: Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

### H.J. Res. 851

Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, to authorize an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That as a mark of respect and affection for President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as a recognition of his abiding desire to promote and encourage the arts in America, and as a commemoration of his great services to the Nation and people of the United States, the National Cultural Center provided for by the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1698), as amended, shall be known hereafter as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the President, in cooperation with the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, shall assist the composition of creative works by young artists by, among other things, national competitions and awards and promoting the publication and performance of such creative works.

Sec. 3. The President and the Congress shall determine, on the basis of studies which the National Capital Planning Commission is hereby authorized and directed to make, or to have made under its direction, where the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center shall be constructed so that it will not be overshadowed by bridges and highways, or be handicapped by traffic.

Sec. 4. Section 5(c) of the National Cultural Center Act is amended by adding the following new language immediately before the period at the end thereof: ", except that the Comptroller General of the United States shall make an annual audit and forward it, together with his recommendations, to the President and the Congress".

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for payment to the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, $5,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, subject to the requirement that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall find that the aggregate amount of the funds otherwise received by the trustees of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, together with the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section, is sufficient to construct the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

Sec. 6. (a) To meet the operating deficit of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for payment to the trustees of such Memorial Center, in addition to the funds provided for in section 5 of this Act, a sum equal to, but not more than, the sum appropriated each fiscal year by the Congress for the National Gallery of Art. The funds provided by this section shall be available for all purposes of the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, including festivals and competitions.

(b) The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall include an annual appropriation of not less than $300,000 in the District of Columbia budget to help meet the operating deficit of such Memorial Center including the cost of presenting in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center the National Symphony Orchestra and other qualified professional, educational, or amateur performing arts groups and individual artists resident in the District of Columbia.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY PROCEDURE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to observe that Calendar Wednesday is going to take place this coming Wednesday. The reason I objected to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday was that it was my understanding the Committee on the Judiciary of the House had a measure that they wanted to bring on the floor of the House for a debate and a vote. If I am in error and they do not have such a measure, we can determine that. But I have since learned that possibly other committees that are ahead of the Committee on the Judiciary in the alphabet, and as we know Calendar Wednesday is a call of the committees in alphabetical order, my understanding is that possibly some of the committees that are ahead of the Committee on the Judiciary might call up bills. I want to make this observation. If that is done, this will be done by the Democratic chairmen of those committees and can only be done really with the consent of the majority of those committees. Now we have had none of those committees in the preceding months request that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. Only one person needs to object and we will have Calendar Wednesday. Not one of those committees has shown any inclination to utilize Calendar Wednesday. There is no question that if these committees attempt to utilize Calendar Wednesday this Wednesday so that the Committee on the Judiciary cannot reach its turn that will be done solely for the purpose of preventing the Calendar reaching the Committee on the Judiciary. I think there is no doubt that the majority party will be responsible for this occurrence if it comes about.

Calendar Wednesday was placed in the rules of the House almost 50 years ago just so the Committee on Rules could not prevent legislation voted out by the legislative committees from reaching the floor of the House. It, in effect, is not a discharge petition. It, in effect, is bypassing the Committee on Rules and is for that purpose. It has been properly utilized in the past. Of course, it cannot be utilized if the majority does not wish the matter to be on the floor of the House. This is not a device where the minority can work its will against the majority. It is only if the majority seeks to work its will. I might add also it requires understanding and proper usage by the Speaker and of those who control the machinery of the House. But properly used, as it has been used in the past—in 1950 to pass a civil rights bill on the floor of the House and in 1960, to pass the area redevelopment bill which also passed the House under Calendar Wednesday. This is a proper technique. So we will see this coming Wednesday whether or not, if indeed the majority wish that this matter be on the floor of the House for debate and vote.

---

## A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

**Mr. STRATTON.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. McCORMACK.** Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a beautiful and expressing poem, a tribute to and in commemoration of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, which came from the mind of and written by George N. Welch, president of the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Mass.:

### A Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States

It was a lovely day in Texas,
In Dallas, a cultural town,
The multitudes were gathered
To see the President and Jacqueline
And receive them with welcome profound.
The welcome was tumultuous
And all was going well
When suddenly shots rang out
And on the gathering cast a spell.
For the President was shot and dying
And the Governor wounded too
By the hand of a fanatic
With a distorted sense of view.
Now he has gone from us
And our lives are filled with pain
For nowhere in this vale of tears
Shall we see his like again.
Superbly endowed by heritage
Education and training
For the greatest office of all
Made it almost imperative
That John F. Kennedy answer the call.
The call that came from the people
Throughout the length and breadth of the land
That J.F.K. should be our President
And on that office place his brand.
As our President he has striven
With all his might and main
To bring peace and order
Throughout the world,
And for this he was cruelly slain.
So we pay him this tribute
Futile though it may seem
As we long for the glint of humor
That in those Irish eyes did gleam.
Taken off in the bloom of his manhood
With his herculean tasks undone,
The awesome responsibility ended
His race of life prematurely run.
But wherever real men gather
Throughout the entire world,
They will talk of his courage and wisdom
And manners beyond compare,
These things he had in abundance
They were part of his daily fare.
We shall miss his encyclopedic memory
And his analytical, panoramic mind.
As well as his humble approach to problems
When answers were hard to find.
The mighty and the humble
Have paid tribute at his bier,
Heads of state from far off places
Have come to shed a tear.
We have lost a great President,
And in the annals of time
His stature will increase and grow,
Until the world regards him
One of our greatest men
In this planet here below.
This valiant warrior for peace
And the brotherhood of man,
Has joined the ranks of the martyred
During his short earthly span.
May the symbolic flame
Which burns o'er his grave
Be as eternal
As his unquenchable spirit.
May the Great God above
Receive his valiant soul,
And give him the peace and serenity
Which was his earthly goal.

---

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. Barrett, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for today and the balance of this week, on account of illness.

Mrs. Hansen (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of death in family.

---

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Wilson of Indiana, to extend the time of his special order from 15 to 30 minutes on Thursday, December 12.

Mr. Whitener, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. Westland, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, December 12.

---

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Boggs, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $630.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cameron in five instances.
Mr. Celler.
Mr. Rooney of New York.
Mr. Powell.
Mr. Downing.
Mr. Morris.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Alger.
Mr. Goodling.

---

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 633. An act for the relief of Michelle Su Zehr (Lim Myung Im); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 689. An act for the relief of Lila Everts Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 692. An act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1169. An act to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile deliquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1332 An act for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Leitzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Pietro Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1466. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Hipolito Mora Lorilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1757. An act to ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1760. An act for the relief of Dr. Margot R. Sobey III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1781. An act for the relief of Antonio Credenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1822. An act for the relief of Apostolos Gerontis and his wife, Anastasia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Garnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1943. An act for the relief of Mrs. William H. Quasha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1951. An act for the relief of George Elias NeJame (Noujaim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1958. An act for the relief of Ivanka Pekar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1976. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Antero Sanchez (Hernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2040. An act to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Pietrina Del Frate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2085. An act for the relief of William Maurer Trayfors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2100. An act to continue for a certain period certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2213. An act to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for the purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2242. An act for the relief of Livia Sernini (Cucciati); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 10, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1419. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the uneconomical management of commercially available items in the supply system of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1420. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the retroactive qualification of certain union-negotiated multiemployer pension funds"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the silt project, Colorado, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1422. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, relative to stating that a loan in the amount of $39,230,000 has been approved for the United Power Association of Elk River, Minn., pursuant to Senate Report 497, Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1423. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of the books of the Quartermaster General of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8171. A bill to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1011). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1012. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 9390. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to require that certain firearms transported in interstate or foreign commerce must be consigned to the recipients through local law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9391. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations; grand jury investigation of enforcement; priority of trials; more severe punishment in cases of violations by employees on the staffs of the White House, Congress, and Supreme Court; power to deny bail; appropriate supervision of convicts during confinement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9392. A bill to designate the Allegheny Reservoir on the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the Leon H. Gavin Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9393. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aides employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9394. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to insure business loans made to small-business concerns by private lending institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9395. A bill to clarify the Renegotiation Act of 1951 with respect to its preemptive effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9396. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9397. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 with respect to the purposes for which loans may be made thereunder and the rates of interest on such loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.J. Res. 854. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9398. A bill for the relief of Pesie and George Szekely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9399. A bill for the relief of Glenn D. Humes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9400. A bill for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9401. A bill for the relief of Antonio Santini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9402. A bill for the relief of Mario Vinci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9403. A bill for the relief of Pedro Velasquez Espinoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9404. A bill for the relief of Clarita D. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 9405. A bill for the relief of Miss Fructuosa Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9406. A bill for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

497. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to support legislation that would place a reproduction of the face of the late President John F. Kennedy on U.S. silver dollar coins and on certain currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

498. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to remind President Johnson that one of the best ways to achieve his announced economic and thrifty goal, is by seriously considering the official reports of the General Accounting Office, under the Comptroller General of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

499. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the length of terms of office of the President, and Members of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

500. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a resolution calling the present Presidential Succession Act a good law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a resolution commending former Florida Gov. Leroy Collins, for his recent speech in Columbia, S.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., transmitting additional material relating to presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

503. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the Speaker acting as President in case of disability to the President, or becoming President in case of death of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

504. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to cause all hearings open to the public, held by Congress, to be joint committee hearings, except in certain cases; to the Committee on Rules.

505. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation naming important Federal installations, places, or buildings, after former Presidents Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Public Works.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Stresses the Importance of a Strong National Effort in Education as a Response to the Challenge of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in an article in the December issue of the Rotarian magazine, the Secretary of Labor, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, made the following statement:

> The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.
>
> The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by automation—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.
>
> Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

I concur wholeheartedly with Secretary Wirtz in his assessment of the urgent need which confronts us in the field of education and in areas of retraining for those citizens displaced by technological expansion. It has long been my view that the gravity of this menace requires that immediate and imaginative steps be taken to insure that the most modern facilities and full educational opportunity are made available to all who seek them, and to those who need our encouragement and help in providing training for meaningful endeavors.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Labor, Education, and Employment and Manpower, it has been my privilege to participate in the consideration and revision of legislation designed to alleviate in part the shortcomings to which Secretary Wirtz refers. I am confident that measures enacted during this session will have significant value in raising the level of our educational system and in building increased public awareness of the needs which exist.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Education: Answer to Unemployment," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, in the December 1963 issue of the Rotarian, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: ANSWER TO UNEMPLOYMENT

(By W. Willard Wirtz)

At one time, not so long ago, a man who was physically capable of working could usually find a job. Today, however, this is not so. A widening chasm lies between many of the unemployed and the jobs they seek, and more and more we are finding that the only bridge across it is education and training.

If a new axiom is needed, it's as simple—and persistent—as this: The less schooling, the less chance for a job. What is distressing about it is its provability, for among the 4 to 5 million U.S. unemployed are legions who don't have even the most modest academic tools.

Recent data show that in the United States more than 300,000 people looking for jobs had less than a fifth-grade education, and almost 1½ million had less than an eighth-grade education. People so ill prepared are at an initial disadvantage in today's highly skilled labor market, and will become progressively more disadvantaged as the Nation pushes its way toward greater technological achievement.

The close correlation between unemployment and educational attainment can be seen in the monthly reports on the labor force. In March 1962, for instance, the unemployment rate was 9.2 percent for people with less than a grade-school education, but only 4 percent for those with some college education.

Earnings of workers are also relative to their educational attainment. A recent study by the Bureau of the Census reveals that additional schooling is clearly associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. Over a lifetime, the difference between the total earnings of men with 1 to 3 years of high school and those of high school graduates is better than $46,000. The difference in lifetime earnings between a high school graduate and a college graduate is close to $180,000. Urban males with 4 years or more of college education had annual incomes of $6,780 in 1958, as compared with the income of $2,504 for urban men with less than 8 years of schooling.

About three-fourths of the heads of families with incomes under $3,000 a year, had not completed high school. Approximately 58 percent of the family heads making $15,000 a year and over had some college education. Only 21 percent of family heads with incomes of $15,000 or more a year had not completed high school, the survey showed.

Facts such as these provide a picture of the increasingly tighter link between education and employment, a consequence, largely, of the complexity of so much modern work. Where there was once a place for the youth who left high school without a diploma, who took an unskilled job and worked his way up, today that place is filled, often, by a machine. That 700,000 16- to 21-year-old youths are presently out of school and out of work is dramatic evidence of this fact.

The future in the United States for the unskilled worker is dim.

Between 1950 and 1960, total employment in the United States went up 11 percent. During this period the number of "professional, technical, and kindred workers" increased 67 percent; and the number of "craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers" went up 12 percent. The number of laborers (not counting those on farms and in mines) went up only 4 percent.

Over the past 15 years, the percentage of white-collar workers in the work force has risen from 35 percent (1947) to 44 percent (1962). The percentage of blue-collar workers has dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent.

In the 10 years following 1952, the number of white-collar workers increased by about 7 million. The number of laborers (again leaving out the farm and mine group) went down by 150,000.

All this is a result primarily of the developments we lump together under "automation" and technological change. The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.

The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by "automation"—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.

Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

This bill's provisions would help to underwrite a revitalized educational program for the Nation—ranging from improved teacher quality, to higher teachers' salaries, to college construction. Of great interest to the Department of Labor are provisions which would greatly strengthen the country's vocational-education system. The proposed law would moderize and expand the present program of Federal grants to the States in this field, and it would benefit far more individuals than is now possible. It would provide financial assistance for the implementation of a new and highly promising concept, the area vocational-educational school. It would assist the development of a large number of ancillary services, notably teacher training and teaching techniques and materials. Finally, it would establish a direct link between the vocational-education planning of the States and the employment-pattern appraisals of the local offices of the public employment service.

Behind all this is the intent to correlate a man's education and the productive role he is to play in an advanced industrial society. Such a purpose does not recoil from the fact that a problem of nationwide proportions is at hand. Nor does it seek to abrogate what are traditionally and constitutionally State and local responsibilities.

What is sought here is an acceptance of the challenge presented by the advance of technology. It recognizes that the Nation's present unacceptable rate of unemployment may climb even higher as a result of the inadequacies of our present school system.

Another Federal program based upon the same philosophy and equally important in terms of the dilemma is that of the Manpower Development and Training Act, administered by the Department of Labor. This program, a little more than a year old now, is directed toward the opening up of job-training opportunities to unemployed or underemployed workers all across the Nation.

Good as it is, however, the measure, as originally construed, leaves something to be desired. The law does not permit us, presently, to pay training allowances to jobless youths between the ages of 16 to 19, and limits the kind of an allowance we can pay to young people between 19 and 22. It also places a 5-percent ceiling on the amount of appropriated funds for the act which can be used for any aspect of youth training.

Amendments to the MDTA now being sought by the administration would lower the training-allowance age to 16 and increase the proportion of funds for youth training to 15 percent.

Some 26 million young people will pour into the U.S. labor market during this decade, and all of them will represent the mass product of the American school system. Only if the link between education and employment is strongly forged will the outlook for these youngsters be a bright one.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my third rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from June 12 through August 12, 1963:

| Roll-call No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| *79 | June 12 | 4996 | Yea | 204 | 209 | 18 | On passage of area redevelopment bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 80 | June 13 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Byrnes, Republican, of Wisconsin (59 Members absent). |
| 81 | do | 6755 | Yea | 283 | 91 | 58 | 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rates. |
| 82 | June 18 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent). |
| 83 | do | 7063 | Yea | 301 | 93 | 39 | Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce. |
| 84 | June 19 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (50 Members absent). |
| 85 | do | 247 | Yea | 263 | 126 | 42 | Suspending equal-time requirements for 1964 presidential campaign. |
| 86 | June 24 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, of California (98 Members absent). |
| *87 | do | 6177 | Yea | 99 | 237 | 98 | District of Columbia appropriations; a motion to recommit. |
| 88 | June 25 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ford, Republican, of Michigan (47 Members absent). |
| 89 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (58 Members absent). |
| 90 | June 26 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (38 Members absent). |
| 91 | do | 7179 | Yea | 410 | 1 | 22 | Department of Defense appropriation bill. |
| 92 | July 9 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (46 Members absent). (R.B.C. in conference re highway and flood control projects affecting the 25th Congressional District.) |
| 93 | do | 3179 | Yea | 314 | 82 | 37 | A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals be entitled to retirement privileges equal to judges of U.S. courts of appeals. |
| 94 | July 16 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (67 Members absent). |
| *95 | do | 4897 | Not voting | 40 | 338 | 53 | Motion to recommit bill to extend geographic jurisdictional reach of wartime sedition statute (2 Members answered present). (R.B.C. in conference with Mr. Robert Rope, city manager, City of Industry.) |
| 96 | July 17 | 5297 | Nay | 144 | 245 | 44 | Motion to recommit conference report on Department of Interior appropriations. |
| 97 | do | 5297 | Yea | 331 | 50 | 52 | On passage of conference report for Department of Interior appropriations. |
| 98 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (52 Members absent). (R.B.C. at committee reception for President of the Afghan National Assembly.) |
| 99 | July 18 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (83 Members absent). |
| 100 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri (83 Members absent). |
| *101 | do | 5171 | Yea | 96 | 258 | 79 | Motion to recommit bill giving GSA control of Federal data processing equipment. |
| *102 | July 24 | 6518 | do | 272 | 102 | 58 | A bill to improve air pollution control programs. |
| 103 | July 25 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (55 Members present). |
| 104 | do | 4683 | Nay | 29 | 343 | 60 | Motion to recommit bill to promote orderly transfer of administrations. |
| 105 | July 30 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Patman, Democrat, of Texas (47 Members absent). |
| 106 | do | 3872 | Yea | 379 | 11 | 41 | To return to conference a bill to extend life of Export-Import Bank. |
| 107 | July 31 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (37 Members absent.) |
| 108 | do | 453 | Yea | 234 | 166 | 32 | Resolution to consider conference report re Philippine war damage claims. |
| 109 | Aug. 1 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (45 Members absent). |
| 110 | do | 467 | Yea | 387 | 1 | 44 | Resolution to consider NASA appropriations. |
| 111 | do | 7500 | do | 334 | 57 | 41 | Appropriating $5,200,000,000 for NASA. |
| 112 | Aug. 5 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (88 Members absent). |
| 113 | do | S. 1652 | Yea | 293 | 33 | 106 | Extending National Cultural Center Act for 3 years. |
| 114 | Aug. 6 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (41 Members absent). |
| 115 | do | 4955 | Nay | 181 | 217 | 34 | Motion to recommit Vocational Education Act (1 Member voted present). |
| 116 | do | 4955 | Yea | 377 | 21 | 35 | On passage of Vocational Education Act. |
| 117 | Aug. 7 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (53 Members absent). |
| 118 | do | 477 | Yea | 303 | 72 | 59 | Resolution to consider debt ceiling. |
| 119 | Aug. 8 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Alger, Republican, of Texas (46 Members absent). |
| 120 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent). (R.B.C. in committee for testimony of Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.) |
| 121 | do | 7824 | Nay | 164 | 229 | 41 | Motion to recommit, with instructions to reduce debt ceiling. |
| 122 | do | 7824 | Yea | 221 | 175 | 38 | To extend present $309,000,000,000 temporary debt ceiling. |
| 123 | Aug. 12 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Diggs, Democrat, of Michigan (115 Members absent). |
| *124 | do | 7525 | Yea | 114 | 222 | 97 | Motion to recommit District of Columbia criminal procedure bill. |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

### ROLLCALL NO. 79

The bill increasing appropriations for area redevelopment was defeated in the House but received subsequent Senate approval. The measure will probably be scheduled for further House action and will receive analysis in a future rollcall.

### ROLLCALL NO. 87

This bill, as passed to the Senate, authorizes increasing the Federal subvention to the District of Columbia from $32 to $45 million for fiscal 1964. I supported a motion, which was defeated, to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to raise the authorization to $53 million. The motion was predicated on the fact that if the Federal Government were a taxpayer in the District of Columbia, as is private industry, the property that it owns in the District would pay a property tax bill of $53 million this year. Nearly every parent in the 25th District who has children in the public schools now fills out a form indicating whether he works for the Federal Government or for an industry that contracts primarily with the Federal Government. This is because Congress has decided, through the Federal impacted school program, that if it is responsible for creating an additional load on the local property taxpayer for the support of education, because of children whose parents work for tax-exempt facilities, it should pay its pro rata share of the increased cost in education. I believe that this approach is sound and should be followed in the District of Columbia.

During debate there was virtually no disagreement on the fact that the Capital is in dire financial trouble resulting from soaring costs of District government and prolonged neglect of the District's needs in the areas of education, police and fire protection, recreation, prevention of crime and juvenile delinquency, and so forth. The conditions of school facilities are a particular disgrace. Not only do those who live and work in Washington recognize this fact but in recent months four national magazines have concluded that the Nation's Capital is a national shame primarily because the Congress has failed to provide adequate funds to do a decent job of governing. In my judgment, failure to support the financial formula was a failure by Congress to meet its responsibilities as the world's largest school board, city council, board of supervisors, and State legislature, all rolled into one.

### ROLLCALL NO. 95

Although I am recorded as "not voting" on the Justice Department's proposal to extend geographic application of the so-called Wartime Sedition Act, had I been present I would have supported the motion to recommit. If enacted into law, this bill will permit prosecution of Americans abroad for making false statements with intent to interfere with the operations or success of military or naval forces of the United States, or to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment of these forces. Since violation of the act is punishable by 20 years in prison, it is conceivable that many of the most vociferous critics of any administration could be put behind bars, because the law implies that a false statement is any statement which runs counter to information presented by the Government. If rigidly interpreted and enforced, citizens who objected to President Eisenhower's use of Federal troops in Arkansas, or President Kennedy's similar action in Mississippi, could be jailed. Congressman JAMES UTT, Republican, of California, might face imprisonment for alleging that Senator GOLDWATER has information suppressed by the Pentagon showing Russia has a 2-to-1 superiority over the United States in nuclear weaponry.

GOLDWATER says:

> I never in my life said anything like that.

Robert Welch, Gus Hall, and others who hold extremist philosophies which I deplore, might, under the Sedition Act, very well be jailed for many of their allegations. While I reject the ideology of extremists of both right and left, I believe it is imperative that we defend their right to hold these views and their right to speak their minds. Sedition does not involve action. It means only speech. The Sedition Act, in my judgment, is in direct conflict with the first amendment:

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech.

Under the Sedition Act, a dictatorial administration could violate this freedom with impunity.

### ROLLCALL NO. 101

I voted to recommit H.R. 5171 because I strongly objected to the perfunctory way it had been handled by the Government Operations Subcommittee. Only 1 day's hearings were held during which two witnesses testified—the Comptroller General and the Administrator of the General Services Administration. The latter, it is important to note, has a vested interest in passage of the bill because his agency would become the sole purchaser and operator of all data processing equipment used by Federal departments and agencies. Under this setup, the potential bureaucratic power of GSA would be tremendous. I was distressed to learn that the subcommittee had failed to call as witnesses—either for or against the bill—administrators of agencies which would be directly affected by its enactment, agencies such as the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of the Budget, and so forth. The subcommittee also did not see fit to hear the testimony of representatives of private industry who are the chief users and suppliers of data processing equipment. In light of these proceedings, I could not in good conscience vote for the measure, regardless of the economy merits which its sponsors purported it to have.

### ROLLCALL NO. 102

Residents of the 25th District should be particularly pleased with House passage of the Clean Air Act for it is a long-range, well-conceived plan which can do much to help combat smog. I have long been an active proponent of anti-smog legislation, and while a member of the California Legislature authored a bill creating the Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. Under the provisions of H.R. 6518, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, and to help set up State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies through Federal grants. The bill is not an encroachment upon States rights for it says in hard language that State and local governments have primary responsibility for smog prevention and control. Here are some of the bill's provisions: First, directs HEW to encourage air pollution control programs between all levels of government; second, permits two or more States to enter into compacts for air pollution control; third, directs HEW to make studies of specific smog problems when requested by a local agency or when the Secretary determines that the problem has an interstate effect; fourth, authorizes HEW to research, collect, and distribute information on smog, and to establish training projects and research fellowships for the study of air pollution.

### ROLLCALL NO. 124

House passage of the omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia is the best argument I know of for giving Washington citizens home rule. This hastily drawn proposal, in my opinion, strikes at the very roots of many constitutional guarantees rather than at the alleged crime "epidemic" it purportedly aims to curb. The measure was opposed by the District Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the District Bar Association. Its most ardent supporter was the Chief of Police. Police chiefs are not generally known as authorities on jurisprudence, and the District chief is no exception.

Under H.R. 7525, for example, unlike the law of any jurisdiction that I know of in the United States, the police could pick up a person suspected of having committed a crime—or a person suspected of being a witness to a crime—and hold him incommunicado until they are through with interrogation. Such detainment without benefit of counsel clearly violates constitutional safeguards. This provision in the bill also denies to the "detainee" the right to secure his liberty by seeking bail or posting collateral, the right to habeas corpus, and the right not to be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

It is apparent that proponents of such rough-shod legislation were stampeded by widespread publicity that Washington is the Nation's leading crime city. This allegation has been refuted by a recent FBI report which ranks the District seventh in crime for all major U.S. cities. The bill's proponents, out of myopia rather than intent, have in effect sacrificed due process of law on the altar of crime control. They have aimed their attack at crime control without giving any consideration to crime prevention. There is no attempt to seek better schools, better housing, better living and working conditions, and better human relations. On the contrary, a realistic attempt to cope with these problems was rejected on rollcall No. 87 when the House failed to provide fair and adequate appropriations for governing the District. Crime prevention is a very complex and expensive process, involving many disciplines and programs. In my judgment, we cannot escape expense and effort in this area by passing a bill which makes a mockery of American justice and jurisprudence.

CORRECTION

Rollcall No. 20 in my first congressional report is mistakenly listed as consideration of H.R. 5517, final passage of appropriations for the accelerated public works program. This rollcall correctly dealt with H.R. 5389, a measure authorizing a change from silver to gold backing of $1 and $2 bills. The proposal, which I opposed, passed 251 to 122. There were 60 Members not voting. In my judgment, the conversion from silver to gold backing for some $2 billion would further dilute our dwindling gold reserves, and further injure our balance-of-payments situation. Defeat of the bill would also have been an economy move in that it costs the Government 3 cents a year to keep a gold-backed dollar bill in circulation, as opposed to no cost when the dollar is backed by silver. With repeal of silver-backing, the Government puts itself in the surplus silver business to the tune of $2 billion, and goes into competition with silver mines for the industrial and jewelry silver markets.

---

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fourth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from August 13 through October 21, 1963.

| Roll-call No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| 125 | Aug. 14 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (37 Members absent). |
| *126 | do | 6143 | Yea | 287 | 113 | 32 | On passage of higher education aid bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 127 | Aug. 20 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin (35 Members absent). |
| 128 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Utt, Republican, of California (47 Members absent). |
| 129 | Aug. 21 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (32 Members absent). |
| 130 | Aug. 22 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican, of Indiana (36 Members absent). |
| 131 | Aug. 23 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. O'Brien, Democrat, of New York (26 Members absent). |
| *132 | do | 7885 | Nay | 222 | 188 | 23 | Foreign assistance authorization bill, motion to recommit for cuts. |
| *133 | do | 7885 | Yea | 224 | 186 | 23 | On passage of foreign assistance authorization bill (1 Member answered present). |
| 134 | Aug. 27 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (50 Members absent). |
| 135 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of California (54 Members absent). |
| 136 | Aug. 28 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (34 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation). |
| 137 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Snyder, Republican, of Kentucky (93 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation). |
| 138 | do | 7500 | Nay | 176 | 200 | 57 | To recommit conference report on NASA appropriations authorization bill. |
| 139 | do | 7500 | Yea | 249 | 125 | 60 | On passage of NASA conference report. |
| 140 | Sept. 10 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. at National Conference of Business Committee for Tax Reduction). |
| 141 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (116 Members absent; R.B.C. at tax conference). |
| 142 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (90 Members absent). |
| 143 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Thomson, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. in office working on backlog accumulated during Labor Day recess). |
| 144 | do | S. 1576 | Yea | 335 | 18 | 80 | An aid program to help combat mental illness and retardation. |
| 145 | Sept. 11 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (98 Members absent). |
| 146 | do | 504 | Yea | 336 | 0 | 97 | Creation of a select House committee to examine scope and effectiveness of federally sponsored research programs. |
| 147 | Sept. 17 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bell, Republican, of California (89 Members absent). |
| 148 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (92 Members absent). |
| 149 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois (85 Members absent; R.B.C. in conference re his bill on U.S. World Film Festival). |
| 150 | Sept. 24 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (47 Members absent). |
| 151 | do | 527 | Yea | 320 | 66 | 46 | To permit consideration of the tax reduction bill. |
| 152 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (49 Members absent). |
| 153 | Sept. 25 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (25 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters). |
| 154 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (29 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters). |
| 155 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (19 Members absent). |
| *156 | do | 8363 | Nay | 199 | 226 | 7 | Motion to recommit tax reduction bill. |
| *157 | do | 8363 | Yea | 271 | 155 | 6 | On passage of tax reduction bill. |
| 158 | Sept. 26 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (102 Members absent). |
| 159 | Oct. 1 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (99 Members absent). |
| 160 | do | 5555 | Not voting | 333 | 5 | 94 | On passage of conference report on military pay bill (R.B.C. receiving innoculations for trip to South Vietnam at time of vote. Would have voted yea). |
| 161 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (115 Members absent). |
| 162 | do | 539 | Yea | 314 | 12 | 106 | To permit consideration of H.R. 7044, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. |
| 163– | Oct. 2 | | Absent | | | | R.B.C. on factfinding mission to southeast Asia with subcommittee of House Foreign Affairs Committee. During this period there were 6 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy. |
| 176 | Oct. 21 | | do | | | | |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 126

The 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act was the third aid-to-education bill passed by the House this year, ample evidence of broad congressional consensus on the need for Federal help in most sections of the Nation. Passage of these bills also punctures the political myth that Republicans oppose Federal aid because it means Federal "control." H.R. 6143 stipulates that no Federal department, agency, or employee is permitted to exercise direction, supervision or control over personnel, curriculum, instructions or administration of any educational institution under the act.

The bill, a "bricks and mortar" measure, authorizes a 3-year, $1.2 billion program of grants and loans to public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to help build classrooms, libraries and laboratories. To be eligible for aid, an institution must show that new construction is urgently needed to meet enrollment demands, that construction will be done as economically as possible, and that Federal funds will be limited to one-third of development costs. Matching grants will be made to the States for expanding undergraduate facilities, with at least 22 percent of the funds reserved for junior colleges and technical institutes. Provisions are also made to assist graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 132 AND 133

In the aftermath of the House vote on the foreign aid authorization bill, Congress—and the Nation at large—is scanning the political horizon to see if this ill-advised action indicates more than a temporary breakdown of bipartisan foreign policy. The conservative Los Angeles Times showed its concern in an editorial stating that the Kennedy administration is "understandably nettled" by the House's indiscriminate butchering of the bill—slashing the authorization to $3.5 billion, more than $1 billion under the President's initial request, and $600 million below the Foreign Affairs Committee recommendation. Noting actions which the President has taken to improve our foreign assistance program, the Times deplored the House's "meat-ax cut," and called on Congress to "go along" with the President's "rockbottom" figure of $4 billion.

Gen. Lucius Clay, Republican chairman of a committee charged with studying and recommending improvements in our assistance program, has frequently warned that excessive cutbacks in foreign aid could seriously jeopardize U.S. security. "Immediate forced reductions could require rapid deterioration in military forces," said General Clay, "with consequent political disturbances in several of the countries now receiving military aid from the United States. In point of fact, we might well reduce the resources of our own defense budget rather than to discontinue or too sharply reduce the support which makes possible the contribution of the foreign military forces to the security of the free world."

With foreign aid placed in its proper role as an important arm of free world security, the House action on August 23—a day that has come to be known as "Black Friday"—deserves careful examination. The Republican motion to recommit the bill for a cut from $4.1 billion to $3.5 billion was unusual in the history of foreign aid fights. Recommittal motions have seldom been made on foreign aid authorization bills, and they have never involved instructions to cut funds. In fact, the House has rarely made cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I sit.

It is particularly disturbing that the GOP assault on foreign aid was aimed at the Alliance for Progress and the military assistance program. Republican strategy did not permit Members to vote on the Alliance as a separate measure. The $150 million slash in Alliance funds was lumped into the overall cut. This prompted one Arizona Congressman—who believes in cutting with a knife instead of an ax—to declare in a floor speech: "I had no opportunity to support a reduction in foreign aid and also cast a separate vote concerning the Alliance for Progress. Had I been able to do so, I would have opposed the Alliance for Progress authorization cut. This program is built on a concept of self-help. It is through this means that we will best be able to fight communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is, in my opinion, a way of building the citadel of democracy within the members of the Organization of American States. It is the one avenue to stop Fidel Castro's regime and communism in our part of the world." This view is shared by many Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats—who warn that to cripple our efforts now, when the program is beginning to show results, is not in our best interests.

The $225 million cut in military assistance funds will prevent the carrying out of military plans laid out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to aid U.S. allies. To be sure, the cost of freedom is not cheap—but there are intelligent ways to maximize the benefits of our dollars in the fight against communism. Military assistance to our allies is one of them. It helps keep the Communist bloc encircled by 2.5 million fighting men in such nations as South Vietnam, Korea, Turkey, and Pakistan. It costs 10 times as much to keep a U.S. soldier overseas—not to mention the potential loss of American lives—as it does to keep his allied counterpart in the field with adequate equipment. In my judgment, and in the judgment of our Nation's top military and civilian advisors, the military assistance program helps provide the United States and the free world with maximum strength at the lowest possible cost to American taxpayers.

I do not believe that we need sacrifice security for economy. I believe that with sound policy decisions and efficient administrative procedures, this Nation can have both security and economy. And because our country needs both, I am not prepared to use either as stakes in a political crap game which, according to present indicators, may float its way right up to the 1964 elections. My attitude is apparently not shared by the Republican leadership in the House. Despite telephone appeals by former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, Christian Herter, Minority Leader Halleck would not call off his partisan attack. The total of 156 GOP Members that he whipped into line was believed to exceed the number of Republicans who actually felt strongly for deep cuts in foreign aid. It is against this background that I stand with President Kennedy in calling the action of the House GOP leadership "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan."

### ROLLCALL NOS. 156 AND 157

President Kennedy's $11.1 billion tax reduction bill passed the House after a Republican attempt to recommit the measure was defeated. Only 1 GOP Member voted against recommittal, while 173 voted for. On final passage, 48 Republicans joined 223 Democrats in securing the largest tax cut in the Nation's history. The GOP drive to tie the tax cut to reduced Government spending fell short when southern Democrats, who have a reputation for being fiscal conservatives, rejected the artificial GOP thesis that by putting a Presidential ceiling on spending the United States would earn a tax reduction. Democrats properly pointed out that Congress is basically responsible for reducing expenditures because it is the branch of government that appropriates the money—the legislative branch spends only what it wants to spend, not what the executive branch asks it to spend. If the GOP motion had passed, I doubt whether any Republicans would have voted next year to cut spending in their congressional districts. The move was obviously Republican strategy to go on record for economy while not having to vote for elimination of pet projects. As one Florida conservative pointed out, the GOP limited-spending proposal was "only an image, and when you reach for the substance, it simply is not there." The wisdom of this observation was reflected by the majority of citizens in the 25th District who wrote urging that I support the President's tax cut proposal.

Enthusiasm for the bill was high not only among individual voters, but among the Nation's business community as well. The 2,400 members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, for example, advocated a tax cut and reduced Government spending but, displaying sound knowledge of the traditional roles of the executive and legislative branches, did not endorse making cuts and spending dependent on each other. Members of the committee include Henry Ford III, chairman of the Ford Motor Co.; Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp.; Frederick Kappel, chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph; and David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce said the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee "deserves the support of every businessman when it reaches the House floor." Subsequent GOP action punctured another political myth: "Republicans are 100 percent probusiness, while Democrats are anti."

The aim of the program is to create jobs by lifting the repressive weight of tax rates imposed in wartime, when the demand for consumer goods must necessarily be restrained. Today, however, our economy needs to grow more rapidly and produce employment opportunities. H.R. 8363 is designed to stimulate demand and incentives to invest, to narrow the gap that now exists between what we produce and what we could produce, and to help reach full employment. Simply put, it gives consumers more money to spend. And because they have more to spend, they demand more goods and services. As consumer demand increases, business hires more workers to produce more good and unemployment decreases. As the unemployed return to the status of income-earners, they now have money to spend, the demand for goods is further increased, more workers are hired, unemployment is again cut, and so forth.

Under the bill, virtually every American taxpayer—whether high or low income, single or married—will pay less in taxes if and when the proposal is passed by the Senate and put into effect. The largest share of the individual tax cut will go to those with incomes of $10,000 and less—the people who need it most, who account for nearly 85 percent of all taxable returns, and who are most likely to put a large part of their tax savings into the spending stream.

On the average, families with incomes of $3,000 and less will have their taxes cut by nearly 40 percent. Those with incomes in the $3,000 to $5,000 range will get cuts of more than 26 percent. Families with incomes in the $5,000 to $10,000 range will get tax reductions averaging about 20 percent. Those with incomes of more than $10,000 will have their taxes cut by about 15 percent.

---

## Twenty-second Anniversary of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, December marked the 22d anniversary of the day that the late President Roosevelt said "shall live in infamy." It was 22 years ago Saturday that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and plunged this Nation into the most costly war in the history of civilization, not only in the terms of dollars but in terms of lives lost.

This was a war that could have been avoided had mankind heeded the warnings of those leaders who believed in freedom and dignity. Our own American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as early as 1937 warned against the rise of the dictators in Europe and the Far East.

But the world was in no mood to listen.

The seeds of World War II were again clearly visible at Munich when Prime Minister Chamberlain agreed to capitulate to Hitler. Again, the world was in no mood to listen.

The years just before Pearl Harbor are replete with volumes of evidence clearly showing the diabolical intentions of Hitler and his storm troopers. But again, the world was in no mood to listen.

On September 1, 1939, when Hitler's storm troopers plowed through Poland, we again had a clear and concise warning of things to come. But even at this late date, the world was in no mood to listen.

The thousands of American boys and fighters for freedom from all nations of the world could have been spared had the world been willing to recognize its responsibility with courage.

Here on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the National Archives Building, those two imposing monuments constantly remind us that "What is past is prolog. Study the past."

Mr. Speaker, this day shall pass in vain unless we Americans can pause to reflect upon the lessons of the past.

Our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, tried to marshal the forces of courage in America to recognize the fact that only through strength and preparedness can we pave the way toward a lasting peace.

President Kennedy has stated so magnificently his principles when he stated:

> Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

President Kennedy well knew that World War II was the result of a world which had failed and refused to prepare itself against despotic aggression. He had welded our Military Establishment into the most awesome defense complex in the world. He did this to make good on his magnificent pledge:

> Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate.

We can find comfort on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, in that President Lyndon Johnson feels the same deep understanding for the need of a strong Military Establishment.

In his first message to a joint session of the Congress, President Johnson has quite properly warned our would-be adversaries not to test our patience.

Mr. Speaker, let us bow our heads in reverence to those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor and the harrowing years that followed. But let us also at once, on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, pay our respect to those gallant Americans, both in the military and the civilian sector, whose heroic contribution made victory ultimately possible. Let not the 22 years dull our memory.

The words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt are as vivid today as they were on December 7, 1941, when he said that day shall live in infamy.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fifth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from October 22 through December 4, 1963:

| Rollcall No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote |  |  |  | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting |  |
| 177 | Oct. 22 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (75 Members absent). |
| 178 | do |  8821 | Not voting | 350 | 1 | 81 | To facilitate restoration to Treasury of funds made available to States for unemployment compensation and social security (R.B.C. on radio program re South Vietnam mission). |
| 179 | Oct. 23 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (69 Members absent). |
| 180 | do | 5945 | Yea | 320 | 44 | 69 | To establish procedure for prompt settlement of Puerto Rico's political status. |
| 181 | Oct. 24 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, Iowa (152 Members absent). |
| 182 | Oct. 28 |  | do |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, Ohio (138 Members absent). |
| 183 | do | 782 | Yea | 279 | 11 | 42 | Making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1964 for certain governmental departments and agencies. |
| 184 | do | 314 | do | 119 | 164 | 149 | Granting authority for 7 members of Education and Labor Committee to visit 7 European cities for purposes of scientific investigation. |
| 185 | Oct. 29 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, Florida (68 Members absent). |
| 186 | Oct. 30 |  | do |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (69 Members absent). |
| 187 | Oct. 31 |  | do |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (66 Members absent). |
| 188 | do | 6500 | Yea | 356 | 1 | 76 | On passage of conference report for 1964 military construction authorization. |
| 189 | do | 8195 | Not voting | 173 | 158 | 96 | One-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program (6 Members answered present; R.B.C. enroute to California for community workshop program El Monte—would have voted "nay". See rollcall No. 59). |
| 190 | Nov. 6 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (95 Members absent). |
| 191 | do | 6143 | Yea | 258 | 92 | 83 | On passage of conference report on higher education aid bill. (See rollcall No. 126). |
| 192 | do | 8920 | do | 258 | 98 | 77 | To revise District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. |
| 193 | Nov. 7 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, Wisconsin (76 Members absent). |
| 194 | do | 564 | Not voting | 212 | 149 | 72 | Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 8969. (R.B.C. in office with Pastor Owen Geer of East Whittier Methodist Church; paired "for"). |
| 195 | do | 8969 | Nay | 172 | 197 | 62 | Setting temporary debt ceiling limit at $315,000,000,000 for remainder of fiscal 1964—motion to recommit. (2 Members answered "present"; see rollcall No. 52). |
| 196 | do | 8969 | Yea | 187 | 179 | 64 | On passage of debt ceiling limit (2 Members answered "present"). |
| 197 | Nov. 13 |  | Absent |  |  |  | During this period R.B.C. was in California conducting a series of Federal-community workshop programs. He also spent 1 day in Connecticut for a speech. There were 6 quorum calls and 4 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy. |
| 206 | Nov. 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 207 | Nov. 19 | 9140 | Yea | 358 | 27 | 48 | Public works appropriations bill. |
| 208 | Nov. 20 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, Ohio (56 Members absent). |
| *209 | do | S. 777 | Yea | 252 | 133 | 47 | To amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. |
| 210 | Dec. 2 |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, California (109 Members absent). |
| *211 | do | 9124 | Nay | 176 | 154 | 104 | To revise college and school ROTC programs. |
| 212 | do |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, California (105 Members absent). |
| 213 | do | 10 | Yea | 301 | 18 | 115 | To give the Nation's young people greater opportunity to work in Washington during summer months. |
| 214 | Dec. 3 |  | Absent |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (64 Members absent; R.B.C. at State Department). |
| 215 | do |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Gubser, Republican, California (71 Members absent). |
| 216 | do |  | do |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (91 Members absent). |
| 217 | Dec. 4 |  | Absent |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Hoeven, Republican, Iowa (33 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to office matters). |
| 218 | do |  | Present |  |  |  | Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, Nebraska (41 Members absent). |
| *219 | do | 6196 | Yea | 179 | 224 | 29 | Motion to recommit Cooley cotton bill, a multimillion dollar subsidy measure (2 Members answered "present"). |
| *220 | do | 6196 | Nay | 216 | 182 | 29 | On passage of Cooley cotton bill (7 Members answered "present"). |

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

### ROLLCALL NO. 209

Mr. Speaker, the main issue on this rollcall was whether the House would accept the $20 million authorization figure set by the Senate for operating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965, or go along with the $30 million figure recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In evaluating the merits of this legislation, it is important to note that the ACDA has been the target of various extremist groups throughout the Nation. Through distortions, half-truths and innuendos many Americans have been led to believe that the ACDA is engaged in a direct conspiracy with Moscow to weaken the security of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. ACDA cannot, nor can the President, obligate our Nation to reduce its armed forces or disarm without congressional consent. This safeguard is explicitly provided in section 33 of the ACDA Act—Public Law 87-297.

The ACDA's chief function is as a support resource for U.S. officials in their conduct of arms control and disarmament negotiations. ACDA, for example, was useful in helping bring to successful conclusion negotiations for a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington, and the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I participated in extensive hearings on the authorization bill and as a result I am firmly convinced, as was a majority of the committee, that ACDA's request for an increased budget was justified. As was pointed out during floor debate, ACDA was instrumental in developing a verification system—through extensive and expensive research—which permits the United States to monitor Soviet adherence to the test ban treaty. In my opinion, we must continue to base our support of the treaty on scientific information provided by effective technical devices. We cannot leave it to the belief that we can trust the Communists.

There can be no question that ACDA strengthens U.S. security, in addition to promoting the cause of peace. Yet during its first 2 years the Agency operated on a $20 million budget, less than the cost of two B-52 bombers. As one Congressman asked, "Can we appropriate $50 billion for the armaments of war, and find $30 million too much to pay for an instrument of peace?" It was unfortunate, in my judgment, that during floor procedure the requested increase was cut from the bill. I voted, nevertheless, to accept the $20 million authorization figure—the best that could be obtained during this session of Congress.

### ROLLCALL NO. 211

My main objection to H.R. 9124 was that it came to the floor under suspension of the rules, a parliamentary procedure which automatically prevents a measure from being amended in any manner whatsoever. Suspension of the rules is normally applied to noncontroversial legislation, bills of limited import upon which the Congress, although informally, is known to be in substantial agreement.

Yet the measure to revise college and high school ROTC programs was brought before the House and described by its floor manager as "perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important piece of legislation that this body has been called on to pass judgment upon." It seemed incredible to me that after this assertion he would bring the bill up under a rules suspension. If the measure was indeed of such great consequence, it certainly should have been open to amendment during the debate on its merits and demerits.

In his recent message to a joint session of Congress, President Johnson emphasized the importance of getting value earned for each dollar our Government invests. Without an opportunity to amend proposed legislation, the chances of getting maximum value are greatly diminished, and there were several areas in H.R. 9124 which were open to serious question as far as spending and subsequent rewards were concerned.

The bill calls for the high school ROTC program, which is a good one as presently carried out in some 250 schools across the land, to be expanded to cover 2,000 high schools. This represents a cost increase of from $5 million annually to $25 million—a hike of 500 percent. And this for a program for which the Secretary of Defense has said there is no military need. The committee report on the bill also indicated that it was opposed by other top civilians at the Pentagon.

In addition, the measure provides that the Holloway plan, presently used by only the Navy, be extended to cover other military branches. This plan permits graduates of civilian colleges, whose 4-year tuition has been paid by the Government, to become regularly commissioned officers for at least 4 years of obligatory service. There is no question that the plan has some merit. But it also has drawbacks. At present, only 62 percent of Holloway plan graduates stay in the Navy beyond the minimum number of years required, and only 38 percent remain for a prolonged period as career officers. These figures compare to an 80-percent retention rate for graduates of the Naval Academy. In effect, the Holloway plan gives a $1 return for every $3 invested. It is for this reason that I question the economic wisdom of shifting the Holloway plan to areas where our officer recruitment needs are being met by OCS programs and others.

If nothing else, the bill should have been amended to require that obligatory service under the Holloway plan be increased from 4 to 5 years, as was done for graduates of our military academies under legislation passed by the House earlier this year. Under suspension of the rules, such an amendment was not possible. It is for these reasons that I voted against the bill.

### ROLLCALLS NOS. 219 AND 220

The Cooley cotton bill, in my judgment, is about the poorest piece of legislation passed during this session of Congress. It was also the most lobbied bill of the year. Bombardment supporting the measure came from many quarters, including heavy salvos from the House's biggest guns. All this for a bill which, in effect, is nothing more than a multimillion-dollar subsidy for the cotton textile industry.

A vote for the Cooley cotton bill was certainly not a vote for economy. It proposes a triple subsidy for cotton: One for producers, one for exporters, and now one for the mills. It is estimated that the proposal will cost the American people more than $635 million—over and above the present cotton program—during a 3-year period. Such a measure is certainly not in keeping with President Johnson's recent call for increased thrift and frugality in government.

The bill provides that the country's 34 leading textile mills, which already dominate 70 percent of the industry, will get about $350 million of the subsidy. Burlington Mills, the largest firm, will reap some $28 million. This handout represents about 80 percent of the firm's operating income in 1951. Statistics show that another will get a subsidy representing a 370-percent increase in its income. Other income hikes via the subsidy route hit 270, 200, 185 percent, and so on.

Provisions of the Cooley bill were carried to such outrageous extremes that it was fought by both the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau, probably the first legislative alliance in the history of these two opposing groups.

If signed into law, this bill will permit domestic mills to buy American cotton at the same subsidized low price as foreign competitors. Since 1956 foreign buyers have been able to purchase U.S. cotton at world price levels. Recently these have been about 24 cents a pound, or roughly 8½ cents below the supported domestic price. The argument used by the textile mills is that foreign competition is driving them out of business. This is absurd since only 8 percent of the textiles in the United States are imported and 92 percent are domestic.

The competition which concerns cotton textile mills does not come from abroad. It comes from America's own synthetic textile mills. And even this domestic competition is not as extreme as the cotton mills would have consumers believe. From 1947 to 1961, although employment in the textile industry dropped 25 percent, actual fiber production fell only 2 percent. The unemployment drop is chiefly attributable not to foreign competition, but to automation, technical improvements and the widespread use of synthetic materials.

If the Cooley cotton bill becomes law, we will have opened a Pandora's box of subsidies. All industries which are having difficulty keeping up with technological and economic change will begin arriving at the public trough for a handout. And American consumers and taxpayers will pay the feed bill. This is not my idea of sound economics, and I will continue, regardless of pressures, to cast my vote against this type of legislation.

## Commissioning of the U.S.S. "James Monroe (SSB(N)-622)," Newport News, Va., December 7, 1963—Address by Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a superlative address given by an outstanding Member of this body at commissioning services for this Nation's 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe.*

Our colleague, J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Richmond, Va., who has served the capital city of Virginia with great ability and great integrity for 20 years, is known to all of us as an extremely effective Member of the House Appropriations Committee with a deep understanding of our Nation's security needs.

His remarks on any occasion would be deserving of our attention, but I believe his address at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. this past Saturday contains a number of points of very great significance to all of us.

I would like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to give our colleagues an opportunity to read VAUGHAN GARY's outstanding address, and under unanimous consent I would like to include his address in the RECORD.

The text follows:

Admiral Smith, Admiral Grenfell, Admiral Taylor, Captain Sandeford, Captain Cobean, distinguished guests, and friends of the Navy, as we gather here today to celebrate the commissioning of our 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe*, I hope you will not accuse me of falling back on an old cliche in saying what a high privilege it is for me to be aboard and have a part in these memorable ceremonies. Since late summer I have cherished the invitation extended me by the Secretary of the Navy. And now that this exceptional ship has been officially delivered to the Navy and turned over to the care of its two gallant crews, my pride in the U.S. Navy, its officers, men, and its fleet runneth over. Particularly at this time I also share your pride in Roger Staubach, whom I hope to see perform in characteristic Navy fashion against the Army this afternoon. And last but by no means least, it is also a pleasure for me to speak in the hometown of my friend, TOM DOWNING, who so ably represents this district in the Congress of the United States.

I had just completed the preparation of my remarks for this occasion when the shocking announcement of the heinous crime which took the life of our great President and your Commander in Chief exploded like a bombshell over the air. The entire world was first startled then stunned. We share a profound grief over the tragic passing of former President John F. Kennedy at the prime of his life, when he had so much to offer his country. But we cannot stop the world in its orbit. It must go on.

If President Kennedy were living today I know that he, as one of your valiant naval heroes, would applaud the progress you are making in assuring the peace of the world through the deployment of Polaris submarines in every strategic sea. His order to you would be: "Carry on."

One thing that makes this Nation great is the continuity of the Government it is our privilege to enjoy. The Polaris submarine program in the last 10 years has progressed under two Commanders in Chief and we can rejoice that it will continue with the same vigor under our new Commander in Chief, Lyndon B. Johnson.

As a Virginian, I take pride in the fact that this ship was built by Virginians working for one of our great defense corporations, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., headed by my good friend, Mr. William Blewett, who is on board with us today. This great enterprise has built many of our most seaworthy and best warships and has thereby contributed immeasurably to the industrial life of Virginia and to the fighting power of the U.S. Navy. We in Virginia are extremely proud of its record.

I had the privilege of visiting one of the outstanding products of its handiwork a year or two ago when I cruised on Guantanamo Bay on the mammoth nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise.* As she flexed her muscles amid the deafening roar of jets being catapulted from and landing on her decks, I was amazed at her maneuverability, speed, and power. My heart filled with pride, as a Virginian and as an American, and I returned to Washington with a far greater feeling of security than I had enjoyed before.

I also share the pride of the citizens of Virginia in the fact that the ship we commission today is named after an illustrious son of Virginia. At relatively the same place and relatively the same time, five men were born in Virginia, the counterpart of which cannot be found in any other nation in all history. These men—Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Madison and Marshall—not only rocked the cradle that nurtured our great Republic, but their influence is still felt throughout the entire world today.

This newest addition to the Navy fleet bears the name of James Monroe, one of those immortal patriots.

James Monroe, the fifth President of the United States, was born April 28, 1758, in Westmoreland County, Va. He attended the College of William and Mary, fought in the Third Virginia Regiment, at White Plains, Brandywine, Monmouth, and Trenton. He studied law with Thomas Jefferson, was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and of the House of Representatives of the United States. He was a U.S. Senator, Minister to France, and four times Governor of Virginia. Jefferson sent him to France as Minister in 1803 to conduct negotiations for the purchase of the isle of New Orleans from France and east and west Florida from Spain. Exceeding instructions, he signed a treaty for all of Louisiana, a venture for which we Americans of today should call him blessed.

He served as Secretary of State and Secretary of War. In 1816 Monroe was elected President and in 1820 he was reelected with all but one vote, this being cast for John Quincy Adams, so that only Washington might have the distinction of a unanimous election to the Presidency of the United States. After his term as President, eschewing complete retirement from political life, he accepted the office of justice of the peace in his native Commonwealth of Virginia. What a man. What a career.

It appears that James Monroe served everywhere except in the Navy, but he crossed the Delaware River with Washington for the attack on Trenton, where he was wounded during the American Revolution, and as President he was given credit for opening the Mississippi River to navigation for the United States.

As President of a young and struggling republic, James Monroe exhibited the same determination and courage which had characterized his actions when he served with Washington at Valley Forge. In his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823, he made a statement with reference to our international relations that came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine and this doctrine has remained, through the years, as one of the tenets of our foreign policy. In that pronouncement, he stated that we would not interfere in the internal concerns of any European power but that we would view any encroachment by such powers on the independent nations of this hemisphere "as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States."

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who assert today that the Monroe Doctrine no longer exists but the falacy of that assertion was clearly demonstrated last year when the Soviet Union attempted to establish offensive missile bases in Cuba. The action of President Kennedy at that time was prompt and firm.

And the response will continue to be the same whenever any foreign power commits an act of aggression against this hemisphere.

When the Monroe Doctrine was stated, our Nation was weak but the expansive oceans which almost surround us were bulwarks of defense to our safety. Today, in the event of hostilities, these oceans will serve as avenues of attack. Therefore, in view of our extensive coastlines, our commitments throughout the world, and particularly our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, we must not only maintain the strongest and best Navy in the world but it must be the most modern.

I am glad to know that this conviction permeates the Navy even to the young midshipmen. It was my privilege to visit the Naval Academy a short time ago. While I was being escorted around the grounds by several of my appointees, we were discussing the rapid changes in weapons and techniques. "Yes," one of the boys remarked, "we have a saying here at the Academy—if it works, it's obsolete." To keep up with modern progress in technology we must be certain that our country does not lag in the fields of science and education.

The U.S.S. *James Monroe* is evidence of the Navy's belief in modernization. This last word in striking force has been added to the Navy not for the purpose of aggression. We will never wage a war of aggression. Our cherished desire with respect to other nations is that they may enjoy the opportunity of freedom with us and that we may enjoy the opportunity of living in peace and harmony with them.

Therefore, we must seek every available avenue of peace and take every advantage, though it may be slight, to advance the cause of better understanding among nations, but we must approach this objective with the full realization that we are dealing with one regime that has no integrity and cannot be trusted. This was the course pursued by President Kennedy in successfully negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty, which, we hope, will prove to be one of his chief accomplishments.

It was my privilege to visit Europe in 1947. I well remember that upon my return to the United States, I made the statement that the one thing which impressed me most during my trip was the fact that regardless of what country we were in there were unmistakable evidences of the fact that the rulers of the Soviet Union had embarked upon a course of world domination and that nothing short of that accomplishment would satisfy them. The events which have transpired since have confirmed that opinion.

As I utter these remarks, my thoughts wander back 22 years to that black day in history—December 7, 1941—when a deceitful, treacherous and double-dealing enemy made its infamous attack on Pearl Harbor. A monument erected over the sunken grave of the battleship Arizona today memorializes the 1,102 brave men who lie buried in its hull. This catastrophe would not have happened if we had been alert and prepared. The monument, therefore, should also be a constant reminder to us that we must never let it happen again.

It is our fervent hope that the U.S.S. *James Monroe* will serve as a deterrent to war and that any nation which is bent upon aggression will know that she and her sister ships will be lurking in the depths of the seas ready at all times and at a moment's notice in the event of attack to unleash from their hidden recesses the most devasting force of destruction ever heaped upon an enemy.

Sir Alex Douglas-Home, the new Prime Minister of Britain, in a major review of the world situation, said recently in London: "I believe we may be over the watershed of danger with the Soviet Union, but if so it is because the deterrent has deterred and, above all, because the Polaris submarine, as a second-strike weapon, has convinced the Soviet Union that war is too dangerous."

In conclusion, may I say to Captain Cobean, Captain Sandeford and their gold and blue crews that this ship is delivered into your hands with the full confidence that you will operate it in the true tradition of the U.S. Navy.

I hope the life of Monroe will be an inspiration to you. You will be crossing greater Delawares, of course, but there may be Valley Forges in your future when the great capacity of your ship will test your endurance to the limit.

Like Monroe—President and justice of the peace—your tasks will be both great and small but remember, there is no greater reward than the satisfaction of a job well done.

You have a great ship and with it you stand as guardians of the liberties of the American people. May the God of our fathers in whom we trust guide your destinies, for freedom must not and shall not perish from the earth.

---

## Voting Record

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have often found it difficult to secure information on the voting records of legislators who have represented me. Recognizing that citizens in my congressional district have probably experienced the same problem, my periodic reports from Washington are a complete tabulation of all rollcall votes, including quorum calls. On measures which are considered to be of greatest significance, I endeavor to give a brief explanation of the reasoning behind my vote.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include my first report covering the period from January 9 through April 30, 1963:

| Roll-call No. | Date | H.R. No. | Vote | | | | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | |
| *1 | Jan. 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call on original organization of the Congress. |
| 2 | do | | McCormack | | | | Election of Speaker—straight partisan vote: McCormack, 256; Halleck, 175. |
| *3 | do | 5 | Yea | 249 | 183 | 1 | Motion to cut off debate on permanent enlargement of Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members. |
| *4 | do | 5 | do | 235 | 196 | 2 | Final passage of the enlarged Rules Committee. |
| 5 | Feb. 27 | 284 | do | 254 | 154 | 27 | Final passage of supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. |
| *6 | do | 249 | do | 386 | 20 | 30 | Final passage of appropriation to continue the work of the HUAC. |
| 7 | Mar. 11 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (51 Members absent). |
| 8 | do | 2438 | Yea | 388 | 3 | 44 | Final passage of 4-year extension of existing draft law. |
| 9 | Mar. 12 | 4374 | do | 378 | 21 | 36 | Final passage of Winston Churchill citizenship bill. |
| 10 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (35 Members absent). |
| 11 | Mar. 13 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia (31 Members absent). |
| *12 | do | 2440 | Nay | 226 | 179 | 29 | Amendment to military appropriations increasing same by $363,000,000. |
| *13 | do | 2440 | do | 149 | 258 | 27 | Motion to recommit military appropriation bill by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri. |
| *14 | do | 2440 | Yea | 374 | 33 | 28 | Final passage of military authorization bill. |
| 15 | Mar. 14 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Passman, Democrat, of Louisiana (38 absent) (R.B.C. at Africa Subcommittee hearing). |
| 16 | Apr. 4 | 5366 | Yea | 386 | 17 | 32 | Final passage of Post Office appropriation bill. |
| 17 | Apr. 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana (39 Members absent). |
| 18 | Apr. 10 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (23 Members absent). |
| *19 | do | 5517 | Yea | 228 | 184 | 21 | Amendment of public works appropriation bill to restore money cut in committee. |
| *20 | do | 5517 | do | 251 | 122 | 60 | Final passage of accelerated public works appropriation. |
| 21 | Apr. 23 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (38 Members absent). |
| 22 | Apr. 24 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (30 Members absent). |
| *23 | do | 12 | Nay | 171 | 239 | 24 | Motion to recommit bill authorizing loans to students in medical, dental and nursing education and grants to schools in health fields by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. |
| *24 | do | 12 | Yea | 288 | 122 | 24 | Final passage of Health Professions Educational Act. |
| 25 | Apr. 25 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (37 Members absent)(R.B.C. in conference at office). |
| 26 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Jensen, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent). |
| 27 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (55 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference in Speaker's dining room). |
| 28 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (42 Members absent). |
| 29 | do | 4997 | Nay | 196 | 205 | 32 | Motion to recommit feed grain bill by Mr. Harvey, Republican, of Indiana. |
| 30 | do | 4997 | Yea | 208 | 196 | 29 | Final passage of feed grain bill. |
| 31 | Apr. 29 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (112 Members absent) (R.B.C. at conference re right-wing movements). |
| 32 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican, of Washington (97 Members absent). |
| 33 | do | 1762 | Yea | 292 | 50 | 91 | Final passage of an act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation. |
| 34 | Apr. 30 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan (48 Members absent) (R.B.C. at cold war hearings, Foreign Affairs Committee). |

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 1

This quorum call was the first recorded vote of the session and provides an opportunity to explain the purpose of a quorum call. Any Member can request a quorum call at any time. The presiding officer then counts the number of Members in the Chamber. If there is less than a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union present, the presiding officer will notice the absence of a quorum and the Clerk will be directed to call the names of the Members. When the Clerk starts to call the names, three bells ring throughout Capitol Hill to notify Members that a quorum call has been asked for. If Members are sitting as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union—virtually all debate is carried on when Members are sitting as the Committee—100 Members constitute a quorum. It takes approximately 40 minutes to call the names of all the Members and, therefore, the device of a quorum call is frequently used as a delaying tactic.

This tactic is frequently used by the minority party to give them time to round up votes. Of the first 16 quorum calls this session, 12 were called by Republicans, 3 by Democrats, and 1 was organizational.

The record indicates that members of the Rules, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs Committees, as well as each of the joint House-Senate committees, tend to miss more quorum calls than the balance of the Members. This is because each of these committees has a continuous authorization from the House to meet while the House is in session. The tremendous volume of work of these committees and the nature of the witnesses who appear before them has prompted the House to give extra consideration to these committees.

Procedure on my committee—Foreign Affairs—is for general committee meetings to be called at 10 a.m. every morning, Monday through Thursday, with subcommittee meetings most afternoons at 2. The House goes into session at 12 noon every Monday through Thursday and frequently on Friday. The House stays in session generally until after 4 p.m. and frequently until after 6 p.m. There is no time out for lunch, coffee breaks, et cetera. Thus, office work must be fitted in before 10 a.m. or after adjournment, and on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and unfortunately some of it must be done while either the House, the committee, or both, are in session.

### ROLLCALLS NOS. 3 AND 4

Under the Rules of the House of Representatives, proposed legislation is referred by the Speaker to the committee of original jurisdiction. This is the committee that makes the policy decision as to whether the proposal is one that should be submitted to the entire membership for consideration. When the committee of original jurisdiction gives its blessing to a bill, under the rules the chairman of the committee refers the bill to the Rules Committee. Rules' function is to decide how much time should be devoted to the debate on each proposal and to schedule that time so that there will be adequate time for each proposal. Rules may not amend a bill; its function is purely housekeeping. However, if a majority of Members happen to be opposed to a particular bill, although they have no power to change it, they can refuse to give a rule which means they refuse to assign time for debate to that matter. In effect, they kill the bill by denying the membership of the House an opportunity to debate the issue.

During the 87th Congress when Sam Rayburn was the Speaker, Mr. Sam determined that it would not be possible to get many proposals assigned time for floor debate because of the nature of the composition of the committee. The chairman was Judge SMITH from Virginia. With his southern colleagues on the committee, and the Republicans, they were in a position to thwart the will of Congress by making an "unholy alliance." To assure that this did not happen, Mr. Sam proposed that the Rules Committee be expanded from 12 to 15 members. This would give an opportunity to appoint three new members who, hopefully, would not use the power of the committee in a manner adverse to the interest of the entire House. Mr. Sam's proposal was adopted by the 87th Congress, for that Congress only. It proved to be a great help in restoring the Rules Committee to its proper role in the legislative process.

Rollcalls 3 and 4 had to do with making this provision a permanent feature of the rules for the 88th and all subsequent Congresses. I voted on both of these rollcalls to keep the committee at its expanded membership of 15 and thus assure that when the committee of original jurisdiction makes a policy decision on a bill, the will of the 435 Members of Congress will not be frustrated by 6 persons who are operating under an "unholy alliance."

### ROLLCALL NO. 6

This was to provide the funds necessary to continue the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. A controversy developed early in the session in an effort to abolish this committee. Many persons believe, and with much reason, that the committee at times has acted in true "McCarthy" fashion in denying due process and condemning innocent persons by innuendo. At the time of this controversy, I clearly stated that I was concerned over past acts of the committee and would therefore support a move to transfer the area of inquiry handled by this committee to the Judiciary Committee. I was hopeful that the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee could be conducted in a manner similar to the Senate Internal Security Committee, which is a subcommittee of Senate Judiciary.

As a result of parliamentary maneuvers in securing permanent enlargement of the Rules Committee, the 88th session of Congress unanimously adopted the resolution by a voice vote creating the House Un-American Activities Committee along with all other standing committees for the 88th Congress. Although I would have preferred to see jurisdiction of the committee transferred, I could not support a motion to deny Congress the right to investigate in the area of un-American activities, which would have been the case had the appropriation for the committee been denied.

### ROLLCALL NOS. 12, 13, 14

All three of these rollcalls dealt with military construction appropriations for fiscal 1963–64. My vote in each instance was in support of the administration position to provide adequate funds for the acquisition of the planes, ships, guns, and so forth needed to maintain our superior Military Establishment. The Republicans, almost to a man, voted to increase the President's requested budget by $363 million to build three additional RS–70 planes. I voted against this proposal although it passed. There is no indication that the three prototype RS–70's currently under construction will be successful military aircaft. There is need for a substantial breakthrough in the technology of weapons systems on these planes that does not appear on the horizon. At present they would have to be equipped with a weapon system similar to the B–52. It does not seem logical to build an aircraft that costs $100 million and have it no more effective than our existing B–52's which cost about $5 million each. It is very doubtful that this money, although authorized, will ever be spent.

### ROLLCALLS NOS. 19–20

During the 87th Congress a program called the Accelerated Public Works Construction Program was developed to provide in depressed areas much needed employment in the form of necessary public works; work which was scheduled to be done soon, however, was to be accelerated because of the employment problem. It was the feeling of the 87th Congress that it would be more beneficial to provide a Public Works program with tax dollars than to use the same dollars for public welfare. To qualify for this program it was necessary for the local agency to submit a plan which called for the maximum number of man-hours of labor, the minimum amount of material cost, and a project that could be completed within 12 months from the start. The original program called for a total investment of $900 million, plus local matching funds, to be spent in a 24-month period. The 87th Congress approved the program in principle, appropriated the $450 million for the first 12 months and left the obligation to the 88th Congress to appropriate the balance. Many communities throughout the country, acting upon the program started in the 87th Congress, had incurred substantial costs in connection with this program in preparing plans, submitting applications, and arranging financing for local participation. During debate on this bill, it was interesting to note that many Members who voted against the appropriation argued in favor of the projects in their districts. There is no project in the 25th Congressional District which comes under this legislation since, thankfully, we are not a depressed area with chronic unemployment. However, I believe that Congress had the obligation not to "welch" on its previous commitment to these communities which had projects underway and I voted to fulfill our obligation.

### ROLLCALL NO. 24

The Health Professions Educational Act provides a system of matching fund grants to accredited medical, osteopathic, dental, and nursing schools. The Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the funds necessary for new construction of educational facilities when the facilities are directly related to increased enrollment. The bill provided 75 percent of construction funds to public health and paramedical school facilities, also predicated on increased enrollment. The bill also provides a system of interest-bearing loans to students who have completed their first year in these schools, upon the recommendation of the school and administered by the school.

The loans, together with the accrued interest, are to be repaid after graduation. In the interest of attempting to provide an incentive for physicians to practice in rural areas, there is a forgiveness feature of up to 50 percent of the loan to an individual physician if he establishes a practice in certain designated rural areas where there is an extreme shortage of medical personnel.

All of the medical and dental schools in California contacted me in favor of this legislation. They pointed out in detail that California must license 2,500 physicians a year to maintain our inadequate physician-patient ratio and yet our schools are capable of graduating only 700 doctors a year; that there are only 5 of our 50 States which graduate enough physicians to meet these needs, and the plight of dentistry and nursing is nearly as bad. The schools pointed out that many persons with the desire and ability for a medical education are unable to secure it because of their parents' limited financial ability. All in all, I believe the arguments in favor of the bill were overwhelming and I supported it.

## Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days now, I have received impassioned pleas from friends and constituents to sign the discharge petition which was placed at the Clerk's desk today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Many of these communications have stated the opinion that it is absolutely vital and necessary that I sign this petition in order to demonstrate my fealty to the cause of civil rights. All of these opinions, I realize, are sincerely expressed. I respect the authors of those opinions as men and women of courage and conviction. However, I want to take this opportunity to explain why I cannot in good conscience be swept along with the tide of public opinion that is currently calling for signatures on this petition. It is my honest feeling that the various media of communication in this country have done a real disservice to the cause of civil rights by improperly conveying the impression that the issue is now whether or not a Member will sign the discharge petition. I had been under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the cause for which we are all striving is the far larger and more noble cause of civil rights in the broadest sense of implementing constitutional guarantees with respect to voting rights and all of the privileges and immunities of first-class citizenship without regard to race or color.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a brief chronology of the events which have led up to the present conflict of civil rights legislation is in order. Mr. CELLER, who is sponsoring the petition, has for many years been chairman of the House Judiciary Committee which he controls with a comfortable 21 to 14 Democratic majority. He introduced a civil rights bill in the 87th Congress back in 1961, but he did not even begin to hold hearings until May of this year although 40 Republican bills were introduced in January. He did nothing to produce a bill for floor action in the 87th Congress. Where was his sense of urgency then? And it was not until October 29, 1963, that Mr. CELLER finally had a bill reported out of his committee. I think it is important to point this out because it clearly shows where the responsibility for delay should really rest. It was not until December 4, 1963, a date which was reached only last Wednesday, that additional views accompanying the report on this legislation were finally filed with the House. Therefore, for the mass media of communications to mislead the American people as it has in this instance by ascribing the delay to a bottling up within the Rules Committee is nothing but gross misrepresentation.

Further, it was not until after the sordid events in Birmingham that the President sent a civil rights message to Congress on June 19, 1963, attaching great urgency to this matter. Thereafter, when the Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he admitted that he had not even taken the time to read any of the more than 40 Republican bills that had been offered and which I referred to above. If you will look at the record you will find that there were only two civil rights bills passed in the last 80 years—in 1957 and in 1960. These bills received overwhelming support from the Republican membership in the House of Representatives. Even more significant than this fact is the fact that it was Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, who is now the ranking Republican member on the Rules Committee, who saw to it that these bills were not unnecessarily delayed within the Rules Committee. Mr. BROWN is still on the committee, and I have his assurance plus the assurance of the other four Republicans that they expect to vote out a civil rights bill. Furthermore, they do not expect to countenance any undue delay when hearings are held in January. When you couple these facts with the fact that a successful discharge petition would still require the bill to lay over until mid-January at the very earliest, I am unconvinced of the merit of this procedure.

It is my conviction that the political maneuvering on the part of some people who are civil righteous either in whole or in part because of political advantages that they see therein, is doing real damage to the cause of civil rights and jeopardizing the passage of the civil rights bill.

I made it clear many months ago that I was in wholehearted support of a civil rights bill, and would vote for it. This I fully intend to do. I will do it even though I do not expect any political advantage therefrom; indeed, I have every reason to believe that many of those who are most vocal in this regard are completely opposed to me in most of the stands that I take. Nevertheless, it is a matter of conscience with me, and I am proud and happy that I have an opportunity to cast an affirmative vote. At the same time, I feel deeply on the matter of some of the pressures that are being exerted with respect to the discharge petition. To those of us here in the Capitol in Washington, it is quite clear that the sponsor of the petition and others are seeking to use this as a political ploy to obtain some small partisan advantage and gain. They seek thereby to obscure the facts of their own negligence and untoward delay in bringing about the passage of this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say that it is difficult to disagree with our friends on this issue, particularly when we are not an enemy to the cause of civil rights, but have every intention of supporting the bill when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives. However, for the reasons already set forth we simply cannot in good conscience lend ourselves to what we honestly feel is nothing more or less than political chicanery.

I would also like to point out further that many persons lose sight of the fact that once a Member of the House of Representatives signs a discharge petition on this particular bill, he is absolutely defenseless before the onslaught of demands that he act similarly with respect to the other pieces of legislation for which discharge petitions have already been filed or will be filed, some of which bills should never see the light of day. If we were to adopt the use of the petition with respect to this legislation, it is almost certain that some of these other bills would find their way to the floor. I think it is significant that our ranking Republican member on the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, has absolutely identical views with mine with respect to the use of the discharge petition for any purpose. Yet without the work of Mr. MCCULLOCH, a civil rights bill would never have been reported out of the House Judiciary Committee in a form so that it could pass the House of Representatives.

## Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my second rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from May 1 to June 12, 1963.

| Roll call No. | Date | H.R. No. | R.B.C. | Yea | Nay | Not voting | Brief description |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | May 1 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (37 Members absent). |
| 36 | do | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas (49 Members absent). |
| 37 | May 6 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Rogers, Democrat, of Colorado (133 Members absent). |
| 38 | do | 40 | Yea | 274 | 30 | 129 | Final passage of assistance to States re agricultural experiment stations. |
| 39 | May 7 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (54 Members absent). |
| *40 | do | 245 | Nay | 384 | 2 | 47 | Final passage of measure purported to limit travel expenses for congressional staff members and Members of Congress. |
| 41 | May 8 | 5517 | do | 207 | 190 | 36 | Motion to recommit a Senate-House conference report on supplemental appropriations. |
| 42 | May 9 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (46 Members absent). |
| *43 | do | 950 | Nay | 340 | 40 | 54 | Final passage of measure denying employees right of appeal or hearing in the event that the Secretary of Defense made a ruling that they were a security risk (1 Member voted present). |
| 44 | May 13 | 4274 | Yea | 278 | 53 | 102 | Final passage of measure authorizing supervised corporal punishment in Washington, D.C., school districts. |
| 45 | May 14 | 5517 | do | 241 | 130 | 62 | Final passage of conference report recommitted by rollcall 41. |
| *46 | do | 5517 | do | 168 | 207 | 58 | House-Senate conference report re Philippine war damage claims, to amend. |
| 47 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bass, Democrat, of Tennessee (62 Members absent). |
| 48 | do | 340 | Not voting | 153 | 217 | 64 | Final passage of measure to send representatives to International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva (R.B.C. in committee hearing with Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; had I been present I would have voted "aye") (1 Member voted present). (See also vote No. 58.) |
| 49 | May 15 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (43 Members absent) (R.B.C. in committee meeting with Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs). |
| 50 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent). |
| *51 | do | 6009 | Nay | 195 | 222 | 15 | Motion to recommit increase in national debt ceiling (1 Member voted present). |
| *52 | do | 6009 | Yea | 213 | 204 | 17 | Final passage of national debt ceiling bill. |
| 53 | May 16 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Johansen, Republican, of Michigan (83 Members absent). |
| 54 | May 23 | 6060 | Yea | 362 | 9 | 64 | Automatic rollcall on question of whether to debate the equal pay for equal work bill. |
| 55 | May 28 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (134 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with officials of United Aircraft Corp.). |
| 56 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas (154 Members absent). |
| 57 | May 29 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mrs. St. George, Republican, of New York (94 Members absent). |
| 58 | do | 368 | Yea | 277 | 52 | 104 | Appointment by Speaker of 2 Members to attend International Labor Conference, Geneva. (See vote No. 48 above.) |
| *59 | do | 5497 | Nay | 158 | 174 | 100 | Bill to extend Public Law 78 (bracero program) for 2 years (1 Member voted present). |
| 60 | June 4 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (45 Members absent). |
| *61 | do | 3496 | Nay | 227 | 174 | 31 | Motion to amend Reorganization Act of 1949 to prohibit Executive creation of any new executive department. |
| *62-65 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (average of 96 Members absent per call) to block discussion of civil rights under a special order. |
| *66 | do | | Nay | 53 | 277 | 103 | Motion to adjourn by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California. |
| *67-69 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (139 Members absent). |
| 70 | June 5 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (51 Members absent). |
| 71 | June 6 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (64 Members absent). |
| 72 | do | 6754 | Yea | 288 | 79 | 65 | Final passage of Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. |
| 73 | June 11 | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican, of California (62 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with Mr. James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs). |
| 74 | do | 6868 | Yea | 271 | 122 | 39 | Legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal 1964. |
| 75 | do | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Bromwell, Republican, of Iowa (82 Members absent). |
| 76 | June 12 | | do | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota (28 Members absent). |
| 77 | do | | Absent | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (64 Members absent) (R.B.C. at Far East and Pacific Subcommittee for testimony of Mr. John Everton, U.S. Ambassador to Burma). |
| 78 | June 12 | | Present | | | | Quorum call by Mr. Kilburn, Republican, of New York (48 Members absent). |

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

### ROLLCALL NO. 40

House Joint Resolution 245 purportedly limits travel expenses abroad for Congressmen and congressional staff members to a per diem allowance and transportation costs. In my judgment, adverse publicity early in the session on the junketing practices of certain Members stampeded Congress into adopting House Joint Resolution 245. At present there are adequate rules of the Congress, which, if rigidly enforced, would protect the public from any would-be malefactors. House Joint Resolution 245 is not foolproof. Its provisions can be circumvented just as existing rules can be thwarted. I considered my vote against the resolution to be a small exercise of protest in contrast to a large exercise of pacification. I also consider the proposal to be discriminatory, in that Congressmen on official business overseas will not be reimbursed for such necessary expenses as phone calls, cables, interpreters, and so forth. Executives in the private sector are reimbursed for all necessary expenses relative to their work, and I see no reason why Members of Congress should not be accorded the same consideration. It is significant that the House failed to include travel within the United States in the proposal. If the resolution is indeed aimed at accomplishing great reforms, I would think its applicability should not be limited to travel abroad

### ROLLCALL NO. 43

Sections 302(a) and 302(b) of this bill provide for a full field examination before a new employee of the National Security Agency is cleared, and establishes a board of appraisal to review each case. I, of course, subscribe to these provisions. Section 303, however, vests the Secretary of Defense with the summary and unreviewable power to discharge as a security risk any employee of the NSA. No hearing whatever is to be granted to the employee. No matter how many years he may have been employed, he is not entitled to know what the charges are against him, nor who made them. It was because of this section that I opposed the bill. It not only exposes individuals to possible injustice, it exposes the Agency itself to a risk that it will lose valuable personnel because some slanderer subjects them to suspicion. Hearings and appeal procedures are an asset, not a liability, because they strengthen morale and diminish the chances of mistaken identity, prejudice, and other errors of judgment. They grow out of a long Anglo-American experience in the administration of justice—out of a knowledge that confrontation and cross-examination are invaluable tools for the discovery of truth.

### ROLLCALL NO. 46

At issue on this vote was whether the United States should pay $73 million in war damage claims directly to the Philippine Government, or disburse this sum—through the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—to the individual damage claimants. The amendment which I supported called for the latter method, with the stipulation that claimants certify they would not pay fees to former Philippine War Damage Commission personnel. This would preclude payments to lobbyists who, while members of the War Damage Commission, had also been on the payroll of various corporations entitled to reimbursement under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The purpose of the act was to provide public rehabilitation of the Philippine economy through payments to individuals and private corporations and organizations. The act explicitly stated that "Compensation shall be payable only to qualified persons." Members who voted against the amendment on this rollcall advocated payment of claims to the Philippine Government and not to the qualified persons as cited in the 1946 law. In my judgment it was not proper to bring a third party—the Philippine Government—into negotiations between the United States and private parties with financial claims against our Government. The United States has no guarantee that the Philippine Government will pay the $73 million to qualified persons under the 1946 act. I found no justification to circumvent existing law once the loophole allowing payment of fees to lobbyists had been closed.

### ROLLCALLS NOS. 51 AND 52

It is interesting to note that on final passage of the national debt ceiling bill, only one Republican (former Speaker Joseph Martin) voted for the increase. The GOP undoubtedly analyzed the bill in political terms—a means of financially crippling the Kennedy administration—rather than in terms of national welfare. H.R. 6009 increases the temporary national debt limit by $2 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963, and by an additional $2 billion during the first 2 months of fiscal 1964. The bill was passed after the House rejected (rollcall 51) a GOP motion to recommit the measure to Ways and Means with instructions to amend it to continue the temporary $305 billion debt ceiling. In rebutting arguments that increasing the debt ceiling was a signal for greater spending, I pointed out that congressional restraint in passing new programs is the only effective way to control Government spending since the ceiling is a measure of what the Government must borrow to pay for the programs that Congress authorizes. Various emergency actions which the Treasury might take in managing the debt if the ceiling were not raised included: Drawing down Treasury cash balances and endangering current policies that limit the flow of dollars abroad; halting the sale of savings bonds; disposing of Federal properties such as mortgages and stockpiled metals on a crash basis which would limit credit for home buyers and hurt the mining industry; and slowing down existing defense and space commitments. Apparently the GOP felt these consequences to be in the national interest. I did not. During debate a conservative southern Democrat told Republicans that:

> The greatest disservice that any of us who claim to be conservatives can do is, under the guise of conservatism, follow policies which are not sound or give the public an erroneous impression of the Nation's fiscal position.

It is also important to recall that during the Eisenhower years the debt ceiling was raised periodically and substantially with the strong support of Republicans and Democrats. As one Member pointed out to the GOP:

> I hope my Republican colleagues will reread their old speeches and again reach their conclusion of yesteryear, because—
>
> "Nor all their piety nor wit
> Can cancel half a line
> Nor all their tears
> Wash out a word of it."

### ROLLCALL NO. 59

This year the administration proposed a 1-year extension of the bracero program plus an amendment designed to strengthen the protection for domestic farm labor. The House Agriculture Committee, however, reported a 2-year extension without the amendment sought by the Department of Labor. Contrary to popular misconceptions about the bracero program, it is not administered without cost to American taxpayers. In fiscal 1963 an estimated $1.4 million in Labor Department funds was spent to insure that American farmers complied with wage and other regulations applicable to braceros. Farmers, however, are not required to offer American workers equivalent workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing or transportation expenses. In 1962 there were 226,948 braceros imported to the United States for farm jobs, this in the face of about 5.5 million Americans in the ranks of the unemployed. The record indicates that the bracero program depressed the wages and working conditions of American migrant farm laborers, who had no systematic program of recruitment and work contracts to assist them in competing with bracero labor, and who were not offered the same fringe benefits as Mexican laborers. With the termination of Public Law 78, I believe that a similar recruitment program should be provided for domestic migrant laborers. I am also confident that with abolishment of the bracero program an adequate supply of American workers can be found to do stoop labor if offered decent wages and working conditions.

### ROLLCALL NO. 61

H.R. 3496, a bill to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 with an amendment prohibiting the President from recommending establishment of any new executive department, was passed by a conservative coalition. On this rollcall 158 Republicans joined with 65 southern Democrats to give President Kennedy what, in effect, was an undeserved rebuke. Only three Republicans voted against the measure. The act grants authority to the President to transmit to the Congress for its approval or its disapproval reorganization plans in the executive branch. It was under this authority that President Eisenhower recommended a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President's recommendations are sent to the House Committee on Government Operations. Extensive hearings are held on the proposal. If any Member of Congress files a resolution of disapproval of the plan, and the resolution is approved by the Congress, the President's plan to reorganize is dead. This is standard legislative procedure: The Executive proposes and the Congress disposes—it either accepts or rejects. With the amendment embodied in H.R. 3496 Congress withdrew the power of the President to propose. Those who voted for the amended bill voted to turn the clock back, not just back of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt, but back of President Hoover, who first suggested the legislation. It is interesting to note that in 1953, when a bill to renew the authority of President Eisenhower to initiate reorganization plans (including the authority to set up new departments) came before the House, it was passed by a vote of 389 to 5. Democrats supported the proposal 184 to 2. Republicans were for it 205 to 3. Democrats gave a Republican President similar support in 1955, 1957, and 1959. In 1963, with a Democrat in the White House, Democrats asked Republicans to give a Democratic President the same powers and responsibilities—no more, but no less—than Democrats gave to a Republican President. It is unfortunate that when the vote was taken the GOP had its eye only on partisan politics and the 1964 campaign, not on efficiency and economy in Government.

### ROLLCALLS NOS. 62–69

Under House rules it is impossible to conduct a filibuster of the Senate variety. However, repeated quorum calls can be used to stall speeches on controversial issues when they are being discussed under a special order. It is this tactic which southerners may use to temporarily block northern discussion of civil rights. After regular business had been transacted on June 4, Representative Lindsay, of New York, took the floor to discuss the civil rights crisis under a special order. The southern bloc, led by Representative Williams, of Mississippi, walked off the floor, leaving Mr. Lindsay without a quorum. Mr. Williams then made the point of order that a quorum was not present and asked for a rollcall. Mr. Lindsay was precluded from speaking while this procedure was in progress, about one-half hour. As you will remember from our discussion on rollcall No. 1, it takes about 40 minutes to complete a quorum call. When a quorum had assembled, Mr. Williams again walked out, and with him went the number of southern Members necessary to make up the quorum. Then Mr. Williams came back, noticed the absence of a quorum and again the process was repeated several times. I remained on the floor until late in the evening, giving Mr. Lindsay, a Republican, my support. At one point, a motion was made to adjourn, a move which, if successful, would have given token victory to the southern coalition. I voted against adjournment on the principle that all Members, regardless of party or philosophy, have a right to present their views in the Congress. I was gratified when southerners finally gave up their obstructionist fight and permitted Mr. LINDSAY to proceed with his speech on civil rights.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of December 7, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

In the aftermath of the assassination of President Kennedy it is vital to the security of the United States that we keep the record straight. Now, more than ever, Americans must remember the words of Abraham Lincoln: "As freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." Only Americans can destroy America.

What are many columnists, commentators, and editorial writers doing today? They are blaming the people of the United States for a foul deed done by a self-avowed Communist. Too many Americans are parroting the line laid down by the Communists in Tass and Pravda. "Beware the extremists of the right and left wing," we are being told. "Americans are filled with hate," we hear over and over again. Ignored completely is the basic American character of compassion, kindness, sympathy so dramatically exhibited in the unity of the entire Nation following the tragedy; the outpouring of sympathy and love for Mrs. Kennedy and the children; a quarter of a million Americans standing all through the cold night outside the Capitol in silent tribute; the immediate and magnificent response of giving concrete help to the widow and children of the slain Dallas police officer, J. D. Tippit; even the contributions, out of our sense of sympathy, to the widow and children of the alleged assassin, Oswald.

Now, what are the facts?

1. The President was killed by a Communist. The hate was in the heart of the killer—hate of America, hate for what is our national purpose, hate for any type of authority.

2. Prior to the moment of the killing, President Kennedy and his party were being honored with enthusiasm, respect and love by thousands of Dallas citizens.

3. The Communists are the purveyors of hate in today's world. It is they who encourage lying, deceit and murder to accomplish their goals.

Of course, there are extremists—there have always been since the dawn of history. If, by extremists, we mean any who would take the law into their own hands by violence or killing, we abjure such action. We hate the deed, but in Christian charity try not to hate the individuals. It is important that we make a clear distinction, short of those who advocate murder, between the so-called rightwing and leftwing extremists.

1. The rightwing belief is based on preservation of the Constitution, to keep America free, to protect the security of the Nation.

2. The extremist on the left (and this does not include the sincere liberal who seeks the common good and believes it can be accomplished only through big government) but the far-out leftist whose goal is communism, the abrogation of our Constitution, and the destruction of America.

3. The great bulk of the American people belong to neither extreme, but are dedicated to this Nation and its free institutions, including the freedom of debate and opposition.

THE DANGER

Once we have made this clear distinction, we ask ourselves, what is the real danger? The threat to America is getting the American people to fall into the Communist trap and ending our will to resist. How?

1. By carrying out the policy of the 1960 Communist manifesto to eliminate the anti-Communists.

2. Get the American people to condemn themselves as bigots, breeders of hate, assassins, degenerates. Entice their own writers, clergymen, educators, politicians, any who can be duped into emphasizing American faults, drown us in self-criticism and self-guilt, ready to accept socialism which by definition escalates into communism.

Our danger comes from the extremist on the left who is dedicated to the Communist conspiracy to conquer the world and destroy the United States. We can handle the extremist on the right, short of those advocating violence (and there are some and always will be as long as man is man) because we can reach him through reason and debate because the objective of the right is the preservation of our limited Government under the Constitution.

THE ANSWERS

What do we do about the danger?

1. We adhere to American principles.

2. We do our best to preserve the spirit and the letter of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

3. We recognize the issues which divide our people, we debate them freely, and we compromise our views to arrive at solutions which will strengthen our country and the freedoms of our people.

4. We encourage, not stifle opposition. To intimidate, by calling them "hate mongers" any who disagree, will only play into the hands of the enemies of our system.

5. We do all possible to keep our people informed, wipe out ignorance, end blind prejudice for any reason.

We maintain uninhibited faith in the collective judgment and wisdom of the people. Under our system of government, divinely inspired, it is a natural law that, given all the facts, the people, in their final judgment, will not be wrong.

## Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected passing of my long-time colleague and friend, the Honorable Estes Kefauver, is not only a great personal loss, but a loss to the State of Tennessee and the entire Nation as well.

I first came to know Estes Kefauver when I was elected to this House in the 78th Congress. We served here together until the fall of 1948 when he was first elected to the other body. He was a hard-working and devoted Member of the U.S. Congress, and I am sure many will agree that this country is a better place today because of his continuous crusade against crime and corruption, racketeering and monopolistic practices in industry. Estes had a genuine concern for the welfare of his fellow men and because of his unyielding dedication to duty and service, he will long be remembered and missed by millions of Americans.

I greatly admired and respected Estes for his honesty, his ability and for his courage, and I am deeply saddened by his passing. Mrs. Kefauver and the children have my heartfelt sympathy and prayers in their great loss.

## Television Overcommercialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement I made on "Congressional Conference," broadcast over station WOR–TV, channel 9, New York, on Sunday, December 8, 1963.

The statement follows:

Permit me to offer praise to the broadcasting industry (both radio and television) for its reporting of the events of the frightful and frightening days, commencing with the firing of the fateful bullet that laid low our late, martyred President.

The industry measured up to highest standards. The achievement is worthy of proud commendation.

The television and radio stations and networks themselves have presented a shining contrast to their ordinary course of business as usual with their comprehensive noncommercial news coverage of the assassination and burial of our late, beloved President Kennedy and the succession of President Johnson.

Advertising revenues, of course, make such a public service possible but broadcasters must recognize, as their audience does, the difference between enough and too much.

The mad, almost weird, scramble of TV and radio stations to push as many commercials as possible at the audience has become a national scandal. The air is saturated with such commercials and the public is surfeited and suffocated.

The airwaves are a public resource. Operators of radio and TV stations are licensees of the U.S. Government through the agency of the Federal Communications Commission. Hence, it is clear that any abuse of the license granted by FCC must be examined by it. And it is an abuse, I maintain, when many TV and radio stations thrust 30 minutes of commercials on the air for every hour of program. A public franchise, giving each broadcaster a limited monopoly of the public airwaves, should not become a license to bombard the public with inane advertising for nearly half the broadcast day.

Obviously, then, the industry has failed to regulate itself. The National Association of Broadcasters in 1948 proposed a limit of

12 minutes of commercials for every broadcast hour—or 1 minute for commercials out of every 5. Many broadcasters, however, do not belong to NAB, and many of those who do failed to live up to its code. The NAB, instead of enforcing its own code, relaxed it this year so that now 18 minutes of commercials to every hour of broadcast—roughly 1 minute out of every 3—is deemed reasonable. But, as I stated before, many stations go far beyond even that 1-to-3 ratio.

The viewing and listening public is virtually a captive audience. Unlike the newspaper reader who can skip past the advertisements to the story which attracts his interest and read it through from beginning to end, you, the television viewer, cannot escape the intrusive interruption of commercials if you are to watch the program of your choice.

Certainly the industry is entitled to a reasonable profit on its investment, but it is equally reasonable that in the public domain a balance be struck between the public interest and the private interest of the licensee.

Broadcasters have enjoyed phenomenal profits in many cases. Radio and TV stations are changing hands for $3, $4, $7, even $10 million these days. Recently, $8 million was offered for a TV station which was worth only $3 million in 1960. A $5 million capital gain on a $3 million investment over 3 years represents a pretty fair profit by any standards.

The networks and their affiliated stations too are enjoying record profits and sales, with sensational advances reported in some instances. How can such broadcasters justly complain about a more reasonable balance between the public and private interest?

While the Federal Communications Commission has sought information as to the number of commercials and licensee uses, it has not sought information as to the amount of time devoted to commercials in each hour of the broadcast day. Without such information it cannot get a true picture.

There are those who oppose any FCC regulation of commercials but its public duty is plain. The overuse of commercials is self-evident. The victims of such overuse, the viewers and listeners of TV and radio, agree, I am sure, that the insistent, intrusive, incessant, inescapable cries of vendors and pitchmen over the air must, in a measure, be inhibited.

---

## Effect of Meat Imports on Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching the livestock and meat situation in the United States and I must say that it has been with a great deal of concern. The cattle market is always somewhat erratic, but since November of last year, cattle prices began an unusual decline, and as always, stockmen and others in the trade searched for a reason. Attention was focused on cattle and veal imports which recently have increased in large amounts. I am well aware of the special report on the livestock situation where the Department of Agriculture found no evidence justifying the citing of beef imports as a cause of the price break for fed cattle. They point out that although total beef and veal imports are at record levels, most of that imported was manufacturing beef. Very little high quality fed beef was imported. It is pointed out that during the increase in imports, fed cattle prices were also rising. However, as we look at the present market, the question comes to mind: imports are increasing, then why are prices falling? For example, last November the average price for choice steers in Chicago rose to a high of $30.13 a hundred, and thereafter began a fall which ended at a disastrous low of $22.61 a hundred in May of this year—a decline of almost 25 percent. Average prices in the following 2 months rose to $24.11 in September, $5.74 a hundred below September 1962. Choice slaughter steer prices in the first half of this year were 9 percent below the first half of 1962. Declines have occurred in other classes of cattle; prices of stocker and feeder steers at Kansas City in the first 6 months of this year were 4 percent below the same period a year earlier. Chicago prices of commercial cows were down 3 percent, cutters and canners were down 3 percent and the wholesale price of fresh choice beef carcasses in New York down from $0.502 per pound in September 1962 to $0.426 in September 1963.

A considerable census of opinion attributes the price declines to the increased volume of meat imports into the United States over the past few years. Imports of beef and veal in 1962 were more than twice the 1956–60 average, and more than four times the 1951–55 average. Moreover, beef imports in the first half of 1963 outpaced those for the first half of 1962 by more than 20 percent. Simple logic would indicate that these increased imports do, indeed, bear down on the price our cattlemen are receiving for livestock, especially when one considers that such imports in 1962 accounted for almost 11 percent of total domestic production as compared with only 4 percent in 1957. The United States has increased its share of the total world meat imports to over 25 percent in 1962—1,850.4 million pounds—compared with 14.8 percent—889.1 million pounds—for the 1956–60 average. In fact, the United States exported 29 percent—103.2 million pounds—less meat in 1962 than the 1956–60 average—145.3 million pounds—while for the same period of comparison our total imports rose an astounding 108 percent. In 1962 exports further decreased approximately 8 percent while imports rose another 39 percent. Even more important, examine the figures for the first 6 months of 1963. Nearly all types of red meat imports were higher than during the same period in 1962. Beef and veal imports at 491 million pounds were 21 percent above the first half of last year, with the major beef item—boneless—20 percent above the previous year at 407 million pounds.

About 96 percent of U.S. manufacturing meat imports came from 8 countries in 1962, Australia and New Zealand supplying 56 or 20 percent, respectively. Last year the United States was the leading market for Australian meats, and has been the major market for New Zealand's boneless beef exports for the past 3 years, taking over 90 percent of their production. All of this is particularly interesting in view of the study of nontariff agricultural protectionism by the Department of Agriculture. This study shows that all our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism than the United States through nontariff barriers. These nontariff import controls involve such things as import quotas, embargoes, variable levies, monopolies, preferential treatment, import licensing, bilateral agreements, and so forth. Using such nontariff import controls as the criteria, the Department of Agriculture found that the following percentages of a country's domestic agricultural production was protected from outside competition: Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; Denmark, 100 percent; France, 95 percent; and West Germany, 95 percent. The study indicates that the United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies.

Statements credited to officials in the U.S. Department of Agriculture minimize the impact of imports on domestic meat-animal prices. They point out that imports, two-thirds of which are coming from Australia and New Zealand, constitute lower quality beef used in making manufactured and processed products, such as frankfurters and luncheon meat. However, representatives of the American National Cattlemen's Association maintain that such imports have a direct impact on cattle prices. The National Livestock Feeders Association has pointed out a possible fallacy of the Agriculture Department theory:

> Processed products constitute very real competition in the sale of fresh beef and veal. The availability of large quantities of imported manufactured boneless beef and veal has resulted in a continuously larger proportion of processed products being offered consumers, in comparison to the volume of fresh cuts which come principally from carcasses grading USDA Good and Choice. Boning beef comes principally from old bulls and cows and from low grade steers and heifers. Without the very large volume of imports, there would be a substantial downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher grades for use as boneless beef. This provides price and supply movement stimuli to the fresh beef market.

We hear quite a bit about the United States not being able to supply the canner and cutter quality of animals and that most of the imports are of that type; however, one must remember that the average age of a cow herd is increasing, and that when a rancher has an area of good grass, a cow will be kept for another winter if there is a possibility she will survive and produce another calf. Because the cow will still have the same slaughter value the following year, many ranchers are optimistic about returns from feeder calves and will carry through the winter many aged cows not barren. Obviously, the time will occur when it is no longer of benefit to return her, however, with foreign beef consistently underselling domestic by some 5 cents a pound the processor who buys domestic beef has no choice but to pay the farmer less. This depressing effect of cheap foreign meat cannot help but cause havoc in the cattle industry.

These various points of view, it seems to me, though they come from highly authoritative sources, are so divergent as to prompt Congress to concern itself with a thorough study of the question. In glancing through USDA statistics, I note that steer and heifer slaughter under Federal inspection in the first 6 months of this year was about 9 percent above a year earlier. Such increased slaughter would seem to support the U.S. Department of Agriculture position that increased slaughter—and not imports—was the cause of the price decline.

But let us look at the facts a little further, red meat production is continuing at a high rate, up 4.3 percent from the first half of 1962, and we are told that a per capita consumption will reach 167 pounds for 1963, a 3-pound increase over 1962. With an expansion in demand for beef from the increased population, higher incomes, and continuation in consumer's preference for beef, one would think that cattle prices would also remain at a high level. At the same time, one cannot escape the inherent logic in the Cattlemen's Association and Feeder's Association statements that sizable imports of beef directly affect the price which producers in this country receive.

I should also call attention to the fact that prices received for farm products in the first 6 months averaged about the same as last year, with lower prices for livestock nearly offsetting higher prices for crops. On the surface, this may appear to be economically sound; however, while farm income has remained the same, the rest of the economy has moved ahead. Indeed, in the June quarter the farmer's share of the food dollar fell to 36 cents, the lowest quarterly average in 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, the livestock segment of our agricultural economy is extremely important. Last year, sales of nearly $20 billion of livestock products accounted for almost 56 percent of total farm income while sales of nearly $12 billion of meat animals alone made up about a third of total farm income.

We are both the world's largest exporter of agricultural products and because of our high purchasing power and liberal policies, the world's second largest importer of agricultural products, exceeded only by the United Kingdom. Over half our agricultural imports are products that compete with our own farm production.

But as realists we are not seeking completely free trade, for many reasons—economics, political, and social, no country is either prepared or willing to remove all protections from its agriculture. The basic question has to do with the degree of protection. Nations must participate in active two-way trade. The two-way trade in agricultural products practiced by the United States is of a vigorous healthful nature. More countries should follow our lead.

I am not sure what would be the proper approach to our meat import problem, and of course, I do not think anyone would demand total exclusion of foreign meats since some is necessary to meet the demand for processed and manufacturing products. However, imports are jeopardizing one of the most important segments of agriculture, and I believe it would be proper to put into effect import quotas or increase the duty on live cattle and meat products. I strongly urge that we give this problem our serious attention.

*U.S. average beef cattle prices per 100 pounds, 1953–63*

| Year | Prices received by farmers for all beef cattle | Choice slaughter steers at Chicago | Feeder steer prices at Kansas City | Commercial grade cows at Chicago |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1953 | $16.30 | $24.14 | $17.35 | $13.92 |
| 1954 | 16.00 | 24.66 | 18.97 | 13.28 |
| 1955 | 15.60 | 23.16 | 18.60 | 12.98 |
| 1956 | 14.90 | 22.30 | 17.37 | 12.72 |
| 1957 | 17.20 | 23.83 | 20.33 | 14.83 |
| 1958 | 21.90 | 27.42 | 25.56 | 17.76 |
| 1959 | 22.60 | 27.83 | 25.61 | 19.11 |
| 1960 | 20.40 | 26.24 | 22.93 | 16.21 |
| 1961 | 20.20 | 24.65 | 23.30 | 16.07 |
| 1962 | 21.30 | 27.67 | 24.53 | 15.89 |
| 1963 [1] | 20.22 | 24.15 | 23.70 | 15.75 |
| January | 21.60 | 27.27 | 24.53 | 15.30 |
| February | 20.40 | 24.93 | 23.89 | 15.24 |
| March | 19.60 | 23.63 | 23.45 | 15.68 |
| April | 20.30 | 23.77 | 24.12 | 15.86 |
| May | 19.70 | 22.61 | 23.80 | 16.44 |
| June | 19.70 | 22.69 | 22.74 | 16.17 |

[1] 1st 6 months.

Source: USDA. Statistical Reporting Service, July 1963 (Statistical Bulletin No. 333) and USDA, Economic Research Service. Livestock and Meat Situation Reports, 1963.

*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, compared with production, 1953–62—Cattle and calves and beef and veal*

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [3] (million pounds) | Imports as a percentage of production (percent) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat (million pounds) | Total [2] (million pounds) | | |
| | Number (thousand head) | Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds) | | | | |
| 1953 | 177 | 62 | 271 | 333 | 13,953 | 2.4 |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.6 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.9 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 |

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production.

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, Livestock and Meat Situation, May 1963 (LMS-130).

*U.S. steer and heifer beef production under Federal inspection, by month, 1962–63*

[In millions of pounds]

| Month | Steer beef production in the United States | | Heifer beef production in the United States | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1962 | 1963 | 1962 | 1963 |
| January | 654 | 678 | 188 | 214 |
| February | 574 | 591 | 173 | 196 |
| March | 647 | 662 | 190 | 222 |
| April | 601 | 710 | 169 | 214 |
| May | 699 | 782 | 192 | 227 |
| June | 700 | 732 | 184 | 199 |
| Total | 3,875 | 4,155 | 1,096 | 1,272 |

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Livestock and Meat Situation, October 1963.

## Independence Day of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1961, Tanganyika achieved her independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Tanganyika, Julius K. Nyerere, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Tanganyika's independence.

Two years have now passed since the new green, black, and gold flag of Tanganyika was first raised in the Dar-es-Salaam and rockets rose 300 miles to the north from Mount Kilimanjaro's icy summit in celebration of Tanganyika's independence. Many changes have taken place in these 2 years, but few of them have been in the news. The changes have been peaceful—the gradual progressive political and economic development of a stable nation toward well-defined objectives—not the shocking, disrupting stories of violence that make interesting newspaper copy.

Still, one of the changes in particular was so momentous that it received wide coverage in the foreign press. On December 9, 1962, Tanganyika ceased to be a legal part of the British monarchical system, a dominion, and declared itself a Republic. Tanganyika retained membership in the British Commonwealth, but the institution of the British Governor-General was jettisoned forever. Dr. Julius K. Nyerere was chosen President of the new Republic in an election in which he received more than 98 percent of the total votes cast.

The country of which Dr. Nyerere is President on Africa's east coast is a land of natural beauty, of ancient legend, but yet of modern outlook. Tanganyika is four times the size of its former colonial master, Great Britain. On its northern frontier Mt. Kilimanjaro rises in a giant floating sugarloaf. To the east lies the Indian Ocean where colorful Arab and native craft plow the coral-reefed sea. To the west is Lake Victoria and the source of the Nile.

In northern Tanganyika archeologists have discovered what are probably the oldest traces of man on earth; deep valleys and gorges reveal the fossils of prehistoric ages. The coast of the country has been known to voyagers for nearly 2,000 years; in contrast, the interior has been known to the outside world for little more than 100 years. Tanganyika was the object of several waves of colonization. The Arabs came in the 8th century; the Portuguese in the 14th. Both these people were interested in Tanganyika chiefly as a stopping place on their profitable trading voyages to India and the Far East. British explorers penetrated the interior in the middle 19th century; by the end of the century German hegemony had been established, only to be ceded to Britain under a League of Nations mandate at the end of World War I.

But the Tanganyika of today is very different from the Tanganyika of the past. Under the skillful leadership of President Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), the economy is gradually being developed in spite of a low potential of natural resources. Increased production of sisal, cotton, and coffee—the country's three most important commercial products—is being encouraged. The transportation network is being improved. The Government has accepted aid from international agencies, Britain, West Germany, and the United States. Peace Corps volunteers—roadbuilders, geologists, secondary school teachers—have been welcomed.

On the second anniversary of your independence we congratulate you, President Nyerere, and the people of Tanganyika, for skillfully putting your resources to the most profitable use and for working cooperatively with friendly countries who desire to assist Tanganyika to reach its development goals.

---

## Gettysburg 1863–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, history was made in Gettysburg 100 years ago.

One hundred years later, November 16, 17, 18, 19, 1963, that history was rather thoroughly reviewed by men in various professions.

The following is another in that series of lectures this one delivered by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, First District of Iowa, before the Sons of the Union Veterans and other patriotic groups:

#### THE LITERATURE OF GETTYSBURG

(By Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, Congressman from First District of Iowa)

Those of us who are here today know that we are here again trying to evaluate an elemental force in human nature beyond anything in the whole spectrum of biographical literature from Plutarch to Carl Sandburg.

We are in the community where one of the noblest utterances ever delivered on this soil was made.

It was spoken a century ago.

Next Tuesday we share with each other a profound emotion of reverence toward the author like that felt by participants in some devout, even mystical, ceremony of worship.

The whole world and all of time will little note nor long remember what we say here today.

But historians and interested citizens will note this commemoration as a reflection on and an extension of what was said on this now sacred spot in that imperishable 2 minutes or so after one of the most decisive battles in the history of mankind.

Somehow our emotions are keyed to the brooding genius who, even as I speak, hovers over this hallowed place.

And whose voice, like eternity itself, can almost be felt whispering to us out of the infinite.

It does our hearts good and it enriches the soul to discuss, to evaluate, to reflect upon, to adulate this infinitesimal fragment of the world's literature we call the Gettysburg Address.

It is our literature because it is inspired by Lincoln.

It is American in every breath and syllable, every punctuation mark.

And it was given to mankind by one of our own.

##### SPRUNG FROM OUR SOIL—THE BEDROCK OF FREEDOM

It is as universal as the Lord's Prayer with which it bears—in my judgment—a measure of divine resemblances.

The literature of Gettysburg and the address which we commemorate today has in it, not only for us but for the whole human race everywhere on this planet, something of a quality that touches all of us.

In whatever condition, it touches us at the noblest side of our nature.

It is my belief that this is its essential secret.

I dare—with reverence and humility—to equate it with the tone, the style, the inner nature and the all-encompassing compassion of the Lord's Prayer.

Is not this the reason that from the very moment of its utterance these brief, utterly sincere 10 sentences, spoken at a moment of overwhelming national bereavement, captured the imagination of the contemporary world?

There were, as you know, those who passed the Gettysburg Address by on the day that it appeared in the public prints and for sometime after.

Like the Lord's Prayer it failed in its own day to receive total recognition.

But there were those on the public level who caught its meaning and its impact at once: Surviving soldiers, poets, editors, reporters, publicists, clergymen, and orators of the day including the remarkable Edward Everett.

This of course was not a speech dashed off on the back of an envelope, but a speech, which had behind it 45 years of learning and deep experience that produced some powerful thinking.

Maybe this is the reason that all that I say here today—which is without value except for what it commemorates—is a sort of irreducible minimum, the tiniest morsel, of what is yet to be said and written about this Gettysburg Address for generations and thousands of years to come.

We have the evidence that the words moved men in the hour in which they were spoken.

The most obvious observations made about the phrases of Lincoln scattered over this blood-drenched field a century ago is their affinity with Holy Writ: "these honored dead," "the last full measure of devotion," "shall not have died in vain," "shall not perish from the earth."

I ask, with all the reverence I can bring to bear upon this humbly offered comparison, do not these words, in their rhythm, their sublime simplicity, their compactness, their ineffable music, the richness of their meaning, and their solace and dedication, have a kinship that is mystical and enduring with the most prayerful lines in Biblical literature: "Hallowed be Thy name," "give us this day our daily bread," "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" "deliver us from evil."

The inner meaning of both pieces of literature bring the loftiest emotions of the human soul into adjustment with the facts of our daily lives.

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

The highest aspirations to which man can reach touch hands with the needs of the moment: spiritual striving on the most idealistic scale wedded with what needs to be done in this hour of necessity and travail.

It is in this wise, it seems to me precisely, that the Lord's Prayer unites the kingdom of heaven with the hunger for one's daily bread.

Something of the immediacy of the impact of Lincoln's words on Lincoln's world, is conveyed in an article that appeared Monday morning, November 23, 1863, in the Daily Ohio State Journal, of Columbus.

Let me read you this revealing and moving literature. It appeared under the headline: "Dedication Day at Gettysburg."

It goes like this:

"Thursday, the 19th day of November, 1863, will long be remembered as the day when the President's calm but earnest utterance of this brief and beautiful address stirred the deepest fountains of feeling and emotion in the hearts of the vast throng before him; and when he had concluded, scarcely could an untearful eye be seen, while sobs of smothered emotion were heard on every hand. At our side stood a stout, stalwart officer, bearing the insignia of a captain's rank, the empty sleeve of his coat indicating that he had stood where death was revelling, and as the President, speaking of our Gettsyburg soldiers, uttered that beautifully touching sentence, so sublime and pregnant of meaning—'The world will little note, nor long remember what we here say, but it can never forget what they here did:'—the gallant soldier's feeling burst over all restraint; and burying his face in his handkerchief, he sobbed aloud while his manly frame shook with no unmanly emotion, and after a struggle to master his emotions, he lifted his still-streaming eyes to heaven, and in low and solemn tones exclaimed:

"'God Almighty bless Abraham Lincoln.' And to this spontaneous invocation a thousand hearts around him silently responded 'Amen.'"

There may be a touch of reportorial hyperbole in some of the nuances of this newspaper story.

Yet it is indicative of the effect of the War President's words on the reporter who heard them and on the audience that was on the spot.

I am much less concerned with the reporter's slightly inaccurate quotation than I am with the plainly stirring emotion that the short speech created and the feeling it elicited of love and veneration for the speaker.

Moreover this very love and this very veneration seems to be timeless and grips the hearts and souls of generations of Americans—and people the world over—in every climate, almost as much as it did those who stood beside the living President and in front of him a hundred years ago.

There were of course editorials that gave praise to the Lincoln utterance on this soil and there were the encomiums from the pulpit.

Phillips Brooks was easily among the greatest pulpit orators of his day.

On April 23, 1865 (8 days after Lincoln's death), in Phillips Brooks' sermon at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, Bishop Brooks left us a literary gem.

Speaking from the title, "The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln," this Protestant Episcopal bishop said in part:

"He (Lincoln) once stood on the battlefield of our own State, and said of the brave men who had saved it words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke.

"Let us stand in the country he has saved, and which is to be his grave and monument, and say of Abraham Lincoln what he said of the soldiers who had died at Gettysburg."

"He stood there with their graves before him, and these are the words he said—"

Here Phillips Brooks quoted the Gettysburg Address.

Then he added the hope and prayer: "May God make us worthy of the memory of Abraham Lincoln."

It seems to me there were few more proficient authorities on what were and what were not "words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke" than this enormously respected and famous clergyman—contemporary of Abraham Lincoln.

Then for me there is the subtle appeal and a most penetrating insight with literary beauty and some prophecy in the lines on Abraham Lincoln in "The Man of the People," by Edwin Markham. Markham was about 11 years old when the Gettysburg Address was delivered.

In fact, among the American poets he is one of the greatest.

We hear the prophecy and note great literature in: "His word were oaks in acorns;" "and his thoughts were roots that firmly gript the granite earth."

This, of course, is testifying in the compactly concentrated language of poetry to the immortality of Lincoln's speech.

"His words were oaks in acorns."

Still another poet, more our contemporary than Lincoln's, was James Oppenheim, who was inspired to write in this touching descriptive poem: "The Lincoln Child."

"And lo, as he grew ugly, gaunt,
And gnarled his way into a man,
What wisdom came to feed his want,
What worlds came near to let him scan.
And as he fathomed through and through
Our dark and sorry human scheme,
He knew what Shakespeare never knew,
What Dante never dared to dream—
That men are one
Beneath the sun,
And before God are equal souls—
This truth was his,
And this it is,
That round him such a glory rolls."

What Oppenheim makes poetically dramatic here is an element basic to the Lincoln character.

This element is the element of godliness, of spirituality as something separate from denominational religion.

The profound Biblical precept: "That men are one" permeates the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln.

(My, how that needs thinking on and response to today.)

It is embedded in Lincoln's character like the cornerstone of a great and magnificent piece of architecture.

We might ask, is it anywhere more manifest than in the Gettysburg Address?

It is clear to me that Lincoln never thought of the North and the South, or East and West, rather he thought of all sections as one Nation.

He found and tried to apply in his time the fundamental tenet that "all men are created equal."

And isn't this the very essence of the American dream?

Even here, at Gettysburg, where the two sections confronted each other on the level of the highest order of human drama, Lincoln still thought of one nation, and could not bring himself to deliver his funeral oration in honor of one part of the country and in derogation of the other.

For him, even in this high moment of intense crisis and antagonism, there were no soldiers of the Union and no soldiers of the Confederacy.

There were only just soldiers.

There was about this awful carnage only "the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here" not enemies and not antagonists.

The magnificent Carl Sandburg makes my point far better than I can make it.

Speaking before the joint session of Congress, February 12, 1959, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, Mr. Sandburg said:

"His words at Gettyburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

"We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living, and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add or detract."

Sandburg dramatically continues as he observes:

"He could have said 'the brave Union men.' Did he have a purpose in omitting the word 'Union'?

"Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation?

"Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there?

"We do not know, of a certainty.

"Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over their double grave, 'God knows which was right?' We do not know."

It can be said with some confidence that Lincoln is the most quoted of our Presidents, and he inspired more quotes and noble literature than any other President.

There are sublime passages in Lincoln that derive an immensely dramatic impact from the facts of his life and the majesty that accrues to his career from having been President.

The greatness and thoroughness that is Lincoln can be found in the Cooper Union speech.

Research, study and respect for history is evident in the capacity for clear reasoning which is shown in the debates with Douglas.

And they achieve a certain posture of validity and responsibility when he speaks as President of the United States.

In uttering the words in the first inaugural: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection." The greatest of our Presidents launched himself into the rarefied altitudes where only the world's immortals are to be found.

This is also evident in that greatest utterance of compassion to be found anywhere in the whole history of statesmanship and leadership: the Biblical paragraphs in the second inaugural.

The words "with malice toward none, with charity for all" are like some indestructible light leading into a new horizon for the whole of the human race.

The impact of these words—and the other in large part—would not have been so great had he not been the President of the United States, upon whose fabulously competent shoulders rested a burden almost beyond human endurance.

And it is this unearthly responsibility that gives his words a flame, a meaning, an immortality, that they might not otherwise have had.

For the drama of his life is inescapably intertwined with the grandeur of his words, and their transparently sincere, soul-searching, decency, and conviction, their unassailable logic.

They were simple words, of course, but that's only a fraction of their virtue for their simplicity was arrived at through immense complexities and confusion.

It is their clarity and their humanity which thrust whole shafts of light where there was only darkness and bedlam.

Shafts of light not only for the young Nation known as the United States of America in the middle of the 19th century but shafts of light that is dazzling today and will brighten the paths of men on their march to freedom to the end of time everywhere on this planet.

We here find abundant testimony to the admonition that it is our businesss as a nation and as individuals to make other men wise and better as we can find or make opportunity to do so.

Like him then let us try to find the right way, the right place and the right time to do what is right.

## The Assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, December 9, 1963*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the assassination of the President of the United States, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD newspaper and other articles which were published subsequent thereto:

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

### THIS WAS MR. KENNEDY'S THANKSGIVING MESSAGE

President Johnson yesterday urged that the late President Kennedy's November 5 Thanksgiving Day proclamation be read in houses of worship as a memorial tomorrow. He also asked the press to "make it available to all the American people." It follows:

"Over three centuries ago, our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts, far from home on a lonely wilderness, set aside a time of thanksgiving. On the appointed day, they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the love which bound them together and for the faith which united them with their God.

"So too when the colonies achieved their independence, our first President in the first year of his first administration proclaimed November 26, 1789, as 'a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of almighty God' and called upon the people of the new republic to 'beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions * * to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue * * * and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.'

"And so too, in the midst of America's tragic Civil War, President Lincoln proclaimed the last Thursday of November 1863 as the day to renew our gratitude for America's fruitful fields, for our national strength and vigor, and for all our singular deliverances and blessings.

"Much time has passed since the first colonists came to rocky shores and dark forests of an unknown continent, much time since President Washington led a young people into the experience of nationhood, much time since President Lincoln saw the American Nation through the ordeal of fraternal war—and in these years our population, our plenty, and our power have all grown apace. Today we are a nation of nearly 200 million souls stretching from coast to coast, on into the Pacific and north toward the Arctic, a nation enjoying the fruits of an ever-expanding agriculture and industry and achieving standards of living unknown in previous history. We give our humble thanks for this.

"Yet, as our power has grown, so has our peril. Today we give our thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and the humility, which they possessed and which we must seek every day to emulate. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them.

"Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world.

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of the Congress approved December 26, 1941, designating the fourth Thursday in November in each year as Thanksgiving Day, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 28, 1963, as a day of national thanksgiving.

"On that day let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and nations, and of ending misery and suffering, wherever they exist."

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register, Dec. 8, 1963]

### DALLAS PRIEST RELIVES PRESIDENT'S FINAL HOURS—FATHER HUBER POINTS TO OUTBURST OF LOVE IN CITY WHERE J.F.K. DIED

(By Very Rev. Oscar L. Huber, C.M.)

The great day set for the visit of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, had arrived. Dallas had worked feverishly to make this the most enthusiastic welcome ever to be given a President of the United States. On TV at 11:35 a.m., I saw his arrival at Love Field and heard the enthusiastic welcome given him. Then I walked down to Lemmon and Regan Streets, about three blocks from Holy Trinity Church, to await the motorcade that would bring the President along the planned route that would end at the Dallas Trade Mart, where a sumptuous luncheon and a spendidly arranged program were to highlight his visit.

There both sides of the street were lined with people eagerly awaiting the President—there also were the children of Holy Trinity school, their teachers, the Daughters of Charity, and lay teachers. Soon the car carrying the members of the Presidential party passed by. The President and Mrs. Kennedy were waving and smiling to everyone and these gestures of good will were enthusiastically returned by the happy onlookers along the way. It was a thrilling moment for me as I had never before seen a President of the United States.

I returned to the rectory—ate a brief lunch—had just finished when Father [James N.] Thompson, C.M., one of my assistants, who had finished his lunch previously and was watching the motorcade on TV—came to the refectory and announced that the President had been shot. We went to the recreation room where we heard, over TV, the President had been taken to Parkland Hospital—this hospital is within the confines of Holy Trinity parish. Within a short time we were on our way to the hospital. Shortly after we left the rectory, a telephone call came from someone at Parkland saying Mrs. Kennedy was requesting a priest to administer to the spiritual needs of the President. Within 10 or 15 minutes we were at the hospital. Father Thompson parked the car while I was escorted by a policeman to an emergency room where I found the fatally wounded President lying on a portable table. He was covered with a sheet that I removed from over his forehead before administering the last rights of the church.

Because of the President's condition, I administered conditionally the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, followed by the Apostolic Blessing. After this I recited for the President, from the ritual, prayers for the dying and for the repose of his soul, to which was added: "Eternal rest grant unto him, O, Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace. Amen."

During these ceremonies, Mrs. Kennedy was standing beside the President. She and others in the emergency room answered the prayers with which they were familiar. Mrs. Kennedy bent and seemed to kiss the President and then, I believe, placed on his finger her wedding ring. This, I have been told, signifies: "Together in life, together in death." Soon after this, followed by Mrs. Kennedy, and others who were present, I walked from the emergency room to the adjoining corridor. Sorrow and consternation bowed the heads of everyone present. The silence that pervaded the corridor was mute evidence that another President of the United States died at the hand of an assassin. Yes, it was evident—the President was dead.

During this most trying ordeal, the perfect composure maintained by Mrs. Kennedy was beyond comprehension. I will never forget the blank stare in her eyes and the signs of agony on her face. I extended my heartfelt sympathy and that of my parishioners to her. In a low tone of voice she thanked me graciously and asked me to pray for the President. I assured her I would do so. Shortly after this Father Thompson and I returned to Holy Trinity rectory.

At 5:30 the same afternoon of his death, I offered a Requiem Mass for the repose of the President's soul. Sunday morning at 9:30 a Requiem High Mass was offered for the President. On Monday, the National Day of Mourning, a Requiem High Mass was offered at 8:45 with Holy Trinity schoolchildren in attendance. In the evening at 5:30, a Solemn Requiem Mass was offered in the presence of an overflowing crowd.

I believe that in every place of worship in Dallas, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, services, attended by unprecedented crowds, were held for the President on the National Day of Mourning. To me this was a marvelous expression of love, devotion, and deep-seated respect for the President of the United States. The fantastic interest of the people shown by the meticulous preparations made for the visit of the President, merits for them a lasting place in the hall of loyalty. A striking demonstration of sorrow can be seen by the great number of wreaths that decorate the spot where the President was assassinated.

The people of Dallas, along with the whole world, deeply mourn the loss of our President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. May God grant him eternal rest. Likewise, may God lead the new President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, safely along the arduous paths that lie ahead of him.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Overwhelming Tragedy: Assassin's Bullet Claims President

What can be said that would pass as adequate comment on the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination?

So overwhelming is the impact of his slaying at Dallas that full realization of what the assassin's bullet wrought cannot be expected to be grasped immediately.

But shock, rejection of the deed, grief, and a sense of shame that this sort of thing happens in the United States today are reactions shared by everyone—and properly so.

The people of this Nation recoil from acts of violence. Their disapproval of such methods as a means to eliminate an official from office is paramount to any feeling they may have about the official's policies.

We grieve that John F. Kennedy has joined the ranks of the martyred Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley.

In so doing, he gave his life for what he believed.

And such strength of conviction must be respected, even by those whose beliefs may differ in great degree and whose convictions are also unwavering.

Mr. Kennedy injected into the Presidency a winning type of personal diplomacy that comprised a new formula for solidifying Western relations on the grassroots level.

The young and dynamic head of an attractive young family, the Chief Executive brought to the White House a vitality and an atmosphere of family life that hadn't been known there since the dawning years of the 20th century.

And he died as surely in the service of his country as had he fallen in military service. All but those whose gnawing rancor has overpowered Judeo-Christian ethic will say as much.

Out of this senseless bloodshed comes a burning truth which Americans cannot escape: Hate breeds more hate and, unstemmed, it and blood spill over into the streets.

For President Lyndon B. Johnson, the position suddenly thrust upon him is necessarily even more complex than it was for his predecessor. May the prayers of a nation, brought together by bonds of sympathy, rest with him as they rest with the family of the late President.

The scar of yesterday's tragedy can never be erased but Americans of good will can see to it that American principle is again enshrined.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A President Dead—All Must Suffer

A few rifle shots rang out near a Dallas underpass around midday Friday. But the sound moved 'round the world with the impact of a nuclear bomb.

The President of the United States had been assassinated. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead.

With the suddenness of the rifle shots, 200 million people were immersed in a great sorrow. At home and almost equally abroad, people were engulfed in perplexity. Who would want upon him the blood of John Kennedy, kindly man, humanitarian; the blood of a President and statesman, the most influential spokesman for the Western World? A crime so useless, so futile, so destructive to the peace of mind of countless millions—how could a thing like that happen in a country like the United States?

But after all, there's no real mystery. For among humankind there are always men of imbalance, of twisted mind, warped concepts and strange causes, some with a deep and ugly malice toward their fellow beings. Often their hate centers upon those in high places. This time the target was President Kennedy, just as thrice before Presidents of the United States had died upon the evil impulses of such assassins.

People everywhere shiver and grieve at the President's death. It is a very personal loss for most, as well as the loss of a leader. While the Nation mourns, the greatest grief, as always, overwhelms the President's family, whose members all of us wish we could console.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as President a couple of hours after the tragedy Friday. How the change will affect the affairs of State or U.S. policies abroad, one can only surmise. History tells us that the jitters will wear off soon and orderly processes will resume.

Meantime, the horror of Friday, November 22, 1963, holds the Nation in a vise that will not loosen immediately—not in these troubled days when we suffer for the crime that has been perpetrated among us.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A Day of Mourning

A national day of mourning proclaimed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, coincident with formal funeral services in Washington for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will find citizens of the United States somewhat recovered and ready to pay their respects today in a thousand ways to the memory of a dynamic Chief Executive brought to untimely end.

In his successor, they have a man qualified by long years of active dealing with the affairs of the country in legislative halls at Washington; the personal choice of the late President for second position in the executive branch; a Vice President who, thanks to the enlightened policy instituted by Mr. Eisenhower, and its adoption by Mr. Kennedy, became so conversant with affairs of state and world conditions that he can take the reins with far greater assurance than ordinarily would be the case.

But as if to pile outrage on outrage and shock on shock, an assassin came forward on the Sabbath to murder the alleged assassin of Mr. Kennedy, depriving the law of its proper course. The same police department that so promptly corralled the prime suspect and with other enforcement agencies built a circumstantial case that at least saved the Nation from a period of uncertainties, wild accusations and unfounded suspicions: The same police failed somehow to shield it and its prisoner from a second unforgivable crime.

The accused individual never admitted guilt. If this was brutality against brutality, coldbloodedness against coldbloodedness, stupidity against stupidity, with no more chance given one victim than another, it nevertheless grievously affronted justice; and it may very well have circumvented it, in that otherwise the full truth of the primary crime might more readily be established.

Needless to say, pursuit of all facts and possibilities remains imperative in this connection, as it does with regard to the second slaying. Judgments, meanwhile, must remain in suspense.

New Orleans is as unhappy to be associated in nativity with the late suspect as Dallas is to have been the scene of tragedy; as our new President must be, that it occurred in his own State. But there is, of course, nothing but unhappiness connected with the entire, ghastly event. The wound that was fatal to John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a wounding of the sensibility of all Americans, wedded to the principle of a Chief Executive serving and representing all the people, and thus identified with his safety and security. The wound fatal to his alleged killer scars another foundation of our common faith. There was far too much to mourn as it was.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 26, 1963]

### Kennedy's Speeches Put Him Among Handful of Presidents

During the dramatic unfolding of the great tragedy in which the American people have shared, one of the commentators observed that John F. Kennedy was the most articulate President since Abraham Lincoln.

He overlooked, to be true, Woodrow Wilson, a profound scholar, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a fluent phrasemaker, but he was on solid ground.

For John F. Kennedy indeed brought intellectual brilliance, wide knowledge, and sound scholarship to the White House, as was often noted.

Carl Sandburg, the poet and biographer of Lincoln, expressed it beautifully and ably in a foreword to a collection of President Kennedy's speeches, published in 1962 under the title, "To Turn the Tide." Said Sandburg:

"Not often has a President of our country had, besides content and substance to his speeches, the further merit of style as such. We recur to Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts, and we are near the end of the list. In the opinion of many, Kennedy belongs among those always having good solid content, often color and cadence in style, and there are moments in the cause of human freedom when his words move with a measured passion."

A few quotations from John F. Kennedy's early speeches in office may remind us that his words did indeed "move with a measured passion."

Eleven days before assuming, as he called it, "that high and lonely office," President-elect Kennedy addressed the Legislature of his native Massachusetts and pledged to characterize his administration with "courage, judgment, integrity, dedication."

The courage of which he spoke was "to stand up to one's enemies, and * * * to stand up, when necessary, to one's associates, the courage to resist public pressure as well as private greed." His idea of judgment concerned, "the future as well as the past * * * our own mistakes as well as the mistakes of others, with enough wisdom to know what we did not know, and enough candor to admit it." His concept of integrity envisaged "men who never ran out on either the principles in which we believed or the people, who believed in us, men whom neither financial gain nor political ambition could ever divert from the fulfillment of our sacred trust." Dedication consisted of "an honor mortgaged to no single individual or group, and compromised by no private obligation or aim, but devoted solely to serving the public good and the national interest."

In President Kennedy's inaugural address, undoubtedly one of the great inaugural speeches, he reaffirmed the faith of the Founding Fathers "that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

And then President Kennedy directed his words across the Iron Curtain and there could be no doubt in friendly chancelleries as well as in the Kremlin as to what they meant:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

He called for an end to the deadly atomic race "to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war." He called for "a beachhead of cooperation" to "push back the jungle of suspicion." He urged: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate." And the keynote of his speech is as valid today as it was yesterday and will be for endless tomorrows:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

In the light of events, this is a call for all factions in American life to rally behind the successor of John F. Kennedy—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

### PRESIDENT'S SLAYING THROWS PALL OVER 61ST TULANE-LSU GAME

The senseless, brutal killing of President Kennedy cast a pall over the 61st football game between Tulane and LSU.

As far as I'm concerned, the game should have been postponed until next Saturday. Apparently close to 10,000 ticket holders felt the same way, for although 64,000 seats were sold for the game, the attendance was estimated at 55,000 over the loudspeaker. I'd like to bet it didn't exceed 50,000. Threatening weather may have kept some at home, but the likelihood is that they didn't have any stomach for football in such a moment of national tragedy.

And for those who were there—or so it seemed to me, because that's how I felt—it was just another football game, not the Tulane-LSU game.

One may rationalize until he's blue in the face that the late John F. Kennedy, himself, a lover of sports, would have wanted the game to go on. Most of the other, but not all, self-respecting universities in the country didn't feel that way and why Tulane and LSU chose not to line up with the vast majority of these schools is anybody's guess.

I said it was just another game. As a Tulane fan, who hasn't seen his team beat LSU since 1948, it really didn't make much difference how it came out. As Tulane lost again, 20 to 0, I found little or no cause to grieve in the face of national grief. What is a lost game when we've lost a President? Had Tulane pulled the virtually impossible, an upset, I doubt if the long denied victory would have brought any feeling of exaltation to me. Does one, can one, feel personal joy while experiencing the impact of an unbelievable national catastrophe?

Normally, I would have devoted this space to the Tulane-LSU game. I will stop here after saying that LSU was a bigger and better and faster team than Tulane and demonstrated it ably and that Tulane, although outmatched, was not outclassed nor outfought.

News of President Kennedy's death came over my car radio Friday as I was driving up to Baton Rouge for a meeting. As the airport slipped by, the first flash came and then, mile by mile, the dreadful story unfolded. Everyone to whom I spoke at Baton Rouge or when I got home had the same reaction. This was a monstrous thing, cruel to a nation, and to a family. And anyone with an honest heart, whether he be pro-Kennedy or anti-Kennedy, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, must have done some soul searching since the fatal shots were fired.

There are those who hated John F. Kennedy with a blind hatred, because they opposed his policies. Can't one have an honest opposition without hatred and venom?

There are those who encouraged disrespect for the law because they didn't like the law any more than they liked Kennedy.

On the other hand, there are those who idolized Kennedy and were perhaps as blind in their idolatry as the Kennedy haters were blind in their hatred.

But the true stature of the man who was the youngest elected President of the United States is shown by the worldwide shock and dismay over the news of his assassination and by the glowing tributes of world leaders, most of whom had flown into Washington for today's funeral.

The consequences of an irresponsible, cruel act—the aim of a gun, the pressure of a trigger finger—were far reaching, for not only a nation, but the free world mourns. And, more intimately, three families have been shattered by the gunfire by Lee Harvey Oswald.

First it was the Kennedy family—suddenly bereft of a son, a husband, and a father.

Then, when Oswald was trying to get away, he killed Policeman Tippit, bringing shattering grief to the officer's family.

And when Jack Ruby killed Oswald in a bizarre development in this tragic story, he brought extra grief to the already grief stricken mother, wife, and children of the President's assassin.

From Oswald's initial shot stemmed a chain of grief which circled the world, starting from the Kennedy family and ending with his own.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

### TODAY AND TOMORROW: MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then resolve.

The American future depends upon it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, as outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who assaulted Lyndon Johnson and Adlai Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much searching of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing arts of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government, with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

---

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

### KENNEDY SLUMPED OVER AND SAID NOTHING: CONNALLY DESCRIBES ASSASSINATION: "FROM GREAT JOY TO GREAT TRAGEDY"

DALLAS, November 27.—Texas Gov. John Connally, wounded during the assassination of President Kennedy, said today that after being shot the President "slumped over and said nothing."

"As I turned to the left, I was hit. I knew I was hit badly. I said, 'My God, they are going to kill us all.' "

"Then there was a third shot and the President was hit again. Mrs. Kennedy said 'Oh, my God. They killed my husband. Jack, Jack.'

"In the space of a few seconds, great joy and anticipation was turned to great tragedy."

Connally, in an interview from his hospital bed—the first since he was shot while riding with Mr. Kennedy last Friday—said he has had many thoughts since the tragedy and one of the most important was why Mr. Kennedy's life was taken and his was spared.

Connally recalled:

"It was a great morning. The crowds were great in Fort Worth. There were huge throngs in Dallas.

"Dallas was real warm, real understanding, and real appreciative.

"The ovation for Kennedy was tremendous.

"The President and his wife both remarked about how warm it was.

"Not 30 seconds before the President was shot, Nellie (Mrs. Connally) had said to the President that no one could say that Dallas did not love and appreciate him.

"Kennedy answered her, 'You sure can't'."

Then Connally described the actual shooting.

Connally said he did not think the assassin was after him only.

"The man did what he intended to do—he shot both of us," the Governor added.

Connally said that perhaps the President, through his death, was asked to do something that is hard to do in life, and that is:

"To shock and stun a nation and its people and the world to what is happening to us through this cancerous growth of extremism."

"This is the only answer I can give you on why he is gone and I am not," he added.

He said the world should avoid the type of extremism that breeds hatred.

"The genesis of our self-destruction—if we are going to be destroyed—comes from this extremism," he added.

Connally wept and dried his eyes with a towel during a pause in the interview, the first portion of which lasted 5 minutes.

### NOT TOLD OF DEATH

The Governor said he was not told that the President was dead until Saturday, the day after the assassination.

"But it was no news, I was almost sure he would be after those two shots."

"My first conscious thoughts were, 'My God, what a horrible tragedy in a space of a few minutes.' It makes you ponder and wonder if you are making the contribution you should make to society because you never know when a thing like this can happen."

Connally said a monument should be built to President Kennedy, "but I hope that the people build not in the sense of absolving themselves. The monument should be through patience, tolerance, knowledge, human understanding, and dignity."

The Governor said he had been very close to the new President, Lyndon Johnson, serving with him in the Navy during World War II.

"I thought how ironic it was that the man who defeated him (for the Democratic nomination) named me Secretary of the Navy and on the day of the tragedy Johnson became President of the United States."

Asked to give his opinion of President Johnson, Connally said he was a person "of many complexities."

He said that President Johnson had a great understanding of human nature, was a man of his convictions and was forever working for perfection.

"No man ever assumed office better equipped to carry out the duties of the Office of President."

Connally said Mr. Johnson was born of hard times and his days of school were arduous.

"But he walked with many people of many nationalities and he understands the heartbeat of this Nation as no other man in this position has," Connally said.

### NEWSMEN SEARCHED

Connally's interview late this afternoon in Parkland Hospital was conducted by Martin Agronsky of the National Broadcasting Co., picked by Connally as a pool reporter. Other reporters watched the interview on a closed television circuit as a part of the interview plan.

Prior to the actual news conference two still photographers and one silent movie cameraman were allowed in Connally's room. Newsmen were checked thoroughly and searched before being allowed near the door.

"We were asked not to reveal the location of the bed in the room or the other security measures that had been taken," a photographer said.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

## No Time for Collective Guilt

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole Nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Any one who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been broad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

## Sociologists Doubt Dallas Killings Indicate National Moral Slump—But They Warn That Economic Tension, Family Trouble Stir Increase in Violence by a Few

(By Herbert G. Lawson)

A crowd outside the Dallas city jail cheers the news that Lee Harvey Oswald, accused slayer of the President, has been fatally shot. A Sioux City, Iowa, man stabs his stepfather to death in an argument over the late President. A Negro on a Staten Island, N.Y., bus accuses a white passenger of being a party to the Presidential assassination, and a fight is narrowly averted.

For 4 days the Nation has witnessed violence that has appeared almost incredible. Countless Americans are asking themselves how this explosive impulse arises and whether the entire public perhaps must shoulder the burden of guilt.

Sociologists and other students of behavior offer some tentative answers. They argue that such violence is not part of our fundamental character. But they warn that pressures in American life have generated an increase in violent crime by the demented and the dispossessed.

"Crimes of violence have been increasing in the last 4 or 5 years," says Gresham Sykes, executive officer of the American Sociological Association and former head of the sociology department at Dartmouth College. "It seems to spring from a derangement of the family. A person like Jack Ruby (Oswald's accused killer) is more likely to come forward to commit such an act in our society."

### MORE ASSAULT CASES

Federal Bureau of Investigation figures confirm the recent increase in violent crime. Ironically, murders last year declined 2 percent from the 1958–60 average. But all reported crimes rose four times as fast as population in the past 5 years. Aggravated assault cases last year soared 14 percent above the 1958–60 average, while forcible robbery climbed 17 percent.

But the prevalence of violent crime, including the tragedies of recent days, is not a sign that violence is a national trait, according to Richard James, a New York psychologist. "The average citizen couldn't do these things," he says. "The whole tenor of the country's reaction has been admirable. A friend of mine at the United Nations pointed out that in almost any other country in the world such an assassination would be followed by riots and civil disturbance."

Others note that the United States is not the only nation where violence or the threat of it is directed against the head of state. Following the Kennedy murder, Swedish Premier Tage Erlander was threatened with death by an anonymous caller, and special security guards were posted. French President Charles de Gaulle has been a target for assassins' bullets.

### HIGH MURDER RATE

But a critical look at American society would have to concede that destructive impulses are widespread. Murder rates are several times higher in this country than in most, if not all, other industrial nations.

Even while dismissing the likelihood of a basic streak of violence in the national character, the experts concede the high U.S. murder rate may be due, to some extent, to habits of thought and action that have their roots deep in American history.

"We have a frontier tradition in which there is a tendency to take the law into our own hands," notes Lewis A. Coser, professor of sociology and an expert on homicide at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

The funeral of William McKinley, 25th President and victim of an anarchist's bullet in 1901, provides evidence that such a vigilante attitude has long existed. According to one account of the funeral, the minister presiding at the Washington services said that if he "had been present at the shooting he would have provided the leadership the crowd needed for an on-the-spot hanging." Actually, the assassin, Leon Czolgosz, was tried, convicted, and electrocuted by New York State.

But sociologists who have studied the urges that have led to violent crimes say other factors are more important than the vigilante tradition. One clear-cut conclusion of their investigations is that geography, economic status, and the quality of law enforcement locally have much to do with crime rates.

For instance, the murder rate is nearly eight times as high in the South as in New England, notes Mr. Coser. Homicide is far more frequent among people at the bottom of the economic ladder. Negroes have the highest rate.

Cities vary greatly in their crime rates, suggesting that the quality of police action has considerable importance. Milwaukee has only about 5 percent as many robberies as Chicago and fewer than one-tenth as many assaults, on a per capita basis. Dallas ranks well down the list of per capita crime rates among the 20 largest U.S. cities. It is sixteenth in robberies and eleventh in assaults, according to FBI figures.

Mr Sykes of the sociological association suggests that the rise in violent crimes in the past few years "springs from derangement of the family." He cites trends to increased urbanization, crowded housing, and the absence of strong father figures in many lower-class families, which means that children often obtain their values on the street rather than in the home.

The loud and often violent propaganda of some fringe groups, such as racists in the South, may trigger violence, he says. "Anything that declares the world is divided into the 'goods' and the 'bads' can lead to violence," observes Mr. Sykes. In juvenile gangs and among some racist groups, he says, the tendency is to excuse violence against outsiders.

Was Lee Harvey Oswald a victim of family pressures that turned him against all society? Did the message of a "hate group" turn his inward frustration into violent action? The answer is unclear. "The unfortunate thing about this is that we'll never understand Oswald as an individual," says Mr. James.

---

[From the Clarion Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

### The Last Full Measure

"Every day is a good day to be born and every day is a good day to die."

With serene faith, Pope John XXIII accepted the illness that on June 3 of this year terminated his brief but brilliant term as Supreme Pontiff.

His words are a consolation as all mourn the tragic death of another world leader on November 22—John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

It is a consolation sadly needed, for, humanly speaking, the passing of President Kennedy seems far more untimely.

The Holy Father died at 82. In his short reign he achieved a greatness that few men in history have reached in decades. In his "Pacem in Terris," completed not long before his death, he left a heritage of hope for world brotherhood and peace. In his convoking of the Second Vatican Council he challenged not only the church but the world to a renewal of faith, to a refashioning of spiritual forces to meet the needs of a world in turmoil, to a uniting of all men in the brotherhood of Christ and the fatherhood of God.

President Kennedy died of an assassin's bullet at 46. He achieved greatness in the service of his country as a naval officer in World War II, followed by distinguished performance as U.S. Representative and Senator, and by truly notable service as President and world leader. Yet his work had only begun. As experience ripened into greater wisdom his native gifts of intelligence, courage, and leadership, how much more could he have wrought for America and for the world.

Upon the strong shoulders of Pope Paul VI fell the mantle of Pope John. Ably has he carried on the mission of the church and especially the concern to complete the ecumenical council.

To Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson are committed the responsibilities of Mr. Kennedy. With his training and experience there is no doubt that President Johnson will prove an able leader. But Kennedy's genius will be sorely missed, particularly in the struggle to make completely effective the American democratic ideal of full equality for all.

This struggle began a century ago with the efforts of another President, Abraham Lincoln, who also was prevented from completing his mission by an assassin's bullet. Just 100 years ago this month Lincoln made his immortal address at Gettysburg, concluding with this charge to the Nation:

"It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The "last full measure of devotion" given to America by these two great Presidents today is a charge upon the conscience of all Americans that they shall not have died in vain.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star. Nov. 29, 1963]

### Text of Message—End Hatred, Johnson Asks

(Note—Following is the text of President Johnson's personal Thanksgiving Day message to the American people, delivered over nationwide television and radio networks.)

My fellow Americans, on yesterday, I went before the Congress to speak for the first time as President of the United States.

Tonight, on this Thanksgiving, I come before you to ask your help, to ask your strength, to ask your prayers that God may guard this Republic and guide my every labor.

All of us have lived through 7 days that none of us will ever forget. We are not given the divine wisdom to answer why this has been, but we are given the human duty of determining what is to be, what is to be for America, for the world, for the cause we lead, for all the hopes that live in our hearts.

A great leader is dead; a great Nation must move on. Yesterday is not ours to recover, but tomorrow is ours to win or to lose. I am resolved that we shall win the tomorrows before us. So I ask you to join me in that resolve, determined that from this midnight of tragedy, we shall move toward a new American greatness.

More than any generation before us, we have cause to be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day. Our harvests are bountiful, our factories flourish, our homes are safe, our defenses are secure.

We live in peace. The good will of the world pours out for us, but more than these blessings, we know tonight that our system is strong, strong and secure. A deed that was meant to tear us apart has bound us together. Our system has passed. You have passed a great test. You have shown what John F. Kennedy called upon us to show in his proclamation of this Thanksgiving: That decency of purpose, that steadfastness of resolve, and that strength of will which we inherit from our forefathers.

What better conveys what is best for America than this. On Saturday when these great burdens had been mine only hours, the first two citizens to call upon and to offer their whole support were Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman.

Since last Friday, Americans have turned to the good, to the decent values of our life. These have served us. Yes; these have saved us. The service of our public institution and our public men is the salvation of us all from the Supreme Court to the States. And how much better it would be, how much more sane it would be, and how much more decent and American it would be if all Americans could spend their fortunes and could give their time and spend their energies helping our system and its servants to solve your problems instead of pouring out the venom and the hate that stalemate us in progress.

I have served in Washington 32 years—32 years yesterday. I have seen five Presidents fill this awesome office. I have known them well and I have counted them all as friends: President Herbert Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, President Harry Truman, President Dwight Eisenhower, and President John Kennedy.

In each administration, the greatest burden that the President had to bear has been the burden of his own countrymen's unthinking and unreasoning hate and division. So in these days, the fate of this office is the fate of us all. I would ask all Americans on this day of prayer and reverence to think on these things. Let all who speak and all who teach and all who preach and all who publish and all who broadcast and all who read or listen—let them reflect upon their responsibilities to bind our wounds, to heal our sores, to make our society well and whole for the tasks ahead of us. It is this work that I most want us to do, to banish rancor from our words and malice from our hearts, to close down the poison spring of hatred and intolerance and fanaticism; to protect our unity North and South, East and West; to hasten the day when bias of race, religion and region is no more; and to make the day when our great energies and decencies and spirit will be free of the burdens that we have borne too long.

Our view is outward. Our thrust is forward, but we remember in our hearts this brave young man who lives in honored eternal rest across the Potomac. We remember him; we remember his wonderful and courageous widow that we all love. We remember Caroline and John and all the great family who gave the Nation this son and brother.

And to honor his memory and the future of the works he started, I have today determined that Station No. 1 of the Atlantic Missile Range and a NASA Launch Operation Center in Florida shall hereafter be known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

I have also acted today with the understanding and the support of my friend, the Governor of Florida, Farris Bryant, to change the name of Cape Canaveral. It shall be known hereafter as Cape Kennedy.

On this Thanksgiving Day, as we gather in the warmth of our families, in the mutual love and respect that we have for one another, and as we bow our heads in submission to Divine Providence, let us also thank God for the years that He gave us inspiration through His servant, John F. Kennedy.

Let us today renew our dedication to the ideals that are American. Let us pray for His divine wisdom in banishing from our land any injustice or intolerance or oppression to any of our fellow Americans whatever their opinion, whatever the color of their skins—for God made all of us, not some of us, in His image. All of us, not just some of us, are His children.

And, finally, to you as your President, I ask that you remember your country and remember me each day in your prayers, and I pledge to you the best within me to work for a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind.

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 30, 1963]

### Bishop Scores Hate Climate—Calls on Americans To Recognize Guilt

The Episcopal bishop of Louisiana called upon Americans to recognize their guilt Friday night at a service of prayer and meditation occasioned by the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Right Reverend Girault M. Jones told worshipers at the Church House on St. Charles Avenue, "We have so completely forsaken the Biblical precepts of charity and of brotherhood that what was once a close-knit society is coming apart at the seams."

"We know that hatred leads to violence, and yet we have been willing to risk such consequences. We have identified political policies with one man, we have personalized worldwide social unrest by this man's image, we have shared in gossip, in offcolor jokes, and in deliberate misrepresentation * * * all in such a way as to plant the seeds of personal hatred, and to nurse them into flower," Bishop Jones said.

"America has created a climate of suspicion and of hatred in which no man is permitted to be himself," he told worshippers at the service, held by the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches and the New Orleans Ministerial Union.

Stating the "American way of life" cannot "stand the test of world scrutiny," Bishop Jones continued, "and now we must admit what can happen in the Congo, or in the Dominican Republic, or in Vietnam * * * can also happen here."

"This is a tragic day. We grieve the loss of a President, and we would honor his memory. We grieve for his family, and we would offer sympathy. We grieve for this Nation, and indeed for the world, and would pray that out of this shocking experience, God will recall us to Himself," the bishop concluded.

Other clergymen who participated in the service were the Reverend Dr. G. Avery Lee, pastor of St. Charles Avenue Baptist Church; the Reverend Dr. Alex W. Hunter, minister of the First Presbyterian Church; the Reverend Herbert L. Polinard, minister of the St. Charles Avenue Christian Church, and the Reverend George Wilson, executive secretary of the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches.

The Reverend W. K. Sisk, Jr., minister of the Elysian Fields Baptist Church, presided.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 1, 1963]

### Assassination Plus Society Also Suffered Two Great Wounds

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Everyone who has spoken and written about the misshapen events that have engulfed us—assassination and then murder on top of assassination—have avowed and prayed and predicted that, as a people and as a nation, we would emerge from the shock and shame of these events a better people and a better nation.

I believe this will prove to be true. But neither words of wrath nor words of expiation nor words pious and wishful thinking will make it so. Words will do little and words without deeds will do nothing.

Jesus taught that man must be judged by his fruits, not by his protestations. And Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, after commending us to think on whatsoever things are pure and honest and just and of good report, instantly added the higher command:

"These things, which ye have both learned and received, and heard, and seen in Me, do, and the God of peace shall be with you." (Philippians 4: 9)

If we are to learn some good from these horrible events, we must fix clearly in mind the exact wounds that have been inflicted upon our society and upon our Nation.

The murder of the President is grievous enough. But great wounds were inflicted upon our whole democracy.

1. The assassin's bullet struck from the hands of the 68,836,385 citizens who went to the polls in 1960 their precious right to have a President of their own choosing and an administration by the consent of the administered.

2. The murderer's bullet struck from the hands of the accused assassin the most precious guarantee of a free society, an open trial in open court by a jury of his peers.

These are two grievous wounds to the fiber and fabric of what most Americans cherish as the pillars of our social compact: a knife wound at our process of democracy, a knife wound at the process of justice.

After Jack Ruby shot Lee Harvey Oswald as he was surrounded by Dallas police in the basement of the city jail, you no doubt listened to the many interviews in the street which television recorded. Not a few of them expressed their praise and pleasure at the murder of the accused assassin. In almost the same words, each said, "I believe in an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; I'm glad he got it."

Are they, when they think it over? Our criminal law is based, in part, on the Old Testament moral law of an eye for an eye, the doctrine that punishment must fit the crime. But who shall determine the guilty? An enemy, an avenger, a crackpot—or a court of law? Ruby acted to sentence Oswald before he was tried—and the American social compact was torn asunder as it has been torn too often in recent years.

I believe that the point of beginning is to be a little less sure that we alone are right and that those who disagree are automatically wrong. I share the view that the words and actions of the extremist right and the extremist left have sown seeds of hatred and violence in the land. But even here I would draw with great care the lessons from the acts of hideousness we have recently experienced.

There is no evidence that the assassination was the act of a racist. There is no evidence that the assassin was influenced to commit his act by the seeds of hatred which extreme racists have sown and which have come to fruition in the murder of Medgar Evers and the Negro schoolchildren in Birmingham.

We don't know what went on in Oswald's twisted mind and, because Ruby took the law in his hands, we never will know.

But we do know that the words of President Johnson need to be taken to heart by all of us: "Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

Why shouldn't we?

---

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

### The President

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, and the Nation mourns him. Yesterday's first shock of horror gives way this morning to a depth of sorrow beyond expression. We can at this moment only look back briefly, and try to look forward briefly, and look into our own hearts as individuals and as a people.

President Kennedy loved the life that has been taken from him. That is what we think of first, remembering him. The pictures that come back are the lively ones: the candidate fighting with a kind of cheerful ferocity for the great office in the performance of whose duties he died; the President laughing, sailing, throwing himself into a speech, joking with his children, reveling in a world full of things to see and hear and think about and above all, do. Life and color and, to use his favorite word, vigor, went with him everywhere. He was greatly endowed by fortune and, unlike many men so endowed, knew it. Complaint and repining were no part of him. Lethargy was no part of him. This quality of vividness, which captivated first the country and then much of the world, makes it seem all the more incredible that he should have been struck down, at the peak of his abilities, gone at an age when most men of his stature are still but on their way toward high achievement.

His death is a tragedy with many facets. The country's first thoughts go to his family, his gentle wife and his young children, only just old enough to understand that their father and companion is gone; his close-knit band of brothers and sisters, his parents, who now lose a third child dead too young. That for all of us is the personal aspect: in loss, all mankind is kin.

There is the tragedy too of great tasks unfinished, of the plow stopped part way down the furrow, the house left standing in framework, the story checked midsentence. No one now can say what Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments would have been had he lived. We do know that he was a strong man in a crisis, and the graver the crisis the stronger the man. Berlin in 1961 and Cuba last year are the memorable examples, written forever in our history: at those breathless moments President Kennedy held the Nation's fate in his hands, and the hands were firm. We do know that in shocking national failure, as with the Bay of Pigs, Mr. Kennedy could take upon himself the full burden of responsibility. We do know that he left his country stronger in the world

**than he had found it, and more confident of its destiny. We do know that when internal discord arose to threaten our tranquillity, because of wrongs left too long unrighted, he faced the issue gravely, squarely, and honestly, leading the country in another crisis, a crisis this time of the national conscience. Thus the record so far. What the rest might have been we shall never know.**

**Regret for a life's work cruelly cut off, and honor at the way Mr. Kennedy died, and grief over personal loss, are not enough. We must resolve as a nation that the story in which Mr. Kennedy was for all too short a time the chief actor shall continue, and grow brighter and more honorable, until the blots of bitterness and hatred no longer stain its pages.**

**The Government of the United States continues; that Government of which a President is at once master and servant. Any one man's passing is, in the long life of this democracy, but a missed heartbeat. Mr. Kennedy, who had looked death in the face oftener than most, who was a scholar of the Constitution and a pragmatic politician, knew that as well as anyone. To every President the existence of the Vice Presidency is a constant reminder of the continuity of the Republic, though men are mortal. It must have crossed Mr. Kennedy's mind, from that moment more than 3 years ago when he asked Lyndon Johnson to run for office with him, that his old Senate colleague, his political rival and friend, might through an accident of history be his successor.**

**Upon President Johnson now falls this weight of office. Only one other man in the United States knows how heavy the mantle is when it falls suddenly upon the shoulders. Harry Truman, in 1945, spoke for Lyndon Johnson today when he asked his hearers, if they ever prayed, to pray for him now.**

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

### KENNEDY'S GREAT WORK—ITS IMPACT ABROAD

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—John F. Kennedy did not have time to achieve everything he hoped to achieve. The biggest single waste in terms of statecraft is that he will not have the chance to use in what might have been his second term the influence and prestige which he had gained during his first.

The immediate damage is minor, since, in effect, a recess had been called in diplomatic affairs. The week of the assassination opened with a restatement of the world balance of power by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara which had the effect of closing the season. The Soviets would hardly be expected to negotiate in the wake of an announcement of decisive Western superiority in both conventional and nuclear weapons.

Even without the McNamara speech the chances of useful or constructive diplomacy during the balance of this year and 1964 were uncertain. Great nations do not often negotiate over major issues when elections are in the offing. Had Mr. Kennedy been spared, he might have been able to do little more until after the November elections next year than others apparently can do now. It appeared probable to be a period of waiting.

But had he won his reelection substantially, he would have possessed such influence and prestige as few staesmen in history ever have achieved. It would have been an advantage to himself and his country of significant value—a credit to be spent for the greater security of his country, of his allies, and of the world.

An English workman who knew me to be an American stopped me on the street and offered me his sympathy on my loss and told me that when he heard the news he wept. I asked him why, and he said, "He was one of us. He was a good man. And I felt safe while he was there."

Many "felt safe while he was there."

That feeling of safety was not an old condition; it was a very recent condition. It can be dated from the Cuban crisis of October a year ago. Until Cuba, the duel between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy was unresolved and relentless. At some point there had to be the decisive confrontation, the final test of strength.

That moment of the Cuban crisis grows larger in perspective as it recedes into the past. It stands out on the record of the past as the watershed between the period when the possibility of nuclear war ever was present in our lives and the period when the danger seems itself to be a major deterrent.

Mr. Kennedy gave the West, indeed all the world, the priceless gain of release from fear of inevitable nuclear war. He gave us all a chance to look and think and plan ahead in an atmosphere of confidence and relief.

Perhaps not everyone realized the achievement until the man who had gained it was gone. Surely the workman on the street did not realize until the blinding moment of tragedy that he indeed had felt more safe and secure over a whole year for the first time since the last great war ended. When the climactic moment came, he understood it and could articulate it.

In one sense that achievement remains for the greater safety of all. The clock can scarcely be turned back entirely to the dark and dangerous times before the Cuban confrontation. The essential facts of these new times remain unaltered and undamaged. It is reasonable to assume that diplomacy can resume its work once the various political uncertainties of the next year are resolved.

But there already will have been two Presidents in the White House in Washington during a span of 2 years and 10 months and there is now a possibility of three in 3 years. The chance of much achievement until this time of change is over is not large.

The evil work in Dallas has taken from us all the opportunity Mr. Kennedy had earned for himself and the human race to use a longer period. None other can use it for him as he could have used it. It takes the better part of 4 years to make a President.

Mr. Kennedy had only just emerged in his full stature as the leading statesman of the world when hatred struck him down. This is the heaviest loss to the world.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1963]

### GO, STRANGER

(By Joseph Alsop)

Of all the men in public life in his time, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the most ideally formed to lead the United States of America.

Such, at any rate, is this reporter's judgment, perhaps biased, but at any rate based on long experience and close observation, and no longer possible to suspect as self-serving. To be sure, judging Kennedy was never easy, for he was no common man, to be judged by common standards.

Courage, intelligence, and practicality; a passion for excellence and a longing to excel; above all, a deep love of this country, a burning pride in its past, and unremitting confidence in the American future—these were the qualities which acted, so to say, as the mainsprings of Kennedy the President.

Kennedy the man, Kennedy the private face, was half the enemy and half the reinforcement of Kennedy the President. He had an enviable grace of manner and person. He enjoyed pleasure. After Theodore Roosevelt, he was the first American President to care for learning for its own sake. After Abraham Lincoln, he was the first American President with a rich vein of personal humor—which is a very different thing from the capacity to make jokes.

This strange, dry, detached, self-mocking humor no doubt aided him to assess men and events; but in his public role, it was a handicap. Certainly it was not the same sort of handicap as Lincoln's humor, which actually prevented great numbers of otherwise intelligent persons from taking Lincoln seriously.

President Kennedy's humor instead inhibited him from showing the depth of his feelings. Any public exhibition of emotion gave him gooseflesh. So foolish people said he was a cold, unfeeling man, although few men in our time have had stronger feelings about those things that mattered to him.

After his country, what mattered most to him was to live intensely, with purpose and effect. He was in some sense the ultimate personification of the observation of Justice Holmes: "Man is born to act; to act is to affirm the worth of an end; and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal."

The ideal that Mr. Kennedy affirmed in action was singularly simple: for no man was ever more contemptous of the theological complexities of ideology. (It was hard to know, indeed, whether he held a more sovereign contempt for the doctrinaire mushiness of the extreme American left or for the doctrinaire hate-preaching of the extreme American right. He was slow to anger, but these made his gorge rise.)

His ideal could be completely summed up in only a score of so of words—a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal; the proud stronghold of a new birth of freedom; and the standing promise to all men Government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth. The noble, ancient phrases, the pieced-together tags from the finest of all American utterances, are as well worn by now as antique coins, whose legend is illegible. But, he could read the legend still. He still took this definition of our Nation's purpose with perfect literalness and this was the ideal that his actions sought to affirm.

Whereas, Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office when the Nation was clamoring for leadership and crying out to be shown a new course, John Fitzgerald Kennedy took office in a time of violent—yet hardly comprehensible, change.

Too many, then as now, confronted the vast revolutionary processes of our time either with fatty complacency or with shrill, embittered indignation. His task was therefore a hard task, and he was untimely cut off before his task could be half done.

Yet if we look at our country and the world in which we live—if we honestly compare the prospects now opening before us with the prospects as they seemed when Mr. Kennedy's Presidency began—we can see that there has been a new birth of hope.

It is perhaps pardonable, at this moment, to be personal. Speaking for myself, I have not dared to hope as I do now since those first months of the Korean war, when such overly high hopes were born from a strong sense that America was grandly accomplishing a high, historic service. That service had its heavy price.

I still remember watching the wolfhound regiment through a long, hard fight, and how the bodies of the fallen were carried in when the fight was won, and how I suddenly could think only of Simonides' epitaph that was inscribed, for all to read, on the tomb of the dead Spartans at Thermopylae:

> "Go stranger, and in Lacedaemon tell
> That here obedient to the laws we fell."

But the President who is lost to us, like those men who were lost so many years ago, was no drilled, unthinking Spartiate. He was the worthy citizen of a nation great and free—a nation, as he liked to think, that is great because it is free and this was the thought that always inspired his too brief leadership of this Republic.

---

[From the Shreveport-Bossier City (La.) Journal, Nov. 25, 1963]

### MICKLE ATTACKS HATEMONGERS

"The stage had been set for someone to murder President John F. Kennedy somewhere. It could have happened to Shreveport."

So spoke Dr. Joe J. Mickle, president of Centenary College, this morning, in addressing a memorial service at the college for the assassinated Chief Executive.

"I make these statements," said the educator, "because John F. Kennedy was much hated—hated both by the Communists and the professional haters of Communists.

"Judging by certain editorials, letters to the editor, an avalanche of filthy printed material, certain radio and television programs and political speeches by any number of candidates for offices in our States, John F. Kennedy was the personification of almost all evil.

"Thus it is that our thinking has been warped by an almost endless stream of words of suspicion and hatred. Hatred and violence have ridden unchecked across our land. Eventually this constant stream of destructive criticism, suspicion, hatred, and violence begins to take its toll; and faith in our Government, our churches, our schools, and our international organizations so vital to world peace and security is undermined. Thus, a climate has been created in which almost any person of warped mind or emotionally disturbed may feel that he is rendering a great service by sending a bullet crashing through the brain of a Government official.

"We can honor a great American, John F. Kennedy, only if we individually and as a nation bow our heads in introspection, humility, and repentence before Almighty God," Mickle said.

Elsewhere in Shreveport and Bossier City, residents joined with the fellow Americans in the national day of mourning for the late President.

From 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., the business life of the community came to a virtual standstill. The Shreveport Civic Center, Bossier City Hall, and many stores and business establishments were closed during the period out of respect to the slain Chief Executive.

Banks, Federal and State offices were closed for the day. So were Caddo Parish public and parochial schools. Bossier Parish schools will be closed throughout the week because of a previously announced teachers' meeting and the Thanksgiving holiday.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

### A SCENE UNDUPLICATED

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Pictures and sounds and music told the story better than words.

The Nation, emotionally depleted, went back to everyday life—to routine jobs, to holiday shopping, and to television commercials, but with a new President and ache when it thought of a former one and with a sense of guilt that it could not quite define but could not eliminate.

Above all, the Nation had watched a brave woman, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, representing it among visiting kings, presidents, and dignitaries—a woman who had seen her young husband slain at her side only 3 days before but who somehow managed from an inner spring of strength and self-control to put her sense of duty above her personal grief and to redeem in personal dignity some part of the shame and ignominy the Nation felt.

#### VERY DETERMINED CROWD

The story of the day can never quite be duplicated in this restless Capital. Scene after scene unfolded, then blurred into one another, and finally ended with the evening starlings flying in as usual from across the Potomac against a fiery sunset.

Sometime during the day the White House announced the President Johnson, as one of his first acts in office, had sent to Nikita S. Khrushchev, Soviet Premier, a message pledging to continue the efforts for peace of his predecessor, John F. Kennedy.

The Johnson message replied to one of condolence and sympathy from Moscow.

Long before this announcement of state, however, the patient crowds had collected and waited and shuffled in the freezing weather all night long for a chance to file past the bier of President Kennedy. It was placed on the Lincoln catafalque in the great echoing rotunda of the hushed Capitol.

Officials were awed at the queue which, by midnight, extended back 30 blocks. At 2 a.m., and 3, at 4, and again at 5, the police warned the shuffling throng that there was little chance of getting in before the great bronze doors shut at 9 a.m. But still they came and came.

At the end, with the grotesqueness that mingles with tragedy, the line was hurried past the casket in a kind of lope.

All during Sunday dignitaries from four quarters of the globe had been gathering in Washington; so many, so varied, and so subdued that often they went to their embassies virtually unrecognized: 22 presidents or prime ministers, 3 reigning kings, and the princes and princesses of 9 countries.

#### SOVIET EMISSARY

There was stately President de Gaulle of France, rotund Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany, and wily Anastas Mikoyan, Soviet First Deputy Premier, who came on a special flight from Moscow as Premier Khrushchev's personal emissary.

From Britain there was Prince Philip, Prime Minister Alec Douglas-Home, and opposition leader Harold Wilson. There was beautiful Queen Frederika of Greece, picturesque Emperor Haile Selassie, and Premier Hayato Ikeda from Japan.

Then somewhat before noon, down historic Pennsylvania Avenue came the roll of drums, and the crowds, lined 10 to 20 deep, craned to see the military procession and cortege, moving from the Capitol to the White House, from whence it would go on to St. Matthew's Roman Catholic Cathedral.

The grief was genuine but is was different from that which greeted the bier of Franklin D. Roosevelt on his final ride.

#### DIFFERING EMOTIONS

For Roosevelt, the crowd made no effort to hide its sobs, as though for a father or protector. For President Kennedy, it was poignant rather than overwhelming. The feeling toward this gay, graceful young man evidently did not go so deep as to the wartime President; it was the tragedy of a broken home and lost opportunity rather than the vivid personal identification to the President of 12 years. Above all, it was crowd eager to see Mrs. Kennedy.

Soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and special service detachments moved precisely, with black-draped drums. The journey was in two parts. The procession came to the White House that seemed to be keeping a kind of silent vigil of its own. And there Mrs. Kennedy and her family and the visiting dignitaries left cars and walked behind the procession to the cathedral.

Crowds were so dense along the streets that those in the rear could not see. Many heard only the clatter of the horses, the cadenced scuff of soldiers' feet, and the Air Force band playing "America, the Beautiful."

At many times at the cathedral and later Mrs. Kennedy stood with her two brothers-in-law, Robert Kennedy and Edward Kennedy.

Caroline and John Jr., wearing blue coats, arrived in a car and joined their mother. Her thoughts were toward her children; she comforted John who cried at one point.

#### A BOY'S SALUTE

At another time she bent over as the band played, and he stepped forward, holding a pretended salute.

She seemed composed as she emerged after the sonorous Latin service and waited while the coffin was placed back on the caisson for its final ride to Arlington. She held the hands of her two children, Caroline sobbing. Bells pealed softly.

Two former Presidents and old opponents, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman, chatted on the cathedral steps. They were asked by Senator KENNEDY to speak to Mrs. Kennedy and came forward briefly to say a few quiet words of comfort. Then they entered the same car for the ride to the cemetery.

#### CENTER OF SCENE

It was around Mrs. Kennedy that the scene turned. It was she that the hushed and almost awe-struck crowd followed with its eyes.

In the solemn serenity of Arlington cemetery the simple headstones of soldiers from all America's battles lie in ordered sequence.

The sky was so clear that vapor trails of airplanes were like sweeping chalkmarks on a blue board.

So on a brilliant November afternoon, in which shadows gradually lengthened, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, came to rest at last, some of his work done, most undone, in a career cut short in senseless tragedy.

Shortly before midnight, Mrs. Kennedy slipped out of the White House and rode to Arlington National Cemetery to place flowers on her husband's grave. A perpetual flame on the grave was burning through its first night.

The only meaning to all the shock and horror at the end came from the posture of his wife, Jacqueline, a woman long considered beautiful, but who came through the ordeal with ennobling dignity.

---

### A PROCLAMATION

(Mayor Victor H. Schiro issued the following proclamation today designating Monday, November 25, 1963, as a day of sorrow in New Orleans in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy.)

Whereas the sudden and untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, has cast the dark pall of sorrow and regret over the city of New Orleans; and

Whereas the assassination of our Chief Executive ranks with the vilest crimes of this generation and as such brings down the resentment of law-abiding people everywhere; and

Whereas citizens of this community abhor and do condemn this truly un-American act which snuffed out the very life of the man chosen by this great Nation to be its duly elected President and Commander in Chief; and

Whereas law-abiding citizens are outraged at this dastardly crime which removes from his place of high esteem the leader of this Nation, a man who not yet attained his true and ultimate mark in life:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, by the powers vested in me as mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the day of President Kennedy's funeral service, Monday, November 25, 1963, to be a day of sorrow, and urge all citizens to publicly and private mourn the passing of our Chief Executive.

On this sad occasion, and in tribute to our late President, I have ordered that city hall and all municipal offices be closed and I request that all American flags, displayed on public and private buildings, homes, institutions, etc., be flown at half-mast during the period of local and national mourning.

I urge all municipal employees, as well as all citizens, to observe Monday, November 25, as a day of prayer and reverence so that God, in His infinite wisdom and goodness, might: bring peace and eternal rest to the soul of President Kennedy; that the President's wife, Mrs. Kennedy, and his family might be sustained in this hour of bereavement; that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, might be given strength and guidance in this hour of crisis; that our Nation might be greater united to meet the challenges that face us today and in the days to come.

In addition, I recommend that all places of amusement and business be closed on Monday, November 25. Where it is not possible to close certain business establishments because of undue hardship on employers or employees, I request that at 11 a.m., c.s.t., on the above date that a 5-minute period of silent prayer be observed.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
*Mayor.*

---

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

BOGGS DESCRIBES SHOCK, SADNESS IN WASHINGTON—SAYS FREEMEN EVERYWHERE LOST FRIEND

(By U.S. Representative HALE BOGGS, House majority whip)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This is a day I never thought I would see. I shall always remember each sad detail.

I had had a busy week. On Sunday, Speaker (JOHN W.) MCCORMACK's brother had died in Boston, and Congressman (CARL) ALBERT spent the week as Speaker pro tempore, and I was acting majority leader. This meant constant attention to floor details.

Today, however, the House was not in session, and I thought I would take care of several of my many requests from constituents.

I got the news (of the President's death) in a Government agency office downtown. Immediately, the Capitol switchboard was swamped, and the streets of Washington almost instantly were jammed with people.

I hurried to Speaker MCCORMACK's office. He had just returned today from his brother's funeral in Boston. Already, the Secret Service had quietly moved in to protect his person. (He is now next in line of succession to President Johnson.)

FLOOD OF RUMORS

Already, he was complaining about the Secret Service agents. I told him that they would be with him from now on whether he liked it or not.

We were flooded with rumors. One was that the Vice President, now President Johnson, had suffered a severe heart attack. This visibly shook the Speaker and caused grave alarm among all of us. Fortunately, this dreadful rumor was unfounded.

Soon the word came that President Kennedy's body would arrive at Andrews Air Force Base in nearby Maryland at 6:05 p.m. Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the dean of the House; Speaker MCCORMACK and I went out to the base together. Other cars brought the other congressional leaders.

Soon, out of a clear and crisp autumn night, came the beautiful Air Force red-white-and-blue jet No. 1. Awaiting it were the dignitaries of the world who represent their Governments in Washington; Representative CHARLIE HALLECK and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican leaders of the House and the Senate, were standing right next to me.

WEEP FOR WIFE

As the brown casket carrying the body of our young President was moved from the plane, the great and the near great wept openly for the brave Mrs. Kennedy, who followed behind the casket, and for the man who had given his life for America.

The President's body was then taken to the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital.

The congressional leaders then went to the White House for a meeting with a grave and saddened Texan who now becomes the loneliest man on earth. Present from the Senate were Senator (MIKE) MANSFIELD, the majority leader; Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader; Senator (HUBERT) HUMPHREY, the majority whip; Senator (THOMAS) KUCHEL, the minority whip; and Senator (GEORGE) SMATHERS, the Senate deputy whip.

And from the House, there were Speaker MCCORMACK, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, Minority Leader HALLECK, and myself.

ALL PLEDGE HELP

The new President asked for our help. He asked for a united country. He said he had been in touch with former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman and they had said they would come to Washington.

We pledged our help, and each of us, on leaving President Johnson, said, "God bless you, Mr. President."

As I left, the White House was dark except for a light in the nursery. The rocking chair in the President's office was now empty, and a lump came into my threat. I remembered on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, at our usual weekly breakfast, the vibrant health of our President. I remembered his interest, as always, in every detail of the legislative program; his quiet comment on his warm reception the day before in Florida, and his concern for the Speaker and the loss of his brother.

As I drove away, I said to myself, I have lost a friend. The Nation has lost a peerless leader. And freemen eevrywhere have lost him too.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart and lean not upon thine own understanding.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the many opportunities we daily have of bringing our human life into a more loyal obedience and closer harmony with the enduring principles of truth and righteousness.

May we strive earnestly to make a worthy contribution to the high adventure and lofty aspiration of establishing a social order in our Republic that has in it the spirit of love and good will.

Inspire us with a sincere longing to emulate and manifest those spiritual virtues of faith and courage which were the secret of the greatness and strength of the Founding Fathers.

Make us more sensitive to the guidance of Thy holy spirit as we seek to determine what kind of legislation will be most helpful in lifting our beloved country and all mankind to higher levels of blessedness and the more abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 5, 1963:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 3, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship and Marine Construction Co., Inc.; and

H.R. 6974. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 776. An act to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying;

S. 1832. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 2220. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL—1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHEPPARD, SIKES, CANNON, JONAS, and CEDERBERG.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KIRWAN, FOGARTY, JENSEN, and PILLION.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I join many of my colleagues in introducing a resolution which will amend the Constitution of the United States to permit prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

This Congress represents the American people. If freedom of worship guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution needs clarifying or amending, then we should do so in the form of this amendment. I greatly fear that if we do not amend the Constitution permitting freedom of religion in our schools and State institutions, this ban on prayer and Bible reading could spread to the Armed Forces of the United States with their bases throughout the world. I fear it could spread to every department of the Federal Government, State government, and local government.

I shudder to think of what will happen to our freedom of religion and freedom to worship if our State courts, State legislatures, city councils, and even Congress is not permitted to call on Almighty God in our activities and call on Him to guide us in leading our people.

If this constitutional amendment is not adopted, I can foresee the day when some atheist or Communist could remove from our coins or even the floor of this House the words "In God We Trust." I can foresee the time when a new President being sworn in is not permitted to place his hand upon the Holy Bible. I can see the day when our great songs, "America," "America the Beautiful," "God Bless America," and "The Star-Spangled Banner" could be banished from our public schools and governmental meetings.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we should read the Bible and have prayer in our homes. We cannot delegate this privilege and responsibility solely to the church or the public school; but I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, as the father of five children, four of whom are in the public schools, children whom I do not see many hours of each week, that they should have the freedom, if they so desire, to listen to the reading of the Bible and hear a word of prayer asking God's guidance in their educational endeavors.

Our teachers are dedicated to the American way of life. They know that the Founding Fathers of this country never intended for prayer and Bible reading to be banished from our schools. I have never visited a public school as a speaker without having the Bible read and prayer offered. This is a basic, fundamental, and necessary freedom. It must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be adopted by this Congress and States so our religious freedom can be guaranteed to all generations to come.

## PROVIDING SOLUTION TO PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the renewed attention of my colleagues the provisions of H.R. 1164, introduced by me on January 9, 1963, providing a solution to the difficult problems of Presidential inability. This proposal would provide a statutory solution that would put on the country's lawbooks an answer that would chart our course should an emergency arise. It would govern until and throughout the long waiting period for a constitutional amendment resolving the dispute among lawyers as to whether an amendment is or is not needed to permit Congress to legislate in this matter.

While many prominent attorneys sincerely differ as to the need for such a constitutional amendment, it is little short of a national scandal that Congress has not enacted both such a statutory solution as that set forth in H.R. 1164 and also proposed the constitutional amendment to resolve any uncertainties.

Our present President in years past has suffered at least one heart attack. Other Presidents, including President Eisenhower, have also had periods of temporary inability. Our Government should not face the danger of paralysis for lack of enabling directives from the Congress.

Executive agreements between a President and Vice President are not a satisfactory answer. Neither is a statute that does not include the means for reliably and quickly issuing a directive to a person in the position of Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the office of President during a Presidential inability as well as the means for declaring termination of an inability.

This bill, H.R. 1164, was unanimously endorsed by the American Bar Association's house of delegates in February of 1962. It should be enacted without further delay.

## KNOWLES DAM PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the House may have an opportunity tomorrow or Thursday to assist President Johnson in his new drive for economy in Government, and to redeem our pledges for economy that were made during the debate on the tax reduction bill, by sustaining the Committee on Public Works in its steadfast refusal to authorize construction of the Knowles Dam project in Montana.

Mr. Speaker, this is a $257 million project at the very least, and testimony was given that the legitimate claims of the Salish Indians, whose tribal lands would be taken in violation of treaty, and the added costs of relocating the transcontinental railroad in the area will add another $100 million to the final bill.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana, through five of its Governors, including the incumbent, opposed this project as unneeded and wasteful.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we will have an unusual opportunity to save the taxpayers a tremendous sum of money, to uphold the intentions of the new President, and to redeem our own pledges if we vote against the authorization of the Knowles Dam project and support our colleagues on the Public Works Committee.

### REAR ADM. WALTER B. DAVIDSON

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1395), an act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 17 and 18, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the nature of relief for the admiral? Is it an overpayment or an underpayment, or does it deal with something else?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ASHMORE. It is to relieve the admiral of the liability to pay to the United States the sum of $21,475.17, which amount represents the total of overpayments in retired pay during the period of November 1958 and ending August 1961.

Mr. GROSS. Has this bill been before the House previously?

Mr. ASHMORE. It has; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Is it a part of some other payment, or what is the history of it? Was it an individual claims bill or a part of another bill?

Mr. ASHMORE. It was due to his employment. He was employed by the Western Contracting Co. of San Francisco when that concern was engaged in certain contract work for the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Then, it is a dual-compensation proposition?

Mr. ASHMORE. It comes under that provision; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSION ESTABLISHED TO REPORT UPON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY TO COMPEL THE ATTENDANCE AND TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES AND THE PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration Senate Joint Resolution 137 authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, but not intending to object, I am pleased to say to the House that this proposal came out of the Committee on the Judiciary this forenoon, only a half hour ago, by a unanimous vote. I am sure it will be so received by the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) for the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Commission" means the Commission appointed by the President by Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963.

(b) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any member of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(d) Process and papers of the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(f) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for the purpose of making legislative history with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 137, passed by unanimous consent earlier this afternoon, and ask unanimous consent that these remarks may follow immediately the passage of that measure.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I would like the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. Celler], the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1962, the House had before it S. 1658 to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. This bill contained a clause providing for the granting of immunity to witnesses from prosecution with respect to any transaction, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of evidence given by such witness after asserting his privilege against self-incrimination.

This bill had been reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and was adopted by the House by a vote of 348 to 1. When the attention of members of the Judiciary Committee was called to the immunity provision, they in turn made representations to conferees on the part of the House and the Senate as a result of which the immunity provision was stricken and did not become law.

Mr. Speaker, a very similar immunity provision is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 137 granting the subpena power to the Commission established by Executive Order No. 11130 dated November 29, 1963, to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 137 was acted upon by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning. I was unaware that it would be brought up so early this afternoon and I understood the resolution would be accompanied by a report in which the Committee on the Judiciary agreed it would issue a caveat particularly with respect to the power contained on page 3, lines 13 and following, of the joint resolution in which immunity can be granted to witnesses and thereby compel them to waive their rights under the fifth amendment and to testify notwithstanding the fifth amendment.

I call attention to the fact that on page 2 of the measure, the following is to be found commencing at the end of line 2:

> The Commission or any member of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

That language, in my judgment, would authorize not the entire Commission but any member taking testimony from witnesses to grant the immunity. Such power would not even be restricted to a member of the Commission since the language reads: "any agent or agency designated by the Commission."

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, first, if it has not been the longstanding policy of the Committee on the Judiciary not to adopt legislation authorizing the Attorney General to grant immunity to witnesses; and, second, if this immunity to witnesses is exercised by the Commission, that it is the hope of our Committee on the Judiciary that it will be exercised wholly as Commission action and not by any one member of the Commission or any agent designated by the Commission.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct; and it is in the report we filed today.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, without advance notice, and in the absence of a great many Members of the House, including myself, many of whom were engaged in other appropriate legislative activities, Senate Joint Resolution 137, authorizing subpena powers to the Presidential Commission To Investigate the Assassination of President Kennedy was passed on unanimous consent request. I have just examined the language of Senate Joint Resolution 137 and compared it with House Joint Resolution 838, which I introduced in this House on Tuesday, December 4.

Senate Joint Resolution 137 amazingly contains no declaration of legislative purpose. It fails to require the Commission to submit to Congress its recommendations for legislation, if any, arising from the investigation.

This omission is critical and may even be fatal to executive use of the subpena power, for much has been written in the law indicating that subpena powers may not constitutionally attend other than legislative functions or judicial processes. Provision for judicial reference does not cure absence of legislative purpose.

In this situation, there is more than reasonable cause to be concerned lest recalcitrant and hostile witnesses, should they be encountered by the Commission, may prevail in refusals to answer for reasons of unconstitutionality.

I would hope and trust that this unnecessary risk in Senate Joint Resolution 137 will be remedied by immediate enactment under suspension of the rules of an amendment thereto which will provide essentially as does House Joint Resolution 833, that:

> The Commission shall report to the Congress not later than the 1st day of the 1st session of the 89th Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

---

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1004)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 10, 23, 27, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 18, 76, 78, 79, 80, 86, 87, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,695,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$880,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,319,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,240,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$79,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,805,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$528,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That total costs of aviation medicine, including equipment, for the Federal Aviation Agency, whether provided in the foregoing appropriation or elsewhere in this Act, shall not exceed $6,073,600 or include in excess of 406 positions"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,581,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,985,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,214,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$210,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$157,600,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$319,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,144,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,902,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,023,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,841,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,023,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$838,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$288,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,298,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,512,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,710,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,634,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,468,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,018,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$319,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,484,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,325,400"; and the Senate agree to the the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$320,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,147,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$328,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$771,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,422,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,860,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$739,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,614,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$297,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$527,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,362,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$969,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$279,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$302,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$293,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,815,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,666,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$46,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,387,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,812,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,670,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$353,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,937,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,742,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,796,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: "but not to exceed $300,000,000,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$885,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,565,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,420,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 81, 82, 84, 91, and 92.

Albert Thomas,
Joe L. Evins,
Clarence Cannon,
Harold C. Ostertag,
Charles R. Jonas,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Warren G. Magnuson,
Allen J. Ellender,
Lister Hill,
Mike Monroney,
Richard B. Russell,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Milton R. Young,
Gordon Allott,
With Reservation on Mohole.
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### TITLE I

### *Executive Office of the President*

### Office of Emergency Planning

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,695,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $4,045,000 as proposed by the House and $5,265,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $4,190,000 for civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,190,000 as proposed by the House.

### Office of Science and Technology

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $880,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $780,000 as proposed by the House and $980,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Department of Defense*

### Civil Defense

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $70,319,000 for operation and maintenance instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House and $70,638,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes $15,000,000 for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations instead of $13,500,000 as proposed by the House and $18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Restores House language authorizing $14,078,000 and not to exceed 1,062 positions for management of civil defense programs.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Delete language proposed by the House and insert language proposed by the Senate relating to shelter surveys, marking, and stocking; and appropriate $41,250,000 for research, shelter survey, and marking instead of $17,800,000 as proposed by the House and $64,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that no further funds are to be provided for shelter survey and stocking.

Amendment No. 10: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate relating to construction of fallout shelters.

### *Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $27,500,000 for emergency health activities of the Public Health Service instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House and $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Independent offices*

### Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,240,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,115,000 as proposed by the House and $10,365,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Appropriates $79,000,000 for payments to air carriers instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $81,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $4,300,000 for subsidy for helicopter operations instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Civil Service Commission*

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $21,805,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $21,680,000 as proposed by the House and $21,930,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Federal Aviation Agency*

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $528,000,000 for operations instead of $515,775,000 as proposed by the House and $535,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate amended to limit total costs of aviation medicine, including employee health services, to $6,073,600 and 406 positions instead of $5,100,000 and 315 positions as proposed by the House and $6,500,000 and 408 positions, excluding employee health services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $100,250,000 for facilities and equipment as proposed by the Senate instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $40,000,000 for research and development instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House and $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $3,581,500 for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,663,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,985,000 for operation and maintenance of Dulles International Airport instead of $3,810.000 as proposed by the House and $4,045,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees adopt the language of the Senate report relating to complaints about the taxi service now provided at National Capital Airport and recommend that consideration be given to alternative systems to the present single-contracting company plan. Specifically, the conferees recommend that consideration be given to allowing independent taxis to freely provide service from, as well as to, the airport.

### *Federal Communications Commission*

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $15,600,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $15,800,000 as proposed by the House and $15,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Federal Power Commission*

Amendment No. 23: Deletes Senate language authorizing not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $11,850,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $11,750,000 as proposed by the House and $11,950,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Federal Trade Commission*

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $12,214,750 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,100,000 as proposed by the House and $12,329,500 as proposed by the Senate.

### *General Services Administration*

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $210,875,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, instead of $200,875,000 as proposed by the House and $214,875,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Deletes Senate language relative to fallout shelters.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $157,600,800 for construction, public buildings projects, instead of $152,540,700 as proposed by the House and $163,623,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Provides $319,900 for border patrol sector headquarters, Tucson, Ariz., instead of $309,600 as proposed by the House and $326,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides $2,144,600 for post office and courthouse, Pine Bluff, Ark., instead of $2,075,400 as proposed by the House and $2,271,450 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Provides $4,902,000 for courthouse and Federal office building, Fresno, Calif., instead of $4,743,900 as proposed by the House and $5,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Provides $1,023,000 for post office and courthouse, Newnan, Ga., instead of $990,000 as proposed by the House and $1,097,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Provides $6,841,000 for courthouse and Federal office building, Boise, Idaho, instead of $6,620,400 as proposed by the House and $7,129,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Provides $1,023,000 for Federal office building, Gary, Ind., instead of $990,000 as proposed by the House and $1,098,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Provides $838,900 for courthouse and Federal office building, New Albany, Ind., instead of $811,800 as proposed by the House and $902,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides $288,300 for courthouse and Federal office building, London, Ky., instead of $279,000 as proposed by the House and $294,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Provides $3,298,700 for post office and courthouse, Bangor, Maine, instead of $3,192,300 as proposed by the House and $3,470,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides $12,512,200 for Federal office building, Baltimore, Md., instead of $12,108,600 as proposed by the House and $13,020,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Provides $3,710,700 for post office and courthouse, Detroit, Mich., instead of $3,591,000 as proposed by the House and $3,790,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Provides $1,634,000 for post office and courthouse, Hannibal, Mo., instead of $1,581,300 as proposed by the House and $1,740,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Provides $1,468,500 for post office and Federal office building, Independence, Mo., instead of $1,421,100 as proposed by the House and $1,564,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Provides $2,018,100 for post office and Federal office building, Bozeman, Mont., instead of $1,953,000 as proposed by the House and $2,142,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides $319,000 for border patrol sector headquarters, Havre, Mont., instead of $308,700 as proposed by the House and $325,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Provides $1,484,300 for post office and courthouse, Helena, Mont., instead of $1,436,400 as proposed by the House and $1,516,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Provides $4,325,400 for courthouse and Federal office building, Las Vegas, Nev., instead of $4,185,900 as proposed by the House and $4,533,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Provides $320,900 for Federal office building, Laconia, N.H., instead of $310,500 as proposed by the House and $349,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Provides $2,147,400 for post office and Federal office building, Portsmouth, N.H., instead of $2,078,100 as proposed by the House and $2,276,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Provides $328,300 for post office and Federal office building, Carlsbad, N. Mex., instead of $317,700 as proposed by the House and $335,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Provides $771,900 for post office and Federal office building, Clovis, N. Mex., instead of $747,000 as proposed by the House and $788,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides $1,422,900 for courthouse and Federal office building, Roswell, N. Mex., instead of $1,377,000 as proposed by the House and $1,515,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Provides $37,860,000 for Federal office building, Cleveland, Ohio, instead of $36,639,000 as proposed by the House and $39,161,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Provides $739,400 for post office and Federal office building, Providence, R.I., instead of $715,500 as proposed by the House and $755,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Provides $2,614,200 for Federal office building, Charleston, S.C., instead of $2,529,900 as proposed by the House and $2,757,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Provides $297,600 for post office and Federal office building, Alamo, Tenn., instead of $288,000 as proposed by the House and $319,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Provides $527,300 for post office and Federal office building, Alice, Tex., instead of $510,300 as proposed by the House and $570,950 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides $14,362,000 for Federal office building, Fort Worth, Tex., instead of $13,898,700 as proposed by the House and $14,880,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Provides $969,000 for post office and Federal office building, Pasadena, Tex., instead of $937,800 as proposed by the House and $1,039,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Provides $279,000 for border patrol sector headquarters, Swanton, Vt., instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House and $285,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Provides $302,300 for border patrol sector headquarters, Blaine, Wash., instead of $292,500 as proposed by the House and $308,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Provides $293,900 for border patrol sector headquarters, Spokane, Wash., instead of $284,400 as proposed by the House and $300,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Provides $11,815,700 for General Services Administration Federal Records Center, District of Columbia, instead of $11,434,500 as proposed by the House and $12,069,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Provides $33,666,000 for Federal office building No. 5, District of Columbia, instead of $32,580,000 as proposed by the House and $34,823,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $46,000,000 for operating expenses, Federal Supply Service, instead of $45,500,000 as proposed by the House and $46,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates $9,387,500 for operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service, instead of $9,275,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates $4,850,000 for operating expenses, Transportation and Communication Service, instead of $4,725,000 as proposed by the House and $4,975,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Authorizes $2,812,000 for operating expenses, strategic and critical materials, instead of $2,712,000 as proposed by the House, and $3,112,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Eliminates Senate language for transfer "in kind" of excess materials in the national stockpile.

Amendments Nos. 68–72: Eliminate Senate language relative to reimbursable services of the administrative operations fund.

Amendment No. 73: Limits amount which may be deposited into administrative operations funds to $18,150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $13,580,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Eliminates Senate language excluding reimbursements for automatic data processing services.

### *Housing and Home Finance Agency*

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates $15,525,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Administrator, instead of $15,325,000 as proposed by the House, and $15,725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $100,000,000 for the housing for the elderly revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

### *Interstate Commerce Commission*

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates $24,670,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $24,500,000 as proposed by the House and $24,840,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Provides $1,918,000 for railroad safety activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,910,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 79: Provides $1,276,000 for locomotive inspection activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,270,000 as proposed by the House.

### *National Aeronautics and Space Administration*

Amendment No. 80: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate authorizing purchase of aircraft for experimental purposes. The committee of conference is agreed that the academic grant program be carried out within funds appropriated and under good administrative practices; that NASA employment should be held to the minimum required for the expanded program; and the number of employees is to be governed by the funds allowed.

Amendment No. 81: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in disagreement.

### *National Science Foundation*

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $353,200,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $323,200,000 as proposed by the House and $373,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference is agreed that funds are provided for Project Mohole and that the National Science Foundation and the Bureau of the Budget shall use good judgment and work out a sensible proposition.

Amendment No. 84: Reported in disagreement.

### *Securities and Exchange Commission*

Amendment No. 85: Appropriates $13,937,500 for salaries and expenses instead of $13,775,000 as proposed by the House and $14,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Selective Service System*

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates $37,940,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $37,840,000 as proposed by the House.

### *Veterans' Administration*

Amendment No. 87: Appropriates $14,800,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,510,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates $33,742,000 for medical and prosthetic research instead of $31,720,000 as proposed by the House and $36,720,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Appropriates $1,081,186,000 for medical care as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,075,186,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates $76,796,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of $72,754,000 as proposed by the House and $76,877,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 91: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 92: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 93: Restores House limitation on funds for property acquisitions and other loan guarantee and insurance operations and authorizes $300,000,000 instead of $246,240,000 as proposed by the House.

### TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

### *Housing and Home Finance Agency*

Amendment No. 94: Authorizes $885,000 for administrative and nonadministrative expenses for Office of the Administrator, Housing for the Elderly, instead of $770,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 95: Authorizes $9,500,000 for administrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, instead of $9,200,000 as proposed by the House and $9,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96: Authorizes $76,565,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $76,065,000 as proposed by the House and $77,065,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97: Authorizes $1,420,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration instead of $1,240,000 as proposed by the House and $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
JOE L. EVINS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
CHARLES RAPER JONAS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. May I explain briefly what is involved? As far as I know we are unanimous in this report. There is one item in true disagreement outside of the report.

When this bill was considered by the House it carried in round figures about $14.6 billion. The House reduced this about $1.5 billion. We allowed an increase in employment of less than 100. There are about 297,000 employees in the bill. There was a request for an increase, in round figures, of about 9,500 to 10,000 employees. The House allowed an increase of less than 100.

When we went to conference, we had about 97 amendments in disagreement. We bring back to you the conference report with six items in disagreement that will require separate action. In fact, there is only one item in disagreement. The other five are technical, and they are actually agreed to.

Here is the sum and substance of the efforts of your conferees. I think I bespeak the unanimous sentiment of the conferees of the House on both sides of the aisle when I say that the other body did the best it has ever done on an appropriation bill. I am sure the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] will agree with that statement. As a matter of fact, they only raised the House about $197 million. I want to go out of my way and compliment Senator MAGNUSON and the ranking minority member, Senator ALLOTT of Colorado. They really did a good job, and we are proud of them. So when we went to conference we let the other body restore about $120 million of that $200 million, and we kept the House language. We think the language is worth more than the money, and may I point out one or two items in the language.

There was a sizable reduction throughout the bill in travel and in printing and binding. Those two items have been getting out of hand.

We have some language that is worth repetition on what we call year-end annualizing of employment, but the way the bills have been handled this year, certainly through no fault of the Appropriations Committee of the House, this annualization maybe has fed upon that unfortunate situation; but the language is still worth millions.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a summary table of the bill. I do hope that the conference report will be adopted.

*Summary of independent offices appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 8747)*

| Agency | Budget estimates | Passed House | Passed Senate | Conference action | Conference action compared with— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Budget estimates | House | Senate |
| National Aeronautics and Space Council | $525,000 | $525,000 | $525,000 | $525,000 | | | |
| Office of Emergency Planning | 17,950,000 | 10,735,000 | 10,955,000 | 10,385,000 | −$7,565,000 | −$350,000 | −$570,000 |
| Office of Science and Technology | 1,025,000 | 780,000 | 980,000 | 880,000 | −145,000 | +100,000 | −100,000 |
| Disaster relief | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | | | |
| Civil defense, Department of Defense | 346,900,000 | 87,800,000 | 135,338,000 | 111,569,000 | −235,331,000 | +23,769,000 | −23,769,000 |
| Civil defense, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare | 41,361,000 | 25,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 27,500,000 | −13,861,000 | +2,500,000 | −2,500,000 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 94,575,000 | 85,115,000 | 91,365,000 | 89,240,000 | −5,335,000 | +4,125,000 | −2,125,000 |
| Civil Service Commission | 111,128,000 | 110,380,000 | 110,630,000 | 110,505,000 | −623,000 | +125,000 | −125,000 |
| Federal Aviation Agency | 815,100,000 | 750,610,000 | 770,483,000 | 758,341,500 | −56,758,500 | +7,731,500 | −12,141,500 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 16,500,000 | 15,800,000 | 15,400,000 | 15,600,000 | −900,000 | −200,000 | +200,000 |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | (15,404,000) | (15,230,000) | (15,230.000) | (15,230,000) | (−174,000) | | |
| Federal Power Commission | 12,675,000 | 11,750,000 | 11,950,000 | 11,850,000 | −825,000 | +100,000 | −100,000 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 13,028,000 | 12,100,000 | 12,329,500 | 12,214,750 | −813,250 | +114,750 | −114,750 |
| General Accounting Office | 46,850,000 | 45,700,000 | 45,700,000 | 45,700,000 | −1,150,000 | | |
| General Services Administration | 658,106,000 | 604,539,300 | 631,096,750 | 620,336,900 | −37,769,100 | +15,797,600 | −10,759,850 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 430,260,000 | 235,062,400 | 260,462,400 | 260,262,400 | −169,997,600 | +25,200,000 | −200,000 |
| Federal National Mortgage Association | (9,125,000) | (8,750,000) | (8,750,000) | (8,750,000) | (−375,000) | | |
| Federal Housing Administration | (88,050,000) | (85,265,000) | (86,665,000) | (86,065,000) | (−1,985,000) | (+800,000) | (−600,000) |
| Public Housing Administration | 221,150,000 | 212,484,000 | 212,484,000 | 212,484,000 | −8,666,000 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 25,450,000 | 24,500,000 | 24,840,000 | 24,670,000 | −780,000 | +170,000 | −170,000 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 5,712,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 | −612,000,000 | | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | | | |
| National Science Foundation | 589,000,000 | 323,200,000 | 373,200,000 | 353,200,000 | −235,800,000 | +30,000,000 | −20,000,000 |
| Renegotiation Board | 2,650,000 | 2,550,000 | 2,550,000 | 2,550,000 | −100,000 | | |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 14,400,000 | 13,775,000 | 14,100,000 | 13,937,500 | −462,500 | +162,500 | −162,500 |
| Selective Service System | 38,140,000 | 37,840,000 | 37,940,000 | 37,940,000 | −200,000 | +100,000 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 5,429,772,000 | 5,372,430,000 | 5,387,843,000 | 5,384,784,000 | −44,988,000 | +12,354,000 | −3,059,000 |
| Total | 14,658,588,000 | 13,102,718,700 | 13,300,214,650 | 13,224,518,050 | −1,434,069,950 | +121,799,350 | −75,696,600 |

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in the foregoing table.

I see my able and distinguished friend from Iowa on his feet, and I will be glad to yield to him. Then I want to yield 10 minutes to my friend from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee, and then I will move the previous question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

How does this bill compare with last year's independent offices appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me see if I have that information available. If I do not, I will put it in the RECORD. That is bound to be more, because you have two or three items where you have a sizable increase. The main one is the Space Agency.

Mr. GROSS. We were spending for the Space Agency last year, too, were we not?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. There is a sizable increase. It is in the neighborhood of $1.355 billion more than last year.

Mr. GROSS. One billion three hundred and fifty-five million dollars more than last year?

Mr. THOMAS. Due to one agency alone.

Mr. GROSS. This bill then does not provide the thrift and frugality which our new President has called for, does it?

Mr. THOMAS. Let us be accurate about it. The House approved the increase in the Space Agency, and you cannot go ahead with a program of that magnitude and not implement it with money. Therefore, this bill is larger compared with last year. It is largely due to the increase in that one agency.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I should like to respond to the gentleman from Iowa by pointing out to him that the House in our original appropriation bill carried with it $5,100 million for the Space Agency. Ironically enough, the other body adopted the same figure, so that the appropriation for the Space Agency was not in dispute, nor was any issue involved because the funds were identical as adopted in the appropriation bills of the two bodies.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join and agree with the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], that we bring back to you what might be termed a unanimous report as a result of the conference with the other body. As he indicated, there is only one item in dispute.

I think it is fair to point out that, generally speaking, when the independent offices appropriation bill passed the House we actually reduced this appropriation below the budget by $1,555 million. The other body increased the appropriation for independent offices by $197 million.

Mr. Speaker, the other body adopted a bill totaling $13,300 million which is $197 million over that of the House.

In conference we finally arrived at a figure totaling $13,224 million which is $1,434 million under the budget. It is $121 million over the amount originally adopted by the House and $75 million under that of the other body.

First of all, I should like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The gentleman from Texas, as chairman of your conferees or managers on the part of the House, I believe, did an outstanding job in representing the House and in holding the position of the House in regard to the many items and appropriations involved in this bill.

It can be said that he knows the subject, and he knows the agencies. He is familiar with the programs, and he certainly has brought credit upon himself and to the House of Representatives by his leadership and representation in this all-important matter. I join with the gentleman, too, in paying tribute to the job performed by the managers on the part of the other body. This year, above all other years, an exceptional job was done on the part of the other body and by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There are many items in this bill of varied and sundry interests on the part of many Members. But I believe all in all that we are adopting a report which is sound and equitable and will in and of itself lend its support toward retrenchment in spending. If you take into account the fact that this independent offices appropriation bill embraces some $14 million, we cannot underestimate the importance of a reduction of $1,434 million, which is substantial and meaningful.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's appropriation, I should like to make a comment. This agency, as the Members of the House know, has been operating under the continuing resolution covering current expenditures.

Yesterday I received a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States whom I had written asking for an opinion as to the legality of the formula under which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been operating and to ascertain if its expenditures have been within the limitation of the joint resolution.

The Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, advised me that in his opinion the formula adopted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not in accordance with the provision of the continuing resolution although, he said, the reported direct obligations actually incurred during the first 4 months of fiscal year 1964 appeared to be within the limitation.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this because I think the Committee on Appropriations should know that under the formula adopted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the budget estimate is used as the limiting factor. This was in excess of the fiscal year 1963 appropriation and therefore violated the continuing resolution, subsection 101(b) of which limited the rate of operation to the lower of the two.

Certainly, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with its expanding program, has been under difficulty, but I would think the Committtee on Appropriations would want to look into this. If an agency's formula is not correct it could well lead to illegal and improper expenditures.

I include at this point a letter from the Comptroller General dated December 6, 1963, which contained the information I had requested:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*December 6, 1963.*

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
*House of Representatives,*

DEAR MR. PELLY: Further reference is made to your letter of September 20, 1963, concerning the expenditures of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) under the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, approved June 29, 1963, Public Law 88-55, 77 Stat. 74, as amended. You request to be informed as to the legality of the formula under which the agency is operating and if its expenditures are within the limitations of the joint resolution.

We are advised that the formula adopted by NASA provides that projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1963 are to be continued under the scope and schedules approved prior to the end of the fiscal year 1963. No approval is to be granted for the initiation of new projects or activities. Concerning fiscal year 1964, the additional increment of effort on continuing projects which is expected to be funded from 1964 appropriations will proceed in accordance with the overall program plan reflected in the fiscal year 1964 budget estimates except where there are indications that planned programs will be modified by congressional action.

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1964 reflect the expanding program now in progress at NASA as such estimates exceed the appropriations available to NASA for the fiscal year 1963.

Subsection 101(b) of the joint resolution, the provision pertinent to your inquiry, provides in part, as follows:

"(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1963 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority:

* * * * *

"Agencies for which provision was made in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1963."

"Rate" has been defined as a price or amount stated or fixed on anything with relation to a standard, a fixed ratio, a settled proportion. *City of Chicago* v. *Illinois Commerce Commision* (150 N.E. 2d 776). The language "current rate," as used in subsection 101(b), might at first glance be viewed to mean the rate of operations for the corresponding month of fiscal year 1963, or as one-twelfth of the appropriations for 1963, or the month of June 1963, or some other portion of the appropriations for 1963. The only standard, fixed ratio, or settled proportion provided for therein with which the current rate is to be related is "the rate provided for in the budget estimate." Since the budget estimate is for a full fiscal year it follows that the current rate may have been intended to mean the rate of operations which was carried on within the appropriations for the entire fiscal year 1963. There is some legislative history of the instant joint resolution to support this view. Therefore, while obligations incurred by an agency during any particular month may exceed the June 1963 obligations, one-twelfth of obligations incurred for fiscal year 1963, or obligations incurred during some other portion of fiscal year 1963, it does not necessarily follow that there has been a violation of subsection 101(b). Variations in the monthly or quarterly obligations are recognized in the apportionment procedures authorized by the Antideficiency Act, section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665). Any mathematical formula not recognizing such variations in the many complex governmental programs would not seem practicable. While the legislative intent of the term "current rate" is not clear, we are inclined to the view that the requirements of subsection 101(b) have been met where an agency can establish that it is operating under a flexible plan that would enable continuation of activities throughout the fiscal year 1964 within the level of the appropriations available during the preceding fiscal year or as provided in the budget estimate, whichever is lower. The guide for agencies restricted to the current rate generally should be the pattern of obligations incurred during the fiscal year 1963. Once the appropriation act has been enacted, expenditures must be charged to the applicable appropriation, as required by section 103 of Public Law 88-55.

Under the formula adopted by NASA, the budget estimate is used as the limiting factor. Since this amount is in excess of the "current rate," i.e., above the amount of the appropriations available for the fiscal year 1963, the formula is not in accordance with the provisions of subsection 101(b) limiting the rate of operations to the lower of the two. However, we found the rate of operations, as indicated by direct obligations of $1,107,150,000 incurred in the first 4 months of fiscal year 1964 to be only slightly in excess of one-third of the total funds available for obligations during fiscal year 1963 ($1,031,679,000). We cannot say that this rate of operations would preclude the continuation of activities throughout the fiscal year 1964 within the appropriations of $3,095,039,000 which were available for fiscal year 1963 operations. The foregoing obligations relate only to the no-year appropriation "Research, Development, and Operations," since NASA is not obligating "Construction of Facilities" funds under Public Law 88-55.

You are therefore advised that while, in our opinion, the formula adopted by NASA is not in accordance with the provisions of the continuing resolution, the reported direct obligations actually incurred during the first 4 months of fiscal year 1964 appear to be within the limitation of the continuing resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note on pages 20, 21, 22, and 23 of the bill funds for the construction of a number of Federal buildings, and in each instance—I find no exception—in each instance the appropriation has been increased over the House figure. Why would all of them be increased? What was the reason?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe that I can explain to the gentleman from Iowa exactly what happened, as it applies to each and every item involving public buildings under the General Services Administration. You may remember that our committee and the House of Representatives took an arbitrary 10 percent reduction across the board in funds for public buildings and that, of course, was revealed in our House bill. The other body restored 5 percent of the 10 percent reduced by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Is this a 10 percent cut on the Senate figures on the expenditures for each building, each project, or was it 10 percent on the total number?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Ten percent of the construction costs and the appropriation for the construction of these buildings across the board and applicable to each project. In order to complete the picture may I say to you that the conferees finally agreed on a 7 percent reduction across the board, which was almost halfway between the 5 percent that the Senate applied and the 10 percent that the House applied.

Mr. GROSS. What was the reason for this increase over the House figures, if I may ask?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Do you mean the increase on the part of the other body?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe the increase on the part of the other body or the restoration of 5 percent was based on their belief that it was too deep a cut. As you know it is applicable to construction costs. But finally we prevailed upon the representatives of the other body to compromise the reduction at 7 percent. The point is and the fact remains that there will be a 7 percent reduction in funds across the board on all public building construction costs and as I stated earlier this percentage applies on each and every project included in this independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal 1964.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to express my appreciation to my colleague, Representative THOMAS, for his work on this bill. It contains appropriations for the Elk City, Okla., Post Office, which is a very worthwhile project.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 356, nays 22, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—356

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—22

Abele
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Beermann
Bruce
Clancy
Curtis
Devine
Foreman
Gathings
Goodell
Gross
Hall
Hutchinson
Johansen
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kyl
O'Konski
Rich
Snyder

NOT VOTING—56

Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Duncan
Fallon
Ford
Gallagher
Gill
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
McFall
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Moorhead
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Purcell
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Schwengel
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Staebler
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Utt
Vinson
White
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gill with Mr. Mailliard.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Utt.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fallon with Ayres.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Grant.

Mr. White with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Blatnik.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Davis of Georgia, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Stephens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 2, insert: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall remain available until expended for studies and research to develop measures and plans for emergency preparedness and telecommunications."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $1,000,000 set forth in said amendment insert "$650,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 38, line 9, insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act for 'Research and Development' may be used for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless (1) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of notice of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility, or (2) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the construction of such facility."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 39, line 10: Strike out lines 10 through 19 and insert:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any other country without consent of the Congress."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 and concur therein.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would delete the language of the bill which was included through adoption of my amendment by the House during consideration of the bill. The House voted 125 to 115, as I recall, to provide a limitation so that funds appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration could not be used in a joint venture with any Communist or Communist-dominated country to land men on the moon without the consent of Congress.

In the other body my language was changed so as to provide that no such cooperative lunar landing venture could be undertaken with any other nation without the consent of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Senate language is an improvement. In fact, I urged the House conferees to adopt the Senate version. I think it is an improvement and that no good purpose would be served by singling out any particular nations. It is my belief that this motion to recede and accept the Senate language should be adopted. As author of the amendment I fully support the action of the conferees. I am very happy at this recommendation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 84: Page 41, line 7, strike out: "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the Government for research."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Thomas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: insert the matter stricken amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the Government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 91: Page 46, line 14, insert: "*Provided*, That the limitation under the head 'hospital and domiciliary facilities' in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for technical services for rehabilitation of the neuropsychiatric hospital at Downey, Illinois, is reduced from $2,063,225 to $1,575,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Thomas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 92: Page 46, line 19, insert: "*Provided further*, That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Florida.".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Thomas moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Ostertag moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92 and concur therein.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in order to save everybody's time I am going to address myself to this proposition and then yield 5 or 10 minutes to my beloved friend from New York [Mr. Ostertag] so that he may present his side of the case.

Briefly, here is what is involved. The other body wrote into the bill the direction in so many words that a Veterans' Administration hospital be started in Bay Pines, Fla. We take the position that we know that the patient load in Florida is growing by leaps and bounds, but the Administration is enlarging and expanding the bed capacity in its four or five hospitals throughout the State of Florida to meet that need. But we go deeper. We think that the Veterans' Administrator should not lose control over his program, that he should be able to allocate these beds and build these hospitals, along with the advice and consent and the help of the regularly constituted Veterans' Affairs Committee and its counterpart in the other body. It is my understanding that the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, headed by my colleague from Texas [Mr. Teague] and the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] are all agreed that that proposition is sound. If I am in error in that respect, I will stand corrected, but I do not think so. I have not had an opportunity to talk to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres], but I have talked with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] and some of the other members of that committee on this side of the aisle.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have been aware of this situation in Florida now for a very long time. I shall not presume to speak for all of the members of the committee, but I will say that it was this member's understanding, and has been for 2 or 3 years, that the amount of money about which we are speaking was to be made available for improving the facilities at Bay Pines Hospital. I am speaking for myself in this regard.

Mr. THOMAS. I at no time will disagree with my able friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair]. I think the gentleman is one of the ablest and one of the finest Members on this floor.

Is there any disagreement between us, may I ask the gentleman? I mean is there any conflict in the statement which I made originally?

Mr. ADAIR. Well, only perhaps, sir, that it might be construed that the gentleman is speaking to the effect that all of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs were in opposition to the position taken by the Senate. This member is in accord with the position of the other body.

Mr. THOMAS. I stand corrected. That is what I meant. I did not have an opportunity to talk to the gentleman. I should have talked with the gentleman. I beg the pardon of the gentleman. He is a gentleman and a scholar.

Mr. Speaker, we know what is involved in this thing. Personally, I am not going—if I can prevent it—to let this House get embroiled in another fight.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter in my hand that was written during the midpart of the year, June 30, 1963, to the Honorable John S. Gleason, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, a very able and fine gentleman. I have worked with a good many administrators, as I am sure you have, of the Veterans' Administration. Certainly Mr. Gleason is one of the most outstanding. He is a wonderful man and a great veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read this long letter, but I shall read this sentence:

> We are grateful to you, Mr. Gleason, for the program which has been developed and we concur in what has been proposed.

Meaning, what Mr. Gleason has proposed. It is signed by our able and distinguished friend, the senior Member of the Florida delegation, Mr. Bob Sikes; my beloved friend, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Charles Bennett; our very lovable friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Herlong]; certainly no finer Congressman than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley]; our beloved and inimitable colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Billy Matthews; my warm and close personal friend, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Dante Fascell, with whom I spent quite a bit of time in the other committee; the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Paul G. Rogers, one of the able and distinguished Members of that great delegation; and certainly our beloved friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], who is well and favorably known to every man on this floor. Also, the gentleman has a very distinguished junior Member here to whom we are all attracted, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Sam Gibbons, as well as one of our other distinguished gentlemen, one of the fine junior Members of the Congress of whom we see quite a bit in the other committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua].

Mr. Speaker, all of these gentlemen signed this letter.

**Mr. HALEY.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one statement?

**Mr. THOMAS.** I yield briefly to my friend, because I do not want this to get out of control. I am going to try to avoid it. I yield to my able friend from Florida [Mr. Haley].

**Mr. HALEY.** May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], who is now speaking and who is in charge of this bill, as you note, the entire Democratic congressional delegation of Florida has signed this letter, and we feel that Mr. Gleason has done an excellent job.

And it does not mean that Florida is not going to receive its proper proportion of beds. I think that the program that he has will take care of the situation in Florida. Furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, these matters after thorough investigation should be left to the discretion, which is the law now, as I understand it, to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

**Mr. THOMAS.** I thank the gentleman from Florida. I now yield to my beloved friend, the ranking Member on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag], 10 minutes. When he finishes, if I may, I am going to move the previous question.

**Mr. OSTERTAG.** Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say that this item in dispute at this time does not involve a single dollar insofar as this bill is concerned. Actually, and as a matter of record, a number of years ago the Congress appropriated and made available $1,722,000 for planning and technical services and improvements of the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital in Florida. For some unknown reason the Veterans' Administration has year after year failed to adhere to the intent and purpose of this appropriation by not going forward with this improvement. The point is that there is no money in this bill for this item. The money has been appropriated several years ago, Year after year and for several years in the past your committee has included in its report wording which indicates our desire to have the Veterans' Administration go forward with the improvement of the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital in Florida. As a matter of fact, this year in the very bill that passed the House or rather in our report associated with it the committee recommended that the $1,722,000 previously appropriated for technical services at the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital remain earmarked for this project if and when the Administrator deems it in the public interest.

The other body in its wisdom wrote into the bill which is a part and parcel of this conference report, language which is in the Senate bill and states:

> *Provided further,* That $1,722,000 shall—

I call attention to the fact that the other body said "shall"—

> be used for sites and plans and expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla.

The veterans of Florida are extremely concerned and endorse this improvement. Bay Pines already exists as one of the outstanding veterans' hospitals in our country. For the life of me I cannot understand why anyone would resist the improvement of this very fine institution. It will in no sense take from any other area of Florida, as far as I can see. It would only be a part and parcel of an overall plan for improved veterans' facilities in the great State of Florida.

I might say, too, that the veteran population of Florida is very rapidly and substantially increasing, far above the national average. Therefore, it seems to me that it is only proper and in line with language we have written into our report year after year that we concur with the Senate in providing a meaningful intent in this bill which directs the Veterans' Administration to go forward with the planning and improvement of Bay Pines Veterans Hospital. Funds have been available and awaited this administrative action for several years and now is the time to act.

**Mr. CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. OSTERTAG.** I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

**Mr. CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple issue. The question is, Is the mandate and instruction of the Congress of the United States going to be ignored by the executive branch, or are they going to conform to the language written into the committee report this year and written into the committee report last year by the House instructing Mr. Gleason to go ahead with that project? As a matter of fact, the other body last year wrote language into the report instructing Mr. Gleason to go forward with it during this calendar year.

There is no additional money involved—$1,722,000 was appropriated in the fiscal year 1958. It has been held by orders of the Appropriations Committees ever since then for the construction of this hospital. The Appropriations Committees on both the House and Senate sides have found this hospital is justified on the merits. It is needed. This is a veteran-impacted area. To hold up the construction of this facility would be a disservice to the veterans of Florida and of the United States.

So the issue is very simple, whether the mandate of the Congress written into the committee reports previously should now be written into the law, which the Senate did. There is nothing partisan about this thing. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] is the one who successfully offered the amendment calling for Mr. Gleason to go ahead and spend this money. The motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag] to recede and concur is to maintain the Senate language. I think it is about time that the executive branch of the Government accede to the mandate of Congress when the Congress instructs it to go ahead. There is no doubt about this being the issue. Both the House and Senate committees approved similar language in the reports both last year and this year. The Senate language was put in the legislation this year.

Let me tell you what this is about. This Bay Pines hospital in Florida is located on one of the most beautiful sites in the entire United States of America. Bay Pines is on a peninsula, over 500 acres of Government property on the waterfront, that has been a hospital for over 30 years. Can you imagine a finer, better location in the United States than right here on Boca Ciega Bay for the location of a veterans hospital? Are we or are we not going to insist that Mr. Gleason do what Congress twice asked him to do, and mandatorily wrote into the Senate bill? If you believe so, and I think you should, then you will vote for the Ostertag motion to go ahead and construct these much-needed beds in this area, where you have 260,000 veterans in the service area, and expect to have nearly 340,000 by 1970. So let us put this issue at rest and the bill at rest by voting for the motion offered by the gentleman from New York and instruct Mr. Gleason to do this work.

To exhibit the support this project has received, I am including in the Record the language adopted by the Appropriations Committee of both the House and Senate over the past 2 years.

I am including as well, a statement made in a letter dated September 18, 1963, to the late President Kennedy by Raleigh W. Greene, Jr., chairman of the Florida Council of 100, on behalf of Bay Pines.

### REPORT ON THE SENATE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The committee approves the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee relative to the earmarking of funds heretofore appropriated for the veterans hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. The committee further recommends to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration that technical services contracts for the new construction at Bay Pines be let no later than during calendar year 1963 because of the critical shortage of beds in Florida Veterans' Administration hospitals, as shown by the long waiting lists at Bay Pines and other Florida hospitals, and the fact that approximately 900 Florida neuropsychiatric veterans are hospitalized outside of Florida and remote from their homes.

### REPORT IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963 AND 1964

The committee again recommends that the $1,722,000 previously appropriated for technical services at Bay Pines, Fla., remain earmarked for this project if and when the Administrator deems it in the public interest to begin such construction at that place.

### LANGUAGE IN THE SENATE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964, TO BE RETAINED BY THE OSTERTAG MOTION

": *Provided further,* That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla."

Statement made in a letter to the late President Kennedy by Raleigh W. Greene, Jr., chairman of the Florida Council of 100:

Third, some 50,000 veterans in the Tampa-St. Petersburg area placed their signatures on a petition protesting the postponement of the Bay Pines program and asking for the retention of scheduled programing for this project which has enjoyed unanimous support and backing for many years. This petition was delivered to the White House and forwarded to the Veterans' Administration.

To reiterate, the Bay Pines program has enjoyed the bipartisan support of the Florida

> delegation in the Congress, of the entire veteran-impacted west coast of Florida and all veterans' organizations in Florida, together with every report and complete study of all hearings held by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House indicating that the immediate area served by the Bay Pines Hospital is the primary need area of the United States as to bed requirements.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman tell the House what is the waiting list at Bay Pines now?

Mr. CRAMER. The waiting list at Bay Pines now is over 600. There is no question about the need for this construction. Last year when this matter was up for debate in the House I asked the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, for whom I have the greatest regard, to tell the House why his subcommittee put this language in the bill instructing Mr. Gleason to go ahead. He replied that "it was the opinion of both sides that they were unanimous" in instructing Mr. Gleason to go ahead and construct this facility. So I think we in the House should vote to adopt this language instructing him to do it as did the Senate, by adopting the Senate language by voting for the Ostertag motion.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the position that the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate amendment No. 92 and urge that the House do support this Senate amendment. The Senate amendment merely earmarks $1,722,000 of the hospital and domiciliary facilities construction funds to be used specifically for site and planning expenses for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla.

The Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress have repeatedly included in the independent offices appropriations bills funds for this purpose. Just last year the House Appropriations Committee in its report called attention to the fact that approximately $1¾ million had been appropriated for the engineering and advance planning of Bay Pines and directed that it be earmarked for the engineering and advance planning at that site. The Senate Appropriations Committee in its report stated:

> The committee approves the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee relative to the earmarking of funds heretofore appropriated for the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. The committee further recommends to the Administration of the Veterans' Administration that technical services contracts for the new construction at Bay Pines be let no later than during calendar year 1963 because of the critical shortage of beds in Florida Veterans' Administration hospitals, as shown by the long waiting lists at Bay Pines and other Florida hospitals, and the fact that approximately 900 Florida neuropsychiatric veterans are hospitalized outside of Florida and remote from their homes.

Despite this clear indication of congressional intent, the Veterans' Administration has taken no action to effect the construction of additional facilities at Bay Pines, Fla.

At first, the reasons advanced by the Veterans' Administration for failure to move ahead with the construction at Bay Pines was that they were awaiting the establishment of a medical school in the St. Petersburg-Tampa area. After it was determined that no additional medical school facilities expansion would take place for some time to come, the reasons advanced for failure to move ahead with the construction at Bay Pines were then attributed to population shifts dictating the need for additional Veterans' Administration hospital facilities "somewhere in central Florida" rather than at Bay Pines.

Mr. Speaker, in early 1959 the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, after repeated urgings by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member, obtained Presidential approval for an authorized level of 125,000 beds. At the same time, the President approved a revision of the authorized bed capacity at each of the Veteran's Administration hospitals. President Eisenhower's letter of transmittal to the Administration of Veterans' Affairs read in part:

> For these reasons I agree with your recommendation and am returning as of this date with my approval your proposed revision of the authorized bed capacity of each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. These revised authorizations total 125,000 beds for the Veterans' Administration hospital system. They are based on your determination of the present structural capacity of each of the hospitals with adjustments for approved hospital replacement and modernization projects.

Additional facilities at Bay Pines were included in the list approved by the President. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the need for expansion at Bay Pines, Fla., was determined as a part of the overall study of the Veterans' Administration hospital needs throughout the United States. This need has been corroborated in succeeding years by the actions of the administration and the Congress. I fail to see any reason for a change at this time. I am reliably informed that the population increase in the area served by the Bay Pines hospital urgently requires the additional hospital facilities which have heretofore been planned. I therefore urge the House to recede from its disagreement with the Senate and approve the earmarking of these funds to begin the advance planning necessary for hospital construction at Bay Pines, Fla.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request my colleagues to vote down the preferential motion.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OSTERTAG) there were—ayes 102, noes 102.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we were standing for a teller vote. Can we not insist on the teller vote?

The SPEAKER. The demand for the yeas and nays is a constitutional right and, therefore, would supersede the request for tellers.

The gentleman from Texas has demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 204, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—171

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Fallon
Findley
Fino
Foreman
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—204

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Boggs
Boland
Bonner

Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Huddleston

Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin

Pike
Pilcher
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Toll
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whitener
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—59

Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Brooks
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Duncan
Flynt
Ford
Gallagher

Gill
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Kelly
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Poage
Purcell
Rivers, S.C.

Rogers, Tex.
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Utt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Stinson.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Downing with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. White.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Thornberry

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. HAGEN of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 4 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## FIFTY-CENT COIN WITH LIKENESS OF THE LATE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 181)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby submit to the Congress a draft of a proposed bill which would provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces with the likeness of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. With the adoption of this proposal each of the five denominations now being produced by the mint; that is, 1-cent through 50-cent pieces, would have the likeness of a President on the obverse of the coin.

The consent of the Congress is required to make this change in view of the provisions of section 3510 of the Revised Statutes, as amended—31 U.S.C. 276—which provides that no change in the design of a coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years. The present design was adopted in 1948.

If the legislation is enacted, the Treasury Department plans to use the likeness of the late President Kennedy which is being used on a "Presidential series" medal now being manufactured and sold at the Philadelphia Mint. The design of this medal was approved personally by the late President. Mint artists would prepare an appropriate reverse for the coin.

I strongly recommend the enactment of this proposed legislation at the earliest possible date in order that the likeness of President Kennedy will appear on the 50-cent coins issued at the beginning of the calendar year 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE.

## RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 9, 1963.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Rules.

Warm regards.

Respectfully,
HOMER THORNBERRY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works.

With warm personal regards, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
JOHN YOUNG.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 9, 1963.*
The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK,
*The Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*The Capitol,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives as of the close of business today, December 9.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Speaker laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963.*
The SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith respectfully submit my resignation from the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on House Administration, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. McFALL,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 581, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 581

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: JOHN J. McFALL, of California.

Committee on Rules: JOHN YOUNG, of Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 8667.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

## PREVAILING WAGE SECTION OF DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 582, Rept. No. 1016), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6041) to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 583, Rept. No. 1017), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on H.R. 4955 have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit tomorrow afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 229]

Ashley
Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Downing
Duncan
Everett
Fisher
Ford
Fulton, Tenn.
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Monagan
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Powell
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Schadeberg
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Utt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT.) On this rollcall, 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1003)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

" 'SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds—

" '(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

" '(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

" '(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

" '(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

" '(b) The purposes of this Act are—

" '(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

" '(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

" '(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

" '(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

### " 'COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

" 'SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

" '(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

" '(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

### " 'RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

" 'SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

" '(1) conduct, and promote the coordination, and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

" '(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

" '(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution in cooperation with any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located; and

" '(4) initiate and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

" '(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

" '(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

" '(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

" '(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in subsection (a)(1) of this section;

" '(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

" '(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

" '(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

" '(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological effects of varying air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof; and

" '(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

" '(c)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

" '(2) Whenever he determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents), present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, the Secretary shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes and made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies. He shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

" '(3) The Secretary may recommend to such air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

### " 'GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

" 'SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated annually for the purposes of this Act but not to exceed 20 per centum of any such appropriation, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 9(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, regional air pollution programs. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States.

" '(b) From the sums available under subsection (a) of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies. No agency shall receive any grant under this section during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for air pollution programs will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year. No grant shall be made under this section until the Secretary has consulted with the appropriate official as designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected.

" '(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the grant funds available under subsection (a) of this section shall be expended in any one State.

### " 'ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

" 'SEC. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

" '(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (g).

" '(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the heatlh or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

" '(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

" '(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials of all affected States, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

" '(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

" '(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

" '(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that the necessary remedial action be taken. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

" '(e) (1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal department, agency, or instrumentality having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

" '(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

" '(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

" '(f) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

" '(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of pollution, and

" '(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law or, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

" '(g) The court shall receive in evidence in any suit brought in a United States court under subsection (f) of this section a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

" '(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '(i) (1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

" '(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

" '(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

### " 'AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE AND FUEL POLLUTION

" 'SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles, and to this end shall maintain liaison with automotive vehicle, exhaust control device, and fuel manufacturers. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of automotive vehicle, exhaust control device, and fuel manufacturers. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels.

" '(b) One year after enactment of this section, and semiannually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels including (A) occurrence of pollution as a result of discharge of pollutants from automotive exhaust; (B) progress of research into development of devices and fuels to reduce pollution from exhaust of automotive vehicles; (C) criteria on degree of pollutant matter discharged from automotive exhausts; (D) efforts to improve fuels so as to reduce emission of exhaust pollutants; and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts.

### " 'COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

" 'SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

" '(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United

States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

### " 'ADMINISTRATION

" 'SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

" '(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

" '(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

### " 'DEFINITIONS

" 'SEC. 9. When used in this Act—

" '(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" '(b) The term "air pollution control agency" means any of the following:

" '(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

" '(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

" '(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

" '(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

" '(c) The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means—

" '(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

" '(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

" '(d) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

" '(e) The term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

" '(f) The term "municipality" means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

" '(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

### " 'OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

" 'SEC. 10. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

" '(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

### " 'RECORDS AND AUDIT

" 'SEC. 11. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

" '(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

### " 'SEPARABILITY

" 'SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

### " 'APPROPRIATIONS

" 'SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 4 of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, not to exceed $5,000,000.

" '(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

### " 'SHORT TITLE

" 'SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the "Clean Air Act".' "

"SEC. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read 'An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
JOHN B. BENNETT,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
ANCHER NELSEN,
DONALD G. BROTZMAN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
FRANK E. MOSS,
LEE METCALF,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

### GENERAL STATEMENT

The House bill amended the entire act of July 14, 1955, the existing statute on air pollution.

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted a complete revision of such act of July 14, 1955.

The proposed conference substitute is also a complete revision of the act of July 14, 1955, and, except for minor clerical, technical, and conforming amendments the differences between the House bill and the proposed conference substitute are as follows:

### *Investigations, research, and surveys*

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 3 of the act as revised by the House bill authorized the Secretary to conduct investigations and research and to make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting any air pollution control agency.

The Senate amendment authorized these investigations, research, and surveys to be made in cooperation with air pollution control agencies.

The proposed conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

Paragraph (3) further authorized these investigations, research, and surveys to be made if in the judgment of the Secretary the problem might affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation.

The Senate amendment deleted this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment in this regard and does not contain this provision of the House bill.

### *Automotive vehicle and fuel pollution*

As it would have been rewritten by the House passed bill, section 3 of the act would have required the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as a part of a national research and development program for the control and prevention of air pollution, to conduct specified studies with respect to motor vehicle exhaust fumes.

These provisions were deleted in the Senate amendment and are not in the conference substitute. However, the Senate amendment added a new section 6 to the act requiring the Secretary to encourage continued efforts on the part of the automotive and fuel industries to develop devices and fuels to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the exhaust of automotive vehicles. For this purpose, the Secretary would be required to maintain liaison with automotive manufacturers and fuel producers and to appoint a technical committee consisting of an equal number of representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and of such manufacturers and producers. This technical committee would meet at the call of the Secretary in order to evaluate progress in the development of such devices and fuels and to develop and recommend research programs which could lead to the development of such devices and fuels. The Secretary would report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the vehicle exhaust pollution problem and efforts to improve fuels, including, among other things, his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the discharge of pollutants from automotive exhausts. Such a report would be made to the Congress 1 year after enactment of this legislation and semiannually thereafter.

The House passed bill had no provisions comparable to section 6 of the act as it would be rewritten in the Senate amendment. These provisions are included in the conference substitute with a modification so that the Secretary would also be required to maintain liaison with, and have representatives on the technical committee from, exhaust control device manufacturers.

### *Sulfur research*

As it would be rewritten in the Senate amendment, section 3 of the act would require the Secretary, as a part of the national research and development program for the control and prevention of air pollution, to initiate, and conduct a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

The House passed bill had no comparable provisions.

In this respect, the conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment. The conferees wish to point out that these provisions do not emphasize an area of air pollution research for which authority appears elsewhere in this legislation, but rather gives specific authority for a program of research directed toward the development of improved, low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from all fuels on the assumption that sulfur and its byproducts resulting from the combustion of fuels constitute some of the major pollutants of the atmosphere.

### *Purposes for which grants may be made*

Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 3 of the act as revised by the House bill authorized the Secretary to make grants to air pollution control agencies whether public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals for research, training projects, and demonstrations.

The Senate amendment permitted these grants to be made to the same agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals as the House bill but for the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 3. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 3 of the revised act provides that the Secretary shall conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment in this respect.

### *Research and publication of criteria*

Both the House bill and Senate amendment provide that the Secretary shall conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution.

In addition, section 3(c)(1) of the Senate amendment provided that in carrying out his duties under the aforementioned authority, the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combination of agents). The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute is, in this respect, the same as the Senate amendment.

Section 3(c)(2) of the Senate amendment provided that whenever the Secretary determines that there is a particular air pollution agent (or combination of agents) present in the air in certain quantities, producing effects harmful to the health or welfare of persons, he shall compile and publish criteria reflecting accurately the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. The Senate amendment further required that such criteria be published for informational purposes only and made available to municipal, State, and interstate air pollution control agencies and required the Secretary to revise such criteria whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions and the conference substitute is, in this respect, the same as the Senate amendment with the exception that the requirement that this criteria be published for informational purposes only has been modified to eliminate the requirement that it be published only for informational purposes.

### *Grants for support of air pollution control programs*

Section 4 of the act as revised by the House bill provided that not more than $5,000,000 of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by section 12 of the revised act for any fiscal year should be available to make grants to air pollution control agencies to help meet the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. These sums were to be allocated to the several States on the basis of population, the extent of the air pollution problem, and the financial need of the State. From each State's allotment the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount not to exceed two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Those allotments not obligated because of insufficient approvable applications were to be reallocated by the Secretary.

The Senate amendment struck out all of section 4 as revised by the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof an authorization that not to exceed 20 percent of the total of all sums authorized to be appropriated for this act could be used to make grants to air pollution control agencies for developing, establishing, or improving programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. These grants would be made in amounts up to two-thirds of the cost of such programs except in the case of developing, establishing, or improving regional air pollution programs in which case the grant may not exceed three-fourths of the cost of such program. The grants were to be made in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the section and he is required, as far as practicable, to give due consideration to population, the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and the financial need of the respective air pollution control agencies. It further provided that any agency receiving such grant shall not have reduced its non-Federal funds in the preceding fiscal year during the fiscal year in which it receives such grant. It also required that no grant be made until the Secretary has consulted with appropriate officials designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected. In addition, it limited the amount to be expended in any one State to not more than 12½ percent of the grant funds appropriated for purposes of the act.

The proposed conference substitute is substantially identical with the provisions of the Senate amendment except for clarifying amendments designed to insure (1) that not more than 20 percent of the annual appropriation made to carry out the act shall be available for grants and (2) that no agency whose expenditures of non-Federal funds for air pollution programs during a fiscal year will be less than its expenditures for such programs during the preceding year shall be eligible to receive any grant during that fiscal year.

### *Conferences on abatement of air pollution*

Under both the House-passed bill and the Senate amendment thereto, one of the principal means of bringing about abatement of air pollution in a State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons is by the calling of a conference. The conferees at any such conference would be representatives of air pollution control agencies for the place where such pollution originates and for the place affected by such pollution.

The House-passed bill would have permitted the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to call such a conference whenever he had reason to believe, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, that any air pollution is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than in which the pollutants originate.

The Senate amendment requires the Secretary (1) to consult with State officials of all affected States before calling a conference in such a case and (2) to invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate amendment.

### *Membership of hearing board*

Section 5(e)(1) of the act, as revised by the House bill, provided that the hearing board convened for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on an air pollution problem shall consist, in part, of at least one representative of the Department of Commerce and one member of the Department of Interior.

The Senate amendment substituted a provision requiring that each Federal agency having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary be given an opportunity to select one member of the hearing board, and, stipulated that one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency (if one exists).

The conference substitute retains the Senate provision, with a modification that not only each Federal agency but each Federal department or instrumentality which has a substantial interest in the subject matter shall be given such opportunity.

### *Abatement of air pollution*

Section 5(f) of the act, as revised by the House bill, provided that if, after the expiration of the time set by the Secretary to secure abatement, such abatement measures have not been taken, the Secretary, in the case of intrastate pollution, shall send the findings and record of the hearing together with his finding that action reasonably calculated to secure abatement has not been taken, to the Governor and the attorney general of the State, and at their request, may provide technical and other assistance to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement. In the case of interstate air pollution the Secretary was authorized to request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. He was prohibited from making such a request until he received a certification from the Governor of each State wherein the health and welfare of individuals are being endangered by air pollution (other than the State in which the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originate) that such Governor has made a good faith effort to enter into an agreement or compact with the State causing the pollution to secure abatement thereof and has been unable to secure such agreement or compact.

The Senate amendment struck out these provisions of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof the requirement that if action reasonably calculated to secure abatement within the specified time is not taken, the Secretary, in the case of interstate air pollution, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement, and in the case of intrastate air pollution shall, at the request of the Governor of such State, provide technical and other assistance necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement under State or local law or, if requested by the Governor of the State, authorizes the Secretary to request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except for certain clarifying amendments to insure that the request of the Governor of the State must be obtained before the Secretary can request the Attorney General to bring suit to secure abatement of intrastate pollution and a clarifying amendment to provide that subsection (g) relating to evidence in court in a suit be restricted to those suits brought in U.S. courts.

*Reports*

The House bill contained a provision authorizing the Secretary to require certain reports from any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to an air pollution problem which has been the subject of a conference.

The Senate amendment provided that such reports may be required in connection with any such conference.

The conference substitute is, in this respect, the same as the Senate amendment.

The House bill and Senate amendment authorized the Secretary to prescribe the form of the report, furnishing such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such report. The Senate amendment further provided that such report is to be based on existing data and that after a conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such reports only to the extent recommended by such conference.

The conference substitute retains these modifications.

In addition, the Senate amendment provided that no person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes, and this language has been retained in the conference substitute.

*Permits for Federal departments and agencies*

The Senate amendment provided in subsection (d) of section 7 of the revised act that the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which Federal departments or agencies shall before discharging any matter into the air in the United States obtain a permit prior to such discharge. These permits would be issued only at specified periods of time and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds the pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. Plans, specifications, and other information which the Secretary deems relevant must be submitted to him in connection with the issuance of these permits, and he is requested to report to Congress each January the status of such permits and the compliance therewith.

The House bill contained no similar provisions.

The proposed conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment in this regard.

*Administration*

The House bill authorized the Secretary to prescribe such procedural regulations as are needed to carry out his functions under the act.

The Senate amendment eliminated the word "procedural" as being too restrictive upon the authority which the Secretary needs to carry out the act.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment in this regard.

*Definitions*

The Senate amendment included American Samoa within the definition of the term, "State."

The House bill did not include American Samoa.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment added a subsection (g) to section 9 of the revised act to provide that all language referring to adverse affects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agriculture crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

The House bill contained no equivalent provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment in this regard.

*Records and audits*

The Senate amendment provides in subsection (a) of section 11 of the revised act that every recipient of assistance will keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe including those which fully disclose the amount and disposition by the recipient of the proceeds of assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in which the assistance is given or used, the amount of that portion of the cost supplied by other sources and such other records which will facilitate an effective audit. Subsection (b) of this section provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General or their agents shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grants received under this act.

The House bill contained no equivalent provision.

The proposed conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

*Appropriations*

Subsection (b) of section 13 of the act as revised by the House bill provides authorization of not to exceed $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1965, not to exceed $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and not to exceed $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The Senate amendment to this provision increased the authorization from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1965, adopted the amounts provided in the House bill for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 and added authorizations of not to exceed $42,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1969.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the provisions of the House bill with the exception of the authorization for fiscal year 1965 which was increased from not to exceed $20,000,000 to not to exceed $25,000,000 as provided by the Senate amendment. It is the understanding of the conferees that limiting the program to 3 fiscal years will permit legislative committees in both Houses of Congress to reexamine this program within a relatively short period of time and, assuming the expectations for the program are realized, will permit the Congress to provide necessary increases in authorizations for future fiscal years. The conferees recognize that air pollution constitutes one of our national problems and that as our population grows and as urbanization expands this may require increased fiscal support of air pollution programs.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
JOHN B. BENNETT,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
ANCHER NELSEN,
DONALD G. BROTZMAN,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. HARRIS (during the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with since the report and statement have already been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], the chairman of the subcommittee, who has given so much time and study to this problem and who has done such an outstanding job in developing it. The gentleman will describe the conference report to the House.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first of all I would like to thank the members of the subcommittee who participated in the conference and who have been very active in bringing about this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is contained in the conference report represents, in my opinion, a vindication or approval of the position of the House in most respects. This legislation is not new to the Congress of the United States. We have been in the air pollution control field now for several years. The first permanent-type legislation was adopted in 1955. Last year we adopted a sort of stopgap program to keep the legislation in effect. The legislation now before you in this conference report represents about the fourth or fifth time that legislation of this kind has been before this body.

The House passed the original bill, my bill, H.R. 6518, in July. The bill then went to the Senate where it passed with overwhelming support. We met in conference with them last week and worked out what I think is a bill that should have wide bipartisan support as this legislation has had down through the years.

During the Eisenhower administration legislation was recommended to the House. Legislation was recommended under the Kennedy administration, although they did not send up an administration bill. Our bill was pretty much worked out by the subcommittee on which I have the honor to serve as chairman. Some changes were made in the House bill which I will briefly call to your attention, but most of the program as envisioned by the House committee, both the Subcommittee on Health and Safety and the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is pretty well carried out in the Senate bill. They have tightened up one or two important aspects of the bill. The conferees on the House side went along with these procedures. We have found that in air pollution we have a considerably different problem from that of water pollution and it must be approached in a different way.

We have recognized that there are about 100 million of our people, or about 90 percent of our population now living on about 10 percent of the land space. Unfortunately no new air is pumped into these spaces. This is getting to be a considerable problem in cities of 50,000 population or more. It is a problem which has seen legislation adopted in some 30-odd States.

We know that perhaps 10 million of our people suffer from the dread disease known as emphysema. We are spending about $65 million a year in social security payments to people who are affected by this disease. We know that it affects and is associated, I might say, as a factor, with some cases of lung cancer. It is an aggravating cause in cases of any type of lung disease, particularly in cases of tuberculosis. We know that a growing number of trucks and vehicles on our highways, particularly in our cities, aggravate this problem. It has been estimated to cost some $10 billion a year. It is a grave problem in the field of agriculture.

In the food and drug field we have had legislation for 50 years. We are a little bit late in attacking this problem but I think that the attack we make in this legislation is going to bear results. It is a cooperative type of attack. We have specifically, I think, allowed this to be seed money and to serve as a catalyst and not to discourage the actions of the States and municipalities and some county organizations in this field.

I might say that the Senate wanted a 5-year program costing some $182 million. The House conferees stood firmly and we came up with a $95 million program. We had originally passed a program of $92 million, which means we did not give in to the Senate. We have what is substantially a 3-year program. We are almost through 1964, with 7 months of it to go. We retained the $5 million for fiscal 1964 and put in $25 million for 1965, $30 million for 1966, and $35 million for 1967 at which time we cut off the program.

We set up in the automotive and fuel producing fields a technical committee which will follow this problem of photochemical smog and other types of smog that emanate from unburned hydrocarbons. We have already had some great effect on the automotive industry which is equipping most of its new models with smog devices. This was an outgrowth of the intense effort and interest of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck].

We passed the Schenck Act 3 years ago which provided for some intensive research in this field.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been wanting to say this to the House for some time; it is long overdue. I think the membership of the House should realize fully that the gentleman's subcommittee, and particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck], have done more for the health and welfare of the people of the United States than any other two individuals, in the field of safety, in the operation of automobiles, and in the field of air pollution.

I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that the unflagging determination on the part of these two gentlemen was the principal reason for bringing seat belts or attachments to the automobiles of this country. A good many years ago the gentleman headed a subcommittee in this field. There were a lot of people in this country opposed to seat belts; the automobile industry opposed it as an industry. But the gentleman and his committee kept working in cooperation with them and through patience and determination over the years the automobile industry came to see the advisability of providing seat belts as a piece of standard equipment.

So it was in the field of air pollution. The gentleman and his committee were determined to do something about air pollution. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee and the members of the conference committee on the part of the House for the outstanding work they have done in bringing this conference report back to the House. It is in keeping with what the gentleman's committee did as well as with what the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did, which was approved by the House. This conference report deserves the approval of the House and I urge the House to approve it by way of showing our appreciation to the gentleman and his committee of the splendid job that they have done.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his fine compliments. I think his fine leadership and help have been a source of inspiration to us.

Mr. Speaker, in the conference the other body brought in the idea of initiating a continuing program of research directed toward development of improved low-cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels which the House was agreeable to.

There has been some testimony in our hearings to the effect that the burning of sulfur in some types of fuels has some aggravating effects and is, perhaps, a cause of the common cold.

Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of the conference committee print we included language which would allow the Secretary to compile and to publish criteria which reflect the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of the effects which may be expected from the presence of such air pollution agents or combination of agents in the air, in varying quantities. This criteria may be made available to the municipal, State and interstate Air Pollution Control Agencies.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we kept the House language which allows the Secretary to make recommendations to these control agencies, in the light of this criteria.

Over in section 4(a), page 11, the Senate held to the idea which we had of providing Federal grants to the local and State agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of establishing, developing or improving air pollution prevention and control programs. One-third of the cost would be paid by the States.

In the case of the regional agencies, the Federal Government would pay up to three-fourths of the amount; this, in view of the fact that it becomes an interstate matter, and we felt that that distinction should be made. The House conferees did provide, however, and go along with the language which provides that the agency which applies for these funds would assure that it would not reduce its non-Federal funds from the preceding fiscal year, which would mean that this would keep the States and local agencies from diminishing their support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the abatement features of the bill, when it is an intrastate matter, the action must be entirely triggered by the chief magistrate of that State, the Governor.

We recognize that in the local situation he may call upon the Secretary for the use of technical data to be used in an abatement suit. But the Governor is in control of the local situation.

Now, in the interstate situations we provide, first of all, for a conference to which the municipal, State, or interstate Air Pollution Control Agencies must be invited. Following the conference—and that conference is not to be called until after consultation with the State groups—after the conference is held, a summary of the conference is to be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Recommendations are also to be made and a period of 6 months allowed for the recommendations to be placed in effect. If, at the conclusion of that period—and this language was also in the House bill—no remedial measures have been taken, a public hearing must be called. The Governor of the aggrieved State, the Governor of the polluting State, or whomever the Governor of each of those particular States may designate as his representative must be given the opportunity to serve on the hearing board and, also, each Federal agency which has a substantial interest in the subject matter must be invited. However, a majority of the people serving on this hearing board must be other than employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They, then, have 6 more months in which to take some action toward abatement. If no action is taken at that time, then the Secretary may proceed to ask the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution.

This about concludes the discussion other than the section on the automotive and fuel industry section. We took the Senate language on that section which sets up a technical committee which must have an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the automotive and fuel manufacturing industries. They can meet from time to time to evaluate progress in the development of devices and fuels which would be in keeping with improving the situation as far as air pollution control is concerned.

I repeat again, I think the House conferees stayed with the position of the House. We have the program down to what we think is the minimum amount of money that should be spent in this important field. This is coming to be more and more of a problem in some 261 cities of the country and we feel that this is the minimum that the Federal Government ought to do in this field.

I hope the House will unanimously adopt the conference report.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to express my sincere appreciation to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his very fine and complimentary words of commendation of the work of our committee, myself, and our colleagues. It has been a very real privilege to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris] and on our Subcommittee of Health and Safety all these years with my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. Roberts]. It has been a deeply rewarding experience the memory of which I shall cherish so long as I shall live.

It was also a very real privilege to serve on the conference committee which report we are considering here today. We had two meetings and there was an unusually fine spirit of give and take during the friendly yet completely thorough discussion on this important bill. We are understandably proud of the fact that we maintained the position of the House and we are pleased with changes in the language that was developed in the other body. We think this conference report is real good, and the resulting changes, I feel personally make it even better, stronger and more workable than the original House measure which I fully supported, and I now express the completely sincere hope this conference report will be overwhelmingly approved.

We have heard it stated authentically many times that air pollution costs each and every person in the United States $65 a year. So it is tremendously important from the economic point of view. We must continue to research and examine the source and causes of air pollution so that it can be better controlled even though it is now being controlled to a remarkable degree. A very good program in research as to the effects of automotive exhaust gases on human health has been conducted by the Air Pollution Division of the Public Health Service. An excellent report was issued on this by the Surgeon General on this question in June of last year. More research and work is being done constantly by all segments of the automotive manufacturers, the fuel manufacturers, and the exhaust gas device manufacturers. The industry has spent large and substantial sums of money on this program each year.

Just recently the General Motors Corp. announced that it was contributing another $100,000 to the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research to study further the effects of automotive gases in the atmosphere. Economical and workable devices will be developed to improve the abatement of the pollution of the air we breathe from automobile exhaust gases and to encourage the proper maintenance of the vehicle; but much also depends on the driver and the manner in which he drives the vehicle.

The entire problem is one of personal concern to everyone in order to assure that each of us has the kind of clean air to breathe that promotes good health. So it will require continuous research and effort on the part of everyone.

There is no person or area in the Nation that can escape the dangers of air pollution.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend and urge overwhelming approval of this conference report by all of our colleagues. I think it is extremely well done. I would like to express my personal appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the fine cooperation they have given on this legislation and on all other questions considered by our committee on this and all related fields since I have been serving on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a release by General Motors Corp. as follows:

> Detroit.—General Motors Corp. recently announced a research grant of $100,000 to the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, for continued study of effects of automotive exhaust gases in the atmosphere.
>
> The grant will support research over a 2-year period, and will double the amount of GM's support of the program in the 6th and 7th years of the corporation's contributions to it.
>
> The Sloan-Kettering Institute's continuing research program includes analyses of samples of tars collected from automotive exhaust gases under a variety of operating conditions and from representative city atmospheres, in an effort to identify the effect of automotive exhaust gases in relation to other sources of air pollution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I notice in the report on page 10, regarding appropriations, section 13, that there is an authorization of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and then for the year ending June 30, 1965, $25 million, $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. Would it not be just as well to save this $95 million in the light of the Federal Budget? Why is this expanded amount asked for at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman does propound a most appropriate question insofar as our desire to do something about budgetary matters is concerned. On the other hand, the House has already passed on the $90 million and here we are dealing only with an additional sum of $5 million in the 4-year period. So at this time we do not have before us the question of whether the program should be adopted. Of course, the conference report could be refused and the House could refuse to do anything, but in dealing with the conference report our problem is the differences between the House and the Senate, and that is what we have under discussion here today.

Mr. BEERMANN. It seems to me that there are private agencies in operation that could take care of this.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the conferees and the subcommittee on the conference report which is now before the House. Although the House version of the bill was better legislation, I recognize the practical alternatives which were crystallized in conference.

In my Cleveland community, the air pollution problem seems to be getting progressively worse. There are certain days when atmospheric conditions cast a complete cloud blanket over the entire metropolitan area, sealing in the effluent of all of the industrial plants of the industrial valley. In this atmosphere of contamination, which periodically occurs, respiratory ailments and deaths are multiplied.

Over 25 years ago, when I was a member of the Cleveland City Council, we organized a community committee to protest the air pollution problem. At that time, we retained the services of a doctor with the school of experimental medicine of the University of Cincinnati who made a very comprehensive study of death records which showed that in the so-called dirtier areas of the city there were 240 more deaths annually resulting from lung cancer than there were in the cleaner sections of the community.

It seems to me that a similar study conducted today of the death records of a community could be made to determine the relationship between air pollution and the respiratory illnesses which result in death. Such a study would be very helpful in determining the urgency for constructive steps to meet this tremendous problem.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 6518, the clean-air bill. The case for the enactment of legislation for the prevention and abatement of air pollution has been made very clear by the statements of the managers on the part of the House.

I have indicated to the House before that air pollution costs some $11 billion a year in damages, which include damages to crops, animals, and human beings as well, and it is estimated by the U.S. Public Health Service that by 1970, two-thirds of our population will be breathing only the air over 10 percent of our land mass due to our population density. Certainly if we do not take steps to purify the air, then the incidence of disease and damage caused by air pollution will rapidly become a grave national health problem.

The clean-air bill before us today is a carefully thought out and researched program to combat the problem of air pollution. The conference committee was able to agree for all practical purposes to a 3-year $95 million program that is 2 years shorter and $87 million less than the original Senate proposal. We members of the conference committee feel that we can make an effective beginning with a shorter and less expensive program, and still obtain the needed result of restraining air pollution and eventually eliminating a major portion of this problem.

We must act now. With the continuous reports of the probability of lung cancer being caused by the toxic matter in the atmosphere we breathe, we cannot afford to wait any longer to combat this problem of air pollution. We often look back when we are confronted by the effects of inaction and say that we should have acted sooner, but hindsight is more often than not, a poor excuse for foresight. We must attack the problem of air pollution immediately—today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that has been brought up about the money, the appropriations authorized by this bill, I think it is well to point out a number of facts. First of all, the air pollution program was authorized before the passage of this law by general provisions of law. In fact, there was no limit as to the amount of money that could be appropriated for air pollution programs under the law heretofore passed. This is the first effort by this committee and this Congress to begin to set some limitations on this program. If the gentleman, and I can furnish these facts to him, will go into it, he will find that we have just about cut in half the proposed carrying out of this program over the years for what many feel needs to be done. Presently the House has already appropriated $13 million. This action was taken not in this legislation but in an actual appropriation bill. This additional $5 million is authorized for this one phase of the program, that is a new program. We simply placed the $5 million in this legislation to cover the appropriation for fiscal 1964, so that we could begin to tie in all of these programs under one bill. So as to what I think the gentleman is concerned about, where it perhaps looks as if the program is jumping from $5 million up to $25 million, that actually is not the case, because you actually have $13 million appropriated and this $5 million takes it up to $18 million. We cut down from the amount the Department wanted. When the House went to conference, we had passed a bill of $90 million. Do you know what the Senate had passed? They had passed a bill of $182 million for a 5-year program. If you go over this report, I think you will be proud of the action of the House conferees because we held the program for $95 million for 3 years.

Mr. BEERMANN. Who in the world authorized or passed a law that said they could dip into the Federal Treasury and spend as much money as they want to? Who authorized a law with no restriction?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This Congress passed a law, the Public Health Service Act, section 304, 311 and 314, the general law states the responsibility for carrying on this program is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. BEERMANN. With unlimited funds?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. With no limitation on the amount that they may request. Then they go to the Committee on Appropriations and whatever they can justify before the Committee on Appropriations, the Congress can appropriate. But here we are changing that. Therefore, the gentleman should be strongly in favor of this because we are cutting down on what they can come to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for.

Mr. BEERMANN. Will the gentleman answer me this question?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I will be glad to try to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BEERMANN. Is there any chance that a law like this was passed under unanimous consent and nobody knew what was happening some several years ago?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. No, no. I would think not and I am sure that is not the case.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to know when it was passed.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the gentleman will check, he will find that there are many laws such as this. There is provided a general authorization and they simply go to the Committee on Appropriations. Here we are changing this position because, fortunately, I feel the House is beginning to want to take more control. Here we are beginning to tie it down more and more. In fact, the research program that we are investigating now, the whole program of research, is in line with this trend, I think in the hope of trying to tie down authorizations more tightly. That is exactly what this does. I am sure when the gentleman goes over this report, he will strongly support the committee's action.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I have taken this time today is to comment upon one change, certainly, which has been made in the bill as it has come from the conference committee. This change relates to an amendment which I advocated and succeeded in having passed in the House on the floor. My amendment had the effect of changing the general rule and limiting the powers which had been given to the Secretary under the provisions of the bill by inserting the word "procedural" before the type of regulations which the Secretary could promulgate. At that time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] and I had a colloquy reported in the Congressional Record which read in part as follows. I stated at that time:

> If we are referring only to procedural regulations within his own department, this (this provision, that is) would be proper. But I see no reason why he should have general regulatory powers under the provisions of this bill.
>
> Mr. Roberts. Will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. Taft. I would be glad to yield.
>
> Mr. Roberts. I think the gentleman has stated what was in the minds of the members of the committee in writing this bill.

Now, apparently, when the House conferees, however, got to the conference committee they were prevailed upon and we find in the report of the conference committee the statement that the Secretary himself apparently had indicated to some members of the conference committee that he did not feel this limitation would be proper and that he felt any such limitation would cut into his authority and his ability to administer the act.

If that was true, I do not know why it was true. There had been no testimony before, so far as I can find out, indicating why he needed general rulemaking power. I think this general rulemaking power, as all of us know, in many programs has been abused. I think there is a chance it will be abused again here. I think, if we are to take out the word "procedural" as a limitation on the powers, the very least we can do is to prescribe some standards.

I would call to your attention that there are nowhere so far as I can see any standards prescribed for regulations.

While we are talking about that, I think we ought to understand what I would call a procedural monstrosity which really does exist in this bill and which I think goes to show the broad powers the Secretary has, not only under the rulemaking power but even further than that. I would call to your attention section 5(i) of the bill, subsection (2). This is a provision under which a person who is asked to file a report as to the cause of any pollution which he may be involved in, must report on the details of it, a provision which I believe violates the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. This has been in the bill all the time. We also find here that if this happens the Secretary can mitigate the fines and penalties, if he wishes to, for failing to file these reports, but in doing so the Secretary determines what the facts are and his determination shall be final. There is no court of appeal and no review of any kind. It is an absolute discretion given to an administrative authority.

I think excessive power is given in this bill, regardless whether it may be a good or a poor bill. We all recognize the need for some action. Hopefully it can be State and local action that will be effective in this field, but there is no excuse for passing a bill of this type at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is the gentleman concerned about rulemaking, perhaps to do with abatement?

Mr. TAFT. The gentleman is concerned with rulemaking in any way. I do not think there is any limitation other than the general scope of this legislation that could be invoked here.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Certainly the gentleman would expect to set certain rules as to the agencies, as to what agencies can qualify, and the time elements, and that sort of thing, would he not?

Mr. TAFT. The gentleman certainly would, and the gentleman's amendment, as offered and passed by the House before, permitting procedural regulations would, I think, have covered that point.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. May I say this: As far as abatement is concerned, I am sure the gentleman knows that before any regulations are put into effect on abatement the court is the one that will decide that.

Mr. TAFT. I hope that is true.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It is written in the bill. I wanted to assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. TAFT. I will say this: It has been written into many other bills, but at the same time if the rulemaking power is there and the rules are prescribed by the Secretary and established under the Administrative Procedures Act, the court has no alternative but to accept that as law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] to reply to some of the questions raised by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for 1 second?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to say there that, of course, there is no way for the Secretary to enforce it except through the courts. So the fears the gentleman raised are groundless.

Mr. TAFT. The court would have no alternative but to take the law as prescribed under the rulemaking power.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. There is no rulemaking power for abatement, if the gentleman will read the law.

Mr. TAFT. I do not agree with the gentleman in this respect. There are certain limitations, it is true, in the general scope of the act, but only in the general scope of the act.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have shared the gentleman's concern as to this matter and we discussed it, we thought, quite thoroughly in the conference. There were some people in the conference who felt the meaning of the word "procedural" is very vague as far as the law is concerned. When we try to ascribe meaning to words such as "substantive" and "procedural," it can be vague. The fear was expressed if we went along with the change which the gentleman put into the bill on the floor of the House that it would probably run us into the Administrative Procedure Act and in the end would not accomplish what we thought the gentleman wanted. It was with great reluctance that we could not prevail on the Senate conferees on this particular point. I do think, however, that the power of the Secretary is very adequately tied down in this bill as to what he can do and as to what kind of information he must act upon, and the extent of the data upon which he may proceed. I think it has taken care of the gentleman's objections.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the gentleman is saying in effect that in his opinion under the act the only type of regulations the Secretary may prescribe are, in effect, procedural, whether we so define them or not.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I would say this; I think there are enough restrictions written into this act to assure local protection and protection of industry. I think that has been the intent of this committee throughout this entire act.

I think we came out of conference with a bill which does that.

Mr. TAFT. Does the gentleman feel that the Secretary would not have power to issue substantive regulations?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The question that bothered the conferees, and rightfully so, is what is procedural and what is substantive. We have had that question, that problem, in connection with regulatory procedures over the years. As I see it, the question is not whether it is procedural or substantive with reference to rulemaking. It is the authority that is contained in the act itself and the restrictions which the act itself provides or the limitations which the act itself places on the administrator who is in this case the Secretary. Those are the guidelines, and I have thought it was the duty of the Congress to set out the standards in the language of the act itself and not get into this broad, general, rulemaking procedure where the courts will construe on the one hand and have difficulty in construing the same question on the other hand.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the problem that the conferees had in the matter of trying to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Subsection 5(i) violates the privilege against self-incrimination since the reports required to be filed under penalty of fines will be included in the transcript under subsection 5(g) and must be received in evidence in any suit brought under subsection 5(f).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the committee on bringing this anti-air-pollution legislation to the floor of the House and also the conferees for their work in behalf of this legislation. I do not know of any piece of legislation that we have had before the House that is as necessary as some kind of action by our Federal Government to regulate the inexcusable, unregulated air pollution, especially in the larger cities and industrial areas throughout the Nation.

In my home district, the industrial Calumet region of Indiana needs relief from smoke, smog, and polluted air. We have three major steel mills; United States Steel, Inland, Youngstown, and several smaller steel manufacturing mills; most of the major oil companies have refineries in my congressional district. We have two or three hundred other industries. Across the State line, in Chicago, there are the South Chicago Steel Works and dozens and dozens of minor and major industries. Those are across the State line, and if local regulations were all that applied possibly we might be able to do something on our side of the State line but nothing would be done on the other side, or vice versa.

I remember a few years ago when I was in Los Angeles. The newspapers had headlines condemning the mayor and city officials about the epidemic of smog which was especially thick for several days. Our old friend and former colleague, Norris Poulson, was mayor of Los Angeles at that time. I called him up to sympathize with him. I told him about the troubles we were having in my area. I said to him that the only difference between our area and his area was that they called it smog out there while we just called it plain smoke in the Chicago area. I said to him that you can fly over New York, Pittsburgh, or Buffalo, or any of our major cities and most smaller towns, and if a strong wind is not blowing, they all are victims of devastating health hazards from smoke or air pollution. There is no question that air pollution is undermining the health of millions of our people, not only the people who live there in the community but the people who are called upon to go into these areas that have major air pollution.

Mayor Poulson invited me to a meeting they were having on air pollution the next day. They had the Southern California Anti-Air Pollution Department, members of the council, business, and labor represented at that luncheon. Of course, they had no solution to it but they did agree that no one city or local community could solve it. The Federal Government must undertake a program to solve this health menace.

I thought that if we can solve the problem of flying a man through space 23 times in a few hours, the Government ought to have enough technique in research to be able to solve the air pollution problem in this country.

This legislation will be a great step forward because our industrial district has been fighting the air pollution or smoke problem for years. It is too complex a problem for Chicago, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, the Calumet region, or any other local area to free its citizens of the health menace of air pollution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend the committee for presenting this legislation onto the floor of the House. I hope this antiair pollution bill passes unanimously. I do think that this great health problem will be solved eventually.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

**Mr. HARVEY of Indiana.** Mr. Speaker, when this piece of legislation was before the House a few weeks ago, I took exception to the principle upon which it was being enacted, and still do.

At that time I offered a motion to recommit, and I hope that we will have a rollcall vote on this conference report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to be in the position of one challenging the motives of the members of this very fine committee. I think they certainly operated in the best of good faith.

I also would not like to be in the position of being for pollution. I think just about anyone would agree that this is a problem and we hope ultimately to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to address myself here primarily to the basic philosophy nor to the mechanics of it. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft], has already touched upon what, I think, are some of the defects in the structure of the bill. My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory], will address himself to the basic philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to touch upon here, and I hope I might have the attention of the members of the committee particularly in this respect, because I am going to humbly suggest that even if this report is passed and becomes a law, you will not have concluded dealing with it. I think, as my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], pointed out, you have a situation which does exist in his corner of our State which is typical of the situation that exists all over the country in which we find large cities located near State lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a good idea on the surface if one State feels aggrieved to be able to haul the other one into court, so to speak, and to deal with them. But I think you are going to find, before this is concluded, that you have sort of opened up the beehive and it is going to be pretty hard to get the bees back into the hives again.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly and sincerely believe that this is not good legislation.

First of all I want to say that if we had some actual, definite, concrete remedy for smog and that this was the conceded method of dealing with it, just as as you have a specific remedy for a given disease, then I would be for it. But you are simply legislating in this instance in the unknown.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore.** The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

**Mr. HARRIS.** Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

**Mr. HARVEY of Indiana.** Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in conclusion, that we have gone in my opinion pretty far afield a great many times in this House in trying to remedy everything by legislative action. I feel very definitely and sincerely in this case that that is what we are about to do. I feel we are making a mistake in passing this specific legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust and hope that this conference report will not be approved by the House.

**Mr. HARRIS.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

**Mr. O'BRIEN of New York.** Mr. Speaker, I was not aware the merits of this legislation were being discussed. As I recall, the bill passed the House originally by a nearly 3-to-1 vote. I feel this conference report brings back a bill which is even superior to the one which obtained overwhelming support in the House.

I have sat occasionally on conferences and I can recall no instance where there was more solid support on the part of the conferees for the ultimate package than there was in this instance and, speaking of packages, if we had accepted the Senate package with the 5 years we would have here a bill $87 million more expensive than the one we have now.

I feel that the House acted wisely in its overwhelming support of the original bill and I think it is wisdom that it should approve the conference report.

**Mr. HARRIS.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

**Mr. McCLORY.** Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentlemen who worked on this bill (H.R. 6518) for their efforts. I do not want to question their interest in public health, nor do I question the interest of the rest of the Members of the House on the subject of public health. I have had some interest in this subject myself. As a matter of fact, my standing here today emanates from the privilege I have had of serving on the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the Government Operations Committee of the House investigating into the subject of water pollution. The subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama has come to be known as the Jones committee. It is my strong feeling this was not good legislation.

It is my firm belief that the bill reported by the conference committee is not good legislation. I might say that when the bill went to the Senate there were a great many changes made there. When it is suggested that the House held its own with regard to the conference report I suggest a reading of the conference committee report. It is plain to see that in most instances the House receded and the Senate version of the bill was recommended. I must say that the Senate amendments to the bill make it less objectionable than it was originally.

It is suggested that perhaps we are late in bringing forth this bill. There is no question about that, because local communities have all initiated programs of air pollution abatement in their own areas where they have their individual local problems of polluted air.

The mayor of Chicago came down here and testified that during the last 30 years that city had reduced the amount of dust per square mile from 350 tons to 43 tons, and he expects Chicago to make further progress on its own. I know that Pittsburgh and other cities have also undertaken to tackle this problem locally. It is reported that there are only 17 States which have programs for air pollution abatement. This is understandable since the problem is not a serious one in many States. We heard yesterday from the gentleman from California [Mr. Burkhalter] who stated that California has done a great deal to try to get rid of the smog. Whether this smog results from the locating of industries in the wrong place, or from natural conditions of terrain and wind currents there is no question but that the Californians have put forth a great deal of effort. However, neither this local condition nor the various magazine articles on air pollution should persuade the Congress to initiate a vast new Federal program, as is done by this bill. If we enact this legislation I think the Congress is making a mistake.

In regard to grants-in-aid. These are held out as bait so that local areas will want this legislation. If there were no Federal funds I am quite sure they would not want it, but with Federal funds they do.

What effect does this have on the local areas? We had some testimony before the Jones committee that it reduced the local initiative with respect to water pollution abatement. I am not surprised that the conference committee report recommends a provision that notwithstanding the provisions of this legislation no grants-in-aid to local areas should be made where local appropriations have been reduced. This is almost a telltale admission as to what this legislation is going to do.

While the Senate version of this legislation, which is adopted substantially in this report, is an improvement over the original House bill, I am sure that by rejecting the conference committee report a much better bill could be produced.

**Mr. HARRIS.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern].

**Mr. HALPERN.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of the conference report on this legislation, H.R. 6518, and recommend it wholeheartedly to my colleagues for approval.

I also wish to commend the conferees on the part of the House. Their conference report, in my opinion, represents a great deal of study and work, and they have come up with an excellent bill. In particular, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] for his excellent leadership in this effort.

I have long advocated an effective bill to clean up air pollution, and have deemed it a privilege to be identified with those who recognize air pollution for the dangerous problem it is, and who have worked for a truly effective program to eradicate this problem. I cosponsored the original legislation at this session, my bill being H.R. 4750, and was also a cosponsor of last year's bill which was enacted as Public Law 87-761. Great strides have been taken since that legislation was approved, culminating in this superb conference report which offers a broad and excellent program to attack this scourge of our metropolitan areas.

The dangers facing us in this area are clear, and the responsibility should not be shirked. Unless action is taken to eliminate the air pollution that is choking our cities we face not only monetary losses, but serious threats to the health and even the lives of our people.

This legislation strikes at the heart of the problem by a comprehensive program involving uniform laws, research, investigation, and training, grants for control programs, abatement of air pollution by judicial proceedings and numerous programs of Federal-State cooperation. This is just what we need, Mr. Speaker and that is just what this bill offers.

Last July the Members of this body approved H.R. 6518 by a substantial vote. Now the conference report even improves on that bill, good as it was. Accordingly, I trust that today we will give it an overwhelming vote of approval.

**Mr. DADDARIO.** Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report on H.R. 6518, the Clean Air Act, House Report 1003.

I want to commend the managers on the part of the House for their efforts and particularly for seeing that restrictive language with respect to patents and other proprietary rights was eliminated from the bill.

This action is in keeping with the decision of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in rejecting patent language included in the draft legislation received from the executive branch. The committee apparently felt, as do I, that legislation in the patents and proprietary rights area must be subject to comprehensive hearings and investigation, and should be considered for its impact on overall Government research contracting, rather than as an amendment or provision of every bill authorizing public expenditures for research and development.

On October 10, our late President issued a far-reaching and important statement of Government patent policy in the form of a memorandum of understanding to sundry Government departments and agencies. I commented on President Kennedy's policy on the floor of the House that same day—page 19281 of the Congressional Record—stating that I was favorably impressed with the overall tone and objectives of the President's statement.

My comments were based on the fact that I understood that the President did not intend his patent policy to be an excuse for further restricting the rights of parties to Government research contracting. The President's policy was designed to provide the flexibility necessary to the successful completion of Government research objectives, while, at the same time, protecting the rights of the public and the equities of the industrial community under Government contracts.

Moreover, as I stated at the time, it provides for a licensing policy with necessary exceptions, which should be implemented by executive agencies without delay.

In direct contradiction to the philosophy of President Kennedy's realistic approach, we have a concerted effort on the part of some to amend every piece of legislation calling for Federal research effort, so as to add provisions which, in my opinion, not only drive the most competent organizations away from such vital research effort, but make the job of responsible Federal agencies doubly difficult.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, which has twice reported legislation to amend the title provisions of the 1958 Space Act, that such provisions as the one originally added to the clear air bill on the Senate floor, "damage small business, cost the taxpayer money, dilute the national research effort, and waste the products of scientific research."

I am pleased to see the clean air bill emerged from conference without restrictive patent language. This is a matter which should, and must, eventually be faced by committees of the House and Senate, having jurisdiction over patent matters. It is not one to be taken lightly or to be included in legislation without full and complete hearings.

Other bills, calling for Federal research effort, are still in committee. I would commend the President's patent policy to these groups, and ask that it be considered as providing necessary flexibility in Government research contracting and as an extension of the license policy not as justification for more restrictive and unworkable provisions.

**Mr. BURKHALTER.** Mr. Speaker, air pollution is a development of our modern civilization. Fumes from motor vehicles are a large part of the problem. Due to the splendid efforts of the auto manufacturers, a solution or partial solution has been developed.

Today in Los Angeles plans are being perfected to equip every motor vehicle in our city and county of nearly 6 million people with a control device of some sort. The fact that there is a control device—that the problem has been analyzed and a preventative in part developed is due to the cooperation of the motor vehicle manufacturers.

But there are new dangers as the numbers of automobiles increase. And I am advised that the production of motor cars now exceeds the growth of population. There are more cars being produced in this country than there are births every day. If my information is correct, there will be produced for the 1963 model year approximately 7,343,000 cars. And there will be, for the same time, approximately 4,167,000 human births.

Today I want to point out to the best of my ability the very real danger to the lives of millions of people living in our metropolitan areas. That problem is still air pollution, in spite of all that has been done. It is insidious and invisible. It deals death and disease to our people. It destroys vegetation. It interferes seriously with our economic life. Its prevention or abatement is tremendously expensive. It can be combated only through Government control, since smog or smaze knows no political boundaries.

It has seriously interfered with the growth of our metropolitan areas and I have heard that some industrial plants, namely the alfalfa compacting plants are spreading smog over the prairies of Nebraska.

Long plumes of smoke from industrial installations, the oil refineries, the steel mills, industrial plants of all kinds, power stations, and others attracted attention to what later became known as stationary offenders. These were offenders that were stationary because of their nature. Gasoline fumes, generated when gasoline tanks were filled at filling stations, came under public survey and a citywide campaign to keep oil and gasoline fumes out of the air was launched. Fumes from the open ladles in steel mills and brass foundries were brought under control.

Real hysteria developed in 1952 when a mystery fog in London killed 4,000 people. The steady progress report of the legislative committee was of little help in the face of tragedies like this. One reason for my great concern with this problem at this time is the very real possibility that a repetition of the London tragedy or the Donora, Pa., tragedy, or the tragedy in Belgium may occur some day soon in this country because of the failure of our National Government to give proper impetus to research and appropriate coordination and dissemination of the scientific knowledge already gained of this great evil.

Crop damage from the polluted air became evident in the lush gardens and fields of Los Angeles County in 1950. The first damage was found on a deposit on the leaves of certain garden plants, another source of damage was pollutants such as sulfur dioxide which caused vegetation to wither and die; and a third source was a dehydration of vegetation from within caused by unknown gas respired by the leaves. As a result of these discoveries the APCD entered into a research contract with our old friends at the California Institute of Technology. In this same year, Dr. McCabe, who had returned to the Department of the Interior, set up a U.S. Technical Conference on Smog which was to have far-reaching effects.

In September 1953, County Counsel Kennedy issued an opinion that the California State law on air pollution was flexible enough to forbid the burning of rubbish if it was found by the APCD that such burning caused discomfort or property damage to a substantial number of inhabitants and that the prohibition would reduce the amount of air pollution.

The full importance of the opinion was not realized until 4 years later when on October 1, 1957, some 1,500,000 domestic incinerators were banned from further use.

In some instances equipment installations to eliminate pollutants cost as much as $1 million for an installation. It should be stated here that while industry as a whole was reluctant to accept the permit system of control, when it was demonstrated that enforcement was to be fair but strict, that industrial leaders throughout the area gave their utmost cooperation. The enforcement task would have been impossible without this cooperation.

When it is remembered that nearly 30 percent of the entire population of this Nation live in cities of more than 50,000 population and that there are 323 cities in this Nation in that class, the problem can be seen in true perspective as of national importance and responsibility.

Great strides have been made in research in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the Federal part of the program is not what it should be in light of the scope of the problem. It should be remembered that the city and county of Los Angeles alone has spent more than $34 million on this problem. It should be remembered that this much more has been spent by private industry to meet the rigid requirements of the control district.

With these figures in mind, the need for new energy at the Federal level, and for coordination and cooperation between Federal, State, and community government is brought into proper focus.

Under these circumstances a brief look at the 11-year history of the air pollution program in the Los Angeles area is in order. Since I lived with this problem, first in the State assembly and later in the City Council of Los Angeles, I think its recital here important.

Although some 60 persons died in the Meuse Valley in Belgium in 1930 as victims of a mysterious "fog," polluted air did not become a real problem until about 1940. At that time, the city of Los Angeles began a study of the problem and immediately ran into the fact that smog knew no political boundaries and that city control or attempts at city control were futile.

The problem was passed over to the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County in 1942 and 3 years later after considerable study, the first countywide ordinance was passed in 1945.

A Citizens Committee of Smog Control was formed of public-spirited citizens and this committee immediately recognized that the problem was bigger than countrywide. They sponsored and secured passage of assembly bill No. 1 through the California Legislature in 1947, and under its terms the first air pollution control district was established in Los Angeles County. A comprehensive study program was launched in cooperation with the California Institute of Technology. We were fortunate to have a number of internationally known experts in the field of air pollution in our area. One who has done a great deal at all levels of control was Dr. A. G. Haagen-Smith. Another man who made a great contribution in the field about this time was Dr. Louis McCabe of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. He became the first Los Angeles director in 1947.

It has been estimated that great quantities of pollutants, 1,000 tons a day, were caused by the 2 million motor vehicles in Los Angeles County, but there was no device available on the market which could control or eliminate the pollutants caused by gasoline combustion. In fact, there was no general agreement as to what type of control should be developed and while there were many "cure-alls," none had been proved to be completely effective. The opinion of the county counsel pointed up this need for a device and stated that control of motor vehicles could be exercised only when "such a device is perfected, shown to be effective, available on the market, and the requirement of its use is found to be reasonable." Industrial location is greatly influenced by air pollution. Air pollution today is the bogey man of city planners and legislators at all political levels.

New interest was generated in the problem when 20 people died and some estimated 6,000 become ill as the result of a deadly "fog" in Donora, Pa. Medical science is beginning to discover new dangers from the invisible enemy. Respiratory diseases are definitely affected by smog. How much, authorities are reluctant to state at this time.

While 49 States are still without comprehensive smog or air pollution laws, while our problem in Los Angeles is partly solved—we have come as far as we can at this time. We cannot wait for the rest of the Nation to catch up—we cannot wait—we must continue our fight with renewed vigor—to slow up now will be to betray those people who helped us so valiantly in the early fight.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I am convinced that this is a very good bill. I think the approach to it is to be commended. I believe the conference report should be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 109, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

YEAS—273

Abbitt
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Brademas
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Cooley
Corbett
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—109

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Avery
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Foreman
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Lloyd
McClory
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stafford
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tuck
Van Pelt
Watson
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—53

Ayres
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Buckley
Burton
Clawson, Del

**Corman**
**Davis, Ga.**
**Davis, Tenn.**
**Diggs**
**Dingell**
**Duncan**
**Finnegan**
**Ford**
**Gill**
**Grant**
**Green, Pa.**
**Hanna**
**Hansen**
**Harvey, Mich.**
**Hébert**
**Kelly**
**Mailliard**
**Martin, Calif.**
**Martin, Mass.**
**Michel**
**Milliken**
**Morrison**
**Multer**
**Murphy, N.Y.**
**O'Brien, Ill.**
**Rivers, S.C.**
**Roosevelt**
**Shelley**
**Sheppard**
**Sikes**
**Stinson**
**Stubblefield**
**Talcott**
**Thomas**
**Thompson, La.**
**Thompson, Tex.**
**Thornberry**
**Trimble**
**Utt**
**Vinson**
**White**
**Whitten**
**Wilson, Bob**
**Wilson, Charles H.**

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Stinson against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. White with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Diggs.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Vinson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD during the debate in connection with the conference report just adopted, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on that conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CURTIS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish first to thank the gentleman for his courtesy in not bringing this matter up without talking to me ahead of time about it as he had promised he would, in view of the fact I had stated I would object.

The point I have been seeking to make I think has been made, that Calendar Wednesday is available for the purpose of bringing matters that have been voted out of the legislative committees onto the floor of the House for debate and passage. The Calendar Wednesday rule was placed in the rules 50 years ago for that very purpose. It is an unusual procedure, and it should be used only when a situation develops where other procedures cannot be followed.

It is my understanding, however, that in spite of the fact that Calendar Wednesday has been available any Wednesday that any committee wanted to avail itself of that privilege, one of the committees that precedes the Committee on the Judiciary in the alphabetical call of committees, the Committee on Agriculture, has stated that it will bring up matters tomorrow. I will say that it is very obvious that that committee, in my judgment, is abusing in that way the procedures of Calendar Wednesday. As I said last night, the majority of that committee could instruct the chairman of that committee not to so use the rule.

But under these circumstances, and it being very clear that the majority party, if it wanted to and had a will to use this procedure, the bill of the Committee on the Judiciary could be brought on the floor tomorrow for debate and vote. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the majority party is interested in bringing up the civil rights bill in a manner that will enable it to be enacted expeditiously, if it is possible to do so. The gentleman knows the one way to beat a bill of such dimensions would be to bring it up on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS. I must say to the gentleman, if we want to get into a challenge on this, I would say I fully disagree. Calendar Wednesday provides the usual kind of rule in the House under which most of the bills are debated, an open rule and the 5-minute rule. As everyone knows, you cannot filibuster in the House because by majority vote at any time, we can close off debate.

Furthermore, I would observe that if it is necessary to continue on beyond midnight and into the next day as long as we simply recess, in fact as long as we do not adjourn, we can continue that legislative day as long as is necessary to complete the business. I would agree with the gentleman that the most orderly procedure, of course, is under a rule designed for that purpose. But I do point out this remedy is available and was placed in the rules of the House for that very purpose, and it has been used in the past successfully and it is available tomorrow, tomorrow being Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I announced sometime ago that I would not sign the discharge petition. Before that I had learned that all of the Republican members on the Committee on Rules would vote to report a rule in due time on the civil rights bill. In my opinion, as I have said before, it is legislatively impossible to act on that bill before the adjournment of this session of the Congress. However, it should be acted upon expeditiously early in the upcoming second session. So far as I am concerned, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that in my opinion while it certainly is evident that Calendar Wednesday is available under the rules of the House to bring measures to the floor for consideration, under the circumstances it does seem to me that the better approach in view of the request of the majority leader and the obvious determination to abandon the Calendar Wednesday procedure and, obviously from what has developed here yesterday and today, that we might as well dispense with Calendar Wednesday and proceed to the conclusion of the business of this session of the Congress and then early—and I say early—in the next session of the Congress, with adequate time for consideration, call up the civil rights bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

## REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 579) providing for the consideration of H.R. 7457, a bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7457) to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in United States courts. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After passage of H.R. 7457, the Committee on the Judiciary shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1057, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7457 as passed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 provides for consideration of H.R. 7457, a bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The bill as amended would require that counsel be appointed by the U.S. commissioner or the court. It would make it unnecessary to follow strict rotation in the appointment of counsel from a panel and thus makes it possible for the commissioner or the court to take into consideration the experience of counsel. Where a defendant who has personally retained counsel finds himself no longer financially able to pay counsel, the court is empowered to provide counsel.

The cost of H.R. 7457 can be only estimated on the basis of the assumption that nearly 10,000 persons, more than 30 percent of the total defendants in Federal criminal cases, annually require the appointment of attorneys because of indigency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 579.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana explained the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding I would like to refer back just briefly to the colloquy that took place between the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], and the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

I concluded from the colloquy that took place, just referred to, that the House, and particularly the majority side, now is in full support of orderly procedure. If I could have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler]. I wonder if the gentleman from New York would give me the indulgence of his attention.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is not speaking on the matter before the House. The question is on the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assumes that the gentleman from Kansas is proceeding, and will proceed in order.

Mr. AVERY. This is a fair assumption, Mr. Speaker, and there has been so much confusion in the House that nobody could tell, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, whether I was speaking to the question or not. Before I think I could explain with any degree of persuasion the resolution that we are about to consider I should have this information from the gentleman from New York. So this I would consider to be in order.

Since it has been agreed upon here now that we are going to proceed to consider the civil rights bill under the regular legislative procedure, does the gentleman from New York——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The point of order is we are now considering the rule on the indigent defendants bill The gentleman from Kansas is talking about the civil rights bill, and is out of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman in the well would like to be heard on the point of order, too.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair takes a lenient attitude toward debate in the House. If the gentleman from Kansas feels that there is anything involved in this bill that might be connected with legislation concerning civil rights, the Chair feels that the gentleman, who is conversant with the rules, is proceeding and will proceed in order.

The gentleman from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas have permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, if his assistance was needed, and I presume it may have been.

May I again request the indulgence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] and invite the attention of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers]. Since it has been concluded, I repeat for the third or fourth time now, that we are going to consider the civil rights bill under the usual legislative procedure, and not going to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, is it the intention of the gentleman from New York to announce that he is no longer seeking signatures to the discharge petition, so that we will proceed in the regular legislative manner?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot accede to that request and I cannot indicate that I will cease from seeking signatures to the discharge petition. I will say to the gentleman, however, that I will not seek any recognition tomorrow, on Calendar Wednesday, for the purpose of bringing up the civil rights bill, nor will I authorize anybody to seek recognition for that purpose.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to understand the gentleman's reasoning on this. If Calendar Wednesday was written into the rules to overcome any obstacles that might be placed in the path of the will of the House by the Rules Committee, certainly this would be a very convenient and early opportunity to call up the civil rights bill. I am surprised at the chairman's announcement not to employ all legislative remedies.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 231]

Abbitt
Ashley
Ayres
Bolling
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Brooks
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Carey
Clawson, Del
Cooley
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Finnegan
Ford
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Kelly
Kluczynski
Lindsay
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Morrison
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
Pepper
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Stinson
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
  Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I was speaking in or out of order at that point. It had never been clarified, as I recall it. However, just previous to the quorum call the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, just announced—and I think for the Members who were not here before the quorum call it should be brought to their attention—he was not going to call up the civil rights bill on Wednesday under Calendar Wednesday, and would not authorize anybody else to do it. So we presume that we will now proceed in the regular legislative manner.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue to address myself to the business before the House just as I had been doing since I have been occupying the well. This, of course, was for the further consideration of House Resolution 579, making in order the consideration of the bill described as the indigent defendants bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure why I should be handling this rule today. This is a lawyers' bill and actually a members of the Rules Committee who belongs to that exclusive profession should more properly be presenting this rule. I can only construe my being in the well this afternoon as a farmer speaking for the legal profession and seeking and requesting the support of those of us in the House, those few of us who are nonlawyers, for this so-called indigent defendants bill. I would hasten on to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a minority report; but contrary to the situation in most cases this minority report does not establish the minority by the center aisle.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 232]

Abbitt
Ayres
Belcher
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cameron
Clawson, Del
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Duncan
Finnegan
Flood
Ford
Gallagher
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hanna
Hansen
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Kee
Kelly
Long, Md.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Powell
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Steed
Stinson
Stubblefield
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
White
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552-C, and for other purposes, and

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9291) entitled "An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes."

## REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to reassure the House, if I may be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes, I will have completed my participation in the consideration of this rule.

I think it should be said that probably the ramifications of this are not as broad as might otherwise be considered. Most cases, as was pointed out before the Committee on Rules, are not within Federal jurisdiction but are within the State jurisdiction. This bill would not provide legal representation for persons who are charged with State crimes. It would largely be applicable, we are told, to the District of Columbia and in Guam and the Virgin Islands.

One of the principal objections, I think, that was brought up before the Committee on Rules was that the selection of counsel rested purely within the discretion of the Federal judge and the available counsel would not be rotated on an established panel or roster. But other than that, I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no great dissent from the bill. The only dissent, as I was about to say when the quorum call was made, does not come from the minority as I view the committee report, but it comes from a portion of the majority or a few members of the majority who prefer that counsel not be appointed by the Federal judge but be retained on a continuing basis by the appropriate Federal jurisdiction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption of the rule and hasten now to consider the bill itself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not know a whole lot about this bill we are trying to consider here today, but I do not think it is of such importance that it could not wait over until after the first of the year. Personally, I have adopted a policy that from now on until the first of the year, I am going to vote against any rule that proposes to bring any new legislation to this floor other than appropriation bills. This bill was introduced on July 29 and was reported on by the committee on October 24. They had a rule for it last week and it could have been heard last Friday or it could have been heard last Saturday when we met with no business being scheduled. There is no urgency about it. I think incidents of the past few days have emphasized the fact that the atmosphere in this House is not conducive to sound legislation. I know many people agree with me that it would be in the interest of this Nation if we should pass the appropriation bills; adjourn this session sine die, after adopting a resolution for the second session to convene about January 7 or 8. The quicker this session is adjourned, the better off all the Members will be, and certainly the public should not suffer when Congress is in recess. It is for this reason that I expect to vote against this rule and every other rule that proposes to bring new legislation to this floor until the second session of the 88th Congress convenes.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, last week I was at home for reasons expressed in the Congressional Record—illness. I was shocked beyond my belief when I learned that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives introduced a discharge petition on his civil rights legislation. Nothing shocked me more in 20 years as a legislator to find that a chairman of a committee, who has all the means at his command to bring a bill before the House, had introduced a discharge petition a few days after the bill had gone to the Rules Committee, not giving the Rules Committee a chance to consider the bill by putting a discharge petition here at the desk. He knew the civil rights bill would come up in January and that is the earliest time possible.

Mr. Speaker, why do I make a point of this? I make it simply because in 1960, our late lamented President John F. Kennedy, in his own statement, in his own words, said that the first order of business when he was elected president would be a civil rights bill, that he would ask the gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, and Senator Clark to introduce such legislation in the first session in 1961. It was not until June of 1963, after the explosions in Birmingham and the demonstrations in other places, that any civil rights bill was considered by the Judiciary Committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, my colleague [Mr. Celler].

But what has happened besides that? Civil rights legislation is important and it is going to come up in January. We know it. We had the experience of 1957 and we had the experience of 1960. Civil rights will come before this House in an orderly and proper way, as it properly should. But in June of 1962, on June 26, the day after the Supreme Court handed down a decision to bar prayers and Bible reading in the public schools—and again in June 1963—but on June 17, I, together with almost 100 other Members of this House, introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution. And where did those resolutions go? To the Committee on the Judiciary. And they rested there for 18 months. There has not been a bit of consideration given to those 100 resolutions.

I say to my good chairman—and I told him this last night and I have told him this on other occasions—there is nothing more important on God's green earth for the salvation of this Nation than Almighty God's presence in our business and public life and the tradition of God in our schools is more important than anything else that can come before this Congress. I think that the people should have the right to vote on such a constitutional amendment.

I say to my colleagues here that I feel somewhat disgraced today as a legislator, because of his action. I know that I am going very deep with my words when I say that we are supposed to have a period of 30 days of mourning for our late President, John F. Kennedy. I wanted to respect the request that was made that we set aside politics during that period of 30 days of mourning. Nobody wanted to respect it more than I. But I have found out in my experience that when the Democrats ask for a moratorium on politics it is only to gag the Republicans but not themselves. This, to me—and I hope that my words are in order—is political demagoguery at its lowest level, to introduce a discharge petition within 1 week after a bill goes to the Committee on Rules.

I have a great deal of respect for my good chairman and I have a great deal of friendly feeling for him, but for 18 months there have been no hearings on those almost 100 resolutions to amend the Constitution. He has prevented this. That discharge petition of mine has been there since July 9. There are 120 signatures on it today. I had hopes that long before this 218 Members would have marched up this aisle and signed that discharge petition, No. 3. I say that there is not a man in this House who would disagree that it is a fundamental right of the people to amend the Constitution in an orderly way, and they should be given that opportunity by a vote in this House.

I say right now that we are all interested in the civil rights bill, just as much as our good chairman or any other Member in this House. But let it come up as we know it will in the proper, orderly manner.

The only way I can get my amendment up is by that discharge petition. It is the only one that I have signed in 20 years and it will be the only one that I will sign as long as I am a Member of this House unless it is one that has to do with the spiritual life of this Nation.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, that 61 of our jet training planes should be sabotaged at the Williams Air Force Base in Arizona is shocking beyond belief. The sabotage was disclosed today by the Defense Department.

I intend to ask our Armed Services Committee to make an immediate inquiry not only into this incident but also into the security system and practices at all our air bases.

To have any military plane sabotaged, particularly when stationed at one of our U.S. bases, is difficult enough to understand. To have 61 sabotaged is incomprehensible and inexcusable if the proper security precautions are followed.

That the sabotage would have been discovered in the regular inspection before taking off and that no major damage was done to the planes is immaterial.

There is a grave laxity in our military security and it behooves us to make certain that effective procedures are rigidly followed at all our military installations.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I advise the House I have no further request for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Jones of Missouri) there were—ayes 146, noes 6.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 345, nays 12, answered "present" 1, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—345

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—12

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Burleson
Goodell
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
McMillan
O'Konski
Pool
Secrest
Siler
Winstead

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt
Ayres
Baker
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Clawson, Del
Collier
Corman
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Fallon
Finnegan
Ford
Friedel
Garmatz
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Leggett
Long, Md.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Morrison
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.

O'Neill
Philbin
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stinson
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wharton
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. White with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Buckley.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Corman.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Duncan with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Abbitt.

**Mr. ANDREWS** of Alabama changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONSIDERATION OF THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL ON MONDAY NEXT

**Mr. CANNON.** Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Monday next to take up for immediate consideration the last appropriation bill, the foreign aid appropriation bill.

**Mr. HALLECK.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen] is here, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations. I assume the gentleman understands what this request is.

**Mr. JENSEN.** Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand it thoroughly and I agree with the request made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## PHASEDOWN OF CERTAIN DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

**Mr. HARDY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

**Mr. HARDY.** Mr. Speaker, on October 28, as chairman of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services and at the direction of the subcommittee, I transmitted to our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], a classified report of an investigation of the phasedown of certain SAGE and radar installations in our defense system. In my letter of transmittal, which was only released to the press after clearance by the Department of Defense, there was one statement which apparently touched a sensitive nerve. Let me quote that statement:

> Without suggesting that Secretary McNamara intended to do so, the conclusion is inescapable that he incorrectly informed the President as to the manner in which the proposed changes would be carried out.

This statement was considerably amplified in the classified report and is completely supported by documentation in the hearing record. It is a factual statement.

I was amazed to see in the press on November 2, a denial of the accuracy of this statement, and first thought that surely there had been a misquotation. Subsequently, I requested and received a copy of the Department of Defense news release No. 1446–63 which contains this statement:

> The charge that the Secretary misinformed the President, even inadvertently, is simply not true, as the White House will be glad to confirm.

Mr. Speaker, that statement in the news release of the Department of Defense is false. I understand it was issued by Mr. Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, who obviously did not know the facts. According to the newspapers this false statement was concurred in by the White House—presumably Mr. Pierre Salinger. Maybe he did not know any better either.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House should know the facts. The statement which I made in my letter to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is correct. The information which Secretary McNamara gave the President was incorrect, as a classified document dated December 3, 1962, clearly establishes. Furthermore, the subcommittee was reluctant to make the conclusion that the President had been misinformed, and because we realized its significance unusual steps were taken to make certain—not only that the documentation was accurate—but that it was complete and that no contradictory or mitigating evidence existed.

To accomplish this I instructed the staff of the subcommittee to confer with the liaison personnel assigned by the Department of Defense to provide the subcommittee with documentation and witnesses. Notes in our files show that such a meeting was held on September 6 and that the Department of Defense personnel were advised that, based on the record, such a finding would have to be made. They were asked to search out and present to the subcommittee any additional data or information bearing on the subject and the documentation which was already in the record. Nothing was produced which could alter the subcommittee's conclusion.

None of us is immune to making occasional mistakes, and this time I feel certain that Secretary McNamara made one. In order that the House may be fully informed, at the conclusion of these remarks I have asked leave to print my letter of October 28 to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]. As it indicated, I would certainly not suggest that the Secretary of Defense was aware that any of the information he sent to the President was incorrect. Nevertheless, the fact remains.

Because this finding of the subcommittee has been characterized by Mr. Sylvester as "untrue", and because, despite the fact that he must now know it was true, he has not acknowledged his error, it seems appropriate for me to advise the House that the subcommittee has carefully reviewed the record and reaffirmed its original finding. The record is clear, and we regret that because of security considerations it cannot be released so that the public can determine the truth for itself.

House of Representatives,
Subcommittee for
Special Investigations,
*Washington, D.C., October 28, 1963.*

Hon. Carl Vinson,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

Dear Mr. Chairman: At your direction, the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, on May 9, 1963, began an investigation of all aspects of the Department of Defense April announcement of planned changes in the U.S. air defense system relating to the phasedown of 6 semiautomatic ground environment (SAGE) direction centers and 17 long-range radars. The investigation has now been completed and the subcommittee's unanimous report is attached hereto. The investigation entailed the review and analysis of several thousand pages of Department of Defense, North American Air Defense Command (NORAD) and Air Defense Command (ADC) documents, the interview of numerous military and Department of Defense personnel, and 3 days of hearings to receive testimony from 15 witnesses, including Charles J. Hitch, Assistant Secretary (comptroller), Department of Defense; Joseph S. Imirie, Assistant Secretary (materiel), Department of the Air Force; Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

Because of the nature of the security information it contains, the subcommittee's report is classified. However, certain of the subcommittee's findings and conclusions, particularly with reference to the Department of Defense public announcement, are not classified and will be discussed below.

On April 26, 1963, the Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs announced:

"As a result of continuing studies by the Department of Defense in coordination with the American Defense Command, a realinement of the U.S. air defense forces is planned.

"The realinement is aimed at achieving the best means of affording an effective defense against the long-range bomber threat. It will provide the best possible ground environment operating capability and will assure maximum survivability of air defense forces in event of an initial large-scale ballistic missile attack.

"SAGE facilities in an adjacent area to those being closed will expand their control responsibility in order to maintain necessary air defense capability."

The announcement then identified by location the SAGE centers and the long-range radars to be closed.

This announcement was both misleading and inaccurate. It was misleading because it inferred that the proposed changes were made at the recommendation of or with the full concurrence of ADC, whereas in truth and in fact the changes as proposed by the Secretary were opposed strenuously by that Command. It was inaccurate in that it stated that the proposed changes would "provide the best possible ground environment operating capability," whereas in truth and in fact the changes have resulted in a degradation of this capability and the Department is chargeable with knowledge that this would be the natural and probable consequence of the changes.

Without suggesting that Secretary McNamara intended to do so, the conclusion is inescapable that he incorrectly informed the President as to the manner in which the proposed changes would be carried out. (See pp. 28-35 of classified report.)

The phaseout was ordered by Secretary McNamara without the concurrence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, ADC, or NORAD.

The Air Force document formalizing its opposition to Secretary McNamara's proposal was briefly evaluated by a 28-year-old employee on a 60-day detail to Department of Defense from the Bureau of the Budget. His conclusion that the objection contained nothing new worth considering, although unsupported by the record, was forwarded to Secretary McNamara as a cover sheet for the Air Force document. The Secretary overruled the Air Force objection.

Although this case illustrates the basic cleavage between Department of Defense and the military services, it is reasonable to conclude from expressed military judgment that our air defenses have been weakened in order to comply with a Department of Defense budgetary decision calculated to save $35 million in fiscal year 1964. Although the subcommittee made no detailed study of the economy aspect of the matter, data developed collaterally indicate that the decision may ultimately result in no dollar savings at all.

Sincerely yours,

PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
*Chairman.*

## TO ELIMINATE THE PROBLEMS CREATED BY OVERLAPPING AUTHORITY AND DUPLICATE REGULATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1963, in House Report No. 429, the Committee on Government Operations approved a report entitled "Common Trust Funds—Overlapping Responsibility and Conflict in Regulations." That report was based upon a study made by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being chairman.

In February of this year the Comptroller of the Currency announced a proposed revision of the regulations which govern the trust activities of national banks. Under the proposal trust departments of national banks were to be permitted to collectively invest in common trust funds moneys deposited with them in managing agency accounts and under self-employed retirement plans under the Smathers-Keogh Act. Soon thereafter the Securities and Exchange Commission publicly asserted that such collective investment funds were so similar to mutual funds that they would be subject to regulation by the SEC under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The Comptroller of the Currency strongly denied that the Federal securities laws would apply to collective investment funds. It was the Comptroller's view that the pooling of the Smathers-Keogh trusts and managing agency accounts would not put bank trust departments into the mutual fund business, and that what the proposed regulation purported to do was merely to extend to such funds the privilege of collective investment which for a quarter century national banks had been permitted to make through the pooling of funds by banks acting as trustees, executors, administrators, or guardians.

On April 5, 1963, while this conflict of views between the agencies remained unresolved the Comptroller put the revised regulation into effect.

My subcommittee is charged with examining and evaluating the efficiency and economy of the operations of certain executive branch departments and agencies, including the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Inasmuch as overlapping authority and duplicate regulation by administrative agencies lessens the efficiency of the operations of the executive branch and is wasteful of taxpayers' dollars, my subcommittee undertook an investigation into the conflict.

Among the findings was that if both the SEC and the Comptroller of the Currency regulated the operation of common trust funds such duplication of regulation would impose hardships on banks through the necessity of complying with separate registration, reporting, and other requirements and the additional legal, operating, and other costs involved. Such duplicate regulation would probably make it uneconomic for banks to handle managing agency accounts in modest amounts or to receive deposits under the provisions of the Smathers-Keogh Act.

We concluded that the collective investment of small managing agency accounts is a logical and reasonable extension to such accounts of the common trust fund investment advantages enjoyed by small estates and trusts, and that if the Congress exempted the collective investment funds here considered from the provisions of the 1933 and 1940 acts, savings of up to $250,000 per year could be expected through elimination of SEC supervision.

Accordingly we recommended that:

> In order to eliminate the problems created by overlapping authority and duplicate regulation, it is recommended:
>
> To the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives that it direct its attention to the consideration of legislation which would specifically exempt common trust funds of managing agency accounts and Smathers-Keogh plans maintained by national banks from the Federal securities laws, and provide for such protections for investors therein as may be deemed necessary.

My bill would carry out this recommendation. The first part would specifically exempt collective investment funds of managing agency accounts and Smathers-Keogh plans from the Federal securities laws.

The bill also provides for protections for investors in such common trust funds which are substantially like—and some claim are greater than—those contained in the Federal securities laws.

I am pleased to introduce this bill and I hope that it will soon receive the favorable consideration of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

## THE ROLE OF FOREIGN AID IN U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, some people do not realize that one of the many purposes served by the foreign aid program is the achievement of U.S. national security. This is not the only purpose of foreign aid. It also helps to advance our political relationships with key countries around the world. It helps to provide new outlets for American business. It helps to stimulate U.S. exports and the development of new markets for American goods and services overseas. But besides serving all of these purposes the foreign aid program also plays a vital role in the defense of the free world against not only communism but the possible opposition of other groups and doctrines as well.

David Bell, the distinguished head of the foreign aid program, recently addressed himself to this subject in an appearance before the Society for International Development in New York. Mr. Bell's address, entitled "Foreign Aid and U.S. National Security," is one of the best statements on this aspect of our foreign aid program that has been made. I know my colleagues will want to read

**what Mr. Bell has to say. The text of the statement follows:**

### FOREIGN AID AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

(By David E. Bell)

Our subject is foreign aid and national security. During recent weeks it has been often said—by the Clay Committee, by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and by myself—that the essential reason why the United States is putting resources into programs of economic and military assistance is because they contribute to the national security of the United States. Such a statement is often misunderstood because it is assumed that it means that the United States has an interest only in aiding those countries which are contributing to the military security of the United States and of the free world. We do indeed help support military forces in many countries around the world which have added substantially to the security of our country and of the free world in the narrow military sense. We need make no apologies for that.

But when we say that the U.S. foreign aid program benefits the U.S. national security we mean a great deal more than that it helps defend us in a military sense. This is true because the United States has committed itself to the proposition that our national security is promoted by the development of independent, self-supporting nations achieving economic and social progress through free institutions.

This broader concept of U.S. national security is not new. Since the end of World War II, we have supported very important countries whose views on international political matters were quite different from ours. India until recently has been the most prominent illustration. We did not assist India because it contributed substantial military strength to the defense of the free world; we aided her because India was endeavoring to become an independent, self-supporting nation basing its economic and social development on free institutions. Both our political parties—Republicans and Democrats alike—have agreed that such aid has been in the national interest.

Now let me make a few comments which stem from this conception. First I would call to your attention how this view harmonizes the U.S. interest with the interest of the countries we are assisting. We want for them the same thing they want for themselves. They too want to become independent and self-supporting and to achieve economic and social progress through free institutions. We and they have a natural, combined, harmonized interest in the process by which their resources plus those that we contribute are applied to this common objective. The fact that we want what the countries we are working with want is a great asset of U.S. foreign policy and stands in strong contrast to the general objective of the countries in the Communist bloc who by and large seek satellites rather than independent partners.

A second comment is that the security objective I have expressed, that of assisting other countries to become independent and self-supporting, establishes a target for terminating outside assistance. In this country, in recent months, we have faced the question of whether the U.S. foreign aid program is endless. Does it have any termination or does it simply go on and on without any end in sight or, as the Clay Committee put it, even without any end in mind?

The fact is that the foreign aid program does have an end in sight and an end in mind and it is to assist countries to establish conditions under which aid is not necessary. This is what we sought through the Marshall plan and this is what happened in Europe. It took about 5 years of economic assistance and it has since taken about 10 years more of military assistance, but today the countries of Europe are virtually all of them independent and self-supporting in the sense I have used the words. Fifteen years of assistance to Europe is now coming to an end.

What will be the time span to achieve the same objective with respect to other countries? So far we do not have enough knowledge about the development process to have a clear and precise answer to that question. We can see, however, some less developed countries which today are approaching the end of the need for economic aid. Greece is an illustration, Israel is an illustration, the Republic of China on Taiwan is another illustration. All of these and others should within the next 5 years be quite capable of moving into an economically self-sustaining situation in which progress can be achieved with no more than the normal access to world trade markets and the world capital markets. (Military aid where it is necessary—and in Greece and free China it would be necessary—may very well need to go on a good deal longer as it did in Europe.)

Other countries whom we are assisting have no such immediate prospects of economic self-support. When you look at the situation in Korea, India, Pakistan, Bolivia and many other countries, you necessarily must expect a substantial period of time during which outside resources will be required on what the technicians call concessionary terms, meaning by gift or by very soft loan. But our goal remains the same: to work toward the termination of foreign aid by achieving independence and self-support.

#### INTERNAL RESOURCES AND EXTERNAL AID

A third comment, and this is perhaps the most important lesson we have all learned in the last 15 years of the aid business, is that success in achieving independence and economic self-support rests primarily on the people, the governments, and the institutions of the developing countries, and not on what is done for them from outside.

This again is not a new idea. I was reminded by Paul Hoffman within the last 2 or 3 months that when the Marshall plan began there was a body of distinguished American citizens appointed by President Truman to make a report on it to him. Paul Hoffman told me he wrote only the opening sentence in that report, but he thought today that it was the most important sentence. It ran, "Only the Europeans can say Europe."

This is the element of wisdom I think we are all prepared to accept today as applying, not only to Europe, but to every country around the world. Most of the resources almost invariably will come from inside the developing country. More important, the policies and legislation and spirit and leadership to mobilize those resources and to apply them properly, whether they are from inside or outside, must come, indeed can only come, from the people and the institutions and the governments of the developing countries.

It is worth recalling also that in assisting countries to reach conditions of self-sustaining growth, we are not talking simply about a level of material welfare. We're talking instead about the achievement of institutional arrangements with respect to the pattern of savings and investment or to the method by which skills and technology are acquired and transmitted—the building of institutions, in short, which establish the incentives and attitudes which will make development happen.

These institutional achievements undoubtedly will result in a steady rise in income and frequently in an improved distribution of income, but they are not dependent upon any particular level of material well-being. The Japanese are certainly moving forward through their own energy and initiative, but the per capita income in Japan is still, I believe, $300 or less. Development therefore is not to be measured solely by levels of income, but by the achievement of self-generating processes which enable a country to move forward under its own power. Outside resources can help if the inside will, energies and policies are present.

This is why, it seems to me, all outside assistance, whether through an international organization or bilaterally, should be made available on conditions. Not "political strings," but conditions such that the receiving countries do in fact undertake the measures which are essential to achieve the objectives which both they and we seek.

All of you know very well, of course, that there are great differences among countries as to the degree to which they are able or willing to apply appropriate and necessary self-help standards and measures. One of the first things we learn when we enter the development business is that we must start from where things are, not from where we wish they were. We must work with countries in a wide variety of circumstances and with a wide variety of degrees of understanding of their own situations and of willingness to embark on the hard measures which will be necessary for success. Consequently, any program of foreign aid, whether it be bilateral or multilateral, is going to be different in different countries and must be adapted to local circumstances.

Having regard to this fact, it is still our role to exert such influence as is possible. Sometimes it can be done most effectively through international channels and sometimes through bilateral channels. However it is done—by persuasion, cajolery, bargaining—our objective is to bring about as much improvement as possible in the policies of the recipient countries, to insist upon a reasonable degree of local contributions to the projects and programs which are being undertaken, to work with and help the local leaders to face up to the problems that confront them. It cannot and must not be our purpose to help developing countries avoid their problems; it must be our purpose to help them meet their problems.

#### EUROPE AND JAPAN

My fourth comment is that the development of independent and self-supporting nations is obviously not only a U.S. interest; it is an interest equally of other advanced countries. There has been in the last 2 or 3 years a very impressive increase in the volume of resources made available through various types of foreign aid programs by the countries of Europe and by Japan. These countries a few years ago were themselves recipients of assistance. Today they are donors. This is a process which we welcome and which we hope will be followed by many other countries over the years to come.

The United States has had some concern that the terms on which such assistance was being made available were not as comparable as they might be. For the last several months a special working party under the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD has been considering appropriate terms of aid among the different DAC countries. I was earlier this week in Paris at a meeting of the Development Assistance Committee which considered that working party report and I was very glad to find that there was agreement on the following propositions:

First, that the terms on which aid should be made available ought to be adjusted and adapted to the particular circumstances of the recipient countries. Thus a country like Greece or free China or Mexico, which is relatively close to achieving economic self-support, might well receive outside assistance on quite different terms from Korea or Pakistan where the balance of payments for some years to come does not look overly promising.

Second, having regard to the recent terms on which aid has in fact been made available, that it is desirable to achieve a larger degree of comparability than has been true in the last year or so.

And finally, that in practice this means, at the present time, that some of the "harder" lenders, to use the colloquial phrase, some of those who have made their aid available on relatively short maturities and at high interest rates, will need to move in the direction of softening those terms.

These agreements, reached at the Paris meeting, will obviously have to be applied to the different circumstances of each donor nation, each of which has its own legislative and budgetary situation to work with. Nevertheless, I think a considerable gain in the spirit of understanding among the advanced countries has been brought about.

### THE LIMITS OF FOREIGN AID

Lastly, I would like to make one more comment related to my major theme—the relationship of foreign aid to national security—and this is to stress the limits of foreign aid as a means for achieving the objective of which I've been speaking.

For one thing, the improvement of economic conditions in less developed countries and their achievement of independence and economic self-support is only one measure and in many instances not the most important measure by which to build the security of the United States and of the free world in general. We have many other instruments through which U.S. resources must be applied. The direct military activities of the United States, our information programs, our diplomatic negotiations—all of these are clearly related to United States and free world security. The foreign aid program does not stand alone; it stands as one element in the effort to achieve U.S. world security.

Secondly, as I've indicated, economic growth is plainly a mutual process. The United States cannot achieve it by itself. It must be achieved primarily by the countries that we are trying to help. In consequence, and by, I think, irrefutable logic, the U.S. national interest in this field is something that depends not only on ourselves, but on what others do. In the future, therefore, as in the past, we shall undoubtedly encounter a great many situations which will lead to considerable frustration among those in the United States who have not been able to disengage themselves from what Dennis Brogan used to call "the illusion of American omnipotence."

Finally, it is, I think, very important for us to recognize that what we are trying to achieve cannot be achieved by government resources alone, either in the recipient country or in the United States. There's been a great deal of argument and there will be, I'm sure, a great deal more argument over the relative merits and demerits of this or that line being drawn between the public and private sectors. I don't think there is any disagreement, however, that the private sector must play a major role in any country in achieving effective growth. And the agency that I head should be conceived in large part as an organization which seeks to mobilize private U.S. resources to contribute to the growth process abroad—resources in business, labor, cooperatives, saving and loan associations, universities, in all the varied and diversified institutions that exist in our pluralistic society.

The same thing should be true of a development program in any less-developed country although most of us would agree that it's not easy to bring about. The stimulation and use of private initiative and private energy in a developing country should be a major preoccupation of those who are attempting to bring about a sustained and lasting forward movement.

For you in the Society for International Development this should be a matter of special concern because you represent so many resources, private as well as public, both in the United States and abroad. If you can contribute to a better understanding of how the development process takes place and what can and should be done, in particular environments, with particular cultural backgrounds, to achieve economic self-support and the development of free institutions you will be making a distinct contribution to the national security of the United States and to the international security of the entire world.

---

## THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 8, some 3,700 people gathered at Temple Emanu-El to bid farewell to Herbert H. Lehman—Governor, Senator, philanthropist, political reformer, and humanitarian. This outpouring of grief was evidence of the love and affection and high esteem which people everywhere had for Governor Lehman.

James A. Wechsler, of the New York Post, in his column for December 9, 1963, described eloquently the public affection which Governor Lehman enjoyed. I include his column at this point in the RECORD:

### THE TRIBUTE

(By James A. Wechsler)

Now it was about 9 o'clock on Saturday evening, and soon the chapel where Herbert Lehman's body rested would finally close its doors. Still there were those arriving to pause reverently and to glance at what seemed to be his serene countenance; the procession had been going on for 2 days—not merely relatives, friends, acquaintances and celebrities but anonymous people who had ridden many tedious subway miles to say this farewell to a man they had never met.

In an anteroom Edith Lehman, whose 54-year marriage and comradeship with Herbert Lehman had ended with such stunning swiftness on Thursday morning, was seated white-faced but controlled, and saying somberly to those who gathered around her:

"I only wish that he could have seen all these people * * * I only wish he could know that so many people cared."

It had always been that way. He was forever being startled by manifestations of public affection, most tangibly reflected in his remarkable success at the polls but also expressed in many other tributes. He always seemed unable to believe that he was the object of such esteem and he frankly rejoiced almost boyishly at each implausible recognition.

On that last Thursday morning, he was preparing to leave for Washington to receive the climatic award—the national medal of honor for which John F. Kennedy had designated him last July.

Then, in a blessedly brief instant, without outcry of anguish, his life was over. For Edith Lehman there came a vast emptiness, and now she was saying, "I know everything has to end * * * but if only he could have seen all those people."

The same thought must have recurred to Mrs. Lehman yesterday as President Johnson entered Temple Emanu-El, leading a parade of dignitaries that included Chief Justice Warren and other members of the High Court, gaunt, grief-scarred Bobby Kennedy, numerous Members of the Senate and House, the leading political figures of the State and city. There were those who had fought Herbert Lehman in life as well as those who had been his allies, and perhaps either cynicism or protocol brought some of them to the scene. But the percentage who came out of authentic emotion was infinitely higher than on most such occasions.

Herbert Lehman had a capacity for evoking the respect of his adversaries as well as his adherents perhaps because, apart from the visible sincerity of his convictions, he never lost a quality now sometimes deemed old fashioned: he was a gentleman in the classic sense. No one ever accused him of striking a low blow. The miracle was that he prevailed so often in the rough political arena without being faithless to himself.

Lehman was born to privilege, and walked in the highest places. Yet it would have gratified him to know that, a few moments before the services began and, as so many men of influence and affluence gathered, Mrs. Lehman asked to see ILGWU president David Dubinsky, the Russian-born immigrant with whom Wall Street graduate Lehman had formed so deep and lasting a friendship. She wanted Dubinsky to know that she had been thinking of how much these two men had meant to each other.

In his soft-spoken, gracious euology, Judge Edward Weinfield remarked that "even as we are gathered here," many children were paying their own tribute to Herbert and Edith Lehman "just across the street by enjoying the children's zoo that he and Edith had so wonderfully provided for them."

The sad thing was that, as the children played, the area in and around the temple was an armed camp. The President's presence had provoked unprecedented security measures; one almost felt under suspicion the moment one arrived. When I took a handkerchief from my pocket during the rites, I had a sense that the eyes of a score of Secret Service men were on me.

The precautions were obviously warranted. But there also seemed a morose symbolism in the gap between the joy pervading the zoo the Lehmans had built and the atmosphere of apprehension and vigilance in which the funeral was being conducted.

It was almost as if, across this Fifth Avenue divide, we were glimpsing a world of laughter, spontaneity, and freedom for which Herbert Lehman fought so long, and the world of terror and anxiety that is still too much for us.

Let there be one comment about the future. One already hears the cry that Lehman's death—1 year after Mrs. Roosevelt's—means the doom of political reform in this city. This was his last great cause, and one about which he felt a special passion. The least those of us who seriously honor his memory can do is to rededicate ourselves to that effort, as to the national and international battles for equality and justice in which he invested so much of his magnificent spirit.

---

## WASTE IN THE AIR FORCE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in a few short minutes today, I am going to prove that the Air Force is wasting up to $3.5 million in the purchase of a radar altimeter and can only excuse its actions by explaining, in effect, that it is bailing out a contractor who is losing money on an earlier contract.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force, after conducting a procurement designed to supply it with a dependable producer, turned around a year later and doubled the sole-source unit price for the equipment, with both contracts going to the same company.

In 1961, the Air Force decided it needed a quantity of radar altimeters identified as the AN/APN 150. To buy them, it chose to adopt what it calls a two-step procurement method.

Interested manufacturers were required to prepare, at their own considerable expense, a technical proposal to show what equipment they intended to supply. Those adjudged technically competent were then allowed to bid for the contract.

These bids were opened January 10, 1962, and the low bidder quoted an average price per system of about $4,671. The total bid was $195,977.64. The next two lowest bidders asked total prices of $750,000 and $987,535. A contract was signed January 19, 1962, with the low bidder.

Thus, a fully open and competitive procurement, which required that all bidders prove their skill, was finalized at a low price to the taxpayers.

Imagine my shock, Mr. Speaker, when I learned that in mid-1962 the Air Force moved to buy another 705 of these jets, but this time awarded a sole source contract to the previous low bidder, and doubled the former price paid under competitive conditions.

I inquired as to this and was told by the Air Force, in effect, that the low bidder had lost his shirt on the two-step procurement and was given a sole source contract to bail him out.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force has no business bailing out any contractor. If an industry underbids, it must live with the consequences. There are remedies for this sort of thing built right into procurement law, but they were not used. The Air Force simply tried to cover up one error by giving away more taxpayers' dollars on a sole source purchase.

Sloppy administration and sloppier bidding is thus covered up under an avalanche of tax dollars. Or, it would have been, but for the fact that one lone Congressman has been looking behind the redtape.

Is it any wonder the Defense Department does not want me to get advance notification of procurements? This series of two procurements speaks for itself and further proves my overall point that a complete revamping is mandatory in military purchasing departments. This kind of waste must not be allowed to continue. Congress must act to bring these spenders back into line.

---

## QUESTION BOEING 707 ABILITIES IN SEVERE STORM

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. Wayne Thomis, aviation editor of the Chicago Tribune and one of the truly outstanding authorities in this Nation on aviation matters, wrote an excellent article which is entitled "Question 707 Abilities in Severe Storm." Mr. Thomis is himself a distinguished pilot.

My congressional district lies just east of O'Hare Field which is the world's largest airfield. About 200 commercial jets fly in and out of O'Hare Field every day. I think this article is very timely. I should like to suggest to the FAA that it give serious consideration to setting up procedures which would permit grounding a 707 whenever there is reason to believe the Boeing 707 will encounter severely turbulent weather along its route and keep the Boeing 707 grounded until the weather has cleared sufficiently to resume operations.

Such FAA regulations would remain in effect until such time as proper authorities have completed an intensive investigation to determine if Boeing 707 jets can tolerate severe turbulence and if their present structural characteristics constitute a hazard not only to passengers who fly in this type of aircraft but to the thousands upon thousands, and even millions, of people who live in the vicinity of major airfields, including my own constituents who live just east of O'Hare Field. There have been quite a few of these Boeing 707's that have gone down and we have watched these tragedies with mounting concern. There have also been other jets that have gone down in inclement weather. Mr. Speaker, the death toll from this latest tragedy would have been even greater than it was had this jet exploded over a highly populated area. I have a responsibility to my constituents who see these jets flying over their homes all day long. I am aware that my suggestion could mean serious financial losses to the airlines but this latest jet tragedy culminates a long series of similar tragedies. How long do we have to wait before we give both passengers and those on the ground adequate protection?

My own theory is that these jets, flying at tremendously high altitudes and near supersonic speeds, experience a greater degree of atmospheric friction than conventional aircraft and therefore are subject to metal fatigue at a faster rate than conventional aircraft. I have reason to believe this metal fatigue makes them less capable to withstand turbulence than conventional aircraft. We need a great deal more study on the entire subject and that is why I hope the FAA will not jeopardize any more lives.

I hope the FAA will apply special "turbulent weather" standards to all commercial jets until we learn more about their flight characteristics in bad weather.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Thomis' suggestion in questioning the safety of this aircraft is perfectly timely and proper. I should like to include it at this point in the RECORD. The article follows:

### QUESTION 707 ABILITIES IN SEVERE STORM

(By Wayne Thomis)

With the fatal crash of the Pan-American World Airways Boeing 707 jet at Elkton, Md., Sunday night, the question must be asked: "Are the Boeings deficient either in structural integrity or control or both when subjected to heavy turbulence?"

This newest incident, with its 81 dead, must be added to a list of earlier incidents and an accident involving a Northwest Orient Airlines Boeing 720–B jet near Miami, Fla., in mid-February in which 43 persons were killed. All these involve handling of the big jets in thunderstorms with up and down air currents of great violence.

#### NO POSITIVE ANSWER FOUND

In no instance has a positive answer been found, but it now is clear, with this latest crash, that such answers absolutely are required.

U.S. domestic and oversea airlines are flying more than 300 Boeing jets of varying sizes and weights and with varying powerplants. At least $2.5 billion are invested in them and they are lifting a high percentage of the traveling public.

Nearly 24 hours after the Elkton accident positive evidence in hand is meager. It shows, largely, that the plane encountered a catastrophic in-flight situation while "holding" in a thunderstorm only 20 miles from its Philadelphia destination.

#### SIX PLANES CIRCLING

This flight—Pan-Am Clipper 214—was only one of six airliners circling and waiting for a thunderstorm and high winds to pass beyond the Philadelphia airfield.

The Pan-Am crew, Capt. George Knuth and First Officer John R. Dale, did not complain to the Philadelphia approach control that there was severe turbulence at their holding height of 5,000 feet. Others, however, did, and there is no question that violent winds, rain, and a good deal of lightning [positively determined thunderstorms in the area] were occurring where they were flying.

Suddeness of the tragedy and the transition from a safe, waiting "hold" to a final, flaming plunge, was indicated by radio transmissions recorded between the plane and the approach control.

#### FIRST DISASTER HINT

After reporting establishment on the holding fix of the New Castle, Del., ground station, Clipper 214 called once, a little impatiently saying it was ready to accept approach. Approach control said, in effect, in a few minutes more. Clipper 214 replied: "Roger. No hurry."

Not 2 minutes later, however, came the message, emotionless in its mechanical reproductions on a tape recording: "Clipper 214 out of control."

Then: "Mayday, mayday * * * down we go."

Approach Controller Paul Alexy, hearing this amid a jumble of other radio calls, answered immediately saying: "214 did you call?"

The same emotionless voice replied: "Clipper 214 going down in flames."

#### WORDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

These words are of enormous significance. They say that a mechanical or structural failure occurred in flight which destroyed the pilot's capacity to maneuver, and which also set the plane afire. The questions which immediately are suggested:

Did a wing, with its internal fuel tanks, break, or did the skin crack permitting a cascade of jet fuel on the flaming jet engines?

Did an engine "explode" in flight, causing wing punctures, loss of control, and fire?

### SPREAD OVER WIDE AREA

Whatever did occur, the plane plunged burning—a great many witnesses agree to this point—through the clouds and into a swamp area. Destruction was complete, fragments being so small that civil aeronautics board inspectors doubt any mockup can be rigged.

Also, and the significance is great, the wreckage is spread over a square mile or more, pointing toward in-flight structural breakups.

The investigators must determine the order in which these events transpired. Such tragedies always are progressive.

A failure to discover the initial or originating cause can conceal the real motivating failure and the CAB's expert teams are completely aware of this fact.

### FLYING THROUGH STORMS

The Northwest Orient Airlines crash at Miami also was in a thunderstorm. In fact the plane was attempting to work its way through violent, cold frontal line of thunderstorms. Off Miami only 17 minutes earlier, the 720-B jet reached 19,000 feet but then plunged almost straight down (flight recorders subsequently indicated) to dash itself to bits in the Everglades.

In this case, too, there was sufficient inflight breakup of structure to cause the plane to burn during the fall.

Incidents involving Boeings have been numerous. One which seems to relate to this latest tragedy being the United Airlines Boeing 720 jet which encountered turbu'ence at 39,000 feet over central Nebraska on July 14, finally stalled and nosed over to plunge downward for 25,000 feet before the crew regained control.

### MILLION TO ONE SHOT

Afterward several hypotheses were advanced, but none really explained what happened.

Experts agreed last night on one aspect of the Maryland accident. Lightning may have struck Pan America's Clipper 214, but it is a million to one shot that it had anything to do with the crash. Planes in flight are struck by lightning frequently, but since they are not grounded very little damage ever is sustained.

CAB has said that never in the history of accident investigation have its experts determined that a lightning strike downed an airliner.

---

## EXPRESSION OF HEARTFELT SYMPATHY OF THE BRITISH GROUP OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION ON THE TRAGIC DEATH OF OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter and cable have just been received by me as President of the U.S. national group of the Interparliamentary Union.

The letter is from General Dimoline, secretary of the British group, and expresses their heartfelt sympathy to us over the tragic death of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The cable is also a message of sympathy from Senator de Baeck, expressing the feelings of the Belgian group.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the letter and cable at this point in the body of the Record:

Inter-Parliamentary Union,
Palace of Westminster,
*London, December 4, 1963.*

Dr. George B. Galloway,
*Executive Secretary of the U.S. Interparliamentary Group, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.*

My Dear Galloway: At the first meeting of the executive committee of the British group, on behalf of all members of the group, I was instructed to write and convey to the American group our deepest sympathy in the tragic death of your late President.

We send you and Mrs. Kennedy and the peoples of the United States, whom you represent, our heartfelt sympathy in this senseless outrage against the cause of humanity which the President did so much to uphold. His death is not only a severe blow to his own countrymen but to all who watched with admiration his noble efforts for peace.

He was a great and human man and his loss will be felt by the world for a long time.

Yours sincerely,

W. A. Dimoline.

---

Palais de la Nation,
*Bruxelles, November 24, 1963.*

Chairman of the Group of the United States of America of the Interparliamentary Union,
*State Department, Washington, D.C.:*

It is with a feeling of real affliction that we heard of the tragic and irreparable loss of President Kennedy. This terrible misfortune that has just come upon the United States of America, and all the countries of the world, must have been the more cruel as it was unexpected. Be assured that we feel most sincerely for the member of your group, and also for the American citizens in their affliction.

Carlos de Baeck,
*Chairman of Belgian Group, Interparliamentary Union.*

---

## WHO IS TO BLAME?

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all patriotic Americans instinctively recoiled with horror at the assassination of the President of the United States. It is only natural and understandable that we should undergo a soul searching as to what was responsible for this horrible deed and what might be done to prevent the recurrence of such an act.

It is also understandable that in times of such emotional stress we may not think clearly. I fear that such unclear thinking may be responsible for some blame being attached to the strong patriotism and nationalism to which many Americans subscribe. It is proper and necessary that patriotic Americans should strongly protect and defend our country, its institutions, and its heritage from the constant attacks, direct and by subversion, from the Communists, parlor pinks, and fellow travelers. We must not allow the assassination of President Kennedy to in any way slow down or deter our battle to preserve the freedom and dignity of the individual from the onslaught on Communist slavery. I am certain that this is the last thing President Kennedy would have desired.

We must keep in mind that Lee Harvey Oswald was not a super American patriot. He was not a patriot at all; he was exactly the opposite. He was un-American to extreme; he was a Communist. He would destroy America's greatness, our heritage, our institutions, and to accomplish this he murdered the President of the United States.

We may never know for certain if Oswald was a Khrushchev Communist, a Castro Communist, or a Mao Tse-tung Communist; whether he worked alone or in a conspiracy to carry out his evil deed. We can know that he was motivated by hate—hate of our American freedom, our American greatness.

Oswald was not trained to hate by American patriots, regardless of how intemperate some of their statements might have been. Oswald's hatred was nurtured in Russia—the very cradle of communism.

Hatred and murder are dominant parts of the Communist heritage. The Communists have never achieved their goals by the ballot, by the will of the people. Murder has always been a way of life with the Communist hierarchy. From Alexander II to Trotsky, from the savage murder of millions of freedom-loving Ukrainians to the slaughter of 15,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, the commissars—be they great or small—have been climbing to power over the assassinated bodies of their rivals.

The road to every Communist takeover has been soaked by the blood of freedom-loving patriots who have resisted slavery. Castro's climb to glory was punctuated with the daily firing squads. The world will never know the millions murdered to keep Mao Tse-tung in power. Only recently the Castro Communists of Venezuela were murdering the citizens of that country in a reign of terror to prevent them from exercising their right to vote. Oswald was merely following in his own misguided way what has for almost half a century been a way of life in the Communist hierarchy.

We hear much of the virtue of tolerance. We should be tolerant for the rights of all to their own beliefs and the right to live their own lives. Such tolerance is a virtue, but tolerance ceases to be a virtue if that tolerance would allow the enemies of our country at home or abroad to destroy the freedom and greatness that is America, which was forged from the very blood and sacrifices of our freedom-loving ancestors and freedom-loving people all over the world.

When we become tolerant of evil, tolerance ceases to be a virtue and becomes cowardice and laziness. America showed great tolerance toward Oswald. He repudiated his country, repudiated his citizenship and left his country to live in Russia, yet when he desired to return to America not only did we allow him to do so, but our Government loaned him money for his return.

Catullus said that "tolerance is the weakness of the strong." Let us beware that this cannot be spoken of America.

Let us be reminded our country's tolerance in allowing Lee Oswald to return to America allowed him his opportunity to murder our President.

We must vigorously fight to preserve our American ideals and way of life from enemies at home and abroad and at the same time we must not allow hatred to sear our mind and soul. Hatred weakens us and our mind and may make us impotent to effectually combat our enemies. But it would be worse than stupid to allow a misguided tolerance to cause us for one moment to weaken our resistance to the forces of evil that would destroy our American heritage, our religious beliefs, our freedom, and our greatness. Such action would be exactly what the Communists, parlor pinks, and fellow travelers would want.

## REPRESENTATIVE LINDSAY ADVANCES ATLANTIC UNITY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, I have taken a special interest in the work that our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, has been doing to strengthen the Atlantic Alliance.

For a long time the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has been developing a program for the creation of an Atlantic Consultative Assembly consisting of parliamentary representatives of the 15 NATO nations and the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

In the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has been working toward the same end. He and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] together have provided the impetus for some productive steps forward in this area. They have had the encouraging and enthusiastic support of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk.

Two years ago our colleague, JOHN LINDSAY, was elected rapporteur of the 15-nation Political Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians. In this capacity, working with the Chairman of the Political Committee, a distinguished Englishman, long a member of Commons and now a member of Lords and the president of the Liberal Party in Great Britain, Lord Ogmore, he has prepared position papers and recommendations designed to persuade European and American legislators of the importance of strengthening Atlantic institutions in general and specifically advancing the cause of Atlantic unity by establishing an Atlantic Parliament consisting of delegates from the free countries of the Atlantic community.

The New York Times on Tuesday, December 10, 1963, published an editorial commenting on the work that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and Senator FULBRIGHT have been doing toward the creation of an Atlantic Assembly. The New York Times editorial correctly pointed out that the "Lindsay-Fulbright proposal has aroused interest on both sides of the Atlantic." I know from my own contacts in Europe and my work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee the extent of this interest and I hope that the many years of work that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and Senator FULBRIGHT have put into this proposal will receive additional support of Members of the U.S. Congress and the public. There is growing support in Europe, and key parliamentarians in European countries take encouragement from this proposal. We in the United States equally can be encouraged by these developments. The New York Times editorial follows:

### ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

> The useful debate on Atlantic political and military issues just concluded in the assembly of the Western European Union calls attention to a serious gap in the Western system of consultation.
>
> Legislators of the six Common Market countries, selected by their national parliaments, meet as the European Parliament, They also meet regularly with British parliamentarians in the Western European Union Assembly and with parliamentarians of eight other European countries in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.
>
> These three assemblies are all official bodies and the six-nation European Parliament even has some real powers: it must debate the Common Market budget and it can force the resignation of the Common Market Commission.
>
> Unfortunately, there is no official assembly that brings European and American legislators together. In their present state of disarray, the Atlantic governments badly need the kind of stimulus and support for common policies that—as European experience shows—an assembly of elected legislators could provide.
>
> Representative LINDSAY and Senator FULBRIGHT have seen this need for some time and have proposed an Atlantic Parliamentary Assembly. It would replace the informal meetings in recent years of NATO parliamentarians and could serve, as well, as the assembly for the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
>
> The Lindsay-Fulbright proposal has aroused interest on both sides of the Atlantic, but no action has yet resulted. What is needed now is an informal meeting of key American and European legislators to prepare a draft charter for submission to all the Parliaments of the Atlantic countries.

## BEEF AND BRANDY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, two recent actions of the Government involving our Nation's tariff policies which have come to my attention are worthy of comment.

The U.S. Tariff Commission filed notice in the December 3 issue of the Federal Register of its plans to hold a public hearing in April of next year as part of its investigation of the "conditions of competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries."

Also last week, President Johnson issued a proclamation raising tariffs on the imports of brandy from Common Market nations from $1 and $1.25 per gallon up to $5 per gallon. The President's action was taken as another step in the so-called chicken war between the United States and the Common Market. Import duties on brandy and certain other selected commodities were increased in retaliation for the action taken by the Common Market in 1962 increasing their import duties on poultry imported from the United States.

These tariff policy actions are of interest to me since I have watched closely during the course of the past year the continuing increase in beef imports and the apparent effect that these imports have on domestic beef prices. As long ago as February of 1963, I brought my concern over beef imports to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and have repeatedly urged that the Secretary take action to restrict the price-depressing volumes of beef imports.

Up to this point, the Secretary has not advised me of any plans to do anything about this situation. In fact, the Secretary in a recent speech to the California Cattlemen's Association stated that the Department of Agriculture has given the matter careful study and has arrived at the conclusion that increased imports of beef have had only a small effect on cattle prices during the past year. The Secretary went on to state:

> I suggest that those who think that the Government should do something immediately about holding down the imports of beef take a longer look, study some of the analyses that have been published, and work together with the rest of our domestic beef industry to formulate plans that will move our domestic supply through the markets in good order in the months ahead.

Undoubtedly this is good advice, but apparently the U.S. Tariff Commission feels that more has to be done than simply keeping close watch on the import situation. The Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate must also be concerned since the Tariff Commission investigation is being instituted pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate Finance Committee last month.

An article which appeared in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "A Farm Problem That Closely Concerns the New President," comments on President Johnson's interest in the beef industry. Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this article at this point in my remarks:

### A FARM PROBLEM THAT CLOSELY CONCERNS THE NEW PRESIDENT

> (NOTE.—Farm troubles—declining cattle prices, wheat surpluses, cotton subsidies—may get more attention now. That's the hope of cattlemen and other farmers. President Johnson is a rancher and cattleman himself. He knows personally what it's like to sell cattle at low prices. One of the hottest issues: rising imports of foreign beef.)

Omaha, Nebr.—There is one important U.S. business that now is depressed—the cattle business.

It just happens that cattle raising is the business in which President Lyndon B. Johnson is engaged on his ranch in Texas. The President is reported recently to have used strong language about the price he received for a batch of cattle.

Here in Omaha, on the Nation's largest cattle market, prices are down as much as 25 percent from a year ago for the kind of choice fat cattle that provide the most popular cuts of beef.

There is trouble, too, for the cattlemen on the ranges of the West and Southwest who raise the calves that go into feedlots on their way to dinner tables.

Cattlemen in the past have shied away from controls and subsidies. They are asking none now.

What cattlemen do want is a curb on the flood of imported beef that they hold is helping drive down prices they receive.

### DISSATISFIED CONSUMERS

Cattlemen are irritated, too, because consumers are complaining about the high cost of beef, despite the sharply lower prices for cattle. Latest official figures show that while the average retail price of a pound of beef has dropped 6 cents in the past year, the farmer's share of that price has dropped nearly 10 cents.

Until now, the men who raise cattle on the range and those who fatten them in feed lots have received short shrift in Washington. Officials of the Department of Agriculture have brushed off complaints about rising beef imports.

The feeling now is that President Johnson, as one who understands the cattle business, will be more inclined to listen to cattlemen's complaints.

Other segments of the farming industry, too, are watching Washington for signs of the new President's attitude toward agriculture.

Throughout the Wheat Belt and the Cotton Belt, there is strong sentiment for new farm programs.

### A GLUT OF WHEAT?

Wheatgrowers, last May, voted down a plan advanced by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman to apply rigid Government controls over all phases of their business from planting to marketing. Had the plan been accepted, the wheat price would have been supported at a relatively high level.

Mr. Freeman accepted the farmers' verdict. Now, with no compulsory production control, the result could be a huge wheat crop and much lower prices unless the present drought in parts of the winter-wheat belt persists and spreads. Many growers of wheat hope that President Johnson will ask Congress to provide a voluntary control plan for wheat in 1964, as well as reasonably good price support for those who wish to cooperate.

### A SUBSIDY PLAN

As for cotton, the House, on December 4, approved a new plan. This plan provides a subsidy payment to enable U.S. textile mills to buy American cotton at a price competitive with that at which it is now sold to foreign textile mills in the world market.

Many in the Senate favor a somewhat different approach to the cotton problem. It will be President Johnson's aim to find a compromise that is acceptable to both the Senate and the House.

At the moment, however, cattlemen feel that it is their industry that most urgently needs attention.

Early in December, cattle prices were still dropping, and latest available figures showed the flood of imported beef rising to an all-time high.

In the Omaha stockyards, low prices and beef imports were the prime topic of conversation. Farmer after farmer told of heavy losses.

### FOR A YEAR'S WORK: A LOSS

A Nebraska farmer related this experience, which stockyard officials said was typical: A year ago, in November 1962, he bought 75 beef calves that weighed an average of 400 pounds apiece. After feeding them a year, he sold them on November 17 weighing an average of 1,117 pounds apiece. These fat cattle topped the market that day at $23.50 a hundredweight. The farmer lost $35 a head, and that figure included no allowance for his labor.

Over all, prices for fattened cattle have dropped steadily for a year. The kind of choice cattle that brought $29 a hundredweight in Omaha a year ago brought barely $22 early in December of this year.

The price decline for fattened cattle has been reflected on the ranges where calves are raised and sold to cattle feeders for fattening. On the average, prices for these "feeders" have been down by $2 to $4 a hundredweight.

In Denver, an official of the American National Cattlemen's Association reports that ranchers who got from $30 to $32 a hundredweight for calves in 1962, have been selling calves for $24 to $26 a hundredweight in 1963.

Secretary Freeman holds that the major factor depressing prices has been the large number of cattle coming to market. He says that 90 percent of the imported beef is of lower grades used for hamburger and low-priced cuts, and that there has been little or no price decline for "cull" beef cows and other kinds of cattle that supply the cheaper grades of beef in the United States.

Experts in the cattle business agree that heavy marketings of cattle have been a major factor in price declines. They disagree, however, with Mr. Freeman's view that beef imports have not been a factor. They are urging that quotas be set for imported beef, which now are subject to only a small tariff.

Fred W. Gilmore, president of the Omaha stockyards, points out that an estimated 30 percent of meat from U.S. cattle winds up as ground beef or hamburger. Thus, in his opinion, beef imported in the volume now coming into the United States does compete directly with American beef.

### "FALL GUY"?

Says Mr. Gilmore: "If we expect to sell abroad, we must be willing to accept their produce in return. My only point is: Why should the livestock producer be the fall guy? For every dollar of beef or veal we export, beef and veal imports equal $25."

Cushman S. Radebaugh, president of the Cattlemen's Association, states: "Foreign beef shipped here during the past year literally displaced more than 3 million animals which could have grazed American grasses and eaten well into the huge grain surplus."

Official figures show that in 1957 total imports of beef and veal came to 616 million pounds and equaled 4 percent of total U.S. production. This year, it's estimated that total imports will be close to 2 billion pounds, or more than three times the 1957 level, and equal to 11 percent of U.S. production.

In Australia, where exports of beef to the United States jumped from 17 million pounds in 1958 to 445 million pounds in 1962, a farm paper noted that a delegation of American cattlemen had asked the Australian Government to cut down on the flow of beef to the United States.

Commented the Australian paper:

"Contrast this with what would happen in Australia if our markets were depressed and we suspected that imports were the reason. * * * More than likely we would have a delegation on the first plane to Canberra (the capital) and down would go the chopper in the form of a prohibitive tariff or an arbitrary control of imports."

In the view of U.S. cattlemen, it's time for their Government to do something. They are looking to the cattleman in the White House to lend an ear to their story.

## THE LATE HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that Herbert H. Lehman, Governor, Senator, and world statesman is no longer with us. His death is felt the world over; testimonials to his life and character have poured in from every country, from heads of state, and from the people everywhere. Herbert Lehman stood for excellence in everything he did. He fought for justice for every man. He would not compromise with moral principles and he insisted on the same high standards for all public office holders. His death leaves a void in New York and in the country. Americans and most especially New Yorkers from every walk of life feel they have lost a champion and a friend. He gave his party standards and brought honor and distinction to public office, as Governor of New York, as Senator, and as a fighter for political reform.

There was a great outpouring of mourners at Governor Lehman's funeral in New York. It was a deeply moving service and I was honored, as the Representative in Congress of the late Governor and his family, to have been included in President Johnson's party that flew to New York from Washington in order to pay tribute. Gathered at Temple Emmanuel on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan was a great assemblage of people who came to pay their respects and say "thank you" to this unusual man. I would like to add my voice on the floor of the House of Representatives to the many who have saluted the name and life of Herbert H. Lehman and to extend to Mrs. Lehman, her children and grandchildren my deepest sympathy.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Government Research be permitted to sit during general debate for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## PANAMA CANAL PICTURE: THE REAL "UGLY AMERICANS" AND THEIR JOURNALISTIC BOOMERANG

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a student of Panama Canal problems for many years, I long ago observed a sharp difference between the extensive coverage of important Isthmian news by Panama papers and its inadequate treatment by the press in the United States. This has resulted in our citizens in the Canal Zone being extremely well informed on specific canal questions and those in the United States often being misinformed and misled.

Moreover, on occasions when some papers have sought to correct the news situation by sending their reporters to the isthmus, such efforts have often failed. Too many of our writers have visited the Canal Zone for a stay of some hours, ridden across the isthmus on a train, received some impressions from a car window, talked to a few Isthmian gossips hanging around hotels in rocking chair brigades, obtained questionable information from radical elements, and, without checking on the competence of sources, have filed pontifical stories of harmful nature with their papers for publication to the people of the United States.

A recent example of misleading reporting from Panama by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak was published in the November 1, 1963, issue of the Washington Post in what was a vicious libel against our citizens in the Canal Zone under the title of "Ugly Americans."

In an obvious effort well calculated to support the views of radical elements in Panama and their abetters in the Department of State and to disparage the position of the United States and prestige of our citizens in the Canal Zone, these two reporters fell far short of the objective performance expected of persons writing on a subject of the importance of the Panama Canal. Arranged topically, their article did the following:

First. Minimized the effectiveness of Communist propaganda as "only partly to blame" for anti-American sentiment among Panamanians.

Second. Asserted that the "real culprits" are "strange American policies" and the "unknown ugly Americans who shaped them."

Third. Repeated the statement of an unnamed U.S. diplomat to the effect that 99 out of every 100 Panamanians believe that U.S. canal policy is "grossly unfair."

Fourth. Commended Panamanians as having displayed "remarkable self-restraint" in their attitude toward the United States.

Fifth. Charged our Government with reverting to "big city imperialism" at Panama mainly because of "inordinate influence wielded by some civilian employees of the canal, who must be included among the ugliest Americans anywhere."

Sixth. Attributed the difficulties in Panama-United States relations as stemming from the 1903 Canal Treaty, which they criticized as a "triumph of Yankee trading comparable to the purchase of Manhattan Island" and as having been "engineered by Teddy Roosevelt."

Seventh. Belittled the $1,930,000 annuity paid Panama as "chicken feed" when compared to last year's $60 million in gross toll revenue.

Eighth. Approved Panama's "unique geographical position" as justifying its resentments against the United States.

Ninth. Claimed that, "except for anti-Panama sentiment in Congress" the Department of State would gladly grant additional concessions such as a "token time limit" on the treaty.

Tenth. Charged that this "congressional intransigence is the handiwork of the Zonians" and that they operate one of the "most effective lobbies" in Washington.

Eleventh. Condemned our Canal Zone citizens as "bad-will ambassadors, more irritating to Panamanians than official U.S. policy."

Mr. Speaker, such charges as the above are not only gross misstatements of facts and cruel slanders of our citizens in the Canal Zone, but also are impugning of the integrity of the leadership of the Congress, which has been opposing further paralyzing surrenders of U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal enterprise. Because of their malicious and misleading character, it is important for the Congress and the Nation to have facts essential for sound judgment and a realistic appraisal of the situation.

Among the historical facts that the two reporters failed to disclose are:

First. That the grant of complete sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and other indispensable provisions in the 1903 treaty were parts of the inducement to construct the Isthmian Canal at Panama rather than at Nicaragua.

Second. That the United States, in addition to the grant of sovereignty, obtained legal title to all privately owned property in the Canal Zone through purchase from its owners.

Third. That, were it not for the granting of such exclusive sovereign rights, powers, and authority over the Canal Zone and its ownership, the United States would never have undertaken the task of constructing the proposed canal at Panama.

Fourth. That the perpetuity provision was included in the treaty because the Spooner Act of 1902 authorized the acquisition of the perpetual control of the Canal Zone for the construction and perpetual operation of the Panama Canal.

Fifth. That the total revenue of the canal in 1962, including tolls, was $100,083,205 and that, under law, the enterprise is required to operate on a self-sustaining basis.

Sixth. That the net revenue of the canal operation in 1962 was $7,345,986.

Seventh. That the $1,930,000 annuity to Panama is a substantial part of the net profit and that $1,500,00 of this annuity is borne by Department of State appropriations as a matter of good will toward Panama and is not justified from the standpoint of the net profit from the operation.

Eighth. That, in addition to various forms of aid, U.S. Government sources in the Canal Zone inject around $75 million annually into the economy of Panama, which is about the total of the annual Panamanian national budget.

Ninth. That the United States, in addition to its own vital interests, has treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal for vessels of all nations on terms that are equitable and just.

Tenth. That the framers of the 1903 treaty foresaw the possibility that the Republic of Panama might disappear and guarded against impairment of our treaty rights in such eventuality—see article XXIV of the 1903 treaty.

Eleventh. That our Government, through Executive actions in 1960 and again in 1962, authorized the formal display of Panama flags at civil government installations in the Canal Zone on an equal basis with the flags of the United States.

Nor did the two reporters explain the magnitude of the benefits derived by Panama from the 1936–39 and 1955 treaties that weakened our juridical position on the isthmus through ill-advised concessions to Panamanian demands. Among them are:

First. Revocation of the guarantee of Panamanian independence.

Second. Rescission of U.S. right of eminent domain in the Republic of Panama for canal purposes.

Third. Construction of a transisthmian highway between the cities of Panama and Colon at high cost and its maintenance.

Fourth. Revocation of the right to maintain public order in the terminal cities and areas adjacent thereto.

Fifth. Donation to Panama of valuable real estate in the terminal cities, including lots worth $28 million, a modern school building, and the Hotel Washington in Colon built by the United States at high cost.

Sixth. Giving to Panama of the terminal yards and passenger stations of the Panama Railroad worth many millions with no provision for replacements in the Republic of Panama which required the United States to build new terminals in the Canal Zone that are far less convenient.

Seventh. Abrogation of the right to supervise the health and sanitation of the terminal cities.

Eighth. Construction at Balboa of a $20 million bridge to replace ferries.

While for purposes of reply to the Evans-Novak newsstory the facts mentioned are adequate, there have been many other large gifts and benefits bestowed by our country on Panama that could be pointed out, including the benefits under the Alliance for Progress.

In these connections, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that all of the foregoing concessions and benefits were made without either compensation or worthwhile accommodation on the part of Panama. Did they satisfy the voracious appetites of the radical leadership of Panama? The answer is a resounding "No." Invariably they were followed by greater demands and greater concessions.

Moreover, each concession has been taken as a sign of weakness inviting further aggressions. So successful have Panamanian negotiators been that the conclusion cannot be avoided that our negotiators have been either downright incompetent or subversive.

The two writers evidently did not know the facts that I have presented or did not care about the facts. Doubtless they were wined and dined in Panama and developed a frame of mind induced by the hospitality accorded. Not the least consideration was given by them to the major fact that, under the 1950 act of the Congress, the Canal is required to be operated without loss to the United States, that is to say, to the taxpayers.

Underlying the Panamanian demands for greater benefits has been the idea of increased tolls to provide increased annuities to Panama. Such increase no doubt would drive U.S. shipping from the seas because our shipping costs more to operate than that of any other nation.

Mr. Speaker, these two propagandists either knew nothing about this angle or cared nothing for it. So they went the whole hog in support of the radical demands of Panama and have given an utterly false picture to the American people. Not only that they ignored the fact that the United States, in providing for the protection and defense of the Canal, has built costly installations and maintained land, sea, and air forces to guard the canal through half a century of operation at a cost running into hundreds of millions.

Mr. Speaker, I would not charge either of these two reporters with having been paid by the Republic of Panama or of being subversive, but what they wrote could not be better calculated to serve the interests of radical elements in Panama or the world conspiratorial force that aims to wrest control of the canal from the United States.

The term "Ugly American," as applied by these two propagandists, is malicious slander against loyal and efficient citizens of the United States charged with the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal. The use of this term as they did should prove a boomerang because they and others of their ilk are the real "ugly Americans" in the canal picture.

I quote the indicated news story for the benefit of the cognizant committees of the Congress and agencies of the executive as well as all others who may be interested in the canal question:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1963]

UGLY AMERICANS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

PANAMA CITY.—If anti-American sentiment in Panama ever reaches the point where it menaces the Panama Canal, Communist propaganda would be only partly to blame. The real culprits would be some strange American policies and the unknown ugly Americans who shaped them.

By the count of one U.S. diplomat, 99 out of every 100 Panamanians believe U.S. canal policy is grossly unfair. Given that beginning, a competent demagog could someday build animosity to the danger point.

Actually, Panamanians have displayed remarkable self-restraint so far, considering the way Uncle Sam forgets about the Alliance for Progress and reverts to big city imperialism here.

Why? Mainly because of inordinate influence wielded by some civilian employees of the canal, who must be ranked among the ugliest Americans anywhere.

The trouble stems from the 1903 treaty that gave the United States the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone under terms so favorable that it seemed a triumph of Yankee trading comparable to the purchase of Manhattan Island.

In fact, it is no such thing. The Panamanian Government of 1903, newly independent from Colombia after a revolution engineered by Teddy Roosevelt, was under Washington's thumb. It's understandable that Panamanians want substantial treaty revision.

Their biggest complaint concerns money. In view of nearly $60 million revenue produced by the Canal Zone last year and the U.S. defense installations jammed into the Canal Zone, Panama's $1,930,000 annual share of canal tolls is chickenfeed. Panamanians rightly regard their country's unique geographical position as its one great national resource and resent getting shortchanged for it.

Questions of prestige are more subtle. Although a sovereign country seldom signs perpetual agreements, the 1903 treaty gives away the Canal Zone forever. Panamanians want a token time limit, perhaps 50 or even 99 years. By then, the canal probably would be abandoned.

The State Department would gladly grant such concessions except for anti-Panama sentiment in Congress. For instance, congressional opposition scuttled a modest concession to let Panama handle its own canal freight.

This congressional intransigence is the handiwork of the Zonians: U.S. residents of the Canal Zone, all canal employees, who operate one of Washington's most effective lobbies by playing on justifiable congressional fears about this vital waterway's security.

Moreover, the Zonians themselves are bad-will ambassadors, more irritating to Panamanians than official U.S. policy. At his worst, the Zonian brags about not understanding a word of Spanish and not crossing into the Republic of Panama for years on end.

That's not all. A U.S. employee of the canal receives 25 percent more pay than a Panamanian in the same job. Because of "security," such high-paying jobs as canal pilot ($19,000 a year) are limited to U.S. citizens, and a U.S. employee gets 10 days more vacations annually than a Panamanian.

Apart from canal problems, there's plenty to worry about here. Panama has Latin America's typical headaches—shantytown slums (called "Hollywood" in Panama City), an undeveloped interior, a ruling oligarchy wrapped up in moneymaking and petty politics. Topping this off is dependence on one "crop"—the canal.

Furthermore, Communists recently won student elections at the University of Panama and Communist-infiltrated labor unions are causing trouble on the banana plantations. U.S. intelligence sources estimate that 200 trained Reds have slipped in from Cuba. If they ever launch a concentrated terror campaign, Panama's 3,000-man national guard would be hard put to contain it.

---

## INDEPENDENCE OF ZANZIBAR

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1963, Zanzibar, isle of cloves, will become independent. On this occasion, we wish to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, the Sultan of Zanzibar, Seyyid Jamshid bin Abdulla.

This romantically cast and exotic sounding island off the east coast of Africa, which has been under British protection since 1890, will then join the community of independent nation states. We congratulate His Highness Seyyid Jamshid bin Abdulla, the Sultan of Zanzibar, and all the citizens of the new nation on their approaching independence.

The new state of Zanzibar will actually consist of two islands, Zanzibar and Pemba. Zanzibar comprises 640 square miles of gently rolling land separated from the mainland by a 22½-mile channel. It is a coral island—the largest off east Africa—which has been picturesquely described as "a small green island that smells of cloves." Its sister island, Pemba, which is somewhat smaller—380 square miles—and lies 25 miles to the northeast of Zanzibar, is called in Arabic El Huthera, "the Green One." Both islands are low lying, and on the west are studded with bays and inlets. The east coasts are a beachcomber's paradise of long stretches of sand and palm trees facing the Indian Ocean. Inland the vegetation is a lavish and brilliant mixture of coconut palms, mango trees, shiny cloves, and flowering shrubs.

Zanzibar has long been known to the outside world, for it lies astride one of the most important of the world's sea routes. From the seventh century Arab dhows have sailed along its coast, and Vasco da Gama visited the island in 1498 on his voyage from Portugal to India. Its heterogeneous population of Africans, Arabs, and Indians tells the story of its crossroads location.

"Isle of Cloves" is a fitting epithet for Zanzibar since Zanzibar and Pemba supply 75 percent of the world's supply of cloves. There are about 4 million clove trees on the islands, and cloves are Zanzibar's chief export earner. Realizing that agricultural diversification is necessary for future economic development, however, the government is now taking steps to encourage increased production of other crops. Coconuts are Zanzibar's second product. Cocoa is viewed as a promising new earner of foreign exchange. Also, the government has formed, in partnership with a Greek company, a Zanzibar Fisheries Development Co., to increase sardine catches.

Expenditure for education has trebled in Zanzibar in the last 10 years and is currently some 14 percent of the government's total budget. Primary school enrollment has increased 22 percent since 1958. One of the chief aims of the country's development plan is to expand secondary education.

Zanzibar's relations with its neighboring countries in East Africa are friendly. Membership in an East African federation of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Zanzibar is being seriously considered, and certain services such as postal service, railway transportation, and customs collection are already handled in common.

As the "Isle of Cloves" stands on the threshold of independence its future looks promising. There are many problems to be resolved—budget deficits, a still inadequate educational system, political competition—but we have confidence that Zanzibar will be able to solve these problems as an independent nation.

## THE PRESIDENTIAL LINE OF SUCCESSION

**Mr. ROONEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. O'NEILL.** Mr. Speaker, in these sad days when the Nation must move forward under a new leader there has been much conjecture in the press regarding the Presidential line of succession. We are indeed fortunate, as we here in the House realize so well, to have our distinguished and beloved Speaker first in line of succession. None of us here or outside of these Halls would but hope that our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, will continue to give us the leadership which will lead our Nation to its deserved greatness. However, it is well to know a man of the capabilities and dedication of John W. McCormack is in the high position of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include in the Record two columns, one written by Gould Lincoln and one written by William S. White, which recently appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

### The Presidential Succession

(By Gould Lincoln)

No Vice President of the United States who has stepped into the White House because of the death of a President has died in the Presidential Office. This record should perhaps quiet the fears of those who are today proclaiming themselves exercised over a successor to President Lyndon B. Johnson, the latest Vice President to fall heir to the Presidency. In all, eight Presidents have died in office, including the late President John F. Kennedy. Four of these died of natural causes, and four were the victims of assassins.

Of the seven Vice Presidents who preceded President Johnson in succession to the Presidency, three lived to be elected President, and four passed out of the White House at the close of the term to which they had succeeded. Those who won presidential terms in their own right were Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Harry S. Truman. President Johnson appears entirely likely to become the fourth elected to the Presidency in his own right.

#### RESIGNATION URGED

The latest suggestion emanating from those who profess to have misgivings about a successor to the Presidency if anything happens to President Johnson between now and January 20, 1965, when a newly elected President and Vice President are sworn into office, is that Speaker John W. McCormack, Massachusetts Democrat, should resign his high office and permit the election of a "younger, stronger, and wiser" man to take over the speakership. It comes from Editor James A. Hardman of the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript. It is a ridiculous suggestion. Under the law passed by Congress in 1947, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is in line for succession to the Presidency should both the President and Vice President die or become incapacitated. From a strictly political view it is unthinkable that Speaker McCormack would take such a step. And, from the point of view of the good of country, there is no other Democrat in the House who would make a "stronger and wiser" President if promoted to the White House.

Speaker McCormack is, indeed, 72 years old—but he is a hale and hearty 72. He has been a Member of the House for 35 years. His record in that period has shown him progressive, a leader, a strong supporter always of national defense and an early and determined opponent of communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and of bigotry and racial discrimination. He has been Democratic whip of the House, majority leader, and Speaker, and has given a good account of himself in all these offices. It was as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House that he submitted a report in 1935—28 years ago—in which communism was denounced as an international conspiracy, not merely a political party. His committee also investigated and attacked the Nazis who were trying to gain a foothold in this country. He has sponsored important legislation, has worked with both Republican and Democratic Presidents in support of foreign policies and national defense. A man does not become Speaker of the House without showing qualities of leadership—as the record shows.

Further, Speaker McCormack has been a strong supporter of the policies and programs of the late President Kennedy. The Speaker kept his hands off in the election campaign in 1962 for the nomination for U.S. Senator, when the President's youngest brother, now Senator Edward M. Kennedy, was opposed by the Speaker's nephew. When that battle was over, the Speaker moved in to help bind up political wounds and help unite the party. Nor did President Kennedy oppose Mr. McCormack's election to the speakership after the late Speaker Sam Rayburn died in 1961.

#### PROPOSAL OF TWO

Senator Keating, New York Republican, recently came up with a proposal that the country elect two Vice Presidents, one to preside over the Senate, and the other to be used by the President on foreign missions and other administrative tasks. It would also provide an immediate successor to the White House should the President and Vice President die. This proposal would necessitate a constitutional amendment, a rather long process. It might have merit, however, since it would provide a constant, day-in and day-out, Presiding Officer of the Senate, which has been impossible in the cases of former Vice President Nixon and of Lyndon Johnson, who have been handed many tasks by former President Eisenhower and by the late President Kennedy. As things are today the duty of presiding over the Senate is parceled out to Senators who are not always familiar with the rules and precedents of the Senate, sometimes creating awkward situations.

### Proper Liaison With McCormack

(By William S. White)

President Johnson's action to bring the next man in line for the Presidency, Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, into the highly secret National Security Council puts a Speaker of the House for the first time into the most intimate war-and-peace deliberations of this Government.

It will do a great deal more, however, than this. It will enormously increase Speaker McCormack's real power base outside Congress and most notably within it. There, a quietly gathering "revolt" by a handful of ultraliberal Democrats against McCormack's authority had been signaled, by some of those directly involved, several weeks ago.

This whispered coming palace revolution—or more exactly this potential putsch of good intentions and disorderly implications for responsible operation of the House—may now be said to be doubly dead before it started. Its chances had in any event been thin in the extreme, since a very considerable number of those counted upon to be eager to "go out against John" were in fact always loyal to his elected leadership and meant to remain so.

#### CERTAINTY ABSOLUTE

Now, however, the substantial certainty that the Speaker could not be effectively challenged by small rump movements within his own party has become an absolute certainty. For power is power, and while McCormack is in no way short of that commodity simply as Speaker of the House, he is now freshly and most amply rearmed by the fact that in human truth as well as in law he is the next man to the President of the United States.

That official who is truly next to the President—this or any President—is not lightly rebelled against. Even less is he successfully rebelled against.

All this aborted and minor cloak-and-dagger stuff is only accidental and incidental, however, to the true meaning of Speaker McCormack's elevation into a second hierarchy, that of the executive branch. The genuine and lasting significance of what has been done is this: The United States has made certain before history that there cannot again be such a situation as occurred when Franklin Roosevelt died in 1945 and left his successor without any real knowledge of what had been going on in the White House.

Of course, there was then an elected and sitting Vice President, Harry S. Truman. But Mr. Truman had to assume the Presidency at a moment's notice in almost total ignorance of what his late chief had been doing and thinking and planning and promising. Because he had not been taken into Mr. Roosevelt's confidence—perhaps because of the cruel pressures of a two-front war—Harry Truman had not even been aware that something called an atomic bomb had been made.

The failure here was one of liaison. All the same, it could have been catastrophically costly to this Nation had not Mr. Truman shown an almost incredible capacity to bring himself abreast of the state of affairs all around the world. He soon pointed out that he had no Vice President at his side and that as matters then stood the Presidency would pass to a nonelected official, the Secretary of State, should he himself suddenly become incapacitated.

Congress responded with a bill to make the Speaker of the House the next in line of succession for the Presidency in such circumstances. Today, Mr. Johnson, too, has no Vice President. Today, Speaker McCormack is by law his appointed successor, should tragedy strike. Thus, one of the first acts of the new President is to make sure not simply that he has a successor qualified by law but a successor qualified also to act, not simply after boning up on the facts but in concurrent possession of the facts all along.

#### HAPPY ASSOCIATION

As it happens, too, the close association is not only a clearly necessary one, in the highest of national interest, but also a happy and relaxed one. Speaker McCormack and the

President have been for nearly two decades—a time going back to Mr. Johnson's service in the House—on a "John and Lyndon" basis.

The Speaker, moreover, though an early backer of the late John F. Kennedy for the 1960 presidential nomination, was an equally early backer of Lyndon B. Johnson for Vice President. Mr. McCormack was one of the few who believed from the beginning—rightly, as it turned out—that Mr. Johnson would accept second place if this became necessary to promote Democratic fortunes.

## CONVERTING DEFENSE INDUSTRY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the vital considerations in the background of any possible trend toward settled world conditions is the capacity of defense industry to convert to peaceful activity.

This problem has been the source of study in the Arms Control Agency which published a significant study of this matter and is currently continuing its work in this area.

Needless to say, the attitude of managers of our great defense industry is vitally important, and it was gratifying to me to discover the degree to which one of our great national industries, principally located in Connecticut, had been actively examining this problem.

I believe that the statement which Mr. H. M. Horner, chairman of the board of the United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn., made recently before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, is worthy of wider distribution and the practices described are worthy of widespread emulation.

For this reason, I include Mr. Horner's statement following my remarks:

### Statement of H. M. Horner, Chairman, Before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senator Joseph S. Clark, Chairman, November 18, 1963

Senator Clark, members of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, I am H. M. Horner, chairman of United Aircraft Corp. I welcome this opportunity to appear before you. We at United are extremely interested in the committee's investigations into the proper utilization of defense industry manpower and resources. We are equally concerned with the effect on our communities, manpower and enterprise of the Nation's possible or sudden transition from cold war to peace. As the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has clearly indicated, Connecticut is likely to experience a relatively heavy economic impact from disarmament.

Let me say at the outset that United endorses the bill introduced by Senator Hart to establish a Commission on the Applicability of New Technology to Community and Manpower Needs. Though United Aircraft, like other companies in the defense industry, has fully demonstrated in the past its ability to respond rapidly to the Government's changing requirements, it would be next to impossible over the short term to convert our plants' specialized manufacturing capabilities and labor force skills from defense to wholly commercial and consumer products without severe dislocations. It would necessitate laying off personnel, terminating work with vendors and shutting down facilities to the point where we could support reduced operations on a profitable basis. The situation today is entirely different from that prior to and following World War II. Then, production of commercial products was drastically curtailed and manpower converted on a priority basis to defense production. Pent-up demand for consumer goods following the war permitted the sudden contraction of defense with only temporary dislocations to the economy. Today, there is ample capacity in being and manned for both swords and plowshares. It is essential, therefore, to evaluate fully how our considerable technical skills and specialized capabilities can be channeled profitably into serving new and worthwhile commercial needs. Perhaps a brief review of United's present position and approach to this problem of conversion may be useful to this subcommittee.

As you know, United Aircraft ranks 25th, based on number of employees, of the 500 largest industrial corporations and 39th based on total sales. It is the 7th largest defense contractor in the country accounting for approximately 2.6 percent of the defense procurement business. Including our unconsolidated Canadian subsidiary, we have somewhat over 66,000 employees working in 25 plants, most of which are company owned. The major portion of its operations are concentrated in Connecticut where our Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, Hamilton Standard, Sikorsky Aircraft, Norden, Corporate Systems Center divisions, CANEL, and research laboratories are located, accounting for approximately 55,000 employees. In addition, we have a research and development center in Florida and United Technology Center in California which are concerned with advanced liquid and solid rocket propulsion engines for the missile and space markets. United's employment in its Connecticut plants represents approximately 13 percent of Connecticut manufacturing employment. In addition, it is estimated that there are more than 15,000 employees in subcontractors' plants in Connecticut and 60,000 throughout the Nation whose employment is supported by UAC subcontracts. United has consistently maintained a policy of procuring from vendors a significant amount of its product manufacturing in order to benefit from vendors' special skills, to contribue to cost control and to make possible more rapid and orderly expansion in times of emergency. Approximately 80 percent of our business is under contract with the Government principally for the design, development, and manufacture of such major aerospace products as gas turbine powerplants, liquid and solid rocket engines, environmental and engine controls, helicopters, electronic devices for navigation, radar and communications. These require the technical skills of close to 7,500 graduate engineers and scientists and more than 19,000 others working in our various research and engineering departments.

In order to reduce our dependence on defense business, United has spent an average of more than $30 million (3.5 percent sales) out of profits each year for the past 5 years for research and development largely aimed at exploiting current products and developing new products for commercial and industrial markets.

United Aircraft has maintained over the years a preeminent position in domestic and foreign commercial aircraft markets which today accounts for approximately 20 percent of our business. It is of interest to note that we have more than doubled the commercial share of our business in the past decade. With greater utilization of air transport, both passenger and freight, we foresee an important increase of better than 40 percent in this business over the next decade. In order to maintain our position in this market we have developed out of profits a new turbofan engine which is being used to power the highly successful Boeing 727 commercial aircraft now going into service and will be used to power the Douglas DC–9. We have also developed modifications of our standard line of gas turbine engines for other industrial and marine applications. For example, these engines burning natural gas are being used for gasline pumping; equipped with free turbines and generating equipment, they are being used by several utility companies as peaking power units. They are also being tested for several marine applications. We believe that this gas turbine technology originally developed for aircraft purposes has many broad industrial and marine applications, and we are working diligently to exploit this market.

Three of the four domestic commercial helicopter airlines are using Sikorsky equipment, and these newer aircraft are able to operate economically enough to offer a needed transportation convenience to the traveling public. We expect an expanded use of commercial helicopters as transport vehicles and also for other commercial and industrial roles such as servicing off-shore oil rigs, as a lifting crane for construction purposes as well as continued use as a rescue vehicle.

Several years ago we started the intensive development of fuel cells, as we feel that this energy conversion device offers great promise for commercial and industrial applications. The fuel cell converts chemical energy directly to electricity without the use of rotating machinery and at a considerably higher efficiency than the more familiar, conventional, energy conversion systems.

Within the past few years we have acquired rights from the Zeiss Co. in Germany, and we have developed and marketed worldwide an electron-beam cutting and welding machine which offers manufacturers a new and better solution to many manufacturing problems.

Another extremely important area in our opinion is our development of microminiaturized and molecular circuitry for use in hospitals and health institutes. Utilizing our growing technical skills in the biosciences, we are working with the Nation's hospitals to develop products for the remote, continuous monitoring of various physiological conditions with no wires and little inconvenience to the patient, and to partially automate postoperative wards, outpatient clinics and special medical equipment. Such telemetry devices will be of considerable assistance to the medical practitioner and research scientist.

These are a few examples of the efforts which we have made within the limitations of our financial resources to expand our base into the commercial and industrial markets, so that we will be less dependent upon the defense industry. While we are making progress in this direction, it will take many, many years to supplant with commercial business the plant capacity and employment now utilized by Government business. If we had been allowed to earn a normal profit rate on our military business, we could have progressed further and faster in this endeavor. In this connection, it is significant to note that, although United ranks 39th among the 500 largest companies based on total sales, it holds the position of 380th based on profit as a percent of invested capital and 441st based on profit as a percent of sales.

In conclusion, I would like to say that a thorough study of the application of the new technologies to civil and social problems as proposed by the bill introduced by Senator Hart should be helpful in enabling the national economy to adjust itself to disarmament. I believe the Government can initiate certain actions in the near term which can be constructive. For example, I believe the Government could provide more extensive support of basic research, develop expanded programs in the biosciences and those related to the improvement of the civilian economy, investigate new sources of food, and study the further requirements and consequences of automation in business and industry. In the area of aerospace itself, consideration could well be given to the full funding of an accelerated supersonic transport program, the logistic support for a permanent base on the moon, and the requirements for successful outer space exploration.

Thank you.

## THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WAS FRIEND OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE

**Mr. ROONEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. FOGARTY.** Mr. Speaker, our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a good friend of Providence College in my State of Rhode Island, which is so ably administered by its president, the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., and in all of the words of eulogy that have been expressed following the untimely death of the President, I am particularly proud of the high tribute that has been accorded him by the college. On Monday, November 25, Providence College honored the memory of our late President by a solemn mass of requiem which was attended by the entire student body, faculty, college personnel and many friends and relatives of the college. On that occasion the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., celebrated the mass and delivered the eulogy for President Kennedy which I believe ranks as one of the finest tributes of the many that have been made. Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a copy of the student newspaper of Providence College, the Cowl, which contains the eulogy:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Cowl]

### President Kennedy Assassinated, Buried in Arlington Yesterday—Nation and World Saddened—Providence College Mourns Loss

Following a pontifical requiem mass offered by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, in St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C., the casket containing the body of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery yesterday afternoon.

The President was assassinated last Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex., during a motorcade through the downtown area of that city. He succumbed to his wounds within an hour of being shot.

The alleged assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was murdered on Sunday by a Dallas nightclub owner, Jack Rubenstein, while the Dallas police were transferring him to another jail.

While the casket lay on a catafalque in the East Room of the White House during Saturday, two priests knelt beside it in silent prayer. Earlier in the day, mass had been offered in the East Room for the family and close friends of the President.

From Sunday afternoon at 2 p.m. until yesterday morning at 10 a.m., over 100,000 people filed through the rotunda of the Capitol to view the casket placed on the Lincoln catafalque.

At times, the line of people waiting to enter the Capitol and view the solemn scene extended over a 30-block-long area. Those waiting in the chill Washington air on Sunday evening were numbered at approximately 300,000.

At Providence College, the students began their weekend-long observance of the President's assassination with an all-night vigil in the Chapel of Aquinas Hall on Friday.

Starting at 10 p.m. on that evening, members of the Providence College student community said the rosary continuously through the night until 7 a.m. on Saturday morning when mass was then offered for the repose of President Kennedy's soul. Masses were also offered at 8 and 10 a.m.

Yesterday morning at 9:30 a.m., a solemn high requiem mass was offered for the late Chief Executive in Alumni Hall. The celebrant of the Mass was Very Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of the college. Following the Gospel, Father Dore delivered a eulogy for the assassinated President.

---

[From the Providence (R.I.) Cowl]

### President of Providence College Eulogizes President

(The following is the eulogy for President Kennedy which was delivered by the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of the college, at yesterday's requiem mass in Alumni Hall.)

On this sad day in our Nation's history, you are assembled to assist me in offering the holy sacrifice of the mass, in solemn requiem, for the repose of the soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

Providence College mourns with deepest sorrow the death by an assassin's bullets of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, on Friday, November 22.

Our martyred President was a courageous leader of our people who ennobled our Nation as a virtuous individual; as a devout man who loved his family; and as a scholar, author, and world statesman of high ideals, lofty aspirations, and noble deeds.

He ennobled our Nation and the world by his constant adherence to the principles of liberty, justice, and equality and their application to all men and nations.

May the blood of his martyrdom on the altar of patriotism be the seed from which will spring a greater universal understanding, a higher moral social order, and wider horizons and brighter frontiers of peace and justice and freedom throughout the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was indeed one of God's great noblemen. May his memory ever be held in benediction and may his immortal soul rest in peace.

As we bow our heads in sorrow, let us lift up our hearts to the glory of the resurrection and ask almighty God to sustain and comfort in their great loss—his young widowed wife, his little children, his parents, and their entire family. Let us also include in our prayers the family of the valiant Dallas police officer who lost his life in dedication to his line of duty on that tragic day.

With our fellow Americans and with all men and nations of good will throughout the world we unite through prayerful petition and supplication to almighty God that He may bless our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and grant him health and strength and wisdom to bear the heavy burdens placed upon him and to carry forward under God and with God's help and grace, the destiny of our beloved America.

---

[From the Providence (R.I.) Cowl]

### Memo From the Editor

America's light of liberty to the world shone, and it was extinguished. The symbol of freedom to the Nation and the peoples of the world was, and then it was no more. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our President, had been taken from us.

Unbelieving, we sat before our radios and televisions and hoped against hope that what we had heard was no more than a terrible dream. Could this man, so universally respected and loved, have been so suddenly and cruelly removed from our midst?

Words failed us as we sat stunned and incredulous. This, we said, could not have happened here, today.

Difficult indeed is it for me, as it is for so many, to find words to express so great a loss. The loss is not so great, so shocking, so unbelievable, because a man died. Neither is it such because a President died. Rather, it is because this man, this President, died.

The spirit of our late President is such that it will not soon fade. For, President Kennedy was, in death as in life, so much a part of our generation, so much a part of us.

Frank Devlin.

## FOREIGN AID

**Mr. PASSMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

**Mr. PASSMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention at this time that it is not the fault of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that we cannot bring the foreign aid bill to the floor. We do not have an authorization as yet. My understanding is that the other body will delay taking up the conference report. In addition to that we must have a Peace Corps authorization and an Inter-American Bank Corporation authorization.

I am anxious to get rid of this bill. We had 800 hours of hearings; some 4,000 pages of testimony. I have been sitting on a hot stove waiting for an authorization. The quicker I get it the better I will like it, so do not blame me for the delay, please.

## PERSONAL STATEMENT

**Mr. CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 233 on the rule covering the indigent defendants bill I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS SHOWS CONTINUED DENIAL OF FREEDOM BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

**The SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 60 minutes.

**Mr. PUCINSKI.** Mr. Speaker, December 10 has been set aside to observe the 15th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. It was 15 years ago this month that the United Nations adopted this charter; this document, which was to testify once again that the inalienable dignity of man must be respected in all of its aspects and that the United Nations must use all means within its power to insure that this is done.

In paying tribute to the 15th anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, the President of the General Assembly, Carlos Sosa Rodriguez, stated in part:

> The Assembly has on several occasions asked the Secretary to disseminate certain decisions and documents as widely as possible. Today we can express our satisfaction that through the information centers and other offices of the United Nations, and with the cooperation of many of the state members, 6,000 copies of the adoption of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights has been distributed (in 54 languages this year), and read by millions of persons in the world.

He said further:

> We can rejoice, too, that those copies have reached the national libraries of many member States, schools, professional associations, and centers of study and culture and many homes in all parts of the world.

From this statement one would gather that, indeed, great progress has been made since the adoption of this very important document spelling out the human rights of people throughout the world. It would appear that substantial progress has been made in human dignity until one is reminded that none of this material which the President of the General Assembly referred to in his remarks of December 4, is available to the people of the captive nations, nor is it being distributed in any of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

It would appear to me that the United Nations General Assembly, indeed, has a responsibility to ascertain whether it is, in fact, true that any of this material in freedom and human dignity, spelled out in the human rights declaration which is being distributed by the United Nations in 54 languages, is being denied distribution to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

On this 15th anniversary we should reflect on the true conditions which exist today in the captive nations. Surely no one can deny that when the United Nations General Assembly adopted this very important document 15 years ago, it had reason to hope and insist that the provisions of the charter calling for freedom and human dignity would be applied in all the nations which want to be respected and regarded by the rest of the world as civilized nations.

And yet we find that today in one of the signatory countries, Poland, the same suppression of complete freedom continues that existed before the adoption of this document. There has been some improvement since 1956 but on basic freedoms, very little. As a matter of fact, reports most recently emanating out of Poland, indicate recently there have been some very severe attacks on the freedom of religion in that great country, which in 1966, will observe its 1,000th anniversary of Christianity.

When is this document given any real meaning within the Soviet Union itself, when we hear reports of political persecutions of people of the Jewish faith who are being accused and sentenced to death or long prisons terms for so-called economic crimes against the state, when in reality their only crime is a deep and abiding belief in their religious teachings.

How much longer can the conscience of the free world remain silent in the wake of these mass executions of Jewish people within the Soviet Union? How much meaning can we attach to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which we are observing today in the face of this mass persecution of Jewish people in the Soviet Union?

So it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that on this 15th anniversary, the United Nations ought to take a hard look and see just how well is this Declaration of Human Rights being carried out throughout the world and particularly, it appears to me, the United Nations has a responsibility to see how this document is being carried out in the captive nations of Europe.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations, a highly respected organization of men and women who has been victims of both Nazi and Communist aggression and who have gallant records of service to the cause of freedom and dignity, has prepared a most impressive analysis of the situation that now exists in the captive nations of Europe; the situation that exists today, 15 years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall include this excellent analysis of the situation that today exists in each of these captive nations, because I think this should serve as an impressive basis for the United Nations to indeed study the real conditions and how the Declaration of Human Rights is being implemented in these captive nations.

I shall also include at the conclusion of my remarks several excerpts of reliable reports emanating out of Poland which clearly demonstrate the persecution of the Catholic Church in that nation. Certainly one cannot deny the fact that Poland is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic. It has been so for centuries. It is not my purpose nor anyone else's purpose, as far as I know, to impose any particular religion upon any particular nation. But the fact remains that Poland had been a Catholic nation long before the Communists took this country over by fraud and deceit. Today, under Communist rule, every effort is being made, although extremely subtle, to destroy the very roots of these religious peoples' belief in God.

It would appear to me that on this 15th anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of human rights the United Nations has a responsibility to investigate these charges. The United Nations did not hesitate to use the provisions of article 18 of the universal declaration to send an inspection team into Vietnam to see whether charges of religious persecution in that nation were true. The U.N. Commission was sent to Vietnam with dispatch. It appears to me that if we are to give real credence and real meaning, if we are going to have sustained and continued respect for the integrity of the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations General Assembly ought to dispatch similar inspection teams, forthwith, yes, into the Soviet Union itself, to see what are the real facts behind the religious persecution of thousands of people of Jewish faith in that country. I think the United Nations ought to also send a special inspection team into Poland to see what is happening to religious freedom in that country.

I believe the United Nations ought to send inspection teams into every other country where there are reports of violations of the universal declaration of human rights and where no action is being taken by such nation to correct these abuses. Only then, Mr. Speaker, can we as Americans look upon this declaration as being fully meaningful and only then can we look upon the United Nations as being dedicated and sincere in holding up those lofty principles adopted in 1948. It is my hope this General Assembly is going to move decisively to investigate the charges of violations of this declaration which are so excellently spelled out in the document that has been prepared by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in New York. Unless the U.N. moves with dispatch, Mr. Speaker, we will have to conclude that the U.N. has a double standard; one for the free world, where U.N. investigations are frequent, and one for that part of the world dominated by Communists, where U.N. investigations are nonexistent. Once we reach such a regrettable conclusion, then how much longer can we in the United States continue to support the U.N.?

I submit the charges contained in this document which I will include in the Record today at the conclusion of my remarks, certainly give all of us cause for concern. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are looking for a world that we can all live in; but we seek a world in which all mankind can live in peace, in freedom and with dignity. We are not looking for a world that closes its eyes and turns its cheek on the fact that 180 million people today are living in Communist bondage within the orbit of the Soviet Union in the captive nations of Europe. Nor are we looking toward a world whose security is being threatened with destruction through subversion and denial of human dignity.

Certainly, we are not trying to impose any political philosophies on any of these nations. But I submit if the United Nations is going to give any meaning at all to the universal declaration on human rights, or even to its own basic charter, it has the responsibility to the people of this world to investigate with the same vigor and the same thoroughness in these captive nations, charges of persecution, as it investigated similar charges in Vietnam within the provisions of article XVIII in the universal declaration of the United Nations Charter itself.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to include in the Record the complete statement of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and their analysis of denial of human rights in Eastern Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic document and, in my judgment, I think it should serve as a guidepost for those who throughout the world are concerned about retaining freedom and dignity for man. I also include at the conclusion of this document excerpts from the Inter-Catholic Press Agency about present conditions in Poland regarding freedom of religion. These also should be thoroughly checked by the United Nations if it is serious about the universal declaration of human rights.

The matter referred to follows:

## Denial of Human Rights in Eastern Europe—15 Years After the Adoption of the Universal Declaration

This survey was prepared under the direction of Boleslaw Biega, Poland, chairman of the Economic-Social Committee of ACEN. The national contributors were: Rexhep Krasniqi, Albania; Dimitar Petkoff, Bulgaria; Leonhard Vahter, Estonia; Vilis Hazners, Latvia; Vytautas Vaitiekunas, Lithuania; Iancu Zissu, Rumania.

### GENERAL COMMITTEE (10TH SESSION)

Chairman: Aleksander Kutt, Estonia.

Vice chairman: Ferenc Nagy, Hungary.

Members: Vasil Germenji, Albania; George M. Dimitrov, Bulgaria; Jozef Lettrich, Czechoslovakia; Vilis Masens, Latvia; Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Lithuania; Stefan Korbonski, Poland; Constantin Visoianu, Rumania.

Secretary General: Brutus Coste, Rumania.

Deputy Secretary General: Edmund Gaspar, Hungary.

Observers: Adolf Prochazka, Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe; Wladyslaw Michalak, International Center of Free Trade Unionists in Exile; Henrikas Blazas, International Peasant Union; Raoul Bossy, Liberal Democratic Union of Central Europe; George Petkoff, Socialist Union of Central Eastern Europe.

### CHAIRMEN OF THE WORKING COMMITTEES

Political-legal: Antanas Trimakas, Lithuania.

Economic-social: Boleslaw Biega, Poland.

Cultural-information: Augustin Popa, Rumania.

### INTRODUCTION

"Recognition of the inherent dignity, and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world."

Thus opens the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whose 15th anniversary is being celebrated by the civilized world during this month of December 1963. Indeed, justice and peace in the world cannot be assured if the freedom of the individual, and through him of communities and nations, is denied. The principle that freedom is indivisible and that a divided world cannot live at peace, are universally accepted. Yet the European continent, the cradle of western civilization, remains artificially divided by the Iron Curtain. On the one side are the free nations, living under governments of their own choosing, and on the other—nations subjected to regimes imposed by the Communists directed from Moscow and supported by the military might of the Soviet Union and its political agents. These regimes style themselves officially as dictatorships, and their philosophy of government is based on tyranny and aggression.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations, the free voice of the silenced peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania, takes this occasion of the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to present briefly the special plight of the captive nations in this respect. Throughout all east-central Europe, now under the Communist rule—as in other areas subject to Soviet domination—there exists a constant violation or a flat denial of fundamental human rights and freedoms, despite the recent slight trends toward eliminating, as unnecessary, some of the ugliest features of a system of terror and oppression.

The denials and violations of human rights in the countries of east-central Europe, which are so manifest and unquestionable, are of concern not only to the nations affected by them; they should be of equal concern to all other nations of the free world. To free peoples it is a matter of simple moral obligation to support and comfort the oppressed. There are also legal international obligations resulting from international agreements and treaties concluded during and after World War II between the Western Powers and the present violators of these contracted obligations.

The provisions of these agreements and treaties give the Western powers the means and authority to demand of the U.S.S.R. and the regimes in power in east-central Europe that they cease to violate human rights in these countries and that they fully restore them to the peoples concerned.

### I. HUMAN RIGHTS IN CAPTIVE EUROPE

The primary and most serious denial of human rights in the east-central European countries stems from the suppression of their independence and sovereignty. In the course of World War II, and since the cessation of hostilities, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics committed the following aggressive acts against the sovereign states of central and eastern Europe: (a) Entered into, and carried out, secret agreements with Hitler's Germany to destroy the political independence and territorial integrity of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania; (b) Invaded, with its armed forces, the territories of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, imposed upon them governments subservient of Moscow, and forcibly incorporated these states into the Soviet Union; (c) by means of military force, fraud, and terror, imposed Communist regimes subservient to Moscow on Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania; (d) by subversion and threat of force, staged a coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia and enforced upon that country a Communist regime servile to Moscow, and a Soviet system. The subjugation of the nine sovereign nations and their ruthless colonial exploitation by the Soviets has created a situation in Europe which is rejected by the respective peoples, and which precludes the establishment of a just and durable peace.

### *Baltic States*

The case of the three Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania being of somewhat different character than the others, let us examine it first.

Profiting by the political confusion at the outset of World War II, the Soviet Government, which signed with each a separate treaty of nonaggression and peaceful settlement of disputes in 1926 and 1932, now forced these states to sign the so-called pacts of mutual assistance—providing for the establishment of Soviet military bases. On June 14–16, 1940, the Kremlin presented an ultimatum to the Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and 2 days later Soviet military troops invaded and occupied these countries.

The legal Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were forced to resign and were replaced by puppet regimes faithful to Moscow. Soviet-supervised bogus elections were held in July 1940. The incorporation of the Baltic States in the U.S.S.R. was completed on August 3, 5, and 6, 1940, when the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. granted a petition to that effect by the puppet parliaments. A political, economic, cultural, and social system patterned on that of Soviet Russia was forcibly imposed upon the peoples of the subjugated Baltic countries.

The forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, however, has not been recognized by most of the free nations, and the diplomatic representations of these states are still recognized as the true representatives of the Baltic countries.

Under the imposed Soviet regimes in the Soviet-occupied Baltic States most of the basic freedoms and rights of the individual are suppressed. Free expression of opinion, for instance, is completely impossible as all the media of communications have become instruments of Communist indoctrination. As A. Vishinsky, who directed Latvia's enslavement, bluntly admitted, "In our state, naturally there is * * * no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism."

The concept of class warfare, coupled with the ideal of building the new socialist order, have served as a justification to deprive them of the right to equality of opportunity, freedom of movement, the right to hold private property, freedom of enterprise, the right to choose and change jobs, and other political, economic, and social rights and privileges.

The laws of once-independent states were annulled and replaced by Soviet laws and the constitutions on the Soviet pattern were thrust upon them.

Personal security is nonexistent. The fate of people is at the discretion of the Soviet security police. The Moscow-dominated regimes have constantly used terror to maintain themselves in power. The most self-indicting actions of the Soviets and their Communist agents have been the mass deportations aimed at terrorizing the population into obedience and eliminating any sign of opposition. Between 1941 and 1950, almost a million persons were deported to Siberia and other Far Eastern regions of the Soviet Union.

Deportations are now carried out under various other disguises, such as the transfer of young people for preuniversity practice to the virgin lands of Siberia, or by voluntary applications of a prescribed number of people to complete the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian quota of persons to be sent to study socialism.

The disruption of the juridical system by the Communists deprived the peoples of all personal security. The Soviet Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedures were introduced. The ill-famed people's courts were established, with judges appointed by the Communist Party.

The predominantly agricultural Baltic countries were forcibly collectivized and the resistance of peasants and farmers against collectivization was broken by the most ruthless measures, including deportations. The Constitutions "guarantee" freedom of religious worship as well as of antireligious propaganda. In practice, however, only the latter part of the provision is applied—with all available means—while the regime practices active intolerance toward all the churches and creeds. The church hierarchy and administration has been subjected to strict state controls and pressures.

Since Lithuania is predominantly Roman Catholic, the main blows against religion were directed against the clergy and laymen of the Roman Catholic Church. Out of 14 Roman Catholic bishops and auxiliaries, only

4 are left in the country, and only 2 of them are authorized to perform their functions. All others have been murdered, jailed, deported or exiled. Of 1,646 priests, only 741 are left free and alive. All monasteries have been closed and all church property confiscated. Other churches and denominations have suffered equally at the hands of the Communist authorities. Religious instruction has been forbidden.

Universities and colleges are closed to those who cannot procure a certificate of political reliability. A minimum condition of admission to institutions of higher learning is the fulfillment of 2 years of apprenticeship in industry, mines or agriculture.

Free choice of work does not exist. Any change of employment is under strict regulation by the state. It is practically impossible for an agricultural worker to get permission to move into the city. Practically all private property rights have been eliminated. Land, forest, waters, private industry, commerce, banks, and other economic enterprises were nationalized without compensation.

*Albania*

After Albania was invaded by fascist Italy in April 1939, the Albanian resistance movement split into three major branches, one of which was infiltrated by the Communists, who set up a "movement of national liberation." Subsequently Communist Party leader Enver Hoxha was named Premier of the Communist-sponsored provisional Democratic Government of Albania, established in October 1944. The fraudulent elections of December 1945, resulted in the proclamation of a People's Republic on January 12, 1946. A new Constitution, patterned on that of Soviet Russia, was adopted in March 1946. All the non-Communist leaders of the "democratic front" were liquidated and all governmental posts placed in the hands of the only party (Communist).

The common laws, both civil and penal, and the new Constitution of 1950 are based on Soviet models. The penal code, adopted in May 1954, even exceeds in severity the Soviet code for crimes committed against the state or the party. The most elementary human rights of the Albanian people are flagrantly violated and very often the regime does not even pretend to observe them.

All authority and political power rests in the hands of the Politburo of the Albanian Workers' (Communist) Party. The People's Councils (Soviets) which are described in article 3 of the Constitution as the basis of political power, are merely tools of the Communist Party. As was inadvertently admitted by the official organ of the party, the newspaper Bashkimi on August 28, 1952, the Republic is actually a private preserve of the party.

The professed equality of all citizens before the law under article 14 of the Constitution is contradicted by article 21, which assigns a special place to "the most active and politically conscious citizens," i.e., to the party members.

In practice a mere decree can reverse a basic provision of the Constitution.

The Code of Criminal Procedure of 1953 circumscribes the constitutional guarantee of the right of defense to the extent that it is possible to try even the most serious case without the participation of legal counsel for the defense. Special provisions of the code (secs. 342–345) dealing with the trial of counterrevolutionary terrorists in a summary proceeding expressly exclude the participation of counsel for the defense.

One of the most striking violations of the principles of legality and justice, recognized as such in all civilized countries, is the practice of retroactivity in criminal cases. Article 82 of the Communist Penal Code of 1954 virtually consecrates the principle of passing sentences ex post facto. Its aim was defined by Minister of Justice Bilbil Klosi before the National Assembly on May 22, 1952: "We have elaborated article 82 so that it provides penalties for the activities of war criminals who escaped and served American imperialism previous to Albania's liberation by the forces of the present regime."

Prewar Albania respected all faiths, and the liberty to practice them was assured. Under the Communists all religious bodies have been brought completely under the control of the Government. In November 1949 a law was enacted requiring that the heads of the religious communities, as well as the chiefs of the various sects, be approved by the Council of Ministers. According to this law every church is obligated to develop in its adherents a sense of loyalty to the regime.

*Bulgaria*

At the end of World War II—in September 1944—the Soviet army occupied Bulgaria. Thanks to its intervention, the Communists became, by 1948, the full masters of the country. The democratic opposition parties were banned. Their leaders were imprisoned or even condemned to death. All political and human rights were suppressed.

One of the longest chapters of the Constitution of December 1947 is that dealing with the "basic rights and obligations of citizens." As in the Soviet Constitution, a wide range of civil liberties and economic and social rights is explicitly guaranteed. However, the provisions for the "basic rights and obligations" of Bulgarian citizens are no more than a travesty of justice. Communist theory in itself repudiates any claim to natural or vested rights of individuals.

The application of Communist civil rights shows that "equality before the law" means privilege for the ruling circles and discrimination against "unreliable" elements; "equality between men and women" means equal exploitation of women; "separation of the church from the state" means the elimination of any spiritual force from public life. Art and science, as well as education and health, are "cared for" by the state. The clauses of the Constitution pertaining to "the right and duty" to engage in "socially useful work" are particularly flexible; the Government determines which work is "socially useful" and binds all citizens to jobs without freedom of choice or movement.

The constitutional guarantees of the inviolability of individual liberty, domicile, correspondence, and freedom of the press, speech, assembly and association are the most eloquent examples of Communist hypocrisy, being countermanded in law and in administrative regulations. The very essence of a democratic form of government is refuted by the clear denial of the fundamental right of freedom of political opinion.

The Constitution openly prohibits and punishes the formation of, and participation in, any organization whose aim might deviate from the official ideology of the government.

The Communist judicial system is centralized under the Ministry of Justice. Although the Constitution (art. 56) provides for the independence of judges, the Rules of Penal Procedure and Court Organization of 1950 nullify that provision by stating that such independence "does not place judges above the working class, the party, or the political policy of the party." The present Bulgarian Code of Criminal Procedure assigns the function of police investigation to the People's Police (militia), the Office of State Security and other administrative agencies (sec. 131); the pretrial investigation of political or counterrevolutionary crimes is carried out only by the Secret Police (sec. 143). Since both the police inquiry and the judicial investigation are supervised by the government attorney, the objectivity of these procedures is justifiably doubtful. Lawyers represent the interest of the regime rather than that of their clients. The example of the defense during the well-known trial of Traicho Kostov in 1949 demonstrates this point.

Education in present-day Bulgaria amounts to a ruthless Communist indoctrination aimed at the Sovietization and Russification of the Bulgarian people. Imitation of Soviet culture, arts, and sciences is the only guiding principle.

Evidence of the suppression of human rights by the Government of Bulgaria has been gathered by the United Nations organization. After being presented by the Allied Powers with incriminating evidence accusing the Government of Bulgaria (together with those of Hungary and Romania) of violating the provisions of articles 2 and 36 of the peace treaty, the General Assembly dealt with this matter in its resolutions Nos. 272 (III) and 294 (IV). The case was brought to the attention of the International Court of Justice, which ruled that the peace treaty disputes did exist. The accused governments, however, backed by the Soviet Union, have consistently refused even to entertain any discussion of this issue. As a consequence, the General Assembly, in resolution No. 385 (V), condemned the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania for the wilful refusal to fulfill their obligations under the provisions of the peace treaty.

*Czechoslovakia*

At the end of the Second World War a large part of Czechoslovakia was "liberated" by the Red Army. The Czechoslovak Communist leaders, who had spent the war years in Moscow, returned to Czechoslovakia on the heels of the Red Army and exacted a share in the government out of proportion to the political positions they had occupied prior to the war.

The presence of the Soviet armed forces created conditions favorable to the Communist minority. A political struggle between the Communists and the non-Communists broke out even before the whole of the country was free, and lasted throughout 1945–48. In their successful attempt to break the resistance of their opponents, the Communists used the Uniform Trade Union, which they controlled. The "revolutionary" workers' councils in the factories and mines—consisting almost exclusively of Communists—the Workers' Militias, the centralized police force—all controlled by the machinery of the Communist Party—and the notorious "action committees" were trained and prepared for decisive action.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V. A. Zorin arrived in Prague at the peak of the Communist-provoked governmental crisis of February 1948, to help and guide the developments. Threatened by civil war and the intervention of the Red Army, President Benes yielded to the Communists.

The new parliament enacted various laws destined to safeguard and strengthen the position of the Communist regime.

Communist "justice" is characterized by the penal code which provides that "enemies of the people" should be more severely punished than Communists for the same offenses, and that sabotage of any kind constitutes an act of treason.

Violation of personal freedom is made possible by the legislation on forced labor and by the practices of the national security organs.

The function of the courts as the last recourse of an individual against the infringement of his liberties by the state does not exist: "The question as to who is guilty and who is innocent will in the end be decided by the party, with the help of the national security organs," declared Rude Pravo on December 18, 1952. The Communist notion of independence of the judiciary is similarly perverted: under section 143 of the Communist Constitution of 1948, the judges are bound not only by the laws, ordinances and decrees of the administration, but also by "the principles of the people's democratic order," which are determined by the Party.

Freedom of expression is restricted to opinions and creations which are approved by the Communist Party leadership. Czechoslovak penal law provides the basis for a system of forced labor employed as a means of political coercion or punishment for holding or expressing political views (U.N.-I.L.O., Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor, 35).

The regulations on freedom of the press restrict the right to publish newspapers to organizations controlled by the regime.

The inclusion of the concept of the "right to work" in the Constitution provided the Communists with a legal basis for the coercion of labor. Enforced assignments of labor, which take many forms, also deny freedom of residence. Section 1 of decree No. 128 of 1951 on the organization of labor recruitment states that "manpower must be secured by recruitment." Forced labor is widely used in Czechoslovakia, even though an amendment of October 30, 1952 (Act. No. 67, 1952, art. III, sec. 3) changed the term "forced labor camps" (as used in the Criminal Codes of 1950) to "transitional establishments of the Ministry of National Security."

A new element of discrimination in the sphere of social security was introduced by an act of July 3, 1958, No. 48. Article III of this act reads: "The Social Security Commissions of the councils of the District National Committee may reduce the social security benefits of persons who were notable representatives of the former political and economic order * * * and also of persons who, before becoming employees, were self-employed."

Discrimination in education is quite rampant and the class viewpoint is the only criterion. "The Socialist school demands from the teacher enthusiasm for the cause of socialism, class consciousness, pugnacious materialism," declared Pravda, the official organ of the Slovak Communist Party, on January 8, 1958.

Although sections 15 and 17 of the Constitution guarantee freedom of belief and religious faith, the regime is actively hostile to religion, and the schools are used to bring up a generation of atheists. "We believe that we shall succeed in freeing our students from the fetters of religious concepts and in educating them as conscious atheists," declared Ucitelske Noviny, the official organ of the Ministry of Education and Culture, on July 18, 1957. As in the other captive countries, the various churches and faiths have suffered several ways of persecution at the hands of the state.

### *Hungary*

Ever since the Communist Party came to power in Hungary under the Soviet occupation in 1945, the exercise and defense of human rights has been increasingly unbearable. The Hungarian revolution in 1956, forcibly put down by Soviet troops, was a natural consequence and dramatic proof to the world of the true situation.

The government elected on November 4, 1945, granted all citizens the basic human rights under Act I, 1946. Subsequently, on August 20, 1949, the government enacted the present Constitution, which solemnly promised and granted, without discrimination, the human rights set forth in Act I, 1946. The governmental pledges in this basic act and in the Constitution have been deliberately and systematically broken.

The Communist Government of Hungary has similarly flouted the human rights obligations it had itself assumed under the Peace Treaty of 1947 (referred to on previous pages).

The Communist regime has violated every domestic and international obligation with regard to human rights in Hungary. Freedom of speech does not and cannot exist when the official interpretation of the act on defense of the state reads, in part: "Incitement also means a statement by somebody that he/she dislikes the present regime, and that the present state of affairs will not last."

The persistent denial of all basic freedoms became so unbearable to the Hungarian people that they spontaneously revolted, and the Hungarian nation regained its freedom and independence in October 1956. The facts and significance of that successful revolution are too well-known throughout the world to require repetition here, as is the brutality with which Soviet troops overthrew the new government led by Imre Nagy.

Despite the most solemn pledges given by the Soviet forces of occupation and their puppet Kadar government to respect the right of asylum, Premier Imre Nagy was seized by officers of the Red army as he left the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest on November 22, 1956, was immediately taken to Rumania and subsequently, as was announced jointly from Budapest and Moscow on June 16–17, 1958, executed.

Ever since the Red army invaded and subjugated Hungary on November 4, 1956, Soviet military intervention in Hungary has continued unabated and is the prime element in the continued denial of fundamental human rights and freedoms to the Hungarian people.

Competent estimates of the number of those imprisoned after the revolution or in concentration camps in Hungary range from 50,000 to 60,000. Estimates of the number of those executed since the revolution range from a low of 2,100 to more than 2,500.

Deportations to the Soviet Union are believed to exceed 2,000. In addition, "public security detention" and "internal deportation" were made arbitrarily applicable to all those who, in the eyes of the police authorities, "were dangerous to the state and public security, or to Socialist coexistence, or for economic reasons, or who cause concern from the point of view of other important state interests." Ten thousand Hungarians have reportedly been the victims of internal deportation, and these deportations continue at a substantial rate. During August 1958, some 300 families were deported from Budapest.

To give the Kadar reign of terror a pretense of legality, a series of decree laws was promulgated which, for their ruthlessness, are without parallel in modern jurisprudence. Summary jurisdiction was established for a long list of crimes. Legal redress against the decisions of the summary courts was excluded. The duration of the trial was limited to 3 times 24 hours. Unless there was a court recommendation of clemency, death sentences were ordered to be carried out within 2 hours of the pronouncement.

On November 3, 1957, with much fanfare, the Communist authorities promulgated Decree Law No. 62, which ostensibly abolished summary jurisdiction. But the change was confined to paper. The U.N. Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, in its report of July 14, 1958, declared flatly: "No real alleviations have been introduced by the Decree Laws of June 15 and November 3, 1957, as to the sentences to be imposed or the summary procedures to be followed."

Since the revolution the puppet regime has been attempting an impossible feat. On the one hand, it has striven to restore the country's shattered economy; on the other, it has felt obliged to resort to terror as the chief instrument of control over the workers in factories and mines. It has introduced by Act IV/1957 the death penalty for attempts to strike.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. and its puppet regime in Hungary have flouted and rejected every one of more than 12 resolutions on Hungary adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. To date, there has not been one iota of evidence to contradict the finding of the General Assembly, in Plenary Meeting on September 14, 1957, that:

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, has deprived Hungary of its liberty and political independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental human rights."

The recent moves of the Kadar regime in the direction of relaxation of restrictions and liberalization of the system of controls does not basically change the situation. The Hungarian people do not enjoy any of the basic human rights.

### *Poland*

The present situation in Poland has its roots in the partition of Poland by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of August 25, 1939. In collusion with Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union invaded Poland on September 17, 1939, and on September 28, 1939, the Soviet Union and Germany signed an agreement in which they proclaimed the dissolution of the Polish State and the partition of its territories between themselves, the Soviet Union annexing the northeastern part of Poland. These acts violated both the Treaty of Riga and the Polish-Russian Nonaggression Pact.

Except for the partitioners and the allies of Nazi Germany, the world continued to recognize the legal Polish Government, which moved to London. On July 30, 1941, the Soviet Government concluded a pact with the Polish Government in London (the Sikorski-Maiski Agreement), by which it recognized "that the Soviet-German treaties relative to the territorial changes in Poland have lost their validity." On December 4, 1941, the Soviet Union concluded a "Declaration of Friendship and Mutual Assistance" with the London Government.

However, under the pretext of being "insulted" by the suspicion that it might have been guilty of the "Katyn Forest" massacre (the murder of over 11,000 noncommissioned and commissioned officers, prisoners of war taken in September 1939) which the Germans revealed in 1943, the Soviet Union broke off relations with the London Government in April 1943—though it never actually withdrew its recognition of that government. In the latter part of World War II, when the Red Army entered Polish territory on July 22, 1944, its political commissar, General Bulganin, issued a proclamation to the Polish people declaring the liberation of Poland and the establishment of the Polish Committee of National Liberation as the temporary executive authority. The participation of the London Government was made virtually impossible. This committee, under the chairmanship of Boleslaw Bierut, a Russian citizen, was transformed, on December 31, 1944, into a provisional Polish Government. Bierut assumed the post of Chief of State.

At Yalta (February 1945), Soviet Russia faced the other Great Powers with a fait accompli, and they had to approve the Soviet plan for a provisional government of national unity, which was created in June 1945, with an overwhelming majority of Communists. This government was recognized by the Allied Powers on the condition that it hold "free, unfettered elections at the earliest possible time." This essential condition was never met. The elections were postponed so that the new administration could have time to lay a heavy hand on the life of the country. Finally, in January 1947, elections took place under conditions of fraud and terror. Backed by the presence of Soviet troops, the Polish Workers' (Communist) Party organization exerted pressure to induce voting for the government list of candidates, and although another independent list of the Polish Peasant Party was permitted, there was no public control over the counting of votes, and the declared results were grossly falsified.

The Communist- and Moscow-dominated regime of a dictatorial police state was thus installed.

Subsequent elections, held in 1952, 1956, and 1960, were conducted on the Soviet pattern, with one list of candidates, depriving the people of political influence and of control of the government.

The provisions of the constitution of 1952 appeared to guarantee to the Polish people many of the fundamental rights and freedoms, but in practice they have been ignored and even countermanded by the Communist legislation. The Communist Party's First Secretary Gomulka publicly stated at the eighth Plenum (October 1956) that the methods used by the Communist government before October 1956 consisted of violence, the breaking down of human character and human conscience, of cheating, lying, provocation, lawlessness, and physical as well as moral torture (Nowe Drogi No. 10, 1956).

The political and moral oppression and the economic misrule and exploitation by the regime, cleary subservient to Moscow, resulted in the Poznan revolt of June 1956. It forced the Communists to make concessions and to liberalize the regime headed by Wladyslaw Gomulka, the new first secretary of the party. Moscow, fearing repercussions in the other captive nations, protested violently but in the showdown in Warsaw in October 1956, Khrushchev, who had personally flown in to stem the tide, had to give way lest an attempt at brutal oppression lead to disastrous results.

Among the gains won by the Polish people were the regime's new policy toward the church, which again permitted religious teaching in schools and made other concessions which led to the liquidation of the collective farms so detested by the peasants; the relaxation of censorship which permitted greater freedom of the press—though criticism was tempered by the common knowledge that Soviet Russia would not permit the installation of a non-Communist regime; and the cessation of terror by the security police. Although these achievements by no means restored the full enjoyment of human rights, they were important.

As the Communist Party regained control of the situation, the improvement was shortlived. Developments in subsequent years have been marked by intensified repression of the people, retrogressing toward the conditions in force before October 1956. This retreat from the gains of the Polish October is particularly evident with regard to the freedom of intellectuals, to workers' rights and church-state relations. There are many signs that the gains of October are to be further reduced.

The repressive laws of the pre-1939 era have never been repealed, their enforcement being merely held in abeyance. Increasingly, the regime in power is resuming the traditional Communist pattern of violating and denying the basic human rights and freedoms.

Many examples illustrating the violations of human rights by the Polish regime are cited on other pages of this report.

### *Rumania*

On April 2, 1944, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov declared that "the Soviet Government does not pursue the aim of acquiring any part of Rumanian territory or of changing the existing social order in Rumania."

After the coup d'etat of August 1944, carried out by the democratic parties and the King, the Rumanian armed forces succeeded in driving the German troops from Rumanian territory. Joining the Allies, Rumania continued the fight against the Germans, thus making possible the subsequent entry of the Soviet troops.

On September 12, 1944, Rumania concluded an armistice with the Allies, including the Soviet Union, which provided for the restoration of Rumania's independence. However, notwithstanding the explicit assurances of territorial integrity, the Red Army and the Soviet authorities penetrated all Rumanian territory and initiated the gradual destruction of Rumania's national institutions.

With the help of the Soviet occupation authorities the minuscule Rumanian Communist Party was able to carry out Moscow's orders to provoke confusion and anarchy. This campaign developed rapidly from intimidation to terror. When even this failed to install the Communists in power, the Russians resorted to overt action. In March 1945, the Kremlin imposed the Soviet-controlled government of Premier Groza. Subsequently all the democratic political parties were suppressed and the Rumanian Workers' (Communist) Party took over sole control of the country.

Following the seizure of power, Soviet agents proceeded rapidly with the communization of the whole country. On December 30, 1947, King Michael was forced to abdicate. A "people's republic" was proclaimed the next day. Soon afterward, in April 1948, a new basic law on the pattern of the Soviet Constitution was voted and put into force.

Operating through the Communist Government, Soviet Russia was able to exploit Rumania, economically, while subjugating the nation politically.

Among the first steps taken by the Soviet authorities was the suppression of freedom of the press and of all other media of mass communication. Soon all factories, banks, transportation units and key industries were nationalized. A new constitution, even more closely patterned on the Soviet model than that of 1948, was voted on September 24, 1952.

The Rumanian judicial system is characterized by article 1 of Decree No. 187 of 1949, which declares that any actions which violate the political, economic or social structure of the Rumanian People's Republic, or which "disturb the legal order established by the people under the leadership of the working class, shall be considered as acts dangerous to society." As such, these acts are punishable "even if they are not specifically mentioned as offenses in a legal provision."

Article 187 of the Code of Penal Procedure, as amended in 1952 and 1956, provides the death penalty for those "who by their statements should involve the Rumanian State in a position of neutrality." Article 227 of the same code imposes severe penalties for "crimes" against other Communist States or against the interests of the workers of other countries.

Decree No. 102, published in the Official Bulletin of March 6, 1958, while ruling on the organization of the bar, abolishes professional secrecy. According to article 29, lawyers, are required to report to the Department of Justice the contents of the documents confided to them by their clients, together with the subject of the consultation and any facts which would affect "security and peace."

Discrimination in education is established by law on the basis of "class." Resolution No. 217–253/513 of September 8, 1948, proclaims in article 1 that "In granting a scholarship, the social origin of the student must be taken into consideration." Section 13 of the same document excludes from eligibility for scholarships any students "whose parents have been or who have themselves been industrialists, merchants, or professional men." The sons of farmers who owned more than 12 hectares of land are also disqualified.

The right to vote is regulated by the Law on Elections (January 21, 1948), which stipulates that "all Rumanian citizens guilty of antidemocratic attitudes shall be deprived of electoral rights." The interpretation of an "antidemocratic attitude" is all-encompassing and affects not only the right to vote but is also the basis of discrimination in employment, since section 3 of Decree No. 29 of 1948 declares: "To be appointed to a position, the employee must enjoy civil and political rights."

The Communist regime has issued a number of regulations restricting churches and religions. By Decree No. 176, published in the Official Bulletin of August 3, 1948, the State took over all school property belonging to churches, congregations, communities or private persons. Decree No. 358, published in the Official Bulletin of December 2, 1948, empowers the Government to confiscate all property belonging to the Greek-Catholic Church. A similar move against the Roman Catholic Church was made by Decree No. 810 of August 1, 1949.

The Communist Government of Rumania has systematically violated articles 3 and 38 of the Peace Treaty of 1947 dealing with fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual.

### CONCLUSIONS

This short review endeavors to show the meaning of human rights and their importance for the development of a free, open society as against the closed one represented by any kind of totalitarianism, left (Communist) or right (Fascist). It also seeks to show the importance of these rights as bulwarks against tyranny and oppression, and their essential value in creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding, tolerance, and community of purpose between the nations, on which the stable and just peace of the world depends. It attempts to depict the misery and tragedy of the nations behind the Iron Curtain in east-central Europe—nations now deprived of those basic rights and freedoms, as well as the dangers this situation presents for the future of free nations, threatened with destruction of their national life as established by a centuries-old history of independence and free development of their spiritual and economic life.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a charter of great significance and value for humanity. Yet, in its present form, it does not fulfill the role which the initiators of that charter had in mind: to see the principles embodied in the declaration applied and implemented by the civilized world. The principles of the declaration lack means of implementation. The need for the machinery of such implementation is recognized, and its slow creation is in progress in the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, where the texts for two covenants—or conventions—are being prepared. The task is difficult but the progress is too slow—too slow, in any case, for those who suffer the lack of human rights.

Drastic, energetic and efficient action is required in order to restore the enjoyment of human rights to the peoples deprived of them today.

Only an effective political democracy can guarantee to the individual his natural rights and freedoms. Yet, at the same time, no democratic and independent government can be established without free individuals. The universal declaration has already had a profound impact on the entire world—on its laws, constitutions and everyday life. Inevitably, the constant debates on human rights have enlightened public opinion not only in the free world, but beyond its boundaries; they have made it increasingly aware of the goals to be sought and the failure in reaching them. As a result, world public opinion continuously presses for more accomplishments in the realm of human rights.

The greatest progress in this field has been made in Europe by the member states of the Council of Europe which, by adopting the European Convention on Human Rights on November 4, 1950, have not only solemnly reaffirmed those rights but have also guaranteed to their peoples strict observance and collective enforcement. All Europeans, who have a common heritage of political traditions, ideals of freedom and the rule of law, are proud of this historic achievement. Yet, in tragic contrast, over a hundred million Europeans of central and eastern Europe continue to be deprived of their human rights by the Communist regimes.

Neither the Soviet Union nor the governments of the captive nations have accepted the European convention, though they did subscribe to the United Nations Charter and did not vote against the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, every article of which they cynically violate. In definite contrast to the Soviet-rule portion of Europe behind the Iron Curtain, the peoples of Western Europe enjoy their rights and freedoms in fact and are protected by the European Convention on Human Rights. It is the existence of safeguards and protections written into the European Convention that causes the governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to heap abuse upon it, in contradistinction to their professions of support of the universal declaration, which is devoid of enforcement powers. Its very castigation by the constant and notorious violators of all human rights and fundamental freedoms points the way and underscores the need for further action by the members of the United Nations.

The division of Europe, created and forcibly maintained by the Soviet Union, is one of the principal causes of the world tension which endangers world peace. Various plans are being envisaged and discussed to bring Europe back to normal conditions. It is the essence of democratic liberty of opinion that men are free to advocate, and through constitutional means to seek, changes not only in the policies but in the very character of their government. The restoration of human rights to the peoples of captive Europe is one of the essential prerequisites for such conditions.

It is high time, after an entire decade of drawnout discussions, which amount almost to inaction, that the United Nations proceed to implement the universal declaration which affirms that "recognition of the inherent dignity and of equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world," and that "it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the law."

The speedy creation of practical working machinery capable of implementation in real life of the principles and rights contained in the universal declaration is urgently needed for the sake of the oppressed and for the sake of a just and stable peace in the world.

---

[From the Inter-Catholic Press Agency, Inc., Dec. 2, 1963]

### Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—The Rule of Law in Poland

Warsaw, December 2, 1963.—December 10 marks the 15th anniversary of the adoption by the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Government of the People's Republic of Poland was a signatory to that declaration, adopted in Paris on December 10, 1948, and promised to abide by its resolutions.

Article 18 of the declaration guarantees freedom of conscience and religion, the right to practice and manifest one's religion, both privately and in public, either alone or in community with others.

The message of the Polish episcopate to the clergy on August 28, said that although "restrictive and oppressive laws are not enacted by the parliament," yet it is a fact that, as a result of confidential instructions from the Government, administrative reprisals against Catholics and church institutions are systematically applied. "On orders from the Communist Party authorities, the church in Poland is being ruled by functionaries of the office of worship and the provincial departments of worship—and also by the secret militia. They rule ruthlessly and without appeal," the bishops' message said.

There is no general prohibition of religious practices in Poland and the average citizen can freely go to church. But it is known that large groups of citizens cannot do it without risking reprisals. Army officers, members of the citizen's militia, and allied services, as well as members of some political organizations, are formally forbidden, under penalty of disciplinary sanctions, to openly practice their religion. Many people have been dismissed from their jobs because they had taken part in public religious manifestations. Catholic children in summer camps are forbidden to go to church on Sundays. This certainly is not the kind of religious freedom which the declaration on human rights envisaged.

Contrary to article 23 of the declaration, hundreds of Polish women, professional nurses with State-approved diplomas, were banned during the past year from work in hospitals—many of which had at one time been their property—only because, by wearing their religious garb, they expressed their religious convictions. Scores of convents and minor seminaries have been seized by the Government, even in violation of Polish law.

A glaring example of the discrimination against church institutions is the fact that Government bureaus get orders from above not to act positively upon any matter concerning bishops, priests, or religious without the agreement of officials of the office of worship and the secret police. As a result, church institutions frequently get no allotment of coal, or, in order to keep up appearances, receive allotments which are below the minimum necessary. In view of the fact that winters in Poland are severe, this is a Draconian punishment for the public confession of religion.

Taxes on church institutions and priests and religious are imposed under special regulations. These taxes are out of all proportion to real income. The Catholic University of Lublin has more than 30 million zlotys in tax arrears, which it could not pay even if it gave all its income to the state. Diocesan seminaries and chanceries are in similar situation.

Contrary to article 26 of the declaration of human rights, the religious education of the children, demanded by the great majority of Polish parents, constantly meets with the greatest of obstacles and restrictions on the part of the Government. As for the freedom of association, it practically does not exist for Catholics in Poland.

Commemorating the anniversary of the adoption of that humanitarian declaration, one must unfortunately state that many governments which signed it make greater efforts to violate its provisions than to implement them.

---

## TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT AND MEETING AMERICA'S NEEDS: WHAT PRESIDENT KENNEDY STARTED WE MUST CONTINUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 60 minutes.

**Mr. REUSS.** Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the 88th Congress draws to a close, we are all gripped by a deep sadness. It is a sadness caused by the loss of a great leader. In a lesser sense, it is a sadness brought about by the realization that his thousand days in the Presidency were too few to allow the successful completion of what he sought to accomplish for his fellow Americans.

No goal was closer to his heart than that of jobs for all, and an expanded rate of national growth. Yet attaining these goals is blocked as long as measures such as the tax cut, the youth employment bill, the area redevelopment program, and the accelerated public works program are not enacted by the Congress. Other measures cannot even be proposed while these remain only proposals.

We take the floor this afternoon to affirm our faith in President Kennedy's economic program, and our determination to work for its fulfillment under President Johnson. For it is the Congress which has failed to act and has prevented the accomplishment of the Kennedy program. We intend to do our best to obtain such action.

### THE CURRENT ECONOMIC PICTURE: ACHIEVEMENTS AND DEFECTS

What is America's current economic picture? We have much about which to be thankful. We have avoided the scourge of depression. Our national production of goods and services, our individual incomes, our standard of living, are at an alltime high. For almost 3 years our economy has been expanding. Our gross national product of nearly $600 billion a year is up 20 percent over 1960. Prices have remained steady; wholesale prices have actually declined. We are better educated, healthier, better housed, and enjoy more recreation than at any time in our history.

But we would not be true to the American spirit of progress if, in noting these achievements, we failed to note also where we must do better, and to search for ways to do it.

What are some of these shortcomings?

The poor are still with us—some 40 million of them. Franklin Delano Roosevelt aroused us to an attack on mass poverty in the 1930's when he pointed out that "one-third of the Nation" was ill housed, ill clad, and ill nourished." Today, in 1963, more than one-fifth of the Nation still lacks the income to provide decent levels of housing, food, medical care, and other essentials of life. The poor are not just the sick, the aged, and the long-term unemployed. Millions of workers in such industries as textiles, clothing, leather, in retail stores, in laundries and motels, receive wages inadequate to support an American family. Nor have we been able to reduce materially the numbers of our poor in the last 10 years.

Unemployment—deadening and demoralizing as ever—is still with us, too. Though a record-breaking 70 million Americans have jobs, since 1957 our unemployment rate has averaged 6 percent. We can be thankful that, in part due to meaningful legislation passed since 1961, 70 million Americans now have jobs, and that our current rate of unemployment is no higher than 5.9 percent. But what we must see clearly is that in each period of prosperity since 1953, the overall rate of unemployment in this country has risen—from 2.9 percent in 1953; to 4.3 percent in 1956–57; to 5.6 percent in 1959–60; and to between 5.5 and 6 percent in 1963. Millions more are either partially unemployed, or fail to enter the unemployment statistics at all because they have become hopeless in their search for jobs. Our failure to solve our unemployment program contrasts sharply with the substantially full employment that prevails in countries like France and Sweden, Germany and Japan.

I do not believe the American people are ready to accept a world in which millions of us are condemned to permanent unemployment. A job is the talisman by which we earn respect in the eyes of others, and in our own eyes. It provides the avenue to an honorable life for our young people as they finish their education. It is a central way to overcome discrimination based on race or on any other un-American distinction. If we deprive people of jobs, we read them out of the free and open society that Thomas Jefferson and the Founding Fathers envisaged.

Our failure to use our human and material resources for the common good has brought about a third great shortcoming of the modern age. Every year, we lose what I estimate to be $60 billion of goods and services because we let part of our manpower and our plant lie idle.

Think of what America could do with this $60 billion that is now lost each year.

Think of the better homes and clothing and appliances and medical services which our private economy could provide not only for those presently poor but for vast numbers of those who, though employed, want but are unable to afford the good things in life which you and I enjoy.

Think of the public goods and services which our local, State, and Federal Governments could supply with part of this added output—from slum clearance, cleaner air, safer drinking water, finer schools and universities, more broadly available health care, to better street and highway systems, parks and recreational areas, and cultural institutions.

Think of the relative ease with which we could allocate a part of this added output to the great task of helping the people of the developing nations build free and progressive societies.

We have split the atom, we have entered outer space, and we are working to put a man on the moon. To end mass poverty, to provide jobs for all able to work, and to make our economy grow as it is capable of growing—surely we can master these tasks as we have mastered the immense challenges of science.

### THE FOUR ELEMENTS OF A PROGRAM FOR PROSPERITY

Cannot Americans of good will agree that what is required is not less, but more, effort to make our economy prosper? I think of a program with four main elements—first, to give specific attention to the people and areas where unemployment and poverty have become built in and persistent; second, to purge from our Federal tax system its present tendency to overtax and thus prevent consumer demand from increasing to the point where it can call our unemployed back to work; third, to conduct our monetary policy so as to provide a money supply adequate to keep our machinery running; and fourth, to bring about joint action by local, State, and Federal Governments to fulfill the great public needs.

Let us turn to each of these four lines of attack.

### 1. TAILORMADE JOB-CREATING PROGRAMS

In the last 3 years, we have evolved many useful tailormade solutions to built-in and persistent unemployment—"structural," as it is sometimes called. We have been addressing ourselves to the problems of the depressed coal mining communities of Pennsylvania and West Virginia and Illinois; the cutover areas of the lake States; the pockets of rural poverty in the southern Appalachians and the Ozarks. Our area redevelopment program, our accelerated public works program, our manpower development and training legislation, are designed to substitute hope for despair in these areas. Congress must not abandon them now. Area unemployment and poverty have become more intractable because we have tolerated underemployment and underproduction throughout the entire economy. Had we enjoyed a more vigorous growth rate in the last 10 years, our problems of area unemployment today would be much closer to a solution. So we must pay for neglect of the past by continuing these special programs for the present.

Since, in addition, the children born during the World War II "baby boom" are about to enter the labor market in tidal wave proportions, we urgently need to create many more job opportunities for our young people. We need to undertake a youth employment program.

### 2. THE TAX CUT

The second, and most important, element in our program for jobs and growth is a tax cut. As President Johnson has said:

> The tax cut bill now languishing in Congress is the most massive single attack we can make on this problem of unemployment.

The administration's proposed tax cut, passed here last September and now before the other body, attempts to leave in consumers' pockets sums which, on the basis of past experience, will be spent for the goods and services which the economy can produce. In my opinion, the tax cut is late by several years. It is too little, in that the approximately $9 billion reduction in individual taxes is not likely to result in more than $18 to $20 billion in increased private spending, which seems inadequate in view of the gap of $60-odd billion between our present performance and a full-employment, full-production economy. It may also be too diffused, and improvident of tax revenues. But these are criticisms of details. If anything, it is more imperative than ever that the Congress pass the tax cut bill. This is particularly true because automation—whether at a faster rate than productivity increases in the past, I cannot tell—and the entry of millions of young people into the labor force require that we expand overall demand massively and quickly.

### 3. AN ADEQUATE MONETARY SUPPLY

A third requirement of a program to meet America's goals is a nonrestrictive monetary policy. I am not suggesting that a policy of adequate additions to the money supply, and reasonable interest rates, will by itself bring about full employment and sufficient economic growth. But to deny the extreme claims of the proponents of an easy monetary policy is emphatically not to say that we can now proceed to cut down on bank credit and to raise interest rates. When the tax cut injects a stimulus into the economy, readily available credit at reasonable cost is absolutely essential to keep the stimulus going.

### 4. MEETING THE PEOPLE'S NEEDS

The fourth element in a forward-looking economic program is to meet the great priorities of national need, such as education, health, housing, city renewal, conservation, and culture. These require the best efforts and cooperation of State and local governments, and of the Federal Government as well.

How are we to pay for the public goods that need to be provided—the schools and clinics and buildings and parks? Mainly, they are to be paid for by the increased tax revenues which will accrue to all levels of government from an expanded economy. Adequate attention to the public sector contributes to the growth of the economy, by putting idle men and machinery to work. This very growth in the economy provides revenues needed to pay for what is done in the public sector.

An expanded national economy can finance the great priorities of public need even if our present swollen defense expenditures have to be continued. But some hope exists that our defense expenditures can taper off. If they do, there is all the more reason and necessity for transferring the emphasis to the peaceful side of the public sector.

If the Federal Government cuts its income tax rates, and at the same time maintains its expenditure level at what the national interest requires, what happens to the Federal budget? I say that the best way to balance the budget is to expand economic growth and employment. From an expanded gross national product we can soon obtain the revenues that are needed to match our expenditures. What we need is a balanced budget that comes from equating income and outflow at full employment.

This is a better method of balancing the budget than that tried in 1959 of tightening the money supply, and maintaining the tax burden unrelieved by a tax cut. It resulted in a serious recession, and in the greatest peacetime budget deficit in history, some $13 billion.

The part to be played by the Federal Government, as contrasted with State and local governments, should be decided in each case by commonsense rather than by dogma. But we should be aware that it is the Federal Government, not State and local governments, which has economized on expenditures in recent years. The Federal Government has fewer employees today than it had 10 years ago. In September 1963, the number of civilian Federal employees was actually 242 less than the year before. During this same period, State and local governmental employees increased by about 300,000.

State and local governments employ some 7 million Americans, as opposed to the Federal Government's 2.5 million employees. And almost half of the Federal Government's 2.5 million employees work in the area of defense.

The national debt is very little higher today in dollars than it was after World War II. State and local debt is more than six times as large.

Mr. Speaker, the martyred President Kennedy made a magnificent start to the attack on unemployment and slow growth. President Johnson has said:

> No. 1 in priority today and tomorrow is more jobs. This is our dominant, relentless, domestic problem and we have to face it headon.

It is up to us in the Congress to carry on the job.

THE TAX CUT IS NEEDED TO COMBAT ALL TYPES OF UNEMPLOYMENT, INCLUDING STRUCTURAL

**Mr. BOLLING.** Mr. Speaker, it has been fashionable in recent years to blame our Nation's persistently high unemployment on structural difficulties within our economy. In support of this argument some proponents of the "structural school" cite a faster than usual shift of demand from blue-collar to white-collar workers; a faster than usual rate of technological change; and a lessened willingness of workers to change their occupations or to move to areas where their skills are more in demand.

Of course, this is an oversimplified statement of their case but does contain the substantive points made by advocates of this point of view. In my opinion and that of many outstanding economists of our country, this argument does not explain the forces within our economy that are shaping the course of employment trends. Nor does it offer a solution to the problem of our high unemployment rate despite significant advances in the economy as a whole.

Our unemployment rate has been 5 percent or more for 72 consecutive months. It has averaged 6 percent during the past 6 years. The Labor Department has just announced that the November unemployment rate rose to 5.9 percent. This is despite the fact that our annual increase in gross national product has been about $30 billion. Although the projected increase in gross national product from early 1961 to early 1964 is expected to be about $100 billion, an increase of 15 percent in constant dollars, the unemployment rate will have decreased by only some 1½ percentage points during the 3-year period.

Some critics of the proposed $11 billion tax cut passed by the House in September and now before the Senate Finance Committee argue that because of the structural unemployment difficulties it would have little effect on reducing the high rate of unemployment. However, in testimony presented 6 weeks ago by Chairman Walter Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower a dramatic case has been made to show that demand for goods and services that would be generated by the tax cut is the key to reducing the rate of unemployment to 4 percent or better.

Mr. Heller stated:

> The tax cut would thus increase demand to levels consistent with a 4-percent rate of unemployment. It would ease our most pressing unemployment problems.

Of course, he readily admitted that it would not completely solve the unemployment problem. Unemployment rates of individual groups and economically depressed areas of the country require additional assistance because of abnormally difficult or unusual conditions.

However, Chairman Heller pointed out:

> To be sure, tax reduction will create new jobs in every community across the Nation and expand employment in every industry. The overwhelming majority of American families will benefit directly from the income tax cuts that will accrue to 50 million taxpaying individuals and 600,000 taxpaying corporations. Their direct rise in after-tax income will soon be translated, through the marketplace, into stronger markets for all kinds of goods and services and a quickening of the business pulse in all communities. With average working hours already at a high level, this added demand and activity will in large part be translated, in turn, into additional jobs, and income for the unemployed. Thus, the nontaxpaying minority will, in a very real sense, be the greatest beneficiaries of the tax program.
>
> Experience clearly shows (1) that the unemployment rate will decline for every major category of workers and (2) that the sharpest declines will occur where the incidence of unemployment is the highest: among teenagers, the Negroes, the less skilled, the blue-collar groups generally.

Mr. Speaker, unemployed workers in our Nation represent waste of potential productivity, human suffering, deprivation, and want. The continued high level of unemployment is a blot on our society and evidence of serious shortcomings in our economic system. Unemployment is a human problem as well as a social and economic problem. We have struggled with various aspects of this problem for a number of years. We have enacted measures to assist the unemployed who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, we have provided aid for the dependent children of unemployed workers. We have enacted an accelerated public works program and the area redevelopment program to assist those areas most hard hit by chronic unemployment. We have provided a manpower retraining program to help unemployed workers learn new skills. We enacted a tax measure to stimulate new plant investment to modernize productive facilities, we acted to increase our foreign trade capabilities. We are considering legislation to provide increased vocational training opportunities, to help find jobs for young people who are out of school and unemployed through conservation and urban service corps. We have sought to end discrimination in job opportunities because of race, color, or creed. Finally, as I mentioned earlier, we are considering the $11 billion tax reduction program designed to create the kind of demand in the private sector of our economy that will stimulate production and create new jobs.

All of these programs that have been initiated by the Democratic administration and are the subject of continuing support by President Johnson. His concern over the vast implications of this problem have already been clearly expressed by his call for prompt action on the tax reduction bill and other programs and policies to make possible the goal of 75 million jobs for Americans.

In his statement to the Senate Manpower Subcommittee, Mr. Heller offers valid evidence to show that the problem of structural unemployment has not increased significantly since 1957—the last time unemployment was near 4 percent. This evidence bears out the fact that the high level of unemployment since then can be more directly traced to other factors in our economy such as the decline in consumer demand.

Heller points out that:

> The most notable difference between the pre-1957 and post-1957 periods is found in the strength of market demand. In the first postwar decade, markets were strong. Backlogs of consumer demand had to be worked off. The demands of the Korean conflict had to be met. Outmoded plants and equipment had to be replaced or modernized, and capacity had to be enlarged. Deficiencies in housing, office facilities, and public works had to be made up.
>
> But 1957 marked a watershed. In the ensuing period, demand has slackened at a time when our labor force growth has been accelerating in response to the postwar jump in the birth rate. Business fixed investment dropped off from 10 to 11 percent of the gross national product to only 9 percent—indeed, the level of such investment in 1962 barely struggled back to its level in 1956, while gross national product was rising by nearly one-fifth (both in constant prices).
>
> Thus the clearest and most striking change since 1957 is the weakening of demand. So the clearest and most urgent need today is to remove the overburden of taxation which is retarding the growth in demand to full employment levels. Income tax rates enacted to finance war and fight inflation—though reduced in 1954—are still so high that they would yield a large surplus of revenues over expenditures if we were at full employment today. They are, in short, repressing demand and incentives in an economy operating well short of its capacity.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize the points I have made in my remarks, the evidence is clear that the proposed tax cut to stimulate demand in the marketplace is essential if we are to make any significant reduction in the persistently high level of unemployment that has plagued us since 1957. The problem of structural unemployment, while severe, does not explain the present high unemployment. It can, and must, be met by a series of tailormade programs designed for the unusual problems of teenage unemployment, unemployment among nonwhite segments of the labor force, the unskilled, or those displaced by automation.

The Democratic administration under the leadership of our late beloved President Kennedy and now under President Johnson will continue to move forward toward the solution of these problems on which the strength of our economy and our Nation depends.

### UNEMPLOYMENT AS IT AFFECTS MINORITY GROUPS AND YOUNG PEOPLE

**Mr. ROOSEVELT.** Mr. Speaker, the word "unemployed" conjures for me vivid scenes of 1932; people sleeping under bridges in Chicago; cardboard houses on the flats between New York and New Jersey; the haunting specter of despair which embraced men by the multitudes, and let not one soul escape its heart-rending touch, light though that touch might be.

But never again will such tableaus appear on the landscape of America; nevermore will our citizens be stripped of self-respect and rendered hopeless supplicants of society. Thanks to enlightened programs of social welfare, we are now better organized and equipped to dispel the horrors of those days which can be so clearly recalled by many of us.

Nevertheless, though we are known throughout the world as the richest nation on earth, our Department of Labor continues to issue at intervals with time-clock regularity reports on the total number of our great labor force which is idle at a given time. Percentagewise, the figure is appalling, and gives rise to continual grave concern by those who are charged with maintaining the equilibrium of our economic system.

Frustration and gloom inevitably engulf the ranks of the jobless as each of its members gradually becomes just another digit in the Department's continuing serial on what it terms "hard core" unemployed. While we continue to strive to reduce joblessness in all groups which comprise our labor force, the most serious and persistent problems are encountered among our young people, older workers, members of minority groups, the unskilled, and workers in industries which are declining or seasonal or otherwise unstable. There are those who fall in more than one of these groups, and the problems they face are intensified. The burden is a particularly heavy one for young people and members of minority groups, and it is on this subject I should like to comment.

Minority groups, nine-tenths of whom are Negroes, include Mexican and other Latin Americans, Japanese and those of other Asian descent. Nonwhites last year made up 11 percent of the civilian labor force, but 22 percent of these people were unemployed.

During 1962 there were, on the average, 900,000 nonwhite workers without jobs. This unemployment rate of 11 percent is more than twice that for white workers. Even more startling are the white-nonwhite differences among adult men; in this group, the nonwhite workers' unemployment rate was 2½ times higher than that of the white worker.

It is true that the economic status of Negroes and other nonwhites has improved considerably in recent years. Nevertheless, these people are still especially vulnerable to unemployment, due in part to their heavy concentration in occupations particularly susceptible to unemployment, such as unskilled labor and semiskilled production jobs. Though difficult to assess precisely, discrimination against nonwhites is an obvious factor and accounts in great part for the limited access of nonwhite workers to the skilled and professional occupations, and for the restriction of their advancement even within the occupations groups in which they are employed. Because of their limited opportunities for education and training, many nonwhite workers have been unable to prepare for skilled or professional occupations and thus could not qualify even if the doors of employment were opened. One of our greatest resources is therefore wasted by the failure of industry to put to use the skills and talents of nonwhites, merely on a basis of race discrimination.

I need hardly point out to my colleagues that my legislative endeavors during this Congress have been especially directed toward enactment of an Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Following encompassing hearings by the General Subcommittee on Labor, the Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill with strong bipartisan support. With little prospect of further legislative action on the committee's bill, I recommended the inclusion of fair employment practices provisions in the Civil Rights Act. I am proud that my suggestion was favorably considered by the Judiciary Committee, and although I am disappointed that the language of the bill reported is not as strong as that to which I was originally committed, it represents a good beginning and provides a firm foundation on which to build an effective law.

For a number of readily understandable reasons, young people always experience a higher rate of unemployment than adults. These new entrants to the labor market include a high proportion of job changers seeking a satisfactory working career. Because of their lack of seniority and relative inexperience, these youths are also the frequent subjects of layoffs. Though a high rate of unemployment among young people has often been considered acceptable, it has reached alarming proportions and shows no signs of abatement.

Nonwhite teenagers have one of the highest jobless rates of any age-sex-color group. Last year the unemployment rate for nonwhite boys, that is, 14 to 19 years, stood at 21 percent; for nonwhite girls in the same age group, the rate is 28 percent. But the comparable figure for white boys and girls was 12 percent.

In his recent address to the Congress, our President clearly and with firmness dedicated himself to the continuation of our national work. He emphasized the need for immediate, strong, forward-looking action, and asked for our help. This Congress has pending before it a wealth of measures effectively designed to ameliorate the gnawing problems of unemployment. Let us heed the words of our President, and act now.

### THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ECONOMIC HEALTH OF OUR CITIES

**Mr. MOORHEAD.** Mr. Speaker, shall we continue to have cities in the United States of America? This is the basic question which we face.

Now, it may be that the future of America lies in a total dispersion of people into small towns across the country. If that is the future, then, instead about nostrums for our cities we should be making plans for their orderly decline and disappearance.

However, I believe that this is not only barbarous, but unrealistic. I believe that our cities must continue to serve their function of being the economic and cultural centers of our Nation. Throughout history cities have served this function. Civilizations are almost always city based. From Babylon, Athens, and Rome of the ancient world to Venice and Florence of the Renaissance, to Paris, London, and New York of the modern world, cities have always been the focus of civilizations.

The reasons are obvious. It takes a large concentration of people to support art galleries, symphony orchestras, the opera, and the theater.

There are economic reasons, too. In our complex economy a particular business transaction may well require the bringing together of businessmen, bankers, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and persons of other specialties. Only in a city can such a group be readily and conveniently brought together. America needs and will continue to need its great cities.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite this need our cities are declining. My city of Pittsburgh is a perfect case history of the reasons why cities decline. After the devastating flood of 1936 Pittsburgh was a dying city. The advent of World War II concealed this fact from most people. A few farsighted public and private leaders recognized the problem and took action.

Flood control was first because upon it depended the very existence of the city. Smoke control was next because, without it, few people would choose to live and work in the city. Our third problem was urban blight and slums. Through the process of urban renewal we have the means of solving this problem. We have now come face to face with our fourth major problem—traffic strangulation. The city which we have saved from drowning by floods, made livable through smoke control, and attractive and economically sound through urban renewal may yet strangle to death because of traffic congestion.

In an article which I wrote for the Metropolitan Transportation magazine in August 1961, I asked what transportation progress had been made in our cities since the "horse and buggy" days? My answer was to quote from a New York Times article which reported that, because of traffic congestion, during most of the day, it takes a motorist behind a

**300 horsepower engine longer to cross Manhattan Island in midtown than it took a horse and wagon a hundred years ago. James Gaynor, New York State** housing commissioner, was quoted as saying:

> The trip from the Newark airport to the center of Manhattan, a distance of 13.5 miles, can be made by public transportation at the rush hour in 1 hour and 30 minutes—a hundred years ago a horse and buggy could travel the same distance in 1 hour and 17 minutes, or just a little faster. So much for progress.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the people of the cities are getting a little sick of this situation and their frame of mind is not made any easier when they find their smallest request for Federal aid being frustrated by rural-dominated committees in Congress. Billions and billions of dollars have been spent by the Federal Government in our history for such programs as farm commodity supports, reclamation projects, land-grant college and extension education, rural electrification, agricultural experiment stations, land conservation, crop statistics service, marketing and storage of commodities, and regulation of diseases, to name but a few. Representatives from urban areas voted for these programs along with the Representatives whose districts would most benefit, because we felt that such programs were of benefit to the society as a whole.

Now we who live in the cities are asking our colleagues to support urban programs for the same reason—it will benefit our society as a whole, if the problems of poverty, congestion, illiteracy, obsolescence, blight, and disease are eradicated from our cities.

Only then, Mr. Speaker, can we fulfill the prophecy of Isaiah when he said, "And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations."

### STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE NEED TO UPGRADE OUR HUMAN RESOURCES

**Mr. LONG of Maryland.** Mr. Speaker, a great debate has been underway for some time concerning the nature of and the remedies for unemployment in the United States.

On the one hand is the insistence that there is much more unemployment than the statistics show, that the unemployed are pretty much the same people as the employed, and that the proper medicine is greater purchasing power—through wage increases, tax cuts, public works acceleration, and Government spending generally.

On the other hand is the argument that unemployment is exaggerated by the statistics, that what unemployment there is is mainly due to the lack of skill, lack of mobility, or lack of willingness to work, and that such unemployment—structural as it is called—will yield only temporarily, if at all, to Government spending.

The accuracy of the unemployment statistics needs no discussion here. Suggestions that unemployment is higher or lower than what is shown by the statistics have been refuted by responsible and disinterested authorities. Nothing is to be gained either by sweeping unemployment under a statistical rug, or by exaggerating it as an even worse problem than it actually is.

On the thesis, however, that unemployment is mainly due to the inability of idle workers to qualify for the types of jobs that are vacant, there is much to be said. The question whether structural unemployment has been increasing—apart from changes in total unemployment—can be settled by comparing the unemployment rates of various classes of workers between years in which both the total unemployment rates and the labor force participation rates were the same. Such a comparison can be made between 1949–50, when the unemployment rate averaged 5.6 percent and the labor force participation rate 58.2 percent, and 1959–60, when the average unemployment rate was also 5.6 percent and the labor force participation rate 58.3 percent. The comparison yields the following results:

Unemployment rates rose for Negroes, for the average of manual, unskilled, and domestic service occupations, and for the poorly educated males; while they fell for whites, for the average of professional, skilled, clerical, sales, and nondomestic service occupations, and for better educated males.

The average duration of unemployment lengthened from 11 to 13.7 weeks, and the proportion of persons whose unemployment had lasted longer than 26 weeks rose, while the share of the short-duration unemployed fell.

The occupational composition of employment altered drastically. While total employment in the manual, unskilled, and domestic service occupations fell by over 1 million, the total in the professional, white collar, skilled sales, service, and clerical occupations rose by 8½ million.

The not-in-labor-force rates of Negroes and of poorly educated persons rose substantially; while those of whites and the well-educated rose little, remained the same, or fell. Thus, there have been marked changes in the structure of unemployment, and labor force, independent of the total level of unemployment.

The fact that the unemployment is mainly structural is also borne out in my own experiences as a Congressman. Every Friday and Saturday I hold office hours for the constituents in my district who seek help in their personal problems, of which a substantial portion concern need for jobs. These interviews, many of them heartbreaking, lead me to three conclusions.

First. The problem of unemployment is mainly one of lack of education and skill, mental retardation, and brain damage, emotional instability, and alcoholism.

Second. The problem cannot be solved satisfactorily by mere spending on extended employment benefits or public works. On this I agree with many of my Republican friends.

Third. The problem can only be met by an all-out and enduring effort to improve the quality of our labor supply. On this I disagree with those Republicans who seem to feel that any conclusion that unemployment is structural justifies the Federal Government in getting out of the problem and leaving it up to business or ignoring it altogether. On the contrary, I am inclined to feel that the upgrading of such a substantial part—at least a third—of the labor force requires not just vocational retraining, but massive and expensive effort to improve the quality of our human resources.

Thus the upgrading of workers rests mainly on the upgrading of human beings. This upgrading can be done most cheaply and most effectively by general education of the young in the schools.

I emphasize general education for the young, because, as our brief experience with the manpower retraining program suggests, once the person has reached adulthood it becomes extremely difficult to do much to make him available for the kind of jobs that our economy is opening up.

First. The adult—especially the poorly educated adult—seems to lack the motivation or the confidence to adapt himself to new skills, new employers, or new areas.

Second. The adult usually has family responsibilities which make it very expensive for him to take up educational training programs.

Third. The worker who cannot read or write, or who has less than a high school education, usually lacks the foundation on which to build skills of any kind, especially the technical skills that are most in demand.

Fourth. The poorly educated worker who is able to acquire a skill tends to acquire one that is easily put out of existence by a new machine or process. The best hedge against unemployment is possession of skills which permit flexibility in their application.

Fifth. Poorly educated adults provide an unsatisfactory background for the rearing and motivation of the next generation, so that the problem of poor quality labor supply perpetuates itself.

Sixth. Much of the structural unemployment consists of boys and girls in their teens and early twenties who have dropped out of school without acquiring an adequate foundation for gainful work.

What should an all-out effort of upgrading our human resources consist of?

Certainly, improvement is called for in our general educational system. The last half century has seen a great quantitative expansion in American education. The recent decade has also seen considerable qualitative consolidation. But much room for improvement still remains in both the quantity and quality of our educational effort—in our rural areas, in the slum areas of our cities, and even in our middle-class suburbs. Especial improvement is needed in the first to sixth grades, to make sure that children get off to a good start by learning to read and write, that they get a solid foundation in arithmetic and mathematics, and early start in languages, and above all that they acquire a knowledge of how to study, take notes, and pass examinations.

There is also need of a tremendous stepup in the following aspects of general education: Better people in teaching and better methods of teaching reading, mathematics, and languages. More attention to the child with special problems—retarded and brain-damaged children, who together constitute 3 percent of the child population; the unhappy or disturbed child; the product of homes where parents are dead, divorced, alcoholic, or delinquent; the child of substantial but unbalanced ability—bright in mathematics but poor in reading, good in languages but deficient in mathematics. These aspects of the problem require that education be tailored to the child. We are already undertaking a great stepping up of the average pace of the education, with the unfortunate side result that the improvement in the average quality of education is also currently responsible for a great number of dropouts.

Still another need is for a revitalization of our educational system. Teachers need to go back to school and study continuously to learn the latest ideas and methods. New revolutions in education are taking place in every decade; underpaid teachers who moonlight as accountants or real estate agents cannot keep up with these advances and necessarily pass on to their students obsolete techniques and ideas.

Also to be dealt with is the problem of alcoholism and its attendant emotional disorders; so many that private industry is beginning to concern itself with this problem. There are 6 million alcoholics in the United States. Many of these are employed, but precariously. As they lose their jobs, for one reason or another, they remain chronically unemployed, to say nothing of presenting problems of crime and auto deaths. Even worse, every alcoholic has one or more relatives, many of them children, who are damaged in their own emotional outlooks by the environments in which they find themselves.

Still another problem is that of incentive and guidance in going to college. Questions most often asked me, apart from those concerning jobs are "How can I get my son into college?" "What is a good college for him to go to?" "Where can I get the money to send him?" The mere fact that so many people have to ask their Congressman indicates the lack of a satisfactory system of providing such information.

Finally there is a great need for knowledge of what skills are needed and what skills are available. I like Congressman CURTIS' suggestion, in his very useful little book on 87 million jobs, that we set up a national skill clearinghouse.

These are the needs we face in dealing with the problem of structural unemployment. To provide for these needs will be expensive—so expensive that it is almost silly to think that they can or will be dealt with by private industry or by the local community. Even with all-out effort, the problem of structural unemployment will be with us for at least another decade. But expensive as these needs are, it is far cheaper to deal with them on the educational level than on the unemployment level—with all the associated wastes of lost production and income, delinquency and crime, and human unhappiness.

### PUBLIC INVESTMENT IN CONSERVING OUR RESOURCES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in the future as in the past, our economic progress and prosperity will be dependent upon the accumulation of capital, private and public. A vital part of our capital consists of our natural resources which are the base for the great economy we have built in this country. Our land, water, mineral, vegetation, and wildlife make up an incomparable natural endowment that we must conserve and develop.

Too often during our history we have squandered our natural resources or failed to take full advantage of our assets. But with the rapid increase of population and the ever-growing demand of industry for raw material and power, the need for conserving and developing our natural resources is greater than ever before.

Considered only from the viewpoint of hardheaded economics, conservation is one of our great national needs. The famed conservationist, Carl Schurz, long ago put it this way:

> Destruction of the forests of this country will be the murder of its future prosperity and progress.

That statement has redoubled validity today. And we can rightly add many more items to the list of resources that we must conserve. Conservation of our resources naturally includes a constant search for ways to use them most efficiently, to harness economically resources not used before and to find improved uses for others.

Whether in regulating the exploitation of natural materials, conducting research, or building dams, canals, and roads, the Federal Government has had a major role in the building of this type of public capital. And it must play its part even more vigorously and effectively today if our continuing national need is to be met.

For instance, the changing pattern of our sources of energy dictates a vigorous, imaginative program of research and experimentation with our power sources. Use of ultra-high-voltage powerlines to link hydroelectric sources and mine pithead thermo-power plants with urban areas and to pool the power generating capacities of areas with different peak periods could be expanded greatly. For coal, the high voltage transmission lines and methods of moving finely powdered coal or coal and water in pipes promise more use of that material. Research also offers prospects for better usage of natural gas and petroleum products, which now dominate our energy market. In all these areas, the Federal Government has a role to play together with private industries or State and local governments. The national interest in developing the greatest efficiency in power production thereby reducing costs, is obvious.

Our water resources, although ample nationally, are already in short supply in some areas and regions. And in the compact metropolitan areas, it is becoming more and more necessary to reuse water several times. The priority needs in this area are steps to provide water to dry regions through reservoir construction, desalinzation or other measures, and new action to reduce the pollution of our streams and ground water. The legislation amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which has passed the other body, will be valuable in strengthening these efforts.

Land conservation, not only for agriculture, lumbering, grazing, and other uses directly related to the economy, but also for recreation and sport is indispensable to the good life we want for all Americans. Preservation of open space in and near cities, improvement of our park system, and maintenance of unspoiled wilderness will contribute significantly to American social values. Measures such as the land and water conservation bill, now before the Rules Committee, the public land law review and a wilderness bill, should be enacted. The accelerated Public Works Act is a key instrument for developing and preserving our natural wealth.

A close look at all these conservation projects reveals how they will contribute to the national wealth. And we recognize, in general, that capital investment is one of the main forces that drives our economy forward and raises our standards of living. But, amazingly, there are advocates of "economy" and so-called financial responsibility who oppose Government outlays for conservation and resource development projects. Uninformed observers classify all such projects as "pork."

In part, this is the result of our failure to present these projects clearly as investments in the future. They are usually mixed with current expenditures in the Federal budget. The considerable portion of Federal spending that goes for investment is thus not fully recognized. If we dissect that budget of the Interior Department, the Federal agency most concerned with conservation, we find that 30 to 40 percent of its spending in the last 2 years has in fact been for adding to the capital base of our economy. The fact that we have been so investing in the past as well is reflected in the cash returns from previous investments, which amount to 60 percent of the Department's budget. Even more important, however, are the benefits that are widely diffused through our society and our economy where they provide an indirect return to the people.

In emphasizing that conservation and development are an investment in the future, we recognize, of course, that there is a competition for funds for Government activities. There is a clash between alternative uses of our present resources. In his introduction to Interior Secretary Stewart Udall's book, our late President, John F. Kennedy, told us how we must resolve these conflicts:

> Each generation must deal anew with the tendency to prefer shortrun profits to long-run necessities. The Nation's battle to preserve the common estate is far from won. The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: We must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age.

We must provide the future jobs and economic growth that are the basis of a good life for Americans by comprehensive measures now to conserve and develop our natural resources. Such public investment is as old as the Republic. We owe much of our economic success to the investments in waterways, roads, and harbors that began with the First Congress.

Now public investments in resource conservation and development must continue hand in hand with private investment if the economy is to grow and our people to prosper.

### MEDICARE INDISPENSABLE TO FUTURE WELFARE OF NATION

**Mr. ULLMAN.** Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no issue presently facing the U.S. Congress and the American people that has received more misinformation than the subject of medical care for the aged. Leaders of special interest groups, including both the well-meaning and those who know better, have with some success built a strawman before the American people, and by attacking it with great gusto, have blurred the basic issue that is before us.

Mr. Speaker, that issue is very simple: Are we going to provide adequate medical and nursing facilities for Americans in older age groups, or are we not? And, if we are, are we going to provide medical care in a way that preserves the self-respect, or are we going to require the aged to become charity cases on the public dole?

I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by discussing the strawman which has been erected so frequently by opponents of the King-Anderson bill. That strawman is the shadowy specter of socialized medicine. Mr. Speaker, if the world "socialism" is to have a definitive meaning, so as to be a useful term in the American lexicon, it must mean Government ownership or control of a resource, of a method of production, or of a service. In the case of medicine, it would mean Government operation of medical facilities and Government direction of those involved in the healing processes. No program could be farther from this than the program envisaged under the King-Anderson hospital insurance bill. This program is simply designed to do the same thing for people over 65 that privately operated insurance plans are doing for those under 65. Most of us can remember when the first privately operated hospital and medical insurance program was brought forth. Leaders of the same groups which are today opposed to the King-Anderson bill spread all over the country the alarm that this was going to mean socialized medicine. The same people who had opposed the original concept of social security again waved the red shirt of socialism and made dire predictions of communisms at suggestions of a reasonable and democratic alternative to the tragedy of inadequate medical care.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, 30 years have gone by and the American democracy is even stronger than it was then. It has become stronger because every American has been given a better opportunity to share in the abundance that this land can produce. One great area of neglect, however, has been medical care for people over 65. Up until very recently, most private insurance programs would not enroll a person over 65. Although some companies have tried to develop a program for the aged, the expense, particularly for retired people on a low, fixed income, has been prohibitive. More than one-half have dollar limits on hospital room costs. All the King-Anderson bill intends to do is to insure that any older person who needs hospitalization or nursing care will receive it, without being publicly branded as a pauper.

Care will still be given at private, State, and community hospitals; care will still be under the direction and at the discretion of the personal physician. Decisions related to the patient's health will still be made by the family doctor. In short, Mr. Speaker, this is not, nor is it intended to be, any kind of socialized medicine.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out how great the present need is. The skyrocketing costs of hospitalization make sickness an economically unpleasant prospect at any time. But, for the aged, the bitter combination of increased medical expense and decreased income can make the outlook bleak indeed. People over 65 already use three times as much hospital care as those under 65, and they need even more than they are receiving. After the age of 65, 9 out of 10 people are hospitalized at least once, and 2 out of 3 enter the hospital 2 or more times. For those over 65, the average hospital stay is twice as long as for those under 65. When one realizes that the average daily cost of hospital care has increased from $9.39 in 1946 to $34.98 in 1961, one can begin to understand what a dreaded thing sickness in old age can be.

Furthermore, we all know that the average income for people over 65 is far less than that for younger people. In fact, the American median income is $2,530 for two-person families over 65 as compared to $5,314 in the below-retirement-age brackets.

Mr. Speaker, much is said about the good that the Kerr-Mills program is doing, and some say that this is the means whereby the poverty stricken and the destitute can have their medical needs taken care of, but, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the poverty stricken and the destitute about whom we must be concerned. It is the average American who has worked all his life, who has contributed to social security, who has paid for a modest home, and has laid aside a small nest egg to supplement his old-age insurance. It is that man whose wife becomes ill and has to be hospitalized, and who himself may become ill and have to be hospitalized, who soon finds his savings gone, his house mortgaged, and his security wiped out because of the terribly high costs of medical care.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can if we wish require aged Americans to continue to get by on substandard health care. Some have pointed out that older people are as well, and perhaps better, taken care of than they have ever been. If we are willing to let our parents and grandparents get by on care that was considered normal or satisfactory 30 or 40 years ago, if we are willing to have them forgo the benefits of modern science and all of the great strides that have been made in medicine, there is no need for action. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the American people are willing to do this.

The last question, then, is, How are we going to fill the need? I would suggest as a basic premise that the American answer is not welfare medicine. Welfare medicine for the destitute, for the pauper who has made no effort to provide for himself, may be necessary. But for the average American citizen who has to retire at 65, charity is not the proper way. The private insurance companies have not been able to take care of the need. In their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, they were unable to supply any meaningful assurance that present programs would adequately take care of our older citizens. By adopting a program of social insurance to which Americans can contribute during their working careers, we will avoid placing an economic burden on any single segment of society, while safeguarding basic human self-respect.

Under the King-Anderson bill, the taxable earnings base would be raised $400 and social security and railroad retirement contribution rates would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent for employees and employers, and four-tenths of 1 percent for self-employed persons. This is a small price to pay for the assurance of adequate medical care after retirement.

Mr. Speaker, no remarks on this vital program are complete without some allusion to the leadership given by our late President John F. Kennedy. Hospitalization insurance under social security was proposed as one of the basic goals of his administration. President Kennedy had the vision to realize Americans can solve any problem to which they are willing to apply themselves. There can be no question that America, the richest nation the world has ever known, can afford full care for its aged; the only question is, Does America have the will? I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that we have the will, and I urge my colleagues in the weeks ahead to support this program as a reasonable and intelligent answer to a vital problem of our day.

---

## MEETING OUR NATIONAL NEEDS: THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM AND AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROVIDE JOBS, STIMULATE GROWTH, AND PROVIDE NECESSARY PUBLIC FACILITIES

**Mr. BLATNIK.** Mr. Speaker, nearly 15 months ago the accelerated public works program came into existence when on September 14, 1962, our beloved late President Kennedy gave his signature to Public Law 87-658. One month later on October 14, 1962, the Congress approved and President Kennedy signed the bill appropriating the first funds for the implementation of this program.

Since then some 8,000 public works projects in more than 3,000 communities throughout the United States have been approved. As of September 1, 1963

3,320 of these projects had actually been started and 1,200 had already been completed.

By the end of August, 26,000 man months of labor had actually been worked on the site of these projects. When we consider that each on-site job creates another off-site job in the way of materials and services required for the project, this means that in the initial 10 months of the program 34,000 man-years of work were generated.

In my own hard-hit eighth Congressional District in northeast Minnesota, the accelerated public works program has had a tremendously popular reception and has been most effective in reducing unemployment and giving new hope to a sorely distressed area.

In needy communities, projects have been approved to construct hospital additions, nursing homes, sewage treatment plants, waterworks, and other vital sanitation facilities. Moreover, during the hard and bleak winter months of 1962-63, when unemployment reached depths that have not been seen since the depression days of the 1930's, accelerated public works funds kept hundreds of men off the welfare and relief rolls by giving them useful and productive jobs in the forests of northeastern Minnesota.

The response by the general public, not only in my district, but in hard-hit areas throughout the United States, to this program of necessary, useful public works has been most impressive. The unemployed men are grateful for this opportunity for constructive, gainful employment, and the communities are grateful for the new, long-needed, and long-awaited public facilities, the construction of which was made possible through the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me an excellent, comprehensive, painstaking summary of the operation of the accelerated public works program prepared by Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration. This statement was delivered at hearings conducted by the House Committee on Public Works on the accelerated public works program on October 15, 1963. I include in my remarks Dr. Hoeber's splendid statement:

The Public Works Acceleration Act was designed to bring the great economic potential of public works to bear upon the perplexing problems of those areas of the country which have lagged behind in the Nation's recovery from the recession of 1960-61. These are the areas of substantial unemployment, or underemployment, or economic underdevelopment, the areas of economic distress in the midst of the affluent society.

Participation in the public works acceleration program is limited, therefore, to the approximately 1,100 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or low family income designated by the Secretary of Commerce as "redevelopment areas" and additional approximately 200 labor markets designated by the Secretary of Labor as "areas of substantial unemployment." In the aggregate, these areas cover about one-third of the country, comprise about one-third of the total population, but contain almost one-half of the total number of unemployed or underemployed persons in the labor force.

The public works acceleration program has two principal purposes:

1. To provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in the eligible areas, and

2. To help these areas to become more conducive to industrial and commercial development through the improvement of their public facilities.

APW projects are designed to create jobs for the unemployed, but they must also serve an essential public need.

The Public Works Acceleration Act authorized the appropriation of up to $900 million; Congress appropriated the first $400 million on October 24, 1962, and another $450 million on May 17, 1963, for a total of $850 million.

The funds are appropriated to the President, to be allocated by him to the Federal agencies responsible—

(a) for the construction of Federal public works projects, referred to as direct Federal projects, and

(b) for programs authorizing Federal financial assistance to State and local public works projects, referred to as grant-in-aid projects.

The act imposes certain limitations upon the availability of funds:

1. Public works projects—both direct Federal and grant-in-aid must be located in eligible areas.

2. Direct Federal projects must have been previously authorized by Congress, either by item or by class.

3. States and local governments must increase their total public works expenditures during the fiscal year in which a project is initiated or accelerated by at least as much as they are required to contribute to the cost of the project.

4. No more than 10 percent of the funds may be made available to any one State.

5. At least one-third of the funds must be allocated to the rural areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act as so-called 5(b) areas.

6. Projects are eligible only if they can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time and substantially completed within a year after they are started.

7. Projects must meet an essential public need and contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment.

8. They must not be inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the physical and economic development of the area.

9. No funds may be used for any planning or construction of any school or educational facility.

For grants-in-aid to States and local communities the act provides a sliding scale of Federal contributions geared towards the economic need of the area. The higher the rate and duration of unemployment and the lower the median family income, the higher may be the Federal grant. In most areas the total of Federal contributions may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost, but in areas of special economic need the Federal contribution may go as high as 75 percent.

Immediately following passage of the act, the President, by Executive Order 11049, designated the Secretary of Commerce to assist him in carrying out the act. The Secretary of Commerce, in turn, assigned to the Area Redevelopment Administration responsibility for coordinating the public works acceleration program.

On September 24, 10 days after the act was signed, the Area Redevelopment Administrator issued to the Federal agencies with public works programs instructions for requesting and utilizing public works acceleration funds. These instructions spelled out in detail the procedures to be followed by the participating agencies in selecting and submitting to the Area Redevelopment Administration projects fulfilling all requirements of the act. They emphasized that basic responsibility for the selection and initiation of all projects rests with the Federal agencies normally responsibile for the respective programs and projects. They requested submission of three types of projects: (a) direct Federal works programs already authorized by Congress; (b) projects eligible under existing Federal grant-in-aid programs like the Hill-Burton Act and the Water Pollution Control Act; and (c) projects previously eligible for public facility loans under the Housing Act of 1954 as amended, and now made eligible for Federal grants under the new act.

The instructions were accompanied by a list of 1,129 economically distressed areas eligible as of September 8, 1962, for assistance under the act. Since then 65 areas have become ineligible because of improvement in their economic conditions and 233 areas have been newly designated, bringing the total to 1,297. This total consists of 141 5(a) areas and 937 5(b) areas (including 54 Indian reservations), designated by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Redevelopment Act and 219 labor market areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as labor surplus areas.

The 5(a) areas are those with substantial and persistent unemployment, mostly small- or medium-sized urban areas.

The 5(b) areas are those with low income, low farm income, very small areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, and the Indian reservations. The 5(b) areas are mostly rural areas.

The labor surplus areas are mostly larger metropolitan labor markets with 6 percent or more of the work force unemployed for at least 9 out of the last 12 months.

Up-to-date lists of eligible areas are published periodically by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

By Executive Order No. 11049, the President has also delegated to the Secretary of Commerce the authority to issue rules, regulations, and procedures to carry out section 3 of the act.

After consultation with the participating agencies, such rules and regulations were issued on October 24, and published in the Federal Register on November 14.

The following are the most important provisions contained in these rules and regulations:

Acceleration or initiation of a project "within a reasonably short period of time" was interpreted to mean that preference will be given to those projects which can be undertaken immediately, and that with regard to all projects there must be reasonable assurance that on-site work will start within 120 days after funds are obligated.

The requirement of the act that "a substantial portion" of a project must be completed within 12 months was interpreted to mean that more than one-half of it must be completed within 12 months from the first employment of on-site labor.

In accordance with the directions given by the President, the regulations prescribed that contractors and subcontractors for these projects are required to employ qualified persons residing regularly in the area, except where such persons are not available, or where a lawful collective bargaining contract requires the contractor to offer employment to present or former employees. However, the number of employees in the latter category may in no event exceed 20 percent.

The act provides that, notwithstanding any provision in existing grant-in-aid programs limiting grants to less than 50 percent, grants may be made under the Public Works Acceleration Act which will bring the total of Federal contributions up to 50 percent of the cost of the project, or up to as much as 75 percent if the applicant does not have economic and financial capacity to assume all of the additional financial obligations required.

The regulations established firm and objective criteria for relating grants above 50 percent to "economic and financial capacity."

Areas with median family incomes between $1,700 and $1,800 or twice the national unemployment rate for 3 of the last 4 years are eligible for 58 percent grants. There are now 72 such areas.

Areas with median family incomes between $1,600 and $1,700 or twice the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 66 percent grants. There are now 112 such areas.

Areas with median family incomes under $1,600 or three times the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 75 percent grants. There are now 161 such areas, including the 54 Indian Reservations.

An up-to-date list of "Maximum grants-in-aid for eligible areas" is also published periodically by ARA.

Finally, the regulations prescribed that no grants may be made for projects undertaken principally for the purpose of relocating a commercial or industrial plant from one area to another.

These are the most important provisions of the rules and regulations.

In accordance with the directions contained in the conference report on the appropriation bill, all participating agencies were advised that no funds would be made available for all-Federal projects with costs in excess of $400,000, and that preference would be given to grant-in-aid projects of States and local communities.

Lists of direct Federal projects eligible for Accelerated Public Works funds are prepared by the participating agencies which have programs and projects previously authorized by Congress.

Applications for grant-in-aid projects are filed with and reviewed by the Federal agencies which administer the program under which the project is authorized like, for example, the Hill-Burton and water pollution control programs of the Public Health Service and the community facilities loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Theirs is the primary responsibility for determining whether the project is technically feasible and legally eligible. This includes the all-important responsibility for reviewing the cost estimates on which the grants are based. They are also responsible for taking all necessary steps to assure that all projects adhere carefully to the requirements of the act.

Both the direct Federal projects and the grant-in-aid projects are then submitted to the Area Redevelopment Administration for final clearance.

The act provides that adequate consideration must be given to the relative needs of eligible areas. To carry out this provision of the act, ARA developed a "fair share formula" which assured, by and large, the allocation of funds in direct proportion to the number of unemployed in the eligible area. This basic formula—distribution of the funds in proportion to the number of unemployed—was adjusted to comply with the statutory provisions that no State may receive more than 10 percent of all funds, and that no less than $300 million of the $900 million authorized must be allocated to the 5(b) areas.

At the time Congress passed the second appropriation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the two principal grant-in-aid agencies, had on hand applications far in excess of the amount that could be allocated to them from this new appropriation.

ARA advised, therefore, these two agencies to select projects in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Applications received before January 24, 1963, the date on which these agencies discontinued processing of further applications, would receive first consideration.

2. Applications filed after January 24 would receive consideration:

(a) if they were from areas which are eligible for grants-in-aid of over 50 percent;

(b) if they were from areas which had received no projects from the original $400 million appropriation;

(c) if the applications were from areas newly designated as eligible;

(d) if they were from areas where applications filed before January 24 were not sufficient to balance the program both geographically and functionally; and

(e) if they would meet an essential public need of the area better than applications which had been filed earlier.

ARA publishes monthly a directory of all approved projects. This record will show that the relative needs of the eligible areas have been given every possible consideration, and that every effort has been made to balance the program both functionally and geographically.

The $850 million appropriated by the Congress in October 1962 and May 1963 have been allocated by the President to 12 participating agencies. In order to get the program underway quickly, approximately 25 percent of the first appropriation of $400 million was allocated for direct Federal projects of such agencies as the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the National Park Service, the Bureaus of Indian Affairs, Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads in the Commerce Department. These are the agencies which had hundreds of projects on the shelf ready to go immediately, and suitable for construction during the winter months.

When the Congress acted in May on the second appropriation of $450 million, it limited the direct Federal projects to those dealing with the preservation of forests under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior. Consequently the President allocated only 10 percent of this second appropriation to direct Federal projects.

In accordance with the wishes expressed by the Congress in both Appropriation Acts, that preference be given to projects requiring local matching funds, the bulk of the funds, almost $700 million or 80 percent of the $850 million was allocated to the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants-in-aid to States and local communities.

As directed by the Congress, the cost of administering this program has been held to the barest minimum. Out of the $850 million appropriated, the President allocated only $6.8 million for administrative expenses. This is less than 1 percent of the funds appropriated so far.

Except for relatively small amounts retained by the agencies as reserves against such inevitable contingencies as overruns on bids, virtually all of the $850 million have now been committed to specific projects.

Funds have now been committed to about 8,000 projects in more than 3,000 communities in over 1,100 of the 1,300 eligible areas. Projects have been approved in 1,343 of the 1,576 eligible counties.

The largest amount, about 48 percent, has been allocated to water and sewer projects. Hospitals and health facilities will receive 13 percent, street and road improvements 13 percent, public buildings 9 percent, conservation measures 7 percent, recreational facilities 4 percent.

Costs per man-year vary from $5,000 for such relatively simple projects as the improvement of forest timber stands to $25,000 for heavy construction projects requiring a great deal in materials and equipment.

What all the projects have in common is that they could not have been undertaken this year, or next year, or, not at all without the Accelerated Public Works program.

Now that the first year of Public Works Acceleration is drawing to a close, these are the results achieved so far, the goals which are clearly within reach, and the problems which still remain:

1. At the end of August 3,320 different projects had actually been started and 1,195 of them had already been completed.

2. During the first 10 months of the program—and these include the months when it was just getting underway—an average of more than 20,600 people per month were employed on the sites of these projects, and it may be safely estimated that at least the same number, another 20,600, were employed off-site producing the materials and supplies and providing the services which go into these projects. This adds up to a total average monthly employment for the first 10 months of 41,000 people.

3. During August, the last month for which figures are available, on-site employment reached over 44,000. Including off-site employment, this adds up to 88,000 jobs during August.

4. Since many of the projects financed from the first appropriation will still be under construction early next year, when most of the second appropriation projects will get underway, on-site employment may be expected to reach a peak of over 100,000, and on-site and off-site employment combined will reach a peak of over 200,000.

5. Careful estimates indicate that over the period of 2 to 2½ years it will take to complete all 8,000 projects the program will generate more than 220,000 man-years of on-site and off-site employment. This is the equivalent of 11 percent of the unemployed in the eligible areas.

6. Together with local matching funds the program will channel over $1½ billion into the acceleration of public improvements in economically distressed areas of the country. This will make an appreciable dent into the large backlog of urgently needed facilities which has accumulated over the years.

To continue on a directly related subject, on May 1, 1961, our late beloved President Kennedy signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27, one of the first pieces of major legislation acted on by the 87th Congress and one of the first steps of the New Frontier to reduce unemployment and improve the Nation's general economy. That law established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, armed with authority to provide industrial loans to both urban and rural areas, public facilities loans and grants, funds for technical assistance grants, and worker retraining benefits in areas of persistently high unemployment. Later that same year appropriations were made to enable the agency to get underway.

For more than a decade hundreds of urban and rural communities throughout the United States had been experiencing persistent and substantial unemployment and underemployment. Those serious conditions prevailed even during general economic improvement in the Nation. The fact that certain areas of the country remained in a distressed condition even while other parts of the

Nation enjoyed relative prosperity, emphasized the need for a program to go beyond a general attack on unemployment and slow economic growth. The Nation needed the ARA program of pinpointed economic relief. The new program aimed directly at those specific areas of economic distress to provide relief and hope to the specific case of economic decline and to provide such relief in a manner that would fully utilize all the human and material resources available in the area.

In enacting the area redevelopment program, the Congress rejected the view that local economic decline should be of concern only to those local areas. Congress accepted the position that the entire national community must rally to the support and rehabilitation of any one of its members distressed by persistent and substantial economic depression. Congress accepted the view that sustained high unemployment rates in urban areas and serious rural poverty are in themselves detrimental and costly to the entire national welfare.

In my own hard-hit area of northeastern Minnesota, where in some places unemployment runs as high as 30 percent and in one community up to 48 percent, the ARA program is working effectively to help communities find a solution to their economic ills. New industries have been created from a simple sawmill operation to a highly complex precision machine tool industry. Technical assistance grants have made possible more effective and comprehensive studies of our material resources and potentialities. Worker retraining funds have paved the way for new jobs for men dislocated by technological unemployment. In the Duluth area alone, ARA retraining programs have generated new jobs for men once hopelessly unemployed, creating an annual payroll of $2 million.

There is much yet to be accomplished but the goals are clearly defined and the methods have been carefully worked out. Because of ARA many people can now look forward to a brighter future and new hope.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include with my remarks an excellent and thorough discussion of the need for the Area Development Act presented to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that able and distinguished legislator and my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas, Wright Patman. I also include with my remarks a series of specific answers to the various criticisms of ARA that have been made from time to time:

### WHY ARA IS NEEDED

The Area Redevelopment Act was the first major piece of legislation ever passed by the Congress as an attempt to meet head-on the problem of pockets of chronic unemployment. And unless the application for a rule for S. 1163 now pending before the Committee on Rules is favorably considered, and unless this bill is then passed by this House, this first attempt at legislation dealing directly with the problems of structural unemployment, which took the form of Public Law 87-27, will have been largely in vain, for it will not have been given the full opportunity for trial which the Congress intended at the time of its passage.

The reasons for the economically depressed conditions of these areas are by now well known. They include changes in demand for products, new and improved methods of production which reduce the need for manpower, changes in the location of industrial and commercial operations because of mergers, market conditions, relocations, and the like, and the depletion of, or changes in the demand for, certain natural resources. These primary changes have been accompanied by resulting conditions which further hamper economic development, such as a reduced availability of local capital for investment or expansion, and increasing deficiencies in manpower skills, including those necessary for new operations and the attraction of new industry. The most obvious example is, of course, the coal mining areas of the Appalachian region, where in many cases increasing demand and increasing output per man-day have decreased employment in that industry by 90 percent or more. It is not the fault of the workers who have been thrown out of work that other fuels have been substituted for coal or that more efficient methods of production have been devised, but the outcome is nevertheless that they are without jobs and without hope of ever regaining them.

In other geographic areas, primary natural resources have been exhausted, and the industry has simply moved out, leaving the population without work. Examples of this plight can be seen in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and in sections of New Hampshire and Maine, where huge timber companies have cut down existing trees and moved out, leaving the land desolate and the population stranded.

In other cases unforeseen changes have been the cause of an area's economic downfall. For example, an increase in the temperature of the Atlantic Ocean caused a deterioration in the fishing industry on the east coast, from which these areas have not yet recovered. And the hat and glove and woolen industries have all suffered because of changes in fashion, new synthetic fabrics, and better methods of heating. Carpeting is also going out of fashion; waxed, natural wood flooring is now the thing to have. The result is that the garment and woolen and rug industries of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and of most of the other textile regions of the country, have been severely affected.

But while the mining and textile industries may have been the hardest hit, the specter of automation, and more recently of cybernation, continues to haunt almost every industry, and even more the farming occupations which have traditionally employed so much of the unskilled labor force. Fewer people each year are needed to produce and harvest crops.

### UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN RURAL AREAS IS NO LESS A PROBLEM THAN UNEMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRIAL AREAS

Some of those who criticized and condemned the ARA program have done so for the reason that this program is available to the people of small towns and rural areas of the United States. For some strange reason, these critics seem to think the rural areas really do not have an economic problem and in any case the people in these areas somehow don't count. Let them move, they say.

Well, millions of families in the farm and small town areas have been moving. Over the past 20 years an average of 1 million people a year have migrated from these areas into the cities and the suburbs of the cities. This migration brings about some partial solution to the fuel problems of these areas, of course. But migration is far from a complete solution.

Senator Douglas has quoted Adam Smith as saying that "man of all commodities is the most difficult to be transported." This is just as true today as it was in Adam Smith's day. People have strong ties to the local communities which they cannot easily break. No matter how strong the economic pressures, a great many families are going to stay home and try to make the best of it. To a certain extent, we have got to bring economic opportunities to the people or they will not have economic opportunities.

With the resultant reduction in the number of people living on farms, employment opportunities have likewise shrunk in the small towns and villages where economic activity has been organized on services to the farm families.

In those areas where migration is high and prolonged, inevitably large percentages of unemployed and substantially underemployed workers remain in the community despite extremes of economic pressures. Family and other ties to the local community are not easily broken. Thus, the proposal sometimes made that the rural counties should be eliminated from the ARA program simply because they are "rural" overlooks one of the most serious economic problems of our times. It seems evident that more problems would be created than solved if substantially all of the population of the Nation piled up in the great cities. In terms of total cost to the Nation, it is frequently a more efficient use of material and human resources to help develop new economic activity in the distressed community than it is to have the population move into the great urban areas.

The costs of moving are high, and there is no certainty, especially for those whose skills are no longer required, of finding employment. Those who did move often did not find jobs, and crime, delinquency, and frustration were frequently the result. Migration to the cities is also costly from a national point of view because of the tremendous social and economic investments which have already been made in the rural communities. In these communities such facilities as water and sewer systems, electrification, telephone service, schools, public safety buildings, parks and recreation centers, and similar facilities already exist. These facilities would have to be duplicated if the population moves elsewhere. Hence these communities, and particularly the rural communities which long have suffered from underemployment, continue to struggle along. But the situation in the 1950's was becoming worse, and more and more people within these areas were becoming unemployed; and the economic blight of these communities was beginning to act like a cancer on the whole economy.

### THE REAL NATIONAL SCANDAL IS UNEMPLOYMENT

If there was any national scandal involved, it was in the fact that these communities were left to continue to struggle alone for more than 6 years after the problem was fully recognized before the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, despite two previous attempts by the Congress to pass the bill. During these 6 or more years, American workmen were unable to find work, and whole communities had to eke out their subsistence through inadequate part-time employment and public welfare assistance. Family savings were used up, the tax base was depressed, community facilities deteriorated, and hope for the future within these communities in this land of opportunity dwindled to nothingness.

### TWO HUNDRED PERCENT PROFIT TO UNITED STATES ON "SEED CORN" MONEY

Lone Star Steel at Lone Star, Tex., could not have been built without a Federal loan—RFC. Now the company has been refinanced with private capital, after paying back most of the loan, and the Government has its money back plus interest. Furthermore, the company, its employees, contractors and dealers, have paid twice as much in Federal taxes as the original loan to Lone Star Steel, so that the Government has gotten a 200 percent profit in taxes and all its money back. What is more important, Texas and the Nation have had more productive jobs, more profit opportunities for both the company and thousands of suppliers and contractors in and out of Texas. The Nation has produced more and thus enjoyed a higher standard of living.

Billions of dollars were spent, and are being spent, by our six international agencies, three of which operate entirely on money provided by American taxpayers. And in the other three, we are the major contributor. They made loans for industrial and commercial expansion all over the globe, except in the Iron Curtain countries, but not a single dollar was available for our American citizens. Now I am not against foreign aid, and I have voted for it on many an occasion. But during these years some of us began to wonder why we should not be doing at least a fraction as much for the economically depressed urban centers and rural communities of our Nation as we were doing for the nations abroad.

### THE ARA PROVIDES "SEED CORN" LOANS

The result was the Area Redevelopment Act, which provided essentially a business loan program to help our areas of substantial and persistent unemployment obtain their fair share of the Nation's future economic growth. No other program was specifically set up to operate on the basis of unemployment criteria or to make loans primarily on employment effect. The program provided that more than $3 out of every $4 would be repaid with interest, and that these funds would not be provided where private funds were available. For the most part, this program would not "cost" anything, since the loans would be repaid, and it was far cheaper than doing nothing. We recognized at the time the act was passed that it was inadequate, even as far as it went; and no one who was acquainted with the problems of structural unemployment ever thought it would provide the whole solution. But it was a beginning, and it had to be done. The choice was really between pouring more and more dollars into unemployment compensation and welfare payments without any return and without ever getting at the root of the problem—and thus allowing our communities to further deteriorate—or of providing a means for them to help themselves get back on the road to economic recovery. For the Federal Government to do nothing was unthinkable.

The function of ARA is to provide seed corn money to economically disadvantaged areas to enable them to have a share in the growth which we all confidently predict. Let me reiterate a personal example which I have frequently used in the past. Years ago I succeeded in getting a steel mill constructed in my area of the country. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or RFC, put up $75 million or more in order to construct the mill. The big steel mills did not want it. They said every devastating thing about it that they could think of and tried to discourage people from going into it. But the RFC investigated the matter and said that it was all right. They put up the money, and the Government got every dollar of its money back with interest, along with taxes and other benefits which exceeded many times the cost of the project.

ARA, like RFC, is not a matter of the Government taking over industry or of interfering in private enterprises. Each project is begun by local initiative, and the Government just provides some of the money to help it get off the ground. That is what seed corn money is for. It is giving the people an opportunity to do something for their own community which they could not do otherwise, in order to help the community get back on its feet socially and economically.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, I am told, is reliving the experiences of RFC days. It is receiving applications, for example, for the construction of steel mills and similar projects in other highly competitive industries. And many of these applications are being bitterly opposed by existing businesses. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that those who were assisted during the war by defense contracts and after the war by RFC, and at various other times by various other Government programs, will not want to deny to others the benefits they were able to obtain for themselves. Our Nation is too great and our economy too prosperous for those who have attained wealth to attempt to oppose those who are only trying to get started. If ARA is a moral issue, I think the people of this country will readily recognize where the morality lies.

### COUNTRY NEEDS ARA

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this country needs the area redevelopment program because the people of this country need it, especially the millions of people in our redevelopment areas who had all but lost hope before ARA appeared on the scene. It is up to this Congress to give the people of this country what they need and are entitled to by giving them a means to help themselves obtain a decent standard of living. It is up to this Congress to give the area redevelopment program a fair chance to show what it can do, rather than to kill it almost before it gets off the ground. We cannot lose sight of the fact that we are talking about a program to help American workers, and that ARA is the only program they have got to help them solve their problems. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee will give the ARA bill the rule it needs before too much more time has elapsed and the program has begun to falter. In view of the billions of dollars we spend on foreign aid, justice and morality demand that we do a little something—at least—for the people at home.

But more than this, putting our unemployed and underemployed back to work is good economics. It is good for the whole country.

---

### CHARGE

ARA hasn't used up its current authorizations. Why appropriate more money for ARA when it hasn't used up more than 25 percent of its present authorizations? They don't need more money and can get along without additional funds.

### ANSWER

For industrial and commercial loans ARA has already approved or has on hand approvable projects totaling $59 million more than authorized.

For public facility grants, Congress has already appropriated the full amount authorized and cannot appropriate additional amounts until additional authorizations are provided.

Therefore, unless Congress approves these additional authorizations, ARA cannot approve any additional public facility grant projects, and cannot accept for processing any additional projects for industrial or commercial facilities.

### CHARGE

ARA doesn't relieve unemployment. Out of a total national unemployment of 4 million, ARA only claims to have created 40,000 jobs. This is only 1 percent of the total. ARA is a drop in the bucket and doesn't help relieve unemployment.

### ANSWER

ARA is not designed to relieve national unemployment except indirectly. It is much fairer to compare ARA's employment record with unemployment in ARA designated areas. For instance, it is estimated that 700,000 jobs are needed to reduce the 1.3 million unemployment figure in ARA areas down to 4 percent. Therefore, the 700,000 job figure ought to be the ARA goal.

ARA projects are not quickly put together. They are well planned and thoroughly studied before approval. Therefore, it is only in the last few months that projects have started coming out of the pipeline, and it takes several months afterwards—while plants are being constructed—before people go to work. Therefore, it is much fairer to use the figure of almost 70,000 direct and indirect jobs to be created by ARA-approved projects.

Measured by this criteria, ARA is already 10 percent toward its goal.

If you put together the 135,000 direct and indirect jobs to be created under the present authorization with the 250,000 direct and indirect jobs possible under the proposed increases, the total comes to 385,000, more than half the 700,000 needed to bring distressed area unemployment down to 4 percent.

NOTE.—Each direct job produces 0.6 indirect job.

### CHARGE

ARA isn't very important. The way to cure unemployment is to cut taxes. Area redevelopment is of minimal economic importance, especially when total economic activity is lagging. The way to get jobs in redevelopment areas is to cut taxes, help business expand, and prevent deficits.

### ANSWER

The President's tax program is important and ARA will be able to do more when the economy is moving forward more rapidly. But ARA has already approved projects which will be responsible for close to 70,000 direct and indirect new jobs. Anticipated direct and indirect new jobs from the balance of the present authorization and from the proposed new authorization will bring this total to 385,000. Why delay a program which will create a considerable number of jobs, pays for itself, and relieves human distress?

Even when the economy is moving forward rapidly, pockets fall behind. This happened during the fifties's. Rapid economic change produces dislocations and it is important to have machinery working to relieve the effects of such dislocations.

### CHARGE

Duplication of existing programs. We don't need ARA. CFA and HEW make loans and grants for water and sewer. APW provides grants for many types of community facilities. SBA makes small business loans. This program just duplicates existing programs.

### ANSWER

Legally, ARA may not approve projects which can be handled under existing programs. Therefore, ARA is not a duplication, but a place where communities who desperately need help can come to get help which is not available anywhere else.

It supplements existing public and private programs.

It does not duplicate them.

### CHARGE

ARA uses no judgment in making decisions.

### ANSWER

Under the terms of the act there are a number of preliminary conditions that have to be fulfilled before any Federal financial assistance can be extended to a distressed area. The conditions are:

First. Other Federal and State agencies must provide the unemployment and income data which the Area Redevelopment Administration will use in designating areas eligible for Federal assistance. Although unemployment data were available for many urban areas, special studies were required to establish the eligibility of many other areas, particularly the rural areas, for assistance.

Second. After an area has been designated, the local community must establish a broadly based local organization representing a cross section of all elements of the community to assess the economic conditions of that area and to act as the local coordinator for redevelopment activities.

Third. The local development group must prepare an overall economic development program (OEDP) for that area; that is, a local plan of action for creating new jobs in that area. The OEDP describes the economic characteristics of the area, assesses the problems which the area faces in generating new industrial and commercial activity, states the potential for economic growth in that area, and on the basis of that information maps out a program to regenerate economic growth and create new employment opportunities in the local community.

Fourth. The OEDP must be approved by the appropriate State redevelopment agency.

Fifth. The OEDP must be reviewed and approved by the Area Redevelopment Administration before any project can be approved for Federal assistance in that area.

Sixth. An application for assistance for a specific project must receive State or local approval prior to its submission to the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Seventh. A State or local agency must agree to supply the local 10 percent project cost contribution required by section 6 (b)(9)(B) of the act.

Eighth. The Area Redevelopment Administration must review the project application for general compliance with the act prior to its submission to a "delegate" Federal agency for investigation.

Ninth. After receipt by ARA of the delegate agency's recommendations in regard to the particular project, ARA must make the final determination either by approving or disapproving the assistance requested.

Tenth. If approved, the terms of the loan or grant agreement must be complied with before any ARA funds can be disbursed. For instance, any local fund-raising drives, bond issue referendums, or stock subscription efforts must have been completed, and in the case of business loans, adequate working capital must have been secured.

Before receiving a loan application, ARA requires local bank participation and community investment, as well as the individual businessman's own investment.

After that, other agencies, including a State government office must pass on the application, before submitting to ARA.

Then ARA itself examines the application and solicits the expert advice of technical and economic authorities, such as the other parts of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Interior.

In most cases, ARA will request special feasibility studies as supporting material for applications.

After all this screening, ARA then forwards the application with pertinent documents to SBA for a virtually final microscopic financial, technical, and legal detailed investigation (CFA in the case of public facility projects), which then is the basis for a recommendation to ARA to approve or decline the project.

If ARA were as poorly administered as has been alleged by opponents of the bill, it would not proceed as described above.

Second, and equally important, it would not have a record of nearly 400 applications turned down for one reason or another:

| | |
|---|---|
| Projects transferred to other agencies | 29 |
| Projects withdrawn or removed as inactive | 202 |
| Projects denied as unsound or not eligible under the act | 142 |
| Total (as of June 13, 1963) | 373 |

### CHARGE

Too much ARA money is going to nonurban areas.

### ANSWER

First, the ARA Act sets limits—ceilings—on how much loan money can be made to both nonurban (5b) areas and urban (5a) areas:

| Present ceiling: | *Million* |
|---|---|
| Nonurban areas | $100 |
| Urban areas | 100 |

As of June 13, 1963, ARA had approved and pending nonurban industrial-commercial loans totaling $178 million.

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| Already approved | $42.5 |
| Being processed | 135.8 |

As of June 13, 1963, urban loans approved and being processed total $121 million.

| | *Million* |
|---|---|
| Already approved | $27 |
| Being processed | 94 |

Without accepting any more applications, ARA will be forced to cancel—if the bill is not passed—$78 million in nonurban loans (about 26,000 direct jobs); and $21 million in urban loans (about 7,000 direct jobs).

If the bill is passed, rural areas will still have a ceiling of $250 million in industrial-commercial loans—the same as urban areas.

The fact that at the present time, rural areas have approved and pending projects amounting to more than those in urban areas only means that rural areas have been quicker to respond and more able to stimulate interest and action to use ARA's program. Much of it is a result of pre-existing education programs by USDA.

As for urban areas, on the basis of applications and approvals from these areas over the past 6 months, ARA has estimated that it will have received a total of $396 million by June 30, 1965—of which it conservatively estimates final approval of $214 million, which is still $114 million more than the present ceiling would allow for. In jobs, this $114 million means 38,000 direct jobs (not counting construction and indirect employment).

### CHARGE

ARA adds to deficits. We can't spend our way into prosperity. We have to cut Government expenditures. ARA is just another spending program. It takes money out of the economy by forcing an increase in taxes.

### ANSWER

ARA represents not spending, but an investment. Every dollar disbursed by ARA comes back many times in the form of increased taxes on the profits of the businesses helped, increased taxes on the incomes of those who get jobs, and reduced unemployment compensation and welfare benefits. In addition, 75 percent of ARA disbursements are loans repayable with interest.

### CHARGE

Since ARA's share in all its projects amounts to only 47 percent of all the dollars invested in those projects, it should claim only 47 percent of all the jobs it claims that the agency has helped to create.

### ANSWER

This is the weirdest example of sophism yet displayed in the attack on ARA.

ARA is in existence to make possible job-creating businesses which otherwise cannot obtain all the investment capital required to make a business idea become real.

Each applicant for an ARA loan must provide documentary proof of his inability to obtain sufficient loan funds from appropriate private lending sources.

ARA would be glad to provide evidence from the 191 companies with already approved loans and from the 313 companies whose loans are being processed, to the effect that without ARA participation (maximum of 65 percent of the total project costs), they would not have any new or expanded businesses.

It is true that such enterprises cannot thrive by ARA alone, but could they exist without it?

### CHARGE

ARA is in conflict with free enterprise system.

ARA lures businesses and industries into redevelopment areas, finances private inefficient businessmen to compete with taxpaying businesses, and is in conflict with the time-honored characteristic of a free society which promotes vigor and initiative.

### ANSWER

ARA is based on the private enterprise profitmaking system. It helps develop efficient and capable businessmen in areas where they did not exist before. The businesses it helps finance pay taxes. It insists on local initiative. Nothing happens unless local people get together and decide they want help and unless a business can be established or expanded.

In short, ARA promotes and strengthens the free enterprise system and local initiative. It prevents concentrations of population and economic power by making it possible to disperse economic expansion.

### CHARGE

ARA spends too much per job. Some of these ARA projects cost $277,000 per new job. Others cost $30,000 or $40,000 per new job. This is too much. SBA only costs about $2,500 per new job.

### ANSWER

The average Federal investment per job for all ARA projects is only about $2,700. This includes only direct jobs and is a conservative estimate based only on jobs directly related to the projects. In many cases, there are a considerable number of indirect jobs resulting from increased supplies of raw materials, such as coal, timber, etc., increased transportation jobs, etc.

This is not truly a cost since most of this is disbursed in the form of loans repayable with interest.

The SBA figures are for their development loan company program only. Since this program is limited to financing of buildings only, it should be expected to have a lower cost per job ratio than ARA.

### CHARGE

ARA makes weak loans. Secretary Hodges admitted in his testimony that ARA makes loans which other agencies wouldn't even handle. That is because ARA operated without a knowledge of "basic business economics." Its cheap loans make it possible for inefficient producers to get into the market.

### ANSWER

Of course, ARA takes greater risks than other private or public lending agencies.

**If loans are approvable by banks or Government lending agencies, they are not eligible for ARA consideration.**

**Someone has to take the risks to help distressed areas.**

**A frequent complaint about many Government lending programs is "You have to prove you don't need the money before they'll lend it to you." The whole point of the ARA program is to lend the money to people who need it.**

**ARA was created to fill a void for intermediate financing—that is, long-term, nonequity financing. Unless ARA is willing to take risks, it will not be able to do the job it was created to do.**

**CHARGE**

**ARA is making no significant effort to initiate and support a comprehensive program to redevelop the economy of chronically distressed areas.**

**ANSWER**

**1. ARA is not a central planning agency, imposing Washington-concocted blueprints on local communities and regions. Usually, leftwing extremists have criticized ARA for not trying to be such a bureau, so it seems strange for conservative critics to raise the same attack.**

**Instead, as the letter and the spirit of the act requires, each designated area may—may—choose to participate in the ARA program by:**

**(a) Organizing a local committee of people representing significant economic and civic groupings in the local area interested in bettering the economic conditions of that area;**

**(b) Writing up a local "overall economic development program" (OEDP), consisting of the reasons for the area's decline, its potentials re natural and human resources, and a program of action to improve the area; and**

**(c) Drawing upon the technical and professional resources of the State government, chambers of commerce, etc., including universities, to help them draw up a truly locally conceived comprehensive economic development program.**

**2. In one case, however, the local areas and the several States encompassing what is defined as the "Appalachian" region have banded together and have established an intimate working relationship with ARA and other Federal agencies to jointly design a bold and imaginative "total" program of economic redevelopment for that extensive region (including all of West Virginia, and parts of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, primarily). By January 1, 1964, this State-Federal team effort is expected to present the President with a detailed program statement of practical approaches to private and public actions to stimulate the more rapid economic development of the Appalachian region.**

**But this is being done only because the local citizens and authorities, after more than 18 months of preparation, have requested ARA to coordinate such effort.**

---

## IS NATO BREAKING UP?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of history broods over Western Europe and calls up from the tomb of the past an awesome specter. It is the wraith of nationalism which, it had been hoped, was propitiated by the human sacrifices of two universal wars and laid to eternal rest. Consider the record. In A.D. 843 the world state established by Charlemagne was divided into parts which formed the nuclei of modern European states. Since that date there has scarcely been an hour which was not shadowed by wars or rumors of wars. They were wars of dynastic ambition, wars of religious antagonism, wars of colonial aggression, or, in more recent times, wars of industrial rivalry. They nearly wrecked Western civilization time after time, and the last time they pushed civilization well over the brink of chaos. An intense nationalism is widely accused as the motivating cause of it all. The remedy proposed for the task of revitalizing and unifying Europe was NATO. Today new discords break out over the Continent, and the United States, in particular, is haunted by the fear that they are but the preludes to new contentions escalating eventually into new wars.

But before we come to the conclusion that history justifies the fears, let us look a little further into the record. Way back before the Christian era, history moved across the Hellespont, and established a home in Europe. The Greeks developed the theory that freemen operating free institutions offered the best promise of human progress. The promise was fulfilled. Since that date, progress in Europe has been steady and persistent, while Asia and Africa, where civilization seems to have been born, have either stagnated or declined. History can find little to note or to remember except the contributions of Westerners. In free societies learning has advanced apace, and out of it has branched the codes of public morality, the systems of government, and the technical competence which satisfies the needs of men. No competing theory of the organization of human relationships, ranging all the way from absolutism to anarchy, has been able to match it. The East remained the spawning ground of life in the semblance of the human. Out of the East, from time to time, millions have erupted, led on by misery and by envy of the West. Their attacks have failed. The last serious threat was beaten back on the plains of Tours in the century before Charlemagne.

Today it is evident that only free societies can solve the economic and social problems whose solution furnishes the key to political stability. Competing systems have not even been able to feed themselves, much less to build up the mechanical superiority necessary to successful aggression.

This is a long introduction to what I want to say, but not needless, in view of my reasons for saying it. I have a growing conviction regarding conditions in Western Europe, and that conviction is based partly on the facts which I have just recited. The occasion for trying to put the conviction into words which are understandable and possibly credible has been opened up by some recent incidents, such as these.

I have recently attended several meetings in which the State Department has just completed a series of representations regarding the European situation to Members of Congress. These representations were presented by experts in various sectors of the field, men in close touch with economic, military, and political developments in the areas which they discussed. It was their purpose to present a candid camera image, a picture produced by the unfiltered photographic lens, and not by some impressionistic painter. The substance of their disclosures is as follows:

There is much political ferment in Europe. Control of government has passed from one political party to another, or from one head of state to another, on a rather dismaying number of occasions. Other changes are imminent. The systems of political parties in Europe is for the most part incomprehensible, that is, to citizens of the United States. Even the names of the parties are confusing. The objectives of the various groups relate to methods of dealing with internal problems, and not to broad foreign policies. It would be quite erroneous to believe that any of these groups minimize the necessity of a common front against external aggression, or of concerted action to solve economic problems, or of continued dependence on the nuclear shield of the United States. The recovery of Western Europe has advanced so far that they feel able to focus their attention on peculiar local conditions. It is not a question of what to do, but of how to do it. The economies of all these countries are thriving and prosperous. For the first time in a good many years they are producing more than they can consume. Many of their local problems rise from attempts to dispose of their surplus profitably. Changes in government occur, but they mean as much, or as little, as do changes in the American Presidency. There is a keen awareness of the existence of various conflicting interests, and an equal awareness that the conflicts must be resolved. A number of groups are working on means of accommodating antagonistic aspirations. These groups are working without unnecessary publicity, and they are hopefully drawing the Continent closer together. Full consideration is given to the legitimate claims of the various groups. The Common Market is an objective toward which most nations and most parties look with hope. Cooperation, and not strife, is the universal aim.

The details of this picture are the more credible to me for the very simple reason that they confirm my impressions received from personal observation last September. A number of the Members of Congress toured Europe from Turkey in the south to the far northern reaches of Norway. The principal purpose of the tour was to inspect military installations of the United States and their allies. As it turned out, there was opportunity to meet and talk to not only military personnel, that of the United States and of the Allied Nations, but also to a large number of leaders in Government and in business, and to the man in the street. It was amazing how seldom an interpreter was needed. More amazing were the signs we saw, signs of bursting energy, enthusiastic cooperation, confident assurance of a bright future. We could not have been deluded purposely. Too many of the people we talked to were met by chance. They could not have been planted where they were for purposes of propaganda. Admittedly, we had neither the professional skill nor the time to take a full sampling of public opinion in Europe, but it is not necessary to eat the whole cake to find out what is in it. A small slice will generally show what it is made of. Consequently I do not find it hard to give full credit to the appraisals made by the State Department for our information.

Still another matter adds some confirmation to my views. As the funeral cortege of our late President Kennedy moved through the streets of Washington a few days ago, it was graced by the presence of high representatives of more than a hundred nations. Nothing like it has ever been seen on the North American continent before; so far as I know, no such outpouring has ever been seen anywhere. Much of it was a tribute to a leader who was admired and respected by more people than we had previously believed. It was he on whom they had depended to translate their fondest hopes into reality, and his loss was an anguishing blow. But it now appears that part of their reasons for dropping their own affairs and speeding thousands of miles on a day's notice was concern for their own future. Here was a change in government more hasty and more violent than any that had occurred in Europe in recent years. Did it mean a radical change in the foreign policy of the United States? Our visitors had to see for themselves, and each sought a moment with the new President in the hope that he could gain some reassurance.

If we worry about the adherence of European nations to the Western alliance, it is somewhat of a shock to us to realize that they worry even more about our adherence to it. After all, they can read history too. Ever since 1776 we have gloried in our isolation. Once, during the confused years, we found it expedient to go to the defense of what we considered to be our interests, and we intruded in the affairs of Europe. Then, on slight excuse, we washed our hands of the whole affair, and retired into our splendid isolation. In a sense, we betrayed them in their hour of need, and contributed to the confusion which brought on a second world conflict. At least, this view of the matter might be pardoned in Europeans. Was our attachment to the alliance any less strong than theirs? History says, "yes."

When we judge the motives of others, we should, if possible, look at things through their eyes. A European looking across the Atlantic at America is almost bound to be confused. He sees Texans fighting for oil, Californians fighting for water, New Yorkers fighting for finance, and everybody fighting over tax cuts and civil rights. How soon will the big explosion come, he ponders. Some 180 years ago, 13 "sovereign" States set up a Nation which they called these United States. In the interval, 37 more sovereign States have been added. And we are still "these" United States, for many practical purposes. We become one united Nation at specific times for specific purposes. A few unwary people who doubted our ability to effect that transformation in the twinkling of an eye have had their doubts settled at their own cost. What is valid for America may be valid for Europe. We are all of one stock. We think alike, we act alike.

I should like to sum up my argument in a few short sentences. The rise of nationalism in Europe is unavoidable, in the nature of things. It may even be desirable, since it promotes the clash of ideas, from which truth arises. Western civilization has advanced too far to give up its place to any competing civilization. It has brought too many blessings to humanity to sacrifice willingly. At the same time, it has achieved too much power and wealth to yield to aggression from the less advanced. We have had our differences among ourselves, just like the members of any human family. Some of them we have scrapped about. More of them we have settled by mutual respect and consideration for each other's viewpoints. In the future, cooperation and essential unity are likely to increase rather than decrease. These united nations of the Western alliance are as dependably one united nation in the fact of a comon peril as are the 50 sovereign States which comprise the American Union.

---

## PRESIDENT JOHNSON SAYS TO BUSINESSMEN, "BANISH YOUR FEAR AND SHED YOUR DOUBTS AND RENEW YOUR HOPE—WE HAVE MUCH WORK TO DO TOGETHER—WE WANT YOU TO ROLL UP YOUR SLEEVES AND LET'S GET ABOUT DOING IT"

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Business Advisory Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered an address before the Business Advisory Council. It contains fighting words and discloses a determination on the part of the President to get the country moving and moving quickly. He wants all Americans who are anxious and willing to work to have a job. He is for eliminating poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime—for encouraging family life in America—for giving the breadwinner a job—and for encouraging and supporting through the Government in any way that it is proper for the Government, the home, the church, and the school.

The President's program is built upon cooperation of all of us, a good economic climate, jobs for all deserving, and the elimination of all special privileges.

His speech follows:

### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL, DECEMBER 4, 1963

Mr. F. R. KAPPEL (chairman, Business Advisory Council). Gentlemen, it is a very great honor to present to this distinguished group the distinguished President of the United States, Mr. Lyndon Johnson.

President JOHNSON. Mr. Kappel, Mr. Secretary, my fellow Americans, here in this room is an accumulation of brains and achievement and enterprise that your Government and your President needs for advice, for ideas, for a cooperative spirit whose total aim is to move this great country of ours ahead.

When we take stock of the American inventory for the future, we find this land and its people are strong, are secure, are unafraid.

Let me cite for you the cheering record of economic gains today and the promise for the future.

We are now as we meet here in the 34th month of unbroken economic expansion.

The gross national product will cross the $600 billion mark in a matter of weeks. This is a record rise in gross national product of $100 billion or 20 percent in 3 years.

Since January 1961:

Corporate profits, after taxes, are up 43 percent. These profits are running at an alltime high of $27.4 billion compared with $19.2 billion in early 1961.

Industrial production is up 22 percent.

Construction activity is up 19 percent.

Personal income is up $65 billion, or 16 percent.

Civilian employment is up 2½ million, and labor income is up $49 billion, or 17 percent.

Average weekly earnings in manufacturing are up 13 percent, or over $100 a week for 70 million people working.

Prices have been the steadiest in the entire postwar period. The wholesale price index today is still below early 1961. Consumer prices have risen only about 1.2 percent per year, mostly in services.

Although unemployment amounts to 4 million persons, 5½ percent of our labor force, there are more people at work today than at any other time in our history. As I said, more than 70 million are earning good wages.

Continued expansion of the business community seems assured at least through the first half of 1964.

This will be the longest peacetime expansion in the history of this Republic except for the anemic one in the 1930's.

These are the visible garments of economic success. They are all substantial evidence that the State of the Nation is good; that the health of the Nation is strong. So if we are to be worthy of this success, we must first respond to its challenge.

Languishing before the Congress is the tax cut bill that was sent there 11 months ago. Many of you in this room have enlisted in the fight to win this tax cut. It is uncertainty that deters business. It is the one single decision that could put us firmly on the path to full employment and put the motive power in our expansion to keep it going after mid-1964.

This tax cut could boost our gross national product by an extra $12 billion in 1964 and, when fully effective, by an extra $30 billion a year. It is needed; it is necessary; it demands the support of all enlightened Americans. It is both your defense against a sagging economy and it is a breath of fresh air for our free enterprise system which is the envy of the world. We cannot hesitate.

As my counselor, Ted Sorensen, wrote in his new book: "In the White House, the future rapidly becomes the past, and delay is in itself a decision."

I need your cooperation. I need it now. I need it for tomorrow, next week, next month to win the tax cut, to help you widen your opportunity for your company's expansion; to help you provide more employment; to help you give your workers and your stockholders incentive for the future.

This administration wants to help you and to work with you. We are not prolabor; we are not probusiness; we are not pro any special sector. We are pro what is best for your country.

I happen to believe that a strong, vibrant economy is as essential to our leadership in the free world as the military hardware. I challenge this assemblage of the finest business brains in all the world to take up arms against stagnation and delay.

I challenge this group of business leaders to assault the persistent problems of our generation and to arouse yourselves to help me put an end to them. I join you in taking up this challenge. Let us together destroy for all time the numbing attrition of discrimination in employment.

You men in industry have led the way in plans for progress. I am proud to report that 100 of the top corporations in America for the last quarter employed 60,000 new people for jobs, and, of those 60,000 new employees, 15,000 of them were Negroes, or 25 percent compared to the 11 percent they have in the population.

And I would say to you men who may belong to the party of Lincoln—at least some of you here today—that we have a civil rights bill that was sent to the Congress last May in order to take people out of the streets and pass a law that we thought would give them justice. That bill has been there since May and this is December. It has been reported by a committee. The Speaker of the House went to the committee and asked for a hearing, something that every American is ordinarily entitled to. He was told to come back next January.

I would not think that any group of Americans would be against a hearing or a chance to vote up or down a bill that a committee of the Congress had reported, so I appeal to you for your support of legislation that will help to destroy discrimination, that will help to promote equality, that will help to give opportunity to all American citizens, regardless of their race, regardless of their religion, regardless of the region in which they may live.

So let us all, working together, enlarge our economy by also persuading Congress to cut taxes.

Men in the Government are going to be recognized in this administration by not how much they spend, but by how much they save. The venal and the self-seeking need not knock on our door, but the honorable and the energetic are always welcome. We will not harass or persecute you. We want to help you. I am the only President that you have. If you have me fail, then you fail, for this Nation of yours fails. If you would have me succeed, then you benefit and the country benefits. We will do all that needs to be done and we will try to do it with thrift and frugality. We will try our deadlevel best to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar we spend.

This Nation and your President needs your energy, and needs your ingenuity, and needs your confidence, and needs your support. We need the can-do spirit of the American businessman, so I ask you, banish your fears; and I remember Mr. Rayburn told me that in his 50 years here, he believed the most frightened man that he ran into was the average American businessman. He said although he can go to bed at night, one of the few businessmen in the world, and wake up the next morning knowing his property has not been confiscated out from under his pillow, he is still frightened, and if he can't scare himself enough, he will go hire a lawyer or a public relations man to keep him scared.

So, gentlemen, I say banish your fear and shed your doubts and renew your hopes. We have much work to do together. We want you to roll up your sleeves and let's get about doing it.

The Soviet Union has more population than we have. She has almost 3 times as many tillable acres as we have. She has us outdistanced in potential of power and oil resources, but the one thing she doesn't have is our system of government, and if our philosophy finally prevails, it is going to be primarily because of the system that our forefathers left us, the system that says to the capitalists, "Send your dollar out and we will try to help you get a fair return on it"; that says to the management, "Get up at daylight and work at midnight and develop stomach ulcers like Frank Stanton has and we will give you a profit-sharing plan and a bonus if you are successful"; that says to the worker that "We believe you are worthy of your hire and we will give you a minimum wage, and the highest weekly wage in all the world," and these three working together, the capitalist and the manager and the worker, have brought to us a prosperity that no civilization has ever known. We have much to preserve and much to protect, and I ask you to come here to help me do it.

Thank you.

Mr. Kappel. Mr. President, you are looking at one businessman who has no fears of the kind you are talking about, really, and I think you are looking at 89 of them in this room.

We have, together by telephone, every member of the 65 active members, talked about this and have put together a letter to you, Mr. President, which I would like to read. It does not express the warmth and the other things that I say simply because you can't do that in words or letters, but it is my privilege as chairman of the Business Council to assure you on behalf of this council that we have undiminished confidence in the economic and moral strength of our country under your leadership. We are proceeding in the planning and the management of our respective businesses with this as the basis of our judgment.

Now, the Business Council has had an active, and I am sure and we are sure, constructive and cooperative relationship with each administration since 1933, and I am sure you know that the council provides a medium for better understanding of Government problems by business, and this we need to know in order to be cooperative. It is glad to respond to requests by Government for counsel and assistance and it endeavors to submit to any branch of government a constructive point of view on matters of public policy that affect the business interests of the country.

Please be assured that we in the Business Council will continue to be of service to you and to all of the branches of this government in any way that we can, within our capabilities, and as an organization, within the boundaries we have set for ourselves.

I would like personally, as chairman of this council, to say to you in this contacting that I have done, you would be pleased indeed at the responses that I have gotten, and you have my very personal good wish.

President Johnson. Gentlemen, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, whom a great many of you have been associated with through the years, and who now work closely with you in many fields, to come here and be at your disposal and be available to visit with you and talk to you.

We expect great things of you and we have already received great things, but the next hour we want to exchange thoughts with you and give you an opportunity to speak individually and not just be called in here and listen to our speeches, so we are going to the Cabinet room. It will be a little crowded because notwithstanding all this $100 billion we are spending, we don't have commodious quarters, but if you can endure it, we would like you to indulge us and we can exchange viewpoints and you can give your opinions and ask any questions you want of your President. We have no cutoff period. We can stay there at least until after 5 o'clock.

If you could, before you leave, I think that in tribute to one of the greatest believers in our free enterprise system and one of the greatest exponents of it, and one of the greatest Presidents we ever had, I would like to ask you to bow your head in a minute of silent prayer to John F. Kennedy.

Thank you very much.

## REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AFL–CIO

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1963, President Lyndon B. Johnson met with the members of the executive committee of the AFL–CIO in the White House garden, during which meeting the President made appropriate and pertinent observations.

The President paid proper tribute to this great American organization when he said:

> In every area of human concern, the AFL–CIO can take pride in itself as an instrument to bring a better life to more people.

I herewith include the remarks made by President Johnson on that occasion containing facts and information of interest to all of our people:

### Remarks of the President

I have said before, and I say again to you now: I regard an achievement of the full potential of our own resources—physical, human, and otherwise—to be the highest purpose of Government. In every area of human concern, the AFL–CIO can take pride in itself as an instrument to bring a better life to more people.

Since January 1961 the economic and legislative gains by labor have been cheering and substantial. Let me recite this afternoon for you a record, and to each of you here, what I think you can take justifiable pride in:

Gross national product is up $100 billion since January 1961.

Civilian employment is up 2½ million.

Total labor income is up nearly $50 billion, or 17 percent.

Average weekly earnings in manufacturing are up to $100.53 per week, or 13 percent.

Average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing are up 8 percent, to $2.47.

These are real gains, not illusions. They have not been wiped out by inflation. Wholesale prices are still below those of early 1961. Consumer prices, mostly of services, are up only 1.2 percent per year.

Your legislative gains have also been solid and visible:

There is the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. Over 1,100 projects have been started, costing $200 million and creating 58,000 new jobs. Over 24,000 workers have been helped by training programs under this act.

There is the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962, where more than $717 million has been committed for projects that will create 1,026,000 man-months of work.

There is the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, where more than 140,000 workers will have received training or retraining in this fiscal year.

There is the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, which was extended to cover 3.6 million additional workers. The minimum wage was raised to $1.25.

I know something about minimum wages. When I was a young Congressman, I voted in 1938 for a 25-cent minimum wage per hour. Only two other Congressmen from my State supported in the caucus the signing of the petition to bring up the bill in the House of Representatives, and both of those Congressmen were defeated in the next election.

There are the social security amendments of 1961. These amendments lowered the retirement age for men from 65 to 62. It also increased minimum benefits and broadened coverage. I remember so well working with you some years ago to lower the women's age for social security to 55.

There is the temporary extended unemployment compensation program. It gave 2.8 million unemployed workers additional benefits in 1961 and additional benefits in 1962.

These are gains and advances you know about and that you men standing here on the platform with me here today helped to bring about through your leadership.

But what you and I are most concerned about is not yesterday. What concerns us is tomorrow. No. 1 in priority tomorrow is more jobs, and the goal of this administration is 75 million jobs in America. This is our dominant, relentless domestic problem, and we have to face it head on with all our resources.

The tax cut bill now pending in Congress is the most massive single attack we can make on this problem. This bill has been frustrated in the Congress. It has lain unenacted when it ought to be alive and working. It can pour an additional $11 billion into our gross national product.

Despite the continuing economic growth, I am dissatisfied with the persistence of high unemployment. That the ancient enemy of poverty should thrive and fatten in this abundant land is a vile and shameful thing. The tax cut is our modern weapon today against unemployment, which breeds poverty and ignorance, the inconsiderate allies of apathy and neglect.

I don't intend to stand idly by while this problem of unemployment swells and coarsens. This tax bill must pass.

Before the Congress also is a civil rights bill that is denied a hearing in the Rules Committee. The endless abrasions of delay, neglect, and indifference have rubbed raw the national conscience. We have talked too long. We have done too little. And all of it has come too late. You must help me make civil rights in America a reality.

I commend this labor leadership for the enlightenment you have shown in moving to abolish discrimination in labor's ranks. Even as I compliment you for your action, I ask you to hurry even faster.

Before the Congress is a medicare bill that cries out for enactment. The cost of personal health care has taken off on a straight line upward. In 1950 the annual cost of personal health care was $10.6 billion. Today it is $28.6 billion. So the peril must be plain. Unless we can enact an adequate medicare program, a large segment of our population will be denuded financially by severe illness.

Is it too much to ask the national community to agree to a simple, low-cost program in which a worker puts in $1 a month of his own money, and his employer puts in $1 a month of his company's money that is tax deductible, and the Government puts in nothing, so that the worker can solve his medical cost problems with dignity and not disaster? I hope we will be able to pass a medicare program before this Congress adjourns.

This Government is committed to stimulating the economy with a tax cut; to removing injustices, too long sustained, with a civil rights bill; to a compassionate program to help those in our society who cannot take full part in the competitive race—the aged, the handicapped, the mentally retarded, the illiterates, the dropouts, the unemployed and their dependent children; the uneducated.

But we can do none of this, or only a tiny part of it, unless you here on this platform with me today rise up, roll up your sleeves, stick out your chin, and let it be known you are in this fight, that you are in it for keeps, to the finish, without doubt or without reservation.

I am the President, but I can do nothing without the people. You represent the people. I need you. I want you. I believe you should be standing by my side in the fight ahead as you are this evening. This Nation will be grateful to you, and so will I.

Thank you very much.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6143) entitled "An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) entitled "An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 2 and 84 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 92 to the above-entitled bill.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. BRADEMAS), for today through December 12, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KARSTEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include a statement by Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. CRAMER and to include extraneous matter relating to discussion of the Ostertag motion to recede and concur and relating to the independent offices appropriations conference report today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROONEY of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 776. An act to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1832. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2220. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar;

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Shang Sing;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin;

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6001. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia;

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa;

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli;

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 6975. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio and Vittoria Maida;

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown; and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1533. An act to amend the Act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Mr. PUCINSKI.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1424. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to 45 Stat. 1222, 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1425. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to make Indian reservations eligible for assistance thereunder"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1427. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $12,982,095, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs; and claims against the District of Columbia in the amount of $22,238 (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 852. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence; without amendment (Rept. No. 1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7508. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1015). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 582. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6041, a bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 1016). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 583. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8720, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1017). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9341. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H.R. 8667. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins (Rept. No. 1019). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4732. A bill to change the name of the United States Olympic Association to the United States Olympic Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1020). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9234. A bill to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1021). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1022). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1023). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8459. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. H.R.4955. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation (Rept. No. 1025). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 9407. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to notice and examinations in connection with appointments to positions in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9408. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payments to reestablish the purchasing power of American fishermen suffering temporary economic dislocation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9409. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9410. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9411. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits, to an individual otherwise qualified therefor, from the beginning of such individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 9412. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9413. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 9414. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide that hearings on applications for construction permits for certain facilities must be held at or near the places where such facilities are to be located; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 9415. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 9416. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 9417. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 9418. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 9419. A bill to provide for the regulation of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 855. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 856. Joint resolution imposing an embargo on articles manufactured outside the United States by the Studebaker Corp.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 857. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.J. Res. 858. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.J. Res. 859. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 860. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.J. Res. 861. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 584. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the sale of lethal firearms in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Res. 585. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the "fairness doctrine," applicable to radio and television broadcast licensees, of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9420. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Marjorie Howell (nee Chin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9421. A bill for the relief of Dorota Zytka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9422. A bill for the relief of Bruna Venturi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

506. Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON presented a petition of Rabbi Jacob Shtull, spiritual leader, Men's Club of the Mayfield Temple, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, relative to the persecution of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

# SENATE

### TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, and a member of the General Board of Sunday Schools, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, my colleagues and I approach Thee, carrying the responsibilities for making laws for the people we serve. In our capacity as lawmakers, we realize that Thou hast set for us the perfect example, because Thou art the source of all perfect law. We pray that we may never forget our responsibility to make the laws we frame here conform with the spirit of the laws which have underlain all human progress and all human values since the day of creation.

Since Thou didst create the earth first spiritually, before it was made physically, help us to realize that before we can make laws in actuality, we must first create them spiritually, and that the laws we make must be built upon the sound principles of truth and justice, of which Thou art the Author and Creator.

Be with us in our deliberations and enable us to meet these responsibilities, we pray, in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES WITH THE LIKENESS OF THE LATE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 181)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying bill, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby submit to the Congress a draft of a proposed bill which would provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces with the likeness of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. With the adoption of this proposal each of the five denominations now being produced by the mint; that is, 1- through 50-cent pieces, would have the likeness of a President on the obverse of the coin.

The consent of the Congress is required to make this change in view of the provisions of section 3510 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 276), which provides that no change in the design of a coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years. The present design was adopted in 1948.

If the legislation is enacted, the Treasury Department plans to use the likeness of the late President Kennedy which is being used on a "Presidential series" medal now being manufactured and sold at the Philadelphia Mint. The design of this medal was approved personally by the late President. Mint artists would prepare an appropriate reverse for the coin.

**I strongly recommend the enactment of this proposed legislation at the earliest possible date in order that the likeness of President Kennedy will appear on the 50-cent coins issued at the beginning of the calendar year 1964.**

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9291) to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### Report of Migratory Bird Conservation Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

### Amendment of Housing Act of 1954, To Make Indian Reservations Eligible for Assistance Thereunder

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to make Indian reservations eligible for assistance thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### Reports on Tort Claims Paid by Department of the Army and Claims Settled Under Military Personnel Claims Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during fiscal year 1963, and a report on claims settled under the Military Personnel Claims Act, during fiscal year 1963 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### Adjustment of Immigration Status of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in behalf of certain aliens relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the East Cleveland, Ohio, City Commission, favoring the enactment of civil rights legislation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 756); and

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 757).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1534. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by stabilizing the domestic lead and zinc industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 758).

Under the order of the Senate of May 14, 1963, the above bill was referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 9009. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended (Rept. No. 759).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 2311. A bill to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics (Rept. No. 763);

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 767);

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control (Rept. No. 762);

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 764);

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business (Rept. No. 765);

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools (Rept. No. 766); and

S. Res. 230. Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the eulogies to the late President John F. Kennedy delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on November 24, 1963 (Rept. No. 761).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 217. Resolution to authorize a study of a national system of scenic highways (Rept. No. 760).

## SAMUEL T. MOORE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Samuel T. Moore, father of Harmon A. Moore, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## KATIE L. DISNEY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Katie L. Disney, widow of Francis L. Disney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fifty-three postmaster nominations.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2373. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to State institutions charged with the care, training, and education of minor children; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2374. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aragon Neri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2375. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain land in advance of construction of the Jordanelle Dam and Reservoir portion of the Central Utah project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## RESOLUTIONS

## SAMUEL T. MOORE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233) to pay a gratuity to Samuel T. Moore, which was placed on the calendar.

## KATIE L. DISNEY

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) to pay a gratuity to Katie L. Disney, which was placed on the calendar.

## DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STATE INSTITUTIONS CHARGED WITH THE CARE AND EDUCATION OF MINOR CHILDREN

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of Federal surplus property to State institutions charged with the care, training, and education of minor children.

The need for this legislation was brought to my attention by the Montana State superintendent of public instruction. It appears that until recently the surplus property section of the State superintendent's office was making surplus property available without any restrictions to the Montana Children's Center, an institution established for the support and care of orphans, foundlings, and destitute children resident within the State of Montana.

In October of this year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare informed the State superintendent of public instruction that since the Montana Children's Center was not set up and established primarily as a school, all future donations to the children's center shall be limited strictly to items for the exclusive use in classrooms, shops, and laboratories of the school. This ruling precludes the donation of equipment for the domiciliary care of children and prevents the donation of grounds equipment and other maintenance items.

My bill would permit the donation of surplus property to the Montana Children's Center, and the similar institutions across the country, for any purpose connected with the operation of the institution.

Bills similar to this have been introduced in the past. One of the objections of the Government agencies which studied these bills was that extending the available surplus property to other institutions, and other areas of operation within eligible institutions, would divert what property is available from the already included agencies of education, health and civil defense, and result in the reestablishment of a priority system as existed under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Why this segregation? Back in our country, if you have a barn full of hay and starving cattle, you feed the hay. We have millions of dollars worth of idle surplus property lying around in Government warehouses. Why not utilize this property in any way and every way we can, rather than sell it for a fraction of its original cost to dealers in surplus property. I believe that we should consider all those groups or uses which are worthy to receive aid, rather than only some of them. If priorities must be established, let them be established. At least then we will be making the best possible utilization of a usable and needed resource.

State institutions charged with the care of minor children are an important part of our social and educational system. But they are all seriously affected by the increasing costs of equipment and operation. The receipt of Federal surplus property would permit them to devote more of their overall budget to more important and pressing needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2373) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to State institutions charged with the care, training, and education of minor children, introduced by Mr. Metcalf, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) paragraph (3) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), is amended by inserting in clause (A) thereof, immediately after the words "schools for the physically handicapped,", the words "agencies or institutions for the custodial care, training, and education of minor children,".

(b) Section 203(j) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) The term 'purposes of education', as used in this subsection, includes the operation and maintenance of any tax-supported agency or institution of any State charged by the law of such State with the duty of providing custodial care, training, and education for minor children."

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

## REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted eight amendments (Nos. 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, and 358), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO THE BLIND

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the next time it is printed, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor of S. 2181, a bill I introduced on September 25, 1963, to amend the Social Security Act relating to aid to the blind.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF A KENNEDY CULTURAL CENTER IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 2341, to authorize the appropriation of $5 million to carry out the purposes of the National Cultural Center Act and to designate the National Cultural Center authorized to be constructed by such act, as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RENAMING OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 136, to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, at the next printing of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIKENESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, ON FUTURE MINTING OF SILVER DOLLARS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of December 3, 1963, the names of Mr. Church and Mr. Pell were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2355) to provide that standard silver dollars shall hereafter bear on one side a likeness of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, introduced by Mr. Cannon on December 3, 1963.

### INCREASED IMPORTS OF LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND MEAT PRODUCTS

**Mr. CURTIS.** Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to a very serious situation now existing in American agriculture. One of the major factors causing distress and loss of income to the American agricultural community is the enormous amount of livestock, meat, and meat products imported from abroad. The adverse effects of these imports are not confined to the farmers, although they, of course, are most directly concerned. The effects are felt as well by other, nonagricultural areas, and have their impact upon the national economy.

Importation of these products has increased tremendously year after year since about 1957. It has reached proportions where the imports are determining the market price paid to our farmers for their cattle and hogs and sheep.

It has been pointed out that today approximately 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported. This is an astounding fact when we consider all of the agriculture surpluses we have in this country. The taxpayers are paying huge sums in the interest of agriculture. Farmers are cutting down production; yet imports flow into this country, apparently without any really effective restriction.

Press reports indicate that from January through August of this year, more than 1 billion pounds of beef and veal were sold in the United States by foreign interests. This was an increase of 22 percent over the imports in the previous year.

The imports are not limited to beef. They include also pork, pork products, and lamb. We also import far too many live animals into this country.

This import situation is against the best interests of the individual farmer, of our economy in general, and of the U.S. Government. We should not be encouraging imports of commodities of which we have a surplus.

It has been conservatively estimated that in 1962 our imports of these products displaced the production of approximately 55 million acres of farmland in the United States. In 1963 the figure will be much higher. It is unthinkable that at a time when we are compelling the farmers of America to reduce production, production on millions and millions of acres is being displaced by reason of enormous purchases of foreign livestock, meat, and meat products.

I am told that choice-fed cattle bring about 25 percent less than they did a year ago in the livestock markets of Omaha, Kansas City, and Chicago. Many individual farmer-feeders report they are losing from $80 to $85 per head on cattle they have been feeding.

The losses are not confined to farmers engaged in raising and feeding cattle, hogs, and sheep. They are felt as well by producers of grains, hay, sorghums, and other feeds.

The question has been raised as to whether favoritism and influence may have been used in our import programs, perhaps aggravating an already difficult situation. The little nation of Haiti, for example, which cannot feed its own people adequately, exported to the United States last year some 2.7 million pounds of meat.

As a member of the Committee on Finance, I was pleased, Mr. President, that the committee reported a resolution requesting the Tariff Commission to make a study of the meat imports question and to report to the committee not later than next June 30. I favored that resolution, but it is not enough. We need action, and we need it now.

The Department of Agriculture should use all the power vested in it to lessen the importation of livestock and meat. In addition, Congress should enact remedial legislation. I have a bill designed to curb these imports.

I urge immediate and favorable consideration of the bill I have introduced, S. 1126. I introduced it on March 19, 1963. This bill would place an additional duty or tariff of 25 percent ad valorem upon imports of livestock, meat, and meat products that are in excess of the 1957 level.

This is a reasonable proposal. We are not suggesting that all trade be shut off. Imports were sufficient in 1957; but since that time the imports have gone up and up and up. The situation has become grave, and demands immediate attention.

The economic effects of unreasonable importations of livestock, meat, and meat products are having their impact upon farmers in every State of the Union. They are not only causing farmers to suffer losses; they are also stifling the economy of every agricultural community and every city and town which depends upon agriculture for any part of its business life. Most of them in my part of the country depend upon agriculture very heavily, some of them almost entirely. Action by the U.S. Government to curb these excessive imports would be of great assistance to the farmers of America, to whom we all look to provide the very stuff of life itself.

When those producers of food and fiber suffer, we all suffer in one way or another. In the industrial sections of the Nation, the farmers' economic pinch also can be sensed when we realize that those farmers are foregoing purchases of trucks and machinery used on the farms. They simply cannot afford to replace wornout machines or invest in additional equipment when they know they are going to lose money on their production. This contributes to unemployment in the industrial centers, and does nothing to relieve the problems in the so-called economically depressed areas. It may be noted in passing that not all of the economic depression exists in the urban sections; we have such experiences in the rural sections of the country, too, and excessive meat imports are one of the reasons.

I urge the Congress to act without further delay.

### STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

**Mr. CURTIS.** Mr. President, the Supreme Court has made a ruling concerning the State right-to-work laws. Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with right-to-work laws, this decision must be regarded as of great importance, because it declares that the States have a right to act in this area; it validates State right-to-work laws.

I wish to have printed in the Record, in connection with my remarks, an editorial on this decision, from the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., dated September 20, 1963; also an editorial from the New York Daily News of December 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Sept. 20, 1963]

#### PROFITABLE FREEDOM

One of the false arguments against freedom of choice for the wage earner, as exemplified in right-to-work laws now in force in 20 States, long has been that such freedom undermines the wage structure to the extent that the worker, unprotected by enforced union membership, invariably winds up making less money than if he paid for his job by paying union dues.

This is a fallacy long maintained by professional unionists and those of their ideological ilk who fight right-to-work legislation of any variety in a determined effort to give the worker no choice whatsoever between unemployment and subjection to membership or whatever else the union in his place of employment demands. That it is a fallacy has been demonstrated time and again in those States where right-to-work laws make it possible for freedom of choice to coexist peacefully right alongside strongly organized unions. The current issue of U.S. News & World Report for instance, shows how the Nation's job and wage pattern is shifting in a way to confound arguments advanced by those who see nothing but ruination in States where workers have freedom of choice.

Industrially new Arizona, for one, offers an example in proof. For Arizona, one of the first right-to-work States, last year enjoyed an average hourly wage scale of $2.57, exactly 37 cents an hour more than neighboring New Mexico, a non-right-to-work State that has flourished more or less comparatively with Arizona in recent years. Arizona's average hourly wage is 33 cents more than that in Massachusetts, one of those "high-pay" Eastern States which always has fought right-to-work. And in Arizona, factory employment has grown 86.3 percent in 10 years as compared to Massachusetts 6.5-percent loss in such employment.

Take, for instance, Texas and Oklahoma, two States that in oil and agriculture are somewhat alike, and there you find right-to-work Texas with a $2.32 average wage scale as compared to $2.19 for Oklahoma. Or, while in the West take relatively undeveloped Utah which, despite the alleged handicaps of right-to-work freedoms, still pays 5 cents an hour more than neighboring Colorado.

Consider how industrial doom and starvation for the worker was predicted in Indiana in 1957 when right-to-work legislation was passed. But 5 years later, the average hourly wage was $2.65, a matter of 24 cents an hour above industrial Pennsylvania, and 41 cents above Massachusetts, the State that so fears right-to-work because it will bring down wages. Indiana ranks, too, a matter of 5 cents an hour above neighboring Illinois, generally considered more prosperous.

And so it goes down the line. Nevada, long a right-to-work stronghold, last year paid an average hourly wage of $3.02, the highest of any State in the Union. Kansas, with a right-to-work legislation in force 4 years, paid $2.52, while over the line in Missouri, where workers join unions or else, the average was $2.38.

Those who oppose right-to-work point always to that solid bloc of Southeastern States as the horrible example of an underpaid area to which northern industry has fled. But right-to-work is credited by most authorities with bringing the Carolinas and all the Southeast to a promising new industrial life. True, the average hourly wage there is well below that of most other States as it always has been in that area. But it gets higher every year as industry competes for labor in what was once a workers' wasteland.

All in all it adds up thusly: The 20 right-to-work States by 1962 had an overall average hourly wage increase of slightly more than 3 percent above the overall average for the other 28 States (figures for Alaska and Hawaii are not available) without right-to-work legislation. So, does it look as though the workers in those 20 States are being ground into poverty by ogrelike management because they are not forced one way or another into union allegiance in order to hold their jobs? Indeed, it looks as though those who predict fiscal calamity for both labor and industry in the right-to-work States had better rerun their figures.

It all goes to prove, if you want to be down to earth about it, that freedom in the long run can profit the pocketbook as much as the mind.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 20, 1963]

### RAYMOND MOLEY REPORTS

The most unusual, not to say incredible, phenomenon in American politics in more than one generation is the widespread demand this far before the Republican convention that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER be chosen as the Republican nominee in 1964.

When there is an incumbent President eligible for another term, the choice is foreordained. But in the party out of power many circumstances have determined the choice other than popular demand for a single individual. Some have been nominated because their managers effectively solicited the pledges of delegates. Some have been selected because of deadlocks. Others have been compromises when parties have been divided. But the demand for GOLDWATER has come from the general public sentiment that there should be an authentic alternative to President Kennedy and that the Arizona Senator represents that sort of opposition.

There are some GOLDWATER supporters who are deeply concerned because in some States the Republican organizations seem unwilling to commit themselves this early. Certain individuals in New York, who helped to create a conservative party in 1962 as a protest against the reelection of Governor Rockefeller and Senator JAVITS, have been talking about pushing into Ohio and, despite the responsible Republican organization there, capturing its delegation for GOLDWATER.

In Ohio tnere is some talk about offering its Republican Governor, James A. Rhodes, as a favorite-son candidate. But there is no such plan now in the minds of Ohio's responsible Republican leaders.

The reasons for the reluctance of Republican leaders in Ohio to commit themselves lie in certain very practical political considerations which amateur enthusiasts in other States should, in their own interest, heed and respect.

I use Ohio to illustrate the practical facts because my information about the situation there comes from unimpeachable sources. Ohio has probably the most efficient State Republican organization in the entire Nation. Ray C. Bliss, chairman of the State central committee, is largely responsible for that organization. In 1960, Ohio gave the Nixon-Lodge ticket the largest majority which it received anywhere. In 1962, the Republicans swept the State, electing the Governor, a majority of the State legislature, and 18 of the State's 24 Members of the House of Representatives. This efficient organization is prepared to win the State for the Republican ticket in 1964. But it wants no preconvention contest.

Its reason for this is that if GOLDWATER is entered in the primary, there may be other contestants, perhaps Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. This would involve an intraparty fight. Such a fight would consume money and resources badly needed to win in the election itself. It would also engender differences within the party. Since Cleveland and some other cities are Democratic, the Kennedy ticket will be very hard to beat. If the State is lost to President Kennedy, at least three or four incumbent Republican Members of the House of Representatives will be defeated. Hence a contest for the convention delegations would be a prelude to disaster.

Noting this reluctance of Ohio leaders to commit themselves to GOLDWATER, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon in a magazine interview recently said that the fear of a GOLDWATER candidacy in Ohio is because the State is opposed to a right-to-work law, and that while GOLDWATER is against a Federal right-to-work law, he does support such action in States.

This interpretation of the attitude of Ohio Republican leaders by Nixon is not correct. The right-to-work issue is not their motive at all. In 1958, when the Republicans lost the Ohio election, right-to-work was on the ballot and organized labor spent $4.5 million to defeat it. This time, if GOLDWATER runs for President, it would not be a serious issue there. The reason for withholding a commitment to GOLDWATER is as I have explained above.

But my information is positive that GOLDWATER is the preference of an overwhelming majority of Republicans in Ohio. The most powerful leaders in the party there favor GOLDWATER, and when the showdown comes next summer the Ohio delegation will in all probability be for him.

Above all, Ohio people want no interference in their political affairs, from New York or any other State. They have done very well by themselves and for the Republican party in the past.

---

[From the New York Daily News, Dec. 3, 1963]

### TAFT-HARTLEY WINS AGAIN

Florida, like 19 other States, has a right-to-work law—a statute forbidding agreements that workers must belong to labor unions in order to keep their jobs.

Unions in such States often try to get around these laws via so-called agency shop agreements, under which nonunion employees must pay the union the amount of money it charges its members as dues.

Florida's right-to-work law bans agency shop agreements; and the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act permits the States to have right-to-work laws.

Yesterday, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Florida courts may enforce the prohibition against agency shops, and that the National Labor Relations Board does not have jurisdiction over such cases.

This is a considerable victory for States rights, whether you approve or disapprove right-to-work laws; and we're glad to note that the Supreme Court hasn't entirely forgotten that the States do have some rights.

---

## OUR POLICY TOWARD CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, those of us who believe that Castro's Cuba presents this Nation today with its most immediate and important international problem were encouraged and gratified to learn that President Johnson has ordered a review and reevaluation of our policy toward the tragic and unhappy Cuban situation. I sincerely hope this review will result in a hard, firm, and determined policy which will oust this Communist menace from the Western Hemisphere and will assure the freedom-loving people of Cuba their God-given right of self-determination.

It will be recalled that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, earlier this year conducted an extensive inquiry into the Cuban situation. In a report which we issued on May 9, it was stated that the "entire Cuban problem, both military and political, should be accorded the highest possible priority by our governmental officials to the end that the evil threat which the Soviet occupation of Cuba represents will be eliminated at an early date."

The same report, in enumerating the threats and potential threats which the Soviet presence in Cuba presented to the Americas, listed the first as follows:

> Cuba is an advanced base for subversive, revolutionary and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.

In discussing that report on the floor of the Senate, I said:

> The invasion of the Western Hemisphere by the forces of godless communism is the gravest and most serious of all the challenges and threats confronting the United States.

I went on to say that one conclusion was certain, and that was that Fidel Castro—aided, support, and bolstered by his Soviet masters and their military might—is in every way possible spurring, supporting, and abetting the efforts of the Communists and other revolutionary elements to subvert, overthrow, and seize control of the governments of Latin America.

While the accuracy and validity of these statements were really beyond challenge at the time when they were made, any lingering doubt that may have existed as to their truth has certainly been laid to rest by recent events in Venezuela and elsewhere in Latin America. It is now clear beyond all question that—by covert aggression, infiltration, guerrilla warfare, and agitation—Castro, with Soviet support, is mounting a coordinated and stepped-up effort to subvert and overthrow existing governments in this hemisphere and to replace them with dictatorial regimes modeled in the Soviet image.

It takes only a casual glance about to convince us that, with respect to subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities stemming from Cuba, the situation in Latin America has worsened, rather than improved, since the subcommittee issued its report.

During November, the pro-Castro terrorists in Venezuela raised their campaign of violence to a fever pitch in their unsuccessful attempt to sabotage the December 1 election. This campaign included numerous attacks on United States-owned properties; the kidnaping of Col. James K. Chenault, deputy chief of the U.S. Army mission; and the sending of packaged bombs to the chief presidential candidates and a U.S. Embassy official. On November 28, a 3-ton cache of terrorist arms, valued at about $350,000, was found on a Venezuelan beach. Incontrovertible evidence has established that these arms were of Cuban origin.

On Saturday of last week, we all read that the Communists in Bolivia had captured, and were holding as hostages, three U.S. officials and a Peace Corps volunteer. These American nationals have not yet been released.

It is unnecessary for me to recite additional instances. The occurrences in Venezuela and elsewhere make it very clear that our Latin American neighbors face an unrelenting Communist-inspired campaign of organized terror. Under these circumstances, a mild reaction from us will be of little avail. Mere words will be worse than useless. Positive action is required, to halt this violence and subversion. This can best be done by choking it off at its source—Castro's Cuba.

For all of these reasons, Mr. President, I applaud and endorse President Johnson's action in directing that our policy toward Cuba be reviewed. I hope this review will result in an effective and vigorous policy to rid this hemisphere of the menace of communism. We have given repeated pledges to our neighbors to the south that they will be protected against overt or covert aggression and armed intervention from Cuba. Now is the time to honor and redeem these pledges.

I believe, Mr. President, that President Johnson now has an opportunity to strike a decisive blow for liberty and representative government in the Americas. The action of the Organization of American States on December 3 in voting to conduct an investigation of Venezuela's charges perhaps opens the door for the first time for collective action against Castro.

As I have said, there is now hard and incontrovertible evidence of Castro's involvement in the revolutionary activities in Venezuela. This and other evidence would more than justify strong and drastic action against Castro by the Organization of American States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the morning hour limitation, the time available to the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hope the full weight of the United States will be marshaled in support of Venezuela in the OAS, and that the Organization, acting under the various treaties which are involved, will take vigorous and prompt action to secure and insure the peace of this hemisphere. If economic and diplomatic sanctions are adequate for this purpose, then well and good. If they are not, then harder and sterner measures must be applied.

I support the principle of collective action; but, whether we act collectively or are forced to go it alone or almost alone, the President will have my complete and wholehearted support in any positive, determined, and resolute action which he may take to face up to the cold, hard, and unpleasant facts and to make clear that we will not countenance, either in Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas, the creation or use of any externally supported military capability which endangers our security or that of the Western Hemisphere.

---

## COMMUNITY ACTION BY AMERICAN LEGION IN HEMPSTEAD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago, I inserted in the RECORD an inspiring story about the generosity of Long Island labor unions. Construction workers in and around Hempstead, N.Y., had offered their time and their energies to build a cancer research center and a cerebral palsy clinic.

It has just come to my attention that another organization whose work for the welfare of the community is well known—the American Legion—has made a generous contribution to the very same cerebral palsy patients now using the new clinic. For 3 years before the new building was erected, the Hempstead Post No. 390 of the Legion provided the facilities for the care and treatment of cerebral palsy victims. They built a new wing on their $250,000 clubhouse and turned it over to the Cerebral Palsy Society rent free for 3 years while the new home was being built. The Legionnaires even paid for the gas and electricity used. At their own expense they built a ramp so that children could be moved with greater ease, and they paid the exenses of round-trip transportation for a stricken patient from Hempstead to the new clinic at Roosevelt.

It is indeed edifying to see so many citizens of this area giving of their time, energies, and resources with their only reward—as one Legionnaire put it—"the smile of some child we were helping." This is the kind of community spirit that built America. I am proud that American Legion Post No. 390 is in my State.

## NEW YORK FALLS TO FOURTH PLACE IN DEFENSE WORK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the latest figures released by the Department of Defense reveal that New York's share of defense procurement is declining with every quarter of the fiscal year. For the first quarter of 1964; that is the period from July to September 1963, New York has dropped from second to fourth place. That is a drop of 17 percent from the same time last year.

The top 10 States and the percentage of total defense dollars they received from July through September 1963 are:

California: $1,346 million—21.1 percent.
Washington: $693 million—10.9 percent.
Missouri: $497 million—7.8 percent.
New York: $416 million—6.5 percent.
Texas: $352 million—5.5 percent.
Ohio: $331 million—5.2 percent.
Florida: $306 million—4.8 percent.
Connecticut: $285 million—4.5 percent.
Massachusetts: $187 million—2.9 percent.
Virginia: $164 million—2.6 percent.

Never before in my memory has New York received a smaller share of defense work. Last year, for the same quarter, New York received 7.8 percent as against 6.5 percent now. For the whole fiscal year 1963 New York received 9.9 percent. This compares with 10.7 percent in fiscal 1962 and 12 percent in fiscal 1961.

Moreover, this quarter that I refer to shows a larger dollar volume of procurement than any other quarter since 1951. The month of September alone set a monthly record. Thus even though we can expect this figure to increase and average out somewhat higher in future months, the outlook is not good.

What is more, statistics released by the Defense Department show that the concentration of defense work each year goes more and more to large firms. Small firms, those technically defined as small businesses, are more numerous in New York than in any other State. Yet small businesses throughout the country also received a declining share of defense work—only 27.8 percent so far this year, as compared with 34.5 percent for the first quarter of last fiscal year. And only 15.8 percent of prime contracts compared with 17.8 percent for the same period last year.

The explanation given by the Defense Department for these figures is that many of these contracts, awarded early in the fiscal year, went to airframe, engine, missile, and space systems producers. These are fields in which the Defense Department claims that small business has only limited possibilities. But that explanation is not satisfactory because many of us believe that small firms should have a larger and more direct part in this work; in many instances, this belief is supported by the independent reporting of the Comptroller General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we have recently heard a lot of talk about cutting defense costs, "paring military expenses to the bone," as it has been put. Yet it is interesting to observe that the massive trend for closing down installations—a good many of which seem to be in New York—and centralizing operations is not having that effect at all of saving money. A report just issued by the General Accounting Office has pointed out a good many economies can be realized through decentralization, through letting each facility buy the simple common equipment like nuts and bolts that it needs, instead of operating through centralized procurement centers. This is the exact opposite of the present trend.

Incidentally, I was pleased to note that the smallest of these supply costs were accrued at the Rome Air Materiel Area in Rome, N.Y., which is responsible for procuring electronic parts. Also Roama had the lowest average annual management cost per supply item of any procurement center studied.

In short, it seems to me that the type of centralization which is taking place more and more in defense work is of dubious value. It does not always produce the desired economies, as the Comptroller General has ably pointed out. It puts small business at a serious disadvantage. And it gives rise again and again to questions of political influence that, whether proven or not—and I am not making any such charge—but nevertheless questions arise that are damaging to the morale of all concerned.

In my view, Mr. President, the real source of economy, the real place to start in cutting defense costs is not by setting up new monopolistic centers that concentrate on negotiated procurements with large firms, but rather by increasing the overall competition for defense dollars. The last available figures still show that only about 13 percent of defense work is freely and openly bid on. Although many contracts are negotiated with more than one firm, about one-half of the dollar amount is completely noncompetitive. Report after report from the General Accounting Office has called for more competition. That is the direction for genuine savings, as well as fair treatment for all States and businesses.

## BAY KOW JUNG

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 685, House bill 1273.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1273) for the relief of Bay Kow Jung.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## REINSTATEMENT AND VALIDATION OF CERTAIN U.S. OIL AND GAS LEASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 731, House bill 1233.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1233) to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease No. Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 751), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of H.R. 1233, which was sponsored by the Honorable B. F. SISK, representing the 17th California District, is to do equity to a private citizen who in reliance upon erroneous information from Federal officials, invested his money, time, and effort in developing a Federal oil lease which had in fact been previously terminated by operation of law. Specifically, the measure reinstates U.S. oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552–C, extends the time thereof for 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill and for so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities, and directs the Secretary of the Interior to approve the assignment of the lease subject to statutory requirements for qualification of the assignee. The assignee would be required to pay accrued rental and post proper drilling bond in the amount required by regulations.

### NEED

Oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552–C covering a tract of Federal public lands in the vicinity of Fresno, Calif., was issued effective May 1, 1948, for 5 years, after which it was extended for 5 years to April 30, 1958, and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities.

There were some intervening partial assignments after which on April 30, 1958, a commercial oil well was completed in one area. As a result of a misunderstanding of a recent amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act local representatives of the Department of the Interior held incorrectly that oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552–C was considered to be extended for 2 years from April 30, 1958, instead of the period indicated above; i.e., for the duration of the production of oil or gas in paying quantities.

On April 7, 1960, the lease was assigned to James P. Psaltis who filed it with a request for approval of the assignment. In the meantime, Mr. Psaltis initiated drilling operations and expended in excess of $7,000. He continued these drilling operations until May 9, 1960, when he was informed by the Geological Survey that the lease had expired because production had actually ceased in July 1959, and reworking or further operations had not been started again within 60 days of cessation of production as required by the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(f)).

Mr. Psaltis claimed, and during committee hearings in the House the Department verified, that he had been informed by employees of the Geological Survey at Taft, Calif., and employees of the Bureau of Land Management at Sacramento, Calif., that the termination date of oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552–C was April 30, 1960. Relying on this, he believed that when he obtained an assignment of the lease, on April 7, 1960, he was obtaining the assignment of a valid, existing lease. Nonetheless, in view of the statutory provisions cited above, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to recognize the assignment because the lease had terminated prior thereto.

Inasmuch as Mr. Psaltis in good faith obtained an assignment and expended considerable money in drilling operations, the committee is of the opinion that oil and gas lease Sacramento 037552–C should be reinstated and Mr. Psaltis' assignment recognized if he qualifies to hold a lease under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act.

Enactment of H.R. 1233 will authorize reinstatement and validation of said oil and gas lease and permit the Secretary of the Interior to process the assignment in accordance with existing laws and regulations.

### COSTS

No appropriations are authorized nor contemplated by H.R. 1233.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that in these instances and in other instances which may develop today, I may, at an appropriate point in the RECORD, insert reports and other reasons justifying the various legislative proposals.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the fall 1963 issue of the North Carolina Law Review carries a symposium entitled "Civil Rights and the South." Included in this symposium is an article written by me, entitled "The U.S. Congress and Civil Rights Legislation."

While this article analyzes the specific provisions of S. 1731, which was introduced in the Senate on June 19, 1963, it contains many observations which are relevant to the provisions of H.R. 7152, which was reported to the House by the House Committee on the Judiciary on November 20, 1963, and which is now pending before the House Committee on Rules. As indicated by my article, S. 1731, H.R. 7152, and all other so-called civil rights bills of modern vintage are subject to the following objections:

First. They are wholly unnecessary for the very simple reason that sections 241, 242, and 371 of title 18 of the United States Code and sections 1983 and 1985 of title 42 of the United States Code are sufficient to secure to all Americans of all races every right given them by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Second. Many of their provisions are incompatible with specific provisions of the Constitution, such as article I, section 2, article II, section 1, and the 17th amendment, vesting in the legislatures of the several States the power to prescribe the qualifications for voters; article I, section 1, vesting in Congress all the legislative powers of the Federal Government; the 5th amendment prohibiting the Federal Government from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and the 14th amendment restricting the power of Congress to legislate in respect to State action only in the particulars enumerated.

Third. Virtually all of their provisions are incompatible with the Federal system of government established by the Constitution. As the Supreme Court so well declared in Texas against White, the Constitution in all its provisions "looks to an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

Fourth. Many of their provisions are inconsistent with the fundamental principle of justice which decrees that all laws should apply in like manner to all men in like circumstances.

Fifth. Many of their provisions vest uncontrolled and uncontrollable discretionary power in Federal officials and, for that reason, are irreconcilable with the principle that we have a government of laws rather than a government of men.

Sixth. Many of their provisions undertake to rob all Americans of basic economic, legal, personal, and property rights for the supposed benefit of only one segment of our population and, for that reason, conflict with the principle that all men are entitled to stand equal before the law.

Seventh. They attempt to solve, by the coercive power of Federal law, problems which can only be solved in a satisfactory manner by cooperation, good will, and tolerance on the part of the people in local communities.

Eighth. They are based upon the fallacy that men can achieve economic and social satisfaction by the coercive power of law rather than by their personal exertions.

When all is said, those of us who oppose civil rights proposals of this nature are seeking to preserve the system of government ordained by the Constitution, and the basic economic, legal, personal, and property rights of individuals for the benefit of all Americans of all races and all generations. As one of the greatest students of American government, Woodrow Wilson, declared:

> The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

Since my article in the fall 1963 issue of the North Carolina Law Review points out some of the defects in the pending civil rights proposals, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE U.S. CONGRESS AND CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR.)

Recent years have seen a spate of legislation proposed and enacted allegedly designed to protect the civil rights of American citizens. In the next few pages, I should like to analyze some of the attitudes and philosophies behind this legislation, and to show why I consider them constitutionally defective.

### I

At the very beginning I must declare my opposition to those who hold that a Senator should pay little heed to constitutional questions; instead, seems the attitude, a Senator should concern himself only with policy, relying on the Supreme Court to supply the judgment as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the legislation. There are several answers to such an argument.

First, I as a Senator take my oath of office by swearing fealty to the Constitution of the United States. Just as Chief Justice John Marshall found the source of judicial review in this oath taken by him, so can a Senator honestly repeat the always timely message that it is the Constitution he is expounding. Moreover, the Supreme Court gives a presumption of constitutionality to any law passed by the Congress. Especially, since 1938 this is true of legislation passed under the commerce clause, a clause now being discovered allegedly to have application to the racial problem. For a Senator to deny himself the responsibility of consideration of the constitutionality of legislation would be to deny the very premise of constitutional presumption—that the Court can presume constitutionality because the Congress itself has fully considered the constitutional issues involved.

Moreover, even if one admits that certain proposals would be constitutional in the narrow sense that they would be upheld by a contemporary Supreme Court, "constitutionality" carries with it a broader meaning than that. Cynics are fond of quoting Mr. Hughes' comment that the Constitution is what the courts say it is. To say this, which is only half-true, and stop, is to distort the meaning of the American experience, which attempts, insofar as humanly possible to institute a government of unvarying principles. Alexander Bickel put the issue well in an article in the New Republic on title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 (S. 1731),[1] when he said "what the Court will establish as a matter of constitutional power under the Commerce Clause does not necessarily dispose of all issues of principle, either for the Court or for Congress. There may be reasons of principle that should cause Congress not to exercise its commerce power at all, or to the full."[2] Thus, even though I question seriously even the "technical" constitutionality of the proposed civil rights legislation, should I admit that the Court would uphold them, ad arguendo, I would still insist that the "higher meaning" of "constitutionality" would then come into play and would serve to defeat the legislation.

The central, overwhelming defect of proposed civil rights legislation is the abrogation of the principle of federalism involved in all of the proposals. And, it is sadly true that the Supreme Court itself has been one of the chief agents of taking away traditional rights from the States and investing them in an ever more powerful centralized Federal Government. Thus, it is up to the Congress as a whole and to each individual Representative and Senator to remember his oath and to protect the original meaning of the Constitution.

The men who composed the Constitutional Convention in 1787 comprehended in full measure the everlasting political truth that no man or set of men can be safely trusted with governmental power of an unlimited nature. In consequence, they were determined, above all things, to establish a government of laws and not of men. To prevent the exercise of arbitrary power by the Federal Government, they inserted in the Constitution of the United States the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers.

They delegated to the Federal Government the power necessary to enable it to discharge its limited functions as a central government and left to the States all other powers. It was this use of the doctrine of the separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make these memorable remarks in his opinion in *Texas* v. *White*.[3]

"Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States, through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States."[4]

The proponents of current civil rights legislation, many of them undoubted men of good will, would, in an attempt to meet a genuine problem concerning the inflamed nature of relations between the races in this country, pounce upon an even more pressing need—the need to preserve limited, constitutional government in an age of mass bureaucracy and centralization.

Much of the proposed legislation would obliterate our Federal system. For example, the so-called literacy bills would contravene the specific constitutional assignment to the States to set the qualifications for their voters, limited only by the command of the 15th amendment that racial qualifications are unconstitutional. Instead, the proponents of such measures would have the U.S. Congress arbitrarily impose its own definition of literacy upon the States. In addition, the 1963 version of the bill, incorporated as title I of S. 1731,[5] would even allow the Federal Government to take over the registration machinery from a locality if a judge found that less than 15 percent of the members of one race were registered to vote.

Everyone qualified should be allowed to register and vote or else our democratic heritage is trampled in the ground. Prosecution, by the State or Federal agencies with jurisdiction, of individuals, who under color of law discriminate, should be vigorous. There are laws already on the books to accomplish this. Federal prosecution is guaranteed under provisions of 18 U.S.C. 242,[6] 18 U.S.C. 241,[7] and 18 U.S.C. 371.[8] In addition, there are the Civil Rights Acts of 1957[9] and 1960[10] which put further laws at the disposal of the Attorney General and his staff.

---

[1] S. 1731, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963) (hereinafter cited as S. 1731).

[2] Bickel, "Civil Rights and the Congress," the New Republic, Aug. 3, 1963, p. 14.

[3] 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 700 (1868).

[4] Id. at 725.

[5] S. 1731, § 101.

[6] 18 U.S.C. § 242 (1948).

[7] 18 U.S.C. § 241 (1948).

[8] 18 U.S.C. § 371 (1948).

[9] 71 Stat. 634 (codified in scattered sections of 5, 28, 42 U.S.C.).

[10] 74 Stat. 86 (codified in scattered sections of 18, 20, 42 U.S.C.).

Unfortunately, from the standpoint of some people, these laws all preserve such time-consuming and inconvenient procedures as the necessity for full and convincing proof in individual cases, and the guarantees of trial by jury. Thus, in their haste to achieve the end to any discrimination in voting anywhere, these zealots are willing to trample on traditional judicial guarantees and to destroy the Federal system.

The entire "Civil Rights Act of 1963" can be used as illustration of this theme, for every title has the Federal Government further intruding into State and local affairs. It would be well for our country if the advocates of such legislation would pause and ponder these wise words of Mr. Justice Sutherland:

"Every journey to a forbidden end begins with the first step; and the danger of such a step by the Federal Government in the direction of taking over the powers of the States is that the end of the journey may find the States so despoiled of their powers, or—what may amount to the same thing—so relieved of the responsibilities which possession of the powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to little more than geographical subdivisions of the national domain. It is safe to say that if, when the Constitution was under consideration, it had been thought that any such danger lurked behind its plain words, it would never have been ratified." [11]

The most obvious example of such attempts to reduce the States to meaningless zeroes on the Nation's map is, of course, the public accommodations section of the act, title II.[12] Hopefully, Congress will correctly recognize that few more blatantly unconstitutional and unwise pieces of legislation have ever been proposed. But, whatever the legislative fate of title II, it is still profitable to examine the philosophies behind it.

We do well to look to the words of an eminent jurist, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in regard to the interstate commerce clause:

"The interpenetrations of modern society have not wiped out State lines. It is not for us to make inroads upon our Federal system either by indifference to its maintenance or excessive regard for the unifying forces of modern technology. Scholastic reasoning may prove that no activity is isolated within the boundaries of a single State, but that cannot justify absorption of legislative power by the United States over every activity." [13]

Now it is true that this same jurist also preached that the judgment regarding the balance between the State and Federal Government, especially in regard to the commerce clause, was to be left to the legislative bodies themselves. This points out once again, I believe, the overwhelming importance of the necessity of a Senator or Repsentative to consider fully the constitutional implications of legislative proposals.

The enactment of title II would open the door for Federal supervision over any and every facet of an individual's life. Once we begin using the commerce clause to affect matters that have no rational connection with the free flow of goods, then we have fatally dropped the bar to governmental tyranny that was the purpose of the original framers of the Constitution, who were so careful to construct safeguards against an all-encompassing Federal Government. Again, it is not a matter of the end served. Progress in voluntary desegregation of places of public accommodations is to be applauded. But law, and especially law emanating from the impersonal Federal Government, cannot change social customs; only local men of good will of both races, meeting, and talking frankly together, can solve those problems which exist between the races.

The attempts being made to erase State lines are not only manifestly unwise, but also clearly unconstitutional. I might refer my readers to the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on S. 1731 [14] held in July, August, and September of this year for a full discussion of the unconstitutionality of the legislation. But even a cursory glance at judicial precedent will indicate the constitutional unworthiness of the bill. It is enough to refer to the civil rights cases [15] of 1883, to dismiss the claim that the 13th or 14th amendments offer sustenance to the provision. One need only quote from Mr. Justice Bradley's majority opinion where he stated: "It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject-matter of the amendment." [16] Even those decisions which have extended, and in my opinion, unwarrantably, the concept of State action, have always been careful to point out the interrelationship between the State and the operation regulated. Thus, for example, two controversial decisions [17] both reaffirmed the traditional understanding of the 14th amendment. As stated in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer:* [18]

"Since the decision of this Court in the civil rights cases * * *, the principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the 14th amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful.[19]

Justice Clark, writing for the Court in *Burton* v. *Wilmington Parking Authority* [20] further stated that "private conduct abridging individual rights does no violence to the Equal Protection Clause unless to some significant extent the State in any of its manifestations has been found to have become involved in it." [21]

The interstate commerce clause is also a dubious peg on which to hang the public accommodations bill. Never before has the clause been used to regulate that which has absolutely no connection with the manufacture, labeling, or shipment of goods. Here, too, those decisions which apparently go farthest in the opposite direction actually support this view. For example, *Wickard* v. *Filburn,*[22] which the proponents of title II cite as authority for their position, actually supports my view, in that the decision did nothing more than carry to its logical, if absurd, conclusion the concept that goods which affect other goods in their flow through interstate commerce are covered by the terms of the commerce clause. Thus, poor farmer Filburn's wheat was held to affect the status in interstate commerce of all other wheat. How one can derive from this case any conclusion that the interstate commerce clause could be used to compel whom Mr. Filburn must hire or to whom he must sell, is beyond my understanding. To destroy the Federal system and the liberties guaranteed by that system, with its prevention of centralized tyranny, in order to legislate alleged equality, would be to destroy constitutional government. We should hearken to the words of Mr. Justice Harlan, speaking to the American Bar Association.

"Our Federal system, though born of the necessity of achieving union, has proved to be a bulwark of freedom as well. We are accustomed to speak of the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment as the principal guarantees of personal liberty. Yet it would surely be shallow not to recognize that the structure of our political system accounts no less for the free society we have. Indeed, it was upon the structure of government that the founders primarily focused in writing the Constitution. Out of bitter experience they were suspicious of every form of all-powerful central authority and they sought to assure that such a government would never exist in this country by structuring the Federal Establishment so as to diffuse power between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The diffusion of power between Federal and State authority serves the same ends, and takes on added significance as the size of the Federal bureaucracy continues to grow.

A federal system is of course difficult to operate, demanding political genius of the highest order. It requires accommodations being made that may often seem irksome or inefficient. But out of that very necessity usually comes pragmatic solutions of more lasting value than those emanating from the pens of the best of theoretical planners. Unless we are prepared to consider the diversified development of the United States as having run its course and to envisage the future of the country largely as that of a welfare society we will do well to keep what has been called the delicate balance of Federal-State relations in good working order." [23]

As Justice Harlan says, the reason for the preservation of the federal system is that that system is the best guarantor of our fundamental liberties. I concur wholeheartedly in the mordant analysis of Robert Bock of Yale University's Law School, when he says:

"Instead of a discussion of the merits of legislation, of which the proposed Interstate Public Accommodations Act outlawing discrimination in business facilities serving the public may be taken as the prototype, we are treated to debate whether it is more or less cynical to pass the law under the commerce power or the 14th amendment, and whether the Supreme Court is more likely to hold it constitutional one way or the other * * *. The discussion we ought to hear is the cost of freedom that must be paid for such legislation, the morality of enforcing morals through law, and the likely consequences for law enforcement of trying to do so." [24]

Truly, in the midst of the cynical debate on how best can sections of the Constitution be stretched beyond their traditional understanding to encompass the aims of certain social theorists, there is all too little discussion of the immense price in personal liberty and freedom that will be the cost of such so-called reform. Once again we are well advised by Mr. Justice Harlan, who when writing in *Peterson* v. *City of Greenville,*[25] stated:

"Underlying the cases involving an alleged denial of equal protection by ostensibly private action is a clash of competing constitutional claims of a high order: liberty and equality. Freedom of the individual to choose his associates or his neighbors, to use and dispose of his property as he sees fit, to be irrational, arbitrary, capricious, even unjust in his personal relations are things all entitled to a large measure of protection from governmental interference. This liberty would be overridden, in the name of equality, if the strictures of the [14th] amendment were applied to governmental and private action without distinction. Also inherent in the concept of State action are values of federalism, a recognition that there are areas of private rights upon which Federal power should not lay a heavy hand and which should properly be left to the more precise instruments of local authority."[26]

---

[11] *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.,* 298 U.S. 238, 295–96 (1935).

[12] S. 1731, §§ 201–205.

[13] *Polish Nat'l Alliance* v. *NLRB,* 322 U.S. 643, 650 (1943).

[14] Hearings on S. 1731 before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[15] 109 U.S. 3 (1883).

[16] Id. at 11.

[17] *Burton* v. *Wilmington Parking Authority,* 365 U.S. 715 (1961); *Shelley* v. *Kraemer,* 334 U.S. 1 (1947).

[18] Supra note 17.

[19] 334 U.S. at 13.

[20] 365 U.S. 715 (1961).

[21] Id. at 722.

[22] 317 U.S. 111 (1942).

[23] Address by Associate Justice Harlan, American Bar Center, Aug. 13, 1963.

[24] Bock, "Civil Rights—A Challenge," the New Republic, Aug. 31, 1963, pp. 21–22.

[25] 373 U.S. 244 (1963).

Thus, in summary, the main substantive constitutional defect of proposed civil rights legislation is the abrogation of the Federal system that would come in the aftermath of choosing equality over liberty and freedom. I have spoken briefly only of two particular items of legislation, the literacy bill and the Public Accommodations Act, but both stand for the entire range of proposed legislation, all revolutionizing our traditional understanding of the meaning of liberty within the American federal system.

## II

The first section of this article was intended to expose briefly the chief substantive demerit of proposed civil rights legislation—the loss of the traditional liberty guaranteed by, among other things, the federal system, in an attempt to legislate equality. In this section, however, I should like to consider the chief procedural defect of this proposed legislation, a defect so great in itself as to raise serious constitutional questions. I am speaking of the vast amount of discretionary power that would be lodged in various parts of the executive department by the proposed bill.

Our ancestors appraised at its full value the everlasting truth embodied in Daniel Webster's assertion that "whatever government is not a government of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may." Consequently they prized very highly the following concept: that our courts should administer equal and exact justice according certain and uniform laws applying in like manner to all men in like situations.

Titles I,[27] II,[28] and III[29] of S. 1731 all give the Attorney General of the United States the power to intervene in disputes between the individual and the allegedly discriminating officials or individuals. In the case of title I, dealing with voting rights, the new grant of power merely continues the unwise precedents established in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957[30] and 1960.[31] But the remaining two titles feature entirely new grants of power. Thus, section 204 (a) and (b) read:

"SEC. 204. (a) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 203 [discrimination in public accommodations], a civil action for preventive relief * * * may be instituted (1) by the person aggrieved, or (2) by the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States if he certifies that he has received a written complaint from the person aggrieved and that in his judgment (i) the person aggrieved is unable to initiate and maintain appropriate legal proceedings and (ii) the purposes of this title will be materially furthered by the filing of an action.

"(b) In any action commenced pursuant to this title by the person aggrieved, he shall if he prevails be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee as part of the costs."[32]

Likewise, title III gives the Attorney General the discretionary power to institute suits in behalf of school desegregation.[33]

By these provisions, the bill proposes to do these two things: (1) to establish a new procedure for the enforcement or vindication of certain supposed civil rights of private persons at the expense of the taxpayers; and (2) to confer upon one fallible human being; namely, the temporary occupant of the Office of the Attorney General, whoever he may be, the despotic power to grant the benefit of the procedure to some persons and withhold it from others.

The proposed law is scarcely operative at all unless the Attorney General, acting either with or without reason, so wills. This is not government by law. It is government by the whim of the Attorney General.

It is to be noted, moreover, that the new procedure to be authorized by the bill is to be used for and against such persons only as the Attorney General may select. This being true, the bill is utterly repugnant to the fundamental concept that courts are created to administer equal and exact justice in compliance with certain and uniform laws applying in like manner to all men in like situations. Moreover, section 204(b)[34] requires a successfully prosecuted defendant to pay the costs of his prosecution, whereas if he successfully defends himself, there is no like payment of his costs by the plaintiff. This goes against every canon of equal justice and equal protection and is a particularly glaring example of the fundamental corners some are willing to cut in order to reach allegedly worthwhile goals.

There is always danger that discretionary governmental power may permit the public officer in whom it is reposed to rule arbitrarily without the restraint of law. As a consequence, no legislative body should ever adopt any statute conferring discretionary governmental power upon any public officer unless such statutes satisfies the only valid test of the advisability of legislation of this nature. The test is to measure the evil a bad public officer may do under the proposed law rather than the good a good public officer may do under it.

The above-mentioned titles, in addition to title VI,[35] which would grant the President the uncontrolled power to cut off Federal aid to any projects which he, for whatever reason, deemed to be "discriminatory," cannot satisfy this test. If they were enacted, they would vest in the temporary occupant of the office of Attorney General, regardless of his character or qualifications, absolute power to act or refrain from acting in the premises at his uncontrollable discretion. Thus the proposed laws, especially the one allowing for the arbitrary cutoff of federal aid, would constitute a political weapon of the first magnitude which any administration which happens to believe in pragmatic politics could pervert from their avowed purposes to curry favor with some groups or to browbeat state officials into submission to its will. This is especially true where, as in the case of these bills, the words central to the bills, such as "discrimination" or "racial imbalance," or "substantial," etc., are not defined so as to give anyone a reasonable assurance as to when he might be covered.

This is a despotic power which no good Attorney General or President ought to want and no bad Attorney General or President ought to have.

I happen to adhere to the old-fashioned belief that it is Congress which is responsible for legislating and not the executive department or so-called independent agencies. A major defect of most proposed civil right legislation, is that Congress is asked to make vague declarations of policy and then to cede effective legislative power to administrators or officials within the body of the executive itself.

Title VI is simply the most glaring instance of this. Here the President would have the absolute, arbitrary right to cripple an entire State or even region should he invoke the in fact legislative power delegated to him by Congress. Title VII[36] is a like piece of both unconstitutional and unwise delegation of legislative power to the Executive:

"The President is authorized to establish a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity,' hereinafter referred to as the Commission. It shall be the function of the Commission to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the U.S. Government is provided by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise. The Commission shall have such powers to effectuate the purposes of this title as may be conferred upon it by the President. The President may also confer upon the Commission such powers he deems appropriate to prevent discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin in Government employment."[37]

Thus, Congress is asked for a vague mandate—the prevention of discrimination. But "The Commission shall have such powers * * * as may be conferred upon it by the President." If this is not recognized as an unconstitutional delegation of power, then our view of the alleged separation of powers must undergo a radical change.

In summation then, to effect a good end—the ending of arbitrary discrimination against any American, regardless of his race or color—advocates of civil rights legislation are willing to trample on traditional procedural liberties, among them the freedom from arbitrary discretionary power vested in a powerful Central Government. I might say that, should such legislation continue to be introduced and passed, then several years from now we will need new civil rights legislation to protect all of us from the abuses of an arbitrary Federal Government. Then those of us who had fought to preserve the Constitution from the beginning may have a rueful last laugh, as the truth of the old maxims that "the end does not justify the means" and "power corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely" will be recognized.

## III

Substantively and procedurally, then, the proposed civil rights legislation suffers from fatal defects, manifesting not only the unwisdom of the bills, but also their unconstitutionality. When all is said, certain provisions of S. 1731 would confer upon officers within the executive branch autocratic powers which may befit the office of commissar of justice in a totalitarian country, but which are incompatible with the office of chief law enforcement division of a republic having a government of laws rather than a government of men.

Undoubtedly, Daniel Webster had such governmental actions in mind as those proposed by S. 1731 when he uttered these eloquent words:

"Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields,

---

[26] Id. at 250 (separate opinion).

[27] S. 1731, § 101.

[28] S. 1731, §§ 201–05.

[29] S. 1731, §§ 301–10.

[30] 71 Stat. 634 (codified in scattered sections of 5, 28, 42 U.S.C.).

[31] 74 Stat. 86 (codified in scattered sections of 18, 20, 42 U.S.C.).

[32] S. 1731, §§ 204 (a), (b).

[33] S. 1731, § 307.

[34] S. 1731, § 204(b).

[35] S. 1731, § 601.

[36] S. 1731, §§ 701–03.

[37] S. 1731, § 701.

> still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.
>
> "It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.
>
> "But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?
>
> "Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?
>
> "Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?
>
> "No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than ever were shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty."[38]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call may be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, despite the 3-minute limitation during the morning hour, 10 minutes be allotted to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful to the majority leader. I do not believe I shall require that much time, but I do wish to clear up something which occurred yesterday. Yesterday I gave notice on the floor of the Senate of my intention to propose an amendment to the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill (H.R. 7063) which would restore to the item, "salaries and expenses, general legal activities," the full budget request for personnel in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

At that time, as I stated, I had made only a preliminary investigation of the relevant facts and figures. I had relied to some extent upon an article published in yesterday morning's New York Times for some of the details surrounding the item for the Civil Rights Division.

I have since had the chance to explore the matter at greater length and would like to keep the record straight on what the situation is and what the proposed amendment is intended to accomplish.

First. In both fiscal year 1962 and 1963, and at the present time, there were and are 81 full-time positions in the Civil Rights Division. Right now, they are all filled; there are no vacancies. Of these 81 positions, 40 are lawyers, and 41 are clerical personnel.

Second. The Justice Department has said—and those fully conversant with its enforcement functions under the civil rights laws have concurred—that it cannot properly perform its increasingly heavy caseload duties without additional personnel. The present staff is tremendously overburdened with its current litigation and other important activities in voting, school desegregation, police brutality, and other principal categories of cases. Some measure of the insuperable burdens placed on the present staff lies in the overtime that has been logged. In fiscal year 1962, the clerical staff, 41 in number, had under 2,500 hours of compensated overtime; in fiscal 1963, it has logged more than double the overtime for the previous year—5,069 paid overtime hours for clerical personnel. The lawyers' overtime is more difficult to calculate, because many in the legal staff—for example, those in the appellate section of the Civil Rights Division—handle in addition to strictly civil rights cases a large number of appeals in matters of Federal parole and custody arising out of the administration of the Federal prisons. Right now, however, 20 to 35 lawyers in the Civil Rights Division who concentrate on civil rights assignments are carrying the brunt of the average of 525 hours per week of uncompensated overtime for the legal staff as a whole. That is an average, and applicable to the entire legal staff. I repeat, however, that those lawyers who are handling civil rights cases proper are carrying the brunt of the overtime burdens. They are logging the overtime gratis, and they are tremendously overworked.

Third. The work of the Civil Rights Division is steadily increasing, and, if the civil rights bill is enacted, as it surely will be, the burdens will be staggering. But confining its enforcement responsibilities as they stack up under existing law, the budget request this year was for 38 additional positions, of which half or 19 were provided for in the House bill, leaving 19 positions short of the original estimate. These 19 positions would require the additional sum of $167,000 to be added in the Senate to the item "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities."

Fourth. The Committee on Appropriations restored the sum of $84,000 to the item in question. However, at page 9 of the committee report, it is indicated that the $84,000 over and above the House allowance is intended to provide funding for about 10 additional positions in the Tax and Civil Divisions of the Department to assist with increased workloads in those Divisions. While this statement in the committee report, as a legal matter, does not technically bind the Department to use the funds for the purposes indicated, everyone knows that as a practical matter, these sums cannot be diverted to, say, the Civil Rights Division to help it meet its increasing burdens. Therefore, the Civil Rights Division is, at this time, still 19 positions short of the budget estimate.

Fifth. The 19 positions, at a cost of $167,000, is a modest request. Of these 19 positions, 11 are for clerical personnel. The remaining 8 would be for lawyers, 2 at GS-12, which has a salary of $9,475; 2 at GS-11, which has a salary of $8,045; and 4 at GS-9, which is $6,675. These legal positions, at the salaries indicated, are not exactly ones which would inevitably attract leading members of the bar. They are modest salaries, and for the work that is put in by lawyers in the Civil Rights Division, they are probably less than what in all fairness should be provided.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sent to the desk yesterday an amendment which would add to the amount recommended by the committee the sum of $167,000 for the additional 19 positions in the Civil Rights Division. My colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is a cosponsor of that amendment. Therefore, unless the Justice Department feels it can perform its assigned tasks in this important field with fewer personnel than originally requested, it is my intention to call up the amendment when the Justice appropriations measure is reached for consideration this week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

## FURTHER INSTANCES OF IRRESPONSIBLE SPENDING BY PROCUREMENT OFFICERS IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, once again I call attention to two Comptroller General reports, both of which deal with the same old story—unnecessary waste and irresponsible spending by the procurement officers in the Defense Department.

The first report, dated November 13, 1963—B-146732—discloses that over a 2½-year period the Government paid in leasing costs a total of $2,468,492 on two IBM 704 computer systems which could have been bought as new equipment for only $871,182.

The Comptroller General estimated that had these two machines been purchased outright the total maintenance costs over the entire period would have been $298,034.

Thus, had the Government bought these two IBM computers outright, instead of leasing them at these exhorbitant rates, they could have saved $1,299,276 in actual cash and owned two machines at the end of the period.

In the second report, dated November 29, 1963—B-146823—the Comptroller General calls our attention to an Air Force Department fixed-price incentive contract, AF 01(601)-31042, awarded to Grumman Aviation Engineering Corp.

This contract was for the modification of SA-16 aircraft, and Grumman was authorized by the Mobile Air Materiel Area to procure the needed equipment.

---

[38] Address by Daniel Webster at public dinner celebrating Washington's birthday in Washington, D.C., Feb. 22, 1832.

The Comptroller General stated that the prices obtained by Grumman, which totaled about $2,300,000, were about $872,000, or 61 percent, higher than prices that were currently being obtained by the Air Force and the Navy for like equipment.

In addition Grumman was awarded a profit of about $278,000 on its purchases of this equipment on which it was paying 61 percent more than normal prices.

Thus, the cost to the U.S. Government on this $2,300,000 contract was $1,150,000 more than was necessary, or nearly double what the cost should have been.

I quote one paragraph from the Comptroller General's report which outlines a specific example of these excessive overpayments under the Grumman Aviation contract:

> In June 1960 the Navy purchased 51 AN/APS-88 radar sets at a unit price of $26,971. Three and one-half months later, during October 1960, the Navy purchased 57 additional sets at a unit price of $16,974 and, during October 1961, purchased additional sets at a slightly lower price. However, in September 1960 Grumman purchased nine sets at a unit price of $30,289 and in April 1961 purchased nine additional sets plus spare components at a unit price of $32,275 which was nearly double the most recent Navy price.

I repeat what I have said on numerous occasions heretofore; and that is, that the only manner in which the Defense Department will ever stop this indefensible waste is to fire the procurement officers who are responsible. Had this happened in private industry, they would have been gone long ago.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD pages 8 and 9 of the Comptroller General's Report No. B-146732. This insertion gives a more detailed breakdown of the excessive expenditures under the leasing arrangements and the two IBM 704 computers.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Data reduction computer system*

| | |
|---|---|
| Cost of leasing system (IBM 704 and supporting equipment): | |
| 1961—rental plus overtime charges | $379,938 |
| 1962—rental plus overtime charges | 406,502 |
| 1963—January through August—rental cost plus overtime | 210,240 |
| Leasing cost for 2 years, 8 months | 996,680 |
| Add interest on lease cost | 23,605 |
| Total leasing cost | 1,020,285 |
| Cost of IBM 704 system, new | 1,229,370 |
| Less reduction | 860,559 |
| Cost to purchase Dec. 31, 1960 | 368,811 |
| Add: | |
| Maintenance, 31 months [1] | 121,034 |
| Interest on purchase cost | 21,922 |
| Interest on maintenance cost | 2,784 |
| Total cost to purchase | 514,551 |
| Excess cost incurred by leasing data reduction computer | 505,734 |

[1] 1-month maintenance included in purchase price.

FLIGHT SIMULATION LABORATORY AT WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

The IBM 704 system installed at the Flight Simulation Laboratory in October 1959 was also leased from IBM under GSA contract. The contract provided for a monthly rental rate of approximately $55,000 for primary shift utilization (8 hours per day, 5 days a week) plus an additional charge for extra shift utilization.

Although WSMR could have purchased this equipment from IBM at reduced prices which would have been advantageous to the Government, we could find no evidence that any consideration was given to procuring the needed equipment from IBM. Inasmuch as WSMR continued to lease this equipment from IBM, rather than to procure it, unnecessary costs of $794,000 were incurred from January 1961 through June 1963. This equipment was replaced by more modern equipment in July 1963.

The average monthly rental charge for the equipment which would have been more economical to purchase than to lease was $47,223. The summary of our computation of unnecessary costs incurred by leasing the 704 system is as follows:

*Laboratory computer system*

| | |
|---|---|
| Cost of leasing system (IBM 704 and supporting equipment): | |
| 1961—rental plus overtime charges | $618,427 |
| 1962—rental plus overtime charges | 567,814 |
| 1963—January through June, rental plus overtime charges | 230,468 |
| Leasing cost for 2 years, 6 months | 1,416,709 |
| Add interest on lease cost | 31,498 |
| Total leasing cost | 1,448,207 |
| Cost of IBM 704 system, new | 1,674,570 |
| Less reduction | 1,172,199 |
| Cost to purchase Dec. 31, 1960 | 502,371 |
| Add: | |
| Maintenance, 29 months [1] | 121,248 |
| Interest on purchase cost | 28,432 |
| Interest on maintenance cost | 2,614 |
| Total cost to purchase | 654,665 |
| Excess cost incurred by leasing laboratory computer | 793,542 |

[1] 1-month maintenance in purchase price.

## LONELY SOULS—THE PROBLEM OF THE NEGRO IN A WHITE COMMUNITY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the Miami Daily News of December 9 there appeared a particularly poignant and persuasive article by one of the South's great writers and editors, Bill Baggs, entitled "Lonely Souls."

It is a touching description of the problem of the Negro and his feelings as he endeavors to live in what is predominantly a white man's community.

It is not too often on this particular subject that I find myself in agreement with Mr. Baggs, but in this instance I could not help but agree and be moved by some of the things he had to say, particularly with respect to the indefensibility of intolerance, bigotry, ignorance, and discrimination.

However, the thrust of the article was that the matter is one of the soul and that all souls are alike, irrespective of the color of the skin. Bill Baggs then went on to say, in quoting one of Florida's former Governors:

> The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order. A court by its orders can end racial discrimination, but it cannot end racial prejudice. That is, human conduct can be influenced by laws, but not the soul. And when you get through all the noise, and all the arguments which have swirled up in the civil rights debate, you are talking about souls.

This is the approach, Mr. President, that I have been seeking to take and the reason why I have repeatedly said I do not think we need any additional laws in order to move forward in the solution to this problem which has plagued us for over 100 years.

I have stated in the past, and still firmly believe, that the core of the issue is one of the heart, the mind, and as Mr. Baggs has said "the soul," and that all of us would be better off and the problem would come nearer to being met if we candidly and frankly examined into our own souls, remembering that in God's eyes we are all God's children with no color difference in the souls of any of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### LONELY SOULS

(By Bill Baggs)

He is a Negro, born in Florida, a minister whose work beyond the church door has been a hard mixture of preaching to the black man that he must learn more to become a good citizen and preaching to the white man that our democracy shall not be complete until the Negro gets his civil rights.

In all the noise and fury, the simple reason for the Negro to petition for his rights has been shrouded.

A question was put to the minister. What does the Negro in America want?

"He wishes to become a part of America," said the minister.

This is a fact not understood by many men with white skins in our country. Since Colonial days in America, the Negro has been separate from the other people in the society. An almost historic loneliness dwells inside the Negro who thinks of this fact.

THE WALL STANDS

It is a painful loneliness for the Negro who has learned the wisdom of what Booker T. Washington wrote: "No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem."

Every race has its lazy ones, and surely the Negro race has its share, but the educated Negro suffers horribly. He has learned the dignity in the field and the dignity of a poem, and yet the wall stands there, separating him from the rest of America.

This is true in Birmingham and it is true in Philadelphia. It is true across the Republic.

NORMAL SOMEBODY

"I wish to become a normal somebody," a Negro leader said.

He did not wish to have any edge in society, any special rights, any privileges.

"What I wish is to walk a street and not be looked at, or enter a store and buy what I can afford without a feeling of discomfort, or have the children of my race go to the nearest school."

This is what the man meant in saying he wished to become "a normal somebody."

As Governor Collins remarked in a fine speech last week, the soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order. A court by its orders can end racial discrimination, but it cannot end racial prejudice. That is, human conduct can be influenced by laws, but not the soul.

And when you get through all the noise, and all the arguments which have swirled up in the civil rights debate, you are talking about souls.

### SOUL OF MAN

It is strange that in our modern society, with a treasury of knowledge not before known in history, we are embarrassed to talk aloud about souls. It nearly appears that a person might fear other people think him a nut if he discusses the soul of man.

And yet, it is the soul which is at the bottom of all this struggle. The lonely soul of the Negro in America, and the souls which too many white Americans have not examined. Their own souls.

## EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the State of Connecticut knew President John Fitzgerald Kennedy well. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record various editorials from Connecticut newspapers which pay tribute to our late President. These editorials truly reflect the love and respect all the people of Connecticut had for President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### John F. Kennedy

The young President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was murdered from ambush by a hate-tortured misanthrope.

The backwash of this crime is sobering the American people who, in recent years, have been more and more expressing their anxieties and fears about public policy in reckless, even sick, political behavior.

The prime suspect appears to be a confused and paranoiac promoter of Fair Play for Cuba. This organization has been known to attract persons of far-left affiliations and was, at one time, partially financed from Cuba proper. The suspected assassin was reportedly active in the Cuban sympathy movement after having been denied Russian citizenship.

But this aberration had been preceded by others, suggesting a dangerous and pathetic instability of mind and emotion. That a President of the United States should die at such hands deepens our humiliation and heightens our grief.

Between the extremists of the right and of the left in this country the late President tried nobly to illuminate and to explain the realities of modern problems; to hold the majority on a course of reason; to isolate and to shame those who would employ spittle, and sickening slogans, and riotous conduct as political weapons.

Mr. Kennedy's inaugural proclamation that we must never negotiate from fear but also never fear to negotiate was turned against him by jingoes who still believe that they can blow down the Communist monolith with hot air.

His steely and deadly earnest response to the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba and his contempt for the perfidious Castro enraged the self-exiled minority in American society who cling to the deception that Castro's revolution was genuine, wholesome, and necessary.

The President's eloquent appeal for practical brotherhood as a first fundamental in civil rights and equal justice before the law won him the contempt of Dixie.

The humiliation at the Bay of Pigs. The detestable wall across Europe. The throbbing carbuncle of Cuba. The indissoluble power of the ruling class and moneyed interests of Latin America. The worsening domestic economic future charted for the United States. These challenges were faced by the late Mr. Kennedy with patience, with reason, with firmness and with programs.

But he was finding himself more and more whipsawed between extremes. He was hobbled by equivocation and indecision in Congress and within large areas of public opinion. And he was being abandoned by faithless colleagues who started drifting from the President's side to save their own hides.

It is only now, when this young man is lifeless and mourned, that some shocked Americans will cool down and listen to what he had to say.

Now the vicious gossip about the Kennedy dynasty will not evoke such cruel laughter.

Now the hope and the commonsense, the humor and the idealism, the courage and the insights of what Senator Russell called this brilliant and dedicated young statesman will get the hearing, posthumously, that they have always deserved.

Mr. Kennedy's first 3 years in the White House were interpreted as disappointing by some of his friends. He was damned for moving too slowly in civil rights. Then when he moved, after the violence at Oxford and Birmingham, he was cursed for precipitating tensions with no plans for allaying them.

The President was on the right side in the great debate over the moral challenge inherent in the race crisis—and no man of conscience, of ethical awareness, of scientific reasoning or religious conviction could deny it.

But the rightness of his cause became lost in the fierce and cynical maneuvers of special and regional interests; in the muck of political contention; in the howling tribalism of party factions—stirred to a kind of semantic madness by the narcotic of unreasoning dissent.

Well, John F. Kennedy did not live beyond the age of 46. He was not allowed the grace of even one full term in the office he had won, and which he had enriched and enlivened with great intellectual and cultural attentiveness.

Although personally popular for his masculine charm and the exciting glow cast by his beautiful wife and their utterly normal family, John Kennedy was denied the full attention and the respect that his ideas, his modern idealism, and his vastly researched plans warranted. Too many people were searching for too easy answers—and they still are.

Perhaps as we review the tragically shortened career of this young man, we can think more objectively about the real content and portent of the issues upon which he discoursed so solemnly and, at times, so futilely. That would seem to be the least measure of gratitude and devotion that we can pay to John Fitzgerlald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, whose life was yielded to a fanatic's gun in Dallas, Tex., November 22, 1963.

Robert W. Lucas.

---

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Death of a President

Not since the assassination of Abraham Lincoln has the lightning of fate struck down a President with such swift unexpectedness as yesterday in the streets of Dallas. This senseless murder leaves one awed and numb. Here is a change in the leadership of the country that no one expected and that no one can have wanted—surely not even that twisted, malignant spirit in human form that caused it.

What does this portend? What effect will this tragedy have on that surging tide of racial change whose sweep will still, inevitably, make real for America's Negroes as well as whites that historic affirmation that all men are created equal? What effect will this blow have an legislation? What on the presidential election that is less than a year away? Still more, what new directions will it give to that titanic struggle that dominates the last half of our century—the cold war?

The answers to these questions, and many more like them, are unknown. At the moment one comes back only to the blow itself. There looms the human drama. At one moment President Kennedy was enjoying the accustomed, carefree routine of being a visitor among some part of the American people. And those people, no matter what their party, always find their hearts quickening at the sight of the President. In the next instant the hand of death struck, from nowhere. Half an hour later the youngest man ever to be elected President of the United States lay dead. Almost surely he had ahead of him 5 more years in office, and that full place in history, reserved for those who are two-time Presidents. We remember the confident young man of the inaugural, on that frosty day less than 3 years ago delivering to a listening, watching Nation, what may well be that one of his speeches to live in history. There followed the familiar course of partisan political battles—a tripartite battle it was, what with the backward tug of the southern wing of Mr. Kennedy's own party.

Now all that has fallen away, and there is only awe and stillness.

There remains the bereaved family—two young, fatherless children. Even both of the President's parents remain to mourn. And there was the President's wife, one moment gay with life, the next sheltering the bleeding head of her husband in her arms.

For a moment the turbulent stream of history is stilled. This event calls to mind our earlier President Johnson, Andrew, who likewise came in office by the accident of a madman's bullet. We think of the new President, Lyndon Johnson, suddenly confronted with uncounted responsibilities. He is an older man than his predecessor, and he has known illness. But then President Eisenhower, too, has had a heart attack, and he lives.

Such an event as this highlights the almost casual way we choose our Vice Presidents. Yet this country has lived through such swift, sharp turns in its course before in the century and three-quarters of the Constitution. Today the future is a question mark. All we can do is say, after the fashion of the peoples of old when death brought them the uncertainty of a new ruler: Long live the king.

There are two schools of thought as to what shapes history. One holds that men make events, the other the reverse. This last view was written by Tolstoi in his "War and Peace." The tide in human affairs is what shapes the future, he argues, and it inevitably calls up leaders who ride its crest. Probably the truth lies halfway between this view and the other, that great men bend our course to their will. We can be sure that the next half decade, at least, will be different from what it would have been if yesterday's blow had not struck. Yet there are clearly also great historical forces at work, in this country and in the world. They are forces that will not be denied, no matter who is in office.

This is a time for all of us to open our hearts and our minds, to be generous to the new President, as he faces the darkness ahead. We are a people who do not seem to feel ourselves called to greatness. We are given to seizing the main chance, to letting George do it, to not wanting to be involved. Perhaps now we shall be shocked into a more sober awareness of our duties as citizens. Faced with this tragedy, let us for the moment at least push hate and fear aside. Let us mourn him who has left us. Let us uphold him who succeeds him. Indeed, let us make a quiet resolve to do our part to see that, in those familiar words whose centenary we have just observed, this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom. And, we might add, of courage, and devotion, and strength.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A NATION MOURNS ITS SLAIN PRESIDENT

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, is dead, killed by an assassin's bullet in Texas. The entire free world, of which he was the leader, mourns a man whose sincerity, convictions, integrity, and courage were never challenged.

The assassin struck at more than the President. He aimed his fatal bullets at every American. President Kennedy was shot because he represented you and me. He was our President. Because he was, he died. He was not slain because he was John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the individual. He was murdered because he was our President, our personal representative in national and world affairs. It is because of this that the tragedy strikes into every home and heart in the United States and outside the Nation where freedom burns.

It is ironic that Mr. Kennedy should survive enemy attacks as commander of PT-109 in World War II only to be slain by a madman in his own land.

Mr. Kennedy died as he lived—dramatically. Fate, so kind to him for 46 years, suddenly turned cruel. He did not seek to be dramatic, the role was destined for him. He filled the role nobly with distinction to himself, his family, his Nation, and his God.

Mr. Kennedy's brief but active career was one of public service. Had he so elected he could have followed a life of complete leisure. But he loved his Nation and his fellow man. He served them in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Presidency, the greatest honor any nation can confer upon one of its citizens.

In a world that is mad, it must be expected that some of its madness will rub off upon others. It was such an individual whose bullet snuffed out the life of a truly great man and added his name to those of Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley as assassinated Presidents.

When a man of the stature and character of President Kennedy suddenly leaves this world he loved, there is little that can be said. Mr. Kennedy wrote his own epitaph in life.

When another chapter is written in "Profiles in Courage," it will be about John Fitzgerald Kennedy, public servant, statesman, war hero, and father.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A MARTYRED PRESIDENT

A Nation placidly going about its noontide affairs until the dark hour of last Friday's assassination of President John F. Kennedy, attends upon his funeral today following a weekend of shocked bereavement.

A week in which Americans normally would be approaching the mixed solemnity and festivities of Thanksgiving Day has been blighted by a murder, a monstrous crime which touches upon the lives, the homes, and families of all. The prayers for the dead and for a beloved President are on millions of lips and welling from millions of hearts this morning.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the 46 years of his American boyhood, youth, and manhood was one of those marked by destiny for a role in history, not alone of his own United States but in the annals of the free world and of free men. His fellow Americans, the great and the humble everywhere, find it incredible that the assassin bullet from a sniper's gun would close so abruptly, so dreadfully, the final chapter of this too brief biography—would make of him the fourth of our martyred Presidents.

In an eventful and dramatic life of public prominence and service John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been no stranger to the plaudits of the crowds, the accolades accorded our national heroes, the distinctions designating the famous. In death, he has received the most honest, the most sincere, and the most heartfelt of tributes, an outpouring of a Nation's love and affection, esteem, and recognition. The eulogies of personal friends and admirers, of political supporters and political adversaries, have been one in their mutual expression.

Today the martyred President lies in a flag-draped casket in the Nation's Capitol. The burdens and responsibilities of his office have been thrust upon a new and sorrowing President. Governor Dempsey has proclaimed this a day of mourning in Connecticut.

The sympathies of our people, individually, and collectively, for the family of the slain president, for Mrs. Kennedy, his young daughter and son, his parents, and all who survive him, are echoed in this proclamation. Let this day be observed in our State as the Governor requests us.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE NATION'S TRAGEDY

Tragedy stalked nakedly in Texas yesterday when an assassin's bullet took the life of President Kennedy, as he pressed his previously triumphant speaking tour in the Lone Star State.

But this grim tragedy concerned not only its noted victim, and the Governor of Texas who was wounded by the same rifle burst, but extended to ever-widening circles throughout this country and the free world—yes, even to Communist nations.

The tragic event also placed an overwhelming burden upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who yesterday took the oath as President, as domestic and world problems have moved toward crossroads in which vital policies must be developed and decisive actions taken.

The current issues are too well known to be enumerated here, but some of them are taxes, medicare, Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Berlin, and myriad others. The new President, even though he may have been in close confidence with the martyred President, and is familiar with pending situations, must shoulder the task ahead and maintain the fine balance that has kept us, thus far, out of direct conflict on the international front and out of recessionary trends at home.

Thus the sudden and ghastly death of President Kennedy cast a pall over the world. In world chancelleries lights burned fitfully. In the churches, prayers were offered for the assassinated Chief Executive, and in the hearts of his countrymen, regardless of politics, there was sorrow.

This sorrow was not only for the untimely passing of a young and vigorous President. It contained also a somber feeling of worry over what portends despite the normal American optimism that everything will work out satisfactorily.

In his inaugural address President Kennedy enunciated a major precept of patriotism.

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

A few days ago former President Eisenhower added this sentence to that precept: "To live for your country is a duty as demanding as is the readiness to die for it."

On both counts, President Kennedy has set the example. None can gainsay that he lived and performed his duties faithfully as he saw them, and at the end, he gave his life.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram, Nov. 23, 1963]

### MARTYRED PRESIDENT

A tragedy beyond words struck our Nation yesterday when President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. Beyond words, indeed, for there are no words to describe the unconscionable deed, or the overwhelming grief of millions of Americans.

The facts are so stark, and so wretched, they strike all of us in a shocking manner, deeper and more poignant than any other type of sorrow. The President of the United States, young, vigorous, intelligent, personable—assassinated by the hand of a wanton, pitiless, secret foe.

This awful death, which links the President to the ranks of our martyred dead, is a profound personal and woeful loss to all of us.

Yesterday, millions of Americans differed, which is their political right, in the nature of our democratic government. And moments after President Kennedy had concluded a powerful political address and began a motorcade procession in Dallas, he slumped, virtually in the arms of his young wife, a maniac's victim.

A hush spread from Dallas over the Nation as the tragic message reached city and hamlet and tears welled spontaneously. There were then no differences of political opinion, no Democrats, no Republicans. All Americans were awed by that mysterious sense of loss that comes with death, but more especially such a cruel death.

To Mrs. Kennedy, on her first trip with the President after her own personal suffering, and to their lovely, now fatherless children—our hearts go out—we can say no more.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Herald, Nov. 24, 1963]

### A GREAT MAN DIES AND YET LIVES ON

"For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away."

Thus does the scripture on which John Kennedy's church and faith were founded counsel us regarding the fleetingly transient character of human life, and warn us that even in the fullest flower of mind and body—even in the prime of life—the grass and the flower may die with cruel abruptness.

But the same scripture and the same church that warn of fear and pestilence, agony and death, teach also that life is eternal. The seed lives on; the seed of John Kennedy's greatness was his immortal soul.

And the flower lives on in our mind's eye. The flower that is noble and beautiful may perish as does the flesh, but its image lives on from generation unto generation, as long as men have memories of the great and the good.

The flower lives on as the remembrance of a President with courage to face a revolution whose proportions were as cataclysmic in their way as the other great revolutionary chapters in American history were in theirs.

Nor was it just courage, but a determination to vouchsafe equality and opportunity to the Negro as no President other than Lincoln had done before.

The flower of a great life lives on, too, in other images of courage which men will identify with John Kennedy as long as history is read—the courage to stand up firmly to an aggressive totalitarian power when doing so could have meant imminent nuclear annihilation.

And the courage, too, to stand up to corporate intransigence when its demands for greater profits could have had catastrophic effects on the economy.

His courage we shall remember, and his nobility of character, and the strength of his patience with men and circumstances that often made the Presidency a painful ordeal.

And the flower of a great life lives on in the image of a man of great compassion. Never has any administration, indeed, any head of any government anywhere, exerted so much leadership in behalf of the physically and mentally and culturally disadvantaged.

More than any President, John Kennedy viewed as one of the key roles of Government that of an agent of a humanitarian society lending its encouragement and support to those unable to fend for themselves.

Those who were dearest to President Kennedy have from childhood been steeped in an unshakable faith that the souls of the good live on eternally. And Americans of every faith who know of John Kennedy's works know that the flower of this noble spirit cannot really die, for its roots are grounded in enduring greatness.

---

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

"Eternal rest grant unto him * * * and let perpetual light shine upon him."

The shock and horror at the death by assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 36th President of the United States of America, confounds this Nation and the world of nations.

His death has struck profound tragedy in the soul of America. Stunned as must be every feeling human, sympathy flows to the members of the Kennedy family in their most excruciating hour.

Yesterday's cruel history has enervated Americans and made awful pause in the lives of citizens bereaved of their President. The Nation mourns and wonders, and mixed with sorrow is the pulse of outrage at so despicable an act, a deed all the more chilling because of the pathos of its context. No one can visualize Mrs. Kennedy cradling her husband's head and not feel emotion physically.

As of this writing the man who committed the murder of John F. Kennedy is not positively identified, but he will be the object of this Nation's wrath as he has been the agent of its terrible loss.

Lyndon Baines Johnson, because of the murder in his native Texas, which could have claimed his life too, has been sworn in as the new President of the United States in solemnity and grief, and to him devolve the awesome duties of Chief Executive in an hour of personal and national distress.

What can and will be said and written about John F. Kennedy the man and John F. Kennedy the President will be here left to less trying hours. His death has jolted the fabric of all contemporary affairs and few things in our national and international life will be unaffected.

At this hour, while our country absorbs the shock and the body of President Kennedy lies in state, grief holds dominion. The President held a special place in the hearts of the people of Waterbury, a place now darkened by his death. He promised, at his second electrifying appearance on the green just over a year ago, that he would come back to Waterbury at 3 o'clock in the morning—to speak to the people of a city he had identified with his presidential victory and whose enthusiasm had evidently touched him. The crowd roared and there was no doubt in any observer's mind that Waterbury would have been there again in November 1964, if it had to brave a firestorm.

Perhaps, a year from now, there will be somebody on the green in symbolic waiting.

John F. Kennedy is dead. Let us mourn.

---

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Why?

Persistently, hour after hour, this question pushes itself to the forefront.

Why?

The shocking news of the assassination of the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is almost unbelievable. The rational mind tries futilely to tell itself that this has not really happened—not in the year 1963 in a nation which considers itself civilized and a leader in the fight for human freedom.

Yet the facts are there—cold and harsh and inescapable.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, aged 46, a citizen, a veteran, and a statesman is dead.

The youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency of the United States, the first President to profess the Roman Catholic faith, a man of courage, conviction, and ideals; a man with a warm smile, a strong handclasp, and an overwhelming personality has suddenly been taken from us by the act of a maniac—and the whole world shudders.

Why?

We wish we knew.

But, failing to understand, we must necessarily turn to what lies ahead. Presently we are confronted with tragedy and sorrow and grief—and they will be with us for many months to come.

Even as we individually experience a sense of physical illness—an experience multiplied millions of times over in homes all across the Nation—we must be aware that John F. Kennedy was such a man as to point a friendly finger toward his countrymen and say, in effect:

"Keep punching."

The causes for which he fought and pleaded are still with us. They will not disappear because he has passed, nor will they be relegated to oblivion because his hand has lost its strength.

Ideas and ideals live on long after the men who conceive and support them leave these mortal shores. Even out of the present tragedy there is hope extant—and John F. Kennedy was nothing if not a man of hope for the future, for the improvement of the lot of his fellows, for peace and brotherhood among men.

We must mourn his passing—but we must not let our sorrow obscure the fact that he was a man of faith, a man who did not believe that he had all the answers, but only that he had an opportunity to lead in what he conceived to be the right direction; to set a course which others could follow, leading toward a better and brighter world.

We are stricken—but we would be letting him down if we failed to pursue the objectives which he so fervently and conscientiously sought.

We grieve for his family and his close friends—yet all the while knowing that they must hold close to their hearts a special share of the gratitude of a nation for his stalwart and courageous leadership in times that tried men's souls.

---

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Evening Sentinel, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

When the fact of the President's death had penetrated the shock most of us experienced yesterday, there followed a sickening feeling as we contemplated the human depravity that could coldly undertake so cowardly a deed.

The dreadful news that an assassin's bullet had slain John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, in his 46th year, stunned his fellow citizens and the civilized world almost to disbelief. The lethal attack from a cowardly ambush struck down a leader whose approach to the difficulties that beset our times often invited controversy, yet his high courage, sharp intelligence, dedicated devotion to the good of his country as he saw it, and decent family life earned almost universal respect from his fellow Americans.

The President's triumphal cavalcade had moved through Dallas streets lined with tens of thousands cheering him and his good and loyal wife. Moments later he was dying in her arms. The sympathy of Americans goes out to Mrs. Kennedy in her sudden sorrow that is almost beyond comprehension.

Those who saw what was happening in that Dallas street could hardly believe their eyes. None was more stunned than Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, the native Texan, who had sought the Presidency in vain in 1960 and was now to have it thrust upon him through a national tragedy. As he undertook the onerous obligations of the Presidency, the Nation's new Chief Executive spoke with sadness and humility. The country he said, had suffered a sad loss and he a personal one. The world shares the loss, he said, with Mrs. Kennedy.

"I will do my best—that is all I can do. I ask your help and God's," the new President said.

The youth, vigor, and buoyancy of President Kennedy had commanded wide admiration. His self-possession in the face of crisis had rallied the Nation in the eyeball confrontation over the Cuban missiles. He had given far more than lipservice to the principle that American liberties are the right of all Americans regardless of race.

President Kennedy was the first of Roman Catholic faith to be elected to the Presidency. Only 2 weeks ago he had been recognized by a representative body of the Protestant churches of the country with an award that testified to their sincere respect for him.

The news of his assassination was received around the world with deep sense of shock. No one ever knows the full extent to which a bullet directed by malice may alter history.

As the world mourns John F. Kennedy's tragic death, and recommends him to God in its prayers, men of good will everywhere will also pray earnestly that his successor, President Johnson, may find strength, courage and divine help to guide our ship of destiny on tomorrow's troubled seas.

---

[From the Bristol (Conn.) Press, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE NATION MOURNS

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 46, the 35th President of the United States is dead.

A saddened nation is still in a state of shock at the tragedy in Dallas which shook the entire civilized world. The bullet of a psychopathic sniper sped from an upper floor of a warehouse overlooking the presidential motorcade, and in a fraction of time dealt the lethal blow which snuffed out the life of the Chief Executive of the greatest free nation on the face of the earth.

Two hours earlier at his home in Uvalde, Tex., former Vice President John Nance Garner, giving a press interview on the occasion of his 95th birthday, had said that he believed that John Kennedy would prove to be one of the greatest Presidents this Nation ever had.

Truly, in the midst of life we all face death.

Disbelief, shock, grief and anger that such a terrible thing could happen in this land of ours were the sensations which swept the Nation in that order.

Although the predominant feelings of the people are of grief at the loss of a popular President and sympathy for the bereaved family, it would most certainly be the fervent wish of the late President that the Nation's business is paramount and must be carried on regardless.

President Lyndon B. Johnson is deserving of the consideration and support of the entire Nation as he undertakes the tremendous burden which we place on our highest government official.

Yet time is not so fleeting that we cannot take a moment to cherish the memory of a vigorous leader, a great humanitarian, a Christian gentleman who loved his fellow man and was dedicated to promoting the best interests of the Nation which he served so well for far too short a time.

For John Fitzgerald Kennedy was all of these.

A courageous young chief of state has died in the service of his country.

May he rest in peace.

---

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE WORLD MOURNS

Many an American awakened this morning with a vague hope that this had all been a bad dream, that the tragic events of Friday, November 22, 1963, had not really taken place.

But the disbelief so evident yesterday with the first reports that President John F. Kennedy had been shot in Dallas had long given way to worldwide sorrow and to horror at a monstrous deed.

Sorrow with and sympathy for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her two young children, now fatherless for their third and sixth birthdays next week. And for the grieving parents and other members of the closely knit Kennedy family. Indeed, sorrow for the Nation itself.

And horror at the infamous act which snuffed out the life of a young, vigorous and popular President in the prime of his life.

This was the fourth assassination of an American President in a little more than 98 years. As a world tragedy it ranks with the national tragedy of the first assassination, that of Abraham Lincoln.

It is ironic that John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who had worked so hard, and with such perseverance, to avert world violence, which could culminate only in nuclear war, was himself the victim of violence.

Yet, as we look back over events of the past few years, this in a way is not surprising. In far too many instances, in this country and in this hemisphere, extremists of the right and of the left have found persuasion unavailing and have turned to violent means.

The attack on Ambassador Stevenson, also in Dallas, was one recent instance. Bombings and shootings elsewhere—most noteworthy the murder of four Sunday school tots in a Negro church in Birmingham—was another.

The national horror at the assassination of President Kennedy should have the salutary effect of turning all from the path of violence and toward the path of peace which he unfailingly pursued.

Genuine sorrow surged through the nation yesterday and continued to swell today. Here, as elsewhere, people felt as if they had lost a member of their own family. Events were canceled, bells tolled and prayers offered.

President Kennedy will be remembered for many things—for his heroism as a PT boat commander in World War II, for his intellectual and literary qualities, for his service in the Senate, for his political "savvy" and tireless campaigning.

He will be best remembered, of course, for his nearly 3 years as President, his championing of liberty, his advocacy of human rights, his constant striving for world peace and national prosperity.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, died Friday in the line of duty. The world mourns a great leader, the country a truly great American and New England one who was outstanding among its many famous sons.

---

[From the Greenwich (Conn.) Time, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A NATION MOURNS

The United States has passed through the saddest, most grief-stricken weekend in its entire history. The 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was buried this afternoon in Arlington National Cemetery.

John F. Kennedy died on Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex., a half hour after a sniper's bullet hit him as he rode alongside his wife in a happy motorcade. As the news quickly spread throughout the Nation, Americans were stunned. Heads shook in disbelief. It was difficult to understand. How could such a thing happen in the United States?

A deep, dark sorrow and despair descended on the land. The loss of the President is a personal thing to each and every American. The relationship of a President and his countrymen cuts across all lines of parties and creeds. The assassin's bullet brought a personal, heartfelt grief.

Words cannot describe the national horror. John F. Kennedy, who was dedicated to and worked so hard for peace, for the avoidance of world violence, for tolerance, became the victim of hate and violence.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy typified the emergence of the world into a new era, the space age. Young, fiery, courageous, determined, and able, he was a man who persevered in standing for what he thought was right. His youthful exuberance coupled with high intelligence and with deep devotion to his country, caught the fancy and imagination of America and the world.

We will never know the dimensions of greatness that John F. Kennedy might have reached in the coming years. The effects of his loss on the Nation and the world in the immediate future cannot be assessed at this time.

His comparatively brief career was one of public service—in the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and the Presidency. He easily could have chosen a life of leisure instead. But as his career and stature grew, his dedication centered on human rights and the equality of men.

---

[From the Manchester (Conn.) Evening Herald, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The youth of him and the gallantry of him are tied in together.

They made a beautiful human combination to be ruined by one mad bullet plowing its way through his bone and flesh.

He was young, and he was gallant, and he was full of a dry sophisticated human.

Perhaps the humor helped make him seem the most intelligent President of our times.

He could usually see himself, and one who sees himself can see others well, including his opponents.

There was a time when some of us were a little frightened of his youth. We thought that, when he actually got into the cold war battle he had talked about so much, he was at first nervous and uncertain. But when we saw him settle down, and blood himself, until he got to be able to fight with magnanimity and tolerance toward his enemy as well as considerable mastery.

But even when that judgment he was always talking about may have been a little uncertain, he never lacked for courage. He had the best kind—the courage to be gentle, the courage to go calmly against an hysterical general trend of surface nonsense, the courage to take the full and single responsibility for a mistake which may have been created by many.

He had the courage always to be himself.

He had the supreme courage to make himself the leader in the direct and necessary assault on one of the great barriers unworthily surviving in this democracy of ours.

When he had dared to fight that battle, and had won, the main domestic effort of his administration pressed on toward a second great battle of the same nature.

These domestic battles, the other great battle being fought in the whole world, were such as to breed extremist emotions in the minds of men, or to enlist the partisanship of sick men in search of extremist emotions.

Yesterday some of this irrational ugliness took the shape and concentrated power of a bullet.

When a culprit is found guilty, there will also be some guilt for the climate which produced and inspired him.

Let us try to cleanse ourselves, not merely by condemnation and punishment, but by trying to make some of our own living a tribute to the memory of this clean, gallant, literate, humor-gifted, excellence-dedicated young leader.

All the qualities in John F. Kennedy seemed to add up to one final denominator.

He was a civilized man, who fought against barbarism at home and abroad.

This was in his character as well as in his action. His hope for and belief in the possibility of a world in which men treated each other as civilized human beings was the dominant theme of his living.

The degree to which our living still falls short of that civilized state became the mark of his dying.

The horror of the sacrifice to which he headed, combined with the nobility with which he followed his path of duty and principle toward whatever the danger might be, made the imperfect torch of civilization flame higher as he passed it on.

---

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE ASSASSINATION OF A PRESIDENT

John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, has been cut off in his prime by the bullet of a vile assassin.

The whole Nation sorrows today for the loss of this vital young leader who, like other martyred Presidents, has given his life for his country.

The office of President is one of great risk. The man who fills it is always in danger. Security precautions, as it has been demonstrated again and again, are never an absolute safeguard. A high-powered rifle, with telescopic sights, in the hands of a sharpshooter with the will and the desire to kill, can penetrate the screen of safeguards set up by the Secret Service.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt, Mrs. Roosevelt and Senator Maloney, with Gov. Wilbur Cross drove into Crown Street Square in an open car, all of the surrounding buildings were searched for their protection. Again when President Harry S. Truman spoke from a platform in front of the Record-Journal building, the President's guards surveyed every spot from which a rifle might have been trained upon him. Yet those who occupied the platform remarked that it would have been easy for an assassin, mingling with the crowd, to have plunged a knife into his back or to have shot him at close range. A President takes such risks everywhere he goes. He lives in constant danger, and knows it. If he thought of his own safety at all times, he would be a craven unfitted to be the Chief Executive of a great nation. President Kennedy, a World War II hero, was a brave man—as brave as any President we have ever known.

All Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, have a deep sense of personal loss in this tragedy. They mourn for a great man who stood by his beliefs and proclaimed them to the world. They mourn that he can never achieve the goals for which he had fought. They sympathize with his bereaved wife, his fatherless children, his parents, his brothers and sisters, the whole closely united Kennedy family.

Now comes the turning of the page, the beginning of a new chapter. Lyndon B. Johnson has been sworn in as the President of the United States. It is a matter of record that the new President aspired to the office which he now occupies when he contested with John F. Kennedy for the Democratic Presidential nomination. It is a matter of record that, despite the keen competition between these able men, prior to and at the convention, it was Kennedy who chose Johnson as his running mate. Whatever their differences had been, the pair achieved close harmony in their relationship as President and Vice President.

The Nation should close ranks behind President Johnson at this critical moment of history. He is a man of proven ability and long experience in government. We feel sure that he will acquit himself well in the position which has been thrust upon him.

---

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Morning Record, Nov. 23, 1963]

### The Nation Mourns

We in the United States of America are completely stunned. So catastrophic is the assassination of the President that we are unable as yet to assess the measure of our loss. The suddenness of it all is appalling.

Nearly a century ago Lincoln was assassinated as he sat in the theater. The next morning he was dead. Some years later President Garfield was shot soon after taking office. He lingered for some months but died as a result of the attack. Just after the turn of the century, President McKinley fell at the hands of an assassin. Again there was a gap between the crime itself and resultant death—time in which to condition a country's reflexes to the tragedy. This unhappy Friday noon the end came almost at once with dreadful finality.

How tragic is such a death. How wasteful of the youth, vigor, talent, experience, and capability for growth in leadership of this man who has served us diligently and faithfully for nearly 3 years in the highest office of the land.

Few of us either in his own party or of the opposition have agreed with John Kennedy on every one of his policies and activities as Chief Executive. Americans are independent thinkers. There seldom is unanimity and there hasn't been during this administration. But, as our President, Mr. Kennedy has had our full allegiance. He won our admiration as a hard worker, quick thinker, and courageous official. We quickened with pride in him for the speediness of his rise as a world figure. We have loved his image as an adored and adoring parent, as a husband justifiably proud of his lovely and talented wife, as a man of personal charm and brilliant intellect.

The loss cannot be measured. Our hearts ache for Mrs. Kennedy who has graced the White House these past 2 years and 10 months. We grieve for the two young Kennedys who had to share their daddy with the public and who will have only childish memories of his glowing figure to carry with them through the years. Our sympathy goes to President Kennedy's parents and to his devoted brothers and sisters. Everybody shares in their bereavement. And we are sorry for our United States that is meeting a national tragedy of great proportions, as we pay our last respects to a man whose life has been snuffed out by a dastardly deed.

---

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, Nov. 23, 1963]

### John Kennedy

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, is dead of an assassin's bullet. He died with the quest of reason in his mind, with the vision of peace in his eyes, and with the hope of a more perfect union for all Americans in his heart.

All this he sought for us with gallantry and grace, with charm and wit, with energy and purpose, and with the unwavering knowledge that this Republic, as he once said, is "unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world." May it be so, as we try to orient ourselves in this overpowering hour, that this should be his remembrance.

Our citizens are still stunned beyond all belief; as Adlai Stevenson said, an event such as this is beyond instant comprehension. Here in our land of great civilization the fires of hate have burned so intensely that our President is dead. Willy Brandt in Berlin said it first: A light has gone out.

This is the sad truth. There will be many men in the future of our country who can fulfill the constitutional role of the Presidency with reason, intelligence, and good heart; certainly there have been such in the past. But few men could articulate and personify all that is the best about this country, and refresh for all disbelievers, the truth that this is a youthful, vigorous country whose destiny lies not in the past but in the great years to come.

That is why, perhaps, his death means so much to us all. His work was unfinished. His hopes had been defined, but only a few had been culminated. Even those who disagreed with his methods, often agreed with his aims.

At his inaugural he touched upon the dilemma of the man of the 20th century in a world beset by the cold war. "Let us never negotiate out of fear," he said. "But let us never fear to negotiate." To a world struggling in misery, he described the pragmatic reasons for our help: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

In office, he tried to give national reality to the challenge as he saw it: "Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe." In peace he tried to approach this higher testimony.

Now that globe has one more grave.

When the tragedy slammed into the consciousness of America yesterday, the reaction of most people was that the deed must have been done by a John Bircher or a zealot in the cause of segregation. It now appears that this was not the case, and that there is a strong possibility that the lunacy of the left, and not the right, was responsible. In one sense it makes little difference, because assassinations are always the child of extremism. There is no radical cause for which an American President should die, because it is our national judgment that he should live to fight the fight for which he was elected.

Walt Whitman, writing in 1865 upon the death of Lincoln, said it rightly in: "O Captain! My Captain!"

"My Captain does not answer, his lips are pale and still,
My father does not feel my arm, he has no pulse nor will,
The ship is anchored safe and sound, its voyage closed and done,
From fearful trip the victor ship comes in with object won;
Exult O shores, and ring O Bells!
But I with mournful tread,
Walk the deck my Captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead."

As if to insure that our ship of state does not falter, Democrats and Republicans, Protestants and Catholics and Jews, southerners and northerners, easterners and westerners, white and Negro, all were united yesterday in grief and silent pledge to the Republic, while around the world, queens and pontiffs expressed their bereavement. In Berlin, in that separated enclave of freedom, the candles are to be lit at night in memory, and even also in Moscow, the captain of the guard who stands over Lenin's tomb, expressed sorrow at the death of the man who had tried, with principle, to bring peace to all men.

President Kennedy yesterday was in Texas, a land that shelters many who felt little comity with his views. He believed he should go there and he had prepared a short speech that will rank with his best. But instead of giving it, he was shot down, falling unconscious into the arms of his wife. For her presence, we should not grieve, she would have wanted it no other way, her heart would only have been heavier if she had not been there. Nor should we think thoughts of vengeance, nor have misguided regrets as to why it happened. Lincoln died because of his compassion, it would have advanced no cause to have President Kennedy martyred in the service of civil rights or constitutionalism or even anticommunism.

Now, as well, we have to countenance the ugly fact that the individual accused of the murder of the President was a self-avowed Marxist, an ex-patriot resident of the Soviet Union, and the local chairman of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, an organization which was purportedly originated in the country by a gift of $5,000 from Raul Castro, the brother of Fidel Castro. Nations have gone to war for as much; the comparison of the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand in Sarajevo, the flashpoint of World War I, is not inexact. But we think we know what the President would have wished, and it is not the easiest way to purge our sorrow.

It is a time, we say, to recall what is probably the best known passage of any inaugural address, given as Lincoln reached the pinnacle of his eloquence at his second inaugural: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

For now we have a new President, even if our struggle be constant. May God protect him.

---

[From the Naugatuck (Conn.) Daily News, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Day of Infamy

Yesterday will forever be remembered as a day of infamy. It was a moment of reckoning for the assassins because they will be punished for the murderous attack on President Kennedy. The tears of the Nation fall heavily today and each will imbed in the soul of the Nation. President Kennedy was the image of our country. Whatever he said, whatever he did, so said and did the Nation. Yesterday time stood still. A nation was shocked mute for a period of horror, and when it realized the impact of what had happened, it wept. The blatant response of a people to what is a calamitous incidence rose above the aweful din of an energetic world, and a black page in history was recorded. We cannot know the ordeal of a President but there must have been many hours of fretful sleep; many hours of fears and apprehension. But like every other President before him, Mr. Kennedy waded through the mire of criticism, censure, and festoons of Executive duties. His reward was death at the hands of assassins. We do not pretend to understand the motive nor the reason therefor, but we do know that we have lost a leader of the highest caliber. No matter what our political affiliation may be, whatever we have felt in our hearts toward him when he acted according to his judgment, such acts perhaps contrary to our beliefs, we have now just cause to lament our loss. There is no eulogy more fitting than to say of him: that he mastered our ship of state to the best of his ability, and if he erred, it was because we, the followers, strayed perhaps too far from the path which he took, believing always that the path would lead to more fertile pastures. Though he walked alone at times, he walked in the light of perseverence. Though he may have faltered at times, he was but human. Though he be dead, he lives, for the beacon of his character, his strength, and his wisdom, shines forever to light our paths as we go on without him. Truly this Nation is impoverished by his untimely death. But we, who believe that God so made man that he would require servitude, and in that servitude all must resolve in the ultimate good to be weighed in the great balance, are solaced nevertheless by the knowledge that President Kennedy was needed elsewhere to fulfill a destiny that was marked for a brief period here on earth. He is gone, but his works live on.

---

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A MARTYR TO DEMOCRACY

Grief hangs heavy over America today.

We mourn the death of a great man, a respected man, a prince among men.

Just as another great President fell before the assassin's sinful shot some 98 years ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy died yesterday.

He was slain while in the full flower of his life, in a moment of joyfulness, at a time when his leadership had won him the love and friendship of uncounted millions around the globe.

It was an inconceivable deed. It was a gross, shocking, horrible moment that spun this Nation cyclonically into disbelieving horror. It was an act of hate, all the more violent because ours is a land of reason, of love and understanding. Yet, because we have believed so strongly in democracy, because we have recognized the right of men not to agree, we have allowed the haters to exist in our land.

Our dead President Kennedy is a martyr to democracy.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy believed in peace and freedom. He dedicated his stewardship to those ends, bearing on his own shoulders the massive weight of attempting to achieve justice for mankind even while under the shadow of the possibility of a nuclear holocaust. Yet he bore the burden with dedication, with a savor for the job, with a growing command of the complexities of the world.

Mr. Kennedy was for the little man. He fought hardest for those programs and policies which would have taken the burdens of life, insofar as was possible, off the shoulders of the oppressed and the poor. This sense of Christian charity permeated his very being.

At this moment, we are all Americans first. Not Democrats or Republicans or northerners or liberals or conservatives. We are simply Americans, the children of God, mourning a lost leader. It is as though we have lost a member of our own family: a father, a brother, a son.

Thank God for the wisdom of our Republic that our leadership, even under such terrible crisis, can pass smoothly and without panic, to qualified men. We pray for Lyndon Baines Johnson, our new President.

And we pray, too, that the ideals for which John F. Kennedy gave his life did not die with the firing of that bullet.

---

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The grief, the sense of outrage, at the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, are universal in this country today.

The tragic circumstances were appalling. They stunned millions, first hearing the news and unable to believe it. It seemed incredible, devastating—that a young man in the prime of life, who had been vigorously touring numerous parts of the country and recently Texas, could now lie dead, the victim of a sniper. The apparent ease with which it was done, the fact that Mrs. Kennedy was in the car, the wounding of the Texas Governor—all these make the shock more staggering.

Almost without a single exception Americans react with unbelieving wonder and helpless anger to such a thing as this—a rarity in their more or less orderly lives. In this Nation's long history there have been other attacks upon Presidents, but none with the immediate deadly effectiveness of this one. In other shootings the people have had a little time to absorb the shock, before the death of the Chief Executive.

Political divisions and partisan ideas are forgotten by the people at a time like this, as they try inadequately to express their deep sympathy for the family, their grief over this incomprehensible tragedy. They will, also, loyally pledge their cooperation in this Nation's time of crisis—the transition from the administration of John Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson, which under the best of circumstances will present problems. They will grieve also, it seems likely, over the needless sacrifice of a young man, representing a dedicated and highly intelligent effort to lead his country to peace and prosperity.

The needless angle is, as a former Chief of the Secret Service recently said, that any determined crank, with real ability as a marksman, could assassinate any President we have had in modern times. This follows because of the way in which the Chief Executive appears, relatively unprotected, in the midst of large crowds. The tragic circumstances suggest an earnest appraisal of this situation.

There is incalculable loss to the world, not just to the narrow confines of this Nation. Freedom-loving people everywhere had reason for faith and hope in a brightening ideal of real, democratic government under the inspiration of a hardworking American leader. The intelligence, the qualities of leadership, the inspiration, offered by this dynamic young Executive had a profound bearing upon their lives.

However much the American citizen feels the loss, his thoughts must turn to the personal tragedy inflicted on Jacqueline Kennedy and the two young Kennedy children. Mr. Kennedy was a devoted husband and father, a model of parenthood in the way he found time, despite the demands of a busy life, to meet the needs of his family.

Indeed, Mrs. Kennedy herself set an example of courage and reliance in a higher authority during the terrible experience in Dallas and the subsequent return with the President's remains to the White House. Perhaps there is a lesson here for all Americans.

In truth, life goes on, the man's ideas and ideals live beyond the shadow of death. Mr. Kennedy, born to wealth and with no need for further material advantages, concentrated on service to his Nation. The memory of him can only serve to strengthen America's resolve to face its problems with courage.

---

[From the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A shocked and sorrowful Nation today mourns the tragic death of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, who was fatally shot by a cowardly, hidden assassin Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex.

President Kennedy joins the other martyred Chief Executives who fell from assassins' bullets—Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

In Norwalk, like elsewhere all over the world, news of President Kennedy's death cast a pall of sorrow and brought tears to the eyes of hundreds.

President Kennedy, 46, was the youngest man ever elected to the Presidency, and was the first Roman Catholic ever to hold that Office.

Few will ever forget him at his inauguration when he dedicated himself to two shining goals—survival of liberty at home and peace in a world shivering in an "uncertain balance of terror."

Many important events occurred during his administration: His pledge to fight if necessary to maintain American's rights of access to Red-surrounded Berlin; manned flights into outer space; and abortive invasion of Cuba by U.S.-aided refugees; increase in the minimum wage from $1 an hour to $1.25; social security benefits increased; organization of the Peace Corps; moratorium with Russia on nuclear bomb testing; his showdown with Khrushchev to force Russia to remove nuclear weapons from Cuba.

In the present session of Congress, many of President Kennedy's proposals—income tax reduction, foreign aid, etc., met with a rough reception.

These and the other proposals of his program—what will happen to them now? And how will this affect the delicate balance of the chiefs of state in the cold war—De Gaulle, Erhardt, Home and Khrushchev—in their almost endless negotiations?

But these are, as of the moment, minor considerations compared to the fact that the democratic world not the United States alone, has lost a leader who proved himself fearless in the Russian crisis, a man of intense feeling for the underdog, and a man with the intelligence, imagination and force to fight his way toward all his objectives.

Political friends and foes alike agree on President Kennedy's patriotism and sincerity. His shocking death will never be forgotten. His love of country should be a shining example to all of the youth of our Nation.

---

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A NATION'S SORROW

A sniper's bullet, fired from ambush, plunged the Nation and the world into sorrow as it cut down John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, while he rode with his wife and Gov. John B. Connally of Texas in a motorcade at Dallas, Tex., early Friday afternoon. Mortally wounded in the head, Mr. Kennedy was taken to a Dallas hospital where he died some 20 minutes later. Governor Connally was gravely wounded in the chest by the assassin.

The Nation in its deep mourning at the tragic death of its young President stands appalled and stunned to think that such a thing could happen in a Nation as civilized as ours. Despotic rulers have fallen at the hands of the assassin since the world began, but no one could conceive that it could happen here. There must have been deep hatred in the heart of the man who so ruthlessly fired the shot that took the life of the President. It is unthinkable that anyone, unless mentally ill, could commit such a despicable act.

The assassination of President Kennedy was one of the most tragic in the history of the Nation, largely because of the suddenness that death came. Other Presidents have died at the hand of an assassin but they did not die until some time after they had been shot, and the people were prepared for the news of their death. Yesterday, it was only a space of minutes after the news spread that the President had been shot that word of his death was flashed across the Nation and to the world.

A young man in the prime of manhood John F. Kennedy had achieved the ultimate in the field of politics—the head of the greatest Nation on earth. He had achieved this highest office in the Nation by surmounting obstacles that had defeated many who aspired to the office before him. He was born of a wealthy background; he was considered of the intelligentsia because of his Harvard background; he was the son of a man of great political influence and he was a Catholic. It was his simplicity, his youthfulness and his charming personality that carried him to the heights.

President Kennedy, although severely criticized both by members of his own party and by the Republicans, was dedicated to the interests of the Nation. In fact, his dedication extended beyond the boundaries of America. He thought in terms of world harmony; he strove to help the faltering economy of lesser nations, he was dedicated to the advancement of world peace. But there were times when he could be firm in world crisis, not to say tough. When elected there were cries that he was too young for the duties of President, but he proved his critics wrong. He performed with the efficiency of an older man; he was a student of national and international politics.

John F. Kennedy has gone and the Nation mourns; the world mourns and there is sadness everywhere. Even in Soviet Russia there is respect for the memory of Mr. Kennedy; President de Gaulle of France with whom he differed is saddened; in other nations, in Latin America where Mr. Kennedy visited there are expressions of grief and sympathy. Seldom has a President of the United States met and made friends with the leaders of other nations as the late President. To say that he was not loved by all the international leaders may be putting it mildly but there is certainty that he was respected.

Here in America he was beloved by many and respected by all. Everyone is shocked at the sudden termination of his life and the sympathy of the Nation goes to his wife and children and to his parents. We add our small tribute to a man who has given his all to our Nation and our sympathy to those who were near and dear to him.

---

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, Nov. 23, 1963]

### John F. Kennedy

John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, died yesterday by an assassin's bullet. At the age of 46, he was a man of vigor, good health, and joy of life. His death brought disbelief, shock, dismay, and national sorrow.

He was born to great wealth. With his joyous disposition, he could have spent his life in self-pleasure without criticism. Instead, after an outstanding war record, he entered the field of politics, in which for generations his family had been prominent. He achieved immediate success. He became the youngest man ever to be elected to the highest office in our Nation.

Along with his political New Frontier, he brought to Washington a new, youthful spirit which the whole Nation, regardless of political persuasion, took to its heart. His devotion to his wife, his affection for his children gave the Nation assurance that all the old values were not dead. His sorrow over the death of an infant son became a national sorrow.

He was the first Catholic elected to the Presidency. For all time, he put an end to the false fear that a Catholic in the White House would be controlled by a Pope from Rome in secular affairs.

John F. Kennedy came to high office in trying times. The free world was tiring of the effort demanded of it to fight the cold war. This caused a weakening of needed ties. New states emerged, with loud voices, little power, and no economic viability. Their people needed help if they were to rise from poverty which was destructive to human dignity. Twenty million Negro Americans determined that now was the time to join their white fellow citizens as full partners.

These waves for change placed complex burdens on the youthful shoulders of the President. He shouldered them with courage and deep, human sympathy.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur said that on learning of the former President's death, a small part of him died with him. All Americans, in sympathy with the closely knit Kennedy family, feel with the General the loss of the personification of youthful vitality that John F. Kennedy had made part of the national way of life.

---

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A Nation Mourns

John F. Kennedy's career as President of the United States ended yesterday, when a senseless murderer assassinated him in Dallas, Tex.

The slaying of our Chief Executive struck the Nation with horror, leaving all of us shocked and saddened.

President Kennedy fulfilled the duties of President with dignity and distinction. His youth and vigor indicated he could continue to serve his Nation in distinguished manner for years to come.

It seems unbelievable that, in a free society such as ours, the career of the head of our Nation could be ended in such a manner. We all regret the occurrence, and angrily hope that the person responsible will be brought to justice quickly and properly.

We join people everywhere in mourning the death of John F. Kennedy. Our sincerest sympathy goes to his wife, his children and other members of his family.

And, as we mourn this death, we also express sincere hopes for success to Lyndon B. Johnson, who succeeded to the Presidency because of the despicable act in Dallas.

President Johnson's task is a difficult one. May he have the ability and strength to cope with it, and may all Americans give him the support he needs to guide the United States to new and greater heights.

---

[From the Willimantic (Conn.) Daily Chronicle, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Legacy of a President

"Are you sure? I'm shaking. Is it possible?"

That is the way one woman responded to the news of President Kennedy's death. The President who had mingled with crowds in Berlin, Cologne, Paris, Dublin, London, and San Jose with fearless abandon, was killed by an assassin's bullet in Dallas, Tex.

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, can count himself lucky. When he was in Dallas recently he only got hit on the head with a poster carried by an angry picket. But who envisioned a sniper's bullet for the President?

John F. Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected President of the United States. He brought to this Nation a symbol of a new generation. He came to office at a time when the new age of technology and space was breaking over the civilized world. His phrase "The New Frontier" stirred the imagination of his people.

President Kennedy was a war hero in the greatest tradition. It was not that he won great battles, but that he risked his life for a member of his crew in the South Pacific. That regard for the individual is a hallmark of American tradition and President Kennedy not only preached it, he knew whereof he spoke.

It is ironic that Abraham Lincoln who freed the slaves was shot and so was President Kennedy who almost went down in history as the President who gave the Negroes equal opportunity.

President Kennedy will not leave behind him any great program which he pushed through Congress. He was cut down before his potential could be realized. He will be remembered in history for his dramatic Cuban stand that forced the Russians to take their missiles home. The Peace Corps was a startling innovation and a tremendous success. The Alliance for Progress is on a rocky road but the new emphasis on Latin America was a change in foreign policy.

There were contrasting symbols associated with President Kennedy. His famous word "vigah" became common wherever Americans gathered. His liking for a rocking chair started a new trend in home furnishings. President Kennedy touched a nerve deep within his people.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought to the Presidency a sense of history, a love for the arts and sciences and a respect for intelligence. It seems to us that a whole generation has been inspired by these Kennedy ideals. Perhaps there is no bill in Congress, no monument to point to, but Kennedy's intangible ideals impressed the young and old alike. "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." These few words from President Kennedy's inaugural address gave the Nation renewed inspiration.

There is a new respect for intellectual achievement in the Nation, a reverence for art and a new optimism about the future. The cold war will be long and burdensome, but President Kennedy seemed to give the Nation confidence we can win it.

Our Nation will go on. But the Nation will not soon forget the spirit of the New Frontier. May its momentum carry us forward in the generation ahead.

We join with the world in offering our sympathy to the President's wife and her two small children. The world will miss him—how much, only the future will tell.

---

[From the Winsted (Conn.) Evening Citizen, Nov. 23, 1963]

### To Honor His Memory

When a leader of great power and presence and capacity for good dies in office, the cause to which he gave leadership suffers grievous loss. President John F. Kennedy was such a man. The cause he served, and so eloquently led, was the threefold cause of human dignity and equality and freedom.

Though President Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded.

Guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysburg almost exactly a century ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to reflect on Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the initial period of outraged shock at the murderous act in Dallas. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of needless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams remain strong and malignant. Those forces must now be countered with new dedication, so that President Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain.

The heaviest burden falls upon Lyndon B. Johnson, who became President the moment John F. Kennedy succumbed to the assassin's bullets. But all citizens must in some measure share that burden. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the American people: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." It is a commitment, and a challenge, worthy of the best that is in all of us.

## CUSTOMS GUIDE FOR TRAVELERS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in 1964, the U.S. customs service will observe the 175th anniversary of its establishment. On the eve of this notable milestone in the life of a vital Government agency, I am pleased to note that a constituent of mine, Mr. E. Grant Wing, of Honolulu, has authored a book titled "Customs Guide for Travelers." The guide fills a great need in explaining, in layman's language, the often complicated story of the customs rights and responsibilities of all travelers entering the United States. It provides useful, accurate information for the benefit of both the citizen and foreign visitor. In the words of Mr. Phillip Nichols, Jr., the U.S. Commissioner of Customs, who wrote the preface:

> Because this book provides a signal service to the travel and transportation industry, its early acceptance and widespread use seem virtually assured.

The author of this valuable book—the first of its kind written—is a veteran customs officer, a World War II veteran, and a long-time resident of Hawaii. Mr. Wing has served as a customs inspector in the port of Honolulu for the past quarter century. He is also president of the National Customs Service Association, Hawaii branch. In 1961 Mr. Wing met with the Secretary of Treasury's Citizens' Task Force Committee and discussed ways and means of improving customs procedures for incoming tourists and returning residents. He came away from the meeting convinced of the need for an improved public information program by the customs service. With this in mind, he wrote the "Customs Guide for Travelers," published last month by T. S. Denison & Co., of Minneapolis, Minn.

I commend this book to all who want and need to know about the customs rights and responsibilities of travelers.

## SECRETARY FREEMAN'S REPORT ON HELP TO THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on November 19 I spoke in the Senate in praise of Secretary Freeman's discussion of timber problems at a November 6, 1963, breakfast meeting in Washington, D.C.

When I commented in the Senate on Secretary Freeman's remarks, I indicated I would like very much to have a copy of Secretary Freeman's remarks of November 6 as well as the remarks of others who attended the breakfast meeting.

The November 6 meeting, at which Secretary Freeman was the honored guest, was attended by more than 100 leaders of the lumber industry, 10 Senators, 29 House Members, and 16 staff members of the House and Senate for an across-the-table discussion of matters vital to the lumber industry.

Secretary Freeman was able to report progress, substantial forward steps, and great improvements in the capacity of the Forest Service to provide the economic progress essential for this industry's continuing advancement.

It should be emphasized that the public service Secretary Freeman and the Forest Service are rendering to the lumber industry is being performed in a manner fully consistent with the policies of multiple-use and sustained-yield management of our forests. Secretary Freeman is mindful of and attentive to his responsibilities to wilderness, outdoor recreation, mineral production, livestock use, and wildlife, including hunting and fishing.

Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary Baker, Chief Forester Cliff, and Assistant Chiefs Greeley and Nelson are to be congratulated for their accomplishments. Also, through them I extend my congratulations to all of the Forest Service employees for their part in carrying out the improved policies that stem from the outstanding leadership that has emanated from Secretary Freeman and his associates.

Three years ago, when Secretary Freeman came to the Department of Agriculture, a small group from the Senate met with him to discuss Forest Service policies. Many improvements were needed. We told the Secretary that we wanted him to make the Forest Service a part—not only in name, but in fact—of his Department of Agriculture. We urged him to look its policies over, to consider its budget and to review personally the controversial issues that were then the sources of much difficulty. He, in turn, told us that this was just what he expected to do. He pointed out that as Governor of Minnesota, he took a special interest in the problems of each agency and he expressed surprise that the U.S. Forest Service had not had close secretarial interest and support since the days when Clinton Anderson served as Secretary.

Secretary Freeman has kept his word. He started to work on Forest Service policies at once. The improvements have been many and I am confident that the Forest Service knows that because of his genuine, strong, and constructive interest, today it is better able to meet its responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete report on the November 6 meeting, along with a letter from the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The Secretary's remarks are of particular importance to those who are interested in the proper administration of our Federal forests.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Lumber
Manufacturers Association,
*Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

Dear Senator Morse: I am enclosing a copy of a brochure containing a report on our November 6 breakfast meeting with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman. Since you were present for this important meeting I thought you would be interested in having this report.

You will note that the brochure contains the full text of the Secretary's remarks, as well as comments from the industry by way of presenting the problems as we see them.

There is a good pictorial report on the back of the brochure which shows Members of Congress mingled with industry representatives in attendance for the breakfast.

Again, may I say we are most grateful for your participation in this important meeting, and we hope that we can continue to enjoy your assistance in the future as we seek solutions to problems confronting the forest products industry.

Kindest personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Donald Baldwin,
*Director, Legislative Relations.*

---

## National Forest Management Progress—An Exchange of Views on the Four-Point Program Between Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Producers of American Forest Products

(Statements of forest products industry representatives on the four-point program, Washington, D.C., Nov. 6, 1963)

### M. B. DOYLE, NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURER'S ASSOCIATION

This is a historic moment for the lumber industry. We are participating once again in the highest form of democracy where people from the executive branch of Government discuss mutual problems with industry and with Members of Congress. I know Secretary Freeman personally and professionally as do many others who are here. No one in Government works more assiduously to bring Government and industry together. We are well aware that he has numerous problems in addition to these which concern us. The purpose here, nevertheless, is to set our problems out on the table so that the responsible elements in our country can better understand them and make sound decisions for resolving them together. We sincerely thank you, Mr. Secretary, your staff, and the Members of Congress for participating in this discussion.

### B. L. ORELL, WEYERHAEUSER CO.

Joining us here today are many organizations not affiliated with NLMA showing that discussion of the four-point program is in behalf of the entire forest industry rather than any particular association. We are greatly honored by the number of dignitaries that are here.

To place the problem in perspective, the NLMA Forest Management Committee works on national administrative and legislative problems for the forest industry. In addition to national forest timber management problems we work on many issues which are of concern to the Department of Agriculture. These include access roads, Federal land acquisition, pesticides, and timber surveys.

Our purpose this morning, Mr. Secretary, is to tell you our impression of progress on the four-point program for national forest timber sales policy improvement presented to you in February 1962. By way of background we have a high regard for the Forest Service and its professional staff. We have many areas of common interest, and we appreciate their cooperation on such issues as taxation, fundamental research, forest protection against fire, insects, and diseases. Our differences are serious, however, and involve matters of extreme economic importance.

The chairman of our Federal timber policy committee is Mr. J. J. Fitzgerald, executive vice president of the Edward Hines Lumber Co., who will review the situation as we see it. He will be followed by others from the principal forest regions across the United States—the west coast, western pine, the South, and the Appalachians. Although we will not have specific comments from the Lake States or New England or from the pulpwood industry, their problems are similar and they support the four-point program.

J. J. FITZGERALD, EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO.

You will recall that on February 21, 1962, at a meeting with the Secretary and many Members of Congress, we presented the following four points:

Point I suggested a new regulation establishing the regular sale of the allowable cut as a prime objective and requiring an annual performance report on national forest timber sales. Included would be plans for allowable cut performance and potential so that communities dependent on national forest timber could plan for a stable future. The Secretary has responded to this proposal and the industry is appreciative of the progress made so far in implementing Point I.

Point II requested revision of national forest timber appraisal methods. It asked specifically that the Forest Service avoid taking advantage of its monopoly in pricing timber where there is no alternative source of supply. Following discussion last year the Secretary announced, at the Western Pine Association meeting, that he would ask the Forest Service "to set up an advisory committee of people who are knowledgeable about valuation problems and who have no obligation to the Forest Service or to the industry."

The Forest Service appointed an eminently qualified Committee consisting of Yale forest economics professor, Dr. Worrell, A. N. Lockwood, past president of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, and Internal Revenue Service forest valuation engineer, M. L. Lauridsen.

After nationwide examination of the facts, that Committee submitted a comprehensive report last June. This report substantiated the recommendations we made to you, Mr. Secretary. The Committee recommended, for example, that the role of the Forest Service is broader than that of a mere custodian, and that the sale of national forest timber must be considered in perspective with the whole economy. Further, the Committee supported our concern over the appraisal, profit allowance, the handling of road costs, and the need for more accurate appraisal data.

The Worrell Committee recommendations have received overwhelming nationwide endorsement. We are concerned, however, that we have not heard of steps being taken by the Government to convert these recommendations into actions.

Point III requested a new appeals procedure which would make the Forest Service a party to, rather than a judge of, a dispute. After your request, Mr. Secretary, to clarify our proposal, we submitted a new appeals procedure in June 1963, along with an analysis of the shortcomings of the existing procedures. Our procedure, as proposed, would tend to be in line with procedures of other Federal agencies. Disputes would be resolved at the regional or local level by experienced personnel appointed by the Secretary. Once more, we are concerned that we have had no reaction to the merits of the proposal.

Our fourth point requested a revision of the timber sale contract form to eliminate the one-sided nature of the contract and allow a normal buyer-and-seller relationship. We prepared such a contract and submitted it to you, Mr. Secretary, last month. Mr. Greeley has reported that review of the contract will be undertaken shortly by the Forest Service and that a meeting with industry will follow.

Since our industry is so essential to the economy of hundreds of communities and the people living in them and is one of the largest employers of manufacturing labor in the United States, the need for prompt action on this program is essential.

E. M. STODDARD, SAWTOOTH LUMBER CO.

At the February 1962 meeting, the western pine industry spokesman stated that inequities in Forest Service timber sale policies and contract provisions were in urgent need of attention. We had hoped that, by offering the industrywide four-point program, constructive policy changes would be made.

Mr. Secretary, we appreciate your efforts to assure the sale of the allowable cut of timber on national forests. Your willingness to travel to Portland, Oreg., to discuss timber policy questions with the industry was most encouraging. We greatly appreciated your directing the appointment of the Timber Appraisal Review Committee and requesting review of the Forest Service appeals procedure and timber sale contract. With your personal attention we look forward to the equitable solution to these problems.

It is essential now that the Government implement the recommendations of the Timber Appraisal Review Committee. In addition, we hope that you can find ways to accelerate the review and adoption of the industry's proposals for a new appeals procedure and timber sale contract. You may be assured, Mr. Secretary, of our industry's full cooperation to that end.

It is our sincere belief that adoption of the measures now before you will have beneficial impact on the development and stability of the many communities dependent on the national forests. This is particularly true in the 12-State western pine producing area where two-thirds of the timber resource is Government owned.

The grim reality of these matters is further magnified when you consider its effect upon jobs and payrolls, businesses, and the tax base. We hope we can soon expect satisfactory solutions to these matters.

L. L. STEWART, BOHEMIA LUMBER CO.

Mr. Secretary, we, the representatives of the Douglas-fir region of western Oregon, Washington, and California, are here today in behalf of the 140,000 people employed in our part of the forest industry. National forest timber provides a substantial portion of our annual timber needs. Half of our region's communities are largely dependent on national forest timber.

Two years ago the forest industry cooperated on a nationwide basis in developing a program to improve the management of our national forests, the results were presented to you, Mr. Secretary, as the four-point program, 20 months ago.

We have previously given written endorsement to the recommendations of your Worrell Committee on timber appraisal procedures. It is of the utmost importance that these recommendations for improving the business practices of the national forests be promptly translated into action.

We also need early consideration by you on two other points: (1) We need action on our proposed appeals procedure; and (2) we need action on a revised timber sale contract. We understand that in the last several days arrangements have been made to move ahead on the contract revision.

We are extremely appreciative, Mr. Secretary, of the personal attention you have given in helping the national forests contribute more to our Nation's annual timber harvest.

In conclusion, we hope you will use your offices to secure prompt action on these several problems. The forest-dependent communities we represent are alert to the problems and the developments in the whole field of timber selling policies because of the welfare of the people is directly affected.

JOHN B. VEACH, HARDWOOD CORP. OF AMERICA

The Appalachian Mountain region covers parts of 10 States—its forests are principally hardwoods and its national forests offer a valuable opportunity for creating many additional man-days of work to bolster its economy. The four-point program is aimed at bringing this about. Two of these points are of particular importance to this Appalachian region.

First, we need the completion, at the earliest possible date, of the new timber inventory and growth survey now being made on the national forests to form a basis for establishing a realistic allowable annual cut.

Second, we need the greatly accelerated development of the timber access road system in these national forests.

Also, we need to recognize the great potential of these forests to provide a sizable number of man-days of work in timber harvesting and access road construction.

Thanks to your leadership, Mr. Secretary, a start has been made in our area toward increasing the annual harvest to equal the full allowable cut on the national forests. For example, on these national forests, about 3 years ago only 35 percent of the allowable cut was harvested while this year it will reach 75 percent. However, the new forest surveys being made indicate that the allowable cut may be doubled. The harvest of this timber cannot be accomplished without proper access road construction—at the present, funds appropriated and allocated to the area are building only one-third of the mileage needed to practice good forestry and attain maximum multiple use.

Our forestry problems in this area are quite similar to those of my friends in the South and the West. This was very clearly shown when our group appeared before the Worrell Committee. We are quite different, however, when it comes to the problem of man-days of work which is now so important to us. To emphasize the importance of our eastern national forests, it takes 10 times as many man-hours of work to produce 1,000 feet of hardwood lumber as it does to produce 1,000 feet of western softwood lumber—this is due to size of trees, the rough terrain and the amount of manufacturing required. Our area needs to put men to work. Through the establishment of policies permitting a full allowable annual cut and the development of access roads necessary to harvest it, the national forests in the Appalachian region can be brought up to the level where they will carry their share of the economy of the region.

DEVERE DIERKS, JR., DIERKS FOREST, INC.

Mr. Secretary, the proportion of timber furnished by the national forests in the 12 Southern States is not as large as in other sections of the Nation. However, they do provide a significant amount, and can make a real contribution to industry and community stability. Although few southern lumbermen depend on the national forests for either all or a major part of their timber requirements, many need to supplement their own or other purchased stumpage.

The southern pine lumber industry will support your efforts, Mr. Secretary, to assure the orderly sale of the allowable cut so that timber purchasers will be able to better plan their future operations.

**Members of our southern pine industry participated in developing both the proposed appeals procedure and the timber sale contract revision which have been presented for your review and adoption. The Timber Appraisal Review Committee visited our region and we agree with its suggestions for improving national forest timber appraisal. We urge your adoption of its recommendations.**

---

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ORVILLE FREEMAN TO A NOVEMBER 6, 1963, BREAKFAST MEETING, NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Gathered around this hall are leaders of the great and vital and important timber industry. This is indeed a good example of American democracy in action. I hope you will tolerate me—two opening stories. The first one is about the fellow who held public office. This guy had a tough question and he was wiggling and wangling because there wasn't any clear-cut answer, and finally he came up with the best way to answer it when they got him in a corner and nailed him good. He said, "Well, I'll tell you," he said, "some of my friends are against it, some of my friends are for it, and I'm for my friends."

The same fellow, I suppose I should say, is the one that changed a long-held position that he felt very strongly, and one of his constituents who had vigorously urged the change approached him in a very generous and expansive mood and said, "Joe, we're very happy that you're with us and that you really see the light on this and we're very grateful." And he looked at him and said, "Hell, I didn't see the light, I just felt the heat."

I say this in not anything but good fun. You have put me on the hot seat, and that's the way we do business, and it is a good way. I'm glad to be here. I'm glad to be on the hot seat. I believe that if you can't stand the heat, you should get out of the kitchen, and in case you are interested, I have no intentions of resigning, either now or in the foreseeable future.

The Department of Agriculture is a wonderful Department. I'm not going to give you a chamber of commerce speech, but the more I'm with the USDA the more I am impressed with it. I have never seen such a broad field of human knowledge which I can draw upon, nor have I ever known more devoted and able people. I won't take the time this morning to spell out all the things that this Department of Agriculture does for the people of this Nation—that is, the activities other than those people think about the USDA in terms of, corn and wheat or cows and pigs.

I want to make it clear that I don't have favorites among the agencies. I couldn't afford to have favorites. Even if I had some I wouldn't say so. But I want you to know that forestry and all its relations with our great national forests and with our multiple-use philosophies is an area that is very near and dear to me. I have a deep personal interest and concern, and I have given a great deal of time and attention to all aspects of forestry. I can assure you that I am deeply concerned with and conscious of your problem—whether you can show a profit, or pay us good healthy taxes for us to spend down here at the end of the year, or provide jobs and sustenance for your communities. And John Baker, the Assistant Secretary, who cuts across the whole field of natural resources, also gives a great deal of attention to forestry. And I want you to know that we're going to continue this interest.

Let me say I appreciate the improved communications that we have. I appreciate the forthrightness, directness—I'll stop a little short of saying bluntness—with which you put me on the spot here this morning. I am going to give you the answers. That's what you want. We've been working on them. You've been a little impatient. I think some of you figured that we were just trying to play hard to get and to shift and shuffle our feet around. But we haven't. We've been working on this, carefully and diligently for a long time, even before the meeting we had on February 21, 1962, in my office.

Most of you were there at that meeting. We were working on them even before the meeting with the Western Pine Association in Portland where you were so very gracious and helpful to me and received so thoughtfully the remarks that I tried to make there in answer to your questions.

Art Temple, you were president then; I want to thank you for your graciousness and helpfulness. I want to thank you for setting a new tone of mutual relationships which has been close. But, let me get to the specifics. When we first started talking we were both hurting and bleeding economically. The years of 1961 and early 1962 were tough, hard years for your industry. They were tough economic years in terms of our country. We were concerned about it, and your meeting with me in February of 1962 helped to dramatize the situation.

The first thing you said to us was, "We need to cut timber; we need to go to work; we need to put people to work; we've got communities depending upon us. Let's go.

"Let's cut timber—that's No. 1," you said. That means making it available; that means selling it, and making it possible for you to cut it; and, as you put it very gently, that means getting off our backsides administratively and making it possible for you to get the work done. That's about the way you put it. So we tried to get off our backsides, as the saying goes. I think we did.

We went to work, and 1962 was a better year than 1961, and 1963 is going to be a better year than 1962, as you well know. One reason is that we in the Department went to work and made timber available for sale. We sold 4.7 billion board feet in the quarter ending June 30, 1962. The heavy emphasis on increased sales continued for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, with the sale of 12.2 billion board feet. Now that was 1.9 billion board feet more than the preceding year and 400 million feet higher than the volume we actually had set as a goal when we went to the Congress for financing. For the most recent quarter, which ended September 30, 1963, we had sales of 400 million feet more than the corresponding period of a year ago.

We made timber available and you went to work. May I compliment you on a doggone efficient and effective operation. You went out and you increased the volume actually cut. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, a new all-time record timber cut of 10 billion board feet was established.

The cut of the most recent quarter, ending September 30, 1963, was the highest amount ever obtained in a single quarter, the highest in history. It totaled almost 3½ billion feet, or an increase of 400 million feet over the cut for the corresponding quarter last year.

So working together, we've been selling it, you've been cutting it, and I think it's a record that we can mutually take some pride in. I can honestly say to you that the Forest Service has been really moving efficiently.

The Congress, too, has acted favorably in response to your requests in this field. The Congress, for fiscal 1964 appropriation, raised $5 million above the appropriations of the previous year for timber sale administration. It takes people to do this sales job and to administer it—it's not like falling off a log; it's complicated business. Congress also has appropriated $17½ million more for roads in fiscal 1964 than in 1963. Over 65 percent of that increase is scheduled for timber access roads and road development. Now that isn't all you asked, that isn't all I asked, that isn't what most of the congressional people here asked, but it's a pretty substantial increase.

Now you ask about the four points and I want to go through them with you. But before I do, let me put you on the spot and be equally blunt with you, as you've been with me this morning. One of the things that has helped us make more timber sales has been the accelerated public works program. Now that is a part of ARA, if you will. Through this we've been able to do some work in the forests. We've been able to build a lot of roads; we've been able to accomplish tree planting; we've been able to do a lot of timber stand improvement work.

Mr. Guistina, if I may be very blunt with you, I haven't seen many people from this industry up there lobbying for APW. I'd like to see your people up there because APW is for the industry, and it's for the people that you are interested in, and for the communities that you are worried about. The money spent for forestry measures is money well spent.

Now, you'll find—maybe even in some of your organizations—where you could be a little more efficient—where you make a mistake now and then. But I'll tell you where forests are concerned on APW and a good share of this money has gone into forest work—we're ready to go on 24 hours' notice to build roads, to make timber stand improvement, to start tree planting, and to develop the whole range of multiple-use programs to provide jobs for people and to help fortify and expand the whole economic base of the communities that you're fighting for, talking about, and worrying about. And I hope that you'll discuss before you leave here the APW program and decide to get up to this Congress and help pass it and get us some money so that we can do some of the things you're asking us to do. And may I say to you that this is a doggone good investment in the future of this country.

Oh, yes, one other thing I would like to thank you for, and to say that I think that the Forest Service can properly accept some accolades for, and that is the work that was done in Oregon and Washington following the effects of the hurricane. We have moved a lot of that timber that was down, as a matter of fact most of it. On October 1 out of total of about 2 billion feet, a billion and one-half of the total has been sold and 743 million has been cut. I think that's a pretty good record. You are a fine, efficient group of operators and I thank you for it.

Now let me get to the four points because I'm prepared to give you some answers on them, and here they are:

No. 1, and I thank you for acknowledging this, the allowable cut situation under point 1, I think, has been taken care of.

The request regarding Appalachia which was raised this morning is one I hadn't heard of before this morning. I'll ask Art Greeley to make a check on this. I want to be familiar with the situation in Appalachia for a whole lot of reasons.

Now, what have we done?

In January 1963 the regulations were revised to clarify objectives, specifically S3 and S6. Also, in March of 1963 a statement on "National Forest Timber Sale Activities" was issued. This is important in connection with allowable cuts, so you will have this information. This is a proper request. It is a measuring of accomplishment against criteria, where we set down in depth and detail exactly where we are so you can evaluate it, and can give to the people who make the decision in the final analysis—the Congress of the United States. They will have better knowledge of what these operations are about. So, No. 1 is, basically, answered.

All right, now let me jump down to point 4, which is the timber sale contract. I do that because of its high priority in relation to your very proper concern, and ours, which was: "Let's get busy and cut some timber so we can make a profit and so we can create jobs for people." Now I've looked at this contract and it has gotten kind of old and it's had a lot of things tacked on to it over the years, and I've read it very carefully myself and there are some changes that are needed in it.

You know, and I know, that dealing with the Government under a contract is not like dealing with each other under a contract. It's not quite as bad as that old saying "heads I win, tails you lose". But basically, when you deal with the Government, you deal on a prescribed basis, because the Government is the custodian of the overall public welfare, and as such this is not the same as contracts between individuals. Government contracts which deal with the public domain have got to be "tough" contracts from the standpoint of the private side of that contract. And if the Congress had not written it that way, the GAO would have told them that they should.

We do not want the contract to be a one-sided affair. I emphasized before that this contract needs a lot of work. But you know, and I know, that regarding the public domain, Government, in its relationship with the totality of the taxpayer interest, cannot enter a contract relationship as two modern business institutions would deal with each other. In a private contract you can amend, or change, or adjust it bilaterally, as the occasion may require; in private transactions you can get two lawyers around the table and decide how you are going to make particular kinds of changes. Now you don't do that in dealing with the Government. I don't go into a contract and change it to the disadvantage of the American taxpayer and the American public. I don't change it because under law I cannot do so. Certain procedures on occasion are set up for doing this. I think the point is generally understood. I don't need to belabor it.

This contract of ours has grown, and has been added to until it is a very difficult instrument. And it does tend to be, and will always tend to be, loaded on the side of Government because of the very nature of things. But there is a lot that can be done about it. This need at first was related to the immediate goal of getting out and getting the timber cut and the job done—and so it had and still has a high priority.

We went to work on it right away. And Art Greeley headed up a team which met with some representatives from your industry, and worked out some contract changes, and turned them over to your industry. Those changes were not considered by you to be adequate. You proceeded to make a substantial investment of time, and effort, and know-how to come back with what you considered an adequately revised contract. I understand you spent a great deal of money in doing it. I have looked at this, but we have had it less than a month. And yet our material was sent to you about a year ago. But, it is going to take some work and we are prepared now to sit down and go over it step by step and piece by piece. And we will revise this contract and it ought to be improved and sharpened and cleared up. I am confident this can be done. I can assure you that we are going to be more than cooperative in getting it done. And so that one point is well underway. And I am very confident that contract can be substantially improved.

It took you a year to decide what you wanted, and we will try to act a little bit faster than that. It isn't easy, but we will be digging in and working at it. We ought to have a better contract. And we will try.

Now point No. 3. That is the timber appraisal committee and the Worrell report. As has already been outlined, and as I said in Portland, we appointed a committee. I said it would come from neither the Forest Service, nor would it come from the industry proper. This was done. The committee worked very hard. And they made some recommendations. They made 37 recommendations. Of the 37 recommendations which the committee made, 34 of them, for all practical purposes, the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture welcomed, as you welcomed them. Of those, and I am not going into detail on them here, there are seven which are going to require some working out in practical application. There will be some modifications or adjustments that we think that the committee might not have foreseen in their review. But in substance, we agree. So out of 37 recommendations in this Advisory Committee report, we agree with 34.

Now there are three that have given some trouble. I want to talk to you about those three. We have needed some decisions on them and I am prepared to give them. In this connection, the Secretary of Agriculture has a lot of advisory committees and they are advisory committees. They are appointed to advise or recommend, and not to dictate. I happen to be responsible for what goes on in the Department of Agriculture, and in the Forest Service, and I make the decisions. I appreciate and profit from advisory committee reports. But the fact that I appoint one does not necessarily mean that I am going to agree with it, or accept verbatim everything it says. And of course you realize this without my saying.

Now the three recommendations we have problems with are the ones that run to the question of profit. What do we do to try to handle this so that we will do our best to meet your need for profit in the operation that you carry on in any particular logging operation? Now this is a tough, complicated, and highly involved technical question. I will have to say that though I have spent a good many hours at it I do not completely understand all of its ramifications. But I have done my best.

First of all, I want you to know that we are concerned about this problem. We are certain that you can't operate as a normal American business operation without making a profit. So we want you to make it. And to this end we are going to do everything we can within the law and within proper procedures and protection of the public interest, and acting in the proper way. You would not want us to act in any other way.

These three recommendations, parts of the Worrell Committee report, go to the question of profit. You know that we put into effect in mid-1962 the "sale-as-a-whole" appraisal approach, under which appraised prices for high values species are reduced to make up for less than normal profit opportunities in low value species. And we think this is working out quite well. Now the appraisal review committee did make some comments on this and on the profit ratio levels used and raised questions about the published reports of profit and of profit ratios. We are prepared to make further careful studies of published profit data. So at this time we are "marrying up", as it were, the high value species and the low value species in a sensible and workable way that will make the potential profit that is necessary—assuming efficient operations on your part. It's related to the Worrell committee report but not directly in it.

Now there are two recommendations in the report that create some problem and which, at this point, I am not prepared to accept. I want to share my reasons with you. First, we get into the question of the definition of what constitutes adequate stumpage prices in connection with the whole question of "fair market value" and the "objective of appraisals." What it gets down to in this whole complicated problem, which is a legal problem in part, is a matter of definition. The law says, "appraised value." The Department has always considered appraised value as "fair market value." Now this gets down to a question of how do you handle this appraised value question and what is the definition of "fair market value" in its application to appraisals? The committee came out with something called "acceptable price." I've read this part of the report. It is a little rough to understand how acceptable price concept exactly is going to work. I am concerned also about its legal implications and its relation to the clearly established goal of fair market value. Now this whole business applies to only a relatively small number of cases, a relatively limited number of cases, and I am, at this point, unwilling without some further guidance from the U.S. Congress, to rock the boat in connection with the definition of fair market value to encompass the small number of cases involved in this whole matter.

Now whether we want to seek legislation to establish some basis other than fair market value to appraise national forest timber for sale is a question that I hope that you will consider and that you are considering. On balance, at this point, after careful consideration it seems to me that the handicaps, that the losses, and the complications, and the potential misunderstandings, and questionable legal position—that considering all these things, the transfer from fair market value to something called acceptable price, which about defies any kind of sharp and clear definition, is a highly questionable course of action for both of us. It is one that, at this point, I am not prepared to propose.

On the second recommendation, we come to the situation where the average appraised price for timber in a proposed sale is less than the average minimum stumpage rates. In this instance, timber comes up for sale as a part of allowable cut and you can't cut and make a profit on it. What are we going to do so that you can make a profit on it?

The committee in this instance says, in effect, subsidize it. Make some change in relation to what is required now within the working circle which has been agreed upon by all concerned—the industry and the Forest Service and the Congress. Do something involving proper practices, such as silvicultural practices to safeguard national forest values, or slash disposal, or snag disposal, or erosion control and the measures needed to take care of debris. These have always been considered a part of the logging job. This is work that has to be done.

The recommendation of the committee is that the cost for cleanup be absorbed by someone else. That means that the USDA does it. That means that we subsidize it. That means that we go to Congress for appropriations to do it because we don't have the funds to do it now. Now, again, this problem runs to a relatively small portion of the sales, and there is no doubt in my mind but what this will be clearly characterized as a subsidy. The Secretary of Agriculture is sick and tired of the word "subsidy." I don't know whether you want that label on your back, but I don't think you do. Speaking for myself, I don't.

You have to continue to operate. Some of you are going to be under pressure to operate in logging that presents a tough, knotty problem. But you and the Forest Service are going to be in a whole peck of trouble, including concern by some of the deeply public spirited and knowledgeable congressional leaders in this room this morning, if we start fooling around with sound practices of forestry, and of proper handling of forestry, and of proper procedures for operating jointly in our business. You know that. I know that. It's not a course that I think is sound judgment. It's not sound judgment for us to break away from present practices on this, for reasons that I think we both understand.

So on these two points, and only these two at this time, the answer from the Secretary of Agriculture is: We are concerned, and we know this is a problem, but to the indicated extent, the answer to these two recomendations in the Worrell Committee report is very definitely "No."

Now, also, there is a third recommendation on the 'equal escalation" issue. You've got a point here, for if the price can go down so far, it ought to be able to go up so far, as well. And it looks like it's another "heads I win, tails you lose" situation. There is a problem here, and a lot of related complications, too. We are flexible on this, and as we negotiate these contract issues I think we can do something to make this a bit more effective, fair and workable to you who are conscious of this problem.

To conclude, on the Worrell Committee report there are only two things in those recommendations where at this point the Secretary of Agriculture says "No." I have outlined them. And they are cases which, in effect, involve subsidization in order to give an assured profit. I don't think you want that any more than when you responded, when I asked you in Portland, whether you wanted to have allotments of timber, rather than to have competitive bidding.

You don't want allotments. You want to be competitive and you want to continue on your operations. I think you should. I would not recommend a subsidy type of action although the problem the committee points out is vital and critical. We want to go as far as we can, but I don't think that you want to get a subsidy label on your back in relation to this. And these two things in the Worrell Committee report end up, I think, here. On that basis, the decision on these two points has been made.

Now, finally, we get to appeals. This is one that I've given a lot of attention and thought to, not only as secretary and as a former governor, but also as one who likes to think that he has a little extra interest and background in the pure matter of political philosophy of government and how it works. This concern is with big government, and how it should be responsive to the needs of the individual. This is a tough question and I have seen the problem from both sides. I have represented private industry. I have brought cases all the way to the Supreme Court. And I have been just as frustrated at times as you have in dealing with government. And I have been on the other side of the table, so I assure you that this has concerned me, as a political scientist as well as an administrator, and, I hope, a reasonable policymolder.

I have given this question of appeals a lot of thought. One of the things it comes down to is the dividing line in separating out a properly appalable question of fact where there is a difference of opinion, and where judgment on the facts ought to be made. This should be separate from a basic policy question where the administrative official is responsible for overall policy. On the question of fact, an appeal procedure is essential. On the question of policy there cannot be any appeal procedure as there is on a question of fact. I cannot delegate to an appeal committee the power to make policy decisions within the Department of Agriculture, unless the Congress of the United States says that they want a committee from your industry to run the Department. The Congress hasn't said that; they want the Secretary of Agriculture to run the Department. And so, basic policy questions are my responsibility.

Now fact questions are another thing; and where the same persons are judge and jury in making the decision is a problem. We have given a lot of thought to this, for quite a while. And here is the conclusion that we have come up with.

There are three things involved here. That is three categories of questions, I think. First, a determination of contract relief which involves issues of fact or law arising under a contract. That's No. 1.

No. 2, a decision under regulations governing the permitted use of the national forests having a direct effect on the enjoyment of such use, but where the private party has no contractual right to relief. That's area No. 2. No contract, but a history of use. And a right, or a relationship that does not involve overall policy.

And third, a decision having a broad policy impact on forest administration and management not primarily identifiable with individual private enjoyment. Now the third one involves basic policy questions. And on that one I have to say "No," in connection with appeals. That's my responsibility and I could not dissolve it legally if I wanted to. It otherwise would be impossible to operate the Department of Agriculture. And so on that one the answer is "No."

On the other two we are proposing an appeal procedure. It would work like this. First of all, the present procedure will be continued through the regional forester. At this point, if we were to set up with every regional forester an independent appeal board on every question in every region around this country, I think, gentlemen, we would have an absolutely administrative monster. I think you would find that you would get so piled up in operations that it would be literally impossible to do what we jointly want to do. At least that is my judgment.

So the same procedure through the regional forester, at this point, I would say would continue. We would, however, establish a 5-member board of appeals to consider appeals from decisions of the regional forester. Three members would be regular employees of the Department outside of the Forest Service, and two would be persons not now employed by the U.S. Government. This board would be authorized, first, to hold hearings anywhere in the United States. They would also render final decisions in appeals on questions of facts under contracts, which covers 90 percent or more of the points of which you are concerned. The board would also make advisory recommendations under point No. 2, which are quasi-policy questions, together with supporting determinations of fact to the Chief of the Forest Service.

The decisions of the Chief, based upon recommendations which come from the appeal board in category No. 2, would then be appealable to the Secretary, with the record of both, namely, the recommendation of the independent appeals board and action of the Chief on that recommendation of the appeal board. These will be referred to the Secretary for his action. This is the marginal policy area, but in it there would be a finding by an independent board, which would be highly influential.

I have mentioned that action in connection with the third class of case would remain outside the responsibility of the board. In conection with this one, speaking of broad policy determinations, you know that I have established a policy in the Department which did not always exist for broad public hearings—for example, on land exchanges. Senator MAGNUSON and I have had long talks about problems involved in exchanges. I think we have the same experience here on land exchanges that I had as Governor of the State of Minnesota. As long as we had something that we were doing behind closed doors everybody thought we were going about trying to cheat somebody. And as soon as we opened the doors, and had the press come in and let everybody know all about this exchange, then nobody even bothered to come to the meetings because then they figured nobody was cheating anybody, and we got along pretty well. And so this is what we've been doing. And today there are, on land exchanges, public hearings. Senator CHURCH is one that I have talked with about this. Senator JACKSON, and I could mention Senator NEUBERGER, and Senator MORSE, and I could mention some others, including some over on the House side.

So, on these policy questions, we come down to a matter of public hearings and every opportunity is given for a group that has a particular interest to have their say. When they have had their say, and when they have been heard, then the Congress has its say. If you think that the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Chief of the Forest Service, can be an independent operator, you don't know the U.S. Congress. I can tell you that, for when people get excited, then their Congressmen get excited, for that is their business. And when they get excited, believe me, I hear about it.

So, in this one, why there is this kind of check. And we are, in addition, proposing appeals procedure. We think that it will be workable, and meet your very proper and legitimate protest that in a sense the Forest Service has been prosecutor, judge, trial jury, defendant, and decisionmaker, and appeal court. In a sense there was some truth in that, on the question of facts as there was also on a question of contract.

If I may summarize, I have kept you here a long time, but I have tried to go into these things a little bit, and as I have said we will summarize these things, some of them more fully.

I appreciate your cooperation, communication, the help, the frankness, and, if I may say so, the bluntness. I hope I have not been too blunt this morning. But you wanted some answers. You suggested this morning that we were delaying. We have not been delaying. We have been working and thinking and making decisions and now I have announced some of them. And now you have them. And that's it. Now, let's see how these things work.

Let's keep up the spirit of cooperation, because we have gotten results. We have increased the allowable cut. We have sold more and cut more timber than at any time in the history of this country. And this is a fine record, a record on which I think we both can take some real pride. On the appraisal thing, 90 percent of the recommendations we've met, we reserve on one for more negotiations. On two, at this point, the answer is "No" for reasons I have given. In connection with the contract, we are going to make a lot more progress and I am confident that we can iron out a lot of things. And I believe that 99 percent of our problems come down to trying to do something about that contract.

On the appeal thing, you had a legitimate point in my judgment. It worries me. The appeals board, I think, is a workable procedure, and it will meet your problems and it will also meet mine, which is the eventual responsibility.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your time, and I thank you for your courtesy, and I thank you for, I hope, your friendship. Again, may I say I have tried to give you answers. I suppose they are not everything that you would have liked. I think we have made a lot of progress. These are some terribly important issues, and I am deeply concerned. It is important to this country for its community life. We are all deeply concerned. The Forest Service is concerned. I think it has been more responsive and it will seek to be more responsive, but we first represent the American people as a whole.

We apply the law of Congress in terms of multiple use. That standard and that principle is one that you support. I will only say to you that you are not the low man on the totem pole. Some of you, I know, feel you are. We are seeking to administer this on an equitable and fair basis in the light of present and future needs of the economy—of your industry, of your profits, of your employees, of your towns, of your people, and the social and economic conditions of this country. We are doing the very, very best we can. We are going to be responsive to you in every way that we properly can. You have the answers and the decisions that I have made. I am privileged to have this kind of company, and to make this report to you personally and to meet with you in this fine way.

### Participants at the Breakfast Discussion With the Secretary of Agriculture

#### SECRETARY'S OFFICE

Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Hon. John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and Kenneth M. Birkhead, assistant to the Secretary.

#### U.S. SENATE

Senator Gordon Allott, of Colorado; Senator Frank Church, of Idaho; Senator Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Senator Edwin L. Mechem, of New Mexico; Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Senator Maurine B. Neuberger, of Oregon; Senator Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia; and, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, of Texas.

#### U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative George W. Andrews, of Alabama; Representative James F. Battin, of Montana; Representative Jack Brooks, of Texas; Representative Donald H. Clausen, of California; Representative John Dowdy, of Texas; Representative Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon; Representative George M. Grant, of Alabama; Representative Edith Green, of Oregon; Representative Harlan Hagen, of California; Representative Julia Butler Hansen, of Washington; Representative William Henry Harrison, of Wyoming; Representative Harold T. Johnson, of California; Representative Alton Lennon, of North Carolina; Representative Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine; Representative John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia; Representative D. R. (Billy) Matthews, of Florida; Representative Arnold Olsen, of Montana; Representative Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington; Representative W. R. Poage, of Texas; Representative Joe R. Pool, of Texas; Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota; Representative Walter Rogers, of Texas; Representative George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona; Representative Don L. Short, of North Dakota; Representative B. F. Sisk, of California; Representative K. W. Stinson, of Washington; Representative Roy A. Taylor, of North Carolina; Representative Thor C. Tollefson, of Washington; and Representative William K. Van Pelt, of Wisconsin.

#### CONGRESSIONAL STAFF ASSISTANTS

Buehl J. Berentson, administrative assistant to Representative Westland, of Washington; Lynn Broadhead, staff assistant to Representative Harding, of Idaho; Donald M. Brown, assistant to Representative Julia Butler Hansen, of Washington; Brian Corcoran, press secretary to Senator Jackson, of Washington; Ewing Hass, administrative assistant to Senator Kuchel, of California; Thomas Holley, administrative assistant to Representative Horan, of Washington; Ted Kazy, administrative assistant to Senator Goldwater, of Arizona; L. Stanley Kemp, administrative assistant to Representative Norblad, of Oregon; Walt Kingham, administrative assistant to Senator Simpson, of Wyoming; John A. Knievel, administrative assistant to Representative Catherine May, of Washington; Ed H. Munden, administrative assistant to Senator Tower, of Texas; Teddy Roe, staff assistant to Senator Mansfield, of Montana; Richard B. Royce, staff, Senate Public Works Committee; Joe Smith, administrative assistant to Representative Ullman, of Oregon; John B. Tacke, legislative assistant to Representative White, of Idaho; and Edward T. Woozley, administrative assistant to Senator Jordan of Idaho.

#### OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Arthur W. Greeley, Deputy Chief, Forest Service; Ira J. Mason, Forest Service; M. M. Nelson, Deputy Chief, Forest Service; B. H. Payne, Forest Service; Hamilton K. Pyles, Deputy Chief, Forest Service; Charles Lewis, BDSA, Department of Commerce; and Thomas C. Mason, BDSA, Department of Commerce.

#### FOREST INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES

A. J. Agather, St. Regis Paper Co., J. Neils Division, Libby, Mont.; Sam K. Arness, Humboldt Fir, Inc., Hoopa, Calif.; Donald Baldwin, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Gerhart Bendix, Hi-Ridge Lumber Co., Seiad Valley, Calif.; H. D. Bennett, Appalachian Hardware Manufacturers, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio; Raymond H. Berry, Scott Lumber Co., Inc., Burney, Calif.; J. B. Bishop, Weyerhaeuser Co., Klamath Falls, Oreg.; James M. Boyd, S. W. Forest Industries, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.; Gene C. Brewer, U.S. Plywood Corp., New York, N.Y.; R. E. Broderick, Northeast Lumber Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.; W. S. Bromley, American Pulpwood Association, New York, N.Y.; James D. Bronson, Boise Cascade Corp., Yakima, Wash.; Eugene F. Burrill, E. F. Burrill Lumber Co., White City, Oreg.; Thomas F. Butler, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; John Callaghan, California Forest Protective Association, San Francisco, Calif.; Thomas L. Carter, W. T. Carter & Bro., Camden, Tex.; Julian N. Cheatham, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Portland, Oreg.; Randolph Collier, California State senator, Yreka, Calif.; L. M. Cooley, Commercial Bank of Twisp, Twisp, Wash.; V. W. Cothren, Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La.; George A. Craig, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; S. A. Cuddebach, Cuddebach Lumber Co., Eugene, Oreg.; Stanley P. Deas, Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La.; John B. DeMott, Passamaquoddy Lumber Co., Princeton, Maine; DeVere Dierks, Jr., Dierks Forests, Inc., Hot Springs, Ark.; C. D. Dosker, Gamble Bros., Inc., Louisville, Ky.; John Druckenbrod, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; M. B. Doyle, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Paul M. Dunn, St. Regis Paper Co., New York, N.Y.; Robert F. Dwyer, Dwyer Lumber & Plywood Co., Portland, Oreg.; J. B. Edens, S. W. Forest Industries, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.; G. C. Edgett, West Coast Lumberman's Association, Portland, Oreg.; Stewart Ferguson, Aloha Shake Co., Aloha, Wash.; Joseph J. Fitzgerald, E. Hines Lumber Co., Chicago, Ill.; George C. Flanagan, Elk Lumber Co., Medford, Oreg.; L. K. Floan, Potlatch Forests, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho; Harold J. Ford, American Forest Products Corp., San Francisco, Calif.; D. B. Frampton, D. B. Frampton & Co., Columbus, Ohio; Phillip E. Frankfort, S. W. Forest Industries, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.; Frank R. Gilchrist, Gilchrist Timber Co., Gilchrist, Oreg.; N. B. Giustina, Giustina Bros. Lumber Co., Eugene, Oreg.; Charles T. Gray, American Forest Products Corp., San Francisco, Calif.; W. E. Griffee, Western Pine Association, Portland, Oreg.; W. D. Hagenstein, Industrial Forestry Association, Portland, Oreg.; John F. Hall, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Robert Helding, St. Regis Paper Co., J. Neils Division, Libby, Mont.; Michael Hennessy, attorney at law, Yreka, Calif.; A. T. Hildman, Michigan-California Lumber Co., Camino, Calif.; Charles M. Hines, E. Hines Lumber Co., Chicago, Ill.; George V. Hjort, Boise Cascade Corp., Boise, Idaho.

Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Nils B. Hult, Hult Lumber & Plywood Co., Junction City, Oreg.; Lacy H. Hunt, L. H. Hunt Lumber Co., Nacogdoches, Tex.; E. N. W. Hunter, Pope & Talbot, Inc., Portland, Oreg.; Dave James, Simpson Timber Co., Seattle, Wash.; William T. Jobe, Jr., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Ray E. Johnson, West Tacoma Newsprint Co., Steilacoom, Wash.; Rae L. Johnson, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Portland, Oreg.; Richard Jordan, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Robert C. Keck, attorney at law, Chicago, Ill.; W. H. Kellogg, T. S. Foster Estate, Huntsville, Tex.; Baxter B. Kelly, Williams Sales Co., Sumter, S.C.; Glen M. Kittrell, Wagner Lumber Products Co., Twisp, Wash.; E. L. Kolbe, Western Pine Association, Portland, Oreg.; Jim Larson, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Shane MacCarthy, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Marshall McGrath, International Paper Co., New York, N.Y.; Herbert B. McKean, Potlatch Forests, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho; H. S. Mersereau, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Augusta, Ga.; J. F. Muller, L. & M. Lumber Co., Willis, Tex.; George Neff, Anaconda Forest Products, Bonner, Mont.; Harold P. Newson, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; T. K. Oliver, Timber Products Co., Division Cyprus Mines Corp., Medford, Oreg.; Bernard L. Orell, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.; Leonard E. Pasek, Kimberly-Clark Corp., Neenah, Wis.; Paul D. Plumly, P. W. Plumly Corp., Winchester, Va.; Peter F. Pope, Pope & Talbot, Inc., Portland, Oreg.; Starr W. Reed, Simpson Timber Co., Seattle, Wash.; E. C. Rettig, Potlatch Forests, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho; John S. Richards, Atlas Tie Co., Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; H. A. Roberts, Western Pine Association, Portland, Oreg.; George C. Romeiser, Southern Hardware Lumber Manufacturers Association, Memphis, Tenn.; Mark Schoknecht, St. Regis Paper Co., J. Neils Division, Libby, Mont.; W. Scott Shepherd, Lumber River Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lumberton, N.C.; A. Robert Smith, correspondent, Washington, D.C.; R. E. Stermitz, Intermountain Lumber Co., Missoula, Mont.; W. E. Stevenson, S. D. S. Lumber Co., Bingen, Wash.; L. L. Stewart, Bohemia Lumber Co., Inc., Culp Creek, Oreg.; E. M. Stoddard, Sawtooth Lumber Co., Mountain Home, Idaho; William Swindells, Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg.; Arthur Temple, Jr., Southern Pine Lumber Co., Diboll, Tex.; Latane Temple, Temple Lumber Co., Houston, Tex.; Mark Townsend, Townsend Lumber Co., Stuttgart, Ark.; John B. Veach, Hardware Corp. of America, Asheville, N.C.; Kenneth R. Walker, Paul Bunyan Lumber Co., Atherton, Calif.; W. R. Warner, Potlatch Forests, Inc., Warren, Ark.; L. W. Wilson, Bemis Hardware Lumber Co., Robbinsville, N.C.; Steve Wilson, Steve Wilson Co., Medford, Oreg.; and Gene Wortsman, Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo.

---

## LUMBER STANDARDS WARNING TO THE WEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an article from the October issue of Western Timber Industry. This sets forth action taken in Florida by its State legislature to make it illegal to install lumber exceeding a 19-percent moisture content in any structure or building used for human habitation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DRY LUMBER ADVOCATES PUT OVER QUICKIE BILL TO OUTLAW GREEN

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.—The Florida legislature has passed a law making it illegal to install lumber exceeding 19 percent in moisture content into any "structure or building used for human habitation."

The Southern pine interests (who must dry to 19 percent maximum to prevent stain and damage to their wood) have apparently out-slickered the Douglas fir region producers who hadn't an inkling that the legislation was pending until it was too late.

The South generally, and Florida particularly, have been longtime excellent markets for green Douglas fir dimension lumber which has competed on even (and better) terms with dry pine.

We print the Florida statute below:

"CHAPTER 63-359; HOUSE BILL NO. 1078

"An act relating to the use of lumber for construction; amending section 536.22, Florida statutes, making certain uses of certain types of lumber unlawful; providing for enforcement; providing effective date

*"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:*

"SECTION 1. Section 536.22, Florida statutes, is amended to read:

"'536.22 Lumber, moisture content; enforcement:

"'1. All lumber 2 inches or less in thickness shall contain not more than 19 percent moisture content at the time such lumber is permanently installed into a structure or building used for human habitation. Such lumber shall at no time be less than American lumber standard sizes when such lumber is at 19 percent moisture content.

"'2. It shall be the duty of every State and county attorney, sheriff, constable, the commissioner of agriculture or his duly authorized representative, and any other appropriate State and county official to enforce the provisions of this section. The aforementioned officials are authorized to make application for injunction to the proper circuit court and the judge of said court shall have jurisdiction upon hearing and for cause shown to grant a temporary or permanent injunction or both restraining any person from violating or continuing to violate any of the provisions of this section or from failing or refusing to comply with the requirements of this section, said injunction to issue without bond.

"'3. The installation of any lumber which does not conform to the provisions contained in subsection (1) shall be prohibited and any person installing such lumber in a structure or building for human habitation shall, upon conviction, be guilty of a misdemeanor.'

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect September 1, 1963.

"Became a law without the Governor's approval.

"Filed in Office, Secretary of State June 11, 1963."

Mr. MORSE. For some time, opponents and proponents of the proposal to change lumber standards have been presenting their points of view to me. Therefore, I was gratified when the Secretary of Commerce decided to have the entire matter reviewed by the Bureau of Standards.

One of the views expressed to me by the opponents of the proposed standard change was that it would be followed by efforts to eliminate green Douglas-fir dimension lumber from the marketplace. The action recently taken by the Florida Legislature appears to conform to the views expressed on this score.

It is not for me to judge the action taken by the legislature of a sovereign State in our Union, but certainly the producers of Douglas-fir lumber have every right to be concerned about an arbitrary statute, whether Federal or State in origin, which in its operation works a hardship on an industry and a region without showing that it is essential for protection of the public interest. It may well be that the Western Douglas-fir industry will want to examine this Florida act carefully to determine whether it should be tested in the courts, but certainly the Douglas-fir areas of our Nation should recognize that legislation such as this, if enacted in a number of States where Douglas-fir enjoys a good market, will seriously curtail sales of Douglas-fir lumber. In my view, those who urged the Florida Legislature to enact this bill are not serving the interests of the lumber industry—an industry which is engaged in a commendable program to expand the use of wood.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has urged the approval of revised lumber standards. The Secretary of Commerce has the responsibility to determine whether the approval of these revised standards could have the economic effect of outlawing green lumber, crippling the Douglas-fir lumber industry, and preventing the use of green lumber, even where it can meet the public interest test for utilization and service.

Finally, I think that this is a matter which concerned citizens of the State of Oregon and other Douglas-fir States should take up with their Governors. They should express their views to the Governors of the great lumber-using States so that this legislation will not be repeated elsewhere. They might find it helpful to confer on this matter with the Governor of Florida.

The cause of internal trade is not aided by actions which limit the sale of useful products among our several States. In my judgment if this legislation is not needed to protect the public interest. It is similar, in effect, to a confiscatory tariff. Legislation such as that adopted by Florida constitutes an invitation for retaliatory legislation by other States. In the long run, this will do a disservice to our Nation and the affected States.

## A PRIVATE U.S. PEACE CORPS IN VENEZUELA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a privately organized group of volunteers, mostly Americans, is helping 690 Venezuelan families to help themselves raise their living standards and improve their material circumstances. Calling itself ACCION, which stands for Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations, this group has sent 35 fieldworkers into Venezuela not only to spark self-help projects to improve housing, set up cooperative industries, install sanitary facilities and other community advantages but most importantly to organize counterpart ACCION groups among the Venezuelans themselves. Funds for ACCION's operations are obtained largely through contributions by American and Venezuelan business firms with some help also from Alliance for Progress funds.

The entire enterprise is a tribute to U.S. private initiative outside of the Government and it contains the potential of a tremendous movement by Americans to help our Latin American neighbors in a distinctly American way. It differs from the Peace Corps mainly in having voluntary assignments and personnel preferring a voluntary organizational framework; and in phasing the whole program for indigenous personnel to take over. ACCION's 1964 program is:

First. Continuation of work in 30 barrios initiated or continued in 1963.

Second. Recruitment and selection of 50 North American and European workers through ACCION's U.S. recruiting offices.

Third. Ten-day retraining course for field-workers and a 2-month training course for the new workers.

Fourth. Recruitment and selection of 100 Venezuelan workers—70 full-time workers and 30 university students.

Fifth. Initiation of projects in approximately 75 new barrios for an intensified campaign in the 5 areas mentioned above.

Sixth. Work toward greater unification of agencies and services dealing in community problems in order to keep alive community responsibility on a long-term basis.

In order to distinguish itself from other similar programs ACCION stresses the following characteristics:

First. The full-time trained community action worker from outside the barrio.

Second. Living in the barrio in order to have continuous involvement in barrio life and problems and be able to best stimulate and guide barrio community action and assure followthrough.

Third. The role of the worker as a catalytic agent, stimulating self-help projects within the barrio, multiplying the effect of change by channeling outside aid into projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report in the New York Times of December 1, 1963, headlined "Venezuela Town Honors Kennedy," and the article by James Daniel entitled "ACCION Speaks Louder Than Words," which appeared in Reader's Digest, September 1962.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### VENEZUELA TOWN HONORS KENNEDY—EX-SLUM DWELLERS RENAME NEW SETTLEMENT FOR HIM

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, November 28.—Something of what President Kennedy meant to Latin America became evident Tuesday night on a hilltop 15 miles southwest of Caracas.

Six hundred and ninety families dislodged from sewerside slums of the Venezuelan capital, are building homes on the hill. The settlement is being constructed with the help of Alliance for Progress funds. When the settlers heard of President Kennedy's death, they petitioned the Governor to change their settlement's name from Corral de Piedra to Presidente Kennedy.

On Tuesday night an official motorcade drove up the dirt road. The settlers gathered in the muddy square in front of the school, lit by new electric lights. The Governor announced the new name. The U.S. Ambassador, C. Allan Stewart, a stocky, cigar-chewing man who looks as if he came from the steps of a country courthouse, said in Spanish:

"The best monument to President Kennedy will be the homes."

### MOURNFUL VOICES

The residents of the settlement spoke mournfully of President Kennedy.

"He was a beautiful President, a humanitarian man, that was the main thing," 18-year-old Esperanza Valdes said.

"When the news came you couldn't hear a thing here but the radios," Pablo Oliviett, an electrician, recalled.

"He knew how the poor felt," a laborer said of President Kennedy.

The settlement of Presidente Kennedy is not an impressive sight. The hill is a scar of raw earth and the houses—temporary structures that the residents will replace with permanent ones—stand in drab white rows. Brightly painted huts on nearby hills, overgrown with green foliage, are almost beautiful by contrast—but they are slums.

President Kennedy discloses progress as it generally looks in this part of the world: painful, unnatural and ugly. But it is not a slum.

"For the first time the Venezuelan Government and the United States Government have done the right thing," Mr. Oliviett said, gesturing toward the valley. "They have given the land of the rich to the poor to live."

Miss Valdes said: "We used to live in Bella Vista, 12 of us in a 1-room shack. Now we have three rooms and our own land and it is clean here."

Some residents expressed worry over whether the project would continue to progress. One complained that building materials were slow in coming and another that there were few stores and poor transportation.

Water, light, sewage and the temporary houses have been provided by the Government. It will also provide building materials as a loan and the residents will build their own permanent houses.

Walking through chilly dark alleys between temporary beaverboard walls. Arcemir Millan, a young clerk, said:

"Most of us are young here. We are looking at the future and we hope things will be better."

He helped a visitor over a pile of splintered lumber and added:

"We may look bad but we are not stuck. That's what is important. I wish that every 25 years a Kennedy could be born in the United States."

To the visitor this seemed not only a tribute to President Kennedy but a cogent description of the Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin America.

### OUTSIDERS HELP COMMUNITIES

The 2,500 people of Barrio la Linea, Venezuela, still live in tin-roofed houses of wood and cardboard. But they now have a sanitary sewer that they installed themselves, a community center for adult classes that they built themselves and some other comforts of modern living.

The hamlet, near Caracas, is one of 30 communities in Venezuela where self-help projects sparked by outsiders are bringing in cooperative industries, improving the housing, paving the streets, setting up community institutions, and building a community spirit.

In Barrio la Linea the outsiders were two Californians, Miss Winifred Marich and Miss Suzy Navarrete, the latter of Colombian ancestry. They went to Barrio la Linea as volunteers from ACCION (Action), Americans for Community Cooperation In Other Nations.

ACCION has organized a counterpart in Venezuela, Organizadores de Acción Communal (Organizers of Community Action), and the program has entered its second phase. Now the 30 demonstration projects are carried on by two-member teams. One member is a Venezuelan university student or full-time volunteer and the other is a foreigner from the United States, Canada, Guatemala, the Netherlands, France, Sweden, or Trinidad.

Currently at work in Venezuela are 35 foreign volunteers, most of them from the United States, and 30 Venezuelans.

In the next phase of the program, starting next year, the Venezuelans will take over the projects and initiate and carry out new ones, with the foreign volunteers working alongside them. In the final phase the Venezuelans will take over the whole program and the North Americans and Europeans will depart. The foreign contingent will start over again in one or more of five countries from which ACCION has received requests from leading citizens, private agencies, and concerns interested in developing community action in their own lands.

---

[From Latin American Report]

## ACCION SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS

(By James Daniel)

Just 4 years ago, in Venezuela, ugly Communist-led mobs came within a hairbreadth of murdering U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon. With that mood still lingering, there could hardly be a riskier country for idealistic young U.S. men and women to venture into in the hope of promoting self-help and international good will. Yet the seething, restless slums of this oil-producing South American country are today the scene of a unique and effective adventure—a private Peace Corps.

On the outskirts of the Capital City of Caracas is a dingy slum where cabbies often refuse to go because of Communist brigands who waylay cars, rob gasoline stations and set them afire with the attendants locked inside. Yet in this same slum two young North American girls—Suzy Navarrete, 28, and Winifred Marich, 25—now conduct a thriving community center where local volunteers teach reading, writing, sewing, cooking, auto mechanics. So successful is the center that the local Communist leader has twice tried to get himself listed as a sponsor.

Venezuela's Central University, with 20,000 students, is a hotbed of radicalism where extremists regularly sweep the student elections. Here Rodmar Pulley, 25, who had 2 years of previous Latin American experience as a Mormon missionary in Guatemala, now attends classes. To his Venezuelan roommate, prone to emotional denunciations of "capitalism," Rod suggested that they pool their money, buy an electric blender and go into business making milkshakes. Each night after the campus snack bar closed, their room became a mecca for thirsty students, and soon the two young men were flush with spending money. Whereupon Rod generously sold his interest to the roommate at cost. "Now you are the capitalist," he said.

Taken aback, the Venezuelan student thought a moment. "I guess," he said, "your view of capitalism depends on who is the capitalist."

In the farming community of Magdalena, a suburb of the city of Maracay, Russell Scarato, 27, a former engineer at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at the University of California, persuaded the inhabitants to open up an abandoned factory and make rugs and furniture from wild rushes. The factory now has 10 men working full time and in addition provides cash income to 70 women who braid rushes at home. The products are sold through department stores. Profits are being plowed back to develop a trade school.

The prime movers in these and a dozen similar ventures are young U.S. volunteer members of ACCION (Americans for Community Cooperation in Other Nations) in Venezuela. Recruited mostly from California campuses, their group differs from the taxpayer supported Peace Corps in financing (entirely voluntary contributions) and in freedom from Government control. Also, as a private group, its carefully screened participants are able to go into the politically explosive areas, including the universities, with greater independence in their work.

In operation for only 1 year, the movement has racked up some gratifying successes. Take, for example, the raw frontier town of San Félix on the Orinoco River. Since the discovery of a nearby mountain of iron ore, a combination Pittsburgh-TVA has been fast taking shape here, making it a potentially dangerous area politically. On the edge of town is an area called Barrio La Laja. Six months ago La Laja was as dejected an accumulation of mud-and-wattle houses, naked children, rooting hogs and pecking hens as could be found anywhere in Latin America.

Then Talton Ray, 22, and David Smith, 20, rented a tiny house and moved in. Noting that La Laja needed some sort of recreation facilities, they suggested a court for playing bolas criollas, Venezuela's favorite bowling game. Catching the interest of the people by demonstrating a CINVA-Ram—a portable, hand-operated machine for making building blocks out of earth and a tiny amount of cement—they soon had a dozen eager teenage boys at work. After the bowling court was completed, the men of the community joined in to build a volleyball court. Next, La Laja's menfolk straightened and leveled the dirt streets, calcimined the house fronts, planted flowering trees.

Water for La Laja had to be bought from vendors or carried from the river in the ubiquitous oil drum. But Tal and Dave discovered enough salvageable pipe in an abandoned spur line to connect La Laja with a water main that ran from San Félix to an outlying factory. Thirty-five men of La Laja volunteered to spend their weekends digging trenches and laying the pipe. One month later, the people of the barrio, who had been spending up to a fifth of their meager incomes to have drinking water trucked in at 22 cents a barrel, could turn the tap at any of 13 public fountains and get all the water they wanted free.

To the two Accion volunteers, the climax of the story came when a delegation from an adjoining barrio demanded of a man of La Laja, "Why is the Government doing this for you and not for us?" The weekend worker spat and said, "Amigos, we're doing this by ourselves for ourselves."

The guiding light behind Accion is a 28-year-old, square-jawed Californian, Joseph H. Blatchford. He worked his way through the University of California at Berkeley, where he was class president and a top tennis player—good enough to play at Wimbledon in 1957. A growing interest in public affairs led him to a 4-month job in Washington, D.C., as administrative assistant to a Congressman, before he returned to California and entered law school.

A big topic at the time was the anti-American student riots abroad, particularly in Latin America. In 1958–59, Joe and a team of seven other collegians studied up on Spanish and toured 30 Latin American cities in a youth-to-youth good will effort. At each stop Joe put on an exhibition match with the local tennis champ, and the other fellows gave impromptu jazz sessions. "The Swinging Ambassadors," the boys were frequently called.

One important reason for Latin animosity toward the United States, the group found, was the lack of common purpose at the family and community level. "It's because they have never had a tradition of local responsibility," Joe Blatchford decided. "They evolved under the patrón system of always looking to somebody above you to get things for you. In the course of postwar events the United States became, for them, the ultimate father image. And since we couldn't possibly satisfy all the economic demands made on us, the result was Latin American frustration and rebellious anti-Americanism."

If this thinking was correct, then the answer to the animosity was to help Latin Americans rely upon themselves.

During his second year of law school Joe Blatchford came across the famous essay "A Moral Equivalent for War," by William James. In this 50-year-old essay the philosopher proposed that modern youth be conscripted not for war but to help the have-nots of the world lift themselves.

As he read the essay, Joe recalls, "every nerve came alive." He dashed to a typewriter and banged out the original prospectus for Accion. He visualized it as a movement, like a sports league, in which teams of U.S. collegians from each State would compete to see which could do most to stimulate and transform an underdeveloped country. Working off the kitchen table of his student apartment, with the help of fellow law students Jerry Brady and Gary Glenn, Joe devoted his spare time to canvassing California campuses for student support and faculty advisers.

In June 1960, with a $1,000 contribution from a businessman and his own total savings of $300, Joe made a survey trip to Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. He decided on Colombia as the place in which to begin Accion, and started recruiting volunteers. Then unexpected competition reared its head: Presidential candidate John Kennedy in a San Francisco speech electrifyingly called for a national Peace Corps.

Kennedy's victory in the election almost killed Joe's plan. Businessmen who had been encouraging now said, "Why should I give to Accion when I'm going to be taxed for the Peace Corps?" Also, Peace Corps officials came up with their own proposal for a project in Colombia.

Unwilling to see his years of hard work go down the drain, Joe Blatchford made a risky decision. On his survey trip he had avoided Venezuela, figuring that country was still too incendiary for the program he envisioned. Now, with Colombia out, he decided to take Accion into the lion's den. With an encouraging letter from U.S. Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso (since put in charge of the Alliance for Progress in Washington), Joe flew back and forth between Caracas and New York, got pledges of 400,000 bolivares (about $90,000) for the first year's operation.

A year ago the first band of 30 Accion volunteers arrived in Venezuela. They had had 2 weeks of orientation at the Hispanic-American Institute of Stanford University; in Caracas they underwent 2 months of intensive Spanish instruction, supplemented by lectures on Venezuelan history, politics, and economics. Then they fanned out into the barrios.

"Starry-eyed kids out for a lark," some U.S. businessmen in Caracas considered them, likely to get involved in an incident and damage already shaky U.S. prestige. Today these businessmen, plus rich and poor Venezuelans—who ordinarily don't see things alike—agree on the value of Accion. In Maracaibo's Barrio Cañada Honda, the president of a newly elected community council showed me a tile-and-plaster community center nearing completion with space for classes, films, and an office, and pointed to land where the council plans a children's and nursing mothers' dispensary. Said Acevedo Zerpa, a laborer, "First we awaken the spirit of the barrio, then we educate the people to help themselves. Everybody will come to find out how Cañada Honda did this."

Gustavo Vollmer, who heads one of Venezuela's largest industrial complexes and also serves on Accion's Venezuelan board of advisers, told me, "What these kids have is something like religion."

Certainly, Accion exhibits a kind of self-sacrifice which only a powerful motivating force can elicit. In a country with the highest cost of living in the Western Hemisphere (Caracas is 50 percent more expensive than New York) the average Accion allowance is only $140 a month—which must cover personal living expenses, plus local official travel, many incidental working expenses. Money earned by moonlighting (volunteers translate English publications into Spanish, coach Venezuelan diplomats in English, give guitar lessons, demonstrate tractor maintenance) goes into the common treasury.

A typical feeling among the volunteers (all of whom sign up for 15 months) is that of Dorothy Brinkman, 30. Says Dorothy, a graduate sociologist who once worked in a New York advertising agency analyzing Perry Como's fan mail, and who has now helped the women of the oil camp town of Anaco open a cooperative to manufacture preserves to sell, "This is the first thing in my life that I felt was really for the future."

Four other Latin American countries have inquired about the possibility of obtaining Accion missions. Jerry Brady, who now directs Accion's stateside correspondence and public information,[1] has recently made arrangements to recruit in Arizona and New Mexico (as well as in California) and has opened an eastern beachhead at Yale University. Apart from possible new missions to other countries, more volunteers are needed now in Venezuela. This winter, if sufficient dollars can be raised for their passage 50 new U.S. volunteers will join 50 local trainees, who represent a step toward eventually converting the Venezuela program into a wholly Venezuelan effort.

Accion's ultimate test, of course, will be how successful the volunteers are in inculcating the ideals of individual and local responsibility. In Venezuela, there is reason to hope the lesson is being learned. Dr. Manuel Pérez Guerrera, Minister of Planning and Coordination, told me:

"During the next few years you will see a revolution in the relationship between our people and their government. They have been too dependent on help from above and from the center. There must be more responsibility below and at the perimeter."

To this, C. Allan Stewart, U.S. Ambassador in Caracas, adds: "These Accion youngsters are transforming the image of the United States here in Venezuela. If I were the local Communist chief, I would consider Accion a defeat."

## PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON AUTOMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has recently completed exhaustive hearings on the manpower problems confronting the Nation and has given specific attention to Senate Joint Resolution 105, to create a Presidential Commission on Automation, which I, along with Senators MORSE, CLARK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, INOUYE, LONG of Missouri, and RANDOLPH introduced following President Kennedy's recommendation at the time of the railroad labor dispute this year. A recent editorial in the Washington Star highlights the excellent testimony of Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, whose position is a most farsighted one, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Dec. 7, 1963]

### AUTOMATION

One of labor's ablest leaders has given Congress an honest and articulate appraisal of the effects of automation which merit the prompt and sympathetic attention of that body. The views of Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, strike us as the most intelligent and reasonable yet enunciated on behalf of labor.

It is noteworthy that in his remarks to the Senate Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, Mr. Hayes tacitly accepts the fact that the expansion of automation not only is inevitable, but is necessary if this country is to maintain its competitive position in the world market. Rather than calling for a futile rollback in the tide of technology, Mr. Hayes emphasizes the urgent need for governmental guidance to help displaced workers cross the shoals of unemployment and insecurity.

On the strength of his own figures—that automation is destroying about 5 jobs for every one it creates and that 200,000 factory jobs are being blotted out each year—Mr. Hayes is justified in calling technological change the No. 1 problem facing the Nation. He also is justified in suggesting that the threat of from 8 to 15 million unemployed within a few years "is a fact that Congress cannot ignore or overlook much longer."

As one who is close to millions living "in a suspended state of insecurity, fearful that loss of their jobs will be followed by inability to find another," the Machinists president is putting in a strong word for the Presidential Commission on Automation urged by the late President Kennedy. The commission is needed, he says, not only to find ways of reducing the impact on the work force but to "truly pioneer in the new concepts that must inevitably follow upon the further application of automation in our economy." Mr. Hayes concluded:

"As I have tried to make clear, organized labor in America welcomes automation. Unlike the desperate and unhappy men who roamed the English countryside, more than a century ago, smashing the machines that were destroying their jobs, American labor has no desire to slow the Nation's technological progress. However, we also do not want the machines to smash our society. And, as many studies of recent trends have indicated, such a result is not impossible unless we take steps now to prevent it."

We agree with Mr. Hayes that "the time is long overdue for Congress to take cognizance of a fact that is already so plainly and painfully apparent to so many American families." The establishment of the Presidential Commission on Automation would be a start in the right direction.

## RENAMING NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER IN MEMORY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the response of the Congress and the country to the suggestion that the National Cultural Center be named in memory of

---

[1] Address: Accion, Post Office Box 903, Berkeley 1. Calif.

President Kennedy has been vast and spontaneous. There has been an endless procession of ideas as to how our great, martyred President should be honored, but almost everyone agrees that it is eminently fitting and right that the Cultural Center, to which both he and his lady have given such devoted support, should bear the Kennedy name. It would be the memorial which, I believe, would give him the greatest possible satisfaction could he somehow make his wishes known to us.

Forty-six Members of the Senate—almost half of us—have cosponsored the resolution to establish the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center, the Johnson administration measure. It is as practical as is our new President in that it provides for Federal matching of public funds, dollar for dollar, to build and equip the Center. It has been referred to the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, and which is chaired by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I am confident that the chairman will see that the Memorial Center measure is given prompt attention, and I am sure it will be just as promptly reported. I believe the House Committee will act quickly, too.

This is unquestionably one measure that can, and should, be public law before the Christmas recess.

There are millions of people throughout the country who loved and respected President Kennedy, and who are searching for some way to assuage their grief by contributing to a lasting memorial to him. The John F. Kennedy Memorial Center would give them a way to do so.

One letter I recently received reads this way:

> John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who will be known to future generations as one of our finest Presidents, has been tragically taken from us, and in this hour of sadness we can only thank God that for a short period of time at least, we were permitted to have this great man as leader of our country.
>
> I urge you to do all within your power to aid passage of the bill, now before the Senate, to rename the proposed National Cultural Center the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Cultural Center.
>
> Enclosed please find, in memory of our beloved President, a check for $5 which I ask you to turn over to the public fund for the proposed Center.

I am sure all other Members of the Senate have received similar contributions.

We should not overlook the schoolchildren in any campaign for funds for the Memorial Center. Pennies from schoolchildren helped us pay for the Statue of Liberty, and I am sure that every adult who ever contributed to this statue now feels a pride in this great beacon of liberty. Children who put pennies or nickels or dimes into the Kennedy Memorial Center will always feel that they have a stake in the cultural advancement of the Nation, and in keeping alive literature, music, and art to strengthen our democracy.

I think we may also want to reconsider the site chosen for the memorial to be sure it will be easily accessible to all. I likewise hope enough money can be raised to provide a subsidy so that tickets can be kept within the price reach of all, so that this Center can become both a lasting and living memorial to President Kennedy.

## COMMUNISM IS THE REAL ENEMY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register calls attention to the way in which the attention of this Nation has been diverted from our significant and dangerously potent political enemies of the left and directed instead toward a smattering of noisy rightists.

I believe that the real danger this Nation faces now is the danger of letting ourselves become blind to the greatest enemy our way of life has ever known: communism. The editorial in the News-Register recalls to mind the active and sinister role that communism has played in the events of recent years; in particular, from the outbreak of the Korean war to the assassination of President Kennedy. These are facts which we cannot afford to forget in these perilous times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the News-Register be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE REAL ENEMY

So much attention has been focused on the far right extremist groups and their activities in the United States over the last couple of years that at times we have all but lost sight of the ever-present danger caused by the militant, subversive far left.

Almost in an instant after President Kennedy's assassination there arose national suspicion wanting to link the crime with the radical rightwing. This, in our way of thinking, is the most revealing aspect to come out of the tragedy which upset the entire Nation. Unknowingly, we as a people in these United States, had become blinded to the greatest enemy our way of life has ever known. We are referring to communism and all its leftist affiliates, the cause for worldwide insecurity for so many years.

Isn't it so that it was communism which divided the world into the free and the slave nations?

Isn't it true that there would be no cold war if it were not for communism?

Isn't it a fact that communism murdered thousands of persons in Hungary because they wanted to live as freemen?

Did we not fight a strange war in Korea costing thousands of American lives because of communism?

Did we not hear the leader of Communist Russia boastfully state that he would "bury us"?

Is our memory so short as to forget the conspiracy between Soviet Russia and Castro's Cuba which placed threatening weapons of destruction only 90 miles off the shores of the United States?

Repeatedly have we not found enemy agents working in our very midst attempting to undermine this country's security?

Is it not so that millions and millions of dollars are being drained from the American people in order to provide a deterrent against aggression threatened by the Red forces?

The list could be continued almost endlessly. However, the most compelling reason why we should come back to our senses can be found in the most shocking recent event which has caused this national concern. The man who was charged with the slaying of President Kennedy had his sympathies not with the rightwing extremists but instead with communism, according to the evidence revealed to date. He had gone so far as to write in 1959: "I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

We hold no brief whatsoever for the rightwing fanatics and their stirring up of hatreds, but at the same time our most serious cause for alarm is found in the way the American people have become lulled into a false sense of security by their diminishing alertness to the threat of communism.

There are among us in this country, even in communities the size of Wheeling, those dangerous elements who sympathize with the Communist conspiracy. At all times they are scheming and plotting ways of extending their sphere of influence. They have had an easier time of late because their devious movements have all but been overshadowed by the indignation against the activities of the rightwingers.

The real harm done by the rightist extremists now can be seen. Their fanatical ravings against the left, instead of spotlighting the menace of communism, only did the reverse. It is high time that we got our feet back on the ground in this country, both in high and low places, and recognize once more the true enemies of our great Republic.

## ASSASSINATING THE FACTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Sentinel points out the fact that communism is trying to turn a national tragedy into a national neurosis in our country. The shock of a Presidential assassination has set off a wave of emotionalism which, the Sentinel declares, is being deliberately built up by the Communists in order to weaken our resistance against them.

Mr. President, we must not allow our loss to become communism's gain. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### ASSASSINATING THE FACTS

Our country is shrouded with the tragedy of John F. Kennedy. The personal disaster to the Kennedy family, the violent disruption of the processes of Government, the dread intrusion of assassination into our life, above all, the emotional aftermath—these specters all march across the main stage of national, and indeed, international life. We are a troubled nation, experiencing a sobering crisis.

The facts of the assassination themselves are comprehensible. The motive, however, is still obscure. A second assassination has deprived us of the official verdict that we needed so badly. But, in their most authoritative form, these facts must be preserved and held high for all to see. Without them, we would be experiencing an emotional reign of terror spawning sweeping and unfounded accusations.

Lee Oswald was a man of the Communist left. He had publicly proclaimed his love of the Soviet Union and his hatred of what he called "the prison" United States. He was a follower of Castro. He was an agitator for the cause of Soviet aggression. Whether or not he acted officially as a Communist in perpetrating the dastardly act has not been established.

The evidence that Oswald committed the heinous crime is mountainous. His palm prints were on the box at the sniper's post. Paraffin tests established that he had just fired a rifle. He was photographed with such a rifle as fired the lethal bullets. He went to the building whence the shots were fired with an elongated package he described as "window shades." In his living quarters there was a found a diagram of the trajectory of the bullets that killed the President. Oswald was placed at the scene of the firing. He was seen killing the policeman who sought to arrest him.

When these facts began to reach the grief-stricken Nation, the Communists found it imperative that they be impeached. The Communists, and others, needed to obscure or, at least to fuzz over, the verdict. Onto this scene came Jack Ruby. What was his role?

The whole Communist apparatus has gone to work at impugning the assembled facts. The campaign is well orchestrated. It is helped by powerful voices thundering that the killing was the work of "bigots" and "rightists." Communist street pamphleteers are passing out thousands of leaflets which say that the assassination of the President was the work of the "Birchites."

This is the framework of the struggle ahead. The Communists, and those who unaccountably side with them, will be pressing hard to deflect the great emotional surge that swirls around the tragedy of John F. Kennedy into a national neurosis against further resistance to the growing Soviet tide.

It is appalling even to contemplate the emotional frenzy that would have been unleashed against the city of Dallas and the so-called political right if Police Chief Jess Curry's men had not apprehended an out-of-town Marxist as the assassin of the President in the first hours after the deed. It is becoming more and more apparent that Dallas is being designated by the Communists as a symbol in the chess game they are playing with our destiny.

It is particularly lamentable that the man who should be the most judicial-minded in the land, the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, is being less than carefully judicial about his emotional assessments of the evidence, and hurls his own emotional charge over the land.

## PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN TARIFFS ON CATTLE AND BEEF

**Mr. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, yesterday at my request there were inserted in the RECORD two statements in opposition to the proposed reductions in tariffs on cattle and beef—by Robert M. Howard, secretary-treasurer of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, representing the cattle raisers of my State, and by C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, which represents cattlemen from all over the country.

Today, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statement against these reductions which was submitted to the Tariff Commission by the National Livestock Feeders Association of which Don F. Magdanz is executive secretary-treasurer and B. H. Jones, associate secretary-treasurer. In this matter, there is no difference of opinion between the cattle raisers and the cattle feeders; all segments of the cattle industry recognize that they suffer from the excessive volume of imports experienced during recent years.

There being objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO TARIFF DECREASES

**(Submitted by National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.)**

### I. MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION ARE UNEQUIVOCALLY OPPOSED TO FURTHER TARIFF CONCESSIONS ON LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND/OR LIVESTOCK AND MEAT PRODUCTS IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES [1]

### *A. Statement of position and interest*

The National Livestock Feeders Association is a voluntary, nonprofit, nonpolitical trade organization of domestic livestock farmers engaged in the business of feeding and finishing livestock—cattle, hogs, and sheep—for the slaughter market. The association is sustained by membership dues. Membership exists in 22 States, and there are 100 State and local livestock feeders associations affiliated with the national association.

Almost a third of the total cash receipts from farming come from the sale of meat animals.[2] Typically, members of the National Livestock Feeders Association own the livestock they grow and finish in the production phase of preparing meats (beef, pork, lamb, and mutton) for the American consumer. They buy feedlot replacement animals in the framework of a competitive market and sell the finished cattle, hogs, and sheep under the same market situation, in which supply (domestic production, imports, and supplies of competing—substitute—products) is the most important determinant of price. The business risks inherent in such an operation are assumed by the livestock farmer himself (National Livestock Feeders Association member). This means that he is vitally interested, in fact his financial well-being depends upon maintaining a balance between meat supplies and consumer demand in the United States. Of primary concern in this connection are foreign trade agreements (including tariff and nontariff protection) which in effect force domestic producers to compete with unlimited volumes of imports, while, on the other hand, they face serious obstacles in the exportation of domestically produced meat and meat and livestock products.

### *B. Commodities and products of interest*

Tariff schedules of the United States
Schedule 1—Animal and vegetable products
Item and product name

Part 1. Live animals—live animals other than birds—cattle:
100.40 Weighing under 200 pounds each.
100.43 Other.
100.45 Weighing 200 pounds or more but under 700 pounds.
100.50 Weighing 700 pounds or more each.
100.53 Other (than for dairy purposes).
100.55 Other.
100.81 Sheep.
100.85 Swine.

Part 2. Meats, subpart B—Meats other than bird meat; meats (except meat offal), fresh, chilled, or frozen, of all animals, except birds:
106.10 Cattle.
106.20 Goats and sheep (except lambs)—mutton and goat meat.
106.30 Lambs.
106.40 Swine—fresh or chilled, frozen.

Edible meat offal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, of all animals (except birds):
106.80 Valued not over 20 cents per pound.
106.85 Valued over 20 cents per pound.

Sausages, whether or not in airtight containers:
107.10 Pork, fresh.
107.15 Pork, other.
107.20 Beef, in airtight containers.
107.25 Beef, other.

Pork, prepared or preserved (except sausage):
107.30 Not boned and cooked and packed in airtight containers.
107.35 Boned and cooked and packed in airtight containers.

Beef and veal, prepared or preserved (except sausage)—beef or veal, cured or pickled:
107.40 Valued not over 30 cents per pound.
107.45 Valued over 30 cents per pound.
107.50 Beef in airtight containers.
Other:
107.55 Other, valued not over 30 cents per pound.
107.60 Other, valued over 30 cents per pound.
107.80 Extract of meat, including fluid.

### II. TARIFFS ON LIVESTOCK, MEAT, AND LIVESTOCK AND MEAT PRODUCTS SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED

1. Virtually no reciprocity exists now for the United States in livestock and meats, with the exception of trade with Canada.

2. U.S. tariffs on livestock and meats are quite similar to those of Canada, the only country with which any appreciable degree of reciprocity exists, except for Canadian ad valorem rates on canned products which are substantially higher than U.S. rates for corresponding products.

TABLE 1.—*Trade with Canada in livestock and meats* [1]

| | U.S. imports | U.S. exports |
|---|---|---|
| 1960 | $72,388,000 | $27,759,000 |
| 1961 | 95,298,000 | 37,719,000 |
| 1962 | 96,464,000 | 33,842,000 |

[1] Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

3. Every nation with which the United States now trades in any volume of livestock and/or meats, except Canada, provides substantial and very effective nontariff protection for domestic producers.

4. The very large growth in meat imports in recent years is indisputable proof that U.S. tariffs are not at a level to seriously impede the flow of these products into this country. In fact, the opposite is true; namely, that tariffs are not now sufficiently high to provide the necessary protection to domestic producers to enable them to compete on an equitable basis with producers in other nations.

### III. THE UNITED STATES IS AMONG THE MOST LIBERAL IN THE WORLD IN ITS AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS POLICIES. ALL MAJOR COUNTRIES, WITH THE POSSIBLE EXCEPTION OF CANADA, PROVIDES A MUCH HIGHER DEGREE OF PROTECTION FOR DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS THAN DOES THE UNITED STATES

### *A. Tariff and other protection*

The United States cut tariffs in half on most all livestock and meat products in 1948 (fresh, chilled, or frozen beef and veal from 6 cents per pound to 3 cents; mutton from 5 to 2.5 cents; lamb from 7 to 3.5 cents; and pork from 2.5 to 1.25 cents per pound.)

The actual effective level, however, has been reduced much more than those per pound figures indicate, due to the failure of the United States to change to an ad valorem basis during the inflationary years since the thirties. For example, 6 cents per pound was an effective deterrent to imports of beef and veal pre-World War II when farmers were receiving from 3.73 to 8.75 cents per pound for beef cattle; however, a 3-cent-per-pound tariff is very little deterrent under prevailing prices of 38 to 42 cents per pound for imported beef.[3] On an ad valorem basis, this is only 7 percent. Other kinds of meat show a similar relationship.

---

[1] "Meat(s)" as used in this brief refers to red meat(s) only, that which is derived from cattle, hogs, and sheep (beef, pork, lamb, and mutton).

[2] "Meat Consumption Trends and Patterns," Agriculture Handbook No. 187, July 1960, U.S. Department of Agriculture, p. 1.

[3] Prices reported in the National Provisioner for imported beef.

Compare this ad valorem figure to the tariff structure of other countries to which the United States may export, many of which have gone to ad valorem bases and have complex systems of high tariffs, flexible tariffs and/or quotas, import licenses and/or certificates, gate price systems, and so forth.

The European Economic Community nations, to which the United States exported one-fourth of the dollar volume of U.S. livestock and meat product exports in 1961 and 24 percent in 1962 (see footnote 1 of table 2) are employing import duties, gate price system, import certificates and deposits, quotas, and intervention measures in developing common policy on livestock and meat imports.

TABLE 2.—*Common external tariffs*[1]

| Item | Common external tariffs (percent ad valorem) | Gate price | Import certificates and deposits |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cattle and calves | 16 | Yes | No. |
| Beef and veal: | | | |
| Fresh or chilled | 20 | Yes | No. |
| Frozen | 20 | Yes | Yes. |
| Variety meats (offal) | 20 | No | Yes. |
| Tallow (inedible) | 2 | No | No. |
| Canned beef | 26 | No | Yes. |
| Beef sausages, etc | 21 | No | Yes. |
| Hides and skins | 0 | No | No. |
| Casings | 0 | No | No. |

[1] "Common Market Regulations and U.S. Livestock and Meat Products Exports," by Martin V. Gerrity, Chief, Commodity Analysis Branch, Foreign Agricultural Service, August issue of Livestock and Meat Situation, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Note that the common external tariff on beef and veal is three times the ad valorem equivalent of U.S. tariff, two times the U.S. level on canned beef, and one and a half times the U.S. level on sausages.

For trade with non-EEC countries, the basic levy on hog carcasses is made up initially of 3 elements: (1) the intra-Community levy applicable, (2) the difference between feed grain costs for pork production in Netherlands and feed grain cost on the world market, and (3) an amount equal to 2 percent of the average offer prices from third countries the preceding year.

The levy on imports of hog carcasses from third countries, based on the above 3 elements during January-March, 1963, is as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Dollars per 100 pounds*[1]

| | |
|---|---|
| Belgium | 5.85 |
| Germany | 12.95 |
| France | 7.12 |
| Italy | 9.18 |
| Luxembourg | 15.98 |
| Netherlands | 2.85 |

[1] Tables and statements in this section, ibid., footnote 1, table 2.

The import duty on hog carcasses into the United States is $1.25 per 100 pounds. Of the EEC countries, the Netherlands is a major exporter of pork to the United States. In addition to utilizing the variable levy-gate price system of the CAP regulations, this country uses quantitative import controls and minimum import prices as Government policy tools to protect domestic agricultural prices.[4]

The purpose of the EEC gate prices is to provide additional protection against the possibility of oversupply if there is a temporary glut in Community markets.

In addition, if imports under the Common Agricultural Policy cause or threaten serious disruption of markets of one or more EEC States, these States are free to take any safeguard measure necessary.[5]

Australia, the largest exporter of beef and veal and mutton to the United States, prohibits imports of cattle and sheep and imports of hog and pork products from the United States under a health restriction. Also, the Government's Tariff Board has the authority to impose emergency tariffs or other types of import controls whenever it is deemed necessary to protect domestic producers against competition from imports. In addition, commodity boards exercise considerable marketing control over many Australian agricultural commodities, including meats. This control is particularly applicable to exports, but in many instances the boards operate as monopolies and tend to restrict, if not prohibit, imports.[6]

New Zealand, the largest exporter of lamb and second largest exporter of beef and veal to the United States, prohibits imports of most meat and other packinghouse products.[6]

Ireland, the third largest exporter of beef and veal to the United States, generally restricts all livestock and meat products by requiring import licenses. Tariffs are high.[6]

Trade barriers severely restrict U.S. exports of livestock and meat products to Mexico. This is one of the two large exporting countries of live cattle to the United States. If these controls were lifted, U.S. exports would rise sharply. Import permits from the Ministry of Industry and Commerce are required for most products. Imports are also subject to high tariffs, and imports of slaughter livestock are prohibited. Canned pork duties are very high: 2 pesos per net kilogram (7 cents per pound) plus 60 percent of the invoice value or a valuation of 14 pesos per kilogram (52 cents per pound), whichever is higher.[7]

Denmark, one of the largest exporters of pork to the United States, prohibits entry of such products from the United States under a health restriction. Also, annual "licensing budgets" are set up each fiscal year denoting global import quotas with quantity, value, and items specified.[8]

### *B. Nontariff protection*

The United States and Canada are the only two major countries which provide no nontariff protection for domestic producers of livestock and meat.

Nontariff protection is just as effective as is tariff protection for domestic producers; therefore, it is highly important in developing national policy on tariffs to consider nontariffs restrictions, also.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently conducted a study on this subject for agricultural products and commodities.[9] In announcing the results, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman made these statements: "The study shows that all our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism through nontariff barriers than does the United States. The United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies. The farmers of the United States carry out their production operations with far less protection from competitive imports than do farmers of practically all other countries."

With regard to livestock and meat specifically, the study showed that the United States and Canada are the only two major nations in the world with no nontariff protection for domestic producers (see table 4).

TABLE 4.—*Livestock and meat: Proportion of the value of domestic production protected against imports by nontariff trade barriers, selected countries*[1]

[In millions of dollars]

| Country | Total value | Protected value | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| France | 2,479 | 2,355 | 95.0 |
| West Germany | 2,349 | 2,231 | 95.0 |
| Netherlands | 475 | 452 | 95.2 |
| Italy | 1,136 | 1,136 | 100.0 |
| Belgium | 341 | 156 | 45.7 |
| Greece | 109 | 109 | 100.0 |
| Austria | 310 | 310 | 100.0 |
| Denmark | 560 | 560 | 100.0 |
| Norway | 112 | 106 | 94.6 |
| Portugal | 102 | 102 | 100.0 |
| Switzerland | 242 | 232 | 95.9 |
| United Kingdom | 1,355 | 456 | 33.7 |
| Canada | 854 | 0 | 0 |
| Australia | 531 | 383 | 72.1 |
| New Zealand | 312 | 311 | 100.0 |
| Japan | 618 | 355 | 57.4 |
| United States | 9,255 | 0 | 0 |

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1963, p. 17839, Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA. Compiled from data in "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS-Foreign-60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Note particularly the complete or almost complete protection which major exporting nations of livestock and/or meat products to the United States provide for their own producers: Australia, 72.1 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; Netherlands, 95 percent; Denmark, 100 percent.

TABLE 5.—*All meat: Principal exporters and importers; average, 1951-55 and 1956-60; and annual 1960, 1961, and 1962*[1]

[Carcass weight in millions of pounds]

| | Average | | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1951-55 | 1956-61 | | | |
| EXPORTING COUNTRIES | | | | | |
| Australia | [2] 471 | 726 | 591 | 867 | 1,149 |
| Argentina | 802 | 1,369 | 983 | 980 | 1,197 |
| Denmark | 772 | 913 | 1,032 | 1,043 | 1,134 |
| New Zealand | 794 | 954 | 1,060 | 1,043 | 1,062 |
| France | 127 | 163 | 266 | 352 | 451 |
| Netherlands | 271 | 374 | 454 | 382 | 373 |
| Yugoslavia | 22 | 127 | 198 | 251 | 301 |
| Ireland | 158 | 181 | 241 | 309 | 292 |
| Uruguay | 136 | 103 | 153 | 113 | 152 |
| Mexico | 68 | 58 | 112 | 92 | 107 |
| United States | 140 | 145 | 115 | 112 | 102 |
| Others | 577 | 862 | 1,067 | 980 | 916 |
| Total | 4,338 | 5,975 | 6,272 | 6,524 | 7,237 |
| IMPORTING COUNTRIES | | | | | |
| United Kingdom | 2,743 | 3,414 | 3,512 | 3,290 | 3,385 |
| United States | 462 | 890 | 1,048 | 1,327 | 1,850 |
| Germany, West | 129 | 245 | 253 | 284 | 367 |
| Italy | 84 | 280 | 360 | 144 | 275 |
| U.S.S.R | 544 | 342 | 212 | 139 | 169 |
| Canada | 54 | 75 | 90 | 131 | 131 |
| Spain | 12 | 5 | 39 | 26 | 127 |
| Belgium-Luxembourg | 42 | 58 | 69 | 84 | 94 |
| Others | 573 | 719 | 820 | 1,052 | 948 |
| Total | 4,643 | 6,028 | 6,403 | 6,477 | 7,346 |

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1963, p. 17839, Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

[2] Year ending June 30.

NOTE.—All meat converted to carcass weight equivalent. Includes beef and veal, pork, mutton, and lamb, goat and horsemeat, except live animals; edible variety meat, lard, rabbit, and poultry meat. Figures for individual years 1960–62 are preliminary.

Source: Publications of the Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

## IV. U.S. MEAT IMPORTS HAVE INCREASED PHENOMENALLY, AND THE UNITED STATES IS NOW A NET IMPORTER BY A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT

### *A. General status of U.S. foreign trade in livestock and meats*

Prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock, meat, and livestock and

---

[4] "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS—Foreign-60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[5] Ibid., footnote 1, table 3.

[6] Ibid., footnote 7, and "Prospects for Foreign Trade in Livestock and Meat," January 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[7] "Foreign Crops and Markets," Oct. 1, 1962, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[8] Ibid., footnote 9.

[9] "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers," ERS-Foreign-60, September 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**meat products; however, the last 6 years have seen a complete reversal in the balance of trade in these products. The dollar volume of exports of livestock and meats by this country in 1962 amounted to approximately $320 million; whereas, our imports were around $850 million. In other words, in 1962, the United States imported 2⅔ times the dollar volume of her exports.[10]**

TABLE 6.—*U.S. balance of trade in meats* [1]

[Carcass weight, million pounds]

BEEF AND VEAL

| | Imports | Exports | Net imports |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 775 | 58 | 719 |
| 1961 | 1,037 | 58 | 979 |
| 1962 | 1,445 | 53 | 1,392 |

LAMB AND MUTTON

| | Imports | Exports | Net imports |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 87 | 2 | 85 |
| 1961 | 101 | 2 | 99 |
| 1962 | 143 | 3 | 140 |

PORK

| | Imports | Exports | Net imports |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 186 | 138 | 48 |
| 1961 | 187 | 139 | 48 |
| 1962 | 216 | 132 | 84 |

TOTAL MEATS

| | Imports | Exports | Net imports |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 1,048 | 196 | 852 |
| 1961 | 1,325 | 199 | 1,126 |
| 1962 | 1,804 | 198 | 1,606 |

[1] "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

### *B. Imports of cattle and calves, beef and veal*

**Imports of beef and veal have increased at an alarming rate beginning in 1958. The** volume (including livestock, meat equivalent) has reached 10.6 percent of domestic production.

Imports reached a record of 1.45 billion pounds (carcass weight) in 1962. This accelerated rate has continued into 1963. For the first 6 months of this year, import tonnage was 1.09 billion pounds compared to .89 billion pounds during the same period of 1962, an increase of 22 percent.[11]

In the past cattle cycles, the volume of beef and veal imports has tended to vary with the cycle: relatively large when cow slaughter was low and vice versa (cow slaughter tends to decline when cattle inventories are increasing and rise when herds are being reduced). Our people, as domestic producers, have not objected to the importation of what might be considered a stabilizing volume of meat and meat products; however, since 1958 major exporting countries of beef and veal; namely, Australia and New Zealand, have no longer been satisfied to export this level to the United States. In fact, it is apparent that their attitude has changed to one of exploiting the American market to the greatest extent possible.

Prior to 1958, imports of beef and veal from Australia were very small (see table 7). In late 1958, the United Kingdom-Australian Meat Agreement was modified. This agreement had restricted Australia from shipping other than very small quantities of meat to other countries. Since modification, this country has increased both its meat production and exports and has concentrated on exporting to the United States. Of the total Australian exports of beef and veal in 1962, 81 percent (44.9 million pounds, product weight) was shipped to the United States. This constituted 46 percent of U.S. imports of beef and veal.

New Zealand contributed 22 percent of the total beef and veal imported into this country in 1962, ranking as the second largest supplier. For the past 3 years, the United States has been the major market for New Zealand boneless beef exports, taking over 90 percent of its exports.

TABLE 7.—*Imports of all beef and veal* [1]

[Product weight, million pounds]

| | Australia | New Zealand | Ireland |
|---|---|---|---|
| Average: | | | |
| 1951–55 | 1.4 | 13.0 | 7.2 |
| 1958 | 16.9 | 182.0 | 23.7 |
| 1959 | 223.9 | 160.9 | 42.0 |
| 1960 | 144.7 | 130.7 | 43.6 |
| 1961 | 232.2 | 154.3 | 61.1 |
| 1962 | 444.7 | 213.6 | 70.7 |
| 1962 as a percent of 1951–55 | 31,764.0 | 1,643.0 | 982.0 |

[1] Foreign Agricultural Service figures, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Attention is called to the comparison between the 1951–55 average and the 1962 volume: 1962 volume is 31,800 percent of the 1951–55 tonnage for Australia and 1,600 percent for New Zealand.

Beef and veal imports plus the meat equivalent of live cattle imports have risen at a much faster rate in recent years than domestic beef and veal production. The additional supplies provided by this tonnage has exerted pressure on the domestic market for both fed and nonfed cattle. The comparison between imports and domestic production vividly points up the substantially larger proportion which imports now make up of overall supplies, and the magnanimous increase in beef and veal imports (meat) from 1958 to date. Unfortunately for domestic producers, domestic production and import volume have trended to peak together, contrary to past cattle cycles (see table 8).

### *C. Imports of lambs and lamb and mutton*

Imports of lambs and lamb and mutton are now at a level almost equal to one-fourth of domestic production.

The imports of lamb and mutton show a pattern similar to that of beef and veal: substantial buildup from 1958 on, reaching 23 percent of domestic production in the first 6 months of 1963. (See table 8.)

TABLE 8.—*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, lambs and lamb and mutton, compared with production, 1950–63* [1]

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [4] | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat | Total [3] | | |
| | Number | Meat equivalent [2] | | | | |
| | *1,000 head* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | |
| 1950 | 438 | 157 | 348 | 505 | 10,764 | 4.7 |
| 1951 | 220 | 91 | 484 | 575 | 9,896 | 5.8 |
| 1952 | 138 | 47 | 429 | 476 | 10,819 | 4.4 |
| 1953 | 177 | 62 | 271 | 333 | 13,953 | 2.4 |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.9 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.6 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 |
| January to August 1962 | 583 | 132 | 893 | 1,025 | 10,895 | 9.4 |
| January to August 1963 | 555 | 118 | 1,086 | 1,204 | 11,386 | 10.6 |

LAMBS AND LAMB AND MUTTON

| Year | Imports | | | | Meat production [4] | Imports as a percentage of production |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat | Total [3] | | |
| | Number | Meat equivalent [2] | | | | |
| 1950 | 97 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 597 | 1.0 |
| 1951 | 14 | (6) | 7 | 7 | 521 | 1.3 |
| 1952 | (5) | (6) | 6 | 6 | 648 | .9 |
| 1953 | 1 | (6) | 3 | 3 | 729 | .4 |
| 1954 | 1 | (6) | 2 | 2 | 734 | .3 |
| 1955 | 8 | (6) | 2 | 2 | 758 | .3 |
| 1956 | 3 | (6) | 1 | 1 | 741 | .1 |
| 1957 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 707 | .7 |
| 1958 | 40 | 1 | 41 | 42 | 688 | 6.1 |
| 1959 | 76 | 2 | 104 | 106 | 738 | 14.4 |
| 1960 | 50 | 1 | 87 | 88 | 768 | 11.5 |
| 1961 | 1 | c | 101 | 101 | 832 | 12.1 |
| 1962 | 21 | 1 | 143 | 144 | 809 | 17.8 |
| January to August 1962 | 3 | (4) | 95 | 95 | 533 | 17.8 |
| January to August 1963 | 1 | (4) | 115 | 115 | 503 | 22.9 |

[1] "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[2] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle and for lambs an average 30-pound carcass.

[3] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.

[4] Total production (including an estimate for farm slaughter).

[5] Less than 500 head.

[6] Less than 500,000 pounds.

---

**[10] "Cattle and Beef Statistics," Oct. 29, 1963, and U.S. foreign agricultural trade by commodities calendar year 1962, June 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.**

[11] Ibid., footnote 1, table 6.

In 1962, 65 million or 45 percent of the total of 144 million pounds (carcass weight) of imports was mutton. Mutton is used in this country along with boneless beef and veal, primarily in the manufacture of processed meat products. Imports of mutton in 1962 amounted to 80 percent of domestic U.S. production.[12]

Contrary to popular belief, total domestic production of lamb and mutton has not followed a consistent downward trend in recent years. Table 8 shows domestic production together with a comparison between it and imports. Special attention is called to the fact that imports of lambs and lamb and mutton are now at a level almost equal to one-fourth of domestic production. The Commission can take judicial note of the serious financial condition in which the U.S. sheep industry finds itself.

In 1962, 98 percent of the mutton imported came from Australia and 78 percent of the lamb from New Zealand.

### *D. Imports of swine and pork*

The value of swine and pork imported into the United States in 1962 was $128 million.

The initial large jump in pork imports into the United States came earlier than for beef and veal, and lamb and mutton. The year 1953 saw import tonnage increase to 164 million pounds (carcass weight) from 71 million in 1952 and 33 million pounds in 1950, an increase of 400 percent from 1950 to 1953. Pork imports have continued to climb since 1953, reaching 216 million pounds in 1962 and 135 million pounds for the first 6 months of 1963. (See footnote 1, table 9.) In other words, shipments of pork to this country in 1962 were 650 percent of the 1950 volume (on a carcass weight basis).

TABLE 9.—*Imports of pork, 1950-1963* [1]

[Carcass weight—million pounds]

| | |
|---|---|
| 1950 | 33 |
| 1951 | 51 |
| 1952 | 71 |
| 1953 | 164 |
| 1954 | 184 |
| 1955 | 175 |
| 1956 | 151 |
| 1957 | 144 |
| 1958 | 193 |
| 1959 | 186 |
| 1960 | 186 |
| 1961 | 187 |
| 1962 | 216 |
| 1963 (January–July) | 135 |

[1] "Livestock and Meat Statistics," July 1958, and "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963.

The value of swine and pork imported into the United States in 1962 was $128 million.[13] Major pork exporting countries to the United States are Denmark, Netherlands, Poland, and Canada. In 1962 the United States received the following quantities (product weight) of pork from these countries: Denmark, 63.8 million pounds; Netherlands, 43.4 million pounds; Poland, 39.8 million pounds; and Canada, 46.8 million pounds.[14]

### V. EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON DOMESTIC PRODUCERS

Imports of livestock and meats are directly competitive with domestic production, and have reached a level which adversely affects domestic producers.

### *A. The effect on cattle feeders and producers*

Imports have caused a downward pressure on Choice fed steer prices of from $6.60 to $18 per head, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture study.

Cattle feeders have experienced, and are still experiencing, serious financial losses in the feeding season of 1962–63. The average price of Choice steers at Chicago dropped $7.50 per hundredweight from November 1962 to May 1963. Current prices are only $1.50 above the May low.[15]

The seriousness of the financial plight of the cattle feeder is borne out by a study conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.[16] According to this study, considering the cost of feeder cattle, feed costs, and marketing and transportation expenses only, the feeder has operated at a negative margin of $11.86 per head during the feeding season beginning in 1962. When all costs are considered, however, operating losses have been much higher. For the class of cattle used in the USDA study, the Correspondent Bank Department of the First National Bank, Omaha, Nebr., estimated costs not considered in the study to total $28.25 per head; veterinary fees, $2; power and fuel, $2.50; taxes and insurance, $4; depreciation and miscellaneous, $2.25; interest, $8; death loss, $2.50; and labor, $7. This means that the feeder has actually been subjected to a negative operating margin of $40 per head.

Imports affect domestic prices by adding to the total supply of beef. Cattle, beef, and veal imports added 9.4 pounds per capita to domestic supplies in 1962.

The composition of beef and veal imports has changed materially since the mid-1950's. During the period 1954 to 1956, canned beef (imported mainly from South American countries) made up 72 percent of the total. Currently, imported beef and veal is largely in the form of boneless frozen product, some of which is suitable for uses other than in the manufacture of processed products. Thus far in 1963, based on carcass weight, 81 percent of beef and veal imports has been boneless beef and only 14 percent canned beef. This radical change in composition of imports has changed their competitive influence.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture undertook to determine the extent of the impact on cattle prices in a recent study.[17] The following statements are based on the Department findings:

1. Imports have held utility cow prices at Chicago down to a straight line level since 1959 despite low domestic cow slaughter; imports increased substantially during these years. Utility cows at Chicago averaged $15.68 in 1960, $15.66 during 1961, and $15.50 in 1962.

2. Imports do affect the fed cattle market:

(a) The fed cattle market and the cow market, and thus imports, are related in that there is a downward substitution of cuts from fed beef carcasses for use in manufacturing processed products; and, also, the various classes of products do compete for the consumer's dollar.

Definite proof of the above is found in the study results which showed that, at 1962 levels, a 1 pound per capita change in either cow beef or fed beef production results in a change of about 50 cents in the price of utility cows.

(b) A change of 10 percent in domestic cow beef production plus imports for the period of 1948–62 caused prices of Choice steers to change in the opposite direction by 3 percent. Cow and bull beef production from 1948 to 1962 declined some 572 million pounds; whereas, imports increased 1,369 million pounds (carcass weight and including meat equivalent of live animals imported). This means, then, that imports were fully responsible for whatever downward price pressure resulted. During this period cow and bull beef production plus imports increased 18 percent, which would result, therefore, in a downward pressure on Choice steer prices of 5.4 percent. Translated into actual prices, such a percentage decrease would be $1.35 per hundredweight on a $25 Choice steer, or $14.85 per head for a 1,100 pound animal.

(c) At 1962 levels, a 1 pound per capita change in cow and bull beef production plus imports would affect Choice steer prices by 15 to 20 cents per hundredweight. In 1962, imports of beef and veal amounted to 9.4 pounds per capita. Based on the USDA conclusion, this would mean $1.65 per hundredweight, or $18 per head on 1,100-pound steers.

(d) The USDA study showed that the amount of influence on price is affected by the level of imports relative to domestic production. It was indicated that when imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production—as they have recently—an increase of 10 percent in imports would cause, on the average, a drop of about 1 percent in the price of Choice steers. Choice steers in 1962 (Chicago) averaged $27.67 per hundredweight, and for the first 8 months of 1963 imports (carcass weight) of beef and veal were up 21.6 percent. Based on the USDA conclusion, then, imports have caused a 2.16 percent drop in fed prices, or 60 cents per hundredweight and $6.60 per head on an 1,100-pound steer (first 8 months of 1963 versus first 8 months of 1962). In the words of the study, "if imports are a larger proportion of domestic production, the effect on prices is greater."

### *B. The effect on sheep and lamb feeders and producers*

Imports of mutton have caused the same type of pressure on domestic prices as described for beef and veal. Downward pressure on domestic lamb prices has been in the neighborhood of $1.72 or more per head.

In 1962, imports of lambs, and lamb and mutton rose to 144 million pounds (carcass weight and including meat equivalent of live animals imported).[18] Of this tonnage, mutton made up 65 millian pounds.[19] The mutton imported was almost 100 percent frozen boneless product. In actual practice this is used to mix with beef and veal and other manufacturing meat in preparing processed products. Therefore, imports of mutton exert the same sort of downward price pressure on domestic producers as has just been described for beef and veal. Mutton imports increased from 1.7 million pounds in 1957 to 65 million pounds in 1962, an increase of 3,724 percent.[20]

In the case of lambs and lamb (meat), imports increased from 3.3 million pounds in 1957 to 79 million pounds in 1962. These imports compete directly with domestically produced lambs. During the post-World War II period, on the average, for each change in total supplies of lamb of a magnitude to cause a 1-percent change in annual per capita consumption, there has been an average change in the opposite direction in farm lamb prices of 1 percent.[21]

In 1957 (year previous to the large lamb import increase), imports of lambs and lamb (excluding mutton) added 0.02 pound per capita to U.S. supplies (consumption); whereas, in 1962, imports added 0.42 pound per person. Domestic production of lamb (excluding mutton) for 1957 was 3.71 pounds per capita (171 million population), compared to 3.34 pounds in 1962 (187 million population). Therefore, without imports, lamb supplies would have dropped 10 percent and there would have been a corresponding increase in the price paid to domestic producers. With the addition of imports, however, per capita supplies were about the same for both years, 3.72 pounds in 1957, and 3.76 pounds in 1962. This means, based on the Dr. Doll analysis, that imports were responsible for depressing prices paid to domestic producers by 10 percent (1 percent change in per capita supplies causes 1 percent inverse change in prices paid to farmers).[22]

---

[12] Ibid., footnote 1, table 8.

[13] U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade by Commodities Calendar Year 1962, June 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[14] "Livestock and Meat Situation," November 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[15] "Cattle and Beef Statistics," Oct. 29, 1963, and Market News Weekly Summary and Statistics, Nov. 23, 1963, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[16] Reported in August 1963 issue of "Livestock and Meat Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[17] Report in the November 1963 issue of "Livestock and Meat Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[18] Ibid., footnote 23.

[19] Foreign Agricultural Service figures, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

[20] Ibid., footnote 28.

[21] Dr. R. J. Doll, Agricultural Economist, Federal Reserve Bank, Kansas City, Mo., address at the 1960 Convention of National Livestock Feeders Association. Dr. Doll elaborated as follows: "It also should be pointed out that these averages were relatively good ones because the relationships were maintained at fairly close to average rates for each change that occurred from one year to the next."

Based on a 97-pound lamb (average for sheep and lambs slaughtered in 1962), and a price of $17.70 per hundredweight (price received by farmers in 1962), such price pressure would result in a drop of $1.77 per hundredweight, or $1.72 per head. To put this amount in proper perspective, most feeders consider a net profit margin of $1 per head a good return.

The downward pressure on domestic prices described here is for the meat only and does not include the very substantial pressure exerted by the imports of large quantities of wool. We shall not take the Commission's time at this hearing to discuss wool imports. This depressing factor has received wide attention and publicity, as has the overall plight of the U.S. sheep industry which has been, and is now, of serious concern to the U.S. Government.

### *C. The effect on swine producers*

In 1952 (year prior to the initial large jump in pork imports), imports of pork stood at 71 million pounds (carcass weight). By 1962, they had climbed to 216 million pounds.[23]

During the post-World War II period, for each change in total supplies of pork of a magnitude to cause a 1 percent change in annual per capital consumption, there has been an average change in the opposite direction in farm hog prices of 2 percent.[24]

During the period 1952 to 1962, in which imports have continued to climb, per capita imports have gone from 0.45 pound (157 million population) to 1 pound (187 million population). During the same period, there has been a decrease of 15 percent in domestic production per capita (73.42 versus 62.57). With the additional supplies provided by imports, per capita supplies declined 14 percent. Thus, imports have been responsible for a 1 percent change on a per capita basis.

Based on the Dr. Doll analysis, this 1 percent has been responsible for a downward pressure of 2 percent on prices paid to farmers. Prices paid to farmers in 1962 averaged $16.30. Based on this figure, 2 percent would be $0.33 per hundredweight, or $0.78 per head (average weight of all hogs slaughtered in 1962 was 239 pounds).

### VI. EFFECT OF CUTTING TARIFFS ON SECTION 32 FUNDS

Section 32 of Public Law 74–320 earmarked 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to (1) encourage exports of agricultural commodities and products thereof; (2) encourage domestic consumption of such commodities and products; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power.

Although this section has been amended a number of times, the purposes have remained basically as originally enacted. Section 32 funds have been used for a wide variety of expenditures, but the major use after amendments in the 1949 Agricultural Act (Public Law 81–439) has been as a flexible authority to prevent price collapses for non-price-supported crops, poultry, livestock products, and to shore up milk sales. With section 32 funds, the Secretary of Agriculture can move into a marketing area and pick off surpluses accumulating in that area, by market purchases, before price breaks occur. The foods are then donated to school lunch programs, the needy and welfare institutions.

The cutting of tariffs on imported products into the United States will, therefore, reduce the amount of funds available from this source.

## SOCIAL MEANING OF ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the lead editorial in the December 5 edition of the Catholic Transcript, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Hartford, Conn., is a remarkable analysis of the meaning for our society of the assassination of President Kennedy.

It throws a searching light upon the life of Lee Harvey Oswald and the reflection which that life casts upon American society. It relates how Lee Harvey Oswald was at an early age found to be emotionally disturbed, and yet without being either helped or hindered, without being cared for or curbed, was allowed to sink deeper and deeper into a morass of despair, disorder, aggressive acts, rebellion, disloyalty, subversive affiliations, and who finally was allowed free access to a deadly weapon with which he murdered the President of the United States.

In the eyes of the Catholic Transcript, and to all thoughtful observers "this record adds up to a deadly indictment of our society."

I would like to quote the concluding lines of this editorial:

> We both neglect and overindulge the young, not giving them the training they need while giving them limitless license which spares us looking after them as we should. We are indifferent about the proper treatment of the mentally and emotionally disturbed, refusing to appropriate sufficient funds to provide it on the massive scale now urgently required, and failing to see to it that our courts and other agencies dealing with the young are staffed with people cognizant of this acute problem and alert to the necessity of effective referral and therapy. We are indulgent to troublemakers, partly out of fear, partly out of a refusal to be firm in the performance of unpleasant duty, partly out of a vast indifference. We are embarrassed by the ancient virtue of patriotism, interpret freedom to cover a grave fault like repudiation of obligation and honor, and are too pusillanimous to exact respect of constituted authority. We do nothing to curb the virus of violence, actively communicated in print, in pictures, in the television programs carried into every living room, and any cretin, psychopath, or criminal can easily acquire instruments of murder.
>
> The killing of the President of the United States is a judgment on us for our mental and moral disarray, for our abdication of critical intelligence, conscientiousness, courage to face and withstand evil. It is a warning of the fate awaiting our society and ourselves, literally or figuratively.

Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy is one of those rare events which shocks a society into a searching reevaluation of its shortcomings.

This editorial from the Catholic Transcript makes a valuable contribution to this reevaluation and, in order that it may receive as wide a circulation as possible, I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SOCIAL MEANING OF THE DEED

The assassination of President Kennedy already seems remote, so quickly do we accommodate ourselves to a radically changed condition and press on with the business of everyday living. We regret the dark deed, and hope that steps are taken to insure against its repetition. By the latter we mean no more than that President Johnson and his successors will be better guarded. The blame for the crime of November 22 we place solely on a young man fanatical or crazed; the extreme right is exculpated, as is the extreme left, and certainly all in between can in no way be blamed. As of so much else, we say, "It was just one of those things," worse than most of course, but, in the final analysis, freakish, unaccountable, and not to be morbidly dwelt upon.

Such an attitude is a shameful evasion. We should, we must, take a long look at the man who killed President Kennedy, and ask ourselves what he says of our society. He has escaped trial, but we are inescapably on trial.

He was a child of a broken family and home; his mother has been three times married, twice divorced. His lot was poverty, and this he bitterly resented, no doubt influenced by what appears to have been his mother's habit of seeing unfavorable circumstances as always someone else's fault. He was early identified as a youngster troubled and troublesome, as "potentially dangerous" and requiring detention and expert care. These he did not get, partly because his mother flatly refused to see anything wrong in him, partly because she and he moved about in a rootless sort of way. He was thereafter always difficult and in difficulties. Wherever he worked, his one connection with his fellow workers was in vexing and upsetting them. In the armed services, he was a rebel against order and twice had to be courtmartialed. Thus he was, unwittingly but definitely, proclaiming the disturbance within him and demanding aid. Unaided, he went on to more spectacular manifestations of derangement.

When he chose to defect to the Soviet Union, he was let go; when he chose to return, his citizenship was restored with incomparably greater ease and speed than characterize the normal citizen's normal dealings with the Government which such a citizen undeviatingly supports; indeed, the young man's fare home was handed to him. He became identified with a pro-Castro organization which in fact is to some serious degree doubtfully loyal to the United States, and with other young people who have been allowed, in the name of freedom, to demonstrate frantically on Government property and to express outrageous contempt of the Congress of the United States. He could and did obtain with the utmost ease a deadly weapon and, both immediately before and immediately after murdering the President of the United States was allowed to move as he liked, without sensible challenge or restraint, and, ultimately, without due protection.

This record adds up to a deadly indictment of our society. What it says is that irresponsibility and neglect chargeable to all of us and habitual led directly to the destruction of the common, lawful leader of all of us. Symbolically, our society was, in this case, destroying itself, giving apocalyptic evidence of what we are doing piecemeal all along, of what our present course is inevitably leading to if not reversed.

---

[22] Calculated from figures in November 1963 issue of "Livestock and Meat Situation," U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Foreign Agricultural Service (USDA) breakdown on lamb and mutton.

[23] Ibid., footnote 21.

[24] Ibid., footnote 30.

We are complacent about divorce and its devastatingly effect on society and people, especially children. We both neglect and overindulge the young, not giving them the training they need while giving them limitless license which spares us looking after them as we should. We are indifferent about the proper treatment of the mentally and emotionally disturbed, refusing to appropriate sufficient funds to provide it on the massive scale now urgently required, and failing to see to it that our courts and other agencies dealing with the young are staffed with people cognizant of this acute problem and alert to the necessity of effective referral and therapy. We are indulgent to troublemakers, partly out of fear, partly out of a refusal to be firm in the performance of unpleasant duty, partly out of a vast indifference. We are embarrassed by the ancient virtue of patriotism, interpret freedom to cover a grave fault like repudiation of obligation and honor, and are too pusillanimous to exact respect of constituted authority. We do nothing to curb the virus of violence, actively communicated in print, in pictures, in the television programs carried into every living room, and any cretin, psychopath, or criminal can easily acquire instruments of murder.

The killing of the President of the United States is a judgment on us for our mental and moral disarray, for our abdication of critical intelligence, conscientiousness, courage to face and withstand evil. It is a warning of the fate awaiting our society and ourselves, literally or figuratively.

## MAIL-ORDER GUNS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the months of October and November, the Christian Science Monitor published a series of nine articles written by Josephine Ripley. They were designed to show the public the tragedies that result from the promiscuous sale of guns by mail order, as well as for the need for adequate control of their sale.

The articles were culminated by an editorial, which was an intelligent plea for new legislation to control the sales of mail-order guns. It was published on November 19. It was entitled "Murder by Mail Order," and it appeared only 3 days before President John F. Kennedy was cut down by bullets from a mail-order gun.

In its great public service tradition, the Monitor was seeking public support to eliminate an evil from our society. Mr. President, in the belief that the material in those articles will be helpful and informative to the public and to this body as gun legislation is being considered, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record, at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 19, 1963]

### Murder By Mail Order

Congress has been handed an antiweapon weapon with which to crack down on crime, crime made easy through the wide-open sale of mail-order handguns.

This weapon is in the form of a new bill introduced by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and now before the Senate Commerce Committee.

The committee so far has taken no action on this legislation which would crack down on "murder by mail order," as it has been called, through an amendment to the Federal Firearms Act.

If passed and enforced, it would keep mail-order guns out of the hands of trigger-happy juveniles, criminals, mental defectives, and others who use the anonymity of this type of purchase as a means of obtaining firearms.

To the extent that these guns have contributed to the Nation's crime wave—and the Monitor's series of articles on mail-order guns has shown they have—enactment of the Dodd bill would be an important crime deterrent.

Not that guns are the only weapons used by the criminal, or that this bill pretends to offer a complete solution to the firearms problem.

But it would help by requiring all purchasers of mail-order guns to furnish a sworn affidavit as to age and criminal record, if any. It would also require firearms dealers and manufacturers to notify express companies in writing whenever these guns are being shipped in interstate commerce.

It is not a tough bill, probably not tough enough to suit many.

It does not attempt to point up the glaring inadequacy of many State and local laws over firearms or their lack of uniformity. It does not call for gun registration or for the fingerprinting of purchasers of guns.

It is minimum legislation, but it is realistic legislation, the only kind which stands any chance of passage. The Federal Firearms Act has been amended only once since its passage in 1939, so strong is the opposition to firearms controls.

The Dodd bill avoids this opposition by concentrating only on unscrupulous gun merchants. It would infringe in no way on the right of law-abiding citizens to possess firearms for purposes of defense or what is called sport.

It has the support of the National Rifle Association of America and other influential organizations, as well as law enforcement authorities across the Nation.

The legislation is deserving of—and needs—support, encouragement and a vigorous public push to spur Congress to action.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 14, 1963]

### Crime Triggered Probe on Guns

(By Josephine Ripley)

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, who presided over mail-order gun crime investigations, recalls how it all began.

"It was the increase in the numbers of crimes of violence, particularly assaults with deadly weapons where guns were involved, as well as the mysterious changes in juvenile gang warfare, which first aroused my interest and prompted the investigation," he told this correspondent in an interview.

It was obvious to the Senator, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency which conducted the probe, that "a new source was supplying weapons by the thousands to those who should not have them, to juveniles, and others who were using them in crimes."

#### SOURCE DISCOVERED

This source was soon discovered to be "the mail-order outlet which has mushroomed in the last 10 years. Mail-order gun dealers, now virtually uncontrolled because of loopholes in the present law, have been shipping untold millions of guns across State lines where they were delivered in violation of local regulations," he said.

Because the common carrier delivers the packaged weapon, frequently unmarked, directly to the purchaser, local police have no way of knowing how many guns are being received by whom until they show up in a crime.

The investigation into this traffic took more than 2 years. "We moved cautiously," Senator Dodd said, "and had the support of many responsible groups and gun manufacturers. In particular, such organizations as the National Rifle Association and American manufacturers of arms have been a great help."

#### CAUSE FOR CONCERN

The subcommittee's chief cause for concern, however, was not the product of the American gun industry, "but cheap foreign imports, which were the ones finding their way into the mail-order gun trade."

Through this mail-order traffic, a complete arsenal of weapons, ranging in price from $5 to $20 is available to juveniles and to the underworld, the investigation disclosed.

"Complicating the matter for law enforcement officers are the unscrupulous dealers who have no concern for the use the guns are put to after they are sold," the Senator stated.

He recalls one such dealer who, when questioned about the sale of a gun to a juvenile who subsequently used it to kill his neighbor, commented that if he did not make the sale someone else would.

#### BILL INTRODUCED

These imported weapons are poorly designed and engineered, Senator Dodd's subcommittee was informed by experts. The military surplus items which are purchased in Europe and sold here as scrap have been reworked to the point where they are even dangerous to discharge.

On August 2, 1963, when the investigation was finally completed, the Senator introduced a bill, S. 1975, which would amend the Federal Firearms Act to make it more difficult for juveniles, mental defectives, and other irresponsibles to come into the possession of firearms and which would provide traceable records on those who purchased them.

Emphasizing that "the subcommittee has never thought of tampering with the constitutional right of a free people to keep and bear arms," Senator Dodd described the legislation as "intended primarily to bring an added measure of responsibility into mail-order transactions in handguns."

#### PROVISIONS LISTED

It would:

1. Prevent the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of mail-order handguns to juveniles under the age of 18 years.
2. Increase the Federal Firearms Act dealer's license fee from $1 to $10;
3. Require that an applicant for a Federal firearms dealer's license be 21 years or over (there is no age limitation under present law);
4. Provide for the marking of packages which contain handguns being shipped in interstate commerce to include number and type of weapon;
5. Provide that a purchaser of a mail-order handgun enclose a sworn affidavit with his purchase order to establish his bona fide age, felony convictions, etc.

#### PARENTS ON NOTICE

While Senator Dodd says this proposal is not the entire solution to our firearms problems, he feels its requirements should halt the mail-order sale of handguns to juveniles and discourage the lurid gun advertisements in the pulp magazines, all aimed at the juvenile trade.

It will also put parents on notice that no juvenile can legally acquire a handgun through mail-order and express shipments.

With the enactment of the bill, the coupons signed and sent by juveniles to mail-order dealers would no longer be taken at face value. Express company employees will know what the packages contain, and will have to make sure that the persons who receive them are 15 years of age or more.

Senator DODD said the subcommittee has no intention or desire to deprive mature and responsible citizens of their right to purchase or possess firearms.

"Its objective is only to protect the public by providing some assurance that handguns are kept out of the hands of youngsters, the mentally ill, and criminals," he explained.

"I can think," he said, "of no group in America, and particularly the socially conscientious groups of gun makers and owners, who would argue otherwise."

As a matter of fact, the legislation was thoroughly discussed with the industry, as well as with the common carriers to whom it will give additional responsibilities.

"To the credit of them all," Senator DODD reported, "they have approved and endorsed the provisions of our proposal."

The Senate investigator said he feels the series of articles in the Christian Science Monitor has done a service in generating a heightened public interest which he hopes will prompt many to write to their Congressmen and to the Senate Committee on Commerce, which now has the bill under consideration, urging action.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 12, 1963]

## CHAOS IN GUN LAWS NOTED

(By Josephine Ripley, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

The nationwide hodgepodge of laws with respect to the possession of handguns in the United States has contributed directly and substantially to the increase of crime in recent years.

This is the word of law-enforcement authorities from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, down to the policeman on the beat.

Urgent appeals for stronger, more effective, more uniform laws have been made to Congress by way of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency during the course of its 2-year investigation, under the chairmanship of THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, into mail-order gun traffic.

### SURVEY TAKEN

Sentiment for a strengthening of the Federal Firearms Act of 1939, which now does little more than establish procedures for licensing dealers in firearms, apparently is growing.

A Gallup poll in 1959 indicated that a preponderant majority of the adults surveyed around the country favored stricter regulations of handguns.

Testimony before the Dodd subcommittee disclosed the almost unlimited extent to which handguns are constantly being bootlegged from city to city and State to State, slipping easily through the inconsistencies in the laws.

### INCONSISTENCY PUZZLING

This nationwide lack of uniformity in laws governing the purchase, sale, and possession of handguns, is hard to understand considering the crime problem with which the country is confronted.

In 41 States and the District of Columbia there are no license requirements for the purchase of firearms.

Only 21 States and the District of Columbia require dealers to obtain licenses to sell handguns at retail.

Only 7 States require a permit to purchase a gun. Seven States and the District of Columbia require a waiting period between purchase and delivery.

Only in New York State is a license required to possess a handgun. Only in Hawaii must guns be registered, and only in South Carolina is it against the law to sell a handgun.

These restrictions become largely ineffective, however, when a person can cross a border into another city or another State, buy the gun of his choice and return with it concealed in his pocket or where mail-order guns can be shipped in freely by common carrier.

One very vocal advocate for "stricter controls on handgun sales" is James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

"We already have controls on tobacco, alcohol, narcotics, poisons, and, of course, any food or drug that might be dangerous for human use," he points out.

"In my opinion, the traffic in handguns must also be similarly supervised."

### EXERCISES IN FUTILITY

Legislation alone will not put an end to shootings, but many law-enforcement authorities believe that stronger Federal laws would help to curb these crimes and probably stimulate more effective local efforts, "which are now so largely exercises in futility," as Mr. Bennett put it.

Nor is it suggested that the right of individuals to purchase guns for defense, or use in sports, or for gun collections should be infringed.

Mr. Hoover points out that many communities already have local ordinances "which protect the rights of society without infringing on the rights of individuals who purchase guns for protection or legitimate recreation and pleasure."

### LOCAL ACTION URGED

It is his feeling that the answer lies in local action. "No one blanket proposal or universal regulation will meet the needs and requirements of all communities," he has said.

But he has stated his conviction that "the spotlight of public attention should be focused on the easy accessibility of firearms and its influence on willful killings.

"Where local controls and regulations exist, they should be fully implemented. Where there are none, measures should be taken to protect the public's interest.

"Loss of human lives cannot be rationalized—certainly not until all possible preventive action has been exhausted," he declared in an unusually vigorous statement for the FBI chief, who generally confines himself to the subject of law enforcement, not lawmaking.

In New York, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and other cities where firearms are strictly regulated, high officials have urged the development of more uniform laws controlling the sale and possession of handguns.

New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, and Mayor Robert F. Wagner have all spoken out.

Justice John E. Cone of the New York State Supreme Court, chairman of a committee to discourage sales of weapons to juveniles, put it this way:

"Certainly it is of no value if the weapons outlawed within the borders of this State or city are advertised in numerous magazines and then may be lawfully shipped from some other State to purchasers in New York."

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 9, 1963]

## U.S. TRAILS MAJOR NATIONS IN CENTRAL CONTROL OF FIREARMS OWNERSHIP

(By Josephine Ripley)

An airing of the Nation's firearms laws during the course of the investigation of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency produced evidence of their inadequacy to cope with the concealable weapons favored by today's hoodlums and gangs.

This country has fewer enforcible restrictions on the purchase and ownership of handguns than most other nations of the world, the subcommittee investigators were informed.

In Australia, the Irish Republic, Israel, Great Britain, and Sweden, it is necessary to have a license in order to buy a pistol or revolver. In Sweden, a person must show that he has a need for the weapon and knows how to handle it. Japan goes so far as to prohibit entirely the private ownership of handguns.

### TWO FEDERAL LAWS

The United States, in contrast, has only two Federal laws governing firearms, both passed in the 1930's—following the lawless 1920's. There has been only one amendment since that time and it has proved ineffective in keeping concealable weapons out of the hands of criminals.

The first of these, the National Firearms Act, was passed in 1934. Its main purpose was the control of machineguns and sawed-off shotguns, the principal gangland weapons of that day.

Excluded from these restrictions were pistols, revolvers (a favored weapon of modern gangsters), weapons with barrel lengths over 18 inches (most rifles), and .22-caliber weapons with barrel lengths of 16 inches or more.

### OTHER WEAPONS CHECKED

A reference to other weapons makes it possible to control weapons such as tear gas pen guns, which are capable of discharging a standard bullet, and other odd instruments such as umbrellas, which are sometimes designed for that purpose.

Weapons under this act must be registered with the Treasury Department.

Five years later, in 1939, the Federal Firearms Act was passed, its main purpose being to control the transfer of all firearms to certain designated groups, such as mental defectives or those formerly convicted of a crime of violence.

### IRONIC ROLE FOLLOWED

This act requires that all manufacturers and dealers of any firearms shipped in interstate commerce must have licenses from the Federal Government.

(This provision, years later, was to play an ironic role in promoting the sale of "mail order guns.")

The 1939 law, among other things, required that dealers and manufacturers of weapons going interstate must maintain records as to the purchaser.

Both of these laws are enforced by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Firearms Section of the Treasury Department.

### CONTROL LIMITED

They have proved inadequate to control the new-type weapons to which criminals have turned today, mainly the concealable weapon, such as the pistol and revolver, according to the testimony of law-enforcement officials.

The Treasury's enforcement division, the subcommittee was informed, has control over pistols, revolvers, and most rifles only in a limited way under the Federal Firearms Act.

Thus there is no way accurately to check ownership of such weapons. The manufacturer, or dealer, must keep records of the original recipient, but after the first transfer (normally to a retailer) there are no further records maintained.

Also, the provision of the act which requires the recipient to show a license when State law requires a license is ineffective, Senate investigators were informed.

### LOCAL LAWS IGNORED

State law as referred to in the act does not include city and county ordinances.

Therefore, only those States which have laws requiring a license to purchase a firearm are affected.

This means that cities and communities with strong firearms regulations are helpless to control the influx of weapons from other States or even from another county within the State.

Firearms imports are under the control of the State Department, through the Mutual Security Agency. This control is exercised in a limited manner. All that is required of the foreign dealer is that it is a bona fide transaction.

### APPROVAL AUTOMATIC

If the weapons do not come under the National Firearms Act—that is, unless they are machineguns or sawed-off shotguns—the department approves the import.

This has opened the gates to millions of foreign-made guns of the mail order variety, many of which come in, disassembled, as parts of scrap to avoid the high tariff on guns as such.

The dealer license to trade in guns, required under the Federal Firearms Act, is only $1 and some mail order firms have stepped up sales by urging buyers to become dealers and go into business.

It has been estimated that of the 60,000 dealer licenses issued a year, 45,000 of them are not to bona fide dealers.

### NO FINGERPRINTS TAKEN

The applicant is not fingerprinted or checked for criminal record. With such a license, the holder can avoid police clearance on each gun purchased in cities and States which require such clearance.

He can avoid being subject to arrest for transporting guns in his private car (since he is a dealer); he can purchase guns at wholesale, save on sales tax, and make bulk purchases.

That's a lot for a dollar, as one wily individual obviously recognized when he inserted this advertisement in Gun News: "For Sale—Guns, Buy Wholesale. Become a Dealer. Instructions $1."

Whoever responded was, of course, simply told to apply for a Federal license—for another dollar.

The bill introduced by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, would increase this fee to $10 and thus discourage this kind of thing. It would also call for a sworn affidavit that any purchaser of a mail order handgun is of age, eliminating juveniles from these fake dealerships.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 7, 1963]

## RIFLE GROUP BACKS MAIL-GUN CURBS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Any proposal for tightening controls over firearms is critically and thoughtfully scrutinized by the National Rifle Association of America (NRA).

The association's role is that of a defender of law and order and of the constitutional right of American citizens to bear arms.

It has a shooter-sportsman membership of more than half a million persons and represents more than 11,000 affiliated clubs and associations.

It is a formidable opponent to any legislation which would impose restrictions on firearms dealers, sportsmen, or other reputable persons who wish to possess arms.

But when it comes to curbing the virtually unrestricted sale of mail-order guns, the association goes along with the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

"The association agrees that steps must be taken to curtail the traffic of mail-order guns into unauthorized hands," asserts Franklin L. Orth, executive vice president of the association.

This does not mean that the NRA has changed its policy or softened its long-time stand against punishing the gun instead of the criminals, as it is often put.

It is still opposed to proposals which it feels amount only to enacting another gun law, or putting more teeth into existing laws, and is highly critical of New York's tough Sullivan law.

### EXCEPTION MADE

But it makes an exception in the case of mail-order guns on which it looks with disdain. "For the most part," says Mr. Orth, "this traffic involves the relatively inexpensive imported pistols and revolvers that are advertised in many cheap pulp magazines throughout the country."

The NRA has conducted product evaluation studies on many of these handguns and found them to be largely worthless for sporting purposes.

Frank G. Daniel, secretary of the association, said in an interview that "they are not good for anything except to get someone in trouble."

The National Rifleman, official journal of the association, refuses to accept their advertising. In a strong editorial on mail-order guns several months ago, it referred to them as "junk guns."

The NRA is obviously concerned lest the bad name of these guns and the juvenile crime to which they have contributed reflect on the American industry and create a public demand for more gun laws.

### ENFORCEMENT URGED

"Many reputable firearms dealers of good repute based on a history of adherence to existing laws on all levels, could suffer financial disaster if the tide of public opinion is turned in the direction of all-encompassing legislation," said Mr. Orth in an appearance before the Senate investigators.

Instead of more laws, why take it out on the gun, is his attitude.

After establishing its traditional stance, the association which worked closely with the subcommittee on plugging the mail-order loopholes, agreed to proposals embodied in the bill of Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, which would:

Prevent the shipment in interstate commerce and delivery by common carrier of mail-order handguns to juveniles under the age of 18 years;

Increase the Federal Firearms Act dealer's license fee from $1 to $10 in an effort to eliminate the fly-by-night dealers, the unscrupulous, and juveniles from the firearms traffic;

Provide that firearms dealers and manufacturers give written notice to common carriers of handguns being transported in interstate commerce;

Provide that the purchaser of a mail-order handgun enclose a sworn affidavit with his purchase order to establish his bona fide age, felony convictions, or criminal records.

### SOLUTION INCOMPLETE

Senator DODD admits "this is not the entire solution to our firearms problem. But its requirements should halt the mail-order sales of handguns to juveniles."

As the Rifleman editorial put it: "Steps must be taken to stop the traffic of mail-order guns into unauthorized hands. At the same time, due caution must be exercised so that law-abiding citizens are not severely penalized or deprived of their individual rights. * * * It is reassuring that proposed solutions to this particular situation are being directed at irresponsible merchants and purchasers."

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 5, 1963]

## MAIL-ORDER GUNS SLIP THROUGH LAWS

(By Josephine Ripley)

The mail-order handgun came on the American scene like a mysterious thief in the night.

It began making its appearance on the streets around 1958. This is the story of of how it came to the attention of the police in Pittsburgh.

"While an inspector of police in charge of a district station house, I was traveling down a main thoroughfare in my city when I saw a man with a gun in his hands," Assistant Superintendent William J. Gilmore told Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

"A few seconds later I heard shots being fired. I alighted from the automobile and placed him under arrest. He stated to me that he was only firing at rodents behind a display advertising board."

### NO QUESTIONS ASKED

"After questioning him as to where he obtained this gun, he stated he had seen an advertisement in a printed periodical; that he had forwarded a money order. * * * A short period of time later he received the gun without answering any questions or furnishing further information.

"This man, prior to this incident, was under investigation for armed robbery but was released because of lack of evidence. Since that incident, he was arrested on various other charges.

"It was not until 1960, when I was promoted to assistant superintendent of police, that I received information as to how these guns were arriving in the city of Pittsburgh and the names of individuals to whom they were being forwarded."

Pittsburgh Police Superintendent James W. Slusser testified that "the problem of mail-order handguns being shipped into the city of Pittsburgh has been of serious concern to the Bureau of Police for the past several years."

### BUYER CHECKED

The State of Pennsylvania operates under the Uniform Firearms Act which requires that when a handgun is purchased within the State, copies of the purchasing agreement are forwarded to the State and local police.

The gun is then held for a period of time before being delivered to the purchaser, thus allowing the police agency time to ascertain identity of the purchaser and whether he is competent to possess guns.

The mail-order shipment of guns into Pennsylvania "takes away this legislated safeguard and delivers handguns to individuals who should not own them," the superintendent told the subcommittee.

### LACK OF CONTROL CITED

It was not until 1960 that the police were able to develop a source of information and compile at least a partial list of handguns shipped into Pittsburgh by out-of-State dealers.

From Sgt. Kenneth Carpenter and Sgt. George Carr of the Los Angeles Police Department, Senate investigators heard a fantastic story of California's mail-order gun business. The State is a center from which some of the most notorious dealers in the country operate.

"Our investigation has disclosed the mail-order traffic in concealable weapons from the Los Angeles area is virtually uncontrolled," the report stated.

Existing laws prohibiting the sale of concealable firearms within the States are cunningly circumvented "by unscrupulous dealers who operate in a manner which respects neither business ethics nor public safety," according to the police.

Sergeant Carpenter cited the case of dealer A. This dealer fills California mail orders by way of Phoenix, Ariz., to get around California laws.

### OPERATION OUTLINED

It works this way, the Senate investigators were told: Dealer A, on receipt of a mail order from a California resident, will enclose a form letter advising this purchaser that, "since California State law prohibits the mail-order sale of concealable weapons, the purchase order has been forwarded to dealer A's out-of-State store in Phoenix for handling."

"What dealer A has really done is to ship the gun order in Los Angeles to his out-of-State mail drop, have it rewrapped and shipped back into California to the customer via Railway Express. In this way, dealer A is able to circumvent the California State laws covering the sale of mail-order firearms," stated the police sergeant.

### VARIOUS NAMES USED

Mail drops are maintained by many dealers within the city, as well as outside of the State. They are used, it was explained, by "nefarious dealers as a shield from dissatisfied customers who wish to make in-person complaints."

The mail drop is not an office, but only a place to which mail orders are delivered and at which the dealer picks them up.

One dealer may have several mail drops using different names at each one. "A customer, once billed, may unknowingly respond to later magazine ads placed by a company that previously cheated him," explained Sergeant Carpenter.

He added that a "dealer himself admitted that the sale of most commodities and particularly firearms through the mail-order business was immoral, unethical, and that laws should be passed to prevent this sort of activity."

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 2, 1963]

## GUN IMPORTS SLIP PAST TARIFF BARS

(By Josephine Ripley)

The alarming rate at which the United States is being flooded with cheap, foreign-made guns was one of the startling discoveries of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency in its investigation of juvenile crime.

More than 5 million of these imports—and possibly as many as 7 million—have come into this country during the past 5 years, according to the estimate of Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, subcommittee chairman.

These have become known as mail-order guns because they are sold largely by mail-order dealers. They are inexpensive, advertised extensively in the pulp magazines, and can be ordered easily by mail and delivered almost anywhere to anyone by express, no questions asked.

### LEGISLATION URGED

They have come into the hands of thousands of juveniles, adding tragically to the Nation's rapidly rising rate of crime.

Senator DODD is hopeful that Congress will put an end to this murder by mail order, as he has called it, by passing his bill which would stop this free-for-all type of gun sale.

The manner in which these guns have been reaching the United States was one of the sensational disclosures of his investigation.

While most of the dealers handling these guns are probably reputable men, some were reported to have highly questionable backgrounds.

And the guns themselves are barely within the law, being imported by devious means to avoid the normal gun tariff.

To do this, foreign exporters dissassemble the weapons and ship them into the United States as scrap or machine parts, at a fraction of the tariff which is imposed on a complete weapon.

### CONVERTIBLE GUNS

Another gimmick is the starter pistol. If all the starter pistols which are imported today were in races or athletic events as intended, the country would be one big sports arena.

Starter (or blank) pistols come in at a duty of about 12 percent compared to 52 percent on firearms.

But they can be converted into shooting guns ready for real ammunition within a matter of minutes.

They are the hottest items in the mail-order gun business today. Some are even shipped with the separate gun barrel, bored for a real cartridge, ready to be inserted in seconds in place of the original barrel.

These guns are imported so cheaply they sell for as little as $6.95. They are small, light, usually have an imitation pearl handle. They could fit easily into a woman's handbag, and are indeed favored by women, the subcommittee was told.

### LAWS BYPASSED

Last year in Brooklyn, N.Y., a 14-year-old girl was accidentally shot by her 17-year-old brother who was playing with just such a gun in their home.

Police investigation into the shooting led to the discovery of a do-it-yourself gunsmith who was bypassing New York State's tough gun laws by ordering the guns by mail from out of State at $5.80 each, converting them to take .22 caliber cartridges, selling them to a confederate for $15, who in turn, peddled them to youth gangs for $20.

"We feel this and other cases vividly emphasize the need for Federal action to restrict the ease with which such potential firearms can be imported in this country at nominal cost," said Deputy Commissioner Lawrence W. Pierce of the New York Police Department in strong statement to Senate investigators.

### EUROPEAN IMPORTS

These pistols are imported mainly from West Germany which, along with Italy, provides most of the imports which find their way into the mail-order market in the United States.

War-surplus guns are another source of cheap imports. These are reconditioned and sold at ridiculously low prices in comparison with those paid by dealers in domestic weapons.

Many of them are guns of American manufacture supplied to Great Britain and other Allies during the war.

Smith & Wesson, manufacturer of guns for the U.S. Government, estimates that some 2 million of these American-made guns have found their way back into this country where they are being rebored, converted to popular calibers and sold at cut-rate prices.

### GUNS CALLED UNSAFE

"Such guns are, of course, unsafe," said the manufacturer in a letter to Sgt. Kenneth Carpenter, an investigator for the Los Angeles Police Department, "and a detriment to our reputation, since they carry our original trademark."

There is no question in the minds of Senate investigators or the police that mail-order guns have contributed substantially to the tremendous rise in the Nation's crime rate.

The extent to which they have done so can only be estimated but, as Sergeant Carpenter put it, "We do know that the influx of concealable weapons is rising at a time when crime is increasing five times faster than the population.

"In addition, we have no way of knowing how many of these weapons are being collected to form the secret arsenal of some subversive or revolutionary group."

New York's Mr. Pierce reported that a survey in New York City over a 2-year period, 1960 and 1962, showed that firearms, particularly handguns, were used in 70 percent of the arrests of persons under 21 years of age in which dangerous weapons, felonious assault, robbery, and homicide were involved.

During that same period, one out of every four victims in youth-gang killings was killed by a handgun, he said.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 31, 1963]

## MAIL GUNS BLAST ROAD TO CRIME

(By Josephine Ripley)

There are few grimly amusing incidents in the grim story of mail-order-gun-toting juveniles.

But this one illustrates the ease and legality with which guns may be purchased by teenagers today.

A 13-year-old San Francisco boy, with the consent of his parents, ordered by mail for $9.95 what he thought was a model of a Soviet bazooka.

He wanted it to add to his plane collection, and from the advertisement he was sure this would be just like the real thing.

It finally arrived in a 4-foot crate with a $22.60 freight bill. It was, indeed, the real thing.

### EASY TO OBTAIN

The boy's parents refused to pay the freight bill. The company said "keep it." And it was eventually turned over to the police.

Another youngster who purchased a mail-order bazooka took it out in the countryside and began shooting transformers off utility posts. The repair bill came to several thousand dollars.

These are exceptions to the tragic run-of-the-mill gun stories, as disclosed in the investigation of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

The freedom with which guns may be purchased in many States, not only by mail order but over the counter by criminals and the mentally disturbed, has paved the way for crime after crime.

A man who went to the gallows in Iowa for kidnaping shot and killed his victim with an automatic bought openly in a sporting goods store in a Milwaukee suburb.

This man had a long record of crime and delinquency at the time he made this purchase.

### INTO THE PAWNSHOP

An ex-convict who ran out of money in Las Vegas bought a .22 caliber revolver in a local pawnshop and robbed a bank the next day.

A 19-year-old youth who escaped from a mental institution in the State of Washington, drew some savings from a bank in Seattle, bought a .38 caliber automatic pistol in a Portland, Oreg., pawnshop, shot and killed a traveling businessman.

He used the same gun to bludgeon a student nurse.

Another man, released from the Nebraska State Prison traded his wristwatch 3 days later for a 9 mm. automatic Luger and clip of shells in a Casper, Wyo., pawnshop.

He kidnaped a car salesman, forcing him at gunpoint to go on a wild ride through several Western States.

These are case histories in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

"All of these young men, although they had serious records of imprisonment and mental illness, had no trouble buying guns at a moment's notice," comments Prison Director James V. Bennett.

In Fairfax County, Va., not long ago a 17-year-old boy walked into a gun shop, said he was 23, gave a fictitious name and address, paid $65 for a gun, and walked out with the weapon.

The gun was used to kill another youth some months later.

The purchase of this gun was a legal transaction. Under the law in Fairfax County no registration of weapons is required. The only requirement is that the seller be satisfied that the buyer is at least 18.

A few miles away, in the District of Columbia, a person must be at least 21 and of good moral character to buy a gun. He must have a police check of his application and cannot buy a gun if he has been convicted of any crime down to and including petty larceny.

### LAW CIRCUMVENTED

Strict as the District of Columbia law is, it can be easily circumvented by anyone who buys a gun in Fairfax County, slips it into his pocket, and enters the District of Columbia. Also guns may be ordered by mail from outside the District and delivered by express.

In the District of Columbia, it was found that out of about 200 recipients of mail-order weapons, 25 percent had criminal records.

"The highest incidences of mail-order gun deliveries are in those police precincts of the city which are high crime areas," Senator Thomas J. Dodd reported.

In New York City, despite the fact that State legislation regulating the sale and possession of firearms is among the most stringent in the country, police report the amount of weapons found in the illegal possession of persons in the city is shocking.

Of most concern, say police authorities there, are the illegal weapons which come from out of State, either by direct over-the-counter purchase or mail-order sales.

"Guns play a tremendous and increasing role in the overall crime picture of this country," Senate investigators have been told repeatedly by police and prison officials.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 29, 1963]

## Senate Exhibits Mail-Order Gun Cache—Showcase of National Scandal Collected in Delinquency Probe

(By Josephine Ripley)

Washington.—Even the U.S. Senate has a gun cache.

These firearms are stashed away in filing cabinets in a second-floor room in the Senate Office Building, or openly exhibited on enormous squares of heavy cardboard where they are mounted, like venomous insects.

These are the weapons collected by the Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency during the course of its 2-year probe into the highly questionable traffic in mail-order guns.

Thousands of the Nation's youth have been armed—many of them secretly without the knowledge of parents or police—by guns ordered by mail and delivered by express.

This gun collection now in the possession of the Senate is not a pretty one.

### SCANDAL SEEN

It represents a national scandal of growing proportions, according to subcommittee chairman, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut.

These guns have been used by juveniles to hold up banks, gas stations, kill policemen, murder chums and even members of their own family.

They are easily obtainable. All a youngster has to do is pay his money, either down or cash on delivery, fill in a form saying he is 21 or over, has not been convicted of a crime, is not a fugitive from justice, or an alien.

These statements do not have to be made under oath, are not verified in any way.

So guns—real guns—come into the hands of teen-age cowboys, youthful criminals, the mentally confused, the careless, and inexperienced.

### MORE GUNS REPORTED

Police in many parts of the country report there are "more guns on the street today than ever before."

"Three policemen are shot to death each month, on the average, by persons they are trying to arrest," says James V. Bennett, director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

It was the rising rate of juvenile crime that brought the Senate investigating subcommittee into the picture.

How do juveniles find out about mail-order guns? Where do they get them?

These were the questions investigators asked themselves. They found the answer in cheap, sex-and-sensation pulp magazines.

Here they found advertisements such as these:

"Enfield Commando revolvers—the handgun bargain of all time. Genuine ordnance-built, time tested, Enfield Commando revolvers at less than the price of a BB gun—or even pop-gun. Carried in World War II by the illustrious battle-worn commandos. So dependable it fires double action. Only $14.95."

"Webley & Scott MK VI revolvers—the ultimate Webley & Scott revolver—the biggest bore for the least cash ever. The Tommy's World War II favorite sidearm—so potent it was almost barred by the Geneva Convention. Dependability at its best and plenty of ammo in stock. Only $14.95."

"Colt new service revolvers—back again at the lowest price ever. The pride of the Royal Mounted Police, yours at a token price. The revolver that made the most desperate desperado cringe with fear. Only $35.95."

### AD EXAMINED

An advertisement in a Los Angles newspaper:

"Submachinegun for Father's Day?"

There is more to this advertisement than meets a quick glance. Since it is illegal to ship out submachine guns, this one is described as a "collector's item." The advertisement also states that "bores (are) plugged in accordance with Federal law covering deactivated machineguns. * * *"

However, it adds that the gun "can be easily disassembled and assembled for study of all design features."

The Senate subcommittee staff obtained one of these guns and found it could indeed be "disassembled and assembled." It took only 2 minues to knock out a small plug about the size of a fingertip, making the gun capable of firing a .45 caliber shell, and fully automatic.

"A limited quantity of brandnew, hard-to-get, U.S.-made machineguns now available. * * * For mail orders, send check, cash, or money order, $49.95. ($10 deposit for c.o.d., California residents add 4-percent State tax.)"

Another company in Hollywood, Calif., had this advertisement in a number of pulp magazines:

"Reach—for greater protection."

"A genuine Enfield revolver * * * designed for quick draw. The ideal weapons for the plainclothes detective or for personal protection * * * send only $10 desposit—balance c.o.d. $19.50."

While most of these guns are advertised for sport or recreation, experts told the Senate subcommittee that these guns are "useless" for such occupations and "serve no purpose other than to kill, maim, or injure."

### WEAPONS IMPORTED

Reputable gun dealers do not engage in this cheap, exotic type of advertising, according to Lt. Manuel Pena, of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Nor do legitimate firms make a principal business of the importation of junk guns from foreign countries. They deal with American standard conventional weapons mainly. They also keep records in accordance with local, Federal, and State laws, and cooperate with the police.

As a matter of policy, the National Rifle Association's official publication, "The American Rifleman," refused to carry advertising for the cheap, foreign-type guns.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 26, 1963]

## Gun Traffic—Violence Marketed

(By Josephine Ripley)

A small, easily concealable pistol or revolver may be purchased today almost as easily as a tube of toothpaste, so lax, ineffective, and all too often utterly lacking are laws governing the sale and purchase of these weapons.

The traffic in mail-order guns, in particular—guns ordered by mail and delivered by express—is virtually uncontrolled since it circumvents postal laws which prohibit such merchandise in the mails.

These guns are known to be pouring into racial trouble spots in the United States. A Birmingham official recently warned that extremists on both sides have been arming themselves.

Checking into this report, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency discovered that 180 shipments of firearms were delivered by express to 77 cities in Alabama over a 2-month period this summer.

The largest number went to Birmingham and the biggest percentage of these guns were delivered in the areas where the racial troubles have flared, the subcommittee staff was informed.

### ACTION NOT TAKEN

The subcommittee completed a 2-year investigation into the mail-order gun traffic early this year, following which Chairman Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, introduced a bill to curb the delivery of these guns and tighten Federal firearms laws.

No action has been taken on the measure, now in the hands of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

According to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "the easy accessibility of firearms" has contributed significantly to the Nation's crime problem.

Amazing to many, realized by comparatively few, is the fact that in many cities any adult—be he even a criminal, or mentally ill—can buy a gun over the counter in a sporting goods store or a pawnshop, no questions asked.

Even more shocking is the ease with which children may buy guns today. Any child who has $5 in his piggy bank and can scrawl his name and falsify his age on a mail-order form can obtain a gun.

Thousands do, as police records show. Guns are lethal "toys."

### WHOLESALE WAR FOR SALE

The traffic in guns today has become so overwhelming and uncontrolled that some of the big, unscrupulous cutrate dealers could "sell you a war, wholesale," as someone has put it.

The appalling fact is that they can do it legally.

One dealer, who operates a multimillion-dollar business in weapons and has often been under investigation by various departments of the Government, insists, "I have never done anything illegitimate and I don't intend to."

FBI Director Hoover calls the questionable traffic in deadly weapons in many sections of our country a disgrace.

It has contributed substantially, FBI records show, to the thousands of murders committed annually in the United States today.

In 18 States which have "bare minimum control laws over firearms, 65 percent of the murders were committed with guns," Mr. Hoover reported in a special message to law enforcement officials.

Guns play "a tremendous and increasing role in the overall crime picture in this country," says James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

He cites case after case in which young men with prison records as well as mental defectives have had no trouble buying a gun at a moment's notice.

"Anyone," he has testified, "can buy a gun in this country, almost anywhere. All that one needs is the price."

Nor is price a problem. Mail-order guns are cheap. Almost anyone can scrape up the $5 or $10 necessary to buy one.

They bypass the postal laws which ban guns by using common carriers, express that is, as a means of delivery. Thus, they can be ordered by almost anyone, delivered anywhere.

One mail-order gun dealer, when asked to estimate the number of guns sold by this means every year, refused to commit himself. He admitted, however, that sales of one type gun alone, the Webley revolver, were in the millions.

They are among the most dangerous weapons in the country, not because they are big, but because they are small—concealable.

The problem distributors are not the reputable brand name houses with which the Federal Government has no quarrel, but certain military-surplus dealers who now manufacture parts abroad, bring them in at minimum cost as machine parts or scrap, and assemble them here under their own trademark.

Most of these come from Italy and West Germany at the rate of a million a year, it has been estimated.

Some are small as toys, but spit a .22-caliber bullet. Many a policeman fighting crime in the streets has been felled by them.

"Every other kid has a gun," muttered one District of Columbia policeman privately. He had just made four separate arrests on the same street corner. All four carried mail-order guns.

These guns are widely, luridly, and openly advertised and pictured in pulp and sporting magazines.

Those who sell them have no moral scruples. A Los Angeles dealer, when told by Senate investigators that an 18-year-old boy in Fairfax, Va., had accidentally killed a 14-year-old companion with a gun purchased from his California firm, shrugged:

"I didn't break the law, did I? If they've got the money, I sell the gun. I'm not responsible for what they do with it."

## BPW SUPPORTS SENATOR NEUBERGER, SEEKS LIBERALIZATION OF CHILD CARE DEDUCTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased by the strong and active support the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., has given to my amendment No. 209 to the pending tax bill, H.R. 8363, which would liberalize the child care tax deduction in line with the recommendations made by the late President Kennedy and the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

In a strong, forthright, able statement Miss Virginia R. Allan, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, testified before the Senate Finance Committee in support of my amendment.

As Miss Allan states:

> The present House bill is highly unrealistic. The joint husband-wife limitation is so low as to exclude most married couples from the benefits of the bill.

It is a truism, as Miss Allan points out:

> Child care is hardly a luxury item. Nearly 3 million mothers of children under 6 are employed, even though there is a husband in the family. Most of them work because they must—to make ends meet. In order to do their jobs efficiently these mothers need the assurance that their children are properly cared for during working hours. The Nation, too, needs the assurance that children of working mothers are not left to shift for themselve or roam the streets while their parents work. We can have such assurance if we are willing to open the way for their care by providing tax relief to their parents. To the business and professional women in our organization this seems like good business—an investment in the future.

Mr. President, the Business and Profesional Women's Clubs have over 170,000 members nationally, with 3,567 clubs in every State of the Union and in every congressional district. It is my earnest hope that Congress will carefully consider Miss Allan's statement and take to heart her recommendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the testimony by Miss Virginia R. Allan, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., before the Senate Finance Committee, December 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Virginia R. Allan, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., the largest organization in the world dedicated to the interests of women in business and the professions.
>
> I wish to thank you and members of your committee most sincerely for this opportunity to present the views of our federation members, many of them working mothers, and to assure you of their support of the amendments to H.R. 8363 which Senator NEUBERGER has introduced.
>
> The federation finds that the tax deduction allowance now provided under the law falls far short of achieving its objective—to give real tax relief to those who need it most.
>
> Nor does H.R. 8363, as passed by the House, meet the needs of most working married couples. The $4,500 income limitation for married couples, adopted in 1954 is retained, as is the $600 limitation on deductions. This, in spite of the fact that incomes and the cost of living have advanced considerably since 1954. In that year, the median income of families where both husband and wife were in the labor force was approximately $5,336; by 1961 it had risen to $7,188. Surely it is obvious, in the light of these data, that the present House bill is highly unrealistic. The joint husband-wife limitation is so low as to exclude most married couples from the benefits of the bill.
>
> The current tax law recognizes the need for tax deductions for many expenses essential to employment. Certainly the cost of child care while a mother works is such an expense and the relief provided should be adequate to meet the need.
>
> We were pleased to note that the House increased the allowable deduction to $900 for two or more dependents for widows, widowers, and single women but we protest the exclusion of married women from this provision. There seems to be little logic in increasing benefits for some categories but not for all.
>
> The amendments suggested by Senator NEUBERGER would correct the inequities and bring the bill more nearly into line with today's needs. For this reason the federation gives it our wholehearted support.
>
> Child care is hardly a luxury item. Nearly 3 million mothers of children under six are employed, even though there is a husband in the family. Most of them work because they must—to make ends meet. In order to do their jobs efficiently these mothers need the assurance that their children are properly cared for during working hours. The Nation, too, needs the assurance that children of working mothers are not left to shift for themselves or roam the streets while their parents work. We can have such assurance if we are willing to open the way for their care by providing tax relief to their parents. To the business and professional women in our organization this seems like good business—an investment in the future.

## SENATOR KEFAUVER

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post on November 25, 1963, concerning the late Senator Kefauver's stockholdings in drug companies. The letter is by John M. Blair, chief economist of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. It is in the form of a reply to an article by Mr. Philip Meyer, of the Knight newspapers, which appeared on November 10 in the Washington Post. The article contended that Senator Kefauver's ownership of drug stocks "cast a shadow on the respected Senator's career."

The letter shows that the Senator owned stock in only two firms which are properly regarded as drug companies; one of the holdings was purchased 6 months after the Kefauver-Harris drug bill was passed. The letter goes on to demonstrate that, far from favoring these two companies, Senator Kefauver's investigative fervor fell with greater force on these particular concerns than on any of the major drug companies. Any assertions or implication that the Senator in any way favored the companies whose stock he owned is thus shown to be completely without foundation.

I also wish to call the attention of this body to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on November 24. The editorial urges that the pending Kefauver-inspired investigation of drug industry practices in South America go forward. The Washington Post exhibits its concern over the allegation by the head of the world's largest wholesale drug firm that "concerted and malicious practices" have been engaged in to prevent his company from selling low-price drugs in South America. The Post is similarly concerned with the evidence which has developed concerning the possible existence of an international price-fixing cartel in drugs. The editorial says in part:

> Last summer the board chairman of McKesson & Robbins, the world's largest wholesaler of drugs, charged that several American pharmaceutical manufacturers were engaging in "concerted and malicious practices" in an effort to prevent his company from marketing low-cost drugs in Latin America under generic labels. The late Senator Estes Kefauver, before whose Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee the complaint was lodged, proposed to ascertain the validity of these charges by subpenaing the relevant records. But a division of opinion within the subcommittee has delayed action.
>
> To permit doubts to linger on this score can only play into the hands of the enemies of the United States on the Latin American continent who never fail to inflate and exploit issues that can be manipulated to sustain the

charge of "imperialist exploitation." And a failure to investigate would also create further uncertainty in an area where the applicability of the antitrust has never been very clear.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEFAUVER'S MEMORY UNTARNISHED

I find it difficult to discern in Philip Meyer's article concerning Senator Kefauver's drug stock holdings any factual basis for his charge that their ownership "casts a shadow on the respected Senator's career."

Mr. Meyer notes that in a speech of August 2, 1962, Senator Kefauver, who the day earlier had acquired 75 shares of American Home Products, "denounced four of that firm's competitors * * * in which he had no interest."

The speech of August 2 was simply a brief plea, given in the morning hour when Senators are limited to short speeches, for the Senate leadership to bring up the drug bill for action on the floor. In a speech lasting about 3 minutes, American Home was among the many matters which the Senator did not discuss.

Moreover, the immediate occasion of the plea was President Kennedy's reference on the previous day to the shattering tragedy of thalidomide. To make the point that thalidomide was not alone, the Senator cited examples of other drugs with particularly dangerous side effects, none of which is a product of American Home for the simple reason that American Home has not put out any drugs of this type.

If Senator Kefauver's omission of American Home from his August 2 speech is understandable, the same cannot be said of Mr. Meyer's failure to make reference to the Senator's speech of August 23. In this, the Senator's major speech on behalf of his drug bill, he excoriated the drug industry in general and, among others, American Home and Pfizer in particular. He specifically noted that American Home's profits had been sufficient to repay its entire net worth in just a few years and that its gross profit margin exceeded that of any of a representative list of leading corporations in other industries.

In referring to the Senator's stockownership, Mr. Meyer uses the artfully contrived term "six drugmaking companies."

To clear away some of the underbrush, three of the companies cited by Mr. Meyer—Monsanto, Commercial Solvents, and Rexall—are not among the major prescription drug companies and were not subjects of the investigation by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of which Senator Kefauver was chairman. The first two are primarily chemical firms which, as a minor part of their operations, supply some materials to the drug companies. Although owning a small drug-producing subsidiary, the third is primarily engaged in distributon. To the question of what effect they might have had on Senator Kefauver's conduct of the drug investigation, these holdings are simply irrelevant.

The same observation is true of Olin Mathieson whose drug division, Squibb, has a long-established name but is not a leading producer of any of the major classes of prescription drugs and accordingly did not figure in the subcommittee's hearings.

This leaves American Home Products and Chas. Pfizer, in which the Senator's holdings (75 shares of the former and 100 shares of the latter) have a combined current market value of $9,713. It is ironic that these two companies have been more directly and adversely affected by the drug investigation than any of the other major drug companies.

Basing its action in part upon evidence developed by the subcommittee, the Department of Justice brought an antitrust suit against the patent owner, Carter Products, and its exclusive licensee, American Home Products, for restricting trade in meprobamate, more familiarly known as Miltown (Carter) and Equanil (American Home). The Department was successful in securing a consent decree under which the exclusive control by Carter and American Home was ended, licensing of other drug companies was required, and today the product is available to druggists at 2.5 to 3.5 cents a pill as compared to Carter and American Home's previous price of 6.5 cents. During the hearings it was demonstrated that profits from meprobamate exerted a clear and direct influence upon American Home's overall profit position.

Senator Kefauver's investigation had a similar adverse effect on Pfizer, whose stock he purchased on May 16 of this year—6 months after the Kefauver-Harris drug bill was passed. On the day of the Senator's death the Federal Trade Commission issued a finding that Pfizer's patent on the important antibiotic, tetracycline, had been obtained through "misrepresentations" to the Patent Office and that Pfizer had engaged in a price-fixing conspiracy, and ordered the patent monopoly to be terminated.

At the time of his death Senator Kefauver, as Mr. Meyer correctly noted, was "moving heaven and earth" to investigate charges that Pfizer and a few of the other major drug companies had engaged in "concerted and malicious" activities to prevent McKesson & Robbins from selling drugs under generic names in South America. The results of this investigation, plus the burgeoning competition in tetracycline at home, could hardly be expected to enhance the value of Pfizer's stock, which at the time of his death had already declined 2¼ points since its purchase 6 months earlier.

Finally, to support his charge of hypocrisy in drugs Mr. Meyer infers that the Senator was guilty of hypocrisy on the whole issue of monopoly. Against this opinion must be set the Celler-Kefauver antimerger amendment to the Clayton Act, unquestionably the most important addition to the antitrust laws since 1914, as well as laws making final orders issued under the Clayton Act, strengthening penalties for violation of the antitrust laws, giving the Department of Justice civil demand authority to secure documents in antitrust proceedings, and the many provisions of the Kefauver-Harris drug law designed to promote competition and lower drug prices.

JOHN M. BLAIR,
*Chief Economist, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.*
LA PLATA, MD.

## TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION WARN OF ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF EXCESSIVE FOREIGN BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by the serious impact on the domestic beef cattle industry of the current beef import situation.

The feeder committee and board of directors of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, at their quarterly director's meeting in Fort Worth, December 5, 1963, passed a resolution of national significance. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the beef cattle industry is of major importance to the economy of Texas and the Southwest;

Whereas current levels of foreign beef shipments to the United States are causing adverse economic impact on our domestic beef cattle industry resulting in substantial monetary losses to producers and to the Nation's general economy;

Whereas this situation places in jeopardy the economically stable and efficient domestic beef cattle industry and the industry's ability to continue to supply the consuming public with wholesome beef at reasonable prices: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this association recommends that no tariff concessions be granted on livestock, meat, and meat products at the forthcoming Geneva trade talks; and be it further

*Resolved*, That both the legislative and executive branches of our Government be requested to take note of the serious beef import situation and take immediate action to provide reasonable protection for the domestic beef cattle industry through adequate tariffs and the establishment of a beef import quota system.

## FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EXPRESS THEIR ABIDING LOYALTY, AFFECTION, AND GRATITUDE FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the National Association of Letter Carriers has passed a resolution in eulogy to the late President John F. Kennedy which expresses the deep sense of loss and sorrow shared by all Federal employees.

President Kennedy, with his encouragement and boundless drive, provided the leadership that was doing more to raise the status of Federal employees, more to get for them a fair living wage, more to bring about improved Federal service in this country, than had ever been done before.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee, I had many occasions to learn of the love and loyalty Federal employees had for President Kennedy—and many occasions to witness this administration's deep concern for members of the Federal service.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted December 2, 1963, by the National Association of Letter Carriers be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cowardly and senseless assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has spiritually impoverished the entire free world, and

Whereas the cause of intelligent liberalism has suffered an irreparable blow through the sudden death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and

Whereas the National Association of Letter Carriers, its officers and its 165,000 members, feels a deeply personal loss in the death of a man whom they considered a very great President and a beloved friend: Be it

*Resolved*, That the executive council of the National Association of Letter Carriers convey to the widow of the martyred John Fitzgerald Kennedy and to his children, the expression of their deep and personal grief, their abiding affection, their loyalty, their gratitude and their boundless admiration and sympathy.

Jerome J. Keating, President; James H. Rademacher, Vice President; J. Stanly Lewis, Secretary-Treasurer; Charles N. Coyle, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; George A. Bang, Director, Life Insurance; James P. Deely, Director, Health Insurance; Philip Lepper, Carl J. Saxsenmeier, J. Joseph Vacca, George G. Morrow, Jr., James C. Stocker, Thomas M. Flaherty, Glenn M. Hodges, Dean E. Soverns, Fred Gadotti, Edward F. Benning, William T. Sullivan, Tony R. Huerta, Austin B. Carlson.

## TRIBUTE TO NEVILLE HOLCOMBE

**Mr. THURMOND.** Mr. President, the Kiwanis Club of Spartanburg, S.C., has selected the former mayor of Spartanburg, Mr. Neville Holcombe, to receive its citizenship award of 1963. The citizenship award is made annually by the club to that citizen who has given outstanding civic contributions and unselfish service to our community. I was very pleased to learn, Mr. President, that the Kiwanis Club has recognized Mr. Holcombe's distinguished service to his community, both as an individual citizen and as mayor of Spartanburg during the period 1953–61. Mr. Holcombe is noted in South Carolina not only as one of the most capable attorneys in our State, but also as a gentleman of impeccable personal integrity and as one who made particularly important contributions to the improvement of his community as a dedicated and forward-looking public servant.

Mr. Holcombe is a graduate of Wofford College and received his bachelor of law degree from Harvard University. During World War II he rendered distinguished service to his country as an intelligence officer attached to the eastern sea frontier. In addition to his service as vice president of the chamber of commerce of the Greater Spartanburg area, Mr. Holcombe also serves as director of the united fund, chairman of the city crime prevention council, and is a very active and loyal member of the Episcopal Church of the Advent.

Mr. President, the Spartanburg Herald has made particular note of this award being given to Mr. Holcombe, pointing out that he might well be considered the citizen of the decade for Spartanburg, S.C., in view of the outstanding service he has rendered to his community. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Man Named Neville Blew Into Town" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Man Named Neville Blew Into Town

Neville Holcombe would be among perhaps three or four people considered for "Citizen of the Decade" if Spartanburg were bestowing such an honor.

The Kiwanis Club chose well to name him its "Citizen of the Year."

It would be sufficient to name some of the major improvements which came to this community during Mr. Holcombe's 8 years as mayor, accomplishments which required the leadership he gave.

City limits extension, offstreet parking, slum clearance, downtown renovation, new city hall, major traffic and street improvements.

But the story would be only partially told if you continued the list on and on.

Neville Holcombe and his lovely wife represented this city with dignity and charm. They became personifications of Spartanburg's wholesome character and warm friendliness.

He left the office of mayor in May 1961, nearly 3 years ago. At that time, word of his leadership and Spartanburg's progress had spread throughout the State—and people from other communities were asking whether he intended to run for statewide office.

Whatever he planned on that, an extremely serious illness intervened.

As he regained his strength, Neville Holcombe again offered himself to his community as a citizen. He is now first vice president of the chamber of commerce, among many capacities of leadership.

His recognition by the Kiwanis Club brings to mind Rudy Rivers' tribute at the time Mr. Holcombe relinquished his office:

"Once a man named Neville blew into town from Woodruff via some Yankee school and hung out a shingle as a counselor at law.

"He spent some years at this and picked up enough political savvy from somewhere to run for and win the mayor's post. That was Spartanburg's good fortune.

"It is probably by dint of personal persuasion on his part and careful organization of goals and resources that Spartanburg has enjoyed the most fruitful years since the first railroad hit town.

"To the outgoing Mayor Holcombe and Councilman L. L. Hyatt and Sam Mize, I believe Spartans owe a large debt of gratitude.

"I don't know how to clear my debt except with a sincere, thank you "

## PROTECTION AGAINST NUCLEAR ATTACK

**Mr. THURMOND.** Mr. President, I have been impressed with recent testimony that has been given by Assistant Defense Secretary Steuart Pittman before the special Subcommittee on Civil Defense of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Mr. Pittman has emphasized the importance of proceeding expeditiously toward making adequate preparations in this country to protect our country against an enemy attack, especially under conditions of nuclear warfare.

I have noticed in reading the December 1963, issue of Army magazine that the Association of the U.S. Army, at its 9th annual meeting, approved a number of resolutions, including two important resolutions which support concepts which would help provide our Nation with a more effective defense posture in the event of a nuclear exchange. I call particular attention, Mr. President, to Resolution No. 5 entitled "Defense Against Ballistic Missiles" and Resolution No. 12 entitled "Civil Defense." I ask unanimous consent that both of these resolutions be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### No. 5. Defense Against Ballistic Missiles

Whereas an effective antiballistic missile defense at the earliest practicable time is vital to the security of the United States; and

Whereas the Army has in an advanced state of development the Nike-Zeus, which has successfully intercepted ICBM targets, and is developing an even more effective system, the Nike X: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That, in the interest of national security, the Association of the U.S. Army urges the earliest possible production and deployment of an effective defense system against ballistic and other space environmental threats.

### No. 12. Civil Defense

Whereas the threat of an attack against the United States by mass destruction weapons continues to be an ever-present possibility despite recent indications of decreasing cold war tensions; and

Whereas the President has declared the need for a greatly accelerated civil defense program, including the provision of effective fallout protection for both civilian and military personnel; and

Whereas the public is manifestly interested in its own active and passive self-defense against mass destruction attack; and

Whereas the protection of our population requires the coordinated effort and resources at Federal, State and local levels: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That adequate resources, funds and priorities be allocated to insure the development of a reasonably effective civil defense throughout the country so that all citizens will be better informed on this vital subject; and be it further

*Resolved,* That since the Army has been given certain responsibilities of military support of civil defense, it be furnished increased funds and personnel commensurate with the tasks assigned.

**Mr. SMATHERS.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

## OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

During the delivery of Mr. Ervin's address:

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that the interruption will appear elsewhere in the Record, and that he will not lose his right to the floor for so yielding?

**Mr. ERVIN.** I am glad to yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accelerated Public Works of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

**Mr. ALLOTT.** I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Objection is heard.

**Mr. COOPER.** Mr. President, may I address myself to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the hearing is upon the proposed extension of the accelerated public works program. A number of witnesses are in the city, having come here from other States, to testify. It would be a hardship on them if they had to wait over, or perhaps go back home. I wish to address this information to the Senator from Colorado for his consideration.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if I may reserve my objection for a few moments, until after I have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I may withdraw it. If I must state it at this time, I object. May I do that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is temporarily entered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will renew my request later.

I hope the Senator from Colorado understands that I am acting under instructions in making the request.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand.

## ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of November 6, 1963, pp. 21123–21129, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, if the Senate is still considering the pending legislation when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, it be continued as the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the majority staff and the minority staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be granted the privilege of the floor, to assist in connection with the debate on the higher education bill conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before explaining the conference report on the higher education bill, I am pleased to announce that a few minutes ago the Senate conferees on the vocational education bill succeeded in reaching an agreement with the House conferees. The conference report is signed; and I thank each of the Senate conferees for the great assistance he was to me throughout this very difficult conference. I also thank each of the House members of the conference committee, including those who finally voted against the conference report, for the unfailing courtesies they extended to me, as chairman of the conference committee, during our markup of the conference report.

At another time, I shall have more to say about the conference report on the vocational education bill. At this time, I say only that this is a great day for school dropouts in America, because the conference report offers them some hope of getting back into school at a school level at which they can succeed. It offers great hope also for the many thousands of school dropouts between the ages of 18 and 21 who are fast becoming an increasingly large part of the pool of unemployability in the United States. I have been heard to say, and I repeat it today, that in my judgment this aspect of the educational problem is one of the most serious which confronts the Republic. Not only is it vital, from the standpoint of its human aspects, it is also exceedingly important from the standpoint of its economic aspects.

I believe that all the conferees are deserving of many thanks from the Members of both Houses of Congress for what I—as one who observed the conference committee discussions—consider the greatest exhibition of educational statesmanship I have observed at any time in my many years of service in the Senate. I am greatly indebted to them.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was of inestimable assistance to me, as chairman of the conference committee, when yesterday he made a suggestion which broke the most difficult deadlock which confronted us—a deadlock over residential schools and work-study programs. The Senate version of the bill made provision for both residential school and work-study programs. Those subjects were not covered in the House version of the bill. For a long time it seemed that it might not be possible to obtain a conference report. Because of this difference in view of the testimony taken by the Senate committee, many of the Senate conferees were of the opinion that the work-study program and the residential school program were among the most important aspects of the entire program, those two topics deal directly with the problem of school dropouts or potential school dropouts between the ages of 18 and 21. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] finally suggested that the two programs be combined into one lump-sum program—which was done; and on the basis of that suggestion, an agreement was reached. I particularly thank the Senator from New York for the great assistance he was to me.

Mr. President, I believe in giving credit where it is due. In my judgment, if it had not been for the never failing shoulder-to-shoulder support I received from the chairman of the full Senate committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], an agreement never would have been reached on the vocational education bill. The Senator from Alabama sat next to me throughout the many days of the conference. Never was there a time, after we had listened to the objections on the House side and the suggestions for compromise, when I failed to receive the finest support from the Senator from Alabama, after he and I conducted a whispered conversation as to what we thought would be a reasonable compromise of the differences.

One of our very difficult problems concerned the definitions in the bill. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] had been our leader in regard to the area vocational school definitions problem. These are exceedingly important in connection with this vocational education bill since it involves a broadening of the concept. The Senator from Vermont led us out of that wilderness, and was instrumental in helping us to reach an agreement in this area.

Mr. President, before taking up the conference report on the higher education bill, I have mentioned the vocational education bill, because I would have Senators remember that if the conference report on the higher education bill is approved by the Senate and if, subsequently, the conference report on the vocational education bill is approved by both Houses of Congress, we shall have made more progress in the field of education legislation in this Congress than has been made in this field in the last 100 years.

That is not an original thought of mine for that is what the late President Kennedy said when he was discussing the challenges of education which faces Congress at this session. He pointed out, that if we succeeded in having these two bills passed by both Houses before the adjournment of Congress this year, we would have made more progress in the field of education than has been made in the last century. Unquestionably, he was correct about that.

The first of these two challenges—the conference report on higher education—is now before the Senate.

Senators who do not agree with me on the conference report know the great respect I have for them. They also know that, as chairman of the Senate conferees on higher education, I have done the best I could to the maximum extent possible to carry their wishes. I shall have more to say about that when we discuss the Ervin-Cooper judicial review amendment adopted by the Senate but deleted in conference.

I wish to make it clear at the beginning of the debate that I do not question the sincerity and the dedication to education of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] nor that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I say to them most respectfully, that the Senate is confronted with a practical legislative problem. We are bringing before the Senate a conference report on higher education that, in my judgment, is very much in the best interests of the country, in the best interests of education, and in the best interests of the tens of thousands of young men and women who will be the beneficiaries of the program.

Later, if it is sought and desired, I shall give a round-by-round account, as to how the Ervin amendment was handled in conference; but I wish Senators to know that I shall keep faith with the Senate—in the legislative process as I did in conference—in connection with the provision on judicial review.

When the higher education bill was before the Senate, I said on the floor of the Senate that in my judgment the judicial review amendment did not have a proper place in the higher education bill. I said that it involved a subject which should be considered in a separate bill, and not by way of an amendment written into the bill at that time. I said there should be hearings on the subject, and that the most outstanding constitutional lawyers and authorities in the country, as well as leading educators, should be called before the committee. I said then that in due course of time I would introduce a bill along the lines of S. 1482 the Clark-Morse judicial review bill of the 87th Congress which was introduced after consultation with the present Attorney General of the United States and the Solicitor General of the United States.

The language in S. 2350 of this session, the successor bill to S. 1482, is substantially the same language that was agreed upon and written in the Office of the Solicitor General of the United States in consultation with the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself. I believe S. 2350 will stand the test of the courts. I believe it is an improved bill. I believe that S. 2350 is a much better legal instrument to achieve its purpose of judicial review than the Ervin-Cooper amendment. In my judgment, we should agree to the conference report on higher education and then proceed with early hearings on the judicial review bill that has been introduced on behalf of myself and a group of cosponsors. I invite other Senators to join us as cosponsors.

As I said during the October debate on higher education I believe that is the way to handle the question. This issue will be brought before the Supreme Court anyway. It has started its climb to the Supreme Court in connection with the Maryland case brought by the Horace Mann League. The Maryland case raises points under both the 1st and 14th amendments.

As a lawyer, it is my opinion that the issue, will be before the Court in due course of time, and that it will not be a long time.

I have great respect for lawyers, including the proponents of the Ervin-Cooper amendment who disagree with me in this matter. However, in my opinion they are in error and that my view will prevail. If the Maryland case does not reach the Supreme Court, there are other cases that will. But I am not for delay. I advocate going ahead and obtaining early action on S. 2350, the Morse-Clark judicial review bill.

A similar bill has been introduced on the House side by my able colleague from the Third Congressional District of Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN; and I have been given assurance that it will receive prompt consideration in the House.

I now request Senators to turn to page 18 of the report of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. I will point out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill and the final results of the conference. I shall read those differences quickly:

> The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed upon in conference are described in this statement, except for minor, clarifying, or technical differences.
>
> The conference substitute contains four titles. Titles II, III, and IV of the substitute are substantially the same as the corresponding titles of the House bill. In most respects, title I of the conference substitute is also the same as title I of the House bill. There are, however, two significant differences which are discussed below.

### CATEGORIES OF FACILITIES ELIGIBLE

> The House bill permitted Federal grants for facilities so long as they were "academic facilities" within the meaning of the act. The term "academic facilities" excluded, specifically, certain athletic facilities and facilities used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or used or to be used in connection with a divinity school.
>
> The Senate amendment provided Federal grants for "academic facilities" (defined as in the House bill), but also contained an additional limitation. It limited construction to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed, and to be used only, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library.
>
> The substitute agreed upon in conference limits construction (except in the case of public community colleges and public technical institutes) to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for use as a library.

It will be noted that the conferees added to the categories, eligible for grants "Modern foreign languages and mathematics." In our opinion, mathematics as a subject matter discipline was included under the science category. All the definitions that have been used heretofore in connection with the sciences include mathematics. But it was suggested that we should specifically name mathematics to remove any doubt on the matter, so it was included. We also included modern foreign languages, because modern foreign languages, as is true also of mathematics, is a category covered in the National Defense Education Act.

I stress that what we are giving the Senate is what the Senate has already approved category-wise in the national defense education program and a Senate passed library construction bill.

I read further from the report:

### SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PUBLIC TECHNICAL INSTITUTES

> The House bill provided special treatment for junior colleges and technical institutes by requiring that 22 percent of each State's allotment of funds for construction of academic facilities could be used only for these institutions. In all other respects junior colleges and technical institutes were treated the same as other types of institutions of higher education. Since the House bill authorized the appropriation of $230 million, the result would be to earmark, on a full appropriation, $50,600,000 for junior colleges and technical institutes.
>
> The Senate amendment, in contrast, contained a separate title providing construction grants for public community colleges; that is, junior colleges which are under public supervision and control. It authorized the appropriation of $50 million for this purpose. This title differed in many respects from the provisions of the House bill governing grants to other types of institutions of higher education. Of these, the five listed below are of the greatest significance:
>
> 1. The method of administration.
> 2. The formula for allotting the funds among the States.
> 3. The matching requirements.
> 4. The differing treatment of public community colleges and of private junior colleges.
> 5. The treatment of technical institutes.
>
> These differences, and the conference action on each, are discussed below:
>
> 1. The method of administration in the House bill is to have a State agency, broadly representative of the public and the various types of institutions of higher education in the State, be responsible for carrying out the program in the State. The State agency would establish the relative priority to be accorded projects for construction, and would also fix for projects for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes the extent of Federal participation (the Federal share) within the prescribed ceiling. The grant would be made directly to the institution by the Commissioner of Education. The Senate amendment, in the case of these grants for public community colleges, provided that the grant should be made to a State agency, and that that agency would in turn make the grants to the public community colleges. The conference substitute is like the House bill in that public community colleges and public technical institutes are embraced within title I along with all other types of institutions. However, where deemed appropriate, special provisions applicable only to these institutions are included in title I.
>
> 2. The formula for allotting funds among the States contained in the House bill applied to public community colleges and public technical institutes in the same manner it applied to all others.
>
> The Senate amendment, in the title dealing with public community colleges, contained a formula for allotting funds among the States which was entirely different from the formula used in the case of other types of institutions of higher education. This formula provided that the funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of (a) the number of persons graduating from high school in the respective States in the

most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available, and (b) the relative income per person in the respective States. The formula contained special provisions to insure that no State would receive more than three times as much as any other State per high school graduate no matter what its relative per capita income, and to provide that Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam would receive the same amount per high school graduate as the States with the lowest per capita income.

The substitute agreed upon in conference provides 22 percent of each year's allotment shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the Senate formula just described (with one minor modification) and that the funds so allotted may be used only by public community colleges and public technical institutes. The minor modification referred to is to reduce the maximum spread between the States with the lowest per capita incomes and those with the highest from 3 to 1 to 2 to 1. The result is that under the conference substitute each State will receive substantially the same allotment for public community colleges and public technical institutes as it would have received under the Senate amendment for public community colleges.

3. The matching requirements in the House bill were the same for all types of institutions of higher education; that is, the State commission would fix the amount of the Federal share, which could not exceed one-third of the cost of the project. The Senate amendment provided for variable matching in the case of projects for public community colleges. The conference substitute retains the House pattern but provides that in the case of public community colleges and public technical institutes the Federal share shall be 40 percent of the cost of the project.

4. The treatment of public community colleges and private junior colleges differed between the House bill and the Senate amendment. The conference substitute earmarks 22 percent of each year's appropriation for the public community colleges (and public technical institutes), and, correspondingly, does not permit any of the funds allotted for other institutions to be used for these. Private junior colleges will be eligible for assistance, but must draw their funds from the remaining 78 percent of the annual appropriations. The private junior colleges will be able to use their funds only for the categories of specially designed facilities referred to above. The sums allotted for public community colleges are not limited to use for such categories of specially designed facilities, and may be used for construction of any facility coming within the definition of "academic facility."

5. The Senate amendment treated public and private technical institutes alike. The conference substitute provides that public technical institutes will be treated like public community colleges and that private technical institutes will be treated like private junior colleges. The conference substitute includes the provisions of the House bill providing a special accreditation procedure for technical institutes.

Mr. President, on one other technical aspect of the bill, I should like to reassure those who have expressed to me their concern over the language of that part of section 403(a) which reads: "but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time on the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction."

I should like to make it crystal clear that it is the intent of the bill that voluntarily donated services means those services which are given without any compensation at all. I make this legislative history for the purpose of clarifying a possible ambiguity.

I close by saying that there are many fine features of the higher education facilities bill, but I suppose the thing of which I am most proud—and I would not be surprised if most of my colleagues share that pride—is what we will do to help community and junior colleges.

In the years immediately ahead the great need in higher education is at the community level, at the junior college level. So many young men and women at the present time are being denied a higher education only because the facilities are not available.

It was brought out in our hearings on the bill, by one education expert after another, that within the next 10 years—the demand on the part of the American people for junior and community colleges will be so great that there will be more young people going to college at the community and junior colleges of this country, than there will be in all of the standard universities and colleges, public and private combined but only if we do our job in this Congress.

We must provide such facilities in this age of automation.

Let us never forget that if we are to meet the higher education needs of the young people of this country in 1980; that if we are to respond to their knocks on the doors of the colleges for admission; that if we are to insure to them equal opportunity for the development of their potential brainpower, we shall have to double the size of every university and college in America, public and private, and we shall have to build at least 1,000 new ones, to accommodate student bodies of at least 2,500 students each.

Let me recall again to you the basic reasons for this bill. They are set forth in an article in the New York Herald Tribune of September 29 entitled, "War Baby Population Boom To Hit Colleges Next Fall."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WAR BABY POPULATION BOOM TO HIT COLLEGES NEXT FALL

(By Terry Ferrer)

It's all been said. Now it's going to be done.

For almost a decade, the educational seers have been warning about the coming college boom, the tidal wave of students, the need to build more and more college classrooms, the zooming costs for which parents should be saving.

Now the deluge is beginning.

This year's high school seniors—who will be headed for college next fall—and the present high school juniors are going to have the toughest college admissions problems of any young students for the next 12 years, that is, through 1975.

Beginning in the fall of 1964, almost one-half of the total increase in college freshmen expected by 1975 will be concentrated in a 2-year period.

Between now and the fall of 1965, some 309,000 more freshmen will be enrolled across the country (one can't even consider the boys and girls who won't make it). The total increase in a dozen years, U.S. Office of Education figures show, will be 645,000—or a jump from this fall's 1.117 million freshmen to 1.762 million.

#### FIGURES

And even these figures may be too low—they have been in the past. The war babies of 1946 and the continuing population boom will jump the high school senior age group from its present 2.9 million to almost 4 million by 1970 alone. As a higher and higher percentage of high school graduates go to college each year, the freshmen figures may well rise even higher.

And adding to the pressures of numbers are the strictures of space. Not only do more students go to college, but more stay in. For example, this year's 4.4 million college students—expected to double by 1975—number 200,000 more than they did last year. But the estimated number of freshmen is down from 1962. Obviously, if more students stay in, there is less room for those coming in.

How well have the colleges—long warned—prepared for the deluge?

Who will get in—and who will be left at the post?

How expensive will it be—and how about scholarships?

The answers are uniformly gloomy. The country's 2,000 colleges have been building—but they are running about $1 billion a year behind what is needed. Dr. W. Robert Bokelman, Chief of Business Administration in the Office of Education's Higher Education Division, says that the annual construction rate for colleges should be $2.3 billion; instead it is $1.3 billion.

"The colleges can probably get by next fall," he said, "but the real pinch will be in 1965. Shortages of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories—right in the heart, that's where the pinch will be felt."

As far as admissions are concerned, more and more college candidates will have to look to the public institutions rather than the private colleges. The present ratio of public to private enrollment is 60–40. By 1985, when there will be 12.8 million students in college, the ratio will be public 80 percent, private 20 percent.

And the signs are already going up at the public colleges and universities. Don't come looking for admission in September. Rather, the nonselective public institutions are beginning to spread their freshman enrollments over a whole year instead of 1 month.

#### DEFERRED

Thus Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, already tells its weaker applicants that they must wait until February for admission, rather than September. By February, presumably, first-semester flunkouts will make a little room available. Students can take jobs while they wait.

Both Ohio University and Ohio State, who by law must admit all comers, now say that students in the lower third of their high school class cannot enter in the fall, but must begin work in the summer, winter, or spring quarters.

New also is the "summer tryout," the catch word of Dr. Robert E. Iffert, coordinator of research for colleges in the Office of Education. The University of Maryland, for example, says "we will admit you next fall if you take summer work now and do it satisfactorily. If you don't do well in the summer, we won't."

In similar vein, the University of Illinois has a "progressive admissions plan"—it takes the upper half of each class in the regular fall term, and does not even consider the lower half until after May 31. The lower half must take college-entrance tests, and if they don't do well, they are deferred admission for a term.

### CUT OFF

The University of Tennessee is even more brutal. Beginning next fall, any student with a high school average below C who scores in the lower fifth of the American college testing program simply will not be accepted.

Does this mean that all the not-that-bright students will never get out of the starting gate? Not if they have the funds to pay for an education at one of the smaller, not-too-selective private colleges.

What about those students who don't have the money? If they are extra bright, they will probably make it into college, with help in a combination of scholarship, loan, and job.

The problems of college admission will be most real for the B-minus or C and C-plus students. These are the boys and girls who will suffer the most in the crucial 2 years.

As for the cost of college, there is just one word—up. College costs have been doubling every 12 years, according to Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, college finance expert of the Office of Education. Tuition fees alone are jumping 7 percent each year, and living and other expenses 3 to 5 percent.

This year's average cost in a public institution is $1,775, and in a private college $2,375. If you multply that by 4 years, assuming present rates, public costs for a college education would be $7,100 and private $9,500. Double these figures, and, by 1975, it will cost $14,200 for 4 years in a public and $19,000 in a private college.

Will there be any help in paying the bill? By next fall, there should be about $400 million available to college undergraduates in scholarships, jobs, and loan (exclusive of commercial loans). This compares with $169 million available in 1955–56, says Rexford G. Moon, head of the College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board.

But, as costs go up, this $400 million will be nowhere near enough, Mr. Moon predicts. The trend is for fewer students to be helped—more in actual numbers but fewer as a percentage of the whole.

For example, the total number of scholarship, loan, and job awards made to college students by their colleges in 1955 amounted to 34 percent of the college enrollment. But in the next 4 years, the awards went to only 27 percent of the enrollment—a drop of 7 percent.

Higher costs, waves of students, not enough classrooms—it's all coming true right now, just as the prophets said it would.

And after the deluge, more.

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, that is the challenge which confronts the American people in the field of higher education.

It is the prayer of the conference committee that the Senate will recognize this need by approving the conference report this afternoon, postponing for later consideration the issue of judicial review We believe that is the way to face this issue.

I say most respectfully to my friends, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], that I fully respect their position. I sincerely hope, however, that they will see their way clear to permit an early vote on the conference report. Further I hope will join me next session in putting through the Senate at the earliest possible date the Morse-Clark bill on judicial review.

## CANADA'S AID PROGRAMS

**Mr. FULBRIGHT.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a recent statement by Mr. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, which concerns the programs of the Canadian Government in the field of foreign aid, following one paragraph from a letter I have received from the Ambassador, which I shall read.

> While the expected level of Canadian economic aid during the current fiscal year (April 1, 1963, to March 31, 1964) is expected to reach about $120 million, this amount will be increased by $70 million ($20 million in grants and $50 million in a new loan fund from which loans will be available on terms of 50-year maturity, three-fourths of 1 percent interest and 10-year grace period) during the 1964–65 fiscal year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Canada's Aid Programs

(Statement in House of Commons, November 14, 1963, by Mr. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs)

I should like to make an announcement on a subject which I am sure will be of considerable interest to the House and to the Canadian people—Canada's programs of economic assistance for the developing countries of the world.

The record demonstrates, I think, that since 1950, when Canada was one of the founding members of the Colombo plan, Canadian governments have regularly reviewed the adequacy of their aid programs and have made provision for increases whenever national circumstances permit. Last year only was a reduction made in the level of our assistance as part of a general program to reduce expenditures in every area of Government activities.

When the present government took office it became increasingly apparent that because of the changing framework of international assistance a fresh look was required at our international aid effort. The requirements of the developing countries are urgent and growing and economic assistance for them has become an established policy of all of the advanced nations of the free world, who have recognized the need to cooperate in assisting to the best of their ability those countries in the process of economic development. Accordingly, our Canadian aid effort cannot be viewed in isolation but rather as part of a broad collective effort. We would be failing in our responsibilities both to the developing countries and to other advanced countries with which we are associated if we did not insure that Canada played its proper role in this common aid effort.

As an integral part of our foreign policy, our Canadian aid programs have, I am convinced, the broad support of the Canadian people. By sharing our resources, skills, and experiences, we not only benefit others but also help to expand and enrich our own experiences. Incidentally, our aid programs provide a stimulus to the domestic economy and contribute to a betterment of employment conditions, since the main part of our aid funds is spent in Canada to purchase Canadian goods and services required in the developing countries. Taking all these factors into account, the Canadian Government has now formulated general plans for an expansion of Canada's aid programs beginning in the fiscal year 1964–65.

The main proposed area of expansion would be in special Canadian lending for development purposes. If Canada is to be in a position to provide assistance on terms commensurate with the needs of recipient countries, consistent with the agreed objectives of international bodies of which Canada is a member, and in line with what other major donors are providing, there should be available for implementing Canada's bilateral assistance programs facilities for lending of the type now carried out by the International Development Association, involving such features as long maturity periods, liberal grace periods, and little or no interest. It is proposed, therefore, that a lending program of this type should be commenced in the fiscal year 1964–65 with an initial ceiling for commitments of $50 million.

It is the Government's intention to ask Parliament to make separate provision beginning in 1964–65 for a food aid program, as already announced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and for Canada's contribution to the Indus Basin Development Fund, which was set up in an effort to resolve the difficult dispute between India and Pakistan over the use of the waters of the Indus Basin. These have been included in Canada's bilateral grant aid programs which will be continued in 1964–65 at their present level of about $50 million, but which will in the future be devoted to the provision of project assistance, the supply of industrial commodities and the carrying out of technical assistance only for the developing countries. The result will be a significant increase in our grant aid. These improvements in our aid programs would of course be additional to Canada's other existing programs of assistance, including our long-term financing arrangements under section 21(A) of the Export Credits Insurance Act and our contributions to the multilateral programs of the United Nations. Recent references have been made in the House to the increased Canadian contribution to the U.N. Special Fund and the International Development Association.

In the current fiscal year, it is expected that the overall level of Canada's expenditures for assistance to less-developed countries will be in the neighborhood of $120 million. It is the Government's intention to seek authority to make available an additional $70 million in 1964–65. It is, of course, not possible at this stage to forecast an actual expenditure level for 1964–65 but it is expected that with the new resources available, the level might be in the range of $180 to $190 million.

The overall program which I have described will be a flexible one designed to place Canada in a position to make an effective response to changing national and international circumstances. In particular, it will provide for:

(a) Aid to Colombo plan countries of Asia at a higher level than was provided prior to the reduction in 1962;

(b) A more comprehensive and sizable Canadian program for the Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean;

(c) Larger and more effective programs for Africa, including the French-speaking states;

(d) A further contribution to Latin American development, in close cooperation with the Inter-American Development Bank, through the availability of new and additional lending resources.

I make this announcement at this time in view of the OECD ministerial meeting in Paris next week at which the subject of aid to developing countries will be discussed.

## SPEECH BY CHANCELLOR ERHARD ON FOREIGN AID AND ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP

**Mr. FULBRIGHT.** Mr. President, on October 27, in Frankfurt, Germany, the new Chancellor of the West German Federal Republic delivered one of the most sensible and hopeful speeches that it has been my good fortune to hear in many years. His speech gives us encouragement to hope that the concept of an Atlantic partnership and close cooperation is still being seriously and hopefully considered by the people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the speech delivered by Chancellor Erhard.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SPEECH BY CHANCELLOR ERHARD, PAULSKIRCHE, OCTOBER 27, 1963

The following is an unofficial translation of Chancellor Erhard's speech delivered in Frankfurt, October 27, 1963:

"The historically short period of 16 years which has elapsed since the initiation of the greatest aid action in history will, nevertheless, suffice to evaluate properly and judge the almost miraculous developments which have taken place since the hostile division of the world. We Germans cannot do justice to the significance of the Marshall plan in a better way than by remembering this accomplishment at the present time, as well as in the future, and by drawing the necessary conclusions.

"It seems to me that an interpretation of the Marshall plan would be particularly useful at the present time when many problems are demanding solutions.

"Our thoughts do not have to go back very far to find some parallels between the events of those years and today's tasks. Possibly all of us are today again facing a similar decisive turn of events. When in 1947 the United States assumed the responsibilities of the world's leading power by announcing the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, they gave to the world much more than mere dollars. They gave hope to discourage people and nations. They launched the idea of cooperation and gave all persons of good will a tremendous impulse toward reconciliation and progress. The concept that the economic life of the Western World requires common ground rules which in the meantime has become generally accepted is the fruit and the result of that impulse.

"I do not mean any disrespect for the merits of all those theoreticians who labored for unification and reconciliation of Europe if I say that Europe as a political value and concept began with the Marshall plan. This is a historic truth. We should remember this today when a new appeal is being made to Europe for an enlarged Atlantic community. And there is something else which we must not forget: General Marshall's plan was a concept of peace and not a plan to begin a separation of East and West. It is indeed tragic that the dangers of war presented by the Korean crisis imposed all too soon new burdens on the nations of the world. Nevertheless, the success of the Marshall plan makes me hope that communism in Europe has been defeated once and for all. And this defeat was not the result of military or police action, but was brought about by the reestablishment of dignified human existence.

"We Germans in our divided country feel clearly the value of this success. Not because of the Marshall plan but, unfortunately, in spite of it, the division of the world by an Iron Curtain has been accentuated.

"It is a historical fact that people will only reunite for genuine cooperation if they can affirm a common, liberal, social, political, and ecenomic order and are prepared to defend it. This truth was confirmed by the refusal of the East bloc countries to participate in the Marshall plan. The idea of the plan was based on understanding and reconciliation. During the period 1947–62 the United States has given more than $32 billion in economic aid to the countries of Western Europe. Of this sum, the Federal Republic has received not less than $4.5 billion. Two-thirds of this amount was an outright gift from the American people, that is, from the American taxpayer. I am proud to be able to say that this magnanimous aid has not only been gratefully received in the Federal Republic but it also has been put to good use. This can be proven not only by economic statistics but even more by the close bond which has existed between the United States and the German people since that time.

"I have often emphasized that the moral help of the Marshall plan gave us Germans the confidence that we had not been written off, an assurance which, in retrospect, seems particularly valuable.

"I would like to mention two things which seem to me particularly important as far as the solidarity of the West and the well-being of all free people is concerned. By taking this approach I will explain the concept of the Marshall plan in a broader, but in my opinion logical, fashion. Everybody knows that the political face of the future world will depend essentially on the long-run attitude of the industrial nations of the world toward the problems of development aid.

"Also, we in Europe now have a possibly not recurring chance to apply again a great deal of the theory and practice of the Marshall plan for the benefit of the young Afro-Asian countries. We must help these nations to become self-supporting, exactly as the United States assisted a hopelessly prostrate Europe in those 16 years. Indeed, there is very much at stake and it is our duty to do not just everything possible but actually the very best possible.

"By our own experience we have learned—and the developing countries will have to appreciate this too—that assistance from outside must be accompanied by mutual confidence and by a determined fruitful cooperation. As controversial as these problems may appear today, the Europeans have not forgotten the times of the dollar drive; and the developing countries will do well in aiming at a similar improvement in production and in increased and intensified foreign trade. A healthy growth of free world economies offers a chance to the emerging countries to enter usefully into this process and at the same time to strengthen their readiness to recognize the principles of a free democracy as their own obligations.

"At that time we Europeans did not hesitate to take advantage of the technical knowledge and the modern methods of our American friends. Today technical aid is also offered by Europe, and it should be accepted in good will, even if it is offered in the form of social and economic policy and organization. And finally, like the United States which at that time, by giving approval to the founding of the European Economic Council, agreed to a discriminating liberalization of the Europeans among themselves, we should temporarily apply the same principle to the developing countries in order to encourage their free cooperation. As far as the principle of reciprocity is concerned, which appears to be unimpeachable for future tariff politicians, I should like to mention that with the first tariff reductions in GATT the United States offered a unilateral advantage to the Europeans inasmuch as the simultaneous tariff reductions on the European side were only of very low material value due to the sharp quantitative limitations on their imports.

"This we should remember when shortly we will be confronted with the question of whether the industrialized nations will be ready to give preferential treatment in the field of tariffs to the rest of the world. I know how difficult this will be. In examining the difficulties which we are challenged to meet on our side—especially the unifying political formula we Europeans have not yet found—it appears to be difficult to overcome national egotisms. But precisely this problem shows the inseparable association between politics and economy. A broad spirit and a strong moral power as embodied by George Marshall could bring hope and recovery to us Europeans in our entanglement. We sin against him if we isolate ourselves or even split up in Europe.

"This obligation presupposes that Europe really opens its doors to the world and does not merely pay lip service to this idea. Aid through trade may in the first place seem to be pure altruism, but in the long range and in reality it is a kind of selfish altruism. Trade aid will be of advantage not only to the developing countries but also to the importing Europe, even to the whole world. If this thesis were false, the idea of integration would be false in principle and as a whole. The lessons and experiences of the last decade would be false. Who would seriously venture to state that the division of labor would not be beneficial to all? It goes without saying that there are problems of adjustment and losses may occur here and there. But I consider it to be the duty of the governments of the industrialized world to answer for these consequences despite internal political difficulties. Each renunciation of natural production advantages—whether it be effective in developing countries, in the United States or in Europe—is expensive, too expensive, to allow protectionism.

"What is called division of labor in economic terms means integration and cooperation in the political field. This endeavor emerges from the insight that nations must have to unite their strengths and apply them in the right places. We gained this insight when the Marshall plan began to become effective, and we must maintain it. It would be a shameful disgrace for the newly strengthened Europe if it refused to exercise a world-open policy to the advantage of all. We know that we on both sides of the Atlantic will soon be called to trial if the so-called Kennedy-Round is to be successful. The good cooperation between you and our country preceding the GATT negotiations was in the spirit of George Marshall. During those 16 years supranational cooperation was intensified in many cases, but as yet Europe has not been built and therefore the Atlantic partnership is visible only in its beginnings. Let us turn to a significant problem that will have to be solved jointly by the United States and Europe. In only 6 years from now, the members of the European Economic Community will speak only with one voice in economic policy, and in the last analysis the language which Europe will then use will depend on political developments.

It seems that Europe is united—and I hope it is—in its dedication to creating a greater Atlantic community. The positive position of the Federal Government is beyond any doubt, but it will take much good will from all sides to lead the negotiations between the economic areas of the Common Market, the other free countries of Europe, the United States and the rest of the world to the desired successful end. We are happy about the fact that hate and envy among the people of the free world are diminishing. We must work and see that no new rivalry will emerge, rivalry concerning the leading role in continental Europe or just rivalry concerning the first place among equal partners. There is no place for mistrust of this kind when we reach a point where people come together and governments work together.

It was a fertile idea to have in OEEC all countries, big and small, rich or poor—even victors and losers of the war—sitting together as equals among equals to arrange our matters. There should be no question of who was a better friend of the other. It is an unbearable thought to anticipate that today the favor of one partner can be paid for automatically only by the disfavor of another partner. The Common Market is very well on its way to becoming a well-fitting organization of states—mainly in the economic field. In the political and military field there is at least a conviction which is held in common in its basic features. This is so far a benefiting factor. But it will last only if the political structure of Europe will mature at the same time. This structure will not grow automatically out of the progress of economic integration; it makes necessary an original political inclination. Only then can the Common Market get free from the reproach that it discriminates against others. It will not and should not be the idea of a closer cooperation of some countries to do harm to other countries. For myself, I can claim to have pointed out this view at the right time, especially to the United States. The Common Market, after all, will be more than just a customs union, as claim those who look at it as just an enlarged home market. It is a common market and there is nothing—really nothing—which could justify its separation from the outside in the long run. It would be bad if a common market would degenerate to a market which is satisfied with itself. It is not new—and we all were aware of it—that the customs union meant remarkable preferences to its members. But when we strive toward the goal of intensifying the world economy, we must draw our conclusions as early as possible; namely, that a too individual existence of a partnership is basically no better than the isolationism of national economic areas. The faster the economic union progresses, the more it is necessary to remove the pressure for isolation from the outside. On the contrary, the Common Market should make it a point to use every occasion to measure its own power and potential with the outside. Supranational regionalism is worse than a national one, because it comes in a modern package and pretends to have a good conscience. When I ask myself which alternatives we have, my decision is quickly made.

Let us take a look at today's world.

UNCLASSIFIED

"While Europe's position in trade and financial policy is growing stronger all the time, the United States is rendering the major portion of economic and military aid to the free world. Neither today nor in the foreseeable future will Europe be able to take the place of the United States in this respect. If we were aiming at a compensation between Europe and the United States by merely financial means, this would—in the best possible case—be only an interim solution. A harmonic and organic balance of a future world economy could not be guaranteed in this manner. Nothing, therefore, seems more appropriate than to aim at a solution which will become the final solution. We must see to it that the flow of trade corresponds to the flow of capital, that the European governments seriously explore all possibilities of how to make allowance to the desire for mutual assistance in the Atlantic cooperation during the future economic policy negotiations. Even though in connection with Marshall plan aid economic cooperation between peoples is asked for, we are not as shortsighted as to forget that this is only part of the relations between states and countries. Politics have to include all phases of life. And the better politics are able to take care of this, the more peacefully the world and the people in it will be joined. Our future decisions will have to be borne by the inner obligation to assist each other. Under the present obligation and determination for solidarity of the West, politics are a continual giving and receiving. George Marshall wanted to educate us toward this approach.

"During our darkest hour the American nation set an example for us on the meaning of solidarity. Let me, dear Mrs. Marshall (hochverehrte), add a personal confession. I am standing here not only as the chief of the Federal Government but even more as the man, the politician, who was particularly close in the fateful year of the beginning of the Marshall plan to your husband—the personality who has so well deserved of his country and of the whole world, and his associates (let me mention only Paul Hofmann as one out of many).

"I am proud and grateful if I may be convinced to have done justice to the spirit, the conceptions and the aims of George Marshall. If we do not want to perish from history, the name and figure of George Marshall must remain an obligation and an inspiration for the free world, particularly for us Germans. He is unforgotten."

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1395) for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. CEDERBERG were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. PILLION were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

## HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while I have the floor, I should like to compliment the conferees of the Senate on the bill encompassed in the pending conference report. As I understand the conference report on the Higher Education Facilities Act, this is one of the many education proposals before the Senate. I think this is one of the most important activities to come before the Senate and before the country.

I was quite interested this morning, in a briefing on other subjects, to hear mentioned that our competitors and antagonists, the Russians, are spending almost twice as much of their gross national product on education as this country is.

I predict that history will show that it is in this area that the real struggle will be determined—whether or not we do what needs to be done for the youth of this country in training and preparing them for the kind of world in which we live and shall live.

I compliment the Senator from Oregon for guiding this, and another bill in the same area, to what appears to be completion and enactment. I shall support the conference report. I think this is a very good start, at least, and a good Christmas present for a period when we have long been suffering delay in other legislative matters.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much. Senators have just listened to one of the great educators of America, who not only is a former president of the University of Arkansas, but the author of the Fulbright program in the field of education. I do not know of any program passed by the Congress in our generation that has meant so much to so many young people in this country as the Fulbright program.

I appreciate very much his support of the conference report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the words of the Senator. I realize that in this field, because of other questions, this is an especially difficult matter to get through conference. Not because of the merits of the bill, but for what I could say are irrelevant reasons, although they are not entirely irrelevant, it has been especially difficult to move forward. I think it is a great accomplishment to bring two bills in the field of education to completion just before adjournment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of urging the Senate to reject the conference report. I do so because, under the parliamentary situation which exists, the Senate cannot ask for another conference with the House on the so-called higher education bill and instruct its conferees to insist upon the retention in another conference of the Cooper-Ervin judicial review amendment until this is done. It would be my purpose to request a second conference with the House on the bill, and to have the Senate instruct its conferees to insist upon the inclusion of the judicial review amendment, if the Senate should reject the conference report.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and I are deeply grateful to our friend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for the many courtesies which he has extended to us in connection with this matter, and for giving us ample opportunity to advocate the wisdom of adopting our judicial review amendment.

I also appreciate very much the statement the distinguished Senator from Oregon made with reference to our devotion to the cause of education.

As a member of the school board in my hometown, as a member of the North Carolina Legislature, as a member of the boards of trustees of the University of North Carolina and Davidson College, and as a Member of the Congress, I have consistently supported all programs for education, other than the program embodied in the higher education bill. I have opposed this program because I believe that this bill, as it was phrased at the last session of Congress, and as it is phrased at present, gives religious denominations access to the Federal Treasury for the purpose of financing schools owned and operated by them. I conceive this to be a violation of the provisions of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States which declares that—

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Oregon that if I were not convinced that the House would not pass a judicial review bill in this field without some pressure being exerted upon its Members by the Senate, I would agree with him that it would perhaps be a better way to handle the problem to adopt a specific law in the nature of the bill introduced by him and our distinguished colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. However, the question whether authorization bills of this nature, and appropriation bills implementing such authorization bills, violate the first amendment to the Constitution has arisen every time one of these bills has been presented to Congress.

The very department which would administer these bills, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has stated that it has grave doubts as to whether a judicial review of this question could be obtained under existing law, because of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Massachusetts against Mellon, which is reported in 262 U.S. 447.

When this bill was originally presented to the House drafting subcommittee, it contained a provision for a judicial review of the constitutionality of grants and loans to be made under the bill.

The proponents of the bill in the House waged an all-out effort to remove that provision from the bill in its original form, and were successful in that endeavor. The proponents of the bill have fought on every occasion to make it as certain as they possibly can that there shall be no judicial review of grants or loans to church-owned, operated, or controlled colleges and universities under the provisions of the bill.

Therefore, I believe the only chance that the American taxpayers have to determine whether the provisions in the bill controvene the first amendment, insofar as they apply to church-owned, operated, or controlled colleges and universities, is to have such a provision written into the bill itself.

I am convinced that if a judicial review amendment is not written into the higher education bill, the American taxpayers will have great difficulty in obtaining an adjudication from any court as to whether or not the provisions of the bill authorizing grants and loans to church-owned, operated, or controlled colleges and universities are constitutional under the first amendment to the Constitution.

I do not have any faith that the case now pending in the Maryland court, involving grants or loans of State funds to religious colleges will reach the Supreme Court of the United States. The reason why I have no faith in that taking place arises from the fact that in recent years, namely, since the Everson decision was handed down, State courts have ordinarily held that financial aid from States to religious institutions violates State constitutions, and have ordinarily refrained from passing on the Federal question. I infer this to be so because of the disapproval by State courts of the obviously incorrect determination of the Everson case that the use of State tax moneys to reimburse parents for the cost of transporting their children to church schools does not offend the first amendment.

The only recent State court decision which passed on the Federal question is the case of Swart against South Burlington Town School District. This is a decision of the Supreme Court of Vermont, which is reported in 167 Atlantic, 2d series, at page 514.

The decision in the Everson case, which upheld the State law authorizing reimbursement to parents for the transportation costs they incurred in transporting their children to parochial schools, was a 5 to 4 decision. The majority in the Everson case stated that that State law was at the verge of the Constitution.

If that statute went to the verge of the Constitution, certainly a statute which would authorize the appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars to construct buildings for church owned or controlled or operated colleges and universities would go far beyond the verge of the Constitution.

I say that the Senate should reject the conference report so that a request may be made for another conference, and so that the Senate conferees may be instructed to insist at the other conference upon the inclusion of the judicial review amendment in the bill. If that is done, the House will know that the Senate wants the question of constitutionality settled, and settled speedily. It necessary for us to do this if we wish to make it certain that congressional appropriations for educational purposes are consistent with the first amendment.

The great cases dealing with this subject were discussed by the Senator from Kentucky and myself during the consideration of the bill upon its merits. I call attention at this time to only one or two cases dealing with the merits of the situation. I wish to refer briefly to the *Everson* case, 330 U.S. 1, as follows:

> The establishment of religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. * * * No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and state" * * *.

The most recent case dealing with the merits of this subject is Abington School District against Schempp, which was decided on June 19 of this year. I wish to read one passage from that decision.

I read an except from the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas in the case of Abington School District against Schempp:

> But the establishment clause is not limited to precluding the State itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the State to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone. Thus, the present regimes must fall under that clause for the additional reason that public funds, though small in amount, are being used to promote a religious exercise. Through the mechanism of the State, all of the people are being required to finance a religious exercise that only some of the people want and that violates the sensibilities of others.
>
> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it; and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.
>
> Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended; as this case illustrates, it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed; it says that "no law respecting an establishment of religion" shall be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.

The bill is wholly inconsistent with the declaration made by Mr. Justice Douglas in that statement, because it attempts to divorce the supposed secular activities of church colleges and universities from their religious activities, and to provide for financial support from the Federal Treasury only for their secular activities. As Mr. Justice Douglas said in the Abington case, and as the Supreme Court said in the case of *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, and *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, that cannot be done.

The Supreme Court has held that the first amendment prohibits either the Federal Government or the State government from assisting institutions of learning which blend religious and secular instruction. This being true, the proponents of this bill base their contention of its constitutionality upon the theory that Congress can separate what it calls the nonreligious, irreligious, or unreligious activities of a religious institution from its religious activities and finance the former but not the latter. This is exactly what the Supreme Court has said cannot be done. The constitutionality actually rests upon the question whether the grant or the loan is made to church-owned or controlled or operated college or university.

A number of recent decisions on this subject have been handed down in the State courts. One of the most illuminating of them is the case of Dickman against School District No. 62–C, Oregon City. This decision of the Supreme Court of Oregon is reported in 366 Pacific 2d series 533. The Constitution of Oregon provides that public money may not be used for the benefit of any religious institution. The Supreme Court of Oregon held in this most lucid decision that under that provision it was unconstitutional for the State of Oregon even to furnish secular textbooks to be used for instruction in secular subjects in a religious school.

In the Swart case, to which I alluded a moment ago, the Supreme Court of Vermont held that it was an unconstitutional blending of secular and religious instruction under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the State of Vermont to pay tax moneys to religious schools for providing secular instruction in such schools to high school students. These things being true, it is manifest that the bill offends the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I believe that the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] puts the same construction on the Mellon case that I do. Some persons construe the Mellon case to reach a ridiculous conclusion. They assert that those who drafted and ratified the Constitution provided that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, but decreed that the same Constitution disables Congress from passing any law which would confer upon Federal courts the power to determine whether that prohibition of the Constitution is being violated. With all due respect to those who take that position, I must say that such assertion does not give any credit to the intelligence of those who drafted and ratified the Constitution.

The reason why I say there should be a judicial review amendment written into the bill is the uncertainty that has been engendered in the minds of many persons concerning the interpretation of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447. That decision illustrates the fact that sometimes judges emulate the example of Senators and talk too much.

The only point in this case which has any relevancy for us is the portion of the decision which involves the claim set forth by Mrs. Frothingham, an individual plaintiff. Mrs. Frothingham merely sued as an individual to enjoin the execution of an appropriation of Federal funds for grants to the States for maternal benefits.

She did not sue on behalf of all the taxpayers. She did not sue on behalf of a class of taxpayers. She sued merely for her individual benefit and asked that the appropriation of Congress for this purpose be adjudged a violation of the Constitution. The Court held—and I believe quite properly held—that, under existing laws, applicable to a plaintiff seeking equitable relief in the form of an injunction, she failed to make a case in her complaint.

The relevant portion of the opinion, and the only portion which is not obiter dicta, is to be found on page 487 of the opinion, as follows:

> But the relation of a taxpayer of the United States to the Federal Government is very different. His interest in the moneys of the Treasury—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and indeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating, and uncertain, that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity.

When all is said, this decision merely recognizes and enforces the well-established proposition that under existing procedure when a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief in a Federal court, he must show that it is necessary for the court to issue an injunction, as prayed by him, to prevent him from suffering irreparable injury. That is as far as the decision of the Court actually goes.

However, the Court proceeded further to say, by way of dicta, that if one taxpayer could sue to enjoin the execution of one appropriation, other taxpayers could sue to enjoin the execution of all other appropriations, and that this would make it difficult for the Federal Government to operate. When the Mellon case is properly analyzed, however, it simply holds that since the plaintiff showed no standing to sue for equitable relief, she failed to state a cause of action.

The argument that Congress cannot enact a law which would authorize a taxpayer to sue to enjoin the consummation of a specific grant or specific loan is wholly inconsistent with many decisions of the Supreme Court.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to what the Supreme Court said on this point in the case of *Nashville, C. & St. L. Railway* v. *Wallace*, 288 U.S. 249, I read from page 259:

> After the jurisdictional statement required by Rule 12 was submitted, this Court, in ordering the cause set down for argument, invited the attention of counsel to the question "whether a case or controversy is presented in view of the nature of the proceedings in the State court." This preliminary question, which has been elaborately briefed and argued, must first be considered, for the judicial power with which this Court is invested by article 3, section 1, of the Constitution, extends by article 3, section 2, only to "cases" and "controversies"; if no "case" or "controversy" is presented for decision, we are without power to review the decree of the court below.

Mr. President, under this statement a suit which challenges the validity, under the first amendment, of the use of State funds or property for religious purposes constitutes a case or controversy within the meaning of the judiciary article of the Constitution. If this were not so, the Supreme Court could not have reviewed, as it did the State action involved in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1; *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306; *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203; *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421; and *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, handed down on June 17, 1963.

So the fact that the Supreme Court reviewed these five cases to determine whether the use of the State funds or State property involved in them violated the first amendment shows that each of them constituted a case or controversy within the meaning of the judiciary article of the Constitution; that is, Article 3.

It is well to remember that the lower Federal courts owe their existence to Congress, and that Congress can confer upon them jurisdiction to determine any case or controversy which involves the construction of a provision of the Constitution of the United States. I could take the time of the Senate to read a great many decisions to show exactly what a case or controversy is within the purview of the judiciary article of the Constitution. A case or controversy arises, under the Constitution of the United States, whenever the interpretation of a provision of the Constitution of the United States is necessary in order to determine conflicting claims of rights of adverse litigants.

Those who deny the power of Congress to provide for a judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans to church-owned or church-operated or church-controlled colleges or universities base their claim fundamentally on the proposition that no one has standing to sue.

As I construe the statements of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the provisions of the bill which he and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have introduced, which calls for such judicial review, I infer that he does not accept this conclusion, but, instead, accepts the conclusion that Congress can authorize a suit to be brought to determine this question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from North Carolina correctly states my position.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; that is what I understood.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I think the Morse-Clark bill should be passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Then why not put that provision in this bill?

Mr. ERVIN. That is exactly what I say should be done; and that is where the Senator from Oregon and I disagree as to what is the wise thing to do.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from North Carolina wants to lock the door before the horse gets out; is that correct?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, whereas the Senator from Oregon wants to lasso the horse after it has gotten out on the range—and on the range controlled by the House of Representatives, rather than by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The reason why I am not in favor of putting that provision in this bill is that I try to be an apt student of my great parliamentary teacher, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I know very well what would happen to this proposed legislation if we tried to proceed in that way. But I think in due course of time we will pass the Morse-Clark bill.

Mr. ERVIN. I hope so, because I believe it is a well-phrased bill. But I believe we would have to convert a majority of the 435 Representatives before we could secure passage of the bill. I am not so certain that they are susceptible to conversion on this specific point.

Mr. HILL. When the Senator says, "In due course of time," how much time is that? Has not provision been in the Constitution since 1787?

Mr. ERVIN. It was written in as the first amendment.

Mr. HILL. Yes, which was adopted very shortly after ratification of the Constitution.

Mr. ERVIN. In 1791.

Mr. HILL. In 1791?

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment was drawn up by the Congress which assembled in 1789.

Mr. HILL. The amendment became effective in 1791; is that not correct?

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That is 172 years ago.

Mr. ERVIN. It was written in the first amendment because the people of many States—notably the States of Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia—had been fighting over that very question before and after the Revolutionary War. The people wrote the amendment into the Constitution to put an end to that fight. I do not believe we should have to wage that same fight in the year 1963, since the question was supposed to have been settled in 1791, when the first amendment was written into the Constitution. But we shall have to renew and repeat the controversy at every session of Congress unless the Federal courts place an authoritative interpretation upon the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment.

Mr. HILL. Action was taken under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, was it not?

Mr. ERVIN. Exactly. James Madison drew the first amendment in order to make clear that what the people of Virginia had written into the Virginia Statute for Religious Liberty should be a part of the Constitution of the United States; namely, that people should not be taxed to support the dissemination of religious opinions which they did not believe.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. James Madison carried forward the effort to a successful conclusion and victory. He got into a battle which Thomas Jefferson had been waging prior thereto, is that not true?

Mr. ERVIN. That is true. Thomas Jefferson had been fighting for a number of years to have the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty written into the law of Virginia. It was a long fight, which started about 1776 when Virginia drew up its first constitution—after the Revolutionary War had started. Jefferson and Madison did not win the battle until 1784. It took them 7 years to win. We do not wish to spend 7 more years trying to persuade the House to adopt an amendment which would bring about a determination as to whether the House and Senate are violating the Constitution of the United States in passing bills of this nature.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will recognize as true, I am sure, that if the Ervin Cooper amendment were retained in the conference report, certain persuasion in behalf of the amendment would result which would not perhaps be available if the bill to which the Senator from Oregon has referred went to the House by itself.

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment would certainly operate both as a carrot and as a stick to persuade the House of Representatives to act in what I consider to be a righteous manner. There is nothing strange in the Cooper-Ervin amendment. As a matter of law, the amendment is virtually similar in all respects save one to a rule of procedure which has prevailed in Federal courts of equity from time immemorial. I refer to the procedure permitting class suits which was originally embodied in the Federal Equity Rules, and which is now incorporated in rule XXIII of the Rules of Civil Procedure prescribing the procedure of Federal district courts.

I ask unanimous consent that subsection (a) of rule XXIII of the Rules of Civil Procedure governing Federal district courts may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RULE 23. CLASS ACTIONS

(a) Representation: If persons constituting a class are so numerous as to make it impracticable to bring them all before the court, such of them, one or more, as will fairly insure the adequate representation of all may, on behalf of all, sue or be sued, when the character of the right sought to be enforced for or against the class is—

(1) joint, or common, or secondary in the sense that the owner of a primary right refuses to enforce that right and a member of the class thereby becomes entitled to enforce it;

(2) several, and the object of the action is the adjudication of claims which do or may affect specific property involved in the action; or

(3) several, and there is a common question of law or fact affecting the several rights and a common relief is sought.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the only substantial difference between that rule, which permits the bringing of class actions in instances when all the members of a class having a common interest in the same question of law are too numerous to be brought into court and the Cooper-Ervin amendment is that under rule XXIII of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the jurisdictional amount of $10,000 must be involved between each plaintiff and the defendant. Consequently the Cooper-Ervin amendment, for all practical purposes, would merely amend rule XXIII, so as to eliminate the requirement that the jurisdictional amount must be shown to exist between each plaintiff and the Federal Commissioner of Education.

So the Cooper-Ervin amendment is entirely in harmony with rule XXIII, which is nothing but a reembodiment of the previous Federal equity rule giving the Federal district courts jurisdiction of class actions.

There is clearly a case or controversy within the meaning of the judiciary article of the Constitution in any claim by a taxpayer that a Federal official, whom he seeks to sue, is expending tax money in violation of the provisions of the first amendment. By our amendment we merely seek to make certain that the taxpayer suing for himself and all other taxpayers shall have what we call standing to bring suit.

The courts have held in a number of cases that if a controversy between adverse claimants involves the interpretation of a provision of the Federal Constitution, a provision of an act of Congress, or a provision of a treaty, Congress has the power to confer upon the Federal courts jurisdiction to determine such controversy.

In many instances Congress has authorized the Federal Government to bring suit in cases in which the Federal Government has no pecuniary interest, insofar as the old doctrines of equity are concerned, and in which the Federal Government would not have power to bring such suit except for the act of Congress.

I wish to call attention, among other things, to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, which allow the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the

United States to postpone a strike which would threaten injury to the national health or safety.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the pertinent part of this statute be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 178. Strikes subject to injunction; inapplicability of sections 101–115 of this title; review.
>
> (a) Upon receiving a report from a board of inquiry the President may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out or the continuing thereof, and if the court finds that such threatened or actual strike or lock-out—
>
> (i) affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce; and
>
> (ii) if permitted to occur or to continue, will imperil the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any such strike or lockout, or the continuing thereof, and to make such other orders as may be appropriate.
>
> (b) In any case, the provisions of sections 101–115 of this title, shall not be applicable.
>
> (c) The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals and by the Supreme Court upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 346 and 347 of title 28. (June 23, 1947, 3:17 p.m. EDT, ch. 120, title II 208, 61 Stat. 155; June 25, 1948, ch 646 32(a), 62 Stat. 991; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, 127, 63 Stat. 107.)

Mr. ERVIN. The Supreme Court of the United States held that that statute is valid; that the citizens of the United States have a basic interest to have unimpeded for a period of time production in industries vital to the national health and safety; and that Congress can give the Attorney General standing to sue in the name of the United States to protect this interest of the citizens. The Supreme Court so held in *Steelworkers* v. *United States*, 361 U.S. 39. I read from page 43 of the opinion in that case:

> But the statute does recognize certain rights in the public to have unimpeded for a time production in industries vital to the national health or safety. It makes the United States the guardian of these rights in litigation.

A very interesting case on this point is the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Raines*, 362 U.S. 27, which interprets the provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 authorizing the Attorney General to sue to vindicate the private constitutional rights of citizens who are denied the right to register and vote. I call attention to this statement by the Supreme Court in that case:

> It is urged that it is beyond the power of Congress to authorize the United States to bring this action in support of private constitutional rights, but there is the highest public interest in the due observance of all the constitutional guarantees, including those that bear the most directly on private rights, and we think it perfectly competent for Congress to authorize the United States to be the guardian of that public interest in a suit for injunctive relief.

There is another interesting case on this point which holds that Congress can confer upon the Federal courts jurisdiction to entertain a suit in which a State challenges the constitutionality of the provisions of the Hatch Act insofar as the act requires the reduction of grants to the States for highway purposes for violation of the provisions of that act.

I refer to the case of *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission*, 330 U.S. 127. In this case the Court held that Congress acted within its constitutional authority to regulate the jurisdiction of the Federal courts when it enacted section 12(c) of the Hatch Act, conferring upon States the power to challenge the constitutionality of provisions of the Hatch Act decreasing grants to States for retaining in their service State employees guilty of violating the Hatch Act.

Since a grant is something in which nobody has any property right of any character, this case is a recognition of the constitutional power of Congress to confer a standing to sue upon a legal entity; namely, a State, even in the absence of any title to moneys which are to be covered by a prospective grant out of the Federal Treasury.

We find, upon consideration of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that the Court has recognized that not only can Congress confer upon the Federal Government the right to sue as guardian of the legal rights of citizens of the United States and upon the State the legal right to sue for the purpose of securing the full amount of a prospective grant to the State, but also that Congress can confer such a right upon individuals, having no property right in the subject of the action. One of the most interesting cases on this point is *Anti-Fascist Committee* v. *McGrath*, 341 U.S., 123. In this case there is a very illuminating concurring opinion by Justice Frankfurter, who states on page 151 that:

> Adverse personal interest, even of such an indirect sort as arises from competition, is ordinarily sufficient to meet constitutional standards of justiciability. The courts may therefore by statute be given jurisdiction over claims based on such interest.

Justice Frankfurter said further, on page 152 of his concurring opinion:

> A litigant ordinarily has standing to challenge governmental action of a sort that, if taken by a private person, would create a right of action cognizable by the courts. Or standing may be based on an interest created by the Constitution or a statute.

There are at least two decisions sustaining the power of Congress to confer upon an individual who has no property right the power to litigate a matter involving Federal law in the Federal courts. I refer to Commission against Sanders Radio Station, reported in 309 U.S. 470, and Scripps-Howard Radio against Commission, reported in 316 U.S. 4. I wish to read two extracts from the second of these cases:

> The Communications Act of 1934 did not create new private rights. The purpose of the act was to protect the public interest in communications. By section 402(b)(2) Congress gave the right of appeal to persons "aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected" by Commission action. But these private litigants have standing only as representatives of the public interest.
>
> That a court is called upon to enforce public rights and not the interests of private property does not diminish its powers to protect such rights.

If Congress can confer upon a mere applicant for a radio license or a prospective competitor of such an applicant statutory standing to sue as representatives of the public interest as it did in the Communications Act of 1934, it certainly can confer upon taxpayers the statutory power to sue to prevent the disbursement of tax moneys to church owned, operated, or controlled colleges or universities in violation of the first amendment.

I respectfully submit that the decisions I have cited sustain the proposition that whenever there is an actual controversy between a taxpayer and a Federal officer that the Federal officer is disbursing Federal tax moneys in violation of the Constitution, a controversy exists within the meaning of the judiciary article, and Congress has the power to confer a statutory power to sue the Federal officer upon any one individual taxpayer who has sufficient interest to apply to the Federal court to obtain an interpretation of the relevant constitutional provision and to prevent the disbursement of Federal tax moneys contrary to such provision.

There is a rather intriguing decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the second circuit in the case of *Associated Industries* v. *Ickes*, 134 Fed. 2d 694. This case involved an interpretation of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, and the opinion was written by Circuit Judge Frank. He says, at page 704:

> While Congress can constitutionally authorize no one, in the absence of an actual justiciable controversy, to bring a suit for the judicial determination either of the constitutionality of a statute or the scope of powers conferred by a statute upon Government officers, it can constitutionally authorize one of its own officials, such as the Attorney General, to bring a proceeding to prevent another official from acting in violation of his statutory powers; for then an actual controversy exists, and the Attorney General can properly be vested with authority, in such a controversy, to vindicate the interest of the public or the Government. Instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such proceedings, Congress can constitutionally enact a statute conferring on any nonofficial person, or on a designated group of nonofficial persons, authority to bring a suit to prevent action by an officer in violation of his statutory powers; for then, in like manner, there is an actual controversy, and there is nothing constitutionally prohibiting Congress from empowering any person, official or not, to institute a proceeding involving such a controversy, even if the sole purpose is to vindicate the public interest. Such persons, so authorized, are, so to speak, private attorney generals.

It is very interesting to note the statements dealing with this question by Dr. Bernard Schwartz, author of the most recent commentary on the Constitution of the United States, bearing the title "The Powers of Government."

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of Dr. Schwartz' book, volume 1, beginning at page 459, and ending at page 462, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SAME: STATUTORY STANDING

In *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, we saw, a State was held without standing to challenge the validity of a Federal statute appropriating moneys to be paid to the States for maternity benefits. In the more recent case of *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission*, on the other hand, a State was ruled to possess standing to attack the constitutionality of a Federal law providing for the withholding of Federal grants from States which refused to remove State officers who took an active part in political management or political campaigns. The relevant Federal agency had found that a member of the Oklahoma Highway Commission had engaged in the proscribed political activities and issued an order directing his removal. This order foreshadowed, if he were not removed, a further order that Federal highway grants be withheld from Oklahoma in an amount equal to 2 years' compensation of the State officer concerned.

Oklahoma brought an action in the Federal courts seeking review of the order which had been issued, asserting the unconstitutionality of the statute under which it had been made. Interestingly enough, the constitutional claim was essentially similar to that urged in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*—namely, that the Federal statute, so far as it attempted to regulate the internal affairs of a State, was an invasion of the rights reserved to the States under the Constitution. Yet, as already stated, Oklahoma, unlike Massachusetts in the earlier case, was held to have standing to raise this constitutional issue.

The sharp difference in result as between *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* and *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission* may be explained by the fact that the Federal statute in the latter case contained an express provision authorizing judicial review of any order issued under it by any party aggrieved. The Supreme Court ruled that a State like Oklahoma was such a party within the congressional intent and that, under the statutory review provision, it could attack the constitutionality of the statute. As the Court put it, "By providing for judicial review of the orders of the Civil Service Commission, Congress made Oklahoma's right to receive funds a matter of judicial cognizance. Oklahoma's right became legally enforceable. Interference with the payment of the full allotment of Federal highway funds to Oklahoma made the statutory proceeding to set aside the order a case or controversy between Oklahoma and the Commission whose order Oklahoma was authorized to challenge.

If the standing of the party initiating a constitutional action is essential to the existence of a "Case" or "Controversy" under article III, how can a statutory provision confer standing where, under *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, none would otherwise exist? And how can the Supreme Court say that the statutory proceeding makes for a "Case" or "Controversy" over which the judicial department has jurisdiction, when no such jurisdiction could constitutionally be exercised in the absence of the statutory standing provision?

In a suggestive opinion, Justice Douglas has implied that a statutory standing provision may not go so far as to make for a "Case" or "Controversy," where none would otherwise exist. According to him, unless one seeking to challenge a governmental act "can show that his individual interest has been unlawfully invaded, there is merely damnum absque injuria and no cause of action on the merits. * * * On that assumption I fail to see how an appeal statute constitutionally could authorize a person who shows no case or controversy to call on the courts to review an order of the Commission."

From the point of view of strict logic, it is difficult to rebut the Douglas position on the congressional power to confer standing where none would otherwise exist. The only answer which the Supreme Court has given to such position was expressed in the majority opinion in *Scripps-Howard Radio* v. *Federal Communications Commission*—the case in which the Douglas opinion quoted from was delivered in dissent. Referring there to the standing conferred by the Communications Act of 1934 to seek review of governmental action taken under that statute, the Scripps-Howard opinion states that the Act "did not create new private rights. The purpose of the Act was to protect the public interest in communications." That being the case, those private litigants whom the Comunications Act permitted to bring review actions "have standing only as representatives of the public interest."

What the High Bench is saying in Scripps-Howard is that, in an action brought to challenge the validity of governmental action, "the rights to be vindicated are those of the public and not of the private litigants." That is the case even though, in our system, the public interest in maintenance of the rule of law is normally vindicated in an ordinary lawsuit instituted by private litigants. "That a court is called upon to enforce public rights and not the interests of private property," said the Court, "does not diminish its power to protect such rights."

If, under Scripps-Howard, the action to secure judicial review of the validity of a governmental act vindicates the public interest, it should follow that the legislative department, as the representative of the public, can delegate the task of vindicating such public interest as it chooses. If it sees fit, it can confer such task upon some public official, such as the Attorney General, or even upon some private litigant, who might not otherwise possess standing.

The approach just expressed has been best articulated judicially in a remarkable opinion on the subject by Judge Jerome Frank. As he puts it: "While Congress can constitutionally authorize no one, in the absence of an actual justiciable controversy, to bring a suit for the judicial determination either of the constitutionality of a statute or the scope of powers conferred by a statute upon Government officers, it can constitutionally authorize one of its own officials, such as the Attorney General, to bring a proceeding to prevent another official from acting in violation of his statutory powers; for then an actual controversy exists, and the Attorney General can properly be vested with authority, in such a controversy, to vindicate the interest of the public or the Government. Instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such proceedings, Congress can constitutionally enact a statute conferring on any nonofficial person, or on a designated group of nonofficial persons, authority to bring a suit to prevent action by an officer in violation of his statutory powers; for then, in like manner, there is an actual controversy, and there is nothing constitutionally prohibiting Congress from empowering any person, official or not, to institute a proceeding involving such a controversy, even if the sole purpose is to vindicate the public interest. Such persons, so authorized, are, so to speak, private Attorneys General."

As seen in section 165, the United States has a direct interest in insuring compliance with the organic instrument. That being the case, an action seeking to insure such compliance, brought by a Federal official, such as the Attorney General, who is duly authorized by the Congress to institute such action, presents a justiciable controversy. Following the Frank view, Congress may, instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such action, enact a statute conferring upon some private citizen authority to bring suit. When such a suit is brought, such "private attorney general" is vindicating, not his own personal interest (which may not be affected at all by the governmental act which is challenged), but that of the public, asserted in accordance with the governing provision enacted by the people's representatives. If that is true, there is still an actual controversy whenever the public interest is asserted by a duly authorized congressional delegate.

If the Frank approach just outlined is followed, it makes for a different result in a case like *Muskrat* v. *United States*, discussed in section 156. There the Supreme Court ruled that it was beyond the judicial power to entertain what was essentially a test case framed by the Congress. The legislative department was held without authority to create a "case" or "controversy" by statute merely by stating a constitutional issue and designating parties who might raise it. Under the Frank approach just discussed, such a congressional statute could be sustained on the theory that those designated possess the standing of "private attorneys general" vindicating the congressional interest in insuring compliance with the basic document.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I invite attention to footnote 933, which is appended to that portion of Dr. Schwartz' commentary which appears at page 382 of volume 2 of his most illuminating work. He gives this footnote:

> Under this approach, proposed statutes authorizing taxpayers to sue to challenge Federal aid to education, where, under *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* and *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, no one would otherwise have standing, would be valid.

The judicial review amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and myself is a simple amendment. It would make certain that there would be no delay in bringing such actions, because it provides that before making a specific loan or grant under the bill, the Federal Commissioner of Education must publish in the Federal Register a notice of his intention to do so.

The bill provides that any taxpayer who desires to contest the constitutionality of the proposed loan or grant may sue to determine its constitutionality in a suit which must be brought before the date specified by the Federal Commissioner of Education in the notice which he publishes in the Federal Register. The taxpayer can bring the suit in behalf of himself and other taxpayers against the Federal Commissioner of Education only, and he must bring it in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

This provision is to prevent the Federal Commissioner of Education from being harassed by suits throughout the United States.

The amendment undertakes to prevent a multiplicity of suits even in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. To this end, it provides that if two or more suits are brought to challenge the constitutional validity of the same proposed grant or loan, the District Court can consolidate all such suits for the purpose of a single trial and judgment.

The amendment would take care of any proposed loan or grant to a specific college by providing that when the suit is brought, the Federal Commissioner of Education shall hold the amount of the proposed loan or grant in escrow until the suit is determined.

Under an existing statute, any decision adverse to the Federal Commissioner of Education could be appealed directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, without first being heard by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Such direct appeal would lie from a decision adverse to the Federal Commissioner of Education under the provisions of section 1252 of title 28 of the United States Code.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of this statute inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States Code, title 28, page 5012:

**1252. Direct appeals from decisions invalidating acts of Congress**

Any party may appeal to the Supreme Court from an interlocutory or final judgment, decree or order of any court of the United States, the U.S. District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and any court of record of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, holding an act of Congress unconstitutional in any civil action, suit, or proceeding to which the United States or any of its agencies, or any officer or employee thereof, as such officer or employee, is a party.

A party who has received notice of appeal under this section shall take any subsequent appeal or cross-appeal to the Supreme Court. All appeals or cross-appeals taken to other courts prior to such notice shall be treated as taken directly to the Supreme Court.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, to recapitulate, in my considered judgment, it is necessary to have the Cooper-Ervin amendment, providing for judicial review, inserted in the higher education bill before it is enacted into law. I say this because I have no hope that we shall be able to obtain enactment, within any reasonable period of time, of a separate bill providing for judicial review of the constitutionality of the loans or grants authorized by the bill.

The amendment is simple. It provides for speedy trial. It prevents a multiplicity of actions. It prevents the Federal Commissioner of Education from being harassed by suits all over the country. It provides, in harmony with existing law, that any decision which is adverse to the Federal Commissioner of Education with respect to any particular proposed loan or grant can be reviewed directly by the Supreme Court of the United States, without intervention by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

I do not believe a more simple, direct, adequate, or speedy method of obtaining a Court review can be obtained than that set forth in the Cooper-Ervin amendment.

Regardless of how they may view the question of whether grants or loans should be authorized by the bill to church owned, controlled, or operated colleges or universities, Senators should join in voting down the conference report and requesting a new conference, and insisting on the insertion of the amendment in the bill. This is true because we ought not to legislate in constitutional darkness; we ought to legislate in constitutional light. Then we shall know how far we can go, and what appropriations are valid, and what appropriations, if any, are invalid.

It seems to me that Senators, who have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States should favor the judicial determination, as provided in the amendment, of this grave constitutional question, so that they may not have to argue again the question that Thomas Jefferson thought had been resolved when he persuaded the Virginia Legislature to adopt the Virginia statute for religious liberty, and which James Madison thought had been resolved when the first amendment was written into the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, I apologize for having left the Chamber three times when the Senator from North Carolina was speaking; but it was only because I had to answer official calls. I did not want to miss any of the Senator's legal views.

With reference to the legal argument of the Senator from North Carolina, he does not find the Senator from Oregon in disagreement.

I shall do the best I can to see to it that that legal argument is put to work when the hearings are held on the Morse-Clark judicial review bill. If the Senate votes down the Senator's motion this afternoon—as I pray it will—I wish the Senator from North Carolina to know that I believe he should open the hearings as the first witness on the Morse-Clark bill.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his remarks. One reason why I made my presentation was to call to the attention of Senators the fact that there are some Members of the Senate and some news commentators who do not agree with the Senator from Oregon and me on the constitutional power of Congress to enact a statute such as the judicial review amendment, proposed by the Senator from Kentucky and myself, or a statute conforming to the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina has very generously referred to the motion under discussion as the Cooper-Ervin amendment. In truth, the senior Senator from North Carolina developed the amendment to the bill which I cosponsored, providing for judicial review, and which it is hoped will be adopted by the Senate and by the conference, if our initial motion to reject the conference report should be adopted.

When the bill was before the Senate in October, the Senator from North Carolina and I discussed at great length and in detail the history and background of the first amendment, which led him to the belief, as it has led me, that the provision of general aid to church schools in the bill before the Senate is unconstitutional. We gave our reasons for the support of the amendments which had been offered by us and which have been referred to as the Ervin-Cooper amendments.

Therefore, today I do not intend to deal at great length with the same subject matter.

Nevertheless, I believe it is important to provide some background for the situation which faces Senators today.

I have the highest regard for the senior Senator from Oregon, as he knows, not only for his devotion to education, but also for his great legal ability. I am appreciative that the Senator from Oregon has referred so kindly to my interest and devotion to the cause of education. I had the honor of serving as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the Senator from Oregon, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was my happy privilege to participate in the development of several bills in aid of education which were enacted, among them, notably, the National Defense Education Act. In 1947, I joined with Senator Taft in sponsoring one of the first bills designed to provide assistance to States for elementary schools which passed the Senate. Again, in 1953, I introduced a similar bill, which was accepted by the committee, but was not acted upon by the Senate.

It is difficult for me to oppose an education bill, for I believe that education is one of the most important problems before the Nation.

I know that our colleges are in difficulty, whether they be public, or private, or religious. They need additional funds for the construction of facilities and for their teachers. Church colleges contribute to the richness of our educational system, and to its spiritual values, and without them our educational system could not be as full, as rich, and as helpful to our free system, and to our society.

All of these realities make it difficult to oppose this bill, as one thinks of the great needs of our educational institutions and their importance to our country.

Nevertheless, we are faced, as I see it, with the question—not a simple question, but certainly a direct question—whether Congress has the authority to provide tax funds to church schools.

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table from the Educational Directory, 1962-63, part 3, Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, page 13, providing statistics concerning the number of public institutions of higher learning, and denominational institutions of higher learning in our country over a period of years.

The figures for 1962-63 indicate that there were 482 Protestant schools, 435

Roman Catholic schools, and 25 others. A footnote states that the 25 include Greek Orthodox, interdenominational, Jewish, Latter-day Saints, Russian Orthodox, and one Unitarian. I believe this table will show that the problem of aid to church schools cuts across the whole framework of all our denominations, not merely one or two.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Public and denominational institutions of higher education in the United States, 1938–63*

| Year | Tota. | Public | | Private | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | State | District or city | Independent of church | Denominational | | | |
| | | | | | Protestant | Roman Catholic | Jewish | Other |
| 1962–63 | 2,100 | 398 | 345 | 515 | 482 | 335 | ---------- | [1]25 |
| 1961–62 | 2,040 | 393 | 328 | 512 | 475 | 308 | ---------- | [2]24 |
| 1960–61 | 2,028 | 389 | 314 | 520 | 496 | 303 | 6 | ---------- |
| 1959–60 | 2,011 | 387 | 311 | 520 | 494 | 294 | 5 | ---------- |
| 1958–59 | 1,957 | 386 | 291 | 509 | 486 | 280 | 5 | ---------- |
| 1953–54 | 1,851 | 367 | 279 | 486 | 471 | 243 | 5 | ---------- |
| 1948–49 | 1,728 | 362 | 206 | 466 | 472 | 217 | ---------- | ---------- |
| 1943–44 | 1,702 | 360 | 201 | 453 | 480 | 208 | ---------- | ---------- |
| 1938 | 1,686 | 352 | 196 | 445 | 502 | 190 | ---------- | ---------- |

[1] Includes 1 Greek Orthodox, 9 interdenominational, 8 Jewish, 6 Latter-day Saints, 2 Russian Orthodox, and 1 Unitarian.

[2] Same as note 1 except as follows: 6 Jewish, 5 Latter-day Saints.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, all of us are familiar with the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The first amendment was directed against the Federal Government, and against the Congress. The 14th amendment has made the 1st amendment effective against the States.

One cannot find many decision of the Supreme Court, except in recent years, interpreting the first amendment as it related to action by the Congress, or by the States. As I said when I spoke in October, I believe there is good reason for this.

The States abandoned the early practice of establishing State churches, which, curiously enough, was the practice of some of the original colonies in the early days of our Republic. Many States adopted constitutional prohibitions against aid to church schools.

The question of Federal aid to church schools has not been directly before the Court.

I believe that one of the reasons it has not reached the Supreme Court is that Congress has respected the prohibition of the first amendment until it acted upon this bill, which provides full aid to church schools.

A second reason is that there is great difficulty in bringing congressional action before the Supreme Court for a constitutional decision—unless the Congress adopts the amendment offered by Senator ERVIN and myself.

I shall not attempt to cover the entire judicial history of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment, but in the Everson case, which brought in issue the constitutionality of the use of State tax funds, the Supreme Court determined the basic principle. It stated the constitutional principle to be this:

> No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt, to teach or practice religion.

The Supreme Court, by a decision of 5 to 4 in the Everson case, upheld the use of State tax funds for the transportation of pupils to parochial schools. The Court made its decision upon the ground that tax funds were not provided for the general use of church schools, but were of direct benefit to the child, and only incidentally beneficial to the school itself.

In a number of cases since that time, the Supreme Court has upheld the principle of the Everson case again and again. In the recent Prayer cases—and while many may disagree with that decision it is, nevertheless, the decision of the Supreme Court—one of the grounds upon which the Court held that religious exercises could not be conducted was that the school building was constructed by tax funds and, therefore, such exercises fell within the prohibition of the first amendment. If religious exercises cannot be held in a school building constructed by taxes, I submit it is incongruous for the Congress to provide literally hundreds of millions of dollars to church colleges to build practically any building, even to start a church college.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Was there not another factor present in that decision, besides the recital of a prayer or the reading of the Bible in a building constructed by public funds? Was it not that attendance in that building by the students concerned was compulsory?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I appreciate the Senator's comment. I have used the prayer decisions as an illustration. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the prayer issue.

Mr. MILLER. I thought I should point out that other factors were present.

Mr. COOPER. Actually, the Supreme Court said there were only two factors: First, the direction of a prayer by a State; and, second, the use of a school building erected by tax funds. So I should have to disagree with the Senator from Iowa to the extent that compulsory attendance was a ground of the decision. I have just read the decision again, for perhaps the 50th time.

Mr. MILLER. When the Court spoke about a school constructed by public funds, it was not talking about a school at which attendance was voluntary; it was talking about a school at which attendance was mandatory.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question on that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. When all is said and done, does not this question come down basically to taxation; and is not all taxation compulsory?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

We are dealing with a bill which provides large sums for grants and loans for the general purposes of public and private colleges and universities, including church schools. Without question, tax funds are to be used. Without question, if the bill is enacted, and if no means are provided to determine the constitutionality of the use of such funds, they will be made available to church-related schools for their general purposes.

In view of the unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court relating to the use of State tax funds, I believe it would be only right and proper that Congress adopt this necessary amendment which Senator ERVIN and I propose to permit the Supreme Court, if there is any question, to determine whether the grant or loan of public tax funds to church colleges is constitutional.

And may I say: We are not facing this question without landmarks, without signposts, held up for us to see.

I shall call attention to some of these signposts. They have been provided by the Supreme Court during the past 16 years. I start with the Everson case, in which the question presented was the use of State tax funds for a very limited purpose—to pay for the transportation of students to parochial schools. The Court laid down the general principle in these words:

> No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt, to teach or practice religion.

In that case, the Court itself said, in approving the use of tax funds for the purpose of transportation by a 5 to 4 vote, that it went to the verge of constitutionality. In dealing with the use of State tax funds cases since then, the constitutional principle of the Everson case has been affirmed.

In a later case, Zorach against Clauson, Justice Douglas stated:

> The Government may not finance religious groups, nor undertake religious instruction, nor blend secular sectarian education, nor use secular institutions to force one or some religion on any person.

The provision in this bill which attempts to separate the use of tax funds, prescribing they may not be used for the construction of classrooms where religious subjects are taught, does not avoid the language I have just quoted, relating to an institution in which there is a blending of secular and nonsecular instruction.

Now I come to the case of School District of Abington Township, Pennsylvania, and others, against Edward Lewis Schempp, and others, and William J. Murray III, and so forth, and others, petitioners, against John N. Curlett, president, and others, individually and constituting the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City, decided June 17, 1963. This is one of the decisions concerning religious exercises in public tax-supported schools. I do not attempt to argue the substance of the prayer cases; but in this case, in which the decision was 8 to 1, the opinion written by Mr. Justice Clark has this to say:

> These regimes violate the establishment clause in two different ways. In each case the State is conducting a religious exercise; and, as the Court holds, that cannot be done without violating the "neutrality" required of the State by the balance of power between individual, church, and state that has been struck by the first amendment. But the establishment clause is not limited to precluding the State itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the State to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone. Thus, the present regimes must fall under that clause for the additional reason that public funds, though small in amount, are being used to promote a religious exercise. Through the mechanism of the State, all the people are being required to finance a religious exercise that only some of the people want and that violates the sensibilities of others.
>
> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it; and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.
>
> Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended; as this case illustrates, it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed; it says that "no law respecting an establishment of religion" shall be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.

This language is found in the decision of the Court on June 7, 1963. It is dictum, but it warns the Congress as well as the States.

I can only say that we will not make our decision today blindfolded. We have before us these recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

Today, the Senator from North Carolina and I are endeavoring to persuade the Senate to vote to give the Supreme Court a chance to pass upon this constitutional question. That is important, because for the first time we are embarking upon a program which will lead to the expenditure of billions of dollars to assist church and public schools, when we cannot adequately provide for public schools.

If it is constitutional, I would have no opposition to this proposal, because I realize the importance of education, which has been one of my great interests all my life and also throughout my service in Congress. As I have stated, I have had the opportunity to serve as a member of the board of trustees of a public institution—the University of Kentucky; and as a member of the board of trustees of a church-related college, which I attended for a year; and as a member of the Yale Council. Perhaps this measure would affect all of them. Certainly this principle is at stake.

With the decisions of the Supreme Court available to us—prohibiting the use of State tax funds for the general purpose of church schools—it would be a travesty if Congress were to permit a bill such as this one, which would provide hundreds of millions of dollars, to be enacted without providing the Supreme Court authority to determine whether Congress can constitutionally appropriate funds for this purpose.

We have passed bills which I have helped write, and I have supported, providing scholarships regardless of the colleges or universities the recipients attend. I think such bills are constitutional, for they go to the direct benefit of the individual who makes his or her free choice of college or university.

I have helped write, and I have supported, college housing bills, because I believe they provide direct benefits to the students. I believe the principle would also apply to church hospitals, for their first purpose is the benefit of their patients.

But this bill is the first of its kind. It proposes general loans and grants to church colleges. Under all the decisions of the Supreme Court, I do not see how we can possibly permit this measure to be passed without providing the Supreme Court authority to pass upon its constitutionality.

I hope very much that the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and myself will be agreed to.

If it is not, I hope the Supreme Court will examine the issue in a much broader way than it did in the case of Massachusetts against Mellon, in which the Court decided there was no justiciable issue on which it could decide the constitutional question. As the Court was willing to decide the prayer cases upon the constitutional question, I hope very much that regardless of the action Congress may take upon our motion, the issue will come before the Supreme Court; that the Court will go to the merits; that it will take the position that a justiciable issue is presented under the first amendment; and that it will determine whether the type of aid provided in this bill is prohibited by this first amendment, so that the Congress will know the path to travel.

I am sorry the opposition, whether in the Senate or House, are not willing to open up this path, and provide the Supreme Court with the express authority to pass upon this issue arising under the first amendment.

We are indebted to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] for his presentation of this matter; and I believe that the people of the country are likewise indebted to him.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I commend the Senator from Kentucky for his fine argument, and also for his presentation of the merits of this question in October. In my judgment, he merits the thanks of the American people for his endeavor to fight for the presentation of what Mr. Justice Jackson said is one of the most basic rights; namely, the right not to be taxed for the support of activities which contravene the first amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. He knows the high regard in which I hold him and his work and his efforts in behalf of education. However, I feel that the pending conference report is directly in violation of the Constitution and is a complete negation and defeat of the fundamental principle of the separation of church and State.

I wish to associate myself with the very able and excellent presentations made this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina is one of the ablest lawyers with whom I have been privileged to serve in my long years in this body. Formerly, he was a justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina. He has carefully studied this question and has given to it his devoted and indefatigable efforts. He has presented to the Senate the cases from the courts, showing how clearly the pending conference report is contrary to, and in violation of, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has ably and compellingly confirmed and ratified all that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina had to say. He has sustained his position with pertinent quotations and citations from our courts, making out the case so clearly against the conference report.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I have served for many years on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that the cause of education has no better friend than the Senator from Kentucky. He and I have been associated in our efforts and in the battles which we fought to promote the cause of education to help the schools of this country. I well recall that he and I worked side by side and fought side by side in our efforts to provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. We were comrades in arms in the battle for the National Defense Education Act and many other acts which have been enacted by Congress to promote the cause of education.

He and I have been cooperating and fighting side by side.

The Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky have cited many cases. They have covered the subject so thoroughly and compellingly that they have left little to be said.

However, I wish to emphasize two quotations from the Supreme Court of the United States that go to the heart of the question before us.

Four times in the past 16 years; namely, in the Everson case, the *McCollum* case, 333 U.S. 203; the *McGowan* case, 366 U.S. 420; and the *Torcaso* case, 367 U.S. 488; the Supreme Court of the United States has expressly declared that the first amendment means at least these things:

> Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and state."

This was well emphasized by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky, but I wish to reemphasize it myself. The Court in the Abingdon School District Case—we find these words:

> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it, and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church, either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities, is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.
>
> Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended, as this case illustrates, it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed, it says that "no law respecting an establishment of religion" shall be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.

Mr. President, when we read the language before us in the conference report which provides that these funds may go for "construction—except in the case of public community colleges and public technical institutes—to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for use as a library."

We see how broad and how wide is the authority to make grants and how grants can be made without any question to do the very thing that the Supreme Court has declared in clear and specific language cannot be done under the first amendment of the Constitution. To make these grants would be to contravene that amendment. It would be not to simply impair the wall of separation between church and state but indeed it would be to tear down that wall between church and state.

As both the Senators from North Carolina and Kentucky have said, this provision of the first amendment does not prohibit funds to any one religion or to any one religious controlled, owned or dominated or related school. It applies to all schools, all colleges, all institutions of learning that are in any way connected with, related to, owned or controlled by a church or religious organization. It applies to all denominations.

That which we plead for today is to hold fast to the first amendment, which prohibits grants to any religious controlled, dominated, or owned institutions. Surely the least we can do is to stand fast by the Ervin-Cooper amendment and take this matter to the Supreme Court of the United States where it can be tested and tried under the decisions and the language of the Court. The Senate by a substantial majority voted to amend the bill, with the Ervin-Cooper amendment when the bill was before the Senate. If there were good reason, good logic, and good compulsion for voting it in the bill at that time, surely there is all the more logic, all the more reason, and all the more compulsion for insisting that it be in the bill now, because the proposed grants have been very much increased and the fields in which they would operate have been very much broadened.

Under the language of the bill now, a grant can be made to a school for nearly any purpose because these buildings can be used for nearly any purpose. In the bill as considered by the Senate the use of those buildings was limited. It had the language, "to be used only," but that language is now stricken out so that the buildings can be used for nearly any purpose a school might see fit to use them.

So, Mr. President, standing squarely with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I urge that the conference report be sent back to conference with an insistence on the part of the Senate that the Ervin-Cooper amendment be agreed to and that we not be in the position of passing legislation which, is in contravention of and strikes down the first amendment to the Constitution. It strikes down the wall of separation between church and state. Let us stand squarely by the Constitution of the United States as we have solemnly sworn to do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, provided that in doing so he does not lose the right to the floor?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and I do so after consultation with all interested parties with whom I was able to get in touch—that the vote on the conference report on higher education be had at 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first will be on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, can the distinguished majority leader assure me that I will have at least 15 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that a few Senators wish to speak on this subject. I will do my best, if need be, to prolong the time.

Mr. PROUTY. With that understanding, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for the information of the distinguished majority leader, I do not intend to speak for more than 10 minutes. As I told the majority leader, I do not wish to be limited, but I believe I can cover what I have to say in that time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator what was the request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the vote be taken at 4 o'clock on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the distinguished majority leader consulted with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] about this request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Is it perfectly agreeable to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is. I would not think of doing this without consulting both the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HILL. I wished to be certain of that.

Mr. COOPER. That was the question I had in mind—as to whether the Senator from North Carolina had been consulted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

---

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield briefly, so that the Senator from South Carolina may present a House amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

## OFFICE SPACE, SUPPLIES, EQUIPMENT, AND FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR MRS. JACQUELINE BOUVIER KENNEDY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there is at the desk a House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 9291, which I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9291) entitled "An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes," which was, in lieu of the matter proposed in the Senate amendment insert the following:

That all mail matter sent by post by Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, the widow of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, under her written autograph signature or facsimile thereof, shall be conveyed within the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico free of postage during her natural life. The postal revenues shall be reimbursed each fiscal year, out of the general funds of the Treasury, in an amount equivalent to the postage which otherwise would be payable on such mail matter.

SEC. 2. For a period of twelve months following the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall furnish to Mrs. Kennedy suitable office space appropriately furnished, supplied, and equipped, as determined by the Administrator, at such place within the United States as Mrs. Kennedy shall specify. The supplies to be furnished shall include a sufficient quantity of envelopes marked "Postage and Fees Paid" to be used for international mail. For the same period, the Administrator of General Services shall, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, provide for an office staff for Mrs. Kennedy. Persons employed under this section shall be selected by Mrs. Kennedy and shall be responsible only to her for the performance of their duties. Mrs. Kennedy shall fix basic rates of compensation for persons employed for her under this section. Such compensation, in the aggregate, shall not exceed $50,000 during such period. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each person employed under this section in a position on the office staff of Mrs. Kennedy shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, but shall not be held or considered to be an officer or employee of such Government for any other purpose.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the United States Secret Service, is authorized to protect the person of Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children for such period of time, not in excess of two years, immediately following the enactment of this Act as she may request.

SEC. 4. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this Act and to pay not to exceed $15,000 toward the expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including undertakers' charges and the expenses of transportation, the sum of $65,000, to remain available until June 30, 1965. No payment shall be made from this appropriation to any officer or employee of the Government for personal or professional services. Appropriations now or hereafter available to the United States Secret Service shall be available for the purposes of section 3 of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the House amendment would amend the text of H.R. 9291 by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting a new text.

The first section of the amendment adds a sentence providing reimbursement of postal revenues for franked mail authorized by the section, in order to correct an omission from the bill as passed by the House and the Senate. This is a technical amendment.

Section 2 of the amendment provides a 12-month period during which the widow of the late President Kennedy will be furnished office space, equipment, and staff, as in the Senate enactment. The amendment retains the limitation of $50,000 on aggregate staff salaries as passed by both Houses, but adds a clause at the end of the section spelling out that no person employed on such staff shall be considered an officer or employee of the Government, except as to civil service retirement, disability compensation, and Government life insurance coverage. This clause is a clarifying amendment.

Section 3 of the amendment authorizes Secret Service protection for the widow and minor children for not over 2 years after enactment, in lieu of the 1-year limitation contained in the bill as first passed by the House and the omission of any limitation in the Senate enactment.

Section 4 of the amendment appropriates $65,000 to carry out the purposes of the act, of which not in excess of $15,000 may be applied to expenses incident to the death and burial of former President Kennedy; prohibits any payment from such appropriation to any Government officer or employee for personal or professional service; and makes regular appropriations of the U.S. Secret Service available for protection of the widow and minor children under section 3. The $15,000 maximum for funeral expenses replaces the $5,000 provided in the Senate-passed bill.

Advice from the administration is to the effect that the estimate of $5,000 for funeral expenses previously submitted is too low but that the new maximum of $15,000 will be adequate.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 81, 82, and 91 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 84 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Fereno Molnar;

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin;

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6001. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia;

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa;

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli;

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 6975. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio and Vittoria Maida;

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown; and

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

## HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

**Mr. ALLOTT.** Mr. President, there is before the Senate for consideration the question of the adoption of the conference report on the bill for aid to higher education. Basically, though not entirely, it comes to the Senate upon one issue. That issue is the elimination of the Ervin-Cooper amendment, which was adopted in the Senate by a substantial majority, the effect of which would be to permit anyone to sue in order to test the constitutionality of a grant to a private education institution. The Senate now is concerned primarily with aid to religious institutions.

I believe it is important to go into the background of the first amendment to the Constitution and why it exists.

The Constitution provides:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The framers of that language had in mind the sad and sorrowful history of the world, in which religions of all kinds—we are not pointing at any one religion—had been coupled inextricably with governments.

I am sure the Jewish people of this world under a half dozen—perhaps under dozens—of religions have good cause to remember the sad effects upon their race of such connections.

When our forefathers came to this country, they wished to establish a government under which the people would have freedom of religion. The issues finally peaked into the makings of a revolutionary war. Then followed the adoption of the Constitution and the first 10 amendments, and our forefathers brought the issue squarely to the fore.

In the first amendment they said:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.

My colleagues, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, have expressed the question far more eloquently and in far more detail than I could ever hope to express it.

The question is whether we believe the principle which our forefathers adopted in the first amendment is worth keeping, or whether we shall squirm and rationalize around it, and ignore its purposes.

I am fully aware of the consequences of my remarks today, and of remarks I have made previously in the Senate with respect to this question. Anyone who opposes the proposal brings down upon himself the pressure of every private school and every religious school in the country. I am sure that Senators who voted and spoke in behalf of the Ervin-Cooper amendment have found this to be so.

With respect to the first amendment to the Constitution, I personally believe it means exactly what it says. I invite particular attention to the constitution of the State of Colorado, because it is only one of many constitutions which contain similar provisions. Article 9, section 7, relates to "Aid to private schools, churches, sectarian purpose, forbidden."

It states:

> Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian society, or for any sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property, ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

So far as any moneys which come to the State of Colorado are concerned, the purpose of this section is clear. The distribution of it to any private school, religious or not, would be forbidden unequivocally by the State of Colorado, under section 7 of this article.

Many other States have similar clauses in their constitutions.

Today we are trying to determine whether or not we would absolutely preclude—as I believe we would under this bill—assistance to the colleges in a given State, while we would inequitably help institutions of higher learning in those few States which do not have such a prohibition in their constitutions.

Let us take a look at the bill as it is now before the Senate. There is a very great technical deficiency in the bill. It states, in section 104(a):

> Of the funds to be allotted for any fiscal year for use in providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.

Except for the elimination of the public community colleges and public technical institutes, this provision covers every institution of higher learning.

Then it is stated, in subsection (b) of section 104:

> The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share.

This is as near as the bill comes to saying to whom the Federal moneys shall be paid. I assume it means the Federal moneys shall be paid to the States for reallotment, who in turn, will pay them to their schools and institutions of higher learning. If that is so, not only the Colorado constitution, but the constitutions of many other States, specifically forbid such a repayment.

How many States have such clauses? Ten? Twenty? Thirty? Forty? By this bill, shall we enact a law to support higher educational institutions in the remaining 10, or 20, or whatever the number may be, and forbid aid to all other States until they have amended their constitutions so that the States can support religious institutions, and in effect coerce them into changing their constitutions?

Under section 105, the bill provides that the Commissioner shall approve any such plan which:

> (1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission.

It is brought back under the direct jurisdiction of the State. What is to be done with States that have in their constitutions provisions similar to what Colorado has? There are many of them.

Subsection (5) of section 105 reads: "provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the State commission adversely affecting such applicant."

Subsection (6) of section 105 reads: "provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this title."

I assume, therefore, that the funds which the Federal Government would or could allot under the bill would be allotted to a State or State commission for disbursement. Here again, we are at loggerheads with the constitutional prohibitions of many of the States.

I speak now of a different facet of this question.

Section 106 comes under the title "Eligibility for Grants."

It reads:

> An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title (1) in the case of an institution of higher education other than a public community college or public technical institute, only if such construction is limited to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, or engineering, or for use as a library, and—

Certain other qualifications follow.

The key to this particular section is the word "designed."

It does not provide that the facilities must be used only for this purpose. But even if it did, I would be opposed to the bill as written. It states that they need only be especially designed. What is a school building "designed" for a physics laboratory or a chemistry laboratory? It is merely a school building; it is not a chemistry or physics laboratory until the scientific equipment has been brought into the room or rooms to make it a physics or chemistry laboratory. It is not a place to study computer technology until machines have been installed.

So, the word "designed" was placed in the bill—whoever the original author was—purposely to deceive the people of this country and to make them believe that we were creating an exception, and that this was to apply to rooms that would be used for the physical sciences, mathematics, and so on.

Let there be no mistake about what the Senate will do if it adopts the conference report. Under the provisions of the bill, Federal funds can be had for the construction of a building which is "designed" for scientific, mathematics, and similar subjects. The day after the money is paid, the building can be converted to any use to which the owners wish it to be converted.

There is one other factor involved. The argument is often made, "We are just doing this for our young men and women." I do not think many persons have been more interested in education than has the senior Senator from Colorado. The foresight of our forefathers led to the establishment of the public educational system which enabled him to get an education; and it is to them that he owes his education. Otherwise, it would not have been possible for one such as I to have obtained one. So I have a deep respect for education. But one cannot avoid the ultimate fact that if the bill passes in its present form, we shall be contributing directly to the support of religious institutions, because a building constructed under the bill becomes the property of the religious institution.

I have just pointed out that the institution is under no obligation to continue to use it solely as a scientific, mathematics, or foreign language facility. I again point out that it would be possible to build an ordinary school building, and still have it qualify under that clause with respect to foreign languages. Therefore, the entire question of design for physical sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, is just so much camouflage. It does not mean that the buildings will be restricted to that use.

I am about to conclude, but I wish to add one further thought. When I supported the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky on their amendment, I told the distinguished Senator from Oregon, when he was criticizing the particular language of that amendment—the Ervin-Cooper amendment—that I could see weaknesses in the language, but that the conference committee would have adequate opportunity to rewrite the language. I told the distinguished Senator from Oregon that some such provision in the bill was necessary.

S. 2350 has been introduced by certain Senators to provide for a review of this subject. How are we to be deceived? If the House will not take the amendment to the bill which provides for judicial review, under the pressure to have a bill enacted, how are we ever going to enact a bill like this, which provides specifically and exclusively for judicial review? How are we going to get such a bill through the House of Representatives when we seem to be unable to get it to accept a single amendment applying to only one aid to education program?

The answer is that we will not. The sponsors of the bill know we will not. They know as well as we that the opportunities for a judicial review have been reduced to almost nothing.

I have the greatest respect for the private institutions of this country and the service they are rendering. Both of my sons were graduated from private schools—not religious schools, but private schools. They were not graduated from public colleges. I have the greatest respect for the service private colleges are providing. I understand the problems they face. The point is that a bill which is subject to judicial scrutiny is not wanted.

Upon this basis, I suggest that now is the time to raise the issue. The Senate conferees could have brought this bill back in disagreement. They did not. Now is the time for the Senate to declare in a loud voice, as it did before, that we believe we should not go into the field of supporting religious institutions at least until we give the Supreme Court an opportunity to examine the question.

During the delivery of Mr. Allott's address:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The House conferees made it clear that they would not agree to a judicial review amendment on the present bill, because in the House such an amendment would have to go to the Judiciary Committee. Such a bill has been introduced in the House. It will go to the Judiciary Committee and I have no doubt that hearings will be held on it. I say most respectfully that the Senator from Colorado is jumping to conclusions if he thinks the House will not pass the judicial review bill. However, I am assured that the House will not pass a higher education bill with a judicial review amendment added to it. I am even more confident that it would not adopt an amendment not considered by the appropriate committee of the House and which has never been approved after hearings in the House by that committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to have the benefit of the Senator's advice. However, the House had an opportunity to hold hearings since this matter came up in the Senate. That proves the point I have made, that such a bill would not pass the House. I predict that it will not pass the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator made one point which I believe needs clarification. He said the terms of the Ervin-Cooper amendment could have been revised by eliminating the provision that held up all payments until there was a court test, to which there was considerable exception. In fairness to my colleagues who are very much interested in the Ervin-Cooper amendment, let me say that I personally proposed exactly that change. All the Senate conferees supported it. The House conferees, however, promptly voted it down. That was the end of it. We really tried to have that provision accepted. This was not a cursory matter. It was argued during the whole session of the conference. I proposed that change, and the Senate conferees went solidly with it. However, we could not get anywhere with it with the House conferees.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am appreciative of what the Senator has said. I am sure the conferees on the part of the Senate did everything they could. The House wants this bill, but it is said that it will not pass the bill with this amendment. If the House will not pass it with the amendment, it will not pass the other bill either, because the cold facts are that the proponents of the bill do not want judicial review.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator's point is whether the conferees, if they ran into a stone wall, so far as the House conferees were concerned, with respect to this provision, could not arrive at a conclusion by eliminating the grants part of the program, so that the problem the Senator from Colorado has been discussing would not arise. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon that question. The Senator from Oregon just said that the House conferees were adamant about deleting the Cooper-Ervin amendment. What was their attitude so far as taking out the grant part of the bill? It seems to me that the Ervin-Cooper amendment has this main application.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the Senator to address that question to the Senator from Oregon, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. It would have been subject to a point of order in the House, because both bills contained the grant provision. Therefore, if we had followed that course of action—and we did not attempt to do that, I am frank to say—it could have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask a further question. Could it not have been changed so that the grant part of the program would have been made applicable only to public higher education?

Mr. MORSE. We would not have been keeping faith with the Senate. That would have made it a very bad bill.

Mr. MILLER. Were the House conferees amenable to that type of solution?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. They said the House would not pass this bill with a judicial review provision in it. However, it does not follow that it would not pass a judicial review bill. The House conferees said that as a matter of practice they would not support an amendment being added to a bill with respect to which there was no opportunity to hold hearings before the Judiciary Committee.

Representative EDITH GREEN, a member of the conference committee, said to the Senate conferees, "We are going to introduce a judicial review bill." It has been introduced, and hearings, according to my understanding, are to be held on it before the committee which has jurisdiction over that subject matter.

We cannot change the practice in the House. We will either pass this bill, or there will be no education legislation. Not only will there be no higher education bill, in my judgment, neither will there be a vocational education bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am sorry, but the Senator will have an opportunity to obtain the floor in his own right. I have consumed more time than I had thought I would use. I should like to conclude my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that this colloquy may appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, although I voted against the Ervin-Cooper amendment when it was before the Senate, I felt that as a member of the Senate conferees I had a responsibility to do my utmost, as did all Senate conferees, to sustain the Senate's position. We gave way only when it became quite clear that the House conferees were adamant in their position with respect to the question of judicial review, and that we would end with no higher education bill whatsoever.

The Ervin-Cooper amendment was advertised as being a device by which the individual taxpayer could contest the constitutionality of a grant to a private college which has a religious affiliation. Its provisions, however, when read from end to end are so sweeping in scope, so startling in their ramifications, as to stagger the imagination.

The Ervin-Cooper amendment does not simply specify that grants to colleges with religious affiliation shall be subject to judicial review. It states in bold and clear language that any taxpayer, whoever he may be, may contest any grant or loan made under the bill by simply alleging that—

> The proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States.

I ask Senators to take note of the language "first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States."

This language is so broad that a single individual taxpayer upon filing suit could prevent the making of a grant necessary to the well-being of a great university. That grant could be held up until the civil action is finally determined. This, of course, could be months, or even years, later.

In filing such a suit, what need the taxpayer allege? Only that a proposed grant is inconsistent with any provision in the Constitution.

The Ervin-Cooper amendment is, in short, one of the most sweeping civil rights proposals ever brought before the Senate. Let us examine why this is so.

If the Commissioner of Education proposed to make a grant to a private college, for example, in North Carolina a single taxpayer could hold up the grant if he alleged in a complaint that the college discriminated in its admission policy. He could be a crank, he might be barred for academic reasons, but his complaint alone would hold up the grant.

I firmly believe that the Federal Government should not make grants to institutions that have discriminatory policies, but I believe that such grants should be withheld only when there is a substantial factual showing that such discrimination does take place. The Ervin-Cooper amendment goes away beyond that: one taxpayer complaint could hold up a grant indefinitely whether justified or not.

In attempting to reach one problem, the Ervin-Cooper amendment creates a thousand others, and none of its supporters can deny that all sorts of civil rights suits could be brought under its provisions.

Thomas Jefferson once said—I do not quote him verbatim—that a country cannot be ignorant and remain free; it has never happened in the past and will never happen in the future.

During the 1950's the population 18 to 21 years old increased only 358,000, or 4 percent. During the 1960's it is expected to jump 5.2 million, or over 56 percent.

During the 1950's enrollment in the colleges and universities increased more than 50 percent. It will be double during the present decade and reach nearly 7 million by 1970.

To meet this tremendous challenge our institutions of higher learning must expand their physical plants at a rate of $2.3 billion a year. We are now falling below that goal to the extent of $1 billion.

The bill before us, which is in the nature of a conference report, might well be called the "open door" bill, because it will open to thousands of American youngsters the college doors that might otherwise be closed to them.

A vote for the bill is a vote to create opportunity for the individual and to promote the future of the country.

The Nation needs the engineer who will build its bridges, the scientist who will design its weapons, the student of politics who will write its laws, the language scholar who will make effective its diplomacy. In short, the Nation needs the enactment of a higher education bill.

1963 is the crucial year. It is the year that represents our last chance to provide new buildings to accommodate those who will want to study and for whom there is no room.

If we delay now—if we temporize—if we put this conference report over until another day—we will pay a hard and bitter price. We will have turned our backs on bright and eager young men and women who have the talent and the industry to make this country a model nation beyond our wildest hopes and dreams.

The higher education bill on which we are about to vote will, if approved, go down in history as one of the greatest achievements since the Morrill Act. I am happy that I have had the good fortune to play a significant role in its advancement to this, the final stage.

The final version of the bill is not everything I had hoped it would be. It is a matter of record that I favored the House bill, which would have permitted the Federal Government to aid in the financing of construction of academic facilities for both the arts and the sciences. I attempted to persuade the Senate to accept the House bill but lost in this endeavor by a fairly close margin. The Senate bill, it will be recalled, provided for Federal funds to be used only for science, engineering, and library buildings.

It was difficult indeed to compromise these two viewpoints, but compromise we did. Under the new bill the eligible categories were broadened, and mathematics and modern foreign languages became entitled to assistance.

Further salutary changes were made which deleted the strict Senate requirement that these facilities could be used only for extremely limited purposes. The changes take into account the fact that colleges conduct adult education programs and would be hampered in the management of these programs if they were barred from using certain facilities.

The changes take into account the fact that when renovation or remodeling is underway at a given college, space is at a premium, and all facilities must be available for the education of young men and women.

The conference report removes the intervening hand of the Federal Government and places wide discretion in the hands of the school administrator.

We cannot deny the fact that there was a deadlock in conference for some time concerning the question of how federally aided facilities would be used. I offered the compromise that broke that deadlock, and I stand 100 percent behind it.

To each Member of the Senate I say: Look to the future. Consider the needs that must be met, and cast your lot with the young men and women of tomorrow who will make this world the kind of place every decent human being wants it to be.

This is not legislation designed to help any individual university or college; it is a bill to further higher education, education which is so desperately needed at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement now in effect will expire at 4 o'clock. In view of the fact that some Senators would not have an opportunity to be heard by 4 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon

[Mr. Morse], who is in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is now recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. From the analysis of the conference report made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], do I correctly understand that if a State has a constitutional prohibition against the use of public funds for private educational facilities or for church-related schools, any funds which might come to the State under this conference report, under the grant portion of the program, could not be used in violation of the constitution of that State?

Mr. MORSE. I completely disagree with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]; but I do not think this is the time or the occasion to discuss that point. I believe it should be discussed in connection with the bill which has been introduced, S. 2350. Briefly, however, under the bill the funds flow to the institutions from the commissioner of education in accordance with the provisions of the State plan which establishes priority.

There are some 11 Federal programs under which millions of dollars of Federal funds have been poured out, giving some sort of assistance to private and church-related institutions. Only recently the Senate voted for the hospital bill. I did not hear any Senator argue then in favor of an Ervin-Cooper amendment or argue that that bill was unconstitutional. Neither did I hear the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] argue that there should not be a distribution of funds, under the Hill-Burton Act, to hospitals operated by Catholic universities and Presbyterian universities.

So let us face the fact that the way to handle this matter is by means of the separate bill we have introduced and get on with the aid-to-education program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Under the order, the Senator from New York is now recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, let me say that I can testify—because I am most sympathetic with what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] have tried to effectuate—that I am mindful of the duties of the majority conferees who voted on the Cooper amendment; and I point out that the factual situation confronting us reflects that realization, because if the Senate were to reject the conference report, that would mean the appointment of other conferees—at least, other House conferees, and perhaps it would mean that it would be necessary to obtain in the other body a rule for that purpose, or perhaps no action at all would be taken. To judge from what we observed in the conference committee meetings, I would say the chances are no better than 50-50 that any action whatever would be taken.

There is no question about the need for the enactment of this measure. It is much later than we think, in dealing with higher education; and we are falling dangerously behind our chief competitor in the world, the Soviet Union.

Why do I believe the Senate should agree to the conference report, in the face of the legal doubts which have been expressed by two distinguished lawyers? The reason is that the Ervin-Cooper amendment was an effort to shift the responsibility of the Senate to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Senate could choose to do that or not to do it. The Senate chose to do it. But we could not sustain that position in dealing with the other body, which did not choose to do it. It is a coordinate branch of the National Legislature. Therefore, Mr. President, the other body, by refusing to concur with us in the effort to shift the basis of the responsibility for the Constitution decision, has said to the Senate, in effect, "We are sorry, but the Senate will have to decide this question for itself."

Let us understand that through the years the tradition and precedent of the Senate have constantly been that it has not hesitated to decide constitutional questions. Every Senator understands that endemic to his duties is his responsibility to decide for himself whether a given proposal is constitutional. So when we vote now, we shall be voting to express our convictions as to whether we believe the plan established by the conference report is, in accordance with our judgment as Senators, constitutional or unconstitutional.

In my judgment, there is no way to shift that responsibility if the other body does not join with us in the effort to shift it. That—and nothing else—is the nub of this debate.

I agree with the chairman of the committee; I believe there is a good prospect of enacting separate generic legislation on this subject, covering all the programs involved. That is the correct way to proceed. However, there must be concurrence by both Houses.

The question before the Senate is whether it wishes to have a higher education bill enacted into law, despite this argument; or whether the Senate believes the plan involved in the bill is so unconstitutional that Senators should vote to reject the conference report.

As to the constitutional argument, I have read the decisions, as have other Senators; and I deeply believe that although the pending measure may go to the outermost limits of what has been decided to date, I believe this plan is constitutional. So, Mr. President, when I vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I shal' be voting in good conscience my conviction that this proposal is constitutional.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court itself, if it ever gets the case, will have to consider the fact that usage and practice over the years have shown acceptance of the plan incorporated in the bill—namely, that Congress has shown, by its usage and practice, that it is not endemic in the constitutional scheme that every grant to a sectarian institution is necessarily unconstitutional. Instead, that will depend on the purpose for which it is intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time made available to the Senator from New York has expired.

Under the agreement, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging to the time available to either side the time required for the quorum call—after which I shall divide the remaining 5 minutes between the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I assure the Senators that the Senate will vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report within a few minutes. The vote will be to adopt or reject the report of the conference committee on the higher education bill. Under the parliamentary situation, it will be necessary to reject the conference report before I can move to request that a new conference be held, and that our conferees be instructed to insist upon inclusion in the bill of the Cooper-Ervin amendment, which is merely designed to authorize a judicial review by the Federal courts of the question whether grants and loans to church colleges or universities as authorized by the bill violate the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. For that reason the vote will be on the adoption or rejection of the conference report. All who agree with the position of the Senator from Kentucky and myself that there should be a judicial review of that question to determine whether we are legislating in accordance with the first amendment should vote "nay," to reject the conference report, so that a motion can then be made for a new conference with instructions to our conferees to insist upon inclusion of the amendment in the bill.

Many millions of American citizens believe that the appropriation of Federal tax moneys to support colleges and universities operated by religious denominations violates the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. There is a great dispute as to whether that is so or not. For that reason, I cannot see why any Senator should object to having the question determined by judicial decision so that we might be certain as to whether we are legislating in a constitutional manner.

If we wish to make certain that we shall obtain a judicial review of the question, we must get it by this process; this is so because the House has rejected a proposal for a judicial review every time it has had an opportunity to do so.

When the bill was originally introduced in the House, it provided for a judicial review—a provision which the House committee eliminated.

The House itself refused to agree to a provision for judicial review. Moreover, the conference committee removed the Cooper-Ervin amendment from the bill at the insistence of the House conferees.

I ask all Senators who believe there should be a judicial review to vote "nay" and reject the conference report. If this is done, we can move to have another conference with instructions to the conferees to insist on the inclusion of the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, there is before the Senate the question of whether or not to pass a higher education bill in this session of Congress. In my judgment, there is before the Senate the question of whether there will be any education legislation this session.

In my opinion, the passage or rejection of the conference report this afternoon will determine the fate of the vocational education bill.

Next, I point out that the House will never agree to a bill containing a judicial review provision. Judicial review was voted down by the House overwhelmingly. The House will not agree before it has gone to the Judiciary Committee of the House for hearings.

We are trying to keep faith. We fought for the amendment in conference. The House conferees were adamant.

A judicial review bill has been introduced in the House by Representative EDITH GREEN, and in the Senate by myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and other cosponsors. Early hearings will be held. The bill will cover all the programs in which the same problem exists.

Not long ago, millions of dollars were voted for medical school facilities in Catholic and Presbyterian universities—for medical schools in other parochial universities as well. The law presently contains provision for 11 Federal projects or programs in which religious schools are the beneficiaries under the same formula as is the conference report. Till now the constitutionality of these programs has never been questioned.

I want a review. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Carolina that there should be a judicial review. I always have. Several years ago, the Senator from Pennsylvania and I offered an amendment to the elementary and secondary school bill providing for judicial review. But I am not going to jeopardize educational legislation by urging that the Senate reject the conference report; to do so would write finis to the program for this session of Congress.

Behind this is the vocational education bill, with all the impacted area funds and national defense education funds and vocational education funds.

Wisdom calls for adopting the conference report and then getting on with the business of holding hearings on the Morse-Clark judicial review bill. The House will do the same thing. We can then consider the question of judicial review on its merits.

On the other hand, while many do not agree with this view, there is a substantial body of law and legal opinion to the effect that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is itself unconstitutional. Several of my colleagues on the conference were concerned lest incorporation of this amendment in the bill as finally passed would jeopardize the higher education program for public as well as private institutions.

Article III, section 2, of our Constitution limits the jurisdiction of Federal courts to "cases and controversies." To present a proper case or controversy, the individual litigant must have a real and substantial interest in the outcome of the issue.

In the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447 (1923) the court held that the interest of a taxpayer in the general funds of the Federal Treasury is insufficient to give him a standing in court to contest the expenditure of public funds on the grounds that his interest "is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and indeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating and uncertain that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court in equity."

In other words, a suit by a taxpayer such as was proposed by the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina does not present a "case or controversy" and the courts are powerless to entertain such suits.

In *Muskrat* v. *United States*, 219 U.S. 346 (1911), the Supreme Court said the Congress of the United States is without power to impose jurisdiction on the Federal courts which was not given them by article III, section 2.

Both the Mellon and the Muskrat decisions are good law to this day, and under these decisions the Erwin amendment would seek to impose on the Federal court power to hear, entertain, and decide matters beyond the limits of article III, section 2.

If the Erwin amendment had been retained by the conferees and enacted into law, and if it were, as it may be unconstitutional, the courts might well declare the entire higher education act unconstitutional.

I point out to my colleagues that this act contains no separability provisions.

The courts might well say that the Erwin amendment was unconstitutional but it was the sine qua non of passage of the measure in the Senate that the measure would not have passed had it not been contained in the bill. And therefore they might strike down the entire program.

They would not do so because they ever got to the real constitutional problem but because of the presence of the judicial review provision alone.

I think I can assure my colleagues that the case brought by the Horace Mann League in Maryland will test the constitutionality of grants to private and parochial schools for secular education purposes. If the courts rule such grants to be unconstitutional surely the President will put a stop to them under our higher education bill forthwith. And he can do so without interruption of the program, so far as it relates to the State and public colleges and universities.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MORSE**. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The **PRESIDING OFICER**. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. **MORSE**. My time is up. I apologize.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for 1 minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **CLARK**. I am a strong supporter of the Ervin amendment. If I were not convinced that we would get no higher education bill at all unless we jettisoned the Ervin amendment, I would still be fighting for it.

I sat through the conference. The choice which confronts the Senate on the vote to be taken is, Do we want a higher education bill this year or not?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CLARK**. I am happy to yield.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I fully support what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Oregon have said about the conference report. This is something which, as the Senator from Vermont stated, is for the benefit of the young people of this country. I hope most sincerely that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me 1 minute?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may have 1 minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **COOPER**. The Senator from Oregon spoke of 11 other programs. Many of those programs might be found to fall under the rule of the Supreme Court; I do not know.

This proposal goes far beyond any educational bill ever before passed with respect to the use of public funds, of tax funds, for church schools.

I say to my good friend the Senator from Oregon that the arguments he has made to press the Senate into taking this action today in order to get an education bill could be used as directly and clearly against the House. The same pressures which direct us to get an education bill direct the House to do the same.

The reasonable provision for which we speak would permit a scrutiny of the law, the first of its kind, by the Supreme Court. I think that ought to be made available, by rejecting the conference report.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas may have 1 minute.

### CLASSROOMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDED NOW

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I support the conference report on the

Higher Education Construction bill, because it seems the only practical answer to the critical need for additional college classrooms in the next few years. The mushrooming college enrollment is pouring into inadequate and overburdened classrooms.

As a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, and a cosponsor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, I share some of the misgivings of my colleagues the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] as to the constitutionality of some applications of the proposed program, but these questions can be resolved through the passage of a separate judicial review bill which I am cosponsoring. The important thing is to get the program passed and construction started on projects of unquestioned validity. I have worked for a college classroom construction program almost as long as I have been in the Senate; I have coauthored a number of bills for classrooms, libraries, and laboratories for colleges to help meet the unrequited need of the coming generation for higher education. Therefore, I shall not let this opportunity pass to take another great step toward making the American educational system the glory of our Nation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask you for the yeas and nays on the question of adopting the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDMONDSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CANNON. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MORTON. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and that of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 27, as follows:

[No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Miller
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—27

Allott
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Russell
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—19

Burdick
Cannon
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Morton
Pearson
Robertson
Symington
Williams, N.J.

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## THE MAYTAG CO. OF NEWTON, IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, today the Maytag Co. of Newton, Iowa, pays tribute to its worldwide independent dealer organization, and Newton honors both Maytag and its dealers at ceremonies surrounding production of Maytag's 15-millionth home laundry appliance.

Four dealers have been selected by Maytag to represent their thousands of fellow retailers as guests of honor for the day. They are Vincent Aitoro, Aitoro's Applicance Co., South Norwalk, Conn.; R. H. Hall, R. H. Hall Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; James A. Bethanis, Bethanis Appliance, Burbank, Calif., and Sol Polk, Polk Bros., Chicago.

Special guests watched this morning as the 15-millionth appliance, an automatic washer, was completed on the assembly line at Maytag's Plant No. 2.

From its tiny beginning in 1893 as a maker of farm implements, the Maytag Co., through the sound and progressive policies of its officers and quality workmanship and loyalty of its employees, has grown to where today it is firmly established as the Nation's leading independent manufacturer of home laundry applicances.

Located in Newton, Iowa, a town of 15,381 people, the company today has some 3,500 employees, more than 10,000 shareowners, and assets of well over $70 million. Maytag expects to top the $100 million mark in net sales for the sixth consecutive year in 1963.

The first Maytag washer was built in 1907 as a sideline to farm equipment and and was a wooden tub model called the "Pastime."

The 15-millionth Maytag appliance produced today typifies the advancements made by the company in just the past decade with such features as cold water wash, an automatic bleach dispenser and complete flexibility in laundering any of the multitude of modern fabrics which have emerged since World War II.

From the 30- by 40-foot building which served as its first plant, the company has grown to two manufacturing plants in Newton, each with well over a million square feet of floor space, and an auxiliary plant at Hampton.

The company's philosophy of doing business largely stems from that of its founder, F. L. Maytag. While this has been broadened and strengthened, its basic direction has not changed. It was true under the founder's grandson, Fred Maytag, II, who headed the company during the postwar spurt and it is being continued by today's management team headed by George M. Umbreit, chairman of the board, and E. G. Higdon, president.

This philosophy is dedicated to turning out dependable, high quality products and maintaining "a just balance among the interests of customers, employees, shareowners, and the public."

The company, since the beginning, has recognized the importance of the independent retail appliance dealer in the distribution of its products. The dealer represents the final, vital link between the manufacturer and the consumer and has been responsible for moving the millions of washers and dryers from Maytag's assembly lines in Newton into homes throughout the world.

Maytag's heavy reliance on independent dealers stems basically from the rather unique position the company occupies in the industry. It manufactures only laundry appliances—wringers and automatic washers, clothes dryers and combination washer-dryers—and every product it makes is marketed under the Maytag name.

The loyalty of these independent dealers and their ability to make a profit in handling the Maytag line have been essential ingredients in the successful financial record achieved by the company through the years.

Key to this has been the longstanding close relationship established between the company and its dealers, exemplified by Maytag's method of distributing its products. Rather than sell its products to independent distributors, who in turn sell to retail dealers, which has been the historic practice in the industry, the Maytag company deals directly with the retail dealers.

This is accomplished through 19 major distribution centers under which nearly 250 regional managers work closely with the thousands of franchised Maytag appliance dealers located across the Nation.

This direct contact has generated an image of the company, sustained by millions of satisfied Maytag owners, which is made possible only through the independent dealer who has the inherent advantage of knowing his market and is best able to serve it.

Attesting to the mutual benefit of the system is the fact that many dealers have been associated with Maytag for years, including some who have been Maytag dealers for more than a half century.

Further evidence of the pride and loyalty of dealers is a statement by Mr. Sol Polk, president of Polk Bros., of Chicago, Ill., addressed to the people at Maytag, which appeared in today's Chicago Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### TO THE PEOPLE AT MAYTAG FROM AN ADMIRING INDEPENDENT RETAIL MERCHANT

It isn't very often that a retailer stands up in public and pays tribute to a manufacturing organization that is one of his suppliers.

However, because of an event being celebrated yesterday and today in Newton, a small Iowa city, because of which I feel strongly impelled to speak up for myself and for all my associates in Polk Bros.

This marks the completion of 15 million pieces of Maytag home laundry equipment, and your start into your 16th million.

Iowa is proud of its tall corn. It should be equally proud of what has grown up in a central Iowa town surrounded by corn fields—the Maytag Co. What has happened there is a good deal more important to all of us—and I include the American public—than most people realize. It is something that could happen only in America.

Fifty-seven years ago, your founder started manufacturing home laundry equipment in Newton. For more than half a century, your organization has grown, has employed the young men and women of your town, and has helped the town, and the people of the town, to grow along with you.

You have grown because of the honesty and reliability you put into your products. Because you sold them fairly. Because you were interested in the after sale as well as the sale.

It means something to Polk Bros. when we sell a Maytag washer or dryer to a family in our area that will perform reliably. And to know that, if the family retires in Ocala, Fla., or Apple Valley, Calif., or anywhere else, they will still be close to parts and service on the rare occasions when attention is needed.

You are a splendid example of the kind of company that can grow in America, and help retail businesses to grow with you, because you put rock-ribbed honesty into your products and all your dealings, and give the American people values that they can depend on, year after year.

We have been doing business with you for almost 30 years, a relationship that has been delightful and stimulating every inch of the way. I am sure thousands of other retailers can say the same thing. They have helped you, you have helped them. Together we have all performed a service for the people of our country.

I wish I could be sure that the American people understand what they have in organizations like yours, and in the American system which makes it possible to grow up to such important usefulness to the Nation.

This message is a small attempt to help that understanding.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Maytag Co. is a splendid example of the success of the American capitalistic economic system sometimes referred to as "people's capitalism" as distinguished from the monopoly or laissez-faire capitalism which characterizes some European countries. A recent speech by Mr. E. F. Scoutten, vice president of the company, on the subject of the American free enterprise system merits recognition. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM VERSUS THE WELFARE STATE

(A Speech by E. F. Scoutten, vice president, the Maytag Co., at Martburg College convocation series on "Comparative Economic Systems," November 21, 1963)

A discussion of the merits of the American free enterprise system as contrasted with the welfare state could obviously fill several volumes. Since I have only a limited time, and since I do not pose as an economist, I suggest that it is essential that I limit my remarks this morning to the basic elements of these two economic systems. It is not really important that we consider the almost unlimited fringe areas of these two ideologies. If we understand the essential differences, we should be able to determine the relative merits.

#### THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

It behooves us, I think, to take a moment in a brief clarification and definition of terminology. When I speak of the American free enterprise system, I am referring to the economic system as it has operated in this country, subject to reasonable regulations and controls. Many of the critics of the American system, when they attack it, deliberately define it as it existed perhaps 100 years ago. In effect, they define it as a laissez faire economic system which is free from governmental control or regulation. There has been no laissez faire system in this century. To attack the American free enterprise system as though it existed today as it did 100 years ago is as meaningless, unfair and inaccurate as it is to criticize business management as though it still operated in the fashion which was current prior to the Civil War.

I submit that it is quite proper that reasonable limitations, regulations and controls should be imposed upon the functions of our free enterprise system. There can never be any system which is totally free. There must always be limits. The limit to your right to swing your arm ends where another person's nose begins. The right to freedom of speech does not entitle you to shout "fire" in a crowded theatre. I know of no intelligent person who argues that our free enterprise system should be totally free and without restrictions. The various governmental regulations designed to prevent monopoly control of a commodity, or to protect the individual worker against possible exploitation, or to guarantee the consumers against misrepresentation, are all desirable limitations. No qualified businessman is opposed to the regulations of government which provide workmen's compensation for injured employees, or which require fair and ethical procedures in the labeling of products for the protection of the customer, or which prohibit the formation of cartels for artificially maintaining unrealistic price levels. As a matter of fact, responsible businessmen everywhere would insist upon such regulation, even if it were not currently available. And yet, it seems to many businessmen today that what began as a reasonable limitation upon our free enterprise system is fast turning into a deliberate attempt to destroy our free enterprise system and the form of democratic republican government under which it has existed, and to produce, in its stead, a welfare state under a socialistic form of government.

Let's be sure that we understand what we are talking about. When I speak of free, I have reference to freedom in the great Anglo-Saxon tradition as meaning independence from the arbitrary will of another person or another group. When I speak of our free enterprise system, I am referring to the freedom which any member of our society enjoys to engage in business enterprise with the privilege of making a profit or suffering a loss. Such persons have frequently been called entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs, having elected to exercise their talents in our free enterprise system, usually begin by assembling the capital necessary to create enterprise. The formation of this capital occurs either by their having saved it from their earnings or, frequently, by joining with others so as to accumulate the necessary funds. Having assembled the capital, they then usually develop the product or the service which they hope will find some significant need in the marketplace. They then invest it in the building of a plant and the purchase of machinery and equipment. They hire and pay a labor force to produce the product. They seek a market for the product so that the plant and the labor force can be kept working. They attempt, in the face of competition, to sell the product at a price that will yield sufficient profit to enable the business to continue. Sometimes they are successful. Frequently they fail. The most basic and significant element of the American free enterprise system, however, is that such people have the freedom to embark upon such a venture.

They have the freedom to risk their savings and the savings of other like-minded persons in an attempt, through the provision of a service or a product, to earn the favor and the consequent profits which result from their filling a consumer demand.

The most drastic shortage in this country today is a shortage of able people who are willing to accept such responsibility and get things done efficiently and effectively. Science and invention are progressing at an amazing pace and will probably continue to do so, but, as always, the work of translating the discoveries of the scientists and the inventor into marketable products must wait upon people with talent and energy to produce, distribute and sell.

There is probably little or nothing being done in American business today that cannot be done better. American business and industry and the American consumer are awaiting anxiously the future growth and development which can be realized if our free enterprise system is permitted to flourish and grow.

One of the great needs in our economic system is for the continuous and increasing availability of venture capital. Let's examine that term.

If you have saved, inherited, or otherwise acquired $1,000, there are a variety of things you can do with it. You can put it in a savings bank or in a Government bond where it will be readily available, but where it will earn comparatively little interest.

You can invest it in a corporate bond, or a secured loan, or a mortgage. It will be perhaps not quite as safe, and it will not be quite as readily available when you want it, but the rate of return will be a bit higher.

Or, you can buy a so-called blue chip stock, which is even a little more risky and sometimes is a little more profitable.

### VENTURE CAPITAL ESSENTIAL

Or, finally, you can use the money to go into business on your own or perhaps buy stock in some new or struggling enterprise, the future of which is still in doubt. In such a case, you are taking a very real risk of losing all or part of your money. In return, however, there is also a chance for maximum gain or profit on your investment. This is venture capital. Such capital is the lifeblood of our free enterprise system. Without it—without people who have saved money from their earnings and who are willing to risk it on new ventures—free enterprise, as we know it, could not exist.

Obviously, the prime consideration which motivates a man to invest his savings in the form of venture capital is the possibility of realizing a significant profit. There are some people who would have you believe that profits, in and of themselves, are objectionable and that the individual or the business enterprise which earns a profit has somehow or other done so at the cost of the sweat, blood, and tears of other human beings. Actually, profits are the lifeblood of our free enterprise system, which has given us the highest standard of living that the world has ever known. Incidentally, it should be noted that profits are also the lifeblood of any system of government based on taxation. Furthermore, there is no such thing as an excessive profit. There is no such thing as an excessive profit because when the system is permitted to perform its legitimate function, any excess profit is automatically self-correcting.

### FUNCTION OF PROFIT

If an enterprise in a new venture succeeds in realizing an unusually high profit, it automatically has the effect of attracting other capital to the same field, to the same activity and to the same market, until such time as the profit on the invested capital, through the force of competition, declines below the level that capital is earning generally.

In this fashion, therefore, the so-called excessive profit serves as a signal to direct the flow of capital into those areas where additional capital is obviously needed. And, by the same token, the level of the profit, when it becomes ordinary, likewise serves as a signal to direct the flow of new capital to other areas or activities.

Let's illustrate specifically: When the Ford Motor Co. in the early part of this century began to realize unusually high profits, resulting from a high volume and a standardized product, there was, as a result, a tremendous flow of capital into the automotive industry to help supply the demand which Ford had unearthed. Literally hundreds of corporations were established and competition for Ford sprang up everywhere, until such time as the profit rate in the automotive industry sank back to normal levels. During this development, of course, hundreds of different automobiles were marketed, of which more than 90 percent failed and ultimately disappeared from the market. Those automobiles which remain in the market today are there and available only because they have successfully weathered the drastic tests of competition and have earned a share of the consumer's dollar. The Ford profits signaled the need for additional capital in the industry. As soon as this need was supplied and the profits returned to or below a normal level, the capital was diverted to other fields.

It should be noted that the level of profit which is returned on the capital investment serves as a signal in directing the investment of additional capital by other investors. The level of profit, however, is merely the signal. The effective determinant of the level of profit is the consumer—collectively called the marketplace.

If a company's product and service meet a need of the consumer, the company will be rewarded with a profit. When competitors flock to supply the same need, the competition which is created forces all competitors to refine the product, improve the service and better satisfy the consumer's need. Those enterprises which fail to keep abreast of competitive developments presently fail entirely and disappear from the scene. It is this refining effect of competition which has guaranteed the continuing improvement in the standard of living of the American people.

### THE WELFARE STATE

Opposed to and contrasted with this system of competition, as it operates under the free enterprise system, is the concept of the welfare state. When I use this term, I am referring to the elemental notion that a central government should, in whatever fashion may be required, undertake to guarantee the welfare of all of its citizens in all aspects of their existence from the cradle to the grave. This concept undertakes to guarantee the citizens with employment, with medical care, housing, clothing, food, education, and usually a great many nonessential benefits ranging without limit into such things as cultural activities. This concept is based upon the assumption that a governmental bureaucracy, directed by a group of supposed experts, is better able to direct the activities of the people than are the people themselves. It assumes, furthermore, that the people will prefer this absolute and benighted direction, and, in fact, that they will welcome it in preference to a regulated free enterprise system which guarantees the citizen a right to succeed and a right to fail.

You will note that in this definition of the welfare state, I have deliberately made no reference to the political form of government involved. This omission is because there is only one kind of government structure under which the welfare state can be operated: This is a strong and absolute central government. It makes no difference whether you call such a government fascist, or socialistic, or communistic, or anything else. It is invariably the same kind of government: A dictatorial, powerful, central direction which reserves unto itself the decisions and choices which, under a representative form of government, are left to the people. It reserves to itself the regulation and control, ultimately, of all aspects of the citizen's existence. It makes all the decisions.

If through regulation and control of profit, as occurs under a welfare state, it becomes impossible for the consumer to make his wishes decisive, then all of the merits of competition and the free enterprise system disappear. If a government bureaucrat is entrusted with the authority of determining what products are to be produced and who is to produce them; and when they are to be produced; and where they are to be produced; and what their selling price is to be, then we have eliminated the consumer judgment factor and have entrusted the development of the economy to a fallible human being who cannot conceivably exercise judgment in these matters which even approaches the quality of judgment which results when all of the populace participate. This system of state control and state direction has never succeeded anywhere in the history of the race, and it is not succeeding now in those countries where it is being tried, including those relatively limited areas of our economy where it is being applied in this country.

### MONOPOLY CONTROL

Under the laws of our country, which for many years have been directed toward the reasonable regulation of our free enterprise system, it is impossible to acquire or sustain a monopolistic control of a commodity or of an industry, except when the Government, in effect, assumes, creates and sustains such a monopoly. In every instance in which such Government-supported monopolies have been created, they have proved to be failures and they have failed to accomplish the very goals for which they were originally created.

Farmers' organizations, for an untold number of years, tried to maintain farm prices through collusion. They had no appreciable success until the Government took over. Labor unions tried for a hundred years to create monopoly control in individual labor markets, but they failed miserably until the Government came to their aid and foisted a monopoly control of labor on the American economy.

How long has the Government been "helping the farmer"? It has been going on for more than 30 years. Today there are fewer farmers and there is some evidence to suggest that those who are producing crops in the Government program are worse off than those who are not covered. We are paying out billions of dollars a year to maintain agricultural prices at a false level, yet the subsidized farmer's income is still falling. This is nationalization of farmers. It is expensive and it is morally wrong. The consuming public pays a subsidy through taxes, and then, in addition, pays the higher food prices which result from price control. Still, every year thousands of farmers quit the farm. It was only last spring that the wheat farmers in this country came to their senses and voted out the Government's newest proposal in the subsidization, monopoly control and nationalization of the wheat farmers. It took the wheat farmers 30 years to discover that the rewards of the free enterprise system are superior to the results produced by the welfare state controls.

### GOVERNMENT, ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Our type of Government, as created in this country, took the form of a republic. So long as it retained the elements of a republic, it prospered and grew in a fashion unprecedented in the history of the race. It has been only since significant attempts have been made to convert it into a dictatorial welfare state that many of the problems confronting us today have emerged and that our progress as a nation is becoming increasingly reduced and even stultified.

The success of our form of Government depended upon the functioning of our free enterprise system. The two systems are complementary and mutually interdependent. Our form of Government could not exist in the absence of a free enterprise system; nor can a free enterprise system exist in the absence of a republic. And yet, today, there is considerable evidence to indicate that we are trying to convert both our form of Government and our economic system into a dictatorial welfare state.

And let's recognize another fact as we proceed: There is no essential difference between an absolute monarchy, a dictatorship, a Fascist form of government and a welfare state. It makes no difference how tortured the semantics are—whenever you create a form of government which makes decisions for the people; which directs their economic activities; which limits their choice of economic alternatives; and which attempts to provide an unlimited security, then you have created a dictatorship—and you may call it socialism, communism, or fascism, or anything else you choose. It makes no difference, because there is no difference.

It is important, I think, to examine very carefully these great and basic issues which are presently being debated in our country. Millions of our citizens, without adequate training or means to distinguish among the several alternatives available to them, are being deluded, misled, and purchased by demagogic politicians who, either ignorantly or deliberately, are attempting to destroy not only the American free enterprise system, but our form of government and our standard of living. Let's examine briefly how we got into this situation.

### MONETARY AND MORAL VALUES

Free societies have always been those in which the individual has been required to accept responsibility for not only himself, but for his immediate family. Such societies have accordingly permitted the individual a considerable freedom of choice and have likewise permitted him to enjoy the results which he was able to achieve. When he occasionally failed, he was likewise accorded the privilege of failure.

In free societies, remuneration to the individual has always been made in accordance with the value of his services and contributions. The value of such services and contributions has been determined by his fellows. Very often, this has caused some concern among the society, because the remuneration to many people seemed to be inconsistent with their opinion of the individual's moral merit. There has frequently been noted a discrepancy between moral merit and the individual's remuneration. It must be noted, therefore, that personal esteem and material success are not necessarily identical. The free enterprise system is the only kind of society which provides us with ample material means, and still leaves us free to choose between material and nonmaterial rewards. Our free enterprise system deals only with economic means. We are required, as individuals, to accept the responsibility of making what we choose of our freedom. If men are to be free to use their talents, we must remunerate them accordingly, but we ought to esteem them in accordance with the use they make of the means which they thus acquire for their disposal. The actress, Elizabeth Taylor, presents a striking example of this conflict.

### NATURE OF EQUALITY

We must also note that there is in our society at the present time a confusion with respect to the democratic process, the free enterprise system and equality. No political thinker of any stature in all history has ever interpreted democracy as necessarily meaning equality in all things. When the Founding Fathers incorporated into the Declaration of Independence the phrase, "All men are created equal," they referred only to equality before the law and equality of opportunity to each individual to fulfill his highest potential. That is the American ideal.

In recent years, however, our basic concept of government has begun to give way to the sentimental and superficial notion that people should somehow be made equal in fact. Our public education system during the past 25 years has contributed tremendously to this ridiculous objective. Along with this attempt has come an unwarranted emphasis upon security. As Dr. Felix Morley has said, "The desire for security has become the opium of the people in America." Whenever a society dedicates itself to the totally impossible goal of making all individuals equal and to the equally objectionable goal of providing perfect security for all members of the group, that society immediately loses the boldness, the dedication, and the responsible citizenship which, otherwise, would be available to it; its members cease to be masters of the state, but, rather, they become its wards. When the citizen accepts the government as his guardian, our form of Government will decay.

For many years, our public schools were contaminated by what was known as the "progressive education" movement. This highly organized and publicized mass of fuzzy thinking fostered what we used to call the "child-centered school." In these schools, we placed great emphasis upon creativity, originality, and self-expression. I submit that creativity is a desirable attribute of the human personality; but I also suggest that it has no role in the application of the multiplication tables. Nine times seven has been 63 for a long time and will probably continue so for a long time in the future. Originality, although a most desirable attribute, certainly has no place in the spelling of the English language. Having two boys who came through this school system, I have seen some charming illustrations of originality in spelling. Unfortunately, however, they were also unintelligible.

### SELF-EXPRESSION OBJECTIVE

The emphasis upon self-expression has led us, among other things, to perfectly asinine and ridiculous results in many phases of our cultural activities. As someone has said, "Too many people are writing books who never bothered to learn to write; and too many people are painting pictures who never bothered to learn to paint."

By way of illustration, I refer you to the current state of the so-called modern art. Paintings which have been awarded prizes have been found, when the artist appeared, to be hanging upside down. I submit this is patently ridiculous, since there is no conceivable way of telling the top from the bottom. An artist, mentioned in Time magazine recently, developed a new technique for painting nudes, whereby he smeared paint over the front of his nude model and dragged her across the canvas. Ultimately, he sold the resulting mess—the canvas, not the model. I have merely to remind you of the painting which won first prize in a Chicago show last spring, and which consisted of a piece of 4-by-8 plywood painted black. This sort of thing is alleged to be self-expression. In reality, it is a retreat from standards of excellence and it is, in fact, a fraud and a delusion. If there are no standards, then truly anyone can paint; but the sad part of this is that it is accepted by many gullible citizens as being a new kind of art. As my friend Jenkins Jones says, "When somebody welds together some old gears, some corset stays and a piece of sheetmetal, and says it is art, we may conceivably ignore him; but when he contends it is more beautiful than Michelangelo's 'David,' then we should say 'It looks like junk, and it probably is.' "

This retreat from standards of excellence has been an outgrowth of the child-centered school which for many years constituted the ultimate in the so-called progressive education. Under this doctrine, we used to delay teaching a discipline until the child evidenced a readiness for the learning. I recall a school in Ohio in which, for 6 long years, we failed to teach the children to read because they failed to indicate a readiness for reading. During this period, they built birdhouses and footstools beyond belief. We produced a group of first-class, little carpenters Unfortunately, they were also illiterate.

### FUNCTION OF FAILURE

The naive notion that children in school should not be subjected to failure, as though failure were not a right of every human being, has led us to dilute the curriculum, to lower the standards and to use what has been called noncompetitive marking. Little Willie, the near genius, achieves a report card full of S's, indicating that he is working up to his capacity. Little Ignatz, the near idiot, in the same class achieves an identical report card full of S's, because he allegedly is working up to his capacity. This engenders the belief that all men are, in fact, equal; or if they are not equal, they ought to be made equal. Whenever we embrace that doctrine, we are automatically accepting the equally false notion that all men are entitled to identical benefits under our economic system. This means that if one man earns more than another, it is wrong and he is obviously doing so at the expense of his fellows. This leads us to the acceptance of the welfare state.

The lack of craftmanship in industry, the widespread featherbedding in all levels of industry, the emphasis upon what somebody has called "togetherness," are all symptoms of this general decline in quality.

From this fountainhead of fuzzy thinking has grown, increasingly, our national trend toward the welfare state. I have to remind you only of what happened in a sizable American city a few months ago when the town fathers, confronted with a crushing load of welfare cases, suggested that ablebodied men, as a condition of receiving welfare checks, would be required to work in various ways for the city. They also served notice that unmarried mothers who persisted in having additional illegitimate children would be disqualified from receiving further welfare assistance. What was the result? The so-called liberals from the State and National capitals, the Government planners, swooped down upon the city with one accord protesting that such requirements by the city officials were un-American, and threatened to cut off Federal money unless the city fathers withdrew their requirements. Apparently, the right to continue on relief rolls, literally from one generation to the next, is now regarded as an acceptable career opportunity.

### CHALLENGES TO DEMOCRACY

If the American people will permit it, our Federal Government will be glad to do all our thinking and planning and spending for us. The theory of the welfare state, which presumably protects the citizens from the cradle to the grave—which guarantees them a living whether it be in the form of living on the welfare rolls or working as assigned by a bureaucrat in Washington—is a throwback to the old feudal system under which the lord of the manor was not only the master of the people, but the source of their livelihood, as long as they acknowledged his authority and obeyed his orders.

Many of the innovations of the welfare state are, in fact, throwbacks to former social systems which men now regard as malevolent. They are systems which man have fought to overthrow over hundreds of years. The slave, the serf, the communal peasant, all had ultimate security. It seems to many people that this alleged progress toward the welfare state is, in fact, a retrogression to what the race of men have found to be anathema in generations past.

The chief elements with which the welfare state concerns itself are in reality local matters. They can and should be solved locally; but when the Federal Government steps into the picture, local efforts cease. In the welfare state in the Soviet Union, the state regulates almost every aspect of life and there is little room left for individual initiative and little need for individual self-reliance. From the cradle to the grave, the individual is under the protective custody of the state, which has the authority to educate him; doctor him; tell him where he is to work and how much he is to make; what he is to eat; what he is to wear, and for how long a time.

We cannot blame our present trend toward the horrors of the welfare state upon the change which has occurred from a simple to a complex civilization. If this were the case, we would be yielding grudgingly, rather than gladly, to the blandishments of such a system. Many people would be ashamed to accept social security payments they do not really need. Fewer women would complain as one did recently that, because his unemployment compensation was delayed, her husband had been forced to take a job. More of us would endorse the belief affirmed by President Kennedy in his inaugural address that, "The rights of men come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God."

This shift toward centralization which has been going on in our country for more than 30 years is a very gradual thing. Freedoms have been surrendered little by little in pieces thought to be too small to be worth fighting for, until now it is necessary to look back many years to realize the tremendous distance we have traveled toward centralized, dictatorial control. In 1913, a 31-word Federal personal income tax law was enacted. It limited the rate to 1 percent on taxable income below $20,000 and a maximum top rate of 2 percent. Today, this 31-word law has grown to over 450,000 words and it takes 23 cents out of every dollar earned, with a minimum rate of 20 percent—10 times the maximum rate in 1913—and with the maximum rate of 91 percent.

In 1930, the entire budget of the United States was $3 billion. This year, the budget will approach $100 billion. In 1930, there were 592,000 Government civilian employees. Today, there are more than 2½ million. Our national debt has increased from $16 billion in 1930 to cover $300 billion at the present time. If you add the unfunded pension liabilities to Government employees; contracts; commitments to defense, welfare and Government, and the actuarial deficit in the social security system, the national debt today is more than $1,000 billion—more than a trillion dollars.

If you have difficulty imagining what a trillion dollars is, you might reflect that if with the birth of Christ someone had started to save at the rate of $1,000 a minute, or $60,000 an hour, or $43 million a month, it would require such a saving up through the end of 1963 before you would have acquired the trillion dollars necessary to put the U.S. Government in the black.

Years ago, the socialist leader Norman Thomas said, "The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism, but under the name of liberalism, they will adopt every fragment of the socialistic program, until America will one day be a socialistic nation without knowing how it happened." We are long gone down that road.

There is an evident assumption that Americans should be coddled, subsidized and regimented from the cradle to the grave. Concurrently, there is a naive notion that when our neighbor departs for Washington and moves into an office in some Federal bureau, he somehow or other magically attains an expertise and is thereby qualified as an authority on matters about which he never seemed to know very much when he lived down the street.

James Madison said, "We rest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

The free enterprise system, which has worked so well for us for so many years is now faced with its ultimate death, because we have failed to realize that we cannot have the superifically attractive benefits of the welfare state and, simultaneously, continue to maintain and expand our standard of living. If we are to destroy our free enterprise system, we must recognize that, with it, we destroy our democratic form of government. Inferior as it is, the welfare state still exacts a tremendous price: the creation of a dictatorship of the central government.

---

## IMPENDING STRIKE AGAINST UNITED AIRLINES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is a threatened strike against the United Airlines which, if it goes off according to schedule, will tie up transportation on December 18 or 19.

To tie up transportation at any time, but more especially at Christmas time, is a strike against the general public.

There has been a Presidential factfinding, or emergency board, proceeding in this matter. It made its decision or recommendations on November 18. Management has agreed to the recommendations. The union has not.

I have today sent a telegram to the President of the United States asking him, in behalf of many Nebraska mayors, civic leaders, educators, students, servicemen, airline employees, and others, to use his good offices to appeal to the union leaders in control to accept the findings of the Presidential factfinding or emergency board.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1963.

HON. LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON,
*President of the United States,*
*White House, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In behalf of many Nebraska mayors, civic leaders, educators, students, servicemen, airline employees, and others, I appeal to you to use your good offices to prevent the threatened strike against the United Airlines. Travel at Christmas time is very important to many individuals and their families as well as to those economically affected. I urge that you request the union leaders in control to accept the findings made by the Presidential factfinding board on November 18 and thus avoid the strike. Such action will be deeply appreciated.

Kindest regards.

Senator CARL T. CURTIS.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this possible strike is a matter of direct concern, I am sure, to all the Members of the Senate. This is especially true because in approximately 35 States the constituencies you represent are served by this air carrier with a very considerable daily volume. Perhaps one-fourth of the scheduled airlines traffic of the Christmas season will be carried by United.

In West Virginia we are dependent on the services of United Air Lines, as we are on other excellent carriers. I have been consulted by citizens from our State capital city of Charleston—among them, Charles E. Hodges, managing director of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce. I, too, have consulted with the White House and the Civil Aeronautics Board on this problem.

It is not so much a question of whether management is right or wrong, or whether labor is at fault in this immediate situation. There is a controversy, but we know there should be no breakdown of air transportation for hundreds of thousands of passengers, and cargo shipments and the handling of mail in the Christmas season.

West Virginians are particularly concerned about possibilities of a strike since 50 percent of all traffic moving through Kanawha Airport in Charleston is generated by United Air Lines. The deadline being just a week before Christmas, all of the flights moving into and out of our capital city are completely booked, and the suspension of service would be little short of calamity for citizens who are dependent on air travel to or through that terminal.

It is my most earnest hope that reasonable attitudes and approaches will prevail in meetings between representatives of both union and management as they seek a settlement. It is a matter of public concern and national interest that a strike be averted at this most inopportune time.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I share the concern expressed by the Senators from Nebraska and West Virginia. I feel that the threatened strike in United Air Lines is a strike against the public rather than against the airline. In view of the fact that findings have been made by the factfinding board, and have been accepted by the airline, if a strike takes place it will be in defiance of the regular procedures in trying to secure a resolution of the differences. It could spread to other airlines. It could result in a strike that would cripple the Nation at a time when travel is at its peak.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for urging that more time be granted for settlement of the dispute.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield, if I may.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I share the deep concern of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska about the impending United Airlines strike. United Airlines which carries approximately 30 percent of the Nation's air passengers has estimated it will carry 800,000 air passengers through the holiday period between December 18 and January 8.

All these people will be discommoded, and many will be greatly injured if a strike materializes. We in Hawaii, especially, will be greatly injured. At the present time there are approximately 7,000 Hawaiian students on the mainland United States, and at least two-thirds of them are preparing to return to the islands to spend the Christmas holidays. We know that if the strike is called on the 19th of December it will cause great inconvenience and disappointment to many of these students, and most of them probably will not get home for the holidays.

In addition to upsetting the regular travel of our people, which travel is considerable, there is also a great flow of tourists in and out of Hawaii, especially during the holiday season. Tourist arrivals in Hawaii last month were 79 percent more than last year in November.

Hawaii expects to be host to 412,000 tourists for 1963. A strike at this time will cause a great deal of inconvenience, hardship, and injury to our students, our people, and our tourist business.

I do hope that the Machinists at least will agree to postpone the strike until after the holiday season, so that our students can get back home and return to the mainland, and that our tourists will be able to spend their vacations in Hawaii during the Christmas holiday season.

I sincerely hope that the President will use his good offices to see that the strike is at least postponed until after the holidays.

I sincerely hope that the meetings which are now underway between the Machinist Union and the United Air Lines officials will result in preventing a walkout during this holiday period.

I have communicated with all parties concerned and have expressed the feelings of all Hawaii toward the hope that a settlement can be reached and that there be no tieup and that if a strike is inevitable that it be at least postponed to after the holidays.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to state to the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators that the Committee on Commerce has been very conscious of the pending strike. We have been asked not only our opinion about it—and without going into the merits of the matter—but also about the possibility of having a delay in the strike until some sensible solution is arrived at. Also, it has been urged that the strike not occur during the holiday season when, as the Senator from Hawaii has pointed out, there is a great increase in air traffic all over the country.

Without having consulted with every other member of the Commerce Committee, we have agreed to prepare a letter in the form of some expression of sentiment, which members of the committee will sign, because this question is in our jurisdiction. Other Senators may also sign. Copies of the letter will be sent not only to the President of the United States but also to the Chairman of the CAB, who would have some interest in this matter, as well as to the parties involved.

The letter will be prepared today, and Senators who wish to express their opinion may join in signing the letter.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was called from the Chamber just as this subject was taken up. I wish to make my own position clear. The strike is scheduled to begin on the 18th of December, at midnight. The economic loss and hardship that would be imposed upon our country would be almost beyond comprehension. I hope that when the letter is prepared, I shall have an opportunity to join in signing it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We thought this should be done, because today the airlines, particularly the large airlines such as United, are almost in the same position, from the standpoint of public accommodations, as are the railroads, trucks, the merchant marine, and the buslines. The public interest is far more important than any argument between the parties.

We ought to realize that to be the fact, because Congress does not want to go through another argument like the one which occurred with respect to the railroad strike. It might be well for both management and labor to know that the public interest will not be overridden in this case. I believe most Senators will agree with me.

## ATOMS FOR PEACE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Sunday, we observed the 10th anniversary of President Eisenhower's dramatic atoms-for-peace speech before the United Nations.

Over the past decade, we have witnessed many solid accomplishments in the atoms-for-peace program. President Eisenhower's appeal for international cooperation in the development of the atom had its genesis in the creative thought of President Harry Truman and Senator Brian McMahon. President Kennedy shared this dream and affirmed our continuing support for the principles of the atoms-for-peace program.

Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to express my support for the objectives of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and particularly for its function in providing safeguards against the diversion of atomic energy materials to military uses. The safeguards program recently adopted by the Agency is a modest first step on the road to international controls over the possession and use of these tremendously powerful materials. I would hope that the Agency's safeguards system can be refined and expanded so that the nations of the world may proceed with the development of the peaceful atom, secure in the knowledge that the materials they work with will never be instruments of war.

Yesterday, in a statement observing the 10th anniversary of the atoms-for-peace program, President Johnson reasserted our continuing belief in the importance of cooperation among nations in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and our belief in the International Atomic Energy Agency as an important instrument in carrying out this cooperation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the statement by President Johnson on this very important subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ten years ago today, President Eisenhower appeared before the General Assembly of the United Nations and made the following pledge:

"The coming months will be fraught with fateful decisions. To the making of these fateful decisions the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma, to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

In his address, President Eisenhower also proposed the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency which would help channel into peaceful pursuits the scientific and material resources which had been created primarily for military purposes, and noting that such an agency could serve as a vehicle to advance the use of the atom for the peaceful pursuits of mankind.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has assumed an essential and natural role in the international development of atomic energy. In each year of his administration, President Kennedy supported the International Atomic Energy Agency and on three separate occasions sent AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg to the General Conferences in Vienna, Austria, as his personal representative.

In the past 10 years, the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes throughout the world has grown steadily. The United States has led the efforts to bring the benefits of atomic energy to the world—shared its knowledge, its skills, and its materials with other nations in every continent.

Today, I reassert our continued belief in the importance of cooperation among nations in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and our belief in the International Atomic Energy Agency as an important instrument in carrying out this cooperation. I can think of no more appropriate way in which to convey to freemen everywhere our intention to bring the benefits of the peaceful atom to mankind than in the words of President Kennedy in his message to the President of the Fifth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, on September 27, 1961:

"The General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency is a welcome event to all peoples who value peace. Your meeting accentuates the enormous potential of the atom for improving man's well-being. We already know the atom can help place more food on our tables, provide more light in our homes, fight disease and better our health, and give us new technical and scientific tools. The exploitation of this force for human welfare is just beginning. The International Atomic Energy Agency can assume a position of leadership in bringing the peaceful uses of atomic energy to the people of the world.

"Moreover, the intangible benefits of your work are no less than the material rewards. When people from different countries work together in a common cause, they help to maintain a bridge of understanding between nations during times of tension and build firmer foundations for a more stable and peaceful world of the future. I applaud your efforts and assure you that they have the full support of the United States.

"John F. Kennedy,
*"President, United States of America."*
Lyndon B. Johnson,
*President of the United States.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill—H.R. 8747—making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about the conference report and about the bill itself.

Only one amendment is in disagreement with the House. The House had a rollcall vote on the amendment about 2 hours ago, and sustained the House conferees on that amendment.

I wish to pay tribute to the members of my committee and to the members of the House committee for working long and hard on this very complex bill, which covers 29 agencies of government. They are all important agencies of government.

I point out again to the Senate that in the conference report a bill is reported which will total in the vicinity of $1,400 million under the budget estimates.

We were very careful, particularly in the Senate, to insist, in an effort to do something about Government spending and for the economy of the Nation, that the agencies not employ any new employees, with one or two exceptions, where new employees were allowed, such as in the case of FAA, because new towers are being built and additional men are needed to man those towers.

This may seem a little harsh, but I have come to the conclusion, after many years in handling matters for these agencies, particularly the agencies I have in mind—and I am sure the Senator from Colorado agrees with me—that a great deal of Government spending can be eliminated if we eliminate the hiring of new employees.

It seems that every time an agency has a problem of some kind, the only answer is to hire some new personnel to solve it. After that particular problem has been solved, the employees run out of something to do, and the Administrators sit around and think of something else for the employees to do. They convince themselves and then they convince the Bureau of the Budget, and pretty soon they are adding to the cost of the Government year by year.

Therefore, I believe we have taken a long step forward in the direction of Government economy by bringing forth a bill which is close to $1,400 million under the budget estimates, involving, with one or two rare exceptions—I have mentioned one—no new employees. The conference report covers 29 agencies of Government.

Representatives from various agencies come to the Senator from Colorado, to me, or to the Senator from Massachusetts, and complain. They say they need this, that, or the other thing.

However, I am sure that by the end of next fiscal year they will probably be more efficient, and they will not know that they have not had any additional employees given them. Someone said to the Senator from Colorado and me that if we could make this principle stick, perhaps Parkinson would add a chapter to his book.

I hope he will write such a chapter; but we made it clear, and it is in the conference report. So, for the first time we have taken a forward step in controlling the growth of Government personnel. I compliment all members of the subcommittee, and also the House conferees, who joined with us.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is the chairman of the subcommittee, in this instance, who should be complimented, because from the first of the year he took a strong, adamant stand that we would not add employees. We provided for some additional employees in the Federal Aviation Agency. The specific purpose should be stated. It was to enable the FAA to operate navigational facilities which are in the process of construction and will be completed before the end of the year. It would be a foolish policy not to provide the necessary additional employees for this facility. But the Senator from Washington is correct.

Moreover, we tried to prevent some agencies from moving into areas which were outside their own areas of responsibility, and to hold them until, at least, the legislative committees concerned had had an opportunity to act upon the proposals.

I pay my personal tribute to the distinguished Senator from Washington, because he was adamant, and it was only because of his stand that we were able to bring back a bill in an amount which is far below the budget request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join in what the Senator from Colorado has said. As one who has sat as a member of the subcommittee for many years, I believe the results of the bill justify the actions of the chairman and the senior member of the minority, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

I call the Senator's attention to one item in the conference report, at the top of page 12, in which the conferees agreed that no further funds could be provided for shelter survey and stocking. I interpret that to mean for this year only. The Senate conferees did not finally agree that there should be no further stocking. Am I correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a correct interpretation. I believe that is the understanding of the conferees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. My brief comment would be directed to the Open Space Land Grants portion of the report. The original House position in this matter was contained in language to the effect that this program should not be utilized in the Washington metropolitan area. The Senate report rejected this position. In excellent language on pages 18 and 19, the Senate report states:

> The committee believes it is unwise, however, to single out any one area, wherever located, for the purpose of denying to them grants for which they have qualified. Title VII of the Housing Act of 1961, which embodies the open-space land provisions, contains some of the stiffest requirements for qualifying for Federal assistance of any law of this kind. The Congress wisely insisted that communities must demonstrate that the land purchased with Federal assistance conform to a comprehensive development plan, that an active program of comprehensive development planning for the entire area is being actively carried on, and that they are already taking such steps as they can without Federal assistance to preserve a maximum of open-space land at a minimum cost. The purpose of this law is to assist urban areas to curb sprawl and prevent the spread of blight and to encourage more economic and desirable urban development by assisting local governing bodies in acquiring fast-disappearing undeveloped land for urgently needed park, conservation, and historic purposes. The preservation of open space and parks is a recognized national need, rather than one that is restricted to any particular region or locality. How promptly metropolitan areas move to acquire suitable lands is conditioned both by the funds available and by the recognition and acceptance of local responsibilities. The committee feels that no area should be penalized because of its ability to quickly qualify for, and receive, Federal assistance and its willingness to expend substantial sums of its own money for necessary open-space lands.

The Washington Post of December 6, 1963, stated:

> Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee that adopted the ban, said after the conference session, "The House language is out.
>
> "We will let the suburbs do what they want."

So I note with some degree of satisfaction that the suburbs of Washington, in Maryland and Virginia, will be allowed now to utilize the open-space land grant program, as will any other area in the Nation.

I, too, commend the Senate chairman and his fellow members of the conference for seeing to it that the Senate position prevailed in this case.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Maryland. We believe we did the right thing in not limiting this provision.

The Senator from Maryland speaks about open spaces. We did something else this year which we hope will be carried out: We informed the General Services Administration that when a new building is built—and a new building is being constructed for the Pentagon—a little Pentagon—and is ready for occupancy, the first persons in the Department of Defense to move in should be those now occupying temporary buildings. Otherwise, it would never be possible to get rid of the old buildings. So we expect to provide a few more open spaces in areas that were intended to be left open by those who designed this beautiful city. Some of the old buildings have existed since prior to World War I. Their occupants will never get out unless they are moved out.

I am sure the Senator from Maryland will be pleased with the proposed open-space move. I hope it will be carried out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8747, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 81, 82, and 91 to the bill (H.R. 8747) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes", and concur therein.
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $1,000,000 set forth in said amendment insert "$650,000".
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Insert the matter stricken, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation may be transferred to any other agency of the Government for research without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget".
>
> *Resolved,* That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 2 and 84.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one amendment remains in disagreement, amendment No. 92, relative to the veterans' hospital in Bay Pines, Fla. As I have already said, the House voted on this item a couple of hours ago and sustained its conferees by a very narrow vote. I am hopeful that we may discuss the matter in the Senate and probably not have to return to conference, because I fear the House would have the same vote, and the Senate would then be in the same position and would only delay the bill.

However, the Senator from Florida has felt so keenly and honestly about this matter for some time that I am sure the Senate would have liked to have the language on which we agreed remain in the bill. To bring the matter to a head, I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 92.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the amendment is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and all the other members of the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations who handled this matter and who unanimously agreed to place in the bill the amendment relating to Bay Pines. I believe it is amendment No. 92. Am I correct in my assumption?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank each of them for their attitude. Furthermore, I desire to have the record show that I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Colorado, and other members of our committee who were conferees upon this bill, every one of whom stood by the Senate position and insisted on the matter being carried back to the House in disagreement for an expression of opinion on the part of the House. They could not have been more loyal to the objectives which I had in mind. I thank them for it.

This bill carries, as I recall, some $14 billion of appropriations, and is more than 5 months behind time. Many agencies have been handicapped in connection with the delay in enactment of the bill, which should be cleared promptly at this time.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as well as with other Senators. There is no doubt that the Senate would again stand by its amendment. Therefore, I wish to take to myself the responsibility for what I am about to do: It seems to me that, having in mind the importance of this entire measure, and having in mind the lateness of the hour at which this question comes before us, and also the fact that various Senators involved already have made travel reservations in connection with returning to their homes, and also having in mind the fact that the vote in the House of Representatives has clearly substantiated the feeling of many of the good people in Florida about this matter; namely, that the line being drawn in this case is a political line, rather than one based primarily on the welfare of the veterans—it seems to me that I should not oppose the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Senate recede, but, instead, that I should let the RECORD show the way the House has voted on this matter, which is as follows: In the House, on the question of accepting the Senate amendment on this matter, the vote was 170 in favor of accepting the Senate amendment and 204 opposed to accepting the Senate amendment. Of the 170 who voted to accept the Senate amendment, 164 were of one party and 6 were of the other party. Of the 204 who voted against acceptance of the Senate amendment, all were of one party.

I hardly think a stronger showing could be made to the effect that—unfortunately—a political issue has been allowed to creep into the matter of taking care of the ill and disabled veterans of the Nation. I am distressed that this is the case.

I recall to the attention of the Senate that in a communication from a most distinguished group of citizens in the State of Florida—the Florida Council of One Hundred, which is a bipartisan body—to the late beloved President of the United States, President John F. Kennedy, dated September 18, 1963, a strong case was made for the amendment included in the Senate bill, which would have insisted that the Administrator proceed to use the funds, appropriated at the request of the Administrator in 1958, for the purpose of doing the advance planning and the engineering for the enlargement of the Bay Pines Hospital—the hospital which the Administrator himself has stated, in the record, as having, in his opinion, the finest location of any veterans hospital in the Nation—700 acres facing the Intracoastal Waterway, looking out across the bay, across the spit of land which comprises the offshore islands opposite St. Petersburg, and to the Gulf of Mexico with a most beautiful view from a hill crowned by virgin pines. There is ample room for the construction of several hospitals of the size of Bay Pines which has been there since World War I—it being the oldest veterans' hospital in our State, and the most popular veterans' hospital, and the one which most veterans' organizations want to see retained and enlarged.

For the Administrator, I wish to say, first, that he has been most generous in his treatment of the needs of the veterans in other areas of our State; and, second, that he has revised his view as to Bay Pines, in that at the last hearing he told our committee that he no longer plans to abandon the hospital, but assured the committee that it would be retained at its present size, which I believe is 600-plus beds—and that under no circumstances would it be abandoned. I believe he said it would be a foolhardy act to abandon the hospital, because of the great need shown for it in the Tampa Bay area, where there are 1¼ million people, and where veterans' needs are very, very great, indeed.

I call attention to the fact that in connection with the statement made by the Florida Council of One Hundred there appears the following sentence in the letter written to the late President of the United States; which, incidentally, appears in the committee hearings at page 2191:

> I have taken your time to review this case in some detail because many of us here in

Pinellas County have come to the reluctant conclusion that the real reason behind Mr. Gleason's refusal to act is a political one.

Mr. President, I regret the fact that a clear political division is shown by the action taken this afternoon in the other body.

Mr. President, having in mind the fine treatment which, the Veterans' Administrator has given otherwise to our veterans, and also having in mind the fact that the new President of the United States, himself a veteran, will, I am sure, be unwilling to have the record continue to disclose the drawing of a political issue in connection with a matter of this kind, I am content to let the record stand because I think perhaps it will bring more speedy action than we would have if we forced the issue and returned this amendment to the House of Representatives, in disagreement.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show at this point the situation with reference to the veterans in our State, I ask unanimous consent that the wording on page 23 of the report on the independent offices appropriations bill for this year, beginning with the words "the record of the hearings," and continuing to the paragraph headed "Loan Guarantee Revolving Fund," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The record of the hearings before the subcommittee includes correspondence from the Florida Council of 100 with most cogent reasons for proceeding at long last with the architectural and engineering work relating to the expansion of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Bay Pines, Fla.
>
> Data submitted to the committee from the State of Florida, Department of Veterans' Affairs, reveals that as of July 19, 1963, there were 152 veterans on the waiting list for the VA hospital at Lake City, Fla.; 587 veterans were on the waiting list for the veterans hospital at Bay Pines; 645 veterans were on the waiting list of the VA hospital at Coral Gables—in all a total of 1,384, all of whom had been found eligible. In addition, the information provided reveals that 1,098 Florida veterans were hospitalized outside the State of Florida by the Veterans' Administration and that a total of 395 Florida veterans were awaiting hospitalization outside the State in VA hospitals.
>
> The Administrator's testimony before the subcommittee indicated a reluctance to proceed with site and planning expenses for this project even though it was authorized and funded some years ago in the absence of a clear-cut statement in the form of appropriate wording in the bill. The committee has therefore recommended the following language be included in the bill:
>
> ": *Provided further*, That $1,722,000 shall be used for the sites and planning expenses involved in the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Bay Pines, Fla."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the report shows that on the date of the report by the Veterans' Bureau in Florida, in July of this year, 1,098 veterans from Florida were being hospitalized in hospitals outside our State, some of them as far as 1,000 miles away.

I know something of the sympathy which both the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado have shown in connection with this matter; and I hope they will feel—and will state for the record, if they feel it is appropriate to do so—that, in their judgment, it is best to let this matter remain as it is, and to give the Administrator a chance to move ahead with the construction and enlargement of this hospital, in order partially to meet the need which has been shown to exist.

With that brief statement, I make it very clear that I shall not oppose the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 92.

At this time I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Florida has made a wise decision, although we of the committee feel very strongly about this provision. We thought it was the only thing we could do in this case, in order to proceed with this matter.

I have been somewhat at a loss to understand why the Administrator—although I have never asked him directly—did not go ahead with this hospital, and then also proceed with whatever plans he may have had for another one, in another area, because all the testimony we receive from the Veterans' Administration every year is of the growing need for hospitalization facilities for veterans.

Mr. HOLLAND. Especially in Florida.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, all over the country, but more so in Florida.

It seems to me that by the time that is done and by the time they obtain the sites and the funding—which will take 4 or 5 years—both of these hospitals will be needed.

I have no doubt about it. The need for veterans hospitals all over the country has grown, but more so in areas such as Florida and beautiful places like Bay Pines and other places of that kind. I am at a loss to understand why they do not proceed. The facility has been funded. They can go ahead with the other hospital, because by the time it is completed they will need the space anyway. They may even have to move other veterans down there because the table of veterans hospitalization shows that the World War II veterans are reaching the age at which they need more medical care, and it goes higher.

There is in this bill $1,100-million-plus for inhospital care alone. This is not outhospital care. It has reached that proportion.

I dislike to add this statement, but I believe for the record it should be stated that every other bed is a mental case. This is startling, but it is true.

It seems to me that the Administrator could well proceed with this hospital. It is funded. So I believe he should go ahead and start the other one, too, because surely the number of veterans in the area justifies it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Washington. With regard to his reference to mental cases, I am sorry to have to say that of nearly 1,100 Florida veterans hospitalized in points remote from our State—where it is difficult for their families to reach them and necessary that they do so—almost all or a large part of them are neuropsychiatric cases. That is one of the pitiful features of the whole picture.

I thank the Senator for his sympathetic attitude towards this problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. The chairman of the committee has said many of the things I wished to say.

With the more than one thousand cases from Florida which now have to be hospitalized outside the State, it seems to me that in the last 2 years there has been an adequate record made as to the necessity for the hospitals in Florida with the addition of the Bay Pines Hospital. I also am reminded that this particular hospital was funded by the Congress more than 3 years ago. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The funding for the engineering plans and all the advance planning necessary to build the proposed addition to the hospital was provided for by the Congress some 5 years ago and has been carried forward every year in the budget but no action has been taken to proceed with the project despite the fact the money has been available to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will yield further, what he has mentioned is what distresses me about this question. The President has named the Administrator, but I believe it is the function of Congress to make the laws of the country and to designate the locations where hospitals should be built if they are believed to be necessary. The fact that the hospital has been funded for more than 3 years can only lead me to believe—and I do not say that my opinion is the viewpoint of the Senator from Florida—that the decision of the Administrator in that case is an arbitrary one.

Another provision in the report—which I will not discuss at this time but I certainly intend to do so later—leads me to believe that the Administrator has reached another arbitrary decision.

But I say in conclusion to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am convinced after listening to this subject for 3 years, that the Senator from Florida is entirely correct in his basic concept for this hospital, and that if he had made a different decision than he has now made on the floor of the Senate, I would have been ready to continue to support him as long as he desired support.

I hope that what has occurred will not be without some beneficial effect upon the Administrator in starting the hospital at Bay Pines.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Colorado. It is true that before the conference report came before the Senate, the Senator from Colorado stated to me that he would take the position he has mentioned. I deeply appreciate it.

However, it seems to me that to allow what apparently in the other body has now become a political controversy to continue on a question of this kind is not the wise course. I have consulted with the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, and other Senators who are deeply concerned with this matter. We all feel that action probably will be taken when it is shown that in this body the feeling is so strong for going ahead with the project—and the Senate has remained unanimous on the question—as it is and that in the other body the lines are so closely drawn, if I may use that expression, as they appear to be from the vote just taken there.

I again thank the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington. I hope that the veterans' program in our State and in every other part of the Nation will move ahead in a completely nonpolitical manner, based wholly upon the merits of the program that will best take care of the needs of the veterans who so badly need added care; and who, as I have already said—to the extent of 1,098 of them—are hospitalized in points remote from our State. That kind of situation should not continue.

In addition, between 1,000 and 2,000 veterans are on the waiting lists of the various veterans hospitals in Florida. Such a pitiful situation should cry out for immediate action. I hope that the Administrator will hear that cry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to recede from amendment No. 92.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I want to join our colleagues in also commending Mr. Earl W. Cooper and Mr. Franklin B. Dryden, the efficient members of the staff.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing the action taken on each item of the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964 (H.R. 8747)

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1964*

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill | Senate bill | Conference action |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I | | | | | |
| EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE CONTROL | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $530,000 | $525,000 | $525,000 | $525,000 | $525,000 |
| OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 5,240,000 | 7,200,000 | 4,045,000 | 5,265,000 | 4,695,000 |
| Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies | 5,190,000 | 7,750,000 | 5,190,000 | 4,190,000 | 4,190,000 |
| State and local preparedness | | 3,000,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Total, Office of Emergency Planning | 10,430,000 | 17,950,000 | 10,735,000 | 10,955,000 | 10,385,000 |
| OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 764,150 | 1,025,000 | 780,000 | 980,000 | 880,000 |
| Total, Executive Office of the President | 11,724,150 | 19,500,000 | 12,040,000 | 12,460,000 | 11,790,000 |
| FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| Disaster relief | 25,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | | | |
| CIVIL DEFENSE | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 75,000,000 | 82,200,000 | 70,000,000 | 70,638,000 | 70,319,000 |
| Research, shelter survey and marking | 53,000,000 | | 17,800,000 | 64,700,000 | 41,250,000 |
| Research and development, shelter, and construction | | 264,700,000 | | | |
| Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense | 128,000,000 | 346,900,000 | 87,800,000 | 135,338,000 | 111,569,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE | | | | | |
| PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | | | |
| Emergency health activities | 7,600,000 | 41,361,000 | 25,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 27,500,000 |
| INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | | |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 9,450,000 | 10,800,000 | 10,115,000 | 10,365,000 | 10,240,000 |
| Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization) | 82,864,000 | 83,775,000 | 75,000,000 | 81,000,000 | 79,000,000 |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Board | 92,314,000 | 94,575,000 | 85,115,000 | 91,365,000 | 89,240,000 |
| CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 22,161,300 | 22,180,000 | 21,680,000 | 21,930,000 | 21,805,000 |
| Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations | 600,000 | 670,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| Annuities under special acts | 2,000,000 | 1,888,000 | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 |
| Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund | 5,166,000 | 9,530,000 | 9,500,000 | 9,500,000 | 9,500,000 |
| Government contribution, retired employees health benefits fund | 8,000,000 | 14,860,000 | 14,800,000 | 14,800,000 | 14,800,000 |
| Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund | 30,000,000 | 62,000,000 | 62,000,000 | 62,000,000 | 62,000,000 |
| Administrative expenses employees life insurance fund (limitation) | (263,550) | (279,000) | (270,000) | (270,000) | (270,000) |
| Total, Civil Service Commission | 67,927,300 | 111,128,000 | 110,380,000 | 110,630,000 | 110,505,000 |
| FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY | | | | | |
| Operations | 488,930,000 | 545,500,000 | 515,775,000 | 535,000,000 | 528,000,000 |
| Facilities and equipment | 125,000,000 | 127,000,000 | 110,000,000 | 100,250,000 | 100,250,000 |
| Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization) | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 20,000,000 |
| Grants-in-aid for airports | 75,000,000 | | | | |
| Research and development | 35,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 35,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 40,000,000 |
| Operations and maintenance, National Capital airports | | 8,000,000 | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport | 3,475,000 | | 3,500,000 | 3,663,000 | 3,581,500 |
| Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport | 3,276,600 | | 3,810,000 | 4,045,000 | 3,985,000 |
| Construction, National Capital airports | | 4,600,000 | | | |
| Construction, Washington National Airport | 2,000,000 | | 2,075,000 | 2,075,000 | 2,075,000 |
| Construction, Dulles International Airport | 3,200,000 | | 450,000 | 450,000 | 450,000 |
| Civil supersonic aircraft development | 20,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 60,000,000 |
| Total, Federal Aviation Agency | 775,881,600 | 815,100,000 | 750,610,000 | 770,483,000 | 758,341,500 |
| FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 14,950,550 | 16,500,000 | 15,800,000 | 15,400,000 | 15,600,000 |

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964 (H.R. 8747)—Continued

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and estimates and action taken on items in the bill for 1964*—Continued

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill | Senate bill | Conference action |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 11,080,000 | 12,675,000 | 11,750,000 | 11,950,000 | 11,850,000 |
| FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 11,472,500 | 13,028,000 | 12,100,000 | 12,329,500 | 12,214,750 |
| GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 43,900,000 | 46,850,000 | 45,700,000 | 45,700,000 | 45,700,000 |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service | $184,386,500 | $216,439,000 | $200,875,000 | $214,875,000 | $210,875,000 |
| Repair and improvement of public buildings | 65,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 75,000,000 |
| Construction, public buildings project | 180,955,600 | 171,965,000 | 152,540,700 | 163,623,150 | 157,600,800 |
| Sites and expenses, public buildings projects | 30,500,000 | 41,100,000 | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 |
| Payments, public buildings purchase contracts | 5,440,000 | 5,200,000 | 5.200,000 | 5,200,000 | 5,200,000 |
| Expenses, U.S. court facilities | | 1,587,000 | 1,030,600 | 1,030,600 | 1,030,600 |
| Additional court facilities | 8,500,000 | | | | |
| Improvements, National Industrial Reserve Plant No. 485 | 1,100,000 | | | | |
| Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia | 375,000 | | | | |
| Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service | 42.212,000 | 51,000,000 | 45,500,000 | 46,500,000 | 46,000,000 |
| General supply fund | 38,500,000 | 35,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts) | (8,756,500) | (10,000,000) | (9,275,000) | (9,500,000) | (9,387,500) |
| Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service | 14,416,100 | 15,000,000 | 14,730,000 | 14,730,000 | 14,730,000 |
| Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service | 4,287,000 | 5,870,000 | 4,725,000 | 4,975,000 | 4,850,000 |
| Federal telecommunications fund | 9,000,000 | | | | |
| Strategic and critical materials: | | | | | |
| (Indefinite appropriation of receipts) | (18,095,000) | (28,145,000) | (23,925,000) | (23,925,000) | |
| Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator | 1,405,100 | 1,500,000 | 1,438,000 | 1,438,000 | 1,438,000 |
| Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents | 320,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Administrative operations fund (limitation) | (17,538,000) | (20,194,000) | (18,150,000) | (13,580,000) | (18,150,000) |
| Total, General Services Administration | 586,397,300 | 619,961,000 | 571,339,300 | 597,671,750 | 587,024,400 |
| HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY | | | | | |
| Office of the Administrator: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 14,728,000 | 16,675,000 | 15,325,000 | 15,725,000 | 15,525,000 |
| Urban planning grants | 18,000,000 | 23,500,000 | 21,150,000 | 21,150,000 | 21,150,000 |
| Urban studies and housing research | 375,000 | 2,500,000 | 387,400 | 387,400 | 387,400 |
| Mass transportation demonstration grants | 32,500,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Administrative expenses, mass transportation activities | (200,000) | 195,000 | (195,000) | (195,000) | (195,000) |
| Open-space land grants | 15,000,000 | 32,325,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Low-income housing demonstration grants | 3,000,000 | 5,065,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Public works planning fund | 12,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| Urban renewal fund (liquidation of contract authorization) | 300,000,000 | 200,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| Housing for the elderly fund | 70,000,000 | 125,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| Total, Office of the Administrator | 465,603,000 | 430,260,000 | 235,062,400 | 260,462,400 | 260,262,400 |
| Public Housing Administration: | | | | | |
| Annual contributions | 180,000,000 | 205,000,000 | 197,000,000 | 197,000,000 | 197,000,000 |
| Administrative expenses | 14,881,500 | 16,150,000 | 15,484,000 | 15,484,000 | 15,484,000 |
| Total, Public Housing Administration | 194,881,500 | 221,150,000 | 212,484,000 | 212,484,000 | 212,484,000 |
| Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency | 660,484,500 | 651,410,000 | 447,546,400 | 472,946,400 | 472,746,400 |
| INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 23,502,800 | 25,450,000 | 24,500,000 | 24,840,000 | 24,670,000 |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Research, development, and operation | 2,897,878,000 | 4,912,000,000 | | | |
| Research and development | | | 3,926,000,000 | 3,926,000,000 | 3,926,000,000 |
| Construction of facilities | 776,237,000 | 800,000,000 | 680,000,000 | 680,000,000 | 680,000,000 |
| Administrative operations | | | 494,000,000 | 494,000,000 | 494,000,000 |
| Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 3,674,115,000 | 5,712,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 | 5,100,000,000 |
| NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance of properties | 40,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 | 43,000 |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 322,500,000 | 589,000,000 | 323,200,000 | 373,200,000 | 353,200,000 |
| RENEGOTIATION BOARD | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 2,450,000 | 2,650,000 | 2,550,000 | 2,550,000 | 2,550,000 |
| SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 13,261,700 | 14,400,000 | 13,775,000 | 14,100,000 | 13,937,500 |
| SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 37,714,200 | 38,140,000 | 37,840,000 | 37,940,000 | 37,940,000 |
| VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| General operating expenses | 161,129,950 | 159,750,000 | 159,750,000 | 159,750,000 | 159,750,000 |
| Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses | 13,981,950 | 14,982,000 | 14,510,000 | 14,800,000 | 14,800,000 |
| Medical and prosthetic research | 30,500,000 | 33,742,000 | 31,720,000 | 36,720,000 | 33,742,000 |
| Medical care | 1,048,172,300 | 1,087,688,000 | 1,075,186,000 | 1,081,186,000 | 1,081,186,000 |
| Compensation and pensions | 3,874,000,000 | 3,921,000 000 | 3,921,000,000 | 3,921,000,000 | 3,921,000,000 |
| Readjustment benefits | 95,800,000 | 101,100,000 | 67,000,000 | 67,000,000 | 67,000,000 |
| Veterans insurance and indemnities | 32,000,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 |
| Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities | 77,600,000 | 81,000,000 | 72,754,000 | 76,877,000 | 76,796,000 |
| Grants to the Republic of the Philippines | 500,000 | 310,000 | 310,000 | 310,000 | 310,000 |
| Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations) | (311,603,000) | | (246,240,000) | | (300,000,000) |
| Total, Veterans' Administration | 5,333,084,200 | 5,429,772,000 | 5,372,430,000 | 5,387,843,000 | 5,384,784,000 |
| Total, definite appropriation | 11,842,799,800 | 14,620,443,600 | 13,069,518,700 | 13,356,789,650 | 13,191,205,550 |
| Total, indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales) | 26,851,500 | 38,145,000 | 33,200,000 | 33,425,000 | 33,312,500 |
| Total appropriations, title I | 11,869,651,300 | 14,658,588,000 | 13,102,718,700 | 13,390,214,650 | 13,224,518,050 |

*Administrative and nonadministrative expenses*

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

| Corporation or agency | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimates, 1964 | House bill | Senate bill | Conference action |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | ($2,037,500) | ($2,470,000) | ($2,430,000) | ($2,430,000) | ($2,430,000) |
| Nonadministrative expenses | (11,580,750) | (12,934,000) | (12,800,000) | (12,800,000) | (12,800,000) |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation | (1,160,900) | (1,335,000) | (1,315,000) | (1,315,000) | (1,315,000) |
| General Services Administration: Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund | (25,000) | | | | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency: | | | | | |
| College housing loans | (1,847,500) | (1,925,000) | (1,903,000) | (1,903,000) | (1,903,000) |
| Public facility loans | (1,188,000) | (1,280,000) | (1,220,000) | (1,220,000) | (1,220,000) |
| Housing for the elderly | (744,000) | (1,250,000) | (770,000) | (1,000,000 | (885,000) |
| Revolving fund (liquidating programs) | (145,000) | (140,000) | (135,000) | (135,000) | (135,000) |
| Federal National Mortgage Association | (8,392,500) | (9,125,000) | (8,750,000) | (8,750,000) | (8,750,000) |
| Federal Housing Administration: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | (10,732,500) | (9,900,000) | (9,920,000) | (9,600,000) | (9,500,000) |
| Nonadministrative expenses | (69,305,000) | (78,150,000) | (76,065,000) | (77,065,000) | (76,565,000) |
| Public Housing Administration: | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | (14,881,500) | (16,150,000) | (15,484,000) | (15,484,000) | (15,484,000) |
| Nonadministrative expenses | (1,223,750) | (1,600,000) | (1,240,000) | (1,600,000) | (1,420,000) |
| Total, administrative expenses | (123,263,900) | (136,259,000) | (131,312,000) | (133,302,000) | (132,407,000) |

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to try to clear up two or three points in the report. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts called the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language appearing on page 12 of the conference report, which reads as follows:

> The conferees are agreed that no further funds are to be provided for shelter survey and stocking.

I am quite sure—and I should like to have the assurance of the Senator from Washington—that it was certainly not our intention when we approved that particular amendment that there would be no further funds used for stocking. What that language means is that no further funds, other than those included in the bill, will be used for stocking this particular year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, that is the interpretation of the conferees and is correct. I agree.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, under the heading of "Space Appropriations," in the Senate report, on page 20, the following language appears:

> The committee found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has initiated an academic grant program which is projected to cost between $21 and $28 million per year in the near future. Because of the overlap with other governmental grant education programs, the committee questions the propriety of such a program administered by this agency, and therefore directs that no new grants be made without specific authorization and appropriation.

When the bill was before the Senate, it was agreed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the committee, by me, and by other Senators that what this meant was that no new grants should be made but that it would not forbid the continuance of those underway.

I find in the language of the conference report, written by the House conferees—and this matter was not discussed at all, so far as I can remember, in the conference committee—on page 16:

> The committee of conference is agreed that the academic grant program be carried out within funds appropriated and under good administrative practices; that NASA employment should be held to the minimum required for the expanded program, and the number of employees is to be governed by the funds allowed.

How to interpret that language is a question.

It is my opinion that until the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, has an opportunity to act upon such legislation, this matter should be held in abeyance in accordance with the recent language and understanding of the Senate.

We did not discuss this particular item, which was a language matter, in the conference committee, but I interpret the language to mean that we are not appropriating any funds as such for the academic program, and that it will be necessary, if the academic program is carried on, to make way for it out of any funds available. My own feeling is that the position agreed to in the Senate, when the bill passed the Senate a few days ago, is the one which should be sustained.

I should like to speak of one other matter; namely, the National Science Foundation. It is quite complicated. I will try to state it in its bare essence. It involves a program under the National Science Foundation which is called the Mohole project.

The Senate committee put this language in its report:

> Such a diversity of scientific and engineering opinion has been presented to the Committee on Project Mohole that it is obvious that construction of the large drilling platform at this time would be unwise. The committee therefore directs that no planning, research, or construction funds leading to such platform be expended until more data is available to this committee upon which it can base a more informed judgment.
>
> No other moneys than those previously appropriated for this purpose shall be expended.

I wish to follow immediately with the language of the House, as shown on page 16 of the conference report on this same matter. This matter was discussed in the committee. We came back to it two or three times:

> The committee of conference is agreed that funds are provided for Project Mohole and that the National Science Foundation and the Bureau of the Budget shall use good judgment and work out a sensible proposition.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that we cannot control what the House puts in its reports, but I shall take a few moments to state what it is all about.

Project Mohole is a basic scientific project to go through the first, second, and third layers of the crust of the earth and into the real mantle of the earth. It is a fantastically complicated scientific endeavor, and I shall not go into it at length. There exists at this time nothing but the most rudimentary means of attempting such a grand scientific exploration. We must learn everything new about it as we go along.

The large vessel which has been referred to will cost, by itself, an estimated $16 million. I believe it will cost more than that. With its supporting equipment, the cost of the vessel will be $40 million. The entire Mohole project, it is now estimated, will cost $70 million.

This is the reason for my great concern.

Numerous scientists appeared and testified before the committee. They appeared and testified at my request, because I knew of the great controversy which exists in our scientific community as to how we should proceed with the project. When we are talking about juggling $70 million, I believe there is reason to use a little common horse sense and precaution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the statements of Dr. Hollis D. Hedberg; of Dr. John Brackett Hersey; of Capt. Lewis Rupp; and of Jack I. McClelland; and letters from Dr. Roger Revelle of the University of California, and from Dr. Walter H. Munk, of the Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics of the University of California; and I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD immediately prior to the excerpts from the statements by these men short biographies of these men.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the several requests by the Senator from Colorado are agreed to.

The excerpts and biographical sketches, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

### DR. HOLLIS D. HEDBERG, CHAIRMAN, AMSOC COMMITTEE

Professor of geology, Princeton University; vice president for exploration, Gulf Oil Corp. Previously, petrographer, Lago Petroleum Corp.; director, Geological Lab, Mene Grande Oil Co.; chief geologist, exploration coordinator, Gulf Oil Corp.

Geology: Compaction of sediments, micropaleontology, sedimentary petrology; use of heavy minerals in stratigraphical studies; geology of Caribbean region and South America; petroleum geology in Africa; stratigraphic nomenclature.

Ph. D. stratigraphy, Stanford University, 1937. Member, National Academy of Sciences; president, Geological Society of America, 1960; recipient of Medalla Honor, Venezuela, 1941; Sidney Powers Medal, 1963; Ph. D. (honorary), Kansas University, 1963.

Commissioner and chairman, American Commission on Stratigraphic Nomenclature; chairman and president, International Subcommittee on Stratigraphical Terminology; chairman, U.S. committee (geology-geophysics) 6th World Petroleum Congress, 1963; director, Cushman Foundation for Foraminiferal Research; member, U.S. National Committee, International Union of Geological Sciences; U.S. delegate, ECAFE Conference, Teheran. Served as member and consultant on committees, panels and working groups of NASA and other Government agencies.

---

### STATEMENT OF DR. HOLLIS D. HEDBERG, CHAIRMAN, AMSOC COMMITTEE, DIVISION OF EARTH SCIENCES, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

#### MOHOLE PROJECT

This project can readily be one of the greatest and most rewarding scientific ventures ever carried out. I must say also that it can just as readily become instead only a foolish and unjustifiably expensive fiasco if there is not insistence that it be carried out within a proper concept and in a well-planned, rigorously logical, and scientific manner. There must be insistence that it not be allowed to degenerate into merely another costly publicity stunt. The Amsoc Committee, as originator of the project, feels a deep public responsibility for this project, and is dedicated to keeping this pioneering effort on a sound and rational basis which will give to science and engineering and to this country a maximum return in value received for dollars spent. I might further add that personally I would far rather see this project killed where it now stands than to see it carried out in a manner not worthy of its potentialities or in any way which will not insure that the country gets its maximum money's worth in scientific and engineering achievement in return for the large expenditure which must necessarily be involved.

The Amsoc Committee carried out directly the first phase of the project—experimental oceanic drilling early in 1961 at La Jolla and at Guadalupe Island sites on the Pacific coast, which yielded very significant results.

The need for an intermediate stage between the first experimental drilling and the ultimate objective of the project was clearly recognized in the first published statement of the objectives of the project printed in the Scientific American of April 1959.

#### RECOMMENDATION OF INTERMEDIATE DRILLING PROGRAM

In June of 1961, at the time of the decision to turn operations over to a prime contractor, the Amsoc Committee had recommended an intermediate drilling program and had even included the prompt construction and operation of an intermediate vessel in their budget for the fiscal year 1962.

Specific recommendations for an intermediate stage and an intermediate vessel were submitted by the Amsoc Committee to NSF several times before NSF signed the contract with the prime contractor and these recommendations have subsequently been repeated by the Amsoc Committee many times both orally and in written communications to NSF.

The Amsoc Committee consists of some 20 scientists and engineers from universities, research institutions, and industry, selected for their competence in the field with which the project is concerned and for their interest and ability to aid in the accomplishment of the objectives of the project.

In addition, the Committee has established special panels to give attention to particular aspects of the project and these panels include not only Amsoc members but also draw on the experience and ability of some 25 additional scientists and engineers selected from research and industrial organizations throughout the country for their competence in particular fields.

These panels are those of site selection, scientific objectives and measurements, drilling techniques, naval architecture, and oceanic sediments drilling.

Neither Amsoc Committee members nor Amsoc panel members receive any remuneration for their services, but donate these freely in the interests of science and engineering.

#### COMMITTEE CONCEPT OF PROJECT

The Amsoc Committee concept of the project calls for a progressive and orderly approach to the ultimate drilling investigation of the earth's mantle by investigating first, with a vessel of moderate drilling depth capacity, certain aspects of the oceanic crust to moderate depths below the ocean floor, thus achieving some of the more readily attainable, but no less important, shallow and moderate depth objectives, while at the same time gaining the experience, know-how, and general geologic background necessary for a more assuredly successful attainment of the deeper and more difficult ultimate goals.

The work of the intermediate stage is in Amsoc's concept a natural and an integral part of the Mohole project. It is also an absolute essential to the justification of the cost of this project.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Now, the Amsoc Committee has recommended this approach to the National Science Foundation for reasons including the following:

1. The information to be obtained from a number of strategically located, moderate depth, oceanic holes is essential to the proper choice of the best location for a Mohole.

2. The information from such holes is essential background for adequate interpretation of the results of a Mohole when drilled.

3. The information which can be obtained from any one of the moderate depth holes will be, at this stage in our knowledge, a contribution to science and national prestige at least equally as great as may be expected from penetration of the Mohole, and can be attained much earlier and much more certainly.

4. The drilling of moderate depth holes in oceanic waters will furnish invaluable experience in vessel design and drilling techniques for use in ultimate Mohole drilling, which may very conceivably mean the difference between success and failure in attaining the ultimate objectives of the project.

5. Experience and knowledge gained in preparatory drilling may well result in overall long-range economy and reduction in costs for the project as a whole.

6. The more easily accomplished initial moderate depth holes will provide definite insurance for the success of the project, regardless of success or failure to reach the Mohole, by the early attainment of other goals of major importance.

7. The program of the intermediate stage approach is in harmony with the broad framework of the project as previously approved by Congress.

#### ESSENTIALITY OF INTERMEDIATE VESSEL

The use of a special vessel of moderate drilling depth capacity—the intermediate vessel—rather than the ultimate Mohole vessel for this experimental-exploratory stage is essential because of:

1. the greater mobility of such a smaller vessel and its ability to move readily from one ocean to another;

2. the lesser delay involved in its construction and the consequent advantage of earlier returns of data;

3. the need for experience with a moderate-depth drilling vessel in order to decide what should be the final character of the ultimate vessel;

4. the advantage of having further experience available for utilization in the design and construction of drilling equipment;

5. the need for continuing investigation of alternative and supplementary sites during the long interval in which the ultimate vessel will be tied up on its initial Mohole effort, estimated at maybe 2 or 3 years;

6. the overall long-range economy to the project which it could effect in terms of results obtained for money expended; and

7. the fact that such an intermediate vessel would find immense and continuing service in the long-range national investigation of ocean crustal sediments which is quite certainly to be anticipated after the immediate objectives of the Mohole project have been fulfilled.

In conclusion, let me reiterate what has been the strong recommendation of the Amsoc Committee to NSF for at least the last 2 years.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

We strongly recommend that the Mohole project be carried forward only by a route which involves, as an initial and integral part of the project, an adequate preparatory stage of moderate-depth experimental-exploratory oceanic drilling (intermediate stage) carried out by a mobile vessel of moderate drilling depth capacity (intermediate vessel).

We believe this is the sane, logical, and economical approach which will not only provide the best promise of an eventual successful sampling of the deep mantle but will also provide a maximum return in national scientific prestige through its early contribution of numerous discoveries in the suboceanic sediments and deeper crust of equal or even greater scientific importance, prior to a possible eventual Mohole penetration.

We believe that this approach offers positive assurance of a successful project, whether or not the Mohole is attainable at greater depths, and that it is the only approach which justifies the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars and which will have the support of the vast majority of scientists, engineers, and the informed public.

---

### DR. J. BRACKETT HERSEY, GEOPHYSICIST, WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION

Professor of oceanography, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; previously recorder, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey; assistant observer, Phillips Petroleum Co.; instructor, Lehigh University; physicist, Naval Ordnance Laboratory; lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Geophysics: Oceanography; reflection and refraction seismic exploration of earth's oceanic crust; heat conductivity; magnetic and gravity exploration; sound transmission in the sea; sound production by marine animals; oil exploration; 27 publications since 1941.

Ph. D. physics, Lehigh University, 1941; individual citation, U.S. Navy, 1945; John Fleming Award, 1958.

### Statement of Dr. John Brackett Hersey, Chairman, Geophysics Department, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

#### LIMITATION ON PROJECT

NSF and a few Amsoc members continue to prefer to restrict the scope of the Mohole project at most to the limited but worthwhile objectives I outlined to you earlier.

Senator ELLENDER. What percentage in the Amsoc holds a contrary view? I mean of the membership.

Dr. HERSEY. I am perfectly certain of three members of whatever the total membership is. I would like to refer to someone who——

Senator ELLENDER. What is the membership?

Dr. HERSEY. The membership is 20.

Senator ELLENDER. And only three hold as you do?

Dr. HERSEY. No. Only three hold the contrary.

Senator ELLENDER. Oh, contrary.

As far as you know, only three hold a contrary view to what you are now expressing.

Dr. HERSEY. That is correct. Namely, they hold the view in agreement with the restricted definition of the Mohole project as a deliberate restricted program to penetrate to the mantle without taking into account the broader objectives.

### Dr. Maurice Ewing, Chairman, Oceanic Sediments Drilling Panel

Director, Lamont Geological Observatory; Higgins professor of geology, Columbia University; previously associate professor of geology, Lehigh University; research associate, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

Geophysics: Author (or coauthor) of some 174 scientific papers on seismology and marine geology. First to do seismic refraction work at sea. Developed numerous oceanographic instruments including underwater camera and deep-sea corer.

Ph. D. physics, Rice Institute 1931; member, National Academy of Sciences; president, American Geophysical Union, 1956–59; recipient of numerous medals, awards, and honorary degrees.

Served as member and consultant on committees and panels of Geological Society of America, Research and Development Board, International Geophysical Year, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and President's Science Advisory Committee.

### Letter From Maurice Ewing

Senator ALLOTT. Are you, Doctor, acquainted with Maurice Ewing of the Lamont Geological Observatory at Columbia University?

Dr. HERSEY. I am.

Senator ALLOTT. In a letter to me he says:

"I note you have also invited Drs. Revelle and Hersey. If as appears likely, I am at sea at the time of the hearings, you will receive from them a good account of my views because we thoroughly agree on this subject."

I take it, then, from his letter to me, that he is in accord with Dr. Revelle's ideas and yours that the intermediate work should precede the all-out construction of a huge deep large vessel for the primary purpose of making one penetration of the earth's mantle.

Dr. HERSEY. I believe that is correct, sir.

Senator ALLOTT. And you know, do you, that he and you are in accord on your views on this matter?

Dr. HERSEY. Yes.

### Capt. Lewis A. Rupp, U.S. Navy, Retired, Chairman, Naval Architecture Panel, AMSOC

Executive vice president, Ionics, Inc., previously head, Hydromechanics Division, David Taylor Model Basin, U.S. Navy; Propeller and Shafting Division, Bureau of Ships, U.S. Navy; design superintendent, Navy Ship Yard, Portsmouth, N.H.

Naval architecture: Hydromechanics; naval construction; marine engineering; ship shafting; metallurgy.

B.S., U.S. Naval Academy 1937; M.S., naval construction and marine engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1943; advanced metallurgy, University of Maryland.

### Statement of Capt. Lewis Rupp, U.S. Navy, Retired

The Naval Architecture Panel of the Amsoc Committee was formed in August 1961 to provide advice to the Amsoc Committee concerning the naval architecture and marine engineering problems associated with deep drilling from a floating vessel at sea. The panel members comprise a group of the most eminently qualified naval architects and engineers in the country today.

#### SELECTION OF PRIME CONTRACTOR

Initially, and prior to the selection of a prime contractor for the Mohole project, the panel met several times to review the state of the art in deep ocean drilling and to discuss vessel specifications and characteristics for carrying out a logical and necessary development program, leading ultimately to uncovering the mysteries of the earth's crustal layers and penetration of the mantle.

From these studies came a unanimous recommendation for a two-ship program. We believed that this approach not only would minimize the risk of scientific failure but also would be less costly, overall. An intermediate-size ship, with capabilities of drilling to 20,000 to 25,000 feet, with low initial and operating costs, was considered the most satisfactory solution to carrying out the experimental drilling program necessary for determining suitable site selection for the ultimate Mohole drilling, for developing untried drilling methods, techniques, and equipment, for evaluating ship positioning equipment and control instrumentation, for developing buoyancy methods for the riser casing and methods of attachment to the ship, for developing hole reentry techniques, for evaluating down-hole scientific measuring instruments, and a host of other problems.

#### ALTERNATIVE TO INTERMEDIATE VESSEL

The alternative was to design an ultimate vessel and equipment at once, with capability of penetrating to the mantle. The prime contractor for the project has followed the latter course, which, I believe, entails the route of highest cost and risk. When a solution of a magnitude of new design problems for development of tools, techniques, and procedures are required, it is not feasible, in my opinion, to attempt to solve all of them at one time by paper studies. Certainly, some of the problems to be encountered will be satisfactorily solved by such an approach, other so-called problems for which great effort and cost has been expended, will not turn out to be problems at all, and many new problems and changes in developments, which were not perceived in advance will be encountered when we finally get on with the job. There is no substitute for an orderly experience-gathering approach to such a complex system development.

It is an extremely costly vehicle both in first cost and operating cost, and lacks the mobility for economically carrying out a thorough exploratory and site selection program.

Even at this date, I firmly believe that the public and the scientific community would be best served by carrying out a two-ship program.

Immediate investment in a modest intermediate vessel, with deferral of construction of the ultimate vehicle until some of the development problems are better defined, would not only save the public considerable dollars, serve the scientific community more fully with earlier concrete results, but also minimize the risk of a major fiasco.

### Dr. Jack I. McLelland, Ph. D., Vice President, Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc.

Chief Engineer for National Academy of Sciences on Mohole phase I.

Degrees: Engineer of mines, Colorado School of Mines, 1950; geological engineer, Colorado School of Mines, 1953; Ph. D., mechanical engineering, Clausthall-Zellerfeld, Berg Akademie, Germany, 1959; was ship engineer in merchant marine, 1940–42 and 1944–47; with AEC on the Colorado Plateau, 1953–54; with a private company as exploration geologist, mine superintendent, and chief of drilling operations for oil and minerals, 1954–56.

### Statement of Jack I. McLelland, Vice President, Ocean Science & Engineering, Inc.

#### OBJECT OF PROJECT

When the Mohole project began in 1958 its object was to try to learn about the nature and history of the layers of the earth's crust beneath the sea by drilling; eventually we hope to sample the earth's mantle. This progressive concept of the project has permeated every National Academy of Sciences publication on the subject and I can assure you that whatever else you may hear, this is the basis upon which we have worked since 1958—certainly up until the project was taken over by the National Science Foundation.

#### PLAN OFFERED FOR PROJECT

In keeping with that idea and taking into consideration the things learned in the experimental drilling (which, by the way, did not complete phase I as originally conceived) in Ocotober 1961, the Amsoc staff, under Willard Bascom, set forth a plan for the future of the project.

I wish now to quote from the memorandum of October 1, 1961:

"In the opinion of the staff and its principal consultants, it would not be prudent to begin by trying to design and build the ultimate deep-drilling ship in final form with all the complications that are entailed.

"Our opinion as engineers is that the proper way to proceed is to build an experimental drilling ship of modest proportions and use it to develop ideas and equipment and to work out logistics problems at a relatively small cost. We propose that this ship be equipped to reach downward 20,000 feet with a drill bit. (Note that this is half a mile deeper than the Soviet land record; equal to the U.S. land record of only 10 years ago; deep enough to reach the third layer at sea in many places.)

This is the intermediate ship concept.

It is our considered opinion that it is necessary to have an experimental (intermediate) ship on which new devices can be tested. We believe that in the end the Moho will be reached sooner and for less cost if this course is followed."

In December 1962, our company, in formal proposal to the Amsoc Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, offered to design, build, and operate the drilling ship that we had first proposed as members of the NAS staff. In that proposal (which would not change substantially if we re-

**wrote it today) we gave detailed characteristics, costs, and time schedules. The cost of building that ship and operating it for 2 years in a deep sea drilling program will be somewhat less than $10 million if OSE manages the work.**

**On the other hand, assuming that the presently proposed six-column platform is the proper route to the Mohole, it means another year of study, 2 years of design, construction, and testing, and 2 to 3 years of drilling. At that time, roughly 8 years after the successful work at Guadalupe Island, all of the oceanic crust except that one site will remain to be explored.**

---

**DR. ROGER REVELLE, DIRECTOR, SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY, AND UNIVERSITY DEAN OF RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Previously commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, U.S. Naval Electronics Lab, and Buships; head, geophysics branch, ONR; with Operation Crossroads and resurvey; science adviser to Secretary of Interior; leader, several Pacific oceanographic expenditures.**

**Oceanography: Physical oceanography and geology of the sea floor. Author of some 59 scientific papers.**

**Ph. D., oceanography, University of California, 1936; member, National Academy of Sciences, 1957; several distinguished awards including Albatross Medal of Swedish Royal Society of Science and Letters, 1954.**

**President, Special Committee on Oceanic Research, International Council of Scientific Unions; First International Oceanographic Congress at the United Nations; Chairman, Divisional Committee for Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, NSF; Oceanography Panel, Research and Development Board; member, several congressional, Government agency, and Academy advisory committees and panels.**

---

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,**
***Berkeley, Calif., October 19, 1963.***
**Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,**
***Committee on Appropriations,***
***U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.***

**DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I am sorry that a reply to your letter of September 4, 1963, has been so long delayed. I have two jobs in the University of California, one as director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, and the other as university dean of research, with headquarters in Berkeley. In addition, I have been spending a good deal of time during recent weeks in Washington. One of the unfortunate results of this complicated business is that your letter did not catch up with me until recently.**

**I am well aware of your enlightened interest in Project Mohole. You have the gratitude and respect of many scientists for the concern you have expressed that the tremendous scientific potential of the project should be realized.**

**If you think a useful purpose would be served, I should be glad to testify before the Senate Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee at a suitable time. However, I am convinced that the new Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Leland Haworth, is giving the most serious and perceptive attention to the project, based on his great experience in handling large scientific-engineering ventures. He has been consulting many knowledgeable persons and listening carefully to their views. Public discussion of such an important public matter as the mohole project is always desirable, particularly when it takes place in the great forum of a Senate subcommittee. But in the changed circumstances of the past few months, such discussion might be premature until Director Haworth has had a chance to formulate his plans and to present them to the Congress.**

**Your judgment on this matter is far better than mine, and I shall await word as to your wishes.**

Very truly yours,
ROGER REVELLE.

---

**DR. WALTER H. MUNK, PROFESSOR OF GEOPHYSICS AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE OF GEOPHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Previously with University of California Division of War Research; meteorologist, Directorate of Weather, Army Air Force; professor of geophysics, Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Geophysics: Author of some 85 scientific papers on ocean waves, wind stress and ocean currents, rotation of the earth.

Ph. D. oceanography, University of California, 1947; member, National Academy of Sciences, 1956; with President's Science Advisory Committee, 1959 to present; Guggenheim Fellowships, University of Oslo, Norway, and Churchill College, Cambridge, England; member, executive committee, American Geophysical Union; Tsunami Committee, and the International Latitude Service, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics.

---

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, INSTITUTE OF GEOPHYSICS AND PLANETARY PHYSICS, LA JOLLA LABORATORIES,
*La Jolla, Calif., October 24, 1963.*
Senator ALLOTT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I very much regret that I cannot testify before the National Science Foundation Appropriations Committee concerning Mohole. For about 4 months I have had a speaking engagement on the Riverside campus of the University of California on this particular day, October 28. It would, perhaps, be helpful if I would put down my feelings in this letter.

In our meeting with Director Haworth on September 28, he stated very clearly that the National Science Foundation will relinquish the scientific supervision of the Mohole project to a university or a group of universities. This is the first breath of fresh air after a number of years during which there has been mutual distrust and lack of confidence. Dr. Haworth proposes to put the responsibility and authority into the hands of the people who are most concerned to see the project succeed, those who are interested in the scientific results. This is how it should have been when we came back from Guadalupe Island in 1961. I hope we can put Dr. Haworth's proposal into effect at once.

A study by Bascom and his associates 3 years ago convinced me of the wisdom to attack the project in three phases:

1. A feasibility study (which was successfully carried out during the work off California and near Guadalupe Island);

2. An intermediary program to explore the upper crust (both for its intrinsic interest and for determining the conditions under which mohole will be drilled) and to continue the study of technical problems;

3. The deep holes.

Most of Amsoc favored this step-by-step approach. There has been opposition from NSF and Brown & Root concerning step 2, but by now I think everyone is agreed on the intermediary program. There is disagreement as to whether it should be carried out from an intermediary vessel or the ultimate platform. I favor the intermediary vessel for the following reasons:

1. We could get started more quickly.

2. It would be cheaper and less cumbersome to operate during the intermediary program (estimated duration: 3 years).

3. At the end of the 3 years, one will want to radically redesign the platform, and this might involve half its original cost.

4. There is a chance, ever so slight, that mohole itself can be drilled from the intermediary vessel using radically new techniques.

5. At the end of the intermediary program, a vessel would be available for continuing the exploration of the sediments and upper crust.

I think that the two-ship approach will be cheaper by more than $10 million. Brown & Root's figure for the differential is much smaller. These estimates should be checked by an independent group. In all events, I would urge that this most important decision not be made prior to the time a university group takes over the management of mohole. The judgment of this university group should not be foreclosed by prior decisions on the part of NSF or Brown & Root. It would also seem reasonable that this university group should have the freedom to make its own choice of subcontractors, such choice being dictated solely by considerations of competence.

You may think, Senator ALLOTT, that the gradual approach here proposed is too timid and that the immediate construction of the ultimate vessel means a decisive leap forward to get the job done. I have never yet worked on a new problem in oceanography where the equipment we developed and the methods we used were not hopelessly outdated after a couple of years. The oceans do not yield readily to methods of brute force. I see no evidence on the basis of performance to date that Brown & Root can hope to build a platform now that they will find satisfactory 3 years after it is completed.

I have been credited by some as one of the originators of mohole. I remain convinced that it is a feasible and rewarding scientific venture. I hope it can receive support on this basis. Its success should be measured on its scientific merit in all phases. It is not an engineering spectacular.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER H. MUNK,
*Associate Director.*

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this may seem like a great deal of information to put in the RECORD, but I am most anxious to call to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that these men are the heads of the 3 largest oceanographic institutions in the United States. Included among these men are the people who did phase 1 of Operation Mohole, who know what is involved and how it can best be accomplished.

For the sake of the RECORD, I wish to make it clear that until I have been personally assured that the scientific community has arrived at some agreement as to how this project should proceed, I shall never cease trying to slow it down. I wish to be assured that it is on a sound footing.

When the great majority of the scientific personnel in this country, who are knowledgeable in this field, say that proceeding with the larger vessel is a mistake, I think any cautious, prudent, ordinary man ought to stop and listen; and I am stopping and listening and urging my colleagues to do so.

That is all I have to say about this matter now.

---

## THE CLEAN AIR ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the conference report, and I wish to discuss it briefly. The report is signed by all of the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate, and the report has been accepted by the House of Representatives.

The House bill amended the entire act of July 14, 1955, the existing statute on air pollution. The Senate amendment struck out all after the enactment clause of the House bill and inserted a complete revision of such act of July 14, 1955.

The proposed conference substitute is also a complete revision of the act of July 14, 1955, and reflects the agreement which was reached between the conferees.

The Senate conferees pressed strongly for the provisions of subsection (d) of section 3, which would provide that all scientific or technological research or development activity contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of the act which involves the expenditure of Government funds shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such activity, with certain exceptions, be available to the general public.

The House conferees insisted that it be deleted because of pending general legislation dealing with this particular subject, and the undesirability of dealing with such matters on a partial basis. The Senate conferees argued strongly for its retention, but finally reluctantly accepted the deletion.

#### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BILL AS PASSED BY THE SENATE AND THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

#### 1. INVESTIGATIONS, RESEARCH AND SURVEYS

The House in accepting subsection (c) (1) of section 3, which relates to the authority for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research, compile and publish criteria reflecting the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of pollution agent or agents in the air, suggested that the language in the House-passed bill which would authorize the Secretary to make recommendations to appropriate agencies with respect to air quality criteria be restored.

The Senate agreed to include the original House language, in addition to the Senate amendment, so that the Secretary would not only be called upon to conduct research and compile and publish criteria, but he would also be authorized to recommend such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare. The Senate conferees agreed to the deletion of the word "only" in subsection (c)(1) where it was provided that "any such criteria shall be published for informational purposes only." This was done in order that information developed by departmental sponsored research could be used by the Secretary in making recommendations under section 3(c)(1) as agreed to by the conferees.

#### 2. GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

The House accepted the Senate version of section 4 relating to grants for air pollution programs substantially in the form as passed by the Senate, except for clarifying amendments designed to insure, first, that not more than 20 percent of the annual appropriations made to carry out the act shall be available for grants; and second, that no agency whose expenditures of non-Federal funds for air pollution programs during a fiscal year are less than its expenditures for such programs during the preceding year shall be eligible to receive any grant during that fiscal year.

#### 3. CONFERENCE ON ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

The Senate-passed version provides that the Secretary may, after consultation with State officials, also call a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, and studies, he has reason to believe that air pollution is occurring in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons. The conferees agreed that the language should be clarified to provide that State officials of all affected States shall be consulted by the Secretary before he calls a conference.

#### 4. MEMBERSHIP OF HEARING BOARD

The conferees accepted the Senate provisions with respect to Federal membership on the Hearing Board. They adopted a technical amendment to make it clear that each Federal department, agency or instrumentality which has a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board.

The Senate amendment provided that members of the Hearing Board who are not regular, full-time officers or employees of the United States, be entitled to receive compensation at not to exceed $100 per diem. The Senate receded and accepted the House language which provided $50 per diem.

#### 5. ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except for certain technical amendments to clarify congressional intent that the request of the Governor of the State must be obtained before the Secretary can request the Attorney General to bring suit to secure abatement of intrastate pollution, and a technical amendment to show that subsection (g) relating to evidence in court in a suit is restricted to those suits brought in the U.S. courts.

#### 6. AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE EXHAUST AND FUEL POLLUTION

The House accepted the provisions of this section (section 6.) The conferees included certain modifying language so that the Secretary would be required to maintain and have liaison with and have representatives on the technical committee from exhaust control device manufacturers in addition to automotive and fuel manufacturers. The Senate amendment had not included this segment of the industry concerned with the automotive exhaust problem.

#### 7. APPROPRIATIONS

First. The Senate receded on section 13(a) in order to permit a $5 million grant program to be initiated during fiscal year 1964 if appropriations are made for such purpose.

Second. Section 13(b) of the Senate bill provided for authorizations for appropriations as follows: Fiscal year 1965, $25 million; fiscal year 1966, $30 million; fiscal year 1967, $35 million; fiscal year 1968, $42 million; fiscal year 1969, $50 million.

The conferees agreed to the appropriations as contained in the Senate bill for fiscal years 1965–67, and the Senate receded from its amendment which provided authorizations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 with the understanding that the legislative committees in both Houses of Congress will reexamine the program to determine progress being made and the need for authorizations in those and subsequent years. The conferees recognized that air pollution constitutes one of our national problems and that as our population grows and as urbanization expands, increased fiscal support of air pollution programs may be required.

#### AREAS OF COMPLETE AGREEMENT WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS

#### A. INVESTIGATIONS, RESEARCH, AND SURVEYS

First. The Senate amendment authorized investigation, research, and surveys to be made in cooperation with air pollution control agencies. The conference adopted the Senate language.

Second. Subsection (a)(4) of section 3 of the House bill would have required the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as a part of a national research and development program for the control and prevention of air pollution, to conduct specific studies with respect to motor vehicle exhaust fumes. The Senate deleted this provision and substituted section 6 which dealt with the problem more specifically. The House accepted this approach.

Third. The House accepted the Senate provisions with respect to the initiation and conduct of a program of research directed toward the development of improved low cost techniques to extract sulfur from fuel.

Fourth. The Senate amendment provided broader authority for the Secretary to make grants than the House version. The conferees accepted the Senate version.

#### B. REQUIREMENTS OF REPORTS

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment to this subsection.

#### C. COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment which provides that the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which Federal departments or agencies shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit prior to such discharging. These permits would be subject to revocation if the Secretary finds the pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons.

#### D. ADMINISTRATION

The Senate amendment deleted the word "procedural" immediately preceding the word "requirements." This was accepted by the House conferees.

#### E. DEFINITIONS

Certain amendments were made in the Senate amendment and were accepted by the House conferees.

#### F. RECORDS AND AUDIT

The House conferees accepted this section in its entirety.

Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the House and Senate conferees who worked with me on H.R. 6518. We were able to transact our business expeditiously and in a spirit of cooperation. My special thanks go to Representative ROBERTS, chairman of the House conferees and to my colleagues Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. PEARSON.

I believe the product of our endeavors represents a constructive contribution to the solution of air pollution control problems. This was a case where compromise moved us forward. The bill, as now written, is an improvement over both the House and Senate versions.

Mr. President, the report is signed by every member of the conference on the part of the Senate and of the House. The conference report was accepted in the House of Representatives today.

I move the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

## CAUSES OF CANCER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today's Washington Post carried a story on the report of the World Health Organization on the causes of cancer. The report calls attention to the role of air pollution as a cause of cancer.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post story be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WHO NAMES EXCESSES THAT CAN CAUSE CANCER

GENEVA, December 9.—Cancer can be caused in human beings through excessive smoking, eating, drinking, or sunbathing, the United Nations World Health Organization reported today. Lipstick and artificial colors and flavors in food were listed among additional causes.

The Organization published a summary of known causes of cancer together with advice on how to prevent it.

The list, divided into 13 main groups, was drawn up by a committee of cancer specialists from 7 countries, convened here by WHO last month. It was the most comprehensive survey of the causes and prevention of cancer ever published by the 110-nation Organization.

The report said: "It is generally accepted that there is a causal connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer," adding that "studies have shown that there is a clear relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked and the incidence of lung cancer."

The experts listed air pollution as an important cause of cancer. They urged the greatest possible use of electricity and natural gas and control of the fumes of coal and oil installations and of automobile exhausts.

Another major cause of cancer, the report said, is radioactivity in all its forms. "Since the size of the dose required to cause (cancer) is not yet known," the report said, "all radiation received by the individual * * * should be reduced to a minimum."

The American expert on the committee was Dr. Wilhelm C. Heuper of the National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.

## BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AND HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, by proclamation of President Johnson, today has been designated Human Rights Day, December 15, 1963 has been designated Bill of Rights Day, and the week of December 10–17 has been designated Human Rights Week. In his proclamation the President stated that today's observance coincides with the 15th anniversary of the adoption by the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the General Assembly has called for special observance of this anniversary "in the hope that it may mark a decisive step forward in the affirmation of these fundamental freedoms."

It would surely be a step forward in the affirmation of these fundamental freedoms if the United States could by law set the standard for nondiscrimination on grounds of race, color or creed which is in good part embodied in the omnibus civil rights bill pending in the other body. On this day an attempt is being made to further progress on that bill by obtaining signatures on a discharge petition, and it would be a most fitting celebration of the event if the necessary number of House Members joined in the petition, which in my view could eventually turn out to be one of the decisive steps in ultimate passage of that bill.

No one provision of law or series of provisions of law will itself guarantee the fundamental human rights which we today honor, but it is important to note on this day that it is the rule of law which underlies those rights. With law, setting an enforceable standard to which men may repair for guidance and support, there is greater likelihood of achieving in actuality and, soon in our domestic society, the precepts which we proclaim to ourselves and to the rest of the world.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

## GOV. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in 1960, when the present Governor of the Virgin Islands was named, it was the position of the senior Senator from Colorado that the naming of Ralph M. Paiewonsky as Governor was a great mistake. It was my contention then that the great proliferation of his own business interests, and of his family's business interests, could never be separated from his governorship, no matter how he tried, or if he tried; and it was the personal consideration of the Senator from Colorado that he would not try.

Numerous things have come to my attention since then which have only served to fortify that opinion. Because I believe the situation in the Virgin Islands is becoming, and is, a political cesspool, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Daily News, published in Charlotte Amalie, Virgin Islands, touching upon the financial escapades of the Governor, be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FACTS, NOT OPINIONS

In using such words as "vendetta," "fantastic and ridiculous outburst," "frustrated opposition," "insinuation and innuendoes," and "victim of his own frustrations," Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky made a public reply to facts recently disclosed by the Daily News regarding sharp real estate practices in which he was directly involved and in which he used his high office to the direct advantage of a company in which he was (and is) financially interested.

We are quite certain that the people of the Virgin Islands are not particularly interested in any opinion which the Governor of the Virgin Islands may have concerning the editor of the Daily News, or vice versa.

In fact, we regard the people of these islands as of such maturity that we believe they are not interested in insinuations, innuendoes, or fantastic or ridiculous outbursts. Nor are they interested in any effort on the part of the Governor to psychoanalyze the editor of the Daily News. We do believe, however, that they are interested in facts, and, as a newspaper, our only concern is to put facts before the people of these islands.

Briefly, to summarize the facts which we disclosed, and which are, of course, a matter of public record in legal documents, 60 acres of choice land in St. Croix, formerly occupied by the hospital building and known as Peter's Farm, was leased to a non-existent real estate development firm in 1955. Within a month the firm was incorporated by Ralph M. Paiewonsky and two others, who agreed to invest certain funds in the property and to develop it as a housing project, an agreement which was never kept.

Is this true, Governor?

In 1960, the Government of the Virgin Islands, at the request of the then-Governor Merwin, instituted legal proceedings to recover the land and buildings from the corporation because the terms of the lease had not been adhered to.

Is this true, Governor?

In 1962, an agreement was signed between the Government of the Virgin Islands, represented by Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky and the firm, of which Ralph M. Paiewonsky had been an incorporator, to sell the 60 acres and the buildings to the firm which had failed to honor its lease agreement, for the sum of $20,000 down and the balance of $80,000 to be paid over a 10-year period.

Is this true, Governor?

The firm, which had failed in its lease originally, was to erect housing units and apartments on the 10 acres of land, which units were to be rented by the Government of the Virgin Islands for a sum exceeding $400,000 over the 10-year period. The remainder of the land was to be used by the real estate development firm.

Is this true, Governor?

A deed executing this agreement and conveying the property to the real estate development firm was recorded in January 1963.

Is this true, Governor?

Considering the source from which the accusations and blasts against the Daily News came, we consider it a compliment to our factual reporting, since the Governor made no attempt to repudiate the facts of the case, but merely sought recourse in personal abuse and psuedo clinical terminology.

We reaffirm our strong belief that the people of the Virgin Islands are not interested in personal opinions or psychoanalyses of individuals, but in facts. We have laid the facts before the public.

If Gov. Ralph M. Paiewonsky wants to, or can, refute these facts, the radio waves and television channels are certainly open to him, and we pledge to him a column in the Daily News.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider in sequence the bills on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 732, H.R. 4479.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MINERAL RIGHTS CONVEYED TO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The bill (H.R. 4479) to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 752), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of H.R. 4479 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell, at fair market value plus costs, the reserved mineral rights of the Federal Government in a certain tract of land in California to the State of California, which owns the surface of the land.

The area is dedicated to public park purposes, and the Federal reservation of the mineral rights constitutes a cloud upon the title of the State, thus hampering development for public purposes.

### BACKGROUND OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The lands involved were patented by the United States on July 24, 1928, to one Aaron W. Harlan under the Stock Raising Homestead Act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 862; 43 U.S.C. 301). In accordance with the provisions of that act all minerals, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove them, were reserved to the United States.

By deed recorded June 20, 1962, the lands were conveyed to the State of California for use as part of the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. The conveyance was made subject to the outstanding reservation of minerals in the United States, which presents a possible interference with the use of the property for park purposes. The lands involved in H.R. 4479 are considered by the Geological Survey to be without mineral values. Nonetheless, the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to dispose of the mineral estate reserved by the United States.

Because the outstanding mineral estate may interfere with the development of the lands described in the bill by reason of the possibility, even though remote, that exploration for and extraction of minerals might be undertaken and thus interfere with the surface use of the lands, the committee agrees that disposal of the mineral estate by the United States to the State of California, the surface owner, should be effected under conditions that will assure that the interests of the United States are protected.

### COST

There is no increase in budgetary requirements involved in nor contemplated by H.R. 4479.

## EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN OF CERTAIN VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 221) to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from a disease or an injury arising out of active military service during a period of war, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Finance, with amendments, on page 3, line 1, after "Sec. 3.", to insert "(a)"; after line 14, to insert:

(b) Section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, an eligible person may be afforded educational assistance beyond the age limitation applicable to him under such subsection by a period of time equivalent to any period of time which elapses between the eighteenth birthday of such eligible person or the date on which an application for benefits of this chapter is filed on behalf of such eligible person, whichever is later, and the date of final approval of such application by the Administrator; but in no event shall educational assistance under this chapter be afforded an eligible person beyond his thirty-first birthday by reason of this subsection."

On page 4, line 8, after "Sec. 5.", to insert "(a)"; in line 12, after the word "years", where it appears the first time, to strike out "and below the age of twenty-three years"; in line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "Act." and insert "Act, excluding from such five-year period any period of time which may elapse between the date on which application for benefits of chapter 35, United States Code, is filed on behalf of an eligible person and the date of final approval of such application by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; but in no event shall educational assistance under chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, be afforded to any eligible person beyond his thirty-first birthday by reason of this section."; and, at the top of page 5, to insert:

(b) Any individual who is an "eligible person" within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, due to his parent's death as a result of a service-connected disability shall be considered to be an "eligible person" solely by virtue of the amendments made by this Act if his eligibility due to his parent's death occurred after the age limitation applicable to him under section 1712(a) of title 38, United States Code, and if he is an "eligible person" as defined in the amendments made by this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 733), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, provides educational assistance for the children of persons who die as a result of service-connected disabilities incurred during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the induction period. The standards and criteria for determining whether or not a disability arising out of service during a period of war are the same as those applicable in determining disability and death compensation under chapter 11, title 38, United States Code. The same standards and criteria are used for service during the induction period if the disability arises from an armed conflict or from participation in extrahazardous service. In other cases the causative factor of a disability arising from service during the induction period must be shown to have arisen out of the performance of active military, naval, or air service. This law provides education not to exceed 36 calendar months generally between the ages of 18 and 23, with an educational assistance allowance of $110 per month for a program of education pursued on a full-time basis, $80 per month for a program pursued on a three-quarter time basis, and $50 if pursued on a half-time basis. This chapter originated as Public Law 634 of the 84th Congress.

H.R. 221 will amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to include the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of service-connected disabilities or who were at the time of their death afflicted with a permanent and total service-connected disability.

The same criteria which are presently used to determine whether or not the death of an orphan's parent was service connected will be used to determine whether or not the permanent and total disability of a child's parent is service connected.

Any disability rated total for the purposes of disability compensation which is based on impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the life of the veteran would meet the requirements of this bill.

This bill would apply if the disability is rated 100 percent in accordance with the regular provisions of the 1945 rating schedule, providing it is based on an impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the veteran's lifetime. Temporary ratings of 100 percent assigned during periods of hospitalization or convalescence under paragraph 28, 29, or 30 of the 1945 rating schedule could not serve as a basis for the grant of benefits under this law. A rating protected under the 1925 rating schedule or a rating protected after 20 years by 38 U.S.C. 110 would meet the requirements of H.R. 221. Because of recent advances in therapeutic methods, a rating of 100 percent for tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric disorder would not confer entitlement under this bill unless the disability reached a static level as determined by a rating board. Ratings in which the 100-percent evaluation is based on unemployability, and extraschedular ratings of 100 percent assigned under authority delegated by the Administrator, are within the scope of this bill, if the disability is static.

### EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

Section 1712 of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, sets out time limits or age limits within which the educational benefits of the chapter must be used by the eligible person. One series of amendments approved by the committee adds a new subsection to section 1712 which will insure that the time available to the eligible person shall not be reduced as a result of the time required by the Veterans' Administration to process an application filed on behalf of the eligible person, with the proviso that no educational assistance can be afforded to the eligible person beyond his 31st birthday as a result of this new subsection.

Since varying lengths of time are required by the Veterans' Administration to process an application under chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, especially when there is some question as to the eligibility of the person on whose behalf an application has been filed, the committee did not feel that the time required for this processing should be counted as having deceased the time that would otherwise be available to the eligible person to use the benefits of the chapter if his application had been approved on the same day it had been filed.

Section 5 of H.R. 221, as passed by the House of Representatives, contained a provision allowing 5 years to anyone between the ages of 18 and 23 on the date of the enactment of H.R. 221 to use the benefits of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, if he was made eligible for the benefits of the chapter solely by the passage of H.R. 221. The committee amended this section by deleting the requirement that the eligible person be under the age of 23 on the date of enactment, with the proviso that no educational assistance can be afforded to the eligible person beyond his 31st birthday as a result of this section. Section 5 was also amended by adding a provision similar to the new subsection added to section 1712 mentioned above.

The rationale of a saving clause such as section 5 of H.R. 221, is that an eligible person should not have his rights reduced simply because the bill had not been enacted at an earlier date. In this instance the committee decided that this reasoning had equal validity in the case of an eligible person who was 23 or over on the date of enactment as it did in the case of an eligible person under the age of 23 on the date of enactment. Section 5, as amended, applies only to those persons made eligible solely by the enactment of this act.

The committee also adopted amendments adding subsection (b) to section 5 of H.R. 221 in order to eliminate the possibility that the application of section 5, as amended, would discriminate againt the children of a parent whose death was service connected. Since the child of a parent who had died as a result of a service-connected disability would be an "eligible person" within the meaning of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act due to his parent's service-connected death, he would not be an "eligible person" solely as a result of the amendments made by H.R. 221 even though his parent had been afflicted with a permanent and total service-connected disability at the time of his death. However, the child in the same fact situation would be solely eligible within the meaning of section 5 of H.R. 221 if his parent's death had not been service connected. Therefore, in order to avoid any unjust discrimination in the application of section 5 against the children of a parent who died as result of his service-connected disabilities, the committee added subsection (b) to section 5 of H.R. 221.

This subsection provides that in those cases where a child's eligibility due to his parent's service-connected death occurred after the lapse of the time periods and age limitations applicable to him under section 1712, he shall be considered to be an eligible person solely as a result of the amendments made by H.R. 221 if his parent was afflicted with a permanent and total service-connected disability at the time of his death.

Both the new subsection to be added to section 1712 of chapter 35, title 38, United States Code, and section 5 of H.R. 221, as amended, contain provisos that no educational assistance shall be provided to an eligible person beyond his 31st birthday. This proviso was felt to be advisable for two reasons: (1) Similar provisos are present in two other provisions of chapter 35, which permit educational assistance to be furnished beyond the 23d birthday of the eligible person. (2) It cannot reasonably be expected that a parent, assuming he were financially capable, would be furnishing educational assistance to his children beyond their 31st birthdays.

## RELIEF OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FROM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN INTEREST

The bill (S. 2064) to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 1823(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The Administrator shall not be required to pay interest on transfers made pursuant to the Act of February 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 8), from the capital of the 'direct loans to veterans and reserves revolving fund' to the 'loan guaranty revolving fund' and adjustments shall be made for payments of interest on such transfers before the date of enactment of this sentence."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 754), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund.

Section 1823(b) of title 38, United States Code, requires the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Veterans' Administration to pay interest on funds advanced by the Treasury to the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of making direct loans to veterans to buy or build homes or farmhouses. The interest paid by veterans on these direct loans is used to make the interest payments to the Treasury on the borrowed funds and to cover the losses incurred by the direct loan program.

Public Law 87-404 authorized the transfer of funds from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund during the fiscal year 1962, in order to finance the increased cost of claims and property acquisitions resulting from defaulted guaranteed or insured loans. Pursuant to this provision, $105.7 million was transferred from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund. Under present law, the Administrator is required to pay approximately $4 million annually in interest payments to the Treasury on these transferred funds even though they have not been used in making direct loans and do not provide any income with which to meet the interest payments owed to the Treasury. Therefore, the interest income earned by the direct loan revolving fund has been used to cover the interest due on the transferred $105.7 million which does not itself produce any income to the Veterans' Administration.

The effect of this bill would be to remove the obligation of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to pay interest to the Treasury on the funds which were transferred to the loan guarantee revolving fund from the direct loan revolving fund. This revocation would be retroactive as to previous interest payments which have already been paid to the Treasury.

## DELEGATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (H.R. 5691) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veteran's Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act on the recommendations of disciplinary boards was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report

(No. 755), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill amends title 38 of the United States Code in order to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code, in the cases involving physicians, dentists, and nurses.

Present law provides that the Chief Medical Director shall appoint disciplinary boards to determine, after notice and fair hearing, the corrections of charges of ineptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of physicians, dentists, and nurses. The chairman and secretary, however, are appointed directly by the Administrator. Recommendations are made by these boards to the Administrator for approval and action. The present bill would permit the Chief Medical Director to appoint the entire membership of the board, and to receive and act upon the recommendations of such board, with the employee facing disciplinary action afforded the right of appeal to the Administrator. This legislation is intended, among other things, to correct, as an example, a situation wherein a staff nurse who has been found guilty of misconduct and is slated for demotion, suspension, of discharge, must have such action personally approved by the Administrator, whereas authority to take similar disciplinary action in the case of higher ranking employees in the competitive service can be taken at lower administrative levels.

It is the intent of the committee that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should have the authority to make the delegation of authority as contemplated by the bill, however, he should not feel compelled to do so. While the committee realizes that the right of appeal by an employee from a decision by the board, under the bill, to the Administrator is provided, concern was expressed that some future Chief Medical Director might assume dictatorial powers under this delegation. The committee feels that the Administrator should keep a constant watch over the situation in order to prevent any such abuse. If the authority delegated is at any time abused the Administrator should, and he has the authority to, forthwith withdraw such delegation of authority.

The proposal was formally submitted by the Veterans' Administration, is favored by that agency, and would result in no additional cost to the Government. The Bureau of the Budget reported favorably on the bill. The favorable reports of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget follow:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which the bills just called from the calendar were passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign, after the adjournment today, three enrolled bills that have duly passed the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as we approach the end of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I wish to express myself about the majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana. I shall speak very briefly because I do not think that mere words can do him justice or adequately convey the great respect and deep admiration that I have for him in the manner in which he has handled the very difficult job that is his.

He is a man of great wisdom—a man of deep feeling—a man of consummate consideration of the feelings of others. But he is yet a man of determination who does not yield to political expediency—who never takes his eyes off the course or is shaken from the ideals and objectives to which he is dedicated.

I think that such greatness on his part is recognized by many. But there is another greatness of which very few are aware—that is very few outside of those who have been the beneficiaries of his kindnesses. There are very few who know of this attribute of the true greatness of MIKE MANSFIELD—very few simply because he does not want people to know of these kindnesses. For that is his nature.

For example, he was the collaborator with me when I placed the single red rose on the desk that was occupied by the late John F. Kennedy when he was a Member of the Senate. In collaborating with me, he asked that I not reveal that he had done so because he felt that it would have more meaning if his part was not known.

I disclose this now because it is an example so typical of him and is only one of innumerable acts of kindness which have made him so endeared on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, although this is very unexpected, I express my deepest thanks to the distinguished Senator from Maine for her kind words, and to assure her that I appreciate them more than I can say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I fully concur in all the expressions about the kindnesses so often shown by the distinguished Senator from Montana. He deserves every one of these encomiums.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the minority leader very much. He has been most cooperative with the majority leader and very helpful to us all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe this has been cleared on all sides, although I am not absolutely certain. I ask unanimous consent that not later than 3 o'clock p.m. on Thursday next there be a vote on the pending conference report, H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the permission which has just been granted by the Senate will be subject to rectification after I have had an opportunity to speak personally with some Senators who are vitally interested in the proposed legislation, and who have indicated that they are not averse to a reasonable time limitation, but whose final approval will be necessary before the consent agreement will go into effect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, we are reaching the end of the long furrow. I know, of course, that Members would like to have the business of the Senate scheduled to suit their convenience, but that can be allowed only up to a point. I assure the majority leader that I shall cooperate with him in every possible way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. The Senators I have in mind have been most cooperative and helpful. I feel certain that a reasonable agreement can be reached. It is one of those things that need final confirmation before we can be definite as to what our action will be.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, no business will be transacted tomorrow.

Tomorrow will be a day on which eulogies will be delivered by Members of the Senate in honor of our former colleague and late departed President, John F. Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be no morning hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

**The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.**

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 10, 1963:

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls general, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert J. Francis, of Tennessee.
Jack B. Kubish, of Michigan.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

George H. Steuart, Jr., of Virginia.
Paul R. Sweet, of Texas.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Philip A. Heller, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel J. James, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William Dawson, of Maryland.
Paxton T. Dunn, of Connecticut.
Lucian Heichler, of Virginia.
Leonard Sandman, of West Virginia.

G. Michael Bache, of New Jersey, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert J. Bushnell, of Hawaii.
Lloyd Livingston Lee, of Hawaii.

Anthony G. Barbieri, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edward P. Allen, of Massachusetts.
Kenneth H. Bailey, Jr., of New York.
William G. Barraclough, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary Helen Barrett, of California.
Michael J. Danbury, of New York.
John A. Fowler, of Montana.
Roger R. Gamble, of New Mexico.
John D. Hope, of California.
Richard B. Johnson, of Connecticut.
Arthur D. Levin, of Rhode Island.
Jack W. Mendelsohn, of Illinois.
David T. Morrison, of Michigan.
Edward G. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Jerrold M. North, of Illinois.
Robert Rackmales, of Maryland.
Philip J. Rizik, of the District of Columbia.
Edward Michael Sacchet, of Maryland.
Archelaus R. Turrentine, of Arkansas.
James O. Westmoreland, of Tennessee.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Kenneth W. Bleakley, of New York.
Miss Gwendolyn Coronway, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Yvonne P. Fonvielle, of Illinois.
Samuel C. Fromowitz, of New York.
George H. Haines III, of New York.
Peter R. Keller, of Connecticut.
Miss Gail A. Kelts, of New York.
Charles E. Lahiguera, of Rhode Island.
Miss Sylvia Manjarrez, of Illinois.
Roger B. Merrick, of Colorado.
Miss Sarah Louise Nathness, of Ohio.
Bruce S. Pansey, of Rhode Island.
John P. Riley, of New Jersey.
Thomas Ronald Sykes, of Illinois.
Paul Daniel Taylor, of New York.
Miss Judith D. Trunzo, of Virginia.
Miss Theresa A. Tull, of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be consuls of the United States of America:

Kenneth Bache, of New Jersey.
Thomas W. Cormier, of Virginia.
Fred W. Dickens, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Richard D. Drain, of Maryland.
Paul J. Gartenmann, of Virginia.
Jack W. Juergens, of Kansas.
John D. McGrail, of Massachusetts.
Donald E. McNertney, of Iowa.
Herbert Morales, of the District of Columbia.
Gil M. Saudade, of Maryland.
Martin Stahl, of California.
Harold M. Young, Jr., of California.

Winn L. Taplin, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Jerry E. Kyle, of California.
Robert H. Larson, of Virginia.
Allen R. Phillips, Jr., of Virginia.
Rob Roy Ratliff, of Maryland.
Joseph A. Reinstatler, of Virginia.
Michael J. Walsh, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Robert C. Amerson, of Minnesota.
Paul E. Arnold, of Virginia.
Edgar M. W. Boyd, of New York.
James L. Carlin, of Minnesota.
Robert K. Davis, of Florida.
Alexander de Bilderling, of New York.
Roland E. Dulin, of the District of Columbia.
Roy H. Green, Jr., of California.
John L. Hadden, of New York.
Peter B. Harrison, of Illinois.
John H. Kenney, of Massachusetts.
James S. Lanigan, of New York.
Burton B. Lifschultz, of California.
Hugh J. McMillan, of Washington.
Leon A. Shelnutt, of Alabama.
Throop M. Wilder, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Leon E. Woods, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Bernard J. Brogley, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Karp, of Pennsylvania.
Raymond W. T. Pracht, of Illinois.
Joseph Radford, Jr., of New Jersey.
Charles B. Sebastian, of the District of Columbia.

*To the Senate of the United States:*

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

*To be brigadier general*

Col. Charles Lutcher Southward, O329922, Infantry.

### IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

*To be major, Chaplain*

Burnette, Lester E., O79682.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

*To be first lieutenants*

Aldrich, Harold B., 3d, O97880.
Bertelsen, Geoffrey H., O92326.
Brandt, Goetz K., O92280.
Campbell, John C., O93137.
Casto, James G., O93141.
Clawson, Lucien B., Jr., O97099.
Cleveland, Donald L., O92399.
Elderd, Raymond K., Jr., O95312.
Ferguson, Jack W., O94527.
Ferring, Theodore J. J., Jr., O95318.
Fox, James H., O93171.
Hager, Henry F., 3d, O94197.
Hogan, Thomas F., O91436.
Hudson, Richard L., O96985.
Hyde, Thomas A., 3d, O97924.
Jacobs, Darrel D., O91282.
Johnson, Ben A., O97925.
Johnson, Lidge O. J., O97927.
Jones, Robert S., Jr., O97142.
Kawamoto, Dennis F., O92595.
Kazenski, John T., O90898.
King, Thomas R., O97157.
Labell, Simmin N., O90176.
Mahr, Walter C., O97438.
Mason, Robert W., O89549.
McCarthy, William J., O97448.
McClendon, Miles R., O94217.
Miyamasu, Paul K., O97333.
Moody, Robert D., O97951.
Nartisissov, George, O97818.
Orlov, William S., O97549.
Powers, Gary R., O97959.
Rizer, Gene C., O98353.
Scott, Kenneth G., O97974.
Shiner, Clyde R., Jr., O92880.
Stainback, William C., O94347.
Stonehocker, Herbert F., Jr., O92929.
Sturdivant, Clifford R., O97986.
Taylor, Benjamin D., O97363.
Terry, William F., 3d, O97047.
Walker, Larry T., O98261.
Wenz, Henry F., O97996.
Wright, Kenneth E., O97374.
Zimmers, Joe L., O96726.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Anderson, Jon D., O94736.
Blakemore, Vaughan A., Jr., O97280.
Constable, Joseph F., O94920.
Cundiff, David E., O94744.
Harman, Richard B., O97349.
Judy, Richard B., O94939.
Kistler, Thomas E., Jr., O96691.
Lemmers, Dean P., O97390.
Murphy, Thomas W., O94775.
Sandifer, Calvin P., 6th, O92780.
Schafer, Thomas E., O95096.
Shambora, Robert A., O94788.
Shelton, Edward J., O95101.
Spiker, James E., Jr., O98199.
Walker, James O., Jr., O95114.
Ward, John R., O97218.

*To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps*

Cope, Doris A., N3056.

*To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Sager, Jane F., R10184.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

*To be colonel*

Sams, Gerald A., O41931.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

*To be first lieutenants*

Boroski, Marvin R., O85727.
Dickson, Richard C. (MSC), O82317.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

*To be majors*

Darling, Gregory, O1688813.
McMahon, Richard A., O1341809.
McManus, Luther M., Jr., O975625.
Sexton, Thomas L., O2014581.

*To be captains*

Adams, Paul M., Jr., O4015888.
Ahearn, John F., O4009741.
Ashby, Charles C., O4031237.
Austin, Richard K., O4074442.
Baker, Ralph H., Jr., O2289397.
Bartlett, Leslie R., O4026690.
Blaker, John R., O1932128.
Bolduc, Donald A.,O4006135.
Bond, James A., O4025668.
Bournes, William V., O1936308.
Brown, Paul M., O4031425.
Cascio, Charles J., O4069406.
Corbett, Cleveland, O1935009.
Costanzo, Irving E., O4038632.
Covert, James L., O4010707.
Daniels, Thomas W., O2033988.
England, Marion F., Jr., O1924732.
Fleming, Hewell D., O1931245.
Fromm, Rudolph W., O4083218.
Fuchigami, Hideto, O4014617.
Greenleaf, Edward T., Jr., O1935125.
Hollowell, William E., Jr., O1931464.
Hottel, David T., O4062484.
Isaacson, Roger M., O1936232.
Jones, Richard B., O2273918.
Kowal, Samuel J., O4057698.
Kramer, Gordon L., O4009704.
Lang, Marlin C., O4074509.
Leakey, Robert J., O4074404.
McFadden, Louis P., O4034756.
Noonan, Richard B., O4016826.
Olson, Eugene S., O4010954.
Phillips, Edward L., O4005842.
Reid, James W., O4048558.
Reynolds, Leslie D., O4071936.
Ridgeway, James H., O4070376.
Rohlfing, Robert E., O4040287.
Smart, William E., O4029625.
Smith, Osbin E., O4030948.
Smith, Loren K., O4010324.
Thompson, James A., O1702308.
Tompkins, Edward, O4074641.
Treadway, James D., O4083658.
Vittorini, Domenic, O4006889.
Walker, Delbert L., O2285394.
Wehrle, Alfred L., O4066147.
Westerman, Ted G., O4031275.
Wilson, Roosevelt, O1925864.
Woods, James R., O4049657.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ackerman, Donald C., O4066842.
Allen, Richard H., O5000837.
Belisle, Aldorien E., Jr., O5207222.
Bendele, James C., O5403534.
Benton, Hubert F., O5409530.
Brunner, Karl R., Jr., O5209690.
Byrnes, James P., O5511154.
Cameron, Carl H., O5303702.
Coston, James G., O5410068.
Cressler, Walter L., Jr., O5007423.
Culbertson, James E., O5405126.
Donlon, Roger H. C., O5307067.
Driscoll, William J., O5006655.
Duerre, Chester W., O5509539.
Dunham, David L., O5502761.
Eggerichs, James M., O5510424.
Eisenbarth, Roland W., O5700282.
Elliott, Thomas H., O5511597.
Elrod, Baron S., O5308927.
Estes, Jimmie L., O5409049.
Faubel, Gordon J., O5511907.
Faulkner, Robert S., O5302501.
Gaffney, William W., O4067150.
George, James T., O5203880.
Girard, Valmore J., O5006584.
Harris, Lyman B., Jr., O5305804.
Heard, Wayne L., O5410518.
Heathman, Jimmie J., O5511935.
Higginbotham, Jerry R., O5308350.
Higgins, Glenn E., O5205143.
Hughes, William L., O5303797.
Hungerford, Dale, O5305487.
Kelly, Robert H., O5507878.
Kierstead, Dana S., O5000787.
Koreski, Rolland A., O5701978.
Kraft, Thomas J., O5509268.
Ladd, Eddie B., O5306480.
Lind, Richard W., O5405441.
Markofski, Donald R., O2309819.
Mattox, James I., O5206922.
Miller, Andrew J., Jr., O5301780.
Minutoli, John R., O5005175.
Mirkovich, Richard S., O5704803.
Mohr, Carl E., O5702435.
Polk, Paul G., O5302484.
Potter, Donald C., O5510162.
Quinn, John T., O5001111.
Riley, Wilmot T., III, O5307853.
Roney, Kenneth D., O5310939.
Schmid, Thomas W., O5207082.
Shrontz, Alva G., O5203662.
Stephens, Donald G., O5402054.
Stokke, Edward T., O5405328.
Stronach, Ronald E., O5304074.
Stroud, Lamar A., Jr., O5203907.
Thompson, William E., O2297844.
Truumees, Vallo, O5309969.
Walker, Byron G., O5508289.
Ward, Joseph G., II, O5405503.
White, Travis W., O5309555.
Williams, James E., Jr., O5405680.
Willison, Darryl L., O5509686.
Wise, George W., O5310711.

*To be second lieutenants*

Adams, Charles W., O5412957.
Backley, Donald A., O5509660.
Beeman, Richard C., O5009932.
Bogden, Joseph, O5207930.
Bosserman, David C., O5405806.
Cooper, Nelson J., O5405741.
Craft, Carroll F., O5010111.
Danner, Robert F., O5512538.
Dill, Paul H., O5211576.
Duzenski, Thadeus A., O5218723.
Dye, Preston C., O5314899.
Elliott, David R., O5216520.
Gabelmann, James F., O5406144.
Grindell, Chelsey V., O5007206.
Hansen, David G., O2300357.
Harrison, David A., O5514207.
Henderson, William D., O5706971.
Holmes, Larry L., O5516960.
Jackson, Jerry E., O5705986.
Jarock, Norman F., O5506259.
Karrer, Robert J., Jr., O5307607.
Krebs, Joseph G., O5514589.
Labovich, Walter, O5875175.
LeFew, Charles F., O5215755.
Martin, Robert F., O5410758.
Massengale, Thomas H., O5213841.
Myer, Allan A., O5405929.
Payne, Gilbert M., Jr., O5216570.
Perry, Stephen M., O5706357.
Pryor, Robert W., O5311801.
Randt, Richard C., O5000462.
Ritter, James T., O5009702.
Scruggs, James T., Jr., O5314897.
Simpson, Jerry J., O5215092.
Smart, Eric E., O5314271.
Spaulding, William J., Sr., O5515901.
Staehler, Joseph C., O5512030.
Taylor, John C., Jr., O5213161.
Walker, Charles R., O5410292.
Walton, Jamie W., O5311153.
Watson, Neal C., O5313574.
Zimmer, Otho B., Jr., O5309956.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311.

*To be major, Medical Corps*

Dwyre, William, R., O4071001.

*To be captain, Army Nurse Corps*

Cotter, Joan K., N902601.

*To be captain, Chaplain*

Dowd, Theodore J., O2277101.

*To be captains, Dental Corps*

Noelke, Donald R., O5501237.
Nutter, David J., O4067340.
Preston, Jack D., O5701368.
Russell, Emery A., Jr., O5307031.

*To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps*

Conboy, Joseph B., O2021607.

*To be captains, Medical Corps*

Chesky, Frank H., O4056602.
Cove, Laurence A., O5518010.
Davis, Charles J., Jr., O5220012.
Gunderson, Finn O., O5703243.
Murphy, John J., O2298303.
Sakakini, Joseph, Jr., O4036161.
Thomas, John P., O5214106.

*To be captain, Medical Service Corps*

Garrett, McLain G., Jr., O4075800.

*To be captain, Veterinary Corps*

Stolz, Hal F., O2295487.

*To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps*

Cohen, Marvin W., O5217235.
Kaplan, Martin, O5004907.
Kazlusky, Joseph B., O5518669.
Wentz, Clarence E., O4060296.

*To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps*

Belknap, Hobart D., Jr., O2307755.
Crow, Samuel J., O2310072.
Davis, Franklin G., O2309833.
Rogers, Jack D., O2311799.
Su-Brown, James C., O2306107.
Wicker, Raymond K., O2307708.
Wilson, Norman S., O2304471.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Drill, John C., O5512323.
Hanson, Robert L., O2297608.
Zell, Matthew N., O2298307.

*To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps*

Freel, Marvin E., O2305797.
Hilmas, Duane E., O5519041.
Keefe, Thomas J., O2305782.
Lawton, Richard R., O2307973.
Morris, James M., O2305093.
Vandercook, Richard A., O2309870.

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps*

Cascone, Joan C., L2298052.
Gross, Dorothy M., L2304898.

*To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Huff, Fred V., O5513950.
Lobingier, John H., O5412345.

*To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps*

Tate, Alice M., L2305151.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

Shaw, Richard A., O5704414.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Spille, Robert M., O5531934.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of

**second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:**

Abel, Gene P.
Andersen, Foster.
Bluhm, Raymond K., Jr., O5531728.
Boyd, Clinton B., O5320699.
Burkheart, George W.
Cepiel, Edward R.
Cholak, Paul M.
DeLisio, Paul L.
Dotson, George S., O5016090.
Eakin, William C.
Emigh, Donald B.
Fritz, Ronnie E.
Gregory, Thomas R., O5319521.
Gressette, Tatum W., Jr.
Grose, William C., O5319532.
Guin, Jackie B.
Haack, Duane G.
Hankins, Guy L.
Isaac, William T., Jr.
Jensen, Bruce A.
Johnson, Julius F.
Kimenis, Visvaldis.
Koehler, Albert P.
Landis, George A.
Loher, Eugene P.
Mason, Edward P.
McFatter, Arthur L.
McLean, Donnie B.
Mehle, F. Douglas.
Morrison, Ronald E., Jr.
Orsini, Fuldo E.
Peters, Donald G.
Peters, Joseph F.
Pfluger, Addison L.
Reid, Michael J.
Rhame, Thomas G.
Ricketson, Don A.
Satterlee, Alan K.
Sonricker, William C.
Stone, Frank D.
Strecker, William, Jr.
Taylor, John M., Jr.
Wiener, William, O5018079.
Winmill, John I., O5017342.
Zunkel, Alan D.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Studebaker and Trade Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following release was given to the press today:

Congressman DENT, of Pennsylvania, calls Studebaker's move another nail in the coffin of the U.S. economy.

DENT says Studebaker joins the hundreds of runaway industries in its attempt to gain profits by dodging U.S. responsibilities and share of the cost of the U.S. Government.

Congressman DENT, longtime critic of what he calls economic suicide trade agreements said the Studebaker decision is nothing new. Many corporations have done the same thing only they hid their movements behind patriotic, theoretic, and disarming slogans of free trade, peace, underdeveloped nations, and in many cases, false and misleading packaging, advertising, and merchandising. DENT repeated his warning that in today's world market the United States can only participate by paying subsidies similar to the textile mill subsidy passed by Congress last week, and by monopolistic domestic production tied into world cartels. This is already true in our export programs for wheat, cotton, and other subsidized farm products; it will soon be true in textiles. It's true in our import program for sugar to the detriment of our domestic sugar industry.

Said DENT, "No matter how you try to explain it or cover it up, the theories of trade relations put into practice by the profiteering internationalist trader, have been the cause of the major portion of our domestic unemployment, our negative trade balance in goods and man-hours, our flight of gold, and the mad rush of U.S. industry to displace man with automated machines.

"It's long been my belief that the first duty of a government is to provide work and pay opportunities for its own citizens; not the production of surplus for export. Every nation in the world wants to export more than it imports. It can't be done, and the unprotected nation in this economic war will die.

"I have today warned the Congress that the time is running out for reconsideration of our trade policies, our foreign investment policies, and our aid policies. I've asked Congress to put an out-and-out embargo on all Studebaker and any other products produced outside U.S. limits by American capital in competition with domestic industry.

"To do less, is to add to the further depreciation of our industrial, agricultural, and mining complexes.

"When we finally admit to ourselves that Studebaker is not leaving the automobile manufacturing business but is only leaving this country because of three very normal pressures: (1) A lower cost of production in a foreign country, (2) opportunity to make greater profits while still holding onto the U.S. market, and (3) the threat of foreign governments against U.S. corporations doing business in their markets unless the U.S. corporations create employment and profit for their peoples and nations.

"The pressure from Canada on U.S. imports is no secret. The Canadians, like every other nation except the United States, looks to its people's welfare first, last, and always.

"Chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign trade is like a dog chasing its tail; after he catches it he has to let go because he can't go anywhere with his tail in his mouth and besides, it hurts."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, for his early and untiring efforts to alleviate the harsh conditions to be visited upon this community, its peoples, its institutions, and particularly the displaced workers and their families by the decision of the Studebaker Corp.

The attached release was issued by Congressman BRADEMAS and Senators HARTKE and BAYH, of Indiana.

A review of the record shows that, under the provisions of our ill-advised Trade Expansion Act of 1962, Members of Congress find the avenues of relief in situations of this kind restricted to petition and relief.

Nothing can be done to save these jobs except to subsidize Studebaker.

WASHINGTON, December 10, 1963.—Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS said today that in response to their suggestion to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, a meeting was held here this morning of representatives of several Federal agencies to consider the manpower implications of termination of automobile and truck production by the Studebaker Corp. in South Bend.

In addition to BRADEMAS and aids of HARTKE and BAYH, present at the meeting were William Batt, Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration; Stanley Ruttenberg, Economic Advisor to the Secretary of Labor; representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security and the Manpower Development and Training Administration, both in the Department of Labor; representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Indiana State Labor Commissioner Hobert Butler and Dan Bedell of the Washington office of the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO.

The group discussed the facts in the Studebaker situation and considered measures, local, State, and Federal, which might assist Studebaker workers who face immediate unemployment.

The two Senators and the Congressman emphasized that "the primary responsibility for meeting this extremely difficult problem is at the State and community level." They said, however, they wanted to insure that "all possible Federal resources" would be made available.

They said that they have been in touch with Indiana Gov. Matthew Welsh to be sure of coordination of Federal with State efforts.

HARTKE, BAYH, and BRADEMAS also announced that Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, now with the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, and formerly with the Area Redevelopment Administration, would serve on the spot in South Bend to insure that resources of the Departments of Labor and Commerce are both made available and are coordinated with State and local activities.

## Hon. Leon H. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my profound sorrow over the loss of our good friend and your colleague of many years, Leon H. Gavin, the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation.

Leon, a man of strong convictions and sincerity of purpose, served his district, his State, and his Nation faithfully and well.

Throughout the years he was truly a servant of the people in the Congress and he worked hard for the interests of the people who placed their faith and confidence in him by returning him to Congress so many times.

Leon was an outstanding American, devoted to his country, and he was continually in the forefront in the fight to preserve our wonderful form of Government.

His work in the field of conservation, for the armed services and national defense, for veterans, and in many other areas, will not soon be forgotten. He left the imprint of his interests and efforts upon so many of us.

I know Leon will be sorely missed by all of us and I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

## Senator Monroney and Oklahoma Congressmen Defend Domestic Cattle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 days, the Oklahoma congressional delegation has gone on record before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee to protest the damage to the domestic cattle industry resulting from imported beef and beef products.

This morning, before the Tariff Commission, the dean of our delegation, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, presented an excellent statement on the dangers facing our domestic beef producers.

This statement is supported by the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation. I feel that Senator MONRONEY's remarks represent a very thorough study of the present status and the future prospects of the U.S. cattle industry.

The complete text of Senator MONRONEY's remarks follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION DECEMBER 10, 1963, BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, FOR HIMSELF AND THE OKLAHOMA DELEGATION IN CONGRESS, SENATOR J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, CONGRESSMEN CARL ALBERT, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, TOM STEED, AND VICTOR WICKERSHAM

The seriousness of the impact of importation of beef and beef products on the domestic cattle business cannot be denied. This can well be pointed up by a committee resolution adopted by the Senate Finance Committee on November 20, 1963, directing the U.S. Tariff Commission to investigate the competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries. To my knowledge, the committee has never requested such an investigation except upon obvious occasions of critical and hurtful competition of foreign products upon a domestic industry.

The importance of livestock to the health of agriculture in this country is axiomatic. In 1962, $20 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural production was derived from cattle and calves. Therefore, any action taken or condoned against the cattle business is a shock wave throughout the agricultural economy of the whole Nation.

Illustrating further the importance of the cattle business, live weight sales of beef have grown from 17.5 billion pounds in 1940 to about 38 billion pounds in 1962, an increase in 22 years of more than 217 percent, while 50 percent of the harvested crops is fed to beef cattle and calves and over 1 billion acres of land is used for pasture. Sixty percent of the total farms in the United States have cattle on them.

The tariff on beef and veal was reduced in 1947 from 6 cents to 3 cents a pound.

By the very fact of a stable 3-cent-per-pound tariff, in light of increased prices the tariff has been automatically lowered. For example, in 1947 prices received by farmers for beef cattle were about $15 per hundred weight, in 1962 about $22 per hundred weight. Therefore, the tariff of $3 per hundred weight was 20 percent in 1947 but was only 13.6 percent in 1962. This is not enough to deter imports. Imports have risen steadily from less than 4 percent of production in 1957 to almost 11 percent today in spite of increased per capita domestic consumption of beef and a decided population increase. By comparison, the United States has among the lowest tariffs on beef in the world and among the highest production costs, overlapping about twice world production costs.

By the very nature of the cattle business, it cannot like other industries change locations, build new plants, or reduce overhead. The cost of doing business is steadily going up, prices for finished products are going down, and the tariff squeeze makes it possible for importers to operate at a high profit while the domestic prices are being depressed by $2 to $3 per hundred weight. This is the difference between profit and loss.

We urge adequate tariffs and a reasonable percentage quota be fixed to protect the domestic livestock industry.

It is very surprising to find that the list of products which are to be considered for further tariff reductions includes beef and beef products.

Here is an industry that is so vital to so many families in the United States and one that is so depressed at the present time because of excessive imports that further tariff cuts and further damage to the industry are unthinkable.

It is proposed here to demonstrate that (1) imports are already entering in such quantities as to damage seriously the U.S. cattle industry, and (2) that any further tariff reductions would be disastrous.

One deduction can be made from the facts as they present themselves—namely, that if the present low tariffs are promoting imports at the record rates indicated by the statistics, then further tariff cuts would cause a still greater volume of imports and would permanently damage, if not destroy, the cattle growing and fattening industry of the United States.

The industry objected strenuously to the tariff reductions of the past, indicating that they were ill-timed and too deep. What was forecast then has now transpired. Imports grew and grew until at present the depressed prices for domestic beef can be traced directly to the huge volume coming in from foreign countries.

The tariff on beef is not only very low, it is a specific duty—one that is so much per pound. It is not necessary to explain to the experts that as time passes and the economy grows, the spiral of inflation reduces the protection afforded by a specific rate of duty. When the Tariff Act of 1930 was adopted, the price of beef was very low compared with present prices. As the general price index climbed, the 6-cents-per-pound tariff on beef, fresh chilled, or frozen, gave less and less protection. Without any tariff reductions per se, it could be said that as a result of the increasing prices of beef over the years corresponding to the general growth of all price indexes, the farmer would be getting fractionally less protection than he formerly had. Whereas many ad valorem duties were reduced in trade agreements by 50 percent, or in some instances by more than that, the producers of beef have had a double cut and it has proved to be of very serious dimensions.

The average value of imports of boneless fresh or frozen beef in 1962 was about 31 cents per pound. This is boneless only. As the general price spiral continues, the price of such beef may reach 35 cents and then perhaps 40 cents with, of course, accompanying increases in our costs of producing competitive beef. However, when this occurs, the equivalent ad valorem will have dropped by a proportionate percentage, and this without the help of any additional tariff reductions.

This is mentioned to lend force to the claim that any further concessions on imported meats will but compound what is already a serious situation and one that can only grow steadily worse without any impetus given by added tariff reductions.

Now for a close look at what will happen if the already inadequate tariffs are cut still further. There is not a major cattle producing country in the world that cannot grow cattle much cheaper than it can be done in the United States. This is not to say that U.S. producers are not efficient. U.S. producers are the most efficient cattle growers in the world, but this does not mean that they cannot be undersold by foreign growers.

A day-old calf worth $25 to $50 in the United States would be worth about $5 in Australia or New Zealand. The feed necessary to bring an animal to market condition may run as much as 10 times higher in the United States. The labor necessary in the caring for cattle, bringing them to market, and reducing them to boneless beef would cost perhaps five times as much in the United States. It is not inefficiency in the United States that makes it impossible for U.S. growers to compete. No matter how much costs are cut and prices are held, imports will continue to undersell the U.S. products.

If duties were further reduced, foreign beef producers in a number of countries would take it as a direct invitation to wage war on the American market. Further indications that the U.S. market is to be opened wider and wider will but spur world output of beef until the cattle of Canada, Mexico, Ireland, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand start competing for the U.S. market. No longer will it be competition between foreign and domestic beef. The wide open market will sound the death knell of beef production in the United States. When these foreign herds have grown to the point where they must be sold regardless, then no farmer, no cattle grower in the United States will have a chance.

Judging from the history of the past, and confirmed by the president of the American Hereford Association, for every 1 percent of the U.S. market supplied by imports, domestic producers can count on getting $25 less for a steer and $10 less for a calf.

Now to turn briefly to the growth in imports. The statistics are readily available, and it will not be necessary to dwell upon them. It should be pointed out, however, that the relation of growing imports to declining domestic production and prices is plain and unescapable.

Charts have been prepared to indicate the trend in production and imports. In 1957 when imports began their sharp upward climb, domestic production took an even sharper drop. In 1959 when foreign growers of cattle had oversold and depleted their herds in an endeavor to reap the reward of a lucrative U.S. market, it was necessary to curtail imports somewhat, and the domestic production reacted slightly upward.

Beginning in 1960 as foreign cattle growers increased their herds, domestic production leveled off and imports began another sharp increase. In 1961, 1962, and 1963, sales of domestically grown cattle leveled off and barely held their own, but at a terrific sacrifice. This should be emphasized. Many thousands of farmers in the United States depend on sales of perhaps 2 or 3, perhaps as many as 50 animals each year per farm for the cash necessary to the modern American way of life. When the time comes for the sale, the farmer must sell and accept the price offered. Domestic sales dropped and dropped until they hit bottom—that point at which sales had to be made whether the farmer made money, broke even, or lost money. Most of them have been losing money in the last couple of years. Prices have dropped on choice steers, f.o.b. Chicago, from $28.58 per hundred in 1959, to just over $24 at present; prices on canners and cutters dropped from $16.30 in 1959 to less than $13.50 at present. At the very time when these prices were falling sharply, the general price index was going up. Feed for cattle has a great bearing on whether the farmer gains or loses, and feed has continued to cost more. Gasoline, fencing, fertilizer, materials for barns, seed, labor, and all the other farm essentials, including tractors, planting equipment, and harvesting equipment, cost more each time the farmer makes a purchase. At the very time when the farmer had to take less and less for this cattle, he had to pay more and more for what he bought.

The leveling off of domestic sales as indicated by the chart is the result of thousands of farmers unloading, even at losses which will be reflected in the taxes paid to the Federal Government.

Statistics prove that imports are supplying about 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States. Foreign suppliers are building up their herds in anticipation of a still greater share of the American market. Where will it stop? This is a matter of chief concern at the present time, and it does not seem fitting that this growth should be encouraged and assisted when there is so much surplus of agricultural products in the United States.

According to a table compiled by the Tariff Commission, imports of beef and veal in 1963 in terms of dressed weight equivalent amounted to 1,762 million pounds. It is assumed that before these hearings are over some experts will translate this into the number of acres of feed which have been idled or which have been harvested and put into storage by the Federal Government as absolute surplus. On translating this, consideration must also be given the thousands of our unemployed who might otherwise have found jobs producing and processing this enormous amount of beef. There can be no doubt that many thousands of acres of land are involved and many thousands of workers as well.

This is not a case of shortage in the United States, nor a lack of ability to produce sufficient for our consumption. It is the direct opposite of that. For many years U.S. growers not only supplied this country's wants, but also exported to many countries of the world. It could be granted that limited amounts of imported manufacturing beef, which is used in the many kinds of prepared cooked meats that find important uses in the kitchens of America, might be imported. The farmers of the United States are not complaining about any reasonable amount of imports. However, it is now noted that imports of manufacturing beef amount to about 40 percent of our consumption. This is entirely too much—it is a ruinous amount and is very seriously affecting domestic prices and the whole future of the industry.

The price of canner and cutter cows dropped more than $4 per hundred since 1959, and the price of choice steers dropped about $5 per hundred during the same period. It is no coincidence that this occurred during a sharp upward spiral in imports. The price of choice steers held firm for a while, but in 1963 it could hold no longer and the sharp decline was accentuated by the attempt to hold the line in the face of heavy imports.

There is no question about the desirability of foreign trade. There should be a maximum of beneficial foreign trade, in beef as in a thousand other items. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 does not contain any directive to the Tariff Commission to find the exact point at which the domestic industry would be imperiled by imports resulting from duty reductions. However, it will make reports, and those reports should make it plain that there comes a point when maximum benefits are reached and where damage outweighs the benefits.

The fact that the Tariff Commission has, in the past, kept its reports objective and accurate and has not been prone to let untested theories dilute the facts is appreciated. Here, as in the past, a long and careful look should be given what is already happening in the industries affected by this great influx of beef and beef products and the possible results of further reductions should be weighed carefully. It is felt by many that the costs will be incalculable. If sales of domestic cattle fall off still further, millions of bushels of feed grains will increase the already great surplus. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land may be added to the millions now idle because of surpluses. Farm income will decline below the already shameful low level.

In the final analysis, however, it must be emphasized that the greatest danger in further encouraging foreign cattle growers and processors to take over the market here is the heavy cost to the farmers and cattle growers of the United States. No matter who benefits, it would be dangerous to the economy of the United States to subject its farmers to a still lower standard of living and greater losses in the sale of their beef and veal. It is hoped that something will be done to improve their lot and to get beef prices back to normal, rather than increase the burden they find so heavy at present.

It is urged that the Tariff Commission, in its report to the President, make clear the balance sheet of gain and loss involved in a consideration of whether to reduce duties further and make an already sorry situation still worse. It is believed that the President, when he sees such a balance sheet, will not allow any further tariff reductions on beef and its products. An adequate tariff and a reasonable percentage quota are thought to provide the only fair and equitable solution to this problem.

*Manufacturing beef: U.S. imports, production, and total of imports plus production for use in processed-meat products in the United States, 1954-63*

[Quantities reported in million pounds carcass equivalent]

| Year | Imports for consumption [1] | Domestic production [2] | Total of imports plus production |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1954 | 48 | 4,250 | 4,298 |
| 1955 | 38 | 4,496 | 4,534 |
| 1956 | 50 | 4,450 | 4,500 |
| 1957 | 166 | 4,398 | 4,564 |
| 1958 | 635 | 3,312 | 3,947 |
| 1959 | 847 | 2,825 | 3,672 |
| 1960 | 582 | 3,140 | 3,722 |
| 1961 [3] | 806 | 3,100 | 3,906 |
| 1962 [3] | 1,246 | 3,100 | 4,346 |
| 1963 [3] [4] | 1,223 | 3,100 | 4,323 |

[1] Imports include boneless beef, fresh, chilled, or frozen, pickled and cured beef and veal, and the boneless cured beef imported in the schedule A class 0032 900 (par. 706). The latter was estimated as the increased imports in this class from South American countries in 1957–60 over the 1954–56 average. All imports were converted to carcass equivalent by multiplying the product weight by 1.5.

[2] Unpublished estimates of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on cow and bull beef production.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] 1st 6 months at an annual rate.

Source: Production estimates, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; imports, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Imports of live cattle into the United States have steadily declined from 141,898 head in January 1963 to 16,905 head in August 1963. Imports in 1961 were 1,022,799 head; in 1962 there were 1,232,256 head imported, with no month in either of these years as low as either July or August of 1963.

Beef imports (carcass weights equivalent) were 175.5 million pounds in August, as compared to 172 million pounds in the same month of last year.

The following table compares U.S. meat (beef) production with imports:

*U.S. imports of cattle and beef, compared with U.S. production, by year, 1954–62*

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

| | Imports | | | | U.S. meat production [3] | Imports as percentage of production | Per capita supply of beef and veal [4] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Live animals | | Meat | Total [2] | | | |
| | Number | Meat equivalent [1] | | | | | |
| | *Thousand head* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Percent* | |
| 1954 | 71 | 35 | 232 | 267 | 14,610 | 1.8 | 91.3 |
| 1955 | 296 | 93 | 229 | 322 | 15,147 | 2.1 | 93.2 |
| 1956 | 141 | 43 | 211 | 254 | 16,094 | 1.6 | 96.8 |
| 1957 | 703 | 221 | 395 | 616 | 15,728 | 3.9 | 95.0 |
| 1958 | 1,126 | 340 | 909 | 1,249 | 14,516 | 8.6 | 90.1 |
| 1959 | 688 | 191 | 1,063 | 1,254 | 14,588 | 8.6 | 89.1 |
| 1960 | 645 | 163 | 775 | 938 | 15,835 | 5.9 | 92.8 |
| 1961 | 1,023 | 250 | 1,037 | 1,287 | 16,341 | 7.9 | 96.0 |
| 1962 | 1,232 | 280 | 1,445 | 1,725 | 16,311 | 10.6 | 96.7 |
| January–August: | | | | | | | |
| 1962 | 583 | 132 | 893 | 1,025 | 10,895 | 9.4 | |
| 1963 | 555 | 118 | 1,086 | 1,204 | 11,386 | 10.6 | |

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.

[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.

[3] Total production (including an estimate of farm slaughter).

[4] Commercial beef and veal production plus beef and veal imports per capita.

Exports of live cattle have materially declined from 43,945 head in the peak year of 1957 to 19,312 head in 1962.

Exports of processed beef and veal are as follows:

| Year: | Million pounds |
|---|---|
| 1950 | 16.5 |
| 1951 | 11.6 |
| 1952 | 14.7 |
| 1953 | 38.7 |
| 1954 | 33.8 |
| 1955 | 40.7 |
| 1956 | 89.3 |
| 1957 | 88.6 |
| 1958 | 33.6 |
| 1959 | 37.3 |
| 1960 | 41.7 |
| 1961 | 43.2 |
| 1962 | 40.9 |

Production and consumption of beef in the United States have shown a steady increase in both total amount and per capita consumption.

*Beef*

| Year | Production | Consumption | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Per capita |
| | *Million* | *Million* | *Pounds* |
| 1940 | 7,175 | 7,257 | 54.9 |
| 1941 | 8,082 | 8,021 | 60.9 |
| 1942 | 8,843 | 8,049 | 61.2 |
| 1943 | 8,571 | 6,860 | 53.3 |
| 1944 | 9,112 | 7,146 | 55.6 |
| 1945 | 10,276 | 7,665 | 59.4 |
| 1946 | 9,373 | 8,533 | 61.6 |
| 1947 | 10,432 | 9,916 | 69.6 |
| 1948 | 9,075 | 9,163 | 63.1 |
| 1949 | 9,439 | 9,439 | 63.9 |
| 1950 | 9,534 | 9,529 | 63.4 |
| 1951 | 8,837 | 8,472 | 56.1 |
| 1952 | 9,650 | 9,548 | 62.2 |
| 1953 | 12,407 | 12,113 | 77.6 |
| 1954 | 12,963 | 12,743 | 80.1 |
| 1955 | 13,569 | 13,313 | 82.0 |
| 1956 | 14,462 | 14,121 | 85.4 |
| 1957 | 14,202 | 14,242 | 84.6 |
| 1958 | 13,330 | 13,786 | 80.5 |
| 1959 | 13,580 | 14,202 | 81.4 |
| 1960 | 14,727 | 15,121 | 85.2 |
| 1961 | 15,296 | 15,871 | 88.0 |
| 1962 | 15,296 | 16,303 | 89.1 |

## Resolution in Memory of Hon. Leon H. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Leon H. Gavin, former Member of this body from the 23d District of Pennsylvania, both in this body and on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. He served both the House and the Commission with great distinction and credit.

This morning the Commission held its first meeting since the death of this distinguished Member and when it adjourned, it adjourned out of respect to his memory and in appreciation of his fine service.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the resolution of respect that was passed by that Commission, consisting of Senators Metcalf and Hruska, Secretaries Udall, Hodges, and Freeman, and myself, as it commemorated his association with us and attested his service to the Commission and to the Nation.

The resolution reads:

> Whereas the Honorable Leon H. Gavin, Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania, served this Commission for more than 6 years with outstanding loyalty and devotion; and
>
> Whereas death called this distinguished Member on September 15, 1963, bringing an end to his service and depriving us of his wise counsel, advice, and leadership; and
>
> Whereas in his passing, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission feels a deep and continuing loss: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That this Commission be now adjourned in respect to his memory, and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That this resolution be made a permanent record of this Commission, and that a copy be furnished to his family as an attestation of our respect, admiration, and true regard for this trusted, valued member.

## Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of many of the more desirable features of the Kennedy administration's legislative recommendations and an interested observer of the effects of its intense efforts at propaganda upon the public, I think our current mail on the subject of civil rights is worthy of comment. Those with a personal interest in the subject as well as those most easily impressed by the public media are, of course, in the majority; while others, through personal experience or thoughtful individual analysis, caution against the obvious pitfalls involved in hasty legislation. Strangely enough, those who express great haste, in some instances, are the very individuals who earlier in the present session, insisted that the Rules Committee be packed with liberal thinkers and now complain of their own handiwork.

To anyone who is under the impression that a civil rights bill has been pending before the House during the 3 years sentiment has been whipped to a fever pitch for its enactment, may I call attention to the fact that the first bill of this nature to come before the House Rules Committee for definite action has to date been pending but 7 legislative days. During that week, I understand hearings were scheduled by the House Rules Committee, a fact which certainly does not bespeak undue delay or procrastination. Unaccountably, the friendly Judiciary Committee had already taken 6 months to write up a bill and refer it to the Rules Committee.

Some of our correspondence and press reports carry the suggestion that any Member who does not sign the discharge petition to bring the bill before the House a day or two before Christmas, is an enemy of the cause of civil rights. I think it is most unfortunate that this attempt at political chicanery should follow the most extreme and tiring lobbying effort that has been witnessed in Washington for many years. I doubt that informed friends of civil rights would recommend such precipitous action were they to review the results of other movements of this nature. Actually, less than 10 percent of the bills brought out by petition have been enacted into law, and many legislators have a hard-and-fast rule of signing no petitions of any nature.

Consistent with my customary support of civil rights and because of the acknowledged importance of a reasonable bill to all of our citizenry, I think it requires the most sober reflection and careful consideration in a calmer atmosphere than exists at present. Should the House Rules Committee fail to act following the holiday recess, I feel that I would be favorably inclined to add my name to a petition.

## Friends of Civil Rights Can Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session when attempts were made to tie civil rights—antidiscrimination—amendments to vital education bills, I raised the question whether some of those who used this method were more interested in killing much needed legislation than supporting human rights. I had hoped, and still do, that I was wrong.

This week in the House the real friends of civil rights have an opportunity to sign a discharge petition, thereby speeding up a vital early vote on civil rights and demonstrating their true colors.

Now is the time for those who are responsible and conscientious about this cause to act. Further speeches, explanations, or confessions of "love for mankind" are unnecessary.

Weak excuses that this is a partisan Democratic maneuver, that this method is wrong and some other is the right way, or that it is an insult to our chairmanship system—will not be adequate explanations to those who in personal sacrifices must demonstrate and suffer further humiliations and deprivations in attempts to obtain food, shelter, and human dignity.

I am pleased to call my colleagues' attention to a portion of an editorial in the Washington Post of December 8, 1963, which summarizes in clear and unanswerable logic the issue now presented by the pending discharge petition before the House.

The editorial quotes a Member of the other body as stating:

> Unless a rule can be obtained promptly, I believe that signing a discharge petition may turn out to be as important an action in the other body as the vote for cloture of debate

on the civil rights will ultimately be in the Senate when that test comes here.

The editorial continues:

The Senator is abundantly right. And no one in either Chamber should have any illusion about it. Their constituents will know that the crucial test of civil rights support in the House will consist in signing the discharge petition and the crucial test of civil rights support in the Senate will consist in voting to end the southern filibuster. And let the Members of the House make no mistake about it: the test is at hand. They will determine the fate of the civil rights bill by their willingness to sign the discharge petition before they go home for Christmas.

Anyone who wants to know what's the hurry need only look at the calendar. The civil rights bill was sent to Congress by the President as an emergency measure last June. It was presumed by the colored people of the country, who have long and patiently petitioned Congress for a redress of their grievances, that the measure would be passed by the House and under consideration by the Senate before the end of summer; that is why they scheduled the march on Washington for August 28. Their hopes and their confidence in the orderly processes of representative government have been cruelly disappointed.

Plainly, the foes of civil rights mean to use delay for the purpose of destruction. Do they mean to aggravate the tension and stretch the endurance of Negroes until fresh demonstrations in the streets of the Nation's cities erupt under the provocation of police brutality into desperate violence? Then will they say sanctimoniously that Congress cannot act under this kind of pressure which its own paralysis has provoked?

What's the hurry? The hurry is the same as the hurry felt by surgeons who see a malignant tumor eating away at human life. For a hundred years delay has been piled on delay in dealing with the American cancer of discrimination until the patient is in desperate straits. The test is now. It is a test which will tell definitely who is friend and who is foe of civil rights. It is a test of the capacity of Congress to meet an inescapable and historic challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the Washington Post, and I am honored to have been the 11th person to sign the discharge petition.

## California Alliance for Progress Partner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

**Mr. LEGGETT.** Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have demanded a new face on our foreign aid program as was evidenced by the recent aid authorization debates.

Now is not the time for partisanship in international relations. None of us should be complacent that American revitalized dollar diplomacy will have instantaneous worldwide acceptance unless we continue to strive to make aid effective in reaching people and substantially changing standards of living.

A monumental action was taken in this area last Friday when a tripartite agreement was executed between AID, the Republic of Chile and the State of California.

As was evidenced by the statement of Gov. Pat Brown, Preston Silbaugh, and Earl Warren, Jr., plain Californians do care about the welfare of their Latin brothers. California will cooperate in a massive effort of people-to-people stimulating cultural, educational and technical exchange of advisers, students and tourists in an attempt to bring California greatness south of the Equator. The students of the University of California at Davis in my Fourth Congressional District are already engaged in this exchange.

At the State Department Friday, Congressmen HAROLD JOHNSON and HARLAN HAGEN attended with myself as California became a new partner to the Alliance for Progress. The press announcement and the statements of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos follows:

### STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON PREPARED FOR CEREMONIES MARKING THE SIGNING OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND REPUBLIC OF CHILE

I have asked the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, to convey this personal message of greetings to those, both here and in California, who are participating in today's transcontinental signing ceremony:

"Last February, President Kennedy and Governor Brown inaugurated a new dimension in the Alliance for Progress: the enlistment of the resources of one of our great States—California—in the effort to speed the development of one of our alliance partners—the Republic of Chile.

"Since then, dedicated and imaginative men from the State of California, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, have worked with our Chilean friends to convert that plan into a concrete program. They have succeeded. The documents signed today open the way for Chile to tap the superb resources of men and experience which California's private and public institutions have in such abundance. And California will be enriched by the experience. For it will be working with a country, as we saw recently in the Image of Chile series, with a great cultural and intellectual heritage.

"President Kennedy called this California-Chile plan a pioneering effort under the Alliance. I certainly agree. It is the first attempt to bring the full range of resources of one of our States to bear on the development problems of another nation. It is also a new initiative to bring the Alliance closer to our peoples. For under it, individuals and institutions within our two countries can now develop their own close patterns of cooperation under the Alliance.

"Last week, in addressing the distinguished Latin American delegates and ambassadors who had come to Washington to pay their last respects to our late President, I reaffirmed this Nation's continuing commitment to the goals of the Alliance for Progress, and called upon all our peoples to make this Alliance a living memorial to John F. Kennedy.

"Thanks to the leadership of Governor Brown, and the fine cooperation between his representatives, the Republic of Chile and our AID mission in Santiago, we are today taking this significant step to make good on this pledge.

"In asking the Administrator of the AID Agency, Mr. David Bell, to execute these documents, I want to express my sincere support and best wishes for the success of the program. I also ask Ambassador Gutierrez, who has done so much to help us understand and appreciate the country he represents, to convey to the Government and the people of Chile my assurance of our continued cooperation with them in the pursuit of the high objectives which Chile has set for itself under te Alliance for Progress."

### JOINT CEREMONIES MARK CALIFORNIA AID TO CHILE

California today became an active partner of Chile in furthering the Latin American country's economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

In simultaneous ceremonies at the State Capitol in Sacramento, and at the State Department in Washington, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Chilean Ambassador Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, and Administrator of the Agency for International Development David Bell signed documents to inaugurate the Chile-California program of technical cooperation in the fields of economic planning, agriculture, education, transportation, and water resources development. U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress Teodoro Moscoso joined in the Washington ceremony.

Early this year, the late President Kennedy and President Jorge Alessandri of Chile requested that the idea of a Chile-California association be explored.

California responded quickly and in a joint announcement at the White House on February 12, 1963, President Kennedy and Governor Brown declared, "This is the first time a State has been called upon to investigate the extent to which all of its resources can be brought to bear on the development of another country."

Striking similarities between the South American Republic and the Golden State are expected to make California's development experience useful to Chile.

Their first European settlements were of Spanish origin. Both areas have long Pacific coast shorelines—2,900 miles for Chile and 1,200 miles for California. Both produce grapes for wine, besides cattle, fruit, wheat, and alfalfa. And both have large mineral deposits as well as extensive desert, forest, and mountain regions.

The acquaintance of Chile and California started more than a century ago. About 40,000 Chileans joined the gold rush to California in 1848 and 1849. Some struck gold. But a more meaningful association came during the San Francisco fire and earthquake of 1906. At that time, Chile sent immediate aid to California. Fifty-four years later, in 1960, when an earthquake devastated parts of Chile, California sent relief supplies to her southern neighbor.

California has adopted a community called "California" in Chile, where the State's Bear Flag flies over the village plaza—7,729 miles south of Sacramento.

During the spring and summer months of this year two groups of Californians made preliminary survey trips to Chile. They conferred with Government officials and with the AID Mission in Santiago. On the basis of these discussions it was decided to focus California's technical resources in the areas of economic planning, agriculture, education, transportation, and water resources development.

A field office has been opened in Sacramento and an headquarters office will open early next year in Santiago, Chile. Governor Brown has appointed Preston N. Silbaugh, administrator of the business and commerce agency of the State and a member of the Governor's Cabinet, as Director of the Chile-California program.

Mr. Silbaugh has named Earl Warren, Jr., as the deputy in charge of the Sacramento field office.

The program initiated today will be a key part of the substantial U.S. contribution to

Chile's 10-year economic development plan and is expected to create long-term relationships between public and private institutions in Chile and California.

A nonprofit organization, the California-Chile Fund, is being established to encourage private support and participation in the program as a supplement to AID's contribution.

---

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY AMBASSADOR SERGIO GUTIERREZ-OLIVOS, OF CHILE, AT THE SIGNING OF THE CHILE-CALIFORNIA PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1963

This ceremony, that so eloquently symbolizes and confirms the mutual affection and esteem that bind California and Chile, has an added significance for us today. It is a tribute and memorial to the wisdom and farsightedness of your great leader—I should say of our own great leader as well, for Latin America looked on him as such—the late President John F. Kennedy. Without his profound and intuitive understanding of Latin America and its needs, without his energetic determination, this ceremony might not have taken place in our lifetime.

President Kennedy possessed a rare appreciation of the important role of Latin America in the destiny of the free world at large, and of the United States in particular. He had the broad vision and imagination to discern the road to be traveled if we were to conquer hunger, illiteracy and the economic and social ills that impede progress toward the life of dignity, hope and fullness that should be the birthright of every human born into this world.

He was a leader who sought the most direct route in all that pertained to reaching this goal. I recall a courtesy visit I made to the Department of State shortly after my arrival in Washington, and before I had presented my credentials as Ambassador. There I was introduced to a group of Californian businessmen and specialists who were meeting with officials to discuss the type of program we have undertaken today. Later, when President Kennedy and Governor Brown were about to announce the program, the President paid me the great honor of inviting me to join him and the Governor in the proceedings. He spoke, the Governor spoke, both looked at me, and I spoke. It did not matter to the President that I had not yet presented my credentials. He was determined to get the ball rolling in the most expeditious manner, and that was all that mattered.

Some 10 years ago, President Johnson gathered the representatives of the Latin American republics at the White House and told us of his intention to carry on undiminished the noble enterprise begun by his illustrious predecessor. He made clear to us his own deep and heartfelt concern for the prosperity and stability of the nations to the south and the well-being of their peoples. His words, and the warmth and sincerity with which he spoke them, gave us great comfort and reassurance.

The ceremony in which we have just participated is the harbinger of a new and vital era in California-Chilean relations, but above all it is the renewed confirmation of a cooperation, born of mutual esteem and affection and a myriad similarities, that has joined us for many years in a summer uniquely intimate and complete.

Cooperation between this beautiful land of yours and my own no less beautiful land—how could it be any less beautiful when it so amazingly resembles yours?—is by no means new. It has been almost an instinctive part of us for a century and more. California has left many an indelible imprint on Chile, and the signs of our presence are abundant among you.

Thirty thousand Chileans—a 50th, no less, of our population of the time—surged into California in 1848 to reach for the fabled riches of your Gold Rush. As in the case of most, their dreams of wealth dissolved into disappointment, but unlike many, they found other riches in this land so like their own, the spiritual riches and satisfactions of helping to build a new, dynamic and inimitable society in this world of promise and fulfillment that is California.

Many thousands of these Chileans remained in California to cast their roots into its fertile soil and become an inseparable part of its destiny. They built communities, and in the manner of exiles the world over, gave them names that evoked and perpetuated cherished memories of the homeland: Chilecito—"Little Chile"—Buenaventura Sanchez, J. M. Ramirez. They built streets and avenues, and called them Matte, Bulnes, Ossa, Alessandri, Valparaiso—names that vibrate in the history of Chile. They built Sacramento's first hospital and they published California's first periodical.

They are still with you and shall always be with you I hope, and among the many good Californians who proudly bear the name of Gutierrez, I am sure—with all due apologies to Sir William Gilbert—that I number cousins by the dozens, even as do so many of my countrymen.

When California was visited by catastrophe in 1906, it was to be expected that Chile should stand well in the vanguard of those who bore aid and succor to your afflicted citizens. In a like manner, when Chile was scourged by earthquakes in 1960, it was no more than natural that California should lead in extending the fraternal hand that helped raise us from disaster.

One could continue indefinitely in this vein, for the many-faceted cooperation that so spontaneously unites us provides a wealth of example from which to draw. Let it suffice to say that rarely, if ever, has such an affinity and sympathy existed between any two peoples as exists between Californians and Chileans.

We may confidently await great things from this compact into which we have entered today. It opens to us the wise counsel and technical advice of those who have given California its truly remarkable growth and made it a byword for initiative and progress the world over. Because it is the first of its kind, it can serve as an incentive and guide to other countries and other States of this great Union in drawing closer the ties of understanding and assistance that are among the firmest guarantees of peace and progress.

To help perpetuate the sympathy and understanding that for so long has joined us to California, we are arranging for an exhibition of Chilean contemporary art and of photographs depicting the land and people and life of Chile at the University of California in February.

To bring this compact and others like it to full fruition calls for a realistic and objective appraisal of the Alliance for Progress, of its intent and accomplishments and present development, so that we may pragmatically assess and adapt to our needs the advantages and obstacles which it presents.

We are in the third year of that decade that President Kennedy hoped would become for our hemisphere "a tribute to the power of the creative energies of free men and women, an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand." The instrument of that evolution was to be the Alliance for Progress, and in this third year of its existence its impetus fluctuates and it becomes the target of often unjust criticism and unfounded doubt.

This is a far cry from the hope and even illusion that greeted the birth of the Alliance 3 short years ago. We overreacted then in our optimism, just as today we too often tend to overreact in our pessimism and doubt.

It is just as unrealistic to shroud the future of the Alliance in gloom as it is to chant of success. Like any work of man, the Alliance has defects and limitations, but for all that it already has given us many heartening and even impressive accomplishments. These accomplishments are the product of faith, imagination, and drive such as have produced our Chile-California program. The defects will be corrected and we already are correcting them, as has been demonstrated by the recent meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at São Paulo, where action was taken to guarantee the greater effectiveness of the Alliance and broader participation by Latin America in its basic decisions.

My good friends, the Alliance needs us and our support, if for no other reason than that the alternatives point to our common destruction. Let us see in this ceremony in which we have participated today something of the true promise of the Alliance. Let us realistically acknowledge that, while time is of the essence in forging our salvation, time must inevitably pass before we are safe on the way to that salvation.

Whether that time is shortened or not will depend on our common faith in the Alliance and our will to give it of our best. Let us show that faith, just as we show faith in our action of today, an association between California and Chile that is but a part of our larger Alliance.

---

## The American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much will be said and much will be written in time to come of the recent event which shook our Nation and the world. The assassination of a President is a fearsome thing, a deed so monstrous that it passes understanding. Yet we must make an effort to do so. I am pleased therefore to place before the House a remarkable address delivered Wednesday last in this city by the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope and trust his commentary will receive careful and thoughtful attention. Senator FULBRIGHT's address on "The American Character," delivered before the Rockefeller Public Service Awards presentation luncheon is as follows:

THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

(Address by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Rockefeller Public Service Awards Presentation Luncheon, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963)

It is an honor and a privilege for me to participate in this presentation of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards for 1963. These awards are the highest and most valued honor accorded by a private source for career government service. The recipients, both past and present, are outstanding public servants who have served their country with intelligence and dedication. We are all indebted to Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, for making these awards possible and to Princeton University for its administration of the award program as a national trust.

I am indeed pleased to join in honoring the five distinguished award winners for 1963: Mr. Weber, Mr. Loomis, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Wessenauer, and Mr. Astin. If I may inject a personal note I should like to express my pride and pleasure—which I know is shared by every member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that one of the winners is Mr. Carl Marcy, our committee chief of staff.

As we mourn the death of President Kennedy, it is fitting that we reflect on the character of our society and ask ourselves whether the assassination of the President was merely a tragic accident or a manisfestation of some deeper failing in our lives and in our society.

It may be that the tragedy was one which could have occurred anywhere at any time to any national leader. It may be that the cause lies wholly in the tormented brain of the assassin. It may be that the Nation as a whole is healthy and strong and entirely without responsibility for the great misfortune which has befallen it. It would be comforting to think so.

I for one do not think so. I believe that our society, though in most respects decent, civilized, and humane, is not, and has never been, entirely so. Our national life, both past and present, has also been marked by a baleful and incongruous strand of intolerance and violence.

It is in evidence all around us. It is in evidence in the senseless and widespread crime that makes the streets of our great cities unsafe. It is in evidence in the malice and hatred of extremist political movements. And it is in evidence in the cruel bigotry of race that leads to such tragedies as the killing of Negro children in a church in Alabama.

We must ask ourselves many questions about this element of barbarism in a civilized society. We must ask ourselves what its sources are, in history and in human nature. We must ask ourselves whether it is the common and inevitable condition of man or whether it can be overcome. And if we judge that it can be overcome, we must ask ourselves why we Americans have not made greater progress in doing so. We must ask ourselves what, if anything, all this has to do with the death of our President. Finally, and most important, we must ask ourselves what we must do, and how and when, to overcome hatred and bigotry and to make America as decent and humane a society as we would like it to be.

I do not pretend to be able to answer these questions. I do suggest, however, that the conditions of our time call for a national self-examination although the process may be a long and difficult and painful one. I further suggest, and most emphatically, that if such a national self-examination is to be productive it must be conducted in a spirit of tolerance rather than anger, serenity rather than guilt, and Christian charity rather than crusading moralism.

We might begin our reflections about ourselves by an examination of the effects of crusading self-righteousness, in the history of Western civilization and in our own society.

Moral absolutism—righteous, crusading, and intolerant—has been a major force in the history of Western civilization. Whether religious or political in form, movements of crusading moralism have played a significant and usually destructive role in the evolution of western societies. Such movements, regardless of the content of their doctrines, have all been marked by a single characteristic: The absolute certainty of their own truth and virtue. Each has regarded itself as having an exclusive pipeline to heaven, to God, or to a deified concept of history—or whatever is regarded as the ultimate source of truth. Each has regarded itself as the chosen repository of truth and virtue and each has regarded all nonbelievers as purveyors of falsehood and evil.

Absolutist movements are usually crusading movements. Free as they are from any element of doubt as to their own truth and virtue, they conceive themselves to have a mission of spreading the truth and destroying evil. They consider it to be their duty to regenerate mankind, however little it may wish to be regenerated. The means which are used for this purpose, though often harsh and sometimes barbaric, are deemed to be wholly justified by the nobility of the end. They are justified because the end is absolute and there can be no element of doubt as to its virtue and its truth.

Thus it is that in the name of noble purposes men have committed unspeakable acts of cruelty against one another. The medieval Christians who burned heretics alive did not do so because they were cruel and sadistic; they did it because they wished to exorcise evil and make men godly and pure. The Catholic and Protestant armies which inflicted upon Europe 30 years of death and destruction in the religious wars of the 17th century did not do so because they wished anyone harm; on the contrary, they did it for the purpose of saving Christendom from sin and damnation.

In our own time the crusading movements have been political rather than religious, but their doctrines have been marked by the same conviction of absolute truth and the same zeal to perpetuate it. Thus the German Nazis, with their fervent belief in a primitive racial myth, murdered 6 million Jews in their zeal to elevate mankind by ridding it of a race that they deemed venal and inferior. Similarly, the Russian Communists under Stalin, who as Djilas writes, was a man capable of destroying nine-tenths of the human race to make happy the one-tenth—killed millions of their own people and consigned countless others to the slave labor camps of Siberia in order to pave the way for a society in which all men should be equal and happy and free. And the Chinese Communists of the present are able to contemplate with equanimity a nuclear war in which hundreds of millions would be killed because of their conviction that such a war would destroy capitalism and lead to a higher and nobler civilization.

The strand of fanaticism and violence has been a major one in Western history. But it has not been the only one, nor has it been the dominant one in most Western societies. The other strand of Western civilization, conceived in ancient Greece and Rome and revived in the European age of reason, has been one of tolerance and moderation, of empiricism and practicality. Its doctrine has been democracy, a radically different kind of doctrine whose one absolute is the denial of absolutes and of the messianic spirit. The core of the democratic idea is the element of doubt as to the ability of any man or any movement to perceive ultimate truth. Accordingly, it has fostered societies in which the individual is left free to pursue truth and virtue as he imperfectly perceives them, with due regard for the right of every other individual to pursue a different, and quite possibly superior, set of values.

Democratic societies have by no means been free of self-righteousness and the crusading spirit. On the contrary, they have at times engaged in great crusades to spread the gospel of their own ideology. Indeed, no democratic nation has been more susceptible to this tendency than the United States, which in the past generation has fought one war to "make the world safe for democracy," another to achieve nothing less than the unconditional surrender of its enemies, and even now finds it possible to consider the plausibility of total victory over communism in a thermonuclear war.

It is clear that democratic nations are susceptible to dogmatism and the crusading spirit. The point, however, is that this susceptibility is not an expression but a denial of the democratic spirit. When a free nation embarks upon a crusade for democracy, it is caught up in the impossible contradiction of trying to use force to make men free. The dogmatic and crusading spirit in free societies is an antidemocratic tendency, a lingering vestige of the strand of dogmatism and violence in the Western heritage.

Although no Western nation has completely dispelled the absolutist spirit of the crusades and the religious wars, some have been more successful than others. The most successful of all, I believe—at least among those nations which have had an important impact on the world beyond their own frontiers—has been England. For a number of complex historical reasons, while most of Europe remained under absolute monarchs and an absolute church, England evolved very gradually into a pluralistic society under a constitutional government. By the time of the establishment of the English colonies in the New World, the evolution toward constitutional democracy was well advanced. The process quickly took hold in the North American colonies and their evolution toward democracy outspaced that of the mother country. This was the basic heritage of America—a heritage of tolerance, moderation, and individual liberty that was implanted from the very beginnings of European settlement in the New World. America has quite rightly been called a nation that was born free.

There came also to the New World the Puritans, a minor group in England who became a major force in American life. Their religion was Calvinism, an absolutist faith with a stern moral code promising salvation for the few and damnation for the many. The intolerant, witch-hunting Puritanism of 17th century Massachusetts was not a major religious movement in America. It eventually became modified and as a source of ethical standards made a worthy contribution to American life. But the Puritan way of thinking, harsh and intolerant, permeated the political and economic life of the country and became a major secular force in America. Coexisting uneasily with our English heritage of tolerance and moderation, the Puritan way of thinking has injected an absolutist strand into American thought—a strand of stern moralism in our public policy and in our standards of personal behavior.

The Puritan way of thinking has had a powerful impact on our foreign policy. It is reflected in our traditional vacillation between self-righteous isolation and total involvement and in our attitude toward foreign policy as a series of idealistic crusades rather than as a continuing defense of the national interest. It is reflected in some of the most notable events of our history: in the unnecessary war with Spain, which was spurred by an idealistic fervor to liberate Cuba and ended with our making Cuba an American protectorate; in the war of 1917, which began with a national commitment to "make the world safe for democracy" and ended with our repudiation of our own blueprint for a world order of peace and law; in the radical pacifism of the interwar years which ended with our total involvement in a conflict in which our proclaimed objective of "unconditional surrender" was finally achieved by dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Throughout the 20th century American foreign policy has been caught up in the inherent contradiction between our English heritage of tolerance and accommodation and our Puritan heritage of crusading righteousness. This contradiction is strikingly illustrated by the policy of President Wilson in World War I. In 1914 he called upon the American people to be neutral in thought as well as in their actions; in early 1917, when the United States was still neutral, he called upon the belligerents to compromise their differences and accept a "peace without victory;" but in the spring of 1918, when the United States had been involved in the war for a year, he perceived only one possible response to the challenge of Germany in the war: "Force, force to the ultmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force which shall make right the law of the world, and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust."

The danger of any crusading movement issues from its presumption of absolute truth. If the premise is valid, then all else follows. If we know, with absolute and unchallengeable certainty, that a political leader is traitorous, or that he is embarked upon a course of certain ruin for the Nation, then it is our right, indeed our duty, to carry our opposition beyond constitutional means and to remove him by force or even murder. The premise, however, is not valid. We do not know, nor can we know, with absolute certainty that those who disagree with us are wrong. We are human and therefore fallible, and being fallible, we cannot escape the element of doubt as to our own opinions and convictions. This, I believe, is the core of the democratic spirit. When we acknowledge our own fallibility, tolerance, and compromise become possible and fanaticism becomes absurd.

Before I comment on recent events, it is necessary to mention another major factor in the shaping of the American national character. That factor is the experience of the frontier, the building of a great nation out of a vast wilderness in the course of a single century. The frontier experience taught us the great value of individual initiative and self-reliance in the development of our resources and of our national economy. But the individualism of the frontier, largely untempered by social and legal restraints, has also had an important influence on our political life and on our personal relations. It has generated impatience with the compex and tedious procedures of law and glorified the virtues of direct individual action. It has instilled in us an easy familiarity with violence and vigilante justice. In the romanticized form in which it permeates the television and other mass media, the mythology of the frontier conveys the message that killing a man is not bad as long as you don't shoot him in the back, that violence is only reprehensible when its purpose is bad and that in fact it is commendable and glorious when it is perpetrated by good men for a good purpose.

The murder of the accused assassin of President Kennedy is a shocking example of the spirit of vigilante justice. Compounding one crime with another, this act has denied the accused individual of one of the most basic rights of a civilized society: The right to a fair trial under established procedures of law. No less shocking are the widespread expressions of sympathy and approval for the act of the man who killed the accused assassin. Underlying these expressions of approval is an assumption that it is not killing that is bad but only certain kinds of killing, that it is proper and even praiseworthy for a citizen to take justice into his own hands when he deems his purpose to be a just one or a righteous act of vengeance. This attitude is a prescription for anarchy. Put into general practice, it would do far more to destroy the fabric of a free society than the evils which it purports to redress.

The mythology of the frontier, the moral absolutism of our Puritan heritage, and of course, other factors which I have not mentioned, have injected a strand of intolerance and violence into American life. This violent tendency lies beneath the surface of an orderly, law-abiding, democratic society, but not far beneath the surface. When times are normal, when the country is prosperous at home and secure in its foreign relations, our violent and intolerant tendencies remain quiescent and we are able to conduct our affairs in a rational and orderly manner. But in times of crisis, foreign or domestic, our underlying irrationality breaks through to become a dangerous and disruptive force in our national life.

Since World War II times have not been normal; they are not normal now, nor are they likely to be for as far into the future as we can see. In this era of nuclear weapons and cold war, we live with constant crises and the continuing and immediate danger of incineration by hydrogen bombs. We are a people who have faced dangers before but we have always been able to overcome them by direct and immediate action. Now we are confronted with dangers vastly greater than we or any other nation has ever before known and we see no end to them and no solutions to them. Nor are there any solutions. There are only possibilities, limited, intermittent, and ambiguous, to alleviate the dangers of our time. For the rest, we have no choice but to try to live with the unsolved problems of a revolutionary world.

Under these conditions, it is not at all surprising that the underlying tendencies toward violence and crusading self-righteousness have broken through the surface and become a virulent force in the life and politics of the postwar era. They have not thus far been the dominant force because the Nation has been able to draw on the considerable resources of wisdom, patience, and judgment which are the core of our national heritage and character. The dominance of reason, however, has been tenuous and insecure and on a number of occasions in these years of crisis we have come close to letting our passions shape critical decisions of policy.

American politics in the postwar period has been characterized by a virulent debate between those who counsel patience and reason and those who, in their fear and passion, seem ever ready to plunge the Nation into conflict abroad and witch hunts at home. As the years of crisis have gone on, the politics of the Nation have been poisoned by the increasingly irresponsible charges of those zealots who, as President Kennedy would have said in his undelivered Dallas speech, assume that "words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory, and that peace is a sign of weakness."

The voices of suspicion and hate have been heard throughout the land. They were heard a decade ago, when statesmen, private citizens, and even high-ranking members of the Armed Forces were charged with treason, subversion, and communism, because they had disagreed with or somehow displeased the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy. They are heard today when extremist groups do not hesitate to call a former President or the Chief Justice of the United States a traitor and a Communist. They are heard in the mail which U.S. Senators receive almost daily charging them with communism or treason because they voted for the foreign aid bill or for the nuclear test ban treaty.

If I may, I should like to read a section of a letter which I recently received from a person called John Haller of Greenville, Pa., who writes on stationery carrying the letterhead, "In Defense of the Constitution." The letter is not atypical. It reads, in part, as follows:

"Just heard on the news that you are defending the wheat sale to Russia and are for giving them credit at the American taxpayers(') expense.

"For some time now I have been checking your record and find that you would make a better Communist than you make an American. Any proposals that would protect America or our free-enterprise system are opposed by you and any proposals that would help our enemies are given your wholehearted support. Your famous memorandum is a disgrace and you are a traitor to the Constitution."

This malice and hatred which have become a part of our politics cannot be dismissed as the normal excesses of a basically healthy society. They have become far too common. They are beyond the pale of normal political controversy in which honest men challenge each other's judgment and opinions but not each other's motives and integrity. The excesses of the extremists in our country have created an intolerable situation in which we must all guard our words and the expression of an unorthodox point of view is an extraordinary act of courage.

It was in this prevailing atmosphere of suspicion and hate that the murder of the President was spawned, whatever its immediate causes may have been. In an atmosphere in which dissent can be regarded as treason, in which violence is glorified and romanticized, in which direct action is widely preferred to judicial action as a means of redressing grievances, assassination is not really a radical departure from acceptable behavior. As Chief Justice Warren said in his eulogy of President Kennedy: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by the forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

What is to be done? What must we do to overcome hatred and bigotry in our national life?

For a start, we can call forth the basic decency of America in the wake of the tragedy which has befallen us. Again, in the words of the Chief Justice:

"If we really love this country; if we truly love justice and mercy; if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

"Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?"

It is to be hoped, profoundly to be hoped, that there will be some redemption for the death of our President. That redemption could issue from a national revulsion against extremism and violence, from a calling forth of the basic decency and humanity of America to heal the wounds of divisiveness and hate. We will, and should, continue to have controversy and debate in our public life. But we can reshape the character of our controversies and conduct them as the honest differences of honest men in quest of a consensus. We can come to recognize that those who disagree with us are not necessarily attacking us but only our opinions and ideas. Above all, we must maintain the element of doubt as to our own convictions, recognizing that it was not given to any man to perceive ultimate truth and that, however unlikely it may seem, there may in fact be truth or merit in the views of those who disagree with us.

On another level, we must do more than we are now doing in the way of organized public effort to explore the depths of human motivation. We must learn more than we now know about the pathological roots and the therapeutic treatment of violence and unreasoning passion in human behavior. "Passions," writes Eric Hoffer, "usually have their roots in that which is blemished, crippled, incomplete and insecure within us. The passionate attitude is less a response to stimuli from without than an emanation of an inner dissatisfaction."[1] We must seek the means, in our homes and in our schools and in community programs of mental health, of overcoming that which is crippled, incomplete, and insecure within us and of bringing meaning, fulfillment, and dignity into the lives of all Americans.

Furthermore, if we are to overcome violence and bigotry in our national life, we must alter some of the basic assumptions of American life and politics. We must recognize that the secular puritanism which we have practiced, with its principles of absolute good, absolute evil, and intolerance of dissent, has been an obstacle to the practice of democracy at home and the conduct of an effective foreign policy. We must recognize that the romanticized cult of the frontier, with its glorification of violence and of unrestrained individualism, is a childish and dangerous anachronism in a nation which carries the responsibility of the leadership of the free world in the nuclear age.

Finally, we must revive and strengthen the central core of our national heritage, which is the legacy of liberty, tolerance, and moderation that came to us from the ancient world through a thousand years of English history and three centuries of democratic evolution in North America. It is this historic legacy which is the best and the strongest of our endowments. It is our proper task to strengthen and cultivate it in the years ahead. If we do so, patiently and faithfully, we may arrive before too long at a time when the voices of hate will no longer be heard in our land and the death of our President will be redeemed.

## Recommendation To Revise U.S. Beef Import Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 10, 1963, which may be of interest to other Members:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing here today on behalf of the livestock industry generally, and specifically on behalf of the thousands of Kansas farmers who have a valid "beef" concerning our present beef import policy.

Just last week our Government raised tariffs on imports of brandy, trucks, and certain starch items; for example, brandy valued at more than $9 a gallon in containers of not more than 1 gallon, were raised from $1.25 a gallon to $5. The tariff on trucks valued at $1,000 or more was raised from 8½ to 25 percent, and I might point out that more trucks are used by farmers than any other group I know of. This action is to be commended and mentioned primarily to point up the unfavorable situation the cattle producer is faced with.

During 1963 particularly, the American cattle industry has suffered drastically because of reduced prices, particularly involving cattle in the feedlots of the farm belt. To a large extent depressed livestock markets are a result of rising foreign imports of live cattle and finished beef products. Farmers, livestock organizations, members of the business community, and Members of Congress representing areas of the Nation where livestock is a major source of income, are increasingly alarmed over this situation, which is steadily worsening.

Kansas ranks fourth in the Nation in cattle population, with more than 5 million head of cattle as of January 1, 1963. Farmers in my district, as in other areas, have gone into the livestock business as a necessary means of bolstering shrinking incomes from the production of wheat and feed grains. Western Kansas, particularly, is not suited to a wide diversity in production of crops, and much of it is often referred to as a "one crop area" due to a lack of rainfall and a limited growing season. Forage crops can be successfully raised, hence many farmers have been feeding from 30 to 40 head, to as many as 300 to 400 head, of cattle.

Today in America there are nearly 4 million farms, and 2.5 million of them have livestock. Over 1 billion acres of land are involved in pasture, either permanent or temporary. The growing cattle industry has made a substantial contribution toward holding down the surpluses in feed grains, as millions of bushels are consumed on farms where grown.

The seriousness of depressed cattle prices on the farm economy, and in fact the economy generally, can be immediately seen when the loss per head is estimated to be as high as $30.

Cattle prices have continued to drop steadily for a year now. Choice cattle that were commanding a price of $30 per hundredweight a year ago brought $22 during the current month of December. These declines in fat cattle prices have been reflected also in the prices of "feeders" which have dropped from $3 to $4 per hundredweight over the same time. In the December 7 issue of the Drovers Telegram it was stated:

"Local prices of $21.20 past week is lowest since May 1957, and $4.54 below the 1963 high. Slumping fat cattle markets the past week dropped the average price on slaughter steers at Kansas City to the lowest level in more than 6 years. Losses of $1.00 or more suffered in the local trade the past 5 days tumbled the average price on beef steers to $21.20 a hundred pounds, lowest weekly figure here since May of 1957. The price compared with $22.01 last week and $26.98 the corresponding week in 1962."

Some officials in the Department of Agriculture have attributed reduced prices primarily to heavy marketings, but we cannot disregard unprecedented beef imports the last 3 years have been a major factor. In 1961 imports totaled nearly 1.3 billion pounds, in 1962 nearly 1.5 billion pounds, and it is estimated they will reach almost 2 billion pounds in 1963. Today nearly 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and other countries.

On November 18, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9145 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit imposition of increased duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported in excess of realistic and reasonable annual quotas. In recent years duties on beef have been reduced about 50 percent, and prompt steps must be taken to avoid chaotic conditions in a vital industry. As stated by A. G. Pickett, secretary, Kansas Livestock Commission, in a letter to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations:

"In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries have not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

"The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage. Producers in this country feel that our tariffs and trade policies are permitting this country to become a dumping ground for world supplies of meat, and particularly beef."

USDA officials now recognize imports are having an adverse effect on cattle prices, though they seek to minimize the situation by stating the numbers of live cattle coming into the country are not significant, but admit most 1963 imports have been in the form of frozen and canned beef; in fact, 81 percent was boneless frozen beef, and 14 percent canned beef. It is difficult for farmers, or anyone else, to understand how imported live cattle compete with our cattle producers, but that the finished meat products do not. It has also been suggested by USDA officials that cows imported and used for beef used in hamburger and hot dogs do not significantly affect domestic prices.

The livestock industry is known throughout the history of our country for its independent spirit. Cattlemen pride themselves on being rugged individualists and fear Government programs which could ultimately encompass them, and because of this spirit they have remained free from governmental control or direction.

Now that cattlemen ask their Government to protect their industry against unwarranted imports of beef, some are saying the industry is asking for a subsidy, a form of price support, or even an indirect Government payment. This attitude "begs" the question and is an insult to the integrity of this great industry.

Tariffs are as old as our country and have played a major role in our industrial development. Tariffs are, in many cases, a necessary facet of our way of life and our economy would suffer without them. Is it un-American to protect this American industry rather than use it as a pawn in foreign decisions?

Something must be done immediately to avert disaster to thousands of our farmers. The urgency cannot be overemphasized, and I respectfully request prompt action to raise tariffs to the level necessary to protect a great American industry. The Kansas Livestock Association very properly suggests "a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a long period of time. This system of quotas should be accompanied by substantial increases in our import duties. We feel it is only fair to the livestock industry that our import duties at least equal those of our competitive importing nations. This plan would give importing countries access to our markets on a competitive basis."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## Nuclear Ship "President Kennedy": Symbol of America of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, December 10, 1963*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, some 3 weeks ago an outstanding, dedicated, and I must say, much too modest Member of this House of Representatives, presented an important address before the annual meeting of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York on November 15, 1963.

At that time our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, HERBERT C. BONNER, delivered a message that should be read and taken to heart by all Americans. As he gave a balanced and reasonable analysis of our present depressed maritime situation, he called for constructive action and reappraisal by all concerned.

---

[1] The Passionate State of Mind, p. 1.

Even as he was critical of the lagging pace of our liner replacement program, the lack of constructive developments in tramp and domestic shipping, our nuclear ship project and our treatment of superliner legislation, he was calling for more appreciation of our needs and the actions to satisfy them.

I applaud and heartily endorse his criticism and his call for action. The surest way for us to become second-rate in this world is to continue to allow our decline at sea.

Herb Bonner has fought the odds of ignorance over the years of his chairmanship of an important, but little appreciated, committee since January of 1955. Indeed, his influence has been applied in all the years since he became a member of the committee upon his arrival in Congress in 1940. He knows whereof he speaks.

I have had the honor of serving on the Merchant Marine Committee with its distinguished chairman. I have also served on the Armed Services Committee. From those vantage points one learns the essentiality of national seapower—the vital importance of strength at sea in all its aspects. Military, commercial, and scientific—these are fields in which we must be able to stand on our own without dependence upon others. Supremacy at sea is as important as supremacy in space.

So I earnestly commend to this House a careful reading of his thoughtful remarks on the state of our merchant marine today, his criticism, and his suggestions for future, but careful action.

In his well-reasoned speech to the distinguished group of maritime technicians, he expressed his belief that there is a continuing need for large passenger ships under the American flag. He called for review of our need for ships that will express the American ideal around the world—ships that would serve the practical purposes of being available for use if we should ever again have need for dependable, massive military support to follow initial airlift to any of the trouble spots of the future—ships capable of efficiently maintaining the flow of fighting men to the beachheads in a continuous pipeline of strength.

I agree.

And I want to take this opportunity to urge that the superliner legislation that passed the Congress so overwhelmingly in the previous administration be reveiwed, and reenacted if necessary, to provide for a few outstanding passenger vessels under the American flag for operation in those ocean services where there is a great and growing demand for sea travel.

In the vanguard of such a program, I urge the immediate study of the design of a ship which would know no peer for the foreseeable future, powered by nuclear energy, economically feasible for regular service in the transpacific and capable of round-the-world operation.

I would name this ship Nuclear Ship *President Kennedy*.

I can think of no more fitting tribute to the man who has left us with such tragic suddenness, who, despite his youthful years, has been called the First Citizen of the World.

Congressman Bonner's careful analysis of where we stand, why, and where we should go to strengthen our seaborne posture follows:

### Remarks of Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Before Annual Meeting of Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers at Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, Friday, November 15, 1963

Admiral James, members of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am highly honored to be your guest speaker here tonight at the high point of the 71st annual meeting of this outstanding society, composed of the leading representatives of all the segments which, in combination, create the hard core of total American seapower. I am tremendously impressed by the attendance, knowing that here on the speaker's stand and in the audience are so many of the great names and personalities in our American shipping, shipbuilding, ship repair, and ship equipment industries, the U.S. Navy, and the other Government agencies concerned with our seaborne posture.

Those among you who are professional naval architects and marine engineers comprise the elite group who have the know-how to point the way to technical progress in our seagoing enterprises and to translate into workable terms sound concepts of those less skilled in the finer aspects of your art.

Back in the early spring, when your president, Admiral James, extended to me his flattering invitation to be your speaker tonight, I felt I had plenty of time to bone up on some of the details of your specialty so that I could talk to you with the fullest sense of confidence. However, as this date approached and I received a copy of your program listing the 11 technical papers presented during this session, my earlier self-assurance was shattered. I have to confess that I can't even say some of the words you use—much less understand their meaning.

So, it is with a considerable sense of humility that I appear here tonight to discuss a few of the very many problems that beset us in our exploitation of the world's oceans for our security and economy.

In any discussion of American seapower it is essential to outline briefly where we stand at the present before we attempt to chart a course for the future. We know that our well-established goals are to have an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and the economic welfare of the United States. But where are we in relation to those goals—what obstacles stand in the way of their achievement?

I will not go into much detail, because I am sure most of you are familiar with the figures that show we are far short of having the merchant marine required by our national maritime policy.

Yes, there is a merchant ship replacement program underway, producing slightly over a dozen new cargo ships per year. These new ships are larger and faster than the prewar and war-built ships they replace. But, there are only about 300 of them in prospect under present planning. Since the long-delayed replacement program was initiated in 1958, only 76 vessels have been delivered and entered into service. Present plans call for completing replacement of the subsidized fleet no sooner than 1975. There are no known plans for enlarging the fleets of the present subsidized operators.

There are no plans for replacement of most of the 680 obsolescent, aging American-flag ships owned by the unsubsidized operators.

In January 1954, the active U.S. seagoing merchant fleet consisted of 1,249 ships. As of January 1, 1963, this number was 985 ships—a drop of 264, or at the rate of 24 ships per year. Of the dry cargo ships still active, 90 percent are over 15 years of age.

Note—in connection with these depressing figures—that the U.S.-flag participation in our foreign commerce as recently as 1961 has been as low as 8.8 percent. Today, I believe it hovers around 10 percent.

While our merchant fleet has been rapidly diminishing, our foreign commerce has been rapidly increasing—from 143 million tons in 1950 to about 308 million tons currently. Reliable estimates indicate that continued steady increase in our waterborne foreign commerce will reach 370 million tons or more by 1970. Obviously, we are falling increasingly behind in our merchant shipping position.

While we are deteriorating, most of our free world foreign competitors are carrying their own commerce at percentage rates ranging from 38 percent in Sweden; 41 percent in West Germany; 50 percent in Japan; and 53 percent in the United Kingdom. Relative weakness in relation to our foreign competitors will inevitably leave us at their mercy in world trading.

When the amazing buildup of merchant shipping in the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc is taken into account, our position becomes even more alarming.

As I have indicated, the downward trend in the American merchant marine has been going on for a number of years. It has been clear over these years that the rising costs of Government aid to maintain our merchant fleet on a parity with those of competing foreign-flag fleets have played a material part in the reluctance of both the executive branch and the Congress to broaden in numbers and categories those eligible to receive assistance. In fact, seeking means to minimize assistance to those already receiving it, the Government has urged, and is using, such devices as restraints on the number of subsidized voyages; increasing the statutory life of vessels from 20 to 25 years; holding to a minimum budget requests for the numbers of new ships to be constructed for the replacement program each year; and failure to request authorized appropriations, as in the case of the superliners.

Thus, while our national policy and our clear national interest calls for many more—and more modern—vessels than we have in our oceangoing merchant marine, fiscal restraints—rather than national need—dictate the size, scope, and pace of our program.

Considering the outstanding contractual obligations between the Government and the existing subsidized operators, it can readily be seen that under current fiscal policies there is not much leeway for expansion of the fleet. There is no balanced or concerted national program with regard to tramps, ore carriers, or tankers. They must scramble for what they can get in the way of Government-sponsored cargoes under the Cargo Preference Act—or military cargoes. Present administrative policies force all oversea tanker and ore-carrying vessels to foreign flags.

It seems that this scramble for participation in the limited available forms of Government support is also a major contributing factor in the frequently fierce interunion rivalries which create so much of the instability in our merchant shipping.

And the efforts of the seagoing unions to maintain their memberships through various devices exacted at the bargaining table have contributed to excessive wages and overtime and excessive manning.

These elements have been apparent for a number of years.

In 1955 and 1956, my committee inquired extensively into labor-management problems. Hopefully, we thought that the thorough airing of the problems before a sympathetic and friendly forum would lead to voluntary settlement of differences in line with our concepts of free collective bargaining, and would make more restrictive action, such as legislation, unnecessary.

Unfortunately and regretfully, our hopes were not realized. Five of the eight times in which the injunctive procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act have been invoked have occurred since that review of maritime labor-management problems.

The severe seamen's strikes in 1961 and 1962 and the long, hardheaded, and fruitless longshore strike of December and January, 1962-63, seemed to emphasize the need for again reviewing maritime labor-management relations. Clearly, something needed to be done which would—after complete breakdown of collective bargaining processes—nevertheless protect the third party interests—the public interest—to prevent deep damage to the health, safety, and welfare of this country, engaged as it is in a world where national survival is at stake. Public tolerance—or was it apathy?—resulted in the recent temporary defeat of our very moderate legislation on the piously spoken grounds that it would destroy free collective bargaining and strike at the very roots of the American system. "Leave it up to us," said the opponents to the bill, "and we will not only work out our problems but the public interest will gain thereby."

While all of this was going on we were being confronted with the unbelievable nonsense which has tied up our proud symbol of peacetime uses of the atom, the nuclear ship *Savannah*; the fantastic dispute which arose over the SS *Maximus*; and the utterly outrageous tragi-comedy which has retired the SS *America* from service for many months, if not forever.

I am not here to assess particular blame for these tissue-destroying illnesses. The well known and oft repeated facts and figures should be evidence enough that we have not found the answers.

Former Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Fred Korth, summed up the situation well in a recent article saying:

"In perspective, our merchant marine has not been reduced to its present state due to labor-management difficulties, improper legislation, or unsound shipping practices. These are merely symptoms of the real problem, which is a lack of understanding as to why we need a strong, healthy shipping industry and, therefore no public resolve to do something about it."

This public resolve must be stimulated without further delay if we are to avoid what Admiral Mahan called "the rude awakening of those who have abandoned their share of the common birthright of all people—the sea."

Subsidy alone is no longer—if it ever was—the only answer to maintaining and developing a competitive merchant marine.

We have long since passed the point where we can refuse to reduce costs through mechanization on the grounds that it will mean loss of jobs. On the contrary, the rapidly increasing use of mechanization, or so-called automation, by our competitors—the foreign merchant fleets of Japan, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain and other nations—make it essential that we, too, follow that course as rapidly as possible.

The high level of our economy and our way of life has grown from the untrammeled freedom to invent and employ labor-saving and cost-saving devices and systems. To carry forward with the concept of parity—so inherent in our system of Government aid to shipping—we, too, must automate simply to hold our own.

Up until now, shipping management for the most part has been timid or complacent in regard to crossing the frontiers of automation. Labor has been apprehensive or even belligerent. But the lines are drawn. As one outstanding shipping man said not too long ago, "We must automate or stagnate." This is the very minimum. The alternative could, and possibly would, be instantaneous block obsolescence not too far in the future.

Happily, changes in these attitudes are occurring. Management and labor on the Pacific coast have recognized the problem in the longshore industry and reached agreement which seems to be going well. Today's technology can readily provide the means to bring about major economies in ship design, construction, and operation. Steps are being made in this direction, and a few—though yet a very few—American shipping lines are incorporating mechanized systems in groups of ships presently under contract or obligation. Maritime labor has also recognized that the road to our maritime development, as well as survival, depends upon our taking advantage of the economies of mechanization.

Here, I must comment upon another phase of the American maritime industry where much must be done.

In World War II, with an effort costing more than $12 billion, our shipyards turned out over 5,000 merchant-type ships in a period of 4 years. This entailed the construction of entirely new shipyards. Workers had to be trained, many of whom had never seen a ship, let alone had any experience in their construction. This was possible not only through three-shift, round-the-clock operation, but through the development and employment of new techniques.

By the end of the war, with an oversupply of ships and shipbuilding facilities, our existing yards began to become obsolete. At the same time, the other maritime nations of the world—to a considerable extent with our help—borrowed and adopted the fruits of our wartime experience and improved upon them to the point where the United States is now grievously behind.

We have the highest costs in the world. We pay the highest wages. We have a proliferation of shipyard trades. We take longer from keel laying to launching than several of the other major shipbuilding nations. Of all the leading shipbuilding nations of the world, our productivity is the lowest. This is not simply due to labor rates, for Sweden, whose wages are the highest in the world next to the United States, also has the highest productivity.

As a shipbuilding nation we now rank 9th.

Here I am not trying to say that anyone should expect the American worker to receive less than his brothers in other American industries, nor that our shipbuilding industry should voluntarily make the investments required to increase productivity and lower costs—without ships to build. I do say, however, that there is much to be done in this area which can and must be done in the interest of our national safety. We cannot afford to be behind the rest of the world in shipbuilding. A school child can recognize that we will not have the lead time we enjoyed at the outset of World War II. Our shipbuilding effort was our salvation in that war, and it might well be again. Therefore, as an instrument of national policy, our private shipbuilding industry deserves and needs national support.

I have deplored conditions and attitudes in shipping and shipbuilding and labor. Now I want to deplore attitudes existing in the Government itself.

Since the end of World War II, highly authoritative lipservice has been given by the several administrations to the need for an adequate, modern American merchant marine. Press releases and speeches from chief executives on down to much lesser officials have put together the right words to cheer the hearts and minds of those who appreciate the meaning of seapower. Expensive studies have shown the deficiencies in our maritime posture and made recommendations of various sorts for their correction. But, when it has come to implementing the fine words, significant results have not been forthcoming.

I have already mentioned some of the devices used to slow down our maritime program.

Now listen to this: In a recent opinion rendered in connection with the case of a new applicant for operation in our foreign trade, the majority opinion of the maritime agency pointed to strong foreign-flag competition as a reason for denying operating rights. I found this somewhat shocking, since the very purpose of the 1936 act is to meet foreign-flag competition.

More recently, a high level government-named group, appointed to study our maritime resources for security and trade, seriously made the suggestion that "in view of the world surpluses in shipping capacity, the search for additional practical possibilities for reliance on foreign-flag tonnage should be continued." This I also found shocking. Let's carry the idea a step further and place our reliance upon foreign-flag navies.

These views expressed by responsible sources high in the councils of the Government remind me of a story:

This is the story of a Navy ship which was designed as a commerce raider during the Civil War. She was carefully designed to prey effectively on British commerce if Britain should have joined the Confederacy. Her name was the *Wamponoag* (Wam-pon-o-og).

As a commerce raider, her chief requirements were light armament and extreme speed.

Upon completion, the shipping world was astounded when this new ship averaged 17 knots for 38 hours in a North Atlantic storm during her trial run in February 1868. This was a notable event, since the *City of Paris* held the blue ribbon at the time for crossing the Atlantic at maximum speed of 14 knots.

The Navy, in the early years of the transition from sail to steam, found itself in a predicament. How could this radical innovation of a ship be integrated into the established, traditional program?

The account goes on to say that a board of admirals was convened to serve as a panel to decide what should be done about the *Wamponoag*.

First, the experts agreed two blades of the four-bladed propeller should be removed. Thus, the ship would perform better under sail because of reduction of drag, with the remaining two blades hiding vertically behind the stern post.

It was further agreed that four stacks on such a ship made her a disgraceful-looking craft. So the experts decided to remove two of them. The remaining two, of course, would be telescoped so the ship would look better when it was rigged, and under sail. Of course, removing two of the stacks also made it necessary for them to take out half the boilers.

Then, this distinguished panel decided that it was of utmost importance that they be able to step a proper mainmast. However, a mainmast could not be stepped without the removal of the reduction gears. It was decided that this move should be made.

And, of course, by the time the experts had surveyed their own handiwork, they arrived at a decision that really the best thing to do to solve their problem would be to scrap the ship.

That was the end of the *Wamponoag*.

In reporting its findings, the board observed that the experience "nevertheless may serve as a source from which important lessons may be drawn, and among them it impresses the expediency of consulting, instead of ignoring, experienced and intelligent naval minds."

It was 20 years later, I understand, before the U.S. Navy again had a 17-knot ship.

I think this story points a moral.

To improve the performance and competitiveness of our merchant fleet and its usefulness as a naval auxiliary under emergency conditions, full application must be made of all new technologies. This was the motivation behind the legislation authorizing the construction of the nuclear ship, *Savannah*, which was first introduced in the Congress more than 8 years ago. No one expected the *Savannah* to be economically competitive. She represented that essential first step in the application of nuclear power to a surface vessel for peaceful purposes. She has had her problems—sometimes technical—more recently in the nontechnical area. If the *Savannah* had not been built we would probably not be much further ahead in our knowledge of the potentialities of nuclear ship propulsion than we were 8 years ago.

Whenever the subject of nuclear propulsion for merchant ships is raised, detractors still bring forth the argument that it is not economical; that it is too complex; that its safety has not been fully demonstrated, etc. What this really means is that it is new and will force a change in established concepts.

The *Savannah* has now been constructed and has provided sufficient operational experience to demonstrate that she is extremely safe, and that the propulsion of a merchant ship by means of nuclear power is practical. She has provided a testing ground for social problems which will have to be solved as we apply the new technologies to the merhcant marine of the future. She has been a ground breaker in obtaining acceptance in the very important area of port entry approvals here and abroad. I would not be so bold as to attempt to detail the various advantages offered by nuclear surface ship propulsion. They are many, as you know.

When considering the use of changed concepts in merchant shipping the key question always boils down to one of economics, so the question here is: "Can nuclear systems be used profitably?"

A new technology may offer unique advantages which, if properly used, could eventually lead to the replacement of a more or less conventional technology. On the other hand, the new technology cannot be forced into the straitjacket of the conventional, nor must it be rejected because it does not provide obvious advantages when used in accordance with conventional ground rules. Our *Wampanoag* story is a perfect illustration of what can happen with such a negative approach.

It is necessary to utilize the advantages offered by a new technology, first in those specific areas where maximum advantage can be taken, and then, as it enters useful operation, to improve it and its utilization until it becomes competitive in an ever-increasing area. In other words, use it where it makes the most sense.

According to what I hear from leading naval architects, high ranking Navy officers with intense and concentrated experience in nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, both submarine and surface, and from outstanding industry sources, we are now on the threshold of a breakthrough in nuclear ship applications which, if made now and used where they make the most sense, will produce economically justifiable reusits.

On the strength of these authorities I take this occasion to urge that this country move forward to its next application of nuclear propulsion to a peaceful surface ship—an application whose success will be as assured as anything can be.

Some 6 years ago I introduced legislation to authorize the construction of an outstanding nuclear powered icebreaker for operation by the U.S. Coast Guard, capable of carrying out multiple missions in the Arctic and Antarctic regions—both areas in which we have great stake. I felt that taking all factors into account the construction of such a vessel made sense and was economically justifiable, even at that time. The legislation passed both Houses overwhelmingly, but was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Our need for new icebreakers increases daily as our interests in the polar regions expands. This need is more than ever a national need, above and beyond the traditional roles and missions of the Coast Guard in the field of icebreaking. Criticism undoubtedly will still be heard concerning the cost of new icebreakers with nuclear propulsion. But I believe the truly wasteful and extravagant course would be to proceed with the construction of conventional ships which will be obsolete by the time the first one is completed several years from now. The long range course, the economical course lies in boldly taking advantage of the most advanced technological concepts presently available so we will have an outstanding ship which may well remain modern over much if not all, of its useful life.

Nuclear power in an outstanding icebreaker, highly mechanized, would pay immediate returns on the investment, plus providing a testing ground of incalculable value for surface shipping of the future.

Again, to advance a proposal which I unsuccessfully espoused before, I want to now seriously urge consideration of the building of another and outstanding superliner passenger ship embodying the latest concepts of nuclear power, large passenger and troop capacity, high speed and extensive mechanization.

I do not believe that large passenger ships have become obsolete, but rather that we are in a transition period marking an increasing demand for surface ocean travel. Rising income levels and the increasing lengths of vacations, both here and abroad, are indicators in this direction.

I do not believe that surface transportation for emergency troop lift has become obsolete. Despite the great utility and advantages and the increasing capacity of airlift, I do not believe it is safe or sound for us to be unable to balance our troop transport capability with a few ships designed with troop lift in mind. Obviously this can be done most economically through the construction of vessels which will be gainfully employed during peacetime periods. Here, again, the construction of such an outstanding ship will not only serve maximum purposes as an element of the peacetime American merchant marine, available for effective use in time of war, and, incidentally contributing to the relief of our balance-of-payments problem, but it will serve as a practical laboratory for the continued advancement of our maritime technology.

I know that research and development programs are being undertaken by the Maritime Administration. I believe they are good programs, conducted with dedication. But it does little good to engage in research and development without application of the concepts being studied. Moreover, unless we follow through to employ on a broad scale the advanced concepts which are developed, we will be hastening the digging of our own grave as our competitors learn of and adopt the advances we conceive.

I conclude with these wise words of Sir Walter Raleigh:

"Whoever commands the sea, commands the trade; whoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself."

---

# SENATE

## Wednesday, December 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, we turn to Thee with our drained lives filled with tension for the present, anxiety for the future, with deep concern about ourselves, our Nation, and our world; and yet with a radiant hope that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way.

In spite of all the diversities of gifts and thought, in a common unity help us to lay aside every weight of prejudice, of pride, or of covetousness, and with glad and eager feet to march with the army that goes to free, not to bind; to develop, not to rule; to cooperate, not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, shall cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea.

May this be a hallowed session, as this day in this Chamber, where he served the Nation, there is honored one so suddenly snatched from his great task of world leadership. We will remember him always as—

"One who never turned his back
But marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted,
Wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise,
Are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake."

Now at noonday, in the bustle of man's worktime, he has greeted the unseen with a cheer.

Gird us all to work in sunny hours, knowing that the night is coming when man's work is done.

In the blessed name of the world's Redeemer, who accomplished so much in so short a span, we pray. Amen.

### EULOGIES OF THE LATE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the order of the Senate of November 26 last, supplemented by the order of yesterday, the Senate will now proceed with the delivery of eulogies by Members of the Senate on the life, character, and distinguished public service of the late President of the United States, and a former Representative and Senator from the State of Massachusetts, the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**The PRESIDENT pro tempore.** The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**The PRESIDENT pro tempore.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, what I had to say on the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been said. It was said in the rotunda when his body was delivered into the trust of the Congress and the people of the Nation for a day and a night. It was said when it fell to me to give formal notification of his death to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that both of those statements be included as though read at this point in the Record.

Mr. President, a flame kindled of human decency, courage and dedication does not die. The light which was John Fitzgerald Kennedy will not fail. We must not fail.

It rests with us to fashion in the glow of our grief a renewed sense of high national purpose. It rests with us to labor with humility and forbearance, with dignity and with hope to bring forth a new decency in this Nation and, in this world, a reasoned peace.

The ring is continuous. There is no end except that there is a beginning. There is an hour to grieve and an hour to give meaning to grief. This is the hour for those of us who live. This is the hour to end, to begin, to continue.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### EULOGY BY SENATOR MANSFIELD IN THE ROTUNDA, U.S. CAPITOL, NOVEMBER 24, 1963

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred, prejudice and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON NOVEMBER 25, 1963

### DEATH OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, the Senate has assembled today to remark for the Record the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States.

I shall be brief, for his life, too short, shut off too soon, speaks for him.

In these last hours, a profile in courage has emerged from the emulsion of his death. And the tears of those who knew him and those who did not know him will fix that profile forever in the experience of the Nation and the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy's courage was the human courage, the courage which all must have merely to live in this world, in the ever-present shadow of death. It was the special courage to defy the cold hand of death when it reaches out too eagerly, as twice it did—in the wounds of the war and in the grave illness of his Senate years. It was the quiet courage to accept death's finality when it would be denied no longer.

And his was an extraordinary courage. It was the courage to believe in, with all his heart, and to dedicate himself to, the attainment of the proposition that Americans—all Americans—are born with an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

His was a universal courage. It was the courage of one who had bled in war to seek, unashamed, a peace of decency among all nations. It was the courage to join, before all else, the family of man and, in the joining, to affirm, before all else, the integrity of human life in the face of the powers of violence to destroy and desecrate it.

This is the profile of the man who walked among us not long ago on the floor of the Senate. This is the profile of the man who emerged to reawaken the Nation to its finest meaning. This is the man who struck new sparks of hope in a world dark with unspeakable fears.

His death, Mr. President, has fused the many faces of courage into a single profile of courage set in the enduring frame of faith and reason. This is what we have of him now. It is so little to have, and yet so much.

In a moment, I shall send to the desk a resolution of regret on the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But that will not be the end. It will not be the end of our responsibility, of our debt to this decent man, this American who gave of himself until there was no more to give.

We will find, in his death, the strength to do what must be done to bridle the bigotry, the hatred, the arrogance, the iniquities, and the inequities which marched in the boots of a gathering tyranny to that moment of horror.

We will find, in his death, the strength to renew our faith in what is good in ourselves and in one another throughout this Nation.

We will find, in his death, the strength to follow the paths of reason on which he walked, until they lead us out of the morass of an all-consuming and cynical self-concern.

We will find, in his death, some of his love and reverence of life, some of his humility, some of his patience and forbearance, some of his wisdom, and some of his humor. And, so strengthened, we will join with the President in forging a new decency at home and a reasoned peace in the world.

God willing, these things we shall find or God help us all.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I submit on behalf of the 100 Members of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was read, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Senate has learned with profound sorrow and deep regret of the tragic death of Hon. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late the President of the United States, and a former Representative and former Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

*Resolved,* That in recognition of his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, and his distinguished public service to his State and the Nation, the Presiding Officer of the Senate appoint a committee, to consist of all the Members of the Senate, to attend the funeral of the late President at noon today.

*Resolved,* That the Senate hereby tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their sad bereavement.

*Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the late President.

### JOHN F. KENNEDY: THE MAN

**Mr. DIRKSEN.** Mr. President, the time was a few days before the vote in this body on the nuclear test ban treaty. Senator Mansfield and I made a call on the President. We were visiting quite informally in the Cabinet room. Secretary McNamara went by the window. The President asked him to join us. When the discussion was over, we stood a few paces from the others, to visit.

"Mr. President," I said, "my mind is made up. I shall support the treaty; and I expect some castigation for my vote."

He flashed a broad smile. "Everett," he said, "Have you read 'The Man and the Myth'?" "No, Mr. President, I have not." Then, with a real chuckle, he said, "You do not know what castigation is."

I have not read the book. The John Kennedy I knew was not a myth.

Theodore Roosevelt was said to have remarked, on one occasion, that most of the world's work is done by people who do not feel well. The life of John F. Kennedy is an eloquent lesson to millions of people of things accomplished and work done by one whose life was besieged by ailments and sometimes crippling forces.

Jaundice delayed his college education. Injuries caused his rejection by the Army. Through months of strenuous exercise he qualified for the Navy. The Japanese destroyer which smashed his PT boat brought back the injury to his back. Malaria complicated his problem. The disk operation to his back in 1945 was another event in his struggle for health and vitality. His long hospitalization in 1954 and 1955 gave his family and friends real concern.

Despite these intruding forces, he was elected to Congress in 1946, 1948, and 1950, and to the Senate in 1952 and in 1958. Can anything more eloquently proclaim the determination and stamina of the man?

A presidential contest is a gruelling challenge to the mind and body of any man. Yet I know of no occasion in that contest when he relented in his vigorous pursuit of a victory. I know of no occasion when he whimpered or complained. I know of no occasion when he felt impelled to lay aside the burden of the campaign because of pain or ill health. Day after day he coursed over this land from ocean to ocean and from dominion to gulf. This is not a myth. This is not fantasy. This is the unadorned story of a man who with unquenchable zeal pursued his determination to render public service at the highest attainable level regardless of the handicaps which were his lot. This is the man who became the 35th President of the United States. This is the man who could laugh and smile through it all. This is the man who fought back the ills of the flesh, only to have his unconquerable spirit extinguished by a weapon in the hands of a fellow man with an evil brain and a black heart.

It brings back a picture of a smiling young man, at age 25, lying on a hospital cot in an Edinburgh, Scotland, hospital awaiting perhaps his 20th operation in as many months as physicians and surgeons strove to save his foot. The other had already been amputated. He had gone through illness, pain, suffering and now he was in the hands of the great Scottish physician, Dr. Joseph Lister, who had discovered a new method of treating infections. It was then, with courage high, with faith unimpaired, with the fortitude of a saint, that William Ernest Henley wrote "Invictus," a poem of force and power which has inspired millions to face the unkind blows of fate and triumph over their handicaps. In that hour when William Henley's very soul was tried in the crucible of faith this is what he wrote:

Out of the night that covers me,
  Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
  For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance
  I have not winced nor cried aloud.
Under the bludgeonings of chance
  My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears
  Looms but the horror of the shade,
And yet the menace of the years
  Finds and shall find me unafraid.

It matters not how strait the gate,
  How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
  I am the captain of my soul.

The student, the reporter, the Congressman, the Senator, the President, the PT-boat commander, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was truly the master of his fate—he was the captain of his soul.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Friday afternoon, November 22, 1963, a horrible tragedy saddened every true American citizen. We lost our President, a man whom we respected, one who was conducting the high office to which we had elected him with dignity, courage, ability, and firmness. This tragic event was doubly hard to bear because it happened in our country. Who could have believed that such an act could occur in the United States? We can only be thankful that it was apparently the action of a demented person and not one that can be attributed to any organized group or to any failure of our way of life. This does not, of course, lessen our grief over the loss of a man in whom the country had faith and reliance, a man who was in the prime of life.

We have set aside this afternoon to pay our tribute to John F. Kennedy. When he became a Senator in 1952 I walked up the center aisle with him and introduced him to the Vice President. As his Massachusetts colleague for 8 years in this body, I came to have a relationship with him that developed into a friendship and mutual confidence in each other that lasted through the years. The late President was "Jack" to most everyone, but he was always "John" to me until he became "Mr. President." We early agreed to work together on problems that affected our Commonwealth and we often talked about these matters. I believe we did help our State by supplementing each other before committees and on the floor of the Senate. We knew we would not always agree on national questions, although we often discussed them prior to a vote. On international problems such as foreign aid, NATO, and other understandings, our feelings were generally the same.

Our Massachusetts people have a long history of courage, leadership, dedication to public service, and the ability to rise to the challenge of the times. As a student of history, John Kennedy was aware of this tradition and he became part of it. The qualities that have made Massachusetts a good place in which to do business and to bring up a family formed the historic background and tradition which so influenced John Kennedy.

He was an able man and I enjoyed the opportunity I had to watch him grow and develop during the major part of his political career. Our ages were different and so to some our relationship seemed unusual, but fundamentally we trusted and respected one another and so remained on good terms even though our partisan politics were different. Certainly he was a man of good will, a man of ideas, and yet he was a man who had his feet on the ground. He was an attractive person, never flustered, quick to understand the pros and cons of a problem, a good administrator of his office, a person who demanded and obtained good advice. No one I have ever encountered in public life could size up the public reaction to a legislative proposal more quickly or more accurately than he. One of his greatest assets was his ability to meet a person, disarm him by quick repartee, and persuade him to do what John Kennedy wanted to have done. He was always courteous and straightforward, and could be counted on to live up to his agreements.

During the long illness which he had early in his Senate service, I tried hard to see that his name was included in all that affected our Commonwealth. This I think he appreciated. It helped to strengthen the bonds between us, to make us friends and it increased our determination to work closely together to help Massachusetts. I am glad I had the opportunity to work with him as I did.

So today we like to recall our association and experiences with our late President, our respect for his intellectual and personal character, his sense of humor—and, above all, his patriotism so clearly evident in his military and governmental actions, his firmness, his decision and his understanding.

Certainly the loyalty and affection which he stimulated in his own immediate family—his father and mother, his brothers and sisters, and the vital help that he received from his good wife—helped him enormously. And they gave him this loyalty and affection because they admired and trusted him. We share their grief and sense of loss.

We who knew him will miss him. His fellow citizens will miss him and the leaders of the free world and even those behind the Iron Curtain will miss him. But his spirit and what he stood for will always remain with us.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was too near the one we mourn to attempt to sum up his career and contributions. I will leave that to others. Poets will raise lamentations for him as Whitman did for Lincoln. Historians will fix his place in the pantheon of our Nation's heroes.

And those who speak or write the definitive accounts need never have known him personally, for great men and great tragedies touch the souls of people everywhere. The evidence was in the lines which moved endlessly past the bier in the Rotunda, reverent and inconsolable.

The tears which were shed nearly a century ago by the family and the Nation for Abraham Lincoln have long since dried. But the power of his ideals and of his tragic fate have remained to inspire the living. And some, reading his words and remembering his hopes, reach out to bigger deeds than they might otherwise accomplish.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy will likewise be a living force in generations unborn, through his idealism, his eloquence, and the terrible circumstances of his death. Because he was wise and generous in the choice of his successor, he may even prove to have been a greater immediate influence than Lincoln was on the bereaved Nation which he left behind.

There is a certain consolation in this knowledge that the causes John Kennedy believed in, will be served eternally by his tragic death. More than anyone I ever knew, John F. Kennedy had a sense of history's vast sweep, and an insight into his own special role as an active figure on history's stage. And it is in history that his full measure will be known. Great men are always so far ahead of their times that seldom are they recognized for their greatness while living. Many of President Kennedy's proposals—much of his program—were received with widespread consternation. But in our lifetime we shall see many of them receive general acceptance, and many of us will wonder why we could not see their value before.

More than anyone I ever knew, John F. Kennedy desired fiercely to achieve a greatness which would be remembered beyond his own time and place. His memory will be perpetuated—but not alone in the monuments and memorials of a grateful nation. It will live in the hearts and minds of people everywhere—who saw him grasp a world which was on the brink of an atomic holocaust, and firmly and coolly hold the line, turning it back on the path of a peace with dignity.

It is one of those ironies which I think John Kennedy would have appreciated, that the killer who struck him down in the high noon of his life, also immortalized him. But it is a consolation which provides little solace to those of us who loved him, not as a public person, but as a man. I will miss the inspired leadership, the cool courage, the shining phrases, as shall we all. But the void in my heart was left by the loss of the confident, smiling, vigorous, and yet always thoughtful and tender young man with whom I shared 17 years of friendship. I regret I do not have the words for the poignancy of the loss I feel.

He was just 46. He had talents—and the energy to serve them. He had important things left to do. He had the Irish gift of laughter and of compassion. He had the loyalty and the love of a father and mother, brothers and sisters, who formed as close-knit and active family as any man could wish. He had the adoration of a radiant and gracious lady and of two beautiful, budding children—Caroline and John-John—whom he adored in return. In brief, he was alive—in a sense that few of us ever were or will be. And now he is dead. And the worst of it is that this man who was so rational, so forbearing, so forgiving should have been struck down by a mad act of hate. The finality of it is still beyond bearing.

And yet I know—we all know—that Jack Kennedy would have enjoined us to bear his death bravely and to carry on, as he said, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation." Jack Kennedy loved life and lived it exuberantly. He had everything to live for. But he never shrank from what life might bring. He understood the risks and the responsibilities of living at the vortex; and he accepted them—not with bravado, not with resignation, but with calm and purposeful courage.

For he believed, without being a reckless person, that fear or self-pity make a man the prisoner of circumstance. And so, while he always knew the odds, he did not surrender to them.

It was a constant of his personality. The determined frail freshman trying for the Harvard football team, the pain-wracked swimmer in the Pacific night, the invalid who earned a Pulitzer, the courageous campaigner on a thousand hostile platforms—all of these prefigured the mettle which he showed as President.

We live in a world of danger, he told us repeatedly, "but let us not despair." And he never did. And in the moments of deepest shock and sorrow, his own family showed us how to bear the tragedy of his loss and to do what must be done.

My wife, Rosemary, and my two sons, John and Bruce—both of whom dearly loved President Kennedy—join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his parents, his brothers, and his sisters. To Jacqueline and her two precious children, whose loss is greatest of all, go our love and our prayers.

Though the empty place to which he gave such vividness, such grace, such love, can never be filled, may they—and we—find comfort in lifting high the torch which has fallen from his hand and which now and forever will light his memory. "And the glow from that fire" will indeed "truly light the world."

We shall not see his like again in our generation.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, in joining with my colleagues in paying respect to the late President Kennedy, I do so with full realization that eulogies in themselves may be a weak apology for some of the things we may have done or have left undone.

The only lasting mark of affection and respect we can show for John F. Kennedy will be found in the work we do during our own "little day" and the contribution which that work may make toward the betterment of mankind.

If, because of his dedication to public service and as a result of his death, we dedicate ourselves to greater service, then we will have paid him the highest possible honor.

During his first weeks in office, I was not too sure that Jack Kennedy would be a good President.

The excitement—the glamour—the abandon of many of his enthusiastic friends and supporters seemed to indicate that we might be in for a "playboy administration."

Then came the episode of the Bay of Pigs.

Although he was not called upon to do so, he accepted full responsibility for the failure of that venture.

From that time on it was President Kennedy.

From that time on, it was apparent that the weight of his office rested more and more heavily upon his shoulders.

From that time on, he put forth an ever-increasing effort to insure national prosperity, human justice, and world peace supported by the necessary strength of our Nation.

He was called upon to meet crises both at home and in the international field.

With each new challenge, he seemed to gain strength and wisdom while the burden of his office bore down with an ever-increasing weight.

It may be said that many of his objectives were not achieved during his lifetime.

Granting that this is true, it may also be said that through his thinking and through his action and his utterances an untold host of people found themselves viewing their fellow man and the world itself in a changing light.

I am content to leave to history the record of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, in the belief that history will hold his finest eulogy.

**Mr. HILL.** Mr. President, as we dedicate this day to the memory of a gallant American who graced this Chamber by his presence during 8 years of his and our lives, we recall to one another the high qualities and splendid accomplishments of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our departed friend and leader.

No quality among the many that he possessed, in my judgment, and no accomplishment among the many that he achieved, can equal his deeply devoted love of peace and his ceaseless effort to consolidate the peace of the world.

John Kennedy thoroughly comprehended the nature of the times through which we pass. He had prepared himself well for the task he entered upon less than 3 short years ago. As he grappled with all the manifold problems, threats, crises, and dangers which have confronted this Nation during his brief Presidency, he broadened and deepened his knowledge and his understanding of the awesome challenge facing mankind.

Then, just 14 months ago, he stood alone and stared more deeply than any man has ever stared into what he described as that "dark and final abyss."

It was his courage and his genius that drew us back from that abyss.

He told his countrymen:

> Peace and freedom do not come cheap * * * and we are destined to live out most,

> if not all, of our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril.

He told us:

> Together we shall save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames.

He told us:

> It is our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance, step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved.

John Kennedy conceived it to be the supreme duty of his Presidency to preserve the peace. He dedicated his full energies to binding up the old wounds of our world and to preventing infliction of new ones.

He tried by every means at his command to create an atmosphere of mutual confidence and understanding in which agreements designed to protect humanity from the holocaust could be reached and upheld.

In mounting and maintaining for our country the mightiest military force any nation has ever had, it was his solemn determination that this force shall be used only to keep the peace, to prevent war, to deter any adversary from attacking us or our allies.

Because John Kennedy seldom used the word "peace" without linking it to the word "freedom," the peace that he was seeking was not that of surrender to evil, but of the defense of freedom.

The treaty which the Senate ratified only a few weeks ago, ending nuclear experiments in the sky above us, in outer space and beneath the waters, John Kennedy intended to be only the first step toward the abolition of war as an instrument of national policy.

When the foul deed that struck him down was committed, he was already searching ahead for new ways of reducing the unbearable tensions which grip all mankind.

He saw in the exploration of outer space vast implications for the human spirit—the reactivation of the innate curiosity of the mind of man—new opportunities for the exercise of maximum ingenuity—wholly new, unexplored frontiers for American genius—an end to the suffocating atmosphere of complacency and frustration.

He knew that our age, the age of space, demands the highest order of initiative, intellectual cultivation, and attainment that has ever been required in any previous day in the history of this planet, and he urged us to follow the course of excellence in all things.

John Kennedy wanted America to lead the world toward peace, toward freedom, toward justice, toward a renaissance of civilization.

He wanted America to lead the world in unlocking the mysteries of the universe around us.

It fell to him to be our President at the moment when the revolution in military weaponry is reaching its apogee, when people everywhere have come face to face with the nightmare of the possible extinction of the human race.

Deriving from his own deep religious sentiment, carried forward by his luminous intelligence, expressed in scores of eloquent pronouncements, and sustained with ardor and bravery, the central purposes of the life of John F. Kennedy, I believe, were these:

To impel human beings everywhere to understand themselves and their fellowmen, to oblige every person who loves God to give of himself rather than to demand of others, to follow the ancient Greek injunction, "know thyself," and the ancient Biblical command, "love thy neighbor," to practice rather than to preach the Gospel of the Prince of Peace, to "remark not the mote in thy brother's eye but the beam in thine own."

May God grant that we shall have the wisdom and the humility to follow in the path of peace on which he led us.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we meet to commemorate the memory of one of our famous former Members, John F. Kennedy, our thoughts bring to mind many facets of his impressive career of public service.

Those of us who had the privilege to serve with him in this body had an opportunity to observe and feel his keen interest in humankind, his dedication to the preservation of this Republic, his firm and abiding faith in his God, and his determination to devote untiring effort to promote peace in the world.

Much will, and should, be said about his service to our country and the nations of the world, but I want to direct my remarks to the spiritual qualities of this great man.

For many years I have been president of the International Council for Christian Leadership, and in this position presided at three Presidential prayer breakfasts in which President Kennedy participated.

At the first prayer breakfast, March 3, 1961, following his inauguration as President, he spoke in part as follows:

> I think it is most appropriate that we should be gathered together for this morning's meeting. This country was founded by men and women who were dedicated, or came to be dedicated, to two propositions: First, a strong religious conviction, and secondly, a recognition that this conviction could flourish only under a system of freedom. I think it is appropriate that we pay tribute to this great constitutional principle which is enshrined in the first amendment of the Constitution, the principle of religious independence, of religious liberty, of religious freedom. But I think it's also important that we pay tribute and acknowledge another great principle and that is the principle of religious conviction. Religous freedom has no significance unless it is accompanied by conviction, and therefore, the Puritans and the Pilgrims in my own section of New England, the Quakers of Pennsylvania, the Catholics of Maryland, the Presbyterians of North Carolina, the Methodists and Baptists who came later, all share these two great traditions which like silver threads have run through the warp and the woof of American history.

At the beginning of the second year of his administration, speaking at the annual Presidential prayer breakfast March 23, 1962, he spoke in part as follows:

> I want to, as President, express my appreciation to all those whose efforts make this breakfast possible. This is only one of a worldwide effort, I believe, to build a closer and more intimate association among those of different faiths, in different countries, in different continents, who are united by a common belief in God, and therefore united in a common commitment to the moral order and as Governor Daniel said, "a relationship of the individual to the state." * * *
>
> On our program this morning, there is a quotation from Lincoln which I think is particularly applicable today. He said, "I believe there is a God. I see the storm coming, and I believe He has a hand in it. If He has a part and a place for me, I believe that I am ready." * * * We see the storm coming; and we believe He has a hand in it. And if He has a place and a part for us, I believe that we are ready.

This year, February 11, 1963, speaking at the 11th annual Presidential prayer breakfast, President Kennedy spoke in part as follows:

> We cannot depend solely on our material wealth, on our military might, or on our intellectual skill or physical courage to see us safely through the seas that we must sail in the months and years to come.
>
> Along with all of these we need faith. We need the faith with which our first settlers crossed the sea to carve out a state in the wilderness, a mission they said in the Pilgrims' Compact, the Mayflower Compact, undertaken for the glory of God. We need the faith with which our Founding Fathers proudly proclaimed the independence of this country to what seemed at that time an almost hopeless struggle, pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence. We need the faith which has sustained and guided this Nation for 175 long and short years. We are all builders of the future, and whether we build as public servants or private citizens, whether we build at the national or local level, whether we build in foreign or domestic affairs, we know the truth of the ancient Psalm, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

These quotations from President Kennedy reveal his sublime faith in his Creator and his dependence on his God to guide and direct him as he led this Nation through nearly three stable and prosperous years. As a legacy to him, we should rededicate ourselves to carry on in the faith that helped in dark and troublesome periods in his life of service.

As a part of these remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include an expression of sympathy adopted by the All-Student Council of Kansas University on November 23, 1963.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The All-Student Council of the University of Kansas acknowledges with grief the tragic assassination of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. The very foundation of our democratic system is the peaceful settlement of disputes and change of governments. Americans and foreign students alike realize that the United States of America has lost more than a great President. The world has lost a statesman and mankind has lost a friend. The cause for which the late President died was consistent with the causes for which he fought.
>
> The country must move on, as it will of course, united behind a new President. Yet the Republic will never be the same without the leadership of this man who asked of the people the same devotion he offered them.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> JOHN E. STUCKEY, Jr.
>
> Concurred in by:
>
> REUBEN MCCORMACK,
> *Student Body President,*
> *The University of Kansas.*

**Mr. RUSSELL.** Mr. President, on rare occasions in history figures appear on the world stage to capture the attention and excite the imagination of all mankind.

Such a figure was John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Around him was the aura of the age of chivalry. The world saw him as the young knight with the courage of a lion and the soul of a poet who sprang almost from virtual oblivion to world leadership and dared to challenge the dragons of war and human misery.

The tragic manner of his passing brought universal grief.

Nothing that I might say about his ability and statecraft can approach in eloquence the lofty tributes paid him by the leaders of the nations of the earth. No mortal words can reflect greater sincerity than the tears of millions of the humble who felt that they had lost a great and good friend.

It was my high privilege to have known this man personally and to have enjoyed several years of association with him. Among his other admirable attributes, he was a man of tolerance and understanding. He fought hard for those things in which he believed, but he well knew that all men would not see the same issue in the same light. He would have been the last to have expected anyone to stultify conviction merely to conform to his opinions.

This world is a much better place because he lived and passed this way. Some of his ideas and ideals will forever encourage and assist men in the quest for peace, justice, and the good life for all.

May he rest in peace.

**Mr. SPARKMAN.** Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to the memory of our late President and former colleague in this body.

I knew Jack Kennedy when he first came to Congress. Later, of course, when he came to the Senate I came to know him even better. For a time he was a member of the Senate Small Business Committee of which I was chairman. Still later, he became a member of the Foreign Relations Committee on which I was serving. We served together on that committee and worked together until he assumed the Presidency.

I often think of Jack Kennedy as a Member of the Senate standing at his desk on the back row just under the clock. I have watched him so many times in presenting issues in which he was interested and in managing bills here on the floor of the Senate. I often watched him and was amazed at his tremendous grasp of facts in connection with any measure that he was handling. I was intrigued by his gentleness in debate, his willingness to listen with patience to the arguments that others might have and to work out differences with reference to legislation. He was an able and effective legislator—serious, conscientious, and dedicated.

So many times do I remember seeing him hobbling around the Senate on crutches or with a cane as a result of injuries received in the crash of his famed PT-109.

I have read of his experiences in the South Pacific during the war and have been impressed with the thought: Here was a man. I have read his book "Profiles in Courage" written from a hospital bed recovering from surgery that carried him to the brink of death.

It was my privilege to be closely associated with him at the time of his inauguration. I remember those friendly contacts that we had and I keep with pride on my office walls various pictures and mementos that he gave to me in connection with that inauguration.

While he was serving as President I was often in his office at the White House. I have seen the friendly manner in which he talked to adults and children with equal ease from his rocking chair.

I have seen him out on trips in Tennessee, Alabama, other places throughout the country, speaking to great crowds and then going among the people to speak to them and to talk with them.

He was a man of great intellect and sincerity of purpose. He was a man of courage as was amply demonstrated by his confrontation with Premier Khrushchev. He was truly a leader of the free world who built steadily a greater strength for our country and the free world to the end that Khrushchev openly admitted our overwhelming superiority. Through this strength he was able to push steadily for an advance toward peace. In my opinion he did more than than any other person in our time toward getting the world started toward peace—a durable, universal and dependable peace. We shall remember his work, and future generations will learn of it, in the cause of world peace and will, because of it, call him blessed.

He has been taken away at the time that his free world leadership was recognized throughout the world—at a time when he was still a young man with great promise ahead. We mourn with all the world his untimely death.

Behind him he left his devoted wife and two precious children. Mrs. Sparkman and I extend to them our deepest sympathy. May God watch over and keep them.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. President, in May 1962, the first White House Conference on Conservation in 54 years was convened here in Washington. The President of the United States, who called that historic meeting, addressed the closing session of the Conference. With his eyes on the horizon, his thoughts on the future, John Fitzgerald Kennedy declared:

> I don't think there is anything that could occupy our attention with more distinction than trying to preserve for those who come after us this beautiful country which we have inherited.

In his first message on natural resources sent to the Congress in 1961, President Kennedy declared:

> From the beginning of civilization, every nation's basic wealth and progress has stemmed in large measure from its natural resources. This Nation has been, and is now, especially fortunate in the blessings we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon—and is dependent upon—our water, our land, our forests, and our minerals. How we use these resources influences our health, security, economy, and well-being.
>
> But if we fail to chart a proper course of conservation and development—if we fail to use these blessings prudently—we will be in trouble within a short time.

There are many accomplishments in many fields which can be attributed to the regrettably brief administration of John Kennedy. Foremost among these are the achievements in the wise use and protection of the Nation's endowment of natural resources. And under this heading a distinguished record was created in adding to the national parks system, new areas of recreation, historic and scenic value. President Kennedy dramatized and articulated the fact that a rapidly growing, increasingly mobile population required a vigorous program of outdoor recreation planning and development by government at all levels. I dwell on this aspect of conservation today only because it is a subject of close personal interest.

During his first 2 years of office, 13 new national parks, historic sites, memorials and monuments were authorized by Congress or created by President Kennedy by Executive order. Some time ago I commented that the Kennedy administration was well on its way to one of the most distinguished national parks records in history.

Midway through President Kennedy's first year in office, he signed into law the act creating Cape Cod National Seashore—the first major addition to our national park system in 16 years. John Kennedy had a long and intimate tie with this stretch of sea and sand and marshland. He introduced the bill to create the park and later, as President, put his signature to the act. In another century, another distinguished son of Massachusetts, Henry Thoreau, said of the great stretch at Cape Cod:

> A man may stand there and put all America behind him.

Cape Cod blazed the trail for establishment of other seashore areas. Thirty miles north of San Francisco, Point Reyes National Seashore was created, accessible to 5 million people living within 100 miles. That was in early September of 1962, and before that month was out the President's pen again had signed the act of Congress creating Padre Island National Seashore.

So from the Atlantic, to the Gulf of Mexico, and on to the Pacific shoreline, 285 miles of unspoiled seacoast have been protected for public use.

By Executive order, President Kennedy created Buck Island Reef National Memorial in the Virgin Islands, thus protecting a coral barrier reef.

And while he was stimulating the creation of recreation areas by the sea, President Kennedy also urged favorable congressional action to bring into being new parklands in interior America—in Nevada, in Missouri, in Arizona, along the Indiana lakeshore, in Utah, and on the dunes of Lake Michigan.

President Kennedy called our attention to a new natural resources problem, generally unrecognized 30 years ago. This is the necessity to encourage preservation of open space in and near our urban centers. Increasingly ours is an urban population. Even modest projections show that in merely 7 years an area roughly equal to the combined size of Maryland and Delaware will be engulfed by advancing urbanization. For the well-being of our people, the conservation of natural, green acres in and near urban centers is imperative.

President Kennedy declared in 1961 that "Land is the most precious resource of the metropolitan area." Deploring the present pattern of haphazard suburban sprawl, he won inclusion of the open-space land program in the 1961 Housing Act. Already, in 26 States, 114 grants are making communities more pleasant, better places in which to live.

The administration program for urban renewal demonstration grants induced several States to begin evaluations of their open space needs. New Jersey and Pennsylvania are studying the Philadelphia metropolitan region. Wisconsin is seeking to determine the best use of its waterfront lands, with all their potential for outdoor recreation.

An early request by President Kennedy to Congress was for legislative protection of the Nation's remaining wilderness areas. Preserved, these areas will stand as living reminders of the natural wilderness from which this Nation was wrested, and as a timeless gift of immeasurable value to future Americans.

President Kennedy sought the creation of a comprehensive Federal recreation lands program and the fostering of outdoor recreation programs by State and local governments. This is underway through the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. And before Congress now is a Presidential request for a land and water conservation fund. This fund would provide technical and financial assistance to State and local agencies in the planning, acquisition and development of recreational sites.

When visitors go to Mount Vernon to view George Washington's home and look across the Potomac they will see much the same view that Washington saw because President Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy took a personal interest in the preservation of the historic Potomac shoreline in neighboring Maryland.

Last May, Mr. President, I had the pleasure of accompanying a group of people very much interested in the cause of conservation to the White House. I brought my granddaughter, Mary Elizabeth Roberts, along. I mentioned to the President that she was with me because the work he was doing for her generation is going to count in the future. We stood in the sunshine with President Kennedy and discussed his interest in sound resource programs. The President said he wanted to visit some of the wilderness and other key conservation areas of the Nation. We encouraged him in his plans and in the autumn he made that tour.

Significantly, it began with the dedication of the Gifford Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies at Milford, Pa. There President Kennedy said:

> Every great work is in the shadow of man, and I don't think many Americans can point to such a distinguished record as can Gifford Pinchot, and this institute, which is only the latest manifestation of a most impressive legacy, I think can serve as a welcome reminder of how much we still have to do in our time.

On his trip the President was primarily concerned with the need to conserve and develop our natural resources, but he saw this need in the perspective of the long-term national interest. He saw conservation as one of the basic necessities to make sure that America remained both the land of the free and the home of the brave; he saw the emerging requirement in what he called the "third wave of conservation in the United States to make science the servant of conservation as we devise new programs of land stewardship." But beyond this he saw very clearly that what we did in the field of conservation might not materially alter our lives in the next 3 or 4 years, but it certainly would in the decades that lie ahead.

At the White House Conference on Conservation, President Kennedy closed his remarks with a story about the distinguished French leader, Marshal Lyautey. The marshal, as President Kennedy related it, told his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener replied that it would not flower for a hundred years. "In that case," said the marshal, "plant it this afternoon."

The new parks, the new national seashores, the natural monuments preserved will stand as tribute to the encouragement by President Kennedy of wise use of God's bounty. They are an appropriate inheritance to pass on to generations yet unborn.

I have stressed natural resources because his work in that field was typical of his work in many fields. Others, I am sure, will stress those accomplishments and I would want to echo every word of those eulogies. But in my own heart and mind I cannot fail to remember first the great leadership in the effort for conservation, which centers substantially if not primarily in the West, of this son of New England whom we so reverently remember today.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, if a man is fortunate he may have on one or two occasions in a lifetime, the chance to work in a cause he believes in completely in company with men whom he deeply admires. I had that supreme privilege in the Government service with John F. Kennedy.

I had the good fortune to serve with him when he first came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1947. In 1952 we were both candidates for the U.S. Senate, and were elected that year. During the presidential campaign of 1960, I was associated with him as his chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Then here in the ranks of the Senate in the last 3 years, I have been an advocate or sometimes friendly critic of his policies and programs.

Words do not come easily to express the sense of loss at the death of this happy warrior.

The whole world has recognized his special gifts dedicated to the service of his country and to a just peace. His qualities as a great public figure have been extolled by the leaders and people of every country who have paid him respect in these last weeks.

I would like today to mention a special virtue of John F. Kennedy in the office of President—he deeply understood the supreme problem of this Nation as the wise use of our great power.

For example, consider these words at the University of Washington's 100th anniversary program in November 1961:

> Diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another. Either alone would fail. A willingness to resist force, unaccompanied by a willingness to talk, could provoke belligerence—while a willingness to talk, unaccompanied by a willingness to resist force, could invite disaster.
>
> * * * * *
>
> While we shall negotiate freely, we shall not negotiate freedom. Our answer to the classic question of Patrick Henry is still no—life is not so dear, and peace is not so precious, "as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery." And that is our answer even though, for the first time since the ancient battles between Greek city-states, war entails the threat of total annihilation, of everything we know, of society itself. For to save mankind's future freedom, we must face up to any risk that is necessary. We will always seek peace—but we will never surrender.

During the time I knew Jack Kennedy, I came to especially respect his deep interest in people. He sincerely enjoyed people. We saw this on a recent trip to the State of Washington just a few short weeks ago. He went out of his way to mingle with the crowd, to shake hands, to autograph pieces of paper. It was a special tragedy that it would be on another of these triumphal tours that he would be cut down by an assassin's bullet.

And during the days following this tragedy we have witnessed the magnificent mettle and high courage of Jacqueline Kennedy—and all the Kennedy family. We are profoundly proud of them.

Clearly, John F. Kennedy brought to the Government of the United States and to the Presidency a very special luster that we will not soon see again.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, many words of mourning and of eulogy have echoed eloquently across this land. The Nation's leaders and its humblest citizens have poured from their hearts the testimony of their grief, their horror at a tragedy of unimaginable proportions, and their deep sense of personal and national loss.

I share that grief, that horror, and that loss.

We mourn the loss of John Fitzgerald Kennedy—a born leader, a man of brilliance, a giant among men. We have lost a great President and a rare human being. He was a man of knowledge and of vision—with a distinctive style marked by charm—and a grace tempered by wonderful wit. He brought to the Presidency a keenness of mind unmatched by all who served before him. His strength and courage were nobly translated into love of country and devotion to a world of peace and freedom. He was a young President who became for us—as for men and women and children everywhere—the symbol of a young, a free, a strong, a compassionate America.

With a sense of profound respect, we mourn our loss, and are humbly thankful for the time we knew him. For me it began in 1949. We were both young New England Congressmen. I sensed in him then the inner strength, the contained composure, indeed, the spark of greatness that so many would come to know. In days that followed we worked together, endured defeat together, rejoiced in victory together. With both the challenges of politics and the responsibilities of Government, I was proud and privileged to have had a part in helping him.

What is lost can be remembered in our minds, recalled in our words, and revered in our hearts. But what has not been lost will endure in more meaningful ways. So very much has not been lost. So very much remains.

John Kennedy rallied the forces of freedom throughout the world, and those forces and that spirit of freedom remain strong today. He led the world in a new quest for an honorable peace. He let our adversaries know that hostility meant disaster and that common understanding could lead to a decent world for all. With patience and persistence he worked to achieve the test ban treaty. The world felt and followed his leadership, and continues forward today on the course he set.

John Kennedy raised the sights of this Nation, and those sights are high today. He bid us all look with him at the unfinished business of our country, and those matters hold our attention today. He held up to us the plight of the uneducated, the unemployed, the ill and the poor. He pointed us toward the future of our cities, of our farms, of our industry, of our natural resources. The generation he inspired will never ignore these problems; we will never look away from that future.

John Kennedy set for our people a standard of excellence, a personal challenge to do our best in everything we do, and that personal challenge still lies before us today. He had the ability to lift those around him. He made us try to think more clearly, to read more widely, and weigh the facts more carefully—even to look around us at the pictures on our walls or the physical exercise we were getting—and ask ourselves if we could not do better. The generation he challenged will never cease to pursue the goals he set.

Most of all, John Kennedy caught the imagination of the young people of America, and their imagination remains fired today. He called upon those in their thirties to serve their Government, he bid those in their twenties to make the Peace Corps a reality, and he urged the teenagers to stay in school. Our Nation's youth responded to him, and the response is alive and vigorous today.

John Kennedy led us all to new frontiers and bid us across them with him. He knew the frontiers of our continent had been replaced by frontiers of our national problems, the world and space. Those frontiers remain today, and so does his challenge to cross them.

There remains, too, the spirit of tolerance he sought by personal example to encourage throughout the land. More than any President before him, he committed the Presidency to achieving full civil rights for every American. He opposed prejudice of every kind. There was no trace of meanness in this man. There was only compassion for the frailties of others. If there is a supreme lesson we can draw from the life of John Kennedy, it is a lesson of tolerance, a lesson of conscience, courage, and compassion. And that lesson remains.

For me there remain many memories from a long association. Among the clearest is a cold and windy night 3 days before the 1960 election.

We came to Waterbury, Conn., a little before 3 o'clock in the morning on a Sunday with the man who—the following Tuesday—was to be elected President of the United States. The square in front of the hotel where we were staying was packed with people. They had been waiting for many hours to see John Kennedy.

We came out on the balcony together. The candidate spoke: the crowds responded ecstatically shouting and cheering and showing their love for this young leader. They wanted more—more—more.

But he had had a long day and he was tired. "Abe, you go out and speak," he said, and I did, but the crowd still shouted for "Jack."

So, responding as he always did, he went back to them, and spoke.

"I will close," he said, "by telling you of the letter which Lincoln wrote in a campaign very much like this, 100 years ago, when the issues were the same. He wrote to a friend: 'I know there is a God and I know He hates injustices. I see the storm coming and I know His hand is in it. But if He has a place and a part for me, I believe that I am ready.'"

"Now 100 years later," John Kennedy continued, "when the issue is still freedom or slavery, we know there is a God and we know He hates injustice. We see the storm coming and we know His hand is in it, but if He has a place and a part for me I believe we are ready."

The last "I," he changed to "we." He wanted us to be ready. He lived, worked and died to make his country ready. All that he did, all that he inspired, all that he stood for remains.

As we mourn our loss, let us dearly prize what is not lost. Now 37 years from the 21st century, we are ready for the future and all that it may bring. President Kennedy made us ready, and so by the grace of God we shall remain.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Nation and the free world still mourn the death of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We are all filled with a deep sense of personal loss.

On this day when it becomes our sad duty to honor the memory of President Kennedy in the Halls of the U.S. Senate where he served so well and where we first came to know him, I am reminded of a splendid October morning 3 years ago in Warm Springs, Ga.

The then Senator Kennedy was vigorously campaigning for the Presidency, and I joined tens of thousands of other Georgians in welcoming this young and energetic young man to our State, and to Warm Springs, the site of the Little White House, where the great President Franklin D. Roosevelt was taken from our midst at one of the most crucial times in the history of our Republic.

John Kennedy captured the imagination of the huge throng assembled there before the white portico of Roosevelt's Georgia retreat. He won their hearts and their support of his pledge to get this country moving again.

His visit to Georgia is now legend, and I am proud to have been a part of it. And Georgians are proud that he was there.

John Kennedy knew that he was asking for the most awesome and burdensome job in the world, and he was willing and able to face this great responsibility in keeping with the best of American tradition. As he told my fellow Georgians at Warm Springs:

> I do not run for the Presidency under any expectation that life will be easy for the next President of the United States or easy for the citizens of the United States. To be a citizen of this country is to live with great responsibility and great burdens.

Life was not easy for President John F. Kennedy, and he—perhaps as much as any other of our Chief Executives—lived with great responsibilities and burdens. The President discharged his duties well, and though the dastardly assassin's bullet took him from us in the prime of life, John Kennedy has assured himself of a prominent and respected place in American history.

He died a hero's death in the service of his country, to which he had dedicated his entire life.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, most Americans, following the events of November 22, felt as if a member of their immediate family had died.

I felt that way. I recalled simple personal things about John F. Kennedy, as I had known him. He had paid five visits to my State of North Dakota, the final time as President of the United States less than 3 months ago.

In 1959, when I was a freshman Congressman, my teenage daughter, Jennifer, went over to Senator Kennedy's office to get his autograph.

More than a year later, Senator Kennedy, as the Democratic nominee for President, arrived at the Fargo, N. Dak., Airport. Out of a huge throng, he spotted my daughter and called, "Hi, Jenny." She was ecstatic.

This little story may seem inconsequential, but I partly judged John F. Kennedy by his kindness to my young daughter. It is only human to remember a person in this way, even when the person happens to be President of the United States.

The world has lost a tremendous human being. He was warm and friendly, firm and determined. His quick mind, his wealth of knowledge and his charming manner are no more. But we will never forget him.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was superbly qualified for the Presidency. He had the qualities of greatness—the historical perspective, the wisdom, the sense of purpose, the ability to inspire people.

And he had just begun.

I am appalled by the waste. I am numbed by the magnitude of our loss.

The history books are likely to record that the paramount contribution of John F. Kennedy was to start a new trend in world relationships—a realistic understanding by nations of the necessity for living peaceably with one another in the shadow of the nuclear bomb.

The turning point may have come in October 1962, when we learned that the Soviet Union was emplacing missiles in Cuba.

With steady nerves, but with restraint, John F. Kennedy ordered the Soviet Union to remove the missiles. The Soviet Premier backed down. The missiles were dismantled. And the whole world had heightened respect for American determination to protect freedom and halt aggression.

The tension of that crisis had a sobering effect—the stark realization that, like it or not, nations will have to coexist, or run the risk of a nuclear holocaust.

John F. Kennedy, perceiving this reaction, pressed for a further relaxation of world tension. In July, he negotiated the nuclear test ban treaty, which he termed "an important first step—a step toward peace—a step away from war."

It was at this point that he was taken from us so abruptly.

The cool judgment, the respect John F. Kennedy commanded among other nations will be sorely missed, as we carry forward the unfinished work of building a more livable world.

Our responsibilities have been expressed in many ways since November 22. We have heard about the need to purge ourselves of bitterness, hatred and bigotry and about the hope that our common sorrow will unite us and uplift us.

H. A. Swenson, a member of the choir at the First Lutheran Church at Bismarck, N. Dak., was inspired to write a poem after hearing the sermon the Sunday following President Kennedy's death. It was entitled "The Lamp of Freedom":

> The lamps of freedom often burn from blood by heroes shed.
> The light of freedom is a gift from those who now are dead.
> What does this mean to you and me who share this common good?
> Who have not yet been called upon to give this precious blood.
> We too must share in lesser ways to keep the fire bright.
> There is so much that needs repair; there is some wrong to right.
>
> With humble spirit, purpose true there is a work to do.
> When we can clearly see our call and carry through.
> Ours may not be dramatic spots that shake the very earth.
> But in the simple, humble tasks, we need to prove our worth.

Likewise, the pupils in a small school in North Dakota caught the spirit in a resolution the day after the President's funeral.

An accompanying letter read:

PEKIN PUBLIC SCHOOL,
OSAGO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 58,
*Pekin, N. Dak., November 26, 1963.*

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: I enclose a resolution from our school (grades 1 to 12).

Our school just wanted to do something. Would you take the enclosed letter and do with it what you see fit? Perhaps you would care to file it with your other papers. We seek no publicity.

Sincerely,
HENRY X. HANSEN,
*Principal.*

The resolution, signed by all 76 pupils and the 5 members of the faculty, follows:

### IN MEMORY OF OUR BELOVED PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

We, the pupils of the Pekin public school, dedicate ourselves to one special act of kindness each day for at least 1 year.

**Mr. PASTORE.** Mr. President, unbelievable—still unbelievable—is the tragic passing of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In this Chamber of the U.S. Senate it seems only yesterday that Jack Kennedy moved among us—a colleague of the finest, friendliest character; an earnest youth but a statesman by every test; an ally to cherish; an opponent to command affection; a Senator who moved from our back row to the first seat of the Republic—and yet remained close, companionable to us all.

Our States were neighbors—his and mine—Massachusetts and Rhode Island—with no boundary visible to the naked eye or open heart.

Through all his years John Kennedy was a favorite of Rhode Island. He could not begin to accept the invitations we poured in upon him. When our Newport became the scene of his wedding, the romance seemed part of each Rhode Islander's life. When he favored us with his summer presence as a man of family and as President, an enthusiastic Rhode Island had to be restrained from giving him a summer White House.

So I had the privilege here in the Senate to work often with him on measures of mutual importance.

At the close of a day of taxing debate on the Senate floor—there would come a note of thanks personally penned because he felt you had helped him. Later, the White House telephone would be personally dialed—directly and delightfully—as he seemed never to have separated himself from our midst. On occasion the President has visited this Capitol—and homesickness has led him to this very door—to peer within—smile at a speaking Senator—and whisper, "It is just as I left it."

And when we visited the White House, he would walk outside with us after the meeting, walk to the gate—and even out on the public street—to our dismay and that of the men of the Secret Service—but to the President's delight.

For John Kennedy loved people—loved to meet them face to face—hand clasping hand—winning the hearts of the world to him.

We and the world have been robbed of all this by the senseless savagery of a misfit mind.

But out of the colossal cruelty was born a closeness of our country. A life of service and a death of sacrifice united a nation, revealing the true image of America.

Even in the depths of the tragedy we saw the far-reaching vision of a leader who sought and saw his successor in a colleague who shared this Senate Chamber with him and with us.

Our country saw the John Kennedy profile of courage was a profile of good counsel, commanding the confidence of the people and the continuity of the government, implicit in his selection of Lyndon B. Johnson—guaranteed by his sharing with him all the problems and programs and potentials of administration from their first moment as a team, to their last moment in the close companionship of that day of happy beginning and finality of deepest grief.

If we speak of a people's grief in that hour, words have not yet been fashioned to tell the torment of his closest of companions—wife and mother of the little family endeared beyond cavil to all the world—to tell of her torment or of her nobility, as womanhood has ever risen to nobility in the tragic trials of man.

I borrow the words of a religious editor of another faith to record:

> In the searing and exacting duties that lie ahead, a quiet, slight young woman has given the United States an example of fortitude and strength that will not soon, if ever, be forgotten. In Jacqueline Kennedy, it has seen a pattern for its own devotion to the demands of the future.

All men bow their heads to the sacrifice and service of woman—sweet even in its sorrow—and strongest under bitterest blows.

When any of us in the Senate speak of those November hours of loss and loneliness, our words must needs be painfully personal.

What have we left of John Kennedy? Shall we count a photograph together—a flight together—an autographed volume—a family portrait—intimate letters with a signature that almost smiled as he penned it?

Yes—in our innermost hearts we shall cherish them—and as Senators and Americans we shall treasure all the imperishable words and all the unconquerable hopes of an American who shall possess the dreams and ideals of youth for all eternity.

Time shall never dim nor dull the ringing challenge of the young President at the very doors of this Capitol on the sun-splendored day of his inauguration.

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy asked:

> What can I do for my country?

He lived for it.
He died for it.

### IN MEMORIAM

**Mr. PROUTY.** Mr. President, some day in the quiet of an evening, when his toys are put aside, a young boy will ask: "What was Daddy really like?"

In that fateful moment, when time stands still and all the world descends upon her, may she who bears the burden of the answer tell no tale of office gained, of prize attained, of battle lost or won.

But speak of him who loved the Lord and saw in the least of us the traces of His majesty and in this land the glory of His handiwork.

Or if she choose another way, why then just say: "Your father, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was a good man."

**Mr. MAGNUSON.** Mr. President, the loss to the Nation, the free world, and the free people in the captive world is great. No mortal man in the elapsed time created, in the world, a greater respect or image for what decent people want the world to be, than John Kennedy. Can we but build on his foundations, we can look forward with some hope in this terrible tense world. His decent approach to these should be a model for the betterment of mankind. We can do what he would want by dedicating ourselves to this great cause.

His understanding of our domestic matters was based upon a simple truth. That we were a growing expanding nation and that in these changing times there would be some Americans hurt in the process. Their needs required readjustment. He believed America was strong enough morally and economically to meet the needs of the people. He knew history. He knew that any government that failed to keep up with this responsibility weakened the whole fabric of the country.

The best memorial to him would be a dedication to this basic truth.

His contribution to tolerance was enormous. During 3 years as President, he proved a Catholic can keep his religion and work as President, separate and independent of each other. He was a Christian gentleman. He neither paraded nor preached his religion. He respected others' beliefs and laid no venom or intolerance to it.

He was my personal friend for many years. Even after he assumed the high office of President, he and I never lost that personal touch and on many occasions we met in that period, not on political or business purposes, but just to say "Hello" again as old friends. I will miss that.

He despised pettiness and bigotry in all human endeavor. His mind was sharp, keen, imaginative, but yet mellow as great scholars are wont to be. This may have well been his spark of greatness. Even in his relaxed moments it was there. History will make that greatness indelible in its appraisal.

To his family my deepest sympathy—but words are so futile—dedication to what he stood for will be more rewarding to me and to them.

But the ways of God work wonders. Maybe the country and the world needed a martyr to tolerance—this is a terrible price to pay. But God does reign in the heaven and thank God, the Government at Washington still lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert an address by Mr. Clarence C. Dill, of Spokane, Wash., in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### JOHN F. KENNEDY MEMORIAL SERVICE

(Address of Clarence C. Dill, courthouse, Spokane, Wash., November 25, 1963)

Whenever an orator of ancient Athens arose to address the free assembly, he first offered a prayer to the immortal gods that no unworthy word would escape his lips. So today in the shadow of the terrible tragedy that took our President, I pray no unworthy word shall pass my lips.

We meet in this memorial service for memory and inspiration. John F. Kennedy had not passed on life's highway the stone that marks the highest point. As an English playwright said yesterday: "He was in the summer of his life." The fact is he was pressing forward with all his power, the programs he had proposed.

Although the President is dead, the program of help for the underprivileged of our own country and for the maintenance of human freedom around the world, a program to which he had dedicated his life, must be carried on. During the last 50 years our industrial, commercial, and social life has enlarged so rapidly and so enormously that new governmental remedies have been necessary for new national ills that developed from time to time.

Woodrow Wilson declared his proposed national remedies to establish the New Freedom. Twenty years later, Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed his reforms to give the American people the New Deal. Thirty years later, John F. Kennedy named his remedial programs, the New Frontier.

We are too close to the terrible tragedy that ended his career, to assess what the Nation and the world have lost, but through the gloom of grief we can discern the principal parts of the program he proposed and championed.

When Congress shall have enacted laws that will provide fully for the medical and hospital care of all the aged, and when that reform has been established to extend those same services to all our people, of whatever age, we shall have the full fruition of his dream for providing national medical and hospital service, whether it be by social security charges or some other method.

When Government and industry are able to cooperate so as to distribute the benefits of automation to aid in the employment of those affected by new machines, that will fulfill another of President Kennedy's dreams.

When all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or national origin, can be educated together, work together and have equal rights of every kind, that will be a national achievement of civil rights for which President Kennedy strove so continuously.

When all the great nations of the world destroy all their nuclear war weapons and make it an international crime for any nation to produce or possess nuclear weapons of war, so no wild man in control of any government can destroy the human race, that will be another victory for world peace which President Kennedy so much desired.

He was the symbol of youth to all the world. His Peace Corps has proved the most helpful organization for improving international relations devised by any nation during the 20th century for that purpose.

In addition to all these services to the Nation, we should recognize how well he protected his country in case of his inability to serve as President. First, he chose Lyndon B. Johnson to take his place, because he was a statesman with broad experience as a leader in the Congress, and second, he acquainted the Vice President with full knowledge of the national and international problems of the administration. As a result, despite this terrible tragedy, our land is bright today. The Nation knows and the world knows a strong man stands at the helm of the ship of state, prepared to weather any storm that may develop.

Turning now to John Fitzgerald Kennedy the man: He was born in New England, graduated from Harvard, cum laude, then studied in London and later became an itinerant observer and writer about world events. At 28 he was elected to the House of Representatives; at 38 he was elected to the Senate. He soon became one of the small number of Senators who are known outside their own States because of their independence, their ability, and their leadership. He won the Presidency at the age of 43 and was in the full flower of his leadership at the time of his death.

Television and radio had made millions of common folks feel they knew this man. It will not be easy to go on without hearing and seeing him from time to time by television in our homes. We shall miss the Boston accent of his voice that seemed a part of him. We shall miss too that eager, forward-looking attitude that he so often showed in discussing public questions. We shall miss his wit and charm in parrying political questions or his laughing at his own predicaments in his numerous press conferences. His friendly, almost neighborly style of discussing weighty subjects of legislation and international problems with seeming mastery, made his millions of listeners feel confident that he would meet all challenges with courage, intelligence, and a high sense of patriotism. He had won the respect of the leaders of the Nations of the free world. They looked to him for leadership with hope and confidence.

Although I did not know him as well personally as had I served with him in Congress, I recall an incident in the 1960 campaign when he spoke at the Lincoln Memorial at the corner of Monroe and Main at the noon hour, which like a chip of wood, shows the quality of the whole block.

At the close of his speech I tried to pilot him through the crowds to the Spokane Club. The pressure of those around us wishing to shake his hand and wish him success, was so great at times we could scarcely move at all. When I tried to apologize for not having had a police escort, he laughed and said: "Oh that's all right. I wanted this nomination and this is all a part of the fight."

During 3 years as President, he proved a Catholic can keep his religion and his work as President, separate and independent, each of the other. He was a Christian gentleman. He neither paraded nor preached his religion. On Sunday morning he took his family to the services of his church and seemed to enjoy attending services in the small, unpretentious chapels of the Virginia countryside as much as in the great cathedrals.

No eulogy should omit a tribute to the woman he chose for his wife, Jacqueline. The popularity of her beauty, her style of hair-do's and clothes with the women, were exceeded with the people only by her charming personality. The whole Nation gloried in her redecoration of the White House. She was a first lady of a different kind from all those who had preceded her, and with all this, she devoted herself to her children, Caroline and John, as her first duty.

Early in the administration, little Caroline became the beloved child of all the people. Republican leaders often said they could oppose the President and might find something to criticize about Jackie, but freely said: "There's nothing we can do about Caroline."

Little John, who came as a kind of bonus son to the winner of the presidential election, had not yet reached the age to fascinate the people, but photo flashes show boyish activities which make understandable why his doting father nicknamed him "John-John."

But it was following the crash of the assassin's bullet when he slumped upon Jacqueline's lap that brought forth her hidden strength to meet such a tragedy. She pillowed his head in her arms while his lifeblood oozed away as the automobile rushed to the hospital. There, she remained at his side until life was gone. Then she rode the casket in the ambulance to the airport. In the plane she sat beside the coffin all the way to Washington. Then she went with the body to the funeral home. She remained there until 4 o'clock in the morning when she rode with him to the White House for the last time. Not until then did she cease her vigil of Spartan-like care.

But it is that act of delicate, almost infinite tenderness at the funeral home just before the casket was to be finally sealed, of which I wish to speak especially. Alone, she went to the open casket, removed her wedding ring, placed it in his hands, and kissed his lips for the last time—a symbol of her love that would last forever. By these acts of devotion, she wrote a new and different chapter for closing the "Profile of Courage."

After this she turned over his mortal remains to the military for funeral services and burial in that American Valhalla for heroes who have served in time of war, the Arlington National Cemetery.

In all the mythological tales of the love of gods and goddesses, in all the love stories of the kings and queens of history, in all of Shakespeare's creation of love scenes, you will not find such a beautiful, exquisitely fine demonstration of wifely love as Jacqueline Kennedy's act to symbolize her everlasting devotion.

In conclusion let me call attention to the dramatic phase of President Kennedy's taking off. It was near the close of a highly enthusiastic street parade. Just as his car approached the underpass, with his wife's words, "Dallas has been kind to you," still echoing in his ears as he smiled and waved a responding salute to the cheers of those on the sidewalks, a bullet crashed through his brain. While the automobile rolled on into the underpass, his spirit at that moment must have leaped into the skies to his heavenly home and his spirit, even now, may be exploring the space world to which he planned the astronauts should some day go.

I close in the words of James A. Garfield to a street crowd in New York City the night Abraham Lincoln was shot: "God reigns in His heaven and the Government at Washington still lives."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, November 22, 1963, will go down in American history as a day of national tragedy. The assassination of the 35th President of the United States on that date shocked and saddened Americans of all political persuasions. That act of perfidy, evidently performed by a man whose mind was poisoned with the Communist ideology which thrives on the totalitarian idea that the end justifies the means, closed a brilliant political career of one of the most personable and popular Presidents ever to serve our Nation. There were many disagreements with President John F. Kennedy's policies and proposals; but his personal popularity, according to public opinion polls, continued at an unusually high level for a man who was continuously in the national spotlight, actively seeking approval of his proposals and actions.

I had the pleasure, Mr. President, of serving with the late President Kennedy while he was representing the State of Massachusetts in this great body. We were both members of the Government Operations and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees. I particularly remember, Mr. President, the outstanding service which the then Senator Kennedy rendered to this body when he proposed, and then served as chairman of a special committee to select five great Senators of all time from among deceased former Members of the Senate. I was impressed with the selections made by his committee and with the objective manner in which he and his committee members performed their duties in carrying out this assignment.

I have always had a high regard, Mr. Mr. President, for the late President's appreciation of history, and particularly for his Pulitzer Prize-winning book, "Profiles in Courage." This book placed before each of us serving in the Congress and in public life excellent examples of some well-known and, until then, some little-known public servants who put into practice the high ideal of willingness to stand by the courage of their convictions in seeking to fulfill the trust reposed in them by their constituents.

Our country owes a great debt of gratitude to the late President for his foresight and vision in selecting as the man to succeed him in office, in the event of such a tragedy, one of the most experienced and capable leaders I have ever known. President Kennedy made certain that his Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson, would be more than just a ceremonial officeholder to preside over the Senate. He helped prepare his Vice President for the awesome responsibilities which descended on his shoulders on November 22, by keeping him well briefed on national policies and decisions and by utilizing his talents, not only to serve our Nation, but also to make certain that the Vice President would be able to carry on the duties of the Presidency with the least possible confusion and loss of continuity.

Mr. President, I have expressed my deep sympathy to the members of the late President's family. In closing my remarks here today, however, I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate my condolences to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and the other members of the Kennedy family, and also the heartfelt sympathy of the people of the State which I have the honor to represent in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States, reflecting the poignant feelings of a bereaved Nation and of a mournful globe, pays tribute today to the life and memory of a martyred leader of America, who set his sights on the sublime cause of peace with honor for all mankind.

The late, great, and dear John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our colleague and our friend, emerged from this Chamber to become our Nation's President; and from the steps of this Capitol Building, on Friday, January 20, 1961, taking his oath of office, he cried out to his countrymen, in moving eloquence and ringing phrases, to unite and to move forward "to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

His was the same solemn charge taken before God by all his predecessors back to the beginning of the Republic.

> But—

He said—

> the world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come, not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

Thus began the Kennedy administration.

The intervening months saw the new Chief Executive set about to move toward America's goals, as he saw the light, in a whole galaxy of Executive decisions and of recommendations for new laws. As in the life of any man, there were successes and failures, triumphs and tragedies, as this patriot, acting always as he believed he should, guided our country through days of peril and also through days of hope. Here, unfolding, was an exciting chapter in the life of America, where every conceivable passion, good and bad, where every conceivable feeling, constructive and destructive, made themselves heard in every area across our land.

And then, on another Friday, November 22, 1963, with an appalling suddenness, this valiant man was struck down by a mad assassin; and the people of our country—indeed, those of the whole world—stunned in disbelief and in dismay, sought to take hold of themselves, for the Government of our Nation must go on and the world must continue to turn. Our hearts poured out condolences to his widow and his children, to all his family, and to the Nation.

The late President was my friend. Courageous and intelligent, dedicated to his responsibilities and to his ideals, surely qualified for leadership, impatient at irrelevance but tolerant in disagreement with any of us, sustained by a sweet sense of humor, loved by a devoted wife and children and family, this grandson of immigrants from Ireland devoted his life to the people, and then gave that very life to the ages.

In his inaugural, the late President said:

> We observe * * * not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom.

How true. Freedom is not divisible. His earnest struggle to perpetuate our freedom, his quest for equal treatment under law for all citizens, marked no partisan boundaries. Rather did they, and do they, and shall they, stand as banners to which men of good will hopefully may always repair.

The world will not forget John Kennedy. The Senate will remember him. Perhaps, somehow, with God's good grace, this appalling tragedy may shock the American conscience into an earnest, prayerful rededication to brotherhood, where liberty and happiness may wash away all the evils which man has done to his neighbor too many times. There, I think, is the path which this lamented servant of the people would want America to tread, in memory of the zealous prayers he expressed in his all too short journey through this life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, sundry comments by the press of my State of California.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, Nov. 23, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY—IN MEMORIAM

A people grieve for the loss of their President, John F. Kennedy. In profound shock, the Nation offers its heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and all the family.

Any death of a President in office must have terrific and personal impact upon the citizens; but when it comes so abruptly in the horrible form of assassination, and to a man so young and virile as was our President, then words cannot voice our feelings nor the heart contain our emotions.

So little can be said at a time such as this. Whatever is expressed is incapable of conveying adequately confused and turbulent inner passions.

Nothing we write can alter the unalterable tragedy of the untimely death of our President. No eulogy can restore him to his family and his people from whom he was so suddenly wrenched.

Our bereavement is profound, affecting each of us individually. We offer our prayers for John F. Kennedy, late President of the United States, and pray to God in his memory and for our Nation, which now suffers the blow and the trial occasioned by his tragic loss.

Vale, Mr. President.

---

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A PROFILE IN COURAGE

Born May 29, 1917, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, came to his untimely and tragic death November 22, 1963. Only 46 years old, he was cut off abruptly with the promise of a brilliant and dedicated life incomplete.

Only history can judge the merit of his brief span as President, but we already have lasting opinions and warm memory of John F. Kennedy, the man. His entire career was one of selfless service and devotion to the public welfare.

Son of a wealthy family, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was ever concerned with the welfare of those less fortunate. He was sensitive to the problems of the aged and sick, the needs of the unemployed, the justified aspirations of our Negro citizens, and to all whose cause deserved humanitarian championing.

Courage as well as compassion was an essential ingredient of his character. He sought no special advantage during World War II. As an officer in command of a patrol boat in the Pacific fighting, he distinguished himself.

When his ship was sunk in 1943, he saved the life of his seriously burned engineer despite his own badly wrenched back; and when the wreckage had to be abandoned, he swam to an island 3 miles away while saving another of his crew by holding the straps of a sailor's lifebelt in his teeth.

In times of peace, he showed equal fortitude and determination. It took both to challenge bigotry by running for President of the United States.

Courage was the foundation of his stand when, little more than a year ago, he defied Russia and Cuba about the Communist buildup in the Caribbean. He made clear our unretreating resolve to uphold our commitments to West Berlin—even as he did to other free nations on various occasions.

John Kennedy, a loyal Catholic, showed his firm moral fiber when he opposed the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the subject of Federal grants to parochial and private schools. His physical courage was of comparable fiber; he underwent a spinal operation in 1954 which nearly cost him his life, and he conducted the heavy burden of his office despite actual pain and the discomfort of a back brace.

At the age of 29, he was elected to Congress, and after twice being reelected, he won a Senate seat in 1952. In 1960, he became the youngest President in the Nation's history.

And now, at the age of 46, he is no longer with us. No man, however, left a greater heritage of pride to his family, of unstinting service to his Nation, and of consistent dedication to the ideals of peace and liberty.

No passage of time nor historical verdict is required to engrave eternally grateful memory of John F. Kennedy, respected President, upon the hearts of his fellow citizens.

---

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Nov. 22, 1963]

### THE NATION MOURNS

The entire Nation has been plunged into deep grief and shame—grief for its slain President, John F. Kennedy, and shame it could have bred an assassin capable of so cowardly an ambush.

He came to the Presidency, did Kennedy, in an hour of rising extremism and in an hour when the preachers of hate were spreading their gospels of fascism across the land and because this is a free land they were permitted to speak.

Now Kennedy is dead and a piece of America died with him. And in this hour of tragedy we think of another President who 98 years ago was felled by another assassin who had listened to the hate merchants.

Only several weeks ago another figure in American life, Adlai Stevenson, also visited Dallas and there was spat upon and hit on the head with a sign condemning Stevenson and the principles he has espoused as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations.

These were people who had listened, too, to the preachers of hate and of fear and who wanted all of life their own way.

Another went further today. He shot and killed the President of the United States.

---

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Nov. 26, 1963]

### HERE WALKED A GIANT—IF ONLY BRIEFLY

Never has the world witnessed a more spontaneous and more overwhelming outpouring of affection than shown here in the Nation which sired him and abroad where he came to be beloved, for the late President John F. Kennedy. In his brief years he had come to touch humanity, we learn in his hour of death, as few men have touched humanity and though he died with his song only half sung his place in history is abundantly secure.

In London, citadel of political sophisticates, they cried openly in Trafalgar Square. In West Berlin, where only recently the late President ignited fire in a crowd of more than 1 million when he said: "Ich bin ein Berliner," candles dedicated to his memory lit the night like a ricocheting, vagrant meteor. In Moscow a godless state gave its permission for memorial services and a stunned Nikita Khrushchev, with all the rest of Russia, openly grieved.

Here at home through the bitterly cold night hundreds of thousands gathered in the Nation's Capital to pass by the late President's casket which rested on the same catafalque where lay another martyred President, Abraham Lincoln, 98 years ago. There in their many ways, they paid their last respects. They felt awkward before death, as do all of us, but they wanted to say goodby, and so they came and they came and they came.

All of us are too close to this tragedy to weigh it. History will make its own assessment of Kennedy, man and President, but when it comes to writing the chronicle of his brief years and measuring him against his hour, well may it write: Here walked a giant only briefly.

Now may he rest.

---

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Nov. 25, 1963]

### SELF-SEARCHING BY A SAD PEOPLE

This is not America the beautiful, but America the troubled, upon which the world has looked this past weekend, and to which it has sent its leaders and heads of state for the funeral today of President Kennedy.

The great men are here to honor the late President's great qualities of mind and person, which they had learned to know, measure and respect. Yet may we not believe also that they are here to show, by the testimony of their presence, how much the example and leadership of the United States mean to them and their countries?

In the somewhat dreary discussions which we conduct in this country on our foreign relations and how much they are costing us and how little gratitude they seem to earn us and how weary we are of the burden of them, we tend to forget the force and power of the American example in the world.

President Kennedy never forgot. He never ceased striving to represent this country as strong, determined and resolute. From his inspiration let the American people take that renewed devotion of which Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg a hundred years ago when he said it was "for us the living" to carry on the work of those who have died to defend freedom.

Over this sad weekend, the people of this country, confused and bereaved by the loss of their President, have been engaged in self-searching. They have been asking themselves what forces of hatred have been let loose amongst us and how shall our freedom be preserved from the threats of these forces.

How true and apt, as if in reply to these questions, were the words of Chief Justice Earl Warren, spoken under the Capitol dome yesterday, when he said that if we are to learn from the tragedy, if we are truly to love justice and mercy, we must "abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence."

### THE HERITAGE LEFT BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The Kennedy years in the American Presidency have profoundly shaped the course of this Nation. As time passes, and as some of the still half-concealed events of the past 3 years come to light, we believe that the late President's style and judgment in dealing with international affairs will earn him an ever more secure fame.

At the same time, it seems clear that history will give him no very high score for domestic achievements—though that will not be seen as his fault altogether, rather the fault of an unresponsive and dilatory congressional system which can cheat a victorious President of his reasonable legislative hopes.

The Kennedy years began, of course, on a well-remembered, bright, cold day in January 1961, of which many people retain two outstanding memories: The sight of the greatest of American poets reading a specially written ode to the occasion, and the sound of a sharp, clear, New England-accented voice saying, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

This was a happy, propitious, promising moment of taking over leadership by a man of the 20th century, a man who in the vigor of youth but with the authority of the oldest of republics could challenge Khrushchev and Mao and Adenauer and De Gaulle and masses of men everywhere to make the world a fairer place for men to inhabit.

Very soon after this, the promise which had been invoked by the confident new President was blighted by the Cuban invasion fiasco. This was the one resounding error of Kennedy's foreign policy, yet out of it was eventually to spring, ironically, his most impressive success: The showdown over the Soviet arming of Cuba and the withdrawal of their missiles.

It would be foolish to say that President Kennedy alone was responsible for sparing the world from nuclear war at that moment in October 1962, but it is surely not possible to take from him the credit for having safely brought the Nation, and by extension the world, through the most perilous passage they have ever been through.

Threats and alarms of war have steadily receded since that great climactic hour. Yet it is sadly true that the country which was behind Mr. Kennedy to the man in staring down his adversary in the Cuban confrontation, failed to give him the same backing in reaching a solution of the great domestic crisis of Negro rights. For coming to terms with that revolution, we shall have to look to the new President, or his successors in office.

---

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Nov. 25, 1963]

(By Herb Caen)

### THE LONGEST WEEKEND

It is less than 72 hours since the shots rang out in Dallas, yet it seems a lifetime—a lifetime of weeping skies, wet eyes and streets, and emotions that couldn't always be kept in check. Americans are not, by nature, an emotional people; the San Franciscan prides himself on an unflagging gaiety. And yet, over the endless weekend, San Francisco looked like a city that was only slowly emerging from a terrible bombardment. Downtown, on what would normally have been a bustling Saturday, the people walked slowly, as in shock, their faces pale and drawn, their mood as somber as the dark clothes they wore under the gray skies.

I remember a famous picture, early in World War II, of a Frenchman crying uncontrollably on the Champs Elysées as the Germans marched into Paris; some people found the photo painfully moving, others criticized him for not keeping a stiff upper lip in the face of the Hun. A grown man doesn't cry in public: It is part of the American lexicon.

But we are affected variously by various tragedies, and there were grown men crying in San Francisco—the stinging tears of sorrow and frustration. It was already the day after, but it took only a quick reminder to bring the grief back to the surface.

A man walked past the blacked-out corner window of the City of Paris, with its small white card of tribute, and tears rolled down his cheeks. At Sixth and Mission, an old woman in black passed a late newspaper headline, and suddenly sobbed. At the opera house Saturday night, Sir Malcolm Sargent and the Royal Philharmonic of London opened the concert with "The Star-Spangled Banner," and the sense of loss was felt again; all over the house, tears glistened afresh.

The longest weekend, that was to have been the big game weekend, and never have perspectives been so suddenly shattered, never have day-to-day values come in for such an excruciating reappraisal. The few people in the downtown bars sat hunched over their drinks, staring down or straight ahead. For once, in the Nation that loves humor, there was none. All at once, a city had stopped smiling.

Gray skies, and the constant gray and black of the TV screen. For the first time, in these unprecedented hours, there was total television. You were irresistibly drawn to the tiny screen, as though you expected a miracle. But there were no miracles; only the minor miracle of three networks striving valiantly, and with commendable dignity, to transmit hour after hour of unfolding tragedy, symbolized by a flag on a coffin. You were immersed in a fantasy world of honor guards standing at attention in the rain, of endless streams of black limousines, of faces that suddenly became part of your life, and to whose familiar voice and manner you clung, as though seeking reassurance.

Over the weekend that lasted a lifetime—and ended a lifetime—the faces on the screen, switching from Washington to New York to Dallas and back again, over and over, became part of your reality. Their first names joined the family: Chet, Walter, Frank, David, Frank, Martin. The harried face of the police chief in Dallas became more familiar to you than that of the man next door. You learned more about Lyndon Baines Johnson than you had ever known, or thought you would care to know. Strange and unknown orchestras and choirs came and went before your swimming eyes. History was traced and retraced— a crash course in the Presidency for millions who too often take too much for granted.

For some of us, who spend too much time at our jobs and our pleasures, and too little exploring the manifestations of greatness, the weekend provided an awakening. As always, it came too late. For those of us who seldom have the opportunity to watch TV, John F. Kennedy became more alive in death than he had been in life. For hour after hour, through the marvel of electronics, we saw the President as though for the first time. His life, compressed onto the small screen, passed before our eyes, and we marveled at his spirit, his warmth, his humor, his brilliance. He seemed vibrantly alive, and his words had a life they never seemed to possess before. We drew strength from him, and, in a way difficult to define, hope. But the lump in the throat refused to be downed.

As you watched the fine young man, the utter senselessness of the tragedy that had snuffed out his life gnawed at you. There was not even a mad nobility in the act, no glimmer of even an insane purpose. This had not been a madman in the mold of John Wilkes Booth, leaping onto the stage of a theater, crying "Sic semper tyrannis!" This was not the inevitable gloomy grandeur from which Greek tragedy is forged, nor the uncontrollable furies of Shakespeare. This had been a warped young man—"a loner" they called him—who kept saying he didn't do it. In the confusion of his own life, he symbolized nothing. Or perhaps he symbolized nothing but confusion, and that itself is a symbol of the times.

And so today, a Nation already in shock goes into official mourning, and Arlington prepares to receive another fallen soldier. He died without knowing how much he was loved—or by how many.

---

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### OUR MARTYRED YOUNG PRESIDENT

Every true American, regardless of his political philosophy, and every citizen of the world who holds mankind's good in his soul, is shocked beyond belief by the murder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th and youngest elected President.

More than just a man was slain in the streets of Dallas on Friday morning. The assassin's bullet aimed at the very heart of something we hold most dear as a free people: the majestic office of the Presidency, wherein lies our best hope of liberty here and abroad.

Mr. Kennedy, at 46, had just crossed the threshold of rich maturity as the prime defender of global integrity against communism.

He had demonstrated statesmanlike courage under devastating enemy diplomatic fire.

And he had, at home, sought a program which in principle, if not its many specifics, sought justice for our myriad population.

When the stunned shock wears off—as indeed it will, leaving only shame and sorrow—the American people must find new ways to put aside their bitter divisions, new methods to achieve noble ends.

Out of President Kennedy's martyrdom, let us all pray, will emerge new strength to drive ahead, to persevere, and to triumph over the awesome problems which confronted this young man less than 3 years ago.

We can thank our Republic's founders that the continuity of our governmental affairs continues unabated, owing to their wisdom and foresight.

This is where the assassin's bullet failed. It might wound the heart, but it could not still the inexorable beat of America's destiny.

To Mrs. Kennedy and her two fatherless children, in their terrible grief, we offer our profoundest sympathy.

To President Lyndon B. Johnson, who now assumes the monumental burden of this office, we render our hopes and prayers for strength and wisdom at a bleak and critical time.

---

[From the Los Angeles (Calif) Times, Nov. 25, 1963]

### EPILOG TO TRAGEDY

It did not seem possible that anything could compound the terrible ordeal of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's assassination.

But violence has begotten violence. And punishment has been visited upon the accused assassin, not by the law but by one man's twisted vengeance.

The murderer of the President deserved to die, although no penalty could be imposed that would be commensurate with his offense against the Nation and the world. Yet even the perpetrator of this most heinous crime was entitled to the due process of the law for if this right is abandoned for one, we are abandoning it for all of us.

President Kennedy died because of one man's violent hate, victim of the complete renunciation of law and order. His martyrdom will be cruelly diminished if his death does not inspire in all Americans a greater sense of common purpose and a stronger belief in the democratic process and in justice.

His murder left the Nation filled with not only grief but shame. No one man or group of men, however, can take retribution into their own hands. Nor can we permit blame for the assassination to be extended from one man to whole segments of American life.

As the ultimate manifestation of hatred and violence, the slaying of the President is a tragic warning that we canot tolerate the bitter divisiveness that any from of extremism inflicts upon the country.

If we would honor the memory of John F. Kennedy and redeem his sacrifice, we must emerge stronger and more united.

---

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram, Nov. 22, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The President is dead.

We cannot write words sufficient to express the sickening shock of Americans at the manner of his death.

Only a diseased mind could conceive and execute such a deed.

The madness of one—or a few—has robbed an entire Nation of its leader.

As he fought and suffered in World War II in the service of his country, John Kennedy has died in that service.

The heavy responsibility of the biggest job in the world now falls on the shoulders of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Let us remain calm in our sadness and give the new President the support he now must have as he takes up where the efforts of a courageous and beloved predecessor left off.

---

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The assassination of President Kennedy has overwhelmed the Nation with grief. In Dallas, Tex., that grief must be almost intolerably compounded with shame.

As now is clear the assassination was committed by a Communist fanatic unaware of the depth of evil to which such dogma could lead him. In so doing he served the Communist cause its worst setback in the 46 years since its baneful inception.

And certainly the President was the victim of insensate hatred—so depraved and vicious as to be beyond normal understanding.

He was more than a victim. He was a martyr. Not a marytr of the Democratic Party, but one who exemplified in his character, in his acts, the decency, the reason, the freedoms of his country and all its people.

The assassin is a traitor to those qualities—to Americanism as we honor it and live it. That is one of the reasons why the murder of President Kennedy is so profoundly shocking, so incomprehensibly perfidious.

It is not too much to say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave his life for his country, just as once before, in World War II, he was willing to give his life, and nearly did.

Mr. Kennedy was a good, courageous President. He was a good, courageous American. It is a tragedy that his career had thus to end with an assassin's bullet when he had so much more to give.

To President Lyndon Johnson we offer our fervent prayers in the momentous task that now lies ahead.

---

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent-Press-Telegram, Nov. 24, 1963]

### A MOMENT OF MADNESS

The vast majority of Americans are sane, law-abiding people who respect their President even when disagreeing with him. But the Nation has its maniacal moments. Such a moment transpired Friday as President John F. Kennedy rode through the streets of Dallas enjoying the friendly and respectful greetings of sane, law-abiding Texans. The gun of the exceptional maniac poked through a window and swerved history in its course.

A man has been arrested and charged with the murder. It is not surprising that the suspect has been associated with the fanatical activities of the extreme left, and it would not have been surprising if he had proven to be a member of the fanatical far right. Extremes of all kinds are capable of inciting weak-minded or emotionally unstable men to acts of hatred and violence.

Now that the consequences of extremism and hate have been so stunningly demonstrated, we urge those Americans who are captives of extremist groups and causes to search their minds and hearts.

It is too early and the moment too full of stress for an objective and fair judgment of the place of John F. Kennedy in history. But certainly he was one of the most intelligent, fair-minded, and friendly men ever to hold the office of President. He had a thorough knowledge and firm grasp of the facts and problems of government. He bore criticism, of which there is always more than enough for every President, with equanimity. Despite great physical discomfort, he served devotedly. He was the President, and considering all the implications of that statement, there is no need to say more.

At the time of his death, Mr. Kennedy was deeply concerned with the issue of equal rights under the Constitution for all Americans. While at this time there appears no indication that the civil rights issue was in any way related to his assassination, his dedication to this cause and the work and leadership he had given to it will surely be a factor in the ultimate achievement of the honorable goals he sought. It is an important part of his legacy to a grateful country.

Of Mrs. John Kennedy it must be said that with the death of a husband following close upon the death of a child, she has had more grief in a few short months than any woman should be required to bear. The sympathies of the Nation are with her.

Meanwhile, as the Nation recovers from its shock and goes on with the business of living, Americans can be grateful for the stability and continuity of government which their system provides. Two hours after Mr. Kennedy had slumped in his car, dead of an assassin's bullet, a new President was receiving the oath of office and pledges of bipartisan support. Government goes on; a President has died, but the Presidency and constitutional government survive.

Eyes turn now to the future. Fortunately, the new President has had extensive and practical experience in American Government. As a former Representative, Senator, and Vice President, Lyndon Johnson comes to the office with above-average credentials. He knows Washington, its officials and its processes, as well as any man and better than most.

Even so, the new President will need the aid and good will of all Americans as he adjusts himself to the responsibilities and routines of his new and awesome office. Both in memory of the fallen President and in consideration for the new one, let there be a decent period without the raucous and distracting noise of partisan politics. And in our hour of sorrow and change, let us show to the world a countenance of dignity, calm, unity, and strength—which is, despite that maniacal moment in Dallas, the true countenance of America.

---

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Monitor, Nov. 29, 1963]

### TO A PRESIDENT'S SON

Last Monday, young John, you saluted your father on the way to his burial.

It was your third birthday and you could not understand. But you did well to salute him. And someday you will understand why.

Someday you will understand that God gave to your father all the qualities that other men admire.

Your father had exceptional intelligence. We marveled at his grasp of facts and his clarity of expression.

He seemed to have a natural compassion for all people. It just wasn't in him to be small in dealing with others. He was the kind of man who would have had compassion even for his assassin.

Though he was rich he was one of us.

Though he had every reason to, he never took himself too seriously.

He was young, and our civilization puts great store on youth.

God had given him handsome features and an attractive personality.

He was a man of straighforward religious faith. He attended Mass as easily and unaffectedly as he did everything.

He was apparently the kind of father all fathers want to be—loving you and your sister and loved by you.

More than anyone else in our memory your father seemed to have all the qualities we expect in a hero.

And with it all he had a humility which enhanced everything else.

To all appearances God had been unbelievably generous to your father. But to whom much is given, much is asked.

A man like this doesn't just happen. He is forged out of suffering and sacrifice.

God had asked him to carry many crosses. He had suffered the loss of a brother and a sister in the prime of life. He had seen another sister burdened with a serious affliction. He had been called to endure heroic hardship in a World War. In illness he had come so close to death he was anointed. As a father he had suffered the loss of your brother Patrick.

In his chosen profession he had assumed a job at a time in history when the burdens were enough to break the back of any man.

Though he served in an arena where deeds are sometimes sordid and principles ignored, this was a man demanded by his times.

Like you will be in a few years, young John, the world today is awkward. It is an adolescent asked to grow up faster than it can. It needed a leader with intelligence far above the average; it needed a youth to keep up with the jet-speed times; and most of all it needed someone with stability to temper the wild currents that are sweeping across the world and the passions inflaming the hearts of men.

He helped us in bewildering times.

You do not understand any of this now. But may you salute your father all through your life. May you do more than that.

Please God, may you resemble him.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, John F. Kennedy, our friend, our colleague, and our President, has passed into history. His image need no longer be veiled or shrouded by the mists of partisanship or contention.

He was a man ideally equipped by nature and by training for the leadership of this Nation and of the free world in its crisis of survival.

He was born to wealth. He could have spent his days in idle pleasure and luxury or in the pursuit of some worthy but pleasant endeavor. Instead he chose the most difficult, the most demanding and the most burdensome of all careers—the path which led him to the Presidency of the United States and to that unforgettable November afternoon in Dallas.

From an early age he dedicated his life to the service of his country.

He was a complex man with enormous talents and capacities which he organized and developed through a tremendous exercise of self-discipline.

There was a marvelous balance and proportion in John Kennedy that was not a product of our age but rather the result of a supreme lifetime effort to develop the qualities necessary to rise to the problems of our age.

He was thoughtful and reflective, yet he was a man of decision and action. He had great confidence and self-assurance, but there was nothing of conceit or arrogance in him. He was serious and solemn, yet he possessed a deep and rich vein of humor, which always flickered just beneath the surface and occasionally came into view, lighting up his face and warming all around him.

He was always in the center of action, yet he had the capacity to look at himself objectively and dispassionately as though from a distance.

He was a man of strong convictions, one who threw almost superhuman effort and commitment into the struggle to have his convictions prevail; but he was never intolerant of the views of others, never dogmatic, always modest in victory and philosophic in defeat. He demanded excellence of himself and made vast sacrifices to achieve it, yet he had a limitless compassion for the shortcomings of others.

He was a blend of the idealist and the pragmatist—idealistic in the goals he set for American society, but eminently practical in his efforts to achieve those goals.

He could meet almost any man on his own level. He was scholar and athlete, soldier and writer, hero and intellectual, statesman and politician, a family man and a solitary man. Few American hearts were so narrow or hardened that John Kennedy could not join them on some common ground.

He had a fierce love of country which manifested itself not in hollow diatribes but in a total commitment of mind, spirit and body to the high purpose of making our Nation strong and secure and of making our society conform more closely to our ancient national ideals.

It is a profound tragedy to see this beloved man, this friendly man, this husband, this father, brutally cut down in the flower of his life.

It is a deeper tragedy to see a great life, a unique life, destroyed, wantonly and senselessly, in the midst of vast achievements, and on the threshold of a great design for human betterment to which he had consciously dedicated and disciplined his life.

The depth of our loss can be measured in some small way by the outpouring of emotion which plunged this Nation and most of the world into grief. What cannot be measured is the full meaning of this tragedy for our country and for the causes we uphold in the world.

For in John F. Kennedy as President there was a singular joining of the man and the office. He had the intellect to perceive coolly and clearly the problems of the Nation; the ingenuity to evolve solutions to those problems; the energy to press those solutions to a conclusion; the outward charm to win the hearts of people everywhere and the inner strength to win the respect of leaders of men.

He had 3 years of experience in the most powerful and demanding position on earth. He had mastered the job. He had the confidence of the people, the allegiance of our friends, the respect of our foes. On his shoulders rested the hope of freemen everywhere.

All this—laid in the dust by the bullets of a deranged assassin. The deeper tragedy, then, is the loss to our country and to the world. Every man, woman and child is wounded and harmed by this dreadful act.

The supreme irony of it all is that a John F. Kennedy should be slain by a Lee Harvey Oswald, for no man devoted more effort, more thought, and more care to the afflictions of the Oswalds of the world than John F. Kennedy.

Oswald was a twisted and pathetic product of the worst aspects of American life. He was the product of a broken home and a rootless life; impoverished, mentally disturbed, emotionally unstable, rejected in every phase of life, neglected by society, scorned by his fellow students and fellow workers and fellow soldiers. There were several occasions when he violently forced himself upon the attention of our various institutions.

He was not helped when he could have been helped. He was not curbed when he should have been curbed. He was allowed to sink deeper and deeper into progressive stages of rebellion and violence and finally was given free access to instruments of murder with which he killed the President of the United States.

Who has given so much attention and effort to the problems of which Oswald is representative than our fallen President? It was he who struggled ceaselessly to meet the legitimate needs of the unfortunate and the despairing—the under privileged, the fatherless children, the juvenile delinquents, the mentally ill, the economically impoverished, the unemployed, the untrained, the unfit.

It was President Kennedy who struggled with limitless devotion and ceaseless energy to create a new American society in which there was a place for everyone, an education for everyone, a future for everyone, a job for everyone, and equal opportunity for everyone, a society in which there was adequate medical care for the sick and mental care for the afflicted.

From all sides and from all places there are reports of monuments being raised in memory of President Kennedy. It is appropriate that this should be so.

Let memorials be raised in all corners of this land which he loved so well and which loved him in return.

But I suggest that it is in pushing forward these great causes to which he devoted his life that we can best pay tribute to our fallen leader.

In the midst of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said something that I think expresses a thought in all of our hearts today. He was grieving over the loss of his beloved friend and ally Congressman Owen Lovejoy of Illinois. He was asked what he thought of a proposal to raise a statue in memory of his friend. Lincoln replied, "Let him have the marble monument, along with the well-assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who loved liberty, unselfishly, for all men."

It is in the hearts of the American people and grieving millions throughout the world that the truest memorial to John F. Kennedy resides.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the many words of praise, sympathy, and rededication that are spoken today in memory of our late President can in no way lessen the tragic loss that this Nation and the world have suffered.

This is only one of the many ways in which we in the Senate can express our deep sense of loss for a man who rose from among us to become President of the United States. John F. Kennedy had the unique quality which compelled men to follow him, to listen to him, and to help him carry the awesome burden of the Presidency. He possessed the rare insight into human affairs that makes a man want to serve his fellow men in any way he can and devote his very life to that service.

We knew him in the Senate as a young man of exceptional ability and great desire, and we knew him in the Presidency as a young man of vision and determination, and we know him in death as a man who left his great dream that freedom and justice would be the destiny of all men and all nations, for the fulfillment of those who knew him and will always remember him. We will not forget, nor will we shy from the task before us. We will carry on, for such is the way of all men who love freedom.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is not easy for any of us to speak in tribute to John F. Kennedy without revealing the sharp anguish which time has not dulled. The national consciousness is heavy with fatigue from sustained and genuine grief. "Just like losing a member of the family" one heard people say and, indeed, a great loss it was to the family of man.

Even as the Kennedy family drew together for comfort and support, so each of us have felt a greater bond with one another—a bond formed of common sorrow. In that time, little more than 2 weeks ago when we could not yet comprehend the tragedy, each man somehow seemed a bit more valuable—a bit more worthy of our respect and tolerance. It was as though in his death the message of reason, tolerance, and peace, so much the essence of him, was again proclaimed. Death, the ultimate mystery, always turns men to introspection, but so much more when we grieve for one who was so much to all of us, both in person and philosophy.

John Kennedy was a political man to whom ideas were the stuff of life—to be sifted, analyzed, and refined with the scholar's precision of thought, the historian's perspective, but finally the politician's view toward accomplishment.

And he was a public man who gave himself to the public's business with zeal and enthusiasm. There was no question of his desire to assume the burdens of the Nation's highest responsibility. He sought the Presidency purposely and devoted himself eagerly to the tasks of Government.

He came to authority in a difficult and perplexing age, filled at once with the possibility of total destruction and prospects for the ultimate conquest of the age-old human enemies—poverty, disease, and hunger. He sensed these challenges and with his great faculty for communication he sought to communicate them to his Nation and to the world. The frontispiece of his book, "The Strategy of Peace," carries this quote from Lincoln:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves.

It is not by chance that John Kennedy would choose these words as a preface to this collection of his thoughts on the Nations' problems—present and future. As Lincoln, he saw the newness of his time and the need for new thoughts, new questions, and new solutions.

He was an activist. The Presidency was to him a positive force in our Government and in our society and he set about to be President. Many of his chosen tasks are yet undone and many will never be fully concluded, but true to his inaugural address he began.

He set out to conclude the association of the Western democracies perceiving that strength lies in unity and seeking to achieve it through closer political, commercial, and cultural ties with our European allies. It will be left to others to conduct the trade negotiations and the political conferences aimed at this objective, but those who do will be equipped with tools he forged. Many frustrations beset him in this effort, but he persisted as we must persist to work for closer unity of the free world.

With our own Nation on the threshold of maturity he reminded us of our responsibilities to the emerging nations of the world in Africa, Asia, and especially Latin America. Many of our policies will long bear his mark. Each new Peace Corps teacher and Alliance for Progress project will be his memorial.

Above all, he forced our Nation and the world to examine the precarious position of civilization confronted with the awesome power of modern nuclear weapons and the seemingly insoluble ideological divisions which threaten to trigger them. Walter Lippmann said it well in his column of December 3:

> He achieved one thing brilliantly, which is changing the course of events, and that has been to convince the Soviet Union that it must perforce and that it can comfortably and honorably live within a balance of power which is decidedly in our favor. For that John F. Kennedy will long be remembered.

The nuclear test ban treaty—the historic "first step" with the Soviet Union—was his treaty. He fostered and championed it. While treaties have not the permanence of marble, the spirit of this one is the spirit of John Kennedy and humanity is indebted to him for it.

His quest for a peaceful world won the affection of men of good will everywhere. Particularly do those who share our Western heritage grieve for him. At the conclusion of my remarks I will ask unanimous consent to have a resolution of the British House of Commons commemorating his passing printed in the RECORD.

He was a completely reasonable and human man whose concern for people lay at the root of his efforts to create a better life for all Americans. His legislative proposals centered on people—their economic, social, and political welfare. We should be every grateful that from our society arise such men whose own security makes more acute their consciousness of the insecurity of others. He was endowed with this great concern and the people of America loved him for it with a love not yet come to full fruition. We do not expect young men to die and we do not expect Presidents to die at all. The editor of a weekly paper in Arkansas sensed this mood well. Tom Dearmore wrote in the Baxter Bulletin:

> The shock has been so great partially because the President of the United States is a great embodiment. In his person he is a symbol of the will of the people. But there was more than that in this anguish the Nation has undergone. In his death the people have found Mr. Kennedy. Many never really knew him until they lost him.

When the history of our time is written it will be recorded that in his election and service our democracy reached a new maturity. His election—as our first President who was a Roman Catholic—evidenced a calming of the religious intolerance which has been too much a part of our history. His funeral—as though to complete the effort—brought millions through television into the church which he claimed and for which he was criticized.

And yet other prejudices plagued him. The fruition of our Nation's melancholy history of race relations fell on his shoulders. One could sense the great sorrow this caused him and one must respect the great courage he displayed in meeting this domestic crisis. His courage was manifested, in part, by his refusal to vilify the South for what is truly a national problem.

In fact, one sensed that he had a special affection for the South and its problems. Only 2 months ago he spoke in my State of the new South and concluded by saying:

> This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly, those of you who are young, I think, can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what we are building in this country today.

It is our tragic loss that he will not see this dream fulfilled, as fulfilled it must and will be.

He was a young man and youth responded to him. The student paper at the University of Arkansas said:

> And youth identified themselves with him. They admired him, because they understood his haste and boldness. They criticized him because they felt they were his peers, entitled to judge one of their own. And all the while, they respected him, because they saw in him a leader who belonged to them, maybe even more than to the others.

Now the weight of responsibility has been lifted from him and others are left to do the tasks he so eagerly and conscientiously set out to do. It is our gain to have known him, the country's gain to have had him lead us for awhile, and humanity's gain that such a fine and decent man should have passed through our midst.

Our prayers have been and will be with his family and his successor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the House of Commons, the editorial from the Arkansas Traveler, and a variety of other communications which were addressed primarily to the Senate but which came to me through the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, from many respected leaders of the world, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, editorial, and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963—COPY OF MANUSCRIPT AMENDMENT TO BE MOVED BY A MINISTER OF THE CROWN (PRINTED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF MR. SPEAKER)

Assassination of President Kennedy: That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty praying Her Majesty to be graciously pleased to express to the President of the United States of America the shock and deep sorrow with which this House has learned of the death of President Kennedy; and to convey their sense of the loss which this country and the Commonwealth have sustained, and their profound sympathy with Mrs. Kennedy and the family of the late President, and with the Government and people of the United States of America.

---

[From the Arkansas Traveler, Nov. 26, 1963]

### A UNIVERSITY REACTS

The university campus was still Friday afternoon. People whispered as they walked into 1 o'clock classes. Some teachers lectured jerkily, briefly. Others dismissed classes filled with tension. Groups of people crowded silently around those with radios, waiting to know for certain. When the short announcement came, "John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, is dead," people turned without speaking and slowly drifted away. This was the university's first reaction to the news. It was one of disbelief, then of revulsion. "No it's not true. It couldn't happen in our civilized society." Then came the realization of the baseness of such an action, the animallike violence which shepherded one human thing into taking another's life.

As the weekend went on and the primary murder suspect was caught then killed before a confession was obtained, horror and insensibility seemed to pile on one another. The sequences of events took on a thicker coat of unreality. The consequences of these events, the succession of a new President, are so widespread, so infinite they have not been grasped. The death of this dynamic brilliant man has not really been accepted, cannot be understood.

Perhaps the young will have the hardest time making any sense of this weekend. The youth never really sees death in relation to himself. How can he with a whole life of desires and plans before him? He must concentrate on fulfilling these plans; he must have done with the bothersome blocks in his way. He never dreams he might suddenly be stopped in the middle of fulfilling his goal. Yet, today the sense of death is brought home to him.

John F. Kennedy was a young man, at 46, the youngest to ever hold the office of President of this equally young Nation. He was like a character from a romantic novel. He had a brilliant mind; he had a dynamic warm personality; he had a true sincerity in his beliefs, and most symbolic of his youth, he had an indomitable will. Will these qualities he attained in less than one term a greatness matched by only a handful of his predecessors. He led his people strongly and surely in an unbalanced world. He led them quickly with the haste of his youth.

And youth identified themselves with him. They admired him, because they understood his haste and boldness. They criticized him, because they felt they were his peers, entitled to judge one of their own. And all the while, they respected him, because they saw in him a leader who belonged to them, maybe even more than to the others.

---

DER PRÄSIDENT DES NATIONALRATES,
*November 28, 1963.*

HON. PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The National Council of the Republic of Austria has mentioned by a manifestation of mourning held on November 26, 1963, the bereavement the United States of America and their friendly nations had to suffer by the death of the honorable President, John F. Kennedy.

I have the honor to enclose the text of the speech I addressed to the National Council on this occasion. At the same time I beg you, dear Mr. President, and the Members of the Senate to present my personal condolences as well as those of the Austrian parliamentary representation on this tragical event.

With the assurance of my highest esteem I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED MALETA,
*Director, Parliament of Austria, Vienna, Austria.*

---

NOVEMBER 28, 1963.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Meeting today, for the first time since the staggering events of Dallas, the Foreign Affairs Committee, before beginning its session, said a few words in homage to the memory of President Kennedy.

Its members have unanimously charged me with transmitting to you their expression of deep condolences and to inform you of the hopes which they felt with the speech of President Johnson who assumes these highest duties in the most tragic circumstances.

In reaffirming to you the personal expression of my emotion and of my sadness, please accept my warmest wishes.

MAURICE SCHUMANN,
*President, Foreign Affairs Commission, National Assembly, Republic of France.*

---

TEHERAN, *November 23, 1963.*

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*President of the American Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Deeply distressed by learning the tragic news of the death of the President John F. Kennedy. With profound sympathy I extend to you and to your colleagues of the Senate on my own behalf and on behalf of all my colleagues the Iranian Senators our sincerest condolences in this deeply painful circumstance through which the American Nation and the whole world suffer the loss of a highly distinguished and peace-loving personality of the modern history.

DJAAFAR CHARIF-EMAMI,
*President of the Senate.*

---

CANBERRA, *November 23, 1963.*

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D.C.:*

Profoundly shocked to hear of tragic death of President Kennedy. Please accept the deepest sympathy of all Members of the Australian Senate in the great loss your country has sustained.

A. M. MCMULLIN,
*President of the Australian Senate.*

---

OSLO, *November 23, 1963.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*The Capitol,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

The Norwegian Storting wishes to express to the Senate of the United States its profound sympathy with the people of the United States in their grief over the death of President Kennedy.

NILS LANGHELLE,
*President of the Storting.*

---

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM,
*November 23, 1963.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*Washington, D.C.:*

The Dallas crime has plunged the entire people of Belgium into mourning and consternation. They are deeply touched and indignant at the tragic death of the great American President, whose eminent role in critical moments of the world's history and whose firm determination that peace in justice and honor should prevail they will never forget. Belgium recalls with gratitude the loyal friendship of the late President. It is with deep emotion that the Chamber of Representatives of Belgium conveys the feeling of the Belgian people and sends to the Representatives of the American Nation its heartfelt sympathy and sincere condolences.

A. VAN ACKER,
*President of the Chamber of Deputies of Belgium.*

---

WARSZAWA,
*November 23, 1963.*

Senator CARL HAYDEN,
*President pro tempore of the Senate,*
*Capitol Hill,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Profoundly shaken with the horrifying news of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, distinguished statesman. I am sending you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Sejm of the Polish Peoples Republic and in my own name expressions of the most sincere sympathy. President John F. Kennedy enjoyed admiration for his efforts aiming at the consolidation of peace and promoting of international cooperation. In the person of President John F. Kennedy the American Nation has lost its eminent leader who also displayed concern in the development of the friendly American-Polish relations.

CZESLAW WYCECH,
*President of the Sejm of the Polish Peoples Republic.*

---

BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA,
*November 22, 1963.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
OF THE UNTED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Washington, D.C.:*

In the name of the Argentine Senate and in my own name I express to you the deep feeling of regret caused by the death of the illustrious President of your Nation, John F. Kennedy, whose death has so closely affected the free citizens of the world who shared the ideals of peace and brotherhood among men.

CARLOS H. PERETTE,
*President of the Senate of the Argentine Nation.*

CLAUDIO A. MAFFI, *Secretary.*

---

TOKYO,
*November 28, 1963.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Deep condolence for late President.

KANESHICHI MASUDA,
*Japanese Diet.*

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*November 22, 1963.*

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
*Washington, D.C.:*

I wish to express my condolences and sympathy on the tragic occasion of the death of President Kennedy.

ALI BENGELLOUN,
*Ambassador of Morocco.*

---

It is with profound sorrow that we have been informed of the tragic loss of President Kennedy. The entire world, in addition to the American Nation, mourns for the loss of the greatest protector of its ideals, a man who had devoted his very life to defend world peace and the prosperity and happiness of peoples.

On behalf of the Senate of the Turkish Republic and in my own behalf, I wish to extend to you, Mr. President, and to the Members of the Senate of the United States, our deep feelings of sympathy and our condolences.

ENVER AKA,
*President of the Senate of the Turkish Republic.*

---

BRITISH-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP,
*London, November 27, 1963.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senator from Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate Wing of the Capitol, Washington, D.C., United States of America.*

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: The Executive Committee of the British-American Parliamentary Group at their meeting held yesterday (November 26) in Westminster Hall, Houses of Parliament, unanimously passed the following resolution which it was directed should be sent to you, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and to Dr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, Member of Congress, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, namely:

"The British-American Parliamentary Group offer to their congressional colleagues their deepest sympathy on the tragic and untimely death of President Kennedy whose work for those high ideals, common to our two assemblies, they so greatly appreciated and respected. We share in the great sense of loss which has been felt throughout the world."

With kindest regard.

Yours sincerely,

Sir HOWARD D'EGVILLE,
*Hon. Secretary.*

---

COLOMBO,
*December 4, 1963.*

PRESIDENT, SENATE,
*Washington, D.C.:*

The Senate of Ceylon has nemine dissetiente resolved as follows begins this house desires to convey to the President and Members of the Senate of the United States of America an expression of the deep sorrow with which this house has learned of the assassination of the President of the United States, the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to express their sympathy with his family and with the Government and people of the United States.

THOS. AMARASURIYA,
*President.*

---

ROME.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D.C.:*

The death of President Kennedy is an irreparable loss not only to the United States, but to the entire community of peoples, for in him they had a most vigorous defender of the ideals of liberty and peace and of social justice in the world. His work will remain as a milestone on civilization's road and from it and our affectionate memory of him, man will in years to come obtain inspiration and instruction on the way to achieve progress and on the exaltation of the values so constantly affirmed by him. The Senate of the Republic of Italy, which remembers with emotion his recent visit to Italy, unanimously joints in the grief of the noble American Nation our friend, and shares the loss it has suffered today, which has deprived it in such a tragic manner of its first citizen.

CESARE MARZAGORA,
*President of the Senate of Italy.*

---

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D.C.:*

In the name of the Peruvian Senate and in my own name, I convey to you our expressions of profound sadness and sincere condolences of the irreparable loss of the illustrious President Kennedy, and at the same time, our condemnation of this atrocious crime. World democracy loses an outstanding champion, the United States an esteemed leader, and Latin America a loyal friend. We convey our deepest sympathy to you and to the Senate of the United States.

JULIO DE LA PIEDRA,
*President of the Senate.*

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, we meet here today as desolate men and women who have come together to eulogize a fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

We would extoll his many virtues in the language of the gods, had we but that gift, but as T. S. Eliot once wrote:

> Words strain—crack and sometimes break under the burden—under the tension, slip, slide, perish, decay with imprecision.

We stand here bewildered in the darkness of a grotesque nightmare, the shadows illuminated only by the flickering of an eternal flame on the hills of Arlington. Yet in the infinite quality of that flame lies the legacy passed on to us by a young man who had so much more to give. Thank God that he was able to give enough.

More than anything else, John F. Kennedy taught us to be men of resolution, but also men of reason. This, he told us, is the way to world peace. He could leave no greater gift to all mankind.

John F. Kennedy rekindled within us a burning sense of our national mission, reminding us that we hold within our hands the future of the entire free world.

In his insistence that civil rights be extended to all, he mandated us to be not a nation of words—but a nation of deeds.

Here was a man, a product of our Nation's finest schools of learning; a man whose character was forged in the fire and destruction of a great World War.

When he ascended to our Nation's highest office, an entire generation was on trial. There were grave doubts in the minds of many of our people that this young man—and his generation—would be equal to the task.

We now know that the man—and his generation—met the acid test of history in a grave national crisis. But for this man, we might not exist as a nation today.

I would like to close with a few words of Vachel Lindsay:

> Sleep on, O brave hearted, O wise man that kindled the flame. To live in mankind, is far more than to live in a name, to live in mankind, far, far more * * * than to live in a name.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the date of November 22 and the national tragedy caused by the wanton and senseless act of an assassin has been seared into our memories as individuals and as a nation. On that day we lost a great leader. Many of us standing in this Chamber lost a good friend.

In the days since President Kennedy's death we have emerged from the initial shock of disbelief. As a nation we have roused ourselves from the numbness of despair to a sense of resolution under a new President. In the depths of our grief we were sustained by the memory of a man of wisdom, wit, heart, and grace. We achieved new dignity as a nation through the inspiration of the President's widow, his children, and his family. We have been challenged by President Johnson to take up our tasks in the spirit of President Kennedy.

Today we pause in the course of our work to eulogize our fallen leader. For me this brings a flood of memories—of a young Senator speaking out courageously for a free Algeria—of a bright and forceful presidential candidate inspiring a crowd in a cold and snowy Maine park in the early hours of a November morning—of a new President issuing a challenge and a call to the Nation and the world on his inauguration—of a warm friend reading poetry and musing on the place of America in history as we sailed off the coast of Maine—of a thoughtful President wrestling with issues which had concerned him as a Senator and now confronted him in the new context of the Presidency—of a seasoned and vigorous world leader talking of peace and wisdom and understanding at a gathering of Maine citizens at the University of Maine less than 2 months ago—and, finally, of a man whose responsibilities encircled the globe, yet whose interests involved the needs of each State in the Union and the rights of each citizen, whatever his race, creed, or color, or economic status.

We of Maine are grateful for those golden years which John F. Kennedy gave us. They were not easy years, but they carried, with them the light of promise. President Kennedy, the man, can do no more on the unfinished tasks he set for himself and the Nation. The legacy and the promise of President Kennedy rests with us.

As Norman Cousins has written:

> The ultimate tragedy of a man is represented not by death but by the things he tried to bring to life that are buried with him. The legacy of John Kennedy can be a large one—if that is the way the American people wish it to be.

We, the people, will determine whether the spirit of John F. Kennedy lives or dies; we, the people, will determine whether the eternal flame which burns on a Virginia hillside is the symbol of continuing hope or a shattered dream; we the people, must decide.

Mr. President, many tributes have been paid to President Kennedy. As an indication of the respect and affection in which he was held in Maine, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time a group of statements and editorials which have been printed in Maine, including three of my own comments to the citizens of Maine.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE UPON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY—FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

It is difficult to adjust to the shock of the news. It is impossible to comprehend the motives of one who would do this to his country. We have lost a great leader. I have lost a good friend. If I were to suggest what President Kennedy would say, if he were here, it would be: "This is a time to pray for our country." We must be restrained in our reactions; we must stand together—and, I repeat, pray for our country.

---

### REPORT TO MAINE FROM SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Hatred and virulence reached a tragic climax in Dallas, Tex., last week. As I said upon learning of the President's death: "It is difficult to adjust to the shock of the news. It is impossible to comprehend the motives of one who would do this to his country. We have lost a great leader. I have lost a good friend. If I were to suggest what President Kennedy would say, if he were here, it would be: 'This is a time to pray for our country.' We must be restrained in our reactions; we must stand together—and, I repeat, pray for our country."

As Americans, we mourn the loss of a great President, cut down in his prime. As individuals, our hearts go out to the Kennedy family. In the space of a few short months, Mrs. Kennedy lost a son and a husband. May God grant her the physical and spiritual resources she must need to persevere in the face of this tragedy. May God care for her two children.

Deep as may be our grief, we must immediately reaffirm our faith in our system of government, designed to preserve continuity even in the face of such trying circumstances. Our Republic—although its head may now be bowed in shame that this could happen here—will survive. America will continue to grow and prosper. Freedom will be maintained. However disastrous, this one insane act cannot stem the tide of freedom. I am confident that Americans of all political persuasion will unite behind President Johnson to complete the unfinished business which President Kennedy so capably and so eloquently set before us.

We, in Maine, will long remember his moving plea for peace and understanding, expressed in his address at the University of Maine on October 19.

He was a man of dignity; yet he was humble. He was a man of great intellect; yet he spoke in simple terms. He was born to great wealth; yet his great concern was for the poor, the oppressed. John F. Kennedy's place in history is secure, but all mankind is immeasurably poorer without him.

---

### LETTER TO MAINE FROM SENATOR ED MUSKIE

DECEMBER 11, 1963.

DEAR FRIENDS: None of us will ever forget the 22d day of this past November, or the sad days of deepening, yet unbelieving, awareness that followed.

The memories, though shared with hundreds of millions around the globe, will always be as personal as the tears which stung our eyes and the ache which filled our hearts.

We will remember a President who loved our country deeply, not only for what it has been and is, but also because he believed that it is America's destiny to point the way to a better world for all mankind.

We will remember a leader who dared to lead us where his understanding and his convictions told him we must go.

We will remember the voice of a man who found unforgettable words to remind us of our heritage, to express our hopes, and to summon us to the great unfinished work which is ours to do.

We will remember a warm-hearted friend whose love of home and family were symbolic of his devotion to all those who labored to serve.

We will remember him as one who loved life and lived it fully, welcoming the challenges of the Presidency and thriving on its burdens, stimulated by the wide-ranging interests of a thoroughly civilized man, appealing in the simplicity of his tastes and his clear-eyed faith in the essential goodness of his fellow man.

He believed in us and in our capacity as a people to help build a world where compassion, understanding, and reason will rule.

We will never forget him.

As we remember him, we should bear in mind these words of Norman Cousins "The ultimate tragedy of a man is represented not by death but by the things he tried to bring to life that are buried with him. The legacy of John Kennedy can be a large one—if that is the way the American people wish it to be."

Sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

---

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT ASSASSINATED

An assassin's bullets have destroyed the life of the President of the United States, and changed the course of history.

The rifle shots which rang out as the official motorcade rode through the streets of Dallas, Tex., wrote a violent end to the career of President John F. Kennedy and plunged the Nation and the world into mourning.

In the few brief moments of the terrifying sound of gunfire, the President and the Governor of Texas lay wounded. America's First Lady had flung herself in front of her husband in a brave but vain attempt to shield him from the bullets which already had found their mark.

President Kennedy was in Texas as part of an effort to strengthen the Democratic Party there. He had spoken out against factionalism and strife within his party. He did not foresee that a fanatical assassin would take matters into his own hands to strike a blow against life itself. Even the extraordinary precautions always taken to protect a President were not enough.

Violence is common to the politics of many countries. It is unusual and all the more shocking in the United States. That there were hotbeds of extremism in the West and Southwest has been a matter of common knowledge. That it would kindle the awful flames of assassination was unexpected.

The President's assassination cut short his brilliant career at its very height. He was in the preliminary stages of a campaign for another 4-year term, although he had made no official announcement of his candidacy. His visit to Texas, like the tours into other parts of the country, including the recent trip to the University of Maine, formed part of that background campaign.

Every American, regardless of party, has suffered a personal loss. America has lost an outstanding leader whose brave program for a peaceful world was the hope of all mankind.

There are no words to soothe the pain of his grief-stricken wife and family. But an America in mourning strives to share that great sorrow.

---

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE PRESIDENT PASSES

Telephones jangled in every newspaper office in the land Friday—as anxious Americans sought to learn: "Is it true, what they say about the President?"

This is A.D. 1963, a supposedly civilized era.

Yet civilization's veneer is thin indeed. Friday's tragedy in Dallas brings America up short, in the realization that—for all our devotion to the rule of law, there still are mad dogs among us who obey only the law of the jungle.

It takes a brave man to be President of the United States. President Truman's temporary Washington residence, Blair House, was shot up by a handful of fanatics and Mr. Truman himself had a narrow escape. A shot fired at Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 killed Mayor Anton Czermak of Chicago. Theodore Roosevelt was wounded by a would-be assassin. President James Garfield was mortally wounded by gunshot. President William McKinley was killed. Abraham Lincoln lost his life to an assassin's bullet.

Yet in this day and age, many Americans had hopefully assumed that civilization had advanced to a point at which law and reason—at least in this great country—had everywhere superseded outlawry, or the taking of law into one's own hands. The assumption was premature. Anyone who reads the grim daily grist of crime news from one end of America to the other should understand how utterly uncivilized a large segment of the population still is.

The terrible news from Dallas should move every good American not only to demand a restoration of law and order everywhere in this country, but also to take direct, personal responsibility—at every opportunity—to support and assist all law enforcement agencies.

John F. Kennedy served his country courageously and to the best of his ability throughout his tragically short term of office. His sudden passing shocks and saddens all America.

And—politics or no politics—all America knows today that John F. Kennedy laid down his life for his country.

---

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, Nov. 23, 1963]

### MAINE GRIEVES FOR A NEIGHBOR

It was 100 years ago that a gaunt President of the United States was shot in the back by an assassin.

He was President of a country torn by a civil war whose guns had only recently been stilled.

There is no evidence that President Kennedy's life was taken by a racist, but the tensions in the land today bear a frightening parallel to those which beset Abraham Lincoln.

And overlaying the civil rights issue which again divides North and South is the constant threat of nuclear war posed by the ideological differences between the Communist world and the free world.

How clear is the parallel between the times of Lincoln and the times of Kennedy will be visible only through the perspective of history to be written in another generation.

But, dim though they now may be, the outlines are there.

And only in the pages of history yet to be written can there be an evaluation of President Kennedy's place among U.S. Presidents, even as Lincoln's place was determined only by time.

Few have faced more monumental tasks than did the young man from Massachusetts. He faced them with courage and with dedication to his principles. His fateful trip to Texas was taken to support those principles.

A man of wealth, he might well have chosen the easy life of a moneyed and cultured gentleman. He did not. He chose, rather, a career of service to the country which had given him and his family that wealth.

That career has now been ended by the useless act of an assassin. The nasal New England voice through which his quick, well-trained mind was articulated will be heard no longer.

Maine has special reasons for sadness. President Kennedy vacationed on our coast and only a few short weeks ago he was made on honorary alumnus of the University of Maine.

As a man of Massachusetts he has been, throughout most of his life, our close neighbor and during his career as a Senator from Massachusetts he personally met and impressed many Maine people through his visits.

Every American today mourns the death of his President. Every heart goes out to the family which must bear the most intimate of griefs. A President has been cut down in the prime of his life, but so also has a husband, a father and a son.

---

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE BLACKEST DAY

Today we, the American people, mourn the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. There are no words which can be written to describe adequately the depth of emotion we are feeling over the untimely, brutal, calculated murder of our youthful President.

His near 3 years as leader of our Nation were marked by severe international crises, domestic problems that featured racial bitterness in the South and in some of our larger cities and problems involving a Congress which did not always see eye to eye with him insofar as certain important legislative matters were concerned. Despite the complex and often irritating issues which faced President Kennedy these past 3 years, he maintained a basic good humor and a sense of purpose that made his political opponents like him as a man and admire him for his persistency.

The great warmth of the late President was exemplified many times during the course of his press conferences. Many Maine citizens had a recent opportunity to witness it upon his visitation to the University of Maine where he received an honorary degree. And most remembered of all, of course, were those pictures of John Kennedy which appeared in the press and on the television screen to show him the uninhibited, loving father and family man.

Friday, November 22, 1963, will go down in American history as one of the blackest days this Nation has ever faced. It definitely represents the most tragic single event since the surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor. It was a deed most obviously undertaken by one imbued with the stark, deadly hatred which moves only within those who have taken up the cause of the lunatic left or the radical right. The assassination of President Kennedy carries within it the curse of Cain as so often witnessed to by those who are extremists. May his death bring all who have veered over into paths of intolerance and hatred back to the reality demanded of all who have faith in God; back to a realization that intolerance and hatred solve nothing, and that only love of one's fellow man possesses the virtue to bring understanding.

There are no tears shed which can relieve us of a terrible sense of loneliness and lostness. There are no emotions sufficient to disclose the measure of our sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy, 6-year-old Caroline, and 3-year-old John. Only through our prayers and our faith may we hope to walk from the valley of shadow back into the light.

Today the world shares the bereavement of John Kennedy's family and friends. May the American people of the immediate tomorrow assure the end of any similar future tragedy by dedicating themselves to the sacred task of building and preserving peace for our time at home and abroad. Then and only then may the American people proclaim that the death of this dedicated American was not in vain.

---

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE GREATEST CASUALTY

Friday, November 22, 1963, was a sad and a critical day in the history of the Republic.

A century after a great President had laid down his life in the cause of racial equality another President appeared to have suffered the same fate.

It had not been determined at the time of this writing whether President Kennedy was shot by a fanatical segregationist. The point is that the war hero occupying the world's most powerful and one of its most uncomfortable positions of leadership, believed that the issues of the day called for militancy, whether it be the conflict with world communism abroad, or the struggle for civil rights at home.

A century ago the racial struggle divided the Nation and nearly brought about its extinction. President Lincoln saved the Republic, but in doing so he sacrificed his own life to the most despicable of all adversaries, an assassin.

President Kennedy realized, as many thoughtful observers have confirmed, that the Nation has been drifting perilously close to another internal explosion. He combated this drift in the two ways he knew best, as a battle-scarred soldier openly defying the forces of reaction, and as a skilled politician, carrying his case to the masses, scorning the safety of Secret Service cordons and bulletproof bubble tops.

He paid the supreme sacrifice proving his contention that every American must take risks to protect his rights and his freedoms.

He failed to provide answers available from no other President, living or dead—why does hate displace charity in our differences between fellow Americans, and why does our generosity abroad generate universal suspicion and dislike?

As he rocked in his chair to ease the pain of his wounds, President Kennedy knew there was no soft security and no solace beyond an appeal for men of good will to search resolutely and prayerfully for a common solution to their differences.

His brutal slaying focuses attention on a vacuum in leadership that will mean many sleepless nights for Americans until it is filled by a statesman equal to its fearful demands.

---

[From the Portland Evening Express, Nov. 23, 1963]

### AN INSTANT IN DALLAS

The United States is a nation in shock today.

Millions of Americans awoke this morning still at a loss to comprehend the events of yesterday; it remains all but impossible to accept the reality of that terrible moment in which was destroyed the life of the most popular President this country ever knew.

But reality it is; stark reality born in an instant of violence in the Texas city known as Dallas. John F. Kennedy, yesterday's President, is dead. Today's President is Lyndon B. Johnson, curiously enough a son of that State which will henceforth be remembered for this deed of infamy as much as for its claims to greatness.

The death of a President during his term of office brings a nation to its knees. The suddenness and malice in the violence of assassination compounds the tragedy. But it seems neither extravagant nor emotional to suggest that the death of no other President in our history, from whatever cause, could have caused so many Americans to feel so deep a sense of personal loss. No President ever has shared such an intimacy with his people as did John F. Kennedy.

The sympathy of the entire world goes out to Jacqueline Kennedy, widow, a lovely and charming lady who yesterday as the vivacious and elegant First Lady was the envy of all. That instant in Dallas has plunged her into bereavement in the most crushing event in what has been a year of great personal tragedy for her.

We pray now for Mr. Kennedy, for Jackie and Caroline and John, Junior, and all those who shared the family circle of the late President. We pray, too, for Lyndon B. Johnson, a man who thought the expenditure of thousands of dollars and months of energy could not win his way into the Presidency but who, through an instant of barbarism in his home State, is thrust into that high office. The best of those among us will pray also for the man who in madness or hate has so lost his sense of balance as to commit so foul a deed.

Mr. Kennedy's innate friendliness and the very qualities which have so endeared him to Americans and the peoples of nations he has visited, have often caused concern for his safety. At home and abroad he mingled and became caught up in crowds as none of his predecessors had done. In so doing he exposed himself to innumerable dangers.

There were those, we are told, who were apprehensive about his Texas tour because it has become an area known for its reactionaries and displays of extremism. In Dallas only a few short weeks ago Adlai E. Stevenson, Ambassador to the United Nations and once a presidential aspirant himself, was insulted and molested by extremists of the street.

But it was felt that any danger that might be attached to the Presidential visit would be at the airport. But it was not so. When the evil thing was done it was not when he was caught up in the embrace of a crowd but at a moment when he was thought to be relatively safe; at a moment when all the precautions and security in the world could not alter things.

The ideals and principles which Mr. Kennedy brought to his great office will not be lost with his passing. But foremost in our tributes to him should be a firm and steadfast resolve to bring this Nation back to its proper reliance on peaceful processes, to renounce street pressures and gutter tactics which reach their most despicable example in such demonstrations as that degrading and terrifying instant in Dallas. If we do only this Mr. Kennedy will not have died in vain.

We bow today in mourning but we must not bend in despair. The grief which has seized this Nation must not be coupled with fear. The United States is not, nor has it ever been, one man. It is with considerable difficulty that we strive for objectivity at such a moment, but we must cling to the certain knowledge that our country has not been left leaderless nor given into the hands of irresponsible individuals. The changes precipitated by that cruel and senseless instant in Dallas may be less than those occasioned by an election.

The Nation, so shaken now, will go on not weakened or uncertain, but strengthened, sustained, and rededicated by the service, sacrifice, and martyrdom of John F. Kennedy.

---

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A MADMAN SLAYS THE PRESIDENT, PLUNGING THE NATION INTO GRIEF

The most incredibly tragic news that can befall a country such as ours is the successful assassination of its Chief Executive.

And this is the news that all Americans still numbed by shock, are trying to grasp today.

The youthful, vigorous, personable John F. Kennedy who rode into Texas on Thursday, fell victim yesterday to the dread that haunts every President and his family and his associates—the madman's bullet.

Ever since the dawn of our Nation's history it has been fired for many reasons, or for no comprehensible reason at all. For every attempt made on a President's life, others are thwarted. We do not know, at this writing why the bullet was fired at Dallas. That is far less important, right now, than the stunning realization that the President is dead.

So the Nation grieves, regardless of party, regardless of religion, regardless of national origin, with Mrs. Kennedy, and his family and hers. Yet even as we mourn, we take confidence in the strength of the American system which has already installed his successor, Mr. Lyndon Johnson, until yesterday the Vice President and President of the U.S. Senate.

It is the very strength and stability of our system of executive succession that makes assassination so futile, at least in this day when political moderation is the rule and not the exception in American politics. Of course, there will be changes, but the Republic will go on.

That is for the future to bring. Today we mourn the death of the President of all the American people, struck down in the full flower of manhood, his potential unrealized, his ambitions for his people unfulfilled. It is a desolate day that finds words empty to convey the full tragedy that a single warped mind has heaped upon the Nation, and the world.

---

[From the Bangor Daily News, Nov. 23–24, 1963]

### THE NATION MOURNS

At one moment, a man alive, healthy and smiling; a man waving to well-wishers as he rides with his wife in broad daylight along the street of an American city.

The next moment, a man felled by a bullet; inert and dying in his wife's lap as stunned witnesses gasped in disbelief.

Thus did death come yesterday to John Fitzgerald Kennedy at the prime of his life and of his brilliant political career—a good man, a good American, dedicated to serving his country in war and in peace.

There was peace, in Dallas yesterday. Or there seemed to be. Oh yes, the President was in a State where political differences were flaring.

But when were there not political differences, when was a President not caught up in controversy? He might be heckled, the target of a critical wisecrack—but slain, shot down in cold blood in his native, civilized land?

Unbelievable.

But it has to be believed. It happened. Hate brooded in a twisted mind—brooded and planned, and then pulled the trigger of the assassin gun.

And so today, the Nation mourns the loss of a good man, a good American—a man who risked his life in battle but lost it, ironically, in peace. A man slain like another President almost 100 years ago—Abraham Lincoln—a martyr to the causes he championed.

The prayers of the Nation today are for the Kennedy family, especially Mrs. Kennedy, who has lost an infant son and her husband in less than 4 months' time.

---

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Nov. 24, 1963]

### PRESIDENT'S DEATH IS GRIEF MAGNIFIED

(By Len Cohen)

The death of a President is the shock and sorrow of bereavement magnified. It is not so intense to the average citizen as a death in his own family; but it is a broader kind of shock for it affects the whole country, the whole structure of society that gives people a sense of security in their government and in their nation.

Someone who had visited the White House several times and dined with President and Mrs. Kennedy said Friday, "I can't believe it"—a phrase that undoubtedly was repeated many times that day by those to whom the late President was a warm friend as well as a public personality.

Those who are no longer young remember, still with vividness, the feeling of disbelief, the sense of personal loss that flooded in on millions when Franklin D. Roosevelt died. There was more reason for that feeling then. Roosevelt had been President 12 years and he had become a father image to multitudes of citizens.

I remember, too, the sense of unreality that permeated the statehouse in Augusta only a few years ago when Governor Clinton Clauson died suddenly after only a year in office.

For the newsmen who were covering the statehouse then, there was the same stark quality about the long day when they waited for the new Governor, John H. Reed, to arrive and take the oath—the same, in a smaller way, that those on the scene in Dallas and Washington must have felt on Friday.

Together with the personal shock and the unreality, there was the whole human drama of a shift in power—the shattering of a power structure built up by one group, the falling of the scepter into new hands, eager to grasp it, despite the restraint imposed by grief and respect for the fallen Chief Executive.

And so today, my thoughts are carried back to the day when Governor Clauson's body lay in state in the hall of flags and citizens of Maine, great and small, filed by to publicly express their respect and their grief.

My thoughts go back further to those 2 days of mourning that were observed by the Nation when President Roosevelt died. All the stores in Portland were closed those 2 days; window displays gave way to floral arrangements, from modest wreaths to great basketfuls of flowers.

But if there was grief in the death of Roosevelt, who had worn out heart and brain in the great fights against depression and foreign enemies, there was a tragic loss in the killing of John Kennedy. For he was not the father image. He was the image of youth, of energy, of the young hero who would lead us not only against the foreign enemy but against the enemy within our own country in the form of prejudice and bigotry—in short, the enemy within ourselves.

For Maine people Kennedy held a special place. For he had come to Maine more than any President in modern times. I remember his first visit as a Senator, when he spoke to a Democratic dinner, at the end of a long evening, reading a speech perfunctorily, skipping pages to shorten it, maybe a little irked at the wearying speakers who preceded him.

I remember his coming back, to another party dinner in Augusta, as a candidate for the nomination, this time purposeful, incisive, bold, thoughtful.

He came back again, during the election campaign, radiating the confidence of the man who had won a hard fight for the nomination. He visited again in the summer of 1962, this time for a weekend of relaxation, adding little to the gradually building image of a young man of action tempered by thought. His testing in the crucibles of Oxford, Mississippi, and Cuba was still ahead. He came again, in full vigor, only last month to receive a degree at the University of Maine.

Now he will come no more, to Maine or any other earthly place. And the people mourn him, as they mourned another President who was cut down by an assassin's bullet almost 100 years ago.

We are never prepared for death. We shall always be shocked by the brutality of assassination. And so we move forward unwillingly into the future, like children entering a dark room.

[From the Portland Press Herald, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Freemen Everywhere Mourning Leader of Unrealized Potential

The Nation is still too close to the shocking tragedy enacted in Dallas on Friday to view very clearly what will happen at Washington, or in the 50 American States, or in the world at large, as the result of John F. Kennedy's murder, and the process that transfers Executive power to Lyndon B. Johnson.

Today everything but the country's heartbeat halts as we bury the martyred President. This is not a fit time to talk about politics, in the narrow meaning applied to partisan strife.

The primary task of any President is to execute the laws and take appropriate measures for national security. As the leader of a political party he is required to be a politician. As the Chief Executive of the United States, he is compelled to be a statesman. The late President John Kennedy excelled as a politician, in contrast with the personality of his predecessor. Whether he was a great statesman is too early to judge. Twenty years from now, or a half century hence, it may be possible, putting events of the 1960–63 period in correct perspective, to say that the man whose life was snuffed out 3 days ago was a great statesman as well. It may be discovered that while he made mistakes, and admitted them, he had an intuition for doing the right thing, based upon the information available at the time.

Unlike those who have no responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy in the interests of national survival, Presidents must take the long view of history, a duty rendered all the more urgent today because we must accommodate ourselves to living with other nations in the nuclear age. The Kennedy policies were built around retention and improvement of an immensely powerful military force, economic and military alliances with other free nations, programs of assistance to emerging countries unsure of their future destiny, and with a close eye to changes of a beneficial kind felt to be taking place in the world's second most powerful nation, the Soviet Union.

To carry out these policies, the late President called to his side exceptionally able men, among them Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. And merely to list the broad elements of the American foreign policy he pursued shows how difficult it is to evaluate their worth over a scant 3-year period. Profound changes in world history are not made that quickly, and when one adds to all of this political duties of a President, among them the necessity of dealing every day with an often rebellious Congress, there is a temptation to agree with those who insist that being the Chief Executive of the United States is simply too vast a task for a single person.

Yet there was never any indication that the late President Kennedy felt he could not cope with the burdens of the Presidency. A rich man who loved ordinary people, a fairly uncommon thing in itself, he had a great love for life, he enjoyed the accompaniments of the high office he held, he had an instinct for sensing the feelings of all sorts of minority groups, and he enjoyed playing what Frank Kent once called "The Great Game of Politics."

What kind of a record he might have made, as a politician and statesman, given 8 years in the White House, we shall never know. Yet while we mourn our own loss, his death is a great deprivation for the free world within which he moved, and which he was determined to sustain and preserve and expand against the evil forces that have assailed national sovereignty and individual freedom from time immemorial.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Policeman and President

Two men were carried to their final resting places today, a policeman, and a President.

Each man died in violence, each man died in the course of his duty. They died but a few minutes apart. But for the death of the President the policeman would not have died. But for the death of the policeman the man presumed to be the assassin of the President might not have been apprehended—and he might not have died.

Two women, in stations as vastly different as those of the men they mourned, made their final farewells to their husbands today.

They had nothing in common, these men and these women, but they had everything in common. The men, each in his own way, were keepers of the peace, protectors of the people, symbols of the law and order by which an advanced civilization lives. In those roles the two men lived and in them they died.

And the women, strangers 3 days ago but intimates in grief today, shared the duties of wife, mother, companion. One performed her duty well and the front pages of the world's newspapers noted it. The other, just as equal to her responsibilities, lived in obscurity until the 1 day of tragedy that linked them in the heart of the Nation thrust her unwillingly into the headlines.

So it has been wtih our Nation. To create it, to build it, to preserve it, the meek, and the mighty have stood together and fallen together. And their women have mourned.

The policeman and the President stood and fell together. The widows stand apart but together. Let those women lean on the sympathy of a bereaved Nation. And may their children find proof in their time that their Nation became stronger and better because of the sacrifice of their respective fathers, a policeman and a President.

---

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Nation Bowed in Mourning

This day a sad nation, bowed in mourning and prayer, will bury the youngest President it ever had—a President it lost under tragic circumstances.

We will stop our normal daily activities as a solemn requiem Mass is sung for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, in St. Matthew's Roman Catholic Cathedral at Washington, D.C. And we will grieve with his family and friends for the loss all of us feel.

That sense of loss perhaps can be expressed in how a young girl explained President Kennedy's assassination to her small playmates. "They must need 'doers' awful bad in Heaven," he said.

It is fitting, too, that President Kennedy will be buried in Arlington National Cemetery at the wish of his family and probably at the wish of many, many Americans who will visit his grave in the days, and weeks, and years to come. He was one of the Nation's war heroes and he died still in the service of his country—a vigorous fighter for freedom and the dignity of man.

Among the many world leaders, statesmen from foreign lands and officials of our own Government, joining the family of President Kennedy for the state funeral today will be representatives of countries not counted among our allies—even among our friends. These representatives, here to express the formal solicitude of their governments, should be accorded respect and courteous treatment during their stay. They came on a grave and somber mission and we should not let any incident, however trivial, mar their visit.

It already is enough that President Kennedy was struck down by an assassin in a brutal barbarian assault which does not re-

**flect the democratic and peaceful processes by which we settle our internal differences. We want the world to know our orderly and kindly ways and not picture us as an unruly ruffian. The face the United States shows to the world was of much concern to our late President.**

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Our Final Prayer

**On this national day of mourning the thoughts of the American people have been and remain directed upon the tragic, untimely death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Not only is all America concentrating its attention upon the funeral and burial today of our country's youngest Chief of State, but similar consideration is being given this sad day throughout much of the world.**

**Chiefs of state from many nations, allied to the United States by a mutual interest in the preservation of human freedom, arrived in Washington all day yesterday. A number of important dignitaries from behind the Iron Curtain also were in attendance today at President Kennedy's funeral.**

**There is no question but what this young leader won the admiration and respect of Americans generally. Even though there naturally was disagreement on the part of various segments of the populace with some of his views, the vast majority of those who disagreed with John Kennedy couldn't help liking him. He was that kind of man.**

**This same attitude prevailed among foreign leaders who met him or who knew him indirectly through interpretation given them by their own diplomatic corps. Both allied chiefs of state and those heading up countries generally regarded as cold war foes felt respect for the American President. There is no question but what Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, for example, admired Kennedy's firmness and determination, even though he naturally would have wished for our country to be headed by a less dedicated man.**

**Today we mourn our late President. In doing this we should not forget our obligation to give of our best as citizens in support of our new leader, President Lyndon B. Johnson. Such would be the wish of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who never placed anything ahead of his duty to his country.**

**Our final prayer today in remembrance of our murdered President would be that all Americans might emerge from this tragedy possessed with the same desire for international peace and domestic tranquility as that which prevailed in the mind and heart of John F. Kennedy.**

[From the Bangor Daily News, Nov. 25, 1963]

### From the Four Corners of the Earth

**As John Fitzgerald Kennedy is laid to his eternal rest today, sorrowing Americans can find comfort and reassurance in the great outpouring of sympathy that has come from all parts of the world.**

**The formal diplomatic messages were to have been expected. But there has been much, much more.**

**France's Charles de Gaulle will attend today's services in Washington to bid final farewell to the man who was leader of the free world as well as President of the United States. Britain will be represented by Prince Philip and Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas Home. Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany will be a mourner.**

**Their presence is a tribute to the late President and to the Nation. But most heartwarming of all has been the spontaneous response of the world's common people.**

**In West Berlin, 80,000 free world men and women marched in a solemn torchlight parade, demonstrating their grief over the loss of the young and vigorous free world leader. Candles were burned in the windows of Berlin homes.**

The commander of the Japanese naval craft that sunk Kennedy's PT boat in World War II—and thus very nearly taking Kennedy's life at that time—sent condolences to the Kennedy family. The camel driver friend of President Lyndon B. Johnson sent his personal message of sympathy from Pakistan. A Russian woman—a private citizen—brought an armful of roses to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

And so it went after the news of the late President's assassination was flashed to the far corners of the earth. The plain and good people of the world were shocked and grieved.

More than that, their words signified encouragement to the Nation that has the task of leading the struggle for freedom and justice for all men everywhere. They were speaking from their hearts. They were expressing gratitude for what this Nation has done for them. And they were rallying behind the cause which John Fitzgerald Kennedy symbolized as the President of the United States.

Today's sorrow must be borne. Life must go on. The struggle must go on. The burden is made lighter by the outpouring of sympathy that has streamed into the Nation's Capital from the plain, good people of the world. They have faith in America. This strengthens the faith of Americans in themselves.

And so now to the sad task of saying farewell to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—whose dedicated service to his country was cut short by an assassin's bullet.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Nov. 26, 1963]

### Heavy Burden Changes Hands

Many an eye shed a tear in sorrow Monday as the United States buried its 35th President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy laid to eternal rest her husband and the father of her two children.

Leaders from many parts of the world came to pay their respects and, in tribute, walked behind his casket the long half mile from the White House to the church—walked through crowds of onlookers in a display to the world of the kind of freedom that this country really possesses. Some would not have dared to appear so openly in their own lands.

Among the leaders of our Nation was one with a new job—President Lyndon B. Johnson, already burdened by the heavy responsibilities of his office. But it must have been apparent to those representatives from other countries that the United States was not without leadership; that another hand was at the helm of state even as one loosened its grip.

That this was so is due to the foresight of our Nation's founders who established the Vice Presidency—some with misgivings about its usefulness—for just such a dire contingency as did occur last Friday.

Within hours of President Kennedy's death, his office was assumed by the Vice President, and that was as it should be and as our forefathers planned it. No nation can long drift on the world's troubled waters and those waters were turbulent even then.

So on Monday the 36th President of the United States walked in the solemn funeral procession for the 35th President of the United States—probably acutely aware that he must now take up the immediate unfinished chores and plot our course for the future, aware that sorrow must be put aside for the good of a nation.

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

### A Portrait of Courage

There have been those who have criticized our former First Lady, Jacqueline Kennedy, as too young, too frequently pictured water skiing, and too much inclined toward high fashion. American First Ladies can expect this kind of criticism. If they happen to dress conservatively the criticism will go along another direction, including references to dowdy and uninteresting.

These past few days Jacqueline Kennedy has proved herself eminently worthy as First Lady. She has displayed the sort of courage that may be found in few people. Throughout these days from the moment she witnessed the assassination of her husband in the car with her, this tremendously brave young wife and mother has held her head high and carried through a multitude of obligations which do not confront the average woman following the death of a husband.

Nowhere along the way did Jacqueline Kennedy falter. It was she who told her two children that their father was dead. It was she who trudged the sad half mile from the White House to the cathedral where the pontifical mass was said. It was she who stood in the rotunda of the Capitol and listened to the moving words of Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana. It was she who returned to the rotunda unannounced to be near the casket holding the body of her husband once more. It was she who stayed the night with her husband's body at Bethesda Naval Hospital in Maryland.

Today we would salute as brave an American woman as any who have been written about in history. Jacqueline Kennedy was First Lady in the noblest sense these last, sad, few days. The heart of America has gone out to her, but it was clear she had within herself those firm, sustaining foundations which ever are found in people of great character.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Nov. 26, 1963]

### A Time for Faith and Allegiance

The Nation's elected leader—John Fitzgerald Kennedy—has fallen, victim of a madman's bullet. Yesterday, he was given a hero's burial in Arlington National Cemetery. Today, America moves forward under a new President—Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Nation must move forward without faltering. And it will.

Even as the shocked American populace was mourning the death of the late President Kennedy, it was rallying behind Johnson who, as Vice President, had quickly taken up the reins of Government.

Really, the people were rallying behind more than a man. They were rallying behind the Nation and what the Nation stands for—freedom and justice.

The new Chief Executive, fortunately, is a man of proven ability—and by far better fitted through experience to step into the White House than any Vice President before him who found himself in a similar position. Johnson had a long and distinguished career in Congress. As Vice President, he has had important roles in decision and policymaking. The late President entrusted him also with important assignments in foreign lands.

Still, there is no job quite like the Presidency. The President necessarily is leader of the free world as well as of the Nation. It is a lonely job and one of awesome burdens. The President is called upon time and again in this period of world turmoil to make momentous decisions and to assume full responsibility for them.

He is going to be sorely tested in the weeks ahead. The Communist world especially is going to set out to find what manner of man he is. And, of course, there are vital issues and problems at home.

And so, in this period of transition, he is going to need the moral support of the

American people. We are sure he can count upon it from the vast majority.

It is a time for faith to be reborn and allegiance to be roused and sustained. The struggle against communism must be carried on all over the world. At home, hate and violence must be purged from the Nation's life.

Today, it is essential that the Nation be united and move forward toward its worthy goals. We are confident it will.

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

### WHAT CAN I DO?

The words just won't come.

There's the awareness that words aren't going to do much good, anyway.

This is being written on Monday, the day of President Kennedy's funeral, when one would prefer to be writing nothing.

Augusta, like communities large and small wherever the American flag flies, is a city in mourning.

The erpression, "with a heavy heart," has a literal, physical meaning, one knows now.

So much has happened—so much that is so terribly wrong—since last Friday noon in Dallas. Yet this country must learn quickly to live with its grief. John F. Kennedy certainly wouldn't have wanted us all to sit around with long faces, leaving America's work undone.

Let's think of it that way, and roll up our sleeves and get on with the job, then—the job each of us has to do: Keeping the national economy ticking, doing our part in support of the national defense, striving toward better citizenship and, in consequence, better government at every level, for our country.

When he said it, in his 1960 inaugural address, it sounded a little melodramatic—to his critics, at least. But those words of President Kennedy have taken on new meaning now:

"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

All right. Let's ask—every individual one of us: "What can I do for my country?" And find an answer. And work at it.

If all will do that, there will be literally no limit to the greatness America can achieve.

John F. Kennedy gave his life for this America of ours. Keeping that in mind, let anyone ask, every day from now on: "What can I do for my country?"

[From the Bangor Daily News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### THE LATE PRESIDENT'S WISH

This Thanksgiving Day will be a sorrowful one for America. The late President John F. Kennedy, who prepared a proclamation on the occasion of this traditional American observance, is dead, and the Nation is mourning its loss.

Yet, John F. Kennedy noted in his proclamation that America had much to be thankful for. And this still holds true even in a time of national tragedy. Here, using the late President's own proclamation words, are reasons why all Americans should join in thanksgiving today:

Going back to the early colonists, noted the late President, "they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the laws which bound them together and for the faith which united them under God * * *.

"Today, we give our thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and humility, which we must seek every day to emulate. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them * * *.

"Let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice and understanding among all men and all nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

Let these words from the dead guide today's observances. Man is mortal, but not his principles. Let there be prayer and thanksgiving, though sorrow still hovers over the Nation.

### A BRAVE AND GRACIOUS LADY

In the aftermath of John F. Kennedy's assassination, the world has been given a new and splendid insight into the character of the Nation's and President's "First Lady"—Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy. She resolutely controlled her own profound grief and faced up to the public role which necessarily befell her. She performed the role magnificently.

The Nation first came to know Mrs. Kennedy as "Jackie"—a beautiful young woman born to wealth and elegance. She loved to ride horses, to promote the arts, to travel and to enjoy gay parties. This, in the main, was the way the Nation thought of her.

But she's "Jackie" no more. This happy phase of her life was wiped out in a terrible twinkling of time on a fateful sunlit day in Dallas. One moment a happy married woman, the first lady of a great nation; the next a young widow and a former first lady—her beloved husband of only 10 years cruelly taken from her by the assassin's gun.

Under the circumstances, she might well have crumpled, and the Nation would have understood. But duty lay before her—duty to the memory of her husband, to the Nation and to her children, Caroline and John. She did not falter. Instead, she drew upon what must have been a vast amount of spiritual strength and met the ordealing days head on.

The President had been dead less than 2 hours when she stood beside Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson as he took the oath of office which made him her husband's successor. She added several thoughtful touches to the funeral arrangements, including the inviting of John F. Kennedy's Irish kin to the rites. And there was her unannounced visitation to the President's casket as it was being viewed by the public in the Capitol rotunda. There was the silent midnight visit to her husband's grave on Monday night where the eternal flame was burning. The flame, too, was her idea.

Throughout the 4 painful days, Mrs. Kennedy was a picture of grief, but of composed grief; a grief she sought to shield from her children and from the watching world. The children were too young to comprehend, yet at times they seemed to have a sense of the tragedy and when they did she was quick to console them.

Mrs. Kenndey won the heart of a heartsick world in her last role as First Lady. If her dead husband could speak, we think he might say to her with pride, borrowing a term from his naval days: "Well done."

[From the Maine Campus, Dec. 5, 1963]

### HE LIVED SO MUCH

"There was a sound of laughter; in a moment it was no more. And so, she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hand * * * and kissed him and closed the lid to his coffin." The words of U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD will long be remembered by the millions of Americans who witnessed the tragic death of a beloved leader, a brilliant statesman, a humorous wit, a sincere man, a loving father, a giving husband who wanted that there be no room in our hearts for hatred and arrogance.

A stunned campus received the news of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on that Friday afternoon 2 weeks ago with shock and disbelief. One young man, reluctant to turn away from a television set late that Sunday evening, said, "People find it hard to believe that he is really dead because he lived so much." It is true that he lived a lot. He lived in our hearts and it is there that we hope his spirit will continue to live.

The dazed University of Maine mourned and mourns with the rest of the world at our great loss. As so many others in the world, we feel that we have lost a true friend. The perfect American, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, only a little over a month ago became an alumnus of the university when he addressed the people of Maine here.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave of himself, "above and beyond the call of duty" to his country; he made an indelible mark of progress in the quest for world peace; he achieved the supreme position of leadership in a modern, dynamic, powerful country. We, who considered ourselves friends of the late President, will never forget his energetic youthfulness, his brilliance of perception, his unfaltering memory, his commanding personality, and his high standards for himself and his country.

We extend our deepest sympathy to Jacqueline Kennedy and to the family of our late President.

[From the Maine Campus, Dec. 5, 1963]

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
*Orono, Maine, November 22, 1963.*

The news of President Kennedy's assassination comes as an incomprehensible shock to the university community. Only a month ago we were honored by his presence at a special convocation on our annual Homecoming Day.

Let us learn, however, from this shattering lesson that hatred can gain control of the human mind and override justice and truth. We are prone to make heroes or villains of our public figures in such a way as to cause some citizens to lose sight of their humanity as individuals. Our civilization must take cognizance of the creation of circumstances which have led to such a terrible event as that of the death of the President of the United States and muster all the forces of reason and judgment so that such an event cannot possibly happen again.

LLOYD H. ELLIOTT,
*President.*

[From the Bates News, December 1963]

### TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Brought to an untimely and sudden end by an assassin's bullet in Dallas, Tex., November 22—always to be remembered by this and future generations as a day of infamy and agonizing grief, but also as a day of rededication, by all Americans, to the ideals and principles which inspired and guided our late leader in his relentless struggle for unity and peace for mankind here and throughout the world. Few nations down through the centuries have had the privilege and honor of vesting their responsibilities of high government office in a man equal to his brilliance, courage, loyalty, and compassion. It is most fitting that the world measures him as a statesman of great stature. Truly, if a man is to be inspired and influenced in his pursuit of a better and constructive way of life, he has but to follow the life and deeds of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. For they provide the undimming beacon lights for that ultimate goal. History shall surely record that society was bettered by his many endeavors in private and public life.

---

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY THE CUMBERLAND COUNTY WOMEN'S DEMOCRATIC CLUB, DECEMBER 9, 1963

To be thankful for the time he spent with us,
rather than to be sorrowful for his death;
To go on with the work that he began,
rather than to stand mutely stricken, because he can't finish it himself;
To keep his qualities of character and personality alive within ourselves,
Rather than to let them be buried in a grave in Arlington;
Let this be our tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

**Mr. COOPER.** Mr. President, it is difficult to speak of John F. Kennedy. One must be careful not to give undue significance to associations and experiences in the Senate, or elsewhere, happy as they are in our memories.

The outpouring of grief and concern which attended his death does furnish insights into the regard with which he was held by the people of our country and the world.

There is shock, of course, because of the tragic circumstances of his death. We can believe also that concern is caused in part by recognition of the importance of the office of the Presidency. And we can say humbly that it reflects the importance of our country to countries and peoples throughout the world.

But at last we know that the sense of loss and concern is personal. It comes from the knowledge that President Kennedy set high goals for our country—goals, though they have not always been realized, which have given hope throughout our history to the people of the world—equality of citizenship, the provision of opportunity for all our people, and compassion for the least fortunate among us.

He had a calmness about the problems of the world. He knew they could not be settled by some swift, clear stroke; and his calmness gave assurance to our people and to the other peoples of the world.

He had the courage to set in motion measures to cut through the cold war, to seek solutions of its issues, and to move toward peace.

The standards he set for our country were noble. They expressed more truly than our wealth and power the essence, the majesty, and the promise of our Republic, those goals which another martyred President said were the last best hope of man.

In time, because of his work, we shall come nearer to realization, and that, I believe, will be his best memorial.

He was an idealist and a realist, a man of reason and a man of heart, a man of courage and a man of peace.

We shall remember him as President. We shall remember always his tolerance, his essential fairness, his courtesy, his humor, the happy qualities of youth, and something about him which endeared him to us and made us love him.

I think John Mansfield's tribute is appropriate:

All generous hearts lament the leader killed,
The young Chief with the smiling, radiant face,
The winning way that turned a wondrous race,
Into sublimer pathways, leading on.
Grant to us life that though the man be gone
The promise of his spirit be fulfilled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newsletter written by my wife, Mrs. John Sherman Cooper, on the late President John F. Kennedy, which was published in many Kentucky newspapers.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM MRS. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

I have just come from the President's funeral. The house seems very still after the cathedral crowded with the mighty of the nations, followed by the long, slow procession past the Lincoln Memorial over the bridge to Arlington Cemetery. The afternoon was so bright and fair that the thousands of baskets of flowers, which had been sent regardless of the family's wishes, belied the autumn leaves and gave the impression of springtime. John and I mourned not only for our President but also for our friend. He was your friend too. Because it is so easy to forget, I am going to mention some of the things he did for Kentucky.

On January 21, 1961, Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, said on the Senate floor:

"I am glad that President Kennedy in his first Executive order acted to improve the amounts, variety, and nutritional quality of food distributed to needy families. For 3 years, I have urged this action by the Department of Agriculture. * * * I think it humane and appropriate that the first act of the new President was to help the neediest people of the Nation."

Also, in the beginning of 1961 he requested TVA to locate a steam plant in Knox and Bell Counties, on the Cumberland River, to stimulate the economy of southeastern Kentucky. TVA, however, had made a prior decision to locate the plant in Tennessee, but the President wanted it for Kentucky. This year, after the floods in eastern Kentucky, John and I went to visit the disaster area. After having see the terrible devastation, John went to the President, who, at his request, gave increases in funds for flood protection for eastern Kentucky. As you know, one of President Kennedy's last official acts was on November 13, when he said:

"I have today met with Gov. Bert Combs, of Kentucky, and members of the Kentucky congressional delegation to discuss a crash program designed to bring special attention to the especially hard-hit area of eastern Kentucky—the most severely distressed area in the Nation."

There have been many times in the last 3 years that I have asked the President or Mrs. Kennedy to give our State special consideration. I am sure that the thousands who heard the Lexington Youth Symphony or saw the Berea dancers perform on the White House lawn will never forget the honor it gave our State—an honor which every other State in the Union is trying to attain and which was made possible because I asked Mrs. Kennedy to bring it to her husband's attention. It would be impossible to mention the endless special White House tours and other marks of friendship and consideration. In fact, I have never had "No" for an answer in courtesies for Kentuckians. Although we belong to different political parties, John Kennedy was not partisan in friendship. Even when he came to Kentucky during a recent senatorial campaign he had good things to say about my husband, both at the airport and at the dinner in Louisville, which is most unusual in the heat of a campaign. I wish all of you had known him. This poem by Molly Kazan was printed in the New York Herald Tribune, gives you another glimpse of him.

"I think that what he gave us most was pride.
It felt good to have a President like that:
Bright, brave and funny and good looking.
I saw him once drive down East Seventy-second Street
In an open car, in the autumn sun
(As he drove yesterday in Dallas).
His thatch of brown hair looked as though it had grown extra thick
The way our wood animals in Connecticut
Grow extra fur for winter.
And he looked as though it was fun to be alive,
To be a politician,
To be President,
To be a Kennedy,
To be a man.
He revived our pride,
It felt good to have a President
Who read his mail,
Who read the papers,
Who read books and played touch football.
It was a pleasure and a cause for pride
To watch him take the quizzing of the press
With cameras grinding—
To take it in his stride,
With zest.
We were privileged to see him on the worst day (till yesterday),
The Bay of Pigs day,
And we marveled at his coolth and style
And were amazed at an air (that plainly was habitual) of modesty
And even diffidence.
It felt good to have a President
Who said, It was my fault.
And went on from there.
What was spoken
Was spoken well.
What was unspoken
Needed to be unspoken.
It was none of our business if his back hurt.
He revived our pride.
He gave grist to our pride.
He was respectful of intellect;
He was respectful of excellence;
He was respectful of accomplishment and skill;
He was respectful of the clear and subtle use of our language.
And all these things he cultivated in himself.
He was respectful of our heritage.
He is now part of it."

**Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.** Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate today in paying tribute to a most distinguished former Member of this body, the late President John F. Kennedy.

There is little I could add to the millions of words of well-deserved tribute to this great young President of the United States who literally gave his life for his country. President Kennedy was the youngest man to ever assume the Presidency of the United States. He brought to this most important office, and all of the world, great intelligence, vision, and indomitable courage. More than any other President of the United States he represented the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of the young people of this Nation.

His tremendous popularity here in the United States and all over the world is a great tribute to many causes he espoused and especially his efforts toward peace in the world. His hopes, dreams, and aspirations for a better world will live on. He left a spot in the hearts of untold millions of people that can never be filled by anyone else.

I will always cherish the memory of the warm personal friendship I enjoyed with him all during his service here in the U.S. Senate and as President of the United States. He was an exceptionally likeable person, and a friend one always felt had a real interest in him. Not the least among the fine qualities that endeared him to so many was his superb Irish wit and humor.

Mr. President, of the millions of beautiful and appropriate words written about the late President Kennedy and his wonderful wife, Jacqueline, the article written by Mr. Theodore H. White entitled "For President Kennedy: An Epilog—For One Brief Shining Moment, Camelot," seems to me to stand out above all others.

It reads as follows:

### FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY AN EPILOG—FOR ONE BRIEF SHINING MOMENT, CAMELOT

(By Theodore H. White)

HYANNIS PORT.—She remembers how hot the sun was in Dallas, and the crowds—greater and wilder than the crowds in Mexico or in Vienna. The sun was blinding, streaming down; yet she could not put on sunglasses for she had to wave to the crowd.

And up ahead she remembers seeing a tunnel around a turn and thinking that there would be a moment of coolness under the tunnel. There was the sound of the motorcycles, as always in a parade, and the occasional backfire of a motorcycle. The sound of the shot came, at that moment, like the sound of a backfire and she remembers Connally saying, "No, no, no, no, no."

She remembers the roses. Three times that day in Texas they had been greeted with the bouquets of yellow roses of Texas. Only, in Dallas they had given her red roses. She remembers thinking, how funny—red roses for me; and then the car was full of blood and red roses.

Much later, accompanying the body from the Dallas hospital to the airport, she was alone with Clint Hill—the first Secret Service man to come to their rescue—and with Dr. Burkley, the White House physician. Burkley gave her two roses that had slipped under the President's shirt when he fell, his head in her lap.

All through the night they tried to separate him from her, to sedate her, and take care of her—and she would not let them. She wanted to be with him. She remembered that Jack had said of his father, when his father suffered the stroke, that he could not live like that. Don't let that happen to me, he had said, when I have to go.

Now in her hand she was holding a gold St. Christoper's medal. She had given him a St. Christoper's medal when they were married; but when Patrick died this summer, they had wanted to put something in the coffin with Patrick that was from them both; and so he had put in the St. Christopher's medal.

Then he had asked her to give him a new one to mark their 10th wedding anniversary, a month after Patricks' death.

He was carrying it when he died and she had found it. But it belonged to him—so she could not put that in the coffin with him. She wanted to give him something that was hers, something that she loved. So she had slipped off her wedding ring and put it on his finger. When she came out of the room in the hospital in Dallas, she asked: "Do you think it was right? Now I have nothing left." And Kenny O'Donnell said, "You leave it where it is."

That was at 1:30 p.m. in Texas.

But then, at Bethesda Hospital in Maryland, at 3 a.m. the next morning, Kenny slipped into the chamber where the body lay and brought her back the ring, which, as she talked now, she twisted.

On her little finger was the other ring: a slim, gold circlet with green emerald chips—the one he had given her in memory of Patrick.

There was a thought, too, that was always with her.

"When Jack quoted something, it was usually classical," she said, "but I'm so ashamed of myself—all I keep thinking of is this line from a musical comedy.

"At night, before we'd go to sleep, Jack liked to play some records; and the song he loved most came at the very end of this record. The lines he loved to hear were: Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot."

She wanted to make sure that the point came clear and went on: "There'll be great Presidents again—and the Johnsons are wonderful, they've been wonderful to me—but there'll never be another Camelot again.

"Once, the more I read of history the more bitter I got. For a while I thought history was something that bitter old men wrote. But then I realized history made Jack what he was. You must think of him as this little boy, sick so much of the time, reading in bed, reading history, reading the Knights of the Round Table, reading Marlborough. For Jack, history was full of heroes. And if it made him this way—if it made him see the heroes—maybe other little boys will see. Men are such a combination of good and bad. Jack had this hero idea of history, the idealistic view."

But she came back to the idea that transfixed her: "Don't let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot—and it will never be that way again."

As for herself? She was horrified by the stories that she might live abroad. "I'm never going to live in Europe. I'm not going to 'travel extensively abroad.' That's a desecration. I'm going to live in the places I lived with Jack. In Georgetown, and with the Kennedys at the cape. They're my family. I'm going to bring up my children. I want John to grow up to be a good boy."

As for the President's memorial, at first she remembered that in every speech in their last days in Texas, he had spoken of how in December this Nation would loft the largest rocket booster yet into the sky, making us first in space. So she had wanted something of his there when it went up—perhaps only his initials painted on a tiny corner of the great Saturn, where no one need even notice it. But now Americans will seek the moon from "Cape Kennedy." The new name, born of her frail hope, came as a surprise.

The only thing she knew she must have for him was the eternal flame over his grave at Arlington.

"Whenever you drive across the bridge from Washington into Virginia," she said, "you see the Lee mansion on the side of the hill in the distance. When Caroline was very little, the mansion was one of the first things she learned to recognize. Now, at night you can see his flame beneath the mansion for miles away."

She said it is time people paid attention to the new President and the new First Lady. But she does not want them to forget John F. Kennedy or read of him only in dusty or bitter histories:

For one brief shining moment there was Camelot.

I join all other Americans in extending to Mrs. Kennedy and all of the family our deepest sympathy in their great sorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with great sadness and deep personal grief that I join in memorializing our former colleague and the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Our sorrow is heightened by the tragic circumstances under which he was so suddenly summonsed to his eternal reward.

The horrible and cowardly act of November 22 shocked and stunned the peoples of the entire globe—both those of the free world and of the Communist sphere as well. That such an act of sudden violence and iniquitous villainy could happen in the most civilized country in the world was scarcely believable, and the United States and all humanity have suffered incalculable loss by reason of this heinous crime having been committed in our generation.

The fact that John F. Kennedy had so much to live for makes his loss even harder to bear. He looked forward to long years of rewarding and fruitful service to his country, and the American people confidently expected many more contributions to the cause of peace and freedom from this young, vigorous, and dedicated leader. To have these expectations shattered and wrenched from us so suddenly leaves us with a painful emptiness and grief.

In the past 19 days, literally millions of words of sorrow and condolence have been penned and spoken in memory of our late President, but no words are adequate to depict the depth and breadth of the tremendous void which his death has left. We, together with all civilized people everywhere, shall long mourn the loss of our great leader—a leader who championed the cause of peace, freedom, and justice for all mankind.

For 8 years, John F. Kennedy served the people of the State of Massachusetts and of the entire United States in this Chamber. During those years we all came to know him well as a hard working and driving Senator, whose full time and attention was devoted to his duties and to the welfare of all Americans everywhere. For 3 of those years, he served with me on the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, a committee on which his brother Robert, now the Attorney General, served with marked distinction and ability as chief counsel.

Day after day that committee met for long arduous hours in meetings which necessitated equally lengthy and difficult preparation. Through it all, John F. Kennedy was dedicated and thorough—facing with courage and conviction the many challenges confronting the committee. His statesmanlike conduct, both on that committee and on the floor of the Senate, won for him the admiration of his colleagues and the good will and support of the people of the United States.

While paying tribute to our late President, we might also pause to thank him for his astuteness in selecting Lyndon B. Johnson as his running mate. He selected a man who vigorously opposed him in his efforts to obtain the nomination of his party, but in doing so, he provided the United States with a strong and capable successor.

As a longtime friend, both of the former President and of his family, I extend to Mrs. Kennedy, his children and his bereaved parents my heartfelt sympathy in this dark hour of national sorrow. Mrs. McClellan joins with me in paying homage to the greatness of our former President and in the expression of deepest sadness at his loss.

At this moment I can think of no more fitting words of tribute than those of the American poet, Edwin Markham, who said:

He held his place—
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

"LINCOLN, THE MAN OF THE PEOPLE."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in mourning the tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

No single event in my lifetime has more profoundly shaken and stunned the people of this country and the world than has this senseless and dastardly assassination. People everywhere join with the wife and family in universally sharing the burden of grief and sorrow.

For those of us who have so long known and worked with Jack Kennedy there is a deeper and keener sense of personal loss. It seems that only yesterday he was sitting here with us. No man was ever more generally liked and respected in the Halls of Congress than was he. He was possessed with those sterling traits of character most admired by all—intelligence, courage, energy, compassion, determination, and dedication.

His life has been the realization of the American dream in its noblest and highest sense. A worthy man who openly aspired to achieve the highest office in our Republic, he accomplished the dream through that character of personal drive, initiative, and industry that has been unsurpassed in the modern history of this great Nation.

It is one of the ironies of fate that the author of "Profiles in Courage" should himself end as a shining example of one who gave the ultimate to his own country—his life.

Jack Kennedy was the rare combination of both a scholar and a man of action. The style, pristine clarity, and force of his public utterances will forever form a part of the great literature of this century. President Kennedy was one of the world's leading statesmen. He possessed a keen, analytical mind. He was honest and conscientious. This, coupled with an attractive personality, made him an outstanding man in every sense of the word.

Many of us were sometimes in disagreement with some of his programs and aims. But disagreements did not blind us to the fact that he was motivated by ideals and convictions which left no doubt in his mind that the courses of action that he pursued were for the best interest of the people. Differences of basic public issues are fundamental in the warp and woof of a democratic form of government, and without them the Republic itself cannot long survive.

Death under any circumstances is a saddening human experience. But when a young man is struck down by violence in the prime of life it becomes doubly poignant, and when that young man holds the highest office in the world's most powerful country it constitutes a national and worldwide catastrophe of the greatest magnitude. The events that have transpired since the fatal moment on Friday afternoon, November 22, have again demonstrated the awesome majesty and dignity involved in maintaining the continuity of government in these United States. The beloved wife of the deceased President played a brave and courageous role in this solemn and heartrending drama.

If good is to come out of such great evil, it is incumbent upon all of us to rededicate ourselves to the immortal principles of liberty, justice, and freedom upon which this Republic was founded.

Again, on behalf of myself and all the people of the State of Mississippi, I extend to Mrs. Kennedy and all of the family the deepest and most sincere sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, the date of November 22, 1963, on our calendar has been circled in black forever by the pencil of fate.

We will never forget that on that day our courageous President, John F. Kennedy, gave his life in the service of his country.

My sympathy goes out to his family, to his friends, to his fellow Americans, and to his brothers of the world.

To all, I can say I am convinced that his death was not in vain.

I doubt that any member of the Senate has seen evidence of any single act of providence that has had such a profound effect on Americans as the assassination of President Kennedy.

War in all its terrible ugliness many times has struck us with concern for our lives and property.

Depression has struck us with fear for our economic future.

Disease has struck us with apprehension for those we cherish.

John F. Kennedy's assassination has struck us with interest in an ailing American spirit.

The reflection on what happened in Dallas, Tex., has been healing.

Let us hope the cure will be permanent, for the cost of the treatment was so high that we must never pay it again.

I did not have the opportunity to serve with John F. Kennedy in the House of Representatives or in this body, as many of my colleagues did.

I did have the honor of seconding his nomination for the Presidency, and I value that act.

I marveled at his grace, his dignity, his wit.

I trusted his words.

His deeds projected the devotion of a man endowed with rare understanding—of himself, of his family, of his Nation, of his world, which is a better place because of him.

The silence his passing leaves is more deafening than all the applause his presence brought.

I saw a letter printed in one of our Oklahoma newspapers. A woman told of moving to Oklahoma from another State. Her 5-year-old son came to her and asked, "Is President Kennedy President of Oklahoma, too?"

"Oh, yes," the mother replied.

"Good," sighed the boy. "I would miss President Kennedy."

Indeed, I miss him, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it is a sad occasion for anyone when he rises to eulogize a departed friend, but when it deals with one so young and one with so much unfinished in their life such as our late President John F. Kennedy, then the occasion takes on a sadness of double proportions.

I doubt if any leader in our Nation's history had begun so much and envisioned such greatness for his Nation and was then abruptly departed from the Nation's life. In one fleeting second an irresponsible maniac murdered John F. Kennedy and robbed our Nation of its youngest President in history. However terrible as this tragedy has been for our Nation as a whole, no grief could possibly surpass that of his widow, his mother, and father, and that of his two children; for John F. Kennedy was not only a brilliant young man and an extremely efficient President, but he was also a husband, a son, and a father who exemplified the family unit.

He managed to accomplish all of his official acts and duties and still be husband, father, and son in a tender and homey sort of way. He was a great example setter and many Americans patterned some part of their life after the examples set by our late President and sometimes the members of his family.

His call for physical fitness probably affected in a real, personal way more American lives than anything. His examples of showing interest in music, writing, reading, painting, and other arts kindled little fires of the finer things of life in the hearts and minds of all of his countrymen. He and his lovely wife taught many Americans the art of appreciation and in a sense created the atmosphere for a renaissance of the arts. These things represented one side of the man who the American press had nicknamed in a professional manner as "J.F.K."

Somehow, though, it seems most unfitting to apply an initial or a nickname to the late President any more as we look at him with hindsight. It seems rather clumsy or misfitting to say in a news story now that "J.F.K." visited the Art Gallery to see Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa, or that "Mrs. J.F.K." listened last night to Pablo Casals. Certainly the millions of Americans who have visited the White House and seen the priceless treasures collected by President Kennedy and his widow realize that this was no ordinary President or an ordinary couple whom they had elected to lead this Nation and indeed the free world. He was "Mr. President" in the greatest tradition.

These fine things which the late President appreciated so much and which he wanted his compatriots to appreciate was but a reflection of one part of this unique man. He was a courageous man; he fought without fear of consequences for what he felt was right. He was wise enough to temper courage with restraint, as was exemplified in his actions and leadership during the Cuban crises. A wrong move could have set off a nuclear holocaust for the world or could have lost our Nation's position in world leadership.

In domestic affairs this courage was shown in his stand for legislative matters in which he believed, such as medical care for the aged and civil rights. Personally, I agreed with him on the medicare issue, as in many issues, and I disagreed with him on civil rights. However, never did a difference of opinion with anyone ever deter John F. Kennedy from seeking his goal or from respecting the opposing view which confronted him. He was a politician in the finest sense of the word and maintained his principles and integrity throughout all of his dealings.

It is terrible to realize that this man is no longer with us simply because some misguided individual took it upon himself to eliminate him from society.

Our official 30-day period of mourning for President Kennedy ends on December 22, but I do not believe the American people and the American Republic will ever cease to mourn his passing or fail to remember his charm, his wit, his tremendous ability to converse intelligently on practically any subject, and the great sense of responsibility which he drove home to all of us.

If we in our own lives and in our own efforts try to carry on these things, not the political or social efforts on which all of us may never completely agree, but the basic principles by which he lived, then we will do much to carry into the future these eternal flames for our Nation.

Mrs. Johnston joins me in extending to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and others of the immediate family our heartfelt sympathy on their great loss.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us are trying to find ways to express our devotion and admiration for John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I turn to a wonderful sermon given by my own minister at the First Unitarian Church of Washington almost 20 years ago.

The late A. Powell Davies would have found John F. Kennedy an exemplary President for himself personally and for the ideals he expressed. As my tribute to our late President I would like to quote from that sermon entitled "Christmas Always Begins at Midnight":

### CHRISTMAS ALWAYS BEGINS AT MIDNIGHT

(By A. Powell Davies)

### LIGHT IN THE DARKEST HOUR

It is interesting to notice that in legend upon legend, and story after story, Christmas always begins, not with daybreak and the coming of the morning—but at midnight. It was at midnight that the primitive observances began—or as near it as their reckoning could bring them. It was in the darkest hour of the night—not in the glow of morning—that the shepherds of the legend heard the angels sing. And of course, the three wise men were guided, not by the sun, but by a star.

It kindles a light, and no matter how little a light it is, the darkness cannot put it out. It says, "Be not afraid, the good and the true are stronger than anything that stands against them, and sooner or later, will prevail." If you doubt it, look backward and trace the path by which we have come; and look around you: in spite of everything, we are still on our way. The darkness is vast, truly, but across it there is a path of light—a path of moving light.

It tells a story—a thousand stories gathered up now into the Christmas story. Of an empire that was disdainful and arrogant. Of the privileged and mighty who had sold their souls for the tinsel of a moment's pomp. Of priests and temples where God was a commodity and truth a joke grown stale. They did not see that the very ground beneath their feet was slipping; so much of it was moving, and so fast. It was like the turning of the earth—unnoticed. They saw only what they looked for; things they could measure in the scales of power, and with the reckoning of gain and loss.

But there was something that humbler people could have told them; both of the old that was dying, and of the new that was newly born. For something had sung it at midnight. Something had shone in the darkest hour. A dream had been told and the hearts of men were kindling. Gentleness and brotherhood were waiting for the morning, and already in the nighttime were up on their way.

### HOPE IS ETERNAL

Brotherhood—we betray it, but we cannot forsake it. Love—we disown it, but we cannot renounce it. And the dream?—even in the hour of treason, it reclaims us. For we know that sometime there shall be a world in which man's inhumanity to man is ended. A world of gladness from which all cruelty is gone, in which the joy of each is the joy of everyone, the sorrow of each the sorrow of all. There shall be such a world because there is a song that sings it at midnight, and because in the darkest hour, there comes a light to those who sit in the darkness, and new hope to those who, in the wilderness, must walk beneath the shadow of death.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the world has suddenly lost America's leader: a man of youth and vitality and strength; of a happy mixture of idealism and practicality; of charm, of wit, of intelligence; a friendly man committed to the causes of peace, of freedom, of equal opportunity for all.

In his inaugural address, nearly 3 years ago, President Kennedy said:

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

No madman's bullet can be permitted to stop this memorable march of America as a part of the human race toward peace and freedom, compassion and justice under the law.

The brotherhood of man, and the fatherhood of God, call upon us to reach out loving hands across all barriers of race, religion, color, bigotry, and belligerence to all who feel as he did.

Let us in the Senate of the United States keep our hands outstretched.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, since that fateful hour on November 22 last, certainly the United States, if not the world in general, has witnessed and participated in the greatest and deepest outpouring from human souls in modern history. The tragic and untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy touched the heartstrings of Americans everywhere—men and women, young and old, rich and poor, the mighty and the humble, more than any other event which those of us here today can recollect. It is not my purpose today to attempt to add to the wonderful words, the beautiful passages, and the sincere pronouncements about this great humanitarian. However, the actual realization of what has come to pass is now fully upon this country and the world.

The expressions of grief and a great awareness that President Kennedy stood for, and fought for, the things which make our lives more worthwhile came from my State of Nevada, just as they did from elsewhere throughout this country. Illustrative of this fact is an expression in a Nevada high school newspaper which I believe speaks eloquently for the men, women, and children of my State. I wish to add to this memorial record today the sincere expression of Principal Grant M. Bowler, of the Moapa Valley High School, in Overton, Nev. I believe Mr. Bowler's words, contained in the November 27 special issue of his school's newspaper points up excellently the feeling of those at the grassroots of America, those who make up the strength and the sinew and the great body politic of the United States. I shall not take time to read this memorial, but I ask that it be included in the RECORD following my remarks, together with a eulogy, in the same publication, written by Mr. J. G. Earl, of the Moapa Valley High School. I commend both of these expressions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, these expressions were sent to me in a most sincere letter by Vice Principal Charles K. Pulsipher, of the Moapa Valley Schools; and I ask that an excerpt from his letter, again showing the depth to which this great sorrow was felt, be included in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this farming community, nestled close to the country's greatest manmade lake behind Hoover Dam, is far in miles from the Territory of Guam, this country's farthermost territory in the Pacific Ocean. However, the anguish was also felt in this island by other Americans. There, Gov. Manuel F. L. Guerrero, immediately after news of the President's assassination reached that island, issued a proclamation, together with a statement mourning the passing of President Kennedy. I ask that this proclamation and Governor Guerrero's statement be included in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at Solemn Pontifical Requiem Mass at the Dulce Nombre de Maria Cathedral, in Agana, Guam, a most moving eulogy was offered by Chaplain Joseph P. Trodd, U.S. Navy. I ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I request that several particularly fitting tributes paid to President Kennedy by editorial writers in the State of Nevada also be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in the tragic death of John Kennedy, the Senate—in fact, each and every one of us—lost one of our own. I believe each Member of the Senate has felt this grief deeply, not only because he was our colleague, but also because he went from this Chamber to the highest calling in the Government of this land. We each felt, irrespective of our political beliefs, a certain prideful warmth in his accomplishments and a certain inward grief in his defeats. Mr. President, it was my good fortune, when I first came to the Senate, to strike up a friendship with the then Senator Kennedy. Our desks were close together in the back row in this Chamber. We saw his suffering, some years ago, that kept him from this Chamber, because of recurrent complications from injuries he sustained while fighting for this country in the South Pacific waters during World War II. We marveled at the energetic campaign he waged across this land for the nomination for the Presidency, and the great vigor he displayed in winning the office of President of the United States.

It was my pleasure to have a close, personal, and warm friendship with John Kennedy, and I believe that I am better for it. The world has lost one of its greatest leaders, humanity a noble champion, and the United States of America a fearless, courageous President whose name will be enshrined forever in immortality.

Mr. President, the world is a better place for men everywhere because of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's great human understanding and his dauntless courage to seek for humanity more of God's great benefits.

### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Lakeside Zephyr, Moapa Valley High School, Overton, Nev., Nov. 27, 1963]

(By Mr. Grant M. Bowler, principal)

Monday, America buried the 35th President of these United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. His body now lies entombed in the cemetery at Arlington, Va., the final resting place of many of America's sung and unsung military heroes.

Though his earthly remains return to the soil from which it came, his thoughts, his ideals, the things he stood for, will stare all Americans in the face for generations to come.

Paraphrasing the words of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, "Though the world will little remember what is being said here, the world can never forget what he attempted to do here."

Despised by some, loved by many, and respected by all, John F. Kennedy, the youngest President of the 34 who preceded him, went to his untimely death, not knowing to what extent he had engraved his name in the annals of American history.

Never in history has one man been so dedicated to the universal freedom and individual rights of all mankind, regardless of race, economics, or religious preference.

Never in history has one man been so fearless in his belief that all men should live in freedom and enjoy the fruits of freedom.

When the bullets last Friday, stopped the heartbeat of this dynamic and vigorous leader, it quickened the pulse of all Americans and many millions throughout the world. It in a way made us hang our head in shame that something like this could happen here in our democratic society.

This dastardly act of assassination has brought reality into our living rooms. Through the medium of television and radio, the entire world participated with the first family in its mourning the loss of a husband, a father, and a President.

Those of our student body and faculty that saw him, in his recent trip to Las Vegas, will never forget him. On that day he delivered an address. To all that heard, it enshrined him as a truly great and humble American.

Now he is gone, he belongs to the ages, his works are now history. As we look up to observe the flag at half-mast for the next 30 days, let us rededicate our lives to the building of the America we all want and need.

As we bow our heads in respect at his passing let us pray for ourselves and our leaders, that we together, may maintain the magnificence of this great land of America, a land which all Americans feel is a land choice above all other lands.

---

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY URGED YOUTH TO STRIVE FOR EXCELLENCE

(By J. G. Earl)

At this time of national mourning, let us look back briefly at the other U.S. Presidents who were assassinated. First, Abraham Lincoln was shot in 1865 while attending the theater. Sixteen years later, James A. Garfield was shot while entering a train station in Washington. Twenty years after that, in 1901, President William McKinley was shot in Buffalo while greeting citizens at the Pan-American Exposition. Now, 62 years later, and less than a week after his murder, the name of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy still does not seem to fit into this list of martyrs.

During my stay in Europe from 1956 until 1958, I met citizens from almost every country of the world. Starting with the unsuccessful Hungarian revolution in 1956, I saw our friends in foreign countries gradually lose respect and admiration for America. During the 34 months while John F. Kennedy was our President, we must all agree, regardless of political affiliation, that the prestige and respect of the United States in foreign countries again started on an upswing.

President and Mrs. Kennedy brought great intellect, culture, and formal education into the White House. Before attending and graduating from Harvard University, the late President attended the London School of Economics for 1 year. This formal study in economics was supplemented by experience in the U.S. Congress in later years. President Kennedy was elected to the House in 1946, directly following the Second World War. He served in the House and Senate for 14 years before his election to the world's most powerful office. He then made it clear to the American people that our economic system needed some drastic changes to keep it up to date with our modern way of life. We will undoubtedly associate the initials J.F.K. with certain economic changes of the future, as our parents associated the initials F.D.R. with great changes in this field in the past.

During the past 3 years, President Kennedy was not without opponents, but no one disagrees that he was an educated, intelligent, and aggressive leader. What he recommended for America's young people was not opposed either. First, in Las Vegas recently he admonished the youth of our country to continue in school and advance educationally as far as possible, in order to be of greater benefit to our country. This does not mean just to remain in school and go through the motions of being a student, but implies a striving for excellence and scholarship. Secondly, may we long remember President Kennedy's pleas to fight communism, at home and abroad. Students, it is important that you do not become one of the growing group we call school dropouts, but equally as important that you apply all of your abilities in preparing for your future—as your future is America's future as well.

---

### EXHIBIT 2

OVERTON, NEV.,
*November 26, 1963.*

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
*U.S. Senator of Nevada,*
*U.S. Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Today our students of the Moapa Valley High School published a paper as a dedication to the memory of President John F. Kennedy. It occurred to me that you might be interested in knowing of the great respect our students have for this outstanding President. We mourn with you at his death and although we did not know him as you did we feel that we share your sorrow because of the closeness that television has brought him into our lives. This closeness is expressed very well by faculty and students as you can read in special paper. Especially appropriate are the remarks by Mr. Grant Bowler, our principal, who read these same remarks to the students Tueday in a devotional program.

Sincerely,

CHARLES K. PULSIPHER,
*Vice Principal,*
*Moapa Valley Schools.*

### EXHIBIT 3

GOVERNMENT OF GUAM,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
*Agana, Guam.*

### PROCLAMATION NO. 63-25—THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Whereas the Nation and the entire free world has suffered the loss of a great and unselfish leader in the untimely death of President John F. Kennedy;

Now, therefore, I, Manuel F. L. Guerrero, Governor of Guam, by authority vested in me by the Organic Act of Guam, do hereby proclaim a period of mourning in the territory of Guam, such to last until sundown, December 22, 1963, and I ask that all flags on public and private buildings be flown at half mast during that period and I call upon all residents of the territory to pause in their daily endeavors to pay silent tribute to a great leader who died, as he lived, that our country may live up to its democratic principles of equality, opportunity and freedom; and I urge all residents to reflect upon the tremendous contributions made by President Kennedy during his short and useful life and to gain from that reflection renewed determination to work for and defend the traditions by which he lived; and I urge all residents of the territory to go to the church of their choosing and thank Almighty God for having blessed the world with such a person and pray to Almighty God for guidance for President Johnson and all other officials of our Nation during the critical days ahead.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of Guam to be affixed in the city of Agana, this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-three.

MANUEL F. L. GUERRERO,
*Governor of Guam.*

Countersigned:

DENVER DICKERSON,
*Secretary of Guam.*

### GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT

A heartbreaking tragedy has befallen our land. We have lost a great leader.

This loss extends beyond the boundaries of our Nation and is shared by every person who loves freedom throughout the world.

The leadership of President Kennedy and his human warmth were unsurpassed.

The people of Guam have lost a true friend who, despite the pressures and burdens of his position, took a personal and active interest in the welfare of this territory at all times.

No human effort can erase this disaster; no hand can undo this wrong.

To all of us there is left only one course and that is to redouble our efforts under the leadership of our new President to further the causes of our Nation and our people in the manner typified by the life of John F. Kennedy.

### EXHIBIT 4

### EULOGY FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, CATHEDRAL, AGANA, DELIVERED BY JOSEPH P. TRODD, CHAPLAIN, U.S. NAVY

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"There was a man, one sent from God, whose name was John."

"A bad man killed my daddy."

This plaintive cry of a 3-year-old echoes hollowly through the White House halls. The world listens and grieves. The Nation is shocked and bewildered. A widow numb and unbelieving.

For John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States was murdered last Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex. We heard this stark statement uncomprehendingly, asked why this senseless crime and then paused to assay our loss and perhaps shed a tear.

Who was John Fitzgerald Kennedy? A rich young man who might have wasted his substance? A Harvard undergraduate who might have become a playboy of our Western World? No, he became neither. He was instead a naval officer privileged to wear the Silver Star, an astute politician, a more than competent author, an able statesman, and humanitarian. His intellect was keen. His repartee incisive and at times uproarious with his crackling Irish wit.

Yet our Nation has produced many rich young men, many college graduates, many decorated officers. Why did the mantle of greatness descend upon John Fitzgerald Kennedy? Twenty years ago in the same motor torpedo boat squadrons in which he served were Larry Green, Larry Kelly, Paul Lillis, Bernie Crimmins, Al and George Vanderbilt. Surely these were men as competent and as dedicated as he. Why then did the finger of God single out John Kennedy?

We feel this.

That within him there smoldered a burning compassion for his fellow man, a fiery conviction that true peace in the world depends upon the peace of Christ in the heart. This compassion, this conviction became his mission. He toiled incessantly to teach that all men are created equal and that each, irrespective of the color of his skin is an individual with a soul precious in the eyes of God. His fidelity to his faith, his dedication to his country, his service to all marked him plainly as a doer of the word as well as a believer.

To a Winston Churchill is it given to live in greatness. To a martyr to die in greatness. A select few both live and die magnificently. Such was Abraham Lincoln. And such, we believe, was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

For when the annals of time are weighed, history will agree, that in the manner of his dying, unwittingly he taught his greatest lesson. Here was a man, in the fullness of his strength; perhaps the most powerful single individual on earth—whose whim or nod could make a statesman or break a general who by pressing one button, could bring death and destruction to most of the civilized world.

And yet, last Friday afternoon, as he rode down a sun-drenched Dallas street accepting the plaudits of thousands at the summit of his career, a finger was bent and a shot sounded.

Honor, dignity, and power faded. And in a matter of minutes a soul, naked and alone, stood before its maker.

And what of the lesson?

A poet would say "All that beauty, all that wealth ere gave, await alike the inevitable hour. The paths of glory lead but to the grave." But the Christian mindful of eternity asks "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his immortal soul."

Our prayer today is this: May you, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, hear from the lips of your Savior, "Well done thou good and faithful servant. Enter into the reward which has been prepared for you for all eternity." And then may you see a tiny figure disengage itself from the choir of angels and saints and feel its baby fingers grasp your hand and lead you to the throne of the Almighty and hear your son, Patrick Bouvier Kennedy say, "This is my beloved father in whom I am well pleased. For here was indeed, a profile in courage."

### EXHIBIT 5

[From the Hawthorne (Nev.) Independent-News]

A nation grieves; a world mourns.

Millions of words have been written and spoken since that dark moment on Friday morning when the President of the United States became the victim of an assassin's bullet. Yet, as so many already have said and written, words seem so empty at a time like this. And just as "empty" is used in reference to inadequate words, so does it aptly describe the physical and mental feeling of millions of peace-loving citizens in all parts of the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy already has been eulogized throughout the world as an exceptional man who gave his life in the service of his country, and also in the effort to lead all nations to a more peaceful existence.

Just as nations which differ with ours in philosophy gave recognition to the sincerity of the man, so have those citizens within our country who differed with President Kennedy's political philosophy and parts of his governmental program. That he was a great man in life, few will dispute; that his greatness was even more fully revealed in death, none will deny.

As Chief Executive of our great Nation President Kennedy was a symbol of leadership for freedom-loving nations in all parts of the world. That he should be taken so swiftly, so unjustly, in the prime of life, added to the sorrow of his untimely death, but even more, that he was struck down in his homeland by a cowardly sniper brought shame as well as sorrow to the Nation he loved and served.

It is not for us to attempt to recapitulate the good deeds that are to his credit. The world is well aware of that creditable record; has become more so in the past 5 days; and the story will be retold for generations to come by the historians of the world.

That we chose not to agree with many of his political beliefs and actions is a privilege that we in the United States cherish. And John F. Kennedy was a man who proved his willingness to ever protect the right of Americans to so differ.

The sympathy of a sorrowing world has been extended to his grief-stricken widow and children, his parents, and other family members. We can only repeat, in a way he would understand, the words intoned at his bier, "Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon him."

Just as the truly united spirit of this great Nation was so evident following the tragic death of President Kennedy, it is to be hoped that the same united spirit and confidence will be displayed toward President Lyndon Johnson as he assumes the great burden of carrying on the duties of the Nation's highest office.

To use an old and general appraisal of the situation in which the new President finds himself: "The man is entitled to a chance."

This is not to imply that the traditional two-party system of checks and balances must falter during a period of crisis, but in time of crisis we are Americans first, partisans after. Thus, until the new President has been given ample opportunity to navigate his own course for our ship of state, let use be reasonable, fair, and understanding.

With the passing of time there will be occasions when the policies of President Johnson must be subjected to honest differences of opinion, not only those contentions of the opposition party, but quite likely from the ranks of his own party.

By election time next year the issues will be more clear-cut—or maybe more confused—but next year will be soon enough to debate those issues in the time-honored and successfully tested American custom.

For the present, even though we have our reservations about continuance of some policies established by the martyred President, we must think in terms of what the world is thinking about U.S. leadership, and world reaction to the sudden change in our Government leadership.

This we can best do by remaining calm and confident—going forward with vigor and not in the shadow of fear—and constantly reminding ourselves of the immortal words spoken by President John Kennedy upon the occasion of his inauguration:

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

[From the Paradise Press (Las Vegas) Nev.]

How futile and feeble are words when one tires to understand the monstrous events of the past several days.

Thoughts come seeping into the mind, and you try to push them away for they seem so insufficient in laboring toward comprehension of the history made in our Nation and the world.

The full force of the acts performed before the eyes of millions will not have a lasting effect perhaps for years.

But, the madness which was displayed, the motives behind a twisted mind, the cracking of guns and the barbarous, animal-like acts of so-called human beings give rise to many emotions. Sadness, disbelief, bewilderment, and anger seem to rise to the top of our experience. Of all these, anger continues to prevail.

Yes, we know that anger is the one emotion which must be drowned by common sense. But, reports coming in from all over

America and the nations of the world have as an underlying current—anger.

But it was anger coupled with insanity which produced the assassination of our President, John F. Kennedy. If this be so, then let us dispel anger from our minds and thoughts. Let anger be replaced by dedication to the idea that this can never happen again. Let us also bury, once and for all the thoughts of hate. For hate and anger are partners in crime.

Let us condemn these two criminals. Let them be judged for eternity as having no place in the American way of life.

To those who sell and spread the contraband of hate, let Americans issue a challenge to be backed with action—this Nation will no longer tolerate hate groups be they right, left, or in the middle. Hate is not choosy. It will dwell and grow like a cancer wherever it finds the right festering food.

Science and reason are conquering disease; let democracy eradicate the most devasting of all maladies—hate and anger.

It may be that the death of John F. Kennedy will be justified if it brings home to every man, woman, and child, that our Nation is in grave danger if we do not grind into nothingness the elements existing in our society which caused the death of John F. Kennedy. Let us hold that his death may not have been in vain.

But, we must not let the tragic events of the last week fade away. Let not time lessen our resolve.

It is certainty that the sniveling creature who pulled the trigger and fired the fatal bullets into our President was insane. But, that should not lull us into inaction. For, there are thousands of people in this Nation who could pass a sanity test and be considered normal. Yet, they are fostering hate between people, groups, races, creeds, and religions.

Herein lies the danger for their insane acts and programs cannot be detected until they will have fired a fatal bullet in democracy and America.

Let each and every person, each and every day * * * each and every hour stamp out hate and prejudice. Let us not even joke about it. Let snide remarks which give birth to the destruction of democracy be driven from our land.

We are at war. Our enemy is hate. Let us take to the battlefield now and never relinquish the day to our enemy.

---

[From the Elko (Nev.) Independent]

You look at the gray skies and you think, "even nature is in mourning in keeping with our great sorrow."

And the sun sets red and fiery angry in the west at eventide on this day of great tragedy and the thought wanders aimlessly through your numbed mind that "Even the elements are offended at the dastardly thing that earth's lowest human being has done to one of our finest citizens."

You watch a widow suffering and the tears well up in your eyes. A press camera catches a saluting 3-year-old standing erect and only half knowing the tragedy—his own personal tragedy—of the occasion and an ever-living photograph joins hundreds of others that have been taken on this shocking weekend in America.

And again your mind wanders to thoughts that bear no logic and that have no reality in the cold, steely facts of the situation which your eyes are conveying to your mind.

Certainly the skies are gray on this day but they would have been gray and it would have stormed had not a cold, calculating assassin fired a fatal shot through the head of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

And the sunset would have been red and fiery on this Friday evening, November 22, 1963, whether the President had been shot or whether he had gone home to the White House that tragic November day and stepped softly into the nursery late at night to whisper a fond goodnight to little "John John."

The awful shock of a Presidential assassination, or of sudden death close to the heart of any human being, numbs the senses and makes us prey of uncontrolled emotions. Slowly we accept the truth and resign ourselves to the world of logic from which we have been removed by shock.

When the great men have said their eulogies, when the men of God have called on their deity to take the soul from man's mortal remains, when the mourning family has returned home and has been removed from the public gaze and let to the care of loved ones, then the grim facts return, too, and slowly but surely we begin to face up to reality.

And so it is today. A great American President has been assassinated. The world has reeled in shock and sorrow. Violence has erupted in the wake of this historic tragedy to add further shock and disbelief to our numbed senses. We have been deeply emersed in sorrow and have been depressed and saddened beyond anything we have known and shared with all the peoples of earth previously.

But the ceremonies are over and the mourners have gone home. The reeling effects of time have already begun to be felt. Slowly the grinding wheels pick up speed and a busy world begins to go its way.

Few of us who die will ever cause such a long pause in the normal course of humanity's daily routine. Perhaps only one or more deaths in a century will so affect the peoples of the world.

But the passing days and months and years will close the yawning gap in human society and the world will go on, leaving only a deep scar on the history of the nations to mark the occurrence of this tragic series of events.

So it is that today we begin to look with more interest to the future than we do to the past. The work-a-day world confronts us. Our brethren are anxious to be up and doing. The demands of the present press on us and the uncertainties of the future intrigue us.

**Mr. GRUENING.** Mr. President, historians of the future will have to assess in full the contribution John Fitzgerald Kennedy made to mankind. One may speculate that our late beloved President would have preferred this, for he was also a historian and history was his intimate companion. "Why England Slept," and "Profiles in Courage," will be among his monuments.

He utilized the lessons of the past, kneading them with events of the present, to create for the future. His vigilance and his actions made certain that the United States did not sleep in the face of peril. And his life both in war and in peace turned a profile in courage on the page of history.

History was his friend and we are the beneficiaries of this friendship.

For him the words engraved on the statutes at the entrance to our National Archives—"What Is Past Is Prologue" and "Study the Past"—had full meaning. An idealist, but also a realist, with a look to the future and an eye to the past, he lived in the present. Because he was a man of vision, he looked forward.

Consider his remarks in Anchorage, Alaska, September 3, 1960:

> But I see Alaska, the Alaska of the future. I see an Alaska where there will be more than 1 million people. I see a giant electric grid, stretching all the way from Juneau to Anchorage and beyond. I see the greatest dam in the free world, the Rampart Dam, producing twice the electricity of the TVA, lighting the homes and mills and cities and farms of the great State of Alaska. And I see highways linking all sections of this great State. I see Alaska as the destination of countless Americans who come here not searching merely for land and gold, but coming for a new life in new cities, in new markets. I see an Alaska that is the storehouse of our Nation, a great depository for minerals and lumber and fish, rich in waterpower and rich in the things that make life abundant for those of us who live in this great Republic.
>
> I do not say that this is the Alaska of 1961 or perhaps even of 1971. I do not say that a Democratic administration can magically bring about all of these things by itself overnight. The work must be the work of many, and the burden must be the burden of many. It will take your efforts and your help, but I think it is time we got started.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was articulate, gallant, and courageous. He was witty, gay and high spirited. He was generous, kind and compassionate. And, when our friends across the oceans refer to him as "princely" they, too, are correct.

Moreover, he was stimulating and inspiring. Consider the immortal invocation in his inaugural address:

> And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.
>
> My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America can do for you but what we can do together for the freedom of man.

This was his salutatory as President. He could have no finer valedictory.

His eloquent words he sought to match with deeds. His indefatigable quest for peace lighted the candle of the test ban treaty.

His fight for civil rights will lift our Nation to a new level of justice and racial equality.

With his lovely wife Jacqueline he made the White House the cultural citadel of America: art, music, poetry, creative expression and intellectual achievement found a new warm welcome there.

His continuing interest in the development of our resources is best noted in his own words, spoken in Anchorage, Alaska, on September 3, 1960, when he said:

> The untapped energies of the American people which are more powerful than the atom itself must once again be committed to great national objectives.

Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., writing in the December 14, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post observes:

> He had grown all his life, and he grew even more in the Presidency.
>
> His was a life of incalculable and now of unfulfilled possibility.
>
> Still, if he had not done all that he would have hoped to do, finished all that he had so well begun, he had given the Nation a new sense of itself—a new spirit, a new style, a new conception of its role and destiny. He was the most civilized President we have had since Jefferson, and his wife made the White House the most civilized house in America. Statecraft was for him not an end in itself; it was a means of moving forward a spacious and splendid America.

Statecraft is indeed the word. He was a student of and commentator on public affairs early in life, an eager volunteer in his country's war service, emerging as a battle-scarred warrior, truly a hero; thereafter a distinguished legislator in House and Senate, then President of the United States. John Fitzgerald Kennedy's public career made of politics what it should always be, a noble calling—the profession of public service.

Editorials, newspaper columns, magazine articles by the thousands in all parts of the world, and books have recorded and will continue to record John Fitzgerald Kennedy's great service to his countrymen and to the larger family of mankind. All of us in the Senate have lost a friend. I, for one, shall never forget his kindness in coming to Alaska to campaign for my election to the Senate in 1958.

America is much, much richer and much, much better for his having lived. It is incalculably poorer for his early and untimely departure at the height of his prowess and on the road to greater fulfillment.

Mrs. Gruening joins me in our expression of deepest sympathy for his courageous Jacqueline, for his two dear children, his brothers, sisters, and bereaved parents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials published in the Anchorage, Alaska Daily Times of November 22, 1963; Anchorage, Alaska Daily News of November 23, 1963; the Fairbanks Daily-News Miner of November 23, 1963, and November 25, 1963; Jessen's Weekly of Fairbanks, Alaska, November 27, 1963; Cook Inlet Courier of Homer, Alaska, November 22, 1963; the Juneau, Alaska Daily Alaska Empire, November 24, 1963, and the Nome Nugget, Nome, Alaska, November 25, 1963, commenting on the service of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, Nov. 22, 1963]

### J.F.K. LAYS DOWN LIFE FOR HIS COUNTRY

Anchorage, along with the rest of the world, was shocked and grieved at the stunning news that an assassin's bullet had struck down President Kennedy in Texas. The 35th President of the United States died within an hour of the gunman's attack.

First word of the shooting brought a reaction of disbelief to those hearing the news—it was too stunning to be true.

The President was in Texas on a 3-day visit which had taken him to San Antonio, Houston and Fort Worth prior to the trip to Dallas, where the sniper struck.

Kennedy was the youngest man, and the first Catholic, ever elected to the Presidency. His term had been filled with controversy and therein may lie the key to the assassination. To this writing the person responsible for the President's death has not been captured. He is the fourth President to die at the hands of an assassin. The others were Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

He began his political career in 1946 when he first won election to the U.S. House, representing the Boston district. He won reelection in 1948 and 1950. In 1952 he moved to the U.S. Senate when he unseated incumbent Senator Henry Cabot Lodge.

At the 1956 Democratic National Convention, Kennedy narrowly lost the vice presidential nomination to the late Senator Estes Kefauver after presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson threw open the choice to the convention.

Two years later Kennedy won reelection to the Senate by a record margin.

After sweeping the 1960 presidential primaries, Kennedy had little difficulty winning the Democratic nomination on the first ballot. That November he defeated then Vice President Richard Nixon for the Presidency.

Kennedy was not one to shirk his personal or political responsibilities. He was a naval lieutenant who played a hero's role in the South Pacific in World War II. He won the Navy and Marine Corps Medal as well as the Purple Heart.

As Chief Executive he was the first American to face possible nuclear war. He didn't hesitate to protect American interests with a show of force. Later he won an agreement from the Russians which limited nuclear tests.

The President also quickly made known his stand on civil rights. He took action in trouble spots throughout the South and he brought his forces to bear on Congress to enact a major civil rights bill to combat racial discrimination in public accommodations, schools, jobs, and voting.

Anchorage and the rest of the Nation join the Kennedy family in its time of grief for the President who died for his country.

---

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily News, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGACY

The course of human events is often shaped by violence, and mankind is long inured to the experience of death and disaster. But there is something about the assassination of John F. Kennedy so irrational, so senseless, that words must fail to measure the deed, or the mind of the killer.

Whether he was a lone lunatic or the triggerman in a plot, investigation will tell. Before all the facts are disclosed, it will be unwise to jump at conclusions. Certainly no hostile government worthy of the name could have expected to profit by Mr. Kennedy's death: First, because Mr. Kennedy was a man of peace and, second, because the continuity of the American system is such that the death of a President, however calamitous, leaves the essential marrow of the Nation undisturbed.

That Mr. Kennedy should die by a fanatic's hand is peculiarly ironic, for Mr. Kennedy himself was anything but fanatical. He was a man of driving intelligence, considerable humor, and a remarkable capacity for cool detachment. He was a highly skilled politician, but he could view his role, and himself, in the broad perspectives of history—his favorite subject, and one in which he was widely read.

Like all Presidents, Mr. Kennedy aroused a measure of opposition and controversy, and like all human beings he made mistakes. But on the great questions confronting the Nation he was right. He took his stand firmly on the moral side of the civil rights issue, and he stood equally firm when the Nation was threatened by Soviet missiles in Cuba. By facing down Nikita Khrushchev at that time, he earned the lasting gratitude of America's allies and the lasting respect of its opponents.

He was cut down at the age of 46, before the full fruition of his career. The legacy he leaves to the Nation is his cool, eventempered, rational approach to national and world affairs. There has of late come a distemper over American politics, an extremism in word and action which has assumed a disproportionate influence on the Nation's life. Mr. Kennedy was not one who subscribed to the conspiratorial view of history, to the implacable attitudes which has given rise to much of this contemporary malaise.

He was, as has often been said, a practitioner of the art of the possible. He could disagree without necessarily condemning, and oppose without questioning the opponents' motive. He was a tough man, steeled by the tests of war and of unremitting public service—public service he sought although he was born into a life where he need never have lifted a finger to exert himself. Through all of this, Mr. Kennedy remained a man without bitterness.

If his death could contribute to the amelioration of some bitterness, some of the divisive violence which has invaded American life under the pressure of momentous problems abroad and at home, it is a contribution Mr. Kennedy himself would have cherished.—R.J.C.

---

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Strife in the South.

A great war in progress.

An empty rocking chair.

A Vice President named Johnson suddenly becomes President.

The body of a great man lies in state as the Nation mourns his passing.

How strange it seems that these are the facts in 1963 just as they were in 1865.

Abraham Lincoln, the Republican, freed the Negro from slavery.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Democrat, attempted to free the Negro from bigotry.

Both men met similar fates.

Lincoln fought the Civil War. Kennedy faced the war against communism.

Lincoln was shot in the head while sitting in a rocking chair at Ford's Theater in Washington. Kennedy too left his famous rocking chair empty in Washington when an assassin's bullets struck him in the head and neck.

Mrs. Lincoln was with the President when he was shot. Mrs. Kennedy was also with her husband when tragedy struck.

It is recorded that Mrs. Lincoln wept and fainted and cried "Oh, that dreadful house."

And perhaps now the words of President Kennedy's lovely and beloved Jacqueline will go down in history expressing the grief of all Americans when she cradled the President's head in her arms and cried "Oh, no."

Both men, mortally wounded, lived for a period of time after being shot.

A stunned Nation, caught completely unaware, could hardly believe the news, either in the case of Lincoln, or in Kennedy's death yesterday.

Even today it is difficult to comprehend this murder, for it is a double blow to the national conscience—the killing of John F. Kennedy, the man; the assassination of the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief.

Yet we will know as the days go on that no madman's bullet can stop the progress of this Nation. The rocking chair is empty as it was in 1865, but now as it did then, the country will move forward.

President Lyndon B. Johnson will take charge, and the assassin will have succeeded only in destroying a man—not the American concept of freedom and self-determination.

Our forefathers planned carefully for such tragedies as this.

No one man controls our destiny. Perhaps it is at times like this that we realize how much "In God We Trust."

America is much like a large family. We squabble frequently and fight. We have differences of opinion and we blast each other with verbal vehemence.

But in times of trouble we stand like steel. We stand united now in our anger and our grief.

Black or white, Republican or Democrat, Protestant or Catholic, all Americans are shocked.

When Lincoln died, the course of history was altered. And so is the case with Kennedy. No one can predict what changes this assassin's bullet may bring in our lives.

Kennedy and Lincoln both had small children.

Kennedy's two charming youngsters have lost a father.

America has lost a leader.

Our Nation mourns with clenched fist.

But as it was in 1865, the war will be won, all citizens will enjoy their rights and another man will fill the empty rocking chair.

---

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily-News Miner, Nov. 25, 1963]

### A Difficult and Somber Time

On this day we pay tribute to a man who believed in human dignity as the source of national purpose, liberty as the source of national action, the human heart as the source of national compassion, and in the human mind as the source of our invention and our ideas.

That there were and will be political disputes on the methods of fulfilling our national purpose does not take away from the shared feeling of a great destiny for this country. This national day of mourning is also, in the words of President Lyndon Johnson, a day of rededication. John F. Kennedy would have been the first to say that on such a day our ultimate responsibility is to begin looking ahead.

President Kennedy always was looking ahead. He believed we stood on a frontier of unknown opportunities and perils at a turning point in history. Never was such a statement more valid than today. He believed in Americans as all being partners in a great and historic journey. This journey continues.

Our feeling for the loss of a man is made worse by the feeling of outrage that comes with the helpless realization that a worthless character with a sick mind has murdered the President of the United States. There is other strong emotion, too, as many of us realize that perhaps never will the White House be occupied by a family of more intelligence, vitality, and elegance.

Here was a man who fought for his country, who almost died for it during the war; a man who contributed his Presidential salary to charity; who kept in trim doing pushups, playing touch football, golf, and sailing, while deploring the thought of America becoming a nation of spectators; a man of wit.

"I think the worst news for the Republicans this week was that Casey Stengel has been fired," said Kennedy during the presidential campaign. "It must show that perhaps experience does not count."

"On this matter of experience," he added, "I had announced earlier this year that if successful I would not consider campaign contributions as a substitute for experience in appointing ambassadors. Ever since I made that statement I have not received 1 single cent from my father * * *"

Yes, his sense of humor will be remembered. But more memorable will be John Kennedy's strong sense of purpose and identification with the national purpose.

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility," he said. "I welcome it."

Thinking today about the man, the office, our future, and our Nation's high purpose, we can consider these words carefully as applying to each of us.

And if John F. Kennedy could speak on this day, perhaps he would repeat the words he once said:

"I hope that all of us in a difficult and somber time in our country's history may bring candles to help illuminate our country's way."

---

[From Jessen's Weekly, Fairbanks, Alaska, Nov. 27, 1963]

### Life's Inexorable Course

In the span of hardly more than 72 hours, America lived through 3 days of fantastic events that made the weekend appear, in retrospect, the most nightmarish in our history. A dynamic young President was cut down by a sniper's bullet, the alleged assassin was slain in turn, and a state funeral was held to which the leaders of the free world came.

Americans wept unashamedly and their grief was shared in other lands.

Through the ears of radio and the eyes of television, the Nation observed the indescribable courage of the President's young widow, who saw her husband die and stayed beside him virtually to the end. The heart of the Nation went out to her, as she slowly climbed the Capitol steps and knelt and kissed the flag-draped casket and followed on foot the funeral cortege that took John Fitzgerald Kennedy on his last journey from the White House.

The gathering of kings and princes, Presidents and Premiers in Washington on Monday was a tribute not only to the fallen President, but to the unquestioned place of world leadership the United States has attained.

Stunned and shocked though the Nation is, however imponderable the fates, life follows its inexorable course. Fortunate it is that the Presidential burdens were assumed immediately by an able and tested leader. Americans may give a heartfelt response to the promise, the plea, and the prayer of Lyndon Baines Johnson:

"I shall do my best. I ask your help—and God's."

---

[From the Cook Inlet Courier, Homer, Alaska, Nov. 22, 1963]

### The Shot Heard Round the World

The Nation, even the world, mourns the death of a great man, President John F. Kennedy. Whatever our views, our beliefs, the taking of a life is wrong; by whatever fashion, whatever means, for whatever reason. The broad road our Nation has been traveling at a great rate of speed under his leadership may not have been the one we thought right, nevertheless we grieve and offer a prayer for his sorrowing family. That President Kennedy was a great man, none can deny.

Now may President Lyndon B. Johnson have the courage and strength to face the challenge of the Nation and the world with directness.

In the less than 200 years of our Nation's life its history has been marred now four times by the assassination of the Chief Executive; Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, William L. McKinley, and today, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

---

[From the Daily Alaska Empire, Juneau, Alaska, Nov. 24, 1963]

### Renewed Dedication

Suffering a tragedy like the assassination of President Kennedy, almost all persons want to do something to show their sorrow and respect for the one who is gone. The first thought usually is of a vocal expression of sympathy, followed by a desire to make a public gesture to show unity of feeling with the entire people, by flying the flag at half staff, or by closing the place of work, or by attending a prayer service, or otherwise by doing something different from normal which will show respect.

Beyond all the gestures and ceremonies, however—after all the expressions of respect and regret—there remains a feeling that can only be met by a measure, at least, of long-range dedication to the purposes, standards, or unfinished work of the departed one. Facing the sudden, tragic loss of President Kennedy, we find ourselves seeking the lasting ideals which he was trying to establish in concrete form for the benefit of his people and the world, both present and to come, so that we might carry these ideals on toward the goals he might have won had he not been struck down.

Seeking the meaning and momentum of his life, we find he was the first human leader entrusted with great power to risk with clear and steady judgment a confrontation of nuclear war for the protection of his Nation and the cause of freedom. We find in review that, despite disagreements at home and abroad, he stood firm against the advance of communism, yet hopeful that the good in all people would emerge, and anxious lest blind inflexibility might fail to perceive and grasp real opportunities to advance human unity and dignified peace. He held the line against communism, yet his open mind made possible the first big step—the limited nuclear test ban treaty—in guarding against nuclear contamination and destruction of mankind's home.

Mr. Kennedy saw clearly what many of us, equally sincere in opposing communism, failed to see—that ultimate victory for the dignity of man cannot be won by hasty or extreme antagonism, nor by disregard for the aspirations of confused and misguided peoples seeking in desperation a fair share of the world's goods and reasonable recognition of rights long withheld. He aided throughout the world those governments which gave consideration to the rights and needs of their people—and worked toward reform of those governments which, while opposing communism, continued to oppress their people and withhold the rights and goods to which any human being is entitled.

He stood for reasonable rights and prosperity for all the people, both at home and abroad, regardless of race or creed or condition of birth. He sought these goals, distant though they were in many situations, through the principles that have created American greatness and the greatness of human freedom everywhere, through private initiative when possible but, if not accessible by that route, through initiative of enlightened government. He stood for vigorous living, for moving boldly ahead into the adventurous future of mankind, on earth and in space.

In deep consideration for the tragedy which removed him from leadership while so many of the goals were not reached, we feel, with Alaskans and all Americans, a deep renewal and strengthening of dedication to the work he was forced to leave unfinished.

---

[From the Nome Nugget (Nome, Alaska), Nov. 25, 1963]

### Of John F. Kennedy

John Fitzgerald Kennedy started his administration as the 35th President of the United States by dedicating himself to two shining goals—survival of liberty at home, and peace in a world shivering in an "uncertain balance of terror."

He invited the Communist world to join in a new beginning of "the quest for peace" before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

"Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate," he said in his inaugural address that was devoted almost entirely to foreign policy and foreign affairs.

John Kennedy was born in Brookline, Mass., May 29, 1917. He received his bachelor of science degree cum laude from Harvard in 1940 and then studied at the London School of Economics. He entered politics at the age of 29, when he was elected to Congress in 1946. After winning reelection twice, he ran for the Senate in 1952 and defeated Senator Lodge. Winning reelection in 1958 by the largest plurality ever piled up for a Senate seat in Massachusetts, almost 900,000, further enhanced his political stock. He was sworn in as President of the United States on January 20, 1961.

John Kennedy and Miss Jacqueline Lee Bouvier were married in St. Mary's Catholic

> Church in 1953. A daughter, Caroline Bouvier, was born in 1957. Three years later there was a son, John F., Jr.
>
> John F. Kennedy is gone—murdered by the bullet of an assassin. Our lives and the world with its seemingly never-ending series of crises, out of which arose his death, will go on, but there is now an emptiness where he once stood. All sane peoples are shocked by the manner in which this great man came to his end * * * and all are silently speculating on their own futures.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the nightmarish weekend through which America recently lived will scar the memories of adult citizens for the rest of our days. We simply do not have the country we thought we had. The rest of the world knows this now, even if we may be reluctant to admit it to ourselves.

I shared the assumption of many Americans that Presidential assassination was a thing of the past. The fact that our political and moral climate still makes this heinous crime possible will give rise to much national soul searching. So, too, will the equally incredible sequel—the lynching of the accused assassin. How to eradicate political murder and lynch law from our country will occupy our thoughts for many years to come, even as we go on about the other business of Government.

For me, the greatest inspiration from the life and death of President John F. Kennedy is to be found in his own deep devotion to the principles and ideals of self-government. The tragedy of his passing does not flow from those principles and ideals, but from our failure to realize and achieve them.

I believe that like Abraham Lincoln before him, John Fitzgerald Kennedy would say that it is for the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work which both these great men so nobly advanced; and that from their deaths we should take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

For as long as this Republic survives, and let us pray it will survive forever, the American people will be the beneficiaries of the statesmanship of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He has carved in the tablets of American history, inspiring challenges to all Americans who come after him to strengthen and preserve our system of representative self-government.

His insight and foresight in respect to the obligations of citizen-statesmanship which are the responsibilities of all Americans who come after him, will also be a perpetual flame that will burn throughout history in the hearts of our people.

Of all the monuments that will be erected to his memory, none can ever be as symbolic of his statesmanship as his eloquent, literary writings which record for all time his political philosophy which was so in keeping with Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and with Lincoln who penned the Emancipation Proclamation and emblazoned in American history the Gettysburg Address.

As we sat in St. Matthew's Cathedral on that sad November 25, 1963, there was placed in our hands a small memorial card containing on one side a cherished picture of the President and on the other, three short paragraphs of quotations of challenges to the American people selected from his historic inaugural address. I would let every American citizen honor the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy by way of rededication to the challenges of citizen-statesmanship called for in these three noble paragraphs:

> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself * * *.
>
> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world * * *.
>
> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

It is now up to the American people of his generation and future generations to keep faith with our obligations of citizen-statesmanship. We owe it to our country to ascend to the heights of President Kennedy's idealism and statesmanship and thereby prove to ourselves and the world that this great man did not live and die in vain.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, many Senators who have spoken today in memory of President John F. Kennedy do so as former colleagues in the Congress and as personal friends. I did not have an opportunity for such friendship. Thus my own concept and memory of the man and his work perhaps is more closely associated with that of the general public than as a Member of the Senate.

My first thought is that it is well, in a sense, that some time has passed between the date of death and this solemn occasion. The full meaning of John Kennedy's life and work was difficult to comprehend in the period of shock caused by the tragic manner of death—assassination. While all of us sought some facility to believe the unbelievable, it was difficult to put the life of the President, his impact upon our Government, and his relationship with the people, in sensible perspective.

But now we are slowly beginning to understand that it is not how long but how well one lives that counts. It is not how one dies but how one lives that has meaning.

I have often thought that the height of a man's achievement during his life ought to be measured not only by his final position of accomplishment but also by his point of beginning with due consideration for the obstacles which the uncertainties of the times place in his path. So measured, President Kennedy's life was one of great achievement.

Many others today have spoken of his courage, his intellect, his love of family and life, his appetite for work, his appreciation of good values, his sense of history, and his dedication to the American way of life, and our system of Government. These traits of character and mind he did possess.

But combined with these, I detected a capacity for sustained effort, a consistency of application of all those talents and abilities described so ably by my colleagues. Was this not his finest trait of all?

Many across the Nation have now been seeking in his deeds and words the element in his philosophy, religion, life, work, or ambition which gave him the unity of purpose and the strength required to do what he did. I would suggest that perhaps it was the admonition repeated so often by his fellow townsman, Justice Holmes, who told us all: "Have faith and seek the unknown end."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, nearly 3 weeks have passed since the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and the Nation has not yet fully recovered from the horror and indignation which grew from the most heinous crime of the century.

In almost every State in the Nation, and, indeed, in the National Capital, Americans are demonstrating their profound sense of loss through the renaming of schools, streets, airports, and other memorials.

Certainly, the fact that a brilliant young President, for altogether too brief a period, led this Nation and gave all Americans a glimpse of the promises of freedom for years ahead should not be erased from our memory. We should properly preserve his memory for as long as this Nation endures.

My thoughts today dwell on the invisible, yet powerful, memorials which could be erected to the great leader who has been taken from us. We will be a greater nation, and his legacy will be more towering than any edifice of steel and concrete if John F. Kennedy is enshrined in the national conscience as a martyr who gave his life in the enduring battle against hatred, bigotry, and intolerance.

Surely, these insidious forces guided the quick and brutal hand that struck down the 35th President of the United States.

The greatest memorial that we can give to President Kennedy is to rid ourselves, as a nation, of the fanaticism and insane rage—turned inward—which made this tragedy possible. I cannot escape the conviction that such a living memorial in the hearts of his countrymen would have been most earnestly desired by our late President.

Our Nation is made up of Americans from divergent geographical areas whose regional motives and national origins are more diverse than any other country in the world. Ours is a young nation striving, in a real sense, to find itself. Our national goals and our heritage can never be fully achieved unless we are tolerant of the views and beliefs of our neighbors. We cannot afford to set ourselves upon the Devil's work of national distrust, accusations, and suspicions of our neighbors.

These, I firmly believe, are the lessons of Dallas. We already have suffered an irreparable loss. Yet, how tragically compounded that loss would be if we lost sight of the true meaning and true cause of this tragedy.

In terms of Americanism, humanity, compassion, and decency, John F. Kennedy has left this Nation a great legacy. We are now at a turning point. Will we accept his legacy and rid ourselves of the poison which infects the national bloodstream? Will we turn from hatred and dedicate ourselves anew to the challenges—not the recrimination—that lie before us now? These are questions for each and every American to ask himself.

If these questions are answered in the affirmative; if this Nation rejects hatred and fanaticism in all forms, the greatest memorial man is capable of constructing will be erected and John Fitzgerald Kennedy will not have died in vain.

On behalf of myself and Mrs. Cannon, and of the people of the State of Nevada whom I represent, I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her children and to the entire Kennedy family.

### A FRIEND OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the United States of America has lost a gallant leader; West Virginia has lost a trusted friend. It is no secret that John F. Kennedy held the State of West Virginia closest to his heart, after his own native State of Massachusetts. The path that led him to the highest office in the land can be said to have begun for John F. Kennedy in the coalpits of West Virginia, into which he plunged boldly, as he plunged into all his undertakings, in order to acquaint himself at firsthand with the problems of our people.

John F. Kennedy won our hearts because of his unmistakable sincerity and his determination that the way of life which we in the Mountain State cherish must not be allowed to fall into neglect or suffer needlessly from the growing pains of a swiftly changing economy. His unshakable optimism ignited our own hopes, and his calm confidence in the ability of reasonable men to cope successfully with all human crises strengthened our own resolution embodied in our motto, "Mountaineers are always free."

John R. Kennedy reaffirmed our belief in the American way as the way in which life can be lived bravely, nobly, and in the face of a thousand dangers, heroically. He had no patience with mediocrity, no ear for the prophets of doom, no concern with the raucous outcries of the radical right or left which sought to turn aside this Nation from its destiny as the world leader of freemen, committed to the unavoidable challenge of enlarging the scope of human freedom at home and abroad.

We in West Virginia could feel at home with John F. Kennedy because we were keenly aware of his deep and essential sympathy with all men. We were drawn and held to him by the bonds that unite freemen everywhere, the bonds of the spirit. He asked for our support and help, and we gave it. He promised us that he would give himself to the task at hand with vigor, without reservation, without hesitation. No man can say that he did less.

John F. Kennedy the man, is gone from our midst. Now he has become a legend in our land, a memory in our thoughts, a sadness in our hearts. Historians will etch his portrait with words upon the everlasting stone of time. And the calendar of life will move on.

But for us in West Virginia the shadow of John F. Kennedy will linger awhile, like the afterglow of a sunset on our mountain slopes. In West Virginia we will remember John F. Kennedy as a child might remember a special Christmas joy, as a young man might remember an ambitious dream, as an older man might remember a glorious field of battle. For he enkindled amongst us all these things: Joyful hope, noble ambition, and a sense of honor. We are truly grateful.

Now the period of mourning is drawing to a close, and the happy season of Christmas will be upon us. In the broad ellipse at the foot of the Washington Monument there stands a 75-foot Christmas tree sent from the mountain forests of West Virginia. I like to think that this tree is symbolic of the place that John F. Kennedy will keep in our hearts, a place forever green and bright with the joy of the spirit.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, each of us tends to remember, in a personal fashion, the cataclysmic occasions of a lifetime. Why else is the question so commonly asked, "Where were you on Pearl Harbor Day? or V-day? or the day F.D.R. died?"

In such a fashion, each of us will remember the 22d of November 1963. Each person has indelibly imprinted in his own mind where he was, and what he was engaged in doing, when the dread news flashed that John F. Kennedy had been struck down on the streets of Dallas, by an infamous assassin.

I was at a luncheon in the State Department in honor of Senator Manglapus, of the Philippine Islands. Our host was Assistant Secretary Roger Hilsman. By strange coincidence, I was engaged in a converation with Averell Harriman about the danger of extremism in American politics, when an attendant whispered that I had an emergency call from my office. I excused myself, placed the call back from an adjoining room, encountered difficulty with "busy signals" at the Capitol, wondered why the wires were so crowded, and then, suddenly, I was listening to the choked voice of my press secretary, Porter Ward, saying, "The President has been shot in Texas. He is believed to be either dead or dying."

The rest is a dazed memory of rushing back into the dining room to convey the sickening news. I recall how the table turned to turmoil, how the air was suddenly filled with urgent questions and protests of disbelief, how the faces in the room were pale and shaken.

Then, in the company of my colleague, JOHN SPARKMAN, I remember our hurried departure and return to the Senate, where we prayed for the life of our stricken President, not knowing he was already dead.

If each of us retains a memory of that black day in terms of a personal involvement, it is not because we would blur the day with a trivial recollection, but because no one of us can fully comprehend the magnitude of our common loss.

So it is that we bear our grief, as individuals. It was often said of me that I was a "Kennedy man," a nameplate I proudly acknowledged while he lived, and one that I shall cherish now that he is dead. I took joy in his friendship, and I think I will not know his equal again. Though words are clumsy to express one's feelings, I tried to capsule my reaction to the President's martyrdom in a short tribute which I delivered at memorial services held for him at the River Road Unitarian Church in Bethesda, Md., on Sunday, November 24. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may appear here in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is not my purpose or place to deliver the sermon this morning. That is properly a service for your own pastor to perform. It is, rather, my purpose to say a few words in tribute to our fallen President.

I hope you will understand if I speak of him in somewhat personal terms, for this is the way I shall remember him.

He was my friend. I loved and honored him. I was proud for my country that he was our President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of those rare human beings about whom it could be truly said: "The elements so mix'd in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world 'This was a man.'"

He was as handsome as a storied prince; his wife, Jacqueline, as fair as any princess of song or legend. With his encouragement, she made the White House a place of impeccable beauty, where occasions of state were conducted in the style, and with a graciousness and gaiety that befits a great nation. Whenever I was present on these occasions, I never failed to marvel at the President's composure. His dignity was natural to him, and his friendliness always set his guests at ease. How unprepared they were to discover in him that endearing quality of self-effacement, which he often revealed through some lighthearted witticism, but which invariably disclosed his underlying humility. Once, in a toast to the King of Afghanistan, I recall how he explained why the Constitution limited the President to 8 years in office. The amendment had been adopted, he said, partly out of consideration for the well-being of the President, but mainly, he added with a smile, out of consideration for the well-being of the country.

Many of you will remember the celebrated comment he made to that illustrious company of Nobel Prize winners who came to dine with him at the White House. Never, he remarked, has so much talent been gathered at one time under this roof, since Thomas Jefferson used to dine here alone.

Such was the brilliance of the social life which John and Jacqueline Kennedy brought to the Presidential mansion. But more important was the kind of family life they implanted there. Somehow they managed to make that big house a home. Along with other playmates, their daughter, Caroline, and their little son, whom the President liked to call John-John, used to gather in the play yard, within easy view of their daddy's office. He was seldom too busy to be interrupted by them; he refused to permit the heavy burdens of his office to usurp his family function as a loving father. The personal attention he gave to his children, and to the needs of his grief-stricken wife, when their infant son, Patrick, died soon after birth a few months ago; the tender pictures of John-John on the south lawn awaiting his father's arrival by helicopter, or crawling through the trapdoor in his father's desk, while the President was sitting there absorbed with his evening's work; the familiar sight of Caroline clutching her father's hand as he led the family into church on a Sunday morning—all combined to present to the country the finest example of a devout and affectionate family, setting a moral standard of the highest order.

The many attributes that made John F. Kennedy such an exceptional person cannot be compressed into the short tribute I pay him this morning. Well known was his bravery in battle; his literary talents which won for him the Pulitzer Prize; the fortitude with which he bore the pain in his injured back; the ceaseless energy with which he pursued his quest for self-fulfillment through 17 years of honorable service in the House of Representatives, the Senate, and finally, the White House itself.

History will judge his greatness as a President, but already it is clear that he will be remembered for the strength of his statesmanship which saw us through the dread missile crisis in Cuba a year ago, when the world trembled on the brink of thermonuclear war. And he will be remembered too for the initiative he brought to the search for peace—for the first step along that road he made possible through the nuclear test ban treaty. Not since Lincoln has any President been so deeply committed to the cause of equal treatment for all Americans.

The tragedy of his death is heightened because it came so cruelly at the prime of his extraordinary life. It came as he was grappling with the gigantic problems of our times with the skill and courage of a young David—only to be struck down by an assassin in his own country, in a foul and cowardly murder which crosses us all with shame.

Once, when he faced a crucial primary test, in that long, arduous trek he made toward the Presidency, I asked him whether he believed in prayer. He said he did, and he seemed genuinely moved when I told him I would pray for him. Now, I think, he would want us all to pray for our new President, in faith that a national revulsion against every kind of fanaticism will wash the land clean, so that the hand of Lyndon B. Johnson may be upheld by the councils of reason and decency against the councils of ignorance, bigotry, and hate.

May God preserve this Republic and keep her sensible, strong and free.

**Mr. CHURCH.** It is too soon to pass judgment upon the Presidency of John F. Kennedy. But we sense that he will loom large, more so than we fully realized while he still lived. Time alone can give us a more definitive measurement.

Even now, there are those who are trying to judge his stature by examining his accomplishments in office. If this is where we should look, it still remains for future events to place his achievements as President in proper perspective. I am inclined to believe—though tomorrow could easily prove me wrong—that of the work he finished, during his brief tenure, the nuclear weapons test ban treaty will stand out above all other accomplishments. For it may well turn out to be the first benchmark on the path to peace.

During the Senate debate on ratification of the test ban treaty, I attempted to recount the earlier failures to obtain agreement, and to point up the stalwart role of our late President during the Cuban missile crisis, which, in my opinion, brought about the agreement. The words I used then somehow seem appropriate now, so I ask that the pertinent paragraphs from that address be reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

All of us know the sorry story of how the stalemated negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty ended in dismal failure; we recall how the Soviet Union, after quiet preparations, suddenly resumed testing on a most extensive scale, forcing the United States to do likewise. We remember too how the testing was accompanied by a new round of bellicose speechmaking in the Soviet Union, coupled with a hardening of Russian attitudes on every cold war front. And we shall never forget how the era culminated in a daring thrust by Khrushchev to install missile bases in Cuba, at our very doorstep. In this reckless gambit, Khrushchev in effect was asking: "If her vital interests are challenged, is the United States really willing to risk all in a nuclear war? President Kennedy's response, coming swift and sure, gave Khrushchev his answer. The world watched breathlessly as Kennedy ordered the Navy to turn back Russian ships on the high seas, even as he laid down his ultimatum that the Cuban bases must be dismantled and the Russian missiles withdrawn. Khrushchev had his answer, and he backed away under circumstances which surely inflicted the most serious reversal on the Communist cause since the end of the Second War.

I suppose Khrushchev's question had to be asked—and answered—somewhere, sometime, if a turning point in the nuclear arms race was ever to be reached. The Russians had to know whether, in a showdown situation, we actually stood ready to suffer a full-scale nuclear exchange—whether, in effect, we would sooner choose to be dead than Red. Had Kennedy allowed the Russian missile bases to remain in Cuba, then Khrushchev would have known that he could win his points, one by one, through the threat of nuclear war—that he could bluff his way to world dominion. Under such circumstances, the Russian nuclear arsenal would have had utility, after all, in advancing the objectives of Soviet foreign policy. The Russians would doubtlessly have then intensified the nuclear arms race, and we would have no test ban treaty before us today.

So the tense and terrifying days of last October may well be recorded by historians of the future as a time of destiny for the whole human race, when the fortitude of an American President won for us another chance to harness the nuclear monster, or, as Kennedy himself has put it, to stuff the genie back in the bottle, while there is still time.

**Mr. CHURCH.** I am not so sure, however, that we should try to measure John F. Kennedy by the work he finished, or by the degree he did, or did not, succeed in securing the enactment of his stated program. Lincoln is not remembered for the legislation he put through Congress, but for the inspiration of his leadership.

So it will be of Kennedy. What a rich literature he left us. For generations to come, when others cannot find the words that will do justice to our goals, his words will be quoted; when others falter under the burden of their duty, his example will strengthen their resolve. In less than 3 years as President, it was Kennedy, the man, who lifted the hearts of the humble, who exacted the respect of the prominent and powerful, whether friend or foe, and who fired the hopes of all who would be free.

Every land felt the force of him, and when he fell the whole world sorrowed. The mighty came as pilgrims to march in grand procession behind his flag-draped coffin; the people, whose President he was, filed passed him in an endless stream through the Capitol rotunda, where he rested upon Lincoln's catafalque.

John Masefield, poet laureate of England, wrote:

> The young chief with the smiling, radiant face, the winning way that turned a wonderous race into sublimer pathways, leading on.

And 10,000 torches were lifted in the night by the silent throng that gathered at the city hall in West Berlin, filling the great square which now bears his name.

From among the many messages of mourning that came to me from Idaho, I have excerpted some representative tributes. I have also selected certain passages from editorials, written in memory of the late President, which appeared in the newspapers of my State.

I ask unanimous consent that they be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From letters and poems]

"As the greatest love can produce the greatest joy or sorrow, I realize that your privilege of serving with President Kennedy will intensify and personalize to you this thrust to the heart of every citizen. For this reason, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to you personally and pledge renewed faith in and support to the youthful aspirations for a better United States and a better world which were yours and President Kennedy's. He lived his life in honor, manhood and service. In these, he lived out several lifetimes. He can only die if we refuse the torch which he carried to light a better tomorrow." (E. LeGrande Nelson, Twin Falls, Idaho.)

"They who glimpse the effable sadness of beauty in depth—beyond sound, beyond form—knew, from the fateful words of the last inaugural, 'Let us go forth * * * knowing that here on earth, God's work must be truly our own.' That, amongst us, was another, who in the full magnificence of youth, had chosen the way that leads to Calvary." (Lillian Imler, Fruitvale, Idaho.)

"It cannot be true, were my thoughts when I heard that awful news. Then—such a waste of manhood and ability." (Mrs. John B. Harms, Wendell, Idaho.)

"Words fail to express what emotions have shaken me in the past weekend. What sorrow you have felt who have known our President Kennedy so personally. We can only hope that his death will set a new goal of citizenship for all * * * and a new meaning to the phrase, sometimes too lightly used, 'We are our brother's keeper,' for his interests were a living memorial to that creed." (Judge Frances Sleep, Sandpoint, Idaho.)

"I do not know how to write this little letter. I am so hurt over the death of as true and honest friend as the world ever had, President John F. Kennedy. Every time I watched TV it was just tears and a hurting inside me." (Herman Weisenberger, Kellogg, Idaho.)

### MUFFLED DRUMS IN WASHINGTON

(By Colen H. Sweeten, Jr., Malad City, Idaho)

There's muffled drums in Washington,
  Strange stillness o'er the street;
Tear stained polished brass and robes
  Mid the silent rhythmed feet.

Horse drawn, the fallen leader lies
  'Neath the flag he held so dear.
Princes and beggars mourn their loss,
  While thousands pass his bier.

Yes, muffled drums in Washington
  Half masted flags at dawn,
Yet God is in His heaven
  And truth still marches on.

---

[From the Moscow (Idaho) Idahonian]

President Kennedy will be remembered as a very human President. A very likable President. He was not given to protocol. He seldom wore a hat. When he strode to meet you he didn't wait for the formalities of an introduction, nor stand on protocol that the visitor should be introduced to the President. The writer of this comment knows, for he was privileged, just a little more than a year ago, to be surprised by this informality.

All of us have known that the responsibilities of being President have come to be of mankilling size. What most of us do not realize is that our Presidents also put their lives in the lap of the gods every day and every moment they occupy this high office.

---

[From the Pocatello (Idaho) Sunday Journal]

John F. Kennedy, the man, was a young, vital, courageous leader, wise beyond his years, a loving husband and father. The human tragedy of the swift and ugly assassination shames the Nation, and, in fact, the human race.

Youth and charm and grace characterized the Kennedy family in the White House. They were a part of American life, not aloof from it.

Youngest of our Presidents, John F. Kennedy fought for peace with justice, for true equality of human and civil rights. What history's verdict may be, we cannot foresee. But as a person, he embodied qualities which attracted admiration of millions, the envy and hate of few.

---

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register]

This young, vigorous and impressively intelligent leader was silenced at the very pinnacle of his thrust for an always emerging America. He was a President who could stir his followers, excite them to dreams of New Frontier.

President Kennedy had an unusual warmth, unusual courage and patriotism. People who disagreed strenuously with him as President, admired him as a man as well as a leader.

---

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune]

The martyred President must be judged in history, not so much by what he accomplished as by what he attempted. He had so tragically little time and so many massive barriers before him.

Perhaps no other American President prepared himself so consciously and so completely for his office. Mr. Kennedy was a master of politics, which is the necessary prerequisite for statesmanship. After his election, he laid before his country and its reluctant Congress a program for progress which is as bold as it is comprehensive.

He submitted to his countrymen imaginative new concepts in conservation and resource development, civil rights, education, public health, aid for the aging, employment, international trade and domestic economic policy, to name a few areas of his interest and competency. He demonstrated in his press conferences a continuous mastery of the varied facets of his bafflingly complex office. Many of the domestic programs he advocated doubtless will be achieved in years still to come.

In foreign policy particularly the brilliant vision of this young President surely will help guide the Nation and the free world long after his tragic death. Surely the world will listen to him anew, as it listened to Lincoln, now that he is gone:

"Let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are manmade; therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants."

Or again:

"I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph, for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat, or even by the wishes of all.

"But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere—if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions—then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

"Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God."

He left another message of special meaning this day for his grieving countrymen. He was speaking of Dag Hammarskjold and the United Nations, but he could as well have been speaking of his own beloved country and the void he now leaves in it:

"The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future."

The unfinished work of John F. Kennedy awaits America. May this Nation grow to meet the challenge of our age.

---

[From the Aberdeen (Idaho) Times]

The first grief was at the loss of one so close to each of us. He represented each of us and the principles we stand for. He was a symbol to all of our way of life.

---

[From the Grangeville (Idaho) Free Press]

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a leader among men, yet his personal appeal brought him closer to most Americans and peoples of the world than many of his predecessors in the office of Chief Executive.

The President of the United States extended to the world a warm handclasp in the name of peace. To those in need, he befriended. He was a true American, and it was his spirited approach to the problems of humanity which meant so much to the downtrodden, the poverty stricken. His image shall live for many years to come.

Americans took kindly to Mr. Kennedy and his family. The White House and its residents were next door neighbors to everyone in the United States. The affection shown to the Kennedys by the public was as real as any devotion of family life in an American home.

Mr. Kennedy met major problems while in office with a view always toward universal peace. Nothing would sway him to travel a different route. He would hold the peace to the limit.

Complicated domestic political issues did not meet with evasion when they reached Mr. Kennedy's desk. His proposals for the Nation were bold and vigorous. There was no timidity in asking for major legislation and he pressed with personal sincerity.

In this modern, space age era in which often it appears science is outdistancing the real purpose of man and swamping mankind with difficult social problems, often appearing insurmountable, it was refreshing to have in the White House a President in tune with the times.

This is not a time of hopelessness. This is a time for a reassessment of our stewardship in our democracy. And this is the time for a show of faith and thanksgiving that Mr. Kennedy left the Nation strong and dedicated to continue his deeds toward universal peace.

---

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman]

It is a moment in which attention is focused upon John F. Kennedy as an individual of high ideals, of dedication, and of courage.

A product of his times, John F. Kennedy was called to national leadership in a period of widely prevailing uncertainty and perhaps of epochal transition involving the clash of strongly conflicting forces. He has fulfilled his part stoutly, conscientiously, and fairly.

It has been his prime purpose to minimize the conflict and to do all within his power to make this country and the world a better place for all mankind to live.

It is perhaps that as an outstanding humanitarian his memory will be enshrined. He has been quick to respond to the appeal of human wants and needs. In his book it is the proper function of government to provide the remedy, and he has not hesitated to call upon the resources of government to that end.

In reference to the phrase that sounded like a clarion in his inaugural address, John F. Kennedy never asked what the country could give him personally; instead it has been he who has given his country and the world the last full measure of devotion.

---

[From the Rexburg (Idaho) Standard]

When a leader of great power and presence and capacity for good dies in office, the cause to which he gave leadership suffers grievous loss. President John F. Kennedy was such a man. The cause he served, and so eloquently led, was the threefold cause of human dignity and equality and freedom.

The cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded.

Mr. CHURCH. Sometimes, even in moments of solemn bereavement, a child will make some captivating comment. When we took our boys, Forrest and Chase, with us to the Capitol rotunda, to pay our last respects as a family to John F. Kennedy, our little boy, sensing his mother's distress, reached up for her hand and said, "Don't cry, Mommy. The guards will protect him. If these guards fall, others will come to take their place. They can never take President Kennedy away from us."

They never can take President Kennedy away from us. His memory will be guarded by every person who strives for excellence, by every mind in search of truth, by every eye that would see justice done, by every open hand outstretched for peace, and by every heart that holds freedom dear, for as long as men aspire to do God's work on earth.

**Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina.** Mr. President, we have not been able to bring ourselves as yet to realize fully that the late President John F. Kennedy is no longer with us.

Never before in the history of our country have our people been so shocked and saddened as we were on November 22, 1963.

We gather now to pay tribute to a human being who, in a short lifetime, came to mean so much to so many millions of peoples throughout the world.

In spite of the fact he was still a young man, John F. Kennedy had come to be a living, active, forceful symbol for freedom throughout the world.

It is impossible to express the feelings all of us have had since his tragic and unnecessary death. We are saddened beyond words.

But the greatest tribute we can pay this man today is to carry on the business of the Nation and to go ahead even while we mourn his passing.

Above all else he would want us to make the best of the situation at hand and prove beyond any doubt that our system of democracy is unshakable even at a time such as this. We have lost a great leader, a warm friend, and a courageous man, and we are deep in our sorrow, but we all know that the world is a better place in which to live as a result of his unselfish service to mankind.

**Mr. ERVIN.** Mr. President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of the bulwarks, the bright spires, the strong places.

Today we honor one of our own—one who served and served well—as a Member of this body. It was while he served here that he was chosen by the American people to take the mantle of national leadership during an awesome period of world history.

He was young, and vigorous, and wise, and dedicated to public service. Virtually all of his adult life was spent in the service of his country.

His achievements are too numerous to attempt listing; as is the case with any man so deserving of a eulogy, he does not require one.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy belonged to each of us—to every American. He was our President; but throughout the world he belonged, in a very special way, to many others—for to them he was more than the leader of a great nation—he was a symbol of peace.

Each of us is acutely aware of the tragedy that has befallen us, and in such times we turn to our memories.

I remember him as a strong, brave young man—one who carried to his grave injuries received during World War II and endured through the years; one who offered his life for his country, first in war and again in peace. It is ironic that the first offer was refused and the second accepted; but we can be thankful for those years between the first and second offering when we had the benefit of his wisdom, his ideas, and his ideals. We grieve that his even greater potential for the years ahead has been lost to us.

I remember him for his gallant personal victory over physical disability, and I remember the standing ovation he received from his colleagues when he returned to the Senate floor on crutches in 1955. I remember his vitality, his wit, and his fine mind; and I valued his friendship.

As a public servant, I remember him as a sophisticated, polished statesman who could nevertheless communicate and identify with people of every station. He was a man of rare eloquence, strong conviction, and great courage—a diligent and dedicated colleague.

As President, I remember him not only as a political leader who met the great issues of the age, but also as one who rekindled interest in the arts, renewed concern for our national heritage, and increased respect for scholarship.

And with the confirmation of his death, I recalled the verse from Shakespeare:

> Now cracks a noble heart. Good night, Sweet Prince,
> And flights of Angels sing thee to thy rest.

His was indeed a noble heart, and a noble mind and a noble spirit that we shall never forget.

But perhaps our greatest legacy from President Kennedy was his dream. He said:

> I believe in an America that is on the march—an America respected by all nations, friends and foes alike—an America that is moving, choosing, doing, dreaming—a strong America in a world of peace.

And this must be the dream of all of us.

Our sympathy goes out to the courageous Kennedy family; indeed, it goes out to all the Nation, for he belonged to all of us, and he was the President of all of us—and we shall miss him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the following articles and editorials from the North Carolina press and other news media as evidence of the esteem and affection the people of my State had for the late President.

There being no objection, the articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stanly News & Press, Albemarle, N.C., Nov. 26, 1963]

### A Nation in Shock Needs Prayer

Three shots rang out about 12:30 c.s.t., Friday, in Dallas, Tex., and the effect of them reverberated around the world within just a few minutes. A sniper, armed with a high-powered rifle, killed President John F. Kennedy and seriously wounded Governor John Connally, of Texas, who was riding in the car with the President.

The first reaction throughout this Nation was shock. It was a benumbed people who sat with their eyes fixed on television screens as the story of the dastardly crime was unfolded. The second reaction was revulsion—extreme revulsion that such a thing could have happened in this country.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was no ordinary man. Although born to wealth, so that he could have lived in ease and luxury, he chose a path of service. Endowed with great courage, an excellent intellect, and a high sense of duty, Mr. Kennedy served his country in World War II, earning a heroes acclaim. Entering politics after the war, he distinguished himself as Congressman and Senator and served the country so well that in 1960 he was first-ballot choice of the Democrat Party for the Presidency.

History will record that he served as leader of his country and of the free world during nearly 3 years in an era when danger of a nuclear holocaust was uppermost in the minds of men around the globe. Under his leadership the Nation was spared the horror of hydrogen war, and enjoyed a high degree of prosperity and progress. Significant achievements were recorded, both at home and on the diplomatic front.

As must be said of all men in high places, not everyone was in agreement with President Kennedy. But even his severest critic could not accuse him of being insincere. His administration was dedicated to the cause of peace and sought in every way possible to further the cause of freedom.

His life of service and usefulness was cut short at 46, an age when most Presidents have not even thought of running for that high office. The youthful age at which he attained the world's most responsible office attests the ability he demonstrated and the faith which his colleagues had in his leadership.

Reaction from around the world was that of disbelief, of shock and incredulity, and this soon gave way to uncertainty about the future, for a new President was sworn in a few hours after Mr. Kennedy was pronounced dead at Parkland Hospital, Dallas.

Taking over the reins of leadership is Lyndon B. Johnson, a stalwart Texan and a man well experienced in the intricacies of the Federal Government. This Nation, if it has to experience the loss of a President, is fortunate in having as his successor a man of the ability and experience of Lyndon Johnson.

There is no way of foretelling what the future may hold as this Nation continues to try to uphold freedom and the dignity of man around the globe.

But this we can say that Mr. Johnson is a dedicated Christian leader who has already in this dark hour, invoked the guidance of God and the support and cooperation of the people in carrying on the tremendous task of Government.

Even while our tears drop in mourning for our fallen leader, it behooves us as a people to look ahead, gather new confidence, and to rally our forces in support of our new leader. His path may not be the same as that chosen by Mr. Kennedy, but his is the responsibility for leadership. Our responsibility is that of intelligent cooperation and faithful support.

And may we pray, as did Dr. Gerner at Pfeiffer on Friday afternoon, that the enmity and hatred which prompted such a dastardly deed may give way to the spirit of Christian love and brotherhood befitting a free and democratic nation.

---

[From the Stanly News & Press, Albemarle, N.C., Nov. 29, 1963]

### Why Such Tragic Hate?

A self-styled Communist, hiding behind a sixth floor window, sighted down the barrel of a powerful rifle with a telescopic lens, and pulled the trigger three times. The President fell into the arms of his lovely young wife, mortally wounded, and the Governor of Texas was grievously hurt.

That was about 1:30 p.m. Friday, November 22, a date which will live in infamy and perhaps be known as "Black Friday."

Though the sound of the three shots was not audible over television or radio, the impact reverberated around the world in just a few hours. Friend and foe, alike, sent words of regret, of condolence.

The American people, as one individual, reeled with the incredulity of the crime and then settled themselves in front of television screens, their minds forming one big question, "Why?"

The man Dallas police say definitely killed President Kennedy, a Dallas policeman, and wounded the Texas Governor was himself shot fatally in the basement of the Dallas city hall by a nightclub operator. He died only a few feet from the spot where President Kennedy breathed his last about 48 hours earlier, in Parkland Hospital, where Albemarle's Jack Price is administrator.

There are so many loose threads of the situation, so many coincidences and unanswered questions, that one cannot help wondering if the assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was killed because of what he might have told police if he had lived. We may never really know.

On the other hand, there is a stark realization in the hearts of people everywhere of what hatred—cold and calculating enmity—can do to human personality.

Mr. Kennedy returned to Washington and to the White House, where the people of this great land paid him high tribute. Perhaps a quarter of a million men and women marched silently by his bier as it lay in state in the Capitol rotunda.

I shall never forget the sight of that spirited, prancing and impatient black horse, without a rider, following along behind the caisson bearing the President's body. In that horse it seemed I could almost see and feel the zest, the will, the spirit of the departed President, chafing at the bit and eager for action, for living.

The skies wept over Washington the day after Mr. Kennedy was killed, but the sun shone brightly as the crowds gathered to pay him tribute.

In every phase of the observance, from the time he was brought back to the White House until the casket was lowered into the hallowed earth of Arlington, in the shadows of majestic Custis-Lee Mansion, there was dignity and the aura of tribute. Symbolic of the President's influence, his widow lighted a perpetual fire at the head of his grave, which will be viewed by hundreds of thousands of Americans in the years to come.

Heads of state, kings, queens, princes, prime ministers, emperors—the most impressive array of world figures I can recall—testified to the esteem in which our President was held.

But, during it all, another figure emerged as heroic, an example for American womanhood of all the years to come. Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy cradled the head of her dying husband en route to the hospital, rode with his body in the plane to Washington, remained near him all through the night, visited him in repose in the East Room of the White House, maintained dignity and stately composure in all her many appearances at the Capitol, the final rites, and the reception afterward at which the heads of state formally paid their respects to her.

Poise and grace were evident in her and her children, and "Jack," had be been alive to see them, would have been proud of their demeanor. "Jackie" has earned the praise of Americans everywhere in these days of mourning and loss.

It is never possible to put into words all the things one feels at a time such as this. Hearts and minds have been saddened beyond expression. Such sorrow has not gripped the Nation in many, many years, and never has a people felt so personal a loss, for John Kennedy had come into our homes and talked with us on many occasions. It was almost as if a very dear member of the family had gone beyond.

Though the loss of one so young, so brave, and so handsome must be met with deep grieving, the Nation and the world must carry on. We are fortunate to have a man of Lyndon Johnson's experience and ability to take over leadership.

But we can hope that the wellsprings of hate, which beget such tragedies may be replaced by the Christian spirit of brotherly love.

---

[From the Stanly News & Press, Albermarle, N.C., Nov. 26, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By George B. Weaver)

By birth a product of what has aptly been described as "the great American dream."

In early manhood, a hero through his courageous actions while in the service of his country.

By inclination, an intellectual, with rare gifts of expression and insight into human personality.

His personality, warm, friendly, almost radiant, magnetic, with a ready smile and an engaging wit.

His ambition, to serve his fellow man, to uphold freedom and justice, and to seek peace among all men everywhere.

As a father, exhibiting the love and tenderness of a fond parent, along with the faith of a devout Christian.

In middle life, elected to the highest office the citizens of the United States can offer, respected by heads of state around the world, and with a growing stature of leadership among statesmen of the world.

In death, a martyr to the causes he espoused, and perhaps as strong a testimony for right as in life. He died in the service of his fellow man and his country.

Significantly, as is so often the case, the full appreciation of what he was did not reach the minds and hearts of people in this land and elsewhere until the impact of his loss was felt.

---

[From the Benson (N.C.) Review, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IN MEMORIAM

(By Dr. Gaylor L. Lehman)

Our hearts are saddened today because of the tragic death of our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Last Friday afternoon we looked at each other in silent shock and stunned disbelief. Today our eyes have a glassy stare and we find the stark fact of his death still incomprehensible. As a Nation and as individuals we mourn his untimely passing and are inflamed by the insane act that caused it. In war and in peace John Kennedy offered his life to his country. Many years of leadership and greatness lay before him. His consuming desire was the triumph of freedom in our country and in the world, with its inherent right for each person to develop his talent and ability to the maximum. For this cause he lived and died.

The miracle of television made the name of John F. Kennedy a household word. His 2 years and 10 months in the office of President brought him into our homes on newscasts almost every day. It seemed as if we knew him, his wife, and his children personally. In a very real sense it makes his passing seem not only that of a President and statesman but also that of a personal friend. Whether rich or poor, unlearned or lettered, Protestant or Catholic, white or Negro, we mourn his passing. He was our President and as such he commanded our respect and our loyalty.

It is almost inconceivable that the President of the United States could be shot from ambush and murdered. In barbaric Vietnam or in the uncivilized Congo, yes; in America, no. The fact that it has happened points up the venom of hatred that exists among us—class, racial, ethnic, even religious. It speaks of the sickness of our national morality. One crazed fanatic fired the rifle. But we have all called each other too many names; we have harbored too many prejudices; we have nurtured too many suspicions. And in so doing we must bear our guilt, for it was out of this attitude that the shot was fired. We have been unwilling to exemplify the spirit of Jesus Christ who talked about walking the second mile and turning the other cheek, and who asked that we love our neighbor as ourselves.

Today we mourn the loss of a young and great leader, brilliant in politics, yet human in qualities. It is not that we agreed with everything he said or did. It is rather that he was our President and that he belonged to each of us. Today our hearts go out and our prayers go up for Mrs. Kennedy, her children, and the family, that they may find comfort and strength amid their sorrow; for President Johnson, that he may seek and find divine wisdom and guidance to lead us in the future; and for our Nation, that individually and collectively we may find in this tragedy a new respect for those with whom we differ and a new love for God and for one another.

---

[From the Watauga Democrat]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–63

(By Rob Rivers)

The parade route was lined with friendly, cheering people as the President of the United States, the First Lady, Governor and Mrs. Connally rode along a Dallas street. Things appeared to be going well in the turbulent political tides which have ebbed and flowed in the Lone Star State. But there was the crack of a rifle, the Chief Executive slumped and the Nation was plunged into deep mourning.

Even those who liked the President least found a common ground with those who loved the Executive, in their crushed reaction to the monstrously evil thing, which could well affect the destinies of the Nation and even of the world.

Youthful, vigorous, and imaginative, Mr. Kennedy had served his country well during the agonies of the late great war and during the frenzied and dangerous age of the shaky and uneasy peace. He had served less than three-fourths of his term when an assassin's bullet struck with its crashing, searing lethality.

President Kennedy, who was no stranger to trouble and to sorrow and to family tragedy, carried into the Nation's top office a wealth of knowledge and of experience and a rare concern for the rights and welfare of the peoples of the country and of the world. Articulate, personable, and with no apparent quality of fear, he captured the imagination and esteem of his countrymen. He was thickskinned, impervious to criticism, and could make vital decisions without disturbing his sleep.

The President was not doing well with his programs in Congress. Few men of vision and change are successful right from the start when they speak freely for liberalism, and who espouse the rights of the common man, and who've believed that one race has no moral or legal right to set itself up as the master of another race whose skin comes in darker hues.

In his fight for civil rights and for the dignity of the Federal courts, President Kennedy was never swerved from his convictions, even though he was losing strength in some sections of the country. In the South, even in North Carolina, those who've wanted to keep the status quo have railed out against the President, who would have fared badly in some of the States of the old Confederacy.

But, death in its silent, strange finality, often comes as a grim pacifier, as a sort of common denominator and those who had fought the President, tooth and nail, in and out of the Congress are now united in a common grief, the extent of which has perhaps never been equaled in the Nation's harried history.

The mysterious curtain of death has brought an amazing degree of charity and of sadness, even to his former detractors. Some of the debatable policies which he espoused with youthful vigor and without regard to personal consequences, somehow don't seem to be so tremendously wrong now that heads are bared and bowed in the stillness and hush of his tragic leavetaking. So, in the dispensation of the Father of us all, it could well be that Mr. Kennedy's death could be the means of reuniting our Nation more solidly than before in these days of our tragic sorrows, and of our common dangers.

President Kennedy was a good and a great man. He had matured in his position of power and of prestige and had met issues of monstrous magnitude with firm decisions and with courage casehardened in the caldrons of world conflict.

It is fitting that the President's body, smashed by an enemy of our country, is lying as this is written on the catafalque which first held the body of Abraham Lincoln, who himself met death as an indirect result of some of the beliefs which President Kennedy espoused a hundred years later. While the Kennedy assassination does not tie in, so far as we know, with the racial situation, most of the hatred which the late President acquired was in his efforts to implement and expand the spirit of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The sinews of a great nation are not weakened when watered by its tears, and out of a common grief should come a more purposeful perspective and a renewal of our spiritual and physical might. In our time of sorrowful reflection, we should gain strength from the unchanging purposes and high courage of our fallen President, and tranquillity from Mrs. Kennedy who knelt by the catafalque which once held the body of Abraham Lincoln, kissed the flag which covered the coffin of her husband, and leading her children, Caroline and John-John, one with each hand, walked resolutely from the hushed rotunda of the Capitol into the sunlight.

---

[From the Watauga Democrat, Nov. 28, 1963]

## J.F.K.—He Had Our Esteem

(By Bob Rivers)

When the white horses were drawing the caisson which held the coffin of President Kennedy through the sunshine-laced shadows of the Avenue of Presidents, our tortured mind turned back to another day long ago, when President Harding died in San Francisco's Palace Hotel. The Democrat, short-handed and fairly ill equipped in those skimpy days, managed a special edition and distributed it freely, far and wide, as a public service to a mourning populace. Some years later Franklin D. Roosevelt expired in Warm Springs, but the radio had made a special edition unneeded in a time of change. We recalled the long train trip from the west coast and the great creped engines which headed President Harding's funeral train, and when the steaming, panting moguls of the shiny rails thundered through town and city and hamlet taking F.D.R. back home. There was grief, it seemed, aplenty on both of these occasions when the leaders of our country had fallen. President Harding, elected in a landslide, was popular with the masses of the people; Roosevelt was their idol, but he had little of health and vigor left.

With President Kennedy it was different from the last leavetaking of a Chief Executive. The youngest man to hold the office of crushing responsibility and of grim dangers, he perhaps hadn't yet reached the apex of his colorful career. He was not allowed to die naturally but from the tearing, rending impact of a rifle bullet. This made his going even more tragic. His youthfulness, his courageous striving for what he believed right, his tremendous mental capacity, would have seemed to portend a long tenure in the spotlight's glare.

We, who two-finger this column, liked the President from the days when he went into the political wars against what appeared overwhelming forces in his home State and won for himself a seat in the Senate. We were present when the thatch-haired Boston-trained politician was defeated for the Vice-Presidential nomination by Estes Kefauver in the convention of 1956 (which perhaps saved his political life), and took the missus on a hurried trip to Los Angeles solely to cast a delegate vote for John Kennedy for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1960, thus becoming a sort of moral heretic to the vast majority of the Carolina delegation who'd gone all out for Lyndon Johnson. Fact is we got in about as bad a shape as we did in 1952 when we foresook Senator Russell and went along with Kerr Scott for Stevenson against the wishes of the kingmakers of Carolina politics. Nobody asked us to vote for Kennedy, we just liked the guy, and thought it a waste of political powder to nominate a man whose friends, at the time, couldn't have entertained a serious notion of his inhabiting the White House.

### RECEPTION FROSTY

We saw Senator Kennedy at a breakfast given for the delegation. It was a kind of meet-the-candidates event, and we recall Governor Hollings, of South Carolina, being at our table when Stevenson and Symington were proposed to the delegates, and we heard Lyndon B. Johnson make a homey pitch for the support he had in his vest pocket at the time. In due time Senator Kennedy strode into the room, his bright sorrel hair standing out like a light. He walked with what someone described as that "little-lost-boy look." He spoke briefly, said he'd enjoyed being in North Carolina previously, expected to be there again if nominated "and," he said, "if I fail of nomination, I'll still come to see you, if you'll let me." He smiled the toothy good-natured Irish smile and moved away. The reception he received was not downright discourteous, or anything of that sort, but chilly like a November morning. It looked like the hundred or more people should have fetched out to the Golden State more warmth from Carolina's bright midsummer sun. But politicians being like they are, many can't abide a man running counter to their notions and few sought to shake hands with the President-in-the-making, Mrs. Rivers and we being notable exceptions, and we liked making brief talk with the man whose career we had followed with such great personal concern. Winning in a steamroller style on the first ballot, the Kennedy machine left the losers figuratively weeping in their beer.

### THE OTHER RIDE—ON THE AVENUE

We'd been present on the bleak January day when the snow had been taken from Pennsylvania Avenue, so that the gay inaugural parade could proceed along the route so lately trod by the teams of pale horses. It was a glad time for all and sundry, in spite of the change in the weather, and there were tears all around in our group when a vigorous young man took the oath of office and faced up to his massive problems in an inaugural address without precedent for its eloquence and logic. "Ask not," he had shouted, and his breath was like smoke in the frigid air, "what your country can do for you, but rather what you can do for your country." Little would we have thought that his martyrdom would have been his supreme gift to the Nation.

### HUMAN AND DEMOCRATIC

President Kennedy was very human and democratic. In our personal reflections we thought of having written him some time after his inaugural, offering a suggestion as to the broadening of the base of his press conferences. Back came a reply to a country editor from the Executive, with appreciation and thanks for the suggestion which he said "has a great deal of merit." And across the bottom, in the Kennedy scrawl, he penned, "would like to see you when next you are in Washington." A few weeks ago we had published a letter from President Kennedy congratulating us on the 75th anniversary of the Democrat and commending us and our family on our efforts down through the years. At home with all segments of the population, concerned over the welfare and activities of all the people, his name will be remembered for his greatness and strength.

These personal references are only intended to show the uncommon stature of the man whose tragic death we mourn. We've had a hard time keeping the tears off the typewriter these last days. Somehow they just keep coming.

---

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Nov. 23, 1963]

## John Fitzgerald Kennedy

The death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is a boundless tragedy. A man is dead, one of striking gifts of heart and mind and of enormous capacity for service. And with the life is lost a precious distillation of experience, judgment and wisdom that the Nation can possess only through a President acting and moving in full stride.

A disaster so profound cannot be compassed; it can only be mourned. And the loss cannot be made up. At 46, the President had decades of incalculable promise unfolding before him. Who can guess the shining acts of service the world has been deprived of by a psychotic sniper? One evil moment has ended a life of striving.

The American people wait to follow the new President with that spirit of unity and loyalty always characteristic of them in times of crisis. But only to President Johnson, thrust toward new and hard responsibilities, can the assassination seem fully credible. The gleam of John F. Kennedy's bright and buoyant spirit lingers and will not soon fade.

It is difficult even now to comprehend the swiftnes of his rise in American politics and his unyielding determination to become his Nation's chief executive. Because his ambition to succeed was inseparable from his desire for the Nation to succeed, he came to personify for millions the promise and passion of a nation to remain supreme in the world.

In every Kennedy speech there always came the unquestioned accents of a patriot who loved his country.

There was a driving urgency in him, reflecting an unshakeable belief that the Nation and the world could throw off the coils of peril with unremitting faith and work. Almost from the moment of his inauguration those coils closed about the young President; in a moving speech on Berlin he admitted his astonishment at learning how terrible and awesome were the responsiblities he had sought with such unquenchable zest. Yet he was as equal to them as any man could be.

There never was any doubt, and certainly none in the Kremlin, that a threat to the freedom of America would be met with force. The President, in his finest moments, matched wits and nerves with a wily tyrant and he passed the tests with flying colors.

In the good heart and healthy mind of the President every inhabitant of the globe had a personal stake. In some measure all life was linked to his life because he possessed enough power to unhinge the world; yet neither the power nor the nightmarish problems that created it warped his spirit. On the day he lost his life the President was still carrying his gaiety and courage and, remarkably, his youth. No panic of mind or hardness of heart in the 35th President of the United States ever would have pushed mankind into the abyss. But he had found the strength and the patience to stand on the brink, and the Nation stood with him wholeheartedly. Americans had confidence in the wisdom and judgment of John Kennedy on the great issues of war or peace. He earned that confidence in trial by fire, and he deserved it.

No American can glimpse the relentless pressures and cruel choices that faced President Kennedy from his inauguration on. To reflect on them now can only deepen our grief and respect. History handed him a threatened world, a nation divided politically and a people split along racial lines. Answers of any sort were difficult; answers that would please were impossible. It was not in his power to reconcile world or national tensions; he could only try unceasingly, and he did.

But to dwell on the harshness of President Kennedy's lot would be to miss the greatness of the man. Which was that he welcomed trial, gloried in struggle and kept his faith in the face of shattering disappointments.

Those inner qualities remained untarnished to the end, and they are a large part of the legacy he leaves to a grieving nation. But not alone these. For all her internal frustrations and agony, America is a stronger nation than John Kennedy found her and the world, perhaps, is a little safer.

No President is indispensable; in the depth of its tragedy, the Nation will find new strength. But John F. Kennedy is irreplaceable, and we will tell our children that he was a rare and radiant man who loved his country fiercely and was a martyr to its service, and we will tell them the truth.

---

[From the Clayton (N.C.) News, Nov. 27, 1963]

(By Tom Womble)

We come in this hour to look at a man of courage—a man of dedication—a man of forthrightness. He was a man of sensitivity, a person as comfortable in the presence of political leaders as with his two children.

President Kennedy offered himself, I believe, to be used by his country and by his God.

He gave to the world a new hope for peace on the international horizon, that few others dreamed possible, along with which he gave a new sense of pride at being an American.

McGregor Barnes, historian, quoted John F. Kennedy as having said, "It will take more bravery in the sixties than ever to continue." The late President lived these words, within his life to the point that they may not be considered trivial. A back ailment proved to be only one "thorn in the flesh," of which there were many, which perplexed him throughout his 46 years. Continuous operations brought him near death's gate in 1954. This operation was for the removal of a steel plate, previously inserted, in his back. His church during these days even administered the last rites.

Years before he, as a junior-grade naval lieutenant commanding a PT-boat, had courageously saved several members of his crew, one of which had been personally towed in his teeth, having clutched in his teeth the straps of the sailor's life belt. This ordeal took approximately 5 hours.

The bravery of which he spoke can easily be identified in many areas as being desperately needed in our own land today.

John F. Kennedy's loyalty and devotion to his country is typified in his statement, "Ask not, what can my country do for me? Ask, what can I do for my country?"

This question is prominent in this tragic hour: "What can we do for our country that this great man need not have died in vain?"

First, our country must become united; pettiness cannot have a place among us in this hour.

Secondly, we must live in faith as never before. Faith that God is in control of this world and from out of these moments of upheaval and transition He shall continue to reign.

May I quote from William G. Ballentine's "God Save America" as our final thought in this eulogy to the late President of our United States.

"GOD SAVE AMERICA

"God save America! New world of glory, Newborn to freedom and knowledge and power, Lifting the towers of her lightning lit cities Where the flood tides of humanity roar.

"God save America! Here may all races Mingle together as children of God, Founding an empire on brotherly kindness, Equal in Liberty, made of one blood!

"God save America! Bearing the olive, Hers be the blessing the peacemakers prove, Calling the nations to glad federation, Leading the world in the triumphs of love!

"God save America! 'Mid all her splendors, Save her from pride and from luxury; Throne in her heart the Un-seen and Eternal, Right to be her might and the truth made her free!"

---

[From the Sampson Independent, Nov. 28, 1963]

A verse for today: "Be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches but in the living God who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." (I Timothy 6: 17.)

### President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

"May God rest his soul."

Americans of all faiths and all races were shocked into a prayer for the soul of their assassinated President as the news came over the airwaves on the blackest Friday in recent history.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was 46. In the prime of life, with nearly 3 years of service as Chief Executive of the United States behind him, he was on a peacemaking mission to politically embroiled Texas, when a long-range rifle was thrust from a window and shots rang out.

The President slumped into the arms of his wife, Jacqueline Kennedy, who rode proudly beside him. He was rushed to the hospital. Specialists worked over him. Priests gave him the last rites of the Roman Catholic Church. He died within an hour of the attack.

So little did John Kennedy think that he was in any danger, that he sat beside his wife on his last ride.

Lyndon B. Johnson, who as Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, was indirectly the victim of the assassin. For it was in his State of Texas that the assassination took place which vaulted him into the White House. He was to be the host to the Kennedy's at his ranch for the weekend.

It is too early to render judgment on the 35th President. He had brought the country to its greatest peacetime strength, both in nuclear and conventional arms. He had recovered much of the loss in the space race.

On the economic front, he had seen the gross national income rise $100 billion, from $500 billion to an expected $600 billion this year. The greatest blot was the high unemployment level, that did not fall despite the Nation's great prosperity. He had achieved a certain accommodation with the Soviet Union, which somewhat firmed a shaky peace.

The Nation echoes the anguished cry of Mrs. Kennedy as the President fell into her arms, "Oh, no! Oh, no!" To her and their children, to the bereaved parents and brothers and sisters, the Nation's heart goes out. Their loss is the country's loss. May God help them, and help the country that nurtured him to his high office. And may He be with his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, the 36th President of the United States, as he enters with heavy heart into his exalted office.

---

[From the Concord (N.C.) Tribune, Nov. 24, 1963]

### In Memoriam of President John F. Kennedy—1917–63

Words can scarcely convey the sense of horror, shock, and indignation felt when President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was assassinated Friday afternoon.

That such a thing could happen in the United States of America in this day and age is inconceivable, and even now more than a day later, remains very difficult to believe.

A bullet, fired by a cowardly murderer, cut short the life of the youngest man ever elected to the Nation's highest office. The tragic end came just at a time when it appeared that Kennedy's peaceful overtures to the Soviet Union might at long last bring relief from the pressures of the cold war.

That the late President was a controversial figure cannot be denied, but Americans, regardless of party affiliation, mourn him as a fallen hero.

Although his program—those in effect and those on the drawing boards—drew wrath on one side and bountiful praise on the other, his acts at relieving East-West tensions should serve to place his memory deep in the hearts of all Americans.

In situations like this, we are prone to forget the things with which we disagreed and are more likely to remember only the fine qualities and deeds of the departed. Such should be the case now.

Filled with youthful energy and plans for reshaping the Nation, Kennedy took office in troubled times. And troubles he had—the Bay of Pigs disaster, Berlin, the Cuban missile crisis, civil rights struggles at home, and others.

The office matured him as only the intense pressures, obligations, and responsibilities of the world's highest office can.

Many criticized the late President for the high-powered tactics which won him the Democratic nomination in 1960, and later, the Presidency. But John Kennedy, the politician and statesman, like Jack Kennedy, the naval officer and hero, knew but one way to wage any fight—to win.

He had his successes as well as his failures and his platform raised howls of protests in many quarters, but few can doubt his personal sincerity, integrity, and courage.

An assassin's bullet killed more than a man in Dallas Friday afternoon; it killed the image of a new day in this century, for Kennedy was the symbol of youth, with its vigorous and unsullied plans for reshaping the order of things in a jumbled world.

How his death will alter the course in history is purely a matter of conjecture. However, John Kennedy was a forceful, popular man and much that only he could have accomplished has been lost to a world, now much poorer by his loss.

He took office in troubled times, but died in a period of East-West thaw, for which he was primarily responsible. As the peace-loving Americans that we are, we can only pray that the late John F. Kennedy set the stage for true world peace in the years to come.

Let us not forget the human, for in death he is not only a former President, but a loving husband and adoring father, taken from his family at the height of his success and in the prime of life.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead—he is not forgotten—but now is the time to unite behind President Lyndon B. Johnson, for trying days await the new Chief Executive.

[From the Concord (N.C.) Tribune, Dec. 1, 1963]

### CALLS FOR UNITY

Our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, made a splendid appeal to the citizens of the Nation Thanksgiving night for them to "banish the rancor from our words and the malice from our hearts," so a united nation can face the days ahead.

It was a simple yet great personal appeal from the President for unity and sincerity from the people to get the job done at hand in tribute to the martyred President Kennedy.

And he made a statement that all of us must surely take to heart. He pointed out that "our homes are safe, our defenses are secure," adding "we know our system is strong."

Most of us in days past had not heard such reassuring news. Simply he was telling the people that America is strong and ready for any attack which might be mounted by an enemy.

Moved by the sudden death of his immediate predecessor, the late John F. Kennedy, he announced that Cape Canaveral henceforth will be known as Cape Kennedy, a great tribute to a young man who put America right at the top in the great outer space race.

[From the Concord (N.C.) Tribune, Dec. 3, 1963]

### THE TORCH IS PASSED

It will be remembered that President Kennedy in his inaugural address, made a point of the fact that he was accepting the torch of leadership for a new generation, born in this century and veteran of its wars. The torch is still in comparatively young hands.

Lyndon B. Johnson was 55 last August 27. He was born in 1908. He, too, is a product of this century. He saw active duty as a commander in the Naval Reserve in 1941 and 1942. He is in tune with the times.

But the two men who are next in line, now "a heart beat away from the Presidency," are not of this generation. Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the next in line, will be 72 December 21 next. He was born in 1891. Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate and now second in line, was 86 last October 2. He was born in 1877. MCCORMACK has been in Congress 36 years, HAYDEN 51. They reached their positions partly on seniority, partly on ability.

The act of succession overlooked the fact that normally the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate are old men who might not be able to stand the rigors of the Presidency. The old order, which made the Cabinet the immediate successors in order of Cabinet seniority beginning with the Secretary of State, had its advantages. These men share the burdens of Government with the President and they are usually young men picked for their executive ability. Now they come after the two legislative leaders.

The Congress is not likely to relinquish the succession it voted its presiding officers during the serious illness of President Eisenhower. But it should reconsider its handiwork in the light of the present outlook, should any other indisposition occur.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A NATION MOURNS

Dynamic, magnetic John Fitzgerald Kennedy,
Thirty-fifth President of the United States,
Young, clean, gracious, intellectual, articulate,
Is lost to the Nation and the world,
Victim of a despicable assassin's bullet.
It was a madman's act.
To his fellow-Americans ghastly and grievous.
The Republic, scarcely comprehending, weeps.
It is ironical that a courageous man
Who walked fearlessly
Among alien peoples in safety,
Walked fearlessly among his own people
And was slain.
To his family, especially his widow,
Flow sorrow, and love,
From the hearts of all the world.
None put it better than an average citizen:
"He was a great man—and a good man."

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A BITTER, BITTER AGE

"What," many an American is asking himself and his neighbors today, "is our America coming to? How could so cruel and brutal a horror occur in the enlightened United States?"

The answer: We live in an age of passion and violence, raw passion and violence. The infection has spread to our noble democracy.

Americans will variously and instinctively, in their grief and rage and disappointment, seek to attach the stigma to someone else, thrusting away the guilt which presses in upon themselves. Many will accusingly assign the culpability for the frightful crime to this alinement or that attitude.

That will not do. Nor will it do to point the defamatory finger at any individual, even the miserable, moronic assassin.

Every human being in this country who has pondered passion and violence or who has yielded to passion and violence, thus canonizing passion and violence in our otherwise compassionate and lovely land, may feel himself contributory to November's day of infamy.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 25, 1963]

### TAPS

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the President,
Has been laid in his warrior's grave;
Sacred American ground in Arlington
Which he, by his life and his death,
Dedicated, consecrated and hallowed.
By his own example he illuminated
His "Profiles of Courage."
He has, in his unflinching sacrifice,
Presented a challenge to American's youth
In which he had such faith;
And to it passed a torch.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 25, 1963]

### TWICE A HERO

Twice John Fitzgerald Kennedy went to war and twice he won his country's veneration. In the military sphere, he won his honors in the South Seas. In the civilian domain, he laid down his life.

He belongs to history and only history will comprehensively appraise his contribution to humanity. The Nation and the world today know only that a noble soul has been cut off in the very hour of his opportunity.

Worthy and understanding Americans, lamenting, place a flower on his tomb.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 25, 1963]

### AN EQUALLY BRAVE WOMAN

No heart, American, French, Irish or otherwise oriented, which mourns the lost President, aches for him alone. Equally brave and probably more deeply loved, is the enchanting wife who survives him.

For his children, too, to whom he was so devoted and attentive and who, even at their tender ages, gave him as well as their mother their whole trust and worship, every man's heart contracts; but their lives are unformed. How tragically, cruel savages have dealt with the life of Jacqueline Kennedy.

Gracious, glowingly beautiful, marvelously composed yet joyously alive, she stood proudly yet humbly and captivatingly at his side. How sad that that sparkle should be dimmed.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Nov. 25, 1963]

### THE WORLD BOWS ITS HEAD

Heads of state, ambassadors, ministers, emissaries variously entitled, converged on Washington today. They marched with the bereaved family behind the caisson which bore the 35th President of the United States. In the appalling evil which has befallen our people, they stood uncovered with us.

It is evidence, undoubtedly, that a common humanity and a shared decency lie basically in the background of human aspirations and endeavors. For the moment, materialism is put aside and the hearts of a great part of the world know communion.

Men being men, it will be but an interlude; and, indeed, many in the world, and in our own Nation, continue to harden their hearts, even barely repress fires of bitterness.

Again in history, for history has many parallels of the barbarism of man, man has been shocked at the viciousness of which he is capable.

If only the remorse of this day could forever soften and temper the beings of this universe.

[From the Elizabethtown (N.C.) Bladen Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

### LET US BE THANKFUL FOR A GREAT LIFE GIVEN FOR HIS COUNTRY

America today mourns the tragic passing of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States at the hands of an assassin. Those who loved him and agreed with his policies, and those who opposed, all agree that the Nation has suffered a tremendous blow at a critical period in the world's history.

President Kennedy had a passion for peace and world coexistence and he used every effort at his command to bring these about. He was making great progress. Many of us realize that we probably owe our very lives during the past 3 years to the courage, strength, and intelligence of this dead chieftain.

On this day, set apart for national Thanksgiving, let us lift our hearts and voices in thanksgiving to the most high for the life of this great man and for the torch which he has lighted in a dark era in the history of the world.

Let us give thanks, too, for Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, now the 36th President of the United States. Since he became Vice President he was very close to the late President and was well versed in the President's plans and the affairs of national interest. We can thank God that we have such a man to follow in the footsteps of the great President.

One hundred years ago President Abraham Lincoln speaking at the battlefield at Gettysburg said, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

President Kennedy's life was dedicated sincerely as were those honored dead at Gettysburg. His vision was peace and coexistence for the world. Abraham Lincoln's words seem exceedingly fitting to be remembered at this tragic time, and in tribute to a great man of valor, of Christian faith, vision, and courage, the late President of the United States. On this Thanksgiving Day let us one and all be grateful for his life, given for his country, and pray that his ideals for world peace may come to fruition.

---

[From the Forest City (N.C.) Courier, Nov. 28, 1963]

### FATHER, FORGIVE THEM

The cortege moved slowly up Pennsylvania Avenue, muffled drums echoing against huge buildings and across tree-lined parks. Silent thousands watched as the flag-draped coffin passed. Millions watched over the Nation and world as the national networks carried the complete procession from the White House to the Capitol.

Only then, nearly 48 hours after the bullet crashed into the skull of John F. Kennedy, did most viewers really believe the truth of the terrible nightmare that had gripped the Nation.

The outpouring of national and world sentiment over the loss of this young, energetic, handsome leader, has been unprecedented in the history of man. It must certainly go down as one of the three most terrible losses in history, behind Jesus Christ and Abraham Lincoln.

It mattered little now that he may have been of another political party or of another faith, or of another color. It mattered not that you were for or against his program. This was our President, struck down by a hidden assailant, and this was America, the place where nothing of this nature could possibly happen.

And yet it did happen. It happened in a year when the dignity of man is supposed to have meaning. It happened at a time when America was really beginning to take full leadership in the world community.

Fear not for America is in the hands of Lyndon Johnson. He is an able statesman and experienced leader. But it is necessary that all Americans rally around the new President to assure him of the complete support of the entire country. President Johnson, for all his experience, does not have the magnetic personality or the dynamic electricity of John Kennedy. And the peoples of the rest of the world do not know him.

However, most nations have enough faith in the American way and the constitutional government of the United States to be assured that America will not falter in this time of tragedy, regardless of who is President or which political party happens to be in power.

The death of President John F. Kennedy is a shame that all Americans will have to bear. Seeds of hate have been evident all over the Nation. Few of the perpetrators of these hate seeds would have been willing to pull the fatal trigger themselves. Nevertheless, their leadership provided the spark of hate that touched the heart of a crazed individual.

What lies ahead for America? This may well depend upon how willing Americans are to strive for continued progress at a time when unity is needed above all. For America will progress only so far as the people will let it.

Pray for our fallen leader, and pray, too, for the new President. We might also say a prayer for America in this perilous time. God grant that we have the courage and the strength to carry on, continuing to show the way to peace for the rest of the world.

---

[From the Forest City (N.C.) Courier, Dec. 5, 1963]

### WHERE WERE YOU ON NOVEMBER 22?

What were you doing on the afternoon of November 22 when you heard the news of the assassination of President Kennedy? Chances are, the shocking impact of the news will cause you to always remember where you were, who you were with and what you were doing. There are now three incidents that are imbedded in this reporter's memory, other than personal or family. These would be, in order of occurrence, Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt's death, and President Kennedy's assassination.

For some of our older citizens, they could add the Wall Street crash of 1929, perhaps Lindbergh's flight, the death of Woodrow Wilson, World War I, and perhaps the assassination of President McKinley in 1901.

Naturally, almost everyone has something personal that will be carried to his grave. We're speaking here of events of a national or world stature that was felt by people all over the country.

On the afternoon of November 22, I happened to be riding in my car. The radio had not been on, but for some unexplainable reason, at 1:45 p.m., I reached over and flicked it on. A reporter was excitedly giving the final details of the then unconfirmed shooting. The immediate reaction was—that crazy South America, they're always killing a president.

It took a moment for the announcement to sink in. Dallas—President shot—Governor also believed wounded. This was insane. President Kennedy was to be in Dallas today. He couldn't have been serious. Sure a lot of people are unhappy about some of the President's programs and policies, but shoot the President of the United States? Impossible. Not in 1963.

For the next 30 or 40 minutes, the networks frantically scrambled for information, for reports from Dallas, for opinions of what might result should the President die from the wounds.

Then came the pause and the announcement that spread cold chills down every spine in America: "Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States is dead." There was another instant of complete silence, and then the playing of the national anthem.

How do you drive with tears in your eyes? How can you explain to God the prayer in your heart one moment, and the curse that automatically followed the announcement? The answer is, you don't. You pull the car to the side of the road, and you just sit and shake your head, and ask. "why"?

There are those who are not really unhappy over the passing of John Kennedy, and even a few who admit they are glad it happened. I honestly feel sorry for these people, for they make up a part of the hate that is eating at the very heart of America.

I happen to have been a supporter of John Kennedy before his nomination. I am proud to have had the opportunity to vote for him in 1960. I was looking forward to another chance to vote for him in 1964. This black mark on America hit me hard. I make no excuses for the way I feel. There was a little bit of me that died too, on November 22 in Dallas.

---

[From the Greensboro Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IN MEMORIAM, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917-1963

Since the beginning of man, death has been a mystery. It steals upon us like a thief in the night. It seemingly takes away the greatest possessions man has ever claimed. The graduating degrees of unbelief, shock, and distress mount into a crescendic cry of "why should such a tragedy occur?"

Many more words have been written and spoken about the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, perhaps, than the death of any other man in history. Modern means of communications have brought this terrible breach of morality direct into the minds and hearts of individuals in all parts of the world, in an unprecedented dispatch of the events that prefaced, embraced, and culminated such a savagery by a human.

Many of these words have spoken of the causes and effects of such a crime, while many have portrayed the degree of man's failure with respect to his fellow men. We completely concur in the stunned citizenry's condemnation of such barbarian incredulity that has blackened and saddened this Nation and world.

John F. Kennedy was the object of criticism many times in these pages, just as any public figure must expect as he leads his constituents in controversial paths. His course of action was in keeping with his personal convictions, and never would we deny the rights of an individual, especially those of such an intellect.

Perhaps we seldom consider the fact, but a President's life is a lonely and thankless task, surrounded by various actions clamoring for a different doctrine and better internal relations. John F. Kennedy was the brunt of many jokes, which he took in his stride.

While his progression from U.S. Representative to the Presidency was sparked with the most calculated details, he was not classified by most real political big-wigs as a "politician." By anyone's standards, he was a wealthy man, who never cared for expansion in this direction. By the standards of the most educated nations, John F. Kennedy was an intellect, with a never-ending desire for more knowledge and wisdom. While his was a thankless task, never did he show signs of weakness or self-confidence in his responsibilities. Here was a man of strong convictions, for following through on issues that were not always the most popular. His was a vibrant nature, adding greatly to his leadership of our Nation, and bridging breaches that separated the United States from many nations. John F. Kennedy was at the prime of his potential when his life was snuffed out, stealing from all the world a leadership that is so desperately needed at this troubled time.

It is not for us to appraise the historical significance of this life. But, if it were, we would have to say that this man will go down as one of the world's great leaders of all history. Time is the curer of historical evaluation. We believe time will prove John F. Kennedy's tenure one of complete success.

Our difference of evaluation would be this: While we have mourned with the Kennedy family and other loved ones over this assassination, we believe that this tragedy was not brought to bear on the Kennedy family so much as it was upon the American people. History has taught us to look for the good in all evil. Perhaps from this evil deed we shall salvage the good. If we do, John F. Kennedy will not have died in vain. There are many possible goods that can evolve from such a cowardly act. Not the least of these is the need for our Nation to look into the mirror at a time like this. Look long and hard. What do we see? We see wickedness and hate, love for self and pleasure, disrespect for others' rights, indifference to the problems of our fellow men, a consuming passion for the evils that surround us.

This is the challenge that faces each of us today. If we sincerely sorrow in the midst of this tragedy, if we are sincere in our plaints, if we're really looking for the renewed destiny that lies before us, it is our conviction that John F. Kennedy would challenge each of us to clean up the wickedness that lies within our midst, dislodge the prejudice and cruelty that inhabits our hearts, and pursue with "vigor" the course which lies ahead.

It is ironic that his last message to his beloved country contained these words from Psalms, "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the

Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of vision and courage. His dedication remains with us to challenge our actions.

May his soul rest in peace.

---

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### The Strength of Conviction

We would think the most resounding impression from the world-shattering event that occurred last week, is that given by the former First Lady and her children.

Throughout the devastating ordeal, Jacqueline Kennedy conducted herself with the same sense of courage and peace of mind that had surrounded her husband for so many years. This was the supreme test for a lady. These were the hours of greatest need by a wife and mother. The steadfast devotion for her husband was not displaced in her mourning, but was magnified, and we are certain, had her husband been present for the occasion, he would have said, "Well done, Jackie."

This is the same type of strength that her husband had displayed so many times. This was evidence of her inner strength, her complete dependence upon God, that all would be right for her husband. This was her strength of character even in her deepest grief. The rigidness with which she contained her emotions must surely have been in tribute to her late husband, and witness for her son and daughter.

We would not fail to recognize, also, the other members of the Kennedy family for their complete composure in these hours of trial. Indeed, they must have had the realization that John F. Kennedy had given his best for his country, and would live on through all eternity in his promised reward.

There are those who would point an accusing finger at this clan, saying they had failed in their outpouring of affection for their loved ones.

Conversely, we believe theirs is the strength of conviction contained in the funeral service: We would not have you ignorant concerning those who are asleep, lest you should grieve even as others who have no hope. * * * I am the resurrection and the life: he who believes in Me, even if he die, shall live.

---

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### The Cause and Effect

The mystery of the century could be the "why" in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Lee Harvey Oswald, while not considered a nut or maniac, was, nevertheless, deranged in his appraisal of values, for he snuffed out the life of a person who had done him no personal harm.

The cause of this senseless murder may never be known to man. That he was a loner and resented the mistreatment accorded him while serving in the Marine Corps, were apparently the key motivating forces behind his action.

With rapidly moving contemporary history, we are witnessing during our lifetime the most complex assortment of incidents than anytime in the past. Within the past decade, the transpiration of such events could exceed that of any hundred-year span during our country's entire history.

The effects of Mr. Kennedy's death could have a crushing realization of just where we as a civilized nation stand in the eyes of the world, with a reawakening of our Nation's moral responsibility.

The solidifying effect of John F. Kennedy's murder could exceed that of all expectations, in causing a closer relationship between all members of the free world, and possibly a goodly segment of the Communist strongholds.

Only time will tell the true scope of this deed.

---

[From the Hamlet (N.C.) News-Messenger, Nov. 26, 1963]

### Only History Holds Answers to Our Disturbing Questions

The President is dead.

A grieving wife mourns the death of her husband. Two small children cry in the darkness for a father they will never see again. A nation weeps in silence for its beloved leader. The world bows its head for a man, a friend.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy—the man, the husband, the father, the American, the President, the friend—is dead.

Like Americans and freemen everywhere, Hamlet residents are searching deeply into the darkened pit of reality—and even perhaps into our own disturbed consciences—for a reason on which to base this horrible crime against humanity. Many of us, even a half week after a sniper's bullet etched its infamy into the pages of history, are still hoping the dream will end. We are reluctant, perhaps afraid, to face the cold reality of this insidious deed.

Our sleepless nights are filled with questions. Why did it happen? Who is to blame? What will happen now?

Answers to these questions lie, no doubt, somewhere in the unwritten pages of history, the same history that was jolted so violently off its course by the assassination of President Kennedy. We, as Americans, will hold the pen that writes that important chapter.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy died by an act of lunacy. He did not die in vain.

Although Friday, November 22, 1963, will always be known as one of the blackest days in American history, it will also be known as the day the spirit of democracy rose to face and defeat the challenge of death. It will be remembered as the day Americans proved to the world that even the icy finger of death cannot chill the God-loving soul of this great Nation.

With sympathy and sadness in our hearts, we must now lift the mourning veil and prepare for the future. We must rededicate our lives to the cause of peace and freedom for all men.

The President is dead, but the many perils of our time still exist. The creeping malignancy of communism spreads like wildfire through the poverty-stricken nations of Asia and Latin America. The fight for freedom and the dignity of man has never been more demanding.

In his first statement as the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson asked for our help in this fight, and for God's. God will answer. We must.

---

[From the Henderson (N.C.) Daily Dispatch, Nov. 23, 1963]

### Tragedy for America

All America, regardless of partisan attitudes, was shocked and stunned by the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas, Tex., in early afternoon, Friday. In such a time as this, we are all Americans first before being Democrats and Republicans. The killer's bullet struck down the President of the United States, not merely the leader of the majority party.

Death comes to all men. It is no respecter of persons. It is an enemy alike of the high and the low and the rich and the poor. But when the leader of the greatest nation on earth is cut down, it is a blow to all the people—in this instance to the free world and Iron Curtain countries as well.

In such an emergency, emotions rise to the surface. There is grief and a sense of loss as if a member of one's own family had been taken. First impressions are that the tragedy is hard to accept. This terrific blow emphasizes the fact that uneasy lies the head that wears a crown, whether he be King, Emperor, or President.

However much one may have differed with President Kennedy, there was universal recognition of his vigor of youth, his intellectual capacity in the grasp of problems, and his readiness to assume responsibility. He did his best to be a leader, and showed many of the qualities required of such an individual.

Mr. Kennedy's rise to power and prominence was little short of meteoric. As a politician, first in the House, then the Senate and afterward the Presidency, he stepped from star to star in achieving world stature. Always he seemed to know where he was going and to be on his way. His choice of words in getting his ideas across, his fearless pioneering, especially in the domestic political arena, his charm and personality, and his ability to mix with people, despite the pinnacle of great wealth which he inherited, were assets as he moved along the way. His knowledge of events and procedures was little short of amazing. The combination carried him to the highest office in the land, or, for that matter, in the world.

President Kennedy was the fourth American President to fall victim of an assassin. All were shot to death, Mr. Kennedy with a high powered rifle from a distance and the others with a revolver at close range. Abraham Lincoln was mortally wounded at the hands of John Wilkes Booth in a Washington theater only a few days after the end of the Civil War. James A. Garfield was shot in 1881 and William McKinley at the International Exposition in Buffalo, N.Y., in 1901. Others have died in office, but only these four were the victims of murderers.

What the assassin of a President thinks he is accomplishing is a mystery. All such hitherto have been executed for their crime, and this one almost certainly will be. About the only explanation is that these killers were fanatics. Only a few weeks ago the President of South Vietnam and his brother were assassinated. Other high officials have been in other lands. We in America had come to believe that it couldn't happen here.

What occurred in Dallas to create a day of such tragedy will be long debated. A Secret Service man and a policeman were shot to death on Friday also.

It is a tragedy unspeakable that a crime of this character should occur anywhere in this country. It is doubly so that the President was struck down in a southern city. However unjustly the accusation may be, the South will be hearing from this for months, possibly years, although the other three Presidents who were assassinated were done to death in the North. In no imaginable sense does this crime represent the sentiment of the people of the southland, who believe in justice and are law abiding. No section of the country can regret the tragedy more than this people.

Already there is widespread speculation as to the political effect of the President's death. He was advocating and pressing in Congress for a legislative program much of which was opposed by millions of people in all parts of the country. Will it suffer or will it be advanced as a result of this national tragedy? Will Khrushchev become tougher as a new hand takes the helm in this country? Will American prestige abroad suffer generally while a new Chief Executive is getting his feet on the ground? Will there be renewed defiance and new and more serious threats to American rights and to peace generally? These are questions which can be answered only in the weeks and months ahead.

President Johnson is a veteran of many years experience in the legislative halls. When in the Senate he was a master organizer. He knew how to coax his colleagues to his way of thinking. Albeit with some changes to his own liking, Johnson may be expected to follow the Kennedy line, for at least the immediate future. The extent to which he does or does not will be a factor in his efforts to appease and attract the support of the South, which was not enthusiastic about Mr. Kennedy's program, especially as to civil rights legislation.

Whether Johnson will lend his influence toward economy in Government, toward a balanced budget, and for or against fantastic spending programs will become evident as he grasps more firmly the reins of Government.

The crushing burdens of his office will bear heavily upon him. It will be remembered that he suffered a severe heart attack a dozen years ago. His 3 years as Vice President have acquainted him with the great responsibilities that now devolve upon him. But he is no novice either as a politician or as a leader. He knows his way around in affairs of Government. He realizes the necessity for assistance and for the prayers of the American people. Without these he cannot go far nor be entirely effective as Chief Executive.

For the present while, however, the country mourns at the bier of its President. The people are bowed in sorrow in the face of horrible tragedy. The crisis is upon us. Fortunately, it is not the first testing of the Nation's stamina. It has faced crises before and has found a way through. As tears are shed and as hearts are sad and crushed, it is possible to look toward the future with courage, with strength and with hope. In that spirit and in that consciousness, we can move ahead. Out of respect for a dead but respected leader, Americans can recognize their responsibilities and will meet them in the type of determination which has brought them along thus far. God being our helper and guide, we shall persevere.

---

[From the Hendersonville (N.C.) Times-News, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S DEATH

When President John F. Kennedy was shot at 2 p.m. Friday, normally the time when the UPI teletype closes in the Times-News office, page 1 had been made up and only the women's page remained to be closed before sending them to the stereotyping department.

In the interest of time, only one-half of page 1 was made over to accommodate a story of the tragic occurrence. The President was not dead—or at least it was difficult to believe that he had gone on. The wire services had not confirmed the fact. And then came a bulletin that he had succumbed, followed by a new "lead" and a story of finality that everyone in this office hoped would not be transmitted.

The news, certainly the most important of the year and, as world events develop, perhaps the most significant of the century, again demonstrates that we are living in a hectic age in which tragedy may strike at any moment, in your lives and ours, at almost any time or place. At the height of his career, only 46 and in his first term as President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was struck down in the twinkling of an eye within the sight of thousands. It now appears that a mistake was made in leaving down the "bubble top" of the limousine in which the President and Governor Connally of Texas and their wives were riding. There may have been other oversights, but speculation is futile now.

Although President Kennedy had many political enemies, it is difficult to comprehend how anyone not in a maniacal frame of mind could have assassinated him. We are extremely hopeful, even confident, that the assassin will be found. Meanwhile, the American people, almost to the last man, woman, and child will mourn the President's untimely death. He had led us through many crises; and while his program appeared at times to be faulty and his methods questionable in the light of established principles of American government, we believe he was a great American and that his place will not soon be as adequately filled or his influence duplicated.

It is not given to many men that they reach this exalted office or that they be cut down at the zenith of a career already distinguished. Forceful as a speaker, logical as a thinker, physically and mentally brave, unmatched as a tactician in politics and determined to do the right as he conceived it, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a giant in world affairs and at home. Add to these and other qualities the fact that he was our President and one realizes why the Nation and the world are in mourning today.

---

[From the Hendersonville (N.C.) Western Carolina Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

### IN MEMORY OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WHO DIED IN SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.—PSALM 23.

"Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

He gave his all.

---

[From the Hendersonville (N.C.) Western Carolina Tribune, Dec. 5, 1963]

### ONE MAN LOOKS INTO THE FUTURE

"Unforeseen events do not necessarily change or shape the course of man's affairs."—Think magazine.

To say that no one in this country even from the earliest approaches to adulthood will ever find his outlook exactly the same after 12:30 p.m. November 22 is certainly not denying the above statement, because the author meant to convey that free man, with the right of self-determination, is master of his own destiny provided he is strong.

But it is foregone to say that none of us now in adult pursuits will ever be quite the same. Everything will change, has changed in shades of degree.

Our political outlook will change. Our ability to dream with open eyes will change. Our socioeconomic concepts will change. Our religion will change. Our pursuits of daily livelihood will change.

"But we have had three such tragedies before," you say. True, and what you are today is in some degree caused by those same three murders because they, each in its time, drastically changed the destiny of a nation, even the world at large, and in so doing molded the progeny of which you are a part.

No one can say, even reliably conclude, what those fatal shots will do to us. We can only surmise:

The tax bill: It will pass the Congress even quicker than it would have done before because a nation with a sense of mass guilt and the crushing burden of "getting on with it" will write President Kennedy's favorite project into law.

Civil rights: Contrary to some opinion, the evolution begun by the 1954 Supreme Court decision was and is proceeding at a certain rate and was, in our opinion, neither slowed or facilitated, by the Kennedy administration. It was merely put into sharp focus. The Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower eras contributed far more to the movement because they became the earlier, more cataclysmic phases. The increasing thunder of the Negro's self-assertion will in no wise be dampened by our recent tragedy. Some of the outer, more visible facets will change, certainly, but the wave itself will notice scarcely the tiniest backlashing ripple.

The civil rights bill: (This is the most hazardous to guess.) In our opinion it would not have passed this session had President Kennedy continued in his dynamic way. It will pass, under perhaps other, more acceptable nomenclature, during the next three convenings. Even if we're wrong, much of the essence of the bill will pass into accepted national behavior, regardless.

The lowering cloud of mass guilt which today still hangs over the Nation will be partially dispersed by manifestations, particularly in the South, of further acceptance of the Negro more than anything else as tribute to our dead President who, after all, died championing his cause.

True, it was a self-styled Marxist who pulled the fateful trigger, but the tempo of hate swirling about the head of John F. Kennedy was engendered by the passionate struggle between the races, into which both the amateur and professional Communist is eternally dedicated to step.

Cuba: Ultimate outcome unaffected. Kennedy was determined. Johnson is determined. Neither regard overt action at this stage remotely feasible.

France: President de Gaulle had a strong, personal affection for our late President, but by his actions showed that he was not in agreement with much of administration policies. The very change, coupled with De Gaulle's inscrutable, bullheaded, and intensely nationalistic concepts, will make for improved French-American relations.

Britain: The tragedy itself moved the two English-speaking peoples closer, as always during times of great national crisis on either side of the Atlantic.

The 1964 elections: President Johnson will get the nomination with merely a show of opposition, practically by acclamation. "Somehow the word 'Goldwater' just seems to go flat now," someone said last week, "like saying 'Harold Stassen,' 'John Sparkman' or 'Governor Wallace.' He's a candidate who's lost his cause."

No one on the scene now could give him a run worth the name. Time and changing tides may make it a real contest but if he chooses to run L.B.J. will succeed himself.

Robert F. Kennedy, who's made no statement other than call his new Chief Executive and pledge loyalty, is the real enigma in the wake of his brother's death. Anathema to the South, he has been too dogmatic and strongly committed to become a real political contender, even if he wants it. But it must be remembered he was the real brains and driving force behind his brother's 1960 campaign. His prowess in this respect won't be overlooked.

Hoffa and unionism: Quiet for a while, smart that they are. Knowing full well that the Kennedy brothers were closing in the Hoffa gang they are now in a wait-and-see stage. The more respectable union leaders, Meany and Reuther, are sincerely behind the President, for the time being. Liberal-come-lately that he is, Johnson does not have the confidence of labor that his predecessor had and for this reason labor is one of the two real unknown quantities for 1964—the other being the South, a great gray area of unweighed political portent.

Congress: Literally shaken to its depths, in a wave of reaction will fall in behind the new President in unprecedented demonstration of "getting on with it," passing much legislation they would have stalled.

The new generation: President Kennedy was to the young marrieds, the svelte, smartly modern set and to the maturing teenagers as well the epitome of what they are trying to say to the world. He said it for them by his appearance, manner, mannerisms, and utterances. He was their idol whether they admitted it or not. Now that he is gone their irrepressible urge for self-assertion must find outlet in another direction, perhaps even the same direction but with more extreme and wayout manifestations. They will, on their outer fringes, get wilder, more bizarre and even weird and in the early months it will have a note of pathos in it. A ringing note they can no more subdue than they can send those fatal shots winging back into the muzzle of the $12 rifle.

Christmas, 1963: The soberest, most dedicated observance of the birth of Christ witnessed in the 20th century. If one will but turn off the kids and the TV set a moment, walk out into the chill December air during the coming weeks, carol and hymn singing may be faintly or clearly discerned from every corner of the land.

---

[From the Hickory (N.C.) Daily Record, Nov. 23, 1963]

### NONE DIED IN VAIN

Four American Presidents have died from assassins' bullets. Every one of these deaths represented a great tragedy.

Those slain prior to President Kennedy were: Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, and William McKinley.

President Lincoln was shot in Ford's Theater, Washington, D.C., April 14 (Good Friday), 1865, by John Wilkes Booth, an actor. The President died the following day.

Sixteen years later, on July 2, 1881, President Garfield was shot by Charles J. Guiteau—an unbalanced officeseeker—as Garfield was entering old Baltimore and Potomac passenger station in Washington, D.C. President Garfield died in Elberon, N.J., September 19, 1881.

Twenty years later, September 6, 1901, President McKinley was shot by Leon Czolgosz, an anarchist terrorist, while the Chief Executive was welcoming citizens to the Pan-American Exposition, in Buffalo, N.Y. He died September 14, 1901.

The assassination of President Kennedy followed that of President McKinley by 62 years.

Lincoln was the 16th President, Garfield the 20th, McKinley the 25th, and Kennedy the 35th.

It is our studied opinion that none of them died in vain, inasmuch as the great causes for which they fought were eventually triumphant. The assassins who murdered President Kennedy have promoted, rather than impeded, the many objectives of the New Frontier toward which J.F.K. was relentlessly driving and striving.

---

[From the Hickory (N.C.) Daily Record, Nov. 26, 1963]

### LIFE MUST GO ON

Not that we would change our system for the British, but their system of governmental perpetuation has points in its favor. With the passing of a monarch, there is the heartening cry: "The king is dead. Long live the king." This continuity of a regime gives a stability that has been lacking in some instances in this Nation.

The late President Kennedy's entire record emphasizes his realization of the need to face the future not the past. We are confident that it would be his wish that this Nation move toward the New Frontiers which he visualized as its destiny. Now that the obeisance due his passing has been observed, it is fitting that the Nation resume its normal activity—life must go on.

The soul searching that has occupied the Nation during these days; the frankly facing the fact that all share responsibility for the tragic murder in the fanning of hate among various groups, are bound to have a sobering effect on all and to encourage tolerance toward everything except intolerance.

We believe youths, who have probably been more deeply moved by the assassination than their elders due to their empathy with the fallen chief who was possessed of similar vigor, will be thoroughly critical of any developments in this Nation which might indicate that John Kennedy's sacrifice was in vain—that his guidelines are being ignored.

---

[From the Hickory (N.C.) Daily Record, Nov. 27, 1963]

### WE SHOULD BE THANKFUL

On this Thanksgiving Day—Thursday—let us dwell not on what we have lost with the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Rather, let us be thankful for what we have gained from his life.

Even while we deplore the way he died, we can be grateful for the example he set in living. His outspoken courage was known to all, and his joy of living was a family trademark.

Everyone—those who shared his beliefs and those who scorned them—must be thankful for the strength of his convictions.

John Kennedy did not choose to die. He chose to live for his principles. He fought for these principles—and for his life—in wartime.

We have a great faith in what he termed "the calm determination of the American people," and no greater tribute can be paid to a man than to say he lived up to his faith.

In his final Thanksgiving Day proclamation, the late President said: "We must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them."

Urging expressions of gratitude to God, he begged: "Let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and nations and of ending misery and suffering wherever they exist."

---

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Nov. 24, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Even now there is still a numbness of feeling over the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The man and his spirit are yet too much with us to accept, so suddenly and so brutally, the realization of his death. The mind records the words and the pictures that tell of what happened in Dallas Friday. The heart cries out in an anguish of disbelief.

The 35th President of the United States is dead, slain at a time when, tempered by his experience in office, he was beginning to realize the full sweep of his powers and the confidence to use those powers well for the good of the country. Certainly, his enduring mark as President was yet to come from John F. Kennedy. From the Bay of Pigs and from Vienna in 1961, he grew to face the Russians with a sure touch in Berlin and in Cuba, achieving, as a result, a new balance of respect and of confidence in our relations with the cold war adversary. In South Vietnam, the United States, under his leadership, was entering a more hopeful phase in the war against Communist subversion.

At home, the issues were economic and human, involving relationships between Government and business, and concerning the status of the Negro in the United States. In his approach to both, John F. Kennedy was hardly the man grasping for power many pictured him to be. His touch was pragmatic and, in the nature of things, political, but his principles were firm: to spur America to new heights of freedom and of achievement.

John F. Kennedy brought to the Presidency a refreshing zest for life and its pleasures. His interests were widespread; his intellect was keen. He was faithful to his church and devoted to his family. He loved to read; he enjoyed and appreciated the fine arts; he displayed a sharp wit and a love for humor. There was nothing that escaped his interest. His vigor was noticeable, with rewarding impact, on our tastes and our ambitions.

Now, John F. Kennedy is dead.

Why? The question cries for an answer. Perhaps it will never be answered. But we do well to ponder it. We should not dismiss the question by attributing the assassination to the frustrated mind of a crackpot. Let us look closely at what is happening to us. Let us examine the hate and the venom, the namecallings and the reckless accusations being hurled from both the right and the left into our body politic. Let us search the fears that may haunt our own hearts. Let us replace those fears in this moment of sadness and shame with the confidence of being Americans again.

---

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Nov. 25, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

John Fitzgerald Kennedy came to the Presidency of the United States as the bearer of great change. He was the symbol of something new, but he died by something as old as time—the hand of the fanatic.

He was the first man born in the 20th century to hold the office—and the second youngest in history. He was the first Catholic in the White House. He came as a naval hero of World War II who narrowly had missed death in Pacific waters, and survived a second brush with death in a grave illness 9 years ago.

To the Nation's high politics he thus brought a fresh stamp. The well-remarked "Kennedy style" was a blend of intellect, vigor, wit, charm, and a clear talent for growth.

On the always shifting, often troubled world scene, he sometimes moved with more caution than expected in young leadership. Soon after entering the White House, he gamely took full blame for the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco as an enterprise sadly lacking in boldness.

Yet only his worst enemies withheld from him the label "courageous" when he moved resolutely against Soviet Premier Khrushchev in the great Russian missile crisis in Cuba in late 1962. And he boldly pressed for an East-West test ban treaty this year in the face of heavy charges that this imperiled our security.

In domestic affairs Kennedy won much of his program in beginning 1961, gained far less the following year, and encountered a major stalemate in 1963. The constant note against him was insufficient leadership.

But again, when 1963 brought the greatest racial crisis of this century, Kennedy—at acknowledged heavy political cost—committed himself to sweeping civil rights proposals that opened a vast new battleground.

Amid all his efforts to put the imprint of vigorous, imaginative youth upon the country's affairs in the 1960's, the late President found himself moving against a deepening background of protest, with an ugly underscoring of violence which he sought with only limited success to wipe away.

Much of this protest went to the steady encroachments of the Federal Government and its rising cost. But the bitterest reaction was white and Negro response to the enlarging racial struggle. The far right gave the mood its most perilous texture.

With the calamity in Dallas the lesson of the danger inherent in violent extremism now may be deeply implanted in America's conscience.

In this way, Kennedy in death may achieve what the living President could not do to curb the almost ungovernable rancor that increasingly discolored the politics of his brief time in power.

It was John Kennedy's good fortune to surmount many obstacles to rise to his country's highest office and bring with him the winds of a new era.

It was his final tragedy that as he labored in difficult times to use these forces for the Nation's and the world's gain, they were swiftly challenged by countering winds of bitter reaction. In Dallas, one swift gust struck him down.

The Nation thus loses a young leader whose great promise lived in the shadow of great controversy. The way he died must inescapably cost all Americans deeply in self-esteem as free men of good will.

That is the greater tragedy.

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise]

### A PRAYER

Our Father, we praise Thee for the privilege of prayer; for the assurance that Thou dost hear not only what we express with our lips, but also that Thou art attentive to the unvoiced desires of our hearts, and the longings that are known but to Thee and to us. We thank Thee that Thou hast assured us in Thy Book that if our hearts are sincere, and if we desire that Thy will be done, Thou wilt never fail to answer us according to Thy purposes.

We acknowledge Thee to be the sovereign God, and we pray that in this hour, as well as in the days ahead, that Thou wilt help us to walk by Thy guidance and to do the things that are pleasing in Thy sight. Be Thou the protector of our lives; keep us from wrongdoing; seek us when we go astray; restore our souls, and lead us in right paths for the glory of Thy name.

Let the tragic death of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, serve to remind us that Thou hast not made us to live by hatred and revenge, violence, and contemptuousness. Beget within us now a deeper love for our fellow men of all races, and a more positive concern for freedom and justice. Help us to perceive that rightousness exalteth a nation and that sin is a reproach to any person.

May our hearts be encouraged in this solemn hour that Thou art always present in the midst of the shadows of life to keep a faithful watch over thine own, and to release thine abounding mercy and comfort upon all troubled souls. Especially do we beseech Thee to bestow Thy ministries upon Mrs. Kennedy and the children, the other members of the Kennedy family, and all loved ones of the late President. Mercifully bring them in their deep sorrow into Thy healing and sustaining presence. Enable them to translate their bereavement whereby their faith may be strengthened and their spiritual lives enriched.

We beseech Thee to give President Lyndon B. Johnson the desire to seek Thy will and the readiness and the courage to do it. Bestow Thy guidance upon him and his advisers, and endow him with an understanding heart.

Grant that Thy benedictions may richly abide with the family of the man who was charged with the late President's death, and with the family of the late J. D. Tippit, the law enforcement officer who was killed in Dallas in the performance of his duty. We would also pray that the man who is now accused of killing Lee Oswald may seek to come to a right relationship with Thee.

Move us all to rededicate ourselves to Thee, and to the basic principles of democracy; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Dr. ROY E. WATTS,
*Minister, First Presbyterian Church.*

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press, Nov. 23, 1963]

### PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The brutal assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in Dallas, Tex., Friday, has shocked and stunned the American people and the whole civilized world. It will have a profound and immeasurable impact on history.

The leader who became the 35th President of the United States at the age of 43 was a man of faith, of courage and was dedicated to keeping the peace in a world teetering dangerously close to nuclear destruction. His military service became a saga of courage as he stood by his men after a PT boat disaster in the Pacific during World War II. Although born to wealth and influence, he had a gift for understanding and loyalty to his friends that marked his entire career.

As President his New Frontier administration suffered a serious setback in the April 1961, Bay of Pigs invasion failure in Cuba. But he did not shift the responsibility to others. He bore it courageously and worked to overcome it. His confrontation with the Soviet Premier over the Cuban missile deal 13 months ago won for him the admiration of the free world, and the respect of the Soviets. Khrushchev backed down in the face of possible war with the United States. President Kennedy later went on to negotiate the test ban treaty with the Soviet Union and to pave the way for a lessening of cold war tensions.

On the domestic front civil rights struggles marked his administration. Those who did not share his views on how to handle this matter never doubted his courage or his determination to push for greater rights for all under the Constitution. His medicare, education and economic proposals for the most part are still in abeyance. But his enunciation of his views will long influence the thinking of proponents and opponents on all these issues as well. He was elected by the slenderest margin of any President in modern times; but his personal popularity remained high until his death.

Perhaps the President's most remembered phrase from his inaugural address of January 20, 1961 is "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

He loved his country and gave his life in service to it. He loved his family and he sought ever to give each member a sense of belonging and an appreciated place. He loved his church and as the first Roman Catholic ever to hold the office of President he did as much to emphasize the need for keeping church and state separate as anyone in the Nation's history.

History will assess his proper role among American and world leaders. His legacy to each American today, however, is a ringing challenge for all to do more to uphold and advance the great American ideals for which he lived—and died.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press, Nov. 25, 1963]

### THE NATION MOURNS AND SEARCHES ITS HEART

In its hour of deepest grief and anguish in this century, the Nation Monday joined the family of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the world in paying tribute to a youthful and dedicated leader who was cut down Friday by an assassin's bullet. And in that tribute there was deep soul-searching and anxiety of heart, as the people of free America pondered the shocking and bizarre events of the past 3 days.

Tragedy compounded tragedy Sunday as the suspect in the brutal slaying of the President was cut down by a nightclub operator in the sick and disturbed city of Dallas, Tex. In the church memorial services in every community in the land, in schools, colleges, and even at military installations where the grim work of keeping the peace never ends, men sought divine guidance for this hour of trial.

As the enormity of the loss crystallized in the worldwide tribute of those who trekked to Washington and Arlington Cemetery for the rites, the people sobbed in unison and asked in wounded and distraught spirit, why?

A young leader with promise, intelligence, and magnanimity of heart and spirit had been sacrificed at the altar of hate and psychopathic cunning. And before the prime suspect, who was also charged with slaying a Dallas policeman, could be tried and the full record unveiled to a bewildered world, this young man, also, was killed. The people of Dallas filled the churches Sunday in their search for guidance and direction. The Nation in essence followed suit, because all knew in their hearts that such evil is not confined to one community or to one nation in this troubled world.

Hence the message of the Scriptures comes with even more striking force to one and all. In another day and another age God's own Son was not spared. But out of that great example came the believer's greatest comfort of all. Perhaps in this period greater repentance, humility, and unity of purpose and direction may come to a divided world, torn by mistrust and violence.

Surely His promise to heal the land can and will come if mankind will put spiritual things first and seek His guidance in these days of sorrow and uncertainty.

[From the Leaksville (N.C.) News, Nov. 28, 1963]

### LIFE OF COURAGE

Within the short span of a few tragic days, this country witnessed the assassination of its young President and the murder of the man accused of President Kennedy's slaying.

Both acts were heinous contradictions of this country's philosophy of government by law. And Lee Harvey Oswald's murder, despite the enormity of the crime he was accused of, can be condoned no more readily than John F. Kennedy's untimely death.

Whether we agree or disagree with the policies Kennedy carried out, we must agree that Kennedy was a living example of the courage of which he wrote in his book, "Profiles in Courage."

His words:

"Today the challenge of political courage looms larger than ever before. For our everyday life is becoming so saturated with the tremendous power of mass communications that any unpopular or unorthodox course arouses a storm of protests such as John Quincy Adams—under attack in 1807—could never have envisioned * * * And thus, in the days ahead, only the very courageous will be able to take the hard and unpopular decisions necessary for our survival."

President Kennedy is dead. His political career is history, and only time can tell whether the course he charted was right or wrong. There can be no doubt, however, of the courage with which he pursued that course.

President Kennedy wrote the final chapter of his book with his own blood.

It is for us now to rally behind President Lyndon Johnson and move on, despite the shame of the two deaths which this country cannot forget.

[From the Lenoir (N.C.) News-Topic, Nov. 23, 1963]

### WORLD PAYS TRIBUTE TO ONE OF ITS GREAT

Tributes from people in all walks of life and from all parts of the world are paying tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy. His untimely death on Friday afternoon simply stunned the entire Nation and also most parts of the world when it became known that he had died of an assassin's bullet.

The people of Lenoir and elsewhere were so saddened and so stunned by the news of the tragedy that for a long time they were speechless. Many did not believe it at first until it was verified from a number of different sources.

Few people in the history of the world have done so much in the number of years which John F. Kennedy served his country. Even now it is hard to believe that one so young could reach the world's No. 1 post in government. Those who declared that he was too young and too inexperienced for the Presidency did not have to wait long until their fears were completely dispelled. He soon demonstrated that he had all of the qualities necessary to head the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

While the people of this Nation mourn his passing and extend heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones, our country must continue to move forward and to seek new frontiers of service and remain the world's leader. Since this tragedy did take place, the people of the United States realize now, even if they had not before, that in the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, they have one of the most capable and experienced men in government. He will carry on in the true American tradition despite the great loss which he feels for his intimate friend of many years.

The Nation's newspapers today expressed the people's grief at the assassination of President Kennedy, and said the murder was "a blemish on American civilization."

Editorial comments included:

Richmond Times-Dispatch: The assassination, "coming as it does as the latest in a series of violent deaths of heads of state, is a disgrace to the United States and a blot on the good name of this country."

Indianapolis Star: "We never believed that any American could stoop to the dirty job of murder of the President. John F. Kennedy always stood for what is fine and good in the American tradition."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat: The President is "a martyr to American democracy. His murder is a blemish on American civilization."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: The assassination is "a national tragedy of incalculable proportions. What is wrong with the United States that it can provide the environment for such an act? There is a sickness in the Nation when political differences cannot be accepted and settled in the democratic way. Our democracy itself is in hazard."

Baltimore Sun: "Yesterday's first shock of horror gives way this morning to a depth of sorrow beyond expression. There is the tragedy of great tasks unfinished, of the plow stopped part way down the furrow, the house left standing in framework, the story checked mid-sentence. No one can now say what Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments would have been had he lived."

New Orleans Times-Pica: "With the suddenness of the rifle shots, 200 million people were immersed in a great sorrow. There's no real mystery. For among humankind there are always men of imbalance, of twisted mind, warped concepts and strange causes. Some with a deep and ugly malice toward their fellow beings. Often their hate centers upon those in high places."

New York Times: "All of us—from the country's highest leaders to the humblest citizen—all of us are still in a state of shock from this stunning blow, that even now seems unreal in its grotesque horror. John F. Kennedy died in and for the belief of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed. No madman's bullet can stop this inexorable march of human rights; no murder, however tragic, can make it falter. In death as in life, the words and spirit of this our most newly martyred President will lead the Nation ever closer toward fulfillment of the ideals of domestic brotherhood and international peace by which his administration has been guided from the start."

[From the Lincoln (N.C.) Times, Nov. 25, 1963]

### J.F.K., Our 35th President

Numbness of mind and body, utter disbelief, despair, silent mourning, and heartache prevail among Lincolntonians and Lincoln Countians today as they with millions everywhere in the United States and the world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy by an assassin's bullets in Dallas, Tex., Friday.

The assassination of the President was a sickening, terrible, and despicable thing. As expressed by many, for such a dastardy act to occur in our country seemed almost unbelievable—"in other countries where there are dictators, unstable governments, yes * * * but, no, no, not ours. The United States is known the world over as the leader of Democracy. Now, how will this make us, a free country, look to the rest of the world?"

John F. Kennedy, although he met opposition to his views and programs, even within his own party in the Senate and the Congress, possessed a magnetic, vigorous personality, high intellect, charm and wit, knowledge of government, that made him a popular figure in public life. He drew large and enthusiastic crowds to him wherever he went in the United States or other countries of the world. He compelled admiration from foe and friend, alike. John F. Kennedy gave dignity to the Office of the President of the United States and presented the good image. He was admired for his courage, his belief in his ideals, his dedication to the job of the Presidency.

This newspaper didn't always agree with President Kennedy's views. But, we admired him as a person of keen intelligence, charming personality and courage. He fought for what he felt was right, even when it was the unpopular view, the civil rights issue, as one example.

It could be that the tragic death of our President will bring the people of our Nation closer together, in a spirit of real, sincere unity and true American patriotism. In this hour of our Nation's great sorrow and loss, it is no time for partisan politics. There would be only one label, American. President Kennedy was just that—American, our President, a sýmbol of our dreams, our hopes, our freedom.

We can be calm in this time of great shock and sorrow to have faith in America, its people, and institutions. We can thank God for our blessings, His goodness bestowed upon our Nation in so many ways that the other nations do not possess, and to pray for his guidance over our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, as he assumes the awesome responsibilities of our Nation's highest office.

---

[From the Lumberton (N.C.) Robesonian, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Life to Give

"Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These words were spoken to the people of the United States in January 1961, in the inaugural address of President John F. Kennedy. They are the words most often recalled in the hours of sorrow after his tragic death in November 1963.

In the brief, intervening years, the President did what he could for his country, with all the resourcefulness at his command. What he asked of others, he demanded of himself, constantly expending his energy and vitality in the service of the Nation.

An exceptional man, John Kennedy had a capacity for greatness. It was fully realized to the extent possible within his short span of life. He was not only a dynamic political leader and statesman. He was handsome and heroic, clever, and courageous—a young man to capture the imagination of the people and inspire the youth of the land.

Reared in a superior environment, John Kennedy had the advantages of wealth and education. He lived in a way that showed he knew much is expected from those to whom much is given. He and his wife seemed born to fill the glamorous roles they played. They were as near to the hearts of the people as a storybook prince and princess of old. In the great White House of the Presidents, they kept alive the love of the arts, the humanities, and the home.

To the highest elective office on earth, President Kennedy brought youth and strength and hope and purpose, at a time when much of the world's leadership was aging. The land of opportunity had a leader with a future. The image of America was revitalized. A powerful and benevolent Nation was prepared to keep pace with a changing world in which new nations were emerging and new frontiers were opening in space.

Then suddenly, a sniper's bullet ended the career and the life of this man, whom the free world had come to know as a friend and champion, and the other world of bondage had learned to respect. The man whose bravery had brought survival in time of crisis, was cut down by a shameful shot from ambush.

There was not even a semblance of misguided reason for this deed. It was a case of somebody having no better sense than to shoot the President. It was as though the progress of mankind had been halted and the machinery of civilization had been thrown out of gear, by a pebble tossed into the works.

The slender thread of one man's life has been broken, and millions have felt the impact of his fall. The world has aged more than the days on the calendar since his death, for a part of its hope and inspiration go with him as he is laid to rest. Yet the Nation he served and the people who survive can face the challenge of the future with a sustaining recollection of him, and of the courage he showed so often, in the face of obstacles and reverses and crises and ever-growing responsibilities.

Words by the tens of thousands, from people throughout the earth, have expressed the sorrow of this tragic experience, so sudden that from the President there were no last words for remembrance. But his own inaugural address, and the way he lived and died, revive the words of an American patriot at an earlier time of crisis, when this Nation was struggling to be born. His only regret was that he had but one life to give for his country.

---

[From the Coastland (N.C.) Times, Nov. 29, 1963]

### A Mighty Man Among Men Has Fallen

When the burden of the heart is too heavy, and the mind is thick with grief, it is futile to attempt the expression of sentiment worthy of recording. In this hour we turn to the contemporary press, where we find some passages so well said that we wish to pass them on, about the loss of our great leader—our Commander in Chief. At this time it is too difficult for us to say what should be said about so tragic and senseless a loss in leadership, decency, honesty, ability, and promise for the service of mankind. Let us read from Shakespeare in King Henry IV:

"Oh God! that one might read the book of fate,
And see the revolution of the times,
Make mountains level, and the continent,
Weary of solid firmness melt itself
Into the sea! and, other times, to see
The beachy girdle of the ocean

Too wide for old Neptune's hips; how chances mock,
And changes fill the cup of alteration
With divers liquors! Oh, if this were seen,
The happiest youth, viewing his progress through,
What perils past, what crosses to ensue,
Would shut the book and sit him down and die."

Jonathan Daniels, editor of the News and Observer, who has moved much among the great men of the Nation, had this to say:

### "DARKEST FRIDAY

"Twenty years ago the courageous young commander of a PT boat in the South Pacific narrowly escaped death in the service of his country. Then yesterday in Texas, as the youngest American President ever to die, John Fitzgerald Kennedy fell in his country's service at the hand of a more evil enemy than young Americans have ever met in war.

"Shocked Americans quickly remembered the death in the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt 18 years ago. But no equal and similar tragedy has occurred in the history of America since another dark Friday nearly a century ago when Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. And not even Lincoln's death came at a time when the Nation seemed so besieged by problems and danger. Lincoln lived to see victory and peace. John Kennedy, when he died, was still leading in a far more dangerous time.

"And the death of this great, young President emphasized as nothing else could have done that the dangers around him and around us all are not merely those involving foreign menace but home malice as well.

"The death of the young and brave and beautiful is always sad. The death of the chief of the greatest nation on earth shocks men and shakes history. But John Kennedy's death carried with it not only grief but an element of terror, too. Here in a State which regards itself as especially strong in its Americanism, among thousands of good people who were cheering their pride in the Commander of their country, malice struck its shining mark. It was incredible. It happened.

"John Kennedy will be remembered long. The sacrifice of his death needs to be taken to the shaken heart of the Nation now. There can be no safety in a nation where bitterness at home impels even one assassin to his horrid crime. America's honor, greatness, and glory made the assassin's target in Dallas Friday.

"The young President is dead. The old nation is grievously wounded. Hope lies only in the unity of grief and outrage which rose in the whole continent about John Kennedy's bier. The young man died in the service of his country. His proper mourning requires the solemn understanding of the meaning in his death that the poison of hate cannot only kill a man but the dream too of an America fit to lead the world."

We also quote from the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, whose editor is George J. Hebert, in an editorial, entitled.

### PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

"Even today, as the fuller story is being pieced together of yesterday's ghastly events in Dallas, death of President John F. Kennedy is almost too much to take in. And that, surely, has been the common reaction of heartsick Americans across this land of ours.

"The shared reaction has been one of disbelief, disbelief that it could happen, and cold anger at the dark thing that overtook this country on Friday, November 22, 1963.

"History is no stranger to assassinations. We all know, too, of the minute-by-minute vulnerability of any man in the public eye and most particularly of chiefs of state. Our minds at least are familiar with the unpleasant reality that a madman is capable of anything, and that loose among us are the few—the deranged, the misled, the fanatics—upon whom neither society's restraints nor conscience have any effect.

"But these are things we comprehend with the intellect. What happened yesterday, at the hands of an assassin deeply involved in Communist doctrine and philosophy, is new and fresh and raw and goes deeper.

"What strikes to the heart is the contrast between yesterday afternoon's black headlines, the drumfire of grim bulletins by radio and television, with their engulfing grief for a whole nation, and the bright scene of only a few hours earlier as the people of a civilized country went about their free, generally prosperous affairs in the sunshine, reading in the early newspaper editions of their young President and his smiling wife moving easily and unafraid among them.

"President Kennedy was chosen through one of our cherished democratic processes to lead all of us. No one can question that he led with all the energy and considerable talents that were his. No one can doubt that most of his countrymen admired him as a whole; felt a deep personal attachment to him and Mrs. Kennedy. Barring the unforeseen, it had been generally acknowledged that he would have been entrusted with his high office for another 4 years by those same people.

"He combined intellect with the serviceable realism of a political pragmatist. He carried great responsibilities responsibly and displayed a sense of moderation that steered the country away from many of the extremes his election seemed to threaten in 1960. He had a warmth and humor that survived all the stress and strain of his grueling days.

"As the Cuban crisis proved, he could rise to great heights of leadership when the chips were down, with a coolness that permitted intelligent planning and with a sure insight that the kind of strength the American people had put in his hands.

"He was the President of us all. He had our allegiance and our affection.

"America mourns the loss of a President and the senseless death of a good man."

---

[From the Southern Pines (N.C.) Pilot, Nov. 28, 1963]

### The Trumpet Summons Us Again

Now, after the body of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been laid to rest, the Nation's dark night of the soul is ending—the night of anguish that fell upon the United States with the firing of an assassin's rifle last Friday.

There is no wakening from the past week's nightmare, for it was no dream. The lifting of the darkness, indeed, makes more hideous the reality of what has happened. But light is returning and Americans must live in the world that it reveals.

"Now," the slain President has asserted in his inaugural address, "the trumpet summons us again * * * to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out * * * a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself." The words ring with added grandeur as the Nation faces a new beginning after his death.

No greater tribute can be paid Mr. Kennedy than a thoughtful, fervent, unremitting commitment to that struggle. Nor is there now, in these United States, a more potent power, to dispel the darkness and rekindle hope, than those words.

A great leader has fallen. He has been replaced, in President Lyndon Baines Johnson, by another leader wholly committed to the noble tasks so eloquently outlined by the young President on that cold January 20, 1961.

We have full confidence in Mr. Johnson's leadership. But the people of the United States should remember that the dead President said, in words that move us even more deeply now: "In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course."

Mr. Kennedy is gone. But as the past week's darkness lightens, there is great comfort in this thought: the people of the United States remain—to heed, if they will, the still-echoing, strong, young voice that placed supreme importance on their own efforts in setting and holding the Nation's future course.

Mindful of this, President Johnson and the people must now, together, "go forth to lead the land we love."

### THEY CAME TO HONOR HIM

The coming here of national leaders from all over the world to attend the funeral of President Kennedy is an extraordinary thing.

The young American President, who had fallen so tragically under an assassin's bullet, had been in office less than 3 years. He had accomplished a few things—and a few great things; he was cut down in the promise of so much more.

He was young, his full powers not yet come to fruition, his brillance, his energy, his devotion even not yet fully tried. And still, from lands far and near, allied or unfriendly still, they came, the leaders, to stand beside the young leader's grave.

### AN AMERICAN HEROINE

Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy has won the undying admiration and affection of the American people and the world.

Gallant and brave beyond belief in the ordeal of her husband's sudden assassination and the ensuing series of events and ceremonies—all occurring in the public eye—she was at once so strong and so frail, so imperturable and so touchingly and ordinarily human, that she is now, without question, the most loved woman in the land.

Not once did she falter—and it was a performance of instinct, not conscious direction. She rode with the President's body on the plane from Texas, and when the body came off the plane, she was with it, touching the casket lightly, as though reaching out for a hand, and she rode with it, in the ambulance, to the Naval Hospital.

Her Sunday night return to the Capitol rotunda, where the body lay in state, was almost anonymous among the hundreds filing by, again to reach out, touch and kiss the casket like a child seeking reassurance: a heartbreaking incident. Yet one marveled, with vast respect, at the honest, strong compulsion that sent her back there, when lesser spirits would have retired under sedation.

A British observer defined her quality throughout as "majesty." Of course, she was worthy of the term, but to us it seemed grandiose. We know only that a new American heroine is on the scene.

This is a tribute to him and to our country made doubly strong by the circumstances under which they came. For so many necessary, important persons to come to the United States at this time is another extraordinary thing. For—it must be faced—in doing so they ran a serious risk.

General De Gaulle, the new Prime Minister of Britain and Prince Philip, the Germans, the Russians, the men of the new Africa, all these and the others are controversial figures and for each one there is an "anti" group in the mixed population of the United States. In any of these groups, these lunatic fringes of the far right or the far left, there are crackpots. Every crowd, such as the multitude that lined the streets of Washington, may contain a Lee Oswald; under such circumstances, no police force, even one far less negligent than that of Dallas, can assure protection.

That these factors were well understood by the visitors goes without saying. It is a well-known fact that four American Presidents have died at the hands of assassins and others had the narrowest of escapes. This country is a violent, dangerous land, especially right now.

The leaders who came risked their lives to honor this young man. Why? To them, as he did to us, Kennedy may have stood as a symbol of the hope of peace, the hope of goodness that persists in every man's heart. In the young President's flashing energy, his strong faith in the future and the ability of youth to rebuild it in a better image, they may have recognized a touch of greatness.

These leaders from foreign lands came because they honored him and they came because of the Nation that he represented. They know its faults. They know, and judge rightly, while they scorn, its dangers, but they recognize its will for goodness, its generous heart, its steadfast belief—despite much seeming evidence to the contrary—in the worth of the human spirit.

As these great leaders stood by the grave of John F. Kennedy to do him honor, so let us honor them: for their faith in him and in the United States which he served so well and for the generous, brave spirit that brought them here to share our grief, to stand by us in our hour of trial.

When lilacs last in the dooryard bloom'd,
And the great star early droop'd in the western sky in the night,
I mourn'd, and yet shall mourn with ever-returning spring.
O powerful western fallen star!
O great star disappear'd—O the black murk that hides the star!
O harsh surrounding cloud that will not free my soul.

—WALT WHITMAN.

(After the assassination of President Lincoln.)

---

[From the Montgomery Herald, Troy, N.C., Nov. 28, 1963]

### ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT REMINDS CITIZENS THAT SPREADING HATRED COULD DESTROY NATION

Perhaps it has all been said already.

The President is dead and around the world millions of words have been written and spoken about the man who was the 35th President of the United States, about his contributions to mankind, and about the dastardly deed which took his life.

The shots which rang out on a crowded Dallas street last Friday were, indeed, heard around the world. The sounds of these shots, and what they mean, will reverberate for time to come.

During the long hours following President John F. Kennedy's assassination, millions of grieving Americans paused for moments of self-examination.

People thought serious thoughts. Many people wondered aloud what has happened to our civilized society. Many wondered whether they themselves have allowed seeds of hate to become sown so widely and deeply that hatred threatens to destroy this Nation's way of life.

The easiest way to write off this terrible thing, of course, is to say that the act of assassination was by the hand of a warped individual. But, we must remember that the fires of hatred, fanned by "sane" individuals, help to warp and twist other men's minds.

Friday wasn't the first time that there have been signs of hatred in Dallas. Just a few weeks ago United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson was besieged by an angry mob in Dallas and spat upon. The ugly head of hatred has reared itself in other places in the land.

And, need we not kid ourselves, Dallas and other "trouble spots" are not the only spawning places for the seeds of hatred. Who among us has not been guilty, at one time or another, of uttering statements about things and people—yes, even the late President—which would tend to build hatred in our own minds as well as in the minds of others?

Freedom of speech is a precious heritage which gives all Americans the right to disagree, but we must not use this freedom to build corruptive hate which can only destroy the every things we hold so dear.

It may well be that the events of the past weekend, as tragic as they were, will result in the greatest and most lasting memorial to the late President. Not a stone and concrete memorial, but a memorial in men's minds to remind them that there is no place for hatred and malice in a civilized world.

We've a feeling that this great American would like such a memorial.

#### THERE'S STILL MUCH FOR WHICH TO BE THANKFUL

Still mourning the loss of a President, and still in a state of shock, Americans today pause to give thanks to the Almighty for their many blessings. It's Thanksgiving Day, 1963.

On the heels of the tragic events of the past few days many people may be inclined to feel that there is little to be thankful for this year. They are wrong.

For one thing, they can be thankful for the form of government under which we live. Not a perfect process, to be sure, it is still the best to be devised by mankind.

And, they can be thankful for their forebears who built the framework of our Government. The vivid events of the past few days demonstrate that they took their work seriously and overlooked no detail in assuring this Nation of leadership.

A President can die, but the office must continue. Last week, within minutes after President John F. Kennedy was slain there was a new President and the wheels of government continued uninterrupted.

Americans were brought close to the tragedy through the medium of television, and we believe all Americans felt a feeling of thankfulness for our Democracy.

Americans, too, on this Thanksgiving Day will want to thank God that the Nation has leadership in abundance. While we mourn the loss of President Kennedy, we are thankful that a man with the capabilities and the courage of President Johnson was standing in the wings ready to assume the awesome burden of the office.

Each citizen of course, has many personal things for which he can give thanks. It is, indeed, a dark period in our lives, but out of the clouds of darkness there comes rays of bright hope for the future.

Let us all pause this day to give thanks for the great blessings we are privileged to enjoy.

---

[From the Washington (N.C.) Daily News, November 1963]

### A NATION'S CONSCIENCE AND A BLEEDING HEART

The death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy President of the United States, is at this very moment touching the lives of people over the world in every walk of life.

There are no mitigating circumstances surrounding his death. He was killed in cold blood, and a Nation's conscience is hurting, and it will continue to hurt for a long time. The heart of the entire world is bleeding, and with every drop of blood, there is the realization that a friend of man has given his life in the causes he deemed right and just.

It matters little the name of the assassin, or his age, color, political beliefs, or why he chose to pain the Nation's conscience or bleed the world's heart with this dastardly act.

People in America and people over the world often disagreed with Mr. Kennedy. But in America particularly we live in a land where the right to disagree is as sacred as the right to agree. Surely, John F. Kennedy would have been the last to deny that principle and the first to hold high its banner.

America has lost so very much, but this great loss is not America's alone. John F. Kennedy belonged to the world. Today wherever one lives, and regardless of what one believes, the knowledge is general that mankind has lost a great friend and a true leader.

Mr. Kennedy died fighting for the principles in which he believed. When we begin to think of how much greatness this Nation and the world have lost, the pain of shock becomes so much greater. What a brilliant young man. What a world statesman he could have been when his term of office was finished.

Men die on battlefields, and we never know what measure of greatness they might have given the world. Somewhere on the bloody beaches of Normandy or Anzio, or in the barren coldness of the 38th parallel might lie the remains of some boy, who had he lived, might have given us the cure for cancer or the key that would unlock the secret of world peace or who might have provided the leadership that would have brought political or moral or spiritual greatness to a world torn asunder. To what heights might have Mr. Kennedy gone? We'll never know, but if we could judge the future by the past, we might conclude that the opportunities ahead are limitless.

Yes, Mr. Kennedy, friend to man, champion of this time of history, and fighter to the end, lies still today. But the seeds he has grown and the paths he has explored shall one day bear a bountiful harvest of fruit.

He was our President. He died with his boots on. The mortal man is dead, but the impact lives on. And it shall live in the hearts and minds of men for a long, long time.

America mourns; the world mourns; we all have lost more than we realize.

---

[From the Warren Record, Warrenton, N.C., Nov. 29, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Whether John F. Kennedy will be listed among the great Presidents of the United States history can only tell; that he was a great American there can be no doubt; but that he was beloved has been attested to by the tears of a mourning public, and the sense of depression that gripped the Nation for days following his assassination in Dallas last Friday.

Mixed with the tears and with the sense of loss has been a sense of national shame that such a thing could have happened in America.

The great and the mighty of this Nation and of the nations of the world have paid their tribute to the man, to his courage, his love of his country, his personal warmth, and his compassion for the weak. Now there remains little to say.

We think that in his death a little of us all died. We had watched him on TV, seen his pictures on magazine covers, heard his cultured voice on radio and TV until he had become almost a part of us. Even those who did not care for his views on domestic issues, admired the man as an individual, and most of us were proud that a family such as the Kennedys were in the White House.

It has been said that a man is part of all whom he has known. Certainly the mem-

**ories of John F. Kennedy and his too few days in the White House will be with us the days of our life. Memory paints a picture of a young man in 1956 at the Democratic National Convention when he almost won the Democratic nomination for Vice President. We remember 4 years later his successful fight for the nomination of his party for President, how we were early won to his cause and pulled for him as the fight waged for the nomination. We remember his campaign, the TV debates, his winning the election, and his great inaugural address when he pled for the American people to "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."**

**That it all had to end in such a tragic manner is truly heartbreaking.**

**John F. Kennedy was not only blessed with courage, stamina and an excellent mind; he was blessed with one of the truly great women of this age as his wife. People who did not like the President, learned to love his wife, for her tact, her beauty, her culture, and her courage.**

**Among the memories of the ceremonies connected with the death of President Kennedy, we think we shall never forget the picture of sheer courage and devotion shown by this woman. We will always remember her at the airport entering the hearse to ride to the White House with the remains of her husband. We will remember her standing before the bier of her husband in the rotunda of the Capitol, hiding her grief, as she held the hands of her little boy, 3, Monday, and girl, 6, Wednesday; and how leaving them for a moment she approached the flag-covered casket, knelt and kissed the coffin that contained the remains of her husband.**

**The sympathy of the Nation not only goes out to Mrs. Kennedy and her children, but to his old father and to his mother, who had already suffered the loss of one son in World War II, the loss of a daughter in an airplane crash in 1948, who have known the heartaches of a retarded child; and to his brothers and sisters making up one of America's most devoted families.**

**The sympathy of the Nation also goes to the new President Lyndon Johnson, who not only lost the friendship of a man whom he had learned to love but had the great problems of the world dropped into his lap with the firing of a shot. The prayers of America will be with him in his ordeal and, we believe, the support of the people.**

**As the last muffled drumbeat died, and the body of a beloved President was returned to the earth, the phrase that comes to us is from Horatio's farewell to Hamlet:**

**"Goodnight, Sweet Prince."**

---

[From the West Jefferson (N.C.) Skyland Post, Nov. 28, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

**The tragic and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy, 46, at the hand of an assassin in Dallas, Tex., Friday brought shock and grief to this Nation and the world.**

**This 35th President of the United States, put service above self. He was a leader who had accomplished much but who had more plans for the future. For this reason it is too soon to evaluate his real worth to this Nation and the world. History will in time record this and we believe history will prove him to be one of the greatest Presidents of all times.**

**He was a man known and loved, not only by Americans, but by people throughout the world. The grief over his tragic death at the hands of a sniper, has been profound and been expressed by practically all countries in the world except Communist China. In West Berlin 60,000 torchbearers marched and a street was renamed "John F. Kennedy." In England, fundraising was started to erect a monument for him and a service was held in Westminster Abbey. In other countries there were more expressions of grief and sympathy.**

**President Kennedy championed the cause of the poor and the less fortunate, but kings, queens, presidents, and other world leaders mourned and came to Washington to his funeral to pay final tribute to this young leader cut down in the prime of life.**

President Kennedy had served his country as a naval officer in war, but he was willing and ready to leave nothing undone to keep the peace of the world. But his peace was a peace of dignity and respect.

President Kennedy was a wealthy man, but he knew and understood the problems of the poor and worked for their health and welfare.

He was an educated man and realized the value of education for all Americans.

He was a fearless man of great courage and the last lines of his book "Profiles in Courage" were written with his life's blood.

He was inaugurated as President during a blizzard and brought to this Nation's Capital a real breath of fresh air. In the short period he served, less than 3 years, he has thrown out many challenges. How we accept them from his fallen hand depends upon our sense of individual responsibility.

These are indeed trying times, but they are times to rally behind the new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and give him the support he deserves for the heavy tasks that have been thrust upon him.

---

[From the Whiteville (N.C.) News Reporter, Nov. 25, 1963]

### ASK WHAT YOU CAN DO

All the world is aware now of the atrocity committed in this country last Friday. Free people and the oppressed everywhere have lost a friend and this Nation has lost a great President and a dedicated public servant.

The courageous leader of this land's 180 million has been struck down by an assassin's unerring aim was a shot heard—and felt—around the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave his life in the line of duty and now rests with other heroes in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.

Some 20 years ago he was spared, prophetically, in the Pacific fighting for a cause that this Nation and its freedom-loving allies might live in peace and decency. Now he has joined many of his buddies of that frightful war.

We can ill afford the loss but the despicable deed has been done. The great promise and brilliance with which Mr. Kennedy was endowed is lost for all time. He had been honored with the highest office this Nation could give but, relatively youthful, the potential of his gift for leadership and wisdom gave great promise of strength in future years.

There were those who disagreed with some of the principles Mr. Kennedy espoused and there were those in whose hearts some phases of his domestic program created resentment, even open defiance, but true Americans bore him no hate as was exemplified last Friday. He fought for what he thought was best and proper for his fellow countrymen and not to the sacrifice of one group against another but for all people.

This outrageous act at Dallas, Tex., last Friday has brought shame to this land—haven for the depressed, home of the orphaned, friend of all who love liberty, and benefactor of mankind in many lands beyond our shores. No nation, near or remote, has been denied succor when that nation, great or weak, made its plea in good faith.

The memory of Mr. Kennedy will live for generations and many of his prophetic statements will abide forever. So it is now, in these trying hours, a time to rededicate ourselves to that soul-searching appeal he expressed in his inaugural address almost 3 years ago:

"Ask not what your country can do for you but ask what you can do for your country."

---

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 23, 1963]

### A NATION MOURNS ITS PRESIDENT

"He's dead."

Those words shocked a great nation and much of the remainder of the world into cold and deep silence yesterday afternoon. And it will be a long time before the numbness of the assassination of President Kennedy leaves the hearts and minds of millions of people.

The horror of the tragedy is difficult to appraise and put into words.

In one moment, a happy President was enjoying his visit to one of the Nation's fine cities. Minutes later he entered death's door. Why? Because of the warped deadly brain of a single person.

President Kennedy, like many other great men stricken down at their heights, now belongs to the ages. His supporters and his critics quietly join hands in their mutual respect as they pay homage to a man who literally gave his life for his country. This sad day transcends party lines and differences, big and small, because all Americans realize their President, dedicated to fulfilling his big and demanding role, is gone. One of the most dastardly acts of all time has taken our leader, in the prime and vigor of his life, away.

Today men of all faiths and political parties share a loss that has brought the Nation to a standstill. As these men measure their sadness, they are aware of the challenge ahead. That challenge is to act for the better welfare of the United States in the same spirit—placement of love of country and devotion to duty above all else—that motivated the life of President Kennedy.

The Nation is offered sound, moderate leadership in the new President—Lyndon Johnson. The tasks ahead for him will not be easy. He will need the people's thoughtful, unwavering support. May Americans resolve to fulfill this need as they offer their deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the family in their darkest hour.

---

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 24, 1963]

### WELCOME THE NEW LEADER

As shock ebbs from the minds of Americans it is replaced with profound grief in their hearts over the assassination of President Kennedy.

Untold millions feel a personal loss as the details of one of the most dastardly deeds in history are unfolded. Regardless of whether a person liked or disliked Mr. Kennedy, if he is a true patriot his sadness is comparable to that over the loss of a member of the family if for no other reason than his reverence for the Presidency. As the deep meaning of this awesome tragedy sweeps over the Nation, good people ask themselves: What can I do, other than through my prayers, in memory of a man who gave his life for his country and in behalf of his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson?

As that question is asked, it is likely those famous words from Mr. Kennedy's inaugural address will come to mind:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

The first thing to do is to follow the example of true unity, regardless of partisan politics or other factors, set by the Nation's leaders in the hours following the murder of Mr. Kennedy. History has proved, time and time again, that when bitterness and selfishness are thrust aside the beauty of America's greatness in her dark hours is brilliant to behold.

Next, let there be no doubt in any mind as to the ability, desire and spirit of President Johnson to take up his tremendous responsibilities. Of all men who have stepped from the Vice Presidency to the White House, he is the best qualified from experience, knowledge and courage for the new and larger job. His many years in Government have trained him well as a skilled and respected leader. And remember, he was selected for his role by Mr. Kennedy himself.

As the Nation turns toward its new leadership, it should easily find spiritual inspiration for powerful unity and eagerness to support President Johnson in the demanding days ahead. Seldom before has the need for solidarity been greater, not only among ourselves but in demonstration to a watchful world. May it prevail every hour in behalf of the security and continued welfare of the United States as the leader of the free people of the world.

---

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

### The Message He Left

It is over.

The massive picture, drawn for endless hours in countless scenes and words, of the martyrdom of President John F. Kennedy is no longer before the misty eyes of millions. But much of this tragic panorama is burned deep in the memory of Americans. As they look back, they feel weary in their knowledge they have suffered through a nightmare which the most fantastic fiction could not match in its incredibility.

The bizarre series of events which began with a rifle shot in Dallas last Friday is over—thank God. Its final and total evaluation is now a task for the historians.

But one thing will never be over.

It is the message in the untimely death of the 35th President of the United States.

Mr. Kennedy perhaps could deliver it better than anyone else through application of the powerful oratory he mastered so well. But his lips are cold and silent as the world mourns its loss. So others must speak. But that should not be difficult—if the speaker believes in God, the dignity of man, and the prevalence of law and order. Why? Because the message is so simple. It is:

Hate is the most powerful weapon known to man.

Modern man fears the nuclear bomb. He is just as much afraid of its vehicles of delivery. He knows planes and rockets can smash the bomb down on him and millions of his countrymen in the space of a few minutes. So, as the first means of protection, masses of men curb their hate as they strive for even a shread of genuine hope for eternal peace.

It was no massive nuclear bomb but a simple bullet, fired from a $12.78 mail-order rifle, that ended the world of John F. Kennedy. The bullet was sent into its fatal flight by just one thing—the hate of one man for mankind.

Seldom does the Bible itself match the irony of this story in the death of Lee Harvey Oswald from a bullet in his body from another gun, only hours after the Kennedy murder.

Thus, a second merchant of hate, a man named Jack Ruby, was given the spotlight in Dallas, a city whose damnation seldom has been matched in history.

The end of Oswald was as certain as a direct hit by a nuclear bomb.

Once again, hate sent a fatal bullet into its deadly flight. It was a chain reaction.

It is readily admitted Oswald and Ruby are not average individuals. That is true—but they certainly are not the only people with hate-filled heads in this land.

Are the dastardly deeds in Dallas to be accepted as a mounting trend of uncontrolled violence? Are we to believe that the honor—and life—of the Presidency and the rights of the Constitution are worth no more than mere bullets? Is it to be that the problems of this Nation have surpassed the civilized means of solution? Is hate to rule?

Those questions are asked for the thought they may provoke.

Hate can kill nations as readily and as deadly as it kills men. Never before has it been more important for Americans to remember that—and let their highest interpretations of that thought guide them in their relations with each other and the world.

That, we believe, is the message President Kennedy left.

---

[From the Wilson (N.C.) Daily Times, November 1963]

### The Nation Mourns for the President

Out of the clear of everyday living came the word that the President of the United States of America, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is dead. He was killed by an assassin's bullet.

Smiling, waving and happy was the last picture he gave the people of Dallas, Tex., as he rode in the parade in his honor, in that city. This was the picture you associate with the youngest President ever to take the highest office in the land. He was young, young in spirit, often young in actions, but always vibrant, and thoughtful, and brilliant.

His young wife and their two children, bring to mind the picture that is truly international, the picture of a happy family, carrying the responsibility of the biggest job on earth, with a relish and desire to carry forward for another term. For the President was in Texas on both a national and fence-mending mission.

The people of this Nation were stunned. You read over and again the words "incredible", "beyond comprehension", "unbelievable", and "tragic." While this Nation is trying to recover from the shock, the leaders of the world send words of condolence, respect and admiration for the young, but forceful leader.

It is difficult to reconcile the President's assassination, with this modern age in which we live. Who his assassin is, has not been decided. It really does not matter because his deed so outweighs all other circumstances. If he was killed by a fanatic, by one either possessed of misguided national zeal or by one whose twisted mind led him to believe he was serving some cause, is of little consequence.

For we, of this age, have witnessed an event we did not think could happen. For only three Presidents before have been assassinated. The first was Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States, the President during the Civil War who was shot by John Wilkes Booth. Today he is known as the Great Emancipator. And we predict that President Kennedy, will in our lifetime, be called by many a second Abraham Lincoln, the martyr of this age.

The other Presidents assassinated were James Abram Garfield, the 20th President who was shot in the station in Washington. He was going to Williams College, Williamston, Mass., to attend commencement exercises.

William McKinley, the 25th President was shot while attending a reception in one of the public buildings of the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, N.Y.

President Kennedy was a man of great ability, personality, and talent. He held the admiration of many and the respect of all. Whether you agreed with him or not, you recognized his ability and you respected his intentions. He will go down in history as a great President, and his tragic death will add luster to an already brilliant career, as a patriot, a statesman, and as the President of the United States.

From the tragedy we must come to grips with the fact that our own internal problems are more dire, more serious than those of international scope. This Nation must heal its differences. And the tragic death of the President should teach us that the strength of a Nation is built upon understanding and not bitterness, not arms but the heart. If progress is made in this direction, he will not have died in vain.

---

[From the Bertie Ledger-Advance, Windsor, N.C., November 1963]

### Great Nations Survive

The President is dead. His body lies buried on a hillside in Arlington Cemetery. Life and government for the people of America go on.

These are not facts that the people of Bertie County do not know. In this day of continuous on-the-spot television and radio coverage there is little that is not known throughout the land. Where these media have stopped, the daily newspapers have provided printed coverage.

What is there left for a weekly newspaper editor to say? Is there need to say anything more? In ordinary circumstances a news item so far away from the coverage area of a country weekly would go unnoticed.

But the past few days have been no ordinary days. The world has been affected in a moment of history when the President of the United States was mortally wounded.

Shocked, saddened, disgusted, sickened, grief stricken * * * these are expressions used to describe feelings yet these words seem inadequate and there are none better to describe what Americans have felt since 2 p.m., Friday.

Washington, New York, Los Angeles, Boston, Dallas have no monopoly on grief. People wept in these places. People wept too in Windsor and Colerain, in Aulander and Lewiston and in every crossroad and hamlet where this great leader was known.

These events have passed. As flags continue to fly at half mast, tears cease. A leader has fallen—a nation still stands. The future of this Nation has been affected but thank God there is a future remaining. Great leaders are mortal, great nations survive.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a Christian man. Perhaps in his death he accomplished something that would never have been accomplished in life. He caused millions of people to feel a need to return to God. In churches, cathedrals, and synagogues they went to pray—in tribute to his memory and in search of peace in their hearts.

It takes a tragedy to bring us to our knees for we have become a self-sufficient people who often forget The One who makes all things possible.

In sorrow we were united. Perhaps in days to come we will be united in joy. For this is America, a land where people came and still do to escape the events such as those of the past weekend. It couldn't happen here we were sure.

But it did. It happened this time in Dallas. It could happen in Windsor. It could happen anywhere in the world where regard for God's laws as well as man's laws are forgotten.

The late President was so representative of America's basic conception. He sought peace yet he was unafraid to face danger to fight for ideals. He pressed forward toward accomplishment with determination and in so doing lost personal support but gained strength for the Nation.

No more appropriate monument can be built to his memory than the eternal flame lighted at his grave by Mrs. Kennedy. We will miss him but names and personalities are soon erased.

May the eternal light at his grave be the torch to kindle a spark of love for mankind, peace, and good will that will continue this Nation on its course as:

> "America, the beautiful,
> The land of the free
> And the home of the brave."
> —LAURA HARRELL.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

The proper epitaph for John Fitzgerald Kennedy might well be an American variant of a royal motto: He served.

He served his country as a naval officer in conditions of brutal trial and danger—a danger which called for a test of loyalty to his fellow man and all but cost him his life.

He served his State as a Senator. And though his political beginnings were unpromising, he achieved by hard work a mastery of national and world affairs that few of his contemporaries could equal.

He served the Nation again as President and Commander in Chief. In the span of less than 3 years he experienced all the grandeur and the misery of the Presidency, and he accepted both with equal serenity.

Now he has been struck down by an act of hate.

John Kennedy, as we all know, had the love of countless Americans. He knew in those exciting days of 1960 and the years that immediately followed the welcoming roar of the crowd in the streets, the frantic handclasp of the well-wishers who slipped past his bodyguards, and the "God bless you, Jack" that came from an unknown voice in the crowd.

He also knew—and let us be honest with ourselves in this moment of grief—the hatred of too many Americans. These unworthy ones held him accountable, as Americans have often held their leaders accountable in the past, for the very problems that any man in the President's office would have had to face.

Now these problems are waiting for the new President. They are familiar enough—the antagonism of the races, the malevolence of the Russians and all those they have infected with the Communist virus; the costs of national security, and all the strains in our society and the world at large brought on by the new nationalism, the Russian and Chinese revolutions, and the concurrent industrial, electronic and atomic revolutions.

There they are waiting, these problems, on the desk of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

To meet them in a worthy way, he will need the love and the confidence of his fellow Americans.

So let there be a truce to hate.

And, conscious of our incomparable power and all that depends on it, let us unite behind our new President, raising a prayer that he will prove worthy of the trust.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

### A COURAGEOUS LADY

It can be truly said that nothing became Mrs. John F. Kennedy as First Lady so much as the courage and simple dignity with which she shared her grief.

Among the indelible memories of these past few days, none is etched more deeply than the sight of this slender young woman in black—bending to speak to her young children, kneeling at her husband's casket, lighting the eternal torch at his grave.

Other women have met the sudden death of their husbands as courageously. But no other woman in history, including Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has been called on to suffer this private ordeal so publicly.

It is the price Mrs. Kennedy paid both for having been the wife of the President of the United States, whose death belonged to the people, and for living in the age of technology in which human emotions, like public events, can be viewed by millions.

Longfellow has said that "there is no grief like the grief that does not speak." And the lines of Mrs. Kennedy's silent grief were all to evident behind her mourning veil.

But throughout the long and exhausting ritual, she bore the burden of her position with a composure which we could not have asked but which has made her country proud.

There is little the Nation can say to Mrs. Kennedy as she takes off the mantle of First Lady which she wore so well—except, perhaps, to borrow the words that Abraham Lincoln once wrote to a woman who had lost her sons in battle:

"I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours, to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

[From the Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N.C., Nov. 23, 1963]

### A DEATH IN THE FAMILY

A great many words have been said during the past 24 hours—some of them eloquent, but most in the simple, halting speech of people deeply grieved.

Few of us knew John F. Kennedy as a person. Many did not agree with his policies; some openly fought him. If nearly half the voters of this country had had their way 3 years ago, he would not have been President yesterday, riding in ceremonial splendor through the streets of Dallas.

But the point is, Mr. Kennedy was the President yesterday. And suddenly, stunningly, the President was dead.

Never mind now his politics, his personality, his race, or his religion. All over Winston-Salem, as in every town in every corner of the Nation, people are reacting to his death as though he had been a member of their own family.

The President of the United States is that close to the people.

In a book written for children a few years ago, Gerald W. Johnson touched on why this is so. "No country," he said, "and most certainly no democracy can last long without leadership. But in a democracy the people choose the leadership, so when all is said and done, they are responsible for it, whether it is good or bad."

We did not all help put John Kennedy into the Presidency. But all of us believe in, live by, and bear responsibility for the system that put him there. Thus believing, we hold dear both the office and the life of the man who occupies it, whatever his name may be.

So it is that the bullet which killed Mr. Kennedy yesterday has grazed the lives of us all and left its scar.

[From the Caswell Messenger, Yanceyville, N.C., Nov. 28, 1963]

### CONFIDENTIALLY

(By Erwin B. Stephens)

As this is being written the muffled drumbeats in the funeral cortege of President John F. Kennedy can be heard over the airwaves, bringing a sorrowful sense of finality to one act of one of the most tragic dramas in American history.

Why did it have to happen? Over and over again the question repeats itself in the minds of millions of citizens. Why? A sense of shame and outrage swelled in the hearts of many that a shameful incident should occur in a great Christian nation. We had read about such things in other less fortunate nations; now it had happened to us.

But something of the strength and great spirit of the American people welled up to the surface as the tragic events unfolded. People of all walks of life, of all creeds and colors, came forth with a great outpouring of sympathy and expressions of tribute to one of the great men of the day.

Out of the whole tragic series of events over the weekend one can gain reassurance as to the basic strength of the people of this Nation. People who disagreed in part or in whole with the political philosophy of the President felt just as deep a sense of outrage at the dastardly crime as those who were in accord with his programs and beliefs. To everyone, this was not just a crime against the President or his party; it was a crime against all the people, for in a very real sense the Presidency is symbolic of the ideals and spirit of the American people. It holds a warm place in their hearts.

The people of America are a people of many divergent opinions, of many creeds and faiths, of divergent political philosophies. This is their strength; this is the strength of the Nation. Even the lowliest person can voice freely his disapproval of the acts of a chief executive without fear of retribution or bodily harm. Such is the freedom we possess and cherish. Such is the right that more than half the people of the world do not possess. Yet, despite such divergent opinions, in a time of national emergency or crisis, our people can unite as one, stand solid as a rock against anyone or anything that threatens our own.

Totalitarian subjects and rulers cannot understand Americans. Standing at a distance and viewing the American scene, hearing of our domestic and political squabbles, they might get the idea that the Republic is about to fall apart, that the plum is ripe for the picking. But how wrong they are. They cannot, and perhaps never will, understand how Americans can unite under stress and throw their whole resources into a common cause with zest and enthusiasm, and with a determination that cannot be deterred.

The President's death at the hands of an assassin brings into sharp focus one phase of American life which should be the concern of every rational citizen: The increase in crime and the growing trend toward violations of the laws of our land. Time and again ministers, leaders, and law enforcement officers have pointed out this trend and have sought to arouse the public to its dangers. J. Edgar Hoover, boss of the FBI, constantly sends out bulletins warning of the inherent dangers of increasing violations of the law. Our country was founded by Christian people on the foundation stone of law and order. Every violation of law, whether it be for speeding, trespassing on another's property, or for more serious offenses, chips a little more from the foundation of our Nation and contributes to the chaos which would exist if law and order breaks down. No chain is stronger than its weakest link, and any person who violates any law weakens the system which provides him, and others, with safety in his own pursuit of his goals.

In recent years we have read the statements of those who proclaimed that they would violate what they called bad laws in order to achieve what they called good ends. Such a philosophy is absurd and irresponsible and has no place in American life. It is a foreign philosophy which should never be permitted to take root in American society. Good cannot be achieved by violating the laws enacted by the representatives of the people in the interest of all the people. If we think a law is wrong or harmful, we have the right and duty to use our influence to have that law repealed by the proper authorities. That is what legislatures are for, and the process of changing, repealing, or amending laws goes on year after year in an effort to achieve greater good for more people. But when we take the law into our own hands and violate those which are distasteful to us we take the wrong stand and use our influence in the wrong way. Such a stand leads only to chaos and destruction.

[From station WBT, Charlotte, N.C., Nov. 23, 1963]

### THE PRESIDENT'S DEATH

For the fourth time in the history of this country, a President of the United States has paid with his life for his fidelity to the principle that the Chief Executive of this free Nation can walk among his people unafraid that even his bitterest enemy will lay a violent hand on him.

This terrible day demonstrates for all of us the failure, and the success, of our democracy. Assassination is detested by Americans of all parties and factions, and it is impossible for any of us to believe that an assassin is a man of sound mind.

Yet the President is dead—and to the extent that even one man in this Nation was so deluded as to imagine that taking the life of another would solve any problem, personal or political, our building of a civilized society has failed.

The murderer may be captured and brought to justice, but the vengeance of the law does not in the least diminish this tragedy which, by its very unexpectedness, has reduced the country to a state of shocked unbelief. His punishment cannot assuage the grief of John Kennedy's family and children or replace the shattered illusions of all of us who imagined that our society's conduct was living up to its capacity for good.

Our success lies in the fact that a blow of this kind does not upset our Government or result in wild disorder, as it would in many countries. Our new President, chastened as he must be by the stopping of that single heartbeat that separated him from the most awesome responsibility in the world, will receive the unstinted support and encouragement of the whole American people during his difficult period of adjustment.

It has been said that he who serves his country well builds his own monument. John F. Kennedy was a brilliant and personable, dedicated and courageous young man. He inspired the intense loyalty of his friends and the respect of his political opponents. He had a certain gentility that won people of all faiths, an earnestness in the service of his country that could not be denied, and a humanness that gave him that most engaging of qualities, the ability to laugh at himself.

There were many who disagreed with him violently on national or international policies, but few who were willing to credit him with any other than the highest patriotic motives. There should be none who would have denied him the right to serve as this Nation's elected leader.

The atmosphere of freedom allows the fanatic the right to life and liberty, too. But the man who turns to cowardly violence has denied our heritage, our pride as a Nation, and the God who has led us to greatness in the past.

[From station WBT, Charlotte, N.C., Dec. 4, 1963]

### THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

Yesterday's headlines are growing a little more dim as we retreat into everyday reality. Let's look at them again for just a moment: "The President of the United States died of a head wound inflicted by an assassin"—"His killer was not brought to justice, but died himself by violent means"—"The new President is a man named Johnson, from a Southern State, and faces the difficult task of reconciling a nation at odds with itself."

Those identical headlines might be a week old or 98 years old. All of them apply with equal accuracy to the assassinations of Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy. There is perhaps little in the string of coincidences, except for one startling reminder: that history has a way of repeating itself and of serving up a grim notice to current generations of the fact that progress has not been so great as we imagine it to be. The progress of mechanical civilization, yes—the progress of human comprehension, no.

We live in a very different world from Mr. Lincoln's so far as our external lives are concerned, but it is no different a world of the mind and heart and spirit.

The main change those 98 years have wrought is in the personal involvement of all humanity, rather than just one nation, in such a tragic event. Mr. Lincoln never left the United States, met no other heads of state or peoples of the world personally. His voice was never heard by them, his decisions as President could touch them only indirectly. Certainly, he was admired, as a character in a book might be admired, and his death was regretted, but it was a personal blow to very few outside his own Nation.

He said he lived in a nation half slave and half free, and that such a situation could not long endure. Now, we live in a world half slave and half free, and there is no reason to suppose that Mr. Lincoln's prediction for the Nation does not now apply to the world.

If the unprecedented gathering of heads of state to pray together leads us all to realize that they might as quickly gather to confer together with compassion in their hearts, rather than personal gain, then perhaps it might be said that our President's death was a sacrifice he would have been willing to make.

Even more certainly, if the people of this Nation can realize the tremendous responsibility and opportunity we have been offered, to be a leader in daring new ways rather than the hackneyed techniques of government sparring in diplomacy, the world can experience—under God—a new birth of freedom.

[From station WSOC, Charlotte, N.C., Nov. 29, 1963]

### THE LESSONS WE HAVE LEARNED

From the tragic death of President Kennedy, many lessons can and must be learned by our people.

We should have learned by now that the Office of the Chief Executive is never occupied by a superman, but by a person of the same flesh and bones and feelings as ourselves. The President can be injured or destroyed, not merely by bullets, but by hatred and invective and abuse.

We have seen too how fragile one human life can be, and how it can be snuffed out in a moment of wild madness, and how the taking of that life can be a frightening loss to countless millions of men, women, and children throughout the world.

We have seen how a happy family—a courageous husband, a dauntless wife, and two marvelous young children, can be ripped apart by the blast of a single gun. And it should remind us that we all need to tie our individual families together more closely with sincere love and trust and affectionate concern. This should awaken in the hearts of all partners in marriage a resolution to cherish one another, and as parents to lavish the warmth of real devotion and understanding upon our children, and to let this same love and understanding spread to our neighbors and friends and to all mankind.

Only in this way can we make meaningful the beauty and majesty and the grand design of our democratic, constitutional system of government.

It should be obvious now that we cannot laugh or curse or blaspheme any person or any office, without demeaning ourselves and our Nation.

For this is our country, and it will stand or fall on what each of us says and does each day of his life.

As we assess the weakness and fear that we felt when our President was so abruptly taken from our midst there should be a dawning in our minds the part that we must play if we are to make sure that such violence does not again strike our country or terror stalk our citizens in any home, any community or any State.

We have been taught a costly lesson in citizenship and the responsibilities that every person is born to inherit in our democratic government:

This Nation will be strong and healthy only so long as we individually give it strength through unselfish allegiance.

This land will be peaceful and tranquil, only so long as we insure its tranquillity through law and order.

We must learn to live with one another, resisting hatred and envy, overcoming the ugly passions of arrogance and false judgment. We must not attack but support, we must not tear down but build up, preserve, and protect.

These are lessons we can learn. These are lessons we must learn if we are to keep the soul of our country clean, and make the future of our Nation secure.

[From station WSOC, Charlotte, N.C., November 1963]

### UNITED WE STAND

Although we regret that it took the death of a President of the United States to do it, WSOC radio is encouraged to see the leaders of the world's democratic countries set aside disagreements and rally together in a time of crisis.

It was a moving experience to see the austere Charles de Gaulle of France, the new Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany, Mayor Willy Brandt, the symbol of a free Berlin and many, many more of the most influential leaders of the world, all gathered together in Washington to pay their last respects to this country's late President.

This indicates several things. It shows a basic unity among all of the free people of the world. It proves that for all our petty arguments and disagreements, when the chips are down, our allies can be depended on to stand behind us. And it symbolizes this country's past—and future—role as a global leader.

Our new President can now move forward in his demanding job with the full knowledge that he has the support and best wishes of the leaders of the free world.

[From station WHIT, New Bern, N.C., Nov. 29, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Just one short week ago today John F. Kennedy was assassinated in a terrible drama that goes down as the most dastardly act of this century. The aftermath of that infamous day brought many heart-tugging episodes that will long be remembered: There was the secret service man who quickly threw himself upon then Vice President Johnson when the shooting began, at the risk of the former's own life. There was the "Profile in Courage" composure of Jackie Kennedy during the ordeal, her late and second visit to the Capitol rotunda while her husband's body lay in state. Her walk in the night following that visit, when the former First Lady's presence among thousands of Washington mourners was unknown. Also to be remembered with a tug at the heart was the irony of John-John's birthday falling on the day of his father's funeral and the military salute the little boy bravely gave at the sad occasion. The beautiful black horse in the processions to the rotunda, St. Matthews and Arlington, a high-spirited animal giving his handler a bad time every

**moment. The contrast in height between the tall and stately President de Gaulle and tiny Emperor Haile Selassie, standing side by side. There was also the seeming coldness of quick removal from the White House of John Kennedy's personal mementos, among them a model of his PT boat that was cut in half by the Japanese and the famous Kennedy rocking chair. And, as a climax, perhaps, there was the bugler blowing taps over President Kennedy's grave. He struck just one sour note and you knew it was because he couldn't completely control the quiver of his lips. These are the episodes long to be remembered by all who wear their heart on their sleeve.**

---

[From Station WRAL-TV, Raleigh-Durham, N.C., Nov. 22, 1963]

### VIEWPOINT

**Anguish alone will not suffice as the Nation's proper reaction to the news of President Kennedy's assassination. All men of sanity and humanity feel a sense of revulsion at the act of the fanatical coward who hid in the attic of a building and fired down the shots that extinguished the life of a young man who, to us, seemed to possess not merely the quality of unbounded energy, but a sort of indestructibility as well.**

**At this moment, of course, all Americans are united regardless of party, or philosophy, or ideals. Conservatism, liberalism, right wing, left wing—all these are meaningless semantics, no longer dividers, certainly not important unless and until we respond to the question of what happened to civilization in that dark moment in Dallas.**

**So, in unity there is a helplessness that may assist us in groping for strength. One insane man with a high-powered rifle has exposed the incredible weakness of a nation. If we now see that weakness, if we now understand it, some consolation may be found. Men may have differed with Mr. Kennedy in his exuberant ideas about politics, government, and the quest for peace in a troubled world. But as he lies tonight in death, he has left more than a shocked and stunned nation. The manner of his death leaves America standing naked as a symbol of civilization mocked.**

**Every citizen will reflect upon Mr. Kennedy's life, and his death, in a personal way. Mr. Kennedy had become a part of America in a personal way. His harshest critics recognized his magnetism and persuasiveness which had drawn him into the inner circle of American life. He was not loved by everyone; still, no one doubted his courage or his stamina. He fought his political battles with every ounce of his strength. And he did it openly.**

**And this serves to emphasize the dastardly nature of his assassination. Jack Kennedy was killed by a coward.**

**As we sat alone minutes after the announcement of the President's death, a hundred images flowed through our mind. One little incident that we personally observed nearly 11 years ago came to mind as clearly as if it were yesterday. It was a cold, crisp January morning in 1953 and the quorum bells had just rung throughout the Capitol and the Senate Office Building in Washington. Members of the Senate, the old ones and the new ones, were scurrying to get to the Senate Chamber. It was oath-of-office day for 10 or 12, including a tousled-haired young man from Massachusetts who had been elected to the Senate the previous November.**

**Senators were boarding the subway cars which connect the Capitol with the Senate Office Building by an underground route. Visitors and employees of the Senate were being repeatedly told by operators of the subway cars to stand aside for the Senators. They had priority.**

Jack Kennedy arrived to take a seat on the subway car, but the operator waved him back. "Stand aside for the Senators, son," he said. Jack Kennedy stood aside with a grin—until an observer whispered to the operator: "He's a Senator, too." The embarrassed operator got only a pat on the back and a reassurance from Senator Kennedy.

An unimportant incident? Maybe. But it is one that we will remember always. No matter how much we might have disagreed with certain of the President's views and actions, the memory of that incident provided a sense of warmth and personal affection.

Millions of words will be written and spoken about this dark hour in America's history. Many days will pass before we can stand with pride and confidence, and say to the world that we are civilized. The cause of communism has been served well by this tragedy. Freedom has suffered a telling blow.

As for our new President, Lyndon Johnson, no man has faced a sterner challenge. He needs—he must have—the prayers of a Nation of people who see the need of renewing their faith, who are willing to proclaim honestly and sincerely that "In God we trust."

---

[From station WTYN, Tryon, N.C., Nov. 22, 1963]

### PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Our President, President Kennedy, the President of the United States, is dead. Shockingly and coldbloodedly shot down by an assassin's bullet.

There is not an American who does not know that this is a most terrible and tragic thing that has been done against a good man, against the great office, and against this great country, nay to every American.

The whole world will feel the impact of this foul murder, and, yet, at this time it should be a time of discipline and of careful thought to the future of our United States and to all of us and to those who remain in high offices to do their best to serve her in this hour of sorrow and of tragedy.

Let each of us, citizens of this great Nation of ours, forgetting the prejudices, the differences between us of philosophy, of faith, of petty politics, take stock of this ugly and horrible situation, joining together as free Americans to stand by those who in this time of emergency have the duty and the burden of keeping our Nation on a straight course of freedom and justice which has been handed down to us by our forefathers.

Let us not allow this dastardly and cowardly act of a madman, so to unnerve us as a nation that we become bewildered and easy prey to outside interests.

Let us continue in honor, with courage, and in disciplined order, as citizens of the United States, to stand firm in the heritage of our freedoms, and in the preserving of our Constitution and way of life, with calmness, forthright commonsense, and in the unity of purpose which, as citizens of this great Nation, is our common ambition and our common goal.

Let us pray for those whose burden it is to carry on in the face of our tragic loss. May they be filled with the wisdom and the strength to bring our people and our Nation through these troubled times, and may they have the knowledge of the support and understanding and cooperation of all people everywhere.

Let us pray.

O Lord, our governor whose glory is in all the world, we commend this Nation to Thy merciful care, that being guided by Thy providence, we may dwell secure in Thy peace. Grant to the President of the United States and to all in authority, wisdom and strength to do Thy will. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness, and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear, through Jesus Christ our Lord who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.

---

[From the Nashville (N.C.) Graphic, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A JOURNEY ENDS SADLY, BUT AMERICA'S ROAD LEADS ON

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The President is dead, and a sorrowful Nation mourns his passing.

The mourning is genuine and real.

One of the most moving aspects of the tragedy which ended the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was that his death came as a personal loss to the lowly and the humble, no less than to the great and the near-great.

Grief and sorrow were writen on faces that watched televised news reports for hours after the first announcement of his brutal assassination stunned the Nation last Friday afternoon.

In homes across the land, tears fell silently and unashamedly Monday as a flag-draped caisson, drawn by six great horses, bore John F. Kennedy to his final resting place on a sloping hillside in Arlington National Cemetery across the Potomac River from the Nation's Capital.

Part of the feeling of personal loss at the President's tragic death could be attributed to the untimeliness of his passing. John F. Kennedy died in the prime of life, at the vigorous peak of a brilliant political career.

Part of it could be attributed to the brutality and the cold viciousness of his assassination.

But there is more than this to account for the sense of personal grief that so many felt in the death of John F. Kennedy.

He held the admiration and respect of the Nation because he embodied the principles, the ideals, the hopes and the promise of America in the youth and vigor of his dynamic leadership.

Not everyone agreed with the political views of John F. Kennedy, to be sure. This newspaper has expressed opposition on several occasions to liberal legislative measures advocated by the late President.

But no one could doubt the sincerity of John F. Kennedy's convictions.

None can say that he lacked devotion to the ideals in which he believed or was unwilling to expend the full measure of his energies in the effort to achieve them.

He never asked what the country he loved so well could do for him. He asked what John Fitzgerald Kennedy could do for America.

"Now the trumpet summons us again," said Kennedy in his inaugural address, "To bear the burden of a long, twilight struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war.

"Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance * * * that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?"

The President is dead. Life's brief journey ended sadly and tragically for John F. Kennedy.

Yet the Nation lives on, needing now, more than ever, the devotion and the dedicated service of free people who know in their sorrow that the road America must travel leads on toward a destiny as bright and shining as the courage and faith of their fallen leader.

---

[From the Newton (N.C.) Observer-News-Enterprise, Nov. 25, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

"Ask not what the country can do for you—ask what you can do for the country."

These words spoken by John Fitzgerald Kennedy in his inaugural address in January 1961 gave the people of America a clear insight into the type of man that was to lead this Nation. And, until he was cut down from ambush by bullets Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex., it can be said that President Kennedy asked not what the country could do for him but rather, he gave so much—even the supreme sacrifice—for his country.

This country has been privileged to have had a President of the caliber man such as John F. Kennedy, who in such a short period of time, gained respect of his enemies, solidified his position, both at home, and abroad, brought to America statesmanship built on a foundation of intelligence and moral integrity.

The Washington Star said of him Saturday: "He walked as a prince and talked as a scholar." These few words sum up the type man that was leading this Nation in a time of world and domestic unrest—who was giving to his country and asking not what the country could do for him.

There are so many aspects to the tragic death of the 35th President of the United States. From the beginning of his term of office until his untimely death, he was faced with one major problem after another. In this nuclear age when man attempts with all his might to live with his enemies President Kennedy reaffirmed to the whole world that this Nation was interested in the freedom of nations and the dignity of man. From the beginning he made it clear that the United States would help those freedom-loving nations of the world and that this Nation would not back down from the fist-clinching, table-top pounding of those Nations who sought to destroy freedom.

And at home, in America, decisions in domestic policy were constantly affording the President many hours of deep consternation. Though there are those who did not agree with his policies, they nevertheless would have to hold John F. Kennedy in high respect for his devotion to the causes he felt right.

Sometimes it takes a tragic incident to bring about solidarity. And we feel that through the assassination of John F. Kennedy there will come a closer, more understanding feeling about the tremendous job of the President of the United States regardless of political affiliation.

---

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

### IN REASON, IN COURAGE

It has come to us now to turn away from the body of a friend and begin again in reason and in courage our journey into what must be a better future for all the people of our Nation.

The grief which came to our country at President Kennedy's death will and should remain in our hearts for all the days of our lives. The shock and the terror which came to us at that first numbing news now has no place in us or in our Nation. Neither is there any place in us for the panic and the unreasoning fear which inevitably followed in the first moments after the death of the President.

There must be in our hearts now only the strength of freemen and the courage of freemen. There must be the faith of the long centuries of our reliance on the God who has walked with His people in all their hours of fear and of uncertainty. There can be in our hearts no hate for any man who walks this earth, for we have been told that we shall love our enemies.

There is danger for all of us today, danger just as sure and as deadly as the thing which struck down President Kennedy yesterday. The man who fired those shots must have done so in blind, unreasoning hatred and fear. We, as a nation, must avoid such unreasoning hatred and fear as we now assess the thing which has already happened, and as we look to the things which will come to us during the days ahead. Let there be no mistake about the fact that we will have much to do with what does come. If we act in panic and fear and hatred, we will produce the dark and evil and senseless things which men do in unreasoning moments.

We need only look back to those days almost a century ago when another President fell victim to an assassin's bullet. Abraham Lincoln had wondrous plans for the South and its people. He spoke of "malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right; let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Lincoln did not live to nurture that charity for all, that malice for none, that firmness in the right, that binding up of a nation's wounds. Instead, the men who finally did the things looking toward reuniting the Nation did those things out of hatred and fear and malice. And because they did, we in the South are still paying terribly the bill which has come down to us every bitter day since Reconstruction.

We cannot now permit ourselves to be panicked into hasty and unreasoned actions. The events of yesterday must not be permitted to strengthen the hands of those who would take from all of us some of our freedoms simply because they are men who live by fear and not by faith in the ability of freemen to live their lives well and honestly and patriotically as completely freemen.

What happened yesterday must not be permitted to dim the shining light President Kennedy held out to all men that they should have the rights and the privileges and the opportunities their Constitution says they shall have. Make no mistake about it, there will be men who will now say piously that some of the things President Kennedy did to help men have their just and due rights under the Constitution helped stir up the unsettled conditions which brought us to yesterday. Of course, President Kennedy's efforts did help stir the anger and the conscience of this country, and for that stirring we can thank God and feel that we are the better for it.

A century ago, vengeful men and frightened men tied the hands of President Andrew Johnson as he tried to bring his South and our South back into the Nation on the terms Lincoln had in mind.

Today, a century after that tragedy of the tieing of a President's hands, we must see to it that the hands of President Lyndon Johnson are held high. We can do no less. If we do less we will regret it bitterly and our children and our grandchildren will regret it even more bitterly during all the days of their lives.

A President is dead. A new President has come in. And in this great and shaking change, there still is so little change. The old President was the servant of all the people. The new President is the servant of all the people.

President Johnson must now have the prayers and the active support of all Americans as he seeks truly to be the President of all Americans and the servant of all Americans.

---

[From the Graham Star, Robbinsville, N.C., Nov. 29, 1963]

### NATIONAL TRAGEDY

Never in time of peace has this generation of Americans been so shocked as in the past week. The sorrow was nationwide and it was genuine. No need to fill this space with still another account of those events. No need to tell the miserable story again. Everyone saw it—some of it over and over again.

The late President, John F. Kennedy is gone. And it is unfair. His life was taken, but he deserved to live. The Nation's chosen leader was taken, but it deserved to be led by him. A wonderful lady's husband was taken, but she deserved to live with him. The little children's father was taken, but they deserved to have him.

Some have thoughtlessly said that the American people are responsible. This too is unfair. Was there opposition? This is the way of freedom. Were there those who disagreed with him? This is the way of free men. Was there strong feeling about the issues? This is only natural. No, if the American people are responsible, it is because we are clasping to our bosom a godless breed of men who hold to an alien philosophy which teaches them to lie, and cheat, and kill—if necessary—to overthrow us. If we are responsible at all, this is the reason.

All of the evidence we have seen points to a man who renounced his American citizenship and moved to Russia. He later returned, an avowed Marxist. If other evidence is brought forward, then it should be acknowledged, and acted upon.

In any event, faithful Americans everywhere feel—not guilty—but terribly sorry and hurt that such a thing happened.

### A PART OF THE "WHY"

A 46-year-old man was murdered Friday, November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Tex. The man was John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

The brutal killing shocked the Nation and the world, having a numbing paralyzing effect on nearly everyone.

The President was a popular man. Much of the grief occurred at the thought of the loss of this capable, young, personable leader, and Americans were filled with sorrow for his beautiful young wife and children, ages 3 and 5.

Possessed of great wealth, this man could have turned his back on mankind's problems of poverty, war, universal brotherhood, and economic growth. He could have remained aloof from all its heartaches, worries, and cares. Instead he thrust himself into the middle of them giving of his immeasurable talent and energy to work for the freedom of all men, regardless of their economic status in life, or race, for peace throughout the world.

He was truly a great man motivated by Christian ideals—a great President.

Much of the grief was felt solely at the thought of the loss of this man.

But that seemingly extra numbing chilling effect was created by the knowledge within that we all had a hand in the tragedy.

We have stood idly by while a climate of hate has been fostered and cultivated by many.

We have listened and cheered while self-seeking, ambitious demagogues ranted emotional speeches filled with phrases designed to arouse hate and set race against race. We have been amused at the sight of brutality. We have jeered and belittled efforts of people to help fellow human beings. We have allowed our news media to be used to promote such actions. We have been quick to criticize and have uttered statements not substantiated by facts against persons in authority for their crowd-pleasing effects.

Truly part of the numbing effect caused by the death of President Kennedy was each individual's conscience telling him that we have been derelict in our duty to constantly strive for the true brotherhood of men, to uphold love and denounce hate, to practice tolerance and forgo prejudice.

Americans helped nurture the seeds of hate in the brain of the maniac who killed John F. Kennedy.

As a result the Christian forces of the world lost a great leader.

It hurts and hurts deeply.

B.S.

---

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, Nov. 23, 1963]

### VICTIM OF AN ASSASSIN

It should go without saying that the most odious word in our language is assassin. We become acutely aware of that today as we contemplate something which could not have happened, yet it did: the assassination of the President of the United States.

Friday in Dallas, Tex., where President John F. Kennedy had gone on a mission to proclaim his ideas for the operation of the American Government, he was shot down just as a thug might have been felled in a gang dispute.

Naturally the whole Nation immediately went into mourning. Of course, you may not have agreed with many of the President's policies. In fact, there were rumblings throughout the South because of his civil rights stand. But he still was the President, the duly elected leader of us all and he had a right to complete the term in office, or as many terms in office, as the people decided he should serve.

Not since the turn of the century when President William McKinley fell a victim to an assassin's bullet had anything so awesome happened. The deed also brought back memories of Lincoln, Garfield—yet those were horrors of the past. Today, there is mute evidence, however, at the Nation's Capital because there lies the body of the youngest man ever chosen to preside over the desiny of this great Nation, the victim of an assassin's bullet.

While permitted to hold the most important elective office in the world for only such a brief span, John F. Kennedy still accomplished many things which will assure him a prominent place in history. In many long years to come, historians will recount how he faced up to the great menace of the age, Red Russia, and caused that mighty power to pack up its belongings and get out of Cuba. President Kennedy also will be remembered for his stand on civil rights, a subject which is a tender one today throughout the Southland and which will have to be weighed with passing years before its final evaluation is realized.

Today, however, all animosities should be set aside because Jack Kennedy is dead. Let all those who praised him as well as those who opposed him unite in common sorrow over the passing of our President.

At the same time, let there be a universal backing of Lyndon B. Johnson, the Vice President who has assumed the Chief Office of the land. President Johnson has a task which probably surpasses even that of Harry Truman when he became President upon the death in office of Franklin D. Roosevelt. President Johnson also merits and deserves our united support.

This country could become a shambles as frequently happens in other countries when leadership is changed through violence. Yet we hope we live in a country and in an age which will see that proper respect will be paid to our new President as he assumes the duties of the highest office in the land. And let us never forget that assassinations go hand in hand with anarchy.

---

[From the Roxboro (N.C.) Courier-Times, Nov. 25, 1963]

### NEW PRESIDENT NEEDS SUPPORT IN CRISIS

What makes John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death so incomprehensible is that a little and sick mind can snuff out the life of greatness.

It happened just like that.

Little do assassins know, or care to know, that the one assassinated will likely be martyrized and that those things for which the assassinated stood so strongly will be emphasized, not for a decade, but for history.

The dastardly hand of the assassin, however, rarely strikes one who needs martyrdom. Such was the case with John F. Kennedy.

He was the personification of greatness, and he will likely take his place alongside Washington and Lincoln.

The assassin's bullet struck down not only a popular personality; it struck a blow at the integrity of the office. The office continues; the people who fill this powerful role in the free world's intricate complex change.

In a period of change in a free institution, there must be a period of unity. Nothing brings unity like such a dastardly deed.

The United States of America moves on.

The country is indeed fortunate that it moves on in the capable hands of Lyndon Johnson, a Vice President with vast knowledge of grassroots politics and a broad understanding of domestic and international issues.

We pledge to President Johnson our wholehearted support in this grave and tragic period of transition, and we are confident that he carries with him the support of every right-thinking citizen of Person County.

Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country.

"And ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

---

[From the Sanford (N.C.) Herald, Nov. 22, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

An assassin's bullet Friday struck down John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States. Mr. Kennedy, only 46, is mourned by all of the people of the United States and no doubt most of the world. Certainly, no one anywhere feels anything but contempt for the type of man who would strike as did Mr. Kennedy's assassin.

Mr. Kennedy entered office on a surge of towering personal popularity. The new President, his strikingly attractive wife, and their children made one of the most appealing and photogenic families ever to occupy the White House. Not since the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal did a President and those around him become such an object of interest to an entire nation.

Undisputed personal popularity did not protect Mr. Kennedy, however, from the lash of severe criticism that accompanied some of the efforts of his administration. Nor did it rub off on Congress to the extent that the lawmakers fell over themselves to get his program passed.

In fact, his New Frontier legislative defeats in this area sometimes were impressive; his victories frequently narrow.

His great problems at the start were foreign policy and domestic economy. In 1963 both were overshadowed by the Negro question which confronted the Nation with one of its gravest domestic crises since the Civil War. However, the constant Soviet threat remained, and the President had trouble in southeast Asia and Cuba. The ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion tarnished the bright young American President.

Today both friend and foe mourn him. His was a bright future, and he had many years ahead of him during which he could have served his country. Catching the person or persons who shot him to death cannot regain the loss this country and the world suffered Friday in his needless death.

The days ahead will be dark ones for this Nation as it mourns for John F. Kennedy.

---

[From the Sanford (N.C.) News Leader, Nov. 27, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The midday rays of a bright winter sun sparkled on a grand motorcade that rolled majestically through Dallas. A crisp breeze whipped the flags and bunting that welcomed the President of the United States to the vast Southwest. He responded enthusiastically to the warm outpouring of the love and devotion of thousands of citizens who came to cheer him along the route. Again and again he flashed his sincere smile, again and again he waved to the throngs. It was clear there was mutual respect and admiration. It was a bright day.

High above the street the warped and troubled mind of a sick man focused upon its deadly mission, a finger curled around the cold trigger and a rifle cracked sharply, then again and again. The President slumped into the arms of his wife, the Governor of Texas crumpled on the seat of the car.

The Nation was plunged into grief and a season of mourning began.

Word of the tragic event was flashed around the world by radio and television, then the free world joined us in our sorrow.

Then came the reflections. The brave and the faint, the strong and the weak, we were left helpless to express ourselves, but we tried. "He was a friend of all mankind," we said. And we said, you and I, "He was a peacemaker, a great and skillful statesman." "He was a youth of great promise, a President of great vision, a leader, a writer, a humanitarian and a servant of God." Yes, we said these things you and I, but as we watched that sad cortege travel slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue we knew we had said nothing and could say nothing that could match his sacrifice, nor could we atone for the loss.

---

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Cleveland Times, Nov. 26, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY MET THE TESTS OF COURAGE

Clevelanders were not unlike free people all over the world who were stunned and saddened over the untimely death Friday of this Nation's 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

In a weekend of mourning, the county has been at a virtual standstill out of respect to a great leader. Sanctuaries were filled to overflowing in churches on Sunday and hundreds more returned yesterday as our people instinctively turned to worship in the midst of a crisis and prayed that a change of leadership in the Executive Office in this country will reflect that of a person broadly acquainted with the affairs of this vast Nation and one who is equipped for the greatest responsibility of his life.

As a Senate majority leader and as Vice President, Lyndon Johnson's many roles in public life should find him more able to smoothly take over the reins of our Government, but he will need as never before the backing of American people and renewed strength to use his talents and his skills in the leadership he has already demonstrated as a Senator and in the Kennedy administration.

The tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination and a bereaved Nation focuses on the death of a man of quiet and true courage who charted a course through treacherous seas. Many thought he pushed too hard or drove with ruthless power * * * while as many others thought his views were moderate and reasonable with logic. Whatever one's views, there's no denying that he carried on his shoulders a superhuman burden that was marked with tenacity and determination. He was a fighter for justice and an apostle of peace * * * few can argue otherwise.

As we remain stunned and perplexed over this tragic event we think of the price we pay for the fanaticism of the misguided wretch who completed his distardly deed. It is unbelievable that any person who has enjoyed the fruits and freedoms of America could possibly turn to such an act that for months to come will have reverberations throughout the world. To have cut a man down in his prime and at the time he held the key to so many problems is indeed the act of a madman.

While we express sincerest sympathy to the President's widow and two small children, his parents and other members of his family, we believe they are stronger today for the very reason that John F. Kennedy made them through his Pulitzer Prize-winning "Profiles in Courage", which we believe actually defines Kennedy the man.

In the book about courage and politics, politics furnished the situations and courage provided the theme. He makes clear that a man does what he must in spite of personal consequences, he tells of the satisfactions and burdens of a Senator's job, of the pressures and of the standards by which a man of principle must work and live.

We find his final paragraphs as those which exemplify the late President: "In a democracy, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, 'holds office'; every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

"These problems do not even concern politics alone—for the same basic choice of courage or compliance continually faces us all, whether we fear the anger of constituents, friends, a board of directors or our union, whenever we stand against the flow of opinion on strongly contested issues. For without belittling the courage with which men have died, we should not forget those acts of courage with which men have lived. The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality.

"To be courageous, these stories make clear, requires no exceptional qualifications, no magic formula, no special combination of time, place and circumstance. It is an opportunity that sooner or later is presented to us all. Politics merely furnishes one arena which imposes special tests of courage. In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of courage, whatever may be the sacrifices he faces if he follows his conscience—the loss of his friends, his fortune, his contentment, even the esteem of his fellow men—each man must decide for himself the course he will follow. The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For this each man must look into his own soul."

---

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Nov. 23, 1963]

### This Is a Time for Americans To Rally To America

Barely 2 hours after an assassin's bullet had snuffed out the life of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, the Vice President, was sworn in as President.

In this way, the chain of leadership of the United States was continued, almost uninterrupted, in a moment of confusion and crisis. It is one of the beauties of the American system of government.

The country's welfare does not depend on any one individual. It is ruled by many men, primarily the men of Congress. The President carries more influence on national and international affairs than any other person in the United States but it is the office of the Presidency which lends this prestige and influence to the individual.

The assassination of President Kennedy is a despicable thing. One bullet killed a man whom a majority of the voters who cast ballots in the last presidential election said they preferred as President. Not only did that bullet kill the most important man in the free world, it assassinated the will of a majority of the people who cared enough to vote. It is barbaric.

We seldom agreed with President Kennedy's views. But we admired him as a person of intelligence and fortitude and sincerity. He fought for what he felt was right and he fought a hard battle.

Because this is the United States of America, when we disagreed with the President, we said so. And we had no reason to fear reprisals. We live in a free society and that, too, is one of the beauties of the American system. The assassin's bullet was also a disgrace to that freedom of our society. That bullet does not fit into a way of life in which we may disagree and still live side-by-side and fight for the overriding common cause of building a greater nation.

Because an assassin was unable to have faith in the American system, the next few weeks and months will be a delicate time in the history of our country.

Lyndon B. Johnson will be grasping the reins of the Nation and it will take a short time for the transition to be fully accomplished. It is true that this is the moment for which his previous office has prepared him, but no man can be totally prepared for such a transition.

Therefore, it is a time for Americans to rally to America. It is a time when partisan politics should be laid aside in an effort to speed the transition. In the coming weeks, the labels Democrat and Republican should be forgotten and there should be only one label—American.

This is a time when we can all contribute to America. It is a rare opportunity to serve our country and keep her on an even keel.

What can we do in Cleveland County?

We can remain calm and have faith in this great Nation of ours. We can refuse to be panicked into selling stock in our Nation's industries. We can refuse to be carriers of rumors. We can pray to God to guide our leaders. That, too, is one of the blessings of America.

---

[From the Marshall (N.C.) News-Record, Nov. 28, 1963]

### The World Wept—We Must Go On

A gala parade started in Dallas, Tex., last Friday. Thousands upon thousands waved and cheered as President John F. Kennedy, Mrs. Kennedy, Governor John Connally, Vice President Lyndon Johnson, and many other dignitaries rode by. And then it happened—an assassin fired three shots from a fifth story of a building—one shot struck and fatally wounded our President, another shot seriously wounded Governor Connally. Hysteria reigned throughout Dallas and the news swept quickly over the world. Our President is dead.

A suspect, Lee Harvey Oswald, was apprehended in a theater. He pleaded innocent but evidence mounted. He was to have been arraigned Sunday afternoon. A Dallas policeman was also slain, said to have been killed by a bullet from Oswald's gun. Oswald said "I didn't kill anyone." Evidence mounted.

Oswald, a loner, was expected to break and confess but his life, too, was ended Sunday from a shot of a pistol held by Jack Ruby, a nightspot owner with a high temper. He slipped through all security measures to fire pointblank from a few feet, struck Oswald in the stomach—he died shortly thereafter in the same hospital where President Kennedy died. Three murders in Dallas within 3 days, another charged with murder, all this in Christian America.

The skies shed tears in Washington Saturday as the world paid tribute to the late John F. Kennedy. It was a stunned world, sad, yes, tears were shed everywhere, Among the bravest were Mrs. Kennedy, and Attorney General Bobby Kennedy who remained at the side of Mrs. Kennedy. Television coverage brought all actions of excitement and sadness into millions of homes in America and abroad. Leaders of foreign countries sent messages of condolences. Over 50 countries sent representatives to the funeral of Kennedy. The world was saddened from Friday afternoon through Monday afternoon. Flags at half-mast, banks and stores closed, athletic events canceled or postponed.

Four days seemed like 4 weeks, church services Sunday consisted of tributes. Democrats and Republicans, alike, paid tributes to a young, popular, dynamic President. A new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, succeeds the late President. Dallas feels terrible about the incident but so does the entire world. It is a sad Thanksgiving, but still much for which to be thankful—thankful we live in a country like America, despite the crackpots, assassins, and outlaws. The challenge grows, that if we are to remain a Christian nation, we must pick up the pieces, renew our allegiance to God and mankind, and march forward together to a more peaceful future.

---

[From the Mebane (N.C.) Enterprise, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Country Mourns Kennedy

That wonderfully brilliant mind of President John F. Kennedy has been stilled for all time. The spirit which undergirded the heroic outlook of his dedicated heart will not be silenced. He challenged the Nation with his forthright statement: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Rather, ask what you can do for your country."

He met his own challenge. He paid the price.

Shame has enveloped our people that such fanatics, who have the freedoms of the Nation, should leave the power of the ballot box for that of a high-powered rifle.

Many of the American citizens disagreed with the President in every element. There are those of us who took stanch views opposed to his political philosophy. Some of us feared the rapid growth of the religious system he represented. In all of us was the recognition that he was the leader of the Nation. He was our President. He was our Commander in Chief. We join in with the millions of mourners at his passing.

President John F. Kennedy's funeral was held yesterday at St. Matthew's Catholic Cathedral in the Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C.

In the midst of the highest honors paid him he was joined with Alfred Lord Tennyson in:

"CROSSING THE BAR

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

"But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

"Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark.

"For though out our bourn of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar."

[From the Morehead City (N.C.) Carteret County News-Times, Nov. 26, 1963]

### LAMENT FOR THE LIVING

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

This is written three-quarters of an hour after President Kennedy, struck by an assassin's bullets, died in a Texas hospital. This tragedy leaves us little hope for humanity.

The United States is supposed to be a civilized Nation. But the actions of one individual can drag us down to the depths, can make us feel that we have a long way to go before we are worthy of the many blessings this rich land has been heir to.

We know not why the President's murderer pulled the trigger. If it was because of Kennedy's attitude toward the Negro, it is ironic that this is the week of the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address, delivered by President Lincoln, the man known the world around as the Great Emancipator of the Negro slaves in America.

The President's assassination does not solve the problems we face. His death only increases the burdens the living must now assume "that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Government of the people, by the people and for the people stands in danger of perishing from the earth, for we, by our actions are making a mockery of all those principles which we profess to hold dear.

The Nation should mourn not only for President Kennedy but for itself.

[From the Mount Olive (N.C.) Tribune, Nov. 26, 1963]

### EDITORIALLY SPEAKING—A BLOW AT THE WHOLE NATION

Everything has been said and resaid that could describe the shock and horror of the American people, and the people of other nations, at the unbelievable act of last Friday which took the life of the President of the United States. Even so, this small voice must be added to the echo, and wring its editorial hands at such a senseless and useless tragedy.

The death of a man is always something sad, sometimes tragic, among his family and friends. But this was a blow struck at a whole nation, the savage destruction of the man a nation had chosen to its highest office to lead it through what has proved to be at once the most trying and most opportune time in its history. There can be no partisan thought of feeling at the assassination of a President of the United States. It is a shameful, massive blow to every American.

Somehow, the action of the man who 2 days later murdered the pitiful, misguided wretch who was charged with the President's death, has a little of the same repulsiveness to the average American.

In all this, one can feel sympathy, also, for the people of Dallas and of all Texas, who will suffer anguish that such a thing could happen in their midst. It will be small comfort, but it not only happened in Texas—it happened in the United States.

There is some comfort for all of us, and perhaps a warning thought, too, that this dark plot did not stem from domestic strife and differences, but was hatched in a weak, frustrated mind, contaminated and confused by alien beliefs.

Out of this dark weekend, above the tragedy, shines a monumental endorsement of the American system of government, for all the world to see. How many other nations could undergo such a crisis without public hysteria, with such calm confidence in its governmental processes, seeing its leadership change with a few minutes' notice into hands already selected by the people, without a question, without a challenge? In this example before the world may lie the most far-reaching and significant effect of these sad days. E.B.

[From the Mount Olive (N.C.) Tribune]

### THE MOUTHPIECE

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy last Friday, so shocking in its suddenness, so tragic in its uselessness, and so widespread in its impact, makes every newspaperman yearn for the inspiration necessary to write just exactly the right words. But, for some reason or another, words, which are our stock in trade, suddenly become empty, elusive, and hard to arrange in any order which would bring either logic or purpose in analyzing or explaining such an event.

Who, but another newspaperman, can know the frustration of failing his readers in this respect, at a time when he feels they should use him most to say for them what they would like to say? The dealers in words have filled untold columns of type, and thousands of minutes on radio and television since Friday afternoon, and in a measure, they have failed, too.

So a fresh deflating of the ego with a new realization of no greatness in one's own life, no real rising to an occasion, no worthy contribution to be remembered long after the contributor has left the scene. And there is left, after all, words that have already been written, or spoken, hundreds of times over—and yet, what newspaperman in the Nation has not faced our dilemma since Friday?

In addition to the tragedy of the President's death is the disturbing realization that our society embraces even one individual who would choose deliberate, cold-blooded murder of a complete stranger, simply because he occupied the position of President. Many disagreed with him; many others did not vote for him, and many who voted for him in 1960 would not have done so in 1964. But to kill. * * *

As has so often been stated, the President was indeed intelligent. Brilliantly so. He was born with no shortage of the opportunities or means to develop his capabilities to the utmost. He took full advantage of them all.

Some have claimed for him a peculiar ability for deep understanding of Americans and their problems; yet others, while he lived, claimed he could not possibly know how the "other half" lived or felt. Only eternity will have the full answer.

Who is wise enough to know if fate dealt unkindly with a family to which it had given immense wealth, determined ambition, and talented offspring, only to stalk that same family with tragedies which money and position could not avert—even seemed to attract? Or does personal tragedy become a part of the pricetag one must pay for greatness, as so often seems the case? Again, only eternity can answer.

One thing we cannot deny: with no need for the labor which produces wealth, the family's sons have chosen a field of endeavor which, presumably, offers the heart most complete satisfaction: service to the public. Before the President's death many of their critics claimed the Kennedys served because they sought to fill a need for recognition based upon something other than the family's wealth. Nothing short of eternity knows for sure.

Mrs. Kennedy's composure during the shock of this national tragedy was remarkable. One might say that all her life's training, stemming as it did from wealth, position, and the best education, was to develop just the kind of person who would always do, say, and be the right thing. One could say, not unkindly, that for this she was born, and she was not untrue to her birth.

Of course America's heart also goes out to the Kennedy children. Nothing can replace their daddy. As one Mount Olive woman put it, "I'd rather have my daddy than all the money in the world." And so would they, and it tugs at the heart to realize the experiences ahead of them when this truism will come home to them.

Is there pity for the tragic figure of Lee Harvey Oswald, accused of perpetrating a crime which will never be erased from the human conscience? Will anyone ever consider the sadness of an existence so hemmed in with the incomprehensible that its end would be packaged in assassination of the President of the United States?

(NOTE.—This was written before Oswald's assassination Sunday.)

Ever-widening ripples of the rifle bullet's shockwaves encompass the family and loved ones of the Dallas policeman slain shortly after the President. And the people of Dallas. Yet, no one can truthfully blame Dallas for this historic tragedy, but forever after the city of Dallas will be remembered by the world as the "Ford's Theater" of President John F. Kennedy.

Is there an avenue of escape provided by the Almighty for the Kennedy clan from the burden of hate and revenge? We truly hope so, for their sake.

Yes, President John F. Kennedy had a flare for greatness. He occupied a great position as Chief Executive of a great country, with a great birth, a great heritage, and under God, a great future. We cannot comprehend it all, nor understand it much. We say poorly what probably should not be said at all, but this one thing we do:

We sincerely pray, and know you do, too, that in this period of great national tragedy and mourning the same mantle of greatness worn by John F. Kennedy will transfer with easy grace and excellent tailoring onto the shoulders of Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States of America.

In this Thanksgiving week let us remember to be grateful for a country which does not fall with the fall of its great men, but one which, from its boundless resources of human spirit, can provide itself with other leaders to step into the gap of the fallen. Dear Lord, may it ever be so. Amen.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, as we rise on this melancholy occasion to eulogize our late President, John F. Kennedy, I find the terrible emotions of that dreadful day less than 3 weeks ago are renewed.

The sense of shock is still with us, and perhaps it never will be dulled much by the passage of time.

How often since has some corner of our mind sought to trick us into believing that it did not happen, that it was some bad dream from which we will awake.

But, of course, stark reality is always with us.

We have lost our President. We have lost him under circumstances of which, however ugly they may be, it truly can be said that he gave his life to his country.

We, the people, have lost a President in a most tragic manner that is an outrage against civilization.

Many of us in this Senate Chamber have an additional loss. We have lost a friend.

For many years John Kennedy was our colleague in the Senate.

Here we came to know him intimately as a warm human being, yet possessing the drive and intelligence that ultimately carried him to our highest office.

We watched this rise to the Presidency. Some of us did what we could to help it take place. Others, carrying out the vital traditions of our political system, sought to prevent it.

But when we gathered on the steps of this Capitol on January 20, 1961, to hear John Kennedy deliver his remarkable inaugural address, I am sure that all of us, all the American people, felt the spark and the promise of that eloquent message.

But that spark and that promise have been cruelly snuffed out, depriving our country, and, indeed, the world, of a leader of tremendous ability and human understanding.

I do not pretend to know how the writers of the future will treat the Kennedy administration as they compress these 3 years into the unemotional context of history.

But I do sincerely believe that our Nation—and the world—are the stronger for these 3 years. The cause of human freedom and dignity has been protected and advanced. No greater legacy can be asked of any leader.

I feel privileged to have been a participant in the Kennedy administration, and to have known and worked with John Kennedy in the Senate.

For several years we were seatmates in the rear row of this Chamber, and we served together on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. After he became President we cooperated on many matters of legislation and Government.

These associations are simply memories now, but they are good memories and ones that I will prize.

In paying these tributes to our departed friend and President, we also extend our heartfelt sympathies to his courageous widow, his two children, and other members of the Kennedy family.

Their personal loss is great. But if it is possible for them to find any comfort in this tragic situation, it is that their grief is shared by millions upon millions of citizens of our world.

### BUT YOU SHALL NOT GO OVER THERE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, some 32 centuries ago in the Sinai Peninsula there lived and died a great and beloved leader of his people. A natural leader, he was a man who grew up in wealth, amid palace splendor. But he forsook inherited ease for a thankless, rugged life as champion of his fellow men. He became a political organizer, a lawgiver, a man with a vision of a promised land, one who walked close to God and to the common people.

At the close of his life, after many trials and tribulations suffered for the good of those he served, he stood on a mountain and looked upon the better land he had envisioned. But it was not his destiny to lead the nation further. To Moses, Scripture says, the Lord spoke on Mount Nebo, saying:

> I have let you see it with your own eyes, but you shall not go over there.

So it was with our great and beloved leader.

The story continues:

> So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab.

But it also says of him:

> His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.

And it tells the deep-felt tribute of the people whom he led:

> And the people of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab 30 days.

Today this Nation is in the midst of 30 days of mourning, even as were the Israelites of old. Like them, we have wept for the loss of our leader. To Americans everywhere, the shocking news was so deeply felt, the tears of grief so freely flowing, that probably nothing in history can match the surge of national, or even international, sorrow. It was as though each family had lost a member of its own, someone just beyond the intimacy of our own fireside. We are still in mourning, and it will not cease at the end of 30 days. Thousands will still journey daily, as they do today, to the white picketed enclosure on the hill in Arlington, where the eternal flame continues to burn as it keeps his memory alive.

There was tragedy in Dallas. The enormity of the crime enacted there becomes still greater tragedy in the realization that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one, even more than the aged Moses, whose "eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." His was the vigor of youthful prime; his was the natural force of a vital personality; his was the bright eye of unflagging interest turning to every area of human problems.

We who were his colleagues in this legislative body, we who acknowledged his leadership as President in a very special relationship, knew well his "natural force." To have lost the qualities of his leadership in these infinitely complex times, so unimaginable to the mourners for the leadership of Moses, is a compounding of our loss. For who knows, looking upon the promise of these 3 years of his Presidency, what might have been the incalculable results of another 30 years of life as a President and public leader?

There is another verse of Scripture which says:

> Their young men shall see visions and their old men shall dream dreams.

Not yet old enough to dream the old man's dreams of the past, John Kennedy was still young enough to have fair visions of the future. Nor were they the apparitions of a deluded visionary. For he had looked upon the future with the eyes of both idealism and realism, focusing them together in a rare phenomenon of prophetic vision. Standing like Moses on the lonely eminence whence leadership had taken him, he looked upon that promised land of a future better America. Yet he was denied the right to enter:

> I have let you see it with your eyes, but you shall not go over there.

But as with Moses, the dream, the vision, will not die. The promised land became to the Israelites a reality, and they forever remembered the leader they had mourned in the land of Moab for 30 days.

The Book of Deuteronomy closes with the death of Moses. It is followed by the Book of Joshua, which opens with these words:

> After the death of Moses, the servant of the Lord, the Lord said to Joshua the son of Nun, Moses' minister: "Moses my servant is dead; now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land which I am giving to them, to the people of Israel."

Moses had long since chosen Joshua to be his successor, and the continuation of his work was assured.

Looking out upon our own promised land, President Kennedy saw in the future a nation with greater justice for all its peoples, white and black alike. He looked upon a land which gave hope and promise of work for all and deprivation for none. He saw economic security where there is still too often poverty and uncertainty. His was a vision, but the vision was of a reality attainable in the future.

We now must go over this Jordan. We must leave our sorrowing on the plains of Moab and turn to Joshua, Moses' minister and the new leader of all the people, for guidance in his stead. The Israelites turned not their backs on the vision their Moses had set before them. They wept, as we weep, but they also rallied to the challenge given them. They fulfilled the vision; they crossed "this Jordan."

Of Moses it was said:

> No man knows the place of his burial to this day.

We, on the other hand, know as does all the world the burial place of John F. Kennedy. We are already spontaneously making of it a national shrine for the homage and the honor demanded by his leadership and a nation's love, mingled in these days of mourning. But to the Israelites, inspired and welded into a nation by their leader's vision, the important thing was to press on for the goals he had seen with his eyes but been denied in the flesh.

We mourn a great, young, vibrant leader:

> His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.

The Lord let him stand on Mount Nebo and see with his eyes, but in His inscrutable way said to John F. Kennedy, "You shall not go over there."

Through Joshua, his minister, the goals of Moses lived on until the people were moved to victorious entry into the promised land. As we follow President Johnson across "this Jordan" we will be treading paths untrod before but clearly seen. When we have arrived, we will look back to the lonely tragic figure on our own Mount Nebo, to the leader who was denied his own entry to the land he sought. Then we will know that we are as fortunate as the Israelites, whose attainment of the goal owed so much to the inspiration of their dead leader as well as to the prowess of his successor.

Only a few months ago President Kennedy looked out from very near the spot where now he lies beneath the eternal flame, out upon the memorial to Lincoln, the monument to Washington, and the dome of this building where he himself once sat.

We must take new courage for the future, we must gird up our belts and follow after the vision, as his successor leads us on. President Kennedy saw the promised land; he could not enter. We must enter for him, drive out the enemies of hatred and dissidence, and build the alabaster cities of America the beautiful. In his memory, we will do so.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the days and nights of national mourning and personal grief since the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our minds and hearts have turned from the initial incredulity and shock, to sorrow, and finally to an appraisal of our national character in response to this tragic event.

Senators today have approached this time of memorial by commending the achievements of the late President who once served so well in this forum and who served also in the House of Representatives.

I recall, as do my colleagues and those in the galleries, the period of national and official mourning when the body of President John F. Kennedy lay in state in the great rotunda of the Capitol, approximately halfway between the two legislative Chambers in which he had labored. If there was one significant fact that impressed me during the period when the President was again among us in the Capitol Building, it was that more than one-third of the persons who passed reverently by his bier were boys and girls in their teens. I watched them personally as they moved slowly past, and later watched them also by television.

Citizens from every walk of life were there, expressing their sincere admiration, their genuine love, and their real affection for a fallen leader. But it was the large numbers of young mourners who left me profoundly moved. Generals and admirals, accompanied by their small children, were in the long lines trudging slowly up Capitol Hill. Citizens of high estate and low stood quietly, shoulder to shoulder, awaiting their turn to salute the slain President. And with them were the young people.

The President was a gallant man. Gallantry appeals to the youth of the United States and of the world. Youth sensed in the career of John F. Kennedy something that was good and noble.

I remember the nine young men who drove 400 miles from Huntington, W. Va., to Washington, D.C., that they might express their reverent respect—and it was that—for the President of the United States whom they, in a degree, felt they knew and understood.

These nine youthful Americans were students at Marshall University, located at Huntington, on the western border of our State. Yet, they felt compelled to make the long trip to Washington.

I asked those young men, "Why do you come?"

They replied, "We came because we just had to come."

There were tears in their eyes as they spoke.

I remember five other young men who came from Fairmont State College, at Fairmont, W. Va. They began an automobile pilgrimage to Washington at approximately 2:30 in the afternoon and arrived at approximately 7:45 in the evening. They parked their car downtown and joined the line of grieving thousands. Eight and one-half hours later those five young men from the hills of West Virginia walked by the bier of the late President, expressing in reverent silence their appreciation for his life and their sorrow at his death.

I asked them why they came.

They replied, in essence, "He was our President, and we, as young people, felt that he was concerned with our future."

In reviewing the tragic events of last month, we have, in almost stupefaction asked ourselves, "What manner of people are we that such violence is bred in our midst?" This question, and the self-appraisals which it engenders may help to make us better men and women. But in justice to the American character, for which John F. Kennedy held such high hopes, let us also acknowledge that the same Nation which fostered his assassin, and the assassin's assassin, gave birth to John Kennedy and responded to his call for finer ways and higher deeds for humans everywhere.

Those who will write the judgment of this era will not appraise us on the basis of that insane moment in Dallas—but on the extent to which we as a nation live up to the ideals for which John Kennedy labored.

We today do not judge Athens on the basis of the bigotry and intolerance which sent Socrates to his death. Rather, we marvel at a people and culture which could produce a Socrates and his followers who nurtured his vision of the good life.

So, too, will we be judged by our commitment to the vision which our late and great President held forth for America and the world. His sacrifice will not, unfortunately, dispel all misunderstanding and rancor from our midst. For another Man, Jesus of Nazareth, died almost 2,000 years ago in order to assume the burden of man's evil, but evil is still with us.

For those of us who had the honor of knowing and working with John Kennedy, our lives have already been increased by this cherished experience. And the lives of all Americans will be enhanced if they truly understand the examples of the martyred President, and of the gallant lady who helped support him in his life and helped sustain a Nation in his death.

This example was best phrased by President Kennedy himself, shortly before his tragic earthly ending, when he defined his concept of happiness as being a life in which one utilized all his capacities in the achievement of personal excellence and public service. President Kennedy thus becomes identified with another American President, the author of the Declaration of Independence, who declared the "pursuit of happiness" to be among the unalienable rights of all.

Therefore, perhaps the most meaningful tribute to President Kennedy, and one which would create a living memorial in the hearts of all Americans, would be for all citizens to turn aside from the more shallow pursuits of pleasure, and to seek these standards of spiritual, moral, and intellectual strength which he articulated so clearly and eloquently.

And, we are moved today by an element of personal as well as official loss which millions of families sense in the passing of President Kennedy. My wife, Mary, and our two sons join me in expressing our remembrance to the relatives of the late President.

Our hearts go out to the mother and father of John F. Kennedy; to his fine sisters; to his brothers, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. And finally, we remember his courageous wife, Jacqueline Kennedy, and her two lovely children, who have suffered a loss far beyond anything we ourselves can know. We shall be often in prayer for them.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there arose amongst us a man with grace and wit, with a style and a charm given to but few mortals. The admiration he attracted and the loyalty he won were worldwide.

Only 2 hours ago, at a luncheon at which I was the host, for visiting dignitaries from Guinea, word was given to me and to other Members of this body of the sorrow and the grief felt by the people of that faraway land. Indeed, Mr. President, from around the world we know of the heavy hearts of people who believed in President Kennedy, who trusted him, and who held him to be their champion for what is right, true, good, and brave.

Other generations of Americans have suffered the experience of the assassination of their leader. It is our burden to have seen a champion and a leader amongst all men stricken down in the splendor of his manhood, and now immortalized in the minds and in the hearts of all mankind.

Mr. President, one must wonder why—with all the agitation and the disturbances of our times, the stress and the distress, and the known dangers to leaders in such times—young men aspire to the high Office of President of the United States. I believe it is because of patriotism, pride, and the basic desire of man to win the approval of fellow men, that one is driven on. Beyond that, there are those who are intensely motivated to achieve and to do good in their time, to accomplish, and to give. Except for these motivations—such patriotism, pride, and desire—there would not have been a George Washington, a Lincoln, a Roosevelt, a Kennedy, or a President Johnson. Men thus highly and intensely motivated would, I believe, prefer to live fruitfully and dangerously, rather than obscurely in longevity.

The death of President Kennedy was a keen personal sorrow for me. We served together in the House of Representatives. We were seatmates on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We served together on a special Senate committee where we joined in writing minority views. In many other ways we had official and personal associations which I treasure.

There were other moments which I shall always treasure. On one unforgettable evening, when he was then Representative Kennedy, and when the present senior Senator, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], was then U.S. delegate to the United Nations, along with one other couple, the Ambassador and Mrs. Cooper, my wife and I were present at a little party at which the young Representative John F. Kennedy met a beautiful young lady, Jacqueline Bouvier, who later became his bride.

Upon that occasion, Representative Kennedy, Ambassador Cooper, and I had each recently announced our candidacies for the U.S. Senate. We compared the manner of our announcements, engaged in searching discussion of political techniques and tactics and, of course, we jested with each other as to our own foibles.

It so happened that all three of us were elected, and there was a reunion of the group on another unforgettable evening to celebrate our victories.

Ere long, the beautiful girl became Mrs. Kennedy. Then Caroline, the Presidency, and John-John. A live, vibrant, glamorous, beloved family.

Jacqueline Kennedy became an American heroine during the tragic hours following the horrible assassination. She bore up magnificently. She deported herself with the courage worthy of her gallant but fallen husband.

The works and words of John F. Kennedy have been burned into the hearts and minds of men and will last so long as America lasts.

He is a hero, now immortalized. We cherish his eloquence, his lofty ideals, the sentiments he expressed—and expressed in a manner to inspire all mankind—these are now a precious part of the heritage of our land.

To his widow, and to the little children, who may someday read the proceedings of today, I pour out all the sympathy of which my being is capable.

To his father and mother, his brothers and sisters—all of them I call my friends—I extend the deepest of sympathy. Theirs has been a great loss, but theirs has been a great privilege to have had the companionship, the love, and the inspiration of a truly good and great man.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today Senators will fill page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with words, even though we are all acutely aware that words are hopelessly inadequate.

In the past few weeks, millions of the world's people have worn a look of stunned despair. Certainly, nothing I could say would be a more eloquent tribute to John F. Kennedy than the grief on those faces. It is folly for me to try. And I know that many feel as helplessly inadequate for this chore as I do.

Why do we try?

Surely, the name of John F. Kennedy—like the dead at Gettysburg—has already been consecrated far beyond our poor power to add or detract.

Yet, we feel impelled to rise, one by one, and offer a few words in praise of his vision, courage, and human understanding. Why do we do this? One reason, I think, is that a eulogy day gives us a chance to pour our grief into a common pool where it can be shared more readily and therefore borne more easily.

And what else? Yes, it gives us a forum to praise those attributes we most admire: vision, courage, human understanding. This may be useful. Praise provides the warmth that may nurture vision, courage, and human understanding among others in our Nation, perhaps even among ourselves.

Without a doubt, these attributes deserve and need all the encouragement they can get.

But vision, courage, and human understanding are easy to praise. They are abstractions. There is no lobby against them. No pickets will appear in opposition.

So perhaps for a moment we should turn our attention not to John F. Kennedy's attributes but rather to the products of those attributes. Civil rights. Tax reduction and reform. Aid to education—yes, the search for peace, the concern for our older citizens, and for an expanding economy.

President Johnson has put it simply and straightforwardly. He said that the enactment of President Kennedy's major programs would be the finest tribute we could offer to John F. Kennedy. Unlike most of the stunned faces across the world, we can deliver on that one. Sometimes we feel almost sacrilegious in wishing that someone who has departed this life could tell us what he would most like to have us do in acknowledgment of his passing. I believe, without being insensitive or callous, that we can ask ourselves, "What would he like to see us doing at this moment?" I have a suspicion at this moment he would prefer to have the Senate debating the civil rights bill.

After all, can we honestly admire President Kennedy's vision without also admiring his plan for the Nation's children? Can we admire his courage without admiring his departure from the "conventional wisdom" of economics? Can we admire his human understanding without admiring his civil rights bill?

I do not say that we can admire only those men with whom we are in full agreement. But President Kennedy was not a man who ever demanded absolute conformity.

On the contrary, John F. Kennedy was a strong man—so strong that he understood fully that there are very few questions that can be given absolute answers.

His courage and vision were matched by thoughtfulness and deep insights. There was one thread of continuity in all his programs and I think it can be briefly stated like this: He sought to allow each man to fulfill completely the potential granted by his Creator.

This really was his essential goal, and the strength he showed in pursuing it was the strength of flexibility. This is what I believe history will record about him. This is what I like to believe history will record about him.

And how incredible will historians find the fact that this man's record in Congress and this man's goals in the White House were thought by some to be "soft on the Constitution."

Many have said that John Kennedy had an understanding of history. Indeed he did. He sensed, I believe, those forces which affect the destiny of nations, not merely of men.

There is one lesson of history he would hope we would understand and, understanding, react to.

There have been other great nations on the center of the world stage in the centuries which precede this, and historians indicate that not all of them had to fail. Not all of them needed to become footnotes in history, except that they dilly-dallied over making necessary reform until it was too late.

This is the kind of responsibility which happens to be ours in the Congress. It is for that reason, I suggest, that our best tribute would be to move on in the pursuit of those goals which he so dramatically portrayed for us.

Like it or not, be it fair or unfair, this Congress has acquired a reputation for inaction. Whether it is fair I do not propose to debate.

But the unhappy fact remains that we have the image of a do-nothing Congress. This is not so much because we have done nothing. It is more because we have done nothing with those pieces of legislation on which the Nation's attention has been riveted—the pieces of legislation that events and the late President dramatized before the country.

This is the situation and we cannot escape it. So, essentially, my eulogy of President Kennedy consists largely of a pledge of support to President Johnson.

I join the new President in an appeal for legislation that will be a true memorial to President Kennedy—legislation of that whole litany of recommendations he gave us; legislation in civil rights, in aid to secondary and elementary schools, in youth opportunities, in tax reform—legislation that will be as bright and lasting as the flame that so many earlier mentioned, which burns now on that hillside in Arlington.

If I can be confident of anything, it is that for at least this once I can confidently speak the universal voice of the people of Michigan. Without exception, they would have me express to the Kennedy family their understanding and sympathy. For my own family, I assure each of them of a continual remembrance in our prayers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the predominant impression which I and many others formed of President Kennedy during the 15 years in Washington with him was his extraordinary composure under strain. During the strenuous and critical days of the 1960 campaign, when I was frequently with him, I never noticed the slightest sign of irritability. Similarly, in the hot legislative struggles which we have had in Congress when the President was sorely tried, he seemed to be completely free from excitement or resentment, nor did he ever blame those who differed with him or who bitterly opposed him.

Some people thought this was a proof that he did not have deep emotions and that he was not deeply concerned either with people or with issues. To my mind this was not so. It did not indicate an absence of emotions, but rather a mastery over them. The Scottish playwright, J. M. Barrie, once defined courage as "grace under pressure." If this is so—and this is certainly one attribute of courage—then John Kennedy possessed courage to a supreme degree.

This quality paid off to the greatest extent in the Cuban crisis of last year. Under that tremendous strain the President might well have been pardoned had he lost his head. He was determined to prevent any danger to the United States and to take the responsibility for an attack on the Cuban missile bases, had that been necessary, but he was also anxious to prevent a nuclear war, if this was possible. He therefore gave Khrushchev an opportunity to back down without too great a loss of face. By following this course he skirted the precipice of total war by a hair's breadth. He was able both to obtain the removal of the missiles and a reduction in Russian forces—and at the same time keep the peace. A lesser man could never have done this.

The second impression I had of the President was his extraordinary intelligence and mental ability. This was demonstrated in the way in which he handled the debate on the puzzling issue of secondary boycotts in 1959. This is the most difficult issue in the whole field of labor relations and the President came to the correct conclusions down to 100th of an inch. It was like seeing a skilled surgeon operate.

Without any reflection upon other Presidents, I believe that he ranks along with Wilson, Lincoln, and Jefferson as among the four great intellectuals in the history of our Presidency. He was widely read and a deep student of history. He was broadly versed in the poetry and literature of the Western World. He was also interested in the arts of painting, sculpture, architecture, and music. He was not ashamed to be interested in these things. He was, instead, proud to have these broad interests and to be a practitioner of some of them. He was the one public figure of our time to win a Pulitzer Prize in history. He honored those who had surpassing achievements in their fields and sought to make the American public respect them more. He raised, indeed, the whole level of our intellectual and cultural life.

His political programs were designed for the good of America and the world. It is well to create tangible monuments which will bear his name into the far future. But I think we can best create a memorial for him by our devotion to the great tasks of civil rights, the abolition of unemployment, and a more abundant life for the great mass of American citizens.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy had the sixth shortest term of any of the 34 Presidents who preceded him. He was the youngest man ever to hold that high office. Yet, history may well show that he did more than any other of our Presidents to raise the sights and elevate the spirit of our National Government and the aspirations of our people, not just in our own United States but throughout our world as well. He set a marvelous and harmonious course of domestic growth and fairness and of external peace. And, now, as we think and talk of him with grief in our hearts, we find ourselves overwhelmed with sadness because his inspiring mind and presence, his vigor and sparkling life, have been taken from us so abruptly.

Our own State of Rhode Island particularly grieves because Rhode Islanders knew President Kennedy and his First Lady as friends and neighbors of long standing. He had vacationed in Newport before the war. He had received his PT boat training at Melville on our Narragansett Bay. He had visited our State in the years following the war— to speak at our Democratic dinner in 1954 and to court his future bride, whose family affiliations with Newport are deeply rooted. I remember attending his marriage in Newport in the company of my predecessor, Theodore Francis Green. And, ever since that time, President Kennedy's affection for Newport and Rhode Island grew, as did Rhode Islanders' esteem, admiration, and regard for him. He found in Newport privacy and relaxation, the two rarest luxuries that ever can be enjoyed by a President of the United States. And only a few weeks ago, he asked that arrangements be made to rent a house in Newport so that he could have a summer White House there this coming year.

John Kennedy's secure place in history has been won because he raised the sights of all Americans. The goals he set for his administration in his inaugural address just over 1,000 days before his death and only a few yards from this very Chamber were the most soaring goals that had ever been set by an American President. These were soaring goals of growth for our country, not only in physical terms, but in education and culture. These were goals, not just for our country, not just our hemisphere, but the world. Yes, even for space beyond.

It took a while for our people to fully grasp the soaring nature of these goals. Because he changed the tempo and raised the level of our aspirations, our people through our Congress hesitated at first about rising to the heights his vision made clear.

Most important, President Kennedy recognized the fact that whether we like it or not, all human beings share the same planet and the same atmosphere. As he said at the United Nations, there must eventually come some sort of international control of the nuclear weapons of death and destruction. And he eloquently laid out a path beyond this achievement to the even higher goal of the eventual and complete disarmament of the nations of our world.

For these reasons, and in this manner, he kept first things first in his mind. He always recognized that important as they are, economic growth and integration would be in vain if the human race were to suffer immolation. As a student of history, he took the long view whenever he could. What was the use of thinking only in terms of next year or the year after when we should be planning for the world of 2000?

To my mind, the greatest service President Kennedy rendered was that he raised our sights.

The tragedy of his assassination is that while his course was set, his path, his trajectory, was cut off long before all his goals could be achieved.

The best memorial we can offer President Kennedy is to keep our sights high, our heads high, to follow the course he set, but speed our tempo and to keep our eyes fixed on the vision he gave us. President Johnson has eloquently and magnificently reaffirmed these principles. As President Johnson stated, "Let us continue"—continue to bring fairness, education, and a decent way of life, not just to all Americans, but to all men everywhere; continue toward a world of complete and total disarmament, a world from which the scourge of nuclear weapons is removed. Then, the year 2000 will not be our second Dark Age, but rather a golden age, a true millennium.

Finally, and speaking personally and as an old friend of President and Mrs. Kennedy, I extend all my homage to him as a grand gentleman and to her as a valiant and gallant lady. May the tone and sparkle they set so bravely continue to excite our national life for many years. And may she, their two lovely children, his parents, and his brothers and sisters all accept the utter sympathy of my wife and me and of our children.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in the amount of time fairly allocable to each of us, it would be impossible adequately to express even our present impressions of the late President. And in any event, it is unquestionably too early for a definitive appraisal. As has been said before, history will make that appraisal.

One thing we can be sure of is that those who loved the President—and all of us who knew him did—need have no fear that the final judgment of history will not be high indeed.

It is appropriate at this time, I think, to express merely a brief personal word. Like every other American family, our family, my wife, my children, and I, were deeply moved, were incredulous at first when we heard the news, and were shaken, as we have not often been shaken, by the news of the disaster. It was not merely because—though it was partly because—it was the death of a President of the United States. It was not just because of horror at the way in which the death occurred, or of the sadness that always exists when youth is cut off in its prime. Beyond all those considerations—and this, I know, was the experience of millions and millions of Americans—there was a very direct sense of personal involvement in the life, and then in the loss, of this man.

He had the capacity, though he was not an extrovert as many politicians are, of giving you the realization that he understood you; that he saw through what might be barriers to understanding; that he understood what you had in your mind. Very quickly there arose a feeling of mutual understanding of the sort that usually exists only between those who are most intimate and constantly in contact with one another. This was partly a matter of his keen intellect, and partly a matter of his sensitive reaction to the feelings of other human beings.

Comparable to the almost instinctive understanding that John F. Kennedy had of those with whom he came in contact was his appreciation of the problems we face in this country and that the world faces.

It is not necessary to assert—and surely he would not have been one to assert—that he had advanced us far along the road toward a final solution of these problems. Yet his understanding of them, with this fine mind of his, and his sensibilities, was, in itself, an essential step toward their resolution.

He had the understanding and the courage to state publicly the moral wrong of segregation. He did not limit his affirmation in this area merely to his duty to uphold the laws and the Constitution of this country. He recognized and stated that he was making this effort to cleanse American life of a shame and a stain and an evil thing. This required real courage, because he knew that, in the short term, he would not gain politically by that course; that in the short term he would lose. I believe he could not help make the affirmation because he saw its truth with his mind and felt it with his heart.

He had an appreciation of the great problems of the times in the field of the economy and in the field of employment, problems that no man yet knows all the answers to, arising from automation and our new technology.

While I am sure he would be the first to say he had no final answers, his awareness of these problems put him on the path of vigorous and unrelenting search for ways along which answers may lie.

In the field of foreign policy, perhaps, his awareness was most keen. He understood, surely as well as any man, and better than most, the frustrations, the dilemmas, and the paradoxes which we face, and the great dangers and difficulties faced by a world in which man can destroy himself.

While, again, he would be the last to claim he had any final answers, the very fact that we knew that he understood the problems, and saw them clearly and did not flinch from them, but had the courage to carry on and face them with gallantry and a high heart, gave this Nation, and all of us, courage to carry on.

Mr. President, Mrs. Case and I and our children and all of our family join with all those who have spoken, and for whom statements have been made, in extending to Mrs. Kennedy and the children and all the family, including our colleague in the Senate from Massachusetts, our most affectionate sympathy.

In this, Mr. President, I am joined by our former colleague, H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, who this morning phoned me to ask me, on his behalf and on behalf of Mrs. Smith, to express the high regard and respect which they had for John F. Kennedy, and the warm personal relations which they enjoyed, and their deep sympathy also.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, hundreds of thousands of words have been published and hundreds of thousands more have ben spoken into the microphones of the world since John F. Kennedy was struck down in Dallas, but none of them were really adequate. Words never are in the face of senseless tragedy.

Words cannot describe how the American people felt when they lost their President. Not until the vacuum of disbelief was filled with the horror of comprehension did any of us realize how much we identified ourselves, even apart from personal friendship, with the President—this intellectual, vigorous young man—and he would have been that if he were 80—expressing the very essence of the youthfulness of our Nation. It seems of little consequence now, that there were political differences or objections to this or that legislative proposal, though as far as I am concerned there was a very large measure of agreement. What matters is that feeling of loss—that personal sense of emptiness—that all Americans feel because their President was cut off in the prime of life. As a Nation, we have lost a President who understood the institution of the Presidency, gloried in its overwhelming responsibilities, and discharged his duties with dash and joy, which were an inspiration to the youth of our Nation.

But John F. Kennedy was more than that. He was a man filled with the joy of living, he was a husband, a father—and my friend.

For myself, I remember coming to Congress the same day he did. We were sworn in together on the same January day in 1947. A photograph on my office wall shows that we two, returning veterans, looked a little uncomfortable at the moment in our civilian clothes. It shows us looking at the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and it reflects the first job we did together when we called on the National Veterans Housing Conference of 1947, which we had organized, to support this bill. It was the beginning of an association which extended throughout our careers in the House and Senate. We collaborated in many bipartisan matters, as is not unusual in the Congress. Indeed, in our service together in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we worked closely—as did Senator MORSE and others—on the minimum wage bill, the Labor-Management Disclosure Act and other similar measures which were major aspects of Senator Kennedy's legislative career.

I am a personal witness to the fact that he was resourceful, optimistic, and creative. He became and was my friend, and this is a deep source of gratification to me and to Mrs. Javits and our family.

Mrs. Javits, also, knew President Kennedy well and admired him greatly. She will, I know, always think of the President's graciousness and the warmth of personal friendship which he exuded.

Only a week before his tragic passing, I saw him in the Oval Room at the White House when he accepted the report of the Advisory Committee on Medical Care for the Aged, in which Senator ANDERSON and I joined, and issued a statement offering encouragement and help.

He was vigorous and healthy, smiling and friendly—a complete human being, concerned about other human beings who were no longer as vigorous and not quite as healthy as they used to be.

This concern for the unfortunate by a man with all the social graces and all the social status and as much power as America allows one man, was what made him so much the symbol of the youth of our country. His wife, Jacqueline, who has given Americans so much reason to be very proud of her and of all American womanhood as she reflected it, in these last mournful weeks, has expressed the most beautiful tribute—that John F. Kennedy had the "hero idea of history." She did not want people to forget John F. Kennedy—the man—and replace him with a shadowy figure in the history books.

She need not fear that. There are already thousands upon thousands of people in the world working to keep his memory alive. I have been privileged to join with many others in this body in cosponsoring a bill to rename the National Cultural Center and make it a living, vibrant memorial to this vibrant man who loved the arts. And with Senator HUMPHREY, I have joined in a bill establishing a commission to insure that only the most appropriate memorials be created in his honor.

These are well-meaning, deeply sincere tokens of an affection. In reality it will be John F. Kennedy's youthful freshness in his aspirations for our country that will keep his memory fresh.

In a real sense we, his former colleagues in the Congress are the only ones with the power to write words which can transform these aspirations into memorials with meaning. We can write legislative acts, like a meaningful civil rights law, which would consecrate and perpetuate John F. Kennedy's love for personal and national dignity. We can exorcise from our country—and the American people are doing that even now—those extremes of hatred and disbelief in public affairs which create a climate in which terrible acts become much more likely.

Acts such as these will be his final memorials. It is within our power to establish them. Perhaps his noblest memorial is that he would have wanted such memorials almost as no others.

So, in common with my colleagues in this solemn service—and that is what this is today—I bespeak for Mrs. Javits and my children, Joy, Joshua, and Carla. I place their names in the RECORD so that as they read this RECORD when they grow up, I hope they will read their names in it and see that their father spoke to Mrs. Kennedy and the children and to the President's father and mother and brothers and sisters and their families on this terrible bereavement for them, for our Nation, and for all mankind, with deepest sympathy and with the deep expectation that flowers will grow from his grave for the benefit of man.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, it seems so futile to try to describe with words the profound loss the people of our country and of the world suffered in the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Each one of us wants to pay tribute to him, but how helpless are our words compared to the great tribute that came to our departed President through the spontaneous manifestation of grief and sorrow by the people—strong and weak, rich and poor.

When the word of his death struck at home and in other nations, a pall fell over the people. They prayed, wept, meditated in silence, gathered in groups stunned and grieved. No deed in all of history brought so much grief and bewilderment to people everywhere as did the untimely passing of the man whom we mourn today.

His dynamism, affable attitude, and appealing and sincere smile became an integral part of the home of families everywhere, especially in our country. People felt as though they knew him intimately; that he was their personal friend.

He fought for his country in time of war and peace; did not shirk his responsibility, and was ready to stand in the front line of the fight.

In his service as a Member of Congress, he furthered the causes in which he believed, never harboring any rancor about the opposition that others might interpose against what he advocated.

In his occupancy of the office of President of the United States, he advocated action which he sincerely believed would be to the best interest of the people and the security of our Nation; the full enjoyment of constitutional rights for the citizens of our Nation was his devoted objective.

In his advocacy of favored causes, he encouraged discussion and debates, believing that out of the exchange of views there would come the adoption of programs that would richly and constructively serve the Nation.

It was not to be his lot to see the fight to the end. The grim hand of an assassin took his life on November 22. Our people are still stunned and bewildered.

He now lies in his lonely and narrow cell in Arlington Cemetery with an eternal light burning over his resting place. Mourners are wending their way to his grave, there to weep and pray. Loving, tender hands are placing tear-moistened flowers upon the ground where he sleeps.

With the dauntless courage of a leader he carried the baton on high. It has fallen from his hand, but it will be picked up by the people of our country and carried with honor and distinction to the lofty goal which he set for our country and the world.

Mrs. Lausche joins me, and I am sure the people of Ohio do likewise, in expressing condolences to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and the Kennedy family.

Beautifully appropriate to the life and death of our departed President are the words of Letitia Elizabeth Landon, English poet and novelist:

> Can that man be dead
> Whose spiritual influence is upon his kind?
> He lives in glory; and his speaking dust
> Has more of life than half its breathing
> moulds.

### PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY FIRST IN THE HEARTS AND THE HOPES OF THE WORLD

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, our martyred leader, the beloved President John F. Kennedy, will live in our hearts forever as a gallant knight who held aloft a torch of hope for the freedom-loving peoples of the world to follow. From these legislative Halls of division and debate, he went to bold executive leadership of the Nation, then to leadership of the free world in the quest for peace, his Holy Grail. Now, after his martyrdom, he belongs to all mankind and all the ages.

President Kennedy becomes the only President in the history of the United States to achieve immortality in the quest for peace and freedom, without fighting a war. When we think of immortal leaders in this connection, the names of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt leap to our lips. But each fought a war to achieve greatness as a defender of peace and freedom. How much more difficult was President Kennedy's achievement—to advance the cause of peace and freedom without fighting a war.

At the end of his tragically brief lifetime, he was first in the hearts and the hopes of the world. What greater achievement can be attained by any mortal?

As Christmas time approaches, when our thoughts are always turned to family and faith, our hearts and the hearts of the world go out to the family of our fallen champion, who was so close to his faith and his family. And yet he has left to his children, to his widow, to all his family, to his countrymen, a shining heritage of vision, courage, brilliance, dedication, compassion, strength—a magnificent glow to illuminate the hopes of his family, the Nation, and all the world, for generations to come.

No country in the history of the world ever had more cause to reflect upon its course, to rededicate itself to humanitarian goals, to lay aside smallness, to try to see beyond the self-inflicted, constricting boundaries of time and distance, and to work for a tomorrow as bright as the eternal torch in Arlington Cemetery. President Kennedy's untimely death "tore a hole in the fabric of our society." It is the duty of all Americans of this and succeeding generations to help to repair it. Our task will be long and exacting.

In our grief we ask what course our Nation shall follow. President Kennedy, though the most intellectually brilliant man I have ever known, often turned to the Bible for higher guidance. It was a source of strength for this gallant man, as it was and is to the brave and courageous woman who was at his side in every crisis and who gave the Nation a new pride in woman's courage in the hour of the cruel taking away.

In his acceptance of the nomination to carry the banner for the Democratic Party, he quoted Isaiah:

> But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary.

In his classic Inaugural Address, he looked again to Isaiah when he said:

> Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free."

Never have the American people been more deeply moved than by witnessing the little son of President John F. Kennedy touch his hand to his forehead in a final salute to his father. Never has the American flag had a prouder moment than when held aloft by the President's little son.

Again we may turn to Isaiah who said:

> And a little child shall lead them.

Through the Bible and through the innocence of the President's little son, we find the Nation's path to true glory—we shall salute our fallen leader, we shall raise up the flag of freedom and justice, and by our actions hereafter we shall honor that for which it stands, as President Kennedy honored it both in life and in death.

In the last sentence of his last prepared speech, which was to have been delivered at Austin, Tex., on the evening of that fateful day of November 22, our fallen leader gave us our marching orders of the future in these words:

> Let us stand together with renewed confidence in our course—united in our heritage of the past and our hopes for the future—and determined that this land we love shall lead all mankind into new frontiers of peace and abundance.

**Mr. PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, John F. Kennedy left this Nation a remarkable legacy. His achievements in civil rights legislation were the greatest of any American President since Lincoln. Also, he took us the initial tough and vital step toward peace in these first, infinitely dangerous years of the missile and nuclear age, in which we confront the formidable forces of international communism, including a nuclear armed Soviet Union, for the nuclear test ban treaty was a Kennedy accomplishment, both in conception and execution. As President Kennedy said early this year, the genie of the spread of nuclear weapons is almost out of the bottle, and if we do not get it back this year, 1963, we shall never get it back. The nuclear test ban treaty begins to put the cork on the bottle. Limited as it is, the nuclear test ban treaty does give us a chance to build a peaceful world of control of the immense power of destruction with which mankind has suddenly found itself. If 100 or 1,000 years from now there remains, in the nuclear age, a civilized world that can have a history, that history will recognize John F. Kennedy as being high among those who made it possible.

President Kennedy left two less noticed legacies: 23 days before he died, President Kennedy was asked to define happiness. He called it "full use of your powers along lines of excellence." And he added, "I find therefore the Presidency provides some happiness."

In a nation in which the pursuit of pleasure, fun, and easy living has become so often the accepted happiness goal of life, this reminder by the President of the solid joys of hard work, of discipline, and of determination to use every bit of talent each of us has to make us better instruments of God and country is a solid legacy that could make this a stronger and a better country.

Finally, with all the hundreds of thousands of words spoken off the cuff by President Kennedy in press conferences and in television interviews before millions of people, it is astonishing that not once did he utter a single word, so far as I can recall, which would embarrass or insult any person or in the slightest degree would demean the dignity of the office he held. This is not just a tribute to his intelligence; it is also a tribute, even more, to his sensitivity to other human beings, to his understanding, and to his sympathetic heart. This is all the more remarkable in view of the often hard-hitting and forceful encounters of the President, as in the clash with "Big Steel" and the showdown with Khrushchev and Castro over missiles in Cuba.

What a great asset this sense of the right word at the right time was in a man with the immense power of the Presidency of the United States.

Basically, the Kennedy legacy is a challenge to us to strive to live up to the ideals of equal rights for all Americans, of peace and freedom, and of dedication to personal excellence, to which he so fully dedicated his life.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, November 22, 1963, in the city of Washington was a day out of season. It was a day both of spring and of fall, both of beginnings and of endings, and of endings and of beginnings. Into the quiet of that day came the word of the death of the President.

In the days that followed immediately, grief increased in depth and in breadth, both here and throughout the Nation and the world.

President Kennedy was not merely a Washington President or a political President. He was a President in every home, every town, and every city—a President to everyone, both the very young and the very old, in the United States and in other countries of the world.

It is not for us to attempt to measure or assign the guilt for his assassination and death, for the burden of that act is too great to be borne by any one man or State or nation. Instead, that act and its consequences must be related to all our actions, and the burden of guilt must be shared by all who through the years have excited and stirred the simple and the anxious, who have raised questions and turned them about until they became suspicious, who have nurtured doubt until it bore the fruit of accusation and false charges, who have spread themselves to make a shade for fear and to save it from the light of truth until it grew to be a despairing fear of fear; by all who stood in silent acquiescence or who protested softly, too little, and too late; by all who envied him or any man or wished them ill.

We cannot rest in disillusionment or in grief. Instead, we must move on from these harsh realities, and must seek to accomplish the things for which the President stood—things made clearer by his death. First, to accept with good heart the burden and responsibility of citizenship, and to bring to the performance of these duties, whether in the highest office of the land or in the simplest and most elementary act of citizenship, the spirit described by John Adams as one of "public happiness," which, said Adams, possessed the American colonists and won the Revolution even before it was fought, a spirit which is reflected in a delight in participation in public discussion and in public action, a joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline, and in dedication. Second, to seek to understand, and then to realize in some measure, his vision of the unity of Western civilization and, beyond that, a unity among all the peoples of the world. Third, to seek to realize the potential for use in service and in perfection of all created things, an achievement to be measured, not by arithmetic or by geometry, but by the infinity of human aspirations, of human efforts, in developing and using the material resources of the earth, to the limits of science. Fourth, to seek the fullest possible development of every person—from the simple, and even from the retarded, to those with the greatest talents—making it possible for every one to achieve the goal which President Kennedy set for himself, and described in the words "the full use of one's powers according to the idea of excellence."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy demonstrated in action his realization that there must be a judgment of nations, as well as of persons. He demonstrated his awareness of the two great facts of contemporary history—first, that the mass or the volume of current history, of the things which demand some judgment and some commitment from our Nation and from us, is greater than ever before; second, that the movement of history itself is now at a rate more rapid than ever before known. In the face of these two ultimate facts, we are called upon to exercise, as best we can, and to the fullest possible measure to which it may be applied, the power of human reason, in attempting to give some control and some direction to life.

John F. Kennedy's entire efforts demonstrated a confidence in the future, a hope that the world of men could and would be improved, a belief in the universality of mankind and, in these far-reaching searches, a belief that there was no satisfaction except in the intensification and perfection of the life of every person.

Empty words of politicians of the past are echoed again: "The country will survive," and "the Government will stand." These are true statements, but for some days Americans will not walk as certainly or as straight as they did in the past. The quick step is gone. A strong heart has stopped. A mind that sought the truth, a will ready for commitment, and a voice to challenge and to move are ended for this age and time of ours.

This is, therefore, a time of truth for all, a time for resolution and for strong hope that what we say today may be supplemented and perfected in the future by honest historians who will trace and define the public service of John F. Kennedy.

In addition, we hope that good poets, who speak—as poets must—for each man alone, will do justice to the memory of John F. Kennedy.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, one of New Hampshire's most respected educators, who is a historian of some note, has written me "that President Kennedy will go down in our history as one of the finest and ablest of all Chief Executives, and we who lived in his lifetime may count ourselves fortunate."

If history fastens itself upon one of the many facets that went into the greatness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I have no doubt that it will be his courage. As with many of the great, a thread of tragedy and suffering was woven through his life.

John Kennedy experienced much pain and loss in his brief span. And, yet, I believe he shall be remembered as a smiling, happy, self-assured man—always seeming to be in motion, a man to stir a nation from its lethargy. This was not an elder statesman drawing from the experience of a previous generation, but a young and energetic leader who had himself grown and matured with the mighty problems of the day.

The Nation and the world watched as the young leader transformed the New Frontier from idea to action. John Kennedy was called upon to handle problems as new as space and as old as equal rights. His concerns ranged from nuclear test bans to the Peace Corps; from better education for the young to better life for the old; from more help for the mentally retarded to brighter opportunities for the gifted; from firm insistence on strong defense to an uncompromising search for lasting peace.

The tributes which have been paid him in death are but a small indication of the affection and respect in which John Kennedy was held in life. The lasting tragedy is that the flame of greatness that burned in him has been extinguished from this mortal world, leaving us to wonder forever what he might have wrought.

But a flame burns still—beside the simple grave that has already become a shrine. A hundred years ago at Gettysburg Abraham Lincoln said that "it is beyond our power to consecrate the ground in which our honored dead rest, but it is for us to take up the great unfinished tasks before us." There could be no more fitting memorial to John Kennedy.

And so, Mr. President, on behalf of the people of New Hampshire, and personally on behalf of Mrs. McIntyre and our daughter, Martha, I extend to Mrs.

Kennedy, the children, and the immediate family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I cannot add anything to what has already been said this afternoon about President John F. Kennedy. I join other Senators in their tributes to him.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the death of President John F. Kennedy is a national tragedy. The Nation and the world mourn his loss.

As I reflect upon the privilege of my friendship and association with him, I find myself pondering the contradictions of life. It creates and it destroys. It affirms and it denies. It exalts and it strikes down.

It is not, of course, for us to understand the ways of Providence, and the sequence of events often is beyond human comprehension, particularly when the soul of one so prominent among us is taken.

President Kennedy was a man whose life was dedicated to the service of his country. Practically all of his adult years were spent in this endeavor—in war and in peace, in military service, in Congress, and as President.

He was engaged in the affairs of the highest office his country could bestow upon him in the prime of his life. How deeply we regret the untimely departure from among us of one so vigorous and so dedicated.

He was a man with a remarkable variety of knowledge and a well-governed mind. He was persuasive with his ideas and pursued them with tremendous native force and determination.

It has been my privilege to know his father, and to have served in the Senate with John F. Kennedy when he was a Senator. I have enjoyed his company in my home. He possessed one of the most attractive personalities I have ever known.

He was a man of devotion to his family, his religion, and his chosen work. He was a man of courage and independence. He was a man of bold talent, great enterprise, and infinite skill. He was a man gifted in the art of government.

He demonstrated deep concern for what he believed to be in the interest of the strength and welfare of his country, and proved his willingness to fight for it. His acts of office were felt around the world.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe the eulogies which have been given today and those which have been given continuously since the tragic events of 2 weeks ago are ample evidence of the great affection and regard which America and the world hold for President John F. Kennedy.

I do not know whether adequate words can be found to express the sense of universal shock and grief, not only in our own country, but throughout the world, that resulted from the tragedy.

I believe that most of us still feel that it is unreal. We still refuse to accept the realities of the situation. Somehow it has seemed to be a great myth.

Of course, it is not.

Those of us who knew President Kennedy, not only as President, but as a Member of Congress in this body and in the other body feel a special sense of sadness and loss. Part of that deep feeling, no doubt, comes from the fact that he was a most remarkable and almost unique young man—and I say "young man" in the sense of comparison to my own age. He possessed clarity of thought. He also had a pristine clarity of expression which enabled him to deliver those thoughts in a manner and in language that left no doubt as to his views and his purposes.

He had a driving vigor possessed by few individuals. He had a determination in political combat in advancing the goals which he thought best for his country that probably has seldom, if ever, been equaled. These things make the tragedy so much greater. The personal acquaintance, the attractiveness of his own attitude, his cordiality, and his utter fairness in his associations with those in public life will be remembered and treasured as long as the memories of those alive will last.

I never saw him lose his temper. I never heard him make an extravagant or unwarranted expression. I have heard him many times vigorously advance his views, but always with that degree of courtesy and consideration which mark the man who has no need to be extravagant in his statements.

The tragedy is further pointed up by the circumstances under which it occurred.

While he had an outstanding record as a Member of the other body and as a Member of this body, he was going full stride into the fulfillment of the greatest political objective any man can have—that of President of the United States. He undertook the responsibilities of that office with a dedication and a seriousness which mark him as one of the great men of our time.

I believe it is only objective to say that 3 years were not sufficient for the full development of his programs or his ability. No one can say what the future will bring, but he knew the pattern which he wished to follow, and he was implementing it with a vigor and a consistency which were commendable.

In political offices there are people of divergent views. I did not belong to his party. With some of his views I could not agree. I say that in all humility and in all honesty. But I had unbounded respect for him.

The memories I have are based upon respect and admiration for a man who, in the very prime of his life and vigor, both physically and politically, had to be struck down. I still say that it is unreal, and the shock of that tragedy has not left the American people, nor will it leave the American people for an indefinite and unpredictable period in the future.

Unfortunately, I have poignant memories of the assassinations of two Presidents. I recall the shock when I was a youngster 5 years of age, when the word came to our small schoolroom that President McKinley had been shot. I remember the sadness that universally gripped the American people at that time, a sadness not only for the individual, but also for the occurrence in our free and great American system.

I believe the frustrations which concern us now—that such a thing could happen or would happen in this country of ours—are frustrations we cannot explain, nor do we try to explain them.

President Kennedy wrote an enviable record which is indelibly inscribed in the annals of our country and of our time.

I would not pretend to say more in eulogy than the fine and articulate statements made with heartfelt motives by Senators who have previously spoken. I have a grief and a sadness that I cannot fully express. To Mrs. Kennedy, to her children, and to John F. Kennedy's family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolences, and make the request that all of us be permitted to share to the utmost of our capacity in the grief which they suffer. We hope that grief can in some way be alleviated in the course of time and in the course of the great plan which we are all attempting to develop.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, among the many virtues of our late President John Kennedy, I believe the most outstanding, which will be long remembered and from which fruits will grow, was the remarkable quality he had of constant and unyielding courage.

I looked up some remarks I previously made with reference to him several years ago, in which I referred to his fine and forceful mind, which had a comprehensive grasp of all the problems of our Nation. Placing him in the White House brought that quality to finer fruit, because the opportunity was greater than I realized and greater than most people realized before he went there.

I said then, "I have great confidence in his ability, his character, and his constant and unyielding courage." That shows the trend of thought which ran through my mind at the time, as it does now, and as it runs through the minds of many others who knew him well.

He wrote a book, quite well known. I hold a copy of that book in my hand. It is titled "Profiles in Courage."

With his very clear mind, in rare style, he brought forcefully to the attention of the reading public the lives of seven men, all of whom had served in the Congress and most of whom had served in this body. To him they personified not only personal courage, but also public political courage.

The names of those he mentioned were John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Thomas Hart Benton, Edmund G. Ross, Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, George Norris, and Robert A. Taft.

I found one sentence from his own pen in this book that was of particular interest. Referring to all these men, near the close of this remarkable volume, he said:

> Some demonstrated courage through their unyielding devotion to absolute principle. Others demonstrated courage through their acceptance of compromise, through their advocacy of conciliation, through their willingness to replace conflict with cooperation.

> Surely their courage was of equal quality, though of different caliber.
>
> Most of them, despite their differences, held much in common—the breathtaking talents of the orator, the brilliance of the scholar, the breadth of the man above party and section, and, above all, a deep-seated belief in themselves, their integrity and the rightness of their cause.

I have been proud of the fact that one of the men he chose from the seven around which he built the book was L. Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi, onetime Member of the House of Representatives, a longtime Member of the U.S. Senate, a member of Grover Cleveland's Cabinet, and a longtime Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Our late President developed in his book his qualities and character; and the part I have quoted was with reference to Lamar along with the others.

As he paid tribute to that statesman and that truly great Mississippian, commending him for his courage, Mississippi in turn returns the compliment to our late President, who is capable of standing alongside those he chose, or alongside those anyone else would choose, for the truly great and fine quality of courage which he demonstrated on the floor, in the White House, in the field of battle, or wherever he was.

I am glad to be one of the mediums through whom my State could pay him that compliment. At the same time, I wish to express personal grief and great regret on behalf of myself and Mrs. Stennis, as we have already done to Mrs. Kennedy and other members of the family. All members of the Mississippi congressional delegation have expressed themselves to that effect, as have others in official life in Mississippi.

I hold in my hand a copy of a telegram sent by a fine, outstanding, business executive, a fine citizen of Mississippi, which came to my attention through the Clarion-Ledger, a Jackson newspaper. I take the liberty of reading that telegram, which expresses the sentiments of many of us. It is addressed to Mrs. Kennedy and was sent following the tragic death:

> Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy,
> *White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> You have the profound and sincere sympathy of all Mississippians in this time of your great personal loss shared by every loyal citizen of the United States.
>
> We pray that God will guide you and your loved ones in His own way and by His wisdom use even this tragedy to show all of us the way to build and preserve a greater nation and a better world dedicated to His glory.
>
> Jack R. Reed,
> *President, Mississippi Economic Council—Mississippi's State Chamber of Commerce.*

I join in those sentiments, along with all other Mississippians. The crown of glory based on courage—belongs also to the wonderful lady, his surviving wife. I think her name should be mentioned in the Record every time. She meant so much to him in life, and means so much to his family now, as well as to the Nation.

May God give eternal rest to his soul, and may that same God sustain his wife and children and enable them to see the wisdom of His ways.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, when Gov. John Connally was asked by NBC Commentator Martin Agronsky for his reflections on the tragic assassination of President Kennedy he replied from his hospital bed in Dallas:

> Only that maybe, Martin, the President of the United States, as a result of this great tragedy, has been asked to do something in death that he couldn't do in life—and that is to so shock and so stun the Nation, the people, and the world of what's happening to us—of the cancerous growth that's been permitted to expand and enlarge itself upon the community and the society in which we live that breeds the hatred, the bigotry, the intolerance and indifference, the lawlessness that is, I think, an outward manifestation of what occurred here in Dallas.

If President Kennedy's death is not to be in vain, every American should think soberly on the meaning of the Texas Governor's words.

But while we need to remember the sad circumstances and the lessons of President Kennedy's death, we also want to remember his stirring words of hope and courage.

On a cold morning, January 20, 1961, I sat on the steps of the Capitol, 12 or 15 feet from our new President, and heard these words:

> Let the words go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans.
>
> To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves.
>
> I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.
>
> And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

Second only to this great inaugural, I would rate President Kennedy's magnificent speech at American University on June 10, 1963, which opened the way for the nuclear test ban treaty—that "first step toward peace."

He said in that great address:

> The United States, as the world knows, will never start a war. We do not want a war. We do not now expect a war. This generation of Americans has already had enough, more than enough of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared for war if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just. We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on, not toward a strategy of annihilation, but toward a strategy of peace.

I will remember him for those eloquent words, his grace of manner, his quiet courage, and his consideration of others.

One personal experience particularly will stay in my mind as long as I live. On the Saturday night following my defeat in the Senate race of 1960, my wife and I were having dinner with some friends in Mitchell, S. Dak., when I was called to the phone to take a long distance call from Palm Beach. "Hello, George, this is Jack Kennedy. I am sorry about what happened to you on Tuesday," he said. "Before you make any plans, I would like to talk with you."

It humbles one to know that a great man was not so absorbed in his own moment of triumph that he forgot his friends who had stumbled.

Following that call he gave me the opportunity to serve in his administration as Director of the food-for-peace program.

In announcing the creation of the Food for Peace Office, the President said:

> American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

In a modest, self-effacing manner, President Kennedy had said in 1957:

> I will be frank with you—I'm a city boy who has never plowed a furrow. I do not pretend to be an expert on all the problems of agriculture, and I suppose some of my constituents are opposed to letting their tax dollars aid western ranchers and farmers. But I will say this: When a serious decline in farm income takes millions of dollars out of the pockets of your farmers and your towns, that is a national problem.

Actually, Mr. Kennedy had a broad concept of the role of agriculture in today's world. Speaking in Mitchell, S. Dak.—my hometown—on September 22, 1960, he said:

> Fellow Americans facing a difficult future, I think the farmers can bring more credit, more lasting good will, more chance for freedom, more chance for peace, than almost any other group of Americans in the next 10 years, if we recognize that food is strength, and food is peace, and food is freedom, and food is a helping hand to people around the world whose good will and friendship we want. So you are a great source of strength to us in these great years ahead, and I come as a presidential candidate with the greatest possible hope for the future and ask you to join in a great effort on behalf of our country and the State of South Dakota. The motto of the State of South Dakota is "Under God the People Rule." The motto of the United States could be the same. I hope in the next 10 or 20 years when historians write of our times that they will write that the cause of the people ruling under God spread in these years and became stronger, increased in strength, increased in substance.

President Kennedy's last visit to South Dakota was on August 17, 1962, when he came to our State Capital, Pierre, to inaugurate the power transmission system at the Oahe project in the great Missouri River Basin complex.

In Pierre, the President said:

> I want to tell you, first of all, how much I am enjoying this opportunity to get away from Washington—to talk with local farmers and ranchers and merchants and find out what they are thinking. Those of us who serve in Washington spend too much time talking to each other, repeating the same views or listening to the same pleaders for special interests. That is why it is good to get away from Washington from time to time and to get a better and fresher perspec-

tive of what most of our citizens are thinking and doing.

In this same vein, I would hope that those who visit our country from abroad, if they want to learn the truth about America, would not confine their visits to Washington and to the great metropolitan areas of the east, but would visit this State and others like it. With all of the current crop failures behind the Iron Curtain, I think visitors from abroad should see the abundance of our fields. I think they should see our smaller towns, which show the democratic system at its best—for we started as a nation of small towns.

I think they should see this dam—the largest rolled-earth dam in the world. For this dam alone will produce enough electrical energy every year to meet all of the power needs of a city the size of Edinburgh, Scotland. This dam alone will supply enough irrigation to serve an area larger than the entire nation of Luxembourg. This dam alone will provide a magnificent reservoir lake—enriching the beauty and the recreational opportunities of this area—as long as Africa's famous Lake Victoria.

Above all, this dam provides a striking illustration of how a free society can make the most of its God-given resources. Water is our most precious asset—and its potential uses are so many and so vital that they are sometimes in conflict: Power versus irrigation, irrigation versus navigation, navigation versus industrial, industrial versus recreational. Here in the Missouri Basin, the supply of water cannot meet all of these needs all of the time. Accommodations are essential—and in 1944, under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, a comprehensive Missouri Basin plan was authorized to fulfill all of these objectives.

This is the fifth of six great dams to control the mainstream of the Missouri River—and I can assure those of you at the upper end of the Missouri and our good friends at the lower end that it will continue to be our policy to regulate the storage and flow of water in these reservoirs in the most advantageous manner for all concerned that the most creative engineers in the world can possibly devise.

Speaking in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., at the National Plowing Contest on September 22, 1960, as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy drew a parallel to the election of 100 years earlier which he used on several occasions during the 1960 campaign.

He said it this way:

> During the presidential election 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln wrote a friend, "I know there is a God, and that He hates injustice. I see the storm coming, but if He has a place and a part for me, I believe that I am ready." Now 100 years later, when the great issue is the maintenance of freedom all over the globe, we know there is a God and we know He hates injustice, and we see the storm coming. But if He has a place and a part for us, I believe that we are ready.

Mr. President, these and many other words of our beloved President will live in my memory for years to come.

The life and death of President Kennedy have given new meaning to the inspired New Testament words: "Whosoever shall lose his life for My sake, shall find it."

May God rest his gallant soul in peace and bring comfort to the remarkable family who loved him most of all.

And may we hear again his sadly prophetic words:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

My wife, Eleanor, joins me in expressing our sympathy and our admiration to Mrs. Kennedy, the children and other members of his family.

Since the President's death, I have received numerous expressions from the people of South Dakota, on the life and death of our fallen leader. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the letters and messages be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that several editorials selected from the South Dakota press be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS TO SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN

From Mr. D. C. Walsh, of Miller, S. Dak.: "Certainly, President Kennedy has emblazoned for all time the answer to his own query—not what can my country do for me but what can I do for my country. What have we come to in this Nation that bigotry and personal bitterness can give rise to a disaster of this caliber? Tragic as was the event itself, it seems equally calamitous that anyone in this country would even seriously consider the perpetration of such an act. At the risk of appearing blasphemous, I wonder if at times even our Creator may view us with some feeling of disbelief."

From Mr. C. A. Sundstrom, of Alcester, S. Dak.: "I, having had no contact with this, the greatest man of our time, feel a great loss, so I can imagine how people close to him must feel."

From Mr. John Sauer, of Huron, S. Dak.: "I do not mean to prolong this letter, but I read an excerpt from a small town journalist in Minnesota that expressed my own sentiments so well that I cannot refrain from passing on to you his quotation:

"'John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of grace—physical grace, mental grace, spiritual and moral grace, the grace of breeding, the grace of quality, the grace of courage, and always the grace of reason.'

"To my mind, a very fitting and true vignette of our late President's character."

From Mr. W. Neil Evans, of Watertown, S. Dak.: "I only had the privilege of meeting him once and shaking his hand, but I will always remember his firm handshake and the smile on his face as he told us we were doing a good job on the ASCS committees."

From Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Magedanz, of Revillo, S. Dak.: "We feel that the whole world is so very much better off even with this great man gone, than before, not only for what he has done, but for what he was trying to do."

From Mr. Paul H. Redfield, Madison, S. Dak.: "Beyond all doubt, John F. Kennedy was one of America's great—to America as well as to the freedom loving people of the world. Already this has been demonstrated. The ideals and principles for which he stood and fought must not be forgotten. The eternal flame must never flicker."

From Mr. Kenneth Knudsen of Irene, S. Dak.: "The leadership of President Kennedy will long be remembered by every citizen of the United States and the entire world. We trust this great injustice will be a lesson to us all, not to let hate govern our thoughts and deeds, and hereafter be constructive in our criticisms of others. If this can be accomplished, President Kennedy's fine leadership will still live with us in spirit."

From Mr. Harley Piekkola, of Newell, S. Dak.: "Somehow if you could convey the message, from this small and humble organization, that their loss is our loss, too. It is our fervent hope that the light of truth and friendship that the Kennedys lit will forever continue to grow."

From Mr. Almer Steensland, of Beresford, S. Dak.: "We certainly stand humbled before the world, not only in the assassination of the President, but in the killing of the suspect by a hoodlum before he could be brought to trial. It is simply awful."

From Mr. Sandy O. Graham, Hot Springs, S. Dak.: "The President was a good man and a good husband. May he now rest in peace."

From Mr. Maynard Engelstad, Astoria, S. Dak.: "One lesson I hope Kennedy's memory will leave us is that we must have less hate in this country and that we must grow up and live up to the principles we talk so much about."

From Eleanor McManus, Chamberlain, S. Dak.: "My sympathy goes out to his dear wife and children and I hope and pray God will take care of them. Life must go on as he always said."

From Jerry Gerdes, Rapid City, S. Dak.: "The world has suffered a grievous loss, for seldom does greatness touch a man; it brushed John Fitzgerald Kennedy, paused, and laid its awesome heavy hand upon his shoulder, then, moved on, to be replaced by the hand of God, his life work not yet done—or was it? Was his courage, his leadership, his greatness, taken from us to bring to the Nation, to the world, an awareness of those things of which he spoke. We must rededicate ourselves to the principles for which he died—freedom for all men, peace for a troubled world, fulfillment of the concepts expressed in the Constitution of our Nation."

From Miss Lore Pendo, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.: "Although I am only 20 years old and not of voting age yet, I am nevertheless an American who greatly respected President Kennedy and the principles he stood for. My personal tribute to him will be my own evergrowing realization of his greatness, but more than that, I hope to someday see the fulfillment of the honor herein proposed, which John F. Kennedy so richly deserves (that the Peace Corps be renamed the Kennedy Corps for peace)."

From Prof. Allen Barnes, of Brookings, S. Dak.: "It seems that at a time of crisis such as the one which we are experiencing that most of us pledge to rededicate ourselves primarily to the service of our fellow man. * * * Many of my Spanish speaking friends have told me both verbally and in letters that the United States, through Mr. Kennedy, has a President who fully understands Latin America."

From Mr. Arvid Carlson, of Stockholm, S. Dak.: "Today I have done a lot of thinking, as no doubt we all have. However, the more I think back over the last 4 days, and yesterday particularly, the more I realize that John F. Kennedy was without question the greatest President, the greatest leader, the greatest man this country has known. His loss to our country is a promise unfulfilled, a victory not quite reached."

From Mr. John Troth, of Mitchell, S. Dak.: "If any good can arise from such an unspeakable crime, perhaps it will be the awakening of Americans to a new appreciation of their citizenship in this great Nation, and a new resolve to accept the responsibilities that accompany that citizenship. Perhaps they will now realize and truly know what John F. Kennedy meant when he said: 'We would not exchange this time or place with anyone in the world.'"

From Mr. Leo Rozum, of Sturgis, S. Dak.: "Not since our son Jim's untimely death in 1960 has anything touched me so deeply. Like millions of others we sat literally glued to the TV and radio from Friday afternoon until the close of ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery. We shared with these millions a deep sincere grief although cognizant that God in his wisdom has assigned to each mortal an appointed hour."

**(Telegrams were received from Mayor Charles E. McClean of Hot Springs, S. Dak., and Mayor John T. Barstow of Vermillion, S. Dak., asking that the sympathy and grief of these two communities be conveyed to Mrs. Kennedy and the members of the family.)**

---

[Letter from Mrs. Olive Briles, sister of Senator McGovern]

November 27, 1963.

Dear George: To you the loss of President Kennedy must seem even more overwhelming than it does to the rest of us because he was your personal friend as well as your President, but even to me it seems as if one of our family has died.

I keep asking myself over and over how could it happen? For the first time in our life we have had a young energetic, highly respected President and now he is snatched away.

Why? Why? Why?

The only answer that I can find is that the sins of the masses have again been borne by one. Have we become a Nation so calloused and so dominated by hate and self-interest that we are on the verge of destroying ourselves?

George Orwell in "1984" shows how a totalitarian ruler dominated a people by teaching them to hate one another. The keynote of his book is that the destruction of the humanity within a man is easy once he ceases to love. Is that what we are allowing to happen to us?

We have had repeated warnings that had we heeded might have prevented the tragedy that shocked the world and shamed America with overwhelming remorse and grief.

When little children can be murdered in Sunday School without causing a national outcry, when a brilliant Negro leader can be ruthlessly shot and little or nothing done to bring his assassin to justice, can we be shocked that that same society has produced a warped and twisted Oswald that could destroy the man who was laboring tirelessly to give him and all others a better world in which to live?

President Kennedy's death is a loss that seems greater than we can bear, but his supreme sacrifice will not have been in vain if we will now rise up and join hands—all Americans, regardless of color and creed—to resolve that "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom"—not only freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, but also freedom from hate.

In life President Kennedy was so dominated by love—love for God, love for family, and love for his fellowman—that he failed to comprehend the power of hate. I do not believe that the world will soon forget the man who saw the best in everyone and who envisioned the potential of brotherly love to transform the world.

Neither will the world forget the stately young widow whose trust in God and in man enabled her to transcend the natural human emotion to abhor the public that had robbed her of what she held most dear and to share with them her grief and theirs in a final tribute to her husband.

May the eternal flame that she lighted on his grave be an eternal flame in the heart of every American that will forever burn out selfishness and hatred and burn deep within every conscience the commandment of that visionary, young, and vigorous man, who decreed "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

We still have much to be thankful for in that we live in a land where there are others to take up the torch and carry on. I am sure President Johnson will do as he said—The best that I can.

With much love,

Olive.

---

### Excerpts From Sermon Delivered at the Gettysburg, S. Dak., Episcopal Church by Rev. Charles Greene, Pastor, on Sunday, November 24, 1963

Socrates, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, Abraham Lincoln, Mahatma Gandhi, and John Kennedy were all men of love.

Their devotion to truth, to reality, to God, and to men carried them knowingly to the final sacrifice.

The Nation reels under the swiftness of the tragedy. The world is shocked and appalled. All mankind mourns the death of the man.

A man of courage, dedication, youth and vigor is dead, not because of hate, but because he loved his Lord and his people.

Occasionally a great man emerges to assume the reins of government, and we who so readily criticized should more properly give thanks to God for raising him up.

Today John F. Kennedy lies in state because he loved and desired to serve us. Love, not hate, has laid our President low * * * love shown in deep religious devotion, exemplary family life, sacrifice of personal fortune, and anxious concern for all men.

It is love which struck him down just as surely as it is love which brings pain to all who dare to care. And it is that very love which must continue long after his mortal remains have gone, if his life is not to have been but a vain illusion.

---

### Excerpts From Sermon Delivered at the Memorial Service in Sisseton, S. Dak., by Rev. Edward A. Gilbertson, Pastor of the Grace Lutheran Church, Sisseton, S. Dak.

This is not only a day of sorrow but also of repentence that we have allowed conditions to exist that would breed assassins. Everyone has the privilege of hoping that the town in which he lives may be the birthplace of a future President of the United States. We need also to remember that assassins are born and raised someplace also. This is a day for self-evaluation, not only on the national level, but also on the local level and especially the personal level.

We need well ask is Sisseton the type of town likely to be the birthplace of a future President, or rather the birthplace and the training ground of an assassin of a future President of the United States? As a nation we are nothing more than a collection of individual communities. The character of the community will be the character of the Nation.

In his inaugural address President Kennedy made this historic statement: "Ask not what can my country do for me, but rather what can I do for my country." Let us look at Sisseton in the light of President Kennedy's thought-provoking statement. What have we done for our community, particularly our children and youth, in order that we may produce good citizens, instead of a potential assassin?

---

### Statement by a Secretary in the Office of Senator McGovern

The triumph of a noble spirit—this is President Kennedy's gift to America and a grieving world constituency. He was a spiritual man. He lived life well and he loved it.

He loved God and his family, the sea and books, children and animals, the theater and sports, music and good humor. Most of all, he loved us, his people, and the people of the world. He cared.

An active participant in all fields of human endeavor, he was a quiet reflector who sought solace and guidance in the written word and in contemplative ventures into history and the future that often provided the substance of decision.

His deep feeling for mankind, his intimate knowledge of human nature, his search for common ground in a world arena where only a partial prize can ever be won—he, above most of us, knew that we are merely mortal, that we are prone to error, that our spiritual incompetence can be laid to the limitations of our humanity. But he tested those limits.

And he longed for peace. His search for peace and his measure of success in this ancient quest is our legacy. Man has sought peace for some 2,000 years. We thank God that he continued our pursuit. So hard did he try that his very murder is testimonial enough.

From his oval office window, his spirit looked out on a city, a nation, and a world crying for peace, longing for redemption. From another window, one looked out who deprived that world of a heart pulsing for mankind, of leadership that may never be equaled, of vision rarely known, and of a future we may never know.

But let us look to that future, leaning as did he on the past, a past which now, we can confidently know, embraces his life and his spirit.

---

[From the Daily Republic, Mitchell, S. Dak., Nov. 26, 1963]

### Profile in Courage

As John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery yesterday, a shocked and grieving nation rededicated itself to the tasks that lie before it. That these tasks will be accomplished without further violence—generated by hate and greed and malevolence in the minds of mortal men—is the hope of all rational persons.

The martyrdom of President Kennedy, pray God, will strengthen the forces of righteousness in the everlasting battle against those of fanatic hatred. His death, we pray, will not have been in vain, but will move us to labor long and hard for those ideals which he so clearly enunciated in his brief 34 months as our Chief Executive.

For those who loved and admired the late President, the characteristics of greatness were apparent early in his administration. His greatest achievements seemed yet to come; in his brief span of national leadership he had laid the groundwork for conquering the new frontiers of democracy about which he spoke.

For the American people, Mr. Kennedy had lighted many candles to guide the way. It was not the way all were willing to follow, but it was a charted course designed to elevate this civilization to new heights. It was a grand design to attain in our time a free, disarmed world moving out of the shadows of a threatened nuclear holocaust; to attain in our time a nation in which bigotry had no place, in which there was truly a society where opportunities were equal for all without respect to race, creed or color; to attain in our time great advances in education, in economic strength, in scientific exploration, and to attain in our time a guarantee that those who labored to help us realize our aims would, in their sunset years, be spared excessive financial burdens.

History will note that President Kennedy was far more than a national leader; he was the outstanding world leader of his time. The book "Profiles in Courage," had it been written at a later time by a writer other than himself, would certainly have included him. He was true to the statement he made in his inaugural address that "we must never negotiate out of fear, but we must never fear to negotiate." He faced the crises of Cuba, the Berlin wall, South Vietnam, the autobahn blockade with courage. He stood firm in the face of threat, without panic that might have moved lesser men to calamitous action.

Surmounting each crisis, the President waited for the smoke to disperse, then moved into the clear air of negotiation, in an effort to establish, as he said also in his inaugural address, "a beachhead of cooperation in the jungles of suspicion."

An assassin's bullet has cut short this beachhead assault. It remains for President Lyndon B. Johnson and those who follow him to issue further command. It is up to them to determine whether we advance or retreat. May they be granted the wisdom and courage of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and the great Presidents who preceded him.

---

[From the Black Hills Press, Sturgis, S. Dak., Nov. 23, 1963]

### TIME FOR MOURNING

The President is dead.

A single shot has sent the world into mourning. Breathes there a man with a soul so dead anywhere in the world who does not lament the tragedy of this horrendous crime? We hope not.

The first reaction is one of shock. That such a horrible thing could happen in America seems almost beyond belief. It had happened before, but so long ago that another assassination of an American President seemed to be an impossibility. That it has happened again adds another terrible chapter to the disgraceful story of man's inhumanity to man.

Then comes the stunning realization of the dreadful loss of service to God and country which will result from the assassin's bullet. President Kennedy was in his prime and his public career had not yet reached its zenith. He typified the youth, vigor, and imagination of his beloved country and he gave great promise of leading it to new heights of world prominence. The heart of the country was stilled with his heart. But the Nation will live and survive to realize the lofty objectives that President Kennedy espoused during his short but useful life.

The profound sympathies of the entire world go to the late President's family. Their tears, their heartbreak, their sorrow are shared by all people everywhere. President Kennedy was a family man in the truest sense, and all of America was part of his family. He was father, son, husband, brother, and our President. The loss resulting from his untimely and tragic death is virtually unfathomable.

What of the future?

Time enough for that later.

This is a time of mourning for America, and the free world.

Hurt, angered, shocked, we can only do what another assassinated President once said he did when he had nowhere else to go in times of trial—we can go to our knees and pray for the immortal soul of our lost President, for his family and for the Nation he served with dedication and devotion.

---

[From the Exponent, student publication, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, S. Dak., Dec. 5, 1963]

### THE NATION WEPT

As have all other Americans, the staff of the Exponent has been numbed by the shattering impact of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. No tribute the Exponent could print in this column could match the spirit of the following poem. It was written by the Honorable Robert D. Orr, State representative of Brown County, who received his bachelor's degree from Northern and took his master's degree at the University of South Dakota. State Representative Orr wrote the poem when watching telecasts of the tragic event and agreed to the Exponent's request to publish it.

LOVE—LAUGHTER—HAPPINESS  
HOPE—HATRED—BIGOTRY  
TRAGIC VIOLENCE—REDEDICATION

"The Man is dead.  
His immortal spirit,  
Ideals,  
Humanity, live on.

"In the minds, hearts,  
Aspirations of fellow Americans,  
Deeper meanings of a tragedy emerge.  
"Disbelieving, we cried.  
We prayed;  
We bled.  
The Nation bleeds;  
It suffers, hangs its head—  
Unashamed.

"It is proud, yet grieved;  
Pained that law and order failed,  
Monstrous violence to the restraints of freedom mitigated,  
Grieved of hate, prejudice, and brutality,  
Grieved for the Grievancer.

"Hurt that Man's inhumanity to man prevails;  
Proud to be free, grieved to have felt guilt,  
Tragically united in this hour of sorrow.

"He is martyred for a cause, for many causes,  
Magnanimous:  
Love for Almighty God,  
His fellow Americans,  
His Country,  
His ideals of equality, freedom, peace;  
His passion for the goodness and humanity of all men.

"Paralysis of enterprise,  
The Nation wept,  
Self-examined,  
Reappraised.

"Friends about the world eulogized the man,  
Prayed for the Nation,  
Symphathized our hurt,  
Were themselves hurt.

"And so we laid to rest the mortal,  
While the Spirit and memory became immortal.  
And the Republic rededicated itself to its task."

---

[From the Argus Leader, Sioux Falls (S. Dak.), Dec. 5, 1963]

### HERB BECHTOLD'S ROUND ROBIN

How did the average 9- or 10-year-old feel about the death of President Kennedy? We can find the answer in some of the compositions which students in Mrs. Judith Evans' fourth-grade English class at Harrisburg School wrote.

Here are some excerpts (with the original spelling):

"DEAR JOHN, JUNIOR, I heard your dad was shot last Friday when he was at a parade. But when I heard he was shot I felt like a shok hit me. My dad never even new about it until my brother told him. He was very sad. I was crying when he was buried. I hope you'll grow up to be like your daddy. But do not get shot and die like your dad. A frenid, Dennis Geraets".

"DEAR CAROLINE, when the light was shining I wondered what they were doing that for. Until they said that it was going to shine forever. Say 'Hi' to John and your mother. NADENE OPPOLD."

"DEAR JACQUELINE KENNEDY, I think I saw you going in the parade to Arlington National Cemetery and I thought it was amazing the way the soldiers folded the flag that they gave to you. I hope that you find a nice headstone for your husband's grave. PAMELA HANSON."

"DEAR CAROLINE, "When you leave the White House do what mother tells you to do. I hope you grow up to be married to a nice man and some day he may be our president. You still have a long way to go so be a good citizen. DEONNE AXTELL."

"DEAR CAROLINE: You were very brave to go up and kiss his casket and so was your mother. CINDY BERNHARD."

"TO OUR FIRST LADY: I hope you get another smart husband, like your first one. PAULA ALLEN."

Patricia Dirks wrote: "When I heard that our President died. I was shockt. I prayed a couple of times that he would live. Then when I heard that Lee Oswald was found I felt good. But when I heard Kennedy died I felt shockt again. I had tears on my face."

---

[From the Pep-A-Graph, Lennox High School Paper, Lennox, S. Dak., Nov. 28, 1963]

### DON'T LET OUR PRESIDENT DIE

(By Donnis Hoogestraar)

The halls are hushed. Lockers close quietly. The former disbelief is gone from the mind and only shock and trembling permeate the atmosphere. The students of Lennox High have had the rumor reaffirmed: The President has been shot.

There is no distinction between the failing and the honor student, between the popular and the disliked, or the "rink" and refined. No, in Lennox High School each student has a tear in his eye and solemnity in his voice. All are praying, "Dear God, don't let our President die."

As classes discontinue their regular routine and radios beam forth the minute-by-minute report, everyone thinks and remembers. They can see the smile and warmth of manner, hear the familiar voice, and sense the zeal of their young President. The new and extensive means of communication had made John Kennedy seem a warm and personal friend. And as the students remembered, their prayer became more fervent. "Don't let our President die."

Then came the announcement so terrible in magnitude: "President John Kennedy is dead." Tears were shed but they did not begin to express the sorrow of the school. An atmosphere prevailed that cannot be explained as students just stared, thought, and remembered.

Now Mr. Kennedy lies cold in his grave. The smile is gone; the voice silent. But he need not die. For man's body is just a flimsily built structure that houses the soul and spirit which live on after death. We prayed with great emotion, "Don't let our President die." And we can keep him alive by carrying forth the traits which made him great.

No one would daresay that he was greater than any normal man for this would mean he was supernatural. No, we thought of him as one like us: young, industrious, and most of all, common, without arrogance. So let us pick out the characteristics that made him great and make those traits live in the youth of America.

First is equality in justice. We cannot hope to solve the civil rights problem simply by making everyone treat his fellow man as an equal. This question was started centuries ago by people who lost their vision of true freedom and it will not be solved by simply enforcing a law. President Kennedy made a small dent by alining himself with the Negro. So, let us "let our President live" by defending equality.

Probably the most noticeable of his traits was his courage to stick by his convictions. Congress seldom passed his proposals to their fullest degree, but his attitude toward these beliefs did not change. He believed strongly in medicare, Federal aid to education, and civil rights—no matter what the political pressure. If we would only study the issues, decide our stand and then live by our decisions, the spirit of our President will live on.

Most of all, he was American: enthusiastic, friendly, courteous, physically, mentally, and spiritually fit. He was not infallible, but no human is. In fact, there was nothing in his spirit that we cannot have. Each one of us can take his admirable traits and let them live in America. Don't let our President die.

### AMERICA'S LOSS

(By Christine Olson)

The day dawned ominous and rainy
And half of it passed away.
Crowds lined the streets;
The air was charged with excitement;
People waited to see their President.
Flags snapped in the breeze,
And down the street a band
Struck up a spirited march.
As if in respect to the guest of honor,
The clouds rolled back
And sunshine illuminated the street.
Then, there he was before us:
Our President,
Young, laughing, waving to the people.
Suddenly from nowhere a shot split the air.
Another and another,
And the scene was changed to chaos.

It is another city, another day.
Crowds line Pennsylvania Avenue
Waiting for their President.
Down the street muffled drums
Mark off a hundred paces each minute.
Then, there he is before us;
The man who was our President,
Silent forever in the embrace of death.
Seven white horses draw the caisson
On which the flag-draped casket lays.
Now it is past and gone—
And so is a great man.

Turn, my friend, turn, for this is not the end.
The country marches on; the office is not
void.
Pray now, my friend, for this great land,
And for the man who leads it forward.

---

[From the Salem (S. Dak.) Special, Nov. 28, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY—35TH PRESIDENT

This community, this Nation, and this world literally stopped on Monday, November 25, 1963, to pay homage and honor to a great American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, who lost his life in the service of his country.

Perhaps never in all of history have so many words been spoken, so many lines written, so many prayers been said for one human being. It almost seems futile, and yet so compelling, to add any more to what we have already seen and read and heard and said.

John F. Kennedy lost his life on Friday, November 22, 1963, at the hands of an assassin's bullet. While he has now departed from the scene of this earth, his memory and his ideals and principles will live with us through our lives and with the lives of our future generations. For truly, this outstanding young man, who gave all he had for his country, will be recorded as a great American and great world leader for generations to come.

Your publisher and his family feel, as perhaps every American and world citizen does at this time, a very personal loss and very deep grief, both for the family of this outstanding man, but also for themselves and for all the people of the world.

For us, he was part of our generation. He was young, vital, religious, compassionate, understanding, firm, determined, anxious, patient, sincere, and possessed a deep feeling for the needs of all the people, not only of this country, but he sensed the need for his leadership and guidance in the world.

He was a husband and father of two lovely children. He knew the trials and tribulations of both of these responsibilities—as husband and father. He was real, earnest, honest, and dedicated. And yet, along with all these attributes were his youth and vigor.

He set an example which many of us, of his generation, admired and followed. And yet, the old and the wise, the rich and the poor, the black and the white, all revered him and gave him a special place in their walks of life and in their hearts.

We are grieved at his passing. But, as so many people have said, we are so fortunate to have lived with him and to have worked for him and to have believed in him. And as General MacArthur said, with his passing we have all lost a little of ourselves.

However, the events since that black Friday have proven to all Americans and all world citizens that ours is truly a great heritage. For even with the dreadful passing of our leader, our affairs of state remain stable, secure, and in good hands. For this is our democracy. Now President Lyndon B. Johnson is at the helm of the ship of state. As he said in his first remarks when returning to Washington, "I'll do the best I can, that's all I can do, with your help and with God's." With this sincerity and affirmation, we'll continue in our great American tradition, as a nation, strong and free.

President John F. Kennedy, in his passing, left every American a legacy which we are obligated to remember, repeat, and follow. He gave us this legacy in his inaugural address, in January 1961, when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

John F. Kennedy paid the supreme sacrifice for his country. From his example and actions, our work is put before us, to do the affairs of our lives as he did his. We certainly must always strive for that goal, just as he died for it.

---

[From the Lemmon (S. Dak.) Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

### UNITED WE STAND—IN SORROW AND IN SHAME

(By F. M. Satter)

With reverberations of the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy echoing around the world, Americans—still reeling in disbelief—are attempting to regroup themselves to meet the challenges of a country which has lost its Commander in Chief.

It is indeed fitting that we should ponder this ugly act of coldblooded murder in all its perspectives. It is also proper that we should attempt to mentally probe the philosophical elements which bred, impregnated, and gave birth to the type of hatred which possessed this American-born citizen to commit such a brutal act of violence.

John F. Kennedy, as dynamic a personality to ever assume the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency, was a man who truly loved America. Even his most ardent political opponents respected the young President's dedication to the causes of freedom and his efforts to build a stronger United States. Time and time again throughout J. F. K.'s career as a naval commander and later as a statesman he openly demonstrated his willingness to give everything—even his life, if necessary—to protect America from the poisons of hatred, violence, and dictatorial factions which constantly threaten our shores.

As it came to pass it was, in fact, his life that the mysterious facets of fate decreed he lay down in the service of his country. Not in the heat of battle however, where blood is spilled and the demands of courage are momentous, but on a seemingly placid freeway in Dallas, Tex., where he was concluding a triumphant motorcade sweep through the city proper.

The bullet that winged its way to its mark and left President Kennedy bleeding and mortally wounded in the arms of his wife profoundly spelled out the uncivilized results of mankind's perpetration of extremism and racial indifference.

When will we learn that to wantonly abuse our precious freedom of speech is just as grave a crime against humanity as to deny a man the right to speak?

Let it be known, and may the hatred and bloodshed of those fateful November days in Dallas ever remind us, that the inadequacies of man's tempers are not only confined to unfounded dislike, disrespect, or harmless words. On the contrary, idle and groundless accusations against top level Government leaders, linking them to all sorts of traitorous deeds, can only lend to sway sick minds into action.

Not long ago an eastern publication reported the whole Kennedy family should be hung. The following day the media apologized and said it meant it only in jest. But who knows what terrible repercussions those words in jest might have had on some disturbed mind.

This great country of ours, with all its freedoms and opportunities, does in fact have one poignant weakness.

That being the trait of loose-lipped politicians, editors, and citizens in general to literally talk an innocent, dedicated statesman into the crosshairs of some fanatic sniper's rifle scope.

There was nothing partisan about the deadly bullet which felled J. F. K. and silenced forever the lips of a great American. Under similar foreign and domestic tensions it could have happened to any of his predecessors. The venom of hate which conquers and consumes men's minds is indeed one of the great pities of life. Ofttimes these poor misguided souls, perhaps tormented by experiences known only to themselves, are prompted to commit shocking, heinous crimes because of some careless utterance made by someone in anger.

It is therefore particularly important that we as Americans make a self-examination of our own hearts and ultimately cast out these prejudices and petty emotions.

And finally, let us pray to God that this tragic murder of our President will teach us the true meaning of human dignity. We might use the theme of President Kennedy's Dallas speech if he had lived to deliver it, when he said in part: words alone are not enough to win victories over injustice; we must say those words and then act with dispatch.

We must, as a nation, accept the moral responsibilities which our late President has placed upon our shoulders. Then, and only then, will his tragic death lose some of its sting and the indignation and shame it has brought with it.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead from an assassin's bullet. Let us now then unite behind his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and work unselfishly as a massive team to rebuild the decayed pillars of morality, justice, and decency which have somehow slipped away from our proud heritage.

---

[From the Arlington (S. Dak.) Sun]

### TRAGEDY STRIKES THE WORLD

(By Bonnie Bennett, student at Arlington High School)

The flag is flying at half mast. Why? Because our President, John F. Kennedy, has been assassinated. Usually sitting here in my study hall desk, I can't see the flag. Now as I look at it and know the reason it is not flying at the top of the pole, I realize the tragedy of this event.

Looking first at our country, it has lost a powerful leader. He held the respect of persons all over the world. The New Frontier, "Ich bin ein Berliner," and "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country," are but a few of the principles which have been left to our country by the former President.

As I write of Mr. Kennedy, I think of this: "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their laborours; and their works do follow them" (Revelations 14:13).

---

[From the Tyndall (S. Dak.) Tribune & Register]

A chapter should now be added to J.F.K.'s famous book, "Profiles in Courage," recording the story of himself—one of the most courageous of them all.

And speaking of the President's public utterances, one that he never had the opportunity to actually voice, was the one he had written for delivery in Dallas the afternoon that he was shot. In that speech, the President had written, in part:

"In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Their voices are inevitable."

Thus did the President bring the facts of life to a section of our Nation which had reportedly turned against him because of his determination that all Americans, no matter what color or what creed, no matter whether rich or poor, would be treated as equals under the Constitution.

---

[From the Freeman (S. Dak.) Courier]

(By Glenn Gering)

The events of the past week jolted us out of our common tendency to think that things will be tomorrow as they are today. It is natural to expect to have another chance at life another day. We assume that our family, our friends, our associates will be there the same as they are today. This is a comfortable assumption. It gives us an excuse to put off doing the things we ought to do. We depend on having another chance tomorrow, so we leave a word of encouragement, unspoken; our appreciation, unexpressed; a deed of kindness, undone; an opportunity to teach, unused; a task, unfinished. We ought to be most grateful for every day we get another chance. For some the opportunity has been lost forever. Some day the opportunity will also be lost to you and me.

---

[From the Clark County (S. Dak.) Courier]

But his death has even a greater meaning to the people of the United States and the world. Perhaps never before has there been such a uniting of people as in the past few days. Protestants, Catholics, and Jews have held special services, and churches have been packed and overflowing. Republicans and Democrats have forgotten their differences during this time of crisis. People have become more aware of the loyalty they owe the Government. At a special service in Clark, people stood just a bit straighter and were giving more thought to their democracy as the national anthem was played.

Yes, John F. Kennedy leaves unfinished business, but he also leaves a heritage. He followed a path that he hoped would bring peace among nations, and his hope was for a strong democracy. These are among the unfinished duties, and it becomes the job of all of us to work for this accomplishment.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is a sad moment indeed for us today to gather our thoughts to pay homage to a man who was once one of us and then became a leader of the Nation and, indeed, of free men throughout the world.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of true greatness, whose passing has left us numb with disbelief and horror. In a sense we are now struggling to live with the day-to-day reality of his absence. The Nation goes on, diminished, yet unchanged. Where he was the pilot, he is now the inspiration and example; and those now entrusted with the national destiny have clear and lasting guideposts set by this great man.

We may draw strength from the fact that John Kennedy has driven these guideposts firmly and wisely, so that we have provided for us and the free world, through his foresight, new purpose and direction to our lives for years to come.

I will always count it among my real honors and privileges that I was a colleague and friend of John Kennedy. It is difficult to add to the deeply felt eulogies offered by the many friends of this remarkable man. He was a man of many talents, many interests, a man of deep feelings and strongly held convictions. He was the acme of all the values that our civilization holds dear.

Rather than try to add further words on his greatness, I suggest that his sacrifice is a call to all of us to find new courage, new hope, and new conviction to carry on the job—perpetually unfinished—of maintaining liberty throughout the world.

We may take hope from two conspicuous facts which emerge in the wake of our loss. One is in mankind around the world; the other is closer at home. The first has to do with the high esteem in which the world held him, and in which the peoples of the globe hold our Nation, the Nation he led.

Many times it has been stated that somehow the American image was a negative image, that our national faith was darkened by disparagement and criticism.

Whatever else our great President's passing in recent days has brought to light, foremost is the high esteem in which his countrymen, through his leadership, are held throughout the world.

This fact should halt those allegations made by some that our mission to try to serve mankind and freedom in the world was failing.

Quite in contrast, it not only was succeeding in the wake of a glory such as no modern nation in the world had ever enjoyed before, but that success was galvanized in the inspiration and example of the leader who has now gone from us.

In addition to that outward look, the passing of our President has required that we take a new, hard look at ourselves.

While the picture has not always been pleasant, I believe it leaves us with a positive note.

It has been easy to say that this tragedy is the work of a fanatic, a madman. Yet we must take another look at our public attitudes, at the outpourings of hate and hostility that have in themselves created a climate of intolerance and have produced aberrations which in themselves cannot absolve quickly the rest of us.

Regardless of what compelled this horrible act, we must move toward a better restraint of our emotions, and again pledge our allegiance to truth and tolerance and good government.

John Kennedy was a man whose life was symbolized by a dedication to truth and adjustment to reality. He did not expect the impossible, but neither were his goals diminished or his principles compromised for the sake of expediency.

We can learn from these attitudes, so that sanity may prevail in a world now capable of self-destruction.

President Kennedy's "pursuit of excellance," as he often called it, has enabled us to mobilize the forces of good in our land. Above all, it is time to call a halt to the reckless downgrading of the Government of the United States and of its leaders. Without any question, the activities of some groups in our land have fostered a massive climate of disrespect for democratic government and processes. Reckless assaults on public officials, whatever the intentions may have been, bring to the surface the kind of derelicts who perpetrate the crime that has been visited upon us.

To speak of our Federal Government as though it were an enemy power; to smear the American image by casting around it a shroud of suspicion; to poison the public mind with hate and rumors; to foster panic through planting false fears only serve to create an atmosphere which breeds lunatics and inspires fanatics. The anarchy of irresponsibility can destroy a free society.

Our friend and leader, John Kennedy, new sleeps the deep sleep of history. I have no doubt that that same history will accord to him the respect and honor and eternal greatness that are his due. Even though this tragedy has brought us to the black midnight of sorrow and despair, it also augurs the approach of sunrise, of a dawn that permits us to lift our heads and renew our resolution that this great and noble man may now guide us to the new tomorrow in which he so firmly believed, and which inspired his every act. We must find, in his example, new courage to continue his work, to support his successor, to live his ideals, and to cherish his memory.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks about our late beloved President by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues today on this sad occasion in memory of John F. Kennedy.

Words are inadequate tools to express the outrage and despair we all felt when President Kennedy was struck down on November 22.

We have lost one of the greatest leaders of our time. John F. Kennedy had many gifts. His presence in a room filled it with more life and gave it more wit, intellect, and charm. His presence in the political world made many things possible. It made possible a greater chance for international peace. It made possible a greater chance of irradicating poverty. It made possible a greater chance of conquering the catastrophic diseases.

When we think of the contribution to humanity that John Kennedy was destined to make in the years ahead, the tragedy of his untimely death is incalculably compounded.

My deepest sympathies go to Jack Kennedy's Jacqueline and their two children, and to his parents, sisters, and brothers.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Mr. President, although they were separated by a century in point of time, yet there were parallels, and striking ones, between John Kennedy and Abraham Lincoln. President Kennedy brought to the White House many of the qualities of leadership held by Lincoln. He had a full sense of the dignity of his office, he had the balance and perspective of history, he had a natural taste that guided his every action; and the vision that gave purpose and direction to his stewardship was tempered with shrewd realism and honest evaluation. He worked for the possible in the direction always of the ideal. "Westward look, the land lies bright."

John Kennedy was unflinching and honest, "with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right," said Lincoln. Kennedy was a man of courage, with courage the greater because he understood the implications of his acts and because he understood that the President must act sometimes when the full implications, the end results of his acts, cannot be foreseen. The President, after all, is human, the information supplied to him is fallible, and yet the Constitution requires that he act, that he decide, that he direct and lead the country. As he goes, so the well-being of the country follows.

This great responsibility he sought; he understood the Presidency and he sought it. John Kennedy was the first of his generation and his century to hold the office. With his inauguration the course of the United States was given over to new and vigorous hands. The wheel was seized gladly with new enthusiasm, confidence, and courage.

And, again, this great and terrible office has taken its toll.

Kennedy's Presidency was shaped by his life. Born into a family of great wealth with greater dedication to public service, he was raised to seek responsibility happily, to give to it the best that he was able. His origins and his faith gave him the character and the strength he needed.

His career was shaped by four great lessons which served him every day he was in the White House. He was in England, as a young man, to see the fateful awakening of that country from its long slumber of appeasement. The Prime Ministries of Baldwin and Chamberlain taught many people many things, but none could have learned more than did John Kennedy. The story of those years of the locust is found in that remarkable book, "While England Slept," a book as useful and instructive now as ever it was, made more significant by the fact that it was written by a college boy who was to become our President. That Munich was avoided in Cuba may have been because the President knew firsthand the awful price which Munichs command.

The courage, the daring, the loyalty, the hard perseverance in the face of adversity were fired in the South Pacific during World War II. Had John Kennedy never become President the story of his command of PT-109 would still and always be a part of the record of American heroism. He did become President, and he was served in that lonely office during the long agony of the missile crisis by his wartime experience.

After the war, as a young Senator from Massachusetts, married to a beautiful and charming girl, with the promise of everything before him, he entered a third testing. His wartime back injury flared; he was forced to spend many months on his back in a body cast. His spine was fused, a most difficult and painful operation, and he was close to death several times during his illness. This experience and the pain which was almost always with him thereafter gave him the clarity and perspective that can come from a close acquaintance with final things.

The final lessons came with the campaign for the Presidency itself. No man comes through that unchanged. In 1958 Kennedy was not well known nationally; at his death in 1963 he was grieved around the world as perhaps no man in this century has been mourned. In 1958 the people did not know him; in 1963 he was theirs. These ties with the people were made during the campaign for the Presidency. He gave to the campaign the best his intellect and body were capable of. The people responded as they always do to honesty, intelligence, and leadership. He responded to them. They gave him the personal support which sustains a man in the remoteness of decisionmaking in this nuclear age.

The character of John Kennedy, shaped by these four trials, was ready for the Presidency. In the 2 years, 10 months he held office, in this short time, he framed the principles and the policies which will give direction to our Nation for many years to come. During the thousand days of the Kennedy administration, it was easy enough to criticize, to complain that the problems although faced were not solved, that the legislative program although proposed was not enacted, that the grand design although laid out was not yet constructed. All true. The people and the Congress were not easily convinced of the rightness of his course; the President was forced to convince and cajole, to call and to plead.

It is perhaps central to the tragedy of his early death that he was a leader not yet truly followed, a prophet not yet fully honored. The Nation and the world regret they had not listened more and followed.

And yet, it is impressive how much John Kennedy managed to achieve in this thousand days: directions were changed, corners were turned and there is now going back: the Alianza Para el Progreso, the Declaration of Interdependence, the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations and the new trade act, efforts for tax revision and reform, a space effort second to none, and the all-out, flat-out determination to achieve, at last, full civil rights for all our citizens. His two greatest personal triumphs have literally changed the course of history, and for this the world will long have cause to remember John Kennedy: the Cuban missile crisis and the test ban treaty.

Ultimately what John Kennedy gave to his country is greater than diplomatic or legislative victories. The English political scientist, Walter Bagehot, once said that a nation must choose its head of state with great care for the personality and character of the leader will become the example of the country. The country in time will take on the attributes of its leader. This is Kennedy's legacy to us. By his example in these short years the strength and character of our Nation have been improved.

We are the better for having been exposed to the man. He refused to be sentimental. He maintained always the dignity of great power. He would not duck, he would not flinch. He sought responsibility joyfully. His idealism was tempered with a cool view of the possible and the perspective of history. His taste, enthusiasm, optimism, balance, courage, and vigor cannot soon be forgotten by a nation that drew so freely upon them.

Kennedy was indeed our Arthur and he made us, for a short moment, Camelot.

**Mr. MOSS.** Mr. President, few events in the history of our Nation have so shaken, and then so united, our people as the tragic death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In the black moment when he was felled by an assassin's bullet, each of us lost a little of ourselves.

I know that I also lost a great and good friend whom I intensely admired, not only for his gift of leadership, but also because he was a fine, warm, human being.

I cherish now each contact I had with him, first as a colleague here in the Senate, and then as a Chief Executive who welcomed me again and again to the White House. I watched him gain in maturity and assurance, and saw in him the stuff of which the world's greatest leaders are made.

The people saw this in him too, and he became the embodiment of their ideals. Even those who did not always agree with him recognized in him an apostle for the equality and dignity of men and a leader of good will, dedicated to the cause of peace.

He seemed never to have any private, selfish motives in what he did, but to be interested only in what would advance the purposes of the Nation. There were no vindictive or mean motives behind any move he made. He was motivated by the question: "What is in the best interest of America?"

It has been said that he was the most "civilized" of our Presidents since Thomas Jefferson, and I think this is the way he will go down in history.

Now that he is gone, I find comfort in the assurance that John Kennedy enjoyed being President of these United States. I am confident that though he found the burdens of the Presidency more onerous than he had anticipated, he also found the past 3 years during which he carried these burdens the most exhilarating and challenging of his life. He was able to use his sharp and absorptive mind, his grace, his vigor, his forceful eloquence, and his wit and charm to best advantage—and he used them lavishly. On the day when he was shot, he stood at the pinnacle of life, in full realization of his great powers, and it is one of the tragedies of our times that he was not allowed to complete fully his destiny.

I find particular comfort in the warm reception which my State of Utah gave President Kennedy about 2 months before he died, and his evident relish of it. I have never seen anyone else so completely conquer a State and so thoroughly take over the minds and hearts of thousands of people in it. One could almost feel the opposition melt under the force of his personality and the brilliance of his mind. He was surrounded by eager, enthusiastic crowds, from the moment he stepped off the plane that September afternoon, until he left, the next morning. His good humor, his dignity, and his warm friendliness never left him, even though he was jostled and pushed, as he stretched his arm again and again to shake the last hand. He drew the largest crowd ever gathered at one time in Utah, and there was not a single hostile sign or outburst.

He spoke that night, in the Mormon Tabernacle, to a crowd which filled that historic structure, and flowed out into the temple grounds and the streets around, and grouped themselves before every television screen in our State. He never spoke with more persuasiveness or wisdom. I felt that he made one of his finest speeches on foreign policy, and the crowd he held spellbound appreciated the tribute he paid to them by discussing with them our Nation's most serious problems.

The rapport between President Kennedy and the people of Utah was nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the experience of the Tabernacle choir. When the choir rose in back of the podium, to sing for their distinguished guest, no one was quite prepared for the brilliance of their performance. In their finale—"The Battle Hymn of the Republic,"—the choir seemed to sing as it had never sung before. Everyone was caught up in the glory of that singing. The President was obviously deeply touched, and rose to acclaim them. He was not satisfied with clapping his appreciation in the usual manner, but turned again and again to continue to applaud and to bow his thanks to the choir. A common response—love of great music well performed—seemed to bind the President at that moment to those who had sung so magnificently to him.

The following morning, President Kennedy was the breakfast guest of Latter-day Saints Church President and Mrs. David O. McKay, in their apartment. It was my privilege to be present. Again, I saw in full play, the force and magnetism of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He charmed his hosts, and they charmed him. There was a meeting of minds on some questions, and an appreciation of why there were differences of opinion on others. There were sharp exchanges of wit, and a discussion filled with philosophy and fact. When President Kennedy departed, he left behind an indelible impression of brilliance, wit, sincerity, ability, independence, and strength.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy got only 45 percent of the votes in my State when he ran for the Presidency in 1960. There were many who were chilly to the intense young man from New England who dressed and talked with such understated elegance and who seemed so far removed from our open Western ways. But after his 3 years as our President, and especially after his visit to Utah 2 months ago, it was a different story. I am convinced that Utah would have voted overwhelmingly for him in 1964.

In Utah, as throughout the Nation, there was an outpouring of grief when his death was announced. After the first shock passed, stunned people in all walks of life began to try to put their grief in words. Some used the most eloquent of language, and others the most simple; but all of it came from the heart.

I wish to place at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some examples of the editorials which were printed, the resolutions passed, the telegrams sent, and the letters written in the State of Utah on the death of President Kennedy.

John F. Kennedy lived a tough life of controversy. He stood with fortitude for the things in which he believed. He told us many times that the fight would last beyond his lifetime. How prophetic were those words. The best way we can honor him now is to get down to work and consider the cornerstone of his legislative policy—the equal rights bill and the tax bill. I think he would want us to do this beyond anything else.

But we must do more than that; we must make this country stronger and freer than it was when John Kennedy last knew it. We must expunge from our national life the bitterness and distortions which seemed to have engulfed us, and must rededicate ourselves to the values of decency and rationality for which President Kennedy stood and for which he gave his life. Only then will he not have died in vain.

There being no objection, the editorials, resolutions, telegrams, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Nov. 23, 1963]

### OUR NATION'S TRAGIC LOSS

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy—a senseless, stupid, revolting act—has left the Nation deeply shocked and saddened beyond the power of words to express.

It is still hard to believe that it actually happened, still harder to believe we won't wake up tomorrow and hear his familiar voice, feel his customary influence in so many ways we have come to take for granted.

It is also difficult to believe that in this era and, more particularly, in this great country there still exist a few people so deranged, who take their prejudices so seriously that they would stain their souls with the blood of murder in an insane attempt to achieve their own ends.

The death of our Chief Executive can be serious for our Nation. But now it is appropriate to remember that above and beyond all temporal leaders, we are a God-fearing people and our Nation is ruled over by one Supreme Being. As long as we adhere religiously to His commandments, all will be well with us.

Universally, our sympathy goes out to the late President's charming wife and attractive children, to his bereaved parents and friends for their great loss.

Our sympathy is also extended to the Nation and, in fact, to the entire world—for the death of the man who, by virtue of his position as leader of this country, was a prime champion of freedom. His death is everyone's loss.

In our sadness and sense of loss, however, we must take care to put aside our former differences, which now seem so petty, and unite as never before behind the men who lead this country in these troubled times.

Lyndon B. Johnson, who succeeds from the Vice Presidency to the Presidency, is particularly deserving of our support and our prayers. The Vice Presidency characteristically has not provided a completely satisfactory schooling for the Presidency. However, under President Kennedy, Vice President Johnson was given unusual opportunities to keep abreast of problems and developments both internationally and throughout the Nation. The Vice President traveled widely throughout the world and through special committee assignments was constantly kept in close touch with domestic problems and developments. This background plus his long and varied experience in government eminently qualifies him for arduous and complex responsibilities which he now faces. Moreover, with his new, enormous responsibilities, Lyndon Johnson will grow in the office.

Other men in similar circumstances have stepped into the Presidency on a moment's notice, as he now does. And history bears testimony to the fact they have grown amazingly in mind and spirit in response to that challenge. Lyndon B. Johnson gives every evidence of being such a man. His capacity for leadership is well attested to by the vigor of his activities as majority leader in the U.S. Senate.

As to the assassin, he deserves only our pity and our scorn. Our pity for the irreparable damage he has done himself in his shedding of innocent blood. Our scorn because, no matter how rational he may appear to be outwardly, his is a deranged mind, and he cannot even begin to realize what he has done.

No man can know, really, the full consequences of an act such as this one. The course of history seems bound to change because of it, to be sure. But who can say how or in what direction?

The man who committed this crime against the conscience of the world put his individual will above the will of the majority that elected John F. Kennedy as President of the United States. In the process he put himself above both law and morality, which no man can do with impunity.

The deed he committed, moreover, violates some of the most sacred principles which have made America great. It violates the fundamental truth that in a democracy violence is not only repugnant but also unnecessary because our form of government provides morally acceptable, effective ways for expressing dissent—namely, through the courts, through petitioning legislatures, or at the ballot boxes.

In choosing "bullets rather than ballots," the assassin went against the very tenets of society that are designed to protect the rights not only of ordinary, law-abiding citizens but also the rights of those who, like himself, put themselves outside of civilized society and the law. It is a stirring testimony to the strength of this country that even though the assassin callously violated others' rights, he will be scrupulously protected.

John F. Kennedy will long be remembered for many things. He will be remembered for the fact that he became the first Catholic to be elected President of the United States, thus shattering—one hopes for all time—an ugly bias that had long dishonored our country.

He will be remembered as the youngest man to be elected to the Presidency.

He will be remembered for certain governmental achievements—such as winning adoption of a Trade Expansion Act that is a landmark in the long struggle to lower trade barriers between nations and bring men closer together as the brothers that they are. Also, for working out a nuclear test ban treaty which, if observed scrupulously by all, could release mankind from the fear of the nuclear shadow that has been hanging over it.

He will be remembered fighting for freedom whenever and wherever it needed a champion—whether at home on behalf of minorities being deprived of rights lawfully theirs, or abroad on behalf of peoples who have been deprived of liberty for so long they have forgotten its joys.

He was kind. He was decent. The Nation and the world owe him a lasting debt.

His life was one of unremitting service to his country—from his days as the young commander of a PT boat in the Pacific during World War II through his days as a freshman Congressman to the climax of a remarkable career that took him to the highest position and highest honor this Nation has in its power to bestow upon a man.

Part of the tragedy is that he had more to offer his country by way of future service. Even after his duties in the White House, because of his youth he would still have had years of service ahead of him as a possible adviser on national affairs and as an international ambassador of good will.

Beyond that, John F. Kennedy will be remembered with fondness not because of what he was as an elected official but because of what he was as a person. He made friends readily. Even those who disagreed with his views almost invariably liked him as a man.

Now he is gone. And now it can be said of John F. Kennedy, as it was of Abraham Lincoln when he, too, was felled by an assassin's bullet: "Now he belongs to the ages."

---

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Nov. 23, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–63

America is swept today by a grief that cuts across all lines of race or faith or politics—a grief that struggles without success to express itself in words. Shock, dismay, bewilderment, anger—these and other emotions stand in the way.

John F. Kennedy was a vital, courageous young man. He was the first President of the United States to be born in the 20th century. He brought to the White House the spirit of youth. He set his sights on a better future.

And then in a matter of minutes he is dead, struck down without warning by the bullets of a dastardly assassin.

What was the reason? Who knows? Perhaps there was no reason at all. Hatred knows no rules; fanaticism creates its own warped logic.

This murder was carefully plotted. The man who pulled the trigger did not act on impulse. We hope the assassin will be dealt with as he deserves. We hope that those who abetted or inspired him do not escape. If there was a nest where the crime was hatched, then trace it down. These are people bereft of honor and principle.

Vengeance? No. Stern justice? Yes. This is a land of law.

President Kennedy was murdered in Dallas. Gov. John Connally of Texas, riding in the same car, was shot down. Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, two cars to the rear, escaped. Now he is President Johnson, heir to the many problems of John F. Kennedy.

Dallas, in recent months, has had unhappy experience with fanaticism and violence. National figures were harassed and bodily attacked by those who did not agree with them. But these incidents were no more than ripples. The worst was still to come—the death of the Nation's President.

Yet only by chance did this horrible crime blacken the name of Dallas. It could have happened almost anywhere. President Kennedy, like every head of state, walked with death as a constant companion. And like Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley before him, he was struck down without warning.

How will history assess the career of John F. Kennedy? History will take its time in answering. It is not for us, so close to the events, to attempt a verdict.

We can testify, however, to his courage, his ideals, his aspirations, his deep love of humanity. He fought valiantly in a great war. As President he devoted himself to the cause of peace. He sought with equal devotion to give civil rights true meaning and full scope.

It was a magnificent vision, though he was not spared to turn vision into reality.

Mr. Kennedy had been in office a few months less than 3 years. He had had one historic failure—the Bay of Pigs invasion—and one historic success—the Cuban missile confrontation with Khrushchev. But his legislative program was bogged down in a lethargic Congress. "Wait till next year" was the word on civil rights and the tax cut. And next year, the Presidency is at stake in a national election.

The political pundits were already reading the trends. Now everything is changed. There is a new President in the White House and Lyndon B. Johnson is his own man.

But matters political cannot distract us at a time of national tragedy. Loss overwhelms us. We bow our heads in grief.

John F. Kennedy was the youngest man ever elected President. His beautiful gracious wife was with him when an assassin's bullets cut him down. He leaves two young children. The White House will miss their laughter.

We should pray for the President for his widow, for his family.

We should pray for the state of the Nation.

We should pray for President Johnson, on whose shoulders rest burdens indescribable and unimaginable.

God rest the soul of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

---

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Nov. 23, 1963]

### WORLD MOURNS JOHN F. KENNEDY

All the world joined today in mourning the brutal assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

Millions were stunned by what Adlai Stevenson appropriately termed the "tragedy of a deed that is beyond instant comprehension."

All felt what Dwight D. Eisenhower called "a sense of shock and dismay over this despicable act."

President David O. McKay, of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, spoke not only for his 2 million followers but for men and women all over the the U.S.A. when he said:

"The entire Nation feels a sense of humiliation that such a tragedy could come to a President of the United States."

As the news of President Kennedy's death in a Dallas hospital flashed around the globe, the question "Why?" was repeated from thousands of lips.

The only man who could answer the question was the cowardly assassin who hid in a Dallas building until the young President, smiling and waving, came by in a parade—then pulled the trigger of his rifle.

A communism-embracing chairman of the Dallas Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Lee H. Oswald, 24, is being held as the prime suspect in the murder. But if he did kill the President, he has not yet admitted it.

To Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, her two children, and the late President's parents, brothers and sisters, we join in extending sympathies that their beloved "J.F.K." should be cut down in the prime of life and at the zenith of his career.

To Lyndon B. Johnson, catapulted into the White House as the 36th President of the United States, our best wishes for success in keeping the Nation—and the world—on an even keel during these perilous, bewildering times.

As he returned to Washington as President, Mr. Johnson promised "I will do my best * * * I ask for your help, and God's."

The country, in this hour of deepest grief, must provide the new Chief Executive with its help.

---

[From the Provo (Utah) Daily Herald, Dec. 2, 1963]

### MARTYR TO CAUSE OF BETTER SPIRIT

Many Americans already are saying John Fitzgerald Kennedy is our martyred President. But they differ widely on the nature of his martyrdom.

Even historians may one day define our late President as a martyr and perhaps find many reasons for doing so.

If it is to be thus, we may fairly hope they conclude that, among other things, he was martyred to the cause of a better American spirit. That spirit today is sadly flawed.

The day Kennedy was assassinated, a school teacher made the announcement to her class of 10-year-olds. The children did not exclaim in shocking disbelief. They applauded his death.

It matters not what city and region that school is in. It could have happened in a number of areas.

That it occurred at all is a measure of the strain on the American spirit in 1963.

Many people in this Nation are saying that, as a result of John Kennedy's death, we must have done with hating, with spewing out poison, with turning every controversy into mental civil war.

Whole cities are being nearly engulfed by these poisons. On some subjects and in some places, the legitimate discussion which marks a viable democracy is virtually impossible. Argument is warped out of all resemblance to reality.

All of this is utterly foreign to the true spirit of America. This democracy lives by the free choices its people make. How can they make them without discussion of alternatives? How can democracy breathe soundly if the man who raises an alternative is branded Communist or Fascist?

A nation that has no room for choices cannot have a democracy. Its essence is discussion, negotiation, compromise.

But in the lexicon of the ill in spirit, negotiation and compromise are evil words. They are seen as devices for the yielding of principle, if not the yielding to a foreign power.

In the internal conflicts which flow from this rigid outlook, political adversaries are labeled "foreign agents" or, at the very least, dupes who unwittingly serve an enemy cause.

These terrible distortions corrode American democracy at its vital core. It is a free-ranging system. It is not meant to be constricted by argument founded on the "you're either for us or against us" philosophic theme.

Patience is beginning to run thin in this country with the haters, the distorters, the cheap dispensers of "enemy" labels. None has anything to do with the real America.

If John Fitzgerald Kennedy's death can etch that truth deeply in the now greatly troubled American conscience, then perhaps we shall never have to hear again of schoolchildren applauding the death of a President.

[From the Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune, Nov. 24, 1963]

### GRIEF'S HEAVY HAND

Grief has laid its heavy hand upon Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy. First, the death of a newborn son; now, only a few weeks later, the assassination of her husband, the President of the United States.

She is so young and beautiful, so fragile. Mrs. Kennedy accepted tragedy with the resoluteness of a Spartan woman. Her husband, mortally wounded, slumped beside her in the car in Dallas. She rode with him to the hospital. She made the sad journey back to Washington. She bore the burden of sorrow in silence and dignity.

Our hearts go out to her, though words will not heal her woe. She is solaced by her faith in a life beyond the grave and she is not alone. There are the children. There are the memories. And time is the great healer.

---

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.,
*December 4, 1963.*

Senator FRANK E. MOSS,
*Washington, D.C.:*

We, the Model Congress of Highland High School, in expressing our deepest sympathy at the passing of President Kennedy, do hereby pledge our loyalty and support to those ideals for which he stood.

JACK DOBSON,
*President.*

---

TRINITY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
*Ogden, Utah, December 2, 1963.*

In behalf of the Presbytery of Utah, which represents all of the United Presbyterian Churches in the State of Utah, we extend our heartfelt condolence and sympathy to the bereaved family of the late President Kennedy.

The bullet that struck down President Kennedy has inspired already a deluge of unprecedented tributes across both the Nation and the world, seldom, if ever, equaled at any other time since the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

The tragic manner of President Kennedy's death helps to account for the unprecedented tributes in synagogue and church, but does not wholly explain it. As citizens of our beloved Nation we all share in the guilt of the President's death. We have yet to learn to disagree without being disagreeable. We have yet to learn to disagree but resolve to love. We have yet to learn that the innumerable apostles of discord ascend higher and higher on the flaming wings of so-called forums upholding either the radical far right or the radical far left. This is the price we pay, however, for our precious freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and other priceless freedoms.

So long as love and forgiveness exist among us, we may exclaim with Paul: "I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."

C. SUMPTER LOGAN,
*Moderator,*
*Presbytery of Utah.*

---

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
*November 25, 1963.*

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MOSS: On this day of national mourning I feel the desire to take a few minutes to write to you. There are two thoughts which I wish to express. First, my deep personal grief over the death of President John F. Kennedy. Not only do I concur in the sentiments expressed in innumerable articles and eulogies across the country, but I also feel a great personal loss. Although I came to this country early in 1952 during the Truman administration, and received my naturalization papers in 1957, it was not until 1960 that I had the great privilege of voting in a presidential election. It was then, that after much searching, studying and earnest prayer, John F. Kennedy became my choice and he, in most instances, not only lived up to my expectations, but often exceeded them. The deed of that dark Friday has jolted my family and I to the depth of our souls and only the sure knowledge of a resurrection and of the working of a just God and loving Father has eased our sorrow.

Our hearts have gone out to the President's young widow, her children, and family. Today I have taken two of my six young sons, born as free Americans, to the memorial services at the tabernacle, the same building in which, as you well recall, a great man, only 8 weeks ago found friendly and kind words for a group of Americans once bitterly persecuted by their own fellow citizens because of their religion.

My second reason for writing today is to make to you a pledge. The past few days have led me to believe that America may perhaps never be quite the same. But lest I myself forget this tragic hour, let me hasten to put in writing to you, my Senator, my intentions for the future:

I, an American citizen, shall henceforth more fully endeavor to love and to pay allegiance to this my country, to honor its divinely inspired Constitution, to support its elected officials on all levels of government, to exercise my franchise in this free land, to respect the rights of all people and to extend a hand of friendship to all men, colored or white, Christian or non-Christian, to ban from my heart all impulses of hatred, to make an earnest effort to understand instead of to judge, to love instead of condemn, to live uprightly before God and men and to raise my children in this same spirit.

I realize that I could have made this pledge to myself, quietly and unobtrusively. Resolutions, if shouted from the housetops are generally shallow and vain. I felt, however, that in this instance I should share this rededication with you, my duly elected Senator, whose duty it is to help bear the burden of government and whose mandate includes me as a part. Having expressed myself thusly, that burden may not feel quite as heavy to you and to me, and the hour of sacrifice of a great American takes on a new meaning.

Sincerely yours,

HORST A. RESCHKE.

---

### A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY FROM A SCHOOLGIRL

Today we buried the man who will probably go down in history as the most famous, the most wonderful, and the most spirited President of the United States of America.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, fought for what he knew was right. To the Negroes, he was a symbol of equal rights. To the Nation he was a defender of the Constitution. To the world he was a symbol of peace.

The following words are taken from President Kennedy's inaugural address. He will be most famous for them because they are so spirit-lifting and so freedom-fighting: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." These words made the whole Nation feel that the man they had voted into office would be a good, strong, willing worker.

I was privileged to meet President John F. Kennedy, one clear September night. I had listened to his speech in the tabernacle in Salt Lake City, and afterward I went across the street to the Hotel Utah, in the Skyroom, where the Presidential reception was to be held. It was so crowded that when the President entered he was mobbed from all sides. The atmosphere of the crowd was a friendly one. President Kennedy didn't like orderly receiving lines. He enjoyed people flocking around him. People that night told me I was lucky to have met the President because many people didn't. He was smiling that night. When I shook his hand he grasped mine and held it tightly for that wonderful moment. As I dropped a curtsy and said "How do you do, Mr. President," I can remember the twinkle in his eyes. I will treasure this moment forever.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a close family man. He was a wonderful father to his two children, Caroline and John, Jr. He and his little son spent many happy moments together. One of the first press conferences President Kennedy had, ended up in laughter because Caroline came out in her pajamas and her mommy's high heels.

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy will always be remembered for his courage and willing spirit in the difficult job of being the President of the United States of America.

ARDIS BEYERS.

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

---

### TED CANNON'S SCENE TODAY

The tragic events of last weekend had not yet transpired when Mrs. Beatrice Bennett, 750 Bryan Avenue, mailed us the following. Her note explains that she became a citizen only a year ago, and that she was moved to these lines as she sat in the Tabernacle on the occasion of President Kennedy's recent visit:

"Tonight I saw the President,
The Chief of all our land.
I didn't get to speak to him,
Or even touch his hand.
But from the crowd I saw him smile,
I saw him standing near,
My heart was filled with pride and joy,
And in my eye, a tear.

"Tonight I saw the President,
This man of strength and powers
I watched him as the Choir sang
Of this fair land of ours
America! America!
Oh, how my heart did ring!
On all this land so wonderful
What joy this man did bring!

"Tonight I saw the President
And all my whole life through
It's something I can dream about
And tell my kinsmen, too.
I love this land so beautiful,
It stands for all that's true.
I'm glad that for our President
We chose a man like you."

---

### THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, 1963

The great plane came from Washington,
Then returned the President like a hymn
Of light to the quietness of Arlington,
Where dark repose must come and cherish him.

Out of the drift of air the great plane came,
Glinting the chief power in the whitening stream,
Bearing the letters of his country's name
To the city where in death he kept his dream.

The sunlight gleamed among the thronging streets
Where he turned and passed to find a sudden way,
The pitching storm of sorrow, the floating sheets
That silenced him and wrapt him from his day.

For once he heard the silver voice that came
Above the solemn air of his felicity
When, before the Capitol and certain fame,
He kept the burden of humility.

We start, and hear in the hum of coursing time
What time will not disclose, except bristling
And secret in a rifle's clipping mine
Of death, the spurt and shot, the bullet whistling.

Darkness, and all is gone, against the seat,
Cradled there. The wild shock, waving
Away, stills us as if yesterday were neat
And prim a thousand years ago, craving

To be born again and live again a better way.
We cannot hold it in 1 waning hour,
And it is gone, slipping from us where he lay
Dying, in the envy of time, the silent tower.

Then death. And now to Arlington he comes,
From plane and city and from the sorrow dim
And still that brought him home to muffled drums
And to the Nation that will cherish him.

—Clinton F. Larson, Provo, Utah.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise to add my humble tribute to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Seldom have words seemed so inadequate. A reverent silence—the kind of hush which enveloped this Hill that tragic weekend—might best express our feelings.

The life of our late President and of his family will always symbolize the great traditions of a nation proud of its heritage—unwilling to permit the slow undoing of human rights at home and abroad, but willing, in the President's own words, to "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty." Our late President kept his pledge.

He bore the burdens of the Presidency with infinite good grace. He had verve, vigor, good humor, and the uncommon capacity to laugh at himself. He possessed an almost fantastic knowledge of history—and, more important, he fully understood the lessons that lie therein for all those who will but search for them. He was confident of himself, and rightly so. He was confident and morally certain that the things he believed in and the programs he espoused were right for our country and for our people.

He knew that there were no swift and simple solutions to today's complex problems, and he rightly warned us against confusing rhetoric with reality or the plausible with the possible. He was, in a very real sense, the ultimate personification of the practical idealist.

He never shrank from responsibility. He welcomed it. The energy, the faith, the devotion which he brought to this endeavor did light our country. The tributes from around the world indicate this light was seen from afar.

With dedication, courage, and sacrifice, with a good conscience his only sure reward, with history his final judge, he did go forth to lead the land we love.

The now famous admonition of the inaugural address: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country," was a challenge new to many Americans, but a way of life to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Near the close of this address, President Kennedy spoke these prophetic words:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

In that same address, he said:

> Now the trumpet summons us again.

He called on us to continue the struggle against the common enemies of mankind — tyranny, poverty, disease, and war. More than any of us, he answered that summons. With characteristic vigor, he threw himself into the fight until finally he gave his all—his life.

The sound of another trumpet echoing taps over his final resting place told us our leader had fallen. Yet the struggle to which he gave his life continues unabated. The tasks in which he asked us to join him were not finished in the first 1,000 days. They were not finished in his lifetime. They remain a challenge to every American to give more of himself to finish what we began with him.

Since the afternoon of November 25, all of us must walk in the shadow of the small, but incredibly brave 3-year-old boy who stood on the steps of St. Matthew's Cathedral and delivered that heart-wrenching last salute to one of the truly great men of our time—the 35th President of the United States—his father.

For generations, this small boy's family has served this Republic, enriched its history and all humanity. Its members have made lasting contributions to our national life.

Few families in American history have better symbolized the heritage, the traditions, the opportunities, the struggles, the courage, the achievements, and the meaning of our great country.

Our tribute, then, must be to the living as well as to the dead—particularly to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, whose rare courage helped sustain us all in that terrible time.

Few of us fully realized how this extraordinary man was strengthened by the presence at his side of a truly extraordinary young woman. Many have paid tribute to her, but my good friend and former colleague in the House of Representative Otis Pike, of New York, said what I should have wanted to say when he recently wrote:

> At a time when America should have been comforting her, she comforted America. At a time when she should have leaned on America for strength, America received strength from her. By her courage, her faith, and her fortitude she set a standard for the bereaved of all lands for all times.
>
> By every aspect of her conduct and her bearing, a single, widowed mother poured strength into all Americans, and from the vast majority of Americans, respect and love were returned.

I humbly ask Mrs. Kennedy, our colleague, Senator Ted Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, Bob Kennedy, our former Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, and the other members of his family, to allow us to join in their prayer:

> Dear God, please take care of your servant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Let us be grateful for his life. Let us recognize that the lives of all of us, of his children and of mine, have been enriched. Let us weep with his widow, salute with his son, and continue, as his family does, to serve our country through responsible leadership.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, until November 22 we thought that we would share many more days with John F. Kennedy. We thought we could continue to draw strength from his strength, wisdom from his wisdom, and inspiration from his genius. We could not know that the thousand or so days he gave to us as President were to be painfully precious because they were to be so few. He had not yet given all he had to give us, and yet he was taken from us.

Perhaps it was this that made the news so unbelievable when it came. John F. Kennedy had met many crises in his life, and always he had emerged with greater strength. He had escaped death during wartime combat. He had survived painful personal afflictions and had overcome them. He had calmed our Nation when enemies put weapons of destruction close to our shores.

Time and time again, he had helped us keep our own frailties in check, and we thought him stronger than any of us. His life, his leadership seemed to be secure to us, and yet both were taken by two bullets from an assassin's rifle.

We in this body are trying today to tell what that loss means to us. We are also trying to describe, I believe, the gifts that John Kennedy gave his fellow citizens in his lifetime.

These gifts are all that make our sadness tolerable. We must think of them.

Few of us will forget the cold Inauguration Day that began his administration. As the winds whipped about him and his audience, the new President spoke of our national mission. Man, he said, now has the power to abolish all forms of life, but this clear danger has toughened the will of those who believe that only democracy can create a world of law. The President invited every freeman to find his own way of making freedom stronger, and he spoke of sacrifice and danger. But sacrifice and danger, said our President, would make our ultimate triumph more inspiring to us and to those in nations not yet free.

John F. Kennedy accepted his own responsibility more completely than any of us. He was optimistic enough to call for a Peace Corps and an Alliance for Progress. He was determined enough to build new military strength for our Nation, and it is that strength that has led us to the beginnings of disarmament. He could not stand waste of human energies, and so he asked new programs to combat unemployment and waste of talent. He could not tolerate injustice, and so he asked for the broadest action yet taken against manmade inequalities.

Many men for many years will study the messages he sent to Congress, and we will measure our accomplishments against his requests.

Our 35th President will be remembered for what he was, as well as for what he did. We here in this Chamber have many memories of the days we spent here with him. We remember the book he wrote about six men who preceded us here.

John F. Kennedy was an authority on courage because he had his own great share of it. Each of the men he wrote about had to make decisions under great pressure, and each of them could have found reasons to take the less dangerous path. But not one of them did, and the Nation was stronger because they did not. In the White House, on many lonely occasions, John F. Kennedy made other decisions, and the world could be grateful that he was there to make them. Disciplined and compassionate, he performed the possible while he yearned for even greater accomplishment.

Mr. President, each one of us will remember John F. Kennedy in many different ways. We will remember him addressing Congress and the Nation; we will remember him at press conferences and at speaker's podiums in Washington and in city squares, in meeting rooms with chiefs of state, and on the White House property, his hand closed fast on his daughter's hand, or playing with his delighted young son.

We were interested in everything he did because we liked him as much as we respected him. And this, perhaps, is the best tribute to him.

Our loss is all the more cruel because we lived in his time. Future generations will know of our grief and they may understand it, but only we can say that we knew John Kennedy as a President and a friend. This gives us comfort as we bid him goodbye, and we need comfort now.

Mr. President, many fine editorials and articles about the late President appeared in New Jersey newspapers soon after his death. I will limit my remarks and ask unanimous consent that they be made part of the Record. I would like to draw attention to the comments about the courage of Mrs. Kennedy during her ordeal. To all that her husband gave her Nation, she has added one more magnificent memory.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Times]

### A Great Leader Is Mourned Many Ways, by Many People

(By William J. O'Donnell)

President John F. Kennedy meant many things to many people.

To the little man, he was the champion of the downtrodden.

To the oppressed, he was the knight who would unshackle their bonds.

To the youth of the Nation, he was the symbol of hope and courage.

To the statesman, he was the man of peace.

To the politician, he was the tireless fighter.

To the Communist enemy, he was the roadblock to their ambitions for conquest.

To the average American, he was a loyal husband and kindly father.

Now this man of achievement belongs to the ages. This man of peace has been destroyed by violence. This man of kindness has been taken from us by hate. This man of thoughtfulness has been slain by the unthinking. This man of loyalty has been snatched away by a traitor.

To this reporter, John F. Kennedy signified all that was alive and vibrant in this challenging world. He was a man to instill confidence. He was a man to instill courage. He was a man to instill virtue and character. He was a man.

We asked others what John F. Kennedy meant to them. This is what they said:

A U.S. Congressman, Frank Thompson, Jr.: "He was first a personal friend, but most important he was the symbol of the whole structure of our Government. To me he was all the American people."

A Jewish rabbi, S. Joshua Kohn: "The leader of this youthful dynamic country. One who looked forward to a better world and had the confidence to make this world a reality in the true religious spirit of all mankind."

A mayor of a city, Arthur J. Holland: "A personification of the confident and able leadership needed by our Nation and the world. A man who will always symbolize for youth a call to the pursuit of excellence. A great man who always thought of the little man."

A Federal Judge, Arthur S. Lane: "John F. Kennedy was a splendid young American, possessed of great courage, intelligence and devotion to his fellow men."

A Catholic priest, Msgr. John E. Grimes: "President Kennedy was an inspiration to me and a moving example of what is expected of a true American and a genuine Christian gentleman. He loved this country. He loved his fellow human beings. He dearly loved his family."

A housewife and mother, Mrs. John M. Smith of 54 Smithfield Avenue: "A good man is gone. He would have been a great President. His death is a great tragedy to me."

A president of a university, Robert F. Goheen: "John Kennedy was to me, above all, a man who combined clearsighted intelligence and steady commitment to the ideals of human dignity, freedom and justice. In the face of tangled and often highly recalcitrant circumstances, at home and abroad, he did much to uphold those ideals and to advance their realization in concrete terms."

A Negro leader, the Reverend S. Howard Woodson, Jr.: "To me President Kennedy was the herald of a new breed of political leadership. His forthright acts which strengthened the cause of human dignity, freedom and equality the world over translated beautiful political platitudes into realities. His death is a tragic testimony of the continuing existence of man's inhumanity to man."

A Republican lawyer, Irving H. Lewis: "Even though I am of different political faith, it is my unalterable conclusion that John F. Kennedy was a great man—unselfish in his ideal for the betterment of all mankind. His years of public service will make an indelible imprint on human affairs as long as man's accomplishments are recorded."

A Trenton barber, Peter J. Pulone, 809 Stuyvesant Avenue: "I looked upon him as my Commander in Chief. Whatever he said, I believed and followed it as an order."

A Protestant minister, the Reverend Allan R. Winn: "He bore the Nation's standard for truth and sincerity, for purposeful progress in all human relationships. As Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, he stood ready to commit our Nation to the defense of freedom and to my personal freedom. I greatly admired his courage and bear tribute to his integrity."

A State chairman of the Democratic Party, Thorn Lord: "To me President John F. Kennedy was the symbol of kindness and tolerance. I knew him as a man who understood the essence of the Presidency. I think of him as the light of our times. I remember him as the most generous person I have ever known. I admire him as the most tremendous driving force of the 1960's."

---

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press]

### President Kennedy

A sorrowful Nation mourns the passing of its President and senses profound shame over his assassination. We had hoped that the entire Nation had grown so civilized that political opposition and even hatred would express itself only in the ballotbox. That, indeed, is the philosophy to which the great masses of people in this aggrieved Nation subscribe. Only maniacs fail to comply.

John F. Kennedy served as President for less than 3 years, and during that brief term he fulfilled his responsibilities with devotion. Even those who quarreled with his policies recognized a sincerity and fortitude that evoked admiration. His experience in the Senate had given him valuable training for the Presidency and for the aggressive leadership that he offered in his campaign for election.

Seldom has a Chief Executive been encumbered with more burdensome responsibilities. International tensions were coupled with domestic problems to challenge his wisdom and test his courage. Only history will determine the degree of success that his administration achieved. But his contemporaries can attest to the vigor and enuthsiasm and conscientious effort that delineated his record.

The death of a President is always a national tragedy. In view of his comparative youth and the promise of future achievement, the passing of President Kennedy becomes an especially grievous loss. And the fact that an assassin's bullet should have claimed him carries the Nation's sorrow to the ultimate depth.

---

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger]

### Of Mourning and Rededication

Today has been proclaimed a day of mourning. Americans everywhere will join in a heartfelt, sorrowful tribute to the Chief Executive so ruthlessly and viciously shot down by an assassin.

Now that the initial shock has been somewhat worn away by the inexorable process of time, the terrible enormity of the crime—with all its farflung ramifications—is only beginning to dawn on the American people.

And they are realizing, too, that the deeper the tragedy the more difficult it is to truly do it justice.

The impact of the tragedy was further brought home to millions of Americans via the television sets in their living room. They saw the flag-draped casket bearing the remains of John Fitzgerald Kennedy move slowly on a horse-drawn caisson through the streets of Washington from the White House to the Capitol rotunda.

They heard the regular beat of the hushed drums—100 steps to the minute. And the mournful rhythm beat a tattoo the American people will not quickly forget. There have been few, if any, instances in history where so many people participated in a service marking so great a tragedy.

In many a living room yesterday it would have been hard to find a dry eye. The sight of Mrs. Kennedy, little Caroline at her side, bravely kneeling to kiss the casket of her husband will be etched for a long time on the minds of millions of Americans.

The loss Mrs. Kennedy suffered is, of course, a great one. But all of us also have suffered a great loss.

Mr. Kennedy served but a brief period in the White House. But it was an eventful period. Historians may be reluctant to pass final judgment at this early date. It was clear, however, since shortly after his inauguration that the Kennedy administration was to be earmarked by youth, vigor, intelligence, and determination to make a fresh attack on accumulated problems at home and abroad.

Seeing their young President in action, the American people had a growing confidence in his ability. Not everyone agreed with him. But no one—least of all John F. Kennedy—would have expected or wanted unanimity. The American Government provides room for disagreement and diversity. This is one measure of its strength.

But there is no room for hatred of the type displayed by the assassin who ended the President's life. When it comes to hatred, there is only room for hatred of injustice and violence.

In his few years in the White House, President Kennedy sought to end injustice and inequality in the Nation and violence from abroad. And millions of American people are undoubtedly better off today because of his efforts.

By proclamation, today is a day of mourning. It is also, by proclamation, a day of rededication. In their mourning, the American people should not overlook the obligation to rededicate their efforts to help make their country a better place for all its citizens—in a world secure in justice and freedom, removed from the threat of violence.

Perhaps such a utopia—of which man has dreamed for centuries—cannot be achieved on this earth. But this was the aim of the Founding Fathers of this Nation. And it was the aim of John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy's tragic death may have helped sharpen the full realization of fundamentals to which Americans are accustomed to give lipservice. Now is the time for all to rededicate themselves to giving much more than lip service to the high ideals on which this Nation was founded.

---

[From the Jewish News]

### TIME FOR REDEDICATION

The lively sense of history and national purpose which motivated our beloved President John F. Kennedy is illustrated by an anecdote of which he was fond. As he related the story, on May 19, 1780, the noontime skies over Hartford, Conn., turned from blue to gray and by midafternoon had blackened so densely that men fell on their knees and begged a final blessing before the end came. The Connecticut House of Representatives was in session. And as some men fell down in the darkened chamber and others clamored for an immediate adjournment, the speaker of the house, one Colonel Davenport, came to his feet, and he silenced the din with these words:

"The day of judgment is either approaching or it is not. If it is not, there is no cause for adjournment. If it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish, therefore, that candles may be brought."

In this spirit, and with the unerring instinct of a people profoundly dedicated to democracy, let us do as President Kennedy would have wished and stand in united support of the new administration. President Lyndon Johnson bears a heavy burden, one which was assumed under horrifyingly tragic circumstances. This above all is a time for each American to respond in the courageous Kennedy tradition, to bring candles to light the darkness, to refuse to adjourn despite the staggering loss of a great leader in the parliament of mankind.

Yet, even as we recognize how we must behave at this critical juncture, in our pain and mourning we grope almost blindly for an answer to the agonizing question: Why was he taken from us? We search as well for understanding of our own tears and we find a powerful suggestion of an answer in the perceptive words of James Reston in the New York Times:

"America wept tonight, not alone for its dead young President, but for itself. The grief was general, for somehow the worst in the Nation had prevailed over the best. The indictment extended beyond the assassin, for something in the Nation itself, some strain of madness and violence, had destroyed the highest symbol of law and order."

It is not enough merely to blame the lunatic fringe elements on the far left and far right as the bearers of this "strain of madness and violence." Out of expediency of one kind or another, too many of us have come to disregard clear-cut moral issues. The frenetic climate in which the extremist of any sort thrives has tainted an inordinately large area of our national life.

This extremism and indifference we must purge if we are to be true to those magnificent things for which President Kennedy stood. In his memory, and in the name of the sacred principles which he personified, let us rededicate ourselves to American democracy.

---

[From the Jersey Journal]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

You think all the things an editorial writer is supposed to think, the awful evil of political assassination, the terrible wantonness of it, the incomprehensible fate that lets a demented marksman obliterate a President, but you keep going back to a picture of a young, vital American, President, yes, but a family man like the fellow down the block having fun with the children, weighed down with great affairs, yes, but not so much as to miss the point of a joke and have a good laugh, holder of the most august temporal title, yes, but a man you talk with as easily as you talk to the fellow beside you in the coffee bar.

You keep thinking of when first you met him, before his nomination, it was in Washington and he had just finished a landmark speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in which he closed forever the question of a Catholic in the White House; you intercept him as he gets out the door and tell him: "Senator, I'm from the place that is going to give you New Jersey, Hudson County." His eyes light and he says: "Fine, Neil Gallagher has been telling me about it. I'm certainly glad to meet you." His handshake is strong, friendly but he looks so boyish you wonder will the people choose him over Dick Nixon. Then he moves on through the crush. You have had the seconds he can spare.

You see him that fall in Journal Square. A crowd has waited patiently in the November cold, the largest ever packed into the square, they say. Finally he arrives, hatless as usual. You have a good view because Arthur Knaster lets you and the photographers use the windows of his law office on the second floor of the Jersey Journal building. You are just above and behind the grandstand and you see him come up, through the crowd, onto the stand and before the microphone. You remember how that wild hair stands up on the back of his head, and think bitterly now: "This is how he must have looked to the murderer through that telescope sight" but that night who could think of him slain? The roar of that crowd as he told them how they would help him win, then a farewell smile and he is away. This was the final rally of the long outdoor campaign, the votes will be all in in little more than 48 hours, when he comes this way again he will be President of the United States.

You remember the telegram just about a year later inviting you to luncheon at the White House with the President. He is host to editors from New Jersey. The guard checking you through, the walk up the drive to the front door, noticing some peeled white paint along the driveway wall, then into the Blue Room to wait. A few minutes later the President arrives and joins his guests with their cocktails. His is tomato juice. Through luncheon he explains how "this job" keeps him too far from the people. In effect he asked, "What do you hear?" The luncheon is lively with questions and answers. Once he discusses the movie "Advise and Consent," his tone implies he would not have cast Franchot Tone as the President. You lean across to him and ask: "Mr. President, you could not get that role?" He laughs and snaps back: "I was too busy." He talks about fallout shelters and world economics and Dick Hughes' chances against Jim Mitchell. He autographs his menu because Marty Gately's hero-worshiping teenager has asked you to bring back a souvenir for her. Leaving and shaking his hand, you say: "A year ago you were fighting hard to get this job. Now that you have it, what do you think?" Suddenly he looks much older, then half whispers: "The weapons. The weapons." And you know why he seems to have an invisible weight always upon him.

And only a few months ago, at another editors' meeting in Washington, a spring evening and cocktails and a reception at the White House. He has a light word for everyone in the long line. A handshake and a word of greeting passes about Hudson and John Kenny and Bill Flanagan. The line moves on. Without suspecting, you have seen him for the last time. Six months later all that vitality and youth will be exchanged for a madman's bullet * * * and he will be a Commander in Chief slain for his country as truly as any man who ever died earning the Medal of Honor.

---

[From the Camden (N.J.) Catholic Star-Herald]

### A PRESIDENT NAMED JOHN

Our age has been blessed by the presence of two Johns: Pope John XXIII and President John F. Kennedy. Both were loved and, of late, mourned bitterly in this most unhappy year of 1963. Yet the deeper sorrow was evoked by the death of our late President, not necessarily because he was greater, but because his demise was so untimely, so cruelly inflicted, so incredibly sudden.

What can we say of one whose memory has already been enshrined so fittingly by so many loving fellow Americans and foreign leaders? How can we further exalt the life of a President whose youth belied his wisdom, whose charity tempered his courage, whose patience often camouflaged his pioneering spirit? Without doubt the highest tribute of all was given the late President by the Nation itself when, spontaneously and unanimously, it mourned his tragic passing.

To say that every American wept that day would be a gross understatement. Rather say that everywhere people of good will wept over and over again at the shocking passage of events as it was announced and explained to them. Before the sun had set on that horror-filled day of November 22, the whole world was weeping.

We have been called the ugly Americans, crass materialists bent on making money; a people allegedly oversexed, overstuffed, overstimulated. But on the day John F. Kennedy died our people displayed their innate nobility: their generosity, their tenderness, their love, their profound goodness. All commerce ceased. The TV wasteland became transformed into a panorama of a nation stricken with sorrow. Sports and social events were canceled precipitously; in the very hour of the announcement of the President's death, dazed citizens left late lunches unfinished, stopped shopping, withdrew from their labors, prayed, and wept. Unabashedly, America showed its sorrowing heart to all the world in a manner no people could ever excel. It was Good Friday again on a colossal scale.

The tribute of the people fit the man. Let us make no mistake about it; Kennedy was a great President whose greatness grew with each year. Not that we always agreed with him (in retrospect, the loss was ours), but it is the privilege of ordinary men to criticize the deeds of the greatest men. Yet who can doubt the brilliant range of his thoughts, the magnificent blueprint he presented to America to explore a new frontier? It was a masterpiece of social justice and peace for America and the world. In so many ways it heralded Pope John's two great encyclicals.

Even before the first session of Vatican II had opened, Kennedy had begun a dialog for the Catholic Church in America with all other religious groups that few of us appreciated, even today. In our brief history as a nation, no member of the Catholic hiearchy did so much to make catholicism respected in America as he did in his few short years as President. It is a special debt American Catholics must never forget.

Many of the words John F. Kennedy spoke are already immortalized. Often they were lightened by his flashing Irish wit, his frank, winsome smile. He was politician as well as stateman, knowing the practical demands of political patronage could never be divorced completely from the noblest statesmanship. He was a dreamer but not starry-eyed and impractical. He was an independent Catholic layman, who differed decisively with the Catholic bishops on the question of Federal aid to parochial education, and proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that outside the realm of faith and morals he was the keeper of his own conscience. Thereby he did more for the ultimate cause of the Catholic church than any favorable legislation on education could ever have reaped for it.

Both Johns were too good for our times. We were unworthy of them as we were of Christ and Lincoln. For Congress repeatedly frustrated John F. Kennedy while extremists of the left and the right hated him. A similar setting could be said to have surrounded Pope John XXIII. Concerning Kennedy, clever writers lampooned him, and joked about the Kennedy clan as though it were unfitting for an entire family to be imbued with nobility. Both were sometimes despised by their own, by those who should have known better. The measure, however, of the full stature of the man was the love his family bore toward him and the love he tendered them. We recall his wife, Jacqueline, embracing him, Caroline walking hand in hand with him, and John-John crouched under his desk. We recall these scenes with pride and affection because they portrayed the great heart that accompanied the great intellect. Nor, as a parallel, can we forget Pope John's last testament wherein he spoke so tenderly of children and the love he too had for his family of brothers and sisters.

John F. Kennedy was the first Catholic President but one for whom Catholics can feel justly proud because he served all Americans with all his heart and mind as few Presidents have done. Nor can we devise any better way to conclude this tribute to him than to say it is our conviction that he fulfilled the goal he set forth in his inaugural address: "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love and seek His blessing and His help and knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

---

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Free Press]

### NATION TAKES LEAVE OF SLAIN PRESIDENT

A sorrowful Nation took leave of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as the body of the slain President was laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery and world dignitaries paid final tributes.

As citizens turn from the solemn rites to face the tasks ahead, they should rededicate themselves to the American ideals which President Kennedy symbolized. It is a time for the country to unite behind the leadership of newly sworn President Lyndon B. Johnson.

He will need the active support of all in this trying period of transition.

By striving to put an end to divisive influences, to bigotry and hatred, each of us can help assure that Mr. Kennedy shall not have died in vain.

Bruce Biossat, Newspaper Enterprise Association writer, who traveled and visited with the late President and his family on many occasions, has written for us the following editorial:

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy came to the Presidency of the United States as the bearer of great change. He was the symbol of something new, but he died by something as old as time—the hand of the fanatic.

"He was the first man born in the 20th century to hold the office—and the second youngest in history. He was the first Catholic in the White House. He came as a naval hero of World War II who narrowly had missed death in Pacific waters, and survived a second brush with death in a grave illness 9 years ago.

"To the Nation's high politics he thus brought a fresh stamp. The well-remarked 'Kennedy style' was a blend of intellect, vigor, wit, charm, and a clear talent for growth.

"On the always shifting, often troubled world scene, he sometimes moved with more caution than expected in young leadership. Soon after entering the White House, he gamely took full blame for the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco as an enterprise sadly lacking in boldness.

"Yet only his worst enemies withheld from him the label 'courageous' when he moved resolutely against Soviet Premier Khrushchev in the great Russian missile crisis in Cuba in late 1962. And he boldly pressed for an East-West test ban treaty this year in the face of heavy charges that this imperiled our security.

"In domestic affairs Kennedy won much of his program in beginning 1961, gained far less the following year, and encountered a major stalemate in 1963. The constant note against him was insufficient leadership.

"But again, when 1963 brought the greatest racial crisis of this century, Kennedy—at acknowledged heavy political cost—committed himself to sweeping civil rights proposals that opened a vast new battleground.

"Amid all his efforts to put the imprint of vigorous, imaginative youth upon the country's affairs in the 1960's, the late President found himself moving against a deepening background of protest, with an ugly underscoring of violence which he sought with only limited success to wipe away.

"Much of this protest went to the steady encroachments of the Federal Government and its rising cost. But the bitterest reaction was white and Negro response to the enlarging racial struggle. The far right gave the mood its most perilous texture.

"With the calamity in Dallas the lesson of the danger inherent in violent extremism now may be deeply implanted in America's conscience.

"In this way, Kennedy in death may achieve what the living President could not do to curb the almost ungovernable rancor that increasingly discolored the politics of his brief time in power.

"It was John Kennedy's good fortune to surmount many obstacles to rise to his country's highest office and bring with him the winds of a new era.

"It was his final tragedy that as he labored in difficult times to use these forces for the Nation's and the world's gain, they were swiftly challenged by countering winds of bitter reaction. In Dallas, one swift gust struck him down.

"The Nation thus loses a young leader whose great promise lived in the shadow of great controversy. The way he died must inescapably cost all Americans deeply in self-esteem as free men of good will.

"That is the greater tragedy."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on July 15, 1960, in Los Angeles, Calif., it was a rare privilege for me to make the following observation:

> I have watched the American people, slowly at first and then with ever increasing crescendo, take to their minds and hearts the leading Democrat, the leading American of this day, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts.
>
> People say, "How did he do it?" Well, I will tell you how he did it.
>
> He did it because he has just a little more courage, just a little more stamina, just a little more wisdom, and just a little more character than any of the rest of us.

Less than 3 weeks ago—just before Thanksgiving—a woman lit an eternal flame to a well-known warrior—her husband, our President—a man born early in this century, but destined, as perhaps no other, to outlive it.

Some may have envied the way he lived. Patriots will envy the way he died.

The gratitude for what he gave us, in both life and death, is what we all most intimately feel. He gave us much, and his gifts will unfold for generations to come—and be opened and cherished by our children's children.

One such gift is the reaffirmation in our time of a truth which our forefathers learned from Abraham Lincoln. It is the truth that the greatest danger to our land may not lie abroad; but here in our loss of confidence in one another, and here in our loss of respect for laws which rest on that confidence and that understanding.

The young Lincoln put it this way in an 1838 address, in Springfield, Ill.:

> At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant, to step the ocean, and crush us at a blow? Never.
>
> All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years.
>
> At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? The answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad.
>
> If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

What John Kennedy by word and by example, in life and in death, has done for us, is to remind us that Mr. Lincoln was speaking in 1838 to a very large audience; because it consisted of every generation of Americans born then and to be born thereafter.

Those of us who knew him well, knew that he was a man of special grace, in action, in writing, and in thought. He had a rare humor, which often covered the depth of his fine mind. Is it coincidence, or perhaps a sense of predestination, and that the last stanza of his favorite poem read:

> The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
> But I have promises to keep,
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep.

Now, he has traveled those miles, and he is asleep. As Cardinal Cushing said, "God rest his noble soul."

I ask unanimous consent that a poem published last Thanksgiving Day in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### THE YOUNG CHAMPION

(The following tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy was written by James W. Symington. He is a son of Senator Stuart Symington and a former Deputy Director of the food-for-peace program. Now he is practicing law in Washington.)

He came out of his corner
Like the young champion
He was.
With practiced eye and Irish smile
For a challenger
He knew,
And had beaten before.
In the Pacific
He wrestled him under a wave,
And came up spitting
Jokes. His face shimmering
With destiny.
(He wouldn't wear a hat
To shield us from his sunlight,
His blazing thought,
And the radiant challenge
Of his spirit)
They'd been locked
Like this, too,
Etherized, but straining,
Till the challenger
Was shoved away,
Goodnaturedly,
Like a dull-witted
Sparring partner
When the young champ
Suddenly remembered
An appointment.
Still, this rematch
Came too soon, granted,
The Promoter thought
It time. The Promoter
Who was Trainer besides,
And Referee,
And Timekeeper
And finally, Announcer,
That this was a dream,
And the records would show
That the title really passed
A generation ago
On a beach near Rendova
Where the old challenger
Forever lost.
And failing to pin him then,
And snuff out that spark
So far from our notice,
Cannot now, or ever
Expect the mantel of years
Or any other shroud
To contain the radiance
Much less the flame.
So we file from the arena,
Comforted,
For this was truly a dream,
And his heart, his voice, his hatless glory
Are the reality,
And our white plume
Of victory.

—JAMES W. SYMINGTON.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, John F. Kennedy lies in Arlington Cemetery. A stunned Nation tries to move again into the routine of living. Why? That tragic word, whispered in bewilderment and sorrow by every thinking American, is slowly fading into silence. It is a "why"? that can never be answered because the event is beyond credence, to explain it beyond the scope of a human mind.

And yet it happened. The flags at half-mast tell us that John F. Kennedy is dead.

The great of the world came to his funeral and bowed their heads in prayer. Heads of state were there—an emperor—a king—but they were not more present than his fellow countrymen who came in spirit, 190 million strong.

From the day of his election, John F. Kennedy had been an example to them—a symbol almost of their beloved country. He was young and vigorous and good to look upon, just as their country was. He was vital and smiling and assured. His love for his family, his pride in his family was like a glowing banner swirling around him through all his years in office. Americans, whatever their political differences with him, loved him for this. They admired, beyond words, that warm and close-knit family group who made the White House a home indeed.

There was laughter in the White House while the Kennedys were there. There was kindliness, there was understanding, there was love.

And there was a man.

Americans will not soon forget the dedicated service that John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave them. His eloquence, his wit, his charm will not be forgotten in this generation. They will say of him—"He loved his country, he lived for his country, he died for his country. He was our friend."

What greater tribute can a country pay, than to mourn him as a friend that is lost? And that is how John F. Kennedy is mourned today. To all of us, his death was deeply moving because his smile reached out and touched our hearts.

To those who had the opportunity to serve with him in both the House and Senate, the loss was a personal one, as well as a national one. I served with him for many years, and saw him many times, in many different circumstances. His smile and his friendship were not limited to the members of his own party, which he led with such vision and imagination, but were shared, sometimes with a wry grin, with many members of the loyal opposition.

He was born for leadership, and he achieved it. But in his leadership he never forgot that he was a father too, a husband, a soldier, a patriot—that he was, in short, an American.

President Kennedy was truly of this era. He was the first President of the United States to be born in this century. He was the youngest citizen to be elected to that exalted office. We are all proud of his tremendous achievement.

"Youth" and "Peace"—those two magnificent words were stamped indelibly on his administration. His thousand days were made splendid by his efforts for both. In the Peace Corps—which time may show to be his finest inspiration—he joined them hand in hand.

He sent them out into the world together. Was there ever before such a crusade—young America working peacefully for peace? Was there ever before such a shining example for the world to wonder at?

It must never be forgotten that when the young men and women of these United States flocked to the banner of public service and went out into the world to show by their actions "the mettle of their pastures," it was John F. Kennedy who inspired them. It was John F. Kennedy who showed them the way.

Let us therefore build for him a spiritual memorial of kindliness and understanding and peace, a testament of human rights and equality.

It is the one memorial he would have wished, who was our good neighbor in the White House.

Mr. President, I have received a number of requests, from clergymen and others, to include in the Congressional Record expressions of their tribute and grief over the death of the President. I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks in the Record, the text of these eloquent statements.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### HE LEFT THE WORLD RICHER

(Note.—From the program and meditations by the Reverend Paul R. Hoover, pastor of Grace Evangelical Luthern Church, Rochester, N.Y., in memoriam, John F. Kennedy, Nov. 24, 1963.)

We have read from the Old Testament in our worship memorial. I would now read words from the Letter of James (Phillips translation) which distill in essence the example of President John F. Kennedy:

"Are there some wise and understanding men among you? Then your lives will be an example of the humility that is born of true wisdom. But if your heart is full of rivalry and bitter jealousy, then do not boast of your wisdom—don't deny the truth that you must recognize in your inmost heart. You may acquire a certain superficial wisdom, but it does not come from God—it comes from this world, from your lower nature, even from the devil. For wherever you find jealousy and rivalry you also find disharmony and all other kinds of evil. The wisdom that comes from God is first utterly pure, then peace-loving, gentle, approachable, full of tolerant thoughts and kindly actions, with no breath of favoritism or hint of hypocrisy. And wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves," (James 3, beginning at verse 13.)

Of no man, rich or poor, high or low, ruled or ruler, does God expect more to be said: He left the world richer.

"Let come what will, I mean to bear it out,
And either live with glorious victory
Or die with fame, renowned in chivalry:
He is not worthy of the honeycomb
That shuns the hive because the bees have stings."

Like Biblical characters, his strength was in his purpose:

Like Abraham, he went where he was called and was faithful in all things.

Like Moses, he led the people from doubts and fears to confidence in the face of imponderable difficulties.

Like Joshua, he loved his country and fought and suffered for its success.

He knew the import of Malachi's words: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers."

Like Jonathan, he met many a discouraged brother and cheered him by giving him strength.

Like David, he had the poet's way with words and the magic of music in them. He sang a people to triumph of spirit and shouted on the battle of blessed triumph.

Like Isaiah, he had the mind of a prophet who constantly pointed the world to brighter days and better things in the future.

Like Daniel, he was true through life to the teachings of his boyhood days.

Like John the Baptist, his desert was the loneliness of the White House and from that desert he could cry like John: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

Like Paul, he could be pricked by physical affliction. Like Paul, from affliction he drew from the deep wells of life to let the world know through pen and song and service that God meets men in the voice of freedom.

Like Jesus, his Master, holding the key to power hitherto unknown to men, he could preach the powerful doctrine that God does not withhold from the simplest man the importance men give only to the great.

Like Enoch, "He walked with God and he was not, for God took him."

History will in time through the crucible of future experience refine his image of his walk on earth. He loved his country, his heritage, his family, his church, his fellow men. And to the last he sought to inspire others to share his enthusiasms and worked to the very last moment of his busy life for the interests of the unsaved, confused, and brutish world.

The world is richer because he lived. The world is richer in the way he died. For even our short distance from his fatal scene, this much is clear: he lived true to the words of Henry Van Dyke:

> "Renew the courage that prevails,
> The steady faith that never fails,
> And makes us stand in every fight
> Firm as a fortress to defend the right."

May God add His blessing where our words fail. Amen.

---

### Of Blessed Memory

(Expression of sentiments of the Rochester, N.Y., Jewish community on the death of John F. Kennedy.)

With hearts burdened with grief, and souls seared by tragedy, we have come to this sanctuary for prayer and meditation.

The sun shines brightly without but our world has grown darker and colder.

The assassin's bullet which took the life of this great and good man sent a shudder of shock, sorrow, and outrage through our very being.

We mourn the loss of a man who rose to true greatness through the heights of his vision, the depth of his compassion, the strength of his commitments and the nobility of his passions.

We are all diminished in having sustained this grievous loss.

We now ask God's light in our darkness, direction in our gropings, guidance in our striving.

A martyred President: heroic in war, gave his life for peace; gifted with youthful vigor and courage, dedicated his energies and abilities for the growth of understanding and amity between nations; to the manor born, his concern was for the least among us, the disenfranchised, the dispossessed, the despised.

Selflessly, he gave the fullest measure of devotion to all that is best in our national heritage.

He gave to us the gift of enlightened statesmanship, courageous leadership, and heroic example.

It is now given to us to grant him the gift of the immortality of inspiration by bringing into our lives, into our communities, into this beloved land, those noble qualities, concerns, convictions, and passions which marked this lovely life so brief in years but so great in influence.

---

### Sermon on President Kennedy's Death

(Preached November 24, 1963, by Rev. William A. Sadler, Jr., Ph. D., Dover Plains, N.Y.)

The darkest hour of this generation struck Friday with cruel swiftness, casting a pall of stunned grief over the American people, and indeed over the whole world. The President of the United States was dead. The passing of any man is sad. The passing of any President is an even sadder event. Had the President been an elderly man who died of natural causes, we would mourn deeply. Had he been in late middle age killed in an accident like Dag Hammarskjold, our grief would reach great proportions. He was not an old man, nor one of late middle age. He was a young man, a remarkable man of amazing accomplishments and with magnificent potentialities yet to be expressed, not for his own satisfaction and gain, but for the benefit of his fellow citizens and people around the world. He was cut down in midstride. It was not an accident, but foul, calculated murder that took his life, and took from us an outstanding fellow American, a great President, a strong and courageous leader, and a magnificent representative of the highest ideals of our country and mankind. For us Christians it is an additional loss; for, his assassin struck down a brother in Christ. It is not just grief we suffer. We are struck dumb by this monstrous atrocity and our colossal loss.

The murder of the late President, John F. Kennedy, hit us like a death in the family. It was in fact just that—a death in the American family. John F. Kennedy was not merely a man—not merely a young man, a talented man, a person of wealth, a Democrat. He was the President of our country, and as such he was our representative, chosen by the people to stand for them to the world, to represent their ideals and way of life, and to stand by them as their chief leader. Because he was our President, when he was attacked, we, too, were attacked. When he died, a part of us died with him. We Americans believe that each man is created with certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Presidential office embodies those rights and seeks to guarantee them. On Friday those rights for which our President had fought were taken from him. His earthly life was concluded, those earthly liberties canceled, that earthly pursuit ended. He did not freely give up those rights; he was savagely robbed of them. Because of the office he bore, our rights also were threatened; our ideals, our very reason for existence as Americans, were attacked. And so we suffered a double blow.

President Kennedy was not a weak man. He was not a weak President. He was a person of extraordinary moral strength, courage, wisdom, and foresight. He filled the office of the Presidency with those qualities, and by so doing he helped to make our country morally stronger, more courageous, wiser, and more farsighted than before. His strength and its effects upon the American people were recognized by his adversaries; and numerous people who are marked by weakness, lack of foresight, with little concern for the extension of real justice, have vigorously opposed his principles and policies, revealing to those who observed with patience and conscience not only their lack of character but the greatness of his. President Kennedy was—is a dedicated believer, a believer in God as revealed and present in Jesus Christ. He was also a dedicated believer in the ideals of the American heritage and way of life. His Christian conscience inevitably led him to interpret American ideals in a Christian manner; and we Christians are convinced that the ideals of our Founding Fathers were meant to be interpreted that way. President Kennedy lived and gave his life for those ideals and for us, who are to continue to be led by them. What are they? Certainly they are numerous; but I want at this time to emphasize three of them.

It was reported that the Russian people, and in particular Nikita Khrushchev, were saddened and alarmed by the President's death; for, he had demonstrated forcefully that he was sincerely dedicated to peaceful existence. The Russian people desire a peaceful world, as they have emphasized to the dismay of warmongering Chinese Communists. The Russian people recognize, and we know, that President Kennedy was a man of peace. His consistent efforts as President were directed toward the securing of peace around the world, real peace and not merely a lull in aggression and contention. His understanding of peace was informed by his Christian faith and conscience. At least each Sunday he worshipped our God who is the giver of life and who sends to His children His peace which passes understanding. This peace is no passive thing; it is, like God himself, an active mode of being. To be at peace is not to sleep; it is to exist unhindered from repressive forces that stifle and distort the soul, the life of man, and society. To be at peace is to be free to act toward the fulfillment of the destiny that God makes and gives to each of His children. Peace and freedom are inseparable. Freedom is but the expression of real peace; while peace is the condition which enables true freedom. President Kennedy believed in, proclaimed, and fostered our cherished ideal of peace and freedom.

It was not by any means easy to defend his belief, not even to some of us Americans who supposedly adhered to it. During the Bay of Pigs catastrophe he refrained from providing outright and decisive American support to the invasion forces, because such an action, he estimated, would grossly jeopardize not only the peace of Cubans, but of Americans and the world as well. In his firm stand against the Communist attempt to seize Berlin and to divide Germany permanently, as well as his resistance to the Communist endeavor to establish missile bases in Cuba, President Kennedy demonstrated his aggressive, unswerving aim to preserve the peace and freedom of the people of the Western World, when they were seriously threatened. In spite of the outcry of some nationalistic isolationists, he succeeded in his efforts to establish a peace treaty to prohibit nuclear testing in all but a few countries. He suffered the charge of hypocrisy from those who accused him of supporting warfare in other countries; yet he gave American support to actual war, such as in Vietnam, because a truce there would not effect a meaningful peace, one which respects and guarantees the freedom of individuals to pursue their separate as well as corporate destinies. President Kennedy was a crusader for peace; and, to our great loss, he became a martyr for it.

As Americans it is our role, our duty as citizens, to emulate this great leader who so nobly embodied and promoted the high ideal of peace. The forces obstructing peace and freedom in our world, and what is worse, in our land are gaining momentum to a frightening degree. These are forces which are fed by self-oriented fear and by self-regard which is disdainful of the rights of others, particularly others of a different skin color, class, or origin. They are forces which are armed with the weapons of prejudice, hatred, and the demonic desire to be superior. The war against peace is enkindled by hate; and the fires of hatred burn hot. They scorched the sense and conscience of the President's assassin, so that he committed a crime which outrages our reason and sensitivity. One month before in that same fateful city of Dallas the hateful prejudice of extremists led to the disgraceful and contemptuous treatment of another peaceful man, Adlai Stevenson, who was representing the organization designed to prosecute and to maintain world peace. This year has seen the assassinations of other peaceful men and little children and the bombing of churches. There are ugly, warring, murderous forces in our midst: prejudice, bigotry, smug self-content and disdainful superiority, hatred, and the harboring of anger that leads to the shattering of relationships and human lives. As Americans we must resist them. They do exist and can unleash havoc. It can happen here. As Christians it is our responsibility to wage war against these forces that inhabit the heart of man and do evil business in our lives. It is our responsibility, our privilege, our vocation to bless and not to curse, to settle and not to entrench our divisive differences, to be humble and not to humiliate, to be compassionate and not to condemn, to love and not to hate, to seek peace, to make it, and to keep it. The Lord who taught us to love also taught us: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

A second classic ideal for which President Kennedy lived and died was justice. This, too, was an ideal interpreted and enforced by his Christian conscience. In the numerous policies which he fathered and fostered, particularly those which were vigorously discussed by politicians and often vehemently resisted, one could discern the President's deep-rooted concern for real justice. For him justice was not merely an abstract ideal; it was an obtainable goal, and he endeavored that our land and our world might attain it. It was the desire to extend effective justice to all citizens regardless of color that lay behind his strong civil rights policy. It was a dedication to justice which gave impetus and strength to his programs of medicare, education, tax reduction and reform, foreign aid, and the Alliance for Progress, as well as his vigorous support of the United Nations. In no small measure these programs aimed to enable individuals and nations to find decent and humane treatment to which they are entitled as human beings—a right which is often denied them because of lack of opportunity and funds. To assure proper medical care for the poor and aged, to provide adequate education to talented, ordinary, as well as deprived young people, to reduce inequalities in our economic system, to give aid to people and nations who are destitute of privileges we Americans take for granted, to encourage and to contribute generously to that supernational organization which was established to protect the rights of individual nations and insure fair treatment of all—these are expressions of his sense of justice which was informed by his Christian awareness of the essential command to love our neighbors as ourselves. "What does the Lord require of you," said the prophet Micah, "but to do justice, to show steadfast love, and to walk humbly with your God?" It was his responsibility and privilege, and it continues to be ours as Christians in this world, to do justice which is interpreted by love. There have been countless martyrs for justice; on Friday John F. Kennedy joined their ranks. We shall fail them and ourselves, and certainly be false to our religion and traitorous to Christ, if we do not persevere in the pursuit of genuine justice. And do we not also believe and hope that blessed are those who hunger for justice, for they shall be satisfied?

A final characteristic of the life of President Kennedy and an ideal embedded in the true American character is courage. He demonstrated courage equal to our forefathers and pioneers in his wartime service. He manifested his deep appreciation of this virtue in his famous book "Profiles of Courage." To me, however, he exhibited the highest form of this virtue while President as he found and maintained the courage of his convictions, the courage to seek peace and to promote justice in the face of stiff resistance and stinging ridicule. Several of his programs for peace and justice suffered the most severe attacks, and he personally was abused and slandered by some of his fellow Americans. What did he personally have to gain from strong support of social security programs, from his occasional resistance to big business and other members of his own class, from his continued commitment to underprivileged nations and groups? Little personal gain, and considerable loss of political support, national affection, and mental tranquility. He stood forth with firm conviction that he was serving for the sake of right. Today we pray that he finds the blessing promised to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

The death of our President has caused a darkness to fall upon us; yet it is a darkness that will pass. The important question to ask now is: What kind of light will we discover and follow when the darkness lifts? We know that men are confused and led astray by lights of security, material prosperity, temporal happiness, and the sense of self-importance. These are but partial guides to behavior; regarded as most important they are lights beckoning from dead-end lanes. There are better beacons to lead us, such as the virtues of courage and the search for justice and peace. We Christians know that there is one true light, which can enlighten every man and which is the light of the world; without that light we are disastrously lost. May we Christians now more fervently than before seek that light; and grant that no clouds of this mortal life may hide from us the light of that love which is immortal and which God has manifested unto us in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord. Being thus illumined with the light of Christ, may our lights so shine before men that they may see our good works, our just works, our peaceful works, our courageous works and glorify our Father who is in Heaven.

Finally, this death has brought forth fears that have long lurked in our hearts. What is to become of us? What does the future hold for us? For our children? Those of us who have found the truth of God's reality and His love need not depend upon optimistic political philosophers for our ultimate reassurance. More than 500 years before the birth of Christ the Jewish people lived in exile in Babylon; it was a time for them of darkness, of uncertainty and fear. They were tremendously encouraged by God's message to them, delivered by a great prophet. It was a message that stilled their fears by deepening their faith in the reality of God's redeeming power. We who have been touched by Christ's redeeming love and reborn in His risen life will find that message more comforting and appropriate today than those to whom it was first addressed. Here is that message: "Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by name, you are mine. When you pass through the waters I will be with you; and through the rivers, they shall not overwhelm you; when you walk through fire you shall not be burned, and the flame shall not consume you. For I am the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, your Saviour" (Isaiah 43: 1–3).

---

## IN MEMORIAM: JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By David A. MacLennan, at the Rochester Rotary Club, Nov. 26, 1963)

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep.
And miles to go before I sleep."

—ROBERT FROST IN "STOPPING BY WOODS ON A SNOWY EVENING."

But John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, could not go the miles on this life's road he longed to travel before his sleep. Not an act of God, but an act of the demonic in a human being struck him down on what became the darkest hour of any recent year. And the lines by Robert Frost Mr. Kennedy loved became the refrain of an unfinished symphony.

Yesterday, the closing act of the drama of his death was witnessed and experienced by millions. The world saw an image of America never seen before in history, and of our celebration. If tragedy's chief purpose is to purge the soul, we ought to be cleansed of bitterness, of much that defiles and degrades men made in the image of God:

"Solemn the drums thrill: Death august and royal
Sings sorrow up into immortal spheres.
There is music in the midst of desolation.
And a glory that shines upon our tears."

Is there truly "a glory that shines upon our tears" at the death of one so gifted, so dedicated, so youthful? Nothing can diminish the enormity of the senseless, cruel crime which, as far as this dimension of life is concerned, denied him "the glory of going on, and still to be."

Yet, although he shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old, and although age shall not weary him, there is a glory, a high summons, in our late Chief's life and death.

President Kennedy, like his brave, regal wife, was marked by youthfulness not only because he was still relatively young but because he had an intellectual vigor and receptivenes to new ideas. His sense of the past was keen, he was proud of our ancient heritage and sought to conserve it; but he knew, as did a former teacher of his in college that:

"New occasions teach new duties
Time makes ancient good uncouth."

With patience not always found in eager youth he sought to persuade us that we must move onward "who would keep abreast of truth." President and Mrs. Kennedy came into our national life as a kind of springtime in the winter of our discontent.

"Your old men shall dream dreams,
Your young men shall have visions."

He not only quoted but helped fulfill.

Although he knew by cruel personal experience in the Second World War that law, whether civil or international, must have force behind it, he was a man of peace. He knew that in a nuclear-fission world, if anything goes in the way of atomic war, everything goes. One of the tragic ironies of our time is that this man who knew that successful government requires the art of compromise, this leader who won the admiration and affection of political opponents, should be the victim of hatred and violence.

Closely related to his deep concern for peace among the nations was his outstanding ability to get on with people. He was a master of the art of working with people, and many were his bipartisan conferences and programs. His infectious humor and ready wit, his charm, and unfailing courtesy toward all sorts and conditions of men endeared him to a majority of Americans, and to citizens of every nation he visited.

Our late President was an intellectual who was never pedantic, stuffy or remote from the common people. In a short time, he and Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy did more for the arts and for artists in every field of creative culture than most Presidents could. In a world in which brains, knowledge, skill are essential to civilized living and a future worth working for, he made it not only respectacle but praiseworthy to be educated and creative.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a fighter for justice, for freedom, for the chance of the least and lowest in our Republic to walk in dignity, enjoy equal rights and to make the most of their best. As you watched the saddened faces of Negroes both in Dallas and in Washington during the funeral march, did you think of another martyred President who also died at an assassin's hand because he believed that we were created to be free? When Abraham Lincoln's body was carried through the streets of the Capital, a Negro mother held up her child and said, "Take a long look at him, honey, he died for you."

President Kennedy was a deeply religious man. He knew that the deep sources of social justice, and personal integrity reside in God. He reverenced the reverences of others, because he reverenced the great and gracious God in whose will is our peace, and in whose service is perfect freedom.

Much more could be said. Much more has been said, and will be said. As King David said long ago of a leader who died in battle, "Know ye not that a prince and a great man was fallen this day in Israel?"

We do know. But commemoration without emulation stultifies and condemns. To praise President Kennedy's character—his faith, and high purposes, his devotion to human well-being, as he upheld our Constitution and the higher laws of God, and not to renew our own dedication, is hollow.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy sacrificed his life for his country, and for that other country which is the Kingdom of God. Must a good and great man die because most of us lack insight, moral fiber, willingness to discipline ourselves and our children in self-control? Are we so self-centered that we use persons as means to our own ends? Are we only asking but not giving a worthy answer to the question, "What can I do for my country?" Jack Kennedy already has answered the question with his life. We must respond with the service of our lives. President Johnson cannot do it all, nor can he do what we must do.

Are we men and women committed to peace, not only among nations, but among ourselves? Have we repudiated violence, so that we ourselves obey and uphold law? Will we join in redirecting the energies of our young people, whether in our privileged suburbs or in city streets into constructive channels?

When we praise President Kennedy as a champion of responsible freedom and equal justice, are we willing to follow in his train? Are we on the way with the living God who desires that we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before Him, or are we in the way, by our refusal to advance the best hopes of men?

Do we believe in the living God of whose grace and wisdom we have had rich experience as a nation? In one of his last addresses in Texas, our late President quoted the Bible. "Except the Lord guard the city, the watchmen guard in vain."

Do we confide ourselves to the keeping and guidance of the Lord of life and history, the righteous Father of all mankind? Do we seek to give Him our highest loyalty and obedience? Do we love America enough to practice our religion not fitfully but faithfully? With many other Protestants, Jews, Orthodox, I salute the memory of President Kennedy as a Christian man, who was scrupulously fair to all religious groups and unashamed and faithful in his own religious duty.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy could have written the lines of a poem written in the Washington he knew so well, by a noble patriot who served the Allied cause in the First World War. Relying upon Almighty God, who alone can build the house of our habitation and guard the Nation we love, let us make it our pledge in the light of the sacrifice of our late President:

### "I VOW TO THEE, MY COUNTRY

"I vow to thee, my country, all earthly things above
Entire and whole and perfect, the service of my love.
The love that asks no questions: the love that stands the test,
That lays upon the altar the dearest and the best:
The love that never falters, the love that pays the price,
The love that makes undaunted the final sacrifice.
And there's another country, I've heard of long ago,
Most dear to them that love her, most great to them that know,
We may not count her armies; we may not see her King;
Her fortress is a faithful heart, her pride is suffering.
And soul by soul and silently her shining bounds increase,
And her ways are ways of gentleness and all her paths are peace.
Amen."

—SIR CECIL SPRING-RICE.

**Mr. MILLER.** Mr. President, one could say the prayer, "Dear God, please take care of your servant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy," and the most important thoughts would have been expressed.

However, the 23d Psalm is, to me, the most consoling expression on an occasion of bereavement; and I shall read it:

### TWENTY-THIRD PSALM

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Our late President fired the hopes and imagination of not only his fellow Americans but of the freedom-loving people throughout the world. I was in Rome at the time news of his tragic death was received, and the spontaneous and genuine outpouring of grief on the part of our Italian friends was something to behold. I understand that similar reactions occurred in many of the other world capitals. It seemed as though the lights all over the earth had been dimmed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy lived in the spirit of the poem, "A Psalm of Life" by Longfellow:

### A PSALM OF LIFE

(by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow)

Tell me not, in mournful numbers,
  Life is but an empty dream—
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
  And things are not what they seem.

Life is real! Life is earnest!
  And the grave is not its goal;
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
  Was not spoken of the soul.

Not enjoyment, and not sorrow,
  Is our destined end or way;
But to act, that each tomorrow
  Finds us farther than today.

Art is long, and Time is fleeting,
  And our hearts, though stout and brave,
Still, like muffled drums, are beating
  Funeral marches to the grave.

In the world's broad field of battle,
  In the bivouac of Life,
Be not like dumb, driven cattle!
  Be a hero in the strife!

Trust no Future, howe'er pleasant.
  Let the dead Past bury its dead.
Act,—act in the living Present.
  Heart within, and God o'erhead.

Lives of great men all remind us
  We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
  Footprints on the sands of time;

Footprints, that perhaps another,
  Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
  Seeing, shall take heart again.

Let us, then, be up and doing,
  With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
  Learn to labor and to wait.

Thomas Wolfe, in his immortal "You Can't Go Home Again," gives us the philosophy with which we can accept the loss of our President, and it is with these thoughts I shall close:

To lose the earth you know, for greater knowing;
To lose a life you have, for greater life;
To leave the friends you love, for greater loving;
To find a land more kind than home, more large than earth—whereon the pillars of this earth are founded, toward which the conscience of the world is tending—a wind is rising, and the rivers flow.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, 19 days ago, a man of reason was destroyed by an act of violence.

Today, we cannot judge John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The fact of this assassination still stuns our minds; the loss of this man still sorrows our hearts. If we seek to judge his life and work now, we must fail. Our thoughts will be like rough pebbles, unpolished by the tides of time and wisdom. Our words will be like hollow, gaudy ornaments, attached to a man's soul.

Let us leave judgment to history, and to God.

Today, we can hope only to speak of him honestly, and to remember him with respect.

If we remember his own words which expressed his own highest cause, we perhaps do best. This does not risk trying to gild what is already gold. For to me, at least, John Kennedy wrote his own epitaph: a man dedicated to "the strategy for peace."

He sounded this keynote in his first words after taking the oath of office as President of the United States. He reminded his countrymen and the world that one talon of the American eagle held the arrows of war, but the other clutched the olive branches of peace. "We shall not negotiate from fear, but we shall not fear to negotiate." These words were a fresh and memorable assertion to the world that the power of the United States was not to be feared. Peace was its purpose.

In this same inaugural address, he called us to the responsibilities of leadership for peace and justice:

> Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Deeds followed these words. The Peace Corps was established. The food-for-peace program was expanded. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was proposed and organized. Negotiations with our adversaries were renewed. The motive, spirit, and accent of peace were carried to the far places of the earth.

John Kennedy met supreme crisis at the very brink of disaster when nuclear aggression threatened this hemisphere. The courage of peace was tested and not found wanting. Could courage and peace be combined? Could peace save its life by risking to lose it? Men must hope so, but can they believe it?

They can; and they did when they witnessed John Kennedy's devotion to peace matched by determined action.

That breathless moment a little over a year ago could have brought the exhaustion of hope, or the fears of hostility. It did neither. John Kennedy continued his initiative for peace, with the pledge that the United States would suspend atomic testing in the atmosphere.

Last June, at the American University in Washington, D.C., he reminded all peoples once more "World peace is the most important topic on earth." He continued a theme of his inaugural address:

> We shall do our part to build a world of peace where the weak are safe and the strong are just.

And he clarified our goal with eloquence:

> What kind of peace do we seek? I am talking about genuine peace—the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living—and the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time, but peace for all time.

He pressed his "strategy for peace" to the conclusion of a test ban treaty, stopping the testing of atomic weapons on the earth or above it. More than 100 nations have joined with us in this treaty.

The treaty is a frail hope as yet—frail as the dove Noah sent forth over the waters in search of land. Every day that treaty stands; however, the hope grows that the waters of war's preparation are receding. The genie of atomic power is not yet back in the bottle, to use one of John Kennedy's metaphors. But despair has lost its grip upon us. A new will and resolution for peace has been born.

He again continued his "strategy for peace" last September, in addressing the United Nations. His opening words were: "We meet again in the quest for peace." He concluded:

> My fellow inhabitants of this planet, let us take our stand here in this assembly of nations. And let us see if we, in our time, can move the world toward a just and lasting peace.

In October, speaking to an audience of young people in Maine, he again recalled the American eagle and the two kinds of strength it clutches. The head of the eagle, he emphasized, faces toward the olive branches of peace. He concluded:

> In the months and years ahead, we intend to build both kinds of strength—during time of detente as well as tension, during periods of conflict as well as cooperation—until the world we pass on to our children is truly safe for diversity and the rule of law covers all.

The theme of peace had become his hallmark. We came to expect it. His eloquence of phrase served to keep the passionate sincerity of purpose and goal from being redundant. If any scripture is ever sifted out of the torrents of the words of these years, surely his words in this high cause will survive.

He understood well the meaning of the mordant words of the Prince of Peace: "Be ye wise as serpents in order to be as harmless as doves." When John Kennedy spoke in such a vein, however, it was of a peace strong, not strident. He communicated a sense of power in the service of gentility.

In his address to the Nation on the nuclear test ban treaty, he said:

> Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Each of us lost a bit of ourselves at the death of the man who spoke these words, but our steps did not falter.

In remembering John Kennedy, each of us must recall his words; we must also rely on our personal individual memories of him.

I remember most clearly now my last meeting with him—on the Wednesday before the Friday of his death.

The formal meeting of congressional leaders at the White House had just ended. In that clean, precise, earnest voice, President Kennedy called out:

> HUBERT, come walk with me. I want to talk with you.

He walked confidently and smoothly past the White House rose garden and toward his private office. He talked with intelligence and curiosity and concern about a problem facing the Nation and the people. His stride and his voice reflected the basic nature of the man: strength, grace, eagerness.

I was proud to walk a few steps with John Kennedy.

Today, I am aware that he never walked alone. Neither his distinctions as an individual nor his power as President set him far apart from the people of the United States. He was, perhaps, a step or two ahead of the people at times. But as an American who understood America, who brought form to its amorphous yearnings, who gave direction to its efforts, John Kennedy walked with the people.

Nineteen days ago, the worst of America struck down the best of America. For a few moments of time, violence shattered peace—fear cracked confidence—hate stood above reason.

But the worst of America did not prevail after those ugly moments. The tragedy of that day in November will not endure.

Because of the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we are today a nation more fully committed to peace. Because of the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we are a people more deeply determined to turn from hate and to embrace understanding and reason.

One simple line, from the book of Isaiah in the Bible, best expresses the message and mission of John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

> Come now, and let us reason together.

Our fulfillment of that plea will be John Fitzgerald Kennedy's triumph.

One simple paragraph, from his book "Profiles in Courage," best describes the goodness and nobility of John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

> The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less than a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality.

Yes, Mr. President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy is gone.

He gave us strength, and the strength remains with us.

But we are a stronger nation, and a better people today because of him.

Never before has this Nation been so moved. Never before have the people so revealed themselves and their hearts.

We mourn the loss of this President. But even more, we mourn the loss of this man. The Nation's outpouring of sorrow and love for him expresses our ultimate value—the importance of the individual human being.

Our love turns toward the late President's family, to his brothers and sisters, his mother and his father, and, of course, to his dear, wonderful wife, Mrs. Kennedy. Her beautiful dignity, her constant courage, and her enduring grace strengthened each of us.

At the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, every American felt as if he had lost a loved one.

Never before has there been such a sense of total involvement by all the people. Never before have we been so united. Never before have we been so aware of our national identity.

We are, truly, "one Nation, under God, indivisible."

With a renewed sense of unity, fortified by our common sorrow, we shall rededicate this Nation to the fulfillment of the hopes and the commitments of our beloved, martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, our illustrious colleague, our 35th President, was not a product of the log cabin. He was born rich, and in spite of that he became, among other things, a very prominent world figure, an eminent statesman, a brilliant scholar, and a forceful leader.

Generally, wealth and position are the enemies of genius, and the destroyers of talent. It is difficult for the wealthy to resist the thousand allurements of pleasure. So I repeat that John F. Kennedy, in spite of having been born to wealth and high social position, became truly great—a man of the people.

Even in his youth he was a student of history. While other boys of his age were indulging in play, his fertile brain was absorbing the works of philosophers, historians, and great thinkers, both ancient and modern.

He made a fine record as a college student.

He was intensely patriotic, and when the time came to serve his country in war, in order to protect and preserve our freedom, he was not found wanting. He showed courage and bravery, unexcelled by any of those who fought by his side.

As a world leader he devoted much of his time to the pursuit of world peace. He was well on his way toward that goal when he was assassinated.

Much has been said today, as well as in the past, about his talents and accomplishments. Much will be said of him in the future. Some will be critical, but the good will so far outweigh the bad that he will go down in history as one of our great Presidents. It is tragic that an assassin's bullet deprived us of his leadership in the prime of his life. Our country and the whole world will doubtless be poorer because of his untimely death.

If to love your country more than self is goodness, John F. Kennedy was good.

If to be in advance of your time—to be an advocate in the direction of right—is greatness, John F. Kennedy was great.

If to avow your principles and discharge your duty in the midst of hostile groups is heroic, John F. Kennedy was a hero.

At the age of 46 he was felled by an assassin's bullet. He died in the land he loved and defended.

His critics cannot touch him now—hatred, bias and prejudice can reach him no more. He sleeps in Arlington, beneath the quiet of the stars.

I extend to his bereaved wife and lovely children, Caroline and John-John, my deep sympathy. They can be proud of the rich heritage of love and affection bestowed upon them when he lived, and of the mark his life will leave on the history of the world.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President—

> Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans.

The echo of this unparalleled challenge still rings vividly in our ears, yet he is gone. Tragic as was his passing, more tragic indeed would be the hour if we who remain were content to let this sad day mark the end; if we were content to sit alone in our sorrow and sadness with personal memories which, on each reflection, renews the ache in our hearts and tears in our eyes.

I will always remember him as a world leader with profound wisdom in quest of a world at peace; as a national leader, determined that each of us and our Nation as a whole should not forget the principles of our native land, nor the price paid by others to make secure these principles.

I remember him as an example of devotion to his family and to his God.

I remember him as a great man who would always recognize a face in a distant corner of the room; as a friend who never failed to recall an easily forgotten event of some consequence in the life of a comrade.

I remember the pleasant individual conversation in a caravan and the enthusiastic outpouring of admiration from a crowd.

Some will say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was more severely criticized by his opponents and more dearly loved by his allies than any of his predecessors.

Some will say that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man who lived before his time.

But I remember a man who saw America as it is today. I remember a man who saw and loved a great country unparalleled in the history of mankind. I remember a man who refused to let national pride, political expediency or vitriolic critcism blind him to the shortcomings of the land he loved.

Few of us have the inclination or courage to examine ourselves or our country; to see ourselves as we really are; to point out our shortcomings as well as our strengths; to urge that tomorrow's labors surpass today's deeds.

But I remember a man who refused to be content and complacent; a man who lived, and died, insisting that America should and could be a better place in which to live; a man who resolutely refused to follow the course of least resistance but insisted that the building of the United States of America required sacrifice from each of us—a sacrifice which he so willingly made himself.

I remember a man, a President, and a friend who asked us for our help; help to wage the struggle against mediocrity; help to guarantee equality; help to see our land as it really is today; help to see that we build on our strengths and remove our weaknesses.

I remember a man whose challenge will continue to echo throughout this Chamber and in the ears of each of us—his colleagues—until we have carried the burden and completed the tasks which he began.

Let us remember the challenge as he said:

> In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow from that fire can truly light the world. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

My colleagues, in the name of God, in the name of America, in the name of John F. Kennedy, let us hold high the torch.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there is nothing that any of us on this floor can say that would add to the eulogy paid the late President by the universal lament over his passing. So I will not attempt to explain my personal sorrow, which cannot be done.

Instead I would like to comment very briefly on one word and that word is hate. I have a feeling that I know the American people as well as any living American, and I have never detected hatred as one of their facets. Rather, I know them to be a loving people. Remembering something I wrote connected with the late President and the kind qualities of Americans, I quote it here:

> President Kennedy and I are poles apart on many issues but if you assume we must also be personal enemies as well, you're entirely wrong. The fact is that while the President and I are fully aware of the gulf between us, neither has permitted these differences to develop into personal antagonisms.

Might I suggest on this day of remembrance that we remember that great quality of his which was based on love and understanding, and all of us promise in our professional, personal, and daily lives to practice more love and more understanding, not less. We must recognize, as he did, that there are two sides, sometimes more, to every question and under our concept of life everyone is allowed the possession of these opinions, so must everyone be allowed the free discussion of them.

To me the dedication of all of us to those qualities of his would be the best eulogy we could pay him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy was the greatest national tragedy I have experienced in more than 40 years of public service. I shared with millions of Americans a sense of shocked sadness at the untimely death of a great President.

President Kennedy had strong convictions and expressed them well. He was a brilliant son of Massachusetts and I am reminded of what another son of that great Commonwealth, John Adams, said many years ago in recommending that a young Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, draft the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson had a "felicity of expression," said his friend John Adams. The same can be said of John F. Kennedy.

I enjoyed a warm and friendly relationship with President Kennedy and wish to join with other Members of the Senate in paying tribute to a truly remarkable man whose services to his country and to the world were brought to an untimely end by the bullet of an assassin.

To his parents, who lost an outstanding son; to his wife, who lost a cherished husband, and to his children, who lost an adoring father, I extend my deepest sympathy.

**Mr. MORTON.** Mr. President, along with all Americans I deplore the dastardly act of assassination that struck down President John F. Kennedy. Along with all Americans I mourn the memory of the first President of our country born in this exciting and challenging 20th century.

John F. Kennedy brought to the Presidency the vigor of youth, a broad intellectual horizon, and a dynamic talent for leadership. He had the capacity for putting to maximum use the strength and the energy, the mind and the wit, the charm and the good taste, the reverence and the dignity with which he was so generously endowed.

Let us, the living, dedicate ourselves to the proposition which he so eloquently posed on the steps of this hallowed Capitol less than 3 years ago.

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

**Mr. WALTERS.** Mr. President, it is with humility and a sense of inadequacy that these words are offered, seeking not so much to give some sense to the heinous crime which has cost us the life of our Chief Executive, as to pay him earnest tribute. For we have been taught: "Be thy brother's keeper," and "Love one another as I have loved thee." And yet Cain slew Able, and one, whose love is everlasting and all encompassing, was cruelly murdered on the cross at Calvary. From these paradoxical tenets of scripture we see that man's inhumanity to man is a perpetual mystery that will remain beyond our comprehension until God wills differently.

But, as we draw from our faith, so must we gain from our great loss in the wanton slaying of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. His was a sacrifice on the altar of humanity, for he sincerely cared for all people of all descriptions.

One who loved life as dearly as he, would not have offered his so willingly without the deepest conviction that his example would, in some way, benefit his country. In retrospect, it is clear that he was not unaware of the dangers he faced. He knew the personal risks involved as he fought fervently, ardently and so eloquently for the things in which he believed. He recognized all of this as he cast his light into dark corners where bigotry, malice and hatred needed to be ferreted out. Yet he went forward boldly and unafraid, willing to meet the challenge—his life as the pawn.

In this brief, yet interminable period, we have already learned one bitter and most important lesson: that when poisonous thoughts and hatred mate, they give birth to a despicable action. It is to our everlasting discredit that we could have spawned in our environment the twisted mentality that saw fit to cancel out the pledge of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

One who loved his fellow man completely, his words and his ideals were a fountainhead of the rivers of truth, justice and liberty that flowed through our land. Yet, he was struck down, and as we must bear the loss, and the shame for his assassination, so must we shoulder the yoke and till the now more arid soil of our democracy, nourishing it with the little and yet so much we have left of him—this he would have wanted.

John Kennedy was his brother's keeper in the most absolute sense. He constantly sought ways to care for the aged, the infirm, the mentally ill, the uneducated, the jobless, and the hungry. His concern for human welfare knew no geographic or racial confines and he utilized all of his youthful vigor to restore to our way of life a goodness and wholesomeness that in some way had gradually diminished through the years.

John Kennedy, leader of a great nation, executor of a priceless legacy, and skilled architect in the drafting of blueprints for a better life for all mankind, was recognized for his greatness. Yet none of this recognition will ever equal the immeasurable stature he had attained in the eyes of his wife, his daughter, and his son as their loving and devoted husband and father.

Their sacrifice is monumental, and their grief incalculable in human terms. For them, a glowing eternal memorial will replace the vital living warmth they knew. For them, the tears and homage of millions will supplant the ready wit and the easy smile For them, consolation will be sought in prayer rather than in his arms.

The inbred strength with which they were endowed has been sorely tested during these terrible days of tragedy. America will do well to proudly follow and justly cherish their example.

We have all heard reference to John Kennedy leaving his mark as a profile in courage. Is it not appropriate and equally important for us to seek to emulate him and thereby leave for posterity our own profile in courage, giving some meaning to his sacrifice? And so we must go forward as he would have demanded of us.

We will sincerely miss him.

It is fitting at this time, I think, to include this prayer, written by Mrs. Cora Taliaferro, 200 Forsythe Street, Chattanooga, Tenn., and read to the assembled church women of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Chattanooga, Tenn., on Monday, November 25, after President Kennedy's funeral:

> Almighty God, we beseech Thee to look with mercy upon our land and its grieving people. Guide, we pray Thee, our President and all those to whom has been committed the Government of this Nation, and grant to them special gifts of understanding, of counsel and strength; that upholding what is right and following what is true, they may obey Thy holy will and fulfill Thy divine purpose. Grant, O Lord, that the sound of the shot which took the life of the President of the United States may echo in the hearts of the people of this Nation and tear away the pall of apathy and indifference to the welfare of our country; and may awaken anew a pledge of allegiance to a Republic built on law and order, of physical safety, of mental sanity, and spiritual sanctity; that we may be one people, under God, bound together with that cord of love which is a lifeline to save those weaker than ourselves; with liberty to live a life of abstinence from evil, a life of service to our fellow men, and with justice to all men, who are our brothers. Amen.

**Mr. JORDAN of Idaho.** Mr. President, 46 short years ago, on May 29, 1917, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born in Brookline, Mass.

Since that day he has belonged to the Kennedy family.

On January 3, 1947, he took his oath of office as Congressman from the 11th District of Massachusetts.

Since that day he has belonged to the people of that district.

On January 3, 1953, he took his seat in the U.S. Senate as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Since that day he has belonged to all citizens of that great Commonwealth.

On January 20, 1961, he became the 35th President of the United States, the youngest man ever to be elected to that Office.

Since that day he has belonged to all the people of our great Nation.

On November 22, 1963, in the prime of his life and in a moment of personal and political happiness, he met his Maker.

Since that day he has belonged to the ages. History is the record of the ages.

Let the ages, as recorded in the pages of history, reflect the judgment of the greatness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I feel that he who loved history so much would have wanted it thus.

I add only this thought: Even though I disagreed with some of his policies and programs, I found his idealism inspiring, his objectives admirable. Peace and prosperity should ever be our goals.

Mrs. Jordan and the people of Idaho join with me in extending our sympathy to his father and mother, his sisters and brothers, and most of all to his courageous young widow and his little children.

**Mr. BEALL.** Mr. President, I appreciate having the opportunity to add my voice to the voices of my distinguished colleagues paying tribute to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The many tributes here to the late President will be sincerely spoken by saddened men who were closely associated with him.

I am one of these. It is perhaps pardonable, at this moment, to be personal. I served in the House of Representatives with John Kennedy during his entire tenure in that body. Our service in the House covered the same period. We were elected to the Senate on the same day, and were first sworn in as U.S. Senators at the same time. Six years later we both were reelected.

I knew John Fitzgerald Kennedy well. I always admired his keen intellect, his genial personality, his practical ability as a legislator, and his understanding of and unstinted fairness to those who on occasion opposed him.

President Kennedy was faithful to those things in which he believed, and he respected those who likewise were faithful to their own beliefs, even though they might disagree with him. This trait endeared him to both his supporters and his opposition.

An assassin's bullet struck down John Kennedy. The United States has lost its President and a great leader. The Nation honors him. The Nation mourns.

We extend our deep sympathy and sincere condolences, first, to the bereaved family of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and, second, to our bereaved fellow citizens throughout the land. We all have sustained a great loss.

**Mr. MONRONEY.** Mr. President, the poet Carl Sandburg said in his poem, "Washington Monument by Night":

> The republic is a dream. Nothing happens unless first a dream.

The man we honor with eulogies today was by a dream possessed. John Fitzgerald Kennedy dreamed of a brighter and better world for all mankind. His life was devoted to bringing his dream to reality and to making his dream meaningful to more and more of his fellow men. Another poet, Sheamus O'Sheel, captured in musical phrases the tremendous influence of such a dream. Being, like the late President, an American of Irish descent, Mr. O'Sheel expressed it this way:

> He whom a dream hath possessed knoweth no more of doubting,
> For mist and the blowing of winds and the mouthing of words he scorns.
> No sinuous speech and smooth he hears, but a knightly shouting,
> And never comes darkness down, yet he greeteth a million morns.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy frequently described his dream. His was a dream cherished also by many millions of people throughout the world.

To different individuals his dream held different meanings. Here in our own land, and in many far away places, President Kennedy's dream was the hope for freedom. To uncounted multitudes both in the free world and behind the Iron Curtain the dream of our late President was the dream of peace and justice. But to all who shared it, his was a dream of a brighter and better world.

The dream of an American President is always important. As Editor Norman Cousins put it recently:

> An American President is something special in the world precisely because American history has been something special.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy moved into the Presidency of the United States from this Senate Chamber. During his service in the Senate, he sat here in the chair next to me. Having him as a seat mate enriched my life.

His agile and perceptive mind enabled him to deal decisively with issues before the Senate. As a freshman in the Congress he did his homework, and his rate of learning was phenomenal. His quick smile, his innate modesty and friendliness enabled him to gain stature among the Members of the Senate very rapidly.

The enthusiasm which John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought to the causes closest to his heart proved contagious. In advocating and promoting legislation he seldom launched a play for short yardage. He went for the touchdown every time. With dignity and style, he transferred the spirited gamesmanship and sportsmanship of the playing field to the field of political science. Millions and millions of Americans, particularly our younger people, liked the way he played the game and liked the goals he sought. They rallied to his side and made him President of the United States.

Born to a position of wealth and blessed with uncommon talents and personal attributes, John Fitzgerald Kennedy strove as President to give his country more than he received. In view of the senseless tragedy that cut his term short, one of the most profound contributions he made was in raising the Vice Presidency to a position of unprecedented close rapport to the Presidency. This was a typical demonstration of his courage, of his willingness to face the fact that, being mortal, he should prepare for any eventuality.

In so doing, he left as a legacy to his country and the free world the essential continuity of strong leadership.

His dream is, however, the inheritance we will cherish most. It was the dream of a world free of ill will, ignorance, poverty, and disease. Such a dream can rekindle our spirits in these days of mourning and regret.

Each of us must see that the dream survives.

**Mr. SIMPSON.** Mr. President, all America has been saddened by the tragic death of our young President. Our hearts have ached for his lovely young wife and the two precious children. Although death—the grim reaper—will claim each of us in time, it is the seeming untimeliness and awful brutality of the act which makes the President's passing so tragic and sad.

It is hard for us to realize that the vibrancy and vitality of this young man are stilled forever—but let us remember those beautiful and consoling lines from Laurence Binyon's "For the Fallen":

> They shall grow not old, as
> we that are left grow old:
> Age shall not weary them, nor the
> years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun and
> in the morning
> We will remember them.

**Mr. LONG of Missouri.** Mr. President, millions of words have been written and spoken in bringing to the people of America and the world the heartbreaking story of the assassination of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

For the first time in history citizens of the entire Nation were eyewitnesses to an unfolding national tragedy through television coverage for which even the word, "magnificent," is inadequate. Newspapers kept up with this running story in spite of tight deadlines, supplied background material, and printed some of the most touching and eloquent material we have read in our lifetime.

Yet, for this Nation which hung onto every word and picture of this tragedy, just eight words torn from the hearts of four people tell the story so graphically that none of us here will ever forget them.

They were the "Oh, no!" which was wrung from the soul of Mrs. Kennedy when she saw her husband had been shot; the "My God!" uttered by the first Secret Service man to realize what had happened; the words, "He's dead," which shattered hopes that the President might survive; and, finally, the utterance, "Dear Jack * * *", lifted from the heart of Cardinal Cushing at the funeral service at St. Matthew's.

If President Kennedy had not been a man of wide-ranging and intense but varied interests, we might well now be at the point where we would have to say, "What more can be said."

But as Chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, I had the opportunity to learn that this man's great compassion, which was well known, extended even to those who receive little compassion, the men and women who have been convicted of violating the Nation's laws. This facet of our late President went virtually unpublicized and little noted.

Mr. Kennedy, more than any other President, used his powers of clemency to correct inequities and to relieve hardships. During the 3 years of his administration, he reduced the sentences of more than 100 prisoners and gave full and unconditional pardons to 550 individuals who had been released from prison years ago and thereafter demonstrated good citizenship. Without exception, he approved every clemency action recommended to him by the U.S. Pardon Attorney Reed Cozart, Prison Director Jim Bennett, and the Department of Justice.

He was particularly concerned about injustices resulting from long mandatory no-parole penalties of the Narcotics Control Act. Nearly half the sentences he reduced involved drug addicts and incidental offenders who had become involved in relatively minor drug or marijuana violations and received what in some instances amounted to life sentences for their transgressions. He cut to 20 years the life sentence given a teenage epileptic addict and the 80-year sentence given to another young first offender.

He did not like to see anyone die in prison. Whenever Mr. Cozart sent him an informal note concerning a prisoner who was in terminal illness but who was not eligible for parole, President Kennedy would immediately and without redtape cut the sentence to time served so that the prisoner could return to his home and family right away.

In other instances, where the prisoner was serving a long term and had apparently rehabilitated himself although he had not yet reached the time when he would be eligible for parole, President Kennedy cut the sentence enough to advance the parole eligibility date and make possible an immediate hearing by the U.S. Board of Parole. One such individual with nine children had been in prison several years when the mother of the children abandoned them suddenly.

President Kennedy promptly cut the father's sentence so that the Parole Board could take up his case and arrange his return to his children.

Because of the many cases which came to his attention, President Kennedy was vitally aware of the problems of widespread and extreme disparities in the sentences imposed for given types of offenses from one judge and one district court to another. He encouraged the judges themselves to administer justice in a more fair and equitable manner. When more than 100 Federal judges met at Highland Park, Ill., in the fall of 1961, to examine principles and procedures which would minimize sentence disparities, President Kennedy sent them a message assuring them of his complete support. He said also:

> Our citizens, high and low, rich and poor, the law abiding as well as the lawbreaker, rightfully expect the judge to exercise wisely his position and his power to preserve an orderly and just government and to use this authority as a merciful buffer for the unfortunates and the underprivileged. * * * Without the judge, our Government and our civilization would be without the vigor it must have to survive the present critical competition between systems of government, political philosophy, and social justice. Perhaps more than most elected or appointed officials he symbolizes a government that is ruled by law, a government that today seeks to associate with all nations in the creation of a world of law.

President Kennedy, in his actions and in his words, joined with another great political figure of the Twentieth Century, Winston Churchill, in the belief that one measure of a nation's virtue and strength is its treatment of the criminal. Like Churchill, he believed that "there is treasure, if you can only find it, in the heart of every man."

At this point, Mr. President, I had intended to ask permission to insert a few editorials from Missouri newspapers commenting on President Kennedy's death and what he had meant to this Nation. However, the task of selection was too great. Nearly every paper in Missouri responded in a way I have never seen equaled. Editors of large papers and small papers composed such eloquent, touching and excellent editorials that to have chosen any one, or a few, would have been an injustice to the others.

I did find a commentary, though, that for breadth and depth as well as feeling seemed to sum up the expressions of Missouri newspapermen. The writer is a nationally known Republican, Mr. Roy A. Roberts of the Kansas City Star, one of the great editors and political writers of our time.

In the Sunday, November 24, edition of the Star, he wrote a moving commentary on the death of President Kennedy, and the legend he has willed to this Nation and the world that will see his programs and philosophy live as a shrine to his memory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Robert's article, entitled "Legend Will Live On," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Nov. 24 1963]

### LEGEND WILL LIVE ON—MEMORIES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY WILL BE SPUR TOWARD HIS TWO MAJOR GOALS: WORLD PEACE AND RIGHTS OF MANKIND—LED THE WAY—FORMER PRESIDENT HAD AWESOME RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE SPACE AGE—TIME TO CLOSE RANKS—SOBERING TRAGEDY MAY EASE DIFFERENCE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

(By Roy A. Roberts)

I am confident that the legend of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, living after the man, will drive forcefully toward his two major goals: The peace of the world and the rights of mankind.

Even in the sorrow of the moment, it is possible to see that in the long course of history the legend may prove more effective than was the vibrant national and world leadership of John Kennedy.

But what a shocking price it is to pay. What a pointless sacrifice of a human life at the hands of an assassin.

### HONOR HIS MEMORY

If I know the American people—and I believe I do—they are sentimental and they are fine. They cherish the memory of a man and oftentimes in their midst, the honored legend of one of their fallen fellows carries farther than did his voice, however eloquent and powerful.

We can know, certainly, that the legend of John Kennedy will not quickly pass. In these few terrible hours it has been inscribed on the Nation's consciousness. Both the man and the legend have their place in history and both will grow with the decades. Violent death, pointless death, so often guarantees that it will be so.

And, in the case of the late President, it could be no other way. He was first in so many things.

He was the first President elected to the space age.

He was the first Roman Catholic President.

He was, almost unique in our history, a truly urban President.

He was the first President to carry for long—although Dwight Eisenhower knew the burden in his later years—the awesome responsibility of the finger on the button. He knew that the moment of decision could come and that civilization, in the push of the button, could be reduced to chaos.

Throughout the story of the Republic, there has always been the lonely man in the White House, ordained by his people to make the decisions. The Presidency has always been an assignment of terrible burden. But from the other day henceforth, until man learns to control these nuclear forces, the burden has grown and will continue to grow. It is a time of no second-guessing and beyond peace lies death.

Thus does the happenstance of time ennoble and enshrine the legend of the young President struck down because of some twisted mind's decision. In sorrow, animosities are buried. From grief grows the memory that works on for the cause.

### A TIME TO RALLY

Certainly the immediate impact of the tragedy has sobered the Nation. I hope, indeed, that it will erase permanently some of the fierce antagonisms of the forthcoming campaign. I do know that the American people, as they have always done in moments of emergency past, will close ranks in this dark time. Because it has always been thus, this Nation has reached its heights of freedom and democracy.

But to foresee the future we must know the present. And this, I believe, must be acknowledged as a factor in the Nation's story yet to be told. The present Congress had made a shambles of President Kennedy's domestic program. I have observed these matters for half a century and I can recall no Congress that has placed its stamp of approval on so little that a President wanted.

Frankly, you could describe the legislative situation on Capitol Hill only as an awful mess. There are many reasons and on a recent 10-day swing through the East, I sought them out. I was doing so, in fact, when this awful thing happened. I had intended to write—and in proper time, the story can still be written—of the whys and wherefores of the impasse between the White House and Congress.

Yet in no way did this situation discourage John F. Kennedy or lessen his ardor for his goals. Undaunted, but possibly a bit frustrated, he rode off to the political wars, confident that next year his program—built around civil rights and a tax reduction—would win congressional approval.

### A LOOK AHEAD

It is my guess now—and it is only a guess—that this confidence will be justified, and perhaps sooner than expected. But not, of course, in 1963, for the days left on the calendar simply will not permit it.

I suggest this for two reasons: The shocking end of John Kennedy's life did not resolve the issue of civil rights, for example. But it most certainly will remove much of the extreme bitterness from the picture. In a sense, the Kennedy name had become a symbol in this fight. As symbol becomes legend, we may see a greater sense of reason, a lessening of bitterness. And if there is a lesson in the tragedy of Dallas, it is this: The Nation needs more reason, less emotion in dealing with this major problem of the rights of all citizens.

Then, another and very practical reason. Although John Kennedy served on Capitol Hill, had many friends there and understood the legislative process, it must be said that he was never a member of the lodge, so to speak. He was detached, in a sense, and certainly outside the inner circle.

On the other hand, Lyndon B. Johnson, who now sits in the White House, was in a similar sense the grand master of the lodge during his later years on the Hill. Not for decades has there been a more adept or subtle leader of the Senate than was the Senator from Texas. Perhaps his knowledge and understanding of the world and of its global economy do not equal the knowledge of his predecessor. But Lyndon Johnson knows Congress inside and out. You see the distinct possibility of a breaking of the impasse which had become so serious that thoughtful observers wondered whether the legislative machinery could function in these complex times.

### EXPERIENCE HIS BULWARK

L.B.J. and Mr. Sam—the late Speaker Sam Rayburn—ran a taut congressional ship for so many years. When Mr. Johnson moved from the Senate to the Vice Presidency, one fact was obvious: Those who followed him in the leadership of the lodge would not permit him to run Capitol Hill by proxy. No one realized this more than did Lyndon Johnson and he carefully refrained from interfering in congressional activities. Had he interferred, it would have been a terrific tactical error.

As President, Lyndon Johnson assumes the duty of leadership, and Congress must recognize this fact. His experience, his old associations may ease his task. In the area of domestic legislation at least, this is a significant fact of the Johnson administration.

It is hardly the time to discuss politics and it would not be in good taste. But there are a few thoughts, I believe, that may be properly expressed, toward the end of better understanding John Kennedy and his successor, and in preparation for the difficult months to come.

Certainly all preconceived notions of both parties must now go by the boards. The dope-sheets will be torn up and a new picture will develop but slowly.

### KEYMAN ON TEAM

By coincidence, there was one question in my mind when I left for Washington that, once answered, sheds light on the capabilities of our new President. Did the President and his advisers, preparing for the 1964 campaign, really want L.B.J. on the ticket, or was there an intention to dump him, as some have intimated? I talked to several persons close to the top, and this, they said, was certain: John F. Kennedy did want Lyndon Johnson as his running mate. One associate of President Kennedy told me:

"Of course we want Johnson. He has been a team player. He has given the administration his completely loyalty and support. He has been self-effacing, perhaps too self-effacing, feeling that the President should always keep in the spotlight."

It was a judgment of the man Johnson and a judgment we can take at face value.

Moreover, I think it can be safely noted that the Kennedys did not anticipate defeat next year. The President and those around him recognized that a tough battle was ahead. There was the belief that John F. Kennedy had probably reached his personal low point on the political scale. It was better, the reasoning went, to reach the low point a year before the election, than either just before or just after the convention.

### AT HIS BEST IN CAMPAIGN

Another point might be cleared up. Do not carry any illusions that President Kennedy had entered the political wars reluctantly or with faint heart. He may have been frustrated by the ebb and flow of world events or by the slow progress of his domestic program and the immobility of Congress. But not on politics. John F. Kennedy was a born campaigner with a deep fervor of cause and dedication.

I might recall that Franklin D. Roosevelt referred to Al Smith as the "Happy Warrior." The title stuck to the end. But Al Smith was not a happy warrior. He was a hard, snarling fighter who did not relish the political battle. John F. Kennedy, I say in the deepest of respect, was a happy warrior. And as the bullet flashed, the cheers of the crowd were ringing in his ears.

I mention these bits and pieces of politics now not because they may point to the shape of things to come, but chiefly because of the light they shed on the spirit and character of the President who gave his life and of the President who has succeeded him. There will be time enough, later, for all the politics and it will be time tinged with a deep sorrow that will linger.

I confess freely to a real liking for John Kennedy. I do not pretend to have been close to the man and I never was. But he fascinated me as few Presidents have. I did not buy everything he had to sell and certainly did not buy the philosophy of the Democratic Party on which he ran 3 years ago.

### DURING TIME OF CHANGE

Looking back over those 3 years, however, I think I may say that one achievement of his too-short career was to lead his party from the outmoded ways of the New Deal into the global economy of the space age. I doubt, frankly, that most businessmen ever understood this President. I am sure I did not, for he was not an easy man to fathom. On the surface, he was a great liberal. Yet his tax bill and his general fiscal program contained more of the moderate GOP philosophy than of the New Deal. Perhaps here we have one chief difficulty that he encountered in getting his program through Congress.

You could never size up the man on the basis of those he gathered about him. He had his circle from Harvard, liberals all. Their names made rightwingers foam at the mouth. He wanted the assistance of the liberals but he did not necessarily base policy on their advice.

Then, as Secretary of Defense, he chose Robert McNamara. It is the biggest single job in any administration (for after all, a President is, in a real sense, his own Secretary of State). McNamara is a modern industrialist, a nominal Republican and one of the strongest figures to go to Washington in decades. Excepting Robert Kennedy, McNamara probably carried more weight in the Kennedy administration than any other man.

At the economically sensitive Federal Reserve, John Kennedy strongly supported William McChesney Martin, and no one could regard Martin as anything but a sound money and fiscal man. Douglas Dillon, another nominal Republican who became Treasury Secretary, is a man who also knows money and is by no means a liberal in his economic opinions.

In matters of the deepest concern to labor John Kennedy was sympathetic. Yet he held out a restraining demand against the drive for shorter hours and too-sharp wage increases that might harm the Nation in world marketplaces.

### NOT ONE-SIDED

I hesitate to label any man yet if this is a picture of the liberal, it is also the picture of a leader firmly oriented in a philosophy of real conservatism. Where John Kennedy stood in the ideological spectrum, I never could say. But this much was certain: He knew the score and he had a profound instinct for the principles and processes of government.

Then, too, the words of a man become a mark of his leadership. John Kennedy was one of our most articulate Presidents, one of the best read in history and literature. There was an element of majesty in some of his pronouncements on the world and its search for peace. I suspect that many of his speeches will live on. They were moving and if some of his words on domestic problems seemed to be aimed at the pocketbook, his words on peace spoke to the hearts of men with a real warmth. Of course, his critics said he was better at words than actions. But, I wonder, what action?

Excerpt some of the paragraphs from the speeches he made and was to have made on his final trip to Texas, and you would have a moving creed for the Nation.

History may rate the confrontation of Nikita Khrushchev in the showdown of nuclear decision as the biggest episode in the Kennedy career. But I wonder if more importance should not be given to President Kennedy's whole approach to world affairs than to one single episode, spectacular turning point that it was.

### FAMILIAR WITH SITUATION

And because the new President, Lyndon Johnson, was so familiar with this whole approach, there is an element of reassurance. He sat in with John Kennedy when most of the major decisions were made. He does not face the impossible task that Harry S. Truman faced when Franklin Roosevelt died. Mr. Truman, to put it bluntly, was thrust onto the world stage unprepared, through no fault of his own, for the moments ahead.

In contrast, Lyndon Johnson knows thoroughly the Kennedy program and the men who are charged with carrying it out. To that extent, this transition in brief is easier. But it must be acknowledged that President Johnson has one liability in his new role. Our allies and our foes respect power. John F. Kennedy was elected Commander in Chief by his people. However strong his leadership may be, the new President will carry the mark of a man who succeeded to power only by the accident of another man's death. It will be thus until he is elected in his own right or until there is a new man in the White House. Especially is this a factor of importance against the background of forthcoming elections in other nations. For times of balloting are times of uncertainty and uncertainty does not create easy diplomacy.

And there is always, in national emergency or national change, an element of uncertainty for the economy. New York and Washington, I found, were thoroughly optimistic over the future. They agreed that these good times would be prolonged into the new year. So universal was the optimism that it made me feel somewhat uneasy, for trouble comes, so often, when everyone is thinking the same way. Now, we must wonder how the economy will withstand this great shock.

### MORALE HAD BEEN LOW

Yet with all the optimism, there has been, in the people, a sense of frustration. National leaders I talked to in this last week said they detected a letdown feeling on the part of the public. People are weary of crisis, perhaps tired of spending money on nations that hardly can find their own place on the maps of the world. It is a case of the Nation's morale at something of a low ebb and it has been reflected, I suggest, in the savage attacks on foreign aid and spending.

In times of frustration there is a search for simple answers which so seldom are solutions. It has beeen reflected, I fear, in the growth of extremist groups of left and right, in the manner that the campaign, full of vituperation and name calling, had begun. It has been disturbing. We need, in a democracy, our differences of opinion but if there is a lesson of Dallas, it is this: We do not need the venom spewed by the hate groups; we need reasoned argument without vicious hatred.

And perhaps the death of John F. Kennedy may center our national thinking once more on these principles of reason and moderation in a democracy. If so, his terrible death will not have beeen in vain. But again, I express the common grief: What a terrible price to pay.

President Johnson deserves and will get—because it is the American way—his chance. Technically, he enters the period that politicians call the honeymoon. For him, it cannot be an extended honeymoon for the hour of national decision at the polls is not too far off.

### GOOD BASIC UNDERSTANDING

I have known Lyndon Johnson much longer than I knew John Kennedy. I respect him and his ability. He, too, knows and grasps the principles of government and of democracy. He has the understanding of people that is so essential. I doubt that any new President has had so much experience in Washington and it should be of tremendous help to him in this hour of sorrow and shock.

Yet it is the stuff of a man that counts, that spells the difference between success and failure on the world stage. Certainly President Johnson starts with the good wishes and the good will of his countrymen. We can hope and pray that he will measure up to his awesome task. Yet we cannot expect this

> administration to be a carbon copy of the Kennedy administration. Lyndon Johnson's roots go back to the soil, not to the city. He has lived as a part of the space age; yet, he is, in contrast to John Kennedy, more in the tradition of Presidents past.
>
> And now he must carry on where the young President left off in the moment of violence. On this middle-aged Texan falls the responsibility of world, national, and party leadership. It is a terrifying responsibility but I know that his Nation will stand united behind him in the trying months of history's ordeal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the other Members of this body in paying tribute to our former colleague, the late President John F. Kennedy, whose life was so tragically ended by a coward's bullet last month.

We in the Senate who had known and worked with him for many years were especially stunned and shocked by that almost unbelievable act, not only because we knew the man well, but because we immediately recognized this vicious act as an attack on both our form of government and the highest office to which we can elect one of our citizens.

The fact that we may have differed with some of the policies of our late colleague does not in the least diminish our respect for his determination to pursue the goals which he sought and in which he so strongly believed.

November 22, 1963, will remain a tragic day in the history of our country—a day when the United States lost its young and vigorous leader and a day when we in the Senate lost a friend and colleague whom we had grown to know and respect so well.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President John F. Kennedy, only 46 years of age, happily married, father of two children, brilliant, eager, foremost leader of the free world, died a martyr. He will no longer direct the destiny of our Nation and of freedom-loving people the world over.

John F. Kennedy was a great President of the United States. Perhaps it is too early to fix his place in history because so much of what he initiated was left for others to complete. However, two of his achievements seem likely to take root.

For the first time in this century, he placed the power and prestige of the Presidency behind a downtrodden race whose second-class status demeaned the dignity of all Americans. To protect not only our freedom but the freedom of all mankind, he took the world to the precipice of a war during the Cuban crisis in 1962. Khrushchev's withdrawal of his offensive missiles from Cuba was America's greatest cold war triumph. It was also a great personal triumph for President Kennedy. A measure of his greatness lies in the fact that he followed up this triumph by deeds intended to eliminate the risk of a holocaust through madness or miscalculation—his speech at American University last June, the nuclear test ban treaty, and his other efforts toward peaceful solutions to the world's problems.

Mr. President, something else was irretrievably lost in the death of John F. Kennedy—the brilliance of his presence, the glow of his style. He brought renewed dignity to political life. His literacy, his wit, his physical grace, and his sense of history added new dimensions to the Presidency. He cherished not only learning but the learned. He brought to the Presidency a new brilliance and luster. He sparked the imagination of all Americans, reawakening in them an awareness of the great potential of our Nation.

In World War II the life of this gallant young man was saved in enemy action. In this cold war he lost his life. Why, we ask? Perhaps the answer is that hate for fellow Americans has been building up, stimulated by lunatic fringe propagandists of the radical right and radical left. There has been too much hate built up by unscrupulous demagogs—hate for President Kennedy; hate for his administration; hate for the Chief Justice of the United States; hate unbridled.

Some citizens have been tolerant of extremist elements among us, evidently, in the belief they were crackbrains, loudmouths, and habitual letter-to-editor writers who would disappear of their own accord in due time. Since the witch hunts of the early 1950's a climate was created which encouraged these lunatic extremist organizations to flourish unchallenged. Perhaps this atmosphere, which our young President sought so hard to combat, contributed to his death. If these lunatic fringe extremists of the left and right are to be restrained, they must be subject to constant exposure and relentless publicity. Unfortunately, there are too many of these patriots for profits. America is really last with them. The people of America and the entire world have poured out their grief, shock, and anger over the assassination of our President. Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, expressed the feelings of many Americans in his statement on that tragic occasion. He said:

> A great and good President has suffered martyrdom as a result of hatred and bitterness that has been injected into the life of our Nation by bigots, but his memory will always be an inspiration to Americans of good will everywhere.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with John F. Kennedy both in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate. His death meant to me not only the loss of a great President and a great leader, but the passing of a close personal friend. Let us hope that his otherwise senseless death may become meaningful in the light of history by furnishing the inspiration needed for completing his unfinished tasks. Let us complete that which he began.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on this occasion when the Senate is honoring the memory of our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, I, too, wish to pay tribute to my former friend and colleague. His tragic and untimely death stunned and saddened all Americans, particularly those of us who knew him both as a Member of Congress and as our Nation's Chief Executive. His sudden passing also shocked millions of persons around the globe who mourn with us. Even now it is difficult to comprehend and grasp the brutal truth that he is gone.

As others have thoroughly chronicled his remarkable life and his remarkable career, I shall not dwell upon biographical detail except to note a fact which might be overlooked, yet which endures to his eternal credit: Born to material wealth, John F. Kennedy could have existed in indolent ease; but instead he chose to dedicate his life to serving his country, in war as an officer in the U.S. Navy and in peace as a U.S. Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, and finally as elected President of the United States, giving at each station the fullest measure of devotion to the people he loved and the Nation he revered. It was a mark of his ability and intellectual capacity that he grew in stature with each higher responsibility and each new post.

Then suddenly, when he was at the full height of his powers, an evil hand, from behind without warning, fired two mortal shots, depriving a wife of her husband, depriving two young children of their father, depriving our Nation of its Chief, and depriving the world of one of its great humanitarians and one of its most steadfast friends.

A man of peace was struck down by a villain of unspeakable violence.

A man of great and good will was struck down by a disciple of hatred and malevolence.

A brave and worthy personage was struck down by a craven coward.

And so the horrible news flashed forth: John F. Kennedy, age 46, mortally wounded on active duty in service of his country, felled by an assassin's bullets.

In the long span of recorded history, 46 years on life's stage are but as the twinkling of an eye. But John F. Kennedy's 46 years were crammed with action and good works which will leave their mark in the years to come.

While only time and coming events can render the final verdict on all that John F. Kennedy did, we his contemporaries know now, as we knew instantly at the time of his passing, that someone vibrant and courageous and dynamic and vigorous and imaginative and adventurous and enthusiastic and gregarious and gay and warm and witty and personable and cultured and likeable and gallant and humane and decent and idealistic and purposeful and resolute and intellectual and devout—a complete man—had passed from our midst.

Though as President he occupied our Nation's highest office and stood in the forefront of the world's leaders, John F. Kennedy remained a human being with a capacity to attend to little courtesies and endearing acts of kindness. I recall with pleasure that last October, preoccupied with the unbelievably heavy burdens of office, he took time out to send birthday felicitations to me in Hawaii. I am only one of legions of people who were touched by his thoughtfulness.

These many personal attributes he crowned with a profound sense of national destiny, giving eloquent expression to our overriding mission as a people and as a Nation; to work unceasingly for a world of peace and justice for all mankind.

Although mid-20th century America had become an affluent society, attaining the greatest good for the greatest number in history, John F. Kennedy would not let us, his countrymen, rest on our laurels, but kept prodding us and leading us toward higher goals and new frontiers of endeavor—not merely the obvious frontiers of our land, sea, and space environment, but also the frontiers of the mind and spirit.

So it was that John F. Kennedy, personifying the grandeur and beneficence of America, pressed impatiently on toward a better world where all its people would be nourished, clothed, sheltered, schooled, accepted, and accorded the liberty, equality, and dignity due them as children of the Creator.

He did not spare himself in pursuit of that goal. Last June, he journeyed nearly 10,000 miles from Washington to Hawaii and back in order to deliver a major civil rights plea in our multiracial island State. Had he given his address anywhere, it would have commanded attention. By delivering it in Hawaii, a living showcase of racial tolerance and harmony, before a conference of U.S. mayors, John F. Kennedy created a stunning impact. It was a strong message delivered personally to leaders of local communities where rests so much of the responsibility for attaining equality of opportunity for all races.

We of Hawaii were, of course, highly pleased and very proud that he had selected Honolulu as the forum for his civil rights plea.

Our only regret was that he could not have lingered in Hawaii for a visit to our neighbor islands and a rest in our mid-Pacific paradise. Despite his very tight schedule during his short stay, he found time to visit the Arizona Memorial to pay tribute to his comrades entombed in their battleship since that infamous enemy attack on December 7, 1941.

It is little wonder that, from the moment he landed until the moment he departed, the people of Hawaii received him warmly and enthusiastically without a single sour note during his visit, a tribute not only to his high office, but also to the man himself and to his outgoing and magnetic personality.

Yes, John F. Kennedy personified the spirit of America, giving it new voice, new meaning, new dimension, and new focus for Americans and for the 3 billion souls who inhabit this earth.

Although his person was struck down, his spirit—the spirit of America—endures, as it did before him and as it will long after him if we, as he, are willing to protect and preserve that spirit and pass it on to our children and to their children and to children throughout all generations, emulating in the process his courage, his fidelity, his willingness to sacrifice all, even life itself, that this spirit illuminating the world shall never be extinguished.

Now it is for us, the living, to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished business before us, as he so often exhorted.

No eulogy on John F. Kennedy would be complete without tribute to Mrs. Kennedy, whose grace, gallantry, and fortitude wrote an unforgettable and altogether fitting epilogue to his Profiles in Courage. In those dark days of supreme anguish after her husband's life was so treacherously and horribly snuffed out before her eyes, Mrs. Kennedy's serene composure, indomitable courage, and superb dignity attained awesome and heroic proportions.

She who most needed solace gave solace to others.

In this time of mourning, therefore, we honor not only a distinguished President but also his magnificent lady and from them take inspiration.

To Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, to Caroline, to John, Jr., to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy, to our colleague Edward Kennedy, to the Attorney General Robert Kennedy, and to all the Kennedy family, Mrs. Fong and I extend our heartfelt condolences.

May you find comfort in this expression of affection, respect, and esteem for the memory of your beloved Jack.

And so, one last farewell, one final Aloha, to our fallen leader who so nobly personified the greatness and goodness of America.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it was a bitter cold day, less than 3 years ago when Senator John F. Kennedy, the President-elect rode up Pennsylvania Avenue in the inaugural parade and took the oath of office as President of the United States. It was not an auspicious start for a new administration but the ringing words of his inaugural address warmed the hearts and lifted up the spirit of the whole world:

> Let the word go forth from this time and place—to friend and foe alike—that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage. Let every nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty. This much we pledge—and more.

Less than 3 years after John F. Kennedy made that pledge to our Nation at his inaugural as our 35th President, he gave more. In the words of another President, Abraham Lincoln, President Kennedy gave "the last full measure of devotion."

I was in Washington when the President left for his last trip—to Texas. I was here when his body was returned. I joined hundreds of thousands of Americans in paying tribute to him when he lay in the rotunda of the Capitol—and when he was buried at Arlington National Cemetery. Montanans, who spent hours before their television and radio sets and read thousands of words about the untimely death of our beloved President, are as well informed as I am about the loss we have suffered. Suffice it to say that President Kennedy was a special friend of Montana.

Senator MANSFIELD and I were with President Kennedy on his recent trip to Montana. He was interested in the conservation, orderly development, wise management, and highest possible use of the natural resources with which we are especially blessed. He never forgot the conservation program which, as a presidential nominee, he laid down in Billings in the fall of 1960.

President Kennedy was interested in Yellowtail Dam, Yellowstone Park, Custer Battlefield National Monument. He asked about them on the airplane as we neared Billings. He talked about them, and about other key parts of Montana development, as we drove through Billings.

Because of the interest of President Kennedy, we have more parks, more recreation facilities, more forest access roads than ever before. He recommended to Congress many other proposals to develop our resources—including the greatest resource of all, our youngsters.

But when he spoke to the people of Montana he threw away his prepared speeches and spoke about what was in his heart. He talked about the test ban treaty, about peace in the world. He spoke of complicated problems which concern all citizens.

"So when you ask," he said, "why are we in Laos or Vietnam or the Congo, or why do we support the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, we do so because we believe that our freedom is tied up with theirs, and if we can develop a world in which all the countries are free, then the threat to the security of the United States is lessened.

"So we have to stay at it. We must not be fatigued."

President Kennedy was a special friend of Montanans, many of whom knew him personally. As a Senator, he had spoken in Butte and in Helena. As a presidential candidate, he had made a major speech in Billings. As President, he had visited with and spoken to many groups, including Indian leaders. His trip to Montana this fall, with speeches in Billings and Great Falls, was a return to friends. John F. Kennedy was a friend of man, a leader of men, which enriched the lives and inspired the spirit of all of us.

The epitaph of President Kennedy will be written in the accomplishments of his administration, in the courage of his leadership, in the initiative of his domestic innovations, in his boldness as an international statesman. John F. Kennedy belongs to history and the ages.

### A MEMBER OF THE FAMILY LOST

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I shared with my fellow Americans a very high regard for President John F. Kennedy when he was alive and along with my fellow Americans I share a deep sense of personal loss now that he has been taken from us. His death affected me, as it did millions of others, as though I had lost a member of my own family.

My association with the late President, although not a close one, dated back to the swearing in of Members of the 80th Congress in January 1947. We were both freshmen Members of the House, and I came to know him as a colleague in that great body noted for its fellowship and esprit de corps. He was always friendly. My contacts with him were always pleasant.

I was privileged to become a Member of the Senate in January 1961, when President Kennedy's administration took office. Although I am a member of the opposite party, I never failed to recognize President Kennedy's ability and dedication to the course he considered right for the country. He had my highest respect. Although he was in office only a relatively short time, his youth and vigor and personality have left a lasting imprint on our country.

His memory will always remain bright.

To Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her children, and to all of the other members of the Kennedy family, I extend my profound sympathy.

**Mr. MECHEM.** Mr. President, the people of New Mexico join with other Americans in paying sincere tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

We were stunned beyond description by the manner in which he was taken from us. Such a deed is an attack on all of us and on our institutions and way of life.

President Kennedy was a man of conviction and principle, who fought hard for what he believed. We can take comfort in the way our fellow Americans have withstood this devastating blow. We can take confidence in the steadiness of our great Nation during this trying and dangerous period.

Even in our sorrow, shared by all Americans at the tragic death of our President, let us take renewed faith in the goodness of the overwhelming majority of humanity.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of the Kennedy family.

**Mr. SCOTT.** Mr. President, I would like to say of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy that I knew him well, and I admired him.

He was our President, and for that reason the Nation is in deep mourning. But I knew him also as a man, and that was why I cried, as all America cried, when he was shot.

John Kennedy was young, not just in age, but in outlook. I suspect if he had lived to the fullness of man's normal span, he would still have the vigor that characterized his approach to public affairs.

This youth, optimism, and vigor permeated everything he did and, as many in this Senate remember, these qualities seemed to accompany him through the door of every room he entered.

This young man saw new frontiers and was convinced that they were just beyond the horizon. He strode forward in pursuit of them, with determination and style that carried him to the hearts of many Americans. These Americans elected him first to the House, then the Senate, finally the Presidency.

But his impact spread well beyond our own borders. We all know of the high regard heads of state all over the world had for the late President. However, I received a letter from Australia just this morning which says, in simple terms, what many persons in all stations of life thought of our late President.

My correspondent wrote:

> No matter whose side you are on he was a good guy and had the guts to say and do what he thought was right.

No one knows what was in the mind of the assassin, because he also is now dead. But all evidence indicates that he was deranged.

And, as former President Eisenhower wrote in a memorial article about the late President Kennedy:

> Knowing that such psychopaths are with us, we as a people do have a responsibility for avoiding fanaticism and overemotional political extremes that may tend to incite unstable individuals.

That should give us some suggestion for a fitting memorial for President Kennedy, not the only one, but one which is certainly in order in this Christmas season. Would it not be appropriate to call for a moratorium on hatred?

We are all aware of the fact that stable men are able to handle emotion, including the emotion of hatred, degrading as it is, but which can be handled and kept under control by the majority of people. But when men and women pass on expressions of hatred—of the kind that has swirled around our land, polluting our politics and our very lives—sooner or later the waves go on and reach an unstable person.

That person may be on the right or on the left. It does not matter. But those unstable men and women are capable of horrible violence because they cannot control hatred.

Each of us in our private lives can do something about it. The next time any American hears an expression of hatred or vitriol or a gangrenous kind of remark, he should not laugh nor snicker nor should he lightly dismiss evil in action. It is our duty, all of us, to condemn these things.

We as individuals and we as a nation have an obligation to condemn extremism, the kind that permits of no free discussion, that admits no diversity, that labels persons who refuse to conform to established patterns as "traitors."

This I offer as a part of my personal memorial to the fallen President. We will always cherish his memory.

**Mr. NELSON.** Mr. President, perhaps now that it is all over, we should remember the happy times of the past and face the sober challenges of the future.

We lived through the assassination period, numb with shock and inadequate in our grief, and then we had our spirit as a nation restored by the stately funeral and the towering courage of a great First Lady.

Perhaps now the man whose loss we feel so much would want most of all for us to look backward with a fond smile, and look forward with a brave heart.

The past is rich in memories. One memory which comes back vividly to me now is that dramatic scene at the 1956 Democratic National Convention when a wonderfully boyish John Kennedy, looking like a college freshman, climaxed an amazing drive for the vice presidential nomination by urging the cheering delegates to unite behind Estes Kefauver, who had just defeated him in a close race.

The electric personality, the tremendous ability to radiate charm to the throngs, was clearly visible on that occasion. Many of us said then that he was a man of the future.

Eventually, we in Wisconsin came to know him almost as a native son. All through the late winter and the cold, wet spring of 1960 he stumped our State in quest of the presidential nomination. The wool-shirted woodsmen in the towns of our far north got to know him over a cup of coffee, and the farmers in our rich southern counties met him over the fence.

Everywhere he went this remarkable young man and his extraordinary family won the hearts of the people of Wisconsin. That is why his death leaves such a void within us. That is why, when his young son salutes his departing funeral wagon, we salute too.

Since coming to Washington in January, I was able to visit with him at his home, and to talk with him in his office. I was struck by the same characteristics which the whole world came to appreciate: The open and friendly manner, the good humor, the spirit of confidence in the face of grave problems, and most of all, the keen mind, with its amazing breadth of interest and its storehouse of detailed knowledge.

My happiest memory of all will always be of his trip to northern Wisconsin on September 24, at the start of his nationwide conservation tour. We flew together in a helicopter over Lake Superior and the Apostle Islands, and he peered out of the window in excitement. We talked about the disappearing bald eagle and the clear blue water and the beautiful beaches, which reminded him of Cape Cod, and I was struck anew at this warm feeling for the world of nature in a sophisticated young man from Boston.

John Kennedy shared the sense of urgency many Americans have come to feel about preserving the beauty of the land in which we live. His leadership in this field will be sorely missed.

As the Nation binds up its wounds and tries to return to the tasks before it, we are all struck by the extent to which everything we do must now be recast in the light of his tragic death.

We cannot face up to any of the great issues without realizing that the vigorous young man who articulated these issues and gave them substance is gone.

He had entered all of our lives, to an astonishing degree. He had completely filled the image we have in our minds of the President of the United States, the greatest democratic office on earth. Many things will never be the same without him.

But the tasks remain.

The murder of the man who articulated the great issues of our day does not remove the issues. It simply makes them more difficult to resolve.

Some of the great burden which he carried passes on to each of us who remain behind.

The only way we can begin to replace this great loss of courage and wisdom and dedication to American democracy is to summon some of the same spirit from within ourselves.

I am confident that that spirit is there. It must be, or we would not have responded as we did to these very qualities in President Kennedy.

We loved his wit and his articulateness, we admired his courage, we marveled at his knowledge, we were moved by his deep commitment to America and to preserving the rights of men. Well then, let us live on in his tradition. Let us look within ourselves and find all we can of those same gifts we came to recognize in John Kennedy. Let each of us contribute to our country what we can of these gifts. That is the way for us to remember him. That is the way for us to face the future. That is the way he would have wished it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the fact of John F. Kennedy's assassination remains shrouded in an aura of unbelievability despite the complete news coverage, despite the funeral, despite the finality of his burial. We know it occurred and that life is going on in a new pattern, but we are still staggered by the awful realization that this thing happened in our midst.

Perhaps the reason for this lingering of memory stems from the nature of the man and his approach to national problems. John Kennedy concerned himself with every facet of American life. With youthful vitality he projected himself into every controversy, every decision of national import, every issue at hand. Thus, he became more widely known than most of his predecessors and his sudden removal from the scene touches all of our lives.

It is inevitable that a man of this nature would himself become a storm center of controversy, and that many would rise up to disagree with and oppose him. Such opposition has often been voiced in this Chamber by Members of the Senate including members of his party.

As a former Senator, President Kennedy understood this—indeed, he participated in the process of criticism and opposition himself when he was among us. He recognized that the right to hold honest differences of opinion was one of the privileges of freemen, and he sought to preserve that right in American life. Like any true Irishman, he is reported to have been looking toward the coming political battle in 1964 with zest and was a proven master in political strategy.

This Chamber has been the scene of the unfolding of some of his strategy, and served as an effective forum for him.

It is fitting now that this Chamber should witness a pause in the processes of controversy and strategy to see Senators unite in their determination to do honor to John Kennedy's memory. All Senators, whatever section of the country they represent or point of view they advocate, can and emphatically do subscribe to the proposition that John Kennedy was an extraordinary person whose service to his country requires extraordinary tribute.

Dwight Eisenhower once said:

> To live for your country is a duty as demanding as is the readiness to die for it.

John Kennedy did live for his country, with a style and verve that enabled him to overcome serious hurdles which fate placed in his path.

He was afflicted with physical discomforts severe enough to take him to the brink of death and prevent him from performing his duties here for almost a year. Yet he fought back from that experience to wage one of the most exhausting campaigns in American history. His war record is well known, and underscores his personal sense of courage and dedication.

He suffered personal tragedy in a measure greater than most of us have known. A brother killed in war, a sister dead, a father stricken, two children lost in infancy—how many others do we know whose lives have crumbled in the face of such tragedies in the immediate family. John Kennedy remained resolute and carried on in his constitutional duty.

And so, indeed, must we. An extraordinary, impressive, exciting man has passed our way, and we are all richer for the experience of having known him. He has been brutally removed from us, and we are all poorer for the loss. Our highest tribute to him will be to carry on as he would have done were he in our place—resolutely, firmly fighting for highest principles, motivated by a dedication to the American dream of liberty for all men.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, millions upon millions of words have been printed and spoken concerning the tragic events of Friday, November 22, 1963. More millions of words have been printed and spoken expressing the Nation's—and the world's—sense of loss, and extending heartfelt sympathy to the family of our late President, John F. Kennedy. There is little that I can add here.

Speaking in part for my State of Nebraska, I want to say that the shock, grief and profound sorrow which engulfed our country reached the same depths in Nebraska.

It is most difficult with mere words to reflect properly the esteem and affection in which Americans hold the President of the United States. He is the supreme symbol of a governmental system, a system dear to all of us, for its institutions and principles have brought to us the most bountiful blessings ever enjoyed by any society in all of mankind's long history. Strike down that symbol, let tragedy be visited upon the man who typifies the achievements of America, and we all are stricken.

We mourn for our late President. We mourn the loss suffered by his family and we extend to them our sympathy. We mourn the loss to our Nation and the free world of a man whose own accomplishments bespeak the greatness of our country.

We must not falter in our efforts to guard vigilantly the governmental system of which the President is the supreme symbol. Our late President would have been proud of the swift and unerring transition of leadership following his tragic death. Within a matter of minutes, the mantle of leadership passed to President Lyndon Johnson who raised anew the torch of freedom for the world to see. There was no anarchy, no political junta such as we have seen elsewhere under somewhat similar circumstances. There was no scramble for position and power.

Our forefathers had guaranteed such an orderly transition when they drafted our Constitution; and we today, in our time of sorrow, can thank our Creator for their wisdom.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, while the Nation mourns a President, we in the Congress mourn an associate and a friend. The Nation thinks of him on the high eminence of his great office. Many of us who served with him both in the House of Representatives and the Senate cherish more the memory of those earlier years. Some of us recall his fight for health. Most of us recall his rise in this great body. I can think of no one who did not respect and admire him. A voracious reader, a master of language, a tireless worker, a fierce fighter for his convictions, he had a warmth of personality and a zest for living that endeared him to his close friends and attracted us all.

His death was untimely but therein lies one small kernel of comfort. He will never grow old. I have always remembered the words of another Massachusetts President, Calvin Coolidge, uttered just after he had lost his young son to a friend who had suffered a similar bereavement:

> By the grace of God, your son and my son will have the blessed privilege of being boys through all eternity.

The portrait of John F. Kennedy in the gallery of history will never show an old man. Unlike the rest of us, his steps will never falter, nor his eyes grow dim, nor his mind lose its keenness. He will live forever in the memory of his countrymen in the full bloom and vigor of his young manhood at the very height of his powers.

We and all who come after us will be better servants of the Republic because he lived.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice to the many that have been raised, and will be raised, in tribute to our fallen leader, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Our Nation has much to learn from his brief time as our honored President. As this Senate knows, and as the people of our great and beloved land knows, I was much in opposition to some of the policies of our late President. But I did not doubt the sincerity and the honesty with which he pursued what he thought was best for our country.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was an honorable advocate and a worthy leader. He admired and respected those who did not flinch from battle, whether it be political or military. These are qualities that this Nation would do well to remember and emulate.

We shall all miss John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We shall miss his ready smile and his human warmth. We shall miss his youth and enthusiasm. We shall miss his devotion to duty.

We shall, above all, miss that leadership which said to the country that principles are worth fighting for. If we remember this, and seek to practice it, we will do honor to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the judgment of history, more than any feeble words we may speak here, will provide the proper eulogy for the brave young man we honor today. For, in 3 short years, John F. Kennedy left his mark on time, not only by the tragic circumstances of his untimely death, but by the dedication with which he faced the task which fate had decreed should be his.

Many of us who speak here today, by right of the system that is uniquely ours, found many issues on which we felt compelled to disagree with this brilliant young leader. Yet, it is a tribute to this man, that of those of us who disagreed most with his philosophy, not one questioned his dedication or sincerity of purpose.

Mr. President, as we honor this fallen leader, struck down in the midst of his unfinished endeavors, I cannot help but be reminded of the words of Alfred Lord Tennyson, in his immortal eulogy, "In Memoriam," when he said:

> God's fingers touched him and he slept.

For, truly, God's fingers touched John Fitzgerald Kennedy and he sleeps—far short of his expected lifespan. To those of us who carry on, this tragic event should create in us a rededication to the principles which have sustained man through the ages and which made this great country possible.

May God rest him and keep him, and give solace and comfort to his family.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it has been said that history will be the true judge of a man's record, a man's worth, and that history will appropriately find the perspective in which a man's deeds are to be chronicled. That well may be, Mr. President, but can history even attempt to capture in the cold print of tomorrow the warmth of yesterday's fellowship and association that a man has built over the years?

Perhaps not. Perhaps that is an assignment that history cannot undertake any more than it could recall for us the vivid and excruciating pain that must have been felt by those footsore Revolutionary heroes of Valley Forge or the despair and relief that rode as dual companions in the thoughts of Abraham Lincoln in a day when brother fought brother but men were made free.

But whether history can chronicle this aspect of man's life for future generations does not lessen the impact that such a man as John Fitzgerald Kennedy has had upon us, his contemporaries, who served with him and worked with him in the common cause of good government in this Chamber and in the other body.

Each of us has his own personal recollection of John Kennedy. What we recall about this man is perhaps more important today than reciting what he accomplished and what he planned to accomplish, for these are matters of the public record—what we feel and what we think about the man are not necessarily a part of that record and I think it is most appropriate that such become chronicled for perhaps these then can make history's task not quite so impossible in relating something of the man himself.

Like many Members of the House and the Senate, I first met John Kennedy in January of 1947 when he came to the House. I served one term in the House with him and then came to the Senate.

In 1953 he came to the Senate and for 7 years was a colleague of all of us serving in this Chamber, until his election to the Presidency in 1960.

For some years he and I were on the same committee, the Select Committee to Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations.

What is the one characteristic of this man that stands most firm in my mind?

I would term it his phenomenal capacity for growth.

Even though Jack Kennedy was a member of the other political party, and even though many of us disagreed with a number of his policies and positions, there can be no escaping the fact that he had the admiration of his colleagues, for his career represents a stirring example of the success of our American system of government.

We admired him—I admired him—for the fact that this was a man who dedicated himself to serving our country and in each of the assignments of official capacity he undertook, he grew in stature, taking unto himself the fine attributes of increasing official responsibility but yielding in return something of himself that enhanced the office he held.

I was not one of John Kennedy's closest personal friends. Some in this Chamber were, and it is they who can best speak about the very personal characteristics which gave a unique style and warmth to our 35th President.

But I was a friend in the sense that all who serve together in the Senate are friends—for that is the way—the wonderful way—of our political life. We may be opponents, but we are friends. There are no enemies here, for our political system is too sound, too strong, and so good that enmity has no room here.

The enmity that is found in our political system is that harboring in the hearts of those who do not understand the fundamental nature of our Government and therefore really are not participants. They cannot accept nor recognize that it is a broad foundation upon which our two-party system has been established and upon which it thrives.

And in this friendship of association that evolves out of service together as Members of the Senate, I have many happy recollections of Jack Kennedy and the work he carried on here.

He demonstrated early that he was a worthy proponent of the many causes he espoused and those who engaged John Kennedy in debate on matters before the Senate knew full well that they were not embarking upon some light skirmish. He was formidable and as he proceeded to the top office in our Government he grew in stature and in capacity, but even in the most trying of circumstances, he met his challenges and propounded his points without rancor.

Perhaps that is one of the heritages John Kennedy would leave to us, and to all Americans. To try to understand a little more about the world in which we live and the people about us and to lend a little more understanding to others. He helped impress upon us all the art and the necessity of disagreeing without becoming disagreeable.

I think John Kennedy would want this as much as he would want us to continue to promote America's interests through the forums of discussion and argument, but to do it without compromise of principle or resorting to the weak reeds of vituperation which are not helpful to either cause or country.

It is indeed a tragedy that one who learned and so well practiced this capacity of being persistent without ever becoming unpleasant should be struck down by an assassin who learned only to hate our system of government and its talented and accomplished leader.

Mr. President, on this day of tribute to our late President, Mrs. Mundt joins me in extending our sympathies to the family of John Kennedy, a family which has greatly enriched the spirit of America through its contributions and sacrifices.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

He was a man of great personal ability and energy whose approach to the overwhelming tasks of the vast executive branch of Government created in the minds of his administrators a spirit of enthusiasm, dedication, and teamwork in administering the programs and causes in which he believed and into which he put much of himself.

Both in his life as President of the United States and as the head of the Nation's first family, he added much to the average American's concept of our Chief Executive.

History will record his contribution to the great events of our time.

I join with my fellow Americans in mourning the dark deed which took the life of our Chief Executive and in expressing to his widow and family our sincerest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, all of America found it hard—almost impossible—to believe that their energetic, youthful President, so full of zest for life and of zeal for his official duties, had been so suddenly and cruelly struck down.

Those of us who had known him in the years before he moved into the White House were even more stunned by this horrible truth.

Many honors and privileges have come to me in my lifetime. One of the most highly treasured and longest remembered will be the association I had with John F. Kennedy during his service in the U.S. Senate and during his term of office—so tragically cut short—as the 35th President of the United States.

For 6 years we served together in the Senate. Although we were not assigned to the same committees, where there is the greatest opportunity for frequent meetings and personal consultations, we nonetheless enjoyed a cordial relationship which I shall always value.

The last time we visited was in the White House in the spring of this year. The occasion was the ceremony of his signing the congressional resolution conferring honorary U.S. citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. The President greeted our small delegation genuinely and chatted warmly with us during the proceeding. At its conclusion, he thoughtfully offered me one of the pens which he had used. I later presented it to the Nebraska Legislature for its historical collection, together with a copy of the resolution. After the ceremonies, we stepped outside to the White House garden where the President briefly addressed the assembled group of diplomats, Members of the Congress, and other dignitaries.

During our years in the Senate, Mr. Kennedy was always friendly and cordial. We differed from time to time in issues which arose, but this did not prevent a mutual respect for each other's responsibility and duty to judge and vote on bills according to the best of our knowledge and ability. Both of us served in the Congress long enough to know that dedication to the cause of our Republic did not require that we always reach the same conclusions on national issues and legislative proposals. Unity does not require uniformity. Loyalty means more than conformity.

In fact, in such sincere differences there resides "strength, not weaknesses; wisdom, not despair."

This idea is generally recognized and accepted by Americans. That they applied it in the case of John F. Kennedy is clear, because despite the slender margin by which he prevailed in his last election, and despite the differences expressed as to various of his views and proposals, he was nevertheless accorded generous and wide acclaim at all times.

This was so wherever he journeyed, even unto his last, fateful and tragic tour.

The warm and sincere greetings expressed by the millions of people in all parts of America were, of course, due in some part to the respect of the high office he held. But, more than that, they were demonstrations of enthusiasm, admiration, and love as well as expressions of best wishes to him in his efforts. They were an outpouring from the hearts of the citizenry of their awareness of his bravery in war; his courage in peace; his constant and dedicated efforts to discharge his official duties to the best of his abilities; and his obvious concern that the interests of America be advanced.

Such a memory of our fallen leader will be precious to all of us in the years ahead. Surely in his life and works he carried on nobly and to even more superior heights the splendid traditions of the Presidency and its greatness.

So it is that the Nation mourns so deeply and grieves so sorely. Its every sympathy has been extended to the family which so bravely bore loss and so bravely carries on.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the depth of shock and sorrow which the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has brought to the Nation, and to us who served with him in this body, cannot be measured in words.

To the sadness which we feel that a life so full of brilliance, courage, strength, and promise has been ended at the height of its youth and vigor must be added the deep and lasting regret of our Nation over the tragic manner in which its end came.

I extend for myself, and for the people of Florida, my deepest sympathy to the sorrowing family of our late President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To one who at the age of 16 suffered through an assassination 28 years ago, the weight of the calamity that took place November 22 fell not totally unfamiliarly, but just as heavily.

The news of the events that happened in Dallas that fateful Friday last month swept back all the crushing memories of another day—in 1935—when Baton Rouge was the scene of murder of a top Government official. The Kennedy family would mourn the death of John F. Kennedy in 1963. How well I know that special grief. I experienced it in 1935 as a member of the Long family which mourned the passing of my father, Huey P. Long.

While it was a State—Louisiana—that suffered the loss most of all in 1935, it was a nation, perhaps a world, that bore the brunt of the loss in 1963. John F. Kennedy, who began his tenure in Congress at about the same time I started mine, had risen to become the leader of the free world, the respected pilot of the most powerful Nation in that world. In less than 3 short years as President, John F. Kennedy had become the symbol of this Nation's greatness, its firm grasp of the present, and its continued leadership in the future. John F. Kennedy's youth, his determination, his intellect and, yes, his "vigor" had become a beacon of direction to an often haphazard world. And suddenly, John F. Kennedy was taken from us.

Most of us in our disbelief and shock could only ask why—why was he so suddenly, so prematurely, so tragically taken. My only explanation is that which I set down in a letter to Mrs. Kennedy, which I now read:

NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

Mrs. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. KENNEDY: Twenty-eight years ago I said my last goodbye to my father who was dying from an assassin's bullet. The intervening years have accorded me the opportunity to meditate about the sort of tragedy which took your husband on Friday.

There is no way to explain such a thing unless one has faith in God and believes in the teachings of Jesus. If it is true that there is everlasting life beyond this place of toil and tears, then we can take solace in the fact that God called a good man to a higher reward. It is hard to believe that God knows about all of these things and that He planned it to be that way; yet in time we may come to see that all of this is part of a master plan. In that case we should find comfort in the fact that He chose you and John Kennedy to play a significant role.

Mrs. Long joins me in extending our complete sympathy to you and your family.

With warmest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
RUSSELL B. LONG.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying honor to a great leader, a good man, an outstanding American. John F. Kennedy symbolized the best there is in man, the best the human race has to offer. The legacy he leaves behind is to do what is right, to reject what is wrong, because, "here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is indeed difficult for me adequately to express my great appreciation, and that of my family, for the heartfelt words which have been uttered this afternoon in the U.S. Senate and for the tributes which were paid so adequately and so beautifully by Members of the House of Representatives last week.

It is also difficult to express our great appreciation to the hundreds of thousands of people who have appeared at Arlington Cemetery during the past few days and weeks, and to the millions of people throughout the world who, during the past 3 weeks, have offered their consolation and their sympathy, as well as their prayers.

Many of you who spoke today were my brother's colleagues during the 8 years he was here in the Senate. You were his teachers, as well; and his career bears your imprint.

My brother loved the Senate. He respected its traditions. He read deeply of its history and the great men who made it. It was in this Chamber that he championed the causes which you have heard explained and testified to today, and about which he felt so deeply. I know that many of you stood by his side on this floor in championing these causes, and that many of you, as well, stood by his side during the hard and long campaigns, and counseled and guided him in discharging the burdens of the Presidency.

The Senate, for him, as it is for me, is the symbol of how Americans can resolve their differences through reason, instead of violence. That is why it is so important for all of us to support President Johnson in the burdens he has assumed. And if the sacrifice of life can bind the Nation together, this sacrifice will not have been made in vain.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a recess, there are a few announcements which I must make.

## ADDITIONS TO TODAY'S RECORD

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of today's proceedings be held open for any additional statements by

Senators on the death of the late and lamented President John F. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar 727, House bill 7063, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M., TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session this evening, it take a recess until 10 a.m., tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL SENATE COMMITTEES TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senate committees be authorized to meet, tomorrow, until 12 o'clock noon, during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RESCINDING OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT RELATIVE TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement relative to the Foreign Assistance Act conference report be, at this time, rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do this in the hope that on Friday it will be possible to arrive at a somewhat similar agreement relative to the disposal of this measure.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from California, the acting minority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the information of the Senate, I wish to ask whether the distinguished majority leader contemplates having the Senate return to the consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act conference report at the conclusion of its action on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That will depend on developments. The Senate will either return to the consideration of that measure or will proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the public works appropriation bill or to the consideration of some other measure which may be available.

Mr. KUCHEL. In any event, is it the hope of the majority leader that by Friday we may be able to conclude our deliberations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

## RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy, the Senate—and I believe that this afternoon all 100 Members of the Senate have made their views known—stand in recess until 10 a.m., tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, December 12, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend David P. Small, Jr., pastor, Fair-Park Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

From the Apostle Paul to the Church at Rome: *The authorities are in God's service and to these duties they devote their energies.*—Romans 13: 1–6.

Eternal God, Thou hast taught us to call Thee our Father. We believe with all of our mind and heart that Thou didst lead our fathers to establish in our land a new nation conceived in liberty. Grant that we, their children, may ever be mindful of Thee, without whom no people can prosper or dwell secure.

We pause now to offer from grateful hearts our gratitude for Thy constant goodness to us, our families, and our Nation. Pardon, we beseech Thee, our sins. We have disobeyed Thy holy laws, seeking to enrich and exalt ourselves at the cost of privation and suffering to others. O God, turn us to Thee in hearty repentance and true humility that we may learn Thy will, in which is to be found our peace.

Bless, we beseech Thee, our President, and all who are associated with him in their awesome duties. May their performance be such as to bring honor and blessing to our Nation as well as the nations of our world. Give to these Thy servants of this deliberative body the repose of mind, born of our unfaltering faith in Thee. Enable them to see beyond the disconcerting forces and problems of the present moment. In this moment renew their vision and quest of their noblest self and highest ideals.

As these Thy servants give themselves to their respective duties of the day may they so discharge them that "this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish" from our beloved America and that from their deliberations and actions of this session such a government may one day become the reality of all mankind around the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California; and

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund.

## SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate, Thursday, December 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have had the principal responsibility for the foreign aid money bill for 9 years. It is a most difficult bill to deal with, but during that 9 years, I have never made a commitment that I did not live up to, which is a statement of fact that I make with modesty but considerable personal satisfaction.

I know the membership is anxious to dispose of the foreign aid appropriations, but it must be understood that we do not yet have an authorization approved either on the mutual security program, the Peace Corps, or the Inter-American Bank, all of which must be provided for in this money bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to do all that I can to expedite the handling of this bill. I shall, therefore, ask unanimous consent that we may have until midnight Saturday to file the report to accompany the bill so that our subcommittee may have the opportunity, meantime, to mark up the bill and then go before the full Committee on Appropriations, with our efforts being directed toward trying to get the bill to the floor of the House on Monday.

## PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Saturday, December 14, 1963, to file a report on the foreign aid appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to state to the gentleman who just had the floor that I do not know anything about any meeting on this bill. I am a member of the subcommittee but I have not been informed as yet why the committee cannot meet this afternoon or tomorrow morning and then report the bill to the full committee Friday and then this motion would not be necessary.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am willing to do anything that I can in order to expedite the consideration of this bill, as I am sure the gentleman knows. However, there are certain members of the subcommittee who are not in town, but who plan to be here within a day or two. Therefore, in planning a schedule, I am trying to take into account that fact, as it is certainly desirable to have all of the members present to participate in the markup of the bill. As for myself, personally, I am ready to proceed at any time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana will remember that the date upon which we agreed to mark the bill was today. I came back from my district expecting to do this today. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I happen to know, has rearranged his schedule to be here today as has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall]. Thus far I have not had any explanation as to why we will not mark up the bill today and proceed in the usual order to bring the bill to the floor. If we marked up today, we could take the bill to the full committee on Friday, file the report, and take the bill to the floor on Monday or Tuesday, giving the Members time to look at the report. I have not seen the report myself. I may want to file minority views; I do not know. It is most irregular to ask this unanimous-consent request before the subcommittee has even marked up the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say that, as chairman of the subcommittee, it has consistently been my policy to adjust the time of the markup of the bill, as well as the hearings, to accommodate members of the subcommittee. As the distinguished gentleman from Arizona recognizes, we had planned originally to mark up the bill on Monday, December 9. However, the gentleman said he would be out of town, so we moved the markup of the bill to Friday, as a tentative arrangement. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], was one of the members of the subcommittee who was out of the city, and I do not know now whether he has returned or not.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I understood the situation, the gentleman from Louisiana did not want to mark up the bill on Monday because of the fact that there had been an election in Louisiana late in the week before. The gentleman from Michigan could not be in town Tuesday, but he is here today. I thought today was agreed upon as the date for the markup of the bill because everyone would be here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. In the absence of action by the other body on authorizing legislation pertaining to matters that would be contained in the foreign aid bill, would the subject matter such as the appropriation for the Peace Corps, be subject to a point of order if the appropriation bill is called up on Monday?

The SPEAKER. In response to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, all appropriation bills and general appropriations are dependent upon authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. Those matters, then, would be subject to a point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, in answer to the parliamentary inquiry, would say they would be unless authorized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, there was an election in Louisiana on Saturday, but the chairman of this subcommittee arrived back in Washington on Sunday and would have been available for a markup on Monday, but it was agreed that we would not proceed on that schedule. I am personally willing to proceed with the bill at any time the members of the subcommittee are present and prepared to participate in the markup.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to know when we are going to have the markup. I understand the markup was to be on Wednesday, and that was postponed until Friday. I do not know whether there is going to be a markup on Friday or Saturday. The gentleman from Arizona told me this 2 days ago. I think we ought to be notified when and where we are going to have a markup so that we can plan our schedule accordingly. I want the House to know we completed hearings on this bill on August 19, and we have been sitting idly by since August 19. If the authorization bill is not passed, either for the Peace Corps or any other part of the aid bill, I will raise a point of order against consideration of the foreign aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am pleased to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the plan is to mark up the bill on Friday, December 13. Notice to that effect went out to the subcommittee members today. We plan to go to the full committee on Saturday, and to bring the bill to the floor of the House on Monday.

Mr. CONTE. First of all I want to inform the gentleman from Louisiana that I can say for my side that four Republican members are here. We can meet within the hour called by the chairman of the committee. I can speak only for the Republicans.

Second, I believe it would be tremendously unfair to the Members of the House, let alone a committee member, to come in here with a report on Monday morning and have a vote on the bill on the floor of the House without even having the opportunity to read the report before you vote on it in committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say that I am prepared to bring the bill out on Christmas Eve if such procedure should be necessary.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman may have a bag of gifts, and his Santa Claus uniform for Christmas Eve as he states, and I hope he has the civil rights bill in that bag of gifts.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the request.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H.R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## PART II, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, "JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE"

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments.

Mr. **WILLIS**. Mr. Speaker, all of these amendments are clerical in nature and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. **MEADER**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this is the matter which he brought before the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting yesterday and relates only to technical amendments to a codification bill?

Mr. **WILLIS**. The gentleman is correct and the committee unanimously directed me to bring the matter up this morning.

Mr. **MEADER**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if all of these amendments, and I believe the gentleman referred to 41 amendments, are germane to the bill?

Mr. **WILLIS**. The amendments are germane to the bill and are clerical in nature.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that the Senate amendments be considered as read?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 7, line 8, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 19, line 19, after "as" insert "otherwise".

Page 26, line 27, after "until" insert "the removal of such disability, and".

Page 26, line 34, after "appoint" insert "from the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission,".

Page 29, line 7, strike out "or".

Page 29, line 9, strike out "or".

Page 30, strike out lines 24 to 27, inclusive, and insert "The Juvenile Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings to determine paternity of any child alleged to have been born out of wedlock and to provide for his support in the manner provided by subchapter II of chapter 23 of Title 16.".

Page 33, line 14, after "duties," insert "upon conviction thereof,".

Page 50, line 12, strike out "persons" and insert "persons.".

Page 63, line 30, strike out "defendants," and insert "defendant's".

Page 66, line 19, strike out "debtor" and insert "defendant".

Page 66, line 38, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 67, line 32, strike out "on" and insert "or".

Page 79, line 27, strike out "action" and insert "actions".

Page 92, line 25, strike out "affidavits" and insert "testimony".

Page 93, line 24, strike out "any interest in".

Page 101, line 40, strike out "property" where it appears the first time and insert "estate".

Page 101, line 40, strike out "property" where it appears the second time and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 2, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 7, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 8, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 110, line 26, strike out "15–710(b) (2)" and insert "15–709(b) (2)".

Page 113, line 8, strike out "on intestate share".

Page 114, line 18, strike out "for" and insert "from".

Page 115, strike out lines 29 to 37, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 16–912. Permanent alimony; enforcement; retention of dower.

"When a divorce is granted to the wife, the court may decree her permanent alimony sufficient for her support and that of any minor children whom the court assigns to her care, and secure and enforce the payment of the alimony in the manner prescribed by section 16–911, and may, if it seems appropriate, retain to the wife her right of dower in the husband's estate; and the court may, in similar circumstances, retain to the husband his right of dower in the wife's estate.".

Page 116, line 3, strike out "granted" and insert "granting".

Page 142, line 17, strike out "favor;" and insert "favor,".

Page 149, line 40, strike out "is" and insert "are".

Page 150, line 5, strike out "who has the" and insert "or persons who have".

Page 155, line 25, strike out "so construed" and insert "liberally construed so".

Page 161, line 8, strike out all after "persons" down to and including "twelve" in line 10.

Page 164, line 20, after "Widow" insert "or widower".

Page 164, line 38, after "widow's" insert "or widower's".

Page 168, line 39, strike out "widowers" and insert "witnesses".

Page 177, line 36, strike out "service or publication," and insert "service,".

Page 180, lines 43 and 44, strike out "All actions filed in the Branch shall be made returnable therein." and insert "Where, in a case controlled by another statute, a greater or lesser time for hearing is specified by the other statute, that specified time is controlling. All actions filed in the Branch shall be made returnable therein.".

Page 181, line 11, strike out " 'informa pauperis' " and insert " 'in forma pauperis' ".

Page 193, line 32, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, line 1, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, line 8, strike out "February 1, 1963" and insert "August 10, 1963".

Page 205, in the table "Statutes at Large" in the last line of the column "Section" where it appears for the first time, strike out "5(b) (1),".

Page 205, at the end of the table and as a part of the table "Statutes at Large," insert:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "1963—July 8 | 88–60 | 2, 3 | 77 | 77 | 11–755, 11–756 |
| Do | 88–60 | 4 | 77 | 78 | 11–756 |
| Do | 88–60 | 5 | 77 | 78 | 11–520a,<br>11–771a |
| Aug. 5 | 88–85 | 1, 2 | 77 | 117 | 11–805" |

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to concur in the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SHOCKING STOCKPILING OF SUPPLIES BY NAVY PURCHASING OFFICE

Mr. **WILSON** of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WILSON** of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge by now that the procurement people in the Navy Department make enough mistakes daily to fill Mother Hubbard's biggest cupboard, but do they make so many mistakes that they have to be issued a new eraser every 3 days from Miss Wolfe's cupboard at the Navy Purchasing Office?

I hardly think so, but that is just one of several shocking examples of extravagant stockpiling of supplies which I have uncovered at the Navy Purchasing Office in a case that I call Miss Wolfe's cupboard. This case would be laughable except for the fact that it displays shocking conduct by naval personnel in regard to expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar. This, Mr. Speaker, is the most flagrant example of waste I have seen in my 22 years in Washington.

The examples I shall relate on the floor today were provided me by a Navy employee. He is a conscientious man. He tried to get the abuses corrected. Failing that, he came to me and asked my help. I have checked his record and referred every instance I shall mention here today to the General Accounting Office in the hope the Comptroller General will get to the bottom of this mess.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my Appropriations Committee work I am ranking minority member on the District of Columbia Subcommittee. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is our very able chairman. Each year we interrogate District officials as to their needs. We pin them down on one specific item after another, even down to one typewriter or one new duplicating machine. We ask if they can't repair the equipment or find a way to avoid expense before we give them approval to purchase new equipment. Compare that record with the profligate way in which the Navy Purchasing Office at Independence Avenue and D Street SW. conducts its business. This office has only about 100 employees. It does a part of the Navy's buying of various materials, but it stocks office equipment and supplies only for itself and keeps them in a storeroom I call Miss Wolfe's cupboard. It is important that this be kept in mind—that NPO hires about 100 people and buys for the Navy, but buys only its own office supplies.

Now, how does the Navy Purchasing Office conduct its business? I think I had better warn you to get a good grip on your seats. Part of NPO's function is to send out so-called bid sets to industry. These documents are stapled together before being mailed. To do the job, the Navy needs electric staplers. It can buy them from the Federal Supply Schedule for between $22 and $24 each.

In 1962, NPO said it needed four new stapling machines. The person charged with responsibility for this purchase, according to my information, was office services branch head, Miss Estelle Wolfe, the keeper of the cupboard.

Instead of buying these staplers from the Federal Supply Schedule, Miss Wolfe bought them from a private jobber without any competitive bidding whatsoever. And what did she pay? She paid not $22 nor $24 each, but $44.75 each. And she bought 24 of the machines instead of the 4 that were allegedly needed. To make matters worse, the Navy already had 15 of the machines sitting in Miss Wolfe's cupboard not being used.

Miss Wolfe bought these items from a company identified as Visual Systems, Inc., whose president is Edgerton Smith. Mr. Smith and Miss Wolfe have an interesting record of business friendship at NPO dating back to 1957.

My records show that in 1957 NPO dealt with the Marsden Co. for such supplies. Mr. Smith was employed by Marsden. In the fall of 1957, Mr. Smith went to Federal Supply Co. On September 20, 1957, NPO started buying what are called in "Navy-ese" chart materials from the Federal Supply Co.

In 1960, when Mr. Smith entered business on his own, Miss Wolfe immediately placed a blanket purchase order with Visual Systems. In 1961, another blanket purchase agreement was made with Federal Supply Co., but a note was put in the file stating that no business was to be given this company and instructing that all future business be done with Visual System.

The stapler gouge was just one of the deals, Mr. Speaker. It alone cost the Government twice as much as necessary. But there are others, many others, and they are lulus. They show just how inefficiently and improperly the Navy protects its stewardship of our tax dollars.

In mid-1962, for example, Miss Wolfe bought four brandnew copying machines. They cost $895 each and, with all the copypaper and materials she bought, the whole purchase came to about $5,000. There was just one hitch. The machines had not even been placed on the market yet, and NPO had an extreme overstock of copypaper in Miss Wolfe's cupboard, made especially for old machines, which could serve no useful purpose whatsoever if the old machines were junked.

Thank goodness, one of Miss Wolfe's fellow employees had enough backbone to stop this waste before it got too far. He took action to have the company take back the machines and saved the Government several thousands of dollars. But, in so doing, he made a dedicated enemy of Miss Wolfe.

These two small deals are indicative of the way in which NPO's purchase of supplies has been carried out. I think it is fair to say that maybe Miss Wolfe and her 100 or so fellow employees do not use the materials too fast, but Mr. Smith and assorted salesmen sure sell supplies fast and furiously.

Mr. Speaker, I have evidence in my possession as to some of the overstocked items that a Navy employee found in Miss Wolfe's cupboard. I am not going to bore you with a recitation of all of them. I have picked out some of the outstanding examples. Keep in mind that supplies are supposed to be stocked for 3-month periods and that NPO employs about 100 people.

First, how about those erasers? How can we calculate that NPO employees make so many mistakes they need a new eraser every 3 days? It is simple. An overstock of 246 dozen erasers was turned in to the General Services Administration retail store by Navy employees—none of them Miss Wolfe. This works out to an overstock of 2,952 erasers—enough for every NPO employee to have a new eraser every 3 days. I know they make mistakes down there, but this taxes even my powers of comprehension.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of us know that the Navy makes umpteen copies of everything; therefore, a lot of carbon paper is needed. Certainly, however, the Navy does not need enough carbon paper so that it was overstocked by 5,000 boxes—or 500,000 sheets. Keeping in mind the 3-month supply period, that works out to a new box of carbon paper every other day for each and every one of the 100 people who work at NPO.

Really. Does the Navy waste that much carbon paper? Or do NPO employees tear the paper making all those erasures?

One of the favorite hobbies of Navy people is to staple papers together. When these papers are read, they must be unstapled. This means that each desk must be equipped with a staple remover. It is a small uncomplicated item, but apparently the Navy people are hard on them because Miss Wolfe's cupboard showed an overstock of 3,000 staple removers for an office of 100 people. If that is not an overstock, then we have to believe that every NPO employee required a new staple remover every 3 days. Staple removers just are not built that flimsily.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know how much the military loves to write. Letters from the Pentagon to the Hill prove this. Much of this writing is transcribed from handwritten notes. Even used actively, a ballpoint pen lasts several weeks. Yet, in Miss Wolfe's cupboard, there was an overstock of 3,888 ballpoint pens—more than one new pen every 3 days for each and every employee at NPO. And, just in case the employees recovered from writer's cramp long enough to slip in a refill before throwing the pen away for a shiny new one, there was an overstock of 4,668 ballpoint pen refills on hand.

Speaking of letters, Mr. Speaker, there was never any danger that NPO would run out of stationery. Not with friendly Miss Wolfe doing the buying and with such friendly types as Mr. Smith doing the selling.

An overstock of 3 years' supply of stationery was found in her cupboard, together with a $5,000 extreme overstock of Verifax and Thermo-Fax copying machine paper.

I know you will be interested to know that NPO employees evidently use one box of 100 paper clips per employee every 3 days. When it was cleaned out, Miss Wolfe's cupboard had an overstock of 2,710 boxes of paper clips that were turned in to GSA.

There is much more, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you are getting the idea that I got. There is something rotten on Independence Avenue that needs looking into. It cannot even be disguised by winding the 240,000 feet of scotch tape that was found in Miss Wolfe's overstocked cupboard around NPO. Yes, there were 2,358 rolls of cellophane tape in excess supply—almost a roll a day per employee. What a sticky mess the NPO must be with all the scotch tape on everything.

I know the Navy likes to use rubber stamps of all varieties on documents it sends out. What I did not know, Mr. Speaker, was that NPO employees were so terribly hard on the pads used to ink the stamps. They must have been, because there was an excess supply of 395 stamp pads in Miss Wolfe's cupboard—enough for one new pad per employee per month with some left over for the really strong armed ones.

There was also an overstock of 540 rolls of pressure-sensitive tape—5.4 rolls per employee every 3 months—and 88 rolls of masking tape. Maybe this tape was used to hide the snickers of NPO employees as one truck after another backed up to unload Miss Wolfe's latest orders from the Mr. Smiths who cultivated her with supersalesmanship daily.

The picnics at NPO must have been pretty messy, though. Why else would Miss Wolfe feel she had to order 70 food-handling aprons to cover a 3-month period? That is what was turned back in to GSA. Why in the world does NPO need food-handling aprons?

I know why it had an overstock of 32 whole cartons of rubber bands. These rubber bands were probably used as catapults to shoot the paper clips with when the NPO had maneuvers. Or maybe they were used to catapult some of the overstock of 23 gross of chalk across the room when "marker shells" were fired during the NPO war games.

Perhaps the excess stock of 16,000 index cards was used to keep score in these games. All this writing meant that a lot of pencils had to be sharpened, and that is hard on pencil sharpeners. That is why Miss Wolfe's cupboard bulged with an excess of 91 pencil sharpeners and an excess supply of almost 100 dozen pencils.

There had to be some way of keeping track of all of the piles of office supplies that were at NPO, and I guess the Navy will explain that is why 140 boxes of gummed labels were overstocked together with 131 boxes of index tabs.

And, of course, keeping track of this mountain of supplies came to be an important job and required lots of paperwork. This meant taking work home every evening, so Miss Wolfe stocked the cupboard with 40 plastic brief cases to accommodate the NPO family. Those who had tender hands could use one of the 30 pairs of gloves Miss Wolfe bought but which were later turned in as unneeded.

There is much, much more, Mr. Speaker. I have mentioned just random samples. Remember that all this was done, much of the material was either thrown away or used elsewhere in the Government, and NPO went right on with more than enough supplies to function normally.

And all of this went unchallenged here on the Hill. The Navy, I understand, did have a minor hearing but did nothing, and Miss Wolfe is back at the old stand today.

Mr. Speaker, I have turned over my file on this case to the Comptroller General asking for a complete investigation and report. I know that the General Accounting Office will get to the bottom of the mess. Certainly it will have enough office supplies at NPO with which to do its work.

This is more proof of the inefficiency and incompetency which is rampant in the purchasing departments of our military. It is incidents such as these, multiplied sometimes a hundredfold and sometimes a thousandfold, which cause the cost of defense to go up each year and which require a little more out of the workingman's paycheck every week.

President Johnson recently told the Chiefs of Staff that they must get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar they spend. This is exactly what I have fought for for years. The Miss Wolfes and the Mr. Smiths throughout our Defense Establishment are making this goal harder and harder to reach.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the Miss Wolfes and the Mr. Smiths are exposed and made to pay for their actions. It is time the Congress acts to exercise strong new controls over the way in which the military spends the funds we appropriate for its use.

This is why I keep coming back to the floor day after day, warning the Members that the time is now for a complete revamping of military procurement. Unless this is done, we can never halt the constantly escalating cost of national defense. If we put tight reins on the spending of the defense dollar, we can get just as effective a Defense Establishment for a far lower cost.

## TRIBUTES TO OUR MARTYRED PRESIDENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, from all corners of the earth, letters are still pouring into the White House expressing sorrow and sympathy to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and to the Nation on the death of our martyred President.

Expressions of sympathy also continue to come to my office from constituents who are saddened by the loss of a beloved and great President.

Following is a copy of an inspiring eulogy which was read over the public address system at Mount Penn High School, Reading, Pa., by Mr. Carl F. Constein, supervising principal:

### EULOGY FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Carl F. Constein, Nov. 26, 1963)

For most of us, time stood still over the last bizarre weekend. It is always so during times of great tragedy. It is still difficult for us to believe that President Kennedy is dead. Even though we may not have the heart to return to our books, we must do so, as all people must return to their work and life goes on. It seems appropriate in a school, where the study of history is so important, to mark this moment in history as we take up our separate lives again.

Regardless of our political and other convictions, we Americans unite in our shock that this deed should have happened, in genuine sympathy for the President's family, and in profound grief for our loss. Through the miracle of television, we have come to know Mr. Kennedy well. His face, his mannerisms, his personality were familiar to us all. Because of this familiarity, we feel the loss more keenly.

What qualities did the late President Kennedy possess that drew us to him? I believe courage was his most outstanding quality. PT-109 tells of his great physical courage in World War II. Even more important, he had the kind of courage that demands patience and restraint. He demonstrated this fortitude in overcoming a serious back ailment suffered in the war, in fighting hard in the Halls of Congress, and a little more than a year ago, in standing firm in the Cuban crisis.

History was his major interest; writing was an ambition of his; courage was his conviction. Out of this combination came a very readable book about Americans who faced decisions squarely and without flinching. The book is called "Profiles in Courage."

But courage alone isn't enough. A criminal, even an assassin, may have that. Mr. Kennedy had a tremendous ambition to be of public service. Born to great wealth, he could have chosen any number of less demanding careers and lived a life of ease. He chose to serve his fellow man, openly welcoming the awesome responsibilities of the office of President.

One of the burdens of that office is making far-reaching decisions daily. Mr. Kennedy had an unquenchable desire for detailed knowledge of all the operations of government. He was an avid reader and had an intellectual curiosity about many subjects. Yet somehow he managed to reserve a place for wit and friendly give-and-take with reporters and associates.

In spite of the terrible problems existing everywhere in the world, his attitude was optimistic, even idealistic. He would have us reach for the stars and make a start in attacking problems which might take a thousand years to solve. The important thing is to continue the struggle and to do it with good heart and courage.

These are qualities of greatness which deserve to be emulated. Our sorrow is increased when we realize that he was the youngest President ever to be elected and ever to die in office. He may not have reached the peak of his potential.

We ask ourselves, how could this monstrous deed of assassination have happened? Why would anyone take such desperate action? A democracy has an inherent problem in this regard, for a President must be available to the people. In truth, it is not possible to prevent attempts at assassination. We can conclude that the assassin was mad and dismiss it at that. But that is too easy. We all share the sorrow; we should all consider the guilt.

There was apparently much loose talk about the possibility of assassination in Dallas. Suppose, then, a person who has had this evil intent reads and hears this talk. Is he not encouraged to do the deed? Where does he read such inflamatory words? To our shame, he reads them in those magazines and newspapers which publish the unbridled words of hatred coming from some pens. Where does he hear such inflammatory words? He hears them in the street and in the shops from people who go too far in their hatred. It may take the form of sick humor, or smart satire, or extreme profanity.

For too long now we have taken the attitude that anything goes. Modern psychology tells us to get rid of our pent-up feelings. All of us see value in this advice in our personal relations. But there is a limit to which we can go, a limit far short of physical violence. There are standards to be followed and all of us know what they are. All of us have the moral law within. We don't have to be told what is right and what is wrong. We know when we are going too far in our thoughts, our words, and our deeds.

Here while we eulogize our late President, John F. Kennedy, let us resolve no longer to be part of the furthering of hatred of the kind that caused his death. In our own lives let us control our words in little things so that they don't grow into mass intolerance and hatred resulting in big, tragic deeds.

On Thursday we celebrate Thanksgiving Day. Our observance may be somber. Yet there is much for which to thank God. We thank him for our system of government which makes possible a smooth transition from one President to another. We thank him for the preparation and experience of our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. Finally, we thank God for the life and example of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, following are letters sent from oversea business leaders to Mr. David Frankel, president of American Safety Table Co. of Reading, Pa., expressing deep sorrow and sympathy on the tragic death of President Kennedy:

VLAARDINGEN, NETHERLANDS.

DEAR SIRS: This weekend in the Netherlands was overclouded by what they feel as the loss of a good friend, your President, Mr. J. F. Kennedy.

Due to the medium television and some relay satellites everybody was confronted with the emotions in Washington.

In this hour I like to transmit my feelings of sympathy to you and your coworkers. God bless America.

Very truly yours,

BILL SCHIPPERS.

---

ATHENS, GREECE.

DEAR SIRS: I would beg you to accept my personal sympathy as well as the sympathy of the people of my office for the unexpected death of the President of the United States, John Kennedy.

Be sure that the news of the end of his life touched us as if he would be a relative of ours.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE YANNAKOURAS.

---

AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND.

GENTLEMEN: The whole Dutch nation, and we who feel so close to the people of the United States of America, in particular, were deeply shocked by the sudden and violent death of your President, Mr. John F. Kennedy.

We share the sorrow of his family and of all American people and we shall keep him long in our memory. May he rest in peace.

Very truly yours,

L. C. VERBEEK.

---

SANTIAGO, CHILE.

GENTLEMEN: We wish to express our feelings of deep sorrow for the tragic decease of the President of your country, Mr. John F.

Kennedy. His untiring efforts on behalf of world peace and progress have won him the respect and admiration of all human beings. His passing is a loss to mankind.

All of us here are with you and share your mourning.

Sincerely,

LOWENSTEIN & STEWART.

Mr. Speaker, running through all of the tributes that have been paid to President Kennedy since his tragic death has been the recognition that this young and brilliant man gave a new sense of dignity, and purpose to both the Presidency and the Nation.

From those famous words in his inaugural address, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," to his remarks calling for an end to vituperation and a return to unity prepared for delivery in Dallas, John F. Kennedy gave eloquent voice to his country's highest ideals.

The young people of America were quickest to respond to this call for public dedication and public service and the Peace Corps has become a monument to President Kennedy's success in translating American idealism into gifted action, as well as unto words.

Karl Meyer, staff reporter for the Washington Post, captured the new spirit of eloquence and dignity that marked President Kennedy's administration in an article written shortly after the tragic events in Dallas. I commend it to my colleagues:

### A PROMISE OF POWER WISELY USED: JOHN F. KENNEDY GAVE US AN EXHILARATING VISION OF POLITICAL DIGNITY

(By Karl E. Meyer)

He came in with a snowstorm and the symbolism was flawlessly right on Inauguration Day, January 20, 1961. There was no premonition of tragedy, but rather a sense of rebirth in a Capital mantled in beauty as the oldest President yielded office to the youngest man ever elected Chief Executive of the United States.

It was much more than a change of administration. It was also a change of generations, a change of outlook—and, most immediately apparent, a change of style. When John Fitzgerald Kennedy became 35th President of the United States, he appeared to fulfill Robert Frost's augury that an age of poetry and power was commencing in Washington.

But the poetry is now hushed, and the promise of power wisely used is now an unfinished chapter of a history entitled, "Let Us Begin." We are left with memories of a singular and gifted man, memories that sustain us following a tragedy as unspeakable as it was incomprehensible. None of us suspected that in retrospect the inaugural snow would seem a shroud.

Every President is a bundle of men—the chief of state who admonishes us to be better than we are; the taskmaster of a bureaucracy; the champion of a party, and, not least, in this case the father of a family whose every trivial habit was watched and copied by the Nation. More than most, President Kennedy made of these fragments of official functions a harmonious whole.

This swiftly became apparent during the first 100 days. If he did not give us a new deal, he did provide an exhilarating vision of the dignity of political life. In every aspect of government—small and large—he insisted on trained competence, on grace and integrity, on idealism tempered with a shrewd awareness of the possible. If the substance of his program did not differ dramatically from his predecessor's, it surely contrasted in style.

#### A STANDARD OF ARTICULATENESS

The most obvious element of that style was articulateness. The clipped cadences of the inaugural address set the standard for his other great utterances as President. They also reflected the man, a man who could be ambiguous but who was seldom diffuse or banal.

"He brought an unsparing instinct for reality to bear on the platitudes and pieties of society," Mr. Kennedy once said of Robert Frost. The words applied to the President at his best.

Yet more fundamental than eloquence were Mr. Kennedy's sense of history, his courage, his temperance, his belief in reason and all of these were laced with a potent dram of wit. The President did not excel at slapstick or sarcasm; his weapon was irony, which he used like a rapier, and sometimes so deftly that the victim only slowly became aware that his head had been figuratively separated from his neck.

His favorite foil was the press, but, unlike some other great men, his sense of humor extended even to himself. He was never more memorably engaging than at the White House correspondents' banquet in May 1962, at which he mockingly protested the rise in ticket prices for the dinner—this, after the press had parodied his own attack on big steel.

Only the other day, though it feels like a chasm of time, Mr. Kennedy deflated BARRY GOLDWATER by remarking that the Arizona Senator had spent a busy week in, among other things, selling the TVA and interfering in the Greek election. With his death, President Kennedy has left Washington not only a sadder but also a colder place.

The courage in office was untheatrical and was the more impressive for its understated quality. Though President Kennedy had his share of Irish temper, his nature was not choleric and his anger seldom soured into rancor. But when he felt personally betrayed, or when he believed that a deep principle was involved, he could display a spinal fortitude that belied his need for a rocking chair.

As a presidential candidate, he made what was probably his greatest speech before an audience of Protestant clergymen. The subject was religious bigotry; his delivery blended passion and precision; the place, ironically, was Texas.

As President, his courage was twice tested by Cuba—first in failure, then in success. Perhaps the most morally impressive moment was his acceptance of full responsibility for the debacle at the Bay of Pigs—and his refusal to redeem a fiasco at the risk of American blood and a world war. And though the defeat cut cruelly and deeply into his self-esteem, he disdained making a ritual scapegoat of any adviser.

In what was at once his greatest and most perilous moment as Chief Executive, Mr. Kennedy forced Nikita Khrushchev to pull nuclear missile bases out of Cuba before the eyes of the world—but he did not push the Soviet leader into a corner. He honored his inaugural commitment: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." In triumph, he showed the same restraint that earlier had marked his acceptance of bitter defeat.

Domestically, the strength of his backbone was demonstrated during a summer of racial discontent. Though the President was aware that his support of a strong civil rights program could rend his party and cost him popularity, he accepted both risks with calm—with an almost awesome equanimity.

This detachment frequently drained the drama from his gestures and gave a misleading coldness to his Presidency. Yet that was also an indispensable element of the Kennedy style—an abhorrence of posturing. As President, he placed more confidence in the verdict of history than in the clamor of the crowd. And the sense of history was perhaps the secret of his serenity.

President Kennedy was a prodigious reader who was steeped in the records of the past and absorbed by the literature of the present. His chief military aide, Brig. Gen. Chester V. (Ted) Clifton, was astonished to discover that Mr. Kennedy even glanced critically over the monthly list of books recommended to service officers and that he read, in galley proof, books like Barbara Tuchman's "Guns of August."

From his reading, the President acquired a sense of detachment about himself and about the limits of his power. To his liberal friends, this trait was at once exasperating and winning; to them, he sometimes appeared more a Hamlet than a Hotspur. Like Lincoln, he seemed to feel that he was as much controlled by events as controlling events. In death, his view has acquired a poignant authority.

His favorite biography was Lord David Cecil's "Melbourne," a book about the urbane Whig who was Queen Victoria's first Prime Minister. In both the flattering and unflattering sense, the choice disclosed something of Mr. Kennedy's definition of himself. For the Whig aristocracy, like the President's own family, blended moderate liberalism, an attitude of noblesse oblige, a conventional if broad-ranging interest in the arts and a coolness about excessive commitments.

Above all, the leaders like Melbourne who dominated British politics in the early 19th century were temperate men. They wanted to civilize power as much as to use it. They regarded noisy public dispute as a mark of political failure, not as a device for compelling consent.

#### SYMPATHETIC POLITICIAN

In his relations with fellow politicians, as well as with the press, Mr. Kennedy showed a reluctance for turbulent combat. A gifted craftsman in politics himself, he understood the political problems of others.

When a President of Argentina campaigned for office on a platform calling for a cancellation of contracts with foreign oil producers, Mr. Kennedy's restrained reaction testified to his fraternal feeling for another elective official's need to keep a promise.

The same tolerance marked his relations with a Congress nominally dominated by his own party. He could be tough in private, but his voice was soft in public. Through all the vicissitudes of political life, he retained an abiding faith in the power of reason to affect the destiny of men. It was President Kennedy who saw to it that a "hot line" was installed in the White House to give reason a chance before mankind plunged over a brink.

His belief in human intelligence gave a glow to his style. More, perhaps, than any other President since Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Kennedy cherished not only learning but the learned. His ideal of government seemed to be part academy, part precinct club. His mind was open to fresh ideas, and his official residence was open to anybody—from Nobel laureates to lowly subordinates—who could impart a ferment.

#### THE CHILLING HEIGHTS

It may be that when he took the oath of office, John F. Kennedy was still the carefree playboy of hostile propaganda, though the evidence is to the contrary. Lincoln was also more ambitious politician than a prophet of freedom when circumstances contrived to make him President on the eve of civil war.

But the heights chill as well as elevate, and before long Mr. Kennedy comprehended the responsibility in his hands. In two speeches—at the United Nations in 1961 and at American University only a few months ago—the President disclosed his troubled reflections about a world that modern weapons could turn into a flaming pyre.

In private discussions, the President tirelessly iterated his feeling that mankind walks a narrow ledge. However, he had to zig and zag, the goal he sought was peace, and his methods were those of reason. Those who admired him never doubted his earnestness, though they were sometimes impatient with his caution.

He now belongs to history, and his confidence that time would soon bear him out, bringing the country to where the land was bright, remains an imponderable. So does his buoyant faith in reason.

For the most savage irony is that this apostle of the enlightenment, this advocate of rational discourse, was cut down by the very fanaticism that as President he sought to contain.

He paid with his life in a cause that remains in doubt. The last page of his biography must be written with what Vergil called the tears of things.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of making a personal announcement.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 230 I am recorded as not voting. It was necessary for me to be absent from the Chamber to accompany Ambassador Stevenson in laying a wreath on the grave of the late President Kennedy on behalf of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

Rollcall No. 230 was on the Clean Air Act, a subject which, of course, vitally concerns my constituents in the Los Angeles area. It has been proven beyond doubt that unclean air contributes to such dread diseases as cancer, and it would seem that a government is less than responsive to the needs of its people if it fails to make a sincere effort to provide clean air for its people to breathe. We have done much in other fields, such as to remove contamination from our food and from the water which we drink, but nothing could be more important than the air which we breathe.

I am, therefore, most happy that the bill received such a strong supporting vote.

If I had been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted in the affirmative.

## MORE MONEY FOR CAMBODIA?

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, information has come to me that there is a belief in the high level of the State Department that further funds should be expended on the Cambodian Port Highway. This is the highway which was the subject of a hearing and report by the Hardy subcommittee over 2 years ago and which the committee found to have been so badly bungled as to injure our prestige. It was found that the cost of construction was $34 million. Even at that time at least one-third of the highway was in need of repair. You can imagine what the situation is today after 2 years with their destructive rainy seasons having expired.

Mr. Speaker, this highway was foolish in its conception; it was criminal in its construction. In view of the present situation in Cambodia, it is my belief that it would be the height of folly to spend more American funds on this construction project. I sincerely hope it will go no farther than it has at the present time and I will do all in my power to prevent such expenditure.

## THE DIMENSION OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a speech delivered in Jamaica by our distinguished Ambassador to that country, the Honorable William C. Doherty. He relates the sorrow experienced and expressed by the people of that otherwise happy country.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Ambassador answers in splendid detail the questions of Jamaicans relating to the succession and policies of the new President, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson. The speech is an excellent description of the dimension of "Mr. President."

The speech is as follows:

### Address by Ambassador William C. Doherty Before the Kingston Rotary Club, December 5, 1963

November 22, 1963, will go down in history as a dark day in the lives of all Americans and peace-loving people throughout the entire world. On that day the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was felled by an assassin's bullet and he joined with Abraham Lincoln and other martyrs in the cause of human rights and the dignity of man.

Since November 22, Jamaicans of every walk of life, by word and by deed, have shared America's grief at the loss of a great leader. Messages have come from people great and small. The Governor General and the Prime Minister generously took the lead.

When a book of condolence was opened at the U.S. Embassy, nearly 1,000 people signed during the first day. They climbed stairs to get to the book; they stood in a long line awaiting their turn. A great number of messages, both letters and telegrams, have come to the Embassy. A goodly number of friends have called me by telephone. For days, this generous show of goodness and kindness has continued. I want to acknowledge this mark of sorrow, and to thank all, on this first public appearance since that sorrowful day in November.

This spontaneous and unreserved outpouring of Jamaican friendship was a tremendously moving tribute to our late President.

I should thank the press and radio and television people of Jamaica for the thoughtful and thorough way their media have brought the dreadful story to the Jamaican people. They wrote and they spoke, always with an eye for the truth, and always with a consideration for the sorrow felt in the United States and around the world.

Just as the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy abruptly rang down the curtain and removed that inspiring young leader from the world's stage, so did that tragic event simultaneously thrust the mantle of authority on Lyndon Baines Johnson as 36th President of the United States.

Divine providence must have moved President Kennedy to choose his running mate so wisely. The forces of evil throughout the world will soon learn that, while the United States lost a gallant and courageous leader, one of equal stature has succeeded to power.

Permit me, if you please, to comment on some of the questions most frequently asked during this period of deep sorrow, and, in answering them, to make certain observations concerning this outstanding statesman we Americans now call "Mr. President."

First, I should perhaps observe that one of America's newspapers has described our new President in this fashion: "Lyndon Baines Johnson is in fact a very big man, not just physically, but in all his dimensions as a human being." That comment may be said to be representative of what is being said in many parts of the world by those who know Lyndon Johnson best, and I commend it to you, without reservation.

Probably the most frequent question asked is the broad administrative one: "What happens in the U.S. Government when the President dies and what are the problems of transition?"

If the President of the United States dies in office, the rights as well as the duties of the Presidency immediately transfer to the Vice President. The oath of office is administered as soon as feasible to the new President and he immediately assumes all of the powers which that office holds under the Constitution.

Of course, it must be recognized that the President and Vice President are nominated on the same political party ticket and hence campaigned together in the same election. In the present case, Lyndon Johnson as Vice President strongly and most effectively supported President Kennedy's policies for some 34 months. Thus, it is only natural, under these circumstances, that the new President will wish to carry out the late President's program, for, indeed, it was his program, too.

It should be stated that President Johnson has the power to replace his Cabinet as well as his Ambassadors abroad. Undoubtedly he will make certain changes in due course of time. For the immediate future, President Johnson has already requested that the members of the Cabinet and all American Ambassadors remain at their posts. Many of the men upon whom the late President greatly relied will be a source of considerable strength to President Johnson.

In such a time of national tragedy, both parties in the United States traditionally put aside, at least for a while, their political differences and usually make every possible effort to rally behind the new President while he becomes more familiar with the manifold problems facing him. Republican spokesmen have already announced their intention to support the President during this period of transition.

Next there is the specific question, "Who is President Lyndon Johnson, and what has been his record?"

Our new 55-year-old President was born on August 27, 1908, in a farmhouse near Stonewall in central Texas. His grandfather had been a pioneer who had "homesteaded" in Texas, and both his grandfather and his father had been members of the State legislature. His family was poor and in his youth he worked on farms during those periods in which he was not attending high school.

After finishing high school, he worked for 2 years on a roadbuilding crew and then entered Southwest Texas State Teachers College where he showed particular talent for debating, journalism, and politics. Following a brief period of teaching, he went to Washington in 1931 and became an assistant to a Member of Congress.

Three years later, he was named by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as Texas State director of the National Youth Administration, and 2 years after that he entered political life as a candidate and defeated nine opponents in his campaign for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. Thus, when but 28 years of age, Lyndon Johnson returned to Washington as a Congressman in his own right.

With the outbreak of World War II, he became the first Member of Congress to enter active military service. After a year in combat as a Navy lieutenant commander, during which time he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action, Lyndon Johnson returned to the House of Representatives when President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered all Members of Congress then serving in the Armed Forces to return to their congressional offices.

After five successive terms in the House of Representatives, Lyndon Johnson was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 by a very close vote. Six years later, however, he was reelected by a 3-to-1 majority, which gives some indication of how the people of his home State felt about Lyndon Johnson's capabilities on the national scene.

In 1951, he gained even greater national prominence, for that was the occasion of his being elected by his fellow U.S. Senators as Democratic whip, the youngest man ever to hold a position of Senate leadership. Two years later, he was selected Senate minority leader, and in 1955 became the majority leader of the Senate—again the youngest man ever to hold this high position in either political party.

Over the next 6 years, he gained tremendous national recognition for his ability as a parliamentarian and for his success in securing support from Senate colleagues holding widely differing viewpoints on a number of extremely controversial issues. Indeed, it was during this period that he achieved such stature and admiration as to become widely acclaimed the second most powerful man in America, second only to then President Eisenhower in national influence.

A third question being asked by numerous persons is, "What has Lyndon Johnson done as Vice President?"

He had, of course, as Vice President fulfilled his formal constitutional duty of presiding over the Senate. In addition, Lyndon Johnson performed a number of most important tasks for the President. He served as the Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; Chairman of the National Space Council; and Chairman of the Peace Corps Advisory Council. Moreover, Lyndon Johnson undertook a number of foreign assignments for the President, which missions have taken him to the Far East and southeast Asia, to Europe and Scandinavia, indeed, to numerous countries around the world. I am sure that you well remember his visit to Jamaica in August 1962, at the time of your independence celebrations, and his very great personal interest in the peoples of this beautiful tropical island. I might point out that a number of Jamaican students will soon participate in the Lyndon B. Johnson scholarship program announced during his visit.

Lyndon Johnson sat regularly in the highest councils of Government, participated in the National Security Council decisions, and the weekly meetings which the President held with congressional leaders. Although the late President Kennedy used formal Cabinet meetings less than other Presidents, Lyndon Johnson attended these as well.

Another specific question being asked constantly is, "Do you expect any change in U.S. policy?"

As his first public act in personally addressing the Congress, President Johnson asked that joint session of Congress to enact as quickly as possible President Kennedy's legislative program, and has stated his firm intention of maintaining the late President's foreign policy.

Had President Johnson been opposed to foreign aid, or to freer foreign trade, or to the civil rights bill, some change might have been expected, but he was committed to all these important programs and it is a foregone conclusion that he will do his utmost to accomplish them.

Quite naturally, there will be changes in style, but the basic policy and program previously established will continue. If President Lyndon Johnson decides to seek reelection in 1964, and if he is returned to the highest office in our land, there may well be new issues and new programs which the Democratic Party will evolve under his leadership. Let me remind you, my friends, "Lyndon Baines Johnson is in fact a very big man in all his dimensions as a human being" and, as he said in his address to the joint session of Congress, and to the world, "Those who test our courage will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength, and the just can be strong in the defense of justice."

Another question repeatedly asked me is, "What is President Johnson's attitude on civil rights?"

President Johnson has been a stanch supporter of civil rights, not merely in words but in deeds. It should not be forgotten that from his early days in Congress, Lyndon Johnson was a strong supporter of, and just as strongly supported by, President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Johnson's voting record has been generally liberal and, of course, it must not be forgotten that it was over 6 years ago when he first demonstrated his practical ability in promoting civil rights, for it was then that he piloted through the Senate, in 1957, the first civil rights bill in more than 80 years. Three years later, he was able, as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, to secure the enactment of additional civil rights legislation.

It was last May, in a speech at Gettysburg battlefield, in Pennsylvania that Lyndon Johnson uttered these memorable words:

"The Negro today asks justice. We do not answer him, we do not those who lie beneath this soil, when we reply to the Negro by asking, 'patience'.

"It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Our Nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

"We as a Nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves."

In his address to the joint session of Congress on November 27, President Johnson asked for immediate passage of John F. Kennedy's civil rights program. His address has been well reported in the "Gleaner," both in summary and full text. On last Tuesday night, the Jamaica television station broadcast the full scene of President Johnson addressing the U.S. Congress. I hope you have had the opportunity to read or hear President Johnson's stirring words. His message on civil rights was clear and loud, and I quote his solemn words: "No memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law."

President Johnson continued his recommendation to Congress: "I urge you again, as I did in 1957, and again in 1960, to enact a civil rights law so that we can move forward to eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression based upon race or color."

I believe that President Johnson's ability and experience as a parliamentarian will be put to good use in obtaining congressional assent to the pending civil rights legislation.

And the final question I will attempt to answer is one which, although it involves me most directly, it nevertheless is the one most frequently asked. For that reason, I have chosen to answer it directly since it is usually put to me in these words, "Do you know President Johnson personally?"

Let me say in all modesty and with pardonable pride, that it has been my pleasure to have known this great American personally for more than a score of years.

Indeed it was in May, 1960, that I, as a long-time trade-union leader in the United States, made public my views concerning Lyndon B. Johnson. I said then that he was the most qualified and experienced man ever to be considered for the high office of President of the United States. I believe this statement is true today.

In conclusion, let me say to you, my friends, that a strong and fearless leader now holds the reins of Government in our country. Lyndon Baines Johnson is a man of great vision who, with the help of God, will guide the destiny of 180 million people in the United States of America.

President Johnson has asked me personally to express to the Government and people of Jamaica his appreciation, and that of all Americans, for the heartwarming outpouring of sympathy and concern on the occasion of the death of President Kennedy. In the words of President Johnson:

"It has eased our own sense of grief and loss to know that in the hearts of millions, in homes and streets of cities and villages throughout the world our sorrow has been so deeply shared. This knowledge has strengthened our resolve as Americans and as citizens of the world to pursue the causes of peace and of freedom from want, causes to which John Fitzgerald Kennedy dedicated his life. We find in your sympathy the inspiration to rededicate ourselves to the continuation and the success of President Kennedy's policies. The American people are particularly gratified and honored by the Resolution of Condolence passed by the Jamaican Senate and the House of Representatives."

May I close by quoting lines taken from Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's beautiful poem, "The Lighthouse."

"Sail on, sail on ye stately ship,
And with your floating bridge the ocean span,
Be mine to guard this light from all eclipse,
Be yours to bring man nearer unto man."

## DREW PEARSON

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a number of newspaper columnists including one Drew Pearson have made the charge that the assassination of President Kennedy was somehow the result of so-called hate spread by all those who may have opposed the President's legislative proposals. Those charges hardly dignify an answer, but after having Mr. Pearson's article on December 10, 1963, called to my attention I am constrained to suggest to this House and to the Nation that "the pot is calling the kettle black," and that the worst hatemonger of all is the same Drew Pearson who seems so intent on placing this label on others.

I refer to the vicious despicable implication by Mr. Pearson in the Washington Post that because the House Ways and Means Committee has not given its approval to the Fedicare proposal, that by some warped sense of reasoning the members of that committee, or at least those who oppose Fedicare, are smeared with guilt for the tragic fire in Fitchville, Ohio, last month which claimed 63 lives.

Mr. Speaker, how could a responsible member of the fourth estate make such a despicable statement? How could responsible newspapers carry such a slanderous accusation?

Who but a hatemonger could slur such distinguished Members of this body as the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative Wilbur Mills, and others for standing by their beliefs, and suggest they are responsible for an act of nature? Does Mr. Pearson suggest that if the Fedicare were now the law of the land there would be no more nursing home fires? We have long had a Federal Aviation Agency, but are there still not occasions when airplanes crash with tragic loss of lives? We have long had highway laws and dedicated officers to enforce them, but do we not still have traffic fatalities? We have long had housing codes, but do houses still not catch fire and burn with loss of life? This is what happened years ago in Warrention, Mo.—and I am proud that like the ancient Phoenix—from this disaster grew the model law for all State nursing homes. It is up to the several States to enact and regulate such laws—not the U.S. Government.

Each of us here knows, and Mr. Pearson also knows, that no member of the House Ways and Means Committee, whether for or against Fedicare, shares any blame for the tragic event that occurred in Fitchville, Ohio. Each Member knows that there are bills which have passed this House, and others which will pass it, which will result in the establishment of more nursing homes. Indeed, Mr. Pearson himself has on occasion in the past called for such legislation. So long as there are matches, lightning, defective wiring, and a thousand other things, there will always be fires, in nursing homes and elsewhere. Only does Mr. Pearson suggest that, if the House passed Fedicare, we would do away with nursing homes and, thereby, with nursing home fires?

To use hate, Mr. Speaker, as a means to lobby for passage of highly controversial legislation is the foulest deed that can be committed by a member of the press. I hope Mr. Pearson's poison pen will not inspire some deranged person to fire an assassin's bullet at a member of the House Ways and Means Committee in the misguided belief that he bears any responsibility for the tragedy in Ohio.

I hope all Members of this House, regardless of party and regardless of their views on Fedicare, will come to the defense of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, and the members of his committee in the face of such slanderous accusations. I hope the House will consider a resolution publicly condemning Mr. Pearson for engaging in the very kind of hate spreading he presumes to attack.

I am not unaware, Mr. Speaker, that, as an avowed opponent of this same legislation, I, too, may be a target for smear and innuendo from his poison pen, especially after these remarks. If that happens, I will happily join the company of many others who are not afraid to stand by their principles and God-given independent judgment, regardless of what the haters say.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I took this time to discuss a bit of procedure, this being Calendar Wednesday. If any committee other than the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the one which said that it has a bill ready for floor action, seeks to bring up a bill, I shall, of course, raise the question of consideration, which is then subject to majority vote. The majority can vote down this consideration. We then proceed on with the calendar until we reach the committee, the Judiciary Committee, that has announced it has a bill ready. The point is this: The majority can work its will if the majority desires to. Calendar Wednesday is not subject to filibuster if the majority wishes to prohibit it.

## CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the last several days each Member of this body has received a great number of communications and a number of personal visits concerning civil rights legislation. For the benefit of those who might be interested, and especially for those who are charged with the duty of reporting such matters objectively, I would like to point out that in all of this furor over civil rights in general and the discharge petition and the House Rules Committee, there is no rule which says that such legislation has to originate in the House of Representatives. I would further note it is my belief that this body will pass a civil rights bill after the first of the year and that this bill might have more difficulty in another body of the Congress. Therefore, I follow with the other suggestion that perhaps some of the effort which is now being directed to Members of the House might be better spent in other quarters.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was pointed out in a colloquy in the House that Calendar Wednesday—which is today—is a day established by the rules of the House so that bills previously voted out of legislative committees can be called up by committee chairmen for House consideration.

This Calendar Wednesday rule was placed in the rules 50 years ago for the very purpose of preventing a roadblock and expediting action when other normal legislative procedures cannot be followed.

Calendar Wednesday has been available each week of this session of Congress when any committee wanted action on legislation where the Committee on Rules was not cooperating and scheduling a bill.

Had the majority leadership of the House sincerely wanted immediate consideration of the civil rights bill it could be called up today and brought to a vote.

As stated yesterday by our colleague from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] this would have provided the same type of procedure as with most bills and there would be no chance of filibuster because in the House by majority vote at any time debate can be cut off.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leadership of this House publicly has stated it is pressing for signatures on a discharge petition. The Speaker has told the press he wants to force the bill to the floor of the House in spite of assurance that the Committee on Rules will take up the civil rights bill early in January.

If the Democratic leadership really wanted the civil rights bill considered now, it could have the bill called up today under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. Yet yesterday the House was informed that it would not be called up, so I find it difficult to accept Democratic assurances that the leadership really wants immediate consideration.

Instead, I am inclined to share the reaction of shock so forthrightly expressed by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] yesterday when he criticized a chairman of a committee who had the means of bringing a bill to the House and yet not doing so but rather introducing a discharge petition just as the Rules Committee receives the legislation and never giving it a chance to consider it.

I signed the discharge petition. In fact, I was the fourth or fifth Member of the House to do so. My signature was a reaffirmation of years of support for equality for all citizens.

However, I must say now that the filing of this petition and the lipservice support of the Democratic House leaders—none of whom have signed it or so I understand—can only support the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] that this constituted political demagoguery at its lowest level.

The American people not familiar with legislative rules and procedures will continue, probably, to hold the Committee on Rules and its chairman as obstructionists. Meanwhile, much undeserved credit, no doubt, will be given to those of us who signed the discharge petition.

But what should be widely known is that today the House could be considering the civil rights bill except that certain individual Democratic leaders prefer to delay that consideration. I can only say I have minimum high regard for the sincerity of those who publicly have professed such interest in expediting a vote on civil rights and this during a supposed 30-day moratorium on partisan politics. To me this is shameful.

## NO SURPRISE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a certain newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, after the defeat of the wheat referendum on May 21, 1963, administration leaders, including my good friend the majority leader, and others, stated quite emphatically that no new wheat legislation would be forthcoming. They left the impression the wheat farmers would be permitted to stew in their own juice because they turned down the referendum.

In view of the administration's attitude up to now it is most interesting to note that the new Johnson administration is becoming more astute politically and that it wants new wheat legislation enacted into law before the 1964 election. I predicted that this would happen after the wheat referendum was defeated, and therefore am somewhat pleased that my earlier prediction is coming true.

I include herewith, an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of December 11, 1963:

### Johnson Plans To Offer Wheat Control Bill Next Week Based on a Voluntary Program

Washington.—The Johnson administration plans to submit a wheat control bill to Congress early next week based on voluntary, instead of forced, participation by farmers.

This is the meaning of a brief reference by Agriculture Secretary Freeman to the wheat problem in a speech drafted for delivery in St. Paul yesterday. "I talked with President Johnson about the wheat situation," the Secretary told a convention of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, "and he indicated then his strong feelings that a wheat program will be necessary."

Mr. Freeman's advisers here say they have been ordered to prepare a wheat proposal aimed at holding down Government costs in supporting wheat prices and at reducing the stubborn wheat surplus. The proposal would replace the present mandatory control law enacted in 1962 but rejected last May by farmers in a nationwide referendum.

#### DEPARTURE FROM KENNEDY STRATEGY

The decision to send up an administration-backed bill is a departure from the strategy of the late President Kennedy, who planned to let Congress take the initiative in developing a new wheat plan with behind-the-scenes advice from Mr. Freeman and his farm planners.

It's understood the administration's wheat plan will be similar to a voluntary control proposal introduced after the referendum by Senator McGovern, Democrat, of South Dakota. This plan provides that all wheat produced within Government-issued acreage allotments would be supported at about $1.25 a bushel. An additional payment of around 70 cents a bushel would be paid to cooperating farmers who agreed to reduce their wheat plantings by a specified percentage below their allotments. The Agriculture Secretary would have broad power to set the amount of acreage reduction. Farmers who overplanted their allotments wouldn't be eligible for any price supports.

This proposal follows the principles of the present Federal acreage-cutting program in effect since 1961 on livestock feed grains—corn, grain sorghums, barley, and oats.

#### CHANGE IN CONGRESS NOTED

Looking to next year's elections, the administration is eager to escape blame for any sharp drop in wheat prices if new price-boosting legislation isn't enacted. Under present laws, the Government wheat price prop will go down to around $1.25 a bushel on 1964 production from $1.82 on this year's. Mr. Freeman's policymakers are convinced farmers would again reject mandatory controls if, as required by present law, a referendum governing the 1965 crop is held next year. So administration strategists want to take the lead with a voluntary wheat plan and head off any farmer uprising.

"It is clear," Mr. Freeman said in his speech, "that the Congress is more receptive to wheat program than it would have been last spring." Both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Freeman had warned publicly again and again that Congress wouldn't enact new wheat legislation this year if farmers rejected the tight new controls. But they carefully refused to comment on the legislative prospects for next year. Now administration farm planners are convinced that if wheat prices are allowed to plummet next year, the Democratic Party will be blamed for not bailing out the farmers, even though, in the White House view, they brought it on themselves by rejecting mandatory production controls.

Mr. Freeman's advisers also are hinting that, rather than face certain defeat in a second farmer referendum next spring, the Agriculture Secretary conceivably might proclaim that wheat stocks, prices, and expected domestic demand and exports are such that any Government controls on wheat would be unnecessary next year. "After all," a key adviser says, "the law doesn't define what a surplus is. This is left up to the Secretary himself."

Government controls on 1964 wheat production might also be deemed unnecessary if the present drought in major producing areas remains a threat to the winter wheat crop to be harvested next summer and if extra big export demand materializes as expected in the marketing year that began July 1.

The Agriculture Department estimates wheat stocks probably will drop to about 725 million bushels by next July 1 from around 1.2 billion a year earlier. If next year's harvest appears likely to fall so short of normal that carryover stocks couldn't be maintained at that level through the ensuing marketing year, Mr. Freeman might not have to worry about winning congressional approval of any new controls for at least another year.

## DREW PEARSON ALLEGATIONS

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to take the floor by the 1-minute speech given by the gentleman from Missouri [Dr. Hall]. I read the article by Mr. Pearson, which Dr. Hall mentioned, in which he blamed certain members of the Committee on Ways and Means for the death of elderly people in a fire in an Ohio rest home. The allegation is based on the fact that these members of the Ways and Means Committee are not in favor of a medicare bill. It was not made clear as to how any medicare bill could have made this rest home fireproof, or saved the lives of the elderly people. The whole attack was based on Mr. Pearson's usual brand of far-fetched innuendo.

This brought my memory back to about 1958 when the Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor were accused by the same writer of being guilty of the death of schoolchildren in Chicago at the time that a parochial school burned. It was a very tragic fire which occurred in an old school building. Many children lost their lives.

The allegation was based on the fact that the Committee on Education and Labor had not brought out a general bill for Federal aid to schools. It ignored the fact that the majority of the committee were Democrats, and blamed only Republicans for the tragic death of these children.

Much as we regretted this tragedy we could not plead guilty to it, any more than should the members of the Ways and Means Committee in this case. You see, Mr. Speaker, the bill to which Mr. Pearson referred did not provide for aid to parochial schools; therefore passage or failure of passage could have had no effect on the Chicago tragedy.

I want to welcome the members of the Ways and Means Committee to the "club" previously established by Mr. Pearson for Members of the House in such instances.

I assure them they will not be hurt by this. In fact, their constituents will probably love them for the enemy they have made.

## ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM RESULTS IN UNCONSCIONABLY HIGH COST PER MAN-YEAR

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 87-658 was signed into law on September 14, 1962, and is known as the Accelerated Public Works Act, which interestingly enough is abbreviated as APW and as such is WPA in reverse, and since that date Congress has appropriated some $850 million of the $900 million authorized in the legislation.

This program was proposed as a shot-in-the-arm noncontinuing broad general authority of the Executive to provide Federal grants for unlimited public works programs under the guise of providing substantial additional employment.

The facts have been substantiated, as were suspected by myself and others who opposed this legislation, that the cost per onsite man-year resulting from the program has been unconscionably high, proving that public works pump priming is not the long-range answer to the unemployment problem and that the taxpayers' burden is far too great when compared with the results in additional employment achieved.

As proof of this, I submit the following table of a partial list of approved accelerated public works projects taken from the list made available by the Housing and Home Finance Agency which administers the accelerated public works program. The last column of this table indicates the onsite per man-year cost for the respective projects listed and an examination of those costs clearly shows that the HHFA, in administering the act, has ignored the mandate of the Congress that, in administering it, one of the primary concerns should be to create additional new employment and to get maximum relief for unemployment out of the dollars spent.

This table further shows conclusively that a continuation of this program is not in the best public interest and would be a continuation of one of the worst public works boondoggles since WPA days.

*Partial list of approved accelerated public works projects*

| Location by State, category, area, agency, and bureau | Project number | Brief description | Estimated project cost (in thousands) | | | | On-site man-years | On-site per man-year cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | APW | Other Federal | Local matching | Total | | APW funds | Total funds |
| ALABAMA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Jasper City (DHEW-PHS) | 3010 | Remodel Jasper Community Hospital | $185 | | $176 | $361 | 11.0 | $16,800 | $32,800 |
| 5-B. Bibb (Agriculture, FS) | B-1297 | Repair buildings, recreation facilities | 3 | | | 3 | .3 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| 5-B. Hamilton (HHFA-CFA) | 3045 | Hangar | 91 | | 738 | 829 | 11.0 | 8,200 | 74,700 |
| 5-B. Pickens-Carrollton Town (DHEW-PHS). | B-694 | Construct Gordo Health Center | 30 | | 15 | 45 | 1.0 | 32,700 | 49,000 |
| 5-B. Sumter: Livingston Town (HHFA-CFA). | B-38 | County jail | 70 | | 70 | 140 | 1.7 | 42,000 | 84,000 |
| 5-B. Winston: Anniston City (HHFA-CFA). | 3044 | Water facilities | 299 | | 300 | 599 | 14.3 | 20,900 | 41,800 |
| ALASKA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Anchorage City (HHFA-CFA) | 3016 | Sewer facilities | 217 | | 216 | 433 | 12.0 | 18,200 | 36,300 |
| 5-B. Prince of Wales (Agriculture, FS) | B-130 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 94 | | | 94 | 1.8 | 51,300 | 51,300 |
| | B-131 | do | 23 | | | 23 | .4 | 55,200 | 55,200 |
| 5-B. Cordova City (HHFA-CFA) | B-856 | Sewer facilities | 383 | | 329 | 712 | 12.5 | 30,600 | 56,900 |
| | B-41 | Water supply | 400 | | 332 | 732 | 15.0 | 26,600 | 48,800 |
| 5-B. Seward (HHFA-CFA) | 3005 | Fire station | 87 | | 106 | 193 | 5.0 | 17,400 | 38,600 |
| 5-B. Kuskokwim: Yukon-Kuskokwim (Interior, NPS). | B-984 | Mount McKinley Recreation Facility | 97 | | | 97 | 1.7 | 55,400 | 55,400 |
| 5-B. Fairbanks: Fairbanks City (HHFA-CFA). | B-42 | Water supply | 736 | | 624 | 1,360 | 38.8 | 18,900 | 35,000 |
| | 3001 | Telephone system | 35 | | 35 | 70 | 1.2 | 28,000 | 56,000 |
| | 3011 | Electrical system | 30 | | 22 | 52 | .8 | 36,000 | 62,400 |
| | 3012 | Powershop building | 20 | | 15 | 35 | .7 | 30,000 | 52,500 |
| 5-B. Nome: Nome City (HHFA-CFA) | 3030 | Water facilities | 776 | | 419 | 1,195 | 25.0 | 31,000 | 47,800 |
| 5-B. Norton Sound Reservation (Interior, BIA). | BR-20 | Community centers | 95 | | | 95 | 2.2 | 42,200 | 42,200 |
| ARIZONA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Navajo (Agriculture, FS) | B-137 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 120 | | | 120 | .6 | 180,000 | 180,000 |
| 5-B. Colorado River Reservation: Parker (HHFA-CFA). | 3001 | Water facilities | 138 | | 145 | 283 | 7.2 | 19,000 | 39,000 |
| 5-B. Navajo Reservation: | | | | | | | | | |
| Apache County (Interior, BIA) | BR-25 | Road construction | 399 | | | 399 | 7.5 | 53,200 | 53,200 |
| Chinle (DHEW-PHS) | BR-90 | Water and sewer facilities | 250 | | 250 | 500 | 16.0 | 15,600 | 31,200 |
| Kayenta (DHEW-PHS) | BR-88 | do | 250 | | 250 | 500 | 16.0 | 15,600 | 31,200 |
| ARKANSAS | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Ashley: | | | | | | | | | |
| Crossett City (HHFA-CFA) | 3026 | Street improvements | 280 | | 280 | 560 | .5 | 560,000 | 1,120,000 |
| Wilmot (HHFA-CFA) | B-1450 | Water system | 49 | | 160 | 209 | 5.8 | 8,400 | 35,800 |
| 5-B. Logan (Agriculture, FS) | B-1432 | Road construction | 6 | | | 6 | .1 | 72,000 | 72,000 |
| 5-B. Phillips: | | | | | | | | | |
| Helena (DHEW-PHS) | B-1279 | Helena Hospital construction | 349 | | 175 | 524 | 15.0 | 23,300 | 34,900 |
| West Helena City: | | | | | | | | | |
| DHEW-PHS | B-725 | Treatment plant interceptor | 108 | $162 | 270 | 540 | 2.2 | 49,800 | 249,200 |
| HHFA-CFA | B-1130 | Sewer facilities | 128 | | 698 | 826 | 15.5 | 8,200 | 53,300 |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Modesto: Modesto City (GSA) | A-903 | Public building improvements | 8 | | | 8 | .2 | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Lassen: Susanville (HHFA-CFA) | 3019 | Court and library | 58 | | 58 | 116 | 1.0 | 58,000 | 116,000 |
| 5-B. Plumas: Quincy (DHEW-PHS) | B-1008 | Construct Plumas District Hospital | 15 | | 21 | 36 | 1.0 | 15,000 | 36,000 |
| 5-B. San Benito (Interior, NPS) | B-985 | Pinnacles Recreation Facility | 47 | | | 47 | .1 | 564,000 | 564,000 |
| 5-B. Calpine (HHFA-CFA) | 3084 | Water facilities | 60 | | 66 | 126 | 1.0 | 60,000 | 126,000 |
| LS. Fresno: | | | | | | | | | |
| Fresno County (HHFA-CFA) | 3028 | Street improvements | 112 | | 112 | 224 | 5.8 | 19,200 | 38,400 |
| Fresno City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-414 | Sewer improvements | 99 | | 100 | 199 | 5.5 | 18,000 | 36,100 |
| | 3042 | Road improvements | 12 | | 12 | 24 | .6 | 18,000 | 36,000 |
| Sanger City (DHEW-PHS) | LS-185 | Treatment plant expansion | 124 | | 124 | 248 | 4.5 | 27,500 | 55,100 |
| LS. San Bernardino, Riverside: Riverside County (Interior, NPS). | LS-216 | Recreational facilities | 58 | | | 58 | 1.4 | 40,900 | 40,900 |
| LS. San Diego: | | | | | | | | | |
| El Cajon (HHFA-CFA) | LS-409 | Sewer improvements | 10 | | 12 | 22 | .5 | 20,000 | 44,000 |
| National City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-404 | Sewer facilities | 45 | | 30 | 75 | 1.8 | 24,500 | 40,900 |
| San Diego City: | | | | | | | | | |
| GSA | LS-528 | Public building improvements | 14 | | | 14 | .4 | 33,600 | 33,600 |
| DHEW-PHS | LS-188 | Outfall sewer | 20 | | 20 | 40 | .6 | 34,300 | 68,600 |
| LS. Stockton: Stockton City (DHEW-PHS). | LS-376 | San Joaquin Hospital addition | 370 | | 637 | 1,007 | 15.0 | 24,700 | 67,100 |
| LS. Redding: Shasta County (Interior, NPS). | LS-294 | Recreation facilities | 158 | | | 158 | 2.7 | 59,200 | 59,200 |
| COLORADO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Conejos (Interior, SFW) | B-1689 | Fish facilities | 9 | | 9 | 18 | .2 | 54,000 | 108,000 |
| 5-B. Huerfano (Interior. SFW) | B-1688 | do | 14 | | 14 | 28 | .5 | 28,000 | 56,000 |

*Partial list of approved accelerated public works projects*—Continued

| Location by State, category, area, agency, and bureau | Project number | Brief description | Estimated project cost (in thousands) | | | | On-site man-years | On-site per man-year cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | APW | Other Federal | Local matching | Total | | APW funds | Total funds |
| CONNECTICUT | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 A. Ansonia: Ansonia City (GSA) | A-904 | Public building improvements | $15 | | | $15 | .3 | $60,000 | $60,000 |
| FLORIDA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Liberty (Agriculture, FS) | B-1862 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 11 | | $11 | 22 | 0.6 | 16,500 | 33,000 |
| LS. Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood: Broward County (HHFA-CFA). | LS-480 | Disposal facilities, incinerator | 567 | | 914 | 1,481 | 45.0 | 12,600 | 32,900 |
| LS. Miami: Miami City (DHEW-PHS) | LS-377 | Variety Children's Hospital addition | 755 | | 755 | 1,510 | 38.0 | 19,900 | 39,800 |
| GEORGIA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Baldwin: Milledgeville (DHEW-PHS). | B-1280 | Baldwin City Hospital | 28 | | 27 | 55 | .8 | 33,600 | 66,000 |
| | B-2250 | Milledgeville State Hospital | 330 | | 220 | 550 | 1.8 | 180,000 | 300,000 |
| 5-B. Stewart: Lumpkin (HHFA-CFA) | B-1134 | Water supply | 6 | | 6 | 12 | .3 | 24,000 | 48,000 |
| IDAHO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. West Bonner (DHEW-PHS) | B-731 | Interceptor sewer | 6 | $9 | 15 | 30 | .8 | 7,200 | 36,000 |
| 5-B. Idaho (Commerce, BPR) | B-675 | Highway improvements | 315 | | | 315 | 8.4 | 37,400 | 37,400 |
| ILLINOIS | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Ava (HHFA-CFA) | 3044 | Sewer facilities | 71 | | 71 | 142 | 3.0 | 23,700 | 47,400 |
| 5-A. Johnson County (Interior, SFW) | A-385 | Fish and wildlife facilities | 11 | | 11 | 22 | .6 | 16,500 | 33,000 |
| 5-A. Pocahontas (HHFA-CFA) | 3049 | Sewer facilities | 124 | | 124 | 248 | 6.7 | 18,600 | 37,200 |
| 5-A. Mattoon City (DHEW-PHS) | A-1032 | Construct Memorial Hospital nurses' home. | 250 | | 250 | 500 | 2.1 | 120,000 | 240,000 |
| 5-B. Jersey (Interior-SFW) | B-2141 | Fish and wildlife facilities | 20 | | 20 | 40 | .4 | 48,000 | 96,000 |
| 5-B. Richland (DHEW-PHS) | B-2136 | Richland Memorial Hospital addition | 175 | | 175 | 350 | 1.4 | 123,500 | 247,000 |
| INDIANA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Evansville (DHEW-PHS) | A-546 | Wellborn Memorial Baptist Hospital addition. | 960 | | 961 | 1,921 | 46.0 | 20,800 | 41,700 |
| 5-B. Jasper (Agriculture, FS) | B-1308 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 15 | | 15 | 30 | .4 | 36,000 | 72,000 |
| 5-B. Lawrence (Agriculture, FS) | B-1254 | Road construction | 48 | | | 48 | 1.3 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| 5-B. Shoals (HHFA-CFA) | 3019 | Sewer facilities | 110 | | 120 | 230 | 5.0 | 22,000 | 46,000 |
| L-S. South Bend City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-42 | Street construction | 160 | | 185 | 345 | 5.0 | 32,000 | 69,000 |
| KENTUCKY | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Laurel County (Commerce-BPR) | A-358 | Bridge and approaches | 200 | | | 200 | 5.5 | 36,400 | 36,400 |
| 5-A. Webster County: Dixon (HHFA-CFA). | A-1095 | Water facilities | 63 | | 63 | 126 | .8 | 75,600 | 150,200 |
| 5-A. Harlan County (Interior, SFW) | A-776 | Fish facilities | 250 | | 250 | 500 | 10.0 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| 5-A. Paducah City (HHFA-CFA) | A-444 | City hall | 580 | | 824 | 1,404 | 48.4 | 11,900 | 29,000 |
| 5-A. Jackson County (HHFA-CFA) | A-29 | Courthouse | 300 | | 100 | 400 | 10.4 | 28,800 | 38,400 |
| 5-B. Pulaski (Commerce, BPR) | B-863 | Bridge and approaches | 200 | | | 200 | 5.6 | 35,800 | 35,800 |
| 5-B. Warren: Bowling Green (GSA) | B-1832 | Public building, improve | 80 | | | 80 | 1.2 | 64,000 | 64,000 |
| LOUISIANA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Donaldsonville (Interior, SFW) | B-1976 | Fish facilities | 5 | | [illegible] | 10 | 1.7 | 30,000 | 60,000 |
| 5-B. Lafayette City (DHEW-PHS) | B-1281 | Lafayette Memorial Hospital | 1,325 | 1,000 | 2,530 | 4,855 | 107.0 | 12,300 | 45,400 |
| LS. New Orleans (Interior, SFW) | LS-593 | Fish facilities | 19 | | 19 | 38 | 1.0 | 19,000 | 38,000 |
| LS. Gretna (DHEW-PHS) | LS-9 | Sewage treatment | 1,042 | | 1,042 | 2,084 | 41.7 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| LS. Harahan City, (HHFA-CFA) | 3024 | Road improvements | 268 | | 1,961 | 2,229 | 54.2 | 5,000 | 41,100 |
| MAINE | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Biddeford (DHEW-PHS) | 3002 | Webber Hospital | 200 | 200 | 400 | 800 | 10.0 | 20,000 | 80,000 |
| MARYLAND [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. North Adams: Berkshire County, Adams fire district (HHFA-CFA) | 3017 | Water facilities | 112 | | 83 | 195 | 4.7 | 24,000 | 41,800 |
| 5-B. Gloucester City (HHFA-CFA) | B-64 | do | 314 | | 812 | 1,126 | 33.3 | 9,400 | 33,800 |
| LS. Lawrence (DHEW-PHS) | LS-474 | Lawrence General Hospital, addition | 1,783 | | 1,773 | 3,556 | 90.3 | 19,700 | 39,400 |
| LS. Holyoke (HHFA-CFA) | 3015 | Gas distribution system | 513 | | 396 | 909 | 24.6 | 20,900 | 37,000 |
| LS. Palmer (HHFA-CFA) | LS-56 | Water supply | 81 | | 81 | 162 | 4.7 | 17,100 | 34,100 |
| LS. Springfield City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-421 | Sewer facilities | 28 | | 28 | 56 | 1.4 | 19,800 | 39,500 |
| LS. Easthampton (HHFA-CFA) | LS-59 | Water supply | 70 | | 76 | 146 | 3.0 | 23,300 | 48,600 |
| LS. Hadley (HHFA-CFA) | LS-420 | Sewer facilities | 83 | | 86 | 169 | 4.6 | 18,100 | 36,900 |
| LS. South Hadley (HHFA-CFA) | 3030 | Street improvements | 58 | | 50 | 108 | 1.9 | 30,300 | 56,300 |
| MICHIGAN | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Bay City: Bay County (Interior, SFW). | A-885 | Wildlife facilities | 22 | | 22 | 44 | .4 | 52,800 | 105,600 |
| 5-A. Detroit: | | | | | | | | | |
| Mount Clemens (HHFA-CFA) | A-984 | Water facilities | 92 | | 153 | 245 | 7.2 | 12,800 | 34,200 |
| St. Clair Shores (HHFA-CFA) | A-728 | Sewer facilities | 163 | | 186 | 349 | 3.5 | 46,600 | 99,700 |
| Oak Park (HHFA-CFA) | A-449 | Storm and sewer facilities | 67 | | 66 | 133 | 3.7 | 17,900 | 35,500 |
| Southfield (HHFA-CFA) | A-323 | City hall | 879 | | 879 | 1,758 | 51.6 | 17,000 | 34,000 |
| Detroit City: | | | | | | | | | |
| DHEW-PHS | 3071 | Womans Hospital | 685 | | 735 | 1,420 | 34.0 | 20,100 | 41,700 |
| | 3072 | Crittenton Hospital | 162 | | 163 | 325 | 8.0 | 20,300 | 40,600 |
| HHFA-CFA | A-52 | Water supply | 83 | | 83 | 166 | 4.6 | 18,100 | 36,200 |
| | A-56 | Repair sewage facilities | 30 | | 31 | 61 | 1.6 | 18,900 | 38,500 |
| | A-58 | Water supply | 110 | | 109 | 219 | 6.5 | 16,900 | 33,700 |
| | A-64 | do | 489 | | 489 | 978 | 24.3 | 20,100 | 40,200 |
| | A-65 | do | 315 | | 404 | 719 | 18.6 | 16,900 | 38,700 |
| | A-69 | do | 205 | | 204 | 409 | 11.9 | 17,200 | 34,300 |
| | 3058 | Water facilities | 136 | | 136 | 272 | 6.8 | 19,900 | 39,800 |
| Garden City (DHEW-PHS) | 3073 | Garden City Hospital | 717 | | 717 | 1,434 | 36.0 | 19,900 | 39,800 |
| 5-A. Schoolcraft County (Interior, SFW) | A-949 | Fish facilities | 3 | | 3 | 6 | .1 | 36,000 | 72,000 |
| 5-B. Dickinson: Iron Mountain (HHFA-CFA). | B-1619 | Water facilities | 58 | | 58 | 116 | 2.3 | 24,800 | 49,700 |
| 5-B. Huron (Interior, SFW) | B-1807 | Wildlife facilities | 2 | | 2 | 4 | .1 | 24,000 | 48,000 |

[1] None.

*Partial list of approved accelerated public works projects*—Continued

| Location by State, category, area, agency, and bureau | Project number | Brief description | Estimated project cost (in thousands) | | | | On-site man-years | On-site per man-year cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | APW | Other Federal | Local matching | Total | | APW funds | Total funds |
| MICHIGAN—continued | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Lake (Agriculture, FS) | B-304 | Repair buildings, recreation facilities | $13 | | | $13 | .2 | $78,000 | $78,000 |
| 5-B. Howell City (DHEW-PHS) | B-703 | Addition, McPhersen Community Health Center. | 76 | | $168 | 244 | 5.1 | 14,900 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Luce (Interior, FSW) | B-1919 | Fish facilities | 6 | | 6 | 12 | .1 | 72,000 | 144,000 |
| 5-B. Wexford (Agriculture, FS) | B-315 | Repair buildings, recreational facilities | 10 | | | 10 | .2 | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| LS. Battle Creek: Barry County (Interior, SFW). | LS-599 | Wildlife facilities | 8 | | 8 | 16 | .4 | 19,200 | 38,400 |
| LS. Jackson City (DHEW-PHS) | LS-175 | Addition, Foote Memorial Hospital | 99 | | 98 | 197 | 4.2 | 23,300 | 46,400 |
| MINNESOTA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Cass County (Agriculture, FS) | A-165 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 25 | | | 25 | .6 | 42,900 | 42,900 |
| 5-A. Big Fork (DHEW-PHS) | 3032 | Northern Itasca Hospital | 85 | $181 | 137 | 403 | 4.0 | 21,300 | 100,800 |
| 5-A. Duluth (HHFA-CFA) | 3028 | Water facilities | 114 | | 115 | 229 | 5.8 | 19,500 | 39,300 |
| 5-B. Bemidji City: | | | | | | | | | |
| DHEW-PHS | B-706 | Nursing home, Bemidji | 53 | 240 | 293 | 586 | 4.4 | 12,000 | 132,700 |
| HHFA-CFA | 3009 | Water facilities | 33 | | 32 | 65 | 1.7 | 19,800 | 39,000 |
| LS. Detroit Lakes (DHEW-PHS) | 3031 | Detroit Lakes Retirement Center | 450 | | 450 | 900 | 22.0 | 20,500 | 40,900 |
| MISSISSIPPI [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| MISSOURI | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Washington: Franklin County (Agriculture, FS). | A-181 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 24 | | | 24 | .5 | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Dallas (Interior, SFW) | B-1519 | Fish and wildlife facilities | 8 | | 8 | 16 | .4 | 24,000 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Lexington City (DHEW-PHS) | B-1081 | Sewage treatment | 100 | | 100 | 200 | 3.7 | 27,300 | 54,500 |
| MONTANA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Butte (DHEW-PHS) | 3005 | St. James Community Hospital addition | 147 | | 269 | 416 | 11.0 | 13,400 | 37,800 |
| NEBRASKA [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| NEVADA [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW JERSEY | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Pleasantville (HHFA-CFA) | 3003 | Sewer facilities | 590 | | 598 | 1,188 | 30.0 | 19,700 | 39,600 |
| 5-A. Wildwood-Ocean City: Middle Township (HHFA-CFA) | 3037 | Water facilities | 45 | | 47 | 92 | 2.2 | 20,800 | 42,500 |
| 5-A. Somers Point (DHEW-PHS) | 3010 | Shore Memorial Hospital expansion | 634 | | 1,166 | 1,800 | 48.0 | 13,200 | 37,500 |
| 5-A. Spring Lake Heights Borough (HHFA-CFA). | 3029 | Water facilities | 90 | | 90 | 180 | 4.2 | 21,600 | 43,200 |
| LS. Bayonne (HHFA-CFA) | 3002 | Sewer facilities | 1,586 | | 1,652 | 3,238 | 80.0 | 19,800 | 40,500 |
| LS. Jersey City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-385 | Garage | 1,115 | | 1,114 | 2,229 | 50.0 | 22,300 | 44,600 |
| LS. Piscataway (HHFA-CFA) | LS-427 | Street improvement | 150 | | 150 | 300 | 7.5 | 20,000 | 40,000 |
| LS. Camden County (HHFA-CFA) | LS-234 | Sewage facilities | 300 | | 300 | 600 | 15.7 | 19,000 | 38,100 |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Sandoval (Agriculture, FS) | B-1351 | Road construction | 26 | | | 26 | .5 | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| 5-B. San Miguel (Agriculture, FS) | B-1359 | Repair buildings, recreation facility | 6 | | | 6 | .1 | 72,000 | 72,000 |
| 5-B. Mountainair (HHFA-CFA) | 3004 | Road improvements | 100 | | 99 | 199 | 5.0 | 20,000 | 39,800 |
| NEW YORK | | | | | | | | | |
| LS. Grand Island (HHFA-CFA) | LS-239 | Sewage facilities | 82 | | 193 | 275 | 6.7 | 12,300 | 41,300 |
| Lancaster (HHFA-CFA) | LS-66 | Water supply and road | 385 | | 385 | 770 | 21.6 | 17,800 | 35,700 |
| Sloan (HHFA-CFA) | 3010 | Fire station | 84 | | 71 | 155 | 4.2 | 20,200 | 37,200 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Vance County (Interior, SFW) | A-1043 | Fish facilities | 2 | | 2 | 4 | .1 | 24,000 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Madison (Agriculture, FS) | B-2293 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 4 | | | 4 | .1 | 48,000 | 48,000 |
| 5-B. Mitchell (Agriculture, FS) | B-483 | Road construction | 6 | | | 6 | .1 | 72,000 | 72,000 |
| OHIO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Brown County: Georgetown Village (HHFA-CFA). | A-86 | Water supply | 93 | | 94 | 187 | 5.0 | 18,600 | 37,400 |
| 5-A. Jackson County: Wakefield (DHEW-PHS). | A-556 | Good Shepherd Manor, remodel | 100 | | 159 | 259 | 5.0 | 20,000 | 51,800 |
| 5-A. Belmont County: Brookside (HHFA-CFA). | A-830 | Sewer facilities | 5 | | 3 | 8 | .2 | 30,000 | 48,000 |
| LS. Lorain County: Lorain City (DHEW-PHS). | LS-179 | Addition, Lorain City Health Center | 22 | | 25 | 47 | 1.2 | 17,600 | 37,600 |
| LS. Mahoning County: Niles (HHFA-CFA). | LS-459 | Water system | 254 | | 254 | 508 | 13.8 | 18,400 | 36,700 |
| LS. Muskingum (DHEW-PHS) | LS-578 | Bethesda Hospital, construction | 281 | 1,691 | 3,662 | 5,634 | 21.4 | 13,100 | 263,100 |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Panama (HHFA-CFA) | B-2019 | Sewer facilities | 63 | | 146 | 209 | 1.0 | 63,000 | 209,000 |
| 5-B. Lincoln (Agriculture, SCS) | B-1022 | Dam construction | 105 | | | 105 | 2.3 | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Iowa Reservation (Interior, BIA) | B-1445 | Community centers | 74 | | | 74 | 2.0 | 37,000 | 37,000 |
| Kickapoo Reservation (Interior, BIA). | B-1446 | do | 74 | | | 74 | 1.8 | 40,400 | 40,400 |
| 5-B. Adair (HHFA-CFA) | 3013 | Sewer facilities | 30 | | 96 | 126 | 3.5 | 8,600 | 36,000 |
| OREGON | | | | | | | | | |
| LS. Roseburg: Douglas County (Agriculture, FS). | LS-373 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 41 | | | 41 | .7 | 61,500 | 61,500 |
| LS. Bend: Deschutes County (Agriculture, FS). | LS-615 | Road construction | 9 | | | 9 | .3 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| LS. Richland: Baker County (HHFA-CFA). | 3008 | Water facilities | 61 | | 62 | 123 | 2.8 | 21,500 | 43,400 |

[1] None.

*Partial list of approved accelerated public works projects*—Continued

| Location by State, category, area, agency, and bureau | Project number | Brief description | Estimated project cost (in thousands) | | | | On-site man-years | On-site per man-year cost | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | APW | Other Federal | Local matching | Total | | APW funds | Total funds |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Altoona City (HHFA-CFA) | A-659 | Sewer facilities | $40 | | $40 | $80 | $0.8 | $48,000 | $96,000 |
| | A-581 | do | 111 | | 116 | 227 | 4.3 | 25,600 | 52,400 |
| 5-A. Pittsburgh: | | | | | | | | | |
| Ingram borough (HHFA-CFA) | 3113 | Street improvement | 41 | | 41 | 82 | .2 | 246,000 | 492,000 |
| Pittsburgh city (HHFA-CFA) | A-342 | Water facilities | 125 | | 125 | 250 | 5.0 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| | A-344 | do | 125 | | 125 | 250 | 4.0 | 31,300 | 62,500 |
| | A-349 | do | 100 | | 100 | 200 | 4.2 | 24,000 | 48,000 |
| | 3052 | do | 40 | | 45 | 85 | .6 | 68,600 | 145,700 |
| Munhall (HHFA-CFA) | A-346 | Sewer facilities | 12 | | 52 | 64 | .7 | 16,000 | 85,300 |
| Conway (HHFA-CFA) | A-764 | Sewer system | 50 | | 51 | 101 | 1.6 | 30,000 | 60,600 |
| 5-A. Schuylkill County: | | | | | | | | | |
| Orwigsburg (DHEW-PHS) | 3110 | Sewage treatment plant | 152 | | 152 | 304 | 6.1 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| Pottsville City (DHEW-PHS) | A-550 | Pottsville Hospital, replacement | 2,313 | | 1,430 | 3,743 | 70.0 | 33,000 | 53,500 |
| 5-A. Luzerne County: Nanticoke (HHFA-CFA). | A-838 | Sewer facilities | 55 | | 56 | 111 | .9 | 60,000 | 121,100 |
| LS. Bucks County: Philadelphia City (DHEW-PHS). | LS-28 | Maternity building, Einstein Medical Center. | 886 | | 1,136 | 2,022 | 47.0 | 18,900 | 43,000 |
| | 3015 | Misericordia Hospital addition | 600 | | 600 | 1,200 | 45.0 | 13,300 | 26,700 |
| | 3017 | Skin and Cancer Hospital | 400 | $346 | 882 | 1,628 | 25.0 | 16,000 | 65,100 |
| | LS-218 | Sewage facilities | 42 | | 42 | 84 | 1.6 | 25,200 | 50,400 |
| RHODE ISLAND | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Bristol County: | | | | | | | | | |
| Warwick City (HHFA-CFA) | A-94 | do | 1,827 | | 1,369 | 3,196 | 50.0 | 36,500 | 63,900 |
| Pawtucket City (DHEW-PHS) | 3006 | Miriam Hospital addition | 245 | | 246 | 491 | 11.0 | 22,300 | 44,600 |
| Providence City (DHEW-PHS) | A-263 | Rhode Island Hospital addition | 87 | | 309 | 396 | 9.2 | 9,500 | 43,200 |
| Woonsocket City (DHEW-PHS) | A-553 | Woonsocket Hospital addition | 128 | | 217 | 345 | 6.0 | 21,300 | 57,500 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Bamberg (Interior, SFW) | B-2080 | Fish facilities | 22 | | 22 | 444 | 1.0 | 22,000 | 44,000 |
| 5-B. Blaney (HHFA-CFA) | B-94 | Water facilities | 75 | | 75 | 150 | 1.5 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| TENNESSEE | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Marion: Jasper Town (HHFA-CFA) | B-102 | Water supply | 113 | | 115 | 228 | 1.7 | 64,600 | 130,300 |
| 5-B. Rhea (TVA) | B-964 | Reforestation | 3 | | | 3 | .1 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| LS. Chattanooga: Hamilton County (TVA) | LS-275 | do | 6 | | | 6 | .2 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| TEXAS | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Nacogdoches City (HHFA-CFA) | B-1582 | Water and sewer improvement | 400 | | 45 | 445 | 4.7 | 84,200 | 93,700 |
| LS. Orange County (HHFA-CFA) | LS-497 | Street improvements | 53 | | 365 | 418 | 8.3 | 6,400 | 50,200 |
| | LS-498 | do | 100 | | 732 | 832 | 16.7 | 6,000 | 49,900 |
| LS. Port Arthur City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-109 | Sewage facilities | 575 | | 604 | 1,179 | 8.3 | 69,000 | 141,500 |
| WASHINGTON | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Port Townsend (DHEW-PHS) | 3024 | Construct St. Johns Hospital | 171 | 173 | 769 | 1,113 | 26.0 | 6,600 | 42,800 |
| 5-B. Kittitas (Agriculture, FS) | B-594 | Road construction | 11 | | | 11 | .1 | 132,000 | 132,000 |
| LS. Spokane City (HHFA-CFA) | LS-111 | Street improvements | 742 | | 885 | 1,627 | 43.4 | 17,100 | 37,500 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. Raleigh County: Mabscott (HHFA-CFA). | 3051 | do | 27 | | 9 | 36 | .8 | 32,400 | 43,200 |
| 5-A. Harrison County: Lumberport Town (HHFA-CFA). | A-102 | Water supply | 140 | | 160 | 300 | 7.3 | 19,100 | 40,100 |
| 5-A. Parkersburg City (HHFA-CFA) | 3028 | Reservoir covers | 71 | | 72 | 143 | 2.9 | 24,300 | 49,000 |
| 5-A. Winfield (HHFA-CFA) | 3075 | Courthouse | 45 | | 47 | 92 | .6 | 67,500 | 138,000 |
| 5-A. Green Brier County (Agriculture, FS). | 3060 | Road construction | 520 | | | 520 | 9.2 | 56,700 | 56,700 |
| 5-A. Keystone (HHFA-CFA) | A-801 | Water facilities | 26 | | 9 | 35 | .7 | 39,000 | 52,500 |
| 5-A. Moundsville (HHFA-CFA) | A-1123 | Storm drainage | 766 | | 560 | 1,326 | 1.0 | 766,000 | 1,326,000 |
| 5-B. Hinton (HHFA-CFA) | B-1413 | Correctional institution | 13 | | 63 | 76 | 1.9 | 6,800 | 39,700 |
| 5-B. Buckhannon (HHFA-CFA) | B-1412 | Sewer facilities | 26 | | 25 | 51 | 1.2 | 20,800 | 40,800 |
| WISCONSIN | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-A. La Crosse City (DHEW-PHS) | 3023 | La Crosse Lutheran Hospital addition | 402 | | 2,308 | 2,710 | 36.0 | 11,200 | 75,300 |
| 5-B. Washburn (Agriculture, FS) | B-2055 | Construct buildings, recreation facilities | 29 | | 29 | 58 | 1.5 | 19,300 | 38,700 |
| PUERTO RICO | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-B. Fajardo (HHFA-CFA) | B-1397 | Water facilities | 116 | | 38 | 154 | 1.7 | 69,600 | 92,400 |
| 5-B. Vega Baja (HHFA-CFA) | B-1566 | Road improvements | 59 | | 163 | 222 | 5.2 | 11,200 | 42,300 |
| LS. Bayamon (HHFA-CFA) | A-669 | Sewer facilities | 577 | | 533 | 1,110 | 29.2 | 19,800 | 38,100 |

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr. COHELAN.** Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 227 I was absent from the city on official business. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

**The SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SULLIVAN, for week of December 16, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS, for 10 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. FRASER, for 1 hour, on December 12.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER.
Mr. CRAMER.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California;

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 6143. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions; and

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

## SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

## UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5338) to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, in the eighth line following line 2, strike out "LADING," and insert "LADING".

Page 2, in the twelfth line following line 2, strike out "RIGHTS," and inserts "RIGHTS".

Page 10, line 4, strike out "(15)" and insert "(14a)".

Page 10, line 6, strike out "(16)" and insert "(15)".

Page 10, line 16, strike out "(17)" and insert "(16)".

Page 10, line 18, strike out "(18)" and insert "(17)".

Page 11, line 1, strike out "(19)" and insert "(18)".

Page 11, line 3, strike out "(20)" and insert "(19)".

Page 11, line 5, strike out "(21)" and insert "(20)".

Page 11, line 9, strike out "(22)" and insert "(21)".

Page 11, line 12, strike out "(23)" and insert "(22)".

Page 11, line 16, strike out "(24)" and insert "(23)".

Page 11, line 20, strike out "(25)" and insert "(24)".

Page 11, line 23, strike out "(26)" and insert "(25)".

Page 12, line 11, strike out "(27)" and insert "(26)".

Page 12, line 21, strike out "(28)" and insert "(27)".

Page 13, line 11, strike out "(29)" and insert "(28)".

Page 13, line 16, strike out "(30)" and insert "(29)".

Page 13, line 19, strike out "(31)" and insert "(30)".

Page 13, line 21, strike out "(32)" and insert "(31)".

Page 13, line 25, strike out "(33)" and insert "(32)".

Page 14, line 4, strike out "(34)" and insert "(33)".

Page 14, line 6, strike out "(35)" and insert "(34)".

Page 14, line 9, strike out "(36)" and insert "(35)".

Page 14, line 13, strike out "(37)" and insert "(36)".

Page 14, line 14, strike out "(38)" and insert "(37)".

Page 15, line 13, strike out "(39)" and insert "(38)".

Page 15, line 22, strike out "(40)" and insert "(39)".

Page 15, line 24, strike out "41" and insert "(40)".

Page 15, line 25, strike out "(42)" and insert "(41)".

Page 16, line 3, strike out "(43)" and insert "(42)".

Page 16, line 5, strike out "(44)" and insert "(43)".

Page 16, line 8, strike out "(45)" and insert "(44)".

Page 16, line 23, strike out "(46)" and insert "(45)".

Page 17, line 1, strike out "(47)" and insert "(46)".

Page 24, line 23, strike out "2—105" and insert "2—105.".

Page 49, line 2, strike out "28:—719" and insert "28:2—719".

Page 115, line 14, strike out "issued" and insert "issued.".

Page 115, line 20, strike out "section" and insert "section.".

Page 118, line 22, strike out "indorsed." and insert "indorsed'.".

Page 122, line 24, strike out "pay.'" and insert "pay'.".

Page 126, line 20, strike out "Any" and insert "Any".

Page 132, line 23, strike out "unles" and insert "unless".

Page 153, line 1, strike out "a draft" and insert "A draft".

Page 204, strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and insert "(1) This article applies".

Page 220, line 17, strike out "this state" and insert "the District".

Page 281, line 1, strike out "persons".

Page 299, strike out the tenth and eleventh lines following line 15, and insert "28:9—106. Definitions: 'account'; 'contract right'; general intangibles'.".

Page 309, line 12, strike out "right.'" and insert "right'.".

Page 309, line 14, strike out "products.'" and insert "products'.".

Page 362, line 22, strike out "Article" and insert "article".

Page 362, line 24, strike out "Article" and insert "article".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, with but one exception, the Senate amendments, as shown in the Senate report—Senate Report No. 649—are technical and clarifying in nature.

The one exception is the amendment to article V, dealing with letters of credit. The purpose of this amendment is to make the language of the bill conform to the official text of the Uniform Commercial Code. This amendment was recommended by the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws for the District of Columbia and adopted by the Senate.

These amendments to the House bill are supported by the District of Columbia Bar Association, who requested this legislation.

The bill passed the House without objection, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendments.

## HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act, including the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 1. Short title.
"Sec. 2. Definitions.
"Sec. 3. Horizontal property regimes.
"Sec. 4. Status of condominium units within a horizontal property regime.
"Sec. 5. Joint tenancies, tenancies in common, tenancies by the entirety.

"Sec. 6. Ownership of condominium units, of common elements; declaration; voting; individual unit deeds.
"Sec. 7. Indivisibility of common elements; limitation upon partition.
"Sec. 8. Use of elements held in common, right to repair common elements.
"Sec. 9. Condominium subdivision.
"Sec. 10. Reference to plat.
"Sec. 11. Termination and waiver of regime.
"Sec. 12. Merger no bar to reconstitution.
"Sec. 13. Bylaws, availability for examination.
"Sec. 14. Necessary contents of bylaws; modification of system.
"Sec. 15. Books of receipts and expenditures; availability for examination.
"Sec. 16. Common profits, contributions for payment of common expenses of administration and maintenance.
"Sec. 17. Priority of liens.
"Sec. 18. Joint and several liability of purchaser and seller for amounts owing under section 16; purchaser's recovery, purchaser's or lender's right to a statement setting forth amount due.
"Sec. 19. Supplementary method of enforcement of lien.
"Sec. 20. Insuring building against risks; individual rights of co-owners.
"Sec. 21. Application of insurance proceeds to reconstruction; pro rata distribution in certain cases; rules governing.
"Sec. 22. Sharing of reconstruction cost where building is not insured or insurance indemnity is insufficient.
"Sec. 23. Separate taxation.
"Sec. 24. Actions; right to separate release of judgment.
"Sec. 25. Mechanics' and materialmen's liens, enforcement thereof; removal from lien; effect of part payment.
"Sec. 26. Nonapplication of rule against perpetuities and of rule against unreasonale restraints on alienation to horizontal property regimes.
"Sec. 27. Supplement of existing code provisions.
"Sec. 28. Regulations of the Board of Commissioners and the zoning commission.
"Sec. 29. Interpretation.
"Sec. 30. Supplemental provisions relating to sewer and water services.
"Sec. 31. Authority of Board of Commissioners under Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952.
"Sec. 32. Severability.
"Sec. 33. Effective date.

"SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.—Unless it is plainly evident from the context that a different meaning is intended, as used herein—

"(a) 'Unit' or 'condominium unit' means an enclosed space, consisting of one or more rooms, occupying all or part of a floor in buildings of one or more floors or stories regardless of whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other type of independent use, and shall include such accessory units as may be appended thereto, such as garage space, storage space, balcony, terrace or patio: *Provided*, That said unit has a direct exit to a thoroughfare or to a given common space leading to a thoroughfare.

"(b) 'Condominium' means the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements.

"(c) 'Condominium project' means a real estate condominium project; a plan or project whereby five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings or structures are offered or proposed to be offered for sale.

"(d) 'Co-owner' means a person, persons, corporation, trust, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, that owns a condominium unit within the building.

"(e) 'Council of co-owners' means the coowners as defined in subsection (d) of this section, acting as a group in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the bylaws and declaration established thereunder; and a majority, as defined in subsection (k) of this section, shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, constitute a quorum for the adoption of decisions.

"(f) 'General common element' except as otherwise provided in the plat of condominium subdivision, means and includes—

"(1) the land on which the building stands in fee simple or leased provided that the leasehold interest of each unit is separable from the leasehold interests of the other units;

"(2) the foundations, main walls, roofs, halls, columns, girders, beams, supports, corridors, fire escapes, lobbies, stairways, and entrance and exit or communication ways;

"(3) the basements, flat roofs, yards, and gardens except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

"(4) the premises for lodging of janitors or persons in charge of the building, except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

"(5) the compartments or installations of central services such as power, light, gas, cold and hot water, heating, central air conditioning or central refrigeration, swimming pools, reservoirs, water tanks and pumps, and the like;

"(6) the elevators, garbage and trash incinerators and, in general, all devices or installations existing for common use; and

"(7) all other elements of the building rationally of common use or necessary to its existence, upkeep, and safety.

"(g) 'Limited common elements' means and includes those common elements which are agreed upon by all the co-owners to be reserved for the use of a certain number of condominium units, such as special corridors, stairways, and elevators, sanitary services common to the apartments of a particular floor and the like.

"(h) 'Majority of co-owners', 'two-thirds of the co-owners', and 'three-fourths of the co-owners' mean, respectively, 51, 66⅔, and 75 per centum or more of the votes of the co-owners computed in accordance with their percentage interests as established under section 6 of this Act.

"(i) 'Plat of condominium subdivision' means the plat of the surveyor of the District of Columbia establishing the condominimum units, accessory units, general common elements, and limited common elements.

"(j) 'Person' means a natural individual, corporation, trustee, or other legal entity or any combination thereof.

"(k) 'Developer' means a person that undertakes to develop a real estate condominium project.

"(l) 'Property' means and includes the lands whether leasehold, if separable as defined in (f)(1) of this section, or in fee simple, the building, all improvements and structures thereon, and all easements, rights, and appurtenances thereunto belonging.

"(m) 'To record' means to record in accordance with the provisions of section 499 of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189, 1268).

"(n) 'Common expenses' means and includes—

"(1) all sums lawfully assessed against the unit owners by the council of co-owners;

"(2) expenses of administration, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the common areas and facilities, including repair and replacement funds as may be established;

"(3) expenses agreed upon as common expenses by the council of co-owners;

"(4) expenses declared common expenses by the provisions of this Act or by the bylaws.

"(o) 'Common profits' means the balance of all income, rents, profits, and revenues from the common areas and facilities remaining after deduction of the common expenses.

"(p) All words used herein include the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders and include the singular or plural numbers, as the case may be.

"SEC. 3. HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES.—Whenever the owners or the co-owners of any square or lot shall subdivide the same into a condominium project in conformity with section 9 of this Act with a plat of condominium subdivision there shall be established a horizontal property regime.

"SEC. 4. STATUS OF CONDOMINUM UNITS WITHIN A HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIME.—Once the property is subdivided into the horizontal property regime, a condominium unit in the building may be individually conveyed, leased, and encumbered and may be inherited or devised by will, as if it were sole and entirely independent of the other condominium units in the building of which it forms a part; the said separate units shall have the same incidents as real property and the corresponding individual titles and interests therein shall be recordable.

"SEC. 5. JOINT TENANCIES, TENANCIES IN COMMON, TENANCIES BY THE ENTIRETY.—Any condominium unit may be held and owned by more than one person as joint tenants, as tenants in common, as tenants by the entirety (in the case of husband and wife), or in any other real property tenancy relationship recognized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 6. OWERSHIP OF CONDOMINUM UNITS, OF COMMON ELEMENTS; DECLARATION; VOTING; INDIVIDUAL UNIT DEEDS.—(a) A condominium unit owner shall have the exclusive fee simple ownership of his unit and shall have a common right to a share, with the other co-owners, of an undivided fee simple interest in the common elements of the property, equivalent to the percentage representing the value of the unit to the value of the whole property.

"(b) Said percentage interest shall not be separated from the unit to which it appertains.

"(c) The individual percentages shall be established at the time the horizontal property regime is constituted by the recording among the land records of the District of Columbia, of a declaration setting forth said percentages, shall have a permanent character, and shall not be changed without the acquiescence of the co-owners representing all the condominium units in the building, which said change shall be evidenced by an appropriate amendatory declaration to such effect recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia. Said share interest shall be set forth of record, in the initial individual condominum unit deeds. Said share interests in the common elements shall, nevertheless, be subject to mutual rights of ingress, egress, and regress of use and enjoyment of the other co-owners and a right of entry to officers, agents, and employees of the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia acting in the performance of their official duties.

"(d) The said basic value of said undivided common interest shall be fixed for the purposes of this Act and shall not fix the market value of the individual condominium units and undivided share interests and shall not prevent each co-owner from fixing a different circumstantial value to his condominium unit and undivided share interest in the common elements, in all types of acts and contracts.

"(e) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the declaration may contain other provisions and attachments relating to the condominium and to the units which are not inconsistent with this Act.

"(f) Voting at all meetings of the coowners shall be on a percentage basis, and the percentage of the vote to which each co-owner is entitled shall be the individual percentage assigned to his unit in the declaration.

"(g) Individual condominium unit deeds may make reference to this Act, the condominium subdivision and land subdivision plats referred to in section 10 hereof, the declaration provided for in this section, the bylaws of the council of co-owners, and the deeds may include any further details which the grantor and grantee may deem desirable to set forth consistent with the declaration and this Act.

"Sec. 7. Indivisibility of Common Elements; Limitation Upon Partition.—(a) The common elements, both general and limited, shall remain undivided. No unit owner, or any other person, shall bring any action for partition or division of the co-ownership permitted under section 93 and related provisions of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1203), as amended by the Act of June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 523, ch. 1329), against any other owner or owners of any interest or interests in the same horizontal property regime so as to terminate the regime.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as a limitation on partition by the owners of one or more units in a regime as to the individual ownership of such unit or units without terminating the regime or as to the ownership of property outside the regime: *Provided,* That upon partition of any such individual unit the same shall be sold as an entity and shall not be partitioned in kind.

"Sec. 8. Use of Elements Held in Common, Right To Repair Common Elements.—(a) Each co-owner may use the elements held in common in accordance with the purposes for which they are intended, without hindering or encroaching upon the lawful rights of the other co-owners.

"(b) The manager, board of directors or of administration, as the case may be, shall have an irrevocable right and an easement to enter units to make repairs to common elements or when repairs reasonably appear to be necessary for public safety or to prevent damage to property other than the unit.

"Sec. 9. Condominium Subdivision.—(a) Whenever the owner or the co-owners of any square or lot duly subdivided in conformity with section 1581 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1425), or other applicable laws of the District of Columbia, shall deem it necessary to subdivide the same into a condominium project of convenient condominium units for sale and occupancy and means of access for their accommodation, he may cause a plat or plats to be made by the surveyor of the District of Columbia, on which said plats, together, shall be expressed—

"(1) the ground dimensions as set forth under such section 1581 and the exterior lengths of all lines of the building;

"(2) for each floor of the condominium subdivision, the number or letter, dimensions, and lengths of finished interior surfaces of unit dividing walls of the individual condominium units; the elevations (or average elevation, in case of slight variance) from a fixed known point, of finished floors and of finished ceilings of such condominium units situate upon the same floor, and further expressing the area, the relationship of each unit to the other upon the same floor and their relationship to the common elements upon said floor;

"(3) the dimensions and lengths of the interior finished surface of walls, elevations, from said same fixed known point, of the finished floors and of the finished ceilings of the general common elements of the building, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements restricted to a given number of condominium units, expressing which are those units;

"(4) any other data necessary for the identification of the individual condominium units and the general and limited common elements.

"(b) And said owners or co-owners may certify such condominium subdivisions under their hands and seals in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or on a paper or a parchment attached thereto. And the same shall thereupon be put up, labeled, indexed, and preserved for record and deposit with the office of the surveyor for the District of Columbia in like manner as land subdivisions have been heretofore recorded or in such other books as the said surveyor may prescribe.

"Sec. 10. Reference to Plat.—When a plat of a condominium project and subdivision shall be so certified, examined, and recorded, the purchaser of any condominium unit thereof or any person interested therein, may refer to the plat and record for description in the same manner as to squares and lots divided between the Commissioners and the original proprietors and in the same manner as has been heretofore the practice for land subdivisions: *Provided,* That said purchaser or other person interested therein shall also make reference to the plat of land subdivision appearing prior to the establishment of the condominium subdivision thereupon. Any such conveyance of an individual condominium unit shall be deemed to also convey the undivided interest of the owner in the common elements, both general and limited, and of any accessory units, if any, appertaining to said condominium unit without specifically or particularly referring to the same.

"Sec. 11. Termination and Waiver of Regime.—(a) All the co-owners or the sole owner of a building constituted into a horizontal property regime may terminate and waive this regime and regroup or merge the individual and several condominium units with the principal property; such termination and waiver shall be by certification to such effect upon the plat of condominium subdivision establishing the particular horizontal property regime under the hands and seals of the said sole owner or co-owners, in the presence of two credible witness, upon the same plat or upon a paper or parchment attached thereto: *Provided,* That the said individual condominium units are unencumbered, or if encumbered, that the creditors in whose behalf the encumbrances are recorded agree to accept as security the undivided interest in the property of the debtor co-owner and said creditors or trustees under duly recorded deeds of trust, shall signify their assent to such termination and waiver upon the aforesaid plat, paper, or parchment: *Provided further,* That should the buildings or other improvements in a condominium project be more than two-thirds destroyed by fire or other disaster, the co-owners of three-fourths of the condominium project may waive and terminate the horizontal property regime and may certify to such termination and waiver: *Provided further,* That if within ninety days of the date of such damage or destruction:

"(1) the council of co-owners does not determine to repair, reconstruct or rebuild as provided in sections 21 and 22 of this Act, or,

"(2) the insurance indemnity is delivered pro rata to the co-owners in conformity with the provisions of section 21 of this Act and if the co-owners do not terminate and waive the regime in conformity with this section of this Act, then any unit owner or any other person aggrieved thereby may file a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, setting forth under oath such facts as may be necessary to entitle the petitioner to the relief prayed and praying judicial termination of the horizontal property regime. Said petition may be served as provided in section 14(g) of this Act. The court may thereupon lay a rule upon the council of co-owners, unless they shall voluntarily appear and admit the allegations of the petition, to show cause, under oath, on or before the tenth day, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after service of such rule, why the prayers of said petition should not be granted. If no cause be shown against the prayer of the petition by the council of co-owners, or by any one of the co-owners, the court may determine in a summary way whether the facts warrant termination and thereupon the court may decree the particular horizontal property regime terminated.

"(b) In the event a horizontal property regime is terminated or waived, the property shall be deemed to be owned in common by the co-owners, and the undivided interest in the property owned in common which shall appertain to each co-owner shall be the percentage of undivided interest previously owned by such co-owner in the common elements in the property as set forth in the declaration under section 6 hereof.

"(c) Upon such termination and waiver the provisions of section 10 of this Act shall no longer be applicable and reference to the principal property thereupon, shall be to the plat and record of the prior land subdivision and thereupon the restraint against partition or division of the co-ownership imposed by section 7 of this Act shall no longer apply. In the event of such partition suit the net proceeds shall be divided among all the unit owners, in proportion to their respective undivided ownership of the common elements, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, all liens on the unit of each unit owner. To be valid such termination shall be recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 12. Merger No Bar to Reconstitution.—The merger provided for in the preceding section shall in no way bar the subsequent constitution of the property into another horizontal property regime whenever so desired and upon observance of the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 13. Bylaws, Availability for Examination.—(a) The administration of every building constituted into a horizontal property regime shall be governed by the bylaws as the council of co-owners may from time to time adopt, which said bylaws together with the declaration, including recorded attachments thereto, referred to in section 6 of this Act shall be available for examination by all the co-owners, their duly authorized attorneys or agents, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge.

"(b) A true copy of said bylaws shall be annexed to the declaration referred to in section 6 of this Act and made a part thereof. No modification of or amendment to the bylaws shall be valid unless set forth in an amendment to the declaration and such amendment is duly recorded.

"(c) Each unit owner shall comply strictly with the bylaws and with the administrative rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, as either of the same may be lawfully amended from time to time. Failure to comply with any of the same shall be ground for an action to recover sums due, for damages or injunctive relief, or both, maintainable by the manager, the administrator, board of directors or of administration, or as specified in the bylaws or in proper case, by an aggrieved unit owner.

"Sec. 14. Necessary Contents of Bylaws; Modification of System.—(a) The bylaws must necessarily provide for at least the following:

"(1) Form of administration, indicating whether this shall be in charge of an administrator, manager, or of a board of directors, or of administration, or otherwise, and specifying the powers, manner of removal, and, where proper, the compensation thereof.

"(2) Method of calling or summoning the co-owners to assemble; that a majority of co-owners is required to adopt decisions, except as otherwise provided in this Act; who is to preside over the meeting and who will keep the minute book wherein the resolutions shall be recorded.

"(3) Care, upkeep, and surveillance of the building and its general or limited common elements and services.

"(4) Manner of collecting from the co-owners for the payment of common expenses.

"(5) Designation, hiring, and dismissal of the personnel necessary for the good working order of the building and for the proper care of the general or limited common elements and to provide services for the building.

"(6) Such restrictions on or requirements respecting the use and maintenance of the units and the use of the common elements as are designed to prevent unreasonable interference with the use of the respective units and of the common elements by the several unit owners.

"(7) Designation of person authorized to accept service of process in any action relating to two or more units or to the common elements as authorized under section 24 of this Act. Such person must be a resident of and maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

"(8) Notice as to the existence or nonexistence of a declaration in trust for the enforcement of the lien for common expenses permitted under section 19 of this Act.

"(b) The sole owner of the building, or if there be more than one, the co-owners representing two-thirds of the votes provided for in section 6 of this Act may at any time modify the system of administration, but each one of the particulars set forth in this section shall always be embodied in the bylaws.

"Sec. 15. Books of Receipts and Expenditures; Availability for Examination.—The manager, administrator, or the board of directors, or of administration, or other form of administration specified in the bylaws, shall keep books with detailed accounts in chronological order, of the receipts and of the expenditures affecting the building and its administration and specifiying the maintenance and repair expenses of the common elements and any other expenses incurred. Both said books and the vouchers accrediting the entries made thereupon shall be available for examination by the co-owners, their duly authorized agents or attorneys, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge. All books and records shall be kept in accordance with good accounting practice and shall be audited at least once a year by an auditor outside the organization.

"Sec. 16. Common Profits, Contributions for Payment of Common Expenses of Administration and Maintenance.—(a) The common profits of the property shall be distributed among and the common expenses shall be charged to the unit owners according to the percentages established by section 6 of this Act: *Provided*, That for purposes of the application of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 331), as amended, the council of co-owners shall, in accordance with the provisions of said Act, be regarded as constituting an unincorporated business and shall file returns and pay taxes upon the taxable income derived from the common areas without regard to the 'common profits' as defined in this Act.

"(b) All co-owners are bound to contribute in accordance with the said percentages toward the expenses of administration and of maintenance and repairs of the general common elements, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements of the building and toward any other expenses lawfully agreed upon by the council of co-owners.

"(c) No owner shall be exempt from contributing toward such common expenses by waiver of the use or enjoyment of the common elements both general and limited, or by the abandonment of the condominium unit belonging to him.

"(d) Said contribution may be determined, levied, and assessed as a lien on the first day of each calendar or fiscal year, and may become and be due and payable in such installments as the bylaws may provide, and said bylaws may further provide that upon default in the payment of any one or more of such installments, the balance of said lien may be accelerated at the option of the manager, board of directors, or of management and be declared due and payable in full.

"Sec. 17. Priority of Lien.—The lien determined, levied, and assessed in accordance with section 16 of this Act shall have preference over any other assessments, liens, judgments, or charges of whatever nature, except the following:

"(a) Real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalk, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominimum unit, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a coowner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this subparagraph.

"(b) The liens of any deeds of trust, mortgage instruments, or encumbrances duly recorded on the condominium unit prior to the assessment of the lien thereon or duly recorded on said unit after receipt of a written statement from the manager, board of directors, or of management reflecting that payments on said lien were current as of the date of recordation of said deed of trust, mortgage instrument, or encumbrance.

"Upon a voluntary sale or conveyance of a condominium unit all unpaid assessments against a grantor co-owner for his pro rata share of the expenses to which section 16 of this section a purchaser thereunder shall the sales price or by the grantee in the order of preference set forth above. Upon an involuntary sale through foreclosure of a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance having preference as set forth in subparagraph (b) of this section a purchaser thereunder shall not be liable for any installments of such lien as became due prior to his acquisition of title. Such arrears shall be deemed common expenses, collectible from all co-owners, including such purchaser.

"Sec. 18. Joint and Several Liability of Purchaser and Seller for Amounts Owing Under Section 16; Purchaser's Recovery, Purchaser's or Lender's Right to a Statement Setting Forth Amount Due.—The purchaser of a condominium unit in a voluntary sale shall be jointly and severally liable with the seller for the amounts owing by the latter under section 16 of this Act upon his interest in the condominium unit up to the time of conveyance; without prejudice to the purchaser's right to recover from the other party the amounts paid by him as such joint debtor: *Provided,* That any such purchaser, or a lender under a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance, or parties designated by them, shall be entitled to a statement from the manager, board of directors, or of administration, as the case may be, setting forth the amount of unpaid assessments against the seller or borrower, and the unit conveyed or encumbered shall not be subject to a lien for any unpaid assessment in excess of the amount set forth.

"Sec. 19. Supplementary Method of Enforcement of Lien.—(a) In addition to proceedings available at law or equity for the enforcement of the lien established by section 16 of this Act, all the owners of property constituted into a horizontal property regime may execute bonds conditioned upon the faithful performance and payment of the installments of the lien permitted by section 16 of this Act and may secure the payment of such obligations by a declaration in trust recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia, granting unto a trustee or trustees appropriate powers to the end that upon default in the performance of such bond, said declaration in trust may be foreclosed by said trustee or trustees, acting at the direction of the manager, board of directors, or of management, as is proper practice in the District of Columbia in foreclosing a deed of trust.

"(b) And the bylaws may require in the event such bonds have been executed and such declaration in trust is recorded that any subsequent purchaser of a condominium unit in said horizontal property regime shall take title subject thereto and shall assume such obligations: *Provided,* That the said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be subordinate to and a junior lien to liens for real estate taxes and other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, liens for special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and liens for water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominium unit, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a co-owner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this section then or thereafter accruing against the unit and to the lien of any duly recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances previously placed upon the unit and said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be and become subordinate to any subsequently recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances: *Provided,* That the lender thereunder shall first obtain from the manager, board of directors, or of administration a written statement as provided in section 18 of this Act reflecting that payments due under this lien are current as of the date of recordation of such subsequent deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance.

"Sec. 20. Insuring Building Against Risks; Individual Rights of Co-owners.—The manager or the board of directors, if required by the bylaws or by a majority of the co-owners, or at the request of a mortgagee having a first mortgage of record covering a unit, shall have the authority to, and shall, obtain insurance for the property against loss or damage by fire and such other hazards under such terms and for such amounts as shall be required or requested. Such insurance coverage shall be written on the property in the name of such manager or of the board of directors of the council of co-owners, as trustee for each of the unit owners in the percentages established in the declaration. Premiums shall be common expenses. Provision for such insurance shall be without prejudice to the right of each unit owner to insure his own unit for his benefit.

"SEC. 21. APPLICATION OF INSURANCE PROCEEDS TO RECONSTRUCTION; PRO RATA DISTRIBUTION IN CERTAIN CASES; RULES GOVERNING.—(a) In case of fire or other disaster the insurance indemnity shall, except as provided in the next succeeding paragraph of this section, be applied to reconstruct the building.

"(b) Reconstruction shall not be compulsory where destruction comprises the whole or more than two-thirds of the buildings and other improvements in a condominium project. In such cases, and unless otherwise unanimously agreed upon by the co-owners, the indemnity shall be delivered pro rata to the co-owners entitled to it in accordance with provisions made by the bylaws or in accordance with a decision of three-fourths of the co-owners, if there be no bylaw provision, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, to the extent sufficient for the purpose, all liens on the unit of each co-owner. Should it be proper to proceed with the reconstruction, the provision for such eventuality made in the bylaws shall be observed, or in lieu thereof, the decision of the council of co-owners shall prevail, subject to all provisions of law and regulations of the District of Columbia then in effect.

"SEC. 22. SHARING OF RECONSTRUCTION COST WHERE BUILDING IS NOT INSURED OR INSURANCE INDEMNITY IS INSUFFICIENT.—Where the building is not insured or where the insurance indemnity is insufficient to cover the cost of reconstruction the new building costs shall be paid by all the co-owners in the same proportion as their proportionate ownership of the common elements of the condominium project, and if any one or more of those composing the minority shall refuse to make such payments, the majority may proceed with the reconstruction at the expense of all the co-owners and the share of the resulting common expense may be assessed against all the co-owners and such assessment for this expense shall have the same priority as provided under section 17 of this Act.

"SEC. 23. SEPARATE TAXATION.—(a) For the purposes of assessment and taxation of property constituted into a horizontal property regime and to conform to the system of numbering squares, lots, blocks, and parcels for taxation purposes in effect in the District of Columbia, each condominium unit duly situate upon a subdivided lot and square shall bear a number or letter that will distinguish it from every other condominium unit situate in said lot and square.

"(b) Each of said condominium units shall be carried on the records of the District of Columbia as a separate and distinct entity and all real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, shall be assessed, levied, and collected against each of said several separate and distinct units in conformity with the percentages of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act, and in accordance with the provisions of law in effect in the District of Columbia relating to assessment, levying, and collection of real property taxes.

"(c) The council of co-owners shall be liable for the filing of returns and payment of the tax on personal property located in the common areas and held for use or used in a trade or business or held for sale or rent.

"(d) The title to an individual condominium unit shall not be divested or in anywise affected by the forfeiture or sale of any or all of the other condominium units for delinquent real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, or water charges and sanitary sewer service charges: *Provided,* That the real estate taxes, the duly levied share of such other taxes and of such special assessments, and the water and sanitary sewer service charges on or against said individual condominium unit are currently paid.

"SEC. 24. ACTIONS; RIGHT TO SEPARATE RELEASE OF JUDGMENT.—(a) Without limiting the right of any co-owner, actions may be brought on behalf of two or more of the unit owners, as their respective interests may appear, by the manager, or board of directors, or of administration with respect to any cause of action relating to the common elements or more than one unit.

"(b) Service of process on two or more unit owners in any action relating to the common elements may be made on the person designated in the bylaws in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

"(c) In the event of entry of a final judgment as a lien against two or more unit owners, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements from the lien thereof by payment of the fractional proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, partial discharge, or release or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of the lien of such judgment.

"(d) Such partial payment, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent such a judgment creditor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, satisfied, or discharged.

"SEC. 25. MECHANICS' AND MATERIALMEN'S LIENS, ENFORCEMENT THEREOF; REMOVAL FROM LIEN; EFFECT OF PART PAYMENT. (a) Subsequent to establishment of a horizontal property regime as provided in this Act, and while the property remains subject to this Act, no lien shall thereafter arise or be effective against the property. During such period liens or encumbrances shall arise or be created and enforced only against each unit and the percentage of undivided interest in the common areas and facilities appurtenant to such unit in the same manner and under the same conditions in every respect as liens or encumbrances may arise or be created upon or against any other separate parcel or real property subject to individual ownership: *Provided,* That no labor performed or materials furnished with the consent or at the request of a unit owner or his agent or his contractor or subcontractor, shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against the unit or any other property of any other unit owner not expressly consenting to or requesting the same, except that such express consent shall be deemed to be given by the owner of any unit in the case of emergency repairs thereto. Labor performed or materials furnished for the common areas and facilities, if duly authorized by the council of co-owners, the manager, or board of directors in accordance with this Act, the declaration or bylaws, shall be deemed to be performed or furnished with the express consent of each unit owner and shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against each of the units and shall be subject to the provisions of subparagraph (b) hereunder. Notice of said lien may be served on the person designated in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

"(b) In the event of filing of a lien against two or more units and their respective percentage interest in the common elements, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements appurtenant thereto from the said lien by payment, or may file a written undertaking with surety approved by the court as provided in section 1254 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1387), of the fractional or proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment, or amount of bond, shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, filing of bond, partial discharge, or release, or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of such lien. Such partial payment, indemnity, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent the lienor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, indemnified, satisfied, or discharged.

"SEC. 26. NONAPPLICATION OF RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES AND OF RULE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS ON ALIENATION TO HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES.—The rule of property known as the rule against perpetuities, and the rule of property known as the rule restricting unreasonable restraints on alienation, sections 1023 and 1025 of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1351, ch. 854), shall not be applied to defeat any of the provisions of this Act, or of any declaration, bylaws, or other document executed in accordance with this Act as to the condominium project. This exemption shall not apply to estates in the individual condominium units.

"SEC. 27. SUPPLEMENT OF EXISTING CODE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and supplemental to all other provisions of law of the District of Columbia and wheresoever there appears in the provisions the words 'square', 'lot', 'land', 'ground', 'parcel', 'property', 'block', or other designation denoting a unit of land, where appropriate to implement this Act, after such descriptive terms, there shall be deemed inserted reference to a condominium unit, condominium subdivision, or horizontal property regime, whichever shall be appropriate to effect the ends and purposes of this Act: *Provided,* That wherever the application of the provisions of this Act conflict with the application of such other provisions, the provisions of law generally applicable to buildings in like use in the District of Columbia shall prevail.

"SEC. 28. REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE ZONING COMMISSION.—In order to bring horizontal property regimes into compliance with the laws and regulations in effect in the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia are each hereby authorized to adopt and enforce such regulations as either deems proper, within its respective general authority.

"SEC. 29. INTERPRETATION.—(a) This Act shall be interpreted in such a manner as to require each condominium unit and each horizontal property regime to be in compliance with all District of Columbia laws and regulations relating to property of like type, whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other use. The owner of each condominium unit shall be responsible for the compliance of his unit with such laws and regulations, and the council of co-owners and any person designated by them to manage the regime shall be jointly and severally liable for compliance with all such laws and regulations in all matters relating to the common elements of the regime.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the owner of each condominium unit shall have the same responsibility for the payment of all taxes, assessments, and other charges due to the District of Columbia as does any other person or property owner similarly situated.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the method of enforcement available to the District of Columbia to collect any tax or assessment or any charge from any individual property owner or any building owner shall be available to collect taxes, assessments, and charges from individual condominium unit owners and from the council of co-owners.

"(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall in any way be construed as affecting the right to institute and maintain eminent domain proceedings.

"Sec. 30. Supplemental Provisions Relating to Sewer and Water Services.—(a) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the developer or co-owners of any horizontal property regime shall have the right to have installed for each and every individual unit a separately metered water service. Such installations shall be subject to all laws and regulations then or thereafter in effect in the District of Columbia. Upon the establishment of such separate water services each unit owner and his successor in title and persons occupying such units shall be responsible for the payment to the District of Columbia of all water and sewer charges rendered and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enforce any and all of the remedies for collection of such charges as are authorized by law.

"(b) A common water service is hereby expressly authorized for any horizontal property regime and in the event that a horizontal property regime is provided with a common water service to the charges for sewer and water service shall be billed to the person designated by the co-owners, pursuant to the bylaws, to manage the regime. In the event that the entire sewer and water charges are not paid within the time specified by law for the payment of sewer and water charges, the Commissioners shall be authorized to enforce payment in any manner authorized by law, including, but not limited to, the assessment of an additional charge for late payment, the shutting off of water to the regime and the enforcement of the liens for nonpayment of such charges against the individual units in conformity with the percentage of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act.

"Sec. 31. Authority of Board of Commissioners Under Reorganizion Plan Numbered 5 of 1952.—Nothing in this Act or in any amendments made by this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

"Sec. 32. Severability.—If any provision of this Act, or any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word or the application thereof, in any circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the application of any such provision, section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word in any other circumstances shall not be affected thereby and to this end, the provisions of this Act are declared severable.

"Sec. 33. Effective Date.—This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order until the Chair can obtain a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Derounian and Mr. Conte) there were—ayes 60, noes 63.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 166, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—214

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baring
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
St. Onge
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Watson
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—166

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Glenn
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Vanik
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—54

Abbitt
Barrett
Belcher
Blatnik
Brooks
Bruce
Burton
Collier
Corman
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Dwyer
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Kee
Kelly
Lennon
Long, Md.
McDade
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Milliken
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Pike
Pilcher
Rains
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Shelley
Sheppard
Sikes
Staebler
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHWENGEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1428. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 622. An act to improve and encourage collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and to permit to the extent practicable the adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H.R. 9140. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1027). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 9423. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments for jury duty shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 9425. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to authorize reimbursement of census enumerators for certain telephone tolls and charges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9426. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 9427. A bill to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9428. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 9429. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 862. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Res. 586. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the adequacy of the system of security for protecting the President, Vice President, and other Federal officials, and with respect to certain other matters; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9430. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9431. A bill for the relief of Ovset B. Teghararian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9432. A bill for the relief of Letizia Geta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

507. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to restore the appropriation for the General Accounting Office to the legislative branch appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

508. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to naming armed service installations after former Presidents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

509. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass legislation strictly construing what is specifically meant, by statute, in the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of the rather vague term, to wit, "common law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the administering of the oath of office for President as administered by U.S. Judge Sarah T. Hughes, of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

511. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to defining the Constitution of the United States as it relates to the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Special Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BRUCE ALGER**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, December 11, 1963*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of December 11, 1963, special report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

Revitalizing the American cotton industry was the subject for debate in the House last week as H.R. 6196, the cotton bill, passed 216 to 182. There is little hope this bill will accomplish its stated purpose. It does not solve the basic problem which has caused cotton's problem, as it has created problems for every other agricultural commodity, Government interference, subsidies and control.

As a representative of Dallas, a major cotton center, I recognize the problems besetting the industry and am concerned about them. My interest in the current cotton legislation was not confined to debate on the floor. I worked closely with Republican members on the House Agriculture Committee all during hearings on the bill in an effort to get a measure that would move in the direction of getting cotton back on its feet. These facts were clear from careful study of the problem:

1. Cotton's current problem has been aggravated rather than solved by Government action in the past.

2. H.R. 6196 will only compound the problem further.

3. More equitable legislation would have required the Secretary of Agriculture to use the statutory authority he now possesses under the 1958 amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Agricultural Act of 1949 to eliminate the present inequitable two-price cotton system while at the same time increasing the acreage of cottongrowers in order to maintain their income.

4. Taxpayer costs under the cotton program continue to be heavy. Estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate they will be $612 million in the 1962–63 marketing year and $550.8 million in the 1963–64 marketing year under current legislation.

Some idea of the cost to the American people is contained in a resolution adopted by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, January 22, 1963:

"The American people are paying three tax penalties for the outmoded cotton price-support program. First, they have to foot the bill in taxes for the Federal payments to cotton farmers in support of the inflated price of cotton. Second, they are taxed to provide subsidies amounting to $200 million a year to exporters of cotton products. Finally, they have to pay at least $600 million a year more in prices for domestically pro-

**duced cotton products than would be necessary in the absence of high support prices.**

**H.R. 6196 now proposes a triple subsidy program for cotton—one for producers, another for exporters, and finally the one proposed in this bill for the mills. Total annual cost of H.R. 6196 will be at least $772.4 million or an additional $221.6 million over the present expenditure.**

**THE WAY OUT**

**Cotton farmers, like wheat farmers, want less, not more, Government control of the cotton industry. The solution to the dilemma facing cotton will not be an easy one.**

**We must recognize from the start:**

**1. It is virtually impossible to meet the conflicting demands of all segments of the cotton industry.**

**2. Meet fiscal responsibility to all taxpayers.**

**3. Recognize the continued inroads of synthetic fibers.**

**4. The effect of foreign competition.**

**5. The loss of jobs in the textile industry.**

**6. The promotion of efficient production areas and techniques, while at the same time preserving the status quo for inefficient producers and areas.**

**7. Federal programs distort, then destroy private market forces of price, demand, supply, and sound profitable enterprise.**

**Therefore, a better solution to the cotton problem is contained in these recommendations:**

**1. The Secretary of Agriculture be required by law to follow the mandate and the authority which he has failed to use under the present law.**

**2. The present acts be amended to effect an orderly transition over a period of years toward lower price supports for cotton which would allow increased markets and the reestablishment of a one-price cotton system.**

**Businessmen who ask for an additional subsidy as a means of eliminating subsidies are kidding themselves. Failure to properly solve cotton's problem will mean suicide fo the industry. It is imperative that we stop patching up, by piecemeal legislation, a discredited and unworkable farm policy which has aggravated America's farm problem for more than 30 years.**

**There is only one real solution to cotton's problem as well as the entire farm problem. We've got to get the Government out of the farm business and allow our free farmers to operate in a free market. It was under such a system we built the greatest agricultural plant in the history of mankind. The failure of Government-controlled agriculture is clearly shown in the inability of any Communist country to produce enough food and fiber for its people. Only free farmers can meet America's needs. Until we have the courage to face the basic problem of getting the Federal Government out of the farm business we are continuing the threat and increasing the problems of cotton and every other farm commodity.**

**The cotton lobby was most effective. The bill passed by 216 to 182. I voted against refusing to help cotton industry commit suicide.**

---

## Place the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Subversive List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 11, 1963*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the recent and horrible assassination of President Kennedy has put the spotlight, quickly dimmed, on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee of which the President's assassin was a member. The existence of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is no news to many of us who have been trying desperately to alert the American people to Castro's network in the United States.

The committee, a pro-Castro, Communist-front group, is closely tied to Castro's growing network in Latin America as well as in this country. Another Castroite group that attempted to halt the election in Venezuela, and which continues to raise havoc in that country as well as far too many other Latin American nations, was doing and continues to do the bidding of Fidel Castro.

Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between the various Castroite groups in Latin America and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in this country. Their goals are the same, their leaders are Castro and Khrushchev, their methods are violence and bloodshed. Their relationships are interlocked.

And yet, despite the fact that President Kennedy's assassin was an individual who was proven to be a member of this Communist-front organization which, according to Castro himself has its membership files in Havana, the organization in this country is allowed to thrive and to continue to turn out literature designed to fertilize the minds of men like Lee Oswald.

The abundance of publicity and propaganda protective of the leftwing has provided a convenient shield behind which this abominable organization has hidden. You can be assured, however, that their activities have not ceased and that they are continuing to recruit individuals and are continuing to turn out the real hate literature in our society.

An example is found in the literature of V. T. Lee, a national director of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee who, in a Castro-supporting scandal sheet he printed in Tampa (Fla.) when he headed the Tampa chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, accused President Kennedy and Senator Eastland of "withholding diapers from Cuban babies." In this issue, the Senator is labeled a "hatchetman" and a "loudmouth," and reference is likewise made to those "jackasses in Washington."

I say it's time we woke up to the fact, too long overlooked, that groups and organizations that advocate bullets rather than ballots and who urge the replacement of our form of government with atheistic communism deserve to be treated like the common enemy of our freedoms that they are and to be dealt with accordingly.

How long can we countenance this cancer in our system? How long will it take to get action against this group of American-hating U.S. citizens who are, in effect, acting as foreign agents?

For many months I have been calling for placing the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Attorney General's subversive list. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 15, 1962. For too long this request has been ignored. The failure to place this organization on the Attorney General's subversive list becomes increasingly baffling when one reviews the anual FBI report for fiscal year, 1961, which states in part:

> FBI investigations also have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee.

I shall continue to request that this organization be placed on the subversive list and request it now.

Until we take affirmative action against these pro-Castro organizations, the cancer of communism will grow until it infects our entire system.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Yaakov Pollak, of Young Israel of Jackson Heights, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

**Master of the universe, Lord of all, who implants into the soul of man virtue and reverence, aspiration and will to serve, bless Thou, we pray Thee, this assembly, the House of Representatives of the United States of America.**

**Grant our legislators amply from Thy spirit. May they be both dreamers of soaring dreams and wise interpreters thereof—and implementers for the greater good of our land and all lands that look to our great country for succor.**

**May the symbols of this, the anniversary of the Maccabean victory, stand ever as an inspiration to this Hall. May the light of its lamp be fed by the pure consecrated oil of justice and truth alone; may it ever suffice that they be not tempted to borrow for it the contaminated fuel of expediency. Then Thou in Thy abundant mercy stand up for our beloved country in her times of perplexity and need. Plead her cause, judge her suit, avenge her wrong. Cause the mighty to be also the good, make the strong take thought for the weak, the many for the few. Let evil make way to righteousness and arrogance to humility before Thee.**

**Grant once more and continuously the miracle of the never failing light and may the lamp in the hands of this House light up the road which leads to the Messianic age of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of Thee. Amen.**

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9009. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended;

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business;

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business; and

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools.

## FOREIGN AID

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, just what kind of predicament do we find ourselves in with the foreign aid bill? It is only 12 days until Christmas and we are still dillydallying around without an authorization bill. I am told that the other body is waiting for the House to mark up its bill before they proceed with the authorization bill conference report, and even after that, they will hold additional hearings on the request for an appropriation.

It would appear that members of my subcommittee are becoming restless and confused because I have delayed the markup. It is only a part of a plan to be fair to the overburdened American taxpayer with respect to this Santa Claus bill that I have arranged to mark up and report as I have.

I would certainly hate to think that my subcommittee's 800 hours of research and hearings, covering 13,000 pages of transcript and 3,900 pages of printed hearings so as to pin down the facts and figures as they are, would go down the drain. I hope I will not be called upon to yield to those who have not had time to study the program. If I should yield, it would mean that I would have to sacrifice principle and ignore facts, in favor of political pressure and expediency. This, I will not do.

## FILING OF REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Saturday, December 14, to file a report on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana defer his request until the gentleman from Massachusetts can get to the floor? He is not on the floor at this time but will be here later. I am hopeful that the gentleman's unanimous-consent request will be granted, but at this time I shall have to object unless he defers it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

## MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday next for the House to consider a joint resolution making appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Saturday, December 14, to file a report on a House joint resolution making appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

## SS "HOPE" ON THE JOB IN ECUADOR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, solidly at anchor in the swift currents of the Rio Guayas, just off the city of Guayaquil, Ecuador, is the American hospital ship SS *Hope*.

It arrived there December 2 to conduct a medical teaching-training mission. When she leaves 10 months later she will be sorely missed. It has been that way in Indonesia, South Vietnam, and Peru, and her good and dedicated staff will make it so once again in Ecuador, for the SS *Hope* is one of the outstanding success stories in our country's oversea aid effort.

Her arrival in this principal port of Ecuador was greeted somewhat differently than in Peru a year before. Then she had been greeted by a dozen silent people and her coming had touched off anti-American demonstrations throughout that country.

When she finally departed Peru 40,000 people covered the ship with garlands, concluding a 2-day tribute to the medical staff in appreciation of the lives these Americans had saved and the pain they had alleviated.

The arrival into Guayaquil, Ecuador, was closer to that kind of a reception for the renown of this ship of *Hope* had already traveled north. Thousands lined the shore waving and shouting and small craft of every description surrounded the *Hope* and followed her up the Guayas to meet an official welcome party made up of Ecuador's leading government, military, and medical leaders.

Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project Hope was there to acknowledge this heartening welcome, and to pledge that:

> We are so proud to share with you what we are so fortunate to be able to give, and we will give the best to you from our hearts and minds.

Within 48 hours 50 operations had been performed aboard the ship and 127 trainees had started to learn American techniques, and not so incidentally, American good will.

Since the first voyage in 1961, the log of the good ship *Hope* recounts a proud history: 4,000 major operations—a half million people examined and immunized—participation by 600 members of the American medical profession, most of them volunteers—and over 2,000 local counterparts trained to pass on a legacy of learning to their own countrymen.

On the eve of her departure to Ecuador, Dr. Walsh announced her next destination and the prospect of *Hope* for still another continent; this time Africa. In the fall of 1964, the good ship *Hope* will go directly from Guayaquil to Conakry, West Africa.

## HEADQUARTERS OF THE 5TH ARMY, HYDE PARK, ILL.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon I received a telephone call from the Defense Department that the headquarters of the 5th Army were to be moved from Hyde Park in the district that I have the honor to represent. I was informed that the public announcement was to be made at noon today. Why the holding back of this information to the very late hour of late yesterday afternoon is beyond my understanding. No one outside of the Defense Department had been informed that such a drastic move was contemplated.

Some years ago the Defense Department made a thorough study of the advisability of this move and I was assured that on the basis of this study the headquarters of the 5th Army would remain in Hyde Park and not be removed to Fort Sheridan. I was informed at that time that the study showed conclusively that the removal to Fort Sheridan would entail a heavy loss on the Federal Government and would greatly increase the cost of operation of the headquarters of the great 5th Army. I cannot accept with complacency this sudden decision arrived at without any consultation with anyone outside of the Defense Department. With other members of the Illinois delegation, I am demanding an explanation. Certainly a move so drastic and so opposed to the interest of efficiency and economy should not proceed without a further study that due regard for the public welfare would seem indisputably to require.

## A MAN OF COURAGE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress preach economy in Government, but when those economies hit close to home it is a different story. I know how it feels and I guess I protested just as loud as anybody else when the Secretary of Defense announced it was necessary to cancel further progress on the "Big Dish" which the Navy was building at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

But I believe that the Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the Honorable Robert S. McNamara for his great courage, his remarkable ability to arrive at difficult decisions, and his unparalleled devotion to what is good for the strength of America's defenses and the interests of the entire Nation.

There may be individual instances where people may not agree with certain decisions—and that is the American way—but I salute Secretary McNamara as a great Secretary of Defense who is working to build the strength of America and the free world.

## BEST WISHES TO CONGREGATION ADATH JESHURUN ON THEIR EDUCATIONAL BUILDING PROJECT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the congregation of Adath Jeshurun in Louisville, Ky., and to extend my best wishes to them for the success of their new educational building project. The congregation of Adath Jeshurun has never been content to provide outstanding moral and spiritual guidance alone. Throughout the years, since its founding 110 years ago, the men and women of congregation Adath Jeshurun have been active in practically every program to promote the welfare and betterment of the entire community. It is no exaggeration to say that from this remarkable congregation have come some of the most able and dedicated leaders that Louisville and Jefferson County has ever known—not only in spiritual and religious matters but in civic, cultural, and charitable endeavors as well. Not the least noteworthy of their recent contributions to the cultural enlightenment of our community is the new educational building program which they are currently undertaking.

The sound judgment of the congregation of Adath Jeshurun is evidenced by the fact that they have chosen to dedicate this edifice to the honor of Rabbi Jacob J. Gittleman, their spiritual leader for the past 47 years and a man highly esteemed and respected throughout the entire community by Jews and Christians alike. Almost a half century ago, Rabbi Gittleman came to our community, a young man and a recent graduate of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Since that time, he has devoted himself untiringly to the spreading of good will throughout the community. As far back as I can remember this dedicated man has stood out as one of the most valuable members of our community. While shrines are built of bricks and stones, Rabbi Gittleman's greatness is built on a much firmer foundation—in the minds and hearts of the many people of Louisville and Jefferson County whose lives have been touched by the numerous good works and kind deeds of this outstanding spiritual and civic leader.

I commend the members of Adath Jeshurun and their illustrious and learned leader. May the spirit of truth and knowledge flourish in their new educational building and stand as a lasting testimony of the enlightened goals of the men and women of Congregation Adath Jeshurun.

## CIGARETTE SMOKING

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the recent American Cancer Society report clearly and unequivocally reaffirms what has been known for a long time—that there is an intimate connection between smoking and cancer. The issue no longer is whether cigarette smoking is a health hazard but rather what can we, in Congress, do about this problem.

Although all kinds of suggestions have been made to discourage smoking because of its profound harmful effect on health, over 65 million Americans still continue to smoke. It is estimated that Americans spend over $7½ billion a year to buy 25 billion packs of cigarettes. This multi-billion-dollar-a-year industry which produces more than $3 billion a year in taxes has not suffered one iota in spite of all the evidence pointing to the dangers of smoking.

It should be crystal clear by now, Mr. Speaker, that the urge to smoke is no different than the urge to drink or gamble. All that is required to cope with this serious problem is commonsense—Government regulation on labeling cigarettes in the same manner that we deal with such products as foods, drugs, and alcoholic beverages.

Serious and favorable consideration of my bill H.R. 4168 would go a long way in benefiting the millions of cigarette smokers throughout the country. This bill requiring the labeling of cigarettes with its nicotine and tar contents is a protective measure which would benefit cigarette smokers in the selection of a brand less injurious to health.

Since it has been established that a high level of nicotine and tar have a deadly and poisonous effect on the human body, the smokers are entitled to know what quantity their brand of cigarettes contain.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, will serve two purposes: first, it will provide the smoker with a guide for selecting the brand less injurious to his health; and second, it will, of necessity, stimulate the cigarette manufacturers to reduce and lower the nicotine and tar contents of their product to a healthier and safer level.

## FLOOD CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, if he can advise me as to whether or not the conference report on the River Basin and Flood Control Act will be taken up today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course, that is a matter under the control of the conferees and under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I cannot answer the gentleman's inquiry until I confer with the gentleman from Tennessee. My own opinion is that it probably will not be taken up today.

Mr. HARSHA. In that event, would the distinguished gentleman tell me, will the matter be laid over until the following week?

Mr. ALBERT. I would not want to make any commitment with reference to the matter until I discuss it with the distinguished chairman of the conference.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A MEMORIAL FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, if we continue to use snap judgment and in-haste procedures in connection with the establishment of memorials to our late President, the only thing that the people of this country will remember of him is the fact that he was assassinated.

To me, this is a brutal and shameful fact.

To arbitrarily change the name of important American landmarks arousing local exasperation and resentment, to change the mint of one of our coins and make of it in this coming election year a campaign button—seems to me shabby treatment for the memory of a man who gave completely and finally of himself in his devotion to duty.

If we establish through rapid-fire, fragmented action a system of memorials, in the presence of which many thousands of Americans are uncomfortable, we have indeed done a disservice to the man.

John Kennedy was a man of my time and my generation. I feel that I have a personal stake in this matter. His vision and perception extended far toward the American horizon. The extent of his reach for greatness will be determined by the objective calibration of history. His mark on this earth will not be in marble and bronze, not a new name on the map, nor in his likeness on a silver coin, but rather it will be in the hearts of men.

Let there be some time for us to put this matter in proper perspective.

Let us move with dignity and deliberation.

Let us pull ourselves out of the smoke-filled rooms of politics. Let there be established a commission to deal with the challenging but rewarding task of establishing a memorial for John F. Kennedy that will truly be the prized possession of all Americans and people everywhere.

## HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 4276) entitled "An Act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia", do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act, including the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 1. Short title.
"Sec. 2. Definitions.
"Sec. 3. Horizontal property regimes.
"Sec. 4. Status of condominium units within a horizontal property regime.
"Sec. 5. Joint tenancies, tenancies in common, tenancies by the entirety.
"Sec. 6. Ownership of condominium units, of common elements; declaration; voting; individual unit deeds.
"Sec. 7. Indivisibility of common elements; limitation upon partition.
"Sec. 8. Use of elements held in common, right to repair common elements.
"Sec. 9. Condominium subdivision.
"Sec. 10. Reference to plat.
"Sec. 11. Termination and waiver of regime.
"Sec. 12. Merger no bar to reconstitution.
"Sec. 13. Bylaws, availability for examination.
"Sec. 14. Necessary contents of bylaws; modification of system.
"Sec. 15. Books of receipts and expenditures; availability for examination.
"Sec. 16. Common profits, contributions for payment of common expenses of administration and maintenance.
"Sec. 17. Priority of liens.
"Sec. 18. Joint and several liability of purchaser and seller for amounts owing under section 16; purchaser's recovery, purchaser's or lender's right to a statement setting forth amount due.
"Sec. 19. Supplementary method of enforcement of lien.
"Sec. 20. Insuring building against risks; individual rights of co-owners.
"Sec. 21. Application of insurance proceeds to reconstruction; pro rata distribution in certain cases; rules governing.
"Sec. 22. Sharing of reconstruction cost where building is not insured or insurance indemnity is insufficient.
"Sec. 23. Separate taxation.
"Sec. 24. Actions; right to separate release of judgment.
"Sec. 25. Mechanics' and materialmen's liens, enforcement thereof; removal from lien; effect of part payment.
"Sec. 26. Nonapplication of rule against perpetuities and of rule against unreasonable restraints on alienation to horizontal property regimes.
"Sec. 27. Supplemental of existing code provisions.
"Sec. 28. Regulations of the Board of Commissioners and the zoning commission.
"Sec. 29. Interpretation.
"Sec. 29. Supplemental provisions relating to sewer and water services.
"Sec. 31. Authority of Board of Commissioners under Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952.
"Sec. 32. Severability.
"Sec. 33. Effective date.

"Sec. 2. Definitions.—Unless it is plainly evident from the context that a different meaning is intended, as used herein—

"(a) 'Unit' or 'condominium unit' means an enclosed space, consisting of one or more rooms, occupying all or part of a floor in buildings of one or more floors or stories regardless of whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other type of independent use, and shall include such accessory units as may be appended thereto, such as garage space, storage space, balcony, terrace or patio: *Provided*, That said unit has a direct exit to a thoroughfare or to a given common space leading to a thoroughfare.

"(b) 'Condominium' means the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements.

"(c) 'Condominium project' means a real estate condominium project; a plan or project whereby five or more apartments, rooms, office spaces, or other units in existing or proposed buildings or structures are offered or proposed to be offered for sale.

"(c) 'Coowner' means a person, persons, corporation, trust, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, that owns a condominium unit within the building.

"(e) 'Council of coowners' means the coowners as defined in subsection (d) of this section, acting as a group in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the bylaws and declaration established thereunder; and a majority, as defined in subsection (k) of this section, shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, constitute a quorum for the adoption of decisions.

"(f) 'General common elements' except as otherwise provided in the plat of condominium subdivision, means and includes—

"(1) the land on which the building stands in fee simple or leased provided that the leasehold interest of each unit is separable from the leasehold interests of the other units;

"(2) the foundations, main walls, roofs, halls, columns, girders, beams, supports, corridors, fire escapes, lobbies, stairways, and entrance and exit or communication ways;

"(3) the basements, flat roofs, yards, and gardens except as otherwise provided or stipulated.

"(4) the premises for lodging of janitors or persons in charge of the building, except as otherwise provided or stipulated;

"(5) the compartments or installations of central services such as power, light, gas, cold and hot water, heating, central air conditioning or central refrigeration, swimming pools, reservoirs, water tanks and pumps, and the like;

"(6) the elevators, garbage and trash incinerators and, in general, all devices or installations existing for common use; and

"(7) all other elements of the building rationally of common use or necessary to its existence, upkeep, and safety.

"(g) 'Limited common elements' means and includes those common elements which are agreed upon by all the coowners to be reserved for the use of a certain number of condominium units, such as special corridors, stairways, and elevators, sanitary services common to the apartments of a particular floor, and the like.

"(h) 'Majority of co-owners', 'two-thirds of the co-owners', and 'three-fourths of the co-owners' means respectively, 51, 66⅔, and 75 per centum or more of the votes of the coowners computed in accordance with their percentage interests as established under section 6 of this Act.

"(i) 'Plat of condominium subdivision' means the plat of the surveyor of the District of Columbia establishing the condominium units, accessory units, general common elements, and limited common elements.

"(j) 'Person' means a natural individual, corporation, trustee, or other legal entity or any combination thereof.

"(k) 'Developer' means a person that undertakes to develop a real estate condominium project.

"(l) 'Property' means and includes the lands whether leasehold, if separable as defined in (f)(1) of this section, or in fee simple, the building, all improvements and structures thereon, and all easements, rights, and appurtenances thereunto belonging

"(m) 'To record' means to record in accordance with the provisions of section 499 of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189, 1268).

"(n) 'Common expenses' means and includes—

"(1) all sums lawfully assessed against the unit owners by the council of co-owners;

"(2) expenses of administration, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the common areas and facilities, including repair and replacement funds as may be established;

"(3) expenses agreed upon as common expenses by the council of co-owners;

"(4) expenses declared common expenses by the provisions of this Act or by the bylaws.

"(o) 'Common profits' means the balance of all income, rents, profits, and revenues from the common areas and facilities remaining after deduction of the common expenses.

"(p) All words used herein include the masculine, feminine, and neuter genders and include the singular or plural numbers, as the case may be.

"Sec. 3. Horizontal Property Regimes.—Whenever the owners or the coowners of any square or lot shall subdivide the same into a condominium project in conformity with section 9 of this Act with a plat of condominium subdivision there shall be established a horizontal property regime.

"Sec. 4. Status of Condominium Units Within a Horizontal Property Regime.—Once the property is subdivided into the horizontal property regime, a condominium unit in the building may be individually conveyed, leased, and encumbered and may be inherited or devised by will, as if it were sole and entirely independent of the other condominium units in the building of which it forms a part; the said separate units shall have the same incidents as real property and the corresponding individual titles and interests therein shall be recordable.

"Sec. 5. Joint Tenancies, Tenancies in Common, Tenancies by the Entirety.—Any condominium unit may be held and owned by more than one person as joint tenants, as tenants in common, as tenants by the entirety (in the case of husband and wife), or in any other real property tenancy relationship recognized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 6. Ownership of Condominium Units, of Common Elements; Declaration; Voting; Individual Unit Deeds.—(a) A condominium unit owner shall have the exclusive fee simple ownership of his unit and shall have a common right to a share, with the other co-owners, of an undivided fee simple interest in the common elements of the property, equivalent to the percentage representing the value of the unit to the value of the whole property.

"(b) Said percentage interest shall not be separated from the unit to which it appertains.

"(c) The individual percentages shall be established at the time the horizontal property regime is constituted by the recording among the land records of the District of Columbia, of a declaration setting forth said percentages, shall have a permanent character, and shall not be changed without the acquiescence of the co-owners representing all the condominium units in the building, which said change shall be evidenced by an appropriate amendatory declaration to such effect recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia. Said share interest shall be set forth of record, in the initial individual condominium unit deeds. Said share interests in the common elements shall, nevertheless, be subject to mutual rights of ingress, egress, and regress of use and enjoyment of the other co-owners and a right of entry to officers, agents, and employees of the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia acting in the performance of their official duties.

"(d) The said basic value of said undivided common interest shall be fixed for the purposes of this Act and shall not fix the market value of the individual condominium units and undivided share interests and shall not prevent each co-owner from fixing a different circumstantial value to his condominium unit and undivided share interest in the common elements, in all types of acts and contracts.

"(e) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the declaration may contain other provisions and attachments relating to the condominium and to the units which are not inconsistent with this Act.

"(f) Voting at all meetings of the co-owners shall be on a percentage basis, and the percentage of the vote to which each co-owner is entitled shall be the individual percentage assigned to his unit in the declaration.

"(g) Individual condominium unit deeds may make reference to this Act, the condominium subdivision and land subdivision plats referred to in section 10 hereof, the declaration provided for in this section, the bylaws of the council of co-owners, and the deeds may include any further details which the grantor and grantee may deem desirable to set forth consistent with the declaration and this Act.

"Sec. 7. Indivisibility of Common Elements; Limitation Upon Partition.—(a) The common elements, both general and limited, shall remain undivided. No unit owner, or any other person, shall bring any action for partition or division of the co-ownership permitted under section 93 and related provisions of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1203), as amended by the Act of June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 523, ch. 1329), against any other owner or owners of any interest or interests in the same horizontal property regime so as to terminate the regime.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as a limitation on partition by the owners of one or more units in a regime as to the individual ownership of such unit or units without terminating the regime or as to the ownership of property outside the regime: *Provided*, That upon partition of any such individual unit the same shall be sold as an entity and shall not be partitioned in kind.

"Sec. 8. Use of Elements Held in Common, Right To Repair Common Elements.—(a) Each coowner may use the elements held in common in accordance with the purposes for which they are intended, without hindering or encroaching upon the lawful rights of the other coowners.

"(b) The manager, board of directors or of administration, as the case may be, shall have an irrevocable right and an easement to enter units to make repairs to common elements or when repairs reasonably appear to be necessary for public safety or to prevent damage to property other than the unit.

"Sec. 9. Condominium Subdivision.—(a) Whenever the owner or the co-owners of any square or lot duly subdivided in conformity with section 1581 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1425), or other applicable laws of the District of Columbia, shall deem it necessary to subdivide the same into a condominium project of convenient condominium units for sale and occupancy and means of access for their accommodation, he may cause a plat or plats to be made by the surveyor of the District of Columbia, on which said plats, together, shall be expressed—

"(1) the ground dimensions as set forth under such section 1581 and the exterior lengths of all lines of the building;

"(2) for each floor of the condominium subdivision, the number or letter, dimensions, and lengths of finished interior surfaces of unit dividing walls of the individual condominium units; the elevations (or average elevation, in case of slight variance) from a fixed known point, of finished floors and of finished ceilings of such condominium units situate upon the same floor, and further expressing the area, the relationship of each unit to the other upon the same floor and their relationship to the common elements upon said floor;

"(3) the dimensions and lengths of the interior finished surface of walls, elevations, from said same fixed known point, of the finished floors and of the finished ceilings of the general common elements of the building, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements restricted to a given number of condominium units, expressing which are those units;

"(4) any other data necessary for the identification of the individual condominium units and the general and limited common elements.

"(b) And said owners or co-owners may certify such condominium subdivisions under their hands and seals in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or on a paper or a parchment attached thereto. And the same shall thereupon be put up, labeled, indexed, and preserved for record and deposit with the office of the surveyor for the District of Columbia in like manner as land subdivisions have been heretofore recorded or in such other books as the said surveyor may prescribe.

"Sec. 10. Reference to Plat.—When a plat of a condominium project and subdivision shall be so certified, examined, and recorded, the purchaser of any condominium unit thereof or any person interested therein, may refer to the plat and record for description in the same manner as to squares and lots divided between the Commissioners and the original proprietors and in the same manner as has been heretofore the practice for land subdivisions: *Provided*, That said purchaser or other person interested therein shall also make reference to the plat of land subdivision appearing prior to the establishment of the condominium subdivision thereupon. Any such conveyance of an individual condominium unit shall be deemed to also convey the undivided interest of the owner in the common elements, both general and limited, and of any accessory units, if any, appertaining to said condominium unit without specifically or particularly referring to the same.

"Sec. 11. Termination and Waiver of Regime.—(a) All the co-owners or the sole owner of a building constituted into a horizontal property regime may terminate and waive this regime and regroup or merge the individual and several condominium units with the principal property; such termination and waiver shall be by certification to such effect upon the plat of condominium subdivision establishing the particular horizontal property regime under the hands and seals of the said sole owner or co-owners, in the presence of two credible witnesses, upon the same plat or upon a paper or parchment attached thereto: *Provided*, That the said individual condominium units are unencumbered, or if encumbered, that the creditors in whose behalf the encumbrances are recorded agree to accept as security the undivided interest in the property of the debtor co-owner and said creditors or trustees under duly recorded deeds of trust, shall signify their assent to such termination and waiver upon the aforesaid plat, paper, or parchment: *Provided further*, That should the buildings or other improvements in a condominium project be more than two-thirds destroyed by fire or other disaster, the co-owners of three-fourths of the condominium project may waive and terminate the horizontal property regime and may certify to such termination and waiver: *Provided further*, That if within ninety days of the date of such damage or destruction:

"(1) the council of co-owners does not determine to repair, reconstruct or rebuild as provided in sections 21 and 22 of this Act, or,

"(2) the insurance indemnity is delivered pro rata to the co-owners in conformity with the provisions of section 21 of this Act and if the co-owners do not terminate and waive the regime in conformity with this section of this Act, then any unit owner or any other person aggrieved thereby may file a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, setting forth under oath such facts as may be necessary to entitle the petitioner to the relief prayed and praying judicial termination of the horizontal property regime. Said petition may be served as provided in section 14(g) of this Act. The court may thereupon lay a rule upon the council of co-owners, unless they shall voluntarily appear and admit the allegations of the petition, to show cause, under oath, on or before the tenth day, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after service of such rule, why the prayers of said petition should not be granted. If no cause be shown against the prayer of the petition by the council of co-owners, or by any one of the co-owners, the court may determine in a summary way whether the facts warrant termination and thereupon the court may decree the particular horizontal property regime terminated.

"(b) In the event a horizontal property regime is terminated or waived, the property shall be deemed to be owned in common by the co-owners, and the undivided interest in the property owned in common which shall appertain to each co-owner shall be the percentage of undivided interest previously owned by such co-owner in the common elements in the property as set forth in the declaration under section 6 hereof.

"(c) Upon such termination and waiver the provisions of section 10 of this Act shall no longer be applicable and reference to the principal property thereupon, shall be to the plat and record of the prior land subdivision and thereupon the restraint against partition or division of the co-ownership imposed by section 7 of this Act shall no longer apply. In the event of such partition suit the net proceeds shall be divided among all the unit owners, in proportion to their respective undivided ownership of the common elements, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, all liens on the unit of each unit owner. To be valid such termination shall be recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 12. MERGER NO BAR TO RECONSTITUTION.—The merger provided for in the preceding section shall in no way bar the subsequent constitution of the property into another horizontal property regime whenever so desired and upon observance of the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 13. BYLAWS, AVAILABILITY FOR EXAMINATION.—(a) The administration of every building constituted into a horizontal property regime shall be governed by the bylaws as the council of co-owners may from time to time adopt, which said bylaws together with the declaration, including recorded attachments thereto, referred to in section 6 of this Act shall be available for examination by all the co-owners, their duly authorized attorneys or agents, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge.

"(b) A true copy of said bylaws shall be annexed to the declaration referred to in section 6 of this Act and made a part thereof. No modification of or amendment to the bylaws shall be valid unless set forth in an amendment to the declaration and such amendment is duly recorded.

"(c) Each unit owner shall comply strictly with the bylaws and with the administrative rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto, as either of the same may be lawfully amended from time to time. Failure to comply with any of the same shall be ground for an action to recover sums due, for damages or injunctive relief, or both, maintainable by the manager, the administrator, board of directors or of administration, or as specified in the bylaws or in proper case, by an aggrieved unit owner.

"SEC. 14. NECESSARY CONTENTS OF BYLAWS; MODIFICATION OF SYSTEM.—(a) The bylaws must necessarily provide for at least the following:

"(1) Form of administration, indicating whether this shall be in charge of an administrator, manager, or of a board of directors, or of administration, or otherwise, and specifying the powers, manner of removal, and, where proper, the compensation thereof.

"(2) Method of calling or summoning the coowners to assemble; that a majority of coowners is required to adopt decisions, except as otherwise provided in this Act; who is to preside over the meeting and who will keep the minute book wherein the resolutions shall be recorded.

"(3) Care, upkeep, and surveillance of the building and its general or limited common-elements and services.

"(4) Manner of collecting from the coowners for the payment of common expenses.

"(5) Designation, hiring, and dismissal of the personnel necessary for the good working order of the building and for the proper care of the general or limited common elements and to provide services for the building.

"(6) Such restrictions on or requirements respecting the use and maintenance of the units and the use of the common elements as are designed to prevent unreasonable interference with the use of the respective units and of the common elements by the several unit owners.

"(7) Designation of person authorized to accept service of process in any action relating to two or more units or to the common elements as authorized under section 24 of this Act. Such person must be a resident of and maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

"(8) Notice as to the existence or nonexistence of a declaration in trust for the enforcement of the lien for common expenses permitted under section 19 of this Act.

"(b) The sole owner of the building, or if there be more than one, the co-owners representing two-thirds of the votes provided for in section 6 of this Act may at any time modify the system of administration, but each one of the particulars set forth in this section shall always be embodied in the bylaws.

"SEC. 15. BOOKS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES; AVAILABILITY FOR EXAMINATION.—The manager, administrator, or the board of directors, or of administration, or other form of administration specified in the bylaws, shall keep books with detailed accounts in chronological order, of the receipts and of the expenditures affecting the building and its administration and specifying the maintenance and repair expenses of the common elements and any other expenses incurred. Both said books and the vouchers accrediting the entries made thereupon shall be available for examination by the co-owners, their duly authorized agents or attorneys, at convenient hours on working days that shall be set and announced for general knowledge. All books and records shall be kept in accordance with good accounting practice and shall be audited at least once a year by an auditor outside the organization.

"SEC. 16. COMMON PROFITS, CONTRIBUTIONS FOR PAYMENT OF COMMON EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION AND MAINTENANCE.—(a) The common profits of the property shall be distributed among and the common expenses shall be charged to the unit owners according to the percentages established by section 6 of this Act: *Provided*, That for purposes of the application of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 331), as amended, the council of coowners shall, in accordance with the provisions of said Act, be regarded as constituting an unincorporated business and shall file returns and pay taxes upon the taxable income derived from the common areas without regard to the 'common profits' as defined in this Act.

"(b) All coowners are bound to contribute in accordance with the said percentages toward the expenses of administration and of maintenance and repairs of the general common elements, and, in proper case, of the limited common elements of the building and toward any other expenses lawfully agreed upon by the council of co-owners.

"(c) No owner shall be exempt from contributing toward such common expenses by waiver of the use or enjoyment of the common elements both general and limited, or by the abandonment of the condominium unit belonging to him.

"(d) Said contribution may be determined, levied, and assessed as a lien on the first day of each calendar or fiscal year, and may become and be due and payable in such installments as the bylaws may provide, and said bylaws may further provide that upon default in the payment of any one or more of such installments, the balance of said lien may be accelerated at the option of the manager, board of directors, or of management and be declared due and payable in full.

"SEC. 17. PRIORITY OF LIENS.—The lien determined, levied and assessed in accordance with section 16 of this Act shall have preference over any other assessments, liens, judgments, or charges of whatever nature, except the following:

"(a) Real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominium unit, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a co-owner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this subparagraph.

"(b) The liens of any deeds of trust, mortgage instruments, or encumbrances duly recorded on the condominium unit prior to the gage instruments, or encumbrances duly recorded on said unit after receipt of a written statement from the manager, board of directors, or of management reflecting that payments on said lien were current as of the date of recordation of said deed of trust, mortgage instrument, or encumbrance.

Upon a voluntary sale or conveyance of a condominium unit all unpaid assessments against a grantor co-owner for his pro rata share of the expenses to which section 16 of this Act refers shall first be paid out of the sales price or by the grantee in the order of preference set forth above. Upon an involuntary sale through foreclosure of a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance having preference as set forth in subparagraph (b) of this section a purchaser thereunder shall not be liable for any installments of such lien as became due prior to his acquisition of title. Such arrears shall be deemed common expenses collectible from all co-owners, including such purchaser.

"SEC. 18. JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY OF PURCHASER AND SELLER FOR AMOUNTS OWING UNDER SECTION 16; PURCHASER'S RECOVERY, PURCHASER'S OR LENDER'S RIGHT TO A STATEMENT SETTING FORTH AMOUNT DUE.—The purchaser of a condominium unit in a voluntary sale shall be jointly and severally liable with the seller for the amounts owing by the latter under section 16 of this Act upon his interest in the condominium unit up to the time of conveyance; without prejudice to the purchaser's right to recover from the other party the amounts paid by him as such joint debtor: *Provided*, That any such purchaser, or a lender under a deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance, or parties designated by them, shall be entitled to a statement from the manager, board of directors, or of administration, as the case may be, setting forth the amount of unpaid assessments against the seller or borrower, and the unit conveyed or encumbered shall not be subject to a lien for any unpaid assessment in excess of the amount set forth.

"Sec. 19. Supplementary Method of Enforcement of Lien.—(a) In addition to proceedings available at law or equity for the enforcement of the lien established by section 16 of this Act, all the owners of property constituted into a horizontal property regime may execute bonds conditioned upon the faithful performance and payment of the installments of the lien permitted by section 16 of this Act and may secure the payment of such obligations by a declaration in trust recorded among the land records of the District of Columbia, granting unto a trustee or trustees appropriate powers to the end that upon default in the performance of such bond, said declaration in trust may be foreclosed by said trustee or trustees, acting at the direction of the manager, board of directors, or of management, as is proper practice in the District of Columbia in foreclosing a deed of trust.

"(b) And the bylaws may require in the event of such bonds have been executed and such declaration in trust is recorded that any subsequent purchaser of a condominium unit in said horizontal property regime shall take title subject thereto and shall assume such obligations: *Provided*, That the said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be subordinate to and a junior lien to liens for real estate taxes and other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, liens for special assessments, including, but not limited to, special asssessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, and liens for water charges and sanitary sewer service charges levied on the condominium unit, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities for any tax assessed against a co-owner by the United States or the District of Columbia or due from or payable by a co-owner to the United States or the District of Columbia, and to judgments, liens, preferences, and priorities in favor of the District of Columbia for assessments or charges referred to in this section then or thereafter accruing against the unit and to the lien of any duly recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances previously placed upon the unit and said lien, bond, and declaration in trust shall be and become subordinate to any subsequently recorded deeds of trust, mortgages, or encumbrances: *Provided*, That the lender thereunder shall first obtain from the manager, board of directors, or of administration a written statement as provided in section 18 of this Act reflecting that payments due under this lien are current as of the date of recordation of such subsequent deed of trust, mortgage, or encumbrance.

"Sec. 20. Insuring Building Against Risks; Individual Rights of Co-owners.—The manager or the board of directors, if required by the bylaws or by a majority of the co-owners, or at the request of a mortgagee having a first mortgage of record covering a unit, shall have the authority to, and shall, obtain insurance for the property against loss or damage by fire and such other hazards under such terms and for such amounts as shall be required or requested. Such insurance coverage shall be written on the property in the name of such manager or of the board of directors of the council of co-owners, as trustee for each of the unit owners in the percentages established in the declaration. Premiums shall be common expenses. Provision for such insurance shall be without prejudice to the right of each unit owner to insure his own unit for his benefit.

"Sec. 21. Application of Insurance Proceeds to Reconstruction; Pro Rata Distribution in Certain Cases; Rules Governing.—(a) In case of fire or other disaster the insurance indemnity shall, except as provided in the next succeeding paragraph of this section, be applied to reconstruct the building.

"(b) Reconstruction shall not be compulsory where destruction comprises the whole or more than two-thirds of the buildings and other improvements in a condominium project. In such cases, and unless otherwise unanimously agreed upon by the co-owners, the indemnity shall be delivered pro rata to the co-owners entitled to it in accordance with provisions made by the bylaws or in accordance with a decision of three-fourths of the co-owners, if there be no bylaw provision, after first paying off, out of the respective shares of the unit owners, to the extent sufficient for the purpose, all liens on the unit of each coowner. Should it be proper to proceed with the reconstruction, the provision for such eventuality made in the bylaws shall be observed, or in lieu thereof, the decision of the council of co-owners shall prevail, subject to all provisions of law and regulations of the District of Columbia then in effect.

"Sec. 22. Sharing of Reconstruction Cost Where Building Is Not Insured or Insurance Indemnity Is Insufficient.—Where the building is not insured or where the insurance indemnity is insufficient to cover the cost of reconstruction the new building costs shall be paid by all the co-owners in the same proportion as their proportionate ownership of the common elements of the condominium project, and if any one or more of those composing the minority shall refuse to make such payments, the majority may proceed with the reconstruction at the expense of all the co-owners and the share of the resulting common expense may be assessed against all the co-owners and such assessment for this expense shall have the same priority as provided under section 17 of this Act.

"Sec. 23. (a) Separate Taxation.—For the the purposes of assessment and taxation of property constituted into a horizonal property regime and to conform to the system of numbering squares, lots, blocks, and parcels for taxation purposes in effect in the District of Columbia, each condominium unit duly situate upon a subdivided lot and square shall bear a number or letter that will distinguish it from every other condominium unit situate in said lot and square.

"(b) Each of said condominium units shall be carried on the records of the District of Columbia as a separate and distinct entity and all real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads, and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, and special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, shall be assessed, levied, and collected against each of said several separate and distinct units in conformity with the percentage of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act, and in accordance with the provisions of law in effect in the District of Columbia relating to assessment, levying, and collection of real property taxes.

"(c) The council of co-owners shall be liable for the filing of returns and payment of the tax on personal property located in the common areas and held for use or used in a trade or business or held for sale or rent.

"(d) The title to an individual condominium unit shall not be divested or in any wise affected by the forfeiture or sale of any or all of the other condominium units for delinquent real estate taxes, other taxes arising out of or resulting from the ownership, use, or operation of the common areas, special assessments, including, but not limited to, special assessments for sewer mains, water mains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, alleys, paving of streets, roads and avenues, removal or abatement of nuisances, special assessments levied in connection with condemnation proceedings instituted by the District of Columbia, or water charges and sanitary sewer service charges: *Provided*, That the real estate taxes, the duly levied share of such other taxes and of such special assessments, and the water and sanitary sewer service charges on or against said individual condominium unit are currently paid.

"Sec. 24. Actions; Right To Separate Release of Judgment.—(a) Without limiting the right of any co-owner, actions may be brought on behalf of two or more of the unit owners, as their respective interests may appear, by the manager, or board of directors, or of administration with respect to any cause of action relating to the common elements or more than one unit.

"(b) Service of process on two or more unit owners in any action relating to the common elements may be made on the person designated in the bylaws in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

"(c) In the event of entry of a final judgment as a lien against two or more unit owners, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their precentage interest in the common elements from the lien thereof by payment of the fractional proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, partial discharge, or release or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of the lien of such judgment.

"(d) Such partial payment, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent such a judgment creditor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, satisfied, or discharged.

"Sec. 25. Mechanics' and Materialmen's Liens, Enforcement Thereof; Removal From Lien; Effect of Part Payment.—(a) Subsequent to establishment of a horizontal property regime as provided in this Act, and while the property remains subject to this Act, no lien shall thereafter arise or be effective against the property. During such period liens or encumbrances shall arise or be created and enforced only against each unit and the percentage of undivided interest in the common areas and facilities appurtenant to such unit in the same manner and under the same conditions in every respect as liens or encumbrances may arise or be created upon or against any other separate parcel or real property subject to individual ownership: *Provided*, That no labor performed or materials furnished with the consent or at the request of a unit owner or his agent or his contractor or subcontractor, shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against the unit or any other property of any other unit owner not expressly consenting to or requesting the same, except that such express consent shall be deemed to be given by the owner of any unit in the case of emergency repairs thereto. Labor performed or materials furnished for the common areas and facilities, if duly authorized by the council of co-owners, the manager, or board of directors in accordance with this Act, the declaration or bylaws, shall be deemed to be performed or furnished with the express consent of each unit owner and shall be the basis for the filing of a lien pursuant to the provisions of section 1237 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1384), against each of the units and shall be subject to the provisions of subparagraph (b) hereunder. Notice of said lien may be served on the person designated in conformity with section 14(g) of this Act.

"(b) In the event of filing of a lien against two or more units and their respective percentage interest in the common elements, the unit owners of the separate units may remove their unit and their percentage interest in the common elements appurtenant thereto from the said lien by payment, or may file a written undertaking with surety approved by the court as provided in section 1254 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1387), of the fractional or proportional amounts attributable to each of the units affected. Said individual payment, or amount of bond, shall be computed by reference to the percentage established pursuant to section 6 of this Act. After such partial payment, filing of bond, partial discharge, or release, or other satisfaction, the unit and its percentage interest in the common elements shall thereafter be free and clear of such lien. Such partial payment, indemnity, satisfaction, or discharge shall not prevent the lienor from proceeding to enforce his rights against any unit and its percentage interest in the common elements not so paid, indemnified, satisfied, or discharged.

"SEC. 26. NONAPPLICATION OF RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES AND OF RULE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS ON ALIENATION TO HORIZONTAL PROPERTY REGIMES.—The rule of property known as the rule against perpetuities, and the rule of property known as the rule restricting unreasonable restraints on alienation, sections 1023 and 1025 of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1351, ch. 854), shall not be applied to defeat any of the provisions of this Act, or of any declaration, bylaws, or other document executed in accordance with this Act as to the condominium project. This exemption shall not apply to estates in the individual condominium units.

"SEC. 27. SUPPLEMENT OF EXISTING CODE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and supplemental to all other provisions of law of the District of Columbia and wheresoever there appears in the provisions the words 'square', 'lot', 'land', 'ground', 'parcel', 'property', 'block', or other designation denoting a unit of land, where appropriate to implement this Act, after such descriptive terms, there shall be deemed inserted reference to a condominium unit, condominium subdivision, or horizontal property regime, whichever shall be appropriate to effect the ends and purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That wherever the application of the provisions of this Act conflict with the application of such other provisions, the provisions of law generally applicable to buildings in like use in the District of Columbia shall prevail.

"SEC. 28. REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE ZONING COMMISSION.—In order to bring horizontal property regimes into compliance with the laws and regulations in effect in the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia are each hereby authorized to adopt and enforce such regulations as either deems proper, within its respective general authority.

"SEC. 29. INTERPRETATIONS.—(a) This Act shall be interpreted in such a manner as to require each condominium unit and each horizontal property regime to be in compliance with all District of Columbia laws and regulations relating to property of like type, whether it be designed for residence, for office, for the operation of any industry or business, or for any other use. The owner of each condominium unit shall be responsible for the compliance of his unit with such laws and regulations, and the council of co-owners and any person designated by them to manage the regime shall be jointly and severally liable for compliance with all such laws and regulations in all matters relating to the common elements of the regime.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the owner of each condominium unit shall have the same responsibility for the payment of all taxes, assessments, and other charges due to the District of Columbia as does any other person or property owner similarly situated.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the method of enforcement available to the District of Columbia to collect any tax or assessment or any charge from any individual property owner or any building owner shall be available to collect taxes, assessments, and charges from individual condominium unit owners and from the council of co-owners.

"(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall in any way be construed as affecting the right to institute and maintain eminent domain proceedings.

"SEC. 30. SUPPLEMENTAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO SEWER AND WATER SERVICES.—(a) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the developer or co-owners of any horizontal property regime shall have the right to have installed for each and every individual unit a separately metered water service. Such installations shall be subject to all laws and regulations then or thereafter in effect in the District of Columbia. Upon the establishment of such separate water services each unit owner and his successor in title and persons occupying such units shall be responsible for the payment to the District of Columbia of all water and sewer charges rendered and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enforce any and all of the remedies for collection of such charges as are authorized by law.

"(b) A common water service is hereby expressly authorized for any horizontal property regime and in the event that a horizontal property regime is provided with a common water service to the charges for sewer and water service shall be billed to the person designated by the co-owners, pursuant to the bylaws, to manage the regime. In the event that the entire sewer and water charges are not paid within the time specified by law for the payment of sewer and water charges, the Commissioners shall be authorized to enforce payment in any manner authorized by law, including, but not limited to, the assessment of an additional charge for late payment, the shutting off of water to the regime and the enforcement of the liens for nonpayment of such charges against the individual units in conformity with the percentage of co-ownership established by section 6 of this Act.

"SEC. 31. AUTHORITY OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS UNDER REORGANIZATION PLAN NUMBERED 5 OF 1952.—Nothing in this Act or in any amendments made by this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

"SEC. 32. SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or any section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word or the application thereof, in any circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and of the application of any such provision, section, sentence, clause, phrase, or word in any other circumstances shall not be affected thereby and to this end, the provisions of this Act are declared severable.

"SEC. 33. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill? I was unable to understand.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is a bill the House passed several months ago and the Senate amended it.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. To provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. And the amendments to the bill made by the Senate are all germane to the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. They are.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 9139, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1027)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 9, 10, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$827,146,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,862,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,294,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$185,431,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,342,669,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,142,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

### "TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

### *"Public works acceleration*

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $30,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, and 19.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
PAT MCNAMARA,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

### *Corps of Engineers—Civil*

### General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $19,115,000 instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

| Item | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | Conference |
|---|---|---|
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS | | |
| 1. Surveys; | | |
| (a) Navigation studies | $1,535,000 | $2,164,000 |
| (b) Flood control studies | 4,440,000 | 5,351,000 |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperative studies | 350,000 | 400,000 |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies: | | |
| Big Black River, Miss | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Big Muddy River, Ill | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| Brazos River Basin, Tex | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Colorado River, Tex | 215,000 | 215,000 |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Fox River, Wis | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Grand River Basin, Mich | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Missouri River Basin | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Neches River, Tex | 110,000 | 110,000 |
| Ohio River Basin review | 775,000 | 775,000 |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Pearl River Basin, Miss | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Puget Sound area, Washington | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Sabine River, Tex | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| St. Johns River Basin, Maine | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md | 330,000 | 330,000 |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin | 325,000 | 325,000 |
| Wabash River, Ind. and Ill | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| White River Basin, Ark. and Mo | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg | 350,000 | 350,000 |
| (e) Special studies: | | |
| Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana | 50,000 | 125,000 |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.) | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued | | |
| 1. Surveys—Continued | | |
| (e) Special studies—Continued | | |
| Great Lakes water levels | $40,000 | $40,000 |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y | 200,000 | 250,000 |
| Hurricane studies | 387,000 | 387,000 |
| Jersey Meadows, N.Y., and N.J | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y | 200,000 | 250,000 |
| Rampart Canyon, Alaska | 197,000 | 197,000 |
| San Francisco Bay area survey, California | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| Texas coast | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Hudson River siltation study | ----------- | 55,000 |
| General reduction applied against basin surveys | ----------- | −1,500,000 |
| Subtotal, surveys | 13,234,000 | 13,554,000 |
| 2. Collection and study of basic data: | | |
| Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey) | 280,000 | 280,000 |
| Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau) | 480,000 | 480,000 |
| Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| International water studies | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| Flood plain studies | 715,000 | 715,000 |
| Subtotal, collection and study of basic data | 1,770,000 | 1,770,000 |
| 3. Research and development: | | |
| Beach erosion development studies | 820,000 | 820,000 |
| Hydrologic studies | 185,000 | 185,000 |
| Engineering studies | 1,365,000 | 1,365,000 |
| Plan formulation and evaluation studies | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Mississippi Basin model: | | |
| (1) Construction | 461,000 | 461,000 |
| (2) Mississippi River comprehensive study | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction | 1,915,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Subtotal, research and development | 5,056,000 | 4,341,000 |
| General reduction due to slippage | ----------- | −550,000 |
| Total, general investigations | 20,060,000 | 19,115,000 |

**Flood control studies.**—The amount provided includes $25,000 for the Skunk and Squaw Creeks, Iowa survey.

### Construction General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $827,146,500 instead of $798,282,700 as proposed by the House and $849,856,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Alabama: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (N) | Holt lock and dam | $7,700,000 | | $7,700,000 | |
| (MP) | Jones Bluff lock and dam | | $250,000 | | $250,000 |
| (MP) | Millers Ferry lock and dam | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (N) | Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Paint Rock River | 231,000 | | 231,000 | |
| (MP) | Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (national wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.) | | | | |
| | Alaska: | | | | |
| (N) | Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin | | | 921,000 | |
| (MP) | Snettishan power project | | 225,000 | | 225,000 |
| | Arizona: | | | | |
| (FC) | Alamo Reservoir | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Tucson diversion channel | 1,750,000 | | 1,750,000 | |
| | Arkansas: | | | | |
| (N) | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: | | | | |
| | (a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification | 18,000,000 | | 18,000,000 | |
| | (b) Navigation locks and dams | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Beaver Reservoir | 10,300,000 | | 10,300,000 | |
| (MP) | Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri | 567,000 | | 567,000 | |
| (MP) | Dardanelle lock and dam | 20,000,000 | | 20,000,000 | |
| (FC) | De Queen Reservoir | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (MP) | Degray Reservoir | 2,350,000 | | 2,350,000 | |
| (FC) | Dierks Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Garland City | | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | Gillam Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Greers Ferry Reservoir | 2,917,000 | | 2,917,000 | |
| (FC) | Maniece Bayou, upstream extension | | | 200,000 | |
| (FC) | McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas | | | | 44,000 |
| (FC) | Millwood Reservoir | 15,600,000 | | 15,600,000 | |
| (MP) | Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| (N) | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Ozark lock and dam | | 285,000 | | 285,000 |
| (FC) | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts | | | | 37,500 |
| | California: | | | | |
| (FC) | Alameda Creek | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (FC) | Bear Creek | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (FC) | Buchanan Reservoir | | | | 125,000 |
| (FC) | Camanche Reservoir | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | |
| (FC) | Corte Madera Creek | | | | 20,000 |
| (R) | Crescent City Harbor (breakwater) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Dana Point Harbor | | | | 95,000 |
| (FC) | Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement | | 150,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Hidden Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Los Angeles County drainage area | 15,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries | 610,000 | | 610,000 | |
| (N) | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor | 1,350,000 | | 1,350,000 | |
| | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Merced River Reservoirs | | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| (FC) | Mormon Slough | | | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | New Hogan Reservoir | 2,250,000 | | 2,250,000 | |
| (MP) | New Melones Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Noyo River and Harbor | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Oroville Reservoir | 8,000,000 | | 4,555,000 | |
| (N) | Redondo Beach King Harbor | 950,000 | | 950,000 | |
| (N) | Redwood City Harbor | | | 660,000 | |
| (FC) | Redwood Creek | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam) | 335,000 | | 335,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River bank protection | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries | 1,500,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Sacramento River deep water ship channel | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River flood control project | 900,000 | | 840,000 | |
| (BE) | Santa Cruz County (reimbursement) | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| (N) | Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant) | †100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| (FC) | Tahchevah Creek | | | 200,000 | |
| (BE) | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement) | 122,000 | | 122,000 | |
| (FC) | Walnut Creek | 100,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | West Fork Reservoir | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| | Colorado: | | | | |
| (FC) | Trinidad Reservoir | | 86,000 | | 86,000 |
| | Connecticut: | | | | |
| (FC) | Ansonia-Derby | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Black Rock Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Colebrook River Reservoir | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (R) | Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments) | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (FC) | East Branch Reservoir | 685,000 | | 685,000 | |
| (FC) | Hancock Brook Reservoir | 1,600,000 | | 1,600,000 | |
| (FC) | Hop Brook Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | New London Barrier | | | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Northfield Brook Reservoir | 900,000 | | 900,000 | |
| (BE) | Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement) | 32,000 | | 32,000 | |
| (FC) | Stamford | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Sucker Brook Reservoir | | 90,000 | | 90,000 |
| (FC) | West Thompson Reservoir | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | |
| | Delaware: | | | | |
| | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) | | | | |
| (R) | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Indian River Inlet (bulkheads) | 831,000 | | 831,000 | |
| (N) | Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Florida: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (N) | Apalachicola River channel improvement | $500,000 | | $500,000 | |
| (N) | Bakers Haulover Inlet | 204,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Canaveral Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Central and southern Florida | 14,000,000 | | 14,750,000 | |
| (N) | Cross Florida barge canal | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Intercoastal Waterway: | | | | |
| | (a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River | 950,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| | (b) Jacksonville to Miami | 2,085,000 | | 2,085,000 | |
| (N) | Miami Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (BE) | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement) | 9,000 | | 9,000 | |
| (N) | Palm Beach Harbor | | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act) | 575,000 | | 575,000 | |
| | Georgia: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Carters Dam | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| (N) | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C | | | 270,000 | |
| | Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.) | | | | |
| (MP) | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga | | $350,000 | | $350,000 |
| | Hawaii: | | | | |
| (N) | Hilo Harbor | | 600,000 | | 600,000 |
| (R) | Kahului Harbor (breakwater) | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Kaunakakai Harbor | | | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Wailoa Stream | 766,000 | | 766,000 | |
| | Idaho: | | | | |
| (FC) | Boise Valley | 409,000 | | 409,000 | |
| (MP) | Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Ririe Reservoir | | 375,000 | | 375,000 |
| | Illinois: | | | | |
| (BA) | Calumet River, bridges | 1,400,000 | | 1,400,000 | |
| (N) | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.: | | | | |
| | (a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Carlyle Reservoir | 5,700,000 | | 5,700,000 | |
| (R) | Chicago Harbor (breakwater) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Chicago Harbor—1962 act | | | | 27,000 |
| (FC) | Clear Lake Special Drainage District | | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| (FC) | East St. Louis and vicinity | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Freeport | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana | 6,100,000 | | 6,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Indian Grave Drainage District | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.) | | | | |
| (N) | Kaskaskia River | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| (FC) | Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred) | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| (FC) | McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (N) | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: | | | | |
| | (a) Regulating works | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| | (b) Chain of Rocks | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Mount Carmel | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Oakley Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Rend Lake Reservoir | | 501,000 | | 501,000 |
| (FC) | Richland Creek | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee | | | 150,000 | |
| (FC) | Shelbyville Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown) | 695,000 | | 695,000 | |
| (FC) | Sny Island Levee Drainage District | | 166,000 | | 166,000 |
| (FC) | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | The Sny Basin | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Tri-Pond levee | | | 300,000 | |
| | Indiana: | | | | |
| (FC) | Brookville Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.) | | | | |
| (N) | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | 9,871,000 | | 9,871,000 | |
| (FC) | Evansville | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (FC) | Huntington Reservoir | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois | | | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Levee unit 5, Wabash River | 825,000 | | 825,000 | |
| (FC) | Mason J. Niblack levee | 650,000 | | 650,000 | |
| | McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Mississinewa Reservoir | 5,100,000 | | 5,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Monroe Reservoir | 2,600,000 | | 2,600,000 | |
| (N) | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (FC) | Salamonie Reservoir | 3,520,000 | | 3,520,000 | |
| (N) | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| | Iowa: | | | | |
| | Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge | | | 150,000 | |
| (FC) | Dubuque | | | | 35,000 |
| (FC) | Floyd River and tributaries | 3,800,000 | | 3,722,000 | |
| (FC) | Indian Creek Dam | | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| (FC) | Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16 | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Little Sioux River | 1,148,000 | | 1,148,000 | |
| (FC) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska | 5,600,000 | | 5,600,000 | |
| (N) | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska: | | | | |
| | (a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | |
| | (b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 | |
| | (c) Kansas City to the mouth | 2,700,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13 | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (FC) | Rathbun Reservoir | | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Red Rock Reservoir | 11,200,000 | | 11,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Saylorville Reservoir | | | 400,000 | |
| | Kansas: | | | | |
| (FC) | Atchison | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Big Hill Reservoir | | | | 35,000 |
| (FC) | Clinton Reservoir | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (FC) | Council Grove Reservoir | 1,800,000 | | 1,800,000 | |
| (FC) | Dodge City | | 185,000 | | 185,000 |
| (FC) | Elk City Reservoir | 5,600,000 | | 5,600,000 | |
| (FC) | John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Kansas City, Kans., and Mo | 580,000 | | 580,000 | |
| (FC) | Marion Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Kansas—Continued | | | | |
| (FC) | Melvern Reservoir | | $250,000 | | $250,000 |
| (FC) | Merriam | | | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Milford Reservoir | $14,925,000 | | $14,925,000 | |
| | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Osawatomie | | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| (FC) | Perry Reservoir | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Pomona Reservoir | 1,887,000 | | 1,887,000 | |
| (FC) | Topeka | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Wilson Reservoir | 6,600,000 | | 6,600,000 | |
| | Kentucky: | | | | |
| (MP) | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. | 27,000,000 | | 27,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Barren River Reservoir | 7,067,000 | | 7,067,000 | |
| | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | |
| (N) | Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio | 9,200,000 | | 9,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Carr Fork Reservoir | | 320,000 | | 250,000 |
| (FC) | Cave Run Reservoir | | 220,000 | | 220,000 |
| (MP) | Celina Dam (deferred) | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Corbin | 270,000 | | 270,000 | |
| (FC) | Cumberland | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (FC) | Eagle Creek Reservoir | | | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Fishtrap Reservoir | 9,500,000 | | 9,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Grayson Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Green River Reservoir | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (N) | McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky | 4,220,000 | | 4,220,000 | |
| | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Red River Reservoir | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | |
| | Louisiana: | | | | |
| (N) | Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Calcasieu River and Pass | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | |
| (N) | Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier | | 103,000 | 47,000 | 103,000 |
| (FC) | Campti Clarence levee | | 23,000 | 100,000 | 23,000 |
| (N) | Freshwater Bayou | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Mississippi River, gulf outlet | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | |
| (FC) | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act) | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.) | | | | |
| | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Twelve Mile Bayou | | | [1] (258,000) | |
| | Maine: | | | | |
| (N) | Narraguagus River | | | 500,000 | |
| (N) | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel | 2,000,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.) | | | | |
| (N) | Searsport Harbor (1962 act) | 718,000 | | 718,000 | |
| | Maryland: | | | | |
| (N) | Baltimore Harbor and Channel | 4,500,000 | | 4,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal) part II. (See Delaware.) | | | | |
| | Massachusetts: | | | | |
| (N) | Boston Harbor, Chelsea River | | | | 40,000 |
| (R) | Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Chicopee Falls | 1,385,000 | | 1,385,000 | |
| (FC) | Conant Brook Reservoir | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (N) | Gloucester Harbor | | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Littleville Reservoir | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (FC) | New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier | 3,634,000 | | 3,634,000 | |
| (N) | Plymouth Harbor (1962 act) | | | | 35,000 |
| (BE) | Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement) | 7,000 | | 7,000 | |
| (FC) | Three Rivers | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Wareham-Marion | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Westfield | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Michigan: | | | | |
| (R) | Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (N) | Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel | 1,485,000 | | 1,485,000 | |
| (N) | Gladstone Harbor | | | 200,000 | |
| (N) | Great Lakes connecting channels | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (R) | Ludington Harbor (north revetment) | 150,000 | | 150,000 | |
| (R) | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (R) | Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.) | | | | |
| (N) | Muskegon Harbor | | 18,000 | 100,000 | |
| (R) | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (FC) | Rouge River | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (N) | St. Marys River: New Poe lock | 242,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Saginaw River (flood control) | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| | Minnesota: | | | | |
| (N) | Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: | | | | |
| | (a) Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| | (b) Outer harbor, 32-foot to 27-foot channels | 1,162,000 | | 1,162,000 | |
| (FC) | Marshall, Redwood River | 696,000 | | 696,000 | |
| (R) | Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls) | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (FC) | St. Paul and South St. Paul | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Winona | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| | Mississippi: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Jackson and East Jackson | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | |
| (FC) | Natchez | | | 115,000 | |
| (FC) | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Pascagoula Harbor | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.) | | | | |
| | Missouri: | | | | |
| | Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Canton | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Chariton River, Iowa and Mo | | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (FC) | Gregory Drainage District | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Hannibal | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (MP) | Joanna Reservoir | | 300,000 | | 350,000 |
| | Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir | | 650,000 | | 650,000 |
| (MP) | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| | Missssippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.) | | | | |

See footnote at end of table.

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Missouri—Continued | | | | |
| | Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3 | $330,000 | | $330,000 | |
| (FC) | South River Drainage District | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | St. Louis | 8,000,000 | | 8,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Stockton Reservoir | 2,600,000 | | 2,600,000 | |
| | Montana: | | | | |
| (MP) | Libby Reservoir | | $1,000,000 | | $1,000,000 |
| | Nebraska: | | | | |
| (FC) | Clarkson | | | [1] (205,000) | |
| (FC) | Gering Valley | 650,000 | | 650,000 | |
| (FC) | Little Papillion Creek | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| | Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Norfolk | | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| (FC) | Salt Creek and tributaries | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | |
| | Nevada: | | | | |
| (FC) | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. | | | | 100,000 |
| | New Hampshire: | | | | |
| (N) | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. | | | 1,000,000 | |
| | New Jersey: | | | | |
| (R) | Cold Spring Inlet (jetties) | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (N) | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| (R) | Manasquan River (bulkheads) | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (N) | Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel | | | 400,000 | |
| (R) | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays | 690,000 | | 690,000 | |
| (MP) | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., and N.J. | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| | New Mexico: | | | | |
| (FC) | Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act) | | 130,000 | | 130,000 |
| (FC) | Cochiti Reservoir | | 308,000 | | 308,000 |
| (FC) | Galisteo Reservoir | | 220,000 | | 220,000 |
| (FC) | Las Cruces | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Socorro | 1,235,000 | | 1,235,000 | |
| | New York: | | | | |
| | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.) | | | | |
| (N) | Buffalo Harbor: | | | | |
| | (a) Outer harbor (1962 modification) | | | 250,000 | |
| | (b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels | 707,000 | | 707,000 | |
| (N) | Buttermilk Channel | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (BE) | Fire Island Inlet, Long Island | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | |
| (N) | Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act) | 917,000 | | 917,000 | |
| (N) | Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway | 380,000 | | 380,000 | |
| (FC) | Herkimer | 286,000 | | 286,000 | |
| (N) | Hudson River, New York City to Albany | 5,100,000 | | 5,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet | | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Lackawanna | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (R) | Little Sodus Bay (piers) | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), New York and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.) | | | | |
| (N) | Oswego Harbor (1962 act) | | | | 60,000 |
| (N) | Rochester Harbor | 1,025,000 | | 1,025,000 | |
| (FC) | Rosendale | | | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Salamanca | | | | 20,000 |
| (FC) | South Amsterdam | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| | North Carolina: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (BE) | Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach | | | 54,000 | |
| (FC) | New Hope Reservoir | | | | 180,000 |
| (FC) | Swift Creek | | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act) | | | | 135,000 |
| | North Dakota: | | | | |
| (FC) | Bowman Haley Reservoir | | | 300,000 | |
| (MP) | Garrison Reservoir | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (FC) | Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. | | | 300,000 | |
| | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.) | | | | |
| | Ohio: | | | | |
| (N) | Ashtabula Harbor 27–30-foot channels, deepen turning area | 383,000 | | 383,000 | |
| (N) | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 7,000,000 | | 12,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Big Darby Creek Reservoir | | 266,000 | | 266,000 |
| (FC) | Buck Creek Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Caesar Creek Reservoir | | | | 75,000 |
| | Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.) | | | | |
| (N) | Cleveland Harbor: | | | | |
| | (a) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act) | 900,000 | | 900,000 | |
| | (b) Deepen East Basin to 27–28 feet (1952 act) | | | | 27,000 |
| (R) | Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Conneaut Harbor | | | 225,000 | |
| (FC) | Deer Creek Reservoir | | 216,000 | | 216,000 |
| (FC) | East Fork Reservoir | | | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Fremont | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (N) | Lorain Harbor | 4,100,000 | | 4,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Manchester (deferred) | | | | 8,000 |
| (FC) | North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Paint Creek Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (N) | Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | |
| (N) | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Salt Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Sandusky Harbor | 1,531,000 | | 1,531,000 | |
| (R) | Sandusky Harbor (east jetty) | 370,000 | | 370,000 | |
| | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.) | | | | |
| (N) | Toledo Harbor | 6,268,000 | | 6,268,000 | |
| (FC) | West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | |
| (N) | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | | | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Youngstown, Crab Creek | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | Oklahoma: | | | | |
| | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Birch Reservoir | | 125,000 | | 125,000 |
| (MP) | Broken Bow Reservoir | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | |
| (FC) | Copan Reservoir | | | | 100,000 |
| (MP) | Eufaula Reservoir | 18,500,000 | | 18,500,000 | |

See footnote at end of table.

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Oklahoma—Continued | | | | |
| (FC) | Hugo Reservoir | | | | $100,000 |
| (FC) | Kaw Reservoir | | $200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (MP) | Keystone Reservoir | $15,500,000 | | $15,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Optima Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Pine Creek Reservoir | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam | 1,500,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| (FC) | Skiatook Reservoir | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (N) | Webbers Falls lock and dam | | 370,000 | | 370,000 |
| | Oregon: | | | | |
| (FC) | Blue River Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington | | 170,000 | | 170,060 |
| (R) | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (MP) | Cougar Reservoir | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Fall Creek Reservoir | 3,740,000 | | 3,740,000 | |
| (MP) | Green Peter Reservoir | 11,650,000 | | 11,650,000 | |
| (MP) | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington | 57,000,000 | | 57,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Lost Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Tillamook Bay and Harbor | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Willamette River Basin bank protection | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (FC) | Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage: Shelton Ditch | | | | 10,000 |
| (N) | Yaquina Bay and Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| | Pennsylvania: | | | | |
| (FC) | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. | 21,227,000 | | 21,227,000 | |
| (FC) | Beltzville Reservoir | | 240,000 | | 240,000 |
| (FC) | Bethlehem | 370,000 | | 370,000 | |
| (FC) | Blanchard Reservoir | | 428,000 | | 428,000 |
| (FC) | Butler | 750,000 | | 750,000 | |
| (FC) | Curwensville Reservoir | 6,800,000 | | 6,800,000 | |
| (N) | Dam 4, Monongahela River | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Elkland | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | Latrobe | | 117,000 | | 117,000 |
| (N) | Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River | 5,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Raystown Reservoir | | | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Scranton | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. | 10,800,000 | | 10,800,000 | |
| | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Turtle Creek | 3,200,000 | | 3,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Union City Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| | Puerto Rico: | | | | |
| (N) | San Juan Harbor | 4,633,000 | | 4,633,000 | |
| | Rhode Island: | | | | |
| (FC) | Fox Point Barrier | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Lower Woonsocket | 1,450,000 | | 1,450,000 | |
| (FC) | Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier | | | | 50,000 |
| (R) | Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters) | 470,000 | | 470,000 | |
| (FC) | Point Judith—Hurricane barrier | | | | 50,000 |
| | South Carolina: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| | South Dakota: | | | | |
| (MP) | Big Bend Reservoir | 23,800,000 | | 23,800,000 | |
| (MP) | Fort Randall Reservoir | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 | |
| | Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. | 5,700,000 | | 5,700,000 | |
| | Tennessee: | | | | |
| | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Cordell Hull Dam | 2,400,000 | | 4,800,000 | |
| (MP) | J. Percy Priest Reservoir | 3,700,000 | | 4,800,000 | |
| (BA) | Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn. | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | Texas: | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Bardwell Reservoir | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | |
| (FC) | Big Fossil Creek | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Brazos Island Harbor (jetties) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (N) | Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act) | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (FC) | Buffalo Bayou and tributaries | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | |
| (FC) | Canyon Reservoir | 3,682,000 | | 3,682,000 | |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension | | 132,000 | | 132,000 |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Freeport and vicinity | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (R) | Galveston Harbor (jetties) | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (N) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios | | | | 30,000 |
| (N) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (R) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes | 562,000 | | 562,000 | |
| (N) | Houston ship channel (40-foot project) | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | |
| (FC) | Lake Kemp Reservoir | | | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (N) | Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Pat Mayse Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| (R) | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties) | 750,000 | | 750,000 | |
| (FC) | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection) | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| (FC) | Proctor Reservoir | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| | Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) | | | | |
| (N) | Sabine-Neches Waterway: | | | | |
| | (a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| | (b) Rectification and widening (1954 act) | 2,138,000 | | 2,138,000 | |
| (MP) | Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam | 12,450,000 | | 12,450,000 | |
| (FC) | San Antonio Channel | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Somerville Reservoir | 8,100,000 | | 8,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Stillhouse Hollow Dam | 3,400,000 | | 3,400,000 | |
| (FC) | Texas City | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (R) | Texas City channel (dikes) | 835,000 | | 835,000 | |
| (FC) | Vince and Little Vince Bayous | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (FC) | Waco Reservoir | 8,500,000 | | 8,500,000 | |
| (N) | Wallisville Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| | Vermont: | | | | |
| (R) | Burlington Harbor (breakwater) | 555,000 | | 555,000 | |
| (FC) | Victory Reservoir (deferred) | | 65,000 | | 65,000 |
| | Virginia: | | | | |
| (R) | Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.) | 620,000 | | 620,000 | |
| (FC) | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Norfolk | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | North Fork of Pound Reservoir | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | |

| | Construction, general, State and project | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Washington: | | | | |
| (FC) | Colfax | $600,000 | | $600,000 | |
| | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | |
| | Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2 | | $39,000 | | $39,000 |
| | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Little Goose lock and dam | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |
| | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | |
| (MP) | Lower Granite lock and dam | | 884,000 | | 884,000 |
| (MP) | Lower Monumental lock and dam | 23,000,000 | | 23,000,000 | |
| (N) | Port Townsend | 598,000 | | 598,000 | |
| (FC) | Pullman | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (FC) | Sammamish River | 729,000 | | 729,000 | |
| (N) | Swinomish Slough | | | 150,000 | |
| (N) | Tacoma Harbor | | | 150,000 | |
| (FC) | Washougal area | | | 100,000 | |
| | West Virginia: | | | | |
| (FC) | Barboursville | | | [1] (150,000) | |
| | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | |
| | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Buckhannon | | 73,000 | | 73,000 |
| (FC) | East Lynn Reservoir | | 280,000 | | 280,000 |
| | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Justice Reservoir | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| | Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | |
| (N) | Opekiska lock and dam | 5,058,000 | | 5,058,000 | |
| | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Summersville Reservoir | 10,900,000 | | 10,900,000 | |
| | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | |
| | Wisconsin: | | | | |
| | Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.) | | | | |
| (FC) | Eau Galle River, Spring Valley | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (N) | Green Bay Harbor (1962 act) | | | | 50,000 |
| (N) | Kenosha Harbor | | | 200,000 | |
| (R) | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (FC) | Kickapoo River | | | | 50,000 |
| (R) | Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis. | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (N) | Milwaukee Harbor | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (R) | Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater) | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (R) | Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier) | 188,000 | | 188,000 | |
| (R) | Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| | Wyoming: | | | | |
| (FC) | Jackson Hole | 479,000 | | 479,000 | |
| | Miscellaneous: | | | | |
| (FC) | Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation | 4,000,000 | | 4,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Snagging and clearing | | | 750,000 | |
| (N) | Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000 | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (BE) | Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000 | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| | Projects deferred for restudy | | (150,000) | (158,000) | |
| | Recreation facilities, completed projects | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| | Small authorized projects | 2,128,000 | | 2,750,000 | |
| | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000) | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| | Employees compensation | 72,000 | | 72,000 | |
| | Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages | −65,000,000 | | −75,000,000 | |
| | General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities | | | −3,000,000 | |
| | Grand total, construction, general | 800,471,000 | 19,015,000 | 805,656,000 | 21,490,500 |
| | | (819,486,000) | | (827,146,500) | |

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

**Central and southern Florida.—The increase above the House figure includes $500,000 for beginning construction on Canal C–111, and the Cutler Drain.**

## Operation and Maintenance, General

**Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $154,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $157,368,000 as proposed by the Senate.**

## Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

**Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $77,862,000 instead of $74,500,000 as proposed by the House and $80,406,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:**

| Projects | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| 1. General investigations: | | | | |
| (a) Examinations and surveys | $25,000 | | $25,000 | |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data | 85,000 | | 85,000 | |
| Subtotal, general investigations | 110,000 | | 110,000 | |
| 2. Construction and planning: | | | | |
| Mississippi River levees | 2,580,000 | | 2,700,000 | |
| Channel improvement | 26,500,000 | | 27,250,000 | |
| Memphis Harbor | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| Old River control | 1,225,000 | | 1,225,000 | |
| St. Francis Basin | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| Lower White River | 850,000 | | 850,000 | |
| Cache River | 50,000 | | | |
| West Tennessee tributaries | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| Wolf River and tributaries | 395,000 | | 395,000 | |
| Lower Arkansas | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| Tensas Basin: | | | | |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| 2. Construction and planning—Con. | | | | |
| Yazoo Basin: | | | | |
| Sardis Reservoir | $58,000 | | $58,000 | |
| Enid Reservoir | 56,000 | | 56,000 | |
| Arkabutla Reservoir | 49,000 | | 49,000 | |
| Grenada Reservoir | 37,000 | | 37,000 | |
| Greenwood | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | |
| Main stem | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| Tributaries | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| Big Sunflower River, etc | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | |
| Yazoo backwater | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| Atchafalaya Basin | 7,000,000 | | 7,500,000 | |
| Lake Pontchartrain | | | 182,000 | |
| Subtotal, construction and planning | 54,250,000 | | 55,752,000 | |
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages | −1,500,000 | | −1,500,000 | |
| Total, construction and planning | 52,750,000 | | 54,252,000 | |
| 3. Maintenance | 22,000,000 | | 23,500,000 | |
| Grand total | 74,860,000 | | 77,862,000 | |

### *U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River*

### Joint Board of Engineers

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

### *The Panama Canal*

### Canal Zone Government

### Operating expenses

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $25,725,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

### Capital outlay

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $6,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

### *Limitation on general and administrative expenses, Panama Canal Company*

Amendment No. 8: Limits funds for administrative expenses to $9,285,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Provide for the purchase of 16 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 21 passenger motor vehicles of which 16 are for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Limits the cost of one limousine to $7,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,300 as proposed by the House.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### *Bureau of Reclamation*

### General investigations

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,294,000 instead of $9,894,000 as proposed by the House and $10,442,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided above the House figure include all of the specific items set forth in the Senate report, including $200,000 for comprehensive basin surveys.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that $8,902,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,621,000 as proposed by the House shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

Amendment No. 14: Provides $340,000 as proposed by the House instead of $388,000 as proposed by the Senate for transfer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

### *Construction and rehabilitation*

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $185,431,000 instead of $180,190,000 as proposed by the House and $187,425,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

| State and project | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended) |  | Conference allowance |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Construction | Advance planning | Construction | Advance planning |
| Arizona: |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado River front work and levee system | $4,350,000 | ---------- | $4,550,000 | ---------- |
| Gila project | 2,855,000 | ---------- | 2,855,000 | ---------- |
| Parker-Davis project | 973,000 | ---------- | 973,000 | ---------- |
| California: |  |  |  |  |
| Central Valley project | 50,445,000 | ---------- | 48,295,000 | ---------- |
| Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.) |  |  |  |  |
| Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.) |  |  |  |  |
| Washoe project, initial phase. (See Nevada.) |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado: |  |  |  |  |
| Denver office computer | 1,300,000 | ---------- | 1,300,000 | ---------- |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project | 1,600,000 | ---------- | 1,600,000 | ---------- |
| Trinidad project | ---------- | $7,000 | ---------- | $7,000 |
| Idaho: Mann Creek project | ---------- | 150,000 | ---------- | 150,000 |
| Kansas: Wichita project, Cheney division | 3,800,000 | ---------- | 3,800,000 | ---------- |
| Nevada: |  |  |  |  |
| Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.) |  |  |  |  |
| Washoe project, initial phase | ---------- | 110,000 | ---------- | 110,000 |
| New Mexico: Rio Grande project, recreational facilities | 460,000 | ---------- | 300,000 | ---------- |
| Oklahoma: |  |  |  |  |
| Arbuckle project | 1,800,000 | ---------- | 1,800,000 | ---------- |
| Norman project | 7,400,000 | ---------- | 7,400,000 | ---------- |
| Oregon: |  |  |  |  |
| Baker project, upper division | ---------- | 200,000 | ---------- | 200,000 |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir | 300,000 | ---------- | 300,000 | ---------- |
| The Dalles project, Western division | 3,150,000 | ---------- | 3,150,000 | ---------- |
| Vale project, Bully Creek extension | 642,000 | ---------- | 642,000 | ---------- |
| Texas: |  |  |  |  |
| Canadian River project | 23,000,000 | ---------- | 23,000,000 | ---------- |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, La Feria division | 1,500,000 | ---------- | 1,500,000 | ---------- |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, Mercedes division | 1,400,000 | ---------- | 1,400,000 | ---------- |
| Utah: |  |  |  |  |
| Weber Basin project | 11,309,000 | ---------- | 11,309,000 | ---------- |
| Washington: |  |  |  |  |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division | 1,325,000 | ---------- | 1,325,000 | ---------- |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit | ---------- | 225,000 | ---------- | 225,000 |
| Columbia Basin project | 3,900,000 | ---------- | 4,650,000 | ---------- |
| Spokane Valley project | 600,000 | ---------- | 600,000 | ---------- |
| Various: |  |  |  |  |
| Drainage and minor construction program | 2,432,000 | ---------- | 2,432,000 | ---------- |
| Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects | 3,943,000 | ---------- | 3,943,000 | ---------- |
| Reclamation office building | ---------- | ---------- | 350,000 | ---------- |
| Subtotal, exclusive of Missouri River Basin project | 128,484,000 | 692,000 | 127,474,000 | 692,000 |
| MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado: |  |  |  |  |
| Narrows unit, South Platte division | ---------- | $139,000 | ---------- | $139,000 |
| North Republic unit. (See Nebraska.) |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas: |  |  |  |  |
| Almena unit | $5,580,000 | ---------- | $3,983,000 | ---------- |
| Glen Elder unit | 5,000,000 | ---------- | 5,000,000 | ---------- |
| Kanopolis unit, Smoky Hill division | ---------- | 10,000 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Wilson unit, Smoky Hill division | ---------- | 129,000 | ---------- | 129,000 |
| Montana: |  |  |  |  |
| Chestnut Valley unit, Helena-Great Falls division | ---------- | 3,000 | ---------- | 3,000 |
| Cracker Box, Marsh, and Stipek units, Yellowstone division | ---------- | 54,000 | ---------- | 54,000 |
| East Bench unit | 4,400,000 | ---------- | 4,400,000 | ---------- |
| Jefferson and Whitehall units, Three Forks division | ---------- | 97,700 | ---------- | 97,700 |
| West Branch unit, Three Forks division | ---------- | 27,000 | ---------- | 27,000 |
| Yellowtail unit | 19,000,000 | ---------- | 19,000,000 | ---------- |
| Nebraska: |  |  |  |  |
| Ainsworth unit | 8,100,000 | ---------- | 8,100,000 | ---------- |
| Cedar Rapids division | ---------- | 195,000 | ---------- | 195,000 |
| Farwell unit | 5,000,000 | ---------- | 5,000,000 | ---------- |
| Frenchman Cambridge division | 1,787,000 | ---------- | 1,787,000 | ---------- |
| North Republican unit, upper Republican division | ---------- | 84,000 | ---------- | 84,000 |
| North Dakota: |  |  |  |  |
| Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division | ---------- | 54,000 | ---------- | 54,000 |
| South Dakota: |  |  |  |  |
| Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, South Dakota pumping division | ---------- | 5,300 | ---------- | 5,300 |
| Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.) |  |  |  |  |
| Joe Creek, Culdesac, and Rousseau units, South Dakota pumping division | ---------- | 92,000 | ---------- | 92,000 |
| Oahe unit, James division | ---------- | 253,000 | ---------- | 186,500 |
| Oahe unit, James section | 365,000 | ---------- | 365,000 | ---------- |
| Wyoming: |  |  |  |  |
| Kaycee unit, Powder division | ---------- | 200,000 | ---------- | 133,500 |
| Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.) |  |  |  |  |
| Various: |  |  |  |  |
| Transmission division | 23,956,000 | ---------- | 23,275,000 | ---------- |
| Drainage and minor construction program | 2,258,000 | ---------- | 2,258,000 | ---------- |
| Subtotal, construction and advance planning (MRB) | 75,446,000 | 1,343,000 | 73,168,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Investigations | 1,824,000 | ---------- | 1,717,000 | ---------- |
| Other Department agencies | 3,322,300 | ---------- | 3,180,000 | ---------- |
| Total, Missouri River Basin project | 80,592,300 | 1,343,000 | 78,065,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation | 211,111,300 |  | 207,431,000 |  |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays | −15,351,000 |  | −22,000,000 |  |
| Total, construction and rehabilitation | 195,760,000 |  | 185,431,000 |  |

**Central Valley project.—The conferees are in agreement that none of the available funds shall be used for reimbursement to the Westlands Water District for preconstruction work in connection with the proposed water distribution system since there is no authority in law for such reimbursement. They are also in agreement that funds budgeted for the Trinity River division should be used to initiate construction on both the Cow Creek unit and the Clear Creek South unit.**

**Reclamation office building.—The conferees are in agreement that a new building is needed for the Bureau of Reclamation at the Denver Federal Center, and have provided $350,000 for preconstruction planning and design. However, the construction funds for such a building should be budgeted under the General Services Administration.**

### Loan Program

**Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $12,367,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,217,000 as proposed by the House.**

### *Upper Colorado River storage project*

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $97,989,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $97,845,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that $3,952,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,809,000 as proposed by the House shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as follows:

| State and project | Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended) | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Construction | Advance planning | Construction | Advance planning |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT | | | | |
| Arizona: | | | | |
| Glen Canyon unit | $25,360,000 | ---------- | $25,360,000 | ---------- |
| Colorado: | | | | |
| Curecanti unit | 18,822,000 | ---------- | 18,822,000 | ---------- |
| Utah: | | | | |
| Glen Canyon unit. (See Arizona.) | | | | |
| Flaming Gorge unit | 4,639,381 | ---------- | 4,639,381 | ---------- |
| Wyoming: | | | | |
| Flaming Gorge unit. (See Utah.) | | | | |
| Transmission division | 37,670,000 | ---------- | 36,000,000 | ---------- |
| PARTICIPATING PROJECTS | | | | |
| Colorado: | | | | |
| Florida project | 2,255,000 | ---------- | 2,255,000 | ---------- |
| San Juan-Chama project | 1,600,000 | ---------- | 1,600,000 | ---------- |
| Silt project | 500,000 | ---------- | 500,000 | ---------- |
| New Mexico: | | | | |
| San Juan-Chama project. (See Colorado.) | | | | |
| Utah: | | | | |
| Central Utah project, initial phase | ---------- | $1,721,300 | ---------- | $1,400,000 |
| Emery County project | 3,853,000 | ---------- | 3,853,000 | ---------- |
| Lyman project. (See Wyoming.) | | | | |
| PARTICIPATING PROJECTS—con. | | | | |
| Wyoming: | | | | |
| Lyman project | $600,000 | ---------- | $600,000 | ---------- |
| Seedskadee project | 6,000,000 | ---------- | 6,000,000 | ---------- |
| Drainage and minor construction program | 64,619 | ---------- | 64,619 | ---------- |
| Quality of water studies | ---------- | $73,700 | ---------- | $73,700 |
| Subtotal | 101,364,000 | 1,795,000 | 99,694,000 | 1,473,700 |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays | −6,181,000 | | −7,131,000 | |
| Total, Upper Colorado River Basin fund | 96,978,000 | | 94,036,700 | |
| RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES | | | | |
| National Park Service | 3,000,000 | | 2,795,000 | |
| Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife | 1,309,000 | | 1,157,500 | |
| Total, recreational and fish and wildlife | 4,309,000 | | 3,952,500 | |
| Total, Upper Colorado River storage project | 101,287,000 | | 97,989,200 | |

### Administrative Provisions

**Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.**

### *Bonneville Power Administration*

### Construction

**Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $36,204,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.**

**The managers on the part of the House concur in the Senate report language concerning Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnections.**

### Operation and Maintenance

**Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $13,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,200,000 as proposed by the House.**

### *Southwestern Power Administration*

### Continuing Fund

**The conferees direct that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration, nor shall the Southwestern Power Administration promote the construction of steam generating facilities or associated transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.**

## TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

### *Atomic Energy Commission*

### Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,342,669,000 instead of $2,308,169,000 as proposed by the House and $2,369,524,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as follows:

| Item | Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended) | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|
| Raw materials | $324,843,000 | $320,000,000 |
| Special nuclear materials | 480,471,000 | 475,000,000 |
| Weapons | 782,969,000 | 782,969,000 |
| Reactor development | 530,548,000 | 508,500,000 |
| Physical research | 219,077,000 | 197,137,000 |
| Biology and medicine | 76,973,000 | 71,645,000 |
| Training, education and information | 17,194,000 | 15,850,000 |
| Isotopes development program | 9,260,000 | 8,360,000 |
| Civilian applications of nuclear explosives | 15,100,000 | 13,500,000 |
| Community program | 10,081,000 | 10,081,000 |
| Program direction and administration | 73,415,000 | 72,560,000 |
| Security investigation program | $6,950,000 | $6,950,000 |
| Cost of work for others | 6,240,000 | 6,240,000 |
| Change in selected resources | 53,252,000 | 36,750,000 |
| Resources received from other sources | −32,000,000 | −32,000,000 |
| Unobligated balance brought forward | −150,873,000 | −150,873,000 |
| Unobligated balance carried forward and miscellaneous adjustments | ---------- | ---------- |
| Transfer in 1964 estimates | ---------- | ---------- |
| Total | 2,423,500,000 | 2,342,669,000 |

**Reactor development.—The increase above the House figure includes $3,000,000 for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. The conferees agree that none of these funds are to be used for arrangements involving light water reactors of already proven types. The increase also includes $3,500,000 for the "seed and blanket" reactor concept.**

**Physical research.—The increase above the House figure includes $1,000,000 for the controlled thermonuclear research program.**

**Change in selected resources.—The increase above the House figure includes $3,000,000 for the civilian nuclear power cooperative program.**

### Plant and capital equipment

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $400,000,000 instead of $380,000,000 as proposed by the House and $418,695,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House figure includes $17,945,000 for 12 weapons construction projects approved by supplemental authorization in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty, and $750,000 for a community building at Los Alamos, N. Mex. It is expected that normal replacement and maintenance will be carried on at the Puerto Rico Training Center.

### *Tennessee Valley Authority*

### Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $47,142,000 instead of $46,000,000 as proposed by the House and $48,284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## TITLE IV

### *Funds appropriated to the President*

### Public Works Acceleration

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $30,000,000 instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided $2,000,000 is for the administration of the going program for which $850,000,000 has already been appropriated.

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the $2,000,000 for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

### TITLE V

### *General provisions*

Amendments Nos. 26 through 35: Change title and section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we present the conference report on the public works appropriation bill. There is no difference or controversy on the bill or the report. I shall avail myself of the right exercised in the other body where the rule of germaneness is not observed to diverge for the time being to other subjects.

May I in the first place felicitate the President of the United States on the statement released in this morning's newspapers in which he indicates conclusively that he proposes to carry out to the letter the platform adopted by his party at the 1960 convention.

It will be recalled that the committee on resolutions which formulated that platform was chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who gave us the best platform ever adopted by any party.

May I also commend the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives and the equally distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate in the announcement in this morning's newspaper to the effect that they propose to give no consideration whatever to the absurd proposal that we go back to the old order of succession to the Presidency under which a member of the Cabinet succeeded the President and Vice President in event of a recurring vacancy in that office.

The members of the Cabinet are chosen for a multiplicity of reasons, none of which necessarily include their experience and competency to administer the complex, intricate and highly specialized requirements to serve as Chief Executive of the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are many men in the United States capable of serving in the Cabinet. But the man who succeeds to the high office of the Presidency should be a man who is qualified by experience for that position.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is not only here because of the approval of the voters of his own congressional district and State but he is also here because he has been elected to the speakership by the vote of the Representatives of the people of the entire Nation and during his occupancy of that office has been in direct association with every national problem and is unquestionably the second most influential man in the Government.

There should be no change whatever in the present order of succession to the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the third place, may I again comment on the perennial agitation for a modernization of the rules of the House. It is an annual occasion for perfervid oratory which—like the poor—we have with us always. In every session there are those who claim the rules of the House should be refashioned and brought up to date. They take the position that the rules of the House, like women's hats, should change with the season. It brings to mind the comment of "Uncle Joe" Cannon who, on one occasion, cried from the Speaker's rostrum that Members claimed they are fettered by the rules who would not know the rules if they met them in the public road.

Parliamentary procedure is as exact a science as mathematics or physics or astronomy. And we can no more modernize the basic rules of parliamentary procedure than we can modernize the multiplication table.

It was said that the French Revolution was due to lack of proper parliamentary procedure in the French Chamber of Deputies. Jefferson, himself, who compiled the first parliamentary manual in the history of the American Congress, based on 600 years of experience by the British House of Commons, quoted authorities to the effect that a departure from established procedure hampered the majority and destroyed the rights of the minority. And I myself witnessed an instance in which failure to enforce a fundamental rule of procedure at a national convention literally changed the history of the world.

Of course, a charge that the rules of the House are inadequate and a proposal to change or modify or rewrite them is always an interesting and exciting morsel for the reporters; but as Mr. Deschler, the Parliamentarian of the House, well says in his preface to the House Manual, the parliamentary practice of the House is a system of procedure that ranks second to none and meets every need.

In the fourth place, Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of all concerned to the fact that the House and its Committee on Appropriations are operating under a Federal statute, known generally here in the Congress as the antideficiency rule. It took us several years to perfect it. But it now has teeth and is effective and we expect it to be enforced.

Formerly the departments would come before the Committee on Appropriations and submit testimony indicating that certain sums would be required to finance them through the coming fiscal year. Of course they always allow a wide margin for contingencies. And of course the committee always reduced the amount with that in view. Thereupon the department would accept the money provided and proceed to dispense it in accordance with their own ideas and when the appropriation was exhausted would come up and cheerfully inform the committee that their money was exhausted and they would have to have a supplementary appropriation or close their doors. And the committee had no choice but to pass a supplementary appropriation bill.

But under the antideficiency law, funds provided for a year's operation must be allocated by months or periods and if more than the allocation is spent for any period severe penalties are provided by the law.

In other words Congress and not the departments decides what shall be appropriated and spent and no supplementary bills are necessary except for money required by laws enacted or unforeseen contingencies arising subsequent to the enactment of the original appropriation.

We trust that all will keep in mind the policy of the committee in declining to entertain supplementary appropriation bills where the antideficiency act has been violated.

Mr. Speaker, I supplement my remarks with tables which explain the principal features of the conference report now before us, and ask unanimous consent that they be included as a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

*Summary, 1964 public works appropriations bill*

| | |
|---|---|
| Appropriation, 1963 | $5, 534, 702, 610 |
| Budget estimate, 1964 | 4, 561, 957, 000 |
| House bill | 4, 276, 116, 400 |
| Senate bill | 4, 500, 963, 200 |
| Conference report | 4, 406, 272, 700 |
| Conference total compared with: | |
| Appropriation, 1963 | −1, 128, 429, 910 |
| Budget estimate, 1964 | −155, 684, 300 |
| House bill | +130, 156, 300 |
| Senate bill | −94, 690, 500 |

On page 19 of the pamphlet print of the conference report it is indicated that $50,000 has been provided for the Cache River project in Arkansas. This is an error in printing. On page 24233 of the RECORD, the item is listed correctly. No funds have been provided for this project.

*Public works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1964*

SUMMARY TABLE

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended) | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | | |
| CEMETERIAL EXPENSES | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $10, 333, 000 | $10, 846, 000 | $10, 800, 000 | $10, 800, 000 | $10, 800, 000 |

*Public works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

SUMMARY TABLE

| Item | Appropriations, 1963 | Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended) | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL | | | | | |
| General investigations | $18, 100, 000 | [1] $20, 060, 000 | $18, 000, 000 | $20, 600, 000 | $19, 115, 000 |
| Construction, general | 792, 870, 500 | [2] 819, 486, 000 | 798, 282, 700 | 849, 856, 000 | 827, 146, 500 |
| Operation and maintenance, general | 145, 850, 350 | 157, 368, 000 | 150, 000, 000 | 157, 368, 000 | 154, 000, 000 |
| General expenses | 14, 165, 200 | 15, 252, 000 | 15, 000, 000 | 15, 000, 000 | 15, 000, 000 |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries | 73, 504, 000 | 74, 860, 000 | 74, 500, 000 | 80, 406, 000 | 77, 862, 000 |
| U.S. section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers | 20, 000 | | | 10, 000 | 10, 000 |
| Total, rivers and harbors and flood control | 1, 044, 510, 050 | 1, 087, 026, 000 | 1, 055, 782, 700 | 1, 123, 240, 000 | 1, 093, 133, 500 |
| THE PANAMA CANAL | | | | | |
| Canal Zone Government: | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | 23, 405, 650 | 26, 465, 000 | 25, 000, 000 | 25, 725, 000 | 25, 725, 000 |
| Capital outlay | 3, 120, 000 | [3] 7, 250, 000 | 6, 500, 000 | 7, 250, 000 | 6, 500, 000 |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses | (8, 284, 000) | (9, 550, 000) | (9, 000, 000) | (9, 285, 000) | (9, 285, 000) |
| Total, the Panama Canal | 26, 525, 650 | 33, 715, 000 | 31, 500, 000 | 32, 975, 000 | 32, 225, 000 |
| Total, title I | 1, 081, 368, 700 | 1, 131, 587, 000 | 1, 098, 082, 700 | 1, 167, 015, 000 | 1, 136, 158, 500 |
| TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | |
| BUREAU OF RECLAMATION | | | | | |
| General investigations | [4] 8, 632, 750 | 11, 361, 000 | 9, 894, 000 | 10, 442, 000 | 10, 294, 000 |
| Construction and rehabilitation | [5] 163, 518, 000 | 195, 760, 000 | 180, 190, 000 | 187, 425, 000 | 185, 431, 000 |
| Operation and maintenance | [6] 35, 845, 530 | 38, 588, 000 | 38, 000, 000 | 38, 000, 000 | 38, 000, 000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts | (3, 525, 000) | (4, 363, 000) | (4, 363, 000) | (4, 363, 000) | (4, 363, 000) |
| Loan program | [5] 12, 217, 000 | [7] 13, 300, 000 | 12, 217, 000 | 12, 367, 000 | 12, 367, 000 |
| Emergency fund | 1, 000, 000 | | | | |
| Upper Colorado River Basin Fund | [5] 111, 808, 000 | [8] 101, 287, 000 | 97, 845, 700 | 97, 989, 200 | 97, 989, 200 |
| General administrative expenses | [9] $9, 666, 320 | $10, 051, 000 | $10, 000, 000 | $10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation | 342, 687, 600 | 370, 347, 000 | 348, 146, 700 | 356, 223, 200 | 354, 081, 200 |
| BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Construction | 29, 800, 000 | [10] 56, 058, 000 | 36, 000, 000 | 36, 204, 000 | 36, 204, 000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 13, 126, 250 | 13, 929, 000 | 13, 200, 000 | 13, 500, 000 | 13, 500, 000 |
| Total, Bonneville Power Administration | 42, 926, 250 | 69, 987, 000 | 49, 200, 000 | 49, 704, 000 | 49, 704, 000 |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 800, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | 1, 000, 000 | 1, 000, 000 |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Construction | $7, 210, 000 | $3, 520, 000 | $3, 000, 000 | $3, 000, 000 | $3, 000, 000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 1, 479, 450 | 1, 568, 000 | 1, 500, 000 | 1, 500, 000 | 1, 500, 000 |
| Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts) | (5, 000, 000) | (4, 500, 000) | (4, 500, 000) | (4, 500, 000) | (4, 500, 000) |
| Total, Southwestern Power Administration | 8, 689, 450 | 5, 088, 000 | 4, 500, 000 | 4, 500, 000 | 4, 500, 000 |
| Total, definite appropriations | 395, 103, 300 | 446, 422, 000 | 402, 846, 700 | 411, 427, 200 | 409, 285, 200 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 8, 525, 000 | 8, 863, 000 | 8, 863, 000 | 8, 863, 000 | 8, 863, 000 |
| Total, title II | 403, 628, 300 | 455, 285, 000 | 411, 709, 700 | 420, 290, 200 | 418, 148, 200 |
| TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | | |
| ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | 2, 872, 224, 000 | [11] 2, 423, 500, 000 | 2, 308, 169, 000 | 2, 369, 524, 000 | 2, 342, 669, 000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts | (29, 000, 000) | (32, 000, 000) | (32, 000, 000) | (32, 000, 000) | (32, 000, 000) |
| Plant and capital equipment | 262, 745, 000 | [12] 426, 145, 000 | 380, 000, 000 | 418, 695, 000 | 400, 000, 000 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Commission | 3, 134, 969, 000 | 2, 849, 645, 000 | 2, 688, 169, 000 | 2, 788, 219, 000 | 2, 742, 669, 000 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses | (424, 450) | (429, 000) | (429, 000) | (429, 000) | (429, 000) |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 35, 071, 000 | [13] 48, 284, 000 | 46, 000, 000 | 48, 284, 000 | 47, 142, 000 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $33, 610 | $39, 000 | $38, 000 | $38, 000 | $38, 000 |
| Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission | 80, 000 | 117, 000 | 117, 000 | 117, 000 | 117, 000 |
| Total, Delaware River Basin Commission | 113, 610 | 156, 000 | 155, 000 | 155, 000 | 155, 000 |
| U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins | 552, 000 | | | | |
| Total, definite appropriations | 3, 170, 705, 610 | 2, 898, 085, 000 | 2, 734, 324, 000 | 2, 836, 658, 000 | 2, 789, 966, 000 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 29, 000, 000 | 32, 000, 000 | 32, 000, 000 | 32, 000, 000 | 32, 000, 000 |
| Total, title III | 3, 199, 705, 610 | 2, 930, 085, 000 | 2, 766, 324, 000 | 2, 868, 658, 000 | 2, 821, 966, 000 |
| TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| Public works acceleration | [14] 850, 000, 000 | [15] 45, 000, 000 | | 45, 000, 000 | 30, 000, 000 |
| Total, title IV | 850, 000, 000 | 45, 000, 000 | | 45, 000, 000 | 30, 000, 000 |
| Grand totals: | | | | | |
| Total, definite appropriations | 5, 497, 177, 610 | 4, 521, 094, 000 | 4, 235, 253, 400 | 4, 460, 100, 200 | 4, 365, 409, 700 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 37, 525, 000 | 40, 863, 000 | 40, 863, 000 | 40, 863, 000 | 40, 863, 000 |
| Grand total, all titles | 5, 534, 702, 610 | 4, 561, 957, 000 | 4, 276, 116, 400 | 4, 500, 963, 200 | 4, 406, 272, 700 |

---

[1] Includes $40,000 in S. Doc. 45.

[2] Reflects increase of $1,900,000 in H. Doc. 128, and $170,000 in S. Doc. 45.

[3] Reflects increase of $250,000 in H. Doc. 134.

[4] Reflects transfer of $232,750 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[5] Reflects transfer of $300,000 from "Loan program" and $700,000 from "Construction and rehabilitation" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[6] Reflects transfer of $232,750 to "General investigations" and $366,320 to "General administrative expenses" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[7] Reflects $4,000,000 decrease in H. Doc. 89.

[8] Reflects $2,622,000 decrease in H. Doc. 109 and $500,000 increase in H. Doc. 125.

[9] Reflects transfer of $366,320 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[10] Reflects decrease of $4,860,000 in H. Doc. 125.

[11] Reflects decrease of $49,300,000 in H. Doc. 105.

[12] Reflects increase of $5,945,000 in H. Doc. 166.

[13] Reflects increase of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 125.

[14] Includes $450,000,000 appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[15] Submitted in H. Doc. 173.

*Corps of Engineers—General investigations studies to be funded with increase above House allowance reflected in conference report*

NAVIGATION STUDIES

| *Study* | *Amount* |
|---|---|
| Alaska: | |
| Hydaburg Harbor | $10,000 |
| King Cove Harbor | 10,000 |
| California: Sacramento and Feather Rivers to Colusa and Marysville | 25,000 |
| Florida: | |
| Cedar Keys Harbor | 7,000 |
| Crystal River | 10,000 |
| Georgia: Chattahoochee River, Columbus to Atlanta | 60,000 |
| Hawaii: | |
| Explosives anchorage | 10,000 |
| Hilo Harbor lava barrier | 10,000 |
| Indiana: Michigan City Harbor | +7,600 |
| Louisiana: Plaquemine lock | +12,000 |
| Maine: Saco River | 7,500 |
| Maryland: | |
| Tilghman Island Harbor | 5,000 |
| Cuckold Creek, Neale Creek and Neale Sound to Wicomico River | 10,000 |
| Massachusetts: Pleasant Bay of Orleans | 3,000 |
| New Jersey: New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway | 20,000 |
| New York: Lake Champlain Waterway | +30,000 |
| Oregon: | |
| Coos Bay, Charleston | 3,000 |
| Herman Creek | 5,000 |
| South Carolina: Cooper River | +40,000 |
| Texas: Guadalupe-San Antonio | +10,000 |
| Washington: Columbia River-Puget Sound Intracoastal Waterway | 20,000 |
| Wisconsin: | |
| Door County | 10,000 |
| Oconto River | 10,000 |

FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES

| *Study* | *Amount* |
|---|---|
| Alabama: Warrior River and tributaries | 40,000 |
| Alaska: | |
| Ketchikan Creek | 20,000 |
| Nenana River | 20,000 |
| Arkansas: Saline River | 30,700 |
| California: | |
| Sacramento River, Chester | 10,000 |
| Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks | 15,000 |
| Florida: | |
| Dade County Miami area B | 10,000 |
| Waccasassa River | 20,000 |
| Georgia: Peachtree and Nancy Creeks | 45,000 |
| Hawaii: | |
| Waimea River | 20,000 |
| Waipio River | 16,000 |
| Illinois: Saline River | 20,000 |
| Indiana: Crooked Creek Madison | 10,000 |
| Iowa: Big Sioux River, Klondike Reservoir | +10,000 |
| Kentucky: | |
| Big Sandy River | +10,000 |
| Licking River | +20,000 |
| Little Sandy River, Tygarts Creek | +20,000 |
| Louisiana: Chefuncte | 5,000 |
| Minnesota: Red River, Minnesota and North Dakota | +15,000 |
| Missouri: Spring River, Missouri and Arkansas | 20,000 |
| New Jersey: Passaic River, New Jersey and New York | 40,000 |
| North Carolina: | |
| Tar River | 30,000 |
| Yadkin-Pee Dee River, North Carolina and South Carolina | 20,000 |
| North Dakota: | |
| Missouri River, Bismarck and Mandan | 5,000 |
| James River, North Dakota and South Dakota | 15,000 |
| Oklahoma: | |
| Arkansas River Basin Water Supply, McAlester and Yale | $2,000 |
| Red River Sherwood Reservoir | +10,000 |
| Oregon: | |
| Nestucca River | 5,000 |
| Tillamook Bay Streams | 5,000 |
| South Dakota: Niobrara River (Gavins Point Reservoir, sedimentation and power) | +20,000 |
| Texas: Peytons Creek | 10,000 |
| Utah: Mill and Pack Creeks | +10,000 |

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset of my remarks that I agree completely with the gentleman from Missouri, our chairman, in the remarks he has just made relative to the succession to the Presidency, and also his remarks relative to the rules of the House, and also his remarks relative to supplemental, or deficiencies, which they used to be called.

We have an antideficiency law with teeth in it and even jail sentences and dollar penalties for any agency head that expends more in a quarter than the Congress had appropriated in a general appropriation bill for that agency of Government. But they dreamed up this word "supplemental" which they use in lieu of the word "deficiency," and it has been terribly abused over the years.

I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will remember when Calvin Coolidge was the President of the United States. He served notice on every agency of Government that they had to get their appropriation dollar needs in the general appropriation bill because, Mr. Coolidge said emphatically that he would veto any deficiency bill that came to his desk unless the condition had been caused by an act of God. There were no deficiency bills presented during his Presidency except those which had been caused by an act of God. I hope President Johnson will do likewise for it would save millions, even billions, of our taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that the rules of this House have proven good for the people of America. The rules under which we operate are very stringent rules, and they have not been disobeyed by the House of Representatives. The four Speakers of the House under whom I have served have demanded that the rules of the House be adhered to and adhered to strictly; and as I just said it has been good for America; that I know.

Relative to the succession to the Presidency, the facts are that there are only 537 Americans that are elected by the people. I cannot go along with anyone who says that an appointed official who has not been elected either by the people or by the House of Representatives or by the Senate to the high office he holds should be in line for the Presidency of these great United States of America.

We have a Speaker that is well able to be the President of the United States. We have a Senate President pro tempore who, even though he is quite up in years, would make a great President of the United States. Of course, I hope that nothing happens that will demand that such a condition might have to be handled, but God, in his wisdom, sometimes does things that we humans do not understand.

Of course, I hope the time is soon here when the Republican Party will be in power, when the American people will determine that the great Republican Party, with our great dedicated American principles, are the people that should head the Government of these United States and should control the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, relative to this bill, you will note we have reduced the President's budget to the tune of several hundred million dollars. This bill comes to the floor from the conference, $1,128,439,910 below the 1963 appropriations.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though there are some items which I and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] objected to strenuously in the conference and which should not be in this bill, the facts are the cards were stacked against us. I can only say that as a whole this is a fair to good bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to address the House, particularly you, the committee chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and other committee members to clarify a situation with additional legislative history at this time.

When the House Committee on Appropriations Report No. 902, on the public works appropriation bill, was before the House on November 19, it contained certain language relative to the Glen Elder project in my district in Kansas. The language was:

> None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

As you may recall, I discussed this matter at that time. My remarks included excerpts from the hearings before your committee, wherein Bureau officials testified that they proposed to purchase additional lands in fee for fish and wildlife purposes amounting to 9,167 acres above those required under the Bureau's usual acquisition policy and in fact a total increase in fee of 13,527 acres.

Recent correspondence from the Bureau of Reclamation discloses it is now contended flood control operating procedure has been revised for the Glen Elder Reservoir so as to claim that lands which were formerly desired in fee for fish and wildlife purposes are now, with the exception of 1,400 acres, to be

**classed as flood control lands and to be acquired in fee. This is a patent attempt to evade the congressional restriction on the purchase in fee of lands for fish and wildlife purposes simply by changing the designation of land use and all done without notice to anyone, including your committee.**

**I am positive the Committee on Appropriations will not sanction such an obvious scheme to circumvent the restriction imposed by the committee.**

**I incorporate herein, by reference, the remarks on November 19, a letter from the Bureau of Reclamation of December 5, my letter to Senator FRANK CARLSON and his remarks which appeared in the December 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, followed by another letter dated December 10, from Acting Commissioner William I. Palmer, and finally excerpts of comments provided me by a Bureau official earlier this year, on or about May 10, 1963.**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
*Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.*
Hon. BOB DOLE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DOLE: This will confirm and amplify the telephone conversations of December 4, 1963, between members of our respective staffs, concerning the Glen Elder unit, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, particularly as to how the unit would be affected by the following item appearing on page 48 of the House Appropriations Committee Report No. 902, dated November 15, 1963, on the public works appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 9140):

"Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

A question has been raised as to the significance of the foregoing language in terms of acres of land involved and the probable estimated savings to the Federal Government. We informally advised you on November 20, 1963, to the effect that current estimates indicate approximately 1,400 acres of land to be precluded from purchase in fee because of the cited language.

It has since been called to our attention that this is a considerably smaller amount than you had previously been given reason to believe would be the case, and that you have publicly cited larger acreage amounts. We regret that a misunderstanding has occurred concerning this matter, and offer the following discussion of the problem.

On a number of occasions within the past 6 months we have discussed right-of-way requirements for the Glen Elder unit from the standpoint of lands needed for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources. You were fully briefed on current Department of the Interior land acquisition policies which generally require that lands below the maximum water surface elevation of a reservoir be acquired in fee as distinct from purchase of easements to seep and flood. Application of this procedure had the effect of increasing the fee acquisition of reservoir lands by several thousand acres—many times the above-cited amount of 1,400 acres.

Such misunderstanding as now exists evolves from our failure to acquaint you with a change in the flood control operating concept for the Glen Elder unit which has the practical effect of requiring that the lands in the flood control pool of the reservoir be acquired in fee. Briefly, this change which occurred late this summer provides that Waconda Lake, the reservoir to be created by Glen Elder Dam, would be used as a holdover reservoir for storage of floodwaters pending evacuation of other reservoirs in the Kansas River system. This change in operating concept would require some changes in engineering design of levees and embankments, the cost of which is fully covered by increased flood control benefits arising from the revised operating plan.

As this plan involves retention of floodwater in storage for extended periods, perhaps months at a time, it seems plausible to assume that this fact alone justifies and requires that the lands thus inundated be acquired in fee. Following this logic, we must conclude that the reason for purchase of fee title to lands within the flood control pool is no longer exclusively for fish and wildlife conservation, but is more accurately described as being for flood control purposes.

In summary, only 1,400 acres of the designated taking for right-of-way for Waconda Lake would have a single-purpose fish and wildlife use and thus be clearly precluded from acquisition by the cited action of the committee. The increased taking over previous estimates is occasioned by the revised flood control operating criteria.

We are pleased to submit this explanation and reiterate our regret for any embarrassment you may have felt due to our failure to communicate the changing situation surrounding the Glen Elder unit.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM I. PALMER,
*Acting Commissioner.*

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.*
Re Glen Elder unit.
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The committee report (p. 48) accompanying H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill for 1964, contains the following language: "None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes." I requested this language, as there were plans to acquire 13,527 acres in consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning, some to be acquired in fee and some covered by flowage easements. This is attributed to a revised interdepartmental policy agreed upon by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of the Army in February 1962.

Frankly, I could see no reason for removing this much acreage from local tax rolls, nor devoting this much acreage for fish and wildlife purposes. I would point out that those persons affected are not opposed to negotiating an easement in most instances, but do oppose the land being taken in fee.

At any rate, I felt inclusion of the above language in the report, along with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 22263, November 19, 1963, would clarify any question which might arise; and just as an additional precaution I directed a question to Congressman CANNON, and he affirmed my position that none of the land in the Glen Elder project would be taken in fee for fish and wildlife purposes.

On Tuesday of this week I asked Bill Kats to make certain the Bureau of Reclamation was in accord with what I still consider to be the proper interpretation of the legislative history. In his discussions with Mr. Casey and Mr. Palmer of the Bureau of Reclamation, he was advised of many things, including a statement by Mr. Casey that still another revision in policy had been made late this summer; hence, all the land I had referred to except 1,400 acres would now be needed in fee for flood control. In other words, simply by changing the designation of what the acreage would be used for, my efforts had been completely circumvented.

So you may be fully informed, I am enclosing and attaching hereto copy of a statement prepared earlier this year which contains the following: "From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres." Also attached is a copy of the report containing the language I have referred to on page 48, a copy of my comments in the RECORD, and a letter signed by William I. Palmer, Acting Commissioner, dated December 5, which, in my opinion, is a weak attempt to avoid the clear intent of my efforts.

Let me make it clear there is no misunderstanding on my part, but because of the interpretation contained in Mr. Palmer's letter, it would be appreciated if you would make additional legislative history when the Senate bill is debated on the floor. If this is not feasible, I certainly intend to do whatever may be necessary to clarify the unwarranted interpretation when the bill goes to conference.

Sincerely yours,
BOB DOLE.

---

Senator CARLSON. On page 48 of the report the following is set forth:

"Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

I wish to comment briefly on that point, because I hold in my hand a letter from Representative ROBERT DOLE, who represents that district in the House of Representatives. In his letter he expresses some concern in regard to possible changes in the plans in regard to the fish and wildlife area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, in addition to the statement I have read, which is a part of the committee report, because I, too, share the same feeling in regard to the land purchased in fee simple for this project.

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
*Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963.*
Hon. BOB DOLE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DOLE: This will respond to your telephone request of December 10, 1963, in further regard to the following language which appears in the report from the House Committee on Appropriations on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964:

"Missouri River Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

It would be our view that the foregoing language would not preclude the acquisition of fee title to lands that are required for other water resource purposes such as flood control. Furthermore, if the limitation were amended so as to preclude the acquisition of such fee title for lands required for flood control purposes, it possibly would have the effect of preventing construction of the dam and reservoir.

As further pointed out in our conversation, the Bureau of Reclamation will cooperate with you in every appropriate way in reducing the impact of fee title land acquisition for the Glen Elder unit on the local communities surrounding the development.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM I. PALMER,
*Acting Commissioner.*

INFORMAL REPORT FURNISHED ON OR ABOUT MAY 10, 1963

In summary, the total impact of fish and wildlife land acquisition on the right-of-way requirements for this development may be illustrated as follows:

| Item | Minimum program for reservoir | Wildlife management [1] | New policy |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fee title | $20,213 | $24,573 | $33,740 |
| Easement | 14,925 | 12,605 | 7,470 |
| Total | 35,138 | 37,178 | 41,210 |

[1] This is the plan approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation and which was presented to the Congress in support of initial construction funds.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres; however, 7,465 acres of these lands would have been covered by flowage or construction easements.

In conclusion, I am attempting to save taxpayers between $2 and $3 million and eliminate some of the land to be purchased in fee for no apparent good reason. This project is in my district, so no other Member is affected. In effect, Bureau of Reclamation officials, by changing the stated use or designation of this acreage, completely circumvented the intent of the committee, my intent, shared by Senator CARLSON, as stated and, in fact, reverse their own position. Again, let me state I am positive the Committee on Appropriations will not sanction such an obvious scheme to circumvent the restriction imposed by the committee. To me this action is a flagrant disregard of efforts of the legislatve branch. What does one need to do to impress upon those responsible for this attempt to completely ignore specific language in a committee report along with extensive legislative history? I can assure the House that if there should be further misinterpretation and misconstruction it will be called to the attention of the committee.

I would add a note of disappointment that funds for the project programed for irrigation features in the Almena unit, Norton County, Kans., were eliminated in the conference. It is hoped this can be rectified next year and that the Commissioner of Reclamation will urge appropriation of the funds necessary to conclude this project.

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. JENSEN.** I yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. GROSS.** I commend the gentleman for his remarks. I know the cards were stacked against him in his efforts to hold the bill to the original House figures. Is it not true that this bill is some $260 million more than was approved by the House of Representatives?

**Mr. JENSEN.** No, it is not that much. It is $130,156,300 more than was approved by the House originally.

**Mr. GROSS.** It is $130 million and some hundred thousand dollars more?

**Mr. JENSEN.** That is right. I can assure the gentleman—the increase is not the fault of the Republican Members of the conference committee.

**Mr. GROSS.** Is there an increase of some $30 million for the accelerated public works program?

**Mr. JENSEN.** I am sorry to say there is. I vigorously opposed that item with all the power at my command.

**Mr. RHODES of Arizona.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. JENSEN.** I yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. RHODES of Arizona.** As a member of this subcommittee, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Iowa and the other conferees on what I would regard generally as a good job. I certainly do not agree with the $30 million for accelerated public works nor am I pleased with the fact that the House conferees were unable to uphold the position of the House regarding the Northwest Intertie. The gentleman from Iowa will recall that the position of the Committee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations in the House was that the whole matter needed a very good looking into and the language that we had in the report, indicated to the Department of the Interior that it was our preference that real bona fide negotiations looking toward possible private construction of this Intertie be entered into, and be entered into in good faith. The language in the conference report adopts criteria which I think are entirely new and something that has never been adopted before, and with which I am in complete and utter disagreement as far as the construction of transmission lines is concerned. It seems to make it impossible for a private company to build lines to transport power for the Federal Government. I feel the criteria is wrong and the results will be disastrous for private enterprise. I serve notice on my colleagues right now that in the future, I will certainly do what I can to make sure that this criteria will be confined to this case alone and will not be any precedent as to future construction.

I think it is well to read at this point the language which the House Republicans would have included in the conference report, with reference to the intertie, had we been able to do so. It is as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION—WEST COAST INTERTIE

The committee recommends an appropriation of $5 million (for acquisition of land and acquisition and installation of equipment) and $1,500,000 (for preliminary engineering) to initiate construction of two extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the Bonneville Power Administration's system on the Columbia River and the power systems in California and the Southwest. At least one of them may connect with a non-Federal power system at the northern California border and be terminated at this point. Any line built by the Federal Government shall be self-liquidating, as shall be the portion of the line outside the Bonneville Power Administration area.

The committee directs that construction of these lines not begin until there has been enacted into law S. 1007, or similar legislation guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. In addition, construction shall not begin unless the Secretary of the Interior finds, after good faith negotiations with utilities and other entities interested in constructing any portion of the lines involved that their proposals will not result in benefits to the national interest at least equal to those to be derived from Federal construction; has submitted his findings to the committee; and the committee has had an opportunity to review them.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, PACIFIC COAST INTERTIE—$2 MILLION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $2 million for land acquisition, engineering, design, and initiation of construction of extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the power systems in California and the Southwest with the Bonneville Power Administration's power system on the Columbia River.

The requirements and restriction set forth by the committee as applicable to the extra-high-voltage interconnection for which funds are recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration shall govern use of these funds.

I thank the gentleman and say to him that he can depend on my complete cooperation and by so doing we will try our best to save at least $100 million for the American taxpayers.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. JENSEN.** Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and first of all ask the gentleman from Iowa if he can give me the reasons why the House receded from the language in the House report and accepted the language in the Senate report.

**Mr. JENSEN.** I may say I made an attempt to substitute language of my own for the language in the Senate report but I was voted down.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** There was a vote on this question?

**Mr. JENSEN.** Well, you know, in our committee we hardly ever take a record vote. When the powers that be in that committee say, "this is it," that is it, generally speaking. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and I were outnumbered, it is just that simple.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** That was my understanding.

**Mr. JENSEN.** There is not much a minority member can do about it. We hope the day will soon come when we Republicans will be at the wheel.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Yes. I am aware of that. Let me ask the gentleman this: From what I have been able to read from the Senate language and the conference report, it would indicate if one line was to be built, it must be a Federal line. Is that correct?

**Mr. JENSEN.** That is right according to the language on the report.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** There is no opportunity, then, for construction by a non-Federal entity if only one line is to be built?

**Mr. JENSEN.** That is what I read and understand by the report.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** It would seem to me this conference report is in direct conflict, then, with the position that the House took at the time of the discussion on this bill.

**Mr. JENSEN.** I agree.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Yet there was no debate and no vote and this matter was not battled, you might say, by the majority side of the conferees in favor of the House position?

**Mr. JENSEN.** The Senate language seemed to be very pleasing to the majority members of the managers on the part of the House.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** Is it correct to say that the majority members of the House conferees did not try to uphold the House position on this language?

**Mr. JENSEN.** I think that can be said honestly.

**Mr. WESTLAND.** I thank the gentleman.

**Mr. JENSEN.** Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

**Mr. MOSHER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**Mr. WEAVER.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 9140, the civil functions appropriation bill.

The 24th Pennsylvania Congressional District has an important stake in this legislation.

This bill includes funds for much needed flood control installation now being constructed on the Shenango River near Mercer, Pa. The amount earmarked for continuing work on the Shenango Reservoir is $10,800,000.

The report also contains $150,000 for planning for a flood control installation on French Creek near Union City, Pa.

Both projects when they become a reality will not only have a beneficial effect in the 24th District, but on the Ohio River Basin which encompasses the Shenango and the Alleghany River Basin-French Creek waterways.

The people in Sharon, Pa., along the Shenango, and Meadville along French Creek, have suffered devastating floods, disrupting their economies and creating personal hardships on many families.

As long as a flood threat remains, these communities are handicapped in industrial development. The district already suffers from severe unemployment. The elimination of the flood hazard will encourage existing industry to expand and new industry to develop. This is an area with a labor market of highly skilled workers.

These flood projects are vitally needed. Any delay will subject the residents in those communities to additional hardships. The U.S. Corps of Engineers has set a timetable of construction for both projects. So that this timetable is not interrupted I respectfully urge the support of the House for H.R. 9140.

**Mr. MOSHER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Johnson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

**The SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 9140, the civil functions appropriation bill, containing funds for two very important flood control projects in my district: The Allegheny Reservoir and the Curwensville Reservoir.

The appropriation for the Allegheny Reservoir will permit this project to move ahead, if—and it is my hope—this House will very soon act on the conference report on H.R. 8667, the river basin and flood control project authorizations bill that will raise the ceilings on various river basins projects and allow the funds to be spent.

It is vitally important that work continue to bring this project to completion. A partially finished dam carries more potential for dangerous floods than no dam at all. Therefore, though I am most pleased that this regular civil functions appropriation bill is close to final enactment, I take this opportunity to urge early action on the conference report on the river basins authorization bill.

The $6,800,000 included in this conference report for the Curwensville Reservoir is also encouraging. Like the Allegheny, it offers two chief benefits—flood control and recreation.

Our most valuable resource is water which these two dams will conserve. We are in need of water for domestic consumption and the development of industry and the sooner we can complete these projects the closer we will be to solving some of our problems.

**Mr. CANNON.** Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

**The SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. Rosenthal). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 86, noes 18.

**Mr. GROSS.** Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

**The SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 330, nays 47, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

Yeas—330

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rielhman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—47

Abele
Alger
Arends
Becker
Betts
Bow
Broomfield
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Ford
Foreman
Goodell
Gross
Gurney
Harvey, Ind.
Hoffman
Hutchinson
Johansen
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McLoskey
MacGregor
Marsh
Meader
Minshall
Pelly
Poff
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schenck
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Westland
Wilson, Bob

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Avery

NOT VOTING—57

Abbitt
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Bonner
Brock
Brooks
Bruce
Burton
Cederberg
Celler
Collier
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Garmatz
Gill
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Rains
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Staebler
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Collier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Goodling.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Brock.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Denton.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Thornberry.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Scott.

Mr. ARENDS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate, amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 4, insert the following:

"UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

"For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cannon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 16, line 23, after the word "law" insert the following: "*Provided*, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2(c) of the Act of June of June 17, 1944, and sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cannon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

## MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 583 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]; and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 583 provides for consideration of H.R. 8720, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The record for the first 12 months of operation of the Manpower Development and Training Act is an unqualified success. It is now clear that the target set by Congress for the 3-year program of approximately 400,000 unemployed workers retrained and placed in productive employment will be achieved. This success comes at a time when the need for retraining may be growing far beyond the level originally expected.

H.R. 8720 would waive the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extend the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake such training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized. It provides for the expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects. For these changes one-half of the President's request for new funds, $50 million, is authorized for fiscal 1964 and the full request, $100 million, is authorized for fiscal 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 583.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I take the time to ask a question of the majority leadership, if the leadership is here on the floor, as to what happened to the indigent dependents bill. This is a most important piece of legislation. The rule was approved yesterday and we expected to debate it today. We are prepared to debate it. I do not mind any personal inconvenience, although I canceled some engagements late this afternoon because of this bill and the length of the calendar. But it is an inconvenience to the country, to the courts, and to the American bar.

This is a bill that I advised the bar associations in my community—and I think others did the same—would be discussed in the House today and voted on. I wonder whether I, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who was not advised that the bill had been dropped from today's calendar, may expect the bill on the floor tomorrow, or next week or next year, or when it will come up.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that before the day is over, if the majority leadership is not presently on the floor and if the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is not around, we can obtain an answer to this question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How about a Saturday session to deal with the bill? The gentleman will recall there was a session last Saturday and for a lesser reason.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think it is a bill that we ought to proceed with as fast as possible. It is a bill that is important to the entire country. It has to do with the defense of indigents who are rightly or wrongly accused of crime. It was reported out of the Judiciary Committee a long time ago. We expected to debate it yesterday or today. I do not understand, nor can I agree to the delay.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman from New York has made a valid inquiry. The inquiry should be answered. Therefore we should bring those responsible to the floor.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 236]

Abbitt
Alger
Bass
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Burton
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Collier
Cooley
Denton
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Elliott
Gill
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
Kilgore
Lankford
Leggett
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staebler
Stratton
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, before the call of the House, we were trying to discover what had happened to the indigent defendants bill. We are prepared to talk on that bill today and pass on it. It was originally scheduled for floor debate Tuesday. Then the majority leader forced an early adournjment yesterday, Wednesday, and we were told that we would debate it and pass upon it today. I have now discovered that none of the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee were told yesterday by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that he would not call the bill up today. We heard about it through the grapevine. This is not right. The bill is an important one. Neither it nor its sponsors should be treated in this fashion. Let us get on with our job.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, who is the author of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is asking a very important question with respect to the indigent defendants bill. On this side of the aisle we had no knowledge whatsoever that the bill would not be heard today. I am advised that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has indicated he will not call the bill up this week. I am not advised as to what his intentions are for next week. I do know, as the gentleman has stated, that there is a tremendous amount of interest in this legislation. If I might by way of information say to the House that this bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary long before the civil rights bill and it suffered as a result of the hearings on the civil rights bill to the extent that the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary was completely tied up with hearings on that bill. No report had been filed or written for as much as 2½ months. However, in consideration of the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, I did not push for the report to be filed. I am extremely disappointed that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has not called the bill up, and I would say to the gentleman as far as I have been able to ascertain from the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary others on this side, including myself, who are interested in the legislation, that none of us were advised of the decision by the chairman of the committee to delay consideration of this very important legislation.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a very good point and I commend him on it. I think he made a good point the other day, and I was surprised when one of the leaders of the House said that they do not tell every Tom, Dick, and Harry what goes on. As I took a look around the House during the quorum call, it appears to me also that they do not tell the Glenns, the Elmers, Dels, Sherms, Earls, Alexanders, Thors, Hastings, Flos, Charlottes, Arches, Franks, Johns, Bills, Dons, Harolds, Stewarts, Brads, Stans, Charlies, Margarets, Hermans, Durwards, Joels, Irvings, Burts, Clarks, Ralphs, Ogdens, Mels, Als, Daves, Howards, Bens, Lous, Ollies, Freds, Peters, Pauls, Jims, Genes, Kathryns, Ogdens, Garners, Anchers, Odins, Clarences, Eds, Rosses, Walters, and Joes.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has explained this rule. This resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8720, an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

I have taken this time because I think we ought to discuss for just a moment or two, under consideration of the rule, just what this bill would do if enacted into law and also talk about some amendments that may be offered to the measure when we get into the Committee of the Whole.

The major provisions of this bill would: First, postpone the effective date of State matching requirements and extend the act.

In other words, it would not require any matching on the part of the States with Federal funds during the fiscal year 1965, when it starts next July 1, as provided in the original act.

Second, it would expand the youth training program and would reduce the age for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, with a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts; it would increase the proportion of youth receiving allowances from 5 to 25 percent, and restrict the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects.

The training of our youth for useful work is important and appealing. Although I have not had the opportunity to study fully the impact of the compromise measure brought out as part of the conference report on the vocational education bill, it is my understanding that the vocational education bill has almost the same sort of provision for youth training. In fact there would be grave danger that two different governmental agencies would be trying to do the same thing with Federal funds. This might bring about a conflict and great misunderstanding. I believe that matter should be cleared up here in this bill or in consideration of the conference report on the vocational education bill.

Third, the bill that will be brought before us also provides for the basic education of trainees. This is a new section of the law. It was not in the previous act that is being amended. This bill would extend the period for which training allowances can be provided for another 20 weeks for those who cannot enter any occupational training because of inadequate education. This means that we are going to provide basic education for these individuals for another 20 weeks so they can absorb this training program.

Mr. Speaker, under this proposed new section of the act the extended time for the education of trainees is expected to provide a sufficient period for special training in the area of reading, writing, language skills, and arithmetic.

Fourth, this bill also increases training allowances. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to pay a training bonus of up to $10 a week over the current average level of unemployment compensation paid in the State, when he determines the training allowance to be too low. That is new language.

The bill would also permit trainees to engage in part-time work, up to 20 hours a week, without any reduction in the training allowances granted them.

Fifth, the bill as proposed would transfer authority over advisory committees to the Secretary of Labor and give the Secretary of Labor more power than he now enjoys.

Presently the National Advisory Committee is given the authority to encourage and to assist in the organization of the various local or State advisory committees. The bill would transfer this authority to the Secretary of Labor, and if in the Secretary's opinion it would not be appropriate to have such committees, then they would not have them; they would not be required. In other words, the Secretary would be given complete discretion in the matter.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would provide for labor mobility demonstration projects. That is a new section and something that has not been done before. It would authorize grants of up to 50 percent, or loans up to 100 percent, of relocation costs in a limited number of pilot projects, and no ceiling is placed thereon, in order to increase the mobility of unemployed workers. This would permit them to be transferred over the country.

Now, in the three titles of this act, or the present act, based upon the increases to be added, one can see that there will be some rather hefty increases.

For the present fiscal year of 1964, which has only 6 months to run, the present authorization under the act is $161 million, but it would be increased to $211 million, or $50 million more than under the present law.

For 1965, the present law would authorize expenditures of $161 million, but that would be increased to $422 million, making an increase in the fiscal year 1965 of $261 million.

Then, for fiscal 1966, a year for which there are no existing authorizations, there would be $281,333,333 allocated which, of course, is an increase of just that amount.

And, in fiscal year 1967 there would be $211 million of new money authorized for programs which, of course, would be continued through that fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of these increases will undoubtedly be subject to amendment. I understand that there will be amendments offered, perhaps from the minority side, to meet some of the objections that have been made to the provisions of this act, and, perhaps, to hold down to a certain extent some of the new authorities and the new expenditures provided for in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this program to combat job displacement by reason of automation is merely in its infancy. The Committee on Education and Labor should be congratulated for the work it did and the months spent on hearings in presenting this bill. The legislation started in February 1962. In the short time it has been in operation over 100,000 have received educational benefits under this program. Over 80 percent of those today are employed throughout the country where they otherwise would probably be on relief had this program not been in force and effect.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for job retraining is that as time marches on more and more educational advantages will have to be given to hundreds of thousands of unemployed throughout this Nation. We all realize what automation has done.

Automation in my district, which is an industrial area, has thrown thousands out of work or reduced them to part-time jobs. A great number of people who have been thrown out of work are between the ages of 25 and 45. They are heads of families. They are not equipped to go into any other line of endeavor whatsoever. If a program of this type is not extended, as this legislation calls for, possibly hundreds of thousands will be on the relief rolls for years and years to come.

It is estimated that every person who is unemployed costs the taxpayers of this country, if they are on relief, about $1,000 a year. So this is one of the most economical programs that the Congress and our Government can enact.

The various States after 1965 will pay 50 percent of this load. The Government will pay the remaining 50 percent. But considering the people who are taken off the relief rolls and in relieving the taxpayers of this country of the expense of taking care of them, the program is economical, and it should be expanded.

This is nothing more than a project to help the unemployed take care of themselves.

You have read what has happened to Studebaker in the last week, where there will probably be 6,000 to 8,000 men thrown out of work in South Bend alone. The editor of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune said in his testimony before the committee that large numbers of mechanics, craftworkers, service station attendants and so forth, who have taken this course are working today. Most chambers of commerce and the labor unions in Indiana, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and elsewhere endorse this program. As a matter of fact, I do not know of anybody who is opposed to it if they have made a study of the repercussions of millions of unemployed.

Secretary Wirtz testified before the committee that there are 300,000 unemployed people today who have had only 5 years of education.

He also testified that in this decade, from 1960 to 1970, there will be 26 million young people looking for work in this country. Five and a half million youths just out of college are looking for work, and 2 million of the 5.5 million young people are dropouts from the schools. They are going to be on the relief rolls unless the Government and the States expand and increase this great program to give these young people an opportunity to get jobs. They are married, a lot of them, and have to support their families.

The public school corporations in Indiana are gladly working along with the State employment service to make this retraining of the jobless a success.

These amendments set out in the pending bill provide for training in the fundamentals—reading, writing, and arithmetic—as these are necessary in order to qualify for the most moderate skills.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified before the committee that over 3 million jobless today have less than 5 years of education. Unless this program is expanded they will be on relief or in the human scrapheap.

It is estimated that for each unemployed person on relief it costs the taxpayers $1,000 per year. If many of these folks can be returned to work they will be paying taxes to the Treasury instead of creating a financial burden. This legislation will prove to be, over the years, an economy measure.

Edgar Hoover says that juvenile delinquency costs the taxpayers of this country about $3½ billion a year. A program of this kind will be a help in eliminating a great deal of juvenile delinquency because it will place a great number of these young people in school and give them an opportunity to go to work.

In regard to the dropouts, I think that it will have a moral effect on a great number of these young chaps that drop out of high school. Finally they have passed the age of high school and do not want to go back to school. Then if they have the opportunity to take advantage of a program like this it will give them employment and take them off the relief rolls.

We had an experience in my district back when great unemployment existed 30 years ago during the depression. At that time the Communist agitators had fertile fields to work on, the unemployed and discontented.

So I think this program is one of the best steps we can take, not only to combat communism but to give jobs to our young people who are thrown out of work. It will contribute to the morale and happiness of hundreds of thousands who are rendered idle by automation and other causes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say here this morning and what little I do say will be of no avail. Any effort to stop the expenditure of money in the Congress seems to be an exercise in futility.

I just want to say a few words about this bill as it exemplifies the pattern that goes on about all of these welfare programs. This program was enacted 2 years ago and went into effect last year. I am told that it has done fairly good work, that it has been successful, and I am glad that it has. This is an educational program, to educate people to do other jobs. Of course, we have just in the past few weeks passed another bill, which I supported, for vocational education, to do the same thing to the younger generation that this bill is doing for the older generation.

It is the pattern here that as soon as you get your nose under the tent with a new program you go on from there and the lid is off and the costs go up and up year after year.

It does seem to me that the House ought to have an awareness of where you are heading with our fiscal affairs.

Remember that three times this year we have had to deal with the ceiling on our national debt. Of course, if this tax bill passes, you are going to have to deal with it another time. You are already faced with a deficit for this year of something like $9 billion. Yet, we keep on putting new programs—programs that call for the authorization and expenditures of money. Then you say the Committee on Appropriations ought to stop it. It is not up to the Committee on Appropriations. It is up to you men and women sitting in this room to stop it—to stop the authorization because the authorization is the thing that does it initially.

My chief purpose in wanting to make these remarks to you is just to bring to your attention what the present situation is in regard to new and additional expenditures in this fiscal year—provisions for new expenditures that have already been adopted or that are now pending such as this measure that is now before you.

Now as to the subject matter of this particular bill, it is working fine, but you cannot educate everybody in the United States to do a different job. In the first place, it is not the business of the Federal Government. I do not know of any authorization for it under the Constitution. But if you carry this on out to its extreme limit, you do not know what it is going to cost you.

Do you know what this bill authorizes? It authorizes the expenditure of $783,333,000 in new and increased appropriations. But what is the whole picture on new expenditures either passed in this fiscal year or now pending and being urged upon you people to pass? We hear a lot of talk about economy. It looks mighty good in print and it looks and sounds mighty nice on the radio and television. We rant and rave, some of us, about, "Let's have economy." But you know words do not make economy. The thing that is going to reduce expenditures is going to be the action of the Members of this House of Representatives on the floor of Congress. We have to do the appropriating and we have to do the authorizing. The question is—What are you going to do about it? Are you going to keep on? I think you are, but nevertheless I am going to tell you what you have facing you.

I have prepared a list of either new programs or increasing programs previously authorized. I will not take the time to read them. But I have a tabulation of the bills and what they are and what the total amounts to. Remember you have a projected deficit in the budget this year of $9 billion, I believe, and if you have a tax reduction you are going to reduce your receipts of Government by $9 billion more; and if you pass this bill as you did the rest of them, you are going to have to increase your authorizations for new or increased projects, largely of a welfare nature, by the small sum of $11,191,934,333.

Now you are going to have a test today on this bill. I think we ought to have a rule on it. I think the rule ought to be adopted and I think the House ought to be put on a rollcall vote on it.

But let us see. Here is a program that is working all right but they want to double it or triple it. What I am trying to emphasize is that that is the pattern of every one of these new programs: "Let's get our nose under the tent. Let us get just a little authorization that nobody is going to quarrel about very much."

Get that first step and the next step and then we will go to town on this stuff. That is what you are doing, and everybody here knows it. Everybody here knows it. Now, here is a good opportunity. Do not be overcome by the Christmas spirit. I know it is nice to make Christmas presents of the taxpayers' money. It is awfully easy for us to do that here.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman mentioned a figure a few moments ago of $700-odd million. If my figures are correct, it seems this authorization is for 4 years in title II and it makes authorization for $1,125,335,337. Are you just referring to the increased amount?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am referring to this figure that is gotten up for me, I might say, by my staff in the Committee on Rules. They have all of these figures before them. The new authorization on the manpower bill, which is what I am talking about, this new Christmas gift, is $783,333,000.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But the total authorization for title II for the 4 years would be $1,125 million?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It would. You already have some authorization.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am very happy that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia, has given us this counsel this afternoon. I voted for this measure when it passed the House. I believe it has a good record. However, I do not believe everyone in this House knows what we are spending as a Nation, in total, for various vocational education and manpower retraining and educational efforts. In September, I will say to the gentleman in the well, I had the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations compile a list of those figures, and if the gentleman will permit, I would like to insert in the RECORD, following your remarks, that compilation. It is not large and does not go into details, but it is a compilation of these figures and it amounts to $1.25 billion of the taxpayers' funds every year for existing programs, and to those we are adding more funds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Well, that is the story. In a very fine message delivered in this Chamber in the last 2 weeks by the President we were urged to observe economy and we were promised that he was going to see to it that we did observe economy. I know everybody wants to cooperate as far as their conscience will permit with the wishes of the President. We all want to help him to be successful. Now, here is your first opportunity to do something to carry out his call for economy in Government.

The matter referred to by Mr. HORAN follows:

*Vocational education and training financed by the Federal Government (compiled Sept. 23, 1963)*

[Not intended to be 100 percent complete]

| | Obligations, 1963 (partially estimated) | Estimated obligations, 1964 |
|---|---|---|
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE | | |
| Office of Education: | | |
| Grants for vocational education under the George-Barden Act | $34,571,000 | $34,571,000 |
| Grants for vocational education under the National Defense Education Act | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Grants for vocational education under other acts | 7,306,000 | 7,346,000 |
| Fellowships (National Defense Education Act) | 24,218,000 | 24,320,000 |
| Fellowships (expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded) | 996,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Grants for training teachers of the deaf | 1,490,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Teacher institutes (National Defense Education Act) | 14,500,000 | 14,500,000 |
| Vocational Rehabilitation Administration: | | |
| Fellowships | $154,000 | $158,000 |
| Traineeships | 5,583,000 | 9,135,000 |
| Teaching grants | 5,772,000 | 6,569,000 |
| Inservice training | 1,700,000 | 1,668,000 |
| Public Health Service: | | |
| Fellowships: | | |
| Nursing services and resources | | 316,000 |
| Water supply and water pollution control | 282,000 | 450,000 |
| General research and services | 13,601,000 | 15,277,000 |
| National Cancer Institute | 2,276,000 | 5,188,000 |
| Mental health activities | 5,940,000 | 8,534,000 |
| National Heart Institute | 4,747,000 | 6,399,000 |
| National Institute of Dental Research | 1,202,000 | 1,257,000 |

*Vocational education and training financed by the Federal Government (compiled Sept. 23, 1963)*—Continued

[Not intended to be 100 percent complete]

| | Obligations, 1963 (partially estimated) | Estimated obligations, 1964 |
|---|---|---|
| Public Health Service—Continued | | |
| Fellowships—Continued | | |
| Arthritis and metabolic disease activities | $3,924,000 | $4,019,000 |
| Allergy and infectious disease activities | 2,487,000 | 3,058,000 |
| Neurology and blindness activities | 1,657,000 | 2,054,000 |
| Traineeships: | | |
| Community health practice and research | 6,788,000 | 8,095,000 |
| Dental services and resources | ------ | 2,161,000 |
| Nursing services and resources | 7,276,000 | 7,612,000 |
| Environmental health sciences | ------ | 1,519,000 |
| Air pollution | 453,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Radiological health | 1,007,000 | 2,500,000 |
| Water supply and water pollution control | 1,100,000 | 2,000,000 |
| General research and services | 34,909,000 | 37,256,000 |
| National Cancer Institute | 7,418,000 | 12,520,000 |
| Mental health activities | 49,117,000 | 66,048,000 |
| National Heart Institute | 12,334,000 | 15,179,000 |
| National Institute of Dental Research | 5,859,000 | 4,805,000 |
| Arthritis and metabolic disease activities | 11,966,000 | 14,420,000 |
| Allergy and infectious disease activities | 6,228,000 | 7,992,000 |
| Neurology and bindness activities | 11,351,000 | 14,382,000 |
| Other Health, Education, and Welfare: | | |
| Fellowships | ------ | 23,000 |
| Traineeships | 1,554,000 | 2,774,000 |
| Training Health, Education, and Welfare employees | 3,656,000 | 4,325,000 |
| All other | 3,686,000 | 5,430,000 |
| Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare | 312,168,000 | 372,360,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | |
| Army: | | |
| Training programs for military personnel | 118,300,000 | 133,600,000 |
| Training programs for civilian personnel | 5,800,000 | 5,500,000 |
| Navy (including Marine Corps): | | |
| Training programs for military personnel | 40,300,000 | 39,000,000 |
| Training programs for civilian personnel | 4,500,000 | 5,400,000 |
| Air Force: Training programs for military personnel | 68,400,000 | 82,200,000 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 237,300,000 | 265,700,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | |
| Manpower development and training activities | 64,000,000 | 154,500,000 |
| Area redevelopment training activities | 7,741,000 | 10,541,000 |
| Safety training courses | 219,000 | 228,000 |
| Training Department of Labor employees | 120,000 | 140,000 |
| Total, Department of Labor | 72,080,000 | 165,409,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | |
| Vocational and adult education of Indians | 6,660,000 | 8,073,000 |
| Training in fishery research | 470,000 | 724,000 |
| Training Department of Interior employees | 555,000 | 653,000 |
| Total, Department of the Interior | 7,685,000 | 9,450,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | |
| Federal prisoner training | 1,156,000 | 1,450,000 |
| Training Department of Justice employees | 1,317,000 | 1,439,000 |
| Total, Department of Justice | 2,473,000 | 2,889,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | |
| Training Department of State employees | 4,898,000 | 5,459,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | |
| Training Department of Commerce employees | 7,684,000 | 8,812,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY | | |
| Training Department of the Treasury employees | 3,768,000 | 4,364,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | |
| Training Department of Agriculture employees [1] | 512,000 | 512,000 |
| POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT | | |
| Training Post Office Department employees | $201,000 | $201,000 |
| AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT | | |
| U.S. employees (under economic aid program) | 1,550,000 | 1,900,000 |
| U.S. employees (under military aid program) | 6,891,000 | 6,489,000 |
| Foreign nationals (under economic aid program) | 34,152,000 | 36,595,000 |
| Foreign nationals (under military aid program) | 109,390,000 | 112,266,000 |
| Total, Agency for International Development | 151,983,000 | 157,250,000 |
| NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION | | |
| Fellowships | 21,500,000 | 36,000,000 |
| Institutes for teachers of science and mathematics | 41,500,000 | 50,000,000 |
| Research participation and scientific activities for teachers | 2,865,000 | 4,140,000 |
| Science education for undergraduate students | 4,625,000 | 6,020,000 |
| Science education for secondary school students | 3,460,000 | 4,340,000 |
| Advanced science seminars | 1,500,000 | 1,650,000 |
| Traineeships for graduate education | ------ | 25,000,000 |
| Advanced training institutes for foreign students | 100,000 | 200,000 |
| Participation of foreign scientists in U.S. programs | 200,000 | 300,000 |
| Total, National Science Foundation | 75,750,000 | 127,650,000 |
| FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY | | |
| Training Federal Aviation Agency personnel: | | |
| Operations | 27,891,000 | 28,738,000 |
| Procurement of aircraft for training | 1,602,000 | 5,841,000 |
| Total, Federal Aviation Agency | 29,493,000 | 34,579,000 |
| VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Readjustment training | 62,704,000 | 28,875,000 |
| Training Veterans' Administration employees | 1,340,000 | 1,556,000 |
| Total, Veterans' Administration | 64,044,000 | 30,431,000 |
| ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION | | |
| Courses primarily for foreign nationals | 2,165,000 | 2,350,000 |
| Fellowships | 1,530,000 | 2,318,000 |
| Assistance to schools (faculty training, institutes, etc.) | 1,538,000 | 2,418,000 |
| Contractors' training activities | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 |
| Other training activities | 771,000 | 1,002,000 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Commission | 7,804,000 | 9,888,000 |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Predoctoral training grant program | 14,072,000 | 22,000,000 |
| Training National Aeronautics and Space Administration employees | 1,078,000 | 1,292,000 |
| Total, National Aeronauticcs and Space Administration | 15,150,000 | 23,292,000 |
| TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY | | |
| Training Tennessee Valley Authority employees | 518,000 | 518,000 |
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | |
| Training U.S. Government employees | 323,000 | 425,000 |
| U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | | |
| Interagency training courses | 128,000 | 151,000 |
| Promotion and coordination of training under Public Law 85-507 | 108,000 | 112,000 |
| Training Civil Service Commission employees | 15,000 | 18,000 |
| Total, Civil Service Commission | 251,000 | 281,000 |
| Grand total | 994,085,000 | 1,219,470,000 |

[1] For instance this compilation does not include the Extension Service (over $66,000,000) although the Extension Service is highly educational in the vocational field. Undoubtedly there are other governmental areas where a closer look and a more discerning analysis will turn up similar examples.

---

**Mr. DELANEY.** Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8720, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us, as has been indicated, has been tested and found extremely worth while. It was the first answer of this Congress to the challenge of automation. It was the brainchild of the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], the chairman of the subcommittee and the author of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and I began working on this legislation the day after the elections 3 years ago. We worked here in Washington during November and December, even prior to the committee being organized. I cannot pay too much tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and to his work in this field.

Also I would like to say that this comes from the Committee on Education and Labor with almost complete bipartisan support. I should like to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who served with me on this committee for the way in which they have cooperated.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing today with social dynamite. Five hundred thousand more have been added to the unemployment list during the past 30 days. This legislation did not come to us from the administration, but it is legislation initiated here by the legislative branch. The brief time it has been in operation indicates there were certain errors and the amendments which you have today are the basis for the effort to correct errors in the experimental year which were detected.

The question of cost has been brought up. According to the figures of our Government in 1962 the unemployed of this Nation cost us $4.7 billion. That is in 1 year. This program in 4 years will cost $780 million. It will affect 750,000 adults and 250,000 youths. It will remove some of the potential social dynamite we are faced with. It will save the Federal Government money by reducing the cost of the unemployed. It will save the States money. We do not have an estimate of how much money our States expend on relief payments when unemployment compensation has expired, but we know that it is considerable.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we move as expeditiously as possible to answer this challenge of what I call the permanently unemployed, unless this act is amended to include 1 million more.

There was a remarkable consensus on the part of this group of diverse witnesses regarding two things. First, they were agreed that the program has been a success and will achieve the original objectives Congress had in mind when the act was passed. This means that about 400,000 unemployed workers will be trained and placed in productive employment during the 3 years provided by the program. Second, these witnesses agreed on a number of improvements which they considered desirable and possible in the light of the experience thus far.

The committee's bill was responsive to the proposals advanced by these witnesses. In particular, efforts were made to provide for those changes most strongly urged by State and local representatives. These are the people who bear the responsibility for making the program work and the members of the committee believe that every effort to provide them with the necessary tools should be made.

Manpower is America's basic resource. It is the indispensable means of converting other resources to mankind's use and benefit. How well we develop and employ humane skills is fundamental in deciding how much we will accomplish as a nation.

We in America have come far toward the achievement of a free economy that realizes the full potential of each individual member of its work force. However, as attested by the statistics from our Labor Department and the testimony given at the hearing of our committee, unemployment is our number one economic problem. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some $30 to $40 billions of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. It means further that many of our citizens are not being challenged to their highest level of accomplishment.

There is substantial agreement among all who have studied the problem that a major portion of our unemployment exists because most of our idle workers do not possess the skills necessary to equip them for jobs that are available in our highly industrialized economy. The more rapidly our economy advances, the more rapidly do skills become obsolete—and the need for training and retraining and for a continuing appraisal of skill needs and resources become more pressing.

The record of the first 12 months of operation of the Manpower Development and Training Act certainly justifies the law, and encourages support of the modifications now before us which will give it even sharper teeth to bite into the Nation's most pressing domestic problem of proper utilization of our manpower resources and alleviation of persistently high levels of unemployment.

The figures alone do not tell the entire story. For this we must go to the people and the projects behind the figures. These lend even more support to the serious endeavor and commitment which was made in this legislation.

Let us look first at the scope of the training program already undertaken. Almost 2,400 individual training projects had been approved by the end of October. These covered a broad spectrum of over 400 job fields throughout the United States—in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Let us reflect on this for a moment. Unfilled and hard-to-fill job needs were searched out and a reasonable expectation of employment was found to exist for over 400 different occupations of all types: Technical, skilled and semiskilled industrial crafts, clerical and white collar, and the newly emerging service occupations—maintenance and repairmen, automobile mechanics, and a battery of health occupations, among others. Training programs were developed, many of which have already been completed, and our unemployed and underemployed citizens selected, to fill these needs. This represents the most intensive and concerted effort thus far experienced in balancing labor market factors.

Even more heartwarming is the story of the people behind this training program. The central fact of the experience gained thus far under the Manpower Development and Training Act is that it is successful in reaching the long-term unemployed—those with 15 or more weeks of unemployment. About half of the enrollees in training projects come from this category of jobless workers. Nearly one out of five of all enrollees, moreover, had been looking for a job for over a year. Many of these represent our hard-core unemployed who had become obsolete in the labor market. No emphasis is needed to underscore the value of salvaging these people by restoring them to productive work and human dignity.

To an even greater extent, training programs are reaching adult workers of prime working age—22 to 44 years—with strong attachment to the labor force. About two-thirds of all trainees are in this category, which includes to a very great extent the heads of families of our unemployed population. Directing these people into occupations affording opportunities for employment is not only a labor market need but a vital necessity for our national health and stability.

In addition to the prime thrust of dealing with the rehabilitation of the unemployed, this act has also had some salutary effects for other disadvantaged groups in our society. A beginning has been made—which must be expanded through provision of broader measures which we are now considering here—in coping with the ever-deepening social dynamite of our youth unemployment problems. Older workers, the "forgotten men" of our economy, have profited from this program, comprising about 10 percent of the trainees. Women are being trained in substantial numbers to prepare them for their increasing responsibilities and participation in the working world in this modern age. And our nonwhite citizens—probably the most disadvantaged group in our labor force—have been given the opportunity long awaited to acquire better skills and employment opportunities. These workers make up 23 percent of all enrollees, about the same proportion as they comprise of the total unemployed. An even greater proportion of these trainees are drawn from the long-term unemployed.

These early operating results leave no doubt that this act is reaching out in all directions of need and opportunity envisaged at the time of its passage. It has more than paid for itself in terms of unemployment insurance, public welfare, and other dependency costs which are the alternatives. More than this are the human values and costs served. These cannot be expressed in cold figures and facts. We need only search our memories and hearts for this unestimable estimate.

Let me refer to just one example—one of many—of what has been and can be accomplished under this act. At the Virginia State College in Norfolk, a pilot project was developed to retrain hard-core unemployed, unskilled workers to qualify for employment in skilled and semiskilled occupations in which employment opportunities exist. One hundred men past the age of 25, half of them unemployed so long as to no longer be receiving unemployment compensation, were approved for a 1-year training course which coordinated vocational education, general basic education, counseling, and occupational training. Their inability to find work was not the result of their not wanting to work or not having the capacity for learning skills. It was caused by their not having the skills or sufficient education to qualify for available jobs. The training program developed enabled them to advance their literacy level considerably, and at the same time to receive occupational training. Ninety of these men graduated from the course and emerged with skill qualifications in a number of occupations—electronics technicians, brick masons, sheet metal workers, automobile mechanics, and building maintenance workers. For these men there is a new fulfillment and realization of their occupational potential. For them and their families they have been salvaged for a life of productive work and economic stability.

This is only one example of what is and can be accomplished under this act. Similar opportunities have been provided and have borne results under hundreds of other training projects already completed—and more to come. It surely needs no repeating that we here are both committed and dedicated to continuing this program and to strengthening it wherever we find a loose stone.

Thus in spite of the fact that the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 has been a real success, the late President Kennedy, in his message to the Congress on June 19, 1963, recommended that the Manpower Development and Training Act be amended to "increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements; to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youth, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

H.R. 8720 incorporates each of these proposals in modified form:

First. The State matching requirements for fiscal 1965 is waived and the act is extended for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967;

Second. It authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake such training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized;

Third. It provides for the expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects; and

Fourth. For these changes one-half of the President's request for new funds, $50 million, is authorized for fiscal 1964 and the full request, $100 million, is authorized for fiscal 1965.

H.R. 8720 also provides for:

First. A widening of the eligibility requirements for those who can receive training allowances;

Second. A shift from the National Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Labor the authority to require, where appropriate, the establishment of local and State advisory committees;

Third. A training incentive of up to $10 a week; and

Fourth. A pilot program for labor mobility demonstration projects.

Because of these reasons, I urge favorable action on H.R. 8720.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished author of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, again I come before the House asking for the passage of this legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding as he begins. I take this time to compliment the gentleman for the tireless effort he has put into this measure. He has been trying to get this bill to the floor for weeks. He has been devoted to the objectives of this legislation. I want to commend him and the distinguished gentleman from New York, as well as the Committee on Education and Labor, for the effort that they have made.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is timely. We have arrived at that place in the history of our country when the problem of the unemployed is the problem of everyone. I do not think any of us want to go back to the time when the Government does not concern itself with the problems of the unemployed, the farmers, the working man, or any other group in our country.

I do not think we want the kind of laws we had in the 1920's, back to the dust bowl and the soup lines. I do not think we want to go back to the day when we had no minimum wage laws or unemployment compensation benefits, or old age security. The people of this country want to move forward, not backward.

Mr. Chairman, this is forward-looking, progressive legislation. I commend it to the Members of the House and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] for the initiative which he has given to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, again I come before the House asking for the passage of legislation which will contribute to the solution of our unemployment problem.

Today we have H.R. 8720—amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act—for discussion and passage.

This program has been in effect since July 1962, but in operation only since September 1962. Although there was an unavoidable delay, in initiating this program the year has seen the development of programs for approximately 100,000 unemployed workers.

Some have already completed their training, and 80 percent of those are now working. The remainder are still—or will be—attending classes.

There are, now, many more applications for training courses awaiting final approval by the Department of Labor. These will help thousands of other unemployed, but approval cannot be granted until we here in Congress pass these amendments.

This problem exists because of the delayed start of the program.

Our States were unable to estimate the amount of money they should appropriate to cover their share of the cost of future programs. Hence, partial action was taken by only four States.

This means that in 46 States any program which extends beyond next June cannot be approved by the Department of Labor.

We must remember that the procedures and methods for operating the Manpower Development and Training Act program had to be established. This was an entirely new approach to our nagging unemployment problem.

This was the first time that Congress had required two separate departments of the National Government to cooperate in the administration of a Federal program. We also required the cooperation of two departments in State government—and we carried this requirement to local government level also.

These organization problems have been solved and all the various levels of government are now in accord and operating with apparent efficiency.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program has gotten off the ground and the preliminary results are most encouraging.

Forty-nine of our States now want the Federal Government to underwrite the cost of this program for 1 more year. The Governors of those States made this request. This will give them time to prepare necessary legislation upon which their legislatures can act.

Because of this request, we are recommending the extension of Federal coverage for fiscal year 1965, the lowering of State's responsibility for fiscal year 1966 to one-third the cost, but reestablishing for fiscal 1967 the original State share of one-half the cost.

In H.R. 8720 we also recommend the training of more of our unemployed youth, the teaching of basic education for those who, without it, cannot qualify for occupational training you have provided, permitting trainees to work part time to augment their subsistence allowances, the granting of incentive payments, permitting additional use of private technical schools under certain conditions, the formation of advisory committees at State and local levels, the creation of a pilot program for the mobility of workers, and some minor word changes. Other Members will discuss these more fully.

Last year in this House I stated this program would not be the final solution to the unemployment problem. Rather, it would be the first of many steps we must take.

During 1963 we have seen an increase in the gross national product, an increase in sales and profits, an increase in productivity and output, but unemployment has not decreased. In fact, it is almost 6 percent today. Testimony has been given that we can expect thousands of jobs to evaporate.

In the past 10 days we heard that Studebaker auto division is closing. Five thousand jobs are eliminated. The Defense Department is cutting 25,000 jobs. Steel is laying off additional workers. Office jobs are being eliminated by the closing of district offices of United States Steel. Railroad workers write me that maintenance shops are being closed. In fact, official reports show that unemployment increased by 500,000 in November. What will December's figures show?

The New York Times said the first week of December should be known as computer week, for IBM, Minneapolis-Honeywell, General Telephone & Electronics, and General Electric all announced "newer, faster, smaller, and more versatile data systems are going on the market."

We can guess the results.

This is not the time to let the manpower training slow down—let alone stop.

We know we cannot help everyone who is unemployed, but we must help those we can.

We expect that from 1962 to 1967 over a million unemployed can be helped through the Manpower Development and Training Act. However, that leaves quite a few more million for local, State, and private groups to assist.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program will act as an example for these groups to supplement. The magnitude of this problem requires the cooperation of all America, for no one separate group can do this alone.

Do you realize that for 1962 over $4 billion was spent by public and private funds just to pay the direct costs of unemployment? We have no record of the indirect costs. Nor do we have a record of the public assistance money used for those unemployed, whose benefits expired and they were forced on relief. The States handle this with no report to the Federal Government.

Briefly, here are the known costs: Unemployment compensation, $3 billion; aid to dependent children whose parents are unemployed, $100 million; extension of surplus food program, $140 million; State employment offices, in handling claims, over $400 million; railroad insurance for unemployment, $100 million; State unemployment benefit payments in certain industries, over $100 million; social security pensions for those 62 who cannot secure work, $880 million.

Shall we continue to waste money—both public and private—just to feed, house, and clothe our people? Or are you willing to invest less than 10 percent of that $4.7 billion and educate and train our unemployed workers?

Do we want to see our relief rolls increase or do we want our people to become self-sustaining?

I feel—and I am sure you agree—that the future of this Nation depends upon the intelligence and capability of its citizens. Our manpower is our most precious natural resource.

Therefore I ask you to help our people, our economy, and our Nation by supporting this bill.

The majority of the Members—on both sides of this House—supported this program last year.

This was a bipartisan effort to solve a bipartisan problem.

Machines and computers are not interested in whether the worker is Democrat or Republican. Our unemployed want us—who represent them now—to help them help themselves now.

Machines move in, the workers move out.

Let us think of the Nation today, not party politics.

Let us conquer unemployment together.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee, I wish to make clear at the outset my general approval of, and support for, the pending bill.

When the original proposals authorizing a manpower training program were submitted to the previous Congress, the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee worked diligently to bring to fruition a sound and workable program. Actually Republicans advocated the principle and importance of retraining before President Kennedy did. The bill as finally approved had strong bipartisan support.

Experience has demonstrated the basic soundness of this approach in identifying and coping with a number of the more difficult facets of our continuing unemployment problem. Notwithstanding the basic soundness and effectiveness of the original act, experience has brought to light a number of areas in which that act left something to be desired. We recognize now a number of areas in which minor adjustments can bring about improved results.

The bill before the House is, of course, fully explained in the report which has been submitted by our committee. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to those areas of the bill which I deem to be the most significant and the most necessary.

### BASIC EDUCATION TRAINING

Very early in the retraining program, it became apparent that great numbers of our chronically unemployed citizens did not possess even that modicum of literacy necessary to permit them to acquire and hold a routine job in our modern economy. Due to the changing times and the upgrading of the economy generally, almost all gainful employment today requires at least some mastery of the common skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The old-type jobs that require only physical endurance are fast fading from the scene. As the machine continues to move to a position of greater and greater prominence in almost every area of endeavor, it goes without saying that those who undertake to work in this new environment must be equipped to function effectively within it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, whether we like to admit it or not, hundreds of thousands of our people, young and old, do not possess the basic learning necessary to permit them to survive and go forward in this new and ever-changing economy. If they are ever to be retrained, if they are ever to be returned to the productive work force, they must be given supporting or concomitant training in basic literacy—in the three R's, if you will.

This bill seeks to meet that problem to the extent it can be met in this type of program. It authorizes basic education training when it is needed, and extends the period during which training allowances may be paid to trainees in order to encourage and facilitate such training. In my opinion this provision of the bill is absolutely essential if we are effectively to meet and overcome persistent hardcore unemployment.

### EXPANDED YOUTH TRAINING

Another important and worthwhile feature of this bill is that which provides for a substantially increased training program for the youth of our Nation. One of the most tenacious, and at the same time appalling, aspects of the American unemployment problem is that it engulfs and stifles such great numbers of our young people. Above all else, we as a nation must find an effective method to deal with this problem at this level. We simply cannot let it be said that we are unable to create an opportunity for this generation of youth to move forward and play a full, effective, and self-sustaining role in our society. Yet the facts are alarming: While youth between the ages of 16 and 21—out of school—comprise only 7 percent of the available labor force, this same group accounts for upward of 20 percent of the unemployed. And the projected trend for future years serves only to indicate that the employment outlook for this age group will become even less inviting in the years immediately ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that we in this Chamber feel, and feel strongly, that every boy and girl in America should complete at least a high school education. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that, notwithstanding the best efforts of all concerned, millions of our young people have abandoned formal educational pursuits without completing high school, and that millions more are destined to do so.

Those who drop out of school are for the most part the least employable, and the most in need of training. This legislation faces up to this problem. While making every reasonable provision to see to it that these young people do not needlessly drop out of school, this legislation nevertheless undertakes to provide training for these young people, in order to equip them for employment and for a productive economic life. This effort simply must be made, if the Nation is to be spared a veritable generation born in poverty, reared on charity, and sustained on welfare. We have no choice but to make this investment in the future of America.

### STATE MATCHING

I shall conclude my comments by discussing the principle of the State matching of funds which is carried in this proposal. At the time the original act was adopted, it contained a provision that, beginning with the fiscal year 1965, the funds to sustain this program were to be provided equally by the States and the Federal Government. However, due to the delays in appropriations and the inevitable administrative delays in getting the program underway, most States had little or no opportunity to appraise the program nor could they make the legislative and budgetary preparations necessary to meet the 1965 matching requirements.

In recognition of this fact, the pending bill does not require the States to put forth any funds for fiscal 1965. This fact, however, should not be taken to indicate any abandonment by this committee of the State matching principle. Indeed, the bill specifically requires that the States must provide one-third of the funds for this program in the 1966 fiscal year and one-half the funds in each fiscal year thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I are strongly of the opinion that State matching is a sine qua non of this program. Every State and every community has an undeniable interest in, and an unavoidable responsibility for, meeting and resolving the grave problems at which this legislation is directed. Each and every State must contribute its utmost in these endeavors. The entire responsibility cannot and should not be left to the Federal Government alone. I am confident that the States will respond to this legislation. I know they will meet their responsibilities in full measure, for upon that response the fate of this entire program will undoubtedly depend.

### CONCLUSION

As I have indicated, much worthwhile progress has been realized under this program. I should like to recount only a few of the facts and figures. They indicate not only what this program has done, but the great promise which this program holds for the future.

In the brief 15-month period since this operation began, training programs for more than 100,000 persons have been established, and another 30,000 persons have been approved for training. Training is now being offered in more than 300 different occupations, at least half of which are in white-collar and so-called skilled jobs. More than one-half of those engaged in these training programs have been drawn from the hard-core, long-term unemployed—the area in which continuing and effective work must be done if the problem of unemployment is to be successfully overcome.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. Its purposes are worthwhile; its objectives mandatory. During the course of this discussion, however, a number of amendments will be offered, particularly in the area of the authorization of funds.

I should like to say that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expressed the belief that any effort to stop Federal expenditures is what he describes as an exercise in futility. I agree strongly that we must use restraint. However, in this retraining area I think it essential that we do not stop spending money, because I think it is money well spent. Of course, however, we should be wise in how rapidly we expand. We should hold down these proposed expenditures as much as seems consistent with what we are trying to attain.

Such amendments should be considered on their merits. We should support amendments which will protect the interests of the public while at the same time assuring the proper administration of the essential programs which this legislation embodies.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize my interest in the Manpower Act. The single most significant, concerted, and broad step taken to combat unemployment has been taken under this act. In little more than 1 short year of operation, training projects involving almost 90,000 trainees have been approved. Many thousands have already completed training and have been placed in training-related jobs. They have been able to complete training by having the assurance of a steady but modest income. For thousands of people it has meant renewed hope, renewed opportunity, and renewed dignity; and our Nation is that much richer in its human values.

In my own State of Kentucky this act has been significant. The amendments are essential if we will give to the program the provision necessary for it to reach the "hard core" of our unemployment. We in Kentucky have suffered from economic blight and the suffering brought in its wake. Large areas have been chronically depressed because of the automation and changed economic circumstances in the coal industry. These communities have unemployment rates far in excess of the national average, ranging as high as 20 to 30 and even at times 50 percent. Thousands of these citizens must be given an opportunity to return to productive work, and our youth must be given greater opportunities for training. Many of our people have been set adrift without skills to seek jobs in a labor market which increasingly requires high skill levels and technical know-how.

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, by the end of November 1,204 people in my State had already been enrolled—with several more hundreds already approved for training programs yet to commence—for training in 76 occupational training projects. Federal assistance in the amount of $3,574,154 had been committed for this training. About half of this effort is devoted to the areas of eastern Kentucky. The projects provide training in a broad array of occupations where jobs are available—a variety of skilled and semiskilled crafts, such as welding, draftsmen, machine operators, auto repairmen, mine mechanics, appliance repairmen—in office and clerical occupations—and in health occupations such as nursing, so needed in our communities. Extension and improvement of this law will enable our vocational schools to do a more effective job in furnishing the broadest type of program so necessary to meet all training needs. We are also optimistic that additional new economic opportunities will develop, bringing with them new training needs. For example, the wood-use industries are now beginning to gain a foothold in the mountains and will need hundreds of trained industrial workers. Automated coal mining machinery requires significant numbers of highly trained workers. Recreational and related commercial enterprises can be developed and require special training needs. Expanded health facilities are needed which require trained workers. If this bill is enacted it will result in providing over $6 million available for Kentucky programs each year.

The bridge of opportunity lies in fulfilling this national commitment to see that our labor force is equipped to fill our labor market needs. It is evident that the Manpower Development and Training Act has provided the foundation for meeting our difficult unemployment problem and it is our duty to strengthen it.

With respect to immediate plans for eastern Kentucky under the Manpower Development and Training Act, I can report the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare have made joint plans with the Kentucky State and local officials to increase training opportunities for unemployed persons. The Department of Commerce also is supporting the program. Several projects have been written, and others are being planned, for training in auto mechanics, welding, carpentry and other construction skills, cooking and baking, and many other occupations. Trainees will receive allowances while they are enrolled in the courses.

A team of Federal and State personnel will meet in Kentucky on December 19 to review and approve 13 or more specific training projects. These projects have been developed with advice and assistance from directors of five area vocational schools in eastern Kentucky. These are the area vocational-technical schools in Ashland, Harlan, Hazard, Somerset, and Paintsville.

The first meetings with instructors will be held during the first week of January 1964. Classes will begin about the middle of January.

About 1,000 students will be enrolled during the first few weeks. Fall enrollment will be approximately 3,000 trainees.

The estimated cost of the proposed 30 to 40 training programs is $3 million. As of November 30, $109,000 in ARA and manpower development and training funds had been allocated for 265 trainees.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

**Mr. TAFT.** Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 8720, the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. May I say at the outset I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for the careful study and attention to, and the very thorough hearings that were held upon, this bill. It is designed to deal with what is certainly one of the most important single problems upon the domestic scene in the United States today. Its importance, I am sure, from the point of view of economic problems, is exceeded, if by any other problem, only by the problem of restoring fiscal responsibility, about which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia talked to the House some little time ago. Yet I feel that while I am certainly concerned with the area of fiscal responsibility and our spending and deficit levels and the amount of our national debt, I feel that this measure certainly does not run in any way in conflict with those feelings if we can keep the authorizations down to realistic figures and continue to make the very solid progress that has been made in the program in the past without a waste of Federal funds in any way. I feel it is a problem of Federal concern as well as of State concern, because unemployment is certainly a nationwide problem to a very considerable extent.

While the cost is high, running somewhere, on the basis of present experience, between $1,200 and $1,400 per trainee, although it is aimed ultimately at getting down to somewhere around $800 and $1,000 per trainee, I think all of us should realize that the cost we have here may well be recouped, and fairly quickly be recouped, if the program is successful, not only in the reduction in unemployment compensation payments, not only in the reduction in welfare payments and in the elimination of welfare payments by making those on the welfare rolls in some instances at least gainful producers again, but also in the increased taxes that will be brought in, particularly the social security taxes, and in the general additional production that would be created by rehabilitating and putting more men to work who cannot otherwise find jobs and will not be able to find jobs.

I think we should recognize that this is a serious problem. It is a problem which is not getting any better daily. From May 1962 to May 1963 the total number of persons coming into our labor force was 1.2 million. The total number of jobs increase in that period was only 900,000, leaving a red deficit figure of 300,000 jobs. We hear varying figures on account of automation and other causes, as to the large number of jobs that we are continually losing, which is a matter that I think should be of great concern to all of us. Yet at the same time that we have over 4 million unemployed in this country today it is not certain—there are no reliable figures on which we can draw for the specific proof, but it is pretty conclusive today just from looking at the want ads around the country—that there exist somewhere between 1.5 million and 2 million job possibilities, in this country, for which there are no persons trained to fill the bill.

I think that this measure takes the right approach toward this problem. It takes the approach of pinpointing a rightful attack on the problem of the unemployed. It is not a welfare program. It was never designed to be a welfare program. Its limitation in general is to heads of families. There are other limitations on availability of the program that indicate this.

As to the specific amendments let me comment briefly upon some of them. You have heard some comments already upon them, but I think perhaps something a little more can be said with regard to them. As to the matching principle which is continued by this bill, I might say that it is not continued by the Senate bill; and perhaps before we start on these amendments we ought to call the attention of the House to the fact that the two Senate measures, S. 1716 and S. 1831, are far more limited in principle than this one. They do only four things. They extend the program for training for youth down to the age of 16. They increase the amount of the appropriation at a rate of approximately $100 million a year. They provide another year without any matching. Also they provide that the basic education courses which may be had under that authorization and also under the authorization of this bill would be limited to reading, writing, and arithmetic.

**Mr. GOODELL.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. TAFT.** I yield to the gentleman from New York.

**Mr. GOODELL.** On the question of basic education I think it should be emphasized as a matter of legislative history that we discussed the types of basic education that would conform to the standards of this bill. It is our feeling—and I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree—that reading, writing and arithmetic provided the general description. That is, basic education would be limited to the most elementary levels.

There were people who indicated that they might try to define the term basic education in a rather broad way. I think it is the disposition on both sides of the aisle to have that term narrowly confined; would not the gentleman agree?

**Mr. TAFT.** I certainly do agree with the gentleman. That was the understanding in the subcommittee and in the committee discussions. There was no intention that the authority to provide basic education under these circumstances would extend, for instance, into the formal professional life, or enable people to finish the last year of high school so that they might qualify for some professional requirements.

**Mr. GOODELL.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

**Mr. TAFT.** I yield to the gentleman.

**Mr. GOODELL.** The gentleman has referred to the matching principle. I would like for the record, and for the legislative history, to re-emphasize the importance of this matching principle. It is, perhaps, the most important reason why we have to enact this bill. It is because the States cannot be expected to match in the coming year.

I quote from the committee report on page 6:

> However, in the opinion of the committee, Congress should at this time clearly preserve and reinforce the principle of State matching in Manpower Development and Training Act. Therefore, simple waiver of the third year matching by States is not accepted.
>
> Witness after witness when questioned confirmed the necessity for State financial support. Few were prepared to argue for full Federal responsibility. To most, State support seemed essential if the program is to be both effective and efficient. The committee, therefore, reaffirms its continued adherence to the principle of State matching.

I think this sums up very emphatically the feeling of our subcommittee and our committee and the Congress, that matching is a key element in this program.

I, personally, could not support the program if matching, as a principle, were abandoned. I believe this is the feeling of the subcommittee.

**Mr. TAFT.** I think it is certainly the feeling of the subcommittee, and I would go on to say to the gentleman that I think it was also the feeling of the subcommittee that real progress can be made with the provision of additional training of this sort under the State unemployment compensation systems themselves which may, perhaps, expand in future years. Only if we keep the matching provision in the law and incorporate it into the law itself is this feasible. Thereby we will encourage States and encourage unemployment compensation systems to expand into these areas and, perhaps, ultimately take over this program entirely from any Federal program.

**Mr. BELL.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. TAFT.** I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

**Mr. BELL.** I wanted to point out to the gentleman that the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules, mentioned the possible duplication between vocational education and the Manpower Development and Training Act. I wanted to just mention this which is based upon reading from the Manpower Development and Training Act report, the following:

> Historically, vocational education has been available throughout the country for many years but it had little impact on the training of the displaced unemployed, for the simple reason that no adequate means were available to maintain the financial support needed by a breadwinner for his family during the period needed to complete his training. The act passed by the Congress last year was primarily to plug this void. Some 60 percent of its appropriations is spent for training allowances alone. It covers training costs, but normally these are costs of special courses set up for full-time training outside the normal operations of vocational education.

**Mr. TAFT.** The gentleman, of course, is correct and it was the intention of the committee and the understanding of the committee, of course, that this program would continue to work in such a way as not to be a duplication of the vocational education program. I think that this indeed was the understanding.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to yield further to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity particularly to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

As the gentleman knows, last year in the last Congress I had the privilege of serving on this Manpower Subcommittee. I have missed it a great deal this year.

The gentleman from Ohio has done an indefatigable job. He has been conscientious and thorough in the consideration of these amendments. I think the gentleman has preserved, with the Democrats on that subcommittee, a completely bipartisan approach to this legislation.

Its conception was bipartisan in the Congress and I am happy to say that that atmosphere has been preserved. A great deal of credit belongs to the gentleman from Ohio for doing that at this session.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to go on in my discussion to talk about one of the other amendments.

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment under which the Secretary of Labor is authorized in his discretion to add to the training allowances, by the amount of $10 per week. The present training allowance paid under the basic program relates to the unemployment compensation levels of the particular States involved. They are at the level of the average unemployment compensation level payments.

Mr. Chairman, we had testimony before our subcommittee as to some of the differences which are presently in existence, which indicated that there were persons who were dropping out, trainees dropping out of these programs, because they found under the level of training allowances they simply could not swing it and were not able to adequately sustain themselves and continue this training.

We felt this was uneconomical, unwise, and that something should be done about it. Therefore, we gave the discretion to the Secretary of Labor in cases where he found that the level was such that this problem existed to add to the basic training allowances by the sum of $10 a week.

Mr. Chairman, now moving to one or two of the other amendments I would like to discuss, I would like to point out that there is a private-school provision in here.

The present practices which have been in existence since the program started in operation back in 1962, have for one reason or another practically eliminated all private schools in providing this training.

It was our feeling—and there has been incorporated into this act a provision to the effect that where there will be a savings, actually, of funds by the use of private facilities already in existence to provide this training, authority is given to provide this training.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move on now to talk for a minute about the record of performance to date under this program.

I would like to point out to the House that the program has started somewhat more slowly than originally planned. I do not think any of us are critical of this fact. We have added the word "urgency," at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], in the preamble of the bill, in an attempt to indicate our concern for immediate action. At the same time, the practicalities of properly setting up these courses and getting them going on the basis they will be productive and do the job have to be started.

For fiscal year 1963 we find that the authorizations were $97 million, the actual appropriations were only $60 million. For the current year 1964 we find that the authorizations were $161 million, the appropriations, to date anyway, are at a level of only $110 million. I thought the House would be interested in learning the most recent figures as to the number of persons in training at the present time. So I made inquiry of the departments involved and came up with some figures I would like to call your attention to.

These are figures as of December 2, 1963. As of that date the number approved, for instructional programs actually approved, was 96,000. The number enrolled was actually 61,000. The number who had completed the courses was 28,500. As of June 30, 1963, the number that had been approved was only 60,000, and the actual number enrolled was 35,000. The number who completed their course was 7,500. There has been some lag here, and I think there is going to continue to be a lag in the original directed plans involved. So I expect to offer in this connection a reduction in the authorization which I do not believe in any way will cut into the program. This reduction in authorization will have the effect of maintaining the present total level of expenditures, the original target amount of expenditures of approximately $322 million per year in the program when it gets going in its full impact. It would continue to provide additional funds necessary to substitute for the State matching that were planned for in the year 1965, which has become impractical. I believe it is impractical. I had the privilege of serving on a finance committee in a State legislature for some 3 years, and I can assure you there has to be considerably more experience than you have had here, and considerably more understanding and ability to provide ahead the matching funds than we had under the practical operation period of this bill. It is impossible to get any legislative body to act favorably on such recommendations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, he does not intend there should be any prohibition against the use of the funds authorized for the basic education provisions.

Mr. TAFT. Quite the contrary. There is no intention to cut back that way. I would intend, and certainly I believe that all the Members who would be voting for the bill on our side would intend, that these differences be made available for the new program as well as for the old program.

Let me say with regard to the basic education section that I do not think that it has been thoroughly understood by the House. The basic education can run concurrently with the vocational or the job-related training. It is hoped it will in most instances. The extension of 20 weeks, putting a total limit of 72 weeks, is intended to cover the period, both for basic education, if necessary, and for the job or vocational training.

These are a few of the points I would like to call the attention of the House to at this time. I urge strongly that you give your support to this measure.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to discuss the same features that the gentleman from Ohio talked about when he touched upon the extension of the right to educators and the commissions of education in the various States to use the existing facilities of private training schools when there are not adequate public facilities available and where the private schools can be used at an equal or lesser cost to the taxpayers. By doing so, we believe we are making it possible to extend the benefits of this legislation to a greater number of students who otherwise would not be able to take the training.

One small, but very important item in the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act would clarify the role of private training institutions in the broad training program. To date, private schools have been little used because of wording in the act which suggests that they are a sort of last resort—to be used only if public institutions are "not adequate for the purpose." The amendment which I urge you to endorse would make it clear that training by private schools—many of which have long and distinguished histories as part of the training capacity of the Nation—should take its rightful place beside the herculean effort already put forth by public educational agencies in bringing about the goals of the manpower training program. The new language would encourage development of Manpower Development and Training Act courses in private institutions when equivalent schooling can be offered at a lesser cost to the taxpayer.

Accomplishments under the act are encouraging. Training opportunities have been approved, now, for over 100,000 unemployed and underemployed Americans, but we need not be satisfied with growth of the program to date when we can encourage expansion of the program into a wide range of training facilities which have been left largely untapped.

Public vocational education is not a new thing in America. Since 1917 the Federal Government has encouraged and assisted development of vocational training programs and facilities through the Smith-Hughes Act and subsequent laws. The existent public vocational facilities have proven their mettle over and over again—and most recently as they have shouldered the additional burden of the training courses which have lifted the manpower retraining program off the ground. Inevitably, though, facilities are crowded, and topflight instructional personnel is more in demand than in supply. Recognized training needs—in some areas—must await availablity of schools, equipment, and instructors before program plans can be brought to completion. In other cases, approved courses have been held in abeyance while instructions were being sought. While time passes, selected trainees lose interest, and potential employers turn elsewhere for trained manpower.

If we are to meet the manpower challenge, we must mobilize all of our educational reserves, and among the readiest reserves are established private vocational and technical schools. These schools—the good ones—have space, equipment and expertise which is sorely needed in our fight against occupational obsolescence. The schools we want to work with are preeminent in their fields. Many have records of excellence which are widely recognized and appreciated by the men and women who hire skilled workers. The schools we want to work with maintain close ties with industry and commerce, and know from day to day the changing requirements of industry—the precise skills which applicants must have to compete for jobs.

Unfortunately, not every private vocational school offers the kind of service we can use. Some do not meet our standards. And I believe the amendment, as reported, assures us that we will work only with the ones that give us what we need. To participate, under the revised wording of the law, a school must offer training which compares favorably in every respect to that offered by public facilities and they must do it cheaper.

Quality of instruction would continue to be the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the State and Federal educational experts will continue to keep an eye on the curriculum and how it is presented. All in all, the standards for participation in the manpower training program will be high, and I have confidence in them.

In summary, I submit that we would be two ways richer if we amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to clearly authorize training in private facilities where quality standards are maintained and when costs are lower. First, we would open wide the door to expanded use of a valuable source of training expertise and second, we would get more training for our program dollar. I urge you to concur.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, as a member of the subcommittee who heard the testimony on this legislation, I rise in opposition to the legislation the Committee is considering today and I would hope that members of the Committee and subsequently Members of the House will take the time to read the minority views that appear in the committee report. I think that it is significant—that with the several years' notice that each of the States had—that this would become a 50-50 matching fund program—only four States felt that this program was of sufficient merit and contained sufficient priority in the making of their State budgets so as to appropriate money for their participation. I think that perhaps one of the reasons for this is the fact that today we have so many programs under which unemployed or underemployed workers can be trained or retrained. You may ask me how many programs do we have—and quite frankly, I do not know. In expressing my ignorance of the number of programs under which a worker can be trained or retrained, I do not apologize—because I have been for months trying to get this information from the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Quite frankly, they do not know either, or they are ashamed to tell me. It has been said that there are some 13 different programs under which training or retraining can be had. As I say, I do not know. I have tried to verify this figure and I cannot, but I do know that there are many such Federal programs—and this does not include the many commendable State programs. We can offhand name vocational education which the House recently passed and expanded. We can name Smith-Hughes, George-Barden, the Area Redevelopment Act, and many others. I think the fact that there are so many other available programs, may be one of the reasons the States have not considered this to be of sufficient import so as to require them to give it priority in the making of their State budgets.

I further feel that the State legislatures may be a little bit closer to the people—and, in this connection, perhaps have a little better grasp of what the people of their particular States desire and the amount of emphasis the people want to put on various programs.

It is interesting to note some of the testimony of Mr. William Redman, chief of the employment service, State of California, who testified in favor of this bill. I think it is particularly interesting to note his testimony beginning on about the middle of page 261 and going on to the top of page 262. I was concerned as to why California had not considered this program to be of sufficient merit so as to appropriate some money to match Federal funds to keep the program going. And Mr. Redman, I think, gives me a very honest answer at the top of page 262 of the testimony, an answer that more people would give if they were answering frankly about the situation. Mr. Redman, in saying why they have been unable to get an appropriation out of the California Legislature, says:

> Appropriation requests to the legislature have to be justified and to be justified not with emotion but with concrete facts.

Mr. Redman is saying, in effect, that you cannot justify this program with concrete facts to the legislature of the State of California. Mr. Redman is saying, in effect, that many people apparently believe that you do not have to justify requests for appropriations to the Federal Congress with facts but that they can be justified with emotion. I would hope that this is not true.

I think it also significant to take note of the fact that this bill calls for a whole lot more money than has been used for this program in the past. In this connection, let us look at the testimony of Mr. Joseph T. Nerden, director of the division of vocational education of the Connecticut State Department of Education—another advocate of this legislation. The pertinent part of his testimony appears at page 233 of the hearings, where it is indicated that in Connecticut they spent roughly $300,000 on this program. This was $100,000 less than the amount of money that had been allocated. Now, Mr. Nerden was up here testifying that we should approve this authorization for more money than had been authorized in previous years when they were not able to use all that was authorized for them in the past. I asked him why it was that he was supporting this bill which would put more money into the project and still, in this particular instance, they had operated for a year and only used three-fourths of their money. Now, I am not trying to suggest that they should use the money—just for the sake of consuming what had been authorized for their State. I commend them for not so doing—but I fail to see the consistency in asking that more money be authorized when they were not able to use all that was authorized and appropriated in the previous year. Mr. Nerden said in answer to my question:

> We haven't even begun to scratch the surface of manpower training. There are whole areas today that are literally untouched fields of employment for individuals, for which short-term training can be provided. Take, for instance, the field of agriculture.

Now, I will not try to make a case against using the Manpower Development and Training Act to train people so that they can go to the farm. I say that if there were a demand for farmers that it might well be a proper function for the Manpower Development and Training Act, but I would further say that I doubt seriously that there would be many here who would dispute the fact that we have enough unemployed farmers. The migration has been from the farm to the city—and if anything, we do not need programs that will train city people how to farm. If anything, we need programs that will train the farmhand who is out of work so that he might get a job in the city to which he has migrated.

Now, as I say, we passed the vocational education bill in this body and it will be back before us on a conference report most any time now. I voted against the Vocational Education Act.

I intend to vote against the Manpower Development and Training Act. We may need some kind of a training program, but my friends, members of this committee, I think it is a little bit ridiculous to pile one program on top of another program with all sorts of overlapping and duplication. I say quite frankly that if we would come before this body with a bill for a reasonable training program that would perhaps repeal all of the other training programs we have for training and retraining the unemployed, which would not be piling program on top of program—I would have to do a lot of cold, clear, soul searching to oppose it. But I have no problem today. This area of legislation is so mixed up, so confused with so many programs, one piled on top of the other, that neither the Department of Labor nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been able to answer my correspondence to list for me the number of programs under which training or retraining for unemployed or underemployed workers is available.

Let us also bear in mind that it might not be asking too much of private enterprise to ask them to train their own workers. Would anyone here question the fact that so long as there is a sufficient profit in production and a sufficient demand for products that business will not train workers, if need be, to produce the products and make the profit? I know that generally business endorses this type of legislation. But are they not as guilty here in asking for Federal help—that is, taxpayers' money for their own benefit—as those they condemn who ask for Federal handouts of some other character or nature?

I realize that the possibility of defeating this legislation is rather slim; nevertheless, I feel obligated to make this plea to you to that end.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman serves on the subcommittee that handled this legislation. There has been indication earlier today that there was bipartisan sentiment opposing any further deferral of the State matching. Was that sentiment set forth clearly during the subcommittee deliberations so that we could be sure in the future should a request for a new deferral of State matching be presented that it would not receive favorable action in the subcommittee?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. In regard to insisting that this be a matching program there was bipartisan agreement, but otherwise, if you notice the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], I thing he made it clear, drawing a fine line, that the bipartisanship was lent to this on the subcommittee by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft]. The other two members of the subcommittee were not quite so bipartisan.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I would just simply want to make clear that the gentleman is not saying he is against the matching principle. I do not want any confusion on that. I assume you are for the matching principle.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman in the well is saying he is for the matching principle and for the matching principle now as contained in the present bill—yes, sir—not in the future as proposed today.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the report on the vocational education bill, as to its purpose and on this point on page 4 which states as follows:

> Vocational education for those who have entered the labor market who need training or retraining on the job or advancement.

This is entirely a duplication of the efforts that are being sought in this bill we are debating this afternoon.

The gentleman is absolutely correct in the statement which he made that there is duplication because the vocational education bill as recently amended will cover people up to age 65.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I received a telegram from the Governor of California which so well expresses my own views that I think it would be well if I read it into the Record in its entirety:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
*December 12, 1963.*

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
*Member of Congress,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

I am informed that a floor vote will be taken tomorrow on the Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87–415. For reasons discussed below, I have concluded that this law is making a solid contribution to the problems of unemployment caused by automation and technological advances and is contributing further to the solving of problems of minority workers, veterans, and other deserving groups. As you are well aware, the impact of technological change in this State has been rapid and the effects on the work force cause unemployment among the groups that are the least adaptable to such changes, i.e., the uneducated, the unskilled, the high school dropouts, and the minority worker. We estimate conservatively that automation is costing California 150,000 jobs a year.

This law has been operative for just over 15 months. In that time the value of Manpower Development and Training Act has been demonstrated by 4,948 workers who have entered training in 42 occupations. As of this date we have approved training positions for a total of 9,460 workers, most of whom have had to start their courses of training. Fifty-seven different occupations are involved. The true measure of this legislation will not be felt, however, in the first 15 months, or even in the first 2 years. The value will increase and the effect will be adequately felt only after several years of operation.

The benefits of this law to California have been steadily increasing over the past 15 months. We have been gratified that we can show results as solid as those mentioned above in this relatively short period of time.

I am especially pleased to note that this legislation has been used to attack the problems of hard core and minority unemployment. Twenty-six percent of those enrolled in the Manpower Development and Retraining Act training courses have been minority workers. In some instances, we are in the process of setting up courses especially for minority workers, such as a program operated in conjunction with the youth opportunities board in Los Angeles for 2,500 disadvantaged youth in the East Los Angeles district, primarily Mexican-American, and another 500 youth, primarily Negro, in the Hunters Point district of San Francisco. These special programs, just starting, make an all-out attack, neighborhood by neighborhood on the various effects that unemployment has on youth in terms of the costs in delinquency and crime, social welfare costs, and the general decline of the community as a whole. You will be interested in knowing that approximately 74 percent of those completing the Manpower Development and Training Act training in California have secured jobs to date. We are also pleased to note that of all men entering training, 44 percent have been war veterans.

I would urge in the strongest possible terms that this legislation, which is just now beginning to bear some tangible results, be extended without crippling amendments, and that it be extended by a strong bipartisan vote. Despite the greatest growth in the history of our State, our unemployment rate is over 6 percent. The program is an absolute necessity. I am confident that you will agree with me that at this particular juncture in our efforts to attack unemployment, now is not the time to weaken the unemployment problem.

Please convey my views to the other Members of the California delegation and feel free to indicate my position in the course of the debate.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
*Governor of California.*

May I also comment to the previous speaker that if he will look at page 608 of the hearings he will note that at that time I explained, because of a request from the Governor of California just why it was difficult for California to enact the matching program in this first year. At that point I said to the committee:

> As you are all well aware, it frequently happens that several, sometimes many, months pass from the date a project is authorized to the date of appropriation of funds to implement the authorization. That is precisely what occurred in this instance, and not until 5 months later were moneys appropriated * * * The Governor explained that since the program was delayed at the start, sufficient time had not elapsed to permit the development of efficient techniques and methods for identifying the need and setting up courses which meet the problems of hard-core unemployment * * *.
>
> We then asked for a 1-year delay in State matching requirements.

But we are ready and will go ahead with the matching in the subsequent years. Therefore, I am happy to agree with the gentleman from Ohio who I think made an excellent statement that this is a bipartisan measure and we on our side are equally desirous of sticking with the matching provisions of the act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have had a deep interest in this program since its beginning. As you probably know, the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve was created by the Employment Act of 1946. And within the jurisdiction of my legislative committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, is the unemployment insurance program which deals in this same area.

Let me first add my commendation of the chairman of this subcommittee and every member on it for what I regard as a job well done. I want to include in this and emphasize those who have expressed minority views. This is very helpful in understanding many of the problems that exist in this very difficult area.

Then I would like to keep this in context. Remember that for every dollar we spend on retraining in the governmental sector, whether it is State, local, or Federal, there is probably $10 being spent in the private sector, and this is what we want primarily to keep our eyes upon.

I think that this program has proved to be very successful only in its inception because that is all it has been to date; but one reason why it has been so successful is that those in charge of it have been going slowly and have not been spending all the money that they might have, if that had been their objective. I would warn everyone that you can flood a carburetor just as much as you can choke it and either flooding or choking will stop the machine. I am fearful, I must say to the chairman, that in the desire to move this program forward it can be flooded.

I was very appreciative of the supplemental views of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in regard to that part of it; and, indeed, I think that his recommendations are an improvement and are moving along in the right direction. Judge SMITH very properly calls our attention to what does happen to programs that are good programs. There is a great tendency to get aboard and push them away beyond the capabilities or the intentions. You can damage programs as a result of that.

This really is a very basic battle going on between two major schools of economic thinking, the microeconomists, as some call them, and the macroeconomists.

The macroeconomists believe that aggregate purchasing power can be created by using the Federal Government as a mechanism which will solve unemployment on a cyclical basis. The microeconomists, with which group I would classify my thinking, believe, rather, that this unemployment is a structural and frictional matter created to a large degree by automation, and the emphasis must be dealing in the terms of the component parts. This means emphasis must be placed upon training and retraining. Jobs become obsolete. But I would point out one thing that is being missed by many of our labor leaders today, that automation actually creates more jobs than it displaces. But those jobs cannot be found right away, or are within an entirely different area of endeavor of where the jobs have been reduced. So, there is needed a definite process of taking an unemployed and then retraining him or getting him located in the new jobs that are available. And, indeed, it is not just that. The unskilled or semiskilled or those with obsolete skills—taking him and training him for these new jobs usually requires a much higher skill. The hard reality of retraining is that you take someone with a good job and ask him to go to night school and retrain in order to take this higher skill—his job becomes open for someone below him on the ladder of skills who, too must take retraining.

Now, directing attention to some of the criticism of the State's failure to take hold. Indeed, there are those who are opposed undercover to this retraining approach because they prefer the idea of throwing money into these things and having them go away. There has been similar criticism of the Kerr-Mills Act because it is not being activated as rapidly as some would like.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. These good programs, in my judgment, do move slowly and, in my judgment, they should move slowly.

I shall certainly vote for this bill, provided we do get these funds cut down where we do not flood and damage the program.

Mr. Chairman, one final comment, if I may: We are spending billions of dollars in the field of vocational education and, in effect, retraining. Yet we have never identified it as such, because it has a military uniform on it.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most wasteful programs today and one which is hurting and hitting right at the heart of this whole business of the need for skills, lies in our failure to identify the fact that the Military Establishment is engaged in training, vocational education, which is exactly the field with which we are dealing here. But they do not do a job of identifying those who want to learn with those skills they would like to learn. There is very little coordination between the military sector and the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending too much money primarily in not properly allocating where the money should go.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], a distinguished member of this committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there are 4,070,000 people unemployed in America today. This is 5.6 percent of our total labor force. Of these 4 million unemployed, 1,119,000, or 27.9 percent, have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more; 580,000, or 14.6 percent, have been unemployed 27 weeks or more.

Mr. Chairman, let me show the members of the Committee what these chronically unemployed figures mean in dollars and cents to the taxpayers.

Last month the State of Illinois was able to reduce its public welfare payroll by 2,000 people through various efforts to get them a job. The savings on this has been apparent to the taxpayers of Illinois, which was $450,000 per month, or almost $6 million a year. Thus, you can see why it is important to get these people off the relief rolls and back to work.

Mr. Chairman, using this same formula and citing the figures which the gentleman from California used a moment ago, the figures of Mr. ROOSEVELT, it would appear that the State of California has saved the taxpayers more than $2 million a month, or $24 million a year by finding employment for 9,460 people that he mentioned under this program.

At the appropriate time I shall obtain permission to include a table at the conclusion of my remarks which shows what has been happening to chronic unemployment in recent years.

In 1953, 211,000 people, or 11.3 percent of the unemployed, were unemployed 15 weeks or more. In 1962 the figure rose to 1,119,000, or 27.9 percent.

In 1953, there were 79,000 people, or 4.2 percent of the unemployed, who were unemployed 27 weeks or more. In 1962 this figure jumped to 585,000, or 14.6 percent. These are people who are unfortunate and chronically unemployed, and it has cost the taxpayers of the various States of America in excess of $1.5 billion in various forms of public assistance for these chronically unemployed.

When we talk about cutting the bill, reducing the expenditures, you see what the alternative is if we do not enact this legislation.

This is a problem that is not only peculiar to the urban sections of the country, but to all of it, and I hope my colleagues from rural areas will consider these facts: While the total employment in the United States increased from 63.8 million in 1953 to 71.8 million in 1962, or an increase of 8 million people, the agricultural workers' opportunities decreased by 1.4 million in the same period.

This chronic unemployment involves a major change in manufacturing methods, a change in product demand, and a movement of industry location. Chronically depressed areas include the coal-mining communities and the older industrial centers of the East and Midwest. It was to these urban areas that marginal workers flocked after World War II, and are now not trained to take on the needs of new technological demands.

Intense competition, both foreign and domestic, insured an acceleration of that trend. Employment created by the manufacture of automated equipment and controls went largely to new manufacturing areas free of the disabilities of the older industrial centers. The latter areas received the unemployment resulting from the substitution of machines for men, and the improved methods further cut into manpower utilization, as did the competitive impact of new plants, both domestic and foreign.

Add to this the announcement today that 75,000 additional jobs will be wiped out by the budget cuts in the defense budget.

I have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] author of today's bill. We are now holding hearings on legislation to reduce the workweek from 40 to 35 hours. During these hearings it is becoming abundantly clear that a vast number of those now unemployed in America, just are not prepared to accept a position in our modern stream of technology.

This fact was repeated not only at our current hearings, but during the hearings on the manpower development amendments.

We have in this country today an estimated 11 million adults who have less than a sixth-grade education and cannot read or write.

These people constitute the largest segment of our chronically unemployed Americans. These are the people the legislation, to a great extent, hopes to reach. That is why we had to include in this bill a provision for basic literacy training under very rigid limitations.

This legislation also hopes to reach that growing army of Americans who have been displaced from skilled jobs in the advanced years of their life through automation. These middle-aged Americans have nothing but the relief lines to look forward to unless they can obtain new skills under this act.

You will notice this bill serves unequivocal notice on the States that they must begin assuming their responsibility in this entire field of retraining. Although the committee well realizes the financial crises which confront most of our States, it also directs the labor department to reduce bureaucratic delays to a minimum and incorporates a spirit of urgency into this act.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. You will note that the senior members of our committee strongly support this bill in their minority report on page 38. This bill represents a sincere bipartisan effort by our committee to help the tragic victims of chronic unemployment in America. I hope it will be overwhelmingly approved.

TABLE I.—*Total labor force, employment and unemployment 1953–62*

[Millions]

| | 1953 | 1962[1] | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total civilian labor force | 63.8 | 71.8 | +8.0 |
| Total employed | 61.9 | 67.7 | +5.8 |
| Agriculture | 6.6 | 5.2 | −1.4 |
| Nonagriculture | 55.4 | 62.5 | +7.1 |
| Total unemployed: | | | |
| Number | 1.9 | 4.0 | +2.1 |
| Rate (percent) | 2.9 | 5.6 | -------- |
| Persons at work:[2] | | | |
| Full time, all industries | 49.2 | 51.3 | +2.1 |
| Part time, all industries | 10.2 | 13.3 | +3.1 |
| Full time, nonagriculture | 44.4 | 47.9 | +3.5 |
| Part time, nonagriculture | 8.6 | 11.7 | +3.1 |
| Part time for economic reasons, all industries[3] | (4) | 2.7 | -------- |

[1] 1962 labor force figures specifically adjusted to exclude Alaska and Hawaii and to take account of revised population basis—to make 1962 data consistent with 1953. No specific adjustments made in "at work" figures since adjustments approximately offset each other. Figures do not total due to rounding.

[2] Excludes employed persons not at work because of vacation, illness, etc. Part time is defined as employed 1 to 34 hours per week, full time 35 hours per week or more.

[3] Persons on part-time work and reduced workweeks because full-time work was not available.

[4] Not available.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE II.—*Nonfarm wage and salary jobs*

[In thousands]

| | 1953 | 1962[1] | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| All wage and salary jobs | 50,232 | 55,841 | +5,609 |
| Mining | 866 | 652 | −214 |
| Contract construction | 2,623 | 2,909 | +286 |
| Manufacturing | 17,549 | 16,859 | −690 |
| Production and maintenance | 14,055 | 12,494 | −1,561 |
| Nonproduction | 3,494 | 4,365 | +871 |
| Transportation and public utilities | 4,290 | 3,903 | −387 |
| Class I railroads | 1,207 | 700 | −507 |
| Telephone | 702 | 688 | −14 |
| Electric, gas, and sanitary services | 582 | 611 | +29 |
| Wholesale and retail trade | 10,247 | 11,582 | +1,335 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 2,146 | 2,798 | +652 |
| Services | 5,867 | 7,949 | +2,082 |
| Government | 6,645 | 9,188 | +2,543 |
| Federal | 2,305 | 2,340 | +35 |
| State and local | 4,340 | 6,849 | +2,509 |

[1] 1962 figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE III.—*Long-term unemployed, 1953–62*[1]

| Year | Total unemployed | | Unemployed 15 weeks or more | | Unemployed 27 weeks or more | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number (thousands) | Percent of civilian labor force | Number (thousands) | Percent of total unemployed | Number (thousands) | Percent of total unemployed |
| 1962 | 4,007 | 5.6 | 1,119 | 27.9 | 585 | 14.6 |
| 1961 | 4,806 | 6.7 | 1,532 | 31.9 | 804 | 16.7 |
| 1960 | 3,931 | 5.6 | 956 | 24.3 | 454 | 11.5 |
| 1959 | 3,813 | 5.5 | 1,040 | 27.3 | 571 | 15.0 |
| 1958 | 4,681 | 6.8 | 1,452 | 31.0 | 667 | 14.2 |
| 1957 | 2,936 | 4.3 | 560 | 19.1 | 239 | 8.1 |
| 1956 | 2,822 | 4.2 | 533 | 18.9 | 232 | 8.2 |
| 1955 | 2,904 | 4.4 | 703 | 24.2 | 336 | 11.6 |
| 1954 | 3,578 | 5.6 | 812 | 22.7 | 317 | 8.9 |
| 1953 | 1,870 | 2.9 | 211 | 11.3 | 79 | 4.2 |

[1] 15 consecutive weeks or more.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear that this program is working out so well; that people are becoming employed because of the retraining program. But I have the same concern that the gentleman from Virginia has, that is for the amount of money that we are spending and the deficits that are being piled up in this Government. I am wondering if we are getting value for the money that we are spending in the areas of unemployment.

I have said before on the floor of the House, and I repeat it today, I believe the No. 1 problem facing the Nation today is that of unemployment. Every effort must be made to see if we can solve this great question of unemployment.

Are we really doing everything that can be done, and should be done, and will this bill take care of the areas of real need?

I must confess to you, Mr. Chairman, that my heart aches for those men, not only the 16-year-olds we are taking care of in this, but the men who are 40 and 45 years of age, men who are already trained, who lose their positions, then are unable to become employed because of the restriction against these people 40 to 45 years of age and older.

What are we doing about it? You are going to have your South Bends, you are going to have your defense installations shut down. What is being done for the trained men? Where are their jobs?

I wish at some time during this debate today someone will tell us the area where there are shortages of labor that were retraining people. I have not heard of any great areas of shortages of labor. Are we simply retraining people to have them still unemployed after they are trained?

May I say to the distinguished Committee on Education and Labor I certainly hope that committee will make every effort to check on the U.S. Unemployment Service and determine what they are doing. Are they making a maximum effort in clearing up the question of unemployment, or are they engaged in other areas, not particularly for those who are unemployed, but for those who are employed, and taking them from one job to another? They are building plush offices for professional people to go into. They are turning their backs—I have said this before and I say it again—on the unemployed, and not rendering them the service which they should receive. In other words, they are advertising in newspapers; I had one not long ago, an ad of the Unemployment Service for an open-hearth operator to go to Buenos Aires, an IBM operator to go to Tanganyika, and a business consultant to go to Florida.

I do not believe that is the purpose for which we set up the USES. I think we set them up to find jobs for people who are unemployed and who need jobs, but not to use the employers' tax funds to pirate them from one place to another, but to find jobs for those who are unemployed.

I put in the RECORD here some time ago details of the falsification of facts and figures in the Ohio office in Cleveland, where they admitted they had been falsifying their records to show employment where in fact there had been no employment, where one man said he had placed his sons in 140 jobs in 1 year by putting their names on the record and putting them in. Then when they say they have a man in a job and falsify it, when there is not a job that man's name goes into the dead file and he does not have a chance to get employment.

They have said to us in answer to my charges against them, that they are taking care of the employed and not the unemployed, that from 90 to 95 percent of their placements are unemployed people. They say that was true in May of 1963, and that is the month we found the falsification of records, and the man in Cleveland said it happened all over the United States.

May I point out to you that if they are correct, if their figure is right that 90 or 95 percent are unemployed being placed in employment, and they claim they placed 6 million people last year, well, if 90 or 95 percent were the unemployed we would have no unemployment today. So that they just cannot be right. I would hope that the Committee will do something about an investigation and see if we cannot get them back on the track to get jobs for these people who are unemployed. They are the ones about whom I am concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and for calling to the attention of the House this very real problem. I think there is good evidence that perhaps we are not being nearly as effective as we should be in this service. I think some of the services being provided are unnecessary and not aimed at the hard-core type of unemployment we are talking about. For instance, I have a bill which raises the question of the propriety of campus placement activity for persons who are not really in the labor market at that time. But what is the U.S. Employment Service doing, with 4 million unemployed in this country, going to the campuses and engaging in this kind of effort?

Also, as the result of the gentleman's calling this to my attention and the steps we have taken, an investigation has been authorized by the Special Subcommittee on Labor which I hope will undertake next year an investigation of the Cleveland matter and other problems on this subject.

Mr. BOW. When that committee begins its investigation I should be delighted to turn over to it the file I have now from all over the country, all cases of people who have gone to the agencies and been turned down, but also people now employed who have been transferred to other jobs. I do not think it is necessary for them to go to teachers' conventions and take teachers from one area and give them to another. It seems to me this is not an area we should be working in.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that a great deal more should be done to direct the whole program, directing it toward areas where new jobs are going to be needed. It seems to me not enough emphasis or research has been going into where jobs are going to be available next year or the year after.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. I would say again my concern is for those who are now unemployed.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I first emphasize my strong support for the Manpower Retraining Act and for the basic changes that we are making in that act in H.R. 8720. I think the experience under the manpower bill and its actual operation for just a little over a year now has been a resounding success. There have been many criticisms that have appeared in the press of late that we were not reaching the very hard, hard core. I think those criticisms ignore the problems and the requirements in getting a program of this nature underway. We have to crawl before we walk and walk before we run. I do not mean to say that we intentionally want to avoid the hard, hard core but it does take some special program and some special approach to get to these people who may have a language difficulty or who are lacking in a basic education requirement so that they cannot even undertake a job training course in the normal course of events.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been marked from the beginning by bipartisanship and I am very happy that it is continuing on that basis. About half of the trainees thus far have been those in the long-term unemployed group. I emphasize that, because these are very serious problems. Many of these individuals are trying to support families and find themselves forced to resort to welfare payments or unemployment insurance. Therefore, in that respect they are a drain on the resources of society. The training program has been concentrated in that area and about half of the trainees fall in the category of long-term unemployed. The program tries to get them back to work and back to earning and back to paying taxes, and in that way and many other ways to get back into the general flow of our economy. We think this is the essence of the manpower retraining program and it has demonstrated its merit thus far.

Reference has been made to the fact that only four States chose to match the funds that are put up for training allowances and for the rest of the program by the Federal Government. Let us emphasize that this act was passed in March of 1962. We did not get the funds until September of 1962. These legislative bodies in the States that we are talking about went into session in January, 4 months after the funds were first made available to start the training program. When the legislatures met in these 29 States, in many instances there were no trainees whatsoever graduated and at work as yet, and in a good share of the other States they had no training programs even started as yet. Under those circumstances, we certainly could not expect the States to set up their programs for matching without any history at all to go on. We do feel now on a completely bipartisan basis there will be a sufficient history of experience at the State level so that those legislative bodies can now meet and they will either have to put up the matching funds starting in the fiscal year 1966, with one-third of the amount, and in fiscal year 1967 on a dollar-per-dollar matching basis or the program will just grind to a halt in their State.

I would emphasize that we wrote the committee report with great care. We chose the words very carefully as a legislative history for guidance to the department in the administration of this act.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] with whom I worked so closely last year and with whom I have enjoyed working outside the subcommittee this year, if he does not agree with the legislative history that we have made here in the report and on the floor today, particularly with reference to matching and the basic education provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. I must admit that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and others of our colleagues on his side of the aisle have done a wonderful job in cooperating with us to see that everything is made as clear as possible. We have cleared up a lot of problems that arose as the result of the failure of the administration to carry out our intent in the other bill and I am glad to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman and to others of our colleagues who have cooperated with us and worked so hard to make this legislation as effective and as clear as possible.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say here that the gentleman has been very generous in his credits to the minority side for their contributions in the past, and I appreciate very much the way he proceeded as a subcommittee chairman in a bipartisan fashion, but the gentleman does agree, I take it, with the legislative history that we have here today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Absolutely.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate that, and ask the gentleman from Michigan, who is also one of the most active Members on this particular manpower bill, if he does not agree with this legislative history.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would say, if the gentleman will yield, that the committee report has been very carefully drafted to express our exact intention in the amendments before the House today.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman agreeing.

Mr. Chairman, I would emphasize here that we have in some respects made this program more conservative. We have done this with eyes wide open. The original act, for instance, provided for $20 a week training allowances to some youngsters in the 19- to 22-year-old group. We have lowered that age to 17 and required that they be out of school 1 year. We have also written very careful requirements in the act for qualification for that $20 a week payment by the students. It must go only to those who are in special youth training programs. It is defined in this bill as those who, because of inadequate educational background and work preparation, are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without special training and schooling.

Mr. Chairman, I would also emphasize the limitations we place specifically in this bill with reference to those who qualify for the basic education programs. It is limited to those who indicate an intention to, and will thereby be able to, pursue courses of occupational training of a type for which there appears to be reasonable expectation of employment. I would emphasize the words "reasonable expectation of employment." Obviously, when a person is undertaking a basic education which is necessary to qualify him to go into some sort of job or skill training, it is not possible always to have a specific job or a specific opening available at the end of the line with an offer from an employer that he will take this individual when he finishes. It is our desire and our intention that the individual with problems in his basic educational skills will qualify for the type of training in which there are openings generally in the community and in the area where he is taking that basic education and that skill.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would state that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will offer an amendment to cut the funds that are provided here. As one who believes very deeply in the manpower bill, I think there is more money provided in the authorization than is necessary. I think we can cut that authorization without damaging the program. I would hope that if the cut that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has proposed is too deep and turns out to be too deep and the Secretary comes forward with figures that demonstrate this—and he has not done that, in my opinion, thus far in our hearings and deliberations—that we can on a bipartisan basis restore what funds are necessary to keep this program operating and at full level, efficiently and effectively, to help our unemployed. Thank you.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield as much time as he may desire to close debate to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am impressed, as I am sure other Members of the House are, by the broad agreement that has been expressed by both Democratic and Republican Members of the House both on the performance of this act since its enactment, about a year and a half ago, and upon the advisability of the amendments that we are now proposing to this act.

There seem really to be only two areas of some disagreement. The first would be whether or not there is some duplication or overlapping between the Manpower Development and Training Act youth training program and that provided under the Vocational Education Act. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER], mentioned that there are some 13 Federal education and training programs already. He then proceeded to deny he was certain about that figure. I do not know how many there are, either, Mr. Chairman; but I do know what kind of programs they are. They are not programs which meet the need this program was designed to meet.

Among existing programs are vocational rehabilitation; the World War II GI bill; the Korean GI bill; the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. In other words, none of these programs to which the gentleman has referred are designed to meet the problems of the unemployed, and particularly those hard-core unemployed who need training and skill development before they can find productive employment.

It is not our intention in this manpower development program, in its youth provisions, or any other part of it, to overlap or duplicate that which is being done under any other program. Neither is it our intention to overlap or duplicate that which is being done by any private industry on its own. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] mentioned that he believes a large amount of training is already being done by private industry. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure you that to the extent private training is being done by industry we do not wish to take over any part of that training and begin to support such training with Federal funds without advancing the training of any additional workmen. If, indeed, private industry is doing it, then it adds nothing to the total effort if we take over the cost of that effort.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if one of the chief reasons why the manpower program has not moved faster is because of lack of adequate vocational facilities throughout the country?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is correct. That has been one of the problems under the program. We do not want to set up a duplicate set of vocational training institutions to train manpower trainees. This bill operates through the State vocational education agencies and through the State employment offices. It uses the facilities and personnel and services of those two State agencies.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to be sure that I have been clear on this subject. I said in context let us remember that probably for every dollar spent here $10 was spent in the private sector. I did not want to imply that I did not feel that this was being carefully done in the Federal sector. Indeed, I think it has been, and I think it is a part which the Federal Government can play in it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I did not mean to imply that he had said so. I just want to call attention to the fact that there is an intention in this program only to supply a need that is not presently being met.

If it is being met by private training or, indeed, if it is in an area which requires such a minor skill that heretofore employees have not thought prior training to be a prerequisite to employment, we do not want to undertake training programs. We want to provide training only in those areas where it can be of real assistance to the manpower development program.

In some situations, such as the apparel industry, skill and training are not and never have been a precondition of employment because of the nature of its labor requirements and its hiring and training practices. When training assistance is granted to such industries in any area of the country, particularly if the industries are as mobile and highly competitive as the apparel industry, it has the effect of adding to unemployment elsewhere in the country. I am advised, for example, that the existing labor supply in the apparel industry is more than ample to meet the Nation's needs.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. In talking about the distinction between vocational education and the manpower bill, the gentleman will recall that it was our intention and desire in writing the original act that, to the extent possible, the manpower bill utilize the manpower setups that we have around the country that are handled primarily by the State and local authorities.

I think this has been done and is being done today.

I would like to commend the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, in his administration of this act. I think he has been very wise and very restrained in the way he has approached this act and has been very assiduous in trying to adhere to our intention in the original act. I have great confidence that he will continue to apply himself and to see that his department employees will apply themselves to following the legislative history and the intentions which we have.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further point: There has been some question about whether or not the authorizations contained in this act are needed. It has been pointed out that the authorizations in the last fiscal year and in the current fiscal year were not met by the amount which was appropriated, and that this is some evidence of the fact that we do not need additional authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out here repeatedly in the debate this afternoon, the program was undertaken by the Department of Labor and by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in a very cautious way. They did not want to move ahead into a large-scale program before they knew what they were doing.

Mr. Chairman, we have this program underway and we are now ready to expand it. The State agencies have told the Department of Labor that they are ready now to proceed this year, if they can secure the funds, with the training of 134,000 trainees.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we were very cautious about the on-the-job training program which we wrote into this bill a year and a half ago. The Department wanted to move cautiously in this area. In the first year of this program there were no on-the-job trainees because the Department was setting up its procedures and regulations.

However, we believe we are now ready to move in this area as well.

We would hope that we can have somewhere in the neighborhood of 35,000 on-the-job trainees in the next fiscal year, if we get the money.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that under the beefed-up youth program provided by these amendments and under the various other provisions of this bill before us, we would hope, if the funds were available, to train in the neighborhood of 93,000 additional trainees per year.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are going to need some money to do that. I very much fear the cuts in the authorizations which have been suggested and the manner in which they may take effect would very much hamper the program, and I am sure we do not want to hamper the program.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to urge that the Members of this House consider this bill as our committee considered it; that is, with an eye not toward partisanship but with an eye toward what we can do in a constructive way for the unemployed of this country.

**Mr. RYAN of New York.** Mr. Chairman, increased economic growth and a full employment economy are urgent. The manpower development and training program designed to retrain unemployed workers and place them in productive employment and to help meet the problem of our unemployed youth is part of our efforts to deal with unemployment.

I support the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 provided by H.R. 8720 which will improve the program.

The plight of our out-of-school and out-of-work youth will be alleviated by reducing the age limit for the training allowance from 19 to 17. However, I disagree with the requirement that 1 year elapse before a dropout becomes eligible for a training allowance. During that year young people are likely to become discouraged and demoralized and will be that much more difficult to motivate. The 3-month period originally recommended by the administration should be a sufficient safeguard to discourage leaving school to take advantage of this program.

Experience during the past year shows that the hard-core unemployed are not being reached by the retraining program because of a lack of basic education. Therefore, H.R. 8720 includes an amendment which extends for another 20 weeks the period during which training allowances can be provided. This will help to develop basic education skills among the "functional illiterates."

Mr. Chairman, these and the other proposed amendments will provide a better legislative framework for the program. However, its ultimate success will depend in large measure upon how it is administered. To succeed, the program requires the full cooperation of the State vocational education agencies and the State employment services. The 1962 act provided that State vocational agencies undertake to provide institutional training for persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor.

In New York State the vocational education agency has been a major obstacle. Right now there are 82 projects bottled up. It has taken an average of 6 months to obtain approval after a project is submitted. And time and again the State simply sits on applications.

Furthermore, although the act permits the use of the facilities of private institutions, labor unions, and public agencies other than schools, the State vocational agency refuses to authorize such use. The agency insists on training in vocational schools even if this involves the purchase of expensive equipment already available in private schools or other public agencies.

To cite an example, in June 1962, the YMCA in New York submitted an application for a project to train 90 youths in auto mechanics, machine shop practice, remedial reading, and remedial mathematics. This is a well thought out program which has not been approved yet.

In another case a project to train 25 to 30 individuals as building custodians was submitted more than 15 months ago and has not been approved. This refusal to use outside agencies is frustrating the program, and it is time for action at the Cabinet level to break the logjam.

In his message on civil rights and job opportunities to Congress on June 19, 1963, President Kennedy said:

> I have instructed the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare to examine how their programs for the relief of unemployment and economic hardship can be still more intensively focussed on those areas of hard-core long-term unemployment, among both white and nonwhite workers.

Under section 231 of the 1962 act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide training by contract with public or private educational or training institutions in the case of training which the State agency does not provide. The Division of Vocational Education in the U.S. Office of Education has not entered into any contracts or agreements despite the months of delay in New York State. I certainly hope that the Committee on Education and Labor, which has brought this bill to the floor, will look into this situation.

Mr. Chairman, there is another problem in New York State involving on-the-job training projects. Because the State employment service is responsible for paying training allowances, applications for OJT projects are submitted to it for approval. Although the Secretary of Labor has sole responsibility, the State employment service has a habit of referring applications to the State vocational educational agency for review. Thus the State vocational educational agency exercises a veto over the Secretary of Labor.

When a printer's union proposed a project to train letterpress operators in union shops, the State employment service and State vocational education agency shifted the project to a vocational school.

Mr. Chairman, there must be a complete reappraisal of the legislative approach to this question. Concurrent jurisdiction between the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has resulted in delay and sabotage of the program. Meanwhile, on-the-job training projects—the most promising area for accomplishment—are not being sufficiently encouraged.

**Mr. DONOHUE.** Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope and urge that this bill, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, will be overwhelmingly approved without extended debate and delay.

The history of this measure, in operation, clearly reveals that it has been an unqualified success since its origin. The authorities have presented substantiating evidence that the goal set by Congress, for the 3-year program of some 400,000 unemployed workers retrained and placed in productive work, will be attained.

However, the evidence also shows and the experts further testify that experience, under the act, demonstrates three vital changes are imperative at this time. First, in order to sustain the program over a period long enough to permit a fair appraisal, the present State matching requirement should be postponed for 1 year. Secondly, the plight of the undereducated unemployed demands more specific attention and special provision is included for them in this bill. Third, the present provisions for unemployed youth should be improved and such action is projected in this amended measure.

Mr. Chairman, this bill offers us a chance to alleviate serious unemployment in the country. It also enables us to take a significant step toward meeting the problems generated by the ever increasing technological revolution of American industry, especially as such revolution drastically threatens the economic security of our undereducated and unskilled youth. Without encouragement and opportunity this group of young Americans is practically doomed to a lifetime of joblessness and dependence upon public assistance. If they can be trained to become part of our productive force, at any reasonable cost, then the saving to society is incalculable.

This bill is unquestionably in the national interest; it is "good for all Americans" and is in full accord with our basic national traditions. If we can afford to grant substantial assistance to people in underdeveloped nations around the world surely we can afford to give this limited measure of aid and encouragement to our own citizens. I urge my colleagues, again, to promptly approve this bill.

**Mr. BURKHALTER.** Mr. Chairman, overnight we find that the legislation we are considering today, H.R. 8720, the Manpower and Training Act of 1962, has become doubly important. The reason for this increase in importance is directly attributable to announcements on the closing down of many military installations and shipyards throughout the country. This in itself will be a devastating blow in many communities throughout our land, but it will be double so if we have not provided the funds for a program that was important in its own stead before this announcement of defense cutbacks was made, but as of today this program takes on the status of critical nature. It has always been said that a healthy economic climate is the first basic step in building a successful democratic way of life for which we have so long prided ourselves. Therefore we must, in our obligations to those citizens of our great Nation who elected us to represent them in the House of Representatives, support H.R. 8720 which will enable many of our countrymen to train themselves for employment in new skills that they will be able to learn from the opportunities afforded to them through the Manpower and Training Act of 1962.

The latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, revealed that unemployment jumped in November by nearly 500,000, larger than the usual seasonal increase for that month. The full-time joblessness was brought to over 3.9 million; this made a seasonal adjusted rate of 5.9 percent, which is a sharp gain from 5.4 percent in October and 135,000 higher than a year ago. Then just yesterday the report that the country was losing one of its oldtime automobile producers, the Studebaker Corp., to our neighbor nation on the north, leaves many more good, able and willing American skilled mechanics without a job to go to. Automation is taking its toll each and every week in factories and industrial plants and even in the so-called white collar job categories as well. If there ever was a time that a Federal Government should show leadership and determination now is that time to take the steps that will assist these many good citizens to retrain themselves for new skills and new positions.

Unfortunately many of these workers will find it most difficult to learn new skills and employ them in their advanced age after having devoted the best part of their lives to an industry and skill that is suddenly vanishing on their local scene for one reason or another. If we do not pass this new bill for manpower and training using the excuse for opposition that the program will cost too much, we would only be shortchanging ourselves. This of course is the most useless of arguments because this act will keep all of these individuals in the ranks of the employable and will give them the hope and dignity of earning their own living in the way all men wish to in a democratic society. If this act would be defeated because of such shortsighted so-called economic moves, we again would only be fooling ourselves, because the facts show that the cost for not enacting it would be much, much greater than the moneys involved in its enactment. Individuals would soon use up their unemployment benefits and many would have to apply to their local government agency for relief. These individuals in turn would, because of being unemployed, not be able to contribute toward the tax base of their own Government and they would stop being the potential user of the many goods and services we keep telling the rest of the world are so abundant in our country. It certainly would not be economically right to deprive these individuals of their chances and opportunity of being gainfully employed and it is certainly not morally right for the Nation to deny them the means of securing the needed training for newer types of gainful employment.

I ask those colleagues among us that came here today to oppose passage of this legislation to think and think profoundly of the cost to this great country for not passing this bill. Not costs in just dollars and cents, but costs in not affording a man or woman the opportunity to support themselves and their dependents in the American way. The costs to these individuals in the many agonies and anguishes caused by the ugly shadow of unemployment which eats at the very marrow of individual dignity. Gentlemen, today we must face up to the responsibility placed in us by the free electorate and we can do this best by voting for the enactment of H.R. 8720, the Manpower and Training Act of 1962. I thank you.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, the announcement this week by officials of the Studebaker Corp. of the termination of production of automobiles and trucks at the Studebaker plant in South Bend, Ind., means immediate unemployment for thousands of workers.

The unemployment situation at the Studebaker plant is further evidence of the importance of favorable action on the legislation we are today considering, amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. I say this because the programs of training and retraining which have been and will be established under this act represent one, and only one, but an important one, of the several weapons we must have in our arsenal of attack on unemployment.

I am pleased to say that we have already undertaken training programs under the Manpower Act in South Bend, Ind., and that our community, with wide support from leaders of business, labor, education, and local government, is ready to make further use of Manpower Act programs in an effort to help meet some of the extremely serious problems caused by this unhappy development at the Studebaker plant.

Fortunately one of South Bend's leaders named by Mayor Frank J. Bruggner to serve as cochairman of a community-wide committee to deal with the Studebaker problem is Mr. Franklin D. Schurz, editor and publisher of the South Bend Tribune, chairman both of the St. Joseph County Manpower Advisory Committee and of the Indiana State Manpower Advisory Committee.

The other distinguished civic leader serving as cochairman of the mayor's committee is Mr. Paul D. Gilbert, head of Gilbert's, Inc., a widely known retail clothing store in South Bend.

I am pleased to say, after meeting here in Washington this morning with representatives of a number of relevant Federal agencies to discuss appropriate Federal assistance in the Studebaker situation, that the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor are moving to speed up manpower training programs in South Bend wherever possible.

Let me speak for a moment in support of one particular amendment to the Manpower Act which is of special interest to us in South Bend. I refer to the amendment which will enable eligible trainees who need literacy training in order to qualify for occupation training to receive such training.

South Bend was one of the first cities in the United States to start a training program under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Mr. Schurz testified on August 15, 1963, before Congressman HOLLAND's Select Subcommittee on Labor and described some of the problems which had been encountered in South Bend in carrying out an effective program.

In particular, Mr. Schurz pointed to the importance of broadening the act to, in his words, "permit more prevocational or academic training in such subjects as reading, writing, and arithmetic."

Again, to quote Mr. Schurz's testimony:

> Unfortunately, most of the hard-core unemployed do not have a sufficient educational background to succeed in vocational training for higher skilled work. Their great need is for academic training.

Mr. Schurz also urged that—

> To provide adequately for both academic and vocational training, the allowable training period should be extended up to an additional 52 weeks.

It is, therefore, from the experience of my own home community that I rise in support of this amendment to permit eligible trainees who require literacy courses to receive them if they are going to be able to qualify for vocational training.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that it came as a great shock to many to learn that in this country of universal free, compulsory, public education we have vast numbers of citziens who have either forgone or have been deprived of the opportunity to achieve even the fundamental education—mastery of the 3 "R's"—which is essential to earn a decent livelihood in this modern age. The panel of experts who studied this problem in 1962 reported the staggering facts that over 8 million Americans 25 years of age and older have less than 5 years of schooling, while more than 22 million have less than an eighth-grade education. These uneducated and undereducated citizens are not indigenous to any particular area or region, but are to be found in all parts of our country. These facts leave no room for debate that these millions of Americans are exposed to a future of unemployment, marginal earnings with recurrent joblessness, dependency, and personal deprivation. The Nation, in turn, is faced with the host of social problems, and welfare and other responsibilities, which stem from poverty and human frustration and deprivation.

The "hard-core of the hard-core" unemployed come from our undereducated citizens. There are at present more than 300,000 unemployed persons—every 13th unemployed person—with less than 5 years of schooling. Close to 1 million unemployed have less than an eighth-grade education. These people cannot compete in today's labor market of constantly advancing educational and skill demands. Our uneducated and undereducated citizens will become progressively more disadvantaged as our technology advances. Their personal plight and the human waste to the Nation is a cost which we cannot afford and which must not be borne with equanimity. We must face up to these realities by assuring a greater measure of opportunity for these disadvantaged, else freedom will not be a reality in our country.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was a pioneer measure and a national commitment to "retool" the labor force to meet the skill needs of our technological age and at the same time alleviate hard-core unemployment. Its initial results are encouraging but indicate a need to "retool" the act as well as the labor force.

One of the most striking facts which has emerged is that within the present limitations of this act we are not reaching the least educated group among our unemployed. Although 20 percent of our unemployed population have completed less than the eighth grade, only 3 percent of all Manpower Development and Training Act trainees come from this group. For the Negro unemployed worker, this disparity is even more conspicuous. While 44 percent of all unemployed Negroes have only completed the eighth grade or less, only 5 percent of Negro trainees come from this group.

The limited experience under the act in its first year of operation has shown that educational deficiency is a very real and difficult barrier in providing training as well as employment opportunities. In getting training programs underway, the earliest experience revealed the depressing fact that many of the unemployed have such a low level of education that they cannot absorb occupational training for available jobs, nor even take the initial screening tests which would qualify them for training.

The Secretary of Labor has testified before the Education and Labor Committee that we are faced with the obstinate fact that people with minimal educational attainment are not able to absorb the types of training available under the present act for the occupations in the labor market—that present statutory provisions result in "skimming off" the better educated, leaving the least educated as an even harder core of unemployment—that we run the danger of "retraining the best and disregarding the rest."

But it has also been shown that this need not be an unsurmountable barrier, that these people are potentially employable, that this education barrier can be overcome—and in fact must be overcome, in a free and democratic society. The necessary link can be supplied by introducing provisions for basic literacy training into the broader provisions for occupational training. That this type of training can be productive has already been shown by special demonstration projects conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act to test the feasibility of training for illiterate and semi-illiterate adults. Let me describe one of these, by way of illustration, which was undertaken at Virginia State College.

Ninety men past the age of 25, including 50 who had been unemployed for so long as to have exhausted their unemployment compensation, were placed in a special Manpower Development and Training Act project. Their inability to find work was not the result of their not wanting to work or not having the innate capacity for skill development, but of their inadequate education and lack of job skills. A combined experimental program of sufficient duration was developed which enabled these men to improve their educational skills while learning job skills. Within 6 months, the 40 percent of these men who had less than 7 years of schooling had averaged a gain of almost 2 school years in reading ability, and at the same time these trainees were learning the skills to become electronic technicians, brick masons, automobile mechanics, sheet metal workers, and building maintenance workers. These men—and others in other experimental projects—have been salvaged for a life of useful work and human dignity. Similar opportunity must be provided for larger numbers.

I, therefore, urge adoption of the amendment which will provide literacy training needed to qualify eligible persons for occupational training. Under this amendment, an additional 20 weeks of training allowances will also be permitted to enable these trainees to participate in such training programs. It is estimated that adoption of this amendment will provide literacy training for some 47,000 persons annually—a modest number, but a big step forward in our national manpower training program.

Despite the highly successful experience of retraining unemployed workers under the Manpower Development and Training Act, it is clear that under our present statutory provisions, the unskilled and the unschooled who are most in need of help are the least prone to get it. We must now remedy that condition to open the door wider to provide employment opportunity through appropriate training for more workers. The cost in the long run is modest—$1,200 to $1,500 per individual, as compared with the probable cost to society of continued dependency which has been estimated by informed sources to be in the neighborhood of $30,000. I cannot see that we have a choice if we are to live up to the obligation and commitment which we have undertaken to bring our hard-core unemployed back into productive economic activity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to reassure the Members of this body that the observations of Mr. O'HARA regarding the intent of the program are correct. We recognized from the beginning that existing public and private training efforts should be maintained. In fact, special attention is given to this principle in the act.

Therefore, Mr. O'HARA is correct when he states there are some situations such as the apparel and garment industries where it would not be appropriate to use the manpower development program. In these instances it has been traditional for the employer to provide training on the job and prejob training has never been a precondition of employment. Moreover firms in these industries are highly mobile and compete vigorously with one another in a nationwide market. Training assistance to new firms, for example, in such an industry can have the effect of disrupting competitive relationships and end by forcing other firms to seek similar assistance. If assistance is not extended then unemployment may be created in one area offsetting employment being created elsewhere. And if training assistance is extended then the result can only be a shift in the training function from the industry to the Government. Certainly we want to avoid these possibilities since either would be contrary to the purposes of the act. This is an important matter and I am delighted that Mr. O'HARA has brought this to our attention. I think he should be complimented for the admirable clarification he has provided.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 101 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended by inserting after "sought out and trained" the following: "as quickly as is reasonably possible", and by inserting after "afforded to these people" the following: "with the least delay".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

(b) Section 202 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling, selection, and referral of youths, sixteen years of age or older, for occupational training and further schooling, who because of inadequate educational background and work preparation are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without such training and schooling."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section (as so designated prior to the redesignation provided for in subsection (b)) is amended by inserting after "training" in the first sentence thereof the following: "(other than for training under subsection (i))".

(d) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the attainment of basic education skills those eligible persons who indicate their intention to, and will thereby be able to, pursue courses of occupational training of a type for which there appears to be reasonable expectation of employment. Such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks."

Sec. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 203 of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting in the second sentence of the first paragraph after "fifty-two weeks" the following: "(except where authorized for individuals referred for training under section 202(i))",

(2) by inserting in such sentence after "not exceed" the following: "$10 more than",

(3) by inserting in the first sentence of the second paragraph after "less than" the following: "$10 more than",

(4) by inserting in the second sentence of the second paragraph after "compensation and" the following: "$10 more than", and

(5) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in full-time training under section 231 shall not be reduced on account of his part-time employment which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall pay training allowances only to unemployed persons who have had not less than two years of experience in gainful employment and who are either heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or who are members of a household in which the head of the household or the head of the family is unemployed: *Provided*, That not more than one person in any one household may be receiving training allowances under this Act at any particular time. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may pay training allowances at a rate not in excess of $20 a week to youths seventeen years of age or older who require such training allowance in order to undertake training, who are referred for training in accordance wtih section 202(b), and who are not entitled to allowances under the preceding sentence, except that no such training allowance shall be paid to any such youth who has not graduated from high school, unless the Secretary has satisfied himself that such youth has continuously failed to attend school for a period of not less than one year and that the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling, have concluded that further school attendance by such youth is no longer practicable under the circumstances. Not more than 25 per centum of the persons who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for receipt of unemployment compensation) may be youths under the age of twenty-two."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 33⅓ per centum of the amount of such payments, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments."

(d) Paragraph (2) of subsection (h) of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1964, and for 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid on or after that date" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "July 1, 1965, for 66⅔ per centum of the amount of such benefits paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter".

Sec. 4. (a) The center heading of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "ADVISORY COMMITTEES".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of making expert assistance available to persons formulating and carrying on programs under this title, the Secretary shall, where appropriate, require the organization on a community, State, and/or regional basis of labor-management-public advisory committees."

(c) Subsections (d) and (e) of such section are amended by inserting "National Advisory" immediately before "Committee" each place it appears.

Sec. 5. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

### "LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 208. During the period ending June 30, 1965, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed. Where such assistance is provided in the form of grants, such grants may not exceed 50 per centum of the expenses incurred reasonably necessary to the transportation of the person who is relocating, and his family, and their household effects. Where such assistance is provided in the form of loans, or a combination of loans and grants, the total amount thereof may not exceed 100 per centum of such expenses and shall be made subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title, not more than 2 per centum thereof, or $4,000,000, whichever is the lesser, may be used for the purposes of this section."

Sec. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 231 of the Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that with respect to education to be provided pursuant to referrals under subsection (b) or (i) of section 202, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the education to be provided under such subsection through other appropriate education agencies".

(b) The second sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out ", if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose," and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence the following: "where such institutions can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures".

(c) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The State agency shall be paid 50 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, except that for the period ending June 30, 1965, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed persons, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 66⅔ per centum of such cost."

Sec. 7. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Act is amended by striking out "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and each of the three succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$211,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $422,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $281,333,333 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $211,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and each of the three succeeding fiscal years".

Sec. 8. Section 305 of the Act is amended by striking out "vocational".

Sec. 9. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 309 of the Act are each amended by striking out "March 1, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966".

Sec. 10. Section 310 of the Act is amended by striking out "1965" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAFT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Taft: Section 7(b) is amended as follows:

Strike the figure "$211,000,000" in lines 20–21 and insert in lieu thereof, "$161,000,000".

Strike the figure "$422,000,000" in lines 21–22 and insert in lieu thereof, "$322,000,000".

Strike the figure "$281,333,333" in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof, "$214,666,667".

Strike the figure "$211,000,000" in line 23 and insert in lieu thereof, "$161,000,000".

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, as explained during the discussion on this bill, I offer this amendment because it is my feeling that the level of authorizations included in the bill is excessive. The original plan involved in this measure when enacted in 1962 called for an expenditure in the first year of around $97 million. Then it moved up to $161 million in the next year and went finally with State matching coming in in the year 1965 to a level of $322 million.

The purpose and the effect of the changes which would be made by the amendment I have proposed would be to continue this authorized level of expenditures, but to pick up State matching entirely and put that over onto the burden of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1965. In 1966 it would require State matching for only one-third. Therefore there is an increased Federal contribution.

Finally, in the last authorization year, fiscal 1967, it would have the effect of setting the program with a Federal contribution again of $161 million and a State contribution matching it on a dollar-for-dollar basis for a total authorized expenditure level of $322 million, the original figure that was arrived at when the program was originally contemplated. As I made clear earlier, I feel these authorizations, even though we add to the program, the basic educational and teaching program, even with increased special youth programs and making the other changes in the bill, I feel these authorizations would be more than adequate.

As has been pointed out, I agree with the policies that have been followed by Secretary of Labor Wirtz. He has moved with caution in setting up these programs and they have not been able because of caution to move ahead as fast as expected. The target level, for instance, originally called for 400,000 training in the first 3-year period. For this current year the target was 134,000. Actually, the level under training has gotten up to only 61,000. I do not believe the original target is likely to be met.

I pointed out in my supplemental views the appropriations of the Appropriation Committee total only $110 million for this fiscal year, not the $161 million authorized.

Even if this amendment should fail I feel reasonably certain it is unlikely that the appropriations that could be justified and enacted for the 2 additional authorized years for this program could exceed the amount of authorization which would result from the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The present authorization for the current program is $161 million, but our Appropriations Committee has approved the total appropriation the gentleman stated of $110 million. I think on the basis of the amendments that are being considered today one could justify a higher authorization than $110 million, but I think that this is a logical and a reasonable figure that is set in the gentleman's amendment, one which I think we could justify as an appropriation level. I hope that the Congress realizes that we are clearing on the current program at $110 million, so that with increases in appropriations because of the amendments considered today we could bring up the 1964 figure to $161 million to take care of these amendments. So there is plenty of room to take care of these amendments by the $161 million.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman. This has been brought out by the testimony when this bill was considered. I asked the Department several months ago what they expected the first quarter training would be. They stated they expected to have under training some 72,000 in the third quarter, whereas when you actually look at the figures it turns out they have been able to have in training only some 30,000 additional during that period. I am not critical of this, but I think this is a program that has to move slowly. It is not easy to set up programs and do them well without wasting money. I think we keep a better financial administration of this program by this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of the cost of this program has been brought into this discussion. This is perfectly normal and as it should be.

However, in our debate the question has been raised whether or not the Government can afford to administer such a program. I think we should also consider whether or not the Government can afford not to undertake this task.

With unemployment in the Nation again on the climb, are we going to stand here and tell those displaced workers, "All we can do for you is let the State in which you live place you on the relief rolls"?

If we do, then we are breaking a law that this Congress passed in 1946, the Full Employment Act, as it states "The Government," that is, Congress, "is responsible to promote and insure maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

We know every Member in this House is concerned about the plight of the unemployed. We have heard speech after speech on the need for action to secure the solution to their problem. Yet when the opportunity presents itself to help some of them we hear the cry, "The Nation cannot afford to do this."

We are aware that these amendments will incur additional expenditures. However, we are also aware that this is the wisest investment this Nation could make.

We have faith in our unemployed and we feel that, if given the chance, they will have the ability to pull themselves out of the rut of despair, and the Nation will benefit from the returns it receives from this additional "investment."

In all the testimony we heard, during our hearings on this legislation this summer, representatives of industry, management, labor, education, and all levels of government testified that "Basic education is necessary if we are to get our unemployed into occupational training," and "More of our unemployed youth must be trained if we do not want to develop tomorrow's hard-core unemployed group." And all the witnesses knew more money would be required to do this.

The majority of Congressmen agree with the need for the amendments. However, some are reluctant to pay for them.

Mr. Chairman, if the need is there, and it is, then we must buy it. We cannot have one without the other.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if you were to project the program as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has done on the scale on which it has been operated during its first and experimental year, you would reach the same conclusion he has reached. But as has been pointed out repeatedly, two changes have taken place. First, this program, a new and experimental program, has made such progress that the department is ready to move ahead with it at the rate which the Congress had originally contemplated.

Second, the amendments made by this bill before us today, with respect to a stepped up youth program and, further with respect to taking on additional trainees who would go into combined basic education and skill courses, envisions an additional 93,000 trainees per year in those courses.

Finally, the on-the-job training program, one of those provisions of the bill in which the Members of the House who voted for this bill a year and a half ago put the most hope, did not cost a nickel for training in the last fiscal year. Very wisely the Department was moving slowly in setting up the procedures under which such a program would operate, and they are now ready to go. So we expect an expansion of this program. We would naturally and normally expect an expansion of this program. If we did not have one, we would be disappointed in the outcome of the legislation we enacted.

Very frankly, Mr. Chairman, if I had thought a year and one-half ago that this program would never get any further off the ground than it did in its opening phases, I would never have come down here to vote for its enactment.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, we are ready to move at an accelerated rate. There are unemployed who qualify for training; who can take such training; and who can enter jobs. We want to help them and we are not going to be able to do so unless we have the money to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio although I agree with his analysis of the rest of the bill. I am sorry we have to disagree on this, but I am particularly opposed to his amendment as it affects not the current fiscal year but the next 2 fiscal years following this current fiscal year when we could expect some expansion and improvement in the program. So I would ask the House to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman then if he does not agree that for this fiscal year at any rate, there is no need for any additional authorization? Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that; and is it not true that the Department of Labor for all practical purposes has so stated?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman, there is some room for a difference of opinion as to what is needed. I have not thought that the Department needed perhaps as much as it asked for the current fiscal year. But I think it could use some money in this current fiscal year. The Department probably will not need as much as we provided when we wrote the amount in the bill for the current fiscal year. But so far as the 2 subsequent fiscal years are concerned, I am really very much concerned.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill today for a very urgent reason. It might be described as a personal, selfish, or parochial reason. By virtue of an edict from the Pentagon, the infallible Mount Olympus of our Government, Schenectady County, N.Y., which is in my district, is about to be transferred from a distress area into a disaster area.

There has been a lot of talk here today about economy and there has been talk in other places. Some have stated during this debate that this kind of legislation offers only a soothing syrup for a man with a brain tumor and that the real solution is to provide jobs.

I suggest to you that the overlords in the Pentagon are creating unemployment faster than we can patch up the economic bruises of their victims.

The Pentagon has announced, with a blare of economy trumpets, that it intends to close the Schenectady Army Depot where 1,700 persons are employed in a city already devoting nearly half of its budget to welfare.

The Pentagon claims a saving, which I dispute, of $1.5 million a year by closing this installation which has served the country well since World War I. It neglects to state that its own economy experts, after a costly 13 months investigation, recommended that the depot be continued in the interests of economy.

The taxpayers of this country, Mr. Chairman, do want economy, but they do not want the kind of economy which shows a saving of $1 million in one department and a consequent additional spending by other agencies of Government of twice that amount.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense was asked yesterday if his Department, in closing down installations, considered the impact when the area affected was distressed. "That" he replied "is not our responsibility."

I wonder if he and I are working for the same Government. I will vote for this bill today, Mr. Chairman, and then I will hold out the tin cup for my district. We will take the poultice because nothing else is left since our own Government is taking without just cause jobs from 1,700 of our people. False economy not only means no savings to the taxpayers, but it can trigger a general depression.

### SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out lines 17 through 24, and insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $407,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $281,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment that I have offered for Mr. Taft's amendment simply does this: It provides for a different redistribution of the funds authorized by this bill. In actual dollars and cents it amounts to a $9.5 million, or a little more than that, savings on Mr. Taft's amendment. It is $276 million under the committee bill, and it would shorten the program. This is a brand new program and is certainly needed. I know it is needed in my community.

Last year because of a national policy change placing an embargo on Cuban tobacco the cigar industry in my district was greatly curtailed, and where that industry had at one time employed 10,000 people, it is now employing about 2,000 people. We have a vast retraining problem there.

This is a new and very rapidly expanding program. I think that the Congress should reserve to itself the right to come back and reexamine the program, see how the administration is carrying it out I believe that the redistribution of funds, as I have proposed in my amendment, is a more equitable distribution than that proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I think it would allow the orderly expansion of the program under the administration and also allow Congress to rework the program in the light of the experience that we have had. Let us realize that this is a new program and one that Congress should exercise its responsibility on, to reexamine and rework it as we learn from experience.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his substitute. Although it does end up $9 million less than the Taft amendment it does give us an opportunity at an earlier date to review this program again. I would like to support the substitute.

Mr. GIBBONS. This amendment saves money. It will quicken the congressional review of the problem and it will certainly provide that there be no lag in this very well needed program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be deluded by this amendment as an amendment which cuts back the total authorization by more than $9 million over the cut that I suggested in the authorization. It does that by the very simple expedient of cutting out the last year, the fiscal year 1967, from the program entirely and picking up the $161 million which my amendment had for that fiscal year. The bill actually had $211 million for the 1967 authorization and spread that back over the other 3 years.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. In effect the substitute amendment actually increases the amount, the largest amount authorized in this bill from $422 million to a figure the exact amount of which I do not at the moment recall. But it would be more than the $422 million under the substitute amendment whereas under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio we would get $100 million less.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the gentleman is quite correct but he is very close to it. What the substitute amendment does, as I see it, is to take away from the present bill $50 million in the first fiscal year, which my amendment would do also. However, it takes off only $15 million in the second fiscal year rather than $100 million, which my amendment does. And in the third fiscal year it takes off nothing whereas my amendment would take off some $65 million.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman's amendment does not contemplate that this law would last longer than 3 years; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I would like to point out with regard to the substitute amendment that it has one fatal flaw to which I want to call attention; that is, contrary to the determination of the committee, it fails to establish the 50–50, dollar-for-dollar matching principle at the end of the program in the last year.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]. I do so because I believe so very deeply in this matching principle. Let us remember, first of all, that the only reason the Gibbons amendment can end up with a total figure savings that is close to the Taft amendment is that the Gibbons amendment eliminates the third year completely which involves $211 million. That is where he picks up most of the money. Everyone concedes that we are going ahead and will have a program the third year, but the unfortunate thing that is done if the Gibbons amendment is adopted is that it leaves us with the States matching one-third and the Federal Government matching two-thirds.

The present act with the Taft amendment would not change the ultimate requirement of 50 percent matching by the States. It provides that matching next year would be waived. The following year the States would match one-third to two-thirds by the Federal Government. And, then, the final year it would be done on the basis of dollar-for-dollar matching, State and Federal.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very basic concept that must be preserved in the act.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would the gentleman agree as well that the Gibbons substitute contemplates a review of the program and a program of longer life?

Mr. GOODELL. A review of the program but with longer life?

Mr. WAGGONNER. A review of the program which will extend the life of the program?

Mr. GOODELL. I believe the Gibbons amendment itself does involve a review of the program but I do not believe it affects the life of the program one way or the other.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

**Mr. MILLER of California.** Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor of this body has reported that the record for the first 12 months of operation of the Manpower Development and Training Act is "an unqualified success." I rise to express my full agreement with this finding and my full support of the full committee amendments before us which are necessary and desirable to move the program forward toward fuller realization of its potentialities and objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe at this time it is essential that we get on with this fine program as quickly as we can, foreshortening the time, to make sure that we do have an adequate working program in being.

Mr. Chairman, we were confronted just recently with a cutback in some of the military establishments. We cannot expect the military establishments to be maintained as make-work programs, to be WPA's. We must be prepared to offer retraining for those displaced to lessen the impact of closing installations.

Mr. Chairman, if the shipbuilding industry and the aircraft industry is going to be phased out because of the lessening of international tensions, we must be prepared to pick up the jobs that are going to be lost in these industries. A retaining program at this time is entirely essential and must be gotten on with.

That this law was vital, and that getting it into operation was tough, nobody will deny. That it has achieved so much in so short a time is a testimonial to its need, its worth, and the great effort which went into producing these initial results. At this early date—after only little more than 1 year of operation—the number of projects which have already been approved provide training for about 100,000 trainees. About one-fifth of these trainees have already completed their training, and about 70 percent of these have already been placed in jobs, nearly all of them utilizing their newly acquired skills. Now that the program has gotten into gear, training is currently proceeding at the estimated rate of 108,000 trainees per year, and training capacity and operating knowledge and experience enables an estimate that this number can be increased to over 200,000 in the third year of the act's operation.

This record certainly justifies original enactment of the law, and encourages support of the modifications now before us which will give it even sharper teeth to bite into the Nation's most pressing domestic problem of proper utilization of our manpower resources and alleviation of persistently high levels of unemployment.

The figures alone do not tell the entire story. For this we must go to the people and the projects behind the figures. These lend even more support to the serious endeavor and commitment which was made in this legislation.

Let us look first at the scope of the training program already undertaken. Almost 2,400 individual training projects had been approved by the end of October. These covered a broad spectrum of over 400 job fields throughout the United States—in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Let us reflect on this for a moment. Unfilled and hard-to-fill job needs were searched out and a reasonable expectation of employment was found to exist for over 400 different occupations of all types: professional, technical, skilled and semiskilled industrial crafts, clerical and white collar, and the newly emerging service occupations—maintenance and repairmen, automobile mechanics, and a battery of health occupations, among others. Training programs were developed, many of which have already been completed, and our unemployed and underemployed citizens selected, to fill these needs. This represents the most intensive and concerted effort thus far experienced in balancing labor market factors.

Even more heartwarming is the story of the people behind this training program. The central fact of the experience gained thus far under the Manpower Development and Training Act is that it is successful in reaching the long-term unemployed—those with 15 or more weeks of unemployment. About half of the enrollees in training projects come from this category of jobless workers. Nearly 1 out of 5 of all enrollees, moreover, had been looking for a job for over a year. Many of these represent our hardcore unemployed who had become obsolete in the labor market. No emphasis is needed to underscore the value of salvaging these people by restoring them to productive work and human dignity.

To an even greater extent, training programs are reaching adult workers of prime working age—22 to 44 years—with strong attachment to the labor force. About two-thirds of all trainees are in this category, which includes to a very great extent the heads of families of our unemployed population. Directing these people into occupations affording opportunities for employment is not only a labor market need but a vital necessity for our national health and stability.

In addition to the prime thrust of dealing with the rehabilitation of the unemployed, this act has also had some salutory effects for other disadvantaged groups in our society. A beginning has been made—which must be expanded through provision of broader measures which we are now considering here—in coping with the ever-deepening "social dynamite" of our youth unemployment problems. Older workers, the "forgotten men" of our economy, have profited from this program, comprising about 10 percent of the trainees. Women are being trained in substantial numbers to prepare them for their increasing responsibilities and participation in the working world in this modern age. And our nonwhite citizens—probably the most disadvantaged group in our labor force—have been given the opportunity long awaited to acquire better skills and employment opportunities. These workers make up 23 percent of all enrollees, about the same proportion as they comprise of the total unemployed. An even greater proportion of these trainees are drawn from the long-term unemployed.

These early operating results leave no doubt that this act is reaching out in all directions of need and opportunity envisaged at the time of its passage. It has more than paid for itself in terms of unemployment insurance, public welfare, and other dependency costs which are the alternatives. More than this are the human values and costs served. These cannot be expressed in cold figures and facts. We need only search our memories and hearts for this unestimable estimate.

Let me refer to just one example—one of many—of what has been and can be accomplished under this act. At the Virginia State College in Norfolk a pilot project was developed to retrain hardcore unemployed, unskilled workers to qualify for employment in skilled and semiskilled occupations in which employment opportunities exist. One hundred men past the age of 25, half of them unemployed so long as to no longer be receiving unemployment compensation, were approved for a 1-year training course which coordinated vocational education, general basic education, counseling and occupational training. Their inability to find work was not the result of their not wanting to work or not having the capacity for learning skills. It was caused by their not having the skills or sufficient education to qualify for available jobs. The training program developed enabled them to advance their literacy level considerably, and at the same time to receive occupational training. Ninety of these men graduated from this course and emerged with skill qualifications in a number of occupations—electronics technicians, brick masons, sheet metal workers, automobile mechanics, and building maintenance workers. For these men there is a new fulfillment and realization of their occupational potential. For them and their families they have been salvaged for a life of productive work and economic stability.

This is only one example of what is and can be accomplished under this act. Similar opportunities have been provided and have borne results under hundreds of other training projects already completed—and more to come. It surely needs no repeating that we here are both committed and dedicated to continuing this program and to strengthening it wherever we find a loose stone.

**The CHAIRMAN.** The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Chairman, I request the support of the members of the Committee of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]. It is $9 million less than provided for by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Also, it gives the Congress an opportunity to reexamine the program in 3 years rather than 4.

Finally, the 50–50 matching participation of the States can be added when Congress does review the program, beginning that year.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GIBBONS) there were—ayes 102, noes 105.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. TAFT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 137, noes 121.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as amended by the substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDRUM

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDRUM: Page 4, beginning in line 24, strike out "have concluded that further school attendance by such youth is no longer practicable under the circumstances" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "have concluded, after considering any assistance available (under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963), that further school attendance by such youth in any regular academic or vocational program is no longer practicable under the circumstances."

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, considerable discussion has been had here today about the possibility of conflict between this program, as it relates to the training of youths between the ages of 17 and 22, and the program contemplated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. While it is true that various members of the committee have stated there is no intention on the part of the sponsors of this legislation, and certainly I believe there is no intention on the part of the agency of Government which will be charged with its administration to interfere with the vocational education program as contemplated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, I believe that in order to allay these fears and to remove any question about whether the two programs may come into conflict that this amendment is necessary.

I do not see that it does any violence or harm whatever to the overall program contemplated in this legislation, and I do believe it clarifies the question of whether we will have under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act the work-study program, an opportunity for a conflict to develop and actual competition to arise between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I just want to say it was our intention all along to avoid such conflict and the gentleman's amendment would clarify that point. I think the amendment the gentleman has offered is a good amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very worthwhile contribution to this bill, and I would like to accept the amendment.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: Page 5, beginning in line 12, strike out ", and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments".

Page 5, beginning in line 20, strike out ", and 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter".

Page 8, line 16, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 3, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is, it is a conforming amendment to conform with the amendment we have already adopted reducing the amount of money in this program. I want to point out very clearly that I support the idea of a 50-percent participation in the program by the various States, and when the proper time comes I will certainly support it with all my efforts.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you say you will support that, would you not also have to go over on page 8 and strike out all of lines 4 through 12 to provide for 50 per centum by the State after 1964 in the present bill?

Mr. GIBBONS. The bill as it is presently drawn, graduated the State's participation in this program, and I support that. I support the ultimate 50 percent. I support the same graduation we have had in the bill all along, but when we get to 1966, when we have to take this legislation up again, if we decide we want to take a look at it at this time, I would then support the 50-percent participation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But you are extending at this time 100-percent participation. In other words, 100 percent Federal payment for the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. GIBBONS. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is what the bill does already.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But I mean the present law does not do that.

Mr. GIBBONS. No, but the bill does that already, and what I am doing now is this: This is just a conforming amendment to conform with the money we have already stricken out of the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, could we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Gibbons amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question.

If I understand what was said correctly, he himself favors the 50-percent matching principle.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is right.

Mr. GOODELL. Then, I do not see any harm in leaving this language in the bill. We thereby underline the intention of the Congress that any subsequent years will be on a 50–50 basis. The gentleman is stopping, as I understand it, by his earlier amendment, all authorizations at the one-third matching level. If he had not cut off the last year of authorizations, he agrees he would like to have a 50–50 matching go into effect. It will, by this amendment, just strike the requirement that in subsequent years the 50–50 matching will apply. I do not see that the language of the bill as it is now does any harm, and I think it does underline the Congress intent that in subsequent years when we do authorize money for those subsequent years, the States are going to have to be prepared to match on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. GIBBONS. I would have no objection, frankly, either to amending my amendment or substituting for my amendment to allow on page 5 those two 50 per centums to remain in there, because I do not think they hurt the bill at all. But over on pages 8 and 9 as to the change of 2 and 3, I do not think there is any objection to striking that out.

Mr. GOODELL. I do not have any objection to that.

Mr. GIBBONS. Can we have the amendment then worded to leave those 50 per centums in there? It will not hurt anything.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's amendment be revised to include the 50 percent he struck out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS:

Page 8, line 16, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 3, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if this bill is to be rewritten by unanimous consent on the House floor—and I am sure the gentleman understands this is unusual procedure—will it meet the clarion call of President Johnson for thrift and frugality? Will the President then be satisfied with this bill?

Mr. GIBBONS. I could not tell the gentleman that. I have not consulted with him about this specific amendment. I think we are moving in that direction.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder when Members of the House are going to answer the call of the President for economy, thrift, and frugality. I would like to ask, too, whether the gentleman thinks this will in any way affect the retraining of Members of Congress? Next year being an election year some Members who have failed to support economy may not be returned to Congress and may well need retraining for some other job. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, especially with the Gibbons amendments.

Mr. GIBBONS. I only say that every man has to vote his own conscience on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words. I take this time to announce, so the Members will be clear, what the parliamentary situation will be, that I intend to demand a separate vote on both of the Gibbons amendments that have been adopted. It is my understanding that if the House votes down the Gibbons amendments that were agreed to we will then be free to have a recommittal motion which can cut the funds, not by the amount proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but by half as much as the Taft amendment would have cut them in all the years affected. I think everyone can concede that the program will live easily within those bounds. Frankly, I prefer the bill as it came to the floor to the bill as it has been amended by the amendments of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]. I think it is a better bill because it does retain the 50-percent matching principle.

We have now stricken the 50-percent matching principle, with the States and the Federal Government matching equally. So by voting down the Gibbons amendments we will be permitted to have a recommittal motion that will cut the funds in the bill 50 percent as much as the Taft amendment would have cut those funds. I think that would be a wholly fair and acceptable amendment, and I hope that we can enact it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from New York if it is not true that even with the Gibbons perfecting amendments the 50–50 matching fund no longer specifically is directed to the authorization amounts?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I think there are many in the House, particularly those who voted for the Gibbons amendments, who do not realize that point. I am very hopeful that when the vote comes on the Gibbons amendments they will be voted down so that we can offer a motion to recommit with these instructions. If they are not voted down then the motion to recommit, as I understand the parliamentary procedure, cannot contain that. I have been very much for this program. Yet, I may feel constrained to have to vote against the bill if the Gibbons amendment prevails.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am not quite sure about this. Did the gentleman say we would not keep the matching principle under the Gibbons amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. Under the Gibbons amendment, the 50–50 is out, and even with the perfecting amendment, it does not relate to the authorizations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. GOODELL. Under the Gibbons amendment we kept the one-third matching by the States in the fourth year of this program. Under the bill as it came to the floor, we had a 50–50 matching proposition. In the fifth year the matching went to one-half. That fifth year of the program has now been stricken and eliminated by the Gibbons amendment. In his second amendment, however, he left in what is hopeful language, that when we do authorize the fifth year of this program the States will be expected to match on a 50-percent basis.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The point is that for the years that are now in the bill, the one-third matching that was covered is still in the bill is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The only thing that is left out is the last year, but nothing else is left out at all.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; but it does not tie into the authorization, which I think is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] yield to me at this time?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. I take this time only to announce to the Members of the House, so that the Members may be advised, that immediately following the disposition of this bill, we will go on with the vocational education conference report and with the hope of completing it this afternoon.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, so that the Members will understand exactly what is in this bill, if they will just take the bill and look at page 5, line 12, and read it, they will find it is still in there. Lines 12, 13, and 14 are still in there and lines 20 and 21 are still in there. I admit there is no authorization for the money for those years, but the 50-percent matching provision is still in here. It has not been stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated on the floor that it is my intention to preserve the 50-percent matching formula, if I ever get to it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not believe we are establishing firmly a 50-percent ratio, unless we authorize funds for the year in question. The gentleman's amendment stops the program at the end of the fourth year. So, anything we say about the fifth year is merely an expression of our desire and we cannot bind a future Congress.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is the way I understand it anyway. You cannot bind a future Congress anyway. We are just expressing our opinion here.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, pursuant to House Resolution 583, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the two Gibbons amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remaining amendment, the Landrum amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out lines 17 through 24, and insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $407,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $281,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two Gibbons amendments be considered en bloc.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the second amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 16, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 3, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the amendments.

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. GOODELL.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 126.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 8720.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational opportunities in the Nation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, if it is proposed to take some time to explain this bill so that we may know what this conference report contains.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that time will be taken to explain the conference report.

Mr. **GROSS**. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1025)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

*"Declaration of purpose*

"SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

*"Authorization of appropriations*

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $60,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $118,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $177,500,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $225,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

*"Allotments to States*

"SEC. 3. (a) Ninety per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(4) An amount which bears the same ratio to 5 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(d) (1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .40 or more than .60, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .60.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceeding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) The term 'per capita income' for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

*"Uses of Federal funds*

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

"(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

"(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

"(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

"(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

"(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

"(b) At least 33⅓ per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

"(c) Ten per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

### *"State plans*

"SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4 (a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

"(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

"(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

"(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

### *"Payments to States*

"SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

"(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

"(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

"(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

### *"Labor standards*

"Sec 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

### *"Definitions*

"Sec. 8. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'vocational education' means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

"(2) The term 'area vocational education school' means—

"(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(B) a department of a high school exclusively or principally used for providing vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(D) the department or division of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State or an area of the State designated and approved by the State Board, and if, in the case of a school, department, or division described in (C) or (D), it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

"(3) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(4) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

"(5) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(6) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(7) The term 'State board' means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

"(8) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

"(9) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(10) The term 'Vocational Education Act of 1946' means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj, 15aaa-15ggg).

"(11) The term 'supplementary vocational education Acts' means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31-33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

### *"Advisory Committee on Vocational Education*

"Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Committee'), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'). Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4(c) and section 14.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

### *"Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts*

"Sec. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i-15m, 15o-15q, 15aa-15jj, 15aaa-15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

"(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

"(c) (1) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

"(2) at least 10 per centum of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) to a State for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment under subsection (a), or both.

"(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

"(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

### *"Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs*

"SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out 'of the next eight fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out 'of the next seven fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out 'of the five succeeding fiscal years) and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

### *"Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws*

"SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

"(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

"(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

"(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

### *"Work-study program for vocational education students*

"SEC. 13 (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 15 and determined to be for the purposes of this section for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums so determined for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all of the States in such preceding year.

"(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (b) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

"(b) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a 'supplementary plan'), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (a) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (c), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

"(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefore make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

"(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

"(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

"(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

"(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

"(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

"(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

"(d) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of noncomformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

"(e) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Commissioner shall pay to such

State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (a) for such fiscal year.

"(f) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (a).

"(g) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

### *"Residential vocational education schools*

"SEC. 14. For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants, out of sums appropriated pursuant to section — to State boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this section, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

### *"Authorization for sections 13 and 14*

"SEC. 15. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 13 and 14, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year. The Commissioner shall determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of each such section.

### *"Federal control*

"SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

### *"Short title*

"SEC. 17. This part may be cited as the 'Vocational Education Act of 1963'.

### "PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

### *"Amendments to title I—General provisions*

"SEC. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,' each time it appears therein.

"(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting 'or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner' after the words 'as determined under State law' wherever such words appear in such subsections.

"(c) Subsection (i) of such section 103 is amended by striking out 'does not include' and inserting in lieu thereof 'includes' and by inserting before the period ', except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act'.

"(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school'.

### *"Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education*

"SEC. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and eacr of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education'.

"(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out '$250,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$800,000'.

"(d)(1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting 'or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner' after 'at an institution of higher education'.

"(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting 'or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States' after 'State'.

"(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205 (b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out '1968' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1969'.

### *"Amendments to title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction*

"SEC. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b)(1) The third sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965'.

"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year.'

"(c) Section 303 (a) (1) (A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting 'and published' after 'printed', and (2) by inserting 'of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and' after 'or both, and'.

"(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years'.

### *"Amendments to title IV—National defense fellowships*

"SEC. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 402.', and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine'.

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition.'

### *"Amendments to title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing*

**"Sec. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year'.**

**"(b)(1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'**

**"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 502.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:**

**"'(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.'**

**"(c)(1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:**

**"'(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and'.**

**"(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out 'public secondary schools' and inserting in lieu thereof 'public elementary or secondary schools', and by inserting 'who are not below grade 7' after 'students' in clause (A) thereof.**

**"(d)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years', and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years', and by inserting before the semicolon ', including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan'.**

**"(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out 'the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools', and inserting in lieu thereof 'the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools', and by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.**

**"(e)(1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and to insert in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.**

**"(2) Such section is further amended to insert 'who are not below grade 7 in elementary or' after 'students', and to insert 'elementary or' after 'counseling or guidance in a public'.**

### *"Amendments to title VI—Language development*

"Sec. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years', and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'As used in this section "modern foreign language" includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.'.

### *"Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes*

"Sec. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' and after 'auditory aids,'.

"(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

### *"Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions*

"Sec. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,'.

"(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

### "PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

### *"Amendments to Public Law 815*

"Sec. 31. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1963' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1960–1961' and inserting in lieu thereof '1962-1963'.

### *"Amendments to Public Law 874*

"Sec. 32. Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1963' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

### *"Effective dates*

"Sec. 33. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall be effective July 1, 1963."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

Adam C. Powell,
Carl D. Perkins,
Phil M. Landrum,
Edith Green,
John H. Dent,
John Brademas,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*
Wayne Morse,
Lister Hill,
Pat McNamara,
Ralph W. Yarborough,
Joseph S. Clark, Jr.,
Jennings Randolph,
Winston L. Prouty,
Jacob K. Javits,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose: The declaration of purpose contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a provision in the Senate amendment which reflected the addition by the Senate amendment of a program to provide part-time employment for certain youths. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the Senate provision in light of the action of the conferees with respect to such Senate program.

Authorization of appropriations: The sums authorized to be appropriated by the House bill and the Senate amendment for the purpose of making grants under this part and sums agreed to in conference are as follows: For the fiscal year 1964, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $45,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $108,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $60,000,000 for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1965, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $90,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $153,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $118,500,000. For the fiscal year 1966, the House bill authorized to of appropriated $135,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $198,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $177,500,000. For the fiscal year 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $180,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $243,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $225,000,000.

Allotment to States: The House bill provided that 95 percent of the annual appropriation should be allotted among the States, and the Senate amendment provided that 85 percent of the annual appropriation should be so allotted and accordingly deleted the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4) (prescribing an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 percent of the annual appropriation as the sum of all the allotments to a State based on age groups bears to such sum for all the States). The substitute agreed to in conference provides that 90 percent of the annual appropriation shall be allotted among the States and accordingly retains the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4).

The allotment formula in the House bill was based on the number of persons in various age groups needing vocational education, and the Senate amendment inserted the factor of per capita income (expressed in terms of an allotment ratio) into the formula and added provisions for determining per capita income and allotment ratios which were to be not less than 0.25 or more than 0.75. The Senate formula, based on both population and per capita income, and the corollary provisions relating to per capita income and allotment ratios are adopted by the substitute with a change in the limits on allotment ratios to a minimum of 0.40 and a maximum of 0.60.

### USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

1. Expenditures for construction: As a corollary to its expanded definition of area vocational education school facilities, the Senate amendment limited expenditure for construction of certain of such facilities to 10 percent of a State's allotment. The House bill contained no comparable limitation. The substitute agreed to in conference deletes such limitation and adopts the language of the House bill.

2. Teacher training: The House bill provided that expenditures made for the training of teachers could be used only for inservice teacher training, while under the Senate amendment expenditures could be made for all types of teacher training. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

3. Required expenditures for vocational training of certain youth and construction: The House bill required that at least 25 percent of a State's allotment be used for the vocational training of youths who have left or graduated from high school or for construction of area vocational education school facilities, or both. The Senate amendment increased this percentage for the first 4 fiscal years to 40 percent. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the percentage figure of 33⅓ for the first 4 fiscal years and provides for 25 percent of such allotment to be so available for each of the subsequent fiscal years.

4. Percentage of annual appropriation available for research and pilot programs: The House bill provided that 5 percent of the annual appropriation was to be used by the Commissioner to make grants for research and pilot programs. The Senate amendment increased such percentage to 15 percent. The conference substitute fixed 10 percent of such appropriation as the amount to be used for grants by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed to in conference adopts a provision of the Senate amendment to make it clear that the Commissioner can make grants to colleges and universities independently of the State boards.

The House bill provided that the Commissioner could make grants to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions as well as State boards, and the Senate amendment limited such grants to colleges and universities and State boards. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the provision of the House bill.

The House bill provided that the cost of certain research and pilot programs could be paid by such grants, and the Senate amendment included the cost of leadership training programs. The substitute agreed to in conference includes the cost of training programs as well as the cost of such research and pilot programs.

The Senate amendment provided that the pilot programs aided by grants from the Commissioner should be directed at the needs of communities with substantial numbers of school dropouts and unemployed youths. The House bill did not provide such a direction, and the substitute agreed to in conference deletes such direction.

State plans: The language of the Senate amendment and the House bill are identical except that the Senate amendment included a statement that the Federal funds were to be made available so that ready access to vocational training will be provided as soon as possible to all persons in all communities of the State. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

Labor standards: The language of the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a technical amendment, made by the Senate amendment, with respect to the Contract Work Hours Standards Act which is adopted in the substitute agreed to in conference.

### DEFINITIONS

1. Vocational education: The definition of vocational education contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except that the Senate amendment made clear the inclusion of the training of semiskilled workers, included instruction related to the occupation for which a student is being trained, and deleted the requirement that teacher training be limited to inservice training of teachers. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

2. Area vocational education school: The House bill defines the term "area vocational education school" as a school principally used for vocational training which admits as regular students both persons who have left or completed high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market. The House bill and the Senate amendment require that the training provided by area vocational education schools be available to all residents of a State or a designated area thereof. However, the Senate amendment in an expanded definition enlarged the term from schools principally used for vocational training to: (a) specialized high schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; (b) departments or other units of a high school; (c) technical or vocational schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; and (d) departments or other units of junior colleges, community colleges, or universities. Further, the requirement of availability for full-time study was attached to the schools or departments described in (a), (b), and (c) above, and the requirement relating to the training of both persons who have left or completed high school was attached to the school described in (c) above. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the definition contained in the Senate amendment except that (1) only departments of high schools and only departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities are included in the definition, (2) departments of high schools must be used exclusively or principally for providing vocational training in no less than five different occupational fields, and departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities must also provide such vocational training, and (3) the requirement as to whom the school must admit applies only to the schools described in (c) and (d) above.

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education: The House bill and Senate amendment are identical except that the Senate amendment provided that the advisory committee was to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the approval of pilot projects aided by grants from the Commissioner of Education and with respect to the program to provide residential vocational education schools. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts: The House bill and the Senate amendment were identical, except that in providing a broader use of funds allotted for training in home economics, the House bill required that at least 25 percent of the funds so allotted be used for training of persons to fit them for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skill in home economics subjects or be transferred to another allotment, or both. The Senate amendment did not contain such a requirement. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the requirement but reduces to 10 percent the percentage of the funds allotted that must be so expended.

Work study programs for vocational education students and residential vocational education schools: The Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to enable local educational agencies to provide part-time employment in public schools and other public agencies to students in full-time attendance in vocational education courses. The bill as it passed the House contained no comparable provision. Further, the Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to demonstrate the feasibility of providing residential schools, particularly in large urban areas with school dropouts and unemployed youths, to provide vocational training to youths who need full-time study on a residential basis to benefits from such training. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts both programs for 4 fiscal years starting with fiscal year 1965. The conference substitute, in section 15, authorizes an appropriation for both of these programs in the following amounts: $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1965, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $35,000,000 for the next 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Commissioner of Education is directed to determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of either program.

In providing authorizations at this level the House conferees expressed the unanimous belief that the District of Columbia metropolitan area should be given the highest priority in the establishment and construction of a residential vocational education school, which belief was concurred in by the Senate conferees in the light of the conference agreement which excluded the District of Columbia as a participant in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress.

### EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate amendment, in part B, provided for a 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 beyond June 30, 1964, its present expiration date, and included a number of amendments. The House bill contained no comparable provision, since this was being considered in committee as a separate piece of legislation. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides for a 1-year extension, to June 30, 1965, with certain amendments. The following statement describes the provision of the Senate amendment and the action recommended with respect thereto by the committee of conference.

Title I—General Provisions: The Senate amendment—

(1) extended the coverage of the act to American Samoa,

(2) permitted teachers in federally operated schools to receive benefits under the act,

(3) extended the benefits of the act to schools, such as laboratory schools and State schools for the deaf, which are under the administrative control and direction of any public institution or agency, even though not considered a part of a local public school system.

The substitute agreed upon in conference includes these provisions.

Title II—Student Loans: Title II of the act, due to expire at the end of fiscal year 1964, was extended by the Senate amendment for a period of 3 years. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also increased the amounts authorized to be appropriated for this title for fiscal years 1964 to $125,000,000 and established an authorization for fiscal year 1965 of $135,000,000. The conference agreement adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) raised the institutional loan ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000,

(2) extended the moratorium on the running of interest and repayment of principal on loans while student borrowers are continuing their higher education, to cover periods during which the borrower attends an approved institution of higher education located outside the United States, and

(3) extended the forgiveness feature, under which up to one-half of a student loan is canceled for service as a public elementary school teacher at the rate of 10 percent for each year of such service, so that such feature would cover teachers in elementary or secondary oversea schools of the Armed Forces.

The conference substitute includes these three changes.

Title III—Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction: The Senate amendment extended the provisions of this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallocate to other States any unneeded State allotments.

(2) broadened the categories of equipment and materials which may be purchased with funds made available by the title to include test-grading equipment, equipment used in connection with audiovisual libraries, and certain published materials such as charts, and maps, all of which are now excluded, and

(3) made certain technical changes in the provisions governing the promulgation of allotment ratios.

The conference substitute includes these first two changes, and, in lieu of the third amendment, provides for the use of the allotment ratio promulgated in 1959 for the distribution of title III funds for 1965.

Title IV—National Defense Fellowships: The Senate amendment extended this title, which provides for a program of graduate fellowships for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reaward any graduate fellowship under the act which is vacated before the expiration date of the period for which the fellowship originally was awarded, provides such reawarded fellowship cannot exceed the time period of the original award, and

(2) provided for the payment to institutions of higher education of a flat sum of $2,500 per year, less tuition charged the fellow, to cover the cost of educating fellowship recipients under the act. This payment would be substituted for the variable payment provided under existing law for this purpose.

The conference subsitute adopts these two provisions.

Title V—Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) increased the annual authorization of appropriation for grants to the State educational agencies by $2,500,000, from $15,000,000 per year to $17,500,000 per year,

(2) extended the guidance and counseling program to all seventh and eighth grades,

(3) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallot to other States any portion of a State's allotment under this title which is not used,

(4) increased the minimum State allotment from $20,000 to $50,000 under this title,

(5) excluded support of any program of clinical or psychiatric experimental testing.

The conference substitute adopts only the first four of these changes.

Title VI—Language Development: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also authorized institutes for the training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language. The conference substitute includes this change.

Title VII—Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years and authorized support of research and experimentation in the use of printed and published materials. The conference substitute includes the latter of these changes, but extends the title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

Title X—Miscellaneous Provisions: The Senate amendment provided for a 3 year extension of this title. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

### FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The Senate amendment, in part C, amended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend the temporary provisions of both laws for 3 years—that is, until June 30, 1966. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends these laws for only 2 years.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) extended the laws to the District of Columbia,

(2) provided that property which is sold by the United States would continue to be considered Federal property for 1 year, and

(3) provided for a comprehensive study of these laws.

The conference substitute does not include any of these provisions.

Adam C. Powell,  
Carl D. Perkins,  
Phil M. Landrum,  
Edith Green,  
John H. Dent,  
John Brademas,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy said that the passage of the higher education bill and the vocational education bill would mark the most significant year in American educational history since the enactment of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862.

Therefore, I am more than gratified to bring to this body today the second segment of this two-pronged thrust aimed at alleviating our educational problems—the conference report on vocational education.

On August 6, 1963, by a record vote of 377 yeas to 21 nays, the House passed H.R. 4955, a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand vocational education opportunities in the Nation. On October 8, an amended bill passed the Senate and on October 29, the House adopted House Resolution 554, sending this bill to conference.

Since that time, the conferees have worked assiduously to preserve the spirit of the House-passed bill and to report back to you a conference decision which would be as faithful to the original bill as possible.

From every avenue in American life, our attention has been called to the importance of strengthening the quality of vocational education if we are to maintain America's position as a leader in the world of work. Certainly, no period in the history of mankind has been as revolutionary as the past score of years. Knowledge doubles every 10 years and automation has brought with it new ways of work and new points of emphasis on the manner in which work is to be done. Greater stress is being placed upon the importance of education as a background for achieving the highest level of production and utilizing to the fullest extent the human resources of our great Nation. There is little need in our complex society for unskilled laborers and the demands for semiskilled and skilled jobs increase with every passing day.

The vocational education acts which have guided our education in these areas were inaugurated 46 years ago through the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act. Except for the introduction of the George-Barden Act in 1946, and a few minor changes made possible through the National Defense Education Act, very little has been done in improving the legislation in this important area. There fore, vocational education legislation needs no defense to a group of this kind. Your previous voting record indicates that you share this point of view with me.

It is likewise obvious that the vocational education program has not kept pace with new advancements of technological vocational diversification. If full employment is to be realized and if our manpower needs for the future are to be met, great changes must be made in our vocational education opportunities. Recognizing this fact, the conference report before you would do the following:

First. Make available substantial funds to increase the effectiveness of vocational education programs. Such funds would make possible the broadening of the definition of vocational education and to include semiskilled as well as skilled occupations.

Second. It would authorize a new permanent program of financial assistance to the States for the purpose of maintaining, extending, and improving existing programs of vocational education.

Third. It would develop new programs of vocational education through grants for research and financial pilot and demonstration projects.

Fourth. It would establish through grant assistance to colleges and universities and other public nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies—research and training programs of an experimental nature designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youth.

Fifth. It would authorize Federal funds to be used in the construction and the initial equipping of area vocational schools. The conference report carefully enunciates and defines the meaning of this term to include not only specialized high schools used exclusively or principally for vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study, but also departments of high schools and departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities which provide vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields. Such a program must be available to all residents of the State or area of the State designated and approved by the State board.

Sixth. It would allow Federal funds to be used for (a) all types of teacher training in the fields of vocational education; (b) vocational training of youths who have left or graduated from high school; and (c) specialized training in home economics—10 percent of the funds allotted under this category must be directed toward training of persons to fit them for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics.

In order to meet these goals, appropriations would be authorized as follows: $60 million for fiscal year 1964; $118.5 million for fiscal year 1965; $177.5 million for fiscal year 1966; $225 million for fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Seventh. In addition, the conference report provides for a 4-year work-study program for vocational education students and establishment of residential vocational education schools. Such a work-study program would be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available—to the extent of available funds—to all youths in the area served by such an agency. Only those students who have been accepted for enrollment as full-time students in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency would be eligible to receive assistance under this program. The employment would be limited to 15 hours per week, and compensation would not exceed $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year. Such a program would provide for the employment of students who are in good standing and in full attendance in a vocational program, but who lack the financial assistance necessary for completing their educational program.

For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants for development of such a program. In making these grants, the Commissioner would give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas and substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

Highest priority would be given to the District of Columbia metropolitan area. For the purposes of these two programs, a special authorization has been provided: $30 million for fiscal year 1965; $50 million for fiscal year 1966; and $35 million for the next 2 succeeding fiscal years.

### EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Besides providing for the much needed changes in vocational education legislation, the conference report likewise extended the National Defense Education Act for one additional year, thus allowing this act to expire June 30, 1965. Several amendments have been included:

First. In regard to general provisions, the act has been extended to cover American Samoa; to permit teachers of federally operated schools to receive benefits; and to extend the benefits of the act to such schools as laboratory schools and State schools for the deaf, and so forth.

Second. With respect to title II, due to expire at the end of fiscal year 1964, the student loan authorization was increased from the present appropriation of $90 million to $125 million for the current fiscal year, and established an authorization of $135 million for fiscal year 1965. Such an increase would make possible the raising of the institutional ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000.

Third. The conference report also agreed to extend the moratorium on the running of interest and the payment of the principal on loans while student borrowers are continuing their higher education in approved institutions abroad. The forgiveness feature is also extended for elementary and secondary teachers in oversea schools of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Under title III, relating to the science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction, the conference substitute extends this title for an additional year until June 1965 and makes certain additional provisions, including broadening the categories of materials and equipment which may be purchased.

Fifth. Under title IV, the payment to institutions of higher education for national defense fellowships was fixed at a flat sum of $2,500 per year less tuition charged the fellow. Likewise, the Commissioner of Education was authorized to reaward any graduate fellowship which was vacated before the expiration of the said fellowship.

Sixth. In regard to guidance counseling and testing, the conference report provides for an additional year and increases the annual authorization of appropriation by $2,500,000 from $15 million per year to $17,500,000 per year. The guidance and counseling program is extended to all seventh and eighth grade students and the State allotment is increased from $20,000 to $50,000.

Seventh. The training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language has been added to title VI—"Language Development"—and this title has also been extended for an additional year.

Eighth. Printed and published materials were added to the media for educational purposes included under title VII of the act.

### FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

H.R. 4955, as reported in this conference report, includes as its third major area of consideration, aid to federally affected areas. It extends the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, for 2 years, thus allowing the acts to expire June 30, 1965.

I urge you, my colleagues, to adopt this conference report, which will not only add new life and meaning to our vocational education picture; stimulate our elementary, secondary, and college students through the added provisions of the National Defense Education Act; but also will care for the Federal Government's responsibility to its children and youth whose parents must leave their own chosen homes to render a service for our country through the provisions of our impacted aid legislation.

We can no longer delay. We must assure our responsibility for providing the necessary enlightenment of our citizens so that democracy may continue to flourish in our land. No greater monument can be built for our late President Kennedy than to enact this legislation which he so nobly endorsed in his message on education sent to the Congress on January 29, 1963:

> Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is equally necessary to provide training or retraining for the millions of workers who need to learn new skills or whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development, and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free.

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished author of this bill, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], chairman of the committee that was in charge of this bill.

**Mr. PERKINS.** Mr. Speaker, the conference compromise on H.R. 4955, in my judgment, will enable Federal, State and local education authorities to cooperate in providing an expanded vocational education program so urgently needed to fit our young people for remunerative and productive careers in vocational occupations. It has been 17 years since the Congress last enacted any major legislation in the field of vocational education. Since that time the nature of employment opportunities and the training required has undergone drastic changes. Employment is demanding more and more education and higher degree of skills. Yet under our present trends some 30 to 40 percent of our children now in grade school will not be graduated from high school. About half of those who graduate from high school will end their educational careers at that time and attempt to secure employment. In spite of these trends, only about 13 percent of our 15- to 19-year-olds are enrolled in vocational education programs embraced by the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. The conference agreement maintains the important provisions of the original House passed bill with respect to:

First. Permitting States to transfer funds between categories under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

Second. Broadening the definition of vocational agriculture to include agriculture related occupations.

Third. Authorizing assistance to business and office and other occupational training not now covered by Smith-Hughes and George-Barden.

Fourth. Periodic analysis of job market conditions so as to assure that the vocational education program will be actually geared to meet employment opportunities.

Fifth. Emphasis on the construction and operation of area vocational schools and that type of program which assures an opportunity in all areas for persons to attend a full-time course of occupational training in the vocational field of his preference.

Turning from the vocational education features of the bill I am delighted that we have been able to include two new provisions in the bill extending and improving the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas legislation. It is critically important that our institutions of higher learning be given the funds to enable them to make loans to needy students so that the college door will always be open to the deserving student. I am pleased that we have provided not only for extension but increased from $90 million to $125 million the loan authorization this year and $135 million the next.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the conferees have brought back to the House a report that should be adopted. This report is sound, reasonable, and I am hopeful will receive support from both sides of the aisle.

The program of grants to colleges and universities, State vocational education boards, or with their approval to local school agencies and other public educational institutions for the establishment and operation of one or more residential vocational education schools, was originally proposed by the minority members of the subcommittee in the early stages of the consideration of this program, but as proposed by them was limited to one demonstration school in the District of Columbia. The conferees have adopted this proposal insofar as the substance of the program is concerned, but have modified it to permit, to the extent the Congress makes funds available, the establishment of a few more schools in other areas of the country so as to enhance their value as a demonstration of the worthwhileness of this form of vocational education in all types of communities.

Except for the school in the District of Columbia—which might be operated by the District authorities—the schools will in no case be built, owned, or operated by the Federal Government. Instead, the Federal Government will make grants to State boards or other educational institutions, and these agencies or institutions will construct and operate these schools in accordance with the standards, policies, and procedures prescribed by the State vocational education board for the operation of their other vocational education programs. The conference committee print specifically requires that the program at the school be "vocational education," which term is specifically defined to require public supervision and control of the program by the State board of vocational education. The Federal Government will exercise no control over the operation and maintenance of the school; but it will, of course, require assurances that the school will be so operated as to fully carry out the objectives and provisions of the law.

The Commissioner of Education, under the conference print, will first have to make a determination as to how much will be spent for residential schools and how much for work-study programs from the sums appropriated under section 15. It is the intent of all concerned that the District of Columbia will receive first priority for any funds that may be determined by the Commissioner to be available for the residential school program.

I believe this program will provide a very valuable demonstration of the desirability and feasibility of having this type of vocational training institution to help cope with the hard-core problems that confront communities with a great number of young, untrained people who have dropped out of school and are unemployed, or who are about to drop out of school. The expectation is that, once the soundness of such schools is demonstrated, the States and communities will provide their own funds to establish and operate similar schools without Federal aid.

The work-study program is specifically designed to prevent school dropouts and to enable young people who would otherwise become unemployed to continue their education as far as their capacity will permit them to do so. It is intended as a preventive program rather than one which picks up after much of the damage has been done.

There is precedent for this program in the NYA program of the 1930's, which enabled so many young people to continue their education at the high school level as well as the college level by providing useful part-time employment. Under the work-study program in the conference report, the types of part-time jobs which students would be given by local school systems or other public agencies would include working as teachers' or librarians' aids, assisting in various types of building maintenance activities, and assisting in the provision of after-hours student recreational activities. These part-time employment opportunities would be made available to youths 15 to 20 years old who are enrolled full time in the regular vocational education courses. Under the program, available funds would be allotted to the States and the States would distribute them among school districts, particularly those with substantial numbers of school dropouts and unemployed youths, which have developed local work-study programs and had their applications approved by the State agencies. Unlike the NYA, the complete responsibility for the content and administration of these programs would be vested in the State vocational education boards and the local school systems.

This work-study program in no sense duplicates the program of specialized vocational training and unemployment allowances for unemployed young people under the Manpower Development and Training Act. In the first place, the objective of the program is entirely different in that it is aimed at keeping young men and women in school rather than in providing training for those who have dropped out and been unemployed for an extended period of time. In the second place, it provides part-time employment as contrasted with unemployment allowances. And finally, it would be wholly administered by State and local vocational education authorities, and would utilize and be fully integrated with the ongoing vocational education programs, for which funds are provided in other provisions of the bill. At this point, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a table showing the conference agreement on funds for vocational education:

*Vocational education conference agreement on H.R. 4955*

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

[In millions]

| | Grants for vocational education | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | House | Senate | Conference |
| Fiscal year— | | | |
| 1964 | $45 | $108 | $60.0 |
| 1965 | 90 | 153 | 118.5 |
| 1966 | 135 | 198 | 177.5 |
| 1967 and after | 180 | 243 | 225.0 |

AUTHORIZATION LIMITS ON RESIDENCE SCHOOLS AND WORK STUDY PROGRAM

| | House | Senate | Conference |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year— | | | |
| 1964 | 0 | $65 | 0 |
| 1965 | 0 | (1) | 30 |
| 1966 | 0 | (1) | 55 |
| 1967 | 0 | (1) | 35 |
| 1968 | 0 | (1) | 35 |

[1] No limit.

NOTE.—Both residence schools and work study program terminate at the end of fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that there is no duplication of effort in the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and in the Vocational Education Act with respect to youth training programs.

The Manpower Development and Training Act subsistency payments are designed to salvage the school "dropout"; to be eligible for a program a young unemployed person must be out of school for a year.

On the other hand, the work-study program under the vocational education bill is designed to prevent school dropout; one need not be a dropout to be eligible but those students who, because of economic hardship, were finding it difficult to continue school could use the work-study program while they fit themselves for vocations.

It is true that a 17-year-old—but not a 15- or 16-year-old—would be eligible for enrollment under either the work-study or Manpower Development and Training Act youth programs—but not both—if they had been out of school for a year or more. But this does not mitigate the fact that the major objective of "work study" is to keep minors in the classroom and the major thrust of the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act is to salvage the youngster who has already left the school and has been out of school for such a length of time that a special program is required to put him back into a learning situation.

To say there is unjustifiable overlap in these bills is like saying that we ought to eliminate either the Army or the Navy because both are authorized and equipped to fight the enemy or—to do away with the Marine Corps because we have foot soldiers in the Army.

Economic hardship, crime, delinquency, idleness, and purposelessness claim a disturbing number of our young people today. The youth provisions of Manpower Development and Training Act and the vocational education authorized by H.R. 4955 are modest additions to what must be a concerted National, State, and local effort—to eliminate the school dropout problem and the social maladies that accompany it. Both of these bills are essential to attack unemployment and at the same time give our vocational schools the power to attract and hold our young people and having held them develop skills and vocational competence.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Briefly.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman referred to my offering the residential school amendment. The gentleman will agree that the residential amendment offered was for a national demonstration school in the area of the District of Columbia, a single school.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman concede that the residential schools and the work study programs that were included in the conference report were not in the House bill and both of them are brand new programs in the vocational field?

Mr. PERKINS. They are new programs in the vocational field; that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to give recognition and tribute to the members of the General Subcommittee on Education who labored many long extra hours in considering the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL], the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], were faithful and diligent in subcommittee deliberations.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and others on the committee have made outstanding contributions to this legislation. These members of the subcommittee spent long hours on the bill demonstrating not only a genuine concern for the needs of our young people but also an insight into the vocational education program. The ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, was an extremely valuable member of the committee with a deep understanding of education problems and programs. His service was outstanding and indispensable.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished minority leader of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, one major item of unfinished legislative business, of interest to many Members, is H.R. 4955. This bill would broaden significantly the Federal responsibility for improving, and modernizing, this country's vocational education system. Many of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, on the Committee on Education and Labor worked for months to develop a sound bill. There is general recognition, I might add, of the fact that we need to update and strengthen vocational education to broaden existing opportunities in this area. Our efforts in committee bore fruit, I am glad to say, when the House overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 377 to 21, H.R. 4955 on August 6.

It was not until October 8 that the other body took action on the bill. It was changed very substantially. New programs were authorized, hundreds of millions in additional authorizations were approved total of $327 million, the formula for distributing funds was entirely different. In addition, 3-year extensions were approved for the National Defense Education Act and Public Laws 815 and 874. Certain changes in both these programs were also authorized.

The stage was set for reconciliation of these substantial differences. Four weeks elapsed, however, before 11 House conferees sat down—on November 6—with an equal number of Members from the other body. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, was chosen as chairman of the conference committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman feel that we can get legislation this year if this is recommitted?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of course we could. The simpler we make it, the more we eliminate unnecessary, unwise, and not well-considered programs, the easier it would be to pass it.

Of course, the answer to that question is we could get action next week in the other body as we can get action right now in this body.

Exploratory discussions began at once. At the third meeting the House conferees suggested areas of possible compromise. The conference immediately broke up, presumably to allow consideration of our suggestions. There were no further meetings of the conference committee for a period of over 3 weeks. During this period the tragic assassination of President Kennedy occurred, but no meetings had even been scheduled during that period.

This recapitulation, Mr. Speaker, may account for the delay in submission of the conference committee report. The pressure of time, among other pressures, accounts for the real doubts which some of us conferees have regarding the compromise now being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I have already made it known that this conference report should be recommitted to the conference committee with instructions. This is the unanimous opinion of all five Republican House conferees. I regret that this should be necessary but there are compelling reasons why the House should sustain its position.

The vocational education bill passed by the House was sound legislation. But now it is being proposed that we should undo the long, difficult, and careful work of the House. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to already generous authorizations. Two unrelated measures have been added—extension of the impacted areas legislation and extension of the National Defense Education Act with substantial amendments. But, most serious of all, at the insistence of the other body there have been included two novel, expensive, and quite possibly unwise Federal vocational programs.

These are Federal residential schools and federally financed work-study programs, found in sections 13 and 14 on pages 11 through 14 of the conference report, together with the 4-year, $150 million appropriations authorization found in section 15. My Democratic colleagues among the House conferees agreed to include these provisions, but with great reluctance. The Republican House conferees were unable to sign the conference report.

Why are these two dubious proposals included? First, the addition of the extension of the impacted area program to this bill could be construed as an attempt to make sure that the House would not reject other provisions which otherwise would be unacceptable. Second, approval in the other body of the conference report on higher education was delayed, and made contingent, upon our yielding on these two programs. Finally, the House conferees were constantly confronted with the threat that the conference would be deadlocked or broken off completely unless we made concessions.

I assure you that the House conferees compromised at every turn and with respect to almost every section of the bill. For example, we approved greatly increased appropriations for the regular vocational program. The original House amounts were, for the first 4 fiscal years: $45 million; $90 million; $135 million; $180 million; and $180 million for each succeeding year. These were increased to $60 million; $118.5 million; $177.5 million; and $225 million for the fourth and each succeeding year. This is a total increase over the House amount of $176 million during the first 5 years. This is in an additional $150 million authorization for residential schools and for work study.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be sent back to conference with instructions to eliminate these two programs. The residential school program would—for the first time in our history—permit the Federal Government to establish Federal schools in all sections of the Nation. Under this bill these schools could be established by contract with a public or private university without the permission or approval of the State vocational board. All of the terms of its operation, including selection of students, curriculum, selection of teachers, teachers' salaries, and textbooks could, and might well be dictated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Here we have, in fact, the most direct Federal intervention in education that it is possible to contrive. This is not Federal control of education; it is worse. It is Federal education.

The so-called work study program is equally objectionable. Certainly it should first be thoroughly scrutinized in committee, and fully debated on the floor. It authorizes a form of Federal scholarships for selected high school students. This might well encourage many youngsters to study vocational subjects who, in their own interest and in the national interest, should be preparing for college. Moreover, it would virtually duplicate provisions already contained in the manpower training bill just today discussed here on the floor.

For these reasons, I urge that the House not yield to the Senate on this matter. It is too important to the future of education. Without these two provisions this is an acceptable bill. It will do much to improve vocational education in this country. I hope that you will support my motion to recommit this bill to conference in order that these provisions may be removed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the National Defense Education Act amendments, and this is one of the titles of the bill before us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to say first of all that I am, of course, for this conference report, but mainly to say that I think the disposition of this conference report will mean that the 1st session of the 88th Congress will have undoubtedly made the greatest record in the field of education of any Congress in the history of this country.

I can point to colleagues here in the House whose names will for many years be immortalized on acts of Congress which will have had tremendous impact in the area of education. I am thinking of the gentlewoman who now has the floor, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. The Green Act is the most important bill in the area of higher education ever passed. I am thinking of the bill which we are considering now, the Perkins bill, which represents a major forward step in the field of vocational education and which extends the National Defense Education Act and the impact area legislation. I am thinking of the Harris Act for aid to medical education. I am also thinking of the Harris and the Mills Acts to aid the mentally retarded.

Think of the number of bills we have passed in this area, together with the related bill we have now just passed, bearing the name of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I also commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and his entire committee for their work. I think we can say "well done" to these faithful servants of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill recalls to our minds the day several years ago when we passed the Elliott bill. I am pleased that in extending the National Defense Education Act in this bill we are dealing with this very important legislation pioneered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, I am very glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to take this opportunity, in view of what the distinguished majority leader has just said, to observe that in this Congress, as in previous Congresses, the Republican position, that is, the position on this side of the aisle—has not been one of negative obstruction but of cooperative and constructive action, whenever we have felt that such action was indicated.

I think it is only fair to say that the manpower retraining act when it was originally passed was substantially rewritten by Republican Members, I am sure in cooperation with Members on the other side of the aisle, and was supported on this side of the aisle. The bricks-and-mortar provision for higher education was supported by Republican Members. I think many of them had much to do with the initiation of that action, which has been since carried on. The National Defense and Education Act started some time ago with Republican support. As to the vocational education bill, I voted for it when it was here originally and again we made our contribution.

There have been other cases where we have not felt that what was proposed was good for the country and we opposed those things and many of them which I think were bad for the country were not enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I only take this time and make this observation, as I say, to point out that, when we on this side of the aisle feel there is something that is for the best interests of the country, we will not hesitate to do what we can to promote it and to improve it, and to make it workable and reasonable, even though it is proposed by the administration or the Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman be good enough to yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In connection with what the distinguished minority leader has just said, I want it thoroughly understood that my reference to the work of the committee included every member of the committee. I am sure that Members on both side of the aisle have made their contribution in all these areas and, of course, we commend them all for their good work.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, may I first express my very high regard for the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I say without any hesitation, if it had not been for his leadership and if it had not been for the work he has done, we would not have brought to you this year the bills which have been passed and which have been enacted into law. May I also say he played a major role in this conference committee, recognizing always that in a conference a compromise is essential and that that compromise must be at the highest level possible. This he helped to bring about.

I would agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that this conference report is not everything that every single member of the conference committee would like to have. This is always impossible. There would be changes I would like to make, if it were in my power to make those changes. But may I say to all of my colleagues today that this is a good bill. It will help to provide some of the essential needs in the schools of this country, and we have the choice this afternoon of whether we are going to have progress by action or paralysis by perfectionism. This is really the choice that is before us.

This is a good bill and my task today is to try to answer some of the questions some of you have asked about the second part of the bill, the National Defense Education Act.

This part is extended for 1 year which means it is extended until June 1965.

The most important part of the National Defense Education Act, and the part which most of you have asked questions about, is title II—loans to needy students who are now knocking at the doors of our colleges and universities across the country.

In the conference committee and by the report which we now bring to you, we have extended the program that was started by the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama, a former member of the House Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT]. In 1958, he was farsighted enough to realize that if we are going to make it possible for all of the needy students of this country to complete their education and attain their full potential, we would have to provide some financial assistance. During the years this program has been in operation since 1958, this act has enabled 490,000 students to go on to the colleges and universities.

Loans have been made in over 1,500 different institutions across the country, and Uncle Sam has loaned a total of $330 million for this purpose.

May I say again, Mr. Speaker, and emphasize that this is a real tribute—an enduring tribute to the gentleman from Alabama—the undeniable fact that these hundreds of thousands of youngsters are in college or have been able to complete their college education because of the work he started in 1958.

Now, what do we do in this bill? First of all, we increase the amount of the loans from $90 to $125 million for this fiscal year, the year in which the students are now in attendance in the colleges. Then we increase that amount to $135 million for the next fiscal year, because we know that there will be a still greater need next year.

The second thing we do is remove the $250,000 ceiling for any single college or university. There are over 121 institutions in this country in 39 different States which have applications for loans that are above the $250,000 figure. So that amount has been increased to $800,000. Some of us think we will come back to you and ask that that ceiling be entirely removed.

In regard to the forgiveness—if that feature is to be retained—some of us on the House side would like to have extended it to teachers in private schools and at the college level. We were prohibited by the rules of the conference committee.

The second major change in the National Defense Education Act is in regard to the authorization of funds in the guidance and counseling section. May I say to you that—outside of student loans to be repaid—this is the only part of the National Defense Education Act where there was an increase in the authorization of funds. This was increased from $15 to $17.5 million. In other words, we come back with the National Defense Education Act with an increase for grants of only $2.5 million. When you think of the tremendous amount of good that has been done under this bill, then I am sure all of us who want to exercise every economy we can will admit that this has been very carefully considered.

The third major change in the National Defense Education Act is in regard to title VI. This has to do with strengthening the foreign languages. Several of you have come to me and said you live in districts where English is in fact a second language and would it not be possible to include English in this title. This was done by your Senate and House conferees.

May I say in the guidance and counseling section I think a tremendous amount of benefit has resulted from the legislation first enacted in 1958. We have had 13,800 secondary counselors and teachers who have attended institutes and who have improved their capabilities. We have extended guidance and counseling to the seventh and eighth grade level. Personally, I would have preferred to the fourth grade level.

This is a minor change, but in response to questions that have been asked, we have extended the provisions of title I of the act to the federally operated schools overseas and also to schools such as deaf schools and schools for the blind within the various States. In other words, these schools are now eligible for the various provisions of the original act.

May I say finally that this conference report has three parts. First, the vocational education, which has been under the direction and leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. Secondly the Federal impact legislation under the extremely capable leadership of the very experienced legislator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. Need I again remind you that we have over 1 million dropouts in our schools in this country every year. Automation is the major factor in displacing over 35,000 workers each week. I am in favor of passing the best possible civil rights bill. But in my judgment this alone will be meaningless to the millions of youngsters out of school and out of work. A massive educational program is essential.

The countless number of young people—school dropouts who are without employment and without hope of employment—constitute the combustible material which James Conant has referred to as "social dynamite ready to explode at any moment." Vocational education geared to the age of automation will supply at least one very important part of the answer.

I urge you not to vote for the recommittal of this bill, because it means no legislation in these three fields this year.

I urge that you vote for this conference report.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Thus far the gentlewoman has been speaking to the amendments to the National Defense Education Act. You have not referred to any possible changes in the federally affected or impacted area program under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. Am I to assume that no changes are made in the administrative procedures affecting these two public laws? And if this conference report is adopted these programs will be administered as in the fiscal year 1963?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. In setting up our argument in defense of the conference report today I delegated the vocational education section to the author, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]; the National Defense Education Act amendments to the gentlelady from Oregon whose committee has handled that, and the Federal impact bills which will next be considered to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], who is the chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then I shall withhold my question until then.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of this committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the impacted areas aid program has been brought up. As I am a member of that subcommittee I would like to address myself to that subject. This conference report provides that this program shall be extended until June 30, 1965, with no changes in the present program. This conference report violates the concept expressed on the floor of the House by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a few months ago when we were debating the tax reduction bill, it also violates President Johnson's latest utterances in regard to cutting back on our spending programs and reducing expenditures in all of the departments of the Federal Government.

This bill authorizes in new obligational authority a total of $957 million. The bill as voted by this House provided for $630 million to carry on the vocational education program for the next 5 years. As it came out of conference it provided for $807 million, an increase of almost $200 million, plus $150 million to carry on two programs which were not even in the House bill, the residential school program and the work study program; two programs which would put the Federal Government directly in the field of education. These will be a duplication of the legislation passed only a few moments ago, the Manpower Retraining Act. I think they should be rejected.

As stated by the ranking Member on our side of the aisle, a recommittal motion will be made to delete the residential school section and the work study programs from this bill. I hope that the Members of this body will support this recommittal motion.

In view of the current Federal deficits, in view of President Johnson's statement in regard to expenditures, in view of the statements made on the floor of this House by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, we cannot go down two forks of the road at the same time; I hope that the Members will support the recommittal motion.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the aid to impacted areas, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Now, simply put, this extends Public Laws 815 and 874 for a 2-year period without any changes whatsoever.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr Speaker will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. DENT.** I will.

**Mr. WAGGONNER.** Is it the opinion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if the recommittal motion is adopted, it will effectively put an end to Public Laws 815 and 874? I ask this question because it is my understanding that these two laws have expired unless this conference report is adopted and these two public laws will no longer be active?

**Mr. DENT.** In my opinion that is true. The laws expired on June 30 of this year. There are at the present time thousands of school board directors in jopardy because they have spent money not allocated nor approved by the Congress of the United States at this very moment in the States of Florida, Pennsylvania, and other States. The school board members are faced with the necessity of making up their budgets before the first of the year. They probably could explain away, and believe that they would get the money, by setting their budgets for this year based upon the belief that they would receive this aid. But if this Congress today in any way delays the passage of this act beyond January 1, the school board directors cannot, without being in jeopardy of surcharge, prepare their budgets in contemplation of the use of Federal funds. I believe that the answer to your question is "Yes."

**Mr. WAGGONNER.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

**Mr. DENT.** I yield.

**Mr. WAGGONNER.** Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House how many school districts are affected by Public Laws 815 and 874?

**Mr. DENT.** I cannot tell the gentleman the exact total, but I think there are 4,100, give or take 2 percent.

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

**Mr. DENT.** I yield to the gentleman from New York.

**Mr. POWELL.** I can tell the gentleman how many Congressmen would be affected.

**Mr. DENT.** Three hundred and fifteen.

**Mr. POWELL.** Three hundred and fifteen.

**Mr. DENT.** Three hundred and fifteen Congressmen. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. Speaker, I might say that the total cost of this legislation for this fiscal year, based upon figures received this morning from the Department, of Public Law 815 is $58,496,000, and under Public Law 874, $359,450,000, for a total of $417,946,000 for this fiscal year.

**Mr. QUIE.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. DENT.** I will.

**Mr. QUIE.** Is the gentleman saying that if we adopt the motion to recommit, with instructions, and send the bill back to conference that the conferees on the Senate side will refuse to meet with us and take this part out? Does not the gentleman know that the impacted-aid lobby, the NDEA lobby and the vocational education lobby would descend on this Congress and make certain that we report out a bill?

**Mr. DENT.** I only know what happened in the conference, and the gentleman having been a member of the conference, knows full well that at one point in the conference it was almost at the point of being broken up by the Senate conferees.

At this point I want to pay my compliments to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] who, in my opinion, at that time stepped in to ease the situation and keep us talking instead of walking.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. DENT.** I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** I wonder if there is any reason why this body should yield to the blackmail of the other body with respect to this program? It would be the simplest matter in the world for both bodies to pass extensions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, without accepting a lot of controversial material.

**Mr. DENT.** Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of defining eligibility of local educational agencies for Federal payments, the law recognizes, under various sections, the following categories of federally caused financial burden:

Section 2: Partial loss of tax base by removal of real property from tax rolls through Federal acquisition.

Section 3: Decreased local revenues by reason of tax exempt status of Federal property on which children reside or parents are employed.

Subsection 3(a) authorizes payments of financial assistance to local educational agencies providing free public education for children—referred to as category "A" pupils—who first, reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district or within reasonable commuting distance therefrom, second, reside on Federal property and have a parent on active duty in the uniformed services, or third, reside on Federal property and have a parent employed at or attending any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State.

Subsection 3(b) authorizes payments of financial assistance to local educational agencies providing free public education for pupils—referred to as category "B" pupils—who first, reside on Federal property or second, reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as the applicant or within reasonable commuting distance of the school district, or third, reside with a parent employed at or attending any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State. In addition, the provision of free public education for children of parents in the Armed Forces qualifies an agency for eligibility under this subsection in certain circumstances.

Subsection 3(c)(4) is directed toward a relatively few local educational agencies where the proportion of the school population residing on tax-exempt Federal property is so large that local tax income together with State aid and other available funds is insufficient to provide a level of education for federally connected children comparable to that maintained by comparable communities in the same State.

This subsection provides that any school district where 50 percent or more of the ADA consists of pupils living on Federal property, and which is making a reasonable tax effort and availing itself of State and other financial assistance, may receive additional Federal payments if such funds are needed to provide a level of education comparable to that maintained in comparable districts in the same State. Under subsection 3(c)(4), the law further stipulates that the method of determining State aid for such pupils and the method of determining the amount thereof shall be on a basis no less favorable than that used for other children in other local educational agencies in the State. The act also provides that the amount of payment under subsection 3(c)(4) is to be computed on the per capita cost of generally comparable districts after taking into account funds available from local, State, and other Federal sources and after entitlements under all other sections of the act have been computed.

Section 4: Provision of free public education for increased numbers of children whose attendance has resulted directly from activities of the United States carried on either directly or through a contractor.

For subsection 4(a), first-year category, the increase in the ADA of countable pupils in the year of claim over the ADA in the preceding year must be at least 5 percent of the total ADA of nonfederally connected pupils in the preceding year. The act authorizes applicant school districts to elect whether to count increases in the ADA of section 3 pupils over the prior year for purposes of eligibility and entitlement under section 3 or under section 4.

Subsection 4(d) specifies that whenever the Commissioner of Education determines that a local educational agency has made reasonable preparations to provide education during a fiscal year for a certain number of subsection 4(a) pupils, and that number has been substantially reduced because of a decrease in or cessation of Federal activities or by reason of the failure of such anticipated activities to occur, the amount to which the local educational agency is otherwise entitled under subsection 4(a) shall be increased to the amount which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the local educational agency would have been entitled to receive except for such decrease or cessation.

The one school district which filed under subsection 4(d) for fiscal 1962 was determined by the Commissioner to be ineligible.

Section 6: Arrangements for the education of certain children residing on Federal property. Congress indicated its intent in the pertinent provisions of Public Law 874 that wherever possible free public education for children residing on Federal property should be provided by the regularly constituted State and local educational agencies. However, if no tax revenue of the State or any political subdivision thereof may be expended for the free public education of children residing on Federal property, or if it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children then he is required by section 6 of the act to make such arrangements—other than arrangements with respect to the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service—as may be necessary to provide free public education for the children.

### EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

The bill extends the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 for 2 additional years. This is a simple extension without any changes in the present programs.

The laws authorize financial assistance to local educational agencies in federally affected areas for current operating expenses and for construction of school facilities, respectively.

### ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS—PUBLIC LAW 815

There are three categories of federally connected children which may be considered in determining the eligibility of local educational agencies for Federal funds under Public Law 815. Two of these categories are based on the relationship of the children to the Federal property as set forth in subsection 5(a)(1) and 5(a)(2). The children in 5(a)(1) are those who reside on Federal property with parents who work on Federal property; the children who are classified in 5(a)(2) are those who either reside on Federal property or whose parents work on Federal property but not both. The Federal property on which a claim is based must be in the same State as the applicant district or within reasonable commuting distance of the district. To be eligible for funds under the subsections just explained, a school district must have an increase in the membership of children in either of these categories or of both of them together which is at least 20 in number and is equal to at least 5 percent of the district's average daily membership in the school year preceding the 2-year increase period. A third category is defined in subsection 5(a)(3) as including those children whose attendance in an applicant school district is due to the activities of the United States carried on directly or through a contractor. To be eligible for payment, the estimated increase in the 2-year period must be at least 20 in number and at least 10 percent of the total base year average daily membership. If these increase requirements are met, the number of children in the increase under this subsection still cannot be counted for the purpose of granting funds unless at the same time it can be established that the construction of needed minimum facilities for that number of children would impose an undue financial hardship on the taxing and borrowing power of the district. Under Public Law 85–620 the provisions authorizing payments for children classified under subsection 5(a)(1) were made permanent. The provisions for granting funds under the other subsections expired June 30, 1963, and would be extended for 2 additional years by this bill. The estimated cost of the program for the current fiscal year is $58,496,000.

### SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

A total of $2.5 billion has been appropriated over the 12-year period ending June 30, 1962, for the program of financial assistance to local educational agencies in federally affected areas for current operating expenses and for construction of school facilities. This program of aid to federally impacted areas was authorized under legislation—Public Laws 874 and 815—enacted in 1950.

The primary objective of Public Law 874 is to provide financial assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools in those local educational agencies upon which the U.S. Government has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that: First, local revenues to school districts affected have been reduced as the result of the acquisition of real property by the Federal Government, or second, such agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property or for those whose parents are employed on Federal property, or third, there has been a sudden and substantial increase in the number of pupils in average daily attendance as a direct result of activities of the Federal Government.

In addition to grants to local educational agencies, the law provides that the Commissioner of Education shall make arrangements to provide free public education for children who reside on Federal property if no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children. These arrangements are made either with a local educational agency or with the head of a Federal department or agency administering the Federal property on which the children reside.

Public Law 815 provides Federal financial assistance for construction by local educational agencies of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school enrollment as a result of new or increased Federal activities or where many pupils reside on tax-exempt Federal properties, principally Indian reservations. In addition, assistance is provided for the construction of minimum school facilities by the Federal Government on Federal property—such as Army, Navy, and Air Force installations—where under State law no State or local educational agency can provide these children with suitable free public education.

Payments may be made to local educational agencies where evidence indicates that there has been, or will be, an increase in school enrollment of children residing on Federal property with parents employed on Federal property, and for children who either reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property, or where the increase in school enrollment has resulted or will result directly from activities of the United States, carried on directly or through a contractor.

Numerous amendments made to Public Laws 874 and 815 since their original enactment in 1950 have liberalized the provisions of the laws in several respects, principally by increasing the rate of payment through the establishment of certain minimum rates and by extending coverage to additional categories of federally connected pupils. Public Law 85–620, enacted in 1958, made permanent those provisions of the acts authorizing payments for children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. Legislation enacted in 1961 extended the temporary provisions of both Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 through fiscal year 1963.

### MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION (PUBLIC LAW 874)

A total of $1.4 billion was appropriated for this program from its beginning in 1950 through fiscal year 1962. For the 12th consecutive year the number of school districts and the total amount of their entitlements increased—$247 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1962, as compared with $217.3 million for fiscal year 1961.

The number of eligible school districts increased from 3,965 in fiscal year 1961 to 4,065 in fiscal year 1962. Increases were chiefly attributable to growth in school population and new or expanded Federal activities.

The total number of pupils in the 4,065 eligible districts in 1962 approximated 11 million, or about one-third of all pupils attending public elementary and secondary schools in the Nation. Federally connected pupils totaled more than 1.75 million, representing 15.2 percent of the total attendance in eligible districts.

Over 255 million acres in federally owned property were claimed as a basis for entitlement in fiscal year 1962. The number of different Federal properties claimed as a basis for payment totaled 5,288, an increase of 106 over 1961.

Local educational agencies were entitled to approximately $233 million in 1962, an amount equivalent to about 5.2 percent of current operating costs of eligible districts. Over $230 million of these payments was to meet educational costs for pupils who resided on Federal property or resided with a parent employed on Federal property. The remainder was to meet additional costs incurred by school districts that experienced sudden increases in enrollment due directly to activities of the U.S. Government or loss of tax revenue because of Federal acquisition of real property. Payments of over $13 million were made to Federal agencies or local educational agencies to provide public education to children residing on 48 Federal installations, chiefly military bases, where no local educational agency was able to provide suitable free public education.

CONSTRUCTION (PUBLIC LAW 815)

A total of $1.1 billion was appropriated from the beginning of the program in 1950 through fiscal year 1962.

Federal funds amounting to $947 million have been reserved for 4,961 construction projects submitted by approximately 1,840 different local school districts. Of these projects, 1,326 are new elementary schools and 1,963 are additions to elementary schools; 461 are new secondary schools and 846 are additions to secondary schools; and 365 are for improvements to existing facilities such as equipment and heating plants. Of these projects, 4,469 are completed, 407 are under construction, and 85 are in the preconstruction stage.

To the Federal funds, school districts have added an estimated $670 million—exclusive of site, offsite improvements, and other costs—for a total of over $1.6 billion used to construct 53,345 classrooms and related facilities for 1,547,000 pupils.

Of the total granted to local school districts, almost $42 million has been allocated under section 14—formerly title IV—to 250 projects to provide 1,428 public school classrooms for 40,900 pupils—primarily children living on Indian reservations—and funds for 40 projects costing over $7.5 million have been reserved for construction of temporary school facilities housing 13,900 pupils.

In addition to the funds granted to local school districts, approximately $123 million has been allocated for Federal construction of 310 projects on Federal property, comprised of 3,241 classrooms and related facilities for 98,400 pupils living on Federal property.

To clarify the record and to insure the intent of the conferees on the use of private schools the following exchange between Congressmen DENT and PERKINS is added to the RECORD:

Mr. DENT. With reference to the definition of vocational education in section 8, subsection (1) of the measure, I note that the training programs, as distinguished from construction grants, can be carried out by State boards or local educational agencies either directly in publicly operated schools or by contract.

It is my understanding of this language that it affords to the administrators of the programs the necessary flexibility to utilize existing facilities of private schools as a normal procedure. This administrative discretion would be particularly pertinent, for example, in permitting timely initiation of programs under contract the immediate need for which is indicated on the basis of occupational and employment information furnished pursuant to section 5 subsection (a), subparagraph part (4).

Since the intent of the measure provides for both programs for people and construction of facilities am I not correct in my interpretation of these alternatives that as a normal operating procedure this will give State authorities a greater opportunity to respond more quickly and efficiently to local needs and employment patterns by conducting programs under contract with private institutions, such as business schools or technical institutes or to embark upon construction projects where long-term needs indicate new or expanded facilities?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. DENT. Now as I said, and I am glad that the distinguished Member agrees, that it is the intent of this measure to grant as a normal administrative procedure the right of the States to conduct these training programs in public schools or under contract in a manner which can most efficiently and economically respond to local needs and situations.

I note that training for business and office occupations is included in the definition of vocational education. It would seem to me that a pertinent example illustrating the desirability of the contract method would occur when employment needs expand rapidly by the expansion of a defense or research facility in a new area.

Would it not be appropriate for this sudden increasing need for clerical and office personnel to be programed under contract to local private business schools of which there are some 1,200 in the Nation?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, that is my understanding. State boards and local educational agencies are given wide discretion in putting into effect the vocational education programs authorized by the legislation.

The conferees agreed to drop the city of Washington from the coverage of both 874 and 815.

I believe some explanation is due on this issue.

The attached exhibits have been prepared in the belief that they may be of some significance in connection with the financial plight of the District of Columbia, with its soaring cost of city government operation.

Exhibit No. 1 consists of statistics from the 13 U.S. cities, of which the District of Columbia is 1, with populations between 500,000 and 1 million. These figures, quoted from "Compendium of City Government Finances," editions of 1951 and 1961, published by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, show the population changes for each city over the decade from 1950 through 1960 and also the change in the number of city government employees per thousand population, over the same period of time. It will be observed that the District of Columbia leads all these cities substantially not only in the number of city government employees per thousand population but also in the increase in this number over this 10-year period. Hence, the often advanced argument that the District of Columbia differs from any other city of comparable size in the number of governmental responsibilities which it must assume—functions many of which are discharged by the various State governments elsewhere—and therefore must employ more people to discharge these responsibilities, falls completely flat in view of this latter fact. Since the number of these extra responsibilities has not increased during the past decade, there appears no logical reason for the number of city government employees per thousand population to have increased so disproportionately.

Exhibit No. 2 pinpoints this problem in the District of Columbia in considerably more detail, as it shows the increase in the number of District government employees in the various grades, from fiscal years 1955 through 1963. The tremendous percentage increases in positions from grade 6 upward will be noted, as contrasted with the relatively small increases in positions from grade 5 downward. This clearly indicates a tendency to add more and more to the number of administrative personnel in the District of Columbia government, far out of proportion to the much smaller increase in the number of lower salaried clerical personnel.

Exhibit No. 3 shows the cost of this situation, in the District of Columbia alone, for fiscal years 1954 through 1963, and also in comparison with the other 12 U.S. cities of comparable size. In the latter instance, it will be observed that again the District of Columbia leads all these cities by a considerable margin.

The seriousness of this situation is revealed by the fact that the expenditure for personal services constitutes some two-thirds of the entire operating expense of the District of Columbia government—and has reached the figure of $176,132,000 in the budget estimate for fiscal 1964.

Exhibit No. 4 shows the total appropriations to the District of Columbia government, and the Federal contribution, both authorized and actually appropriated, for fiscal years 1955 through 1963.

EXHIBIT 1

| City | Population | | Percent change in population | Number of city government employees per thousand population | | Number change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1950 | 1960 | | 1950 | 1960 | |
| Milwaukee | 637, 392 | 741, 324 | +16. 3 | 10. 3 | 12. 4 | +2. 1 |
| Baltimore | 949, 708 | 939, 024 | −1. 1 | 27. 0 | 27. 0 | .......... |
| Pittsburgh | 676, 806 | 604, 332 | −10. 7 | 9. 6 | 30. 9 | +1. 3 |
| Boston | 801, 344 | 697, 197 | −13. 0 | 27. 4 | 10. 9 | +2. 5 |
| Cincinnati | 503, 998 | 502, 550 | −. 28 | 11. 25 | 13. 56 | +2. 31 |
| Cleveland | 914, 808 | 876, 050 | −4. 2 | 12. 59 | 12. 39 | −. 2 |
| Buffalo | 580, 132 | 532, 759 | −8. 1 | 15. 56 | 17. 34 | +1. 78 |
| San Francisco | 775, 357 | 740, 316 | −4. 5 | 25. 54 | 29. 93 | +4. 39 |
| Houston | 596, 163 | 938, 219 | +57. 3 | 6. 3 | 9. 1 | +2. 8 |
| St. Louis | 856, 796 | 750, 026 | −12. 4 | 9. 3 | 12. 5 | +3. 2 |
| Minneapolis | 521, 718 | 482, 872 | −7. 4 | 16. 7 | 19. 1 | +2. 4 |
| New Orleans | 570, 445 | 627, 525 | +10. 0 | 11. 3 | 11. 7 | +. 4 |
| Washington | 802, 178 | 763, 956 | −4. 7 | 24. 9 | 34. 5 | +9. 6 |

**EXHIBIT 2.**—*Authorized permanent classified positions, 1955 and 1963*

| Grade level | 1955 | 1963 | Numerical change | Percent change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 511 | 24 | −487 | −202.9 |
| 2 | 463 | 584 | +121 | +26.1 |
| 3 | 1,239 | 1,367 | +128 | +10.3 |
| 4 | 877 | 1,641 | +764 | +87.1 |
| 5 | 1,602 | 1,258 | −344 | −27.3 |
| 6 | 503 | 1,249 | +746 | +148.3 |
| 7 | 730 | 1,507 | +777 | +106.4 |
| 8 | 116 | 373 | +257 | +221.5 |
| 9 | 354 | 925 | +571 | +161.3 |
| 10 | 29 | 142 | +113 | +389.6 |
| 11 | 213 | 515 | +302 | +141.6 |
| 12 | 190 | 303 | +113 | +59.4 |
| 13 | 103 | 194 | +91 | +88.3 |
| 14 | 55 | 163 | +108 | +196.3 |
| 15 | 38 | 104 | +66 | +173.6 |
| 16 | 12 | 29 | +17 | +141.6 |
| 17 | 5 | 8 | +3 | +60.0 |
| 18 | 0 | 3 | +3 | ---------- |

Source: D.C. Personnel Office.

**EXHIBIT 3.**—*District of Columbia government employment statistics, fiscal years 1954–63*

| Fiscal year | Number authorized permanent positions | Total gross payroll |
|---|---|---|
| 1954 | 19,818 | $82,575,105 |
| 1955 | 20,686 | 89,673,840 |
| 1956 | 21,181 | 97,094,671 |
| 1957 | 21,995 | 102,558,852 |
| 1958 | 23,127 | [1] 116,688,138 |
| 1959 | 23,794 | [1] 124,672,939 |
| 1960 | 24,479 | [1] 134,610,294 |
| 1961 | 25,363 | 143,611,577 |
| 1962 | 26,229 | 149,014,318 |
| 1963 | 27,253 | 156,985,278 |
| Numerical increase | 7,435 | 74,410,173 |
| Percent increase | 37.5 | 90.1 |

[1] Calendar year figures.

Salary increases authorized by Congress for District of Columbia personnel since 1954:

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| Classified personnel | 30.5 |
| Police and firemen | 40.4 |
| Teachers | 46.4 |
| Wage board personnel | 36.5 |

Sources: District of Columbia Personnel Office, District of Columbia Budget Office.

**EXHIBIT 3**

[In thousands of dollars]

| City | Expenditure for personal services, fiscal— | | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1951 | 1961 | |
| Milwaukee | 28,097 | 53,829 | 25,732 |
| Baltimore | 58,322 | 128,426 | 70,104 |
| Pittsburgh | 23,758 | 37,113 | 13,355 |
| Boston | 75,131 | 105,215 | 30,084 |
| Cincinnati | 22,843 | 48,762 | 25,919 |
| Cleveland | 55,012 | 75,254 | 20,242 |
| Buffalo | 31,649 | 55,434 | 23,785 |
| San Francisco | 51,811 | 97,916 | 46,105 |
| Houston | 13,531 | 37,853 | 24,322 |
| St. Louis | 33,968 | 57,576 | 23,608 |
| Minneapolis | 21,048 | 30,958 | 9,910 |
| New Orleans | 18,997 | 36,231 | 17,234 |
| District of Columbia | 65,387 | 146,488 | 81,101 |

Source: "Compendium of City Government Finances" (1951 and 1961 editions), U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

**EXHIBIT 4.**—*Total appropriations and Federal contribution (authorized and appropriated), fiscal years 1955 through 1963*

[In millions of dollars]

| Fiscal year | Total appropriation | Federal contribution authorized | Federal contribution appropriated |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1955 | 172 | 20 | 20 |
| 1956 | 179.2 | 20 | 18 |
| 1957 | 200.5 | 23 | 20 |
| 1958 | 203.3 | 23 | 20 |
| 1959 | 218.8 | 32 | 25 |
| 1960 | 242.8 | 32 | 25 |
| 1961 | 288.1 | 32 | 25 |
| 1962 | 271.3 | 32 | 30 |
| 1963 | 289 | 32 | 30 |

The three tables attached hereto relate to District of Columbia public school finance.

Table 1 shows, for each school year from 1952–53 through the current year, the average daily membership, or enrollment, in the school system; the operating expenses per pupil in average daily membership; and the total appropriation for the school system. It will be noted that while the average daily enrollment has increased by 34.4 percent during this 11-year period, the operating expense per pupil has increased by 66.7 percent and the total school appropriation was increased by 160.1 percent.

Table 2 compares the District of Columbia with the other 12 U.S. cities of comparable size, during the 5-year period from 1956–57 through 1960–61, from the standpoint of current expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance. It will be noted that expenditures for capital outlay are not included in these figures, but are treated separately in another table. The reason for the presentation of these statistics on the basis of average daily attendance rather than average daily enrollment, as in table 1, is that these figures were not available to us on the latter basis. The significant fact in these statistics is that whereas the District of Columbia ranked seventh among these cities in school year 1956–57 from the standpoint of current expenditures per pupil, it had risen to second place in school year 1960–61. Also, it ranks second in the increase in this figure over that 5-year period.

Table 3 compares the expenditures for construction of new classrooms in the last 9 fiscal years in the District of Columbia and in eight other U.S. cities of comparable size, as well as the population of these cities in 1960. These figures, which represent all the pertinent statistics readily available on this subject, show the District of Columbia far ahead of these other cities with respect to this important expenditure.

These tables combine to illustrate clearly that the expenditures for public education in the District of Columbia over a period of recent years have more than kept pace with similar expenditures in other cities of comparable size.

**TABLE 1**

| School year | Average daily membership | Operating expenses per pupil in average daily membership | Total school appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1952–53 | 98,357 | $262.87 | $25,872,200 |
| 1953–54 | 102,046 | 276.02 | 29,897,900 |
| 1954–55 | 104,412 | 283.20 | 35,001,570 |
| 1955–56 | 105,796 | 312.61 | 35,928,326 |
| 1956–57 | 106,427 | 328.16 | 39,093,326 |
| 1957–58 | 109,248 | 351.96 | 50,072,772 |
| 1958–59 | 112,358 | 382.48 | 52,963,968 |
| 1959–60 | 116,500 | 387.68 | 54,095,500 |
| 1960–61 | 120,917 | 413.42 | 58,674,700 |
| 1961–62 | 126,646 | 411.78 | 63,092,110 |
| 1962–63 | [1] 132,200 | [1] 438.30 | 67,316,500 |

[1] Estimated.

**TABLE 2.**—*Current expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance, school years 1956–57 and 1960–61, in 13 U.S. cities of populations between 500,000 and 1,000,000*

| City | 1956–57 | 1960–61 | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| District of Columbia | $356 | $435 | $79 |
| Baltimore | 317 | 409 | 92 |
| Cleveland | 311 | 377 | 66 |
| Houston | 245 | 287 | 42 |
| San Francisco | 425 | 451 | 26 |
| New Orleans | 271 | 333 | 62 |
| Boston | 358 | 400 | 42 |
| St. Louis | 362 | 421 | 59 |
| Milwaukee | 343 | 400 | 57 |
| Minneapolis | 385 | 416 | 31 |
| Cincinnati | 346 | 406 | 60 |
| Pittsburgh | 397 | 413 | 16 |
| Buffalo | 388 | ---------- | ---------- |

Sources: "Current Expenditures Per Pupil in Large Public School Systems," published by the U.S. Office of Education. "Selected Statistics of Local School Districts, 1960–61," published by the Research Division, National Education Association.

**TABLE 3**

| City | Population, 1960 | Expenditure for new classrooms, fiscal years 1955 through 1963 |
|---|---|---|
| District of Columbia | 763,965 | $50,160,348 |
| Milwaukee | 741,324 | 42,792,347 |
| Cincinnati | 502,550 | [1] 37,159,439 |
| Cleveland | 876,050 | 36,333,036 |
| New Orleans | 627,525 | 33,118,148 |
| St. Louis | 750,026 | 31,727,458 |
| Buffalo | 532,759 | 22,809,000 |
| Pittsburgh | 604,332 | 14,798,387 |
| Minneapolis | 482,872 | 16,290,981 |

[1] Includes remodeling of existing buildings.

Sources: "Selected Statistics of Local School Districts, 1960–61," published by the Research Division, National Education Association.

Superintendents of Schools in the cities listed above.

### *District of Columbia tax structure and sources of revenue*

| | |
|---|---|
| District real estate tax rate per $100 of assessed value for 1963 [1] | $2.50 |
| Total assessed value for— | |
| Fiscal 1963 | $2,425,424,380 |
| Fiscal 1964 (estimated) | $2,500,000,000 |

[1] There is no distinction in the real estate tax rate between residences and commercial sites.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approximate percentage of true value reflected in real estate tax rate: | |
| Residences | 55 |
| Commercial | 60–65 |
| Difference is explained by relationship of land to improvements: | |
| Assessed value attributed to land | $808,456,096 |
| Assessed value attributed to improvements | $1,616,968,284 |

SOURCES OF REVENUE

[In thousands of dollars]

| | 1962 | 1963 |
|---|---|---|
| General fund: | | |
| Taxes: | | |
| Property taxes: | | |
| Realty | 58,909 | 61,400 |
| Personal tangible | 9,366 | 9,500 |
| Sales and gross receipts: | | |
| Alcoholic beverages | 5,119 | 7,450 |
| Beer | 615 | 780 |
| Wine | 452 | 670 |
| Cigarette | 3,379 | 3,700 |
| Insurance | 3,151 | 3,300 |
| Motor-vehicle excise | 2,298 | 2,300 |
| Public utilities | 9,155 | 9,700 |
| Sales and use | 25,696 | 34,750 |
| Income taxes: | | |
| Individual income | 27,888 | 29,100 |
| Corporation franchise | 8,694 | 9,700 |
| Unincorporated business franchise | 1,639 | 2,000 |
| Other taxes: | | |
| Inheritance and estate | 3,947 | 3,500 |
| Real estate deed recordation tax | 183 | 1,500 |
| Motor-vehicle registration | 4,118 | 4,100 |
| Licenses and other | 4,061 | 4,200 |
| Charges and miscellaneous: | | |
| Charges for current service | 5,747 | 6,000 |
| Fines, escheats and forfeitures | 3,272 | 3,600 |
| Rents and royalties | ---------- | ---------- |
| Police and Firemen's Retirement | 2,242 | 2,600 |
| Interest on investments | 350 | 450 |
| Other miscellaneous revenues | 1,335 | 2,450 |
| Federal payment | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Grand total, general fund | 232,015 | 251,450 |
| Highway fund (regular account) | 15,462 | 18,200 |
| Highway fund (motor vehicle parking account) | 964 | 927 |
| Water fund | 8,749 | 9,268 |
| Sanitary sewage works fund | 14,002 | 13,222 |

*District of Columbia general fund appropriations or estimates for the fiscal years 1955 through 1964, together with the amount and percent of such appropriations or estimates allocated to the public schools*

| Year | Total appropriation or estimate, general fund [1] | Appropriation or estimate for public schools | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Operating expenses | | Capital outlay | | Total for schools | |
| | | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent | Amount | Percent |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1955 | $139,578,760 | $27,626,570 | 19.8 | $7,375,000 | 5.3 | $35,001,570 | 25.1 |
| 1956 | 143,179,303 | 31,457,000 | 22.0 | 4,473,300 | 3.1 | 35,930,300 | 25.1 |
| 1957 | 155,579,025 | 32,911,626 | 21.2 | 6,181,700 | 4.0 | 39,093,326 | 25.1 |
| 1958 | 166,096,999 | 39,430,050 | 23.7 | 10,642,722 | 6.4 | 50,072,772 | 30.1 |
| 1959 | 185,915,914 | 44,043,668 | 23.7 | 8,920,300 | 4.8 | 52,963,968 | 28.5 |
| 1960 [2] | 199,806,074 | 47,184,500 | 23.6 | 6,911,000 | 3.5 | 54,095,500 | 27.1 |
| 1961 [3] | 223,086,004 | 51,730,700 | 23.2 | 6,944,000 | 3.1 | 58,674,700 | 26.3 |
| 1962 [4] | 233,626,683 | 54,206,110 | 23.2 | 8,886,000 | 3.8 | 63,092,110 | 27.0 |
| 1963 | 256,684,668 | 59,504,750 | 23.2 | 7,873,000 | 3.1 | 67,377,750 | 26.2 |
| 1964 [5] | 267,641,423 | 65,271,000 | 24.4 | 17,262,000 | 6.4 | 82,533,000 | 30.8 |

[1] The amounts in this column do not include appropriations or estimates for the following: (1) highway fund (for all street and highway construction, traffic enforcement, and motor vehicle regulation); (2) water fund (for all activities concerned with collecting, purifying, and distributing water); (3) sanitary sewage works fund (for all activities concerned with collecting and treating sewage); and (4) motor vehicle parking fund (for all activities concerned with alleviating the parking problem).

[2] Figures for 1960 include funds made available by transfer for an increase in salary for wage-scale employees, and by supplemental appropriation, for electricity and further increases in salary for wage-scale employees.

[3] Figures for 1961 include funds made available by transfer for an increase in salary for wage-scale employees, and by supplemental appropriation, for an increase in salary for classified and Teachers' Salary Act employees.

[4] Figures for 1962 include funds made available by transfer for an increase in salary for wage-scale employees.

[5] Figures for 1964 are revised estimates assuming the availability of additional revenues.

Prepared by Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, June 1963.

*Enrollment figures*

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

| | *Total* |
|---|---|
| Pittsburgh | 79,767 |
| Allegheny County (including Pittsburgh) | 257,007 |
| Allegheny County (excluding Pittsburgh) | 177,240 |
| Philadelphia | 265,549 |

In answers to the questions concerning the Dodd amendment—H.R. 3113, **St. Onge**, of Connecticut—the letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is presented for the information of the Members:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*November 5, 1963.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in response to your request for our views on the so-called Dodd amendments to part C of H.R. 4955, a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for 3 years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes.

These amendments were adopted on the floor of the Senate and appear on page 69 of the Senate-passed bill—lines 6 to 12 in the case of the amendment to Public Law 815, and lines 22 to 24 in the case of the amendment to Public Law 874. Both amendments would deem property to continue to be Federal property for 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which Federal property is transferred to non-Federal ownership. Thus, in the case of Public Law 874 payments, children whose parents live or work on transferred property during the period immediately following its transfer would be considered to the federally-connected children and countable as such in computing eligibility for and the amount of Public Law 874 payments due to a school district for that period—and this even though, following the transfer to non-Federal ownership, the property became fully taxable for school and other purposes by the school district concerned. In the case of Public Law 815, any increases in the number of children connected with the property following and as a result of its transfer to private ownership would be treated as if the increase were federally caused and connected even though any such increase would be entirely the result of the activity of the non-Federal owner or user of the property and even though, during the period, the property is not exempt from State or local taxation.

We do not believe that either amendment can be justified on the basis that other Federal payments under these laws are usually justified; that is, as compensation to school districts for their inability to levy and collect taxes on tax-exempt Federal property. After transfer to private or other non-Federal ownership, the property loses its Federal immunity to State and local taxes and any failure to levy and collect taxes on the property to support public schools or other public services is attributable to the State or local taxing authorities rather than to the Federal Government. Furthermore, even if the amendments could in some measure be justified on their merits, we believe that amendments such as these two should properly be considered in connection with the study of these two laws which section 33 of H.R. 4955, as passed by the Senate, requires be made by the Commissioner of Education and reported to Congress; undoubtedly there are many amendments of equal or greater merit which will be considered and reported on in the course of that study, and the Congress would and should have an opportunity to consider all such amendments en bloc when it takes up the Commissioner's report and recommendations persuant to section 33.

Of the two amendments, the amendment to Public Law 815, in its present form, is the most difficult to justify or even rationalize. Public Law 815 now includes a provision at section 5(c) which applies only to Federal housing property transferred to private or other non-Federal ownership. This provision has an entirely different effect than that which would result from the Dodd amendment to Public Law 815. Under section 5(c), if federally owned housing property is transferred to non-Federal ownership, the children residing on the property prior to its transfer are eliminated from the count of federally connected children in determining the eligibility for Public Law 815 payments of the school district concerned. Since only increases in federally connected enrollments are counted for payment purposes under Public Law 815, the effect of a transfer of Federal housing property would be—were it not for the special provision in section 5(c)—to show an immediate decrease in federally connected enrollments even though the children involved still continue to live in the same housing and continue to attend the public schools of the school district. The provision in section 5(c) was aimed at preventing this apparent anomoly by treating the transferred property as if it had never been owned by the Federal Government.

The Dodd amendment to Public Law 815—under which children connected with transferred property would be considered federally connected for a certain period immediately following the transfer, as well as so considered for periods before the transfer, is thus in direct conflict with and incompatible with the provision now in section 5(c) of the law discussed above (which deems such children not to be federally connected both before and after the transfer of the property); with both the section 5(c) provision and the Dodd amendment to Public Law 815, the law becomes unintelligible. Furthermore, any justification based on the fact that local taxing authorities are unable, during the year or so immediately following a transfer of Federal property, to put the transferred property on their tax rolls, falls down in the case of Public Law 815 payments since school construction costs are not usually met out of current revenues but, instead, through borrowing and repayment of the loan out of future revenues collected during the maturity of the school construction bond issue. No justification whatever would seem to exist for requiring, as the Dodd amendment to Public Law 815 would require, the Federal Government to pay a portion of the cost of constructing school facilities to house school enrollment increases which are exclusively attributable to increases in employment or housing occupancy due to activities of the purchaser of the Federal property after his acquisition of the property.

For the above reasons we recommend against enactment of both the Dodd amendments, particularly the amendment to Public Law 815.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
*Assistant Secretary.*

**The amounts allocated and spent by States over the lifespan of the legislation Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 are shown by the following charts:**

TABLE 2.—*Public Law 874: Appropriations, entitlements of local educational agencies, and payments to Federal agencies under all sections of the act, by State and year: Aggregate United States, fiscal years 1951–62*

| Category and State | Fiscal year | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1962 (1) | 1961 (2) | 1960 (3) | 1959 (4) | 1958 (5) | 1957 (6) | 1956 (7) | 1955 (8) | 1954 (9) | 1953 (10) | 1952 (11) | 1951 (12) |
| Appropriations | $247,000,000 | $217,300,000 | $186,300,000 | $157,362,000 | $127,000,000 | $113,050,000 | $90,000,000 | $75,000,000 | $72,350,000 | $60,500,000 | $51,570,000 | $29,080,788 |
| Total entitlements | [1]246,633,498 | 208,807,272 | 184,915,147 | 156,909,277 | 122,323,791 | 111,319,914 | 85,671,844 | [2] 75,276,843 | 71,860,087 | 57,696,592 | 47,814,282 | [3] 29,686,018 |
| Net entitlements: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alabama | 5,349,576 | 4,674,413 | 4,094,876 | 3,590,284 | 3,087,346 | 2,811,351 | 1,093,506 | 856,785 | 959,849 | 792,433 | 695,560 | 379,930 |
| Alaska | 6,808,231 | 6,522,272 | 5,855,802 | 4,869,525 | 3,919,086 | 3,422,818 | 2,977,131 | 2,201,546 | 1,839,563 | 420,653 | 338,416 | 104,689 |
| Arizona | 5,189,876 | 4,558,227 | 4,068,003 | 3,529,311 | 1,777,662 | 1,511,829 | 984,783 | 703,612 | 574,245 | 563,760 | 496,521 | 318,343 |
| Arkansas | 1,428,031 | 987,586 | 893,111 | 894,517 | 795,248 | 886,850 | 622,594 | 514,490 | 641,110 | 736,814 | 813,614 | 825,683 |
| California | 42,033,957 | 34,542,833 | 31,014,305 | 26,533,263 | 20,308,050 | 18,221,657 | 14,738,952 | 13,580,814 | 12,966,820 | 10,462,976 | 9,772,554 | 6,729,195 |
| Colorado | 7,163,724 | 5,820,613 | 4,958,187 | 4,202,336 | 3,142,123 | 2,701,452 | 2,153,768 | 1,716,239 | 1,629,170 | 1,469,400 | 1,246,900 | 638,563 |
| Connecticut | 2,457,392 | 1,960,541 | 1,626,847 | 1,485,057 | 1,090,231 | 1,353,270 | 1,197,993 | 1,278,326 | 1,317,256 | 917,350 | 612,781 | 433,497 |
| Delaware | 259,832 | 262,030 | 207,991 | 181,826 | 168,882 | 132,806 | 48,175 | 19,416 | 18,644 | ----- | ----- | 155 |
| Florida | 6,215,166 | 5,499,543 | 4,802,573 | 4,169,476 | 3,500,099 | 2,990,146 | 1,821,277 | 1,368,370 | 1,509,102 | 1,156,636 | 791,406 | 471,089 |
| Georgia | 5,592,672 | 4,996,625 | 4,699,008 | 3,989,099 | 3,699,104 | 3,615,124 | 1,770,026 | 1,555,165 | 2,086,145 | 2,358,738 | 2,532,196 | 2,361,228 |
| Hawaii | 4,938,280 | 4,382,101 | 3,989,155 | 2,900,862 | 1,927,944 | 1,658,274 | 1,272,274 | 1,080,090 | 1,072,150 | 956,703 | 761,059 | 425,018 |
| Idaho | 1,918,609 | 1,514,395 | 1,286,382 | 1,165,642 | 742,138 | 604,106 | 434,561 | 364,115 | 411,891 | 334,964 | 228,300 | 189,533 |
| Illinois | 4,352,845 | 3,452,670 | 3,011,449 | 2,512,990 | 2,275,616 | 2,285,810 | 1,948,610 | 1,705,459 | 1,608,070 | 1,399,181 | 1,124,532 | 872,532 |
| Indiana | 1,282,105 | 1,023,527 | 876,008 | 734,466 | 675,039 | 767,460 | 725,726 | 858,751 | 853,103 | 712,705 | 545,811 | 340,827 |
| Iowa | 832,826 | 693,835 | 645,489 | 403,276 | 312,214 | 338,709 | 216,796 | 304,157 | 278,469 | 177,325 | 166,225 | 79,496 |
| Kansas | 5,838,377 | 5,155,299 | 4,383,589 | 3,977,692 | 3,423,524 | 3,170,594 | 3,242,430 | 3,038,190 | 2,804,045 | 2,474,243 | 1,953,639 | 967,454 |
| Kentucky | 1,472,530 | 1,228,737 | 1,100,329 | 1,004,608 | 892,691 | 873,686 | 607,223 | 851,721 | 753,909 | 1,032,579 | 869,435 | 382,929 |
| Louisiana | 964,454 | 808,316 | 773,087 | 903,544 | 824,043 | 799,203 | 405,771 | 431,599 | 495,416 | 252,539 | 177,309 | ----- |
| Maine | 2,062,810 | 1,875,877 | 1,545,319 | 1,254,913 | 918,627 | 777,173 | 656,382 | 577,673 | 433,632 | 293,271 | 231,319 | 130,262 |
| Maryland | 9,461,446 | 8,016,631 | 7,376,966 | 6,011,590 | 5,069,869 | 4,700,726 | 3,463,413 | 2,811,488 | 1,642,037 | 1,167,216 | 782,228 | 528,243 |
| Massachusetts | 7,131,493 | 6,200,933 | 5,165,025 | 4,062,848 | 2,897,066 | 2,028,915 | 1,083,559 | 938,899 | 755,881 | 564,776 | 439,129 | 290,858 |
| Michigan | 1,918,719 | 1,310,320 | 949,879 | 738,405 | 494,369 | 386,643 | 427,313 | 915,686 | 1,302,873 | 970,797 | 1,029,882 | 1,223,879 |
| Minnesota | 501,835 | 427,884 | 400,874 | 371,221 | 98,184 | 95,793 | 100,370 | 122,382 | 122,177 | 69,866 | 43,311 | 23,207 |
| Mississippi | 1,840,855 | 1,370,946 | 1,276,284 | 1,168,061 | 868,614 | 658,878 | 432,221 | 419,288 | 517,184 | 468,133 | 410,003 | 259,198 |
| Missouri | 2,724,784 | 2,431,540 | 2,192,020 | 1,867,475 | 1,433,309 | 1,097,221 | 984,705 | 905,024 | 1,072,699 | 733,617 | 391,597 | 292,266 |
| Montana | 2,186,265 | 1,551,639 | 1,281,913 | 1,064,703 | 498,120 | 419,872 | 250,968 | 251,267 | 279,683 | 204,886 | 195,205 | 153,972 |
| Nebraska | 2,757,586 | 2,278,656 | 1,742,532 | 1,434,680 | 1,001,070 | 970,055 | 951,462 | 883,155 | 817,440 | 694,584 | 528,818 | 243,444 |
| Nevada | 1,569,402 | 1,262,034 | 1,133,524 | 1,033,546 | 677,412 | 623,605 | 615,176 | 526,394 | 545,071 | 500,704 | 366,693 | 169,034 |
| New Hampshire | 1,320,536 | 1,181,351 | 1,034,969 | 811,060 | 542,294 | 467,633 | 411,955 | 370,549 | 355,187 | 324,059 | 73,812 | 172,313 |
| New Jersey | 5,974,390 | 3,941,434 | 3,346,180 | 2,429,508 | 1,830,745 | 1,596,136 | 1,429,868 | 1,157,109 | 1,074,648 | 824,503 | 564,398 | 172,420 |
| New Mexico | 5,172,539 | 4,702,130 | 4,105,620 | 3,688,988 | 2,352,196 | 1,991,537 | 1,429,583 | 1,132,601 | 1,118,379 | 714,823 | 316,789 | 257,458 |
| New York | 6,058,625 | 5,509,733 | 4,752,190 | 3,670,726 | 2,596,009 | 2,329,486 | 1,934,785 | 1,626,295 | 1,738,007 | 1,235,329 | 472,120 | 150,935 |
| North Carolina | 2,781,324 | 2,329,369 | 2,078,247 | 1,650,161 | 1,316,593 | 1,204,914 | 510,129 | 494,052 | 467,444 | 273,271 | 183,496 | 116,214 |
| North Dakota | 916,227 | 588,221 | 358,526 | 263,706 | 175,850 | 172,175 | 200,902 | 170,309 | 184,365 | 144,513 | 129,725 | 1,797 |
| Ohio | 5,615,602 | 4,614,392 | 4,314,024 | 3,809,672 | 3,208,959 | 3,249,764 | 3,122,014 | 2,814,152 | 2,690,231 | 1,919,414 | 1,453,698 | 989,006 |
| Oklahoma | 7,490,344 | 6,838,656 | 6,489,115 | 5,635,821 | 4,575,770 | 4,285,764 | 3,322,825 | 2,802,876 | 2,793,250 | 2,181,434 | 1,571,275 | 1,196,198 |
| Oregon | 1,176,678 | 1,013,646 | 808,856 | 790,697 | 734,262 | 789,098 | 624,172 | 432,571 | 286,588 | 268,012 | 344,887 | 213,827 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,096,775 | 4,696,095 | 4,400,082 | 3,822,729 | 1,620,098 | 1,557,828 | 1,304,179 | 1,098,528 | 1,155,758 | 866,526 | 612,271 | 391,863 |
| Rhode Island | 2,218,765 | 1,807,221 | 1,568,371 | 1,366,289 | 1,194,812 | 1,127,263 | 802,769 | 630,908 | 559,027 | 475,510 | 381,104 | 256,919 |
| South Carolina | 3,809,630 | 3,343,443 | 2,985,582 | 2,437,919 | 2,166,854 | 1,963,319 | 852,713 | 893,894 | 920,621 | 928,913 | 495,205 | 232,321 |
| South Dakota | 2,425,471 | 2,046,468 | 1,764,425 | 1,592,556 | 1,128,198 | 998,012 | 824,446 | 641,684 | 488,973 | 434,589 | 388,606 | 114,669 |
| Tennessee | 2,511,403 | 2,121,706 | 1,940,253 | 1,673,974 | 1,402,887 | 1,372,696 | 972,964 | 847,372 | 652,406 | 289,133 | 204,170 | 195,862 |
| Texas | 13,981,061 | 11,921,513 | 10,671,390 | 9,606,757 | 8,337,379 | 7,531,865 | 5,306,915 | 4,606,046 | 4,952,728 | 4,277,723 | 4,293,995 | 2,112,238 |
| Utah | 2,257,324 | 1,867,960 | 1,626,874 | 1,390,797 | 1,189,348 | 1,131,263 | 780,574 | 719,953 | 697,177 | 652,542 | 547,482 | 462,054 |
| Vermont | 57,533 | 48,561 | 73,937 | 71,920 | 56,308 | 57,701 | 44,815 | 43,087 | 51,150 | 43,091 | 32,390 | 16,443 |
| Virginia | 15,559,386 | 13,765,735 | 12,714,921 | 10,699,560 | 9,462,484 | 8,715,251 | 7,064,353 | 6,372,227 | 5,434,267 | 4,210,832 | 2,936,658 | 1,895,311 |
| Washington | 9,911,802 | 8,410,555 | 7,296,281 | 6,509,838 | 5,012,721 | 4,487,115 | 4,067,307 | 3,282,358 | 3,553,832 | 2,439,589 | 2,232,746 | 1,638,104 |
| West Virginia | 141,120 | 107,560 | 104,396 | 114,556 | 142,348 | 144,153 | 83,976 | 67,256 | 36,719 | 27,841 | 28,500 | 18,547 |
| Wisconsin | 702,584 | 706,337 | 561,590 | 511,958 | 239,000 | 314,272 | 318,265 | 405,595 | 372,189 | 180,357 | 100,686 | 63,506 |
| Wyoming | 931,349 | 764,742 | 646,853 | 450,100 | 387,874 | 326,491 | 237,671 | 217,037 | 180,372 | 2,049 | 117,692 | 108,489 |
| Guam | 818,432 | 723,766 | 659,348 | 600,980 | 450,458 | 333,758 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Virgin Islands | 71,150 | 70,834 | 76,940 | 43,221 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Payments to Federal agencies | 13,379,770 | 10,875,821 | 9,185,650 | 7,210,568 | 5,682,664 | 5,268,394 | 4,797,499 | 3,670,283 | 2,788,955 | 3,095,690 | 2,788,134 | 75,000 |

[1] May be changed on basis of additional information.

[2] Payments prorated at 99.5 percent.

[3] Payments prorated at 96 percent.

TABLE 15.—*Public Law 815: Federal funds reserved, for local educational agencies and Federal installations, for construction of school facilities under all sections of the act, by State and section of the act: Aggregate United States, fiscal years 1951–62*

| State | Total | | Funds reserved | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | For local educational agencies | | | | | | For Federal agencies—Sec. 10[5] | |
| | 1951–62 | 1962 | Secs. 5[1] and 9[2] | | Sec. 8[3] | | Sec. 14[4] | | | |
| | | | 1951–62 | 1962 | 1951–62 | 1962 | 1954–62 | 1962 | 1951–62 | 1962 |
| Total | $1,069,873,115 | $71,820,859 | [6] $891,716,973 | [7] $60,178,801 | $13,219,771 | $1,435,351 | $41,989,495 | $2,302,045 | $122,946,876 | $7,904,66 |
| Alabama | 21,659,507 | 435,336 | 21,128,099 | 435,336 | 293,922 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 237,486 | ----- |
| Alaska | 29,283,725 | 3,173,420 | 11,239,839 | 56,700 | ----- | ----- | 221,539 | ----- | 17,822,347 | 3,116,720 |
| Arizona | 37,838,304 | 3,118,460 | [6] 18,473,317 | 942,820 | 56,445 | ----- | 10,426,267 | 1,646,640 | 8,882,275 | 529,000 |
| Arkansas | 15,000,595 | 755,299 | 13,782,838 | 664,944 | 1,217,757 | 90,355 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—*Public Law 815: Federal funds reserved, for local educational agencies and Federal installations, for construction of school facilities under all sections of the act, by State and section of the act: Aggregate United States, fiscal years 1951–62*—Continued

| State | Total | | Funds reserved | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | For local educational agencies | | | | | | For Federal agencies—Sec. 10 [5] | |
| | 1951–62 | 1962 | Secs. 5 [1] and 9 [2] | | Sec. 8 [3] | | Sec. 14 [4] | | | |
| | | | 1951–62 | 1962 | 1951–62 | 1962 | 1954–62 | 1962 | 1951–62 | 1962 |
| California | $172,446,297 | $10,133,191 | [6]$159,965,189 | $9,108,041 | $564,291 | | $861,214 | $100,150 | $11,055,603 | $925,000 |
| Colorado | 20,527,133 | 1,814,642 | [6] 19,711,026 | [7] 1,694,017 | 589,707 | $120,625 | 226,400 | | | |
| Connecticut | 12,214,944 | 2,377,916 | 12,214,944 | 2,377,916 | | | | | | |
| Delaware | 3,053,067 | | 305,320 | | | | | | 2,747,747 | |
| Florida | 29,813,885 | 4,591,787 | 27,982,316 | 4,591,787 | | | | | 1,831,569 | |
| Georgia | 36,088,738 | 1,651,914 | [6] 32,218,380 | 832,832 | 1,364,329 | 573,082 | | | 2,506,029 | 246,000 |
| Hawaii | 18,853,589 | | 18,853,589 | | | | | | | |
| Idaho | 8,022,211 | 1,326,068 | [6] 6,995,448 | 1,326,068 | | | 1,026,763 | | | |
| Illinois | 14,872,973 | 136,645 | 14,872,973 | 136,645 | | | | | | |
| Indiana | 9,094,915 | | 8,415,926 | | 678,989 | | | | | |
| Iowa | 2,274,377 | 16,520 | 2,274,377 | 16,520 | | | | | | |
| Kansas | 19,041,365 | 772,763 | 15,420,861 | 772,763 | | | | | 3,620,504 | |
| Kentucky | 15,746,397 | 33,000 | [6] 5,555,043 | 33,000 | 576,602 | | | | 9,614,752 | |
| Louisiana | 7,003,264 | 86,135 | 6,918,665 | 86,135 | 84,599 | | | | | |
| Maine | 7,631,699 | 1,660,000 | 3,241,741 | | | | | | 4,389,958 | 1,660,000 |
| Maryland | 53,818,029 | 4,607,407 | 53,524,741 | 4,607,407 | | | | | 293,288 | |
| Massachusetts | 13,143,167 | 1,040,896 | 7,389,831 | 1,040,896 | | | | | 5,753,336 | |
| Michigan | 46,312,077 | 2,874,702 | 44,232,502 | 2,456,620 | 1,056,212 | 418,082 | | | 1,023,363 | |
| Minnesota | 3,985,029 | 45,381 | 1,496,089 | 18,900 | 25,097 | | 2,463,843 | 26,481 | | |
| Mississippi | 8,152,070 | 30,080 | 8,152,070 | 30,080 | | | | | | |
| Missouri | 19,924,415 | 296,124 | [6] 15,055,184 | 296,124 | 183,930 | | | | 4,685,301 | |
| Montana | $11,197,637 | $2,302,433 | [6] $7,765,381 | [7] $2,302,433 | | | $3,432,256 | | | |
| Nebraska | 7,887,801 | 2,107,063 | 7,700,141 | 2,107,063 | | | 187,660 | | | |
| Nevada | 9,234,886 | 1,573,650 | [6] 7,707,558 | 1,573,650 | | | 692,037 | | $835,291 | |
| New Hampshire | 1,719,954 | | 825,087 | | | | | | 894,867 | |
| New Jersey | 13,828,991 | 1,093,052 | 10,474,909 | 1,078,040 | | | | | 3,354,082 | $15,012 |
| New Mexico | 39,782,535 | 1,522,471 | 23,484,328 | 1,119,116 | $1,130,119 | | 12,472,708 | $403,355 | 2,695,380 | |
| New York | 20,209,688 | 1,279,310 | 16,726,372 | 1,279,310 | | | | | 3,483,316 | |
| North Carolina | 20,242,802 | 1,143,730 | 11,673,182 | 491,870 | | | | | 8,569,620 | 651,860 |
| North Dakota | 4,624,311 | 869,990 | 4,270,828 | 794,990 | | | 278,483 | | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Ohio | 24,776,954 | 1,406,598 | [6] 23,972,636 | 1,406,598 | 466,115 | | 338,203 | | | |
| Oklahoma | 30,184,745 | 1,962,928 | 22,208,224 | 1,777,208 | 2,523,324 | $155,320 | 4,324,262 | 30,400 | 1,128,935 | |
| Oregon | 4,159,318 | 16,675 | [6] 3,925,318 | 16,675 | | | 212,000 | | 22,000 | |
| Pennsylvania | 4,549,996 | 44,010 | 4,549,996 | 44,010 | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | 4,311,395 | 116,000 | 4,311,395 | 116,000 | | | | | | |
| South Carolina | 17,458,233 | 785,655 | [6] 16,959,717 | 413,655 | 15,651 | | | | 482,865 | 354,000 |
| South Dakota | 9,145,125 | 2,283,430 | 7,327,375 | 2,205,543 | 287,952 | 77,887 | 291,891 | | 1,237,907 | |
| Tennessee | 8,954,714 | 19,090 | 8,954,714 | 19,090 | | | | | | |
| Texas | 65,788,334 | 3,624,247 | 57,353,434 | 3,624,247 | 2,104,730 | | 18,000 | | 6,312,170 | |
| Utah | 12,025,862 | 1,094,329 | 10,880,082 | 1,094,329 | | | 180,000 | | 965,780 | |
| Vermont | 185,111 | | 185,111 | | | | | | | |
| Virginia | 73,693,183 | 6,035,453 | 67,453,039 | 5,959,453 | | | | | 6,240,144 | 76,000 |
| Washington | 47,751,320 | 934,943 | [6] 39,476,304 | 934,943 | | | 955,432 | | 7,319,584 | |
| West Virginia | 243,148 | 75,000 | 243,148 | 75,000 | | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | 2,013,328 | 248,990 | 902,472 | 176,890 | | | 1,110,856 | 72,100 | | |
| Wyoming | 2,327,548 | 48,056 | 1,127,278 | 25,137 | | | 1,200,270 | 22,919 | | |
| Guam | 2,818,373 | | 1,748,962 | | | | 1,069,411 | | | |
| Puerto Rico | 4,583,180 | 130,320 | 89,674 | | | | | | 4,493,506 | 130,320 |
| Virgin Islands | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wake Island | 372,871 | 125,750 | | | | | | | 372,871 | 125,750 |

[1] For period 1951–62 includes former secs. 202 and 305.

[2] For period 1951–62 includes former secs. 203 and 309.

[3] For period 1951–62 includes former secs. 209(c) and 308.

[4] For period 1954–62 includes former sec. 401.

[5] For period 1951–62 includes former secs. 204 and 310.

[6] Includes $7,565,170 grant under sec. 9:

| | |
|---|---|
| Arizona | $520,955 |
| California | 175,571 |
| Colorado | 151,230 |
| Georgia | 292,541 |
| Idaho | 553,611 |
| Kentucky | $828,314 |
| Missouri | 202,990 |
| Montana | 357,000 |
| Nevada | 54,921 |
| Ohio | 797,919 |
| Oregon | 333,792 |
| South Carolina | 2,872,934 |
| Washington | 423,392 |

[7] Includes $488,230 grant under sec. 9:

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado | $151,230 |
| Montana | 337,000 |

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished member of this committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

**Mr. POWELL.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. QUIE.** Yes.

**Mr. POWELL.** The gentleman from Minnesota has been very zealous in trying to establish a pilot project for residential schools for vocational education in the District of Columbia.

**Mr. QUIE.** That is correct. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has also worked hard for this project and it was on his insistence that a special residential vocational school for the District of Columbia is included in the juvenile delinquency bill which our committee is considering.

**Mr. POWELL.** I want to compliment the gentleman on that. We tried in the conference to get this specifically included, but, due to the fact that it involved adding additional language, it was not included. However, there was an agreement, a unanimous agreement, by the conferees of both bodies that the District of Columbia would not only have a residential school but that it would be the first one; is that correct?

**Mr. QUIE.** That is correct. That is my understanding.

**Mr. POWELL.** Has the gentleman from Minnesota any idea how much money should be earmarked for such a residential school in the District of Columbia?

**Mr. QUIE.** Of the funds obtained in the bill, I would assume that $1 million of the first year's authorization should be for the District of Columbia and $5 million of the second year's authorization, and $2 million of the authorization for each of the two succeeding years. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from New York?

**Mr. POWELL.** I agree with that. That means $1 million for the acquisition of property and planning, $5 million for construction, and $2 million a year for maintenance.

**Mr. QUIE.** That is correct.

**Mr. POWELL.** Let it be clearly understood that the conferees unanimously agreed on this, let it be clearly understood this shall be the first one to be erected under the residential section of the bill.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. QUIE.** I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

**Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.** I would like to say I agree with the chairman of our committee on the advisability of establishing such a school. I would like also to point out that the motion to recommit which I am planning to offer will except a national demonstration school in the

District from the prohibition against such residential schools.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the silliest argument I have heard all day is that if we agree to the motion to recommit with instructions to take out the work-study program and the residential schools, other than in the District of Columbia, this legislation is dead. That is silly. How in the world can we let the other body roll over us? We can take this back to conference. You have bargained before. You and I have heard all kinds of arguments and charges before. You can be as sure as I am standing here that impact aid is going to be passed this year. No matter what we do the appropriations would not be ready until sometime after January. You can be as sure as I am standing here that there is going to be an extension of the National Defense Education Act; you can be sure that a vocational education bill is going to be passed and would be just as it is written in the conference report, with the exception of the work-study program and the Federal residential schools outside of the District of Columbia.

The work-study program is altogether new. We took it up in the Committee on Education and Labor and turned it down. You people know from experience that the Committee on Education and Labor is not made up of a bunch of radical conservatives. But we turned the work-study program down. We took up residential schools and we turned that down.

The Federal Government has a responsibility in the District of Columbia. Therefore this is going to be an experimental project. Schools all over the country can look at the District of Columbia and see how it operates. There is the problem of the race relations, there is the problem of juvenile delinquency, there is the problem of dropouts, all to be studied. You will not have to take airplane trips all over the country to find out about this program. It would be right here in the District of Columbia for us all to see conveniently. This is why the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] has also been working hard for the District of Columbia.

All we ask you to do is to vote for the motion to recommit to knock out the work-study program and the other residential schools and we will take the rest of the conference report involving vocational education, impacted area aid, and the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie]. In my judgment, this gentleman has provided the most factual information of any Member of this House regarding the conference report now before us relating to vocational education even though his remarks were brief.

At this time, I think it is pertinent that we review the history of this legislation to properly understand the implications involved if the report is adopted with the Senate-inserted "work study programs" and "residential vocational educational schools."

Let us first read part A, sections 1 and 2 of this conference report that spells out the declaration of purpose of this legislation. It reads as follows:

> DECLARATION OF PURPOSE
>
> SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.
>
> AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
>
> SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $118,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $177,500,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $225,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

Mr. Speaker, in these two sections I fully concur and can support without any reservations as evidenced by my vote for the vocational education bill when it cleared the House earlier in this session. Further, I want to declare myself in favor of most of the sections of part B, "Extension of National Defense Education Act" of 1958 and strongly in favor of part C, "Federally Affected Areas" as provided under Public Law 815 and 874. In considering payments to the so-called federally affected areas, the Federal Government properly pays to local school districts funds to offset the cost of education increases brought about by reason of the existence of a Federal installation. In my judgment, this is the fairest, most responsible approach devised to meet the Federal Government's true responsibility. Accordingly, I believe this well established principle of payment in lieu of taxes should be expanded to include payment for lands taken off the tax rolls of political subdivisions for national park purposes and other land management projects of the Federal Government. This concept would appropriately recognize the Federal Government's responsibility to other levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to support this principle as long as the recommended programs follow these well-defined objectives. However, we now find ourselves facing a new decision on the conference report. Instead of being satisfied with a workable recommendation to our vocational education problems, the conferees have seen fit to add an entirely new program to include the so-called work study and residential vocational educational schools—a new program to be established on a nationwide experiment that adds $115 million to the authorization measure. This is included even though the conferees agreed unanimously to conduct their first experiment right here in the District of Columbia where the problems are probably the greatest in the Nation. I will willingly support a program that has a reasonable chance for success but I do not believe in experimenting on a nationwide scale. Therefore, it is my understanding that a motion to recommit this report to the conferees with instructions to delete the aforementioned work study and residential vocational educational programs and add the District of Columbia experimental project is to be introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

I will support this motion because I believe it to be the most responsible approach to a complex problem. If the motion to recommit does not carry, I will vote against the bill. In this way I can register protest to last-minute amendments designed to include this costly experiment. The will of this legislative body was clearly expressed when we passed H.R. 4955. As Mr. Quie suggests, the National Defense Education Act and Public Laws 815 and 874 authorizations will not be disturbed by this action—in this I concur.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] one of the conferees, and a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, those who have preceded me have gone very well and thoroughly, in my judgment, into the provisions of the bill out of which this conference report develops.

I want to address my remarks principally to the vocational education section of the bill. However, I want it thoroughly understood that I do endorse the other sections of the conference report also, involving National Defense Education Act and Public Law 815 and Public Law 874.

I was disturbed, as most of the House conferees were, at the outset about these provisions involving work-study and the residential school. This conference report is not all I would have liked with respect to those two provisions, but it is what a conference report usually is, a compromise. I think unquestionably with the passage of the Manpower Act today with the amendment which the gentleman who is addressing you now offered, made certain there would be no conflict between the work-study program as proposed in the Vocational Act and the program under manpower development. Moreover, I think it is true we have sufficiently contained the residential school idea to where we can expect that the District of Columbia will be the only place in which it will be operated.

If it is outside the District of Columbia then the law does provide approval must be given by the State boards of education or the boards controlling vocational education.

I would like to say in a general way this one thing about the vocational education bill. We are not setting any new precedents here today. The Federal Government has participated in vocational education for many, many years, and successfully. The success of the vocational education program, assisted by the Federal Government, is undisputed. No section of the country has been without benefit from it, and certainly the section from which I come has benefited greatly.

Now in my judgment we have reached the time when we must provide opportunity for this program to expand itself, and this law does give that opportunity and we are now taking on the responsibility of training these new people for a new, automated age. I can think of nothing more important than providing that opportunity and taking whatever money is necessary to provide that opportunity. So I am not troubled about the budget.

While I did have some misgivings about the two provisions I mentioned, and while there are some things in here that I do not like and there are other things not in here that I would like to have here, it is the best we could do. I would suggest to all of the Members that if the distinguished, the very distinguished, Senator from Oregon, who chaired the conferees from the other body, and the gentleman who is now addressing you, can agree upon a conference report and sign it, then it ought to be evidence that the conference report does not go to any great extremes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to find out if the gentleman agrees that we should have federally financed residential schools without any State participation in their construction and operation.

Mr. LANDRUM. I do not agree we should have.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman agrees the motion to recommit should prevail, then?

Mr. LANDRUM. No, I do not. If I may finish my answer to the gentleman's first question, moreover, I do not agree that there is any such danger involved in what this conference report brings, so I would think that the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey ought not to prevail.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I think one thing ought to be made clear right at the outset. The motion to recommit is not going to affect the impacted area program. It is not going to affect the National Defense Education Act. It is not going to affect the basic vocational educational program which we agreed to on a bipartisan basis.

Let me say to you that Republicans and Democrats alike among the House conferees were almost completely united in opposition to the residential school section and to the work study program. We did not like it. It was not a partisan situation. They are wrong. They are Federal schools. They are going to be controlled by the Federal Government.

I ask those of you who are concerned about Federal control, what more Federal control can you get than when the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the price, and it is paying not only for construction but for equipment, facilities, and operation on an annual basis.

These are Federal vocational residential schools. They came from an original idea that we might have one national demonstration school in the District of Columbia to show what can be done by this idea.

Now I tell all of you that these are going to be integrated Federal schools—and they should be—it is Federal money. I do not think anybody can reasonably deny that they will be federally controlled schools because they are going to be put in there with Federal money operating them all the way down the line and the State has no choice but to approve. Now this is fine, if that is what you want. Most of us do not want federally run schools. That is why the conferees on our side, Democrats and Republicans, objected. That is why we have a recommittal motion which would strike the residential schools and the work-study program.

Those two programs were rejected by our subcommittee on a bipartisan basis. The full committee left it out of the bill because we did not like the implications of them in terms of our educational system. We have already two programs going that are going to overlap. That is the work-study system in the juvenile delinquency act, and they are running already in New York City and several other cities with Federal money supporting them. The manpower bill also overlaps this concept.

I do not like many of the things about the conference report. I do not like the allocation formula which, incidentally, at full operation costs New York State $5 million a year as compared to what we would have received in the House bill. But I would even go along with that, reluctantly, because we Republicans want a vocational education bill. We believe in vocational education. We know impacted areas should have been passed 8 months ago. It will be passed in this session of the Congress in any event. We like the National Defense Education Act proposal which was an Eisenhower proposal originally. There are other things that we don't like. But there are two things which we could not swallow in this bill and that is where we disagree. Those two things are the residential schools and the work-study program.

Under the Senate proposal those two things cost $490 million. We carved them down to $150 million in the conference report. You know and I know they are going right back up. This is the foot in the door. As soon as we establish the principle of these Federal schools for residential vocational education and the work-study program, we are making a commitment that will be difficult to ever undo.

We already have now $1.4 billion being spent on vocational education of one kind or another including this bill that we just passed. It is enough. Let us reject this conference report and send it back to conference to eliminate work study and residential schools.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the conference report is not only the best compromise that could be worked out, but those of us who have worked in the conference know that we really worked, and as the distinguished gentleman from Georgia said that any time he and Senator Wayne Morse can sign a conference report, it must be all right. Well—I signed it too—if you know what I mean.

Now let us clear up a few things here. In the first place, as regards the residential vocational schools, the Senate bill had a provision for 15 such schools. They offered a compromise to cut them down to 9. Then I offered a compromise to cut them down to 5 with one of them in the District of Columbia.

And it was upon my recommendation that the conference limited these schools to 4 years—4 years and they are finished—and then the Congress has to act—but to read the provisions of the law—anyone who says these schools are going to be run by the Federal Government has not read the law. I refer you to page 13 of the report, section 14, and I read to you as follows:

> For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational educational schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner—

And listen to this now—

> is authorized to make grants * * * to State boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation.

In other words, the States operate the schools and the local school agencies operate the schools, and it is right there in the law.

The gentleman from Minnesota stood here in the well of the House and said as sure as he stands here, you will get this year NDEA amendments, Federal aid to impacted areas. Well, I stand here also—with just a little more authority—having talked with the Members of the other body all day yesterday and last night, and I tell you 315 Members of this House who get impacted area aid, you are not going to get any impacted area aid because if you recommit this bill with instructions, you cannot instruct the other body to go to conference.

There is no way for you to do it. If you are recommitting this bill with instructions to my committee, then I would call a meeting of my committee tomorrow morning and work the will of the House, but I cannot work the will of the other body, and they informed me they will not go to conference. You just make up your mind as to what you want. This is a 4-year test program costing $35 million, on the average, a year for the 4 years. It is under the operation of the States and not the Federal Government, and it is up to this Congress to review it at the end of that 4 years and then to decide whether they want to continue the work study and residential vocational schools or not. It is up to you. If you want to throw the impacted area funds out of the window, go ahead and do it. If you want to bring the vocational education program to a halt, go ahead and do it. It is up to you. However, you have $35 million experimentally for 4 years, and this Congress is the final body which will decide whether to continue it or not. I say vote for the conference report.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the conference report on H.R. 4955, which is one of the legislative landmarks in the field of education.

I particularly want to commend the House conferees for accepting section 26 (b) which amends title VI, section 611, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, so that the Commissioner of Education may contract with language institutes for advance training in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials for elementary and secondary school teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language. It is sound to include in the National Defense Education Act modern foreign language institutes program those who teach, or supervise or train teachers of, English to thousands of children for whom English is a second language.

I also believe it is equally as important to amend title III, section 301 and section 303, to permit funds appropriated under the National Defense Education Act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for the purpose of teaching English to students whose primary language is not English. This is the purpose of H.R. 8198 which I introduced earlier this year.

H.R. 4955 provides for a 1-year extension of National Defense Education Act to June 30, 1965. Therefore, there will be an opportunity next year for the Committee on Education and Labor to review the program. I urge the committee to support H.R. 8198.

Mr. Speaker, there is an overwhelming need not only for good teachers but also for instructional equipment and materials to assist in the teaching of pupils for whom English is a second language. The New York City school system faces the task of teaching some 168,000 Puerto Rican children of whom many speak Spanish as their primary language. This problem is not confined to New York.

Of 45,000 Indian children in Federal elementary and secondary schools, an estimated 80 percent come from families where English is not the native language.

Texas educates approximately 500,000 Spanish-speaking schoolchildren, mostly of Mexican ancestry. A substantial number of these come from homes where English is not spoken.

Florida has had a big influx of Spanish-speaking students from Cuba, in addition to some who were there before. Maine must teach English to thousands of children whose parents speak French. In some communities the percentage of French-speaking people totals 90 percent.

California has over a thousand classes in English as the second language. In Los Angeles alone, more than 3,500 students are enrolled in such classes.

In addition, consider the significant numbers of individuals involved in Americanization classes. The Americanization school of the District of Columbia averages 1,500 yearly. The annual enrollment in classes in English for the foreign-born in Detroit has ranged from more than 5,000 to more than 8,000 in recent years. The figures for other large metropolitan centers are undoubtedly proportional to these.

Section 26(b) of the bill before us will greatly facilitate the development of teachers of English for thousands of people who in turn will be prepared to partake more fully in the benefits and obligations of our society.

I applaud this forward step, and I hope that H.R. 8198 will be adopted soon to strengthen further the teaching of English to this important segment of our population.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4955) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the deletion of the authorizations for the work-study programs and the residential vocational education schools (with the exception of one national demonstration school for the District of Columbia).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 192, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—180

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Downing
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Minshall
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Selden
Short
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman

NAYS—192

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Donohue
Dowdy
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
King, Calif.
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson

Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Watts
Weltner
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Young
Zablocki

### NOT VOTING—61

Abbitt
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Brock
Burton
Cederberg
Celler
Cohelan
Collier
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Edmondson
Gill
Glenn
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
Keogh
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Pilcher
Quillen
Rains
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whitten
Willis
Wright
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Gill against.

Mr. Michel for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Abbitt for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Edmondson against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Martin of California for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Gubser.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. MAHON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. POAGE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BECKWORTH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAGEN of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MADDEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HORTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 301, nays 65, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

### YEAS—301

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

### NAYS—65

Abele
Abernethy
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Beermann
Betts
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Curtis
Dague
Devine
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gathings
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hoffman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Langen
Lipscomb
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Minshall
Nelsen
Norblad
Passman
Pool
Quie
Rogers, Fla.
Saylor
Schadeberg
Selden
Short
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Westland
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead

### NOT VOTING—68

Abbitt
Auchincloss
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Brock
Burton
Cederberg
Celler
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Edmondson
Evins
Gill
Glenn
Goodling
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Kelly
Keogh
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Laird
Latta
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Quillen
Rains
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whitten
Willis
Wright
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Martin of California for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cederberg.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Gill with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Pepper.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Vinson.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted on the bill H.R. 4955.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader if he can tell us about the program for the balance of the week, and if possible for the program next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Tomorrow the conference report on the military construction appropriation bill will be called up. This is the only legislative program left for the balance of the week. I am unable at this time to advise the gentleman whether the House will be in session on Saturday or not. I will say, I hope we are able to obtain unanimous consent to go over from tomorrow until Monday.

I am not able to give the gentleman the details of the program for next week.

We do have the foreign aid appropriation bill and, I assume, that will be ready for Monday. I would advise the Members that they can expect that bill to be taken up on Monday.

Of course, we have several important conference reports next week. We will also have the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar and suspensions on I hope to have the details worked out by tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

## THE CATTLE INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that an important U.S. business, the cattle business, is actually now in a depressed situation. What cattlemen in America feel is necessary is a curb on the flood of imported beef that they believe is helping drive down prices they receive. In 1958, 1,249 million pounds of beef imports were admitted into this country. It is estimated that in 1963, there will be 1,950 million pounds. In 1963, it is estimated that the value of beef imports into the United States will total an estimated $457 million, 45 percent more than the $316 million of imports in 1958.

As is true in other agricultural commodities, consumers frequently complain about the high cost of beef, and yet at the same time, the producers of the beef, the cattlemen, as the producers of other agricultural commodities, get lower prices for their product. The latest official figures indicate that while the average retail price of a pound of beef has dropped about 6 cents during the past year, the farmer's share of that price has dropped nearly 10 cents. Early in December, cattle prices were still dropping, and latest available figures show that the flood of imported beef was rising to an all-time high.

Agriculture is so often the "fall guy" in our very complex trade operations. To those who say that if we expect to sell abroad, we must be willing to accept the produce of foreign countries in return, the cattleman in this instance could well wonder why he should be the fall guy. Cattlemen tell me that for every dollar of beef or veal that we export, beef and veal imports equal $25.

In Florida, my friends in the cattle industry tell me that although the percentage of imports this year, in the Nation as a whole, will represent 11 percent of the total domestic market at a minimum, that in Florida we are fairly certain from the information we have that the percentage will run 20 percent or more statewide with the high-density market areas of the lower east coast and the Tampa-St. Petersburg sections having a percentage of imports of over 35 percent.

The import of foreign beef in Florida has caused large numbers of buyers to discontinue buying on our livestock markets and at our ranches. I am told that many of them are frank to admit their firms are supplying their needs with foreign beef. Many packers in Florida have purchased cattle and land in Central America and have developed slaughtering facilities and are shipping beef directly to the market, and this practice is being expanded rapidly.

One terrific expense that the American cattleman has that so often his foreign counterpart does not have, is an expenditure to prevent the introduction of a disease or pest. This amounts, approximately, to an average of about $5 per animal. It is interesting to point out here that the Federal Government has expended over $3 million to eradicate the screw worm introduced by Mexico. In the State of Texas, the Federal Government is presently expending some $1 million to eradicate this same disease. The Federal Government expended some $200 million in 1914 to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease. The cost of these matters is not only a charge assessed to the American cattlemen, but is also a charge to the taxpayers of this country.

Cattlemen in America welcome fair competition, provided some method is worked out that will insure that foreign producers will share in, first, promotion of the product, second, cost of prevention or introduction of diseases and insects, third, elimination of any disease or insect that is introduced; and fourth, accept quotas or some other method that will insure to the U.S. producer an income potential so that incentive will continue to be given to U.S. producers to progress and improve their product.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enclose for the RECORD a very splendid statement of the Florida Cattlemen's Association, that was presented before the Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee this past week. The coauthors of this statement are Mr. Ralph W. Cellon, my friend and constituent who is president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association, and another friend, Mr. Arthur Higbie, executive vice president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. I hope that the membership of the House will read this information thoroughly so that we can, in the near future, attempt some measure of relief for the American cattle industry:

### STATEMENT OF THE FLORIDA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOR THE TARIFF COMMISSION AND TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE

My name is Ralph W. Cellon. I am president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association and this is Mr. Arthur Higbie, executive vice president of the Florida Cattlemen's Association. Both of us may be addressed at Post Office Box 646, Kissimmee, Fla. We represent over 4,000 cattlemen producers in the State of Florida. We appreciate this opportunity to present our views before both the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission with regard to importation of beef products and beef animals into the United States.

First, we would like to point out that in our State, as in the Southeast, we have increased our industry's potential outstandingly during the past 10 years and are contributing substantially to our State's economy. In Florida we slaughtered, cattle and calves, in 1951, 134,121,000 pounds, and in 1961, 371,023,000 pounds. We have progressed from a poorly recognized cattle producing State to where we are third in the Southeast and 17th in the Nation.

In our State we are one of the largest segments of the agricultural industry and together with all of Florida's agriculture generate 16½ percent of our State's income (roughly $2 billion). This percentage should be even higher in other States in the Southeast.

Currently we are on a growth plateau. We have grown to a point where we need more improved pastures, better barns, newer equipment, better education for our workers' and producers' families, more improved stock, etc. We have upgraded our cattle exceptionally well over the past 10 years but, as we mentioned above, now need to strike out again.

Herein lies our problem. Currently we are predominately a cow-calf operation and have a substantial number of dairies with their normal release of dairy-type cows to slaughter. This means that overall, we are in direct competition with importation of beef. This means also that fewer dollars are going into the pockets of our producers at a time when they should be receiving extra dollars to provide the foundation for expansion and improvement. In our mind, allowing imports to expand beyond a certain level is in effect destroying the "goose that laid the golden egg."

Most of you realize that producing cattle, or for that matter, producing most agricultural products, is not something that can be accomplished overnight. It takes a good understanding of Mother Nature and great patience. Added to this, in today's world, is the fact that it now requires an educated man. More and more college educations are being required to handle the production of foodstuffs for our Nation. Advanced techniques, use of pesticides, fertilizers, etc., are but a few reasons.

There is an idea of what is involved. Normally to produce a 1,000-head herd of beef cattle capable of manufacturing beef for the Nation's tables requires some 10 years of hard work, planning, programing, etc., and a substantial investment that I would conservatively say would run in excess of $700,000 almost anywhere in the Nation.

When you consider the problems a producer faces everyday with Mother Nature, with other U.S. producers who share similar problems of marketing, taxes, labor, etc., and then you add to those problems open competition or unfair competition with foreign markets, the production of cattle becomes actually a hardship. We need immediate relief from the import situation and we need to have a plan for future handling of this problem that will enable each of the producers to plan and program for the future. If we do not, we believe the following three facts will come out:

1. Producers will discontinue upgrading their herds; dispense with needed improvements or additions to pastures, farm buildings, equipment, etc., and will forgo use of fertilizers, pesticides, etc., with a resultant extreme harm to the productivity of our overall industry.

2. Many producers will gradually move out of the field selling their land for other purposes, because of poor income incentive * * * and a bleak future.

3. Many young people now training for agricultural pursuits, and this is already declining substantially, will begin training in other directions because their own research and the experiences of their families will have taught them that success lies in other directions.

Gentlemen, this may sound a little speculative but we assure you that a check of your own universities where agriculture is taught will prove these are true statements and that the problem of interesting young people in agriculture exists currently. Continued importation of beef without planning and control will continue to intensify our problem.

Currently in our State we find large buyers who previously purchased cattle at our markets are no longer in attendance. Their needs are being supplied by imported beef. This has resulted in much lower demands for our predominate grades and has resulted in many producers keeping these animals on their ranches for future sales. We do not know what effect this retention practice will have on future marketings.

Gentlemen, statistical and general information attached to this report will bear out the statements mentioned above.

In summary, we would like to urge that you favorably consider our request that beef animals and beef products of all types and descriptions be removed from any consideration or negotiation for a reduction in tariffs from 50 percent or to zero. Imports currently in excess of 11 percent are hurting our market at a time when we need to be moving ahead, not standing still. According to a recent report by USDA a 10-percent increase in imports causes a decrease in the price of utility cows of about 2.7 percent or $2 to $3 per animal. In our State this decrease has been well over that amount.

The Florida Cattlemen's Association is in favor of the establishment of a system of quotas to be established based on an average of imports over a period of time. This, in our judgment, would give exporting countries of the world access to our market, and an opportunity to share favorably and evenly on our market. Also, this would give to our producers some degree of stability at the market and within the industry. It would provide incentive for producers to continue to progress through expansion and planning.

Gentlemen we are all Americans and believe in fair play. We see serious difficulties ahead in our industry if we do not obtain relief. We do not wish to block foreign competition but would like to have it placed in its proper perspective within the overall industry.

We hope that you will give us relief.

Respectfully yours,

Ralph W. Cellon,
*President.*
Arthur L. Higbie,
*Executive Vice President.*

## FOREIGN AID

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have been gravely concerned about the effect of the drastic reductions in the foreign aid authorization bill on the overall operation and administration of this important program.

After time-consuming hearings and debate on the floor, we finally adopted the compromise conference report yesterday. This authorizes about $3.6 billion for foreign aid, which is approximately a 20-percent cut in the revised request from the President. This is twice the size of any previous reduction in foreign aid, and in my opinion we cannot make any additional cuts in the appropriation bill which will now come before us without seriously hampering the program and our commitments therein, and without doing inestimable harm to our prestige and influence abroad.

I believe that a recent editorial in the Long Island Press and Long Island Star Journal sums up the present situation, in urging that no further slashes be made and no additional limitations be placed on the actual appropriation bill. I am including it herein at this point in my remarks:

### No More Whacks at Foreign Aid

The badly battered foreign aid measures passed by the Senate and House have been patched up by a conference committee. The compromise now goes back to each House for final approval.

It is still a patched-up job. It authorizes $3,599,050,000—about halfway between the $3.5 billion voted by the House and $3.7 by the Senate. It is a billion dollars under the amount asked by the White House.

It remains a devastating example of the meat-ax approach. Sorry to say, the worst isn't over.

While the House ordinarily accepts compromises worked out by its committees, it appears that militant opponents of foreign aid aren't finished yet. The same goes for the Senate.

There is talk of trying to cut the appropriations to $2.7 billion. The compromise itself simply sets the ceiling, not the floor.

The conferees rightfully knocked out or weakened several restrictive amendments on the use of funds. These restrictions would hamper the administration of aid and impair our Government's flexibility in foreign affairs. But therein lies the danger of another bitter hassle.

Congress will serve the country best by accepting the compromise—the bad and good of it. It should not try to play Secretary of State, as some have chided it. It should by all means avoid any further fiasco to foreign aid this year.

Mr. Speaker, to substantiate the claim that our foreign aid program is justified, and is a definite boon to our own economy, I would like to point out that support for foreign aid is strong, and growing stronger, in one of the most important groups in American life—American businessmen. A recent study of 1,500 prominent businessmen by the Research Institute of America disclosed that the great majority of American business leaders consider foreign aid essential for promoting a self-supporting and prosperous community of free nations. These findings, reported in the General Electric Forum, were hailed as "revolutionary in their significance"—and they are. They signify not only the end of economic and political isolation in the American business community, but also the existence of a new consensus concerning the responsibilities of the United States as the leader of the free world.

Seventy-five percent of this cross section of American businessmen was opposed to eliminating foreign aid. Ninety percent thought that a community of self-supporting free nations is in the best interests of the United States, and believed that the primary goal of the foreign aid program should be to advance this objective.

Business leaders were very realistic about the time and effort required to make progress through the foreign aid program. Most of those questioned thought that it would take at least 20 years to achieve the goals of the Alliance for Progress, and many thought that it would take 50 years.

Among the leading businessmen who were surveyed there was a good deal of support for foreign aid as a tool for helping U.S. business by developing new markets abroad. This objective of the foreign aid program was not considered as important, however, as the development of a community of free nations, the helping of underprivileged people, and the defeat of communism.

Questions and results of this businessman's poll on foreign aid follow:

[In percentages]

| | Fully agree | Generally agree | Neutral | Generally disagree | Fully disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. A prime objective of U.S. foreign aid should be political; it can help defeat communism in the cold war | 25 | 36 | 9 | 19 | 11 |
| 2. A prime objective should be humanitarian; it is our responsibility to help alleviate deprivation abroad | 14 | 36 | 16 | 23 | 11 |
| 3. A prime objective should be economic; a community of self-supporting free nations is in the best interests of the United States | 49 | 40 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| 4. A prime objective should be commercial; future U.S. business growth depends upon developing new markets abroad | 24 | 46 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| 5. Aid should go only to anti-Communist nations | 41 | 25 | 10 | 17 | 7 |
| 6. Aid should be used to swing neutral governments away from the Soviet Union | 19 | 39 | 13 | 19 | 10 |
| 7. Aid should be extended to neutral governments to help them sustain their welfare and independence | 19 | 42 | 15 | 16 | 8 |
| 8. Aid should have "strings" to the extent that we should require certain reforms of recipient nations | 44 | 35 | 7 | 9 | 5 |
| 9. Aid should be without any strings | 3 | 8 | 5 | 29 | 55 |
| 10. There should be major (perhaps increasing) emphasis on military aid, to nations threatened by Communist aggression | 14 | 41 | 18 | 21 | 6 |
| 11. There should be major (perhaps increasing) emphasis on nonmilitary aid, to nations where poverty creates a climate receptive to Communist agitation | 24 | 47 | 12 | 12 | 5 |
| 12. Foreign aid should be eliminated | 6 | 11 | 8 | 30 | 45 |

13. The Alliance for Progress was designed to stimulate economic growth and higher living standards in Latin America. The goal is an increase of at least 2.5 percent in per capita gross national product each year (present rate of increase is 0.8 percent). Do you believe that such a goal will be attained in:

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 years | 18 |
| 20 years | 47 |
| 50 years | 17 |
| Never | 18 |

14. To achieve or approach this goal, which of the following should receive the largest portion of Alliance for Progress funds? (Figures indicate percentage of respondents giving first, second, or third ranking to each factor.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Education | 82 |
| Stimulation of private business growth | 57 |
| Agriculture | 48 |
| Roads, water, sanitation | 47 |
| Housing | 33 |
| Other | 2 |
| None—I do not believe in the Alliance for Progress | 8 |

Besides being strongly supported by leading American businessmen, the foreign aid program is receiving increasing support from the American public. In 1958 the Gallup poll asked people this question: "Are you for foreign aid or against it?" Fifty-one percent of those who were polled said they were for foreign aid.

In 1963 the Gallup poll asked this same question again. Fifty-eight percent replied that they were for foreign aid. Only 30 percent were actually opposed. Contrary to what some people would have us believe, the public is more in favor of foreign aid now than they were 5 years ago, and support is building all the time.

The public, as well as the leading businessmen who were interviewed, would like to see further improvements in the foreign aid program. But contrary to some of the statements which have been made during the debates on the foreign aid authorization bill this year, public and business support for the foreign aid program is stronger than ever. At a time when so many critical things are being said about the program, this increasing support is not only reassuring—it is also clear proof of the fact that the public is ready and willing to give even greater support to the foreign aid program as a vital part of American foreign policy. Rather than invoking the name of the public in criticizing the foreign aid program we should be championing an even better and stronger foreign aid program which is worthy of the American people.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 234 I was absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 234 I am recorded as not voting. This rollcall was on a motion to adjourn, and if I had been present I would have voted in the negative.

As our colleagues know, this motion to adjourn was offered in order to avoid Calendar Wednesday and to prevent bringing the civil rights bill to the floor under this procedure.

I want the record to show, Mr. Speaker, that my absence was due to the failure of the House bells to ring in the House dining room where I was having lunch with constituents. The manager of the House dining rooms has confirmed the failure of the dining room bells to ring on this occasion, and I understand other colleagues missed this rollcall for the same reason.

## ECONOMICAL AND EFFICIENT USE OF VARIOUS DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that a more economical and efficient use of various defense installations has been recommended by Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

Several of the relocations and other recommendations of the Secretary of Defense affect the State of Illinois and the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

For some time, certain Army personnel housed at Fort Sheridan, Ill., in the 12th Congressional District, have commuted by military vehicles a distance of more than 40 miles—to the South Side of Chicago—to the 5th Army Headquarters located there. The transfer of the 5th Army Headquarters to an appropriate military base at Fort Sheridan is both logical and desirable.

Fort Sheridan was established as an Army post in the year 1887. The logistics and other support of the 5th Army emanating from Fort Sheridan, coupled with other important military facilities at this location, make it a most desirable headquarters for the 5th Army.

I commend the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army for the action which has been taken, and urge the Congress and the citizens of the Nation to support this and the other recommendations which are designed to effect overall savings of $34 million annually.

## VOTER SURVEY IN NEW YORK'S UPSTATE 35TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT INDICATED SURPRISING SUPPORT NOT ONLY FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY BUT FOR HIS LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS AS WELL

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1 day before the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, I published the results of my 1963 legislative questionnaire in my upstate district in New York, the so-called gerrymandered "submarine" district. The results, somewhat surprisingly, revealed a very substantial support not only for President Kennedy himself, but for his whole legislative program.

As I said at the time, Mr. Speaker, I made no claim for scientific accuracy, for this poll, but I did say it had been conducted as fairly and as impartially as I know how, and in the past it had proved to be remarkably reliable.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear now, in view of the tremendous outpouring of sorrow and devotion these past 3 weeks for the late President from every part of the country, that this poll did point to the very real support our late beloved President had with the people themselves. And it showed, too, I believe, that contrary to the general published assumption, this support extended also to the President's legislative goals.

I believe this report may be helpful, Mr. Speaker, as this House moves to carry out President Johnson's plea that we enact these measures as a tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

### Your Congressman, Samuel S. Stratton, Reports From Washington

In all, this questionnaire went out to some 60,000 persons. We have received about 5,000 replies, or a return of a little better than 8 percent. Although more replies are still coming in, I believe it is time now to give you a report on how these returns are running. Here is our tabulation of these 5,000 replies:

| Questions | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do you favor: | | | |
| 1. Hospitalization insurance for retired persons under the social security system, the so-called Javits-Anderson bill? | 62.5 | 29.5 | 8.0 |
| 2. The President's civil rights bill, including a section outlawing discrimination in public accommodations? | 68.5 | 20.2 | 11.3 |
| 3. Ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty? | 72.3 | 13.3 | 14.4 |
| 4. President Kennedy's tax-cut bill, reducing both corporate and personal income taxes? | 69.5 | 23.1 | 7.4 |
| 5. The so-called 2-price plan, to permit dairy farmers to cooperate in a voluntary supply-management program? | | | |
| (a) Farmers | 57.5 | 35.8 | 6.7 |
| (b) Nonfarmers | 36.5 | 18.1 | 45.4 |
| 6. Amending present immigration laws to remove national-origin quotas which discriminate against certain European countries? | 40.4 | 34.7 | 24.9 |
| 7. Continuing the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) to help unemployment areas develop new jobs and industrial opportunities? | 79.2 | 13.2 | 7.6 |
| 8. Continuing the accelerated public works (APW) program to assist local communities in building needed public works? | 66.4 | 21.5 | 12.1 |
| 9. Enactment of a youth employment opportunities bill to provide jobs in conservation work, private business, and government service for young persons? | 73.4 | 16.8 | 9.8 |
| 10. Establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps to provide volunteer help for selected community service projects within this country on the same basis as the Peace Corps helps abroad? | 52.9 | 31.4 | 15.7 |
| 11. A Federal program of aid to colleges and universities for— | | | |
| (a) classroom and building construction? | 55.6 | 29.5 | 14.9 |
| (b) scholarship loans for deserving students? | 69.2 | 14.8 | 16.0 |
| 12. Defense Secretary McNamara's efforts to insure civilian control of our armed services? | 55.3 | 18.6 | 26.1 |
| 13. Generally speaking, do you approve of the way in which President Kennedy has handled his job? | 64.5 | 22.6 | 12.9 |

On the whole, as you can see, these returns indicate a very substantial measure of support not only for President Kennedy himself but for most of his legislative program. While such support might seem to be somewhat surprising for an upstate New York district, I think it may be another indication that fairly substantial changes may be underway upstate, especially with the continuing impact of unemployment in our area.

Of course, as I have always pointed out when reporting on the returns from our annual questionnaire each year, I make no claim that this is any scientific survey of public opinion. But the questionaires were sent to people entirely at random, without regard to their political affiliations. And while it is true that we have no clear-cut way of knowing whether those who reply tend to lean more toward one political party than another, our experience in years gone by has been that these results do pretty well reflect the sentiment in our district.

---

## EDITORIALS BY ROSEMARY L. FRISINO AND CAROL ANN KILLEN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include two editorials by Rosemary L. Frisino, and an editorial by Carol Ann Killen, both students of the Institute of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md. Two are tributes to Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy and to Dr. Thomas Dooley.

The third editorial entitled "Puppet Maker," is addressed to Mrs. Murray.

The Members of the House will no doubt recall that Mrs. Murray is that individual who was extremely active in bringing about the Supreme Court decision on prayer and Bible reading in our schools.

### Profile in Courage

(By Carol Ann Killen, "Windows," Institute of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md.)

As an exemplar of courage and stamina in womanhood, Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy deserves the esteem of the Nation.

Her outward composure startled the country at first. People wondered that such appalling circumstances did not affect the bereaved in a more poignant way. But all distinguished in time the wide gulf between expression and restraint.

Emotion-filled ceremonies externally moved leaders of countries, yet Mrs. Kennedy maintained unflinching calmness. The population sought the source of such majestic tenacity.

It was love that fostered her acquaintance with the ideal of courage. Her husband so admired this virtue that he dedicated an entire book to men possessing it. So, in his memory, she walked erect, without emotion, from her home to the cathedral.

Faith guided her throughout the acts of mourning. She could accept his flag without tears because she believed in her husband's goodness and God's eternal mercy.

Her powerful example to the world could not have been mustered at a moment's notice from no foundation. It had to exist inside and develop with age long before called upon for display.

It is not only her actions that demand respect, but also the virtues that form the woman herself.

---

### Listen

(By Rosemary L. Frisino, "Windows," Institute of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md.)

"Listen to the agony of mankind.
I who am fed, who never yet went hungry for a day,
I see the dead, the children starved for lack of bread.
I see and try to pray."

The late Dr. Thomas Dooley, who like most Americans, had brimmed with "health and love and laughter in his soul," heard in desolate Vietnam only the desperate wail of repugnant illness, atrocious hate, and sad, silent tears. Unlike others, he answered the anguished sound with a dynamic wave of love. His life rang one true note in all the sickening discord of human neglect.

Now that that bell-note is silenced, is the faroff woeful wail to go again unacknowledged? Answered only by the careless toss of canned goods into an empty poor basket? A handful of postage stamps, remembered one day, forgotten the next—must this alone suffice for the vacant purse of the Vietnam farmer? Perhaps the threadbare sweater, product of the clothing drive, buttons lost, yarn stretched, will protect the emaciated form of a refugee from the bitter cold.

"Listen to the agony of mankind.
And know full well—that not until I share their bitter cry,
Their pain and hell, can God within my spirit dwell."

God-likeness, such as that achieved by Dr. Dooley, can result only when the charity of one elevates him to a plant where he suffers with the recipient. That is, when that faroff agonizing sound is answered by a bell-note—clear, strong, and beautiful, the union of the two. This sharing of pain and hell becomes the harmonious chord, uniting and transcending all in its magnificence.

The world is off key. Right it with the music of your charity.

---

### Puppet Maker

(By Rosemary L. Frisino, "Windows," Institute of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md.)

Yes, Mrs. Murray, there is a God.

Rise early in the morning, go to an empty place and watch a pulsing orb roll around the earth. Regard a blade of grass, and catch the glistening dewdrops in the luminous light. Record how a flowerbud opens and study the wing structure of a butterfly. Hear the pounding surf, dip your hand into wave froth, examine minutely a grain of sand.

Mark with interest the gurgle of a baby. Look deeply into the eyes of a child. Educate this child in the wonders of the world and explain to him that there is no omnipotent being. Tell him the lightning bolt is accidentally part of the organization of nature. Teach him that there is no one to thank for these miracles.

In time, your teaching will be rewarded. Slowly, the emotions of his heart will disappear. Wonder will become wooden.

If you are successful, this laughing gift from heaven will become a cold, unfeeling puppet. Gone will be the seed of love found in the young. Gone, too, will be faith. This frigid robot will know that nothing is to be taken on that imaginary gift. Hope

**will represent only a kind of warmed-over thought. Thus, you will have destroyed in this child, the entire God concept.**

**Mrs. Murray, does your robot have an "I love you" button?**

---

## TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 86th Congress we passed the Shevchenko resolution providing for the erection of a statue in our Nation's Capital in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of the Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. Under the provisions of this law, Public Law 86–749, the statue will be erected on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW. and the historic unveiling is scheduled to take place on May 30, 1964.

This Congress has a wonderful opportunity to follow up on the constructive action taken by the 86th Congress in reflecting its support for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of this European figure of freedom and independence. It will be another opportunity for us to show to the 45-million-captive Ukrainian nation and to all captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe that the United States shall never lose sight of their captive status and the undying aspirations for freedom and national independence.

I have been most encouraged by the popular support for my resolution (H.J. Res. 174), providing for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko upon the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his death.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of the communications I have received in the Record, indicating support for House Joint Resolution 174:

Buffalo, N.Y.,
*November 14, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Mr. Dulski: I am solidly behind your resolution which calls for the printing of a special postage stamp to honor of Ukraine's great poet, excellent artist and Europe's outstanding fighter for "equality and justice for all", Taras Shevchenko.

I earnestly hope that Postmaster General will issue this special postage stamp.

Sincerely,
Stanley W. Pugowski.

---

Hicksville, N.Y.,
*November 14, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus Dulski,
*The House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Sir: I would like to express my firm support for your House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a U.S. postage stamp honoring Taras Shevchenko.

As a teacher of history, I cannot neglect an opportunity to express my opinion regarding this Ukrainian patriot, who by means of a pen, spent his whole life fighting for freedom and dying for liberty of mankind. Though he died in obscurity before the world and did not see his dream fulfilled, it is the interest of all of us to carry on his fight until freedom and liberty for all will triumph.

This man justly deserves to be honored on the 150th anniversary of his birth in 1964. The issuance of such a stamp in champion of liberty series will be deeply appreciated by all freedom loving people and especially by the Ukrainians and the Americans of Ukrainian origin.

I thank you sincerely for introducing this resolution in the U.S. Congress.

Very truly yours,
Christina Swanyczewesky.

---

October 27, 1963.

The Honorable Thaddeus Dulski,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Dulski: We, the undersigned officers of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in Auburn, N.Y., humbly petition you for your support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko "champion of liberty" postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the "champion of liberty" series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko, for whom a street in our city of Auburn has been named 2 years ago, has been gaining stature as one of Europe's freedom fighters. The city of Auburn recognized the Ukrainian poet laureate and national hero when on December 29, the city council approved the renaming of Heaney Avenue to Shevchenko Avenue.

Thanking you ahead for your kind consideration and support, and with our best wishes and greetings, we beg to remain.

Sincerely yours,
Yaroslow Kowal.

---

Peoria, Ill., *November 15, 1963.*

The Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski,
*Member of U.S. Congress,*
*New House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Dulski: I, the undersigned earnestly urge you to support your resolution, House Joint Resolution 174 calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko "champion of liberty" postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Shevchenko belongs in this category of great and outstanding world figures. His writings and deeds contributed to the advancement of freedom and humanism.

A Shevchenko stamp in the "champion of liberty" series would enhance the prestige and significance of the United States of America in world affairs, especially among the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
Peter Salamacha.

---

The Ukrainian-American
Association, of Omaha, Nebr.,
*November 12, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski,
*Member of U.S. Congress,*
*New House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Dulski: The Ukrainian-American Association in Omaha, Nebr., which is a branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is writing to you in support of House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko "champion of liberty" postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We wish to acknowledge the foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the "champion of liberty" series. We believe as you probably do that such a stamp would symbolize the aspiration for freedom not only of the Ukrainian people, but also of all the captive nations which now live under Communist slavery and tyranny. The issuance of this stamp would also be an important instrument of truth to the world, since the Soviet Government has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda.

Again we wish to thank you for your efforts in this respect and hope you will give your full support to this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,
D. Wijtyk,
*President.*
W. Stolarskyj,
*Secretary.*

---

Detroit, Mich.,
*November 16, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski,
*New House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Our deepest gratitude to you, sir, for your proposal of House Joint Resolution 174 with regard to the Taras Shevchenko stamp; likewise your efforts in urging establishment of a library in the Library of Congress as a tribute to the great humanitarian, poet, and national hero of Ukrainia.

We are certain your name will enter into the history of American Ukrainians, and never be erased from the memory of millions.

For this good deed, you deserve our sincere and heartfelt thanks.

Respectfully yours,
Mr. and Mrs. J. O. Lobodocky.

---

Phoenix, Ariz.,
*December 1, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski,
*Member of U.S. Congress,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Dear Congressman Dulski: We, the undersigned members of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc., branch 77, Phoenix, Ariz., deeply appreciate your sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174, which provides for the issuance of the "champion of liberty" postage stamp honoring Taras Shevchenko; 1964 is the 150th anniversary of his birth and the date of the unveiling of his monument in Washington D.C.

We sincerely hope that our Government will honor the contributions of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet and humanitarian, to national freedom and human liberty; and will arrange for the issuance of the postage stamp in his honor. Now, after the tragic death of our great President Kennedy, we realize more than ever that we must recognize and honor our champions of liberty and fighters for human rights.

It is our sincere hope that your efforts in issuing the stamp will be successful.

Thanking you for your efforts, we remain
Respectfully yours,
Iryna Krylova, Annie Terluk, Mary Sysyn, Nattalie Brewka, Marie Wynnyczok, Msadora Bakovyck, Faina Wasylenko, D. Jatihour, C. Lineczyk, K. Lytwynyslzn, Anne Shalauta, Maria T. Szalauta.

---

Chicago, Ill.,
*December 5, 1963.*

Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

Dear Congressman: I want you to know that I and a great many people are grateful to you for introducing House Joint Resolution 174 into Congress. We truly appreciate the efforts made to print a U.S. stamp com-

**memorating Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet and writer, outstanding for his fight against the forces wanting to do away with the basic liberties of the people.**

**I want you to know that you have my support and I sincerely hope that this resolution will be passed by Congress because it is only fair to this great champion of liberty.**

**Respectfully yours,**

**ANNA KOZAK.**

---

MOUNT VERNON, WASH.,
*November 30, 1963.*

**Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,**
***New House Office Building,***
***Washington, D.C.***

**DEAR SIR: We strongly thank you for your support of House Joint Resolution 174 which involves the printing of a stamp for the observance of the Taras Shevchenko centennial.**

**This apostle of liberty and enemy of all oppression, Taras Shevchenko, goes beyond the narrow limits of one country. He is a poet of humanity; his message of brotherhood and love, truth and justice, and above all, of freedom, is worldwide in scope and universal significance. Other poets have sung his song. Other poets are perhaps better known, but none by the pure identification of his with inspiration deserves greater homage or recognition.**

**I hope that you will continue to see fit to support House Joint Resolution 174. Thank you.**

**Courteously yours,**
**UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS OF SEATTLE, WASH., AND VICINITY,**
**HALINA HRISHBO,**
**HELENA GOLWEY,**
**ALEX. KOSTRESH,**
**WASYL SOLIMA,**
**N. D. DAVID.**

---

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
*November 28, 1963.*

**Honorable Congressman THADDEUS DULSKI:**

**We thank you very much for introducing of the House Joint Resolution 174 into Congress calling for the issuance of the postal stamps with the image of Ukrainian Poet Laureate Taras Shevchenko in the series of liberty champions.**

**And we ask very much for further support of this resolution that it may be accepted by the American Congress and effected by the order of Postmaster General in 1964 before the unveiling of the statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, American capital in 150th anniversary of the birth of this poet.**

**We remain,**
**Sincerely yours,**
**OSYP and OLENO, MUDRY.**

---

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
*November 17, 1963.*

The Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DULSKI: As an American, born in Ukraine I would deeply appreciate your fullest support toward issuance of Taras Shevchenko's U.S. postage stamp on his 150th birthday anniversary in the coming year 1964.

Shevchenko left behind a treasure in writing, where I found so many times a hope and dream of freedom for my beloved country.

His contribution in literature reached far beyond the Ukrainian ethnic and cultural borders.

He wrote sincerely from experience and knowledge, his words reflecting his never-ending opposition to tyranny in all its forms.

Therefore I believe Shevchenko fully deserves to be honored with a "champion of liberty" postage stamp.

Very sincerely yours,
IWAN ISKALO.

---

LUDLOW, MASS.,
*December 6, 1963.*

Subject: Support for a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp and for a Shevchenko freedom library in the Library of Congress.

The Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: We support the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp in 1964, as provided in your House Joint Resolution 174.

We commend you for your continuous efforts on behalf of the captive nations under the Communist domination.

Furthermore, we strongly urge our Post Office Department to consider House Joint Resolution 174 and issue a Shevchenko commemorative stamp in 1964.

We are also endorsing your recommendation to establish a Shevchenko freedom library in the Library of Congress. Such a library would become a center of knowledge not only on Shevchenko but on central and Eastern Europe as well.

Sincerely,

(The above petition was signed by 59 persons.)

---

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
BOSTON BRANCH,
*November 27, 1963.*

Subject: Petition for support of the issuance of a Shevchenko commemorative stamp in 1964.

The Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
*U.S. Representative,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: We, the undersigned Americans, approve and support your House Joint Resolution 174, which calls upon our Post Office Department to issue a Shevchenko "champion of liberty" stamp in 1964.

Although Shevchenko was a Ukrainian by birth, we believe, however, that his contributions to freedom are universal, because he sought and fought for freedom of the oppressed everywhere. The American people have always treasured and honored such individuals.

We believe, furthermore, that the issuance of a Shevchenko commemorative stamp cannot but serve the best interests of the United States which has always stood for freedom and self-government of all nations.

Sincerely yours,
O. SZCZUDLUK.

(The above petition was signed by 178 persons.)

## HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. **CHARLES H. WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KEOGH**. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my deep respect to the memory of one of our most distinguished statesmen, who has passed away after a most fruitful life at the advanced age of 85 years Hon. Herbert H. Lehman.

Herbert Lehman served his State and his country exceedingly well for many years. During World War I he rose rapidly to the rank of colonel on the general staff in the Army and there his excellent work was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1928 he was elected Lieutenant Governor of New York State and served for two terms until 1932 under Governor Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whom he then succeeded. The people of my State rewarded his services by electing him as Governor for four successive terms. Immediately upon completing his terms as Governor, he came to Washington where his work as Director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations in the Department of State and subsequently as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration brought him international renown.

In 1949 Herbert Lehman was elected by the people of New York as the U.S. Senator to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Robert F. Wagner and 2 years later was reelected for a full term. Senator Lehman was a lifetime Democrat dedicated to liberal causes to which he contributed so much.

To the widow and family of Herbert H. Lehman, I extend my sincere condolences.

## MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. **CHARLES H. WILSON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FOGARTY**. Mr. Speaker, it is important for all of us to realize that in the 15 months since operations began under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, one outstanding fact has emerged:

The training and retraining of unemployed and underemployed workers can be done, and can be done successfully.

Witness the following facts:

More than 100,000 people have been approved for training.

Another 31,000 persons, mostly youth, have been approved for special guidance, testing and counseling under this act.

Persons are now being trained in more than 300 different occupations.

The Manpower Development and Training Act training program has been particularly successful in reaching the long-term unemployed.

Fifty percent of all trainees are long-term unemployed—nearly double the corresponding percent among all jobless workers.

The bulk of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, as intended by the act, is made up of adult workers with a strong attachment to the labor force.

About one out of every six male trainees is a veteran. Half of these veterans trainees are long-term jobless.

It also has to be pointed out that the bulk of the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees so far are better educated than the total unemployed.

Nearly 6 out of every 10 trainees so far enrolled have a high school diploma. The situation is just the reverse among the unemployed: 6 out of every 10 do not have the high school diploma.

This points to the urgent necessity for providing basic literacy training under the Manpower Development and Training Act if we are to make a meaningful impact on the hard core unemployed who do not have the educational background which would enable them to successfully complete a training or retraining program. Only by providing, as the amendments before us do provide, for basic literacy training will we begin to make a meaningful impact on the hundreds of thousands of persons who do not even have the educational background to pursue an occupational training course.

The Labor Department just a few days ago released its new employment and unemployment figures. They underscore the need not only for additional resources for this program generally; they also underline the dramatic need for helping young people to train and retrain for jobs.

The Labor Department's recent report of November 1963 showed the unemployment rate moving up to 5.9 percent under the impact of a half million increase in the number of jobless over the month. Significantly, the unemployment rate amongst youngsters jumped to 17 percent—3½ times the overall national rate. The amendments being considered today related to youth will help us move thousands of these young people from the ranks of the jobless into gainful employment. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this legislation, I would like to emphasize to the House that we have been impressed with the success with which this program has been mounted, the cooperation between the various agencies charged with responsibility for carrying out the provisions of this act—not only nationally here between the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, but also at the State and local level—the high placement rate into gainful employment among those enrollees who have finished their training, and the cooperation of industry and labor in making these programs worthwhile.

The amendments before this House in providing for basic literacy training, in permitting additional youth to take training and retraining, in underscoring the special and demonstration projects for disadvantaged groups, in providing additional training allowances to help unemployed workers and their families while the worker is in training, in giving the several States additional time to meet the requirements of matching Federal funds, and in authorizing adequate resources for these programs will be taking one of the most practical and successful steps toward reducing unemployment in every section of the country among all the different groups in the population.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (H.R. 4955)

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4955 and wish to make only this brief observation:

With the passage of the legislation we are today considering, the 88th Congress will have taken another forward step toward writing a magnificent record on behalf of American education.

We have already passed a bill to help our colleges and universities build academic facilities.

We have passed a fine medical and dental school bill.

We have passed milestone legislation in the field of mental health.

Only today this House has passed much needed improvements to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

We are at this moment considering legislation which will modernize the vocational education program and make the most significant advance in this field since the vocational educational program began in 1917.

We are today extending the highly successful National Defense Education Act and making some extremely useful improvements in the law.

We are today extending this program for aid to schools in federally impacted areas.

Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress has already compiled a splendid record of solid achievement on education legislation. It is a record of which we can be proud.

## THE SAFETY OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored House Resolution 586 calling for the appointment of a select committee to make inquiry into the adequacy of the personal security system for the President of the United States and other Federal officials.

The purpose of this resolution is not to place blame or seek recriminations for past acts. However, the tragedy of November 22 has raised some searching questions which need examination.

The stark fact is that since the institution of the present system every assassin who has attempted the murder of a President has succeeded in his crime either against the President or someone at his side.

This alone would point up the uncertainty of current safeguards.

Despite the unquestioned ability and devotion of the Secret Service there is room for exploration of additional ways and means of securing the life of the President.

Such measures as a more extensive common intelligence system between Federal security agencies like that in the armed services, closer liaison with area military commanders, and State and local police forces, and a more extensive screening and sifting of subversives and defectors would be appropriate considerations.

It has been said too often since November 22 that it is impossible to prevent a marksman with a high-powered telescopic-sight rifle from killing a President.

If this is so, on the record of the last 100 years, the election of 1 of every 5 Presidents has meant a fate of execution.

In the next 100 years with a population of 200 million in a country with relatively open borders, unless some new and more effective system is developed, the prospect is for an even more tragic record of survival.

I therefore believe it is time for the Congress to act with dispatch to seek out every possible improvement with the help of the most expert and knowledgeable minds available in the enforcement profession.

To point up the problem, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article by President Eisenhower on this subject:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Dec. 7, 1963]

### "GREATER RISKS THREATEN PRESIDENTS"—IKE, AND THERE IS NO WAY TO ESCAPE THEM

"The hazards the President must face appear to be increasing."

That was the statement today of former President Eisenhower, in an article in the current Saturday Evening Post on the assassination of President Kennedy.

"The very fact of being President involves certain personal risks, which I believe he must accept," the article continues.

"We should give greater attention to reducing the risks without limiting the President's necessary freedom of movement."

Mr. Eisenhower warns against demands for a degree of safety that would make the White House a virtual prison.

Two other points are raised in the article—Mr. Eisenhower feels the Vice President should be kept closely informed of events, to be ready for an instant takeover in an emergency, and believes the order of succession should be, as it was prior to 1947, from the Vice President to members of the Cabinet.

Mr. Eisenhower declares:

"I believe that the American people have too much good sense to do anything that would impair in the slightest degree the essential, traditional character of the office—one of democracy's most vital institutions and the most important political station in the world.

"It is the very combination of powers vested in the Presidency which makes it highly desirable that the President be free to travel widely, to keep personally in touch with the people of the country, and to see with his own eyes what is going on in the world.

"A thorough study of the problem will show us methods that will reduce the opportunity for would-be assassins to make a target of the President. Helicopters could take the place of the automobile for certain trips over fixed routes—always an invitation to trouble. New safety features may be developed to provide improved security in motorcades."

"The record of political assassinations in the United States does seem a black mark in our history. That record will be taken by some, I am sure, as evidence that as a people we lack respect for human life, law and order, for our own elected leadership."

### SEES NO PATTERN

"However, despicable as these deeds are, they do not follow a pattern of political conspiracy and coup d'etat; they have not sprung from widespread plots to overthrow the Government, all too common in less stable nations. Nor do they point to any fundamental weakness in our democratic attitudes and institutions."

"We know that the vast majority of our population is decent and law-abiding. However, knowing that * * * psychopaths are with us, we as a people do have a responsibility for avoiding fanaticism and overemotional political extremes that may tend to incite unstable individuals."

"The shocking event of November 22 reinforces the necessity of keeping the Vice President completely informed, prepared for the possibility that some misfortune might befall the President. It also is a reminder that the President and Vice President never should be exposed together to the same hazards of travel."

As to the type of security for the President which is now required in our urban areas, I submit the account by Jimmy Breslin of the precautions taken by the world's finest police force on the occasion of the visit of President Johnson to New York City. Since such precautions should now be the rule everywhere a question of the Federal responsibility for the cost of such maximum security presents itself and I feel that this is a proper subject for study by the committee I have suggested. The Breslin article follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Dec. 9, 1963]

## HOW NEW YORK'S FINEST PROTECTS A PRESIDENT

(By Jimmy Breslin)

Up to the left, maybe a half mile up, this light red brick factory building stood six stories high against the winter sky, and the black limousine carrying Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States, was going to pass right under its windows. This was yesterday afternoon, coming into Manhattan on the Long Island Expressway, and for a little moment everything became strange and a bad feeling came into your stomach. The same kind of a feeling you had when you first looked up at the light red bricks of the six-story Texas School Book Depository building in Dallas. But now, as the cars moved closer to the building, there was something else. At first, it looked like a flagpole on the roof of the building.

Then it moved, and you could see what the object was. It was a patrolman of the Police Department of the city of New York and he was standing on the roof of this light red brick building, with the wind blowing the bottom of his overcoat, his hands on his hips, the right one directly over his gun, and now the bad feeling went away and you knew everything was going to be all right yesterday.

Which it was.

The President of the United States flew into town at 12:14 p.m. yesterday. He flew back to Washington at 2:35 p.m. In the 2 hours and 21 minutes in which he was in this city, the cops of our town, in one of the most tremendous performances they ever have given, threw a Navy blue blanket over Lyndon Johnson. They were everywhere, almost 5,000 of them.

### JUST NEW YORK COPS

Look straight up, and there were two helicopters circling Johnson's car. Look at any rooftop, and there was a blue uniform, with the wind blowing at the overcoat. Look at the rows of windows in an office building, any office building, and there was somebody with binoculars, scanning the building across the street from him. They were out in Jamaica Bay, off the Idlewild runways, patrolling in boats, and they arrested hunters out there. They were on the streets, and up on the overpasses, and none of them looked at the President. The police had their backs to the motorcade and their heads moved back and forth as they checked on crowds and buildings and anybody who was going to try and take a shot at Lyndon Johnson yesterday was going to run into big trouble.

Forget all those books and stories about the FBI and the Secret Service. Yesterday, the New York cops, the finest law enforcement body the Nation has known, stepped out and showed everybody how things are done here in the big town.

"We are very serious about this," Commissioner Michael Murphy was saying just before he went to church in the morning. Mr. Murphy makes understatements. He had everything but field artillery out on the streets yesterday.

Most importantly, he had a Cuban by the name of Omar Padilla in the Tombs. Padilla was arrested Friday after he had told coworkers he was going to assassinate Johnson. He had been practicing with a rifle against a homemade target on the roof of a midtown factory building where he is employed as a stock clerk by a photoengraving firm. Another rifle, and ammunition, was found in Padilla's room in the Bronx. He was arrested without publicity, and yesterday was held in $25,000 bail. Padilla claimed it was a joke. Commissioner Murphy found no humor in the situation. He grunted when Padilla was mentioned to him yesterday.

President Johnson came to New York to attend funeral services for Herbert H. Lehman. The services were held at Temple Emanu-El, 65th Street and Fifth Avenue. On his way to the services, Johnson told a Secret Service man that he wanted to visit former President Herbert Hoover on the way back to the airport. Hoover lives on the 31st floor of the Waldorf Towers, 50th Street and Park Avenue. The Waldorf-Astoria was on nobody's schedule. But within 3 minutes, the first detectives were swinging in the hotel and taking over the Towers elevators, and moving into the basement to stand guard over the hotel's main electric light switches. Three detectives went immediately to the 40th floor and took over the main air-conditioning unit which feeds Mr. Hoover's floor.

"We would not want any person going into the area of the air-conditioning unit," Assistant Chief Inspector James (Red) Walsh said in precise, police-book language. "We are desirous of ruling out the possibility of somebody dropping poison gas pellets into the air system of this hotel."

Walsh was standing on the sidewalk in front of the Towers entrance while he talked. He took a drag on his cigarette and nodded to a casement window in St. Bartholomew's Church, directly across the street. A detective was looking out the window.

"You could say that he is following police procedures," Walsh said. "That means he has his gun with him."

Things went like this all day.

### HIS LAST DAY

At 5:30 a.m., Assistant Chief Inspector Michael Birmingham, a red-faced, gray-haired man who was in charge of planning all operations for President Johnson's visit, climbed out of bed in his Bensonhurst home and padded into the bathroom to start the day. While he was shaving, Birmingham kept thinking of one thing. "The last day," Birmingham told himself. "The last day can always be the one."

He was to have retired on Friday. The minute the Secret Service notified him that President Johnson would be in town on Sunday, Birmingham put off leaving active duty until the visit was over. Yesterday, at the start of his last day as a cop, he was worried.

"The climate is important," he had been saying since Friday. He did not mean the weather. "This is only 2 weeks after an assassination, and these things always run in cycles," he said.

The boss was up early, too. Michael Murphy was standing on the walk in front of his house, wearing a white shirt and blue tie, and with a gun strapped to his belt, when you came to go to church with him. Murphy was going to make 10 o'clock mass at Our Lady of Hope in Middle Village, Queens, and Jim Walsh, his chauffeur, had the car parked in front of the house early.

Murphy spoke to him for a moment, then went back inside the house and sat down on a chair in his living room and took one last look at a sheaf of maps and schedules in his hand.

"I just want to go over these one last time," he said. "We have a few minutes here."

He is a little bit nervous, this man Murphy. There is red in his roundish face, and he smokes continually and his breath comes in huffs and his hands fumble a bit when he looks through papers. But there is a don't-worry quality to his voice. And he sat there yesterday, with the sun coming through the curtains, and the life of a President of the United States was, as much as it ever has been in any man's hands, in Michael Murphy's yesterday.

### BACK FROM CHURCH

If this is being overly dramatic about arrangements for a simple thing such as driving from Idlewild to Manhattan and back, ask anybody who drove with President Kennedy in Dallas. It was just another motorcade on just another street. But somebody forgot to pick up Lee Oswald, as this Cuban Padilla was picked up on Friday, and somebody forgot to check the windows and the people of the Texas Book Depository, and we lost a President because of it. Mr. Murphy, yesterday morning, was not about to lose anybody.

His wife and son went with him to church and they were dropped off back at the house at 10:50. His daughter was waiting on the sidewalk for him.

"A phone call," she said.

Murphy went in and took it and then came out and got into the front seat of the car.

"Dinner?" his wife said.

"I don't know," Murphy said.

"I'll say 5 o'clock," she said.

"That's fine. If I can't make it, I'll call."

Then Walsh started driving through Middle Village and toward the Long Island Expressway for the trip to Idlewild. Murphy tapped two microphones on the dashboard in front of him.

"We've learned a lot about taking care of somebody like the President," he said. "That business in 1960 with all the heads of state here for the United Nations did it. Communications is the big thing. We used to rely on walkie-talkies. Now these two microphones do it all. A communications man sits right here where I am. He talks with Manhattan South headquarters. That takes care of all police in the area where the President is going, and also the helicopters and boats and such. Now the other microphone handles everything within the motorcade, and the walkie-talkies around the various areas."

The car moved along the expressway and then turned off onto Grand Central Parkway and headed for the Van Wyck Expressway and the airport. Police were everywhere you looked.

### DIFFERENT IN DALLAS

"We've got them out in plenty of time," Murphy said. "The planning was done with a long meeting Friday, then another meeting Saturday. We've never had to secure the temple before, so everybody went up there and the place was gone over from the basement up. Last night we sat down again and talked when I got in from Puerto Rico with the mayor."

Murphy had on a blue topcoat and the kind of gray snap-brim hat that detectives in this town wear as almost a uniform. He kept looking out the window at the cops who lined the road.

"In Dallas," Murphy was told, "two workmen told me they were standing on the railroad trestle, right where Kennedy had to go under, and they said they never were bothered all day. They had a nice spot. Kennedy had to pass right under them. And nobody ever came near them."

Murphy shook his head.

"Can I go and stand on an overpass and watch the motorcade?" he was asked.

"Let's leave that up to the officer on post," Murphy said. "He might have something to say about that.

"We had a last dry run over the route this morning," he said. "You know, to see if there's anything new. A broken down truck, maybe. A change in some excavation from the night before. Just to see if there's anything new. We don't want any surprises."

### THE RABBIT HUNTERS

Surprises were not conducive to the quiet of a Sunday yesterday in New York. A half hour before the President arrived, while Murphy paced the landing apron at desolate hangar 17, which is tucked off into the marshes at one corner of the airport, six rabbit hunters carrying shotguns were grabbed at the edge of the runway President Johnson's plane would use to land. All were dressed in hunters' clothes, but the police listened to nothing and they wound up in night court for "unlawful intrusion on real property."

At 12:05 p.m., the 35 motorcycles lined up against the barrier of hangar 17's apron, started up, and over on the right, 2 helicopters rose up and started to circle the area. The 30-car motorcade was lined up. The President's limousine that had been kept under guard in the police garage all night was placed third behind a squadcar and Commissioner Murphy's limousine. Directly behind President Johnson's car was the "Queen Mary," a big open car with a chest of automatic weapons. Secret Service Chief James Rowley was to drive in that one.

### ALL-SEEING EYE

Within minutes, the first big jet, with the American flag painted on its fin, came gliding out of the sky to the right and after it came the second one, Air Force One, which carried the President. And now the security that had consisted of gentle, but insistent checking of passes for everyone there, became a little rough.

And when President Johnson's plane taxied into the area and came to a stop, this beefy detective in a gray hat and topcoat stepped away from the press area and put his hands right at his sides and started looking. He wanted to see what everybody in the press section was doing and he was not looking kindly at anybody. For some reason, you kept your hands right up near the cigarette in your mouth while President Johnson stepped off the plane and this beefy little guy in the snap brim hat watched every breath you took.

"He looks like he means it," another detective was told.

"He does," the detective said.

The motorcade took off promptly. It moved at varying speeds, sometimes 45 miles per hour, sometimes 40, then back up again to 45. Nobody was going to get a long distance crack at an object moving at a steady, predictable speed. The radio kept crackling throughout the trip as traffic was detoured on the Van Wyck Expressway, the Long Island Expressway and Queens-Midtown Tunnel, and along 3d Avenue to 57th, along 57th and 5th Avenue, and along 5th Avenue and 67th Street. The trip was smooth and uneventful and always there was a cop with the wind blowing at the bottom of his coat.

The crowds in Queens which turned out to see Johnson's motorcade were Sunday sparse. In Manhattan, they were heavier, particularly around the temple. But they were easy to handle. New Yorkers can read. They know now that guarding a President is a terrible job.

The temple was under a quiet, respectful martial law. Even the flowers for Herbert H. Lehman's casket, were fluoroscoped by the bomb squad before they were allowed in.

The moment President Johnson moved into Temple Emanu-El after announcing he was going to see President Hoover on the way back, Murphy walked into the middle of Fifth Avenue and stood with his staff. There was Mike Ledden and Birmingham and Johnny King and Jim Walsh and these set, bulldog-faced New York Irishmen talked for awhile and Murphy gave orders quietly and down the block a bus pulled away with 40 patrolmen headed for the Waldorf. The detectives already were en route. And patrolmen originally stationed on Third Avenue for the trip back, quickly moved up and covered Park Avenue for the trip to the Waldorf.

### FINALLY, HOME FREE

It took only minutes, and then there were enough of Smith & Wesson's best-oiled products around the Waldorf-Astoria to settle a war.

And at the end, at 2:27 p.m., *Air Force One*, its jets whining and throwing a wave of fumes across the landing apron, started to move out and take President Johnson back to Washington. And Michael Murphy, his fingers in his ears to shut out the roar, ducked down behind a green communications car, and stayed clear of the wave of kerosene exhaust which would have flattened him if he was standing up.

Then the plane moved out along the runway.

"You're home free," he was told.

"So far," he said. "We like to wait until the plane is airborne."

Murphy stood quietly, his hands jammed into the slash pockets of the coat, and over to the right, shut off from view by a hangar, there was a loud roar of a jet moving down the runway and into the air.

"Now?" Murphy was asked.

"No," he said.

At 2:34 p.m., Inspector John Kinsella of the department's bureau of special services, the undercover group, came trotting over from a parked port authority radio car.

"Both planes airborne," he said.

"Now," Murphy said. He smiled. "Every time the man leaves I feel relieved."

He went over to shake hands with Birmingham. This one had a big grin on his face and he stood stick straight in the afternoon air that was cold now. He shook hands with Murphy.

Birmingham was officially through as a policeman. And he was going out with a smile on his face and the squared-off shoulders of a man who did the job the way it should be done.

"This morning," he said, "when I got to the job and heard all these units checking in just the way they were supposed to and exactly when they were supposed to, like a clock, I got a feeling of pride. You get a certain pride when you see this force go to work on a thing like this."

### CREDIT TO FINEST

Murphy nodded. "The credit is out there," he said. He pointed to a group of patrolmen. Now usually, this type of a statement is the essence of corn. But yesterday it seemed the natural thing to say. From now on, when you hear somebody say, "New York's Finest," please regard it as something more than an old cliche. These fellows who are paid with your money went out yesterday and did the kind of a job people write stories about.

"What you do not seem to understand," Murphy said as he went to his car, "is that we guard Presidents all the time. And we guard them like that all the time, too. So I would have to say that today was nothing more than a routine matter. We just took a job and handled it right."

He got in the car and was driven home. He was in plenty of time for dinner.

"How was it?" his wife said when he came into the house.

"All right," he said. "The important thing is how did you do?"

"Roast beef," Kate Murphy said. "Give me a few minutes and it will be ready."

---

## ARMY PROCUREMENT OF VEHICULAR RADIO SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a 2-year study of the Army's procurement of a vehicular radio system that I started in September of 1961 has just been completed. That study proves several things. First, it proves that up to $35 million has been wasted in the past through sole-source—no competition—purchasing of this radio. Second, it proves that at least $10 million was saved on the radio the first time it was bought by competitive bidding after being pushed out of the sole-source shelter. And third, competitive purchase of two other systems which are part of a three-radio complex will amount to savings of more than $25 million on the first competitive purchase, after $50 million was wasted on sole-source purchasing.

For 3 weeks now, I have been bringing to the floor case after case against the waste in military purchasing. They have shown various things. For example, I have proven that the military spends Government money on development projects and then allows the developer to claim what the Government has paid for as a patented and, therefore, proprietary item, with resulting sole-source purchases that waste millions.

I have also shown where the Government states it cannot allow bidding on an electronics equipment because, as it says, it has no drawings or plans. Simple inquiry by me has turned up drawings in abundance and changed one procurement after another around from sole source to competition.

The way in which regulations are being changed as a result of constant inquiry into procurements has also been detailed by me in this series of addresses. The military is slowly acknowledging its errors and correcting mistakes, but often it does so grudgingly if at all.

Lastly, I believe I have proved in my remarks on the floor during the past 3 weeks and, indeed, during the past 3 years, that there is an altogether too lackadaisical attitude on the part of procurement officials in doing their job. They take the easy way out, the line of least resistance, in order to keep their jobs as uncomplicated and as undemanding as possible. This not only opens the floodgates of waste, inefficiency and mismanagement; it also sets up a climate whereby questionable tactics may be used by those who are wont to do so.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what I have shown here in the past 3 weeks with speeches on almost all legislative days is that the taxpayer and competitive American industry are being damaged by the attitude in procurement sections of the military today. The taxpayer gets it in the neck with a larger tax bill for defense. Industry is denied the chance to compete for the Nation's defense business in too many cases, and prices which would fall, remain artificially high until someone forces competition.

To sum up today, I am going to review the case of the AN/VRC 12 radio, a vehicular-mounted radio system that is the latest in sophisticated communications equipment for our military.

For 2 years I tried to force the Army into competitive bidding on this set. I finally succeeded early last year. The price dropped dramatically. The low bidder is ahead of schedule almost a full month—in fact, 28 days. He is making a profit and would like to have more business at the same price.

Therefore, I feel it has now been proved that American industry can make this radio at a dramatic savings to the Government and still give our fighting men the best in communications equipment.

You will recall that a moment ago I mentioned the VRC 12 as a part of a three-radio communications complex. Savings of $25 million in the first competitive procurement of this complex was also pointed out.

Insofar as the VRC 12 is concerned, my figures to be explained here today will show that up to $35 million was wasted on two previous sole source purchases from the developer who was paid $4.5 million by the Government to design the set. They will also show that at least $10 million is being saved on this radio in the first competitive purchase.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this complex is the AN/PRC 25 walkie-talkie radio. This radio was bought sole source but some time after my study started in September 1961. Constant inquiry and examination of the equipment and the way by which it was being procured forced it into open competition.

Competitive bidding pushed the price to less than half of the previous sole source price. The Government was saved $10 million on this one competitive purchase of the PRC 25. You might say the low bidder was not qualified and could not make the radio—except for the fact that the low competitive bidder was the former sole source producer who dropped his price by $10 million when other bidders entered the picture.

The Army then had the unmitigated gall to come before this Congress and ask for funds for fiscal year 1964 for this radio still based on the sole source price. If this sounds familiar, it should. This is the overfunding I attacked on the floor June 25, 1963, which resulted in a unanimously approved amendment cutting $10 million from the defense appropriations bill the following day.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the saving that Secretary of Defense McNamara tried desperately to claim as the Defense Department's. This is the saving he would have denied Congress. But he failed. Each time he made a claim, it was refuted on the basis of the written record. McNamara's band wasted the original money and the Congress saved another waste from taking place. It is that simple.

While trying to rob Congress of credit for this saving, the Secretary made another mistake. He mentioned other "savings" his cost-reduction program had achieved. Mr. Speaker, every one of those items mentioned by Secretary McNamara are component parts of the AN/VRC 12 radio, and we all know now how that was pushed into competition. Perhaps it is about time Mr. McNamara gives credit where it is due.

The third part of this communications complex, Mr. Speaker, is the AN/ARC 54 airborne radio. As a direct result of my 2-year study and an opinion handed down late this year by Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, the Army is going to purchase half of next year's ARC 54's by competitive bidding.

The last sole source price for this radio was something around $6,000 per average unit. There is a sole source procurement now about completed at Chicago for the ARC 54. This is to be followed early next year by a competitive procurement.

I invite the Congress and the American people to watch the price tumble when competitive industry has a chance at this equipment.

The price will fall and will prove that millions have been wasted on this one three-part communications complex before my study forced the items into competitive bidding. Also proved will be the fact that savings of almost $25 million will be realized under terms of first competitive purchases and that $50 milllion was wasted before competitive bidding was forced on the military.

Mr. Speaker, the PRC 25 was the cake. The VRC 12 puts the icing on it, and the ARC 54 will be the cherry placed atop it next spring. And it will be a cake that will fatten John Q. Taxpayer's wallet just a little bit. I predict that with a little more hard work and competitive bidding that wallet could get fatter each year as defense costs plummeted.

Now, I should like to deal specifically with the VRC 12, since that is the specific subject of my remarks here today. I have drawn up a fact sheet which carries this procurement through from the inception of the equipment right up through today. These fact sheets are available in quantity and show just how this case developed:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

### CHRONOLOGY OF CONGRESSMAN EARL WILSON'S 2-YEAR STUDY OF PROCUREMENT OF THE AN/VRC 12 VEHICULAR-MOUNTED RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SET

1. June 30, 1960: Courtney Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, signed a determination and findings (D. & F.) that authorized a sole source (no competition) purchase of the AN/VRC 12 vehicular-mounted radio from the AVCO Corp., which developed the radio at Government expense. In this D. & F., Mr. Johnson based his approval on "verbal assurance that sufficient production data will be obtained to insure competition in future procurements of these radio sets." Avco took 8 years to develop the radio fully.

2. November 29, 1960: First production contract for $35,344,104 was awarded to Avco.

3. January 20, 1961: Courtney Johnson left Government service.

4. March 15, 1961: Johnson returned to Government service to train his successor, Paul R. Ignatius.

5. May 5, 1961: Johnson leaves Government service for the second time, his training of Ignatius finished.

6. July 12, 1961: Avco Corp. submits unsolicited proposal that Army give to AVCO (sole source again) the second production contract for the AN/VRC 12.

7. August 9, 1961: Paul R. Ignatius signs the determination and findings authorizing the second sole source production contract to Avco for the AN/VRC 12 radio.

8. August 15, 1961: Courtney Johnson was employed by Avco Corp. as a consultant with payroll status retroactive to August 1.

9. September 26, 1961: I wrote the Army asking when competitive procurement of the AN/VRC 12 will be carried out as stated in the first D. & F. in June 1960.

10. October 5, 1961: Second production contract was signed for the AN/VRC 12 radio. The amount of the contract was increased from the anticipated $54 million to $65,802,653.

11. For the next 15 months I studied the history, development, and procurement of this equipment. Over 200 subcontractors, manufacturers' agents, etc., were contacted by letter and personal inquiry. The Army was urged to make a third purchase of this radio competitive. Serious questions were developed about propriety of the second sole source purchase. (See above.)

12. January 3, 1963: Competitive bids were opened for production of 7,070 units of the AN/VRC 12 radio. The low bidder is Magnavox Corp. Its price was $18,667,746—more than 50 percent under Avco's first sole source price, and more than 28 percent under the second sole source price. Magnavox bid was also $10 million under Avco's competitive bidding price. This proves that $17 million was wasted on second sole source contract. Which wasn't necessary, and that at least $10 million was saved on the third procurement.

13. March 14, 1963: Courtney Johnson, now a consultant for Avco, and Earl "Red" Blaik, president of the board of Avco, visited my office in Washington to discuss Johnson's role in the AN/VRC 12 matter. During this visit, Mr. Blaik and Mr. Johnson stated that the Magnavox bid was too low. They said the radio couldn't be made at bid price and predicted Magnavox "can't live with the contract." Mr. Blaik said, "If Magnavox can make this radio, deliver it on time and make a profit" under terms of its bid, "we'd better reexamine our own operations."

14. March 29, 1963: A contract was awarded to Magnavox for production of the AN/VRC 12.

15. June 18, 1963: I made a speech on the floor of the House regarding the AN/VRC 12 case (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 11042–11047).

16. November 8, 1963: Magnavox Corp. officials, replying to my inquiries, stated they have delivered preproduction units of the AN/VRC 12 to the Signal Corps 28 days ahead of schedule. They said the production line was ready to start as soon as orders were given and deliveries would be accomplished on schedule. Company officials also said they "plan to make a profit on the contract"

and "would take more business on this radio at the same price." They said that Magnavox development of a tuner that had been highly priced by Avco led to a tremendous saving.

17. The tuner is equipment made and supplied to Avco for the AN/VRC 12 at a high price by one of the firms I contacted several times to try to learn of various facets of the AN/VRC 12 case, particularly the payment of fees, royalties, etc. to firms or individuals in connection with the VRC 12 radio. This bears further investigation.

18. Conclusion: This radio was first bought sole source with the provision that the next procurement would be competitive. Competition plans were scrapped after Courtney Johnson left the Army and then returned to train his successor, then left again. Just a few days after Johnson locked up a job with Avco, the second sole source procurement was approved. Subsequent developments proved $17 million was wasted in the second sole source procurement. When competition was induced, Avco, which should have the know-how to outdo competition, ranked 18th among bidders and claimed the low bidder couldn't perform at the price quoted. Magnavox performance and its willingness to take more business at the same price proves the point I set out to prove on September 26, 1961, and that is that the AN/VRC 12 can be made competitively, can be delivered on time, and the manufacturer make a profit—all with a dramatic savings to the taxpayers of the United States. And this is just one of hundreds of cases that are exactly parallel.

Mr. Speaker, the Magnavox people have also told me they were able to build a tuner at a low cost that had been a terrifically high-priced item in the sole source radios. Their price was much, much less than that paid for the tuner by the sole source developer.

This tuner is equipment purchased by the sole source developer from another company, one of those contacted during my 2-year study in an effort to find out how royalties, fees, and the like were paid. This segment of the sole source purchase of the VRC 12 bears further investigation.

During the past month, this Nation has suffered a severe loss with the tragic death of our President. Our new President, Lyndon Johnson, recently told his Chiefs of Staff that he wants a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent. I am happy to see that he and I are in accord on that point. If our President backs up words with action, we can cut the defense budget by 30 percent. I have been working to achieve exactly this in my 3-year study of military procurement.

Also during the past month, I have brought case after case of waste in procurement, of withholding information needed by bidders, and of the inefficiency and mismanagement of the military purchasing agencies to the attention of the Members of the House. All of the examples point to one conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, while some of the mistakes and errors that waste millions are being corrected, progress is entirely too slow. A complete overhaul of military procurement is needed. We in Congress must take a tighter than ever rein over the money we appropriate for defense hardware. A new committee is needed to ride herd on defense purchasing and see that the President's goal of "a buck's worth for a buck" is achieved.

Such a committee is embodied in the House by H.R. 4409, a bill I have introduced that will create a select, nonpartisan committee to ride herd on military purchasing. This committee is vitally needed over and above all other existing committees to insure that a long, hard, and unbiased look will be taken at our dollars before they are spent.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, of which my colleague and friend, Mr. MAHON, of Texas, is chairman, took note of my continuing reports on the waste in electronics procurement.

That committee was so alarmed that it asked the General Accounting Office to undertake a complete investigation of the electronics purchasing sections of our Government. It is my understanding that this survey is nearing completion and that reports will soon be issued.

When the GAO begins to turn loose this flood of reports and cases—and I am sure there will be many—the Congress will see that just such a committee as I have suggested in H.R. 4409 is, indeed, mandatory.

---

## THE CONGRESSMAN: HIS WORK AS HE SEES IT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I first came to the Congress, Charles Clapp, presently legislative assistant to Senator SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts but then on the staff of the Brookings Institution, came to my office and invited me to participate in a series of roundtable meetings with other Members of Congress to discuss our job, our problems, and life as a Member of the House. I was not sure what I was getting into, but I accepted his invitation and along with 35 other House Members divided into Democratic and Republican groups attended the evening sessions. I never regretted my decision to participate.

Several days prior to each session, Mr. Clapp provided us with an agenda of the topics to be taken up, and following dinner we spent 2 hours discussing them. They were stimulating sessions which never lagged, characterized by a frank exchange of views and by a thoughtful appraisal of various aspects of our jobs. The excellent attendance at the meetings attested to their value and the interest they held for the participants. They were of particular help to me as a new Member of the House, but even the most senior of the participants found them revealing and worthwhile. I think everyone regarded the undertaking as important. This may explain the high level of the discussions and the candor evident throughout.

Mr. Clapp followed up these 16 sessions, 8 for each group, with more than 50 individual interviews and with considerable additional research. In April of this year another final meeting was held.

As a former university teacher of political science and a person with extensive and varied Hill experience as well as a careful and observant scholar, Mr. Clapp was well qualified to undertake this study. The results demonstrate that Brookings' confidence in him was well placed. The volume he has produced is remarkable in many ways.

Unlike other books on Congress, "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" presents essentially an insider's perspective. Quotations from Members of Congress are skillfully interwoven into the text. The result is a lively, entertaining, and informative volume which presents a balanced picture of the House and of Members and Congress—the problems and satisfactions, the stresses and strains, the strengths and weakness of the system, the scope of our responsibilities and how Congressmen go about meeting them.

An added feature is the inclusion of a chapter on congressional wives and congressional life which sets forth some of the special problems faced by the long-suffering wives of Members of Congress. My wife, Corinne, participated in a luncheon "work" session with 20 other congressional wives and found it a rewarding and interesting experience.

"The Congressman" is an important book which goes far to counteract the supercritical, often thoughtless comments heard too often today about the Congress. Congressmen can read it with profit. Students of Congress will find it indispensable. It should be required reading in our colleges and for all citizens interested in their government and how it functions.

As one Representative participating in the study put it, few voters understand the nature of the jobs they distribute biennially when they go to the polls to elect Members of the House. I believe it is essential that the general public obtain a better understanding of Congress. This book provides the best single opportunity I know to achieve that goal. I am pleased to have been invited to participate in this study and I am delighted with the finished product. Mr. Clapp and the Brookings Institution are to be congratulated.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to read the forward of this book.

### THE CONGRESSMAN: HIS WORK AS HE SEES IT

(By Charles L. Clapp)

The Congressman believes that his exacting role is poorly understood by the public. The heavy workload, financial sacrifice, and the disruption in his family life are little appreciated, and his general image fails to do justice to him—or to the legislative process in which he is involved.

But though the job is uncertain and sometimes agonizing, it offers excitement, challenge, prestige, and the opportunity to be of service to others. It provides enduring satisfaction. Occasionally "the hard work falls away and the tension is relaxed and you have a sense of purpose that I don't think you find in any other profession," as one Congressman put it.

This account of the Congressman's work as he sees it is based on a series of Brookings conferences and follow-up interviews with Members of the House.

The author, who has been associated with congressional affairs for many years at Brookings and at the Capitol, explores all facets of a Congressman's life: His work in committees, relationship with colleagues and party

**leadership, his legislative functions, and office administration.**

**Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include herewith statements by the following Members: the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford]; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling]; the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes]; and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson].**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Charlie Clapp's book on "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It" is a constructive contribution to the literature on the House of Representatives.

Mr. Clapp has done an outstanding job in editing the material developed at the roundtable discussions in which Republican and Democratic Congressmen participated. He has also provided sufficient background information to make the direct quotations significant and meaningful.

As one who took part in the roundtable meetings I was impressed with the frankness of the discussions at the time. I can attest now that the book reflects this frankness and pulls no punches in delineating many of the problems and practices of the House, its Members and committees.

Anyone interested in a better understanding of the House of Representatives and its membership will find Mr. Clapp's book a scholarly but easy-to-read and fascinating story.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in commending Charles L. Clapp and the Brookings Institution for their excellent new book entitled, "The Congressman, His Work as He Sees It."

As one of the 38 Members of the House who participated in the numerous and wide-ranging discussions that formed the basis of the book, I think Mr. Clapp did a remarkable job of distilling our remarks and shaping them into a well-organized book. His product is at once smooth reading, and full of facts and new observations.

One of the problems of Congressmen, which is highlighted by this book, is the misunderstanding by the public of the Congressman's role and the setting in which he works. This misunderstanding extends even to those most interested in Congress. In fact, most of us confessed in the discussions that we ourselves had not found congressional life to be quite what we had expected before our election.

The book not only spotlights this problem but it makes a valuable contribution to doing something about it. It draws together for scholars, acute political observers and the average citizen concerned with his government a unique collection of the knowledge and wisdom of insiders. The roundtable conference method has drawn upon such a breadth of experience that the book deals with every important facet of congressional life and activity. This book makes a very important contribution to the understanding of Congress and of American government.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and other Members in congratulating the Brookings Institution and, in particular, the author, Charles Clapp, on the publication of that informative and interesting book "The Congressman." A great deal of time and effort went into this project and all concerned must have a feeling of satisfaction in the final result.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything at all which is not factual about Charles Clapp's book, "The Congressman," it certainly would not have resulted from a lack of effort to determine all of the facts. The groups of Congressmen with whom Mr. Clapp worked were made up of some of the most knowledgeable Members from both sides of the aisle, and yet they were not a homogeneous group as far as backgrounds, committee assignments and seniority were concerned. The material was prepared, therefore, from a fair sampling of all of the factors which go to make up the institution known as the Congress, and the character of those individuals who are Members thereof.

I found Mr. Clapp to be extremely adept at leading discussions without seeming to lead them at all. His technique was very simple: he would ask a question or make a statement, and then sit back and listen, as each Member took a crack at the subject matter, and sometimes at each other. The give and take was lively, to say the least.

I am looking forward to reading this book with a great deal of pleasure. I congratulate Mr. Clapp and the Brookings Institution on the preparation of this very significant work.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my sincere congratulations and appreciation to Charles Clapp and to the Brookings Institution for their outstanding publication which was just recently released entitled, "The Congressman: His Work as He Sees It."

A student of the congressional scene for many years, Charles Clapp was an excellent choice to undertake the task of analyzing and evaluating the public and private lives of a Member of Congress.

Mr. Clapp has demonstrated both understanding and appreciation of the subtle intricacies of congressional service in his book.

His knowledge of both the men and the institutions of Congress is plainly evident in his writing. Never before have I read a publication which delves so thoroughly and penetratingly into so many different aspects of a Congressman's life.

As Mr. Clapp points out in his book, a relatively small percentage of our society understands the functions, responsibilities, and obligations of a Member of Congress.

I am satisfied that the Brookings Institution publication makes a significant contribution toward creating a greater understanding on this subject.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Libonati]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Conte], on taking this time in order to talk about a very important book.

This book was written by Charles L. Clapp under the auspices of the Brookings Institution.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] has done a service to Congress in bringing to the attention of our colleagues, in the House particularly, an important piece of work.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who was fortunate in serving on this study group and participated in all the seminars. I think I only missed one.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Clapp worked under great and difficult circumstances. He had to write a book that was absolutely honest. He had to sift and to cull and I imagine that there were literally thousands upon thousands of pages of notes that were taken by the stenographer during those seminars. He was required also to make order out of chaos.

Mr. Speaker, I think that almost any person who intended to run for Congress and, indeed, any person who hopes to make a career out of government, whether or not it be in the legislative branch, would find it useful and helpful to read this book. There really are two books that have been written in the last 2 years which have made significant contributions to the work of the Congress and to the education of the country about what the Congress is all about, particularly the House of Representatives.. The first one, of course, was the much-discussed "Forge of Democracy" by Neil McNeil, and now comes "The Congress" by Charles Clapp.

Mr. Speaker, great credit is due the Brookings Institution also for undertaking this work. It was a difficult task. They undertook it with a determination and did it scientifically and well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that great credit should go personally to the officers of the Brookings Institution who spent a good deal of time working with us on the subject; in fact, were there almost every minute. Robert Calkings, president of the Brookings Institution, made a continuing and splendid contribution. George Graham was there without fail and provided spark and guidance throughout each of these sessions.

I note that our friend Charles Clapp is now back in the Senate as legislative assistant to Senator Saltonstall. I think that is probably one reason why the senior Senator from Massachusetts has always been such a pillar of strength and has made such a wonderful contribution to the legislative process in representing his State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, so effectively.

Massachusetts has every reason to be proud today not only because the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has seen fit to give recognition to an intellectual product of great importance and significance, but he has put the congressional entrepreneur on this book by his taking this special order and bringing it to the attention of the colleges and universities across the country, but he also is saluting a really great fellow in Charles L. Clapp and his colleagues in Massachusetts who have worked with Mr. Clapp.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Clapp and I should like to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for taking it upon himself to have this special order at this time. And, of course, the Brookings Institution is deserving of congressional thanks for the job that it has done.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CONTE. I certainly appreciate the fine and warm remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. The gentleman has certainly made a fine observation on this factual book on Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may include with these remarks the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending Charles Clapp upon the publication of his Brookings Institute book, "The Congressman," which had its first edition released yesterday. Brookings Institute should also be commended for their roundtable conferences that provided the forum for the development of this book.

Mr. Clapp's book is a very definitive look at the functioning and makeup of the House of Representatives. He has candidly pictured Congressmen in their working habitat in one of the most accurate reports that has been undertaken. His information being taken from off-the-record discussions with Congressmen enabled him to focus on matters with the frankness and logical interpretation that is essential to developing a true conception of how the House works.

I think that as we read his book that the Congress itself may perhaps gain a better understanding of the way it functions, and the American people in general who read Mr. Clapp's book will understand their Congressmen better.

Oftentimes when a project or feat is accomplished people will comment, "This is excellent—this should have been done long ago." I feel this opinion should be expressed about Mr. Clapp's book, "The Congressman." His ambitious undertaking has resulted in a lucid and candid story of how the men of the Congress work, feel, and are motivated. His is a true story of how our laws are made.

I would urge the Members of this body to read Mr. Clapp's book, and from it one may gain an even greater insight into the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tributes being paid to Charles Clapp and the Brookings Institution on the occasion of the publication by Brookings earlier this week of Mr. Clapp's book "The Congressman." I was not privileged to participate in the roundtable meetings from which much of the material presented in the book was drawn, but I have participated in other Brookings conferences and have benefited from them.

As one who has served in the House for 11 years, I am convinced that too many citizens do not possess sufficient understanding of the Congress and how it functions. I believe, too, that few individuals really appreciate how hard Members of Congress really work, how complex the problems are which confront them, and how well they meet their responsibilities.

That is why I am so pleased that this book has been written. In writing it, Charlie Clapp has performed an invaluable service both to the House and to all who desire a clear picture of congressional life. It is interesting and revealing. It is well written and comprehensive, a remarkable and in many ways a unique volume.

I agree with the author that too few opportunities are available to Members of Congress to sit down together for serious discussions of common problems and careful evaluation of our experiences and the institutional framework within which we operate. That Mr. Clapp and Brookings chose to approach their study of the House by drawing on the observations and insights of the perceptive Congressmen included in the round table sessions showed excellent judgment. One cannot read the book without being impressed by the fact that the participants did not hesitate to speak candidly about the Congress and their roles in it and reactions to it.

"The Congressman" is a major contribution to the literature on the Congress. We have long needed a realistic, balanced book on the House which draws heavily on the actual experiences of its Members, and here it is. I think it should be read widely, and I think it will be.

Brookings Institution deserves our commendation for undertaking such a study; the author merits our praise for doing such an excellent job of capturing the "feel" of the House and for presenting it so well. I predict the book will stand as an important one for years to come.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add these words of congratulations to the author, Mr. Clapp, who is now a valued assistant to the distinguished senior Senator from my State, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Many books have been written about Congress by men who never served in Congress, and who never worked on Capitol Hill. Many of these books have been interesting, and some have been of real value. But this is the first book I have seen that reports completely and accurately what Congressmen themselves feel about their work.

All of us can learn something from the research that Mr. Clapp has done in preparing this book, and from the opinions and suggestions expressed by the fine Congressmen who cooperated with him in this project.

The citizens of our country need to know more about how Congress works. This book can tell them. I hope that it will be widely read and appreciated.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks pertaining to this book.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. (BOBBY) BAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there are deeply disturbing reports emanating from the Rules Committee of the other body indicating that a partisan bloc may be forming to choke off or circumscribe the investigation into the manipulations of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker.

That investigation must go forward with a full disclosure of the facts no matter who or what may be involved. To that end we need the positive assurance now of President Lyndon Johnson and the congressional leadership that there will be no effort to kill or limit the Bobby Baker probe.

Never in recent years has there been less respect on the part of the public for certain of the operations of their Federal Government, particularly with regard to the use of Federal office for personal financial gain far beyond the remuneration associated with that office.

There can be no valid reason for failing to ascertain now why a German woman, allegedly involved in the Bobby Baker case, was suddenly shipped back to Germany. Who instigated this deportation, and why? Is it fact or fiction that other women were involved in this mess as widely reported in the Nation's press? The public is entitled to know.

We need outspoken concern in Congress and in the press over the indications that the investigation is to be circumscribed, perhaps whitewashed.

Also falling within the scope of the investigation, as set out in the resolution to the Rules Committee of the other body, should be a full-scale scrutiny of the L.B.J. Co., a Texas television and radio operation. The records of the Federal Communications Commission should be opened and examined with regard to the operations of this company since its inception. If this radio and television operation in Texas, until a few days ago under the control and management of the wife of the former majority leader in the other body, is as proper as we are told it is by the L.B.J. interests, there should be no objection to full disclosure and examination. But if, as alleged by potential competitors, it represents a monopoly in commercial television in a city of 200,000 then the manner of acquisition and maintenance of the monopoly becomes a matter of serious and public concern.

The Johnson family piled up a multimillion dollar fortune in this Government-controlled radio and television business while Lyndon Johnson was in Government office, prior to becoming President. On the basis of available facts, it would appear that the burden of proof is on the L.B.J. Co. to demonstrate that the FCC never engaged in any favoritism for a company owned by this family.

It would be naive to accept the self-serving contention that Lyndon Johnson has no interest in this business when his wife owns 52 percent of the stock and his daughters have had 30 percent of the stock in their names. In addition, the investigating committee is now in possession of information that the L.B.J. Co. was spending $7,000 to $12,000 a year for a "key man" insurance policy for $200,000 on the life of Lyndon B. Johnson.

Certainly that would indicate Mr. Johnson had more than a benign interest in the firm.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that this investigation must go on fearlessly and unhampered. If fear of the executive branch or palship with Bobby Baker's crowd can kill or whitewash this much needed investigation then this Nation is in much worse shape than I believed possible.

This is no time for timidity for we have now reached the point where the integrity of the entire process of government is at stake. Make no mistake about it—if this investigation is squelched the responsibility will fall on every Member of Congress who stands idly by.

And the guilt will also fall on every newspaper that timidly bows and accepts, without a fight, what would patently be a political power play.

## FOREIGN AID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to include their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I am about to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday the House is scheduled to take up the foreign aid appropriation bill. I have asked for this time in order that some of the Members who are concerned about the appropriation bill and how it will relate to the authorization bill which this House agreed to last Monday may express their views on this important question.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who hope the Appropriation Committee and the full House will approve the full amount of $3,600 million which was contained in the conference report on the authorization bill agreed to on Monday last.

I believe we should appropriate the full amount for the following reasons:

First, the revised foreign aid authorization request of the President earlier this year was $4.5 billion. The conference committee reported $3.6 billion, which is a 20-percent cut in the revised request of the President. This is twice as large as any previous cut in any other authorization bill. In fact, it is a larger cut than has ever been made including both authorization and appropriation.

Second, because the authorizing committees and the House and Senate have already made unprecedented reductions in the request, the appropriations bill cannot be cut this year as it usually has been.

Third, the House has made clear its concern about some aspects of our foreign aid program by cutting the authorization, and we would defeat our purpose if we make additional cuts under the appropriations bill. Cuts in the authorization bill may help to make a case for improvements in the program, but our goal now should be to improve the program rather than to cripple it. If we go beyond the 20-percent reduction already made, we will endanger the effective operation of the program and thus hurt the case we have made for improvements.

Fourth, it is important to give the new President and the head of the Agency for International Development a chance to make further improvements in the program. Mr. Bell has already made remarkable progress in improving the Agency, and we would show a lack of confidence in him if we cut the program further at this time.

Fifth, additional cuts in the program would encourage budget padding next year, rather than the submission of a more realistic and reasonable request. Responsible congressional action on foreign aid appropriations will lend support to a more responsible administration request.

Sixth, Communist foreign aid programs are on the defensive. This gives us a golden opportunity to move into the vacuum in vital areas of Africa and Asia where the Communists are pulling out. Rather than cutting this program even further, we should be considering stepping it up.

Seventh, the situation in Latin America is both more hopeful and more critical than a year ago. Further cuts in the Alliance for Progress would have a very unfortunate psychological effect at a dangerous period in the struggle to strengthen democracy in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, the status of the appropriations bill is described in some detail in an article in the New York Times of December 12, today. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—President Johnson intervened today to prevent a further slash in this year's foreign aid funds.

He sought to maintain the $3.6 billion compromise authorization recently approved by Senate and House negotiators.

He summoned Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on foreign aid, to a White House conference with David E. Bell, administrator of the Agency for International Development and Lawrence F. O'Brien, congressional liaison chief for the President.

From the meeting emerged a clear definition of the battle lines in what has already become the toughest behind-the-scenes fight over foreign aid in many years. President Johnson gave the component part of the $3.6 billion he wants for this year's commitments. Mr. PASSMAN outlined his own set of figures. They were far apart both on figures and categories.

No agreement or compromise was sought or offered by either side. But it was implicit in the President's position that he was prepared to force a showdown on the House floor if Mr. PASSMAN carried out his announced intention to bring in an appropriation bill of less than $3 billion for what the administration calls its substantive aid program.

Another major consequence of the meeting was to make it impossible for the Louisiana Democrat to outsmart the administration by making a deal on a certain appropriation figure to avoid a floor fight and then including in his agreement figure many extraneous items that the administration does not regard as part of the aid program.

Mr. PASSMAN has employed this technique with success several times in recent years. After reaching an understanding with the Speaker and the White House he has then included in the foreign aid appropriations bill such items as the Peace Corps, the civil administration expenses for the Ryukyu Islands and new funds for various Federal and multilateral financing agencies.

At today's meeting, for instance, the wily foe of the aid program included in his figures an estimated total of $700 million of so-called carryover funds from prior appropriations. He proposed to include these in the appropriation bill he intends to bring out next week.

He was informed at the conference that his $700 million figure was irrelevant since much of the amount was in the form of unobligated balances of various loan programs that were not subject to reappropriation and did not lapse at the close of the fiscal year.

President Johnson made it clear that the only carryover funds in which he was interested were $209 million of unexpended balances of military and economic and appropriations that lapsed last June 30 and had to be reappropriated for that reason.

The President included in his $209 million an item of $127 million that was unexpended from his cold war contingency fund and that the administration said it was turning back to the Treasury Department. That was before Senate-House negotiators compromised differences and brought back agreement on a contingency fund of $160 million, compared with the administration's $300 million asking figure.

Now, President Johnson made clear, he wants the $127 million put back in the appropriation bill.

Representative Passman was keeping his own counsel about his intentions. But some members of his subcommittee indicated that the President's intervention has put him in the most difficult position in many years in trying to win over a majority of the subcommittee to his formula.

This was reflected in his recent attempts to make a "no floor fight" deal with the Speaker. But Mr. McCormack's unwillingness to be maneuvered into the position of middleman culminated in today's White House meeting.

Resentment of some members of the subcommittee at what they considered Mr. Passman's attempts to railroad his formula through that group broke into the open earlier in the day. On the House floor, Mr. Passman sought unanimous consent to file by midnight Friday a report from the full appropriations panel on his bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is important that there be no misunderstanding that we are talking about $3.6 billion of new obligational authority. This does not include the Peace Corps appropriation nor the appropriation for other items not included in the authorization bill, which was finally settled last Monday; nor does this figure include money appropriated but not obligated in prior years. Customarily these unobligated funds are reappropriated, but this appropriation is separate from and in addition to the new obligational authority which is needed in the amount of $3.6 billion.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, is the $3.6 billion figure you are asking to be appropriated more money than was appropriated last year?

Mr. FRASER. No, in fact it is much less than was appropriated last year; $3.9 billion in new obligational authority was appropriated last year, and the $3.6 billion we are seeking this year is not only $300 million less than that but also includes within it $180 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund, used to support the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

This figure of $180 million is not ordinarily a recurring annual item.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does this $3.6 billion appropriation include carryovers of funds previously appropriated but unobligated in fiscal year 1963?

Mr. FRASER. No, absolutely not. This $3.6 billion is the full amount of the authorization approved Monday by the House in accepting the report of the committee of conference and is only for new obligational authority.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the $3.6 billion figure you are seeking include funds for the Peace Corps, the Ryukyu Islands, or any other activities?

Mr. FRASER. I am very happy that the gentleman asked this question. The answer again is—no. Absolutely not.

The $3.6 billion is only for AID economic assistance and the military assistance program. There may be a desire in some parts to include approximately $300 million of related activities in the overall appropriations bill, but these should be in addition to the $3.6 billion for AID and MAP assistance and not be deducted from it. The activities of the Peace Corps, the Department of the Army's administration of the Ryukyu Islands, assistance to Cuban refugees in the United States, migration and refugee assistance in Europe, and aid for the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association are all eminently desirable activities worthy of support but they should be considered in addition to the $3.6 billion AID economic aid and the military assistance program.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the $3.6 billion include any carryovers from the Peace Corps or other activities?

Mr. FRASER. Absolutely not.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is it unusual to have a carryover of unobligated funds from appropriations of previous years? Why shouldn't this carryover be deducted from the $3.6 billion?

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman again for asking this question.

It is not unusual to have a carryover of funds in programs such as this, and this carryover should not be deducted from the new appropriation. Last year's carryover was approximately $600 million, and that was with an appropriation of $3.9 billion of new obligations authority. The potential carryover this year is about $525 million at the absolute outside, and most of this is in no-year funds which have already been appropriated and do not need reappropriation. The total economic aid carryover for AID is about $315 million, and the fact that this money is available now is one indication that AID did not spend its funds rashly in a rush to commit them for fear of losing them. It should be clear that carryovers are not unusual and that, indeed, the President takes them into consideration in asking for new obligational authority. The President will need this carryover to add to the $3.6 billion in new appropriations if he is to have an aid program strong enough to support U.S. foreign policy around the world.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for his very specific answers.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many people think that the foreign aid program today is operating in the same way as it did 5 or 10 years ago; that nothing has changed, and no improvements have been made.

The fact is that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 instituted a basic change in direction in our foreign aid program. This act laid the groundwork for a significantly more effective concentrated aid program. It consolidated the many agencies and functions of U.S. foreign assistance activities into a single agency. It focused previously diffused operating responsibility into four regional bureaus, each reporting directly to the Administrator of the Agency. The potential effectiveness of this arrangement is now being realized throughout the program. Within the framework of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, a number of basic specific improvements have been made and are continuing under the direction of the administrator. The program has been reshaped to effectuate congressional emphasis on, first, long-term development in AID recipient countries; second, increased participation in the economic assistance effort by other industrialized free world nations; third, maximum self-help and reform for AID recipients; and, fourth, building the institutional base for economic and social development of recipient nations.

With reorganization largely completed, a number of other major actions are now improving the foreign assistance effort.

First. The new administrator reviewed U.S. assistance policy toward each recipient country. This exhaustive review process generated the following results, first, decisions were made to reduce some planned programs and plan for termination of others; second, specific U.S. assistance objectives toward each recipient country were formulated on the basis of hard judgments about achievable goals and the ability of the U.S. and others to assist; third, strategies for each AID recipient country were developed specifying self-help measures which the U.S. believes necessary and the manner in which such action by AID recipients can be induced; fourth, concentration and selectivity both among AID recipient countries and within individual country aid programs have been increased. Now—20 countries receive 80 percent of economic assistance—10 countries receive 80 percent of military assistance.

Second. A number of steps have been taken to insure that revised policies and procedures for deciding on levels and kinds of assistance get down to the working field level. Among these steps were issuance for the first time of a comprehensive policy guidance manual and a number of discussions between field and Washington personnel on these basic policies and procedures.

Third. Task forces were established to review all procedures for carrying out assistance programs. The first procedures generated by this review have already been established. These procedures are designed to focus responsibilities more sharply, reduce paper flow, expedite action, and shift more responsibility to those charged with implementing the program in the field.

Fourth. Techniques have been further developed to tie the provision of assistance to actual self-help performance. In three Latin American countries, for example, aid is being released only as the country achieves certain fiscal, administrative, or monetary targets. When these targets have not been achieved, assistance has been withheld.

Fifth: Steps have been taken to further reduce the already small negative effect of AID on the current U.S. balance of payments. As a result, about 85 percent of the dollars appropriated for the fiscal year 1964 will never leave the United States; they will be spent for purchases at home. By next fiscal year—fiscal year 1965—it is estimated that the negative effect of AID assistance on the balance of payments will be reduced to $500 million.

Sixth. Loans have become the major instrument of foreign assistance. In fiscal year 1964, 60 percent of total economic assistance will be in loans, compared to 30 percent in 1961.

Seventh. Special efforts have been introduced and expanded to increase the role of private enterprise, both in the developing countries and in the United States in a development effort. The new office of Development Finance & Private Enterprise, headed by an Assistant Administrator, who reports directly to the Administrator, is spearheading this effort. As a result, since September 1962, 16 completely new investment guarantee agreements have been filed with developing countries. In eight other countries, coverage has been expanded. During this fiscal year, the total of investment guarantees of all types will cross the $1 billion mark. Local currency loans to private investors under Public Law 480 have increased rapidly. AID has loaned more than $150 million in development loans to private enterprise since AID was established. AID has mounted a new program to help U.S. private enterprise to survey investment opportunities around the world.

Eighth. AID has met with increasing success in its efforts to get other industrialized nations to provide more assistance on more liberal terms. In the last month, the British have issued a white paper outlining their intention to substantially liberalize the terms on which they provide assistance.

Ninth. AID has adopted a policy of hardening its loan terms as soon as the capacity to repay of recipient countries has improved sufficiently. Greece, Israel, Taiwan, and Thailand provide examples of countries in which loan terms have been progressively hardened from fiscal 1962 to 1963.

Tenth. AID has completed termination of economic assistance programs to 15 developed countries of Europe.

Eleventh. To improve performance and minimize the need for full-time permanent employees, AID is making increasing use of the vast talents of the entire American community in its assistance efforts. These include business and industry, colleges and universities, private service organizations, and other Federal Government agencies and State governments.

Twelfth. More effective methods of administration of the program overseas have been developed. Already AID has created 10 "delegated posts" in which the Ambassador performs AID functions, thus eliminating the need for a separate AID mission and director. In other countries, steps are being taken to consolidate management functions of AID, USIA, and embassies.

Thirteenth. AID has exercised tight control over personnel levels and functions. Major personnel functions have been decentralized to the four regions, thus improving efficiency and reducing duplication. Many missions have been reduced in size; others notably in Latin America have been increased. Sharp reductions in personnel have been effected in Greece, Israel, Korea, Libya, Ethiopia, and free China. Loan officers and public safety advisers have been added—with increase offset by reductions in other technical specialties.

Fourteenth. Organizational changes have been made to improve AID's ability to do the job. AID established the International Development Organizations Staff to secure better aid contributions from other donors, and to improve aid coordination, set up an Office of Public Safety to focus emphasis on internal defense efforts in certain countries, organized a Cooperative Staff to focus on development of cooperatives in aid-receiving countries. These additions required some additional staff, but were mainly accomplished within existing resources by making cuts in other headquarters staff units.

Fifteenth. AID is now probing ways to improve recruiting of the many talents needed in the foreign assistance effort. Contacts are being expanded with universities, and with trade, labor, and professional organizations. Expanded use of short-term consultants on contracts with firms and private organizations are another possibility. Improvements are being pursued in AID's ability to attract able young people, to achieve more effective manpower planning, to improve inservice training and career development systems.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for bringing this very important problem to the attention of the Congress. As a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the gentleman from Minnesota knows whereof he speaks and his words should be given close attention by the Members of the Congress.

Few programs have caused such titanic conflict between the Congress and the Executive as that relatively small item in our budget known imprecisely as foreign aid.

In Congress I hear such invectives applied as "foreign giveaway," "foreign boondoggle," "global handout," "flagrant waste."

Yet this horrible thing has been supported since its inception by both Republican and Democratic administrations. It is even now supported by Hoover, Landon, Nixon, Truman, and Eisenhower in their role as elder statesmen. It was supported by John F. Kennedy and is now by the present occupant of the White House, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Every Secretary of State—Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Herter, and Rusk—Republicans and Democrats have all supported it. And finally, both party platforms have endorsed the idea of mutual security, which is a more correct description of the program's purpose. Thus, since we find no evidence that this is strictly a political issue, perhaps there is an institutional reason for this conflict.

Under our Constitution the primary responsibility in foreign affairs was given to the Executive.

But, the Congress, and especially the House, was given the primary responsibility for raising revenues and appropriating funds.

President Kennedy concurred with this system of checks in his November 15, 1963, press conference when he stated, "It's been said very many times, and I've never questioned it, that the Senate and the Congress have every right to decide how much money should be appropriated. That's their constitutional right."

President Johnson reaffirmed that belief in his address of November 27.

If, instead of thinking foreign aid as a foreign policy question, one judges it in the light of the constitutional duty of collecting money from taxpayers and appropriating it for their benefit, support of foreign aid, at first glance, becomes more difficult. For while my constituents look primarily to the President of the United States for leadership in foreign affairs, they look to me to represent them in domestic matters. If they ask me to support a tax cut or vote for more money for housing, urban renewal, mass transportation, education, unemployment benefits, increased social security benefits and I say there is not enough money—their first reaction is—cut foreign aid.

If we are seeking a flood control project to protect our city and are turned down by the Bureau of the Budget, my constituents will point to some dam in a foreign country and say "Why benefit Slobbovians over Pennsylvanians?"

This is a natural reaction if we look at foreign aid as a money bill and from a parochial standpoint. But I submit it must be viewed from the national standpoint. For instance, even though Republicans in the House of Representatives voted 120 to 52 against the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, the House Republican leadership—the floor leader, the whip, the chairman of the Republican conference and the Republican national chairman—men whose position requires them to have a national party interest broader than their constituents viewpoint all voted for the Foreign Assistance Act. They voted the same way this week on the conference report.

Thus, if you look at foreign aid as our Presidents and other national party leaders have done, primarily as an instrument of foreign policy, you reach the same conclusions.

In a press conference held not long before his death, President Kennedy stated his position in the strongest possible terms:

> I just want to say personally as President—and my predecessor said the same—this program is essential to the conduct of our foreign policy and therefore, I'm asking the Congress of the United States to give me the means of conducting the foreign policy of the United States.
>
> And if they do not want to do so, then they should recognize that they are severely limiting my ability to protect the national interest. That is how important I think this program is.

Let us then look at foreign aid from the standpoint of protecting the national interest.

It seems to me that we have three clear choices.

First. Cease all foreign aid programs and accept as inevitable the fact that many free nations will be taken over by the Communists either externally or internally or by the use of Communist foreign aid programs.

Second. Cease all foreign aid but be ready and willing to use American troops to put down communistic insurrection, infiltration, or outright aggression in all the many parts of the world where this might occur.

Third. Continue some form of a foreign aid program.

I doubt that the opponents of the foreign aid program are seriously advocating the first course of action which recognizes as inevitable the loss of many countries to the Communists. These opponents, at least in their words, are among the most ardent foes of communism. Surely these opponents who condemn so vociferously what they call a no-win policy could not seriously be advocating a planned policy of surrender and defeat.

Then do they, in the name of economy, advocate the replacement of our foreign aid program by the infinitely more expensive policy, reliance upon American troops, to put down Communist insurrection, infiltration, or outright aggression in all parts of the world where this may be necessary. For example, the cost of maintaining a U.S. soldier is more than six times the cost to maintain a Vietnamese soldier—$3,948 versus $651. Wars—even the most limited of wars—are so expensive that almost any policy which can avoid our involvement in war must be a moneysaving policy.

We come, therefore, inevitably to the third alternative—we must have some kind of a foreign aid program.

Having reached this conclusion, we are just at the beginning of the discussion.

How much foreign aid? What type of foreign aid? To what countries? How should it be administered?

These are questions which the Congress can properly discuss so long as we remember that this question must be viewed from a national and not from a parochial standpoint.

Much of the debate over foreign aid has been whether we should stress military or economic aid.

In my opinion a more meaningful division of thought would be to divide the recipient countries into two categories, first tactical and second strategic—recognizing, of course, that there are some countries which are a mixture of both.

By tactical countries, I mean both allied and neutral countries, who lie adjacent to Communist borders and who seek to maintain their own independence.

In the past year's program, over $1 billion was allotted for the direct military assistance to countries on the Communists blocs' periphery which are allied with us or each other in defense against Communist attack. In addition to military aid, these countries also received about $700 million in economic aid to support their military efforts and otherwise add to their stability and growth. These funds represent 44 percent of this year's total foreign assistance appropriation. If we add to this the military and economic support of Vietnam and Laos and other border countries which wish to retain their independence though not allied with us or other countries in common defense pacts, total expenditures for military support and accompanying economic aid in the border areas aggregate $2.8 billion or 72 percent of total appropriations. In these tactical countries, on the whole, our help has purchased very little development. In these same countries the principal examples of waste and corruption have occurred. It is, I believe, primarily as a result of particular events in these countries that some of the deepest congressional and public misgivings about foreign aid have derived. Yet, the Clay report—in talking of aid—to these tactical countries—said "Dollar for dollar, these programs contribute more to the security of the free world than corresponding expenditures in our defense appropriations."

Seventy-two percent of our total foreign aid appropriation is made to those tactical countries where the direct relationship to free world security is most evident. These nations are carrying defense burdens far beyond their internal economic capacity. While these countries are now receiving the major portion of U.S. foreign assistance, they are also providing more than 2 million men, ready for the most part, for any emergency. While their armies are to some extent static unless general war develops, they add materially to the free world strength so long as conventional military forces are required. As the Clay report said:

> It might be better to reduce the resources of our own defense budget rather than to discontinue the support which makes their contribution possible.

In any review of the front-line or tactical countries, special attention must be given to India even though it is not an ally in the strict sense of the word. Up to June 30, 1962, we provided economic aid in the amount of $3,952 million and no military aid to India. After the Chinese invasion we agreed to extend military assistance to India. India is of supreme importance to us. It is the only country of sufficient size in south Asia to be able to offset the Red Chinese power in Asia. Let us look at what has happened in India—partly as a result of our $3.9 billion of foreign aid.

Recently, I had breakfast with Chester Bowles who served under President Truman and now under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson as our Ambassador to India. He pointed out that in these 10 years, Indian national income has increased by 42 percent with food grain production up by 56 percent. In 1947 it was estimated that 100 million cases of malaria developed annually—now this debilitating disease has nearly disappeared. Life expectancy in India in 1947 was 27 years—now it is 42.

In a country that was only 10 percent literate 15 years ago, 60 percent of all Indian children under the age of 12 are now going to school. Indian industrial production is expanding by 10 percent annually, one of the highest rates in the world.

In its first year of independence, India developed a constitution that combined the features of both the United States and British experience. Since then, India has held three national elections—each the largest exercise of the democratic privilege in the world—in which a higher percentage of the people than in the United States vote.

India has freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and a private enterprise sector that has been chalking up sizable gains.

Only through a free India with growing strength and confidence can we expect to see the development of a political and military balance to Communist China in Asia. What is more, a successful expanding India demonstrates to all of the doubters and the fainthearted in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that democracy is more than an impractical Western political luxury. It is a realistic political and economic system that actually works in practice and produces results. Thus, foreign assistance to the tactical or Communist border countries can be relatively easily defended.

However, aid to the strategic countries is more difficult to explain because these are the countries which are not close to Communist borders and are not in any immediate danger from outside aggression. In these countries the question of military assistance in any substantial amount should be questioned.

Why should we give economic aid to the countries of Latin America and Africa?

First, however, let us explode some of the wrong reasons for assistance to these countries.

For instance, the foreign aid program has been most widely presented in terms of simple anticommunism. Since a major U.S. objective is to stop communism, this implies that if communism did not exist, there would be little or no reason for the program itself.

For developing countries seeking aid, such a view also ironically turned communism into a valuable natural resource, such as oil or uranium.

By the logic of the argument, any developing nation devoid of a powerful Communist neighbor or a noisy Communist minority becomes per se a poor candidate for U.S. economic assistance. It has been suggested sarcastically that a developing nation which lacked a Communist minority should plant and nourish a small but vocal Communist movement—and then implore the United States to provide the funds to squelch it.

Since even Communists are sometimes blessed with a sense of humor, it is not surprising that Soviet spokesmen talking to the people of Asia and Africa have said:

> The Soviet Union offers you loans and technicians to speed your development, for this you are grateful, but you should be equally grateful to Moscow for whatever aid the Americans give you. They are quite frank in saying that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing.

A second fallacy in our past presentation of foreign aid is the claim that the program will bring us military allies, win us votes in the United Nations, or gain us support against Cuba and the Red Chinese. In other words, it is assumed that the program's primary objective is to make friends and buy votes.

This argument is equally hollow and futile. It is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend. To attempt to do so can lead only to frustration and antagonism.

Suppose a wealthy resident of your town should offer to build a swimming pool for your children, a new library, and an extension to your town hall—provided only that you and your neighbors agree to support his political views on public questions.

What would you do? You would invite him to take his money and to live elsewhere.

Unfortunately, in the past we Americans have inadvertently placed ourselves often in the position of the richest man in the world community, naively trying to buy friends and supporters for our views. Yet commonsense and a knowledge of human nature should tell us that foreign aid will not make us love our neighbors, make our neighbors love us, or win international popularity laurels for us—and we should not expect it to do so.

Finally, it has often been wrongly assumed that the success or failure of the aid program should be judged by purely and simply the rate of economic growth in the recipient country.

Obviously increased agricultural and industrial production is of the utmost importance. Yet the record shows that when the added production is badly distributed, it only widens the gap between rich and poor—and, in the process, inevitably erodes the political stability which we are striving to create.

There are many examples. Some of the most productive countries of Latin America, for instance, already have per capita incomes greater than several European countries. Yet because the privileged minority at the top may be getting rapidly richer while the impoverished embittered masses at the bottom of the ladder are making little or no progress, these nations can be as politically explosive as the poorest African or Asian country whose per capita income may be no greater than $100 a year.

In view of our past failure adequately to explain the program, it is a tribute to our national commonsense that so many Americans have continued to give tacit support to foreign assistance, for basically humanitarian reasons.

This leads us back to the basic question: If the purpose of our aid program is not simply to combat communism, and if it cannot be expected to buy friends or votes, and if faster economic growth alone is no sure cure-all, what exactly is foreign aid good for? What will it do?

The answer to this question is deceptively simple to state: A wisely administered U.S. aid program can help build nations that are increasingly prepared to defend their independence against totalitarian enemies—external or internal, overt or covert—and increasingly willing to work with us as partners on common projects which may lead the world a little closer to peace.

In other words, the purpose of our aid program is to develop independent nations able and willing to stand on their own feet—and thereby to share with us a dedication to peace and freedom.

To put the question more sharply, we have a critical choice: We can help to guide the economic and social upheaval now sweeping Asia, Africa, and Latin America into constructive, peaceful channels, or we can sit back nervously and ineffectually, while the revolution of rising expectations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America slips into the hands of reckless extremists who despise everything we stand for—and a succession of Red Chinas and Red Cubas comes into being. If we falter, another runner will surely set the pace.

> Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war.

Wrote Milton, these victories gained thus far have been quiet ones scored in the last 17 years by our mutual defense and assistance programs. Let us continue to influence the winds of historical change not by ignoring them but by making them work in our favor.

**Mr. FRASER.** Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very excellent and penetrating remarks about the nature of the support which the foreign aid program has commanded and some of the difficulties which have been generated through misunderstanding of the purpose of the program.

**Mr. BROWN of California.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. FRASER.** I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

### FOREIGN AID AND THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-HELP

**Mr. BROWN of California.** Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my commendation of the gentleman for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the Members of the House. I have been very deeply concerned at the drastic slashes which have been made in the foreign aid authorization bill as it progressed through the two Houses of Congress. I am extremely hopeful that in the light of some of the things that have been said here this afternoon and in the light of the urgent needs of this country to maintain its position and strengthen its position throughout the world, when the appropriation bill comes to the floor on Monday, we will have a bill which will be as close as possible to the authorization which we approved last Monday.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an extremely significant, and truly basic, principle that should underlie the decisions affecting foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. This is the principle of self-help.

The leadership of three national administrations consistently recognized that the development of independent strength in any country is essentially the responsibility of the people and the government of that country, not of the United States.

Unfortunately, the administrators of our foreign assistance program have not been as consistent when applying this criteria in determining aid recipient eligibility. And, as a consequence, achievements have, in many instances, fallen short of the target.

But, there is a basis for hope in the future, for, as of today, the bulk of economic assistance is going to a dozen or 15 countries, countries which are making solid progress in mobilizing their own resources as their contribution to their own development. These cooperating countries are demonstrating tangibly their willingness to help themselves. They are contributing whatever resources they can, no matter how meager, of men, money, and material.

Lipservice, empty promises, pious hopes, just will not do. They just lead to failures, and we have had our share of those.

I urge that the thrust of America's foreign assistance programs continue to be directed toward assisting each aid recipient country to mobilize, increase, and apply its own resources in a joint effort to achieve stability and economic growth. This would be the self-help concept in action.

Where it has been applied, it has been fruitful, and there are many notable examples of its successful application.

In the field of education, a task that truly tests the imagination, the self-help principle has had dramatic results. I would like to use Latin America for illustrative purposes.

Guatemala, where 72 percent of the people can neither read nor write, that government and AID jointly launched a pilot program to construct more than 2,200 classrooms. It was originally thought that local residents, whose children would use the schools, would account for 33 percent of the construction cost. The fact is that these local residents have accounted for almost half of the actual construction cost.

In Colombia, the larger share of U.S. assistance for education is at the primary school level. It is based on the 4-year plan of the Ministry of Education to provide a minimum of 5 years schooling for every Colombian child. This plan looks to the construction of 22,000 primary classrooms, and the training of more than 16,000 primary teachers over the 4-year span at a cost of $98 million. While the United States is strongly committed to this plan, the bulk of financing, about $60 million, is being carried by the Colombian Government. If the goal of an assured education for every Colombian child is attained, this will have profound future implications for lifting the entire economic and social climate of the country.

Forty villages in Panama will receive an assist in building schools through a $255,000 grant from AID, and Panama's Ministry of Education will initially provide $50,000 toward the cost of this project.

The problem of decent housing is acute throughout the emerging nations. AID's emphasis should be on self-help housing, technical assistance, and the development of local credit institutions that will enable the average man to finance a decent home for his family.

In self-help housing neighbor helps neighbor. The cash outlay is limited to such items as nails and hinges, and self-help works.

In Santiago, Chile, a pioneer housing project has resulted in more than 650 livable homes built on the self-help principle. The Chilean Government paid for the land, site development, utilities, building materials, and administrative costs. The United States paid for the construction equipment, and provided technical assistance. The people who were to live in their own homes did the actual building.

In Korea, 200,000 persons have been housed in more than 36,000 units over a 5-year period. Korea's initial contribution to the program was small, but, as of today, the Korean Government is handling the entire program and AID has stepped out of the picture.

For centuries the scourge of malaria has frustrated the aspirations of millions yearning to better their lot. In the Rapti Valley of Nepal, only 5 years ago, a malaria incidence of 100 percent held the population down to about 5,000 impoverished tribesmen. Today through the combined efforts of the Nepalese and United States Governments, there are 50,000 productive farmers and tribesmen living there, participating in a dramatic economic and social development effort. The malaria incidence is now four-tenths of 1 percent.

In Taiwan, U.S. foreign assistance has contributed to the virtual elimination of malaria.

In India, where malaria accounted for more than 10 percent of all illnesses in 1953, the percentage today is six-tenths of 1 percent.

The successful application of the self-help principle is also demonstrated in Ecuador where there are 3,000 private citizens, ranging from farmers to teachers, who have volunteered their services to assist in malaria eradication. They take blood samples, even administer drugs, help spray 450,000 dwellings every 6 months. They work without pay, but they take much pride in the local prestige they acquire. Many of them display their simple instruction materials, supplied through the Alliance for Progress on the walls for all to see, as professionals display their university diplomas.

And, in the field of agriculture, in the rural areas where most of the people live, self-help projects can have, and in many instances have had, a profound impact on the people right in their own villages.

For example, today, Costa Rica is self-sufficient in rice, corn, and beans, in meat and livestock products, and in fruit and vegetables. This increase has been accomplished in the face of a population increase of about four percent a year.

U.S. assistance, on a self-help basis, contributed to the establishment of an agricultural extension service, and the development of agricultural research, improved food marketing, storage, and processing techniques.

In Brazil, the combined research efforts of Brazilian and U.S. technicians have set the stage for the development of 400 million acres of submarginal land in central Brazil.

These are the kinds of projects that work and, I submit, that self-help provides the impetus.

Our foreign aid program should deliberately challenge the aid recipient to do his part, provide his own resources, to contribute towards his own development.

The self-help aspects of our foreign aid programs have given meaning, as we can see from just a few examples, to the concept that a nation can progress toward its development goal when its own people see the need, have the will to overcome awesome obstacles, and contribute to their own economic and social betterment.

This is not theory, it is fact, proven by the many successes achieved when the principle has been applied.

I would urge that self-help programs be more widely used in the future.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his statement.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota for taking the time to bring to the attention of the House many points of deep concern to the country in connection with the foreign aid appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, next Monday, when the foreign aid appropriation will be on the agenda of the House, and on the days intervening, when the subject is under consideration in committee, we will be reaching a decision of tremendous importance to the future of this country. It will be important for several reasons.

In the first place, foreign aid is a vital part of American foreign policy. In many ways it is as important as our defense program on which we spend 12 times as much money. Our military budget provides an all-important deterrent but this is essentially a passive part of our international policy. Foreign aid is necessary as the active part of our policy. It is foreign aid that provides the President with the opportunity for taking initiative in foreign affairs.

Second, our decision on foreign aid will be a test of our judgment on the long-term importance of aid as an element of policy. This year, the authorization bill for foreign aid has received unprecedented attention and unprecedented criticism. Much of it arises from the dissatisfaction with foreign aid over policies and programs long since changed and long since corrected. Much of it arises out of the impatience of many of our constituents with the burden of foreign aid. But after protracted consideration in the appropriate committees and in both Houses of Congress, we did reach a decision. If in the course of the appropriation procedure in the two Houses that decision is subjected to revision not related to the needs of foreign policy, we will do a great disservice to this country. We will be weakening the President at a moment when his capacities for world leadership are under the closest scrutiny and the severest pressure.

It is important also to call attention to an important change that has taken place in our international relations since the foreign aid authorization bill was under consideration in this House. At that time, the country was greatly troubled by the adverse balance of payments which had reached an annual rate of $4 to $5 billion during the first and second quarters of this year. Since the end of the debate on the foreign aid authorization, the record for the third quarter of this year is now available. It is apparent that we have made a drastic improvement in our exchange balances. The adverse balance during the third quarter was at a rate of $1 billion per year. Moreover, some of the measures undertaken by the administration in the earlier part of the year have begun to take effect in holding down the gold loss. For several months we have had no loss in our gold reserve.

Most of the credit for the favorable developments in our foreign balances are attributable to areas outside of the foreign aid program. Our favorable trade balances have increased. The administration's proposal for a dampening of foreign security flotations has resulted in a considerable reduction in the outflow of capital. But a part of the improvement can properly be credited to the foreign aid program.

An example of such a change is the buy American provision regarding loans and grants. In the present fiscal year, about 85 percent of all aid funds will never leave this county. They will be spent right here in the United States for U.S. goods and services. This 85 percent figure marks a significant tightening of the program. Only two years ago, in fiscal 1962, half of all the foreign assistance funds were spent outside the United States.

Aid is becoming increasingly selective. Rather than spreading our efforts thinly around the globe, we are aiming them where they will do the most good. It is true that there are aid programs in 79 countries today, but many of these countries receive only a token amount. Much more to the point is the fact that five countries account for more than or strategic countries and sometimes both. Few would quibble with our need to be associated with their development. They are, with the total amount of aid obligations for fiscal 1963 given in millions of dollars: India $402.3; Pakistan $185.0; Vietnam $143.7; Turkey $131.1; and Korea $126.2—adding up to $988.3 million. This represents a shade over 40 percent of the $2,396 million total aid programing for the period.

Strengthening this effort toward selectivity, AID is now directing two-thirds of all development funds to only 14 nations. Most of these are in the Near East-South Asia regional grouping, and this too marks a switch in emphasis. In 1950, Europe received three-quarters of all AID moneys. This figure dropped to only 10 percent by 1960 and was cut again to 5 percent in 1962. Today AID is committing no more economic assistance funds to Europe. The Near East and south Asia, which received 5 percent of foreign aid funds in 1950, received 41 percent in 1962.

AID is in process of phasing itself out wherever possible. It is useful to look at some areas of the world where this function has already been accomplished. Fifteen countries that have successfully made use of U.S. assistance and are no longer on the rolls are: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

Others are on their way to phasing out. Let me give you an illustration. The Republic of China on Taiwan which 10 years ago was a backward area, has moved forward with great economic vigor. The total gross national product has been climbing at an average annual rate of 7 percent ever since 1951. Exports are rising by about 12 percent a year. The country is more and more able to manage its own economic affairs, and as a measure of this ability, AID last June authorized a $21.5 million loan on terms approaching those of conventional international lending institutions. The interest rate—normally three-quarters of 1 percent for development loans—was set at 3½ percent. The amortization period—which before had been 40 years—was set at 20 years.

Other countries to follow in the footsteps of China are Greece, no longer receiving any grant aid, Portugal, now able to obtain credit from the Export-Import Bank, Yugoslavia, where the AID mission is being closed down, Israel, Jamaica, Mexico, and Venezuela, and there will be many more to come.

As the program progresses and as the countries around the world become increasingly able to manage their own economic affairs, AID is stepping up its emphasis on private enterprise. AID has put into motion a special effort to improve the climate for private investment in the developing countries and to increase the amount of investment made by both United States and local firms in these countries.

The U.S. aid program is moving forward with purpose, strategy, and success. This is no time to hinder its forward drive. The foreign aid program is in better shape today than it has been in years. It is paying off in results.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] for calling to the attention of this body the urgent necessity for appropriating the fully authorized amount for our foreign aid program. I wish to join the gentleman in his plea for an effective foreign assistance program by providing the authorized amount in full.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation may be said to have come of age on December 7, 1941. Since then it has accepted the responsibilities of a great nation in world affairs. Before that time it had sought to evade responsibility, to avoid involvement in events that seemed far away, beyond the seas.

All of us lived through that period of immaturity and lack of responsibility. We came to see its consequences as all of Europe came under oppression. Then swiftly and dramatically, the events we had sought to ignore came to make themselves felt upon the lives of each of us. We learned and came to accept the fact that we are, indeed, involved in the affairs of mankind.

In dealing with foreign aid legislation in recent years, however, there has begun to be a faltering in that acceptance of responsibility. One can detect a wavering in the resolution that has marked our conduct of foreign affairs during the past two decades.

The question is raised whether this irresolution and growing reluctance to carry the burden of world affairs means we yearn to lapse back into that immaturity that brought such consequences to the world before. The events may be less dramatic than those of the late thirties and early forties. But they are of a historical magnitude, even greater.

A third of the world is in political ferment. The withdrawal of the great empires, the awakening of long-dormant peoples, and their aspirations for betterment, are all bringing rapid change and upheaval that can be seen in specific instances.

Fledgling democracies cannot survive the resistance of entrenched interest groups to the reforms necessary for progress and improvement in the conditions of life.

Communist and Castro-inspired terrorists attempt to bring down those very governments which aim at progress; for progress, democratically achieved, would thwart the Communist aim of total takeover.

New nations, ineffectively ruled, turn to foreign adventure to distract their people from the inadequacies of their developmental efforts.

Nations more directly threatened by Communist takeover, in whom we have made a heavy commitment of resources and our own young men, disappoint us by the repressive nature of their regimes.

Other recipients of our assistance prove incompetent to stem their rampant inflation, or are unable to carry through effective developmental programs, or conduct their external affairs in a way that offends us.

There are successes, but the news focuses on failures, shortcomings, corruption, and difficulties. With this concentration on the troubles of the developing third of the world, a tendency has arisen to turn away from such a burdensome involvement.

Should we ever have thought this task would be easy? Never before in history has there been such an enormous undertaking. A third of the world's population is seeking to raise itself out of the poverty and squalor that has historically been its lot. The new awareness of a possibility of a better life results in impatience. Peoples of the developing countries want to have now the good things it has taken us centuries to achieve. This impatience demands that the long, slow process of development—which took centuries in Western Europe and North America—be telescoped into decades.

Yet it must be remembered that the developmental process is a new one. Never before have entire nations set out consciously to change over their societies, accelerate their economic growth, and build into modern countries that which have been, in many cases, very primitive societies.

We have been at this business only a few short years. It has been a period of learning. Little was known about the process of developing a backward country into a modern, industrial nation. Some people thought they had the answers in the oversimplifications of ideologies. The vast experiment of the Chinese Communists has now shown the disastrous consequences of that approach.

Our own beginnings in assistance were, I am afraid, dominated too much by the economic determinists. They thought that the drawing up of a good country plan was all that was needed to set a nation on the right developmental path. Only in the last few years has there come a growing awareness of the need to energize people, to change their traditional ways, to motivate them toward self-help, to build the societal and political institutions needed if a society is to sustain any economic growth.

Let me repeat, little was known about this process of development. This past decade has been a process of trial-and-error. Mistakes have been made. Gigantic failures can be pointed to. No one can say today that he knows exactly how to bring about the transformation of a society from traditional into modern ways. It is not at all certain that the task of improving conditions of life of more than a billion people can be brought about in any rational, orderly way.

We need a new realism about this task. Very probably some countries will succeed while others will continue to backslide into economic morass and political chaos. It would be easy to continue ignoring the quiet successes while loudly condemning and becoming increasingly fed up with the failures. Editorialists will have ample occasion for pointing the finger of abuse at the shortcomings of assistance. Critics of foreign aid can continue to find reasons for demanding its termination. Every other year we can call for a complete reorganization of the administering agency and its aid programs—a process that has been likened to tearing up a plant to look at its roots in order to see how it is growing.

The question is, Will this Nation, its people, and we, their elected representatives, continue to face up to the challenge that confronts us in the world? Will we continue to accept the responsibility of world leadership? Will we conduct ourselves like statesmen and remain aware of the consequences of our acts upon ourselves and our posterity? Or will we seek to turn away and to retreat into a new isolationism, to ignore the great political upheaval going on throughout the southern half of the world and not do what we can to assert our leadership?

This is not the time for us to grow weary. That period of learning we have been going through now permits us to aid the new nations in their development better than before. They, in turn, are reaching a stage of development when the rapidity of their change could cause them to go one way or the other. Complex as the task of development is, unknown as are many of its mysteries, we are now beginning to understand the social and political problems so that we will increasingly be able to assist national leaders in guiding their nations in a more democratic direction. We do not yet have all the answers. The means and instrumentalities we have to work with are, in turn, comparatively primitive compared to what is needed. Much needs to be learned and we must acquire even better methods of assisting nations along the developmental path we would like to see them go.

But we are learning. We have acquired considerable know-how in the few short years we have been in this developmental business. Yet we find the mood in considering foreign aid legislation turning increasingly negativistic. Instead of considering it in terms of the great political changes that are taking place in the world and what we must do if we are to lead them, it is approached more and more in the spirit of niggardly bookkeeping.

Let us not forget that what we do here is watched throughout the world to see whether the United States is going to continue to accept its role of leadership. Viewed from here, foreign assistance may appear to be just one of the things we are doing, in addition to getting a man on the moon, maintaining our own military defense and the one hundred and one other things that tax our energies and occupy our attention. But let us not forget that to the people in that crucial one-third of the world, to the people in those countries undergoing rapid political and economic change, foreign assistance is not just one of the things that we do. It is the thing that we do. For them, how much we assist them in their development is the most important thing.

Some of us may tire of this fact, or we may lose sight of it and turn our attention inward to our own local concerns. But we do so only with great danger to ourselves and to the future security of the free world. For if we revert to an isolationist view, if we regard foreign assistance as something extra we do only with reluctance and annoyance, we will lose what influence we have with those peoples in political ferment. If we falter, they will lose confidence in our leadership. If we seem unconcerned with the great task of development they have undertaken they will turn elsewhere. If they do not get the assistance they need, they will fall short of their goals and political chaos will result.

I have said that we have in recent years became increasingly negativistic. We continue to ask: Why do not our allies provide more assistance? When can we end assistance to this country or that country? Why must we be aiding every country throughout the world? These are fair questions, but they reveal an attitude that could lead to fatal consequences.

Our foreign policy in relation to the one area of the world in which great political decisions are working themselves out is founded on foreign assistance. It is one of the few instruments we have to influence events throughout that vast area. The many billions we spend for our own military defense may prove illusory some years from now if we scrimp and curtail and give only begrudgingly the few billions that are needed now to sustain economic development in those countries struggling to free themselves from poverty.

There is no guarantee that if we do everything that is needed, the developing countries will surely take the course we desire. There is a certainty, however, that if we fail them and the discontent of their people mounts, the course they then take will surely be detrimental to the course of freedom in the world.

We must not lose sight of the larger significance of our foreign assistance program. The tendency toward niggardliness must not be permitted to overwhelm our discussions of what is really at stake.

The foreign aid program has a greater historical dimension than perhaps any piece of legislation we consider here. Of late, its breadth and scope is tending to become bogged down in pettiness. Instead of being grateful for the opportunity to play the role of statesmen that momentous times demand of us, we tend to let our perspective be foreshortened by political pressures, till we see only the dollar signs and not the human lives involved in what we do here.

For, make no mistake about it, while I have emphasized the political consequences of failing to persevere in helping others help themselves, this is a moral matter as well. Now that we have learned so much, both from our own experience and from the recent years of experiment in foreign aid, can we lessen our efforts to pass on that knowledge to others?

Let me give just one example. This spring 100,000 to 200,000 babies and children, aged 7 months to 3 years, did not die in a measles epidemic who ordinarily would have died. The mass vaccination campaign conducted in the Republic of Upper Volta—at a cost of only 55,000 U.S. aid dollars—saved at least that many infants' lives. Now our aid program has just helped train health workers who are at this moment on their way back to extend the measles vaccination program to their own West African countries.

Our newspapers have kept us well informed of the occasional failures of the aid program, but we hear very little of such great accomplishments as this, achieved with such a small expenditure of money. It could be told a hundredfold.

This is a moral nation, and the American people would be proud to know of the many fine accomplishments of their aid program. A recent opinion poll indicated that more than half of those queried support foreign assistance. The eager response and support to such programs as the Peace Corps, Project Hope, Medico, and other activities overseas, show that the American people willingly accept their own responsibility to assist the needy peoples of the world. This is in line with America's noblest and proudest traditions.

It is not without significance that three Presidents, of both parties, have sponsored and insisted upon the need for foreign assistance legislation. They not only understood the importance of aid in the conduct of our foreign policy; they also represented all the people, and we now know they were right in believing a majority of Americans want to persevere in helping others in their developmental effort.

I do not fear that this Nation as a whole is in any danger of turning back to that isolationism that had such disastrous consequences leading up to December 7, 1941. The slow attrition of a kind of neoisolationism, eating away at our foreign assistance effort, could have equally disastrous consequences unless we pause, take another look, and view this trend against the perspective of what is at stake in the world.

Neither politically nor morally can we allow reluctance to overcome us. We must not falter in this great work. Let us keep our attention turned outward, upon the great historical changes taking place in the world, and let us willingly continue our leadership. Nothing less is worthy of our great Nation.

Mr. **FRASER**. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] deserves commendation not only for the statements which he has just made, but for the outstanding work which he has carried on in behalf of a strong program of foreign assistance or of assistance to the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, he has taken upon himself the responsibility, which is borne by every Member of this House, to help educate the public about this program. He has counseled with, and urged stronger support from, the Members of this House.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that his concern springs from a profound understanding of the responsibility of the United States in preserving freedom and in his understanding of the steps which this Nation must take in order to discharge that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his outstanding remarks.

Mr. **CAMERON**. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress we have seen unprecedented action in the history of foreign aid cuts. The axes have been unsheathed and the program has lost not only the fat, but lots of the meat. President Kennedy's revised request of $4.5 billion—down $400 million from his original request—has been slashed and reslashed until today the foreign aid authorization figure hovers at the $3.6 billion figure. This cut—20 percent—is twice as large as any previous cut in foreign assistance authorization.

I submit that it would be extremely dangerous to the security of the United States and to the security of the entire free world if additional cuts are sanctioned in the appropriation procedure. Cuts have already been made. Some of them were well-advised. The foreign aid program has been tightened up. It has been improved. Further cuts, in my judgment, do not mean further improvement. Further cuts can mean only partial paralysis in a vital arm of national security and international progress.

Mr. Speaker, there is one area of the Foreign Aid Program that is receiving particular attention this year—the number of aid recipients, the amounts of assistance they receive, and whether our aid program in individual countries ever ends. The charge usually runs something like this: "The United States is aiding every country in the world—friendly and unfriendly, developed and underdeveloped. And once an aid program is started in a country it just gets bigger and bigger and never ends." I think it is important for Members of the House to analyze this charge, since I believe close examination will reveal that the charge is a distortion of the facts.

There are three points which I would like to call to your attention:

First, the thrust of the foreign aid program is highly concentrated in a relatively small number of key countries.

Second, military assistance has been reduced and economic assistance eliminated to the developed countries of the world—many of which, incidentally, are now economically developed as a result of previous U.S. assistance.

Third, our limited foreign assistance programs in many of the newly independent countries of the world often constitute the best bargain of our foreign assistance program.

Let us look at each of these points a little more carefully.

First, our aid program is now highly concentrated. In fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that 20 countries will receive 80 percent of total economic assistance and 10 countries will receive 80 percent of total military assistance. If we examine the appropriations categories, assistance is even more concentrated. Six countries will receive 80 percent of Development Loan funds, six countries of Latin America will receive 80 percent of Alliance for Progress loans, and seven key countries will receive 80 percent of supporting assistance.

This concentration of assistance enables the United States to have a significant impact on the development and security of key and strategic countries throughout the world. Even in these countries where assistance is concentrated, the United States is not attempting to do the whole job of generating economic development or providing security. This job can only be done by the recipient countries themselves. One condition upon which our substantial country programs are based is that the country be willing and able to undertake as much of the job as possible and to insure that through self-help and reform they do an increasing part of the job. What the aid program is attempting in these countries where assistance is concentrated is to provide the critical difference in external resources between progress toward self-sustaining growth and economic stagnation and between successful establishment of internal and external security and vulnerability to Communist aggression and subversion.

Second, military assistance to developed countries has been sharply reduced and economic assistance eliminated. Twenty-three countries of the free world other than the United States are considered to be economically developed nations. Six of these countries have never received U.S. economic or military grant assistance under the foreign assistance act or predecessors. Seventeen more countries are no longer receiving economic assistance under this act. These countries include France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, among others. In fiscal year 1964, no developed countries are scheduled to receive economic assistance. A successful major effort has also been made to end military assistance to countries which are becoming sufficiently prosperous and developed. In 1953, over 75 percent of the military assistance program went to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan. In fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that only about 25 percent of our aid will go to these countries. Despite this substantial reduction, further programs will be carried out in eight developed countries in fiscal year 1964. These programs encompass completion of deliveries under previous commitments to six countries, and military training programs in these countries and two others. Successful sales programs in Europe of U.S. military equipment, some generated by incentive cost-sharing arrangements, are now making a substantial contribution toward our balance of payments.

Third, the many small programs of assistance which we mount in small and newly independent countries provide substantial returns to the long-term success of U.S. foreign policy. When we talk about the large number of countries receiving foreign assistance, we are really talking about the 45 countries which will receive only 10 percent of our economic assistance and 7 percent of our military assistance during fiscal year 1964. Limited aid programs in these countries are strongly in our national interest and are effective.

In about 21 countries, the program is almost solely technical assistance or limited capital loans. Almost all of these are in Africa. These limited technical assistance programs provide assistance in key problem areas and demonstrate U.S. interest in the progress of the people in these countries. In many cases, our limited assistance efforts make it politically feasible for European donors to provide substantially larger amounts of assistance. Most of these countries are newly independent and are just beginning to grapple with the basic problems of economic and social development.

The choices that these countries make now about how they will develop, the decisions they make about whether they will face East or West, will determine in large part the makeup of the world community in 25 or 30 years. If these countries squarely face the problems of development and take sound steps to meet them, there can be progress and peace. If instead they turn to the quick solutions offered by the Communists or engage in ultra-nationalistic adventurism, there will be constant strife and crisis.

We have learned in the last 10 years that strife in any part of the world can generate crisis between the free world and the Communist bloc. Our limited assistance programs in these countries attempt to help these nations choose the path of sound growth and development. To cut off these programs now would remove the most effective influence the United States has on the paths that these countries will take.

And one final point. There are many examples of failures in our foreign aid program. Some are old, some are new; some are false, others are true. But there is no doubt that the successes far outweigh the failures. The successes do not make headlines. But they are quietly helping to build a better and more prosperous world. The dividends on the large investment we have made abroad in our foreign aid program are only slowly beginning to come in. But they will increase steadily as the years go by, as more and more nations become self-supporting.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to the argument which has been made by opponents of the foreign aid program, that a reduction of our aid program will substantially affect our balance-of-payments problem. Indeed, in this morning's mail I received a duplicated letter which I am sure went to all Members, raising this issue again, and intimating that our late President believed that foreign aid curtailments would effectively reduce our balance-of-payments deficit. We all know this is patently not true, and we know that President Kennedy believed wholeheartedly in a vigorous follow-through on a program that has overwhelmingly demonstrated its rewards not only to this country but to the whole free world.

Now what are the facts on this balance-of-payments phony argument? In 1962 our total foreign credits were $5.3 billion and our total debits were $7.6 billion leaving a deficit on balance of payments of $2.3 billion. Of the $7.6 billion, the net debits of the important categories were as follows:

[In billions]

| | |
|---|---|
| Tourist spending (net) | —$2.0 |
| Military expenditures abroad | —2.0 |
| Long-term private investment abroad | —2.0 |
| Short-term private investment abroad | —.5 |
| Total aid outflow | —1.1 |

The last figure, "Total aid outflow," is arrived at by subtracting the amount of foreign aid money which is spent in the United States from the total expended.

It is quite obvious that tourist spending, and private investment abroad contribute more to our balance-of-payments problem than either our military expenditures or our foreign aid program.

It is important to realize that in 1962 approximately 65 cents of every dollar spent for foreign assistance was paid to U.S. businesses for U.S. goods and services sent to aid recipient nations abroad. This 65 percent never left the United

States and had no adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments.

The only foreign aid expenditures which contribute to the balance-of-payments deficit are those which are made outside of the United States.

For 1963 it is estimated that over 70 percent of the foreign assistance budget will be spent in the United States. For 1964, about 80 percent will be spent in the United States. This means that every $1 million cut from the foreign assistance budget will result in an $800,000 reduction in aid purchases from U.S. businesses, and only a $200,000 reduction in the balance-of-payments deficit.

Therefore, cuts in the U.S. foreign assistance budget for 1964 intended to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit will be only about 20 percent effective in achieving that goal.

To cut the foreign assistance budget is neither the most efficient nor the most effective way to decrease the foreign aid contribution to the balance-of-payments deficit.

The most effective way to decrease the foreign aid contribution to the balance-of-payments deficit is to insure that less of the foreign assistance moneys are spent outside the United States. Every dollar reduction in foreign aid expenditures outside the United States is 100-percent effective in reducing the deficit.

It was estimated that in 1964 under the original request for over $4.5 billion in aid only $685 million would be spent abroad under the foreign assistance program. Whatever is spent will be spent in underdeveloped nations, strengthening their economies and enabling them to increase their trade with the United States.

In fact, it is estimated that, of the diminishing amount of U.S. foreign aid money spent abroad, about 40 percent eventually returns to the United States in payment for U.S. commercial exports.

In the long run the entire foreign aid program stimulates increased U.S. exports—and increased U.S. commercial exports reduce the balance-of-payments deficit. Foreign aid money spent in the United States acquaints foreign nations with U.S. goods and services and ties foreign consumers to U.S. markets for future purchases of parts and replacements. Foreign aid money spent abroad, a steadily decreasing portion of the total foreign aid budget, stimulates developing economies and prosperous nations buy more from the United States than poor ones. Japan, now our second best customer, is a good example of the direct returns in trade produced by foreign aid.

Foreign aid, then, also represents an investment which will increase U.S. commercial exports and further reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], in yielding to me and compliment him for being one of those taking the initiative in discussing our foreign aid program today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing problems in the foreign aid program is the organization and management of the large-scale and farflung operations of the program. A most encouraging development in recent months has been the changes and improvements in the organization and administration of the foreign aid agency, especially under the leadership of David Bell.

Some of the changes and improvements which have been made are important enough to warrant our consideration at this time.

Our foreign aid agency is charged with administering activities in 80 different countries whose cultures, economies, and political conditions vary from the most primitive to the most sophisticated, and whose importance to the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives varies from the peripheral to the absolutely critical. These programs diverge in content from the relatively simple, such as the provision of technical assistance in establishing small pottery factories, to the highly complex blending into well-conceived and carefully balanced country programs—of such diverse ingredients as food-for-peace assistance, budgetary support, technical cooperation, military aid, the engineering and financing of major capital projects, and the stimulation of local political climates conducive to investment by U.S. private enterprise.

It is not surprising, given this plethora of means and ends, that mistakes have been made in the past. In any comparably bold and broad-scope enterprise which is new, occasional mistakes are an inevitable part of the learning process.

My point today, Mr. Speaker, is that foreign aid is beginning to bear fruit in the less-developed countries, and that the foreign aid program is more soundly conceived and better managed than ever before. Let me elaborate.

The reorganization of foreign aid since 1961 has gone through three phases. The first phase involved the absorption of the Development Loan Fund, military assistance and the economic assistance functions of ICA into one semi-autonomous agency within the State Department known as AID—the Agency for International Development; the hiring and firing of several hundred people; and the development of a new organizational structure in which strong regional bureaus were given primary line responsibility for integrated country planning as well as program implementation. That phase of the reorganization was completed more than a year ago.

The second phase of the reorganization, which was completed in 1962, consisted essentially of a redesigning of the country programing process, a weeding out of marginal projects, and a reexamination of substantive policies. Such new policies as the "self-help" doctrine, the stress on long-term planning by aid recipients, and the emphasis upon concentration of AID's efforts in each country into a smaller number of pivotal economic sectors were evolved during this phase.

The third phase of the Agency's reorganization was started last January and has been completed during the past month. This phase, known within AID as the implementation project, has consisted of a top-to-bottom overhaul of AID's methods of doing business. The project has been a final and necessary step in the creation of AID as a workable, unified, going concern.

Before the implementation project, AID was the inheritor of two sets of policies and procedures—that of the Development Loan Fund and that of the International Cooperation Administration. The two were in many instances inconsistent or contradictory. Large gaps existed where there were no directives at all, such as loan-financed commodity procurement. Other areas existed where old directives were still in force but were in conflict with new substantive doctrines. Still other areas existed where the old directives were substantively adequate but were organizationally obsolete and, by their terms, distributed functions and responsibilities among offices which no longer existed. The net result was confusion, inefficiency, a poor utilization of the Agency's top management resources, low morale, and the reduced overall effectiveness that these weaknesses would make inevitable.

The implementation project sought to simplify, rationalize, create where necessary, and codify the major operating policies and procedures that would govern AID in the future. It did so principally through the efforts of three task forces working in the fields, respectively, of capital, program, and technical assistance. Each of the three task forces wrote a consolidated compact up-to-date book of policy directives, procedures, and substantive guidance; designed mechanisms for the improvement of executive control and the elimination of unnecessary clearances; and framed program selection and implementation policies that would accurately reflect new AID objectives. All three groups devised methods of speeding up and simplifying operations.

Two other major task forces were created to consider problems of procurement and reports coordination. The first group initiated creation of a permanent procurement policy staff and then forwarded a series of policy and procedural recommendations to the new staff. The second directed the taking of an inventory of existing reports and recommended creation of a Reports Coordination Committee, which has since been created, to devise and monitor reporting policies in the future.

So much for the broad outline of the new push for efficiency in AID. Let me now get down to the specifics of Mr. Bell's management accomplishments.

Except for procurement and reporting, both of which are involved in nearly ever phase of AID activity, major foreign assistance has been divided into three distinct categories—program assistance, technical assistance, and capital assistance. Capital assistance consists of dollar financing made available for the construction, equipping, or alteration of physical facilities such as roads, dams, factories, telecommunications networks, and the like. AID's definition of capital assistance also encompasses studies to determine the feasibility of such projects and includes dollar assistance provided to local development banks and intermediate credit institutions.

The new procedures that have been developed for capital assistance apply equally whether it is loan- or grant-financed. Under the procedures, AID has given increased authority to approve capital activities to the four regional assistant administrators. Mr. Bell's personal approval is required only for large or particularly sensitive projects.

The manual orders also provide a framework for giving increased responsibility to missions for the planning and implementation of capital activities. They permit the day-to-day field monitoring of ongoing projects to proceed with less Washington interference than previously.

For the first time, a system of preliminary reviews has been developed to assure that AID staff time is not expended in detailed consideration of proposals which might be financed by other agencies or which do not fall within overall U.S. strategy goals. After the preliminary reviews—if their conclusions have been favorable—an intensive review is made by a specially selected team of experts—the Capital Assistance Committee—which explores all aspects of the project and records its findings and recommendations in a Capital Assistance Paper.

This paper, upon approval, becomes the agency's plan of action for negotiating the capital assistance agreement and subsequently implementing the project. Part of the paper, a so-called implementation plan, evaluates the applicant's technical and administrative capacities to carry out the project, sets forth the various monitoring actions that will have to be taken by AID, and states who will have to take them. This should permit more orderly capital project administration.

The new implementation project manual orders also contain substantive guidance to individuals involved in the capital assistance review process and list criteria to govern many of the decisions that have to be made. In addition, they contain illustrative capital assistance agreements and letters of implementation setting forth such technical matters as reporting and accounting requirements and applicable shipping, pricing, and insurance regulations.

Existence of these illustrative provisions is certain to simplify and accelerate the complicated process of drafting agreements, and it will tend to keep to a minimum unnecessary variances in AID's position from one negotiation to the next.

Policies have also been established to govern the review of borrowers and grantees engineering and construction contracts involved in capital assistance. Although the Agency's right to approve or disapprove such contracts constitutes its major safeguards against poor administration by borrowers and grantees, AID had never before developed standards and criteria to govern that review.

The process of reviewing and approving technical assistance projects has also been improved. Selected projects may now be approved, subject to continued availability of funds, on a life-of-the-project rather than an annual basis. This change should permit better advance planning.

Moreover, substantive project approvals have been separated from final funding approvals. This change is particularly significant, for under the previous system missions were reluctant to proceed with the detailed planning of technical assistance activities until they had received firm allotments for them. In the past several years, it has been October before AID appropriations legislation cleared Congress. A month has then been required for deciding where to absorb the cuts required, and this has delayed firm technical assistance programing decisions until December or January. This has left only a 6-month period of the obligation of available funds.

In the future, projects will be approved within AID in advance of the granting of permission to obligate. The AID missions will be expected to make all preobligations plans and arrangements earlier, and, therefore, to achieve a more orderly administration of technical assistance.

The requirements for careful advance planning of technical assistance projects have been tightened through the implementation project, while checklists, guidelines, and criteria have been prepared to improve the quality of such planning. Before any technical assistance activity is approved for obligation, the AID Mission Director, under the new rules, must be satisfied that an adequate work plan exists. In this plan, which is analogous to the implementation plan for capital assistance, successive activity targets are established against which progress can later be measured. Also, the various possible methods of achieving project objectives are weighed against each other and choices are made as to how to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run, possibly the most significant innovation of the implementation project's technical assistance working group is the requirement for a new "Technical Assistance Project History and Analysis Report." This triennial report from the field will fall due on the third anniversary of each project's inception or at the termination of the project if it is of less than 3 years' duration. The report will contain a searching analysis of all aspects of the project since its inception. In the report, the results achieved through the project will be measured against the purposes for which the project was established and the targets of accomplishments that were set for it. Causes of difficulty and the success or failure of the various efforts to overcome them will be treated in detail, as will the effects on the project of host-country attitudes, political considerations, and other relevant factors, whether or not foreseen.

These activity reports hold promise for a steady improvement in the administration of technical assistance. But more important, they promise to become an invaluable research tool. If properly used by AID, the triennial reports could be a primary means of improving the state of the art of transferring technical skills from one country to another.

AID defines "program assistance" as the provision of resources, whether commodities, cash, or local currency, for the purpose of producing a fiscal rather than a physical result. In program assistance, AID's primary concern is the impact achieved by the totality of the resources provided rather than the specific use to which they are put.

A new process for approving levels of program assistance has been devised and put into practice through the implementation project. Provision now is made in AID for concurrent consideration, country by country, of all available forms of program assistance in the light of economic and political analyses contained in the Agency's country assistance plans and long range assistance strategies.

To assist AID's economists and program officers in preparing the types of analysis that the effective use of program assistance requires, criteria have been developed to govern selection among the various forms of assistance, and guidelines have been prepared for the making of balance of payments and internal financial analyses. Both the guidelines and criteria are new.

Also new is a mechanism—the Program Assistance Approval Document—for obtaining final approval for the immediate obligation of resources for program assistance. Although planning levels of program assistance are determined during overall country analyses, the exact timing, form of, and procedures for providing such assistance is not settled until the PAAD stage. Again for the first time, clear criteria have been developed to indicate which program assistance proposals require Mr. Bell's personal approval and which do not.

Commodities purchased with foreign exchange provided through U.S. program assistance are subject to numerous requirements imposed by AID. Because it is not practical for AID to deal directly with every foreign importer who spends U.S.-supplied currency, the agency imposes various legal requirements on the countries themselves and on U.S. suppliers. These requirements relate to such subjects as ocean shipping on U.S.-flag vessels, pricing, the permissible sources from which commodities may be procured, marking and labeling to indicate U.S. financing, and the provision of notification by the purchaser to American small businesses. These requirements are not new, but the procedures for enforcing them are.

After the merger of ICA and DLF, no usable procedures existed to govern loan-financed program assistance. Those procedures which did govern grant-financed program assistance were difficult to apply in situations where the supplier's certificate could not be used. These shortcomings, bothersome enough normally, were increased by the United States own balance of payments difficulties.

The problems have now been alleviated. The Implementation Project devised a system of three alternative commodity financing procedures which will permit AID to provide appropriately restricted program assistance to countries with varying degrees of administrative, import, and foreign exchange controls. The system will govern all commodity financing in the future.

Another field in which AID has made major improvements during the past year is the vital field of procurement.

Because AID is not staffed to perform all the functions which it is capable of financing, procurement of the skills and resources of American businesses, universities, and other private institutions for use in the program, is a major and important activity. Equally important though less easy to control, is the monitoring by AID of vast amounts of U.S.-financed procurement by foreign importers or by borrowers and grantees. Through the Implementation Project, a running start was given to the new Procurement Policy Staff in its efforts to rationalize, streamline, and codify AID's procurement polices and procedures.

As in other fields, previously significant operative distinctions based on the method of financing the procurement—whether loan or grant—were eliminated. Also, many obsolete distinctions between rules applicable to the procurement of commodities and those applicable to the procurement of services were eliminated. As now constructed, AID's procurement rules are simpler and more effective than before. They reflect distinctions based upon the identity of the procuring entity—whether AID itself, a borrower, another Government agency, or a foreign importer—and thereby also reflect the different types and degrees of control that AID is able to exert over the contracting process in each situation.

AID has revised and shortened its regulation 1, under which commodities financed through program assistance must be purchased. The regulation has been simplified, and its provisions have been brought into closer conformity with established private enterprise trade practices.

Also, AID has codified and tightened its policy regarding the permissible sources of commodities and services which are purchased with AID funds. The new directives will keep to the barest minimum America's dollar losses attributable to the AID program.

In the procurement field, as in the others, emphasis has been placed upon greater speed of action. AID's requisitioning documents, the Project Implementation Orders, have been redesigned with this objective in mind. Provision has been made for the advance submission to Washington of such documents in "worksheet" form when the requisitioning mission lacks the expertise to draft adequate specifications. In order to simplify and speed up the negotiating process, requisitioning missions now are made to spell out in far greater detail than formerly the specific forms of logistic support that they intend to provide or arrange for each contractor.

A new series of mechanisms has been developed in the past year to accelerate the procurement of AID-financed commodities by other U.S. Government agencies, principally the General Services Administration. Now, delivery schedules are established, better followup is provided, and special priorities are attached to procurement related to public safety activities and the counterinsurgency program in Vietnam.

There are many other impressive accomplishments of AID's implementation project in the field of procurement, but I shall not list them all in detail here. It will suffice to say that at least half a dozen studies of key procurement issues are now in progress and that one such study already completed—relating to the acquisition of U.S. Government-owned excess property—has resulted in a single consolidated directive which supersedes no less than 22 former policy and procedural papers.

The achievements I have been discussing do not constitute a comprehensive listing of AID's management reforms in the past year. The implementation project was just one part of Mr. Bell's housecleaning operation. Many other significant improvements were made.

For example, full-scale mission reorganizations were accomplished in Vietnam, Taiwan, Jordan, and Pakistan. Internal mission procedures were totally overhauled and revamped in India, Taiwan, and Laos.

In six countries in Africa, the State Department, AID, and the U.S. Information Agency, in the interests of economy, pooled their administrative resources to create what are now called Consolidated Administrative Management Organizations. In 13 other African countries, the AID effort is conducted as an integral part of the embassy operation to avoid the necessity of having a separate AID mission.

I am informed that in the coming year, AID expects to undertake thoroughgoing reviews of personnel policies and practices, to examine and possibly develop a new system of controlling staffing levels, to vigorously pursue with State and USIA the development of common housekeeping procedures overseas, and to increase its utilization of the services of other U.S. Government agencies in carrying out AID programs. If these efforts are pursued as vigorously as the implementation project, prospects for even greater streamlining of AID in the future are good indeed.

These management improvements in AID show that the agency has come a long way under the leadership of David Bell. They rank, in my opinion, on a par with the striking organizational and management improvements made in the Defense Department under the leadership of Robert McNamara. At a time when so many questions are being raised about foreign aid, I think we should give credit where credit is due. Foreign aid is still difficult to administer, but it is being administered now with care and skill, and I join my colleagues in commending the officials of the program and especially Mr. Bell, for their good work.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans are aware of the tremendous good performed by food for peace. Too often, however, this unique and monumental effort is not connected in their thinking to the foreign aid program, the value of which we are discussing here.

Americans may know of such projects as the Rihand Dam in India, a huge development financed in large part by funds generated by the sales of our surplus food. They may know about the imaginative colonization and school building projects in Bolivia, made possible by the direct donations and sales of American food. They may have heard about reforestation projects in Algeria and Tunisia, carried on by voluntary agencies using our food.

The American people certainly should know that their agricultural products are feeding 40 million children throughout the world, and that food for peace is helping to relieve the suffering in devastated Haiti, Trinidad-Tobago and other lands stricken by disaster.

What many people don't realize, however, is that these achievements and operations of food for peace could not be accomplished with maximum benefit and effectiveness unless they were integrated into a sound, overall development program.

These people may consider food for peace and foreign aid as two separate things. They say, "I am for feeding hungry people, but I am against foreign aid."

This, of course, may express a certain type of charitable spirit but it misses the point. The highest type of charity—if you call it that—does not consist merely of furnishing a cup of milk and a dish of bulgur wheat to a hungry man, but of providing the means to eliminate the need for the man to require charity.

The fact is, food for peace—aside from emergency use—achieves its objectives faster and more completely when it is brought within a program of planning. Capital development and technical assistance, principal elements of foreign assistance programs, are instrumental in helping food for peace achieve its objectives. Take, for example, the Republic of China—Taiwan. We consider that country to be approaching the threshold of self-sustaining economy. It has made good use of its food for peace. But it did this within an overall economic plan that took in capital development and technical assistance. Israel is another country to which we can point both as an example of effective capital development, technical assistance, and uses of food for peace. But those were all used together in a plan—not separately.

Japan, where the total amount of economic aid was $3.6 million, is a spectacular example. Not only did she use food for peace effectively but planned her reconstruction and development to the extent that all of them together contributed to an amazing postwar growth. Food for peace changed Japanese eating habits; today she is our largest customer for agricultural products. But capital development assistance also was necessary for her to achieve this stage.

The point to be made about these three countries, where foreign aid has achieved success, is that food for peace and the other elements of assistance were integrated. Food was used as a resource, along with money and skills. One worked with and for the others. Had they been separate, we would not have the results we see today.

Let me illustrate this point further by citing some agriculture export figures for three countries: Greece, Israel and Taiwan.

These countries have received extensive aid, including food for peace. Significantly, these three countries now are buying more foodstuffs from the United States through unassisted commercial sales. Greece, for instance, has increased her imports from $2 million in 1958 to $4.3 million in 1962. Israel increased hers from $7.6 million in 1958 to $17.5 million in 1962. And Taiwan's commercial agricultural imports rose from $3.1 million in 1958 to $24.5 million in 1962.

We are still shipping a great deal of Public Law 480 food to these countries, but the value of an effective integrated foreign aid program is illustrated by the fact that commercial trade has grown—a direct benefit to the United States.

Those who support food for peace have an enormous stake in an effective foreign assistance program. I do not mean simply finding better ways and means of disposing of our current surpluses or what we can do to feed more people faster. What should be of concern is the future—endeavoring to bring about a multiplication of the Greece-Israel-Taiwan story. The underdeveloped world today is the great market for American products tomorrow. The people of these countries, however, cannot become paying customers unless they are able to increase their incomes and purchasing power. Food for peace alone cannot do this. It can be of immense help, however, if there is a strong, effective, planned foreign assistance program that is designed to help people help themselves.

From a humanitarian standpoint, our aim is not merely to dispense charity but to offer the people of the underdeveloped lands a chance to make a living in dignity and freedom. But this is impossible if capital in the form of loans, does not create the industries to provide the jobs; if technical assistance is not available to provide the training.

It does little permanent good, it seems to me, to feed and clothe a man and provide no opportunity for him to live decently, to be able to educate his children, to become self-sustaining. It is fine to feed 40 million children, but these children ought to have the opportunity to go to school, to be taught by qualified teachers, to read good textbooks—and to look forward to a meaningful and productive life.

A strong AID program provides the framework that enables food for peace to achieve such long-lasting results. This means that those who believe in food for peace, who seek to make it significant and effective, have a vital stake in this legislation now before Congress. Severe cuts in AID authorizations and appropriations will automatically slow down the rate of economic growth of the less developed countries. They will reduce the demand for agricultural commodities as well as other products.

A Public Law 480 program that has as its aim merely the disposal of surplus foods and fibers is not in the long-range interests of the United States. Neither is the mere increase in the number of people fed. But a food-for-peace program that brings permanent benefits, that helps other countries become self-sustaining under freedom is very much in the interests of the United States.

This cannot be achieved by itself. It cannot be achieved by saying, "I will feed hungry people but I'm against foreign aid." It can be achieved when coupled with a strong foreign assistance program that has the means and the flexibility to be an influence in enhancing the security of the free world.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most hopeful developments in the whole foreign aid picture is the newly established Central American Common Market embracing Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Costa Rica.

Until 1821 these countries, comprising an area slightly larger than California, were administered by Spain as a single unit. Fragmentation set in, following their struggle for independence. After 25 unsuccessful attempts during the next century and a quarter to restore political union, the 5 countries decided in 1950 to approach union economically rather than politically. A series of treaties culminated in a five-nation General Treaty of Economic Integration in December of 1960, which Panama is now seeking to join as an associate member.

Recognizing that the first important step was to create a regional free trade area, the signatories pledged immediate free trade benefits for about 95 percent of the items on a large trade list. This resulted in free trade becoming effective within the region on some 1,200 items the day the treaty was ratified.

They further obligated themselves to eliminate the remaining 5 percent of intercountry tariffs and to establish a common external tariff by 1966. Negotiations to establish the common external tariff schedule already are completed on 90 percent of the items. Trade within the region has risen from less than 5 percent of the total in 1959 to more than 8 percent in 1961, and preliminary figures indicate that it rose to above 10 percent of the total in 1962.

The treaty further set up the Central American Bank for Economic Integration to finance and promote integrated economic development. Each country pledged to subscribe $4 million with $2 million to be paid upon ratification of the treaty.

A Central American clearinghouse now is handling 60 percent of all settlements between the five countries in much the same manner as our Federal Reserve System handles settlements between regions of the United States.

The concept of regional integration has now been extended to education with the establishment of a Council of Central American Universities to combine the few institutions of higher learning into an integrated university system. Universities in each of the five countries are being assigned a dominant field of knowledge in which to specialize, and the doors of all will be open to students from throughout Central America.

The United States has taken a number of steps to support these developments. In 1961, the United States made a $5 million loan and a $2 million grant to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration for relending for projects of regional interest. An additional million was granted in 1962 for intrastructure and industrial feasibility studies.

In 1962 the Agency for International Development established in Guatemala a Regional Office for Central America and Panama—ROCAP—to provide better U.S. support for Central American economic integration.

ROCAP works closely with the Permanent Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration in Guatemala City, the operating group responsible for implementing the treaties of 1958 and 1960, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, the Superior Council of Central American Universities, and the Organization of Central American States. ROCAP also maintains liaison with the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America office in Mexico City which has been closely connected with the integration movement for the past 10 years.

ROCAP is involved in planning for expansion of manufacturing and service industries to supply the growing internal markets of Central America. Further assistance is being given to diversification of export products and development of a skilled labor force required for industrial growth.

In the area of social development ROCAP currently is concerned with textbooks—2,200,000 free readers were distributed to about 800,000 first- and second-grade public school children in the 5 republics during the first half of 1963. These are the first of a series of Spanish-language textbooks developed and distributed through the Central American Regional Textbook Development Center in Guatemala. A 5-year plan will embrace all subjects taught through the sixth grade.

ROCAP is cooperating in a mobile rural health program. This program will provide through mobile health units curative and preventive medical service. Also it will organize citizen committees to improve fields allied to health such as water supplies, sewage disposal, and health education.

The Central America Common Market is a dramatic example of the fruits of helping others to help themselves. It is one of an increasing number of foreign aid success stories which do such credit to the United States and its people.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, to say that there is considerable confusion about the so-called foreign aid pipeline is to compete for the mythical understatement of the year award. More words are spoken and less light cast on this subject than on any other area of our complex foreign aid program. Some Congressmen tell us that the foreign aid pipeline is a huge mysterious cornucopia from which foreign aid officials may draw funds according to their whim. We are told that in calculating the foreign aid pipeline total, we must include the unexpended balances for the Peace Corps and our Cuban refugee program. We must include $200 million we hold in callable stock in the Inter-American Development Bank. We must count the unexpended balance of the Department of the Army's administration of the Ryukyu Islands and several other programs not authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act. We are told that the foreign aid program could run for years off the foreign aid pipeline. We are told that the foreign aid program is committing the unmitigated sin of funding activities in advance.

I have made an effort to inform myself about the nature and size of the foreign aid pipeline.

From this analysis, I have drawn a few conclusions which I hope will be of some value to others who have been similarly troubled by the foreign aid pipeline. This is admittedly a complex area, but the following basic points seem clear:

First. Almost 95 percent of the foreign aid pipeline consists of funds already committed to finance specific activities being undertaken by the foreign aid program.

Second. Most of these funds will pay for American goods and services not yet delivered.

Third. These pipeline funds cannot be used for other purposes—such as running the program for 2 or more years—without reneging on the activities for which they are presently committed.

Fourth. The foreign aid pipeline is not inordinately large for a program of this kind. It has grown in the past primarily because of the shift from grants to loans. The pipeline is now beginning to level off.

Fifth. The foreign aid program, as the Congress has developed it, could not be operated sensibly without such a pipeline.

Let us examine each of these points a little more carefully:

First. Almost 95 percent of the foreign aid pipeline consists of funds committed to finance specific activities being undertaken by the foreign aid program. Unexpended balances for the foreign aid program totaled about $6.9 billion at the end of fiscal 1963. This includes $117 million in unused contingency funds which have been returned to the Treasury and about $260 million in investment guaranty reserves which are only technically in the pipeline. Giving proper consideration to these two factors reveals that the foreign aid pipeline level remained about constant from fiscal 1962 to fiscal 1963.

The pipeline arises from the following process: First, Congress appropriates funds for the foreign aid program in a given fiscal year. Then, the foreign aid program commits funds to finance specific activities. The program expends some funds for these activities and for other activities previously authorized. At the end of the fiscal year, some funds have been spent. These are no longer in the pipeline. Some funds have been commited to finance specific activities, but not spent. These funds constiute most of the pipeline. Finally, some funds appropriated have not been committed for any specific purpose. These funds—small in amount—are largely available for other uses if the Congress determines they are needed for the following fiscal year's program and reappropriates them.

At the end of fiscal 1963, more than 90 percent of the pipeline, about $6.4 billion, consisted of funds committed to finance specific activities and not available for other uses. About $500 million was not committed to any specific activity. Included in this $500 million is the $117 million in unused contingency funds which AID returned to the Treasury. Also included is about $120 million in unobligated reserves being built up in the investment guarantee program. Although these funds are included in the pipeline total, they are obviously quite different in nature from the rest of the pipeline because there is no intention that these funds will ever be spent.

Second. Most of these funds will pay for American goods and services not yet delivered. Committed pipeline funds are set aside to pay U.S. manufacturers, merchants, universities, etc., for specific goods and services. Some of these funds will pay for military weapons and equipment—turbines and generators for power dams being built overseas—equipment purchased from American manufacturers to be delivered to private businesses and manufacturers overseas—the services of the skilled professional faculty of American universities.

Third. These pipeline funds cannot be used for other purposes—without reneging on the activities for which they are presently committed. It is not very difficult to see that if these committed pipeline funds are used to "run the program for a year or two," that is, to pay for new activities and different activities, they will not be available to pay for the activities to which they are presently committed. If the foreign aid critics have discovered a way that a single amount of money can be spent to pay for two separate pieces of equipment, I hope they will come forward. As far as I know, it cannot be done.

Fourth. The foreign aid pipeline is not inordinately large for a program of this kind. It has grown in the past primarily because of the shift from grants to loans. The pipeline is now beginning to level off. The foreign aid program is financing construction of roads, hydroelectric dams, and water-supply systems overseas. It is supplying military weapons and equipment to free nations to help sustain the security of the free world. It is engaging the services of American universities to work for 2 or 3 years overseas transferring knowledge and ideas to those who would help themselves build a better life. These things take time to complete. Funds are only expended as work is completed. Therefore, there must be a pipeline.

Why has the pipeline grown? The increase in the pipeline total is due primarily to the change in emphasis in our foreign aid program from grant assistance to dollar repayable loans. Congress was instrumental in this change; it is sound. In 1960, less than one-third of our economic assistance was in loans. Today, 60 percent of economic assistance is loans.

Development loans are used largely for long-term projects; setting up agricultural credit systems so farmers can finance the new tools and seeds they need, building irrigation and power dams that provide a wider base on which a developing country can build its agriculture and its industry. When such loans are authorized, funds are added to the pipeline. Only as actual expenditure occurs for goods delivered and services performed are these funds removed from the pipeline. It can take 5 years or more to build a hydroelectric dam. That is true whether the dam is in Tunisia or in the United States of America. That means that for 5 years, there will be funds in the pipeline to pay for the American equipment and material used in the dam.

Here is an example of a project now in the AID pipeline:

> In Korea, AID is helping to construct a 132-megawatt thermal powerplant to expand that country's supply of electricity. A $20.9-million AID loan for purchase of American-made powerplant equipment was made in 1962, and construction of the plant is going ahead on schedule.
>
> By April 30, 1963, about $14 million of the loan had been paid out for equipment delivered and work completed to date. The balance, about $7.9 million, is part of the aid pipeline.

Expenditures under this loan and others are now increasing. I am told that in the next 2 years the expenditure rate on loans underway will begin to equal loan commitments for new projects. Other parts of the pipeline, such as balances for development grants and military assistance, have already leveled off and started to decline. During fiscal 1963, decreases in other parts of the pipeline just about offset the increases due to new loan obligations.

Fifth. The foreign aid program, as the Congress has developed it, could not be operated sensibly without such a pipeline. Some critics have charged the foreign aid program is funding activities in advance. This charge is absolutely true. Prudence requires that foreign assistance activities be funded in advance. Let us look at what would happen if AID were to authorize a $20 million loan for a project, but only commit $2 million needed for the first year's expenditure. The pipeline could be sharply reduced—and many more projects begun. However, the next year, we in the Congress would be faced with a simple unsatisfactory choice; to provide funds to continue these projects or to renege on U.S. Government contracts and leave projects only partially completed. Sound administration dictates that the total amount for which the United States is committed be earmarked in advance.

I have taken some time and gone into some detail, but I hope that we have at least taken one step toward putting the mysterious evil pipeline to rest.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the needs of our foreign assistance program is to provide the public with a better understanding of the way in which the program operates. For example, most Americans have had the experience of borrowing money, and they understand the often complicated procedures followed in the lending of money. They have personally experienced the way in which loan officers in banks and other financial institutions go about making sure that the loan is bankable. They know that when you lend money you have to make sure that there is some reasonable prospect of repayment, that the loan will be effective in relation to the purposes for which it is made, and that the loan is not out of line with the existing financial obligations of the borrower.

Very few people are aware of the similarities between personal loans of this type and loans made under the foreign aid program to other governments. I suspect some people are critical of the foreign aid program, in fact, because they do not appreciate the thorough, businesslike way in which foreign aid loans are made.

More than half of the foreign aid funds during the past fiscal year were made for loans to the other governments under the development loan program. These loans are intended to promote the economic development of needy countries, with emphasis upon long-range plans and programs for developing economic resources and increasing productivity capacities.

The standards which must be met in the case of each development loan are set forth in the Foreign Assistance Act as well as in the Agency's manual orders which have recently been revised after extensive review and study. Perhaps, the scrutiny to which each loan proposal is subject can best be illustrated by following the processing of a loan through the various steps in the process.

Suppose AID is requested to finance a fertilizer plant in a particular country. The process of review starts with the filing of an application with our AID mission in the country where the plant is to be built. Under AID requirements, the application has to be supported by a study of the technical and economic feasibility of the project. This study is designed to provide the basis on which the Agency can determine whether the requirements of section 611 of the Foreign Assistance Act are met. Section 611 requires that engineering, financial and other plans necessary to carry out the project and a reasonably firm estimate of the cost of the project to the United States shall be completed before a loan agreement is made.

The preliminary engineering required as part of the feasibility study must be performed by a firm whose qualifications and experience are found acceptable by the Agency's staff of engineers.

In addition to the preliminary engineering study, the proposal for financing must include a demonstration of the economic soundness of the project and a specific plan for implementing the project. This plan specifies the means by which the applicant expects to carry out the project, how the required professional services are to be provided for detailed design, procurement, construction, and initial operation and a timetable for the accomplishment of the project. The implementation plan also includes a specific plan for the management and operation of the proposed project in sufficient detail to permit AID to appraise the experience and competence of the proposed management officials.

The application is first examined by an AID staff expert in the field of capital development to determine the priority of the project within the local country's own development plan and its priority in relation to the overall U.S. assistance strategy in the country and alternative activities which AID might otherwise finance. For example, in the case of the request to finance a fertilizer project, it may be noted that one of the local country's principal needs is to increase the productivity of its agricultural efforts. The country's development plan may call for increasing indigenous production of fertilizer to a certain level but the development of such productive output may be lagging. The result may be that the country, already seriously pressed for foreign exchange, must either spend substantial sums of its scarce foreign exchange resources to import fertilizer or curtail the utilization of fertilizer within the country and thus, in turn, to curtail agricultural output. At the same time, our assistance strategy, for both economic as well as political reasons, may call for a major effort in such country to assist in improving its agricultural sector and our technicians in the field may be seeking to encourage local farmers to increase their utilization of fertilizer.

The initial AID review of the project also examines the anticipated impact in the local country of AID financing of the proposed project and the efforts of the applicant to obtain the requested financing from other free world sources. Finally, this initial review includes a preliminary appraisal of the technical and economic and financial feasibility of the project and of the applicant's ability to execute, operate and maintain the project.

The findings of this preliminary review are submitted to the head of the AID regional bureau which has responsibility for the country concerned, as well as to the various staff offices of the Agency. The Agency also submits the proposal to the Export-Import Bank to determine if the Bank is interested in financing the project. The Export-Import Bank is given first call on financing projects submitted to AID.

If the regional administrator determines that the project warrants further study, a team of experts is assigned to review the proposal in detail. This team generally consists of a loan officer, engineer, and lawyer. Each of these staff personnel is familiar with the special conditions of the country in which the project is to be undertaken, as well as with his own field of professional work.

This team thoroughly studies the economic and technical feasibility of the project. In the case of our fertilizer project, the engineering analysis will include a review of the reliability of the cost estimates, the soundness of the site selected for the plant, the availability of the necessary raw materials, transportation and power, the availability of the necessary labor and the experience and competence of the proposed management to implement and operate the project.

The economic analysis will focus on the economic soundness of the proposed plant. For example, an examination of the cost estimates may show that inadequate provision has been made for escalations in local costs. An examination of the technical plans may show the need to obtain firm assurances from the local government that the electric power required to operate the plant will be available when needed, or that an agreement must be obtained from the local government to build the necessary port facilities to handle the import of the raw materials required by the plant.

The economic analysis will also cover the projected profitability of the project, taking into account the prospective demand for the type of fertilizer to be produced at the plant as well as the prospective output of fertilizer from other indigenous sources. There will also be a review of the ability of the applicant to service its debt and of the local country to provide the foreign exchange necessary to repay the U.S. loan in dollars to determine if there are reasonable prospects of repayment of the loan. In addition, an assessment will be made of the possible effects of the loan upon the U.S. economy with special reference to areas of substantial labor surplus. Finally, consideration will be given to the extent to which the country to be benefited by the loan is being responsive to the vital economic, political, and social concerns of its people and is demonstrating a determination to take effective self-help measures. This latter judgment requires an assessment of a broad range of factors over a continuing period of time and not just at any particular moment. Ultimately, it is, in the best sense of the word, a political judgment which is made by the highest officials of the executive branch.

The findings and recommendations of the staff team are then submitted to the head of the AID regional bureau concerned in the form of a detailed loan paper. He, in consultation with his senior assistants and the Agency staff offices concerned with lending policy and program coordination, decide whether the requested financing should be provided.

If the requested loan is over $2,500,000, the proposal is then submitted to the Development Loan Committee. This is a committee made up of the Administrator of AID the Agency's Assistant Administrator for Development Finance and Private Enterprise, and representatives of the State and Treasury Departments and the Export-Import Bank. All loans, whether or not submitted to the Development Loan Committee, are reviewed by the Treasury Department's National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. If these two groups have no objection, the regional administrator of AID will authorize the loan. If, however, the loan is for more than $10 million or presents a significant policy issue, only the Administrator of AID may authorize the loan.

Once the loan is approved, the staff committee which analyzed the proposal is assigned the task of implementing the loan. A loan agreement is prepared and various conditions precedent to disbursement specified. Included among such conditions is the requirement, under section 112 of the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1963, that all contracts financed by the loan be approved by AID, and that all contractors selected by the borrower to perform such contracts also be approved by the Agency. In the case of a loan to finance the construction of a plant, AID generally requires that an independent U.S. consulting engineering firm be retained to prepare the design specifications and supervise the construction of the plant. This requirement serves to insure that projects financed by AID are soundly engineered and constructed.

In the case of the fertilizer project in question, AID financing will be made available to finance the dollar costs of the U.S. engineering and construction services and of equipment procured from the United States. Pursuant to section 112, AID will approve each of the U.S. firms selected to perform these services and supply the equipment as well as the terms of the actual contracts. Included in this review will be the reasonableness of the price, the adequacy of the performance guarantees offered by the U.S. suppliers and the scope of services to be provided by such suppliers. Once the conditions precedent to disbursement are met, AID will authorize the borrower to open letters of credit at U.S. banks in favor of the U.S. suppliers. Payment will be made directly to the U.S. suppliers by the bank against documents specified by AID.

Once the conditions precedent to disbursement have been met, members of the regional bureau are assigned to monitor the project. Progress reports prepared by the borrower are regularly received and reviewed and staff members make periodic visits to the site for a firsthand check on the progress of the project. In addition, periodic financial statements are required and reviewed. At least once a year a report is prepared by the Agency staff reviewing the current status of the project and summarizing the progress made during the year.

The success of this rigorous procedure for the making of each foreign aid loan is demonstrated by the excellent lending record of the foreign aid program. Of the total of $24.7 billion of U.S. credits to foreign governments, $9 billion have been repaid as of June 30, 1963. Of the $15.7 billion outstanding as of June 30, 1963, only $190 million in principal and interest was due and unpaid for 90 days or more. The bulk of this is owed by countries which are not now receiving foreign aid.

This is an excellent lending record by any standard. These facts show that repayment on loans made under the foreign aid program has been just as good or better than the repayment record for regular commercial loans or for personal loans in the United States itself. One of the reasons that the lending record of the foreign aid program has been so good is that rigorous standards and procedures are followed in the making of loans by the officials of our foreign aid program.

The foreign aid program is not, of course, a a straight commercial enterprise, and should not be judged simply by the normal principles for evaluating a commercial lending operation. But I think it is comforting and reassuring to note that in the making of loans, which is such a central part of the effort to help other countries to develop, our Government is doing such a good job of lending money in a responsible and effective manner.

---

## THE GRAVE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 9 of this year I brought to the attention of the House the grave situation in the Middle East, expressing my concern over the intensification of the arms buildup in Egypt and the persistent hostility of President Nasser of Egypt to the democracy of Israel. The situation in the Middle East has not changed. The arms buildup in Egypt continues as does Nasser's opposition to Israel's very existence.

On May 9 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 152. Senators HUMPHREY, GRUENING, HART, McCARTHY, CLARK, and MORSE have introduced a companion resolution in the other body. The resolution states:

> That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States use his good offices with the states of the area to negotiate with them either through the United Nations, or directly, an agreement that nuclear weapons will neither be produced in the area nor be introduced into the area; that missiles of a mass-destruction nature will neither be produced nor be introduced into the area; that an international policing system will be adopted to enforce such agreement; and that the United States continue, in accordance with the tripartite declaration of May 1950, to take all necessary and appropriate actions both within and outside the United Nations to prevent any violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines in the Near East; and that the United States, either through the United Nations, or directly with other nations in the area, devise means to bring to an end the recriminations and incitements to violence which are contributing to tension and instability in the Near East.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the critical situation in the Middle East, it was hoped that this resolution would receive prompt consideration. However, that was not the case. On November 1, 1963, the Department of State sent to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a report which attempts to dismiss the resolution as unnecessary.

According to the Department of State:

> United States actions have given fullest support to the objectives which this resolution seeks to accomplish.

The only evidence the Department offers to support this statement consists of a general declaration that the United States opposes the introduction of nuclear weapons and the production or acquisition of other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, and that it is U.S. policy to reduce tensions in the area.

Then the Department makes the appalling statement that it opposes "public discussion of this resolution" on the grounds that such discussion would "only stimulate emotional reactions among countries in the area and make it more difficult for this Government to continue to use its influence in this way."

Mr. Speaker, contrary to this report U.S. actions have not "given fullest support to the objectives which this resolution seeks to accomplish." It is significant that the report does not point to a single concrete action which supports the objectives of the resolution. For example, no mention is made of reducing our foreign aid program to Egypt. No mention is made of a strong and official protest over Egypt's open declarations of hostility to Israel. When the only democracy in that area is threatened with destruction, pious statements are not sufficient.

While the Department of State wants to hush up public discussion of this resolution, I believe that the situation in the Middle East merits full public discussion. We have an obligation not only to discuss this issue but to do everything we can to preserve peace and stability in the Middle East. That is the purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 152. I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I include the report of the Department of State at this point in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, November 1, 1963.*

Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 30, 1963, addressed to the Secretary requesting comment by the Department of State on House Concurrent Resolution 152, submitted on May 9, 1963, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States use his good offices to obtain agreement among countries in the Near East not to produce or introduce nuclear weapons or missiles of a mass-destruction nature and that the United States takes appropriate action both within and outside the United Nations to prevent violation of existing frontiers or armistice lines. The Department appreciates the opportunity to express its views on this situation.

This Government shares the concerns expressed in the preambular section of the resolution and recognizes the potential dangers of an arms race in the Near East. The means to forestall the spread of nuclear weapons and other similar weapons in the Near East and elsewhere in the world are currently under intensive review by this Government. The President, in his statement to the press on April 3, expressed U.S. opposition to the introduction or manufacture of nuclear weapons in the Near East and stated that this view had been indicated strongly to all countries in the area. This Government's opposition to the production or acquisition of other types of weapons of mass destruction has also been made clear. In this regard, the prompt support given by all countries in the Near East to the agreement for a limited nuclear test ban would indicate that there is an appreciation of the dangers inherent in the arms race escalating to the nuclear level.

In continuing to work to reduce tensions in the area, the United States has also lent its strong support to the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations in the Near East. The existence of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization and the United Nations Emergency Force has helped to prevent serious border difficulties and violations of existing frontiers or armistice lines.

Thus, U.S. actions have given fullest support to the objectives which this resolution seeks to accomplish; namely, effective prevention of proliferation of nuclear armaments and weapons of mass destruction, respect for the territorial integrity of all nations of the Near East and observance of the general armistice agreements, and lessening of tensions and instability in the area. The fact that the United States has been following these courses of action has, in substantial measure, contributed to the somewhat improved situation in the area. The period of stress which existed in the Near East when this resolution was presented should not obscure the fact that the general trend has been toward some lessening of tensions. The Department looks to continued, although not always steady, improvement if present policies remain the guide to our actions in the future, and if U.S. influence is used in the quiet way experience has shown to be the most effective.

Given this Government's espousal of these objectives, public discussion of this resolution would, in the Department's view, only stimulate emotional reactions among countries in the area and make it more difficult for this Government to continue to use its influence in this way. Therefore, the Department does not believe that the passage of this resolution would at the moment enhance the objectives it seeks to accomplish.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
*Assistant Secretary.*

---

## HAS THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY ALREADY DECIDED WHAT A PROJECTED $40,000 BUILDING SURVEY IN THE ADAMS-MORGAN URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT AREA WILL SHOW?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star reported on December 4, 1963:

### RLA WILL ASSIGN 10 TO ADAMS-MORGAN STUDY

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The Redevelopment Land Agency intends to assign 10 employees to a resurvey of conditions for possible urban renewal in the Adams-Morgan area and hopes to have the job completed within 3 months.

Phil A. Doyle, RLA executive director, said last night he was confident the resurvey will show all parts of the proposed 237-acre project are eligible for urban renewal.

"I am confident you will find the area is eligible," he told a joint meeting of the Adams-Morgan Community Council and the Adams-Morgan Planning Committee.

The two groups are working closely with renewal agencies to support Federal activity in the area.

### WAITING FOR APPROVAL

Mr. Doyle said his agency was waiting for the District Commissioners to approve an RLA application for Federal funds to begin the survey.

"I can't reasonably predict when we will have the funds, but I hope it will be within a few weeks," he said.

The District Commissioners several weeks ago requested that a resurvey be made to establish whether there are enough substandard homes and sufficient "environmental deficiencies" to justify urban-renewal operations.

RLA proposes to request an additional $39,000 in Federal survey and planning funds to pay the cost of the resurvey.

Prior to approving such action, the District Commissioners want to know the criteria RLA expects to use as a means of determining what homes are to be listed as "substandard."

### CRITERIA BEING DISCUSSED

Discussions of these criteria are underway between the agency and the Commissioners, the RLA official said. Last night's meeting was held to clarify the resurvey.

Besides Mr. Doyle, others who spoke or answered questions were Lt. Col. Edwin C. Adams, Assistant District Engineer Commissioner; W. C. Dutton, staff director of the National Capital Planning Commission, and John S. Crocker, chief of the District Office of Urban Renewal.

Federal renewal for the far-ranging Northwest section with a population of about 20,000 was sharply attacked and defended at an unprecedented 3-day public hearing before the District Commissioners last July.

Boundaries generally are 16th Street, Connecticut Avenue, Florida Avenue, U Street, Calvert Street, Lanier Place and Columbia Road.

The facts presented by this Evening Star article show that the fears held by the homeowners and small businessmen of the Adams-Morgan area that this projected resurvey will reach a conclusion already predetermined by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency are well justified.

If Mr. Doyle is so confident that the resurvey he will conduct will show all parts of the proposed 237-acres Adams-Morgan project area are eligible for urban renewal then the taxpayers should be spared the $40,000 which this proposed resurvey will cost, as well as the resurvey. What is not needed is a resurvey which will show that Mr. Doyle has been right all the time in that area.

If Mr. Doyle has already made up his mind that the Adams-Morgan project area is eligible it seems to me that this is all the proof needed that his agency should not conduct the resurvey.

I took this matter up with the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, whose jurisdiction covers urban renewal in a letter dated November 14, 1963. In my letter I made two specific suggestions with respect to the resurvey. First, I suggested assigning the responsibilities for the resurvey and analysis to the Housing Division of the District of Columbia in order to avoid any preconceived notions about the project on the part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. Secondly, I suggested taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by this resurvey to find out why structures in the Adams-Morgan project area improved or deteriorated which would provide valuable information for future urban renewal projects throughout the Nation. I received a reply from the Engineer Commissioner, Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, dated November 27, 1963 which I include at this point as part of the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
*Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963.*

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: This is in reply to your letter of November 14, 1963, in which you express certain views and suggestions for consideration in the proposed resurvey of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal area.

As to the suggestion that our Housing Division undertake the resurvey of the area, we are still checking the feasibility of this approach. Several problems have been raised with respect to this approach, one of which is the effect of the deviation of a number of housing inspectors from their normal daily tasks for a period of approximately 3 months on the regularly assigned responsibilities of the Housing Division. I will give careful consideration to your suggestion, however, prior to arriving at a final decision on this item, particularly since our objective is the same as yours.

The value of increasing the scope of the proposed resurvey to the limits you suggest is recognized as a significant contribution to any reevaluation of the whole concept of urban renewal. However, I cannot feel that this broadened scope of survey is absolutely necessary to provide the Commissioners with the current facts we need to formulate our subsequent decisions on the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project plan. In view of the added time that would be required, the greater inconvenience to the residents of the area during the survey, and the considerably greater costs to the District government, I'm forced to conclude that the expanded resurvey you suggest does not appear to be appropriate at this time.

Nonetheless, I appreciate your suggestions tremendously, and quite possibly we will get a lot of data you mentioned as a byproduct.

Sincerely,

C. M. DUKE,
*Brigadier General, U.S. Army,*
*Engineer Commissioner.*

Considering the statement by Mr. Doyle to the Adams-Morgan Community Council and the Adams-Morgan Planning Committee that "I am confident you will find the area is eligible," I would again strongly urge the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia to make use of his own housing staff for the resurvey and analysis. I would also hope that he would reconsider my second request for an expanded informational survey since I am sure the Federal Urban Renewal authorities would be willing to contribute funds for this purpose if requested to do so.

There has been a great deal of unrest on the part of businessmen and homeowners of the Adams-Morgan project area over the analysis of the original survey work by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

These independent Federal agencies—independent, that is, of any of the checks and balances and citizen control normally found in other cities—made a staff analysis in 1959 of structural survey data compiled by the District of Columbia Housing Division in that year. They found 21.7 percent of the structures in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area substandard. Approximately 320 buildings were listed as substandard by these two Federal agencies. On the basis of this analysis these two Federal agencies then encouraged their supporters in the far from representative 25-member Adams-Morgan Planning Committee to request that the Adams-Morgan area be declared an urban renewal project area, and this area was subsequently found to be in need of urban renewal by the National Capital Planning Commission.

How weak the case for urban renewal in the Adams-Morgan project area really is was effectively demonstrated on July 19, 1963, in hearings held by the House District of Columbia Subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] which is studying the District's urban renewal program. At that hearing, Frederick W. Mallon, Superintendent, District of Columbia Housing Division, testified that at the end of the Adams-Morgan demonstration project in 1959, 458 buildings were referred to the Housing Division for enforcement procedures, but that none of these buildings would have been condemned by the Housing Division. I quote from the direct testimony:

> Mr. Mallon. These are buildings that had violations of some nature of the housing regulations. Some of these might have been major and some of them might have been minor. They did not fit in the category, for instance, of the type of buildings that we would refer to the board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings. We would have already done that prior to this stage of the project.
>
> Mr. Dowdy. None of these 458 buildings were such that you would recommend condemnation.
>
> Mr. Mallon. No, sir.

Obviously, no structurally standard building which meets the requirements of the District's building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations should be included for purposes of qualifying an urban renewal project area. Mr. Mallon showed that nearly half of the 320 structures included in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project for this purpose were structurally sound buildings. Far from qualifying as an urban renewal project area, an objective study probably would have shown less than 10 percent of slum and blighted conditions, instead of 21.7 percent, in 1959. Conditions have vastly improved in the Adams-Morgan project area since that time.

The manual of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, part 1, chapter 1, states that "the legal eligibility of a project area must be determined in the light of State and local legal requirements," but this directive was blandly ignored by the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency officials.

The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency's Executive Director, Phil A. Doyle, told the House District Subcommittee that:

> We proceeded on the basis of modified standards recommended by the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association, hereafter referred to as APHA, in its publication "An Appraisal Method for Measuring the Quality of Housing."

Now these standards are not part of the requirements of the government of the District of Columbia's housing code, and so were completely unknown to District property owners willing to comply with the law. The question, therefore, arises: in what ways has the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency satisfied the Federal Urban Renewal Administration's Manual requirement that "the legal eligibility of a project area," such as the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, "must be determined in the light of State and local legal requirements"?

In this connection I think it would be helpful to include at this point a colloquy I had with Commissioner William L. Slayton, of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, when he testified before the Special Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency on Thursday, November 21, 1963:

> Mr. Widnall. Now I believe you said earlier that the Urban Renewal Administration and FHA had come to an agreement on standards.
>
> Mr. Slayton. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Widnall. And that you and FHA and the city come to agreement before projects are approved?
>
> Mr. Slayton. Before a project is approved for execution, before we enter into a loan and grant contract for that rehabilitation project.
>
> Mr. Widnall. I don't quite understand how this can be true when in the District of Columbia the District has vigorously objected to Urban Renewal Administration standards, yet on the Adams-Morgan project grants have been made. How do you distinguish between what you first said and what actually happened here in the District?
>
> Mr. Slayton. Adams-Morgan is in what we call the planning stage. We have made the planning advance to the District of Columbia to prepare a plan for the Adams-Morgan area which includes, as I understand it, some spot clearance and some rehabilitation.
>
> That plan, which has to go before the District Commissioners for approval, will contain rehabilitation standards, and the ruling that I am talking about with FHA and URA has just been established, but that project has not yet gone into execution. We don't have a loan and grant contract with the city or with the renewal agency for Adams-Morgan yet.
>
> Mr. Widnall. You are saying only a planning grant has been made?
>
> Mr. Slayton. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Widnall. And that a project grant will not be made unless there is an agreement as to standards?
>
> Mr. Slayton. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Widnall. Between the District, the FHA, and the URA?
>
> Mr. Slayton. Correct.

It is apparent, from this exchange, that Mr. Slayton is determined to force on the District of Columbia the same inadequate and vague standards that plagued urban renewal in Cleveland's Erieview I urban renewal project. Under these standards almost any building, no matter what its structural condition may be, even the U.S. Capitol Building itself, it was pointed out in the hearings by a witness for the General Accounting Office, can be declared substandard and almost any project can be justified. Efforts by the District's Commissioners to fulfill their responsibilities to the citizens will be useless unless Mr. Slayton allows for the local initiative he has so often talked about approvingly in the past.

The Department of General Administration of the District of Columbia has expressed great concern, on behalf of the District's Commissioners, over the present practice and apparent future plans of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to set up and enforce its own housing standards separate and distinct from those of the government of the District of Columbia. In a memorandum under date of February 1, 1962, it said that:

> Some additional questions which we have in the area of enforcement are: When is RLA through with the area? When does Licenses and Inspections start enforcing the minimum standards in the area? Who inspects (polices) periodically for violations of the requirements imposed by the urban renewal plan that are either above, variations of, or inconsistent with, the minimal standards? Why was the covenant technique applied to the urban renewal area? Was the 40-year time increment chosen because it is consistent with the financing of the project? Will our courts, in the years ahead, be clogged with the increased workload that would be generated by the civil actions instituted by RLA in enforcing these voluminous maverick requirements? We use the word "voluminous" because in 40 or 50 years, if we impose dozens of requirements not contained in our codes and regulations upon each urban renewal project and ultimately have 40 or 50 projects in the city, we could have literally thousands of these special requirements imposed upon a picture-puzzle city.

Mr. Schuyler Lowe is the top administrative officer under the District's Board of Commissioners. The District of Columbia government, he wrote in his memorandum, is fully:

> Cognizant of the temptation to say zoning is too weak an instrument to do a more satisfactory urban renewal job, therefore, we should resort to the more drastic techniques available through the urban renewal process. This matter has given us great concern for some time. We have carefully weighed the pros and cons and believe that the best interest of the Nation's Capital can be best served over the future years by tailoring our urban renewal plans and programs consistent with our minimal standards contained in the building, zoning, housing, sign and related codes and regulations.
>
> This, of course, would not preclude reasonable special rules for the initial development of an area, but in general the present trend toward setting up myriad special rules for longtime application leads to benefits difficult to prove, and most certainly leads to confusing and expensive enforcement situations.

The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, in the interest of sound Government, as well as in the interest of prudence, thrift, and economy should support the District's building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations, rather than undercut them as it has been doing. The problems facing the District of Columbia are common to other cities and towns in our country. Only chaos can result from the present course of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration. Obviously, the properly constituted governing bodies of our cities and towns, conversant as they are with their own local conditions, are much better qualified to establish and enforce building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations for their local jurisdictions than is some Federal official, even if it is Mr. Slayton, sitting behind a desk in Washington.

The District's urban renewal program could be improved administratively, for all that is actually needed is a fundamental understanding of the place of private enterprise in our economy by those officials in charge of the District's program. It is precisely because the role of private enterprise is so little understood by the District's urban renewal officials that their program is in deep trouble and they continually make "mistakes," as in the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project.

The very best way to make sure that the District's urban renewal officials understand the true role of private enterprise is to replace them with pro business officials who will give the District's program the pro business direction it definitely lacks at present.

Here in the District of Columbia, where Congress has such direct control of government matters at the local level, it is especially important that private enterprise be encouraged and assisted, for it is more than ordinarily difficult for local private enterprise to flourish or even exist, in a situation in which the Federal Government is so omnipresent and powerful.

If the changes in the urban renewal program, which are desperately needed in order to encourage and assist private enterprise in the District of Columbia, are not made administratively, Congress will have no other choice but to step in and make them before the urban renewal powers are further enlarged and extended by enactment of S. 628.

One thing Congress could do which would help owners of private property in the District of Columbia immediately would be to drastically curtail the potential uses of appropriations for the local urban renewal program. No single step would do so much to encourage and assist private enterprise in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Housing Act of 1949.

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the 72 hours which elapsed from about noon of Friday, November 22, until just a little after noon on Monday, November 25, encompasses events which will be the subject matter of countless articles and scores of books written in the years to come.

Students of current history are now at work on their appraisal. With the passage of time, future historians will look back upon the events of these 3 days. They will carefully analyze all the facts and gain new insights by years of reflection and study. I suggest the foregoing will happen because such has been the course of history. This was the general outline that developed following the assassinations of President Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I have asked consent today to have become a part of the permanent RECORD some editorials which I have selected as among the best to appear in the papers published in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri together with two others from outside the district which seemed to me to be of such quality as to deserve to be saved by incorporation in the RECORD.

My purpose is not to single out these editorials to the omission and possible neglect or exclusion of others equally well written. The ones which have been included below, it seems to me, each contained some outstanding thought upon the tragic event of President Kennedy's assassination, which deserved to be perpetuated as a part of the literature written at the moment of this incredible happening. They should be made available for reference and review by students of history in the years ahead.

The editorials follow:

[From the Independence (Mo.) Examiner, Nov. 25, 1963]

#### HE DID NOT DIE IN VAIN

How does the death of a President affect the citizens of a small midwestern city like Independence?

It probably is no different than any other city in this great Nation.

Still, it is encouraging to witness the apparent surge of inner strength as people here began to comprehend the tragic news and realize the need for personal reflection and rededication of self and country.

Friday was perhaps the darkest day this Nation has known since the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Today, as that day almost 20 years ago when Independence's Harry S. Truman assumed the grave responsibilities of the office of President, the American people are called upon to use their faith—in God, in their country, and in their fellow man.

It has been said in recent days and months that the United States, and the entire world, is losing its faith.

Feeling the pulse of Independence in the hour of the national crisis Friday, and again today during the sober hour of the funeral of its 35th President, the Examiner feels compelled to acclaim that this Nation has not lost its faith, but that it is a stronger nation, with a stronger people than ever before.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die in vain.

---

[From the Independence (Mo.) Examiner, Nov. 26, 1963]

#### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

John Fitzgerald Kennedy came to the Presidency of the United States as the bearer of great change. He was the symbol of something new, but he died by something as old as time—the hand of the fanatic.

He was the first man born in the 20th century to hold the office—and the second youngest in history. He was the first Catholic in the White House. He came as a naval hero of World War II who narrowly had missed death in Pacific waters, and survived a second brush with death in a grave illness 9 years ago.

To the Nation's high politics he thus brought a fresh stamp. The well-remarked "Kennedy style" was a blend of intellect, vigor, wit, charm, and a clear talent for growth.

On the always shifting, often troubled world scene, he sometimes moved with more caution than expected in young leadership. Soon after entering the White House, he gamely took full blame for the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco as an enterprise sadly lacking in boldness.

Yet only his worst enemies withheld from him the label "courageous" when he moved resolutely against Soviet Premier Khrushchev in the great Russian missile crisis in Cuba in late 1962. And he boldly pressed for an East-West test ban treaty this year in the face of heavy charges that this imperiled our security.

In domestic affairs Kennedy won much of his program in beginning 1961, gained far less the following year, and encountered a major stalemate in 1963. The constant note against him was insufficient leadership.

But again, when 1963 brought the greatest racial crisis of this century, Kennedy—at acknowledged heavy political cost—committed himself to sweeping civil rights proposals that opened a vast new battleground.

Amid all his efforts to put the imprint of vigorous, imaginative youth upon the country's affairs in the 1960's, the late President found himself moving against a deepening background of protest, with an ugly underscoring of violence which he sought with only limited success to wipe away.

Much of this protest went to the steady encroachments of the Federal Government and its rising cost. But the bitterest reaction was white and Negro response to the enlarging racial struggle. The far right gave the mood its most perilous texture.

With the calamity in Dallas the lesson of the danger inherent in violent extremism now may be deeply implanted in America's conscience.

In this way, Kennedy in death may achieve what the living President could not do to curb the almost ungovernable rancor that increasingly discolored the politics of his brief time in power.

It was John Kennedy's good fortune to surmount many obstacles to rise to his country's highest office and bring with him the winds of a new era.

It was his final tragedy that as he labored in difficult times to use these forces for the Nation's and the world's gain, they were swiftly challenged by countering winds of bitter reaction. In Dallas, one swift gust struck him down.

The Nation thus loses a young leader whose great promise lived in the shadow of great controversy. The way he died must inescapably cost all Americans deeply in self-esteem as free men of good will.

That is the greater tragedy.

---

[From the Harrisonville (Mo.) Democrat-Missourian, Nov. 26, 1963]

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY

"And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what America will do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The incredible and tragic events of the weekend brought shame upon our house, and apprehension and sorrow to the rest of the world. In a few seconds in the city of Dallas, Tex., an insignificant 24-year-old agitator, lurking in a warehouse window with a $13 gun and 50 cents worth of bullets, altered the course of history.

Lee Harvey Oswald assassinated the President of the United States.

In a bizarre and almost ludicrous aftermath, a self-appointed judge, jury and executioner, in the person of an also insignificant night club operator and police character, shot the accused assassinator to death.

A stunned nation asks "Why?"

We may never know. We do know that events of the past few years have caused reasonable citizens to make unreasonable utterances. An atmosphere of intolerence, and even hate, upon which twisted minds flourish may have contributed to this world-shaking tragedy.

Now a shocked and confused Nation is attempting to bring some semblance of order to its house. Within 80 minutes of the death of Mr. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as the new President. He asked for our help, and for God's. Perhaps we, as ordinary citizens, can best help by pursuing our ordinary affairs in our ordinary manner, but practicing always in our daily lives those principles upon which our country was founded.

---

[From the Warrensburg (Mo.) Daily Star-Journal, Nov. 25, 1963]

### Our President

Today is one of the saddest in the long history of this community and the Nation. In every Warrensburg and Johnson County home and throughout the country hearts are heavy with grief as last rites are held for President John F. Kennedy.

All weekend the people were seeking comfort and reassurance as well as guidance and strength. Understandably, they turned to their churches. Morning worship services yesterday in Warrensburg were filled beyond capacity in most churches, as they very likely were in every town and city.

It was Friday during the noon hour when first news of the tragedy in Dallas struck. In Warrensburg, as news came in bit by bit while the seconds passed, every possible reaction and emotion occurred. A merchant who normally has the utmost composure stood with tears in his eyes. A young photographer's usual air of quiet, unaffected assurance turned to utter dismay. A newsman who works with remarkable equanimity said his stomach actually was churning inside.

Everywhere it was the same—the people could not believe the President of the United States no longer was John F. Kennedy, a young man with uncommon ability and a charmingly cordial way.

In uncivilized countries, differences in policies still are settled by violence. Surely, the assassination of the President could only have been the act of a person mentally ill.

(Here it must be injected that every man accused of a crime has right in this country to fair trial by a court of law. Yesterday's fatal shooting of the prime suspect as he was being moved from the Dallas jail was a lawless act. It would not have been surprising had this occurred in the Congo or Nazi Germany, but this is the United States of America where every man is innocent until proven guilty. Even though this is a time of high emotion and extreme outrage, it is no time for anyone to take the law into his own hands.)

Was President Kennedy provided adequate protection? Yes, in our opinion it was made as safe as it could be. The only alternative would have been to keep him from the people at all times and this isn't the way a democracy works, or should work.

A week ago today when this writer was at the Americana Hotel in Miami Beach on the same day President Kennedy arrived, a vast amount of security measures were being taken for his safety. For 2 weeks, Secret Service men had checked every room and each occupant of the hotel. No taxicabs, no vehicles were permitted to park, load, or unload in front of the hotel at any time the President was inside. Even though demonstrations were expected by both pro-Castro and anti-Castro Cubans, it seemed to us then the precautions might be excessive.

We talked that day with newspaper publishers from the Dominican Republic, Argentina, Mexico, a former Prime Minister of Peru, and others about the stability of the U.S. Government in contrast to some Latin and South American countries where revolutions and assassinations of national leaders are not uncommon. It was disturbing to hear one or two sanction force as a means of changing governments.

In the United States, we are indeed blessed with stability of government which can only be upset between elections by such an act as occurred in Dallas.

Some of the President's domestic objectives we opposed. But this never lessened our great admiration for him as a man, as a forceful leader, as a Chief Executive who dealt extremely well with the constant Communist threat.

President Kennedy was gifted with the power of expressing his knowledge, and in an effective, pleasing manner. Even under trying circumstances he had a quick humor. The whole record of his life was that of unselfish generosity. We admired, too, his unshakable resolution in the face of adversity. He had a devotion to the Christian way of life that must have given him courage and strength to enable him to carry out the tremendous tasks of President.

Along with all the prayers and messages of sorrow from over the world go those from this community. Of the late President, the people are speaking from their hearts when they say: "We will remember him well, and we will remember him worthy of high praise."

---

[From the Pleasant Hill (Mo.) Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

### Thankful in Our Darkest Hour

This Thanksgiving Day, following so closely on the tragic horror and quick changing national scene of last weekend, may seem empty to many Americans but there can be and should be fervent prayers of gratitude for the dynamic and useful life of our dead President and for the fine qualifications of his successor.

Those who have read and heard the comment of newspapers and radio and TV commentators over the past days have digested the numerous eloquent eulogies of the late President John F. Kennedy by those who were close to him and they have heard the simple expressions of the average shocked and stunned American. They have also been filled in on the unusual qualities and ability of our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Thus, we come to this Thanksgiving Day, many disheartened, sad, and grieved over the loss of a great President, but we should be lifted in spirit by the fact that the new President is well prepared for his awesome responsibilities so suddenly thrust upon him. President Johnson, in his first few remarks after he received the oath of office, said he needed the help of all the people of the United States and the help of God. We recall that former President Harry S. Truman made a similar plea when he was catapulted into the Presidency, and a hot war not yet over when former President Franklin D. Roosevelt died.

Today we should be thankful we had the benefit of the courageous leadership of John F. Kennedy for 3 years and that this country will be led by a man equally as courageous and patriotic—one who will meet the great challenges at home and abroad.

We should thank God that we live under a democratic Government which, through its constitutional processes, makes for an orderly and peaceful transition even in the electrified atmosphere of an assassination; that there will be no struggle for power and authority.

Thus, even in great public bereavement we can, through our belief in this democracy, stand firmly behind our new President and give him the support he asks and needs desperately.

---

[From the Windsor (Mo.) Review, Nov. 28, 1963]

### A Day None Will Forget

Few, if any, who are old enough to comprehend will forget the dramatic and tragic weekend that has just passed.

The present generation remembers reading about the assassination of President Lincoln. The thwarted attempt on President Truman's life at Blair House will be recalled by some. To a lesser degree some will remember the death of Mayor Cermak of Chicago while marching in a parade behind President Roosevelt's car.

The sudden death of President Kennedy by a sniper's rifle in Dallas, Tex., will ever remain in the memory of most Americans and in other countries as well.

Those who watched television over the weekend virtually had front row seats for the assassination and the subsequent murder of the President's attacker.

Pictured were the happy events prior to the rifle shots that felled President Kennedy and Governor Connally of Texas; the swearing in of Lyndon Baines Johnson as the 36th President of the United States aboard the Presidential plane at the Dallas airport; arrival of the slain President's body and those on the plane in Washington; the procession from the White House to the Nation's Capitol where thousands walked by the casket; murder of the assassin in the Dallas police headquarters; arrival of leaders from all over the world to join in paying tribute to a great soldier of peace, and then the climax on Monday with the final tribute and burial in Arlington Cemetery.

These historic events were recorded on film and tape for the entire world to see.

Never has this Nation, or the world, been so moved or drawn together by a single interest, outside of world war, than by the dreadful death of President Kennedy.

From the time the world was electrified by the words, "President Kennedy has been shot," the thoughts of people everywhere were centered on this historic event.

There was no heart for the ordinary activities of life among most Americans, regardless of politics or religion. Our President had been killed.

From disbelief at first, followed shock and then grief—grief for the first family with two small children; for the President's family which has suffered tragedy before and whose father still is paralyzed from a stroke.

Why would anyone want to kill one of the world's foremost leaders in the cause for peace?

---

[From the Higginsville (Mo.) Advance, Nov. 28, 1963]

### John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President, United States of America

Our Nation mourns the untimely death of our 35th President, slain in a violent act by a misguided fellow human being, November 22, 1963.

On November 25, with all the honors and tribute a nation and the world could bestow, he was put to rest with other heroes of our Nation in Arlington National Cemetery.

The ranks of politics, race, and creed immediately closed when this tragedy came, with the citizenry rallying under one patriotic belief—Americanism. Nations of the world see again that we can and do become one in time of tragedy and national disaster.

The 30-day period of national mourning will be but a fleeting moment in the eons of time, but history will forever record his service to his country as a military man, a Senator, and as the President.

Let it never be said of our Nation that we who populate it shall put profit and prejudice above our patriotism and respect. We will long endure as a free people so long as we retain these ideals and principles upon which our Nation is founded.

[From the Rich Hill (Mo.) Mining Review, Nov. 29, 1963]

### JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

This past weekend—hectic, tragic, sad but historic—has most of us a bit confused. We are confused because it all seems so unreal, unbelievable, like a bad dream from which we expect to awaken, yet it did happen.

When the mad dog assassin struck down our brilliant, young President, the grief that followed seemed to unite not only our own country but the whole world. No eulogy that this column can produce will do justice to the occasion. It is interesting to note that some of the most sincere tributes paid to the late President, John F. Kennedy, came from those on the opposite side of the political fence. These contained no maudlin expressions and lacked the tinge of political overtones.

---

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Labor Beacon, Nov. 29, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Historians in the future will assess the impact on America and the world of the tragically short administration of John F. Kennedy.

But the American people—and the people of the world—this week made their overwhelming assessment of the impact of John Fitzgerald Kennedy the man. No leader of modern times has received the spontaneous outpouring of respect and affection shown the fallen President.

The demonstration dramatically showed the effect of President Kennedy's youthful optimism, vigorous idealism and deep-seated understanding of the wants and needs of all people. The fact that around the world tributes were led by the young people proved that a common bond of sympathy and personal identification tied the people to their leader.

Regardless of the ultimate verdict on President Kennedy's 2 years, 10 months and 2 days in the world's most difficult post of responsibility, the effect of his great personality must be recognized as a tremendous force for good throughout the world. It will live on in the rededication of people—and particularly young people—toward the goals which he so precisely stated.

For it was in his vision of the future toward which the United States and the world must work that John F. Kennedy was at his greatest. He was an idealist to the extent that he sought a nation and a world of justice, dignity and peace. He was a realist in that he understood that such a world could not be realized in a hundred days; a thousand days; in "this administration;" or perhaps in our lifetime.

He made that goal a living goal and thereby provided a reason for patriotism, for dedication, and for effort by the young people of the world.

The reaction to President Kennedy's death must give small comfort to the bigots whose preachments of hatred have bewildered and confused many Americans. A Catholic, his death was mourned sincerely by Protestants, Jews, Moslems, Hindus; even some Communists. And this was fitting: President Kennedy felt his responsibility to all people, regardless of religion or color.

These are the lessons in the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The American people this week showed that the majority have learned the lessons and approve. In tribute to President Kennedy, let us not forget what we have learned.

---

[From the Roll Call, Washington (D.C.) Nov. 27, 1963]

### FROM AN OFFICE WINDOW

I looked out of my window and saw history march by.

It was the same office window through which I have contemplated hundreds of bustling mornings, gloomy dusks. The vista from an office window over the years, becomes a humdrum setting; it is hardly the place you expect to see—suddenly and unexpectedly—one of the most awesome spectacles of the age.

It was Monday and the funeral cortege of the late President Kennedy was mournfully surging up Connecticut Avenue.

It is impossible to sort out one's emotions, already so terribly assaulted by sudden violence, upheaval, and grief.

The overriding reaction, as so many said, is one of disbelief. Even looking down from a 12th story building directly upon the flag-draped coffin of the late President, some uncontrollable part of the mind keeps trying to tell you this can't be so. But it is. The muffled drums; the majestic marching troops, the horsedrawn caisson are real.

Real too is the story of how it happened—a lunatic's fanatic gesture, its incredible horror compounded by the vengeance of a self-appointed judge-executioner.

No man can sort and identify the tumbling, crowding, changing emotions of the past few days.

As things begin to even out a little, however, a few reactions begin to take shape.

One is that in death, John Kennedy continues to serve his country.

The world-shattering trauma of his sudden removal from the scene seems to have reached deep into the souls of men. The impotent anger at this disaster is being channeled, with the help of wise clergymen and clear-minded statesmen, where it properly belongs: toward all of us.

Will this rededication to decency and respect for law and order persist after the captains and the kings have departed and we have settled back to normality? The cynic may be doubtful but in this moment of history, we cannot afford to heed the cynic. There is abroad in our land a sudden realization that in our smug prosperity and the comfort of a great system of Government we take too much for granted, we have permitted rot, moral decay, and hatred to exist and multiply.

The shock and shame over what has happened to our young, vital, and inspiring President has shaken us.

The example of his widow, his family, and even his tiny innocent children, challenges those of us less directly bereaved to try to be better people.

We need new insights, new perspectives, along with new dedication.

Until this happened, the common view of Congress was one of a sprawling, ineffective body of men. This one took a junket somewhere; that one was stubbornly blocking this bill. Scandal and gossip shrouded the Hill. The image of our lawmakers was tarnished.

Then comes national crisis—calamity. These same men suddenly emerge to light as what they really are: Fine, dedicated statesmen. Patriots, resolute in helping carry forward this Nation under the new President. Men whose oratory we so often mock as florid and cynical-speaking wisdom and eloquence. We are comforted, reassured, and inspired by this view of our lawmakers, as we are by the conduct of the new President, by the Cabinet and staffs, by the family of the late President—and would it be hyperbole to say, most of all, by two little children whose conduct has been so gallant?

A great New England essayist once wrote that "nobleness enkindleth nobleness." Let us hope this proves true.

Because today I look out the same window and everything looks just as it was before that fatal hour in Dallas last Friday. Now comes the time for all good men to face the real test of putting into practice those good thoughts we have been jolted into expressing these past few terrible days.

---

[From the Huntington (Ind.) Our Sunday Visitor, Dec. 8, 1963]

### JOHN F. KENNEDY: 1917–63

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, first Catholic President of the United States is dead, the victim of an assassin's bullet in Dallas, Tex.

Tributes to the late President have poured in from all over the world, from heads of state as well as from the common people to whom he was dedicated.

President Kennedy's funeral in St. Matthew's Cathedral in the Nation's Capital was thronged with the great and near great from his native land and from nearly every member of the world's community of nations.

Seldom in our history have so many people from all walks of life been struck by the passing of the leader of a nation. And seldom have the tributes been so heartfelt and genuine.

In the three short years John F. Kennedy served as this Nation's Chief Executive, he showed the world an image of a man dedicated to his duties, to his family and to his God.

The office of the Presidency of the United States is an exalted office, and the brutal attack on our late president, as former President Eisenhower pointed out, was the more despicable because it was an attack, not only on the person of the President, but upon the very dignity of the office.

But along with the dignity of the Presidency there goes an awesome responsibility and a duty more demanding than that in any other elective office.

John F. Kennedy measured up to the duty of his office—and he measured up to its dignity. He earned the tributes and the prayers of all the people of the world.

President Lyndon Johnson, who now assumes the Presidency, needs our prayers and our support in a special way. Pope Paul VI, in his message to President Johnson, summed up these thoughts when he wrote: "We pray God to grant Your Excellency as you accede to the Presidency of the Nation, His choicest graces of guidance and strength."

In his message on the occasion of the late President's death, Pope Paul voiced the sentiments of all of us when he said: "We deplore this event with our whole heart. We express the hope that the death of this great statesman will not bring damage to the American people, but will strengthen its moral and civil sense and sentiments of nobility and concord. We pray God that the sacrifice of John Kennedy may help the cause promoted and defended by him of the liberty of peoples and of peace in the world."

May he rest in peace.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEDZI, December 16 through 20, on account of official business.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for December 12 through 21, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN, for 10 minutes, on Friday, December 13.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MOSHER), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mr. Mosher), for 15 minutes, on December 13.

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Charles H. Wilson), to address the House for 30 minutes, on December 13; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holifield (at the request of Mr. Charles H. Wilson), to address the House for 30 minutes, on December 13; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Horan to include tables in his remarks on the rule for H.R. 8720.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Springer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Charles H. Wilson) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Albert.

Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Fraser.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9009. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 11, 1963:

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich;

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jan and Anna Small (nee Dworzanski);

H.R. 1432. An act for the relief of Pasquale Marrella;

H.R. 1475. An act for the relief of John William Horling;

H.R. 1495. An act for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 1545. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 1566. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto;

H.R. 2238. An act for the relief of Erwin A. Suehs;

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Hurley Construction Co.;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar;

H.R. 3662. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett;

H.R. 3908. An act for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Smith L. Parratt and Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Parratt, his parents;

H.R. 4288. An act for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden;

H.R. 4507. An act for the relief of Angeliki Devaris;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin;

H.R. 4862. An act for the relief of Tricia Kim;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5453. An act for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux);

H.R. 5495. An act for the relief of the city of Binghamton, N.Y.;

H.R. 5703. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H.R. 5753. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore-Waterfront Guard Association pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6001. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States;

H.R. 6038. An act for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzine Ciavattini Restuccia;

H.R. 6316. An act for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa;

H.R. 6624. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli;

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.;

H.R. 6975. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida;

H.R. 7268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown;

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.; and

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

On December 12, 1963:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of United States oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552–C, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California;

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code; and

H.R. 6143. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 13, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1429. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to reporting an overobligation of $1,702.97 in an Atomic Energy Commission allotment account on June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1430. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting 23 reports covering 25 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1431. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on high costs pertaining to acquisition of sites for selected low-rent housing projects in the eight-State area administered by the New York regional office of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1432. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518; without amendment (Rept. No. 1029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1030). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1031). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8344. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the

National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1; without amendment (Rept. No. 1032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on Fair Share Refugee Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1034). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8673. A bill to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1033). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 2513. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1035). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD: Committee of conference. H.R. 9139. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1036). Ordered to be printed.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9433. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9434. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9435. A bill to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence and proving documents in litigation with international aspects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9436. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9437. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the time for filing tort actions by persons under the age of 21, or insane, or mentally ill, or imprisoned on a criminal charge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9438. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9439. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide special postage rates for cumulative school records; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9440. A bill to amend sections 6 and 9 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. sec. 2251 et seq.) to provide for voluntary retirement of personnel inspecting or investigating coal mines under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act and power linemen engaged in the maintenance or construction of high voltage power lines of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 9441. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9442. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9443. A bill relating to tort actions against Federal employees who are designated management representatives for safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9444. A bill authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9445. A bill authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorized appropriations for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 9446. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administration prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 9447. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administration prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9448. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administration prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 9449. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9450. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9451. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9452. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9453. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 9454. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 9455. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 9456. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9457. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9458. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9459. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9460. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9461. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9462. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 9463. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 9464. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9465. A bill to provide for the striking of three different medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration in New York City, N.Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 9466. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9467. A bill to provide for the establishment of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9468. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 9469. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payments to reestablish the purchasing power of American fishermen suffering temporary economic dislocation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9470. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 with respect to the acquisition by the Secretary of Defense or his designee of certain housing constructed and insured under section 608 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 9471. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 9472. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 863. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.J. Res. 865. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 866. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 867. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the right to read from the Holy Bible and to offer nonsectarian prayers in the public schools or other public place if participation therein is not compulsory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study the problems of Presidential succession and continuity of Government, to make findings of fact and recommendations for constitutional, legislative and administrative changes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 587. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 588. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 2d session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9473. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Guinot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9474. A bill for the relief of Miss Orina Sarian (Sarioglu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9475. A bill for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 9476. A bill for the relief of Ginevra Parenzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 9477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9478. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Zingarelli, also known as Pedone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9479. A bill for the relief of Chong-jin Kim and Ilhyang Ko Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 9480. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Tahir Kaplan and Sevim Alton Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

512. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass legislation for the preservation of all District of Columbia boundary markers, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1963

*(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 11, 1963)*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou desire of nations, again as our hearts are drawn by the lure of the manger, as time draws near the birthday of the One whose coming broke the ages in two, enable our spirits to kindle with the joy of simple shepherds of long ago. Thou, who in times past, across yearning centuries, spoke to the fathers, through the prophets, hast spoken to us in the word made flesh, whose name is the Prince of Peace, and upon whose shoulder the government of men must ultimately rest.

We thank Thee that not on one wondrous night alone did a star of hope light the heavens, but that straight down the crowding years the starlit pathway leads, reminding our earth-filled eyes that the highest truth is born in lowly places, clad in humble garb.

As the Christmas star rains its fire once more on an earth plowed with spite and hate, may we see in it a shining symbol that if we would find the truth and the life abundant, we must follow our starry ideals, no matter over what burning sands or to what lonely deserts they take our faltering feet.

We ask it in the name of the One who didst come to a violent world, and who is now remembered and adored, while the ruthless dictators are forgotten. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 10, and Wednesday, December 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

## OMISSIONS FROM THE RECORD OF DECEMBER 11, 1963

The following was omitted from the RECORD of December 11, 1963:

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 20, 1963:

S. 912. An act approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

On November 26, 1963:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

On November 29, 1963:

S. 2267. An act to amend Public Law 88–72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on December 11, 1963, he had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5338) to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 1233. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease numbered Sacramento 037552-C, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1273. An act for the relief of Bay Kow Jung;

H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Walter B. Davidson;

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California;

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code; and

H.R. 6143. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk; and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 235) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the remainder of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House, and the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign during such adjournments or recesses enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Rules and Administration.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Committee on Public Works.

The Foreign Relations Committee.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eugene G. Hulett, of Oregon, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT OF 1958—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on yesterday, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate Executive R, 88th Congress, 1st session, being a protocol for the prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958. At the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the protocol; that the protocol and message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the text, as certified by the British Government, of the Protocol for the Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, dated at London, August 1, 1963.

The Protocol was adopted by the United Nations Sugar Conference, 1963, and was open for signature at London from August 1 to September 30, 1963, inclusive. It was signed in behalf of the United States of America on September 27, 1963.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State explaining the purposes and provisions of the Protocol.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *December 1, 1963.*

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### Amendment of Rural Electrification Act of 1936, To Establish the Rural Electrification Administration Loan Account

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsections (a) and (b) and to repeal subsection (f) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish the Rural Electrification Administration Loan Account, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### Reports on Overobligations of Appropriations

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 23 reports covering 25 overobligations of appropriations within the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### The Situation in Yemen

A letter from the Adviser to the Government of the Kingdom of Yemen, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, certain letters relating to the situation in Yemen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Silt Project, Colorado

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Silt project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Buckley, Wash., Kiwanis Club, favoring the inclusion of funds for the Port of Tacoma project, Washington, in the public works appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1322. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 768).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2317. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties (Rept. No. 770).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2364. A bill to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress (Rept. No. 772).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif. (Rept. No. 771).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 1767. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 773).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2664. An act to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service (Rept. No. 774).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 4338. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 776).

## EXTENSION OF MAXIMUM MATURITY OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION GUARANTEED OR INSURED HOME LOANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 769)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a favorable report on the bill (S. 385) to extend the maximum maturity of Veterans' Administration guaranteed or insured home loans for a newly constructed dwelling or the construction of a dwelling, from 30 to 35 years, without amendment, together with the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views be printed with the report of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2376. A bill for the relief of Hsui-Hua Shung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2377. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2378. A bill for the relief of Mardiros Kouyoumjiam and his wife, Manig Kouyoumjiam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Long of Missouri; Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Pell, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Scott):

S. 2379. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 2380. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2381. A bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2382. A bill for the relief of Mrs. In Suk White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 2383. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

## AUTHORIZING RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 235) authorizing receipt of messages from the House and the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions during adjournments or recesses, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the foregoing resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

## EXEMPTION FROM EXCISE TAX CLUB DUES PAYMENTS MADE TOWARD EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT PLAN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Under present law a large number of employees of the social, athletic, and sporting clubs of the United States are not receiving retirement protection from their employers primarily because of the particularly oppressive impact of the excise tax on club dues.

The clubs of this country employ over 310,000 people with an annual payroll of $750 million. They pay over $214 million in taxes each year, of which the Federal excise tax on club dues exceeds $70 million. This club dues tax is exacted at the extremely high rate of 20 percent. The only other items subject to a 20-percent rate are admissions to dog and horse races. Moreover, under the present statute, this 20-percent tax is imposed on all amounts paid to the clubs by their members—except those for capital construction or improvements—regardless of the purpose for which such payments are made.

The harsh manner in which the present statute operates discourages club members from making contributions for the establishment of retirement plans for the club's employees. In other words, unlike the normal employer who gets a tax deduction for the contributions he makes to an employee pension trust, the club member not only gets no deduction but must pay an additional 20 percent on any such contribution. He is thus severely penalized for making a payment which he knows will be used only for the benefit of the club's employees.

It is most inequitable that the retirement needs of such a large segment of the working population as that represented by the employees of the club industry are being neglected whereas persons performing identical work for employers who obtain a tax deduction are being afforded protection. In 1962 Congress enacted the Self-Employed Individual's Tax Retirement Act in an effort to alleviate a similar unfairness which existed between employees and self-employed persons. The bill I am introducing would be a real step toward providing more equitable treatment among groups of similarly situated employees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2381) to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF A VICE PRESIDENT BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a proposed constitutional amendment to provide for the election of a Vice President by the two Houses of Congress, in joint session, with each Member having one vote, in the event the Vice President elected by the people succeeds to the Presidency. Under the proposal, Congress could elect one of its own number or a member of the Cabinet, and he would assume the duties of the Vice Presidency until the end of the term for which his predecessor was elected.

The tragic death of President Kennedy has focused sudden national attention on the adequacy of our governmental machinery to adapt fully to the loss of the Chief Executive. The Founding Fathers in their great wisdom provided specifically in the Constitution for the succession of the Vice President to the Presidency, and this automatic succession has taken place now with reassuring efficiency. But the drafters of the Constitution did not foresee how important the Vice Presidency would, in fact, become and did not provide for the replacement of the Vice President once, as in the present case, he has succeeded to the Presidency. The exigencies of our split-second nuclear age make it imperative that at all times there be a Vice President who is fully apprised of the President's work and able to take over immediately in the event of sudden tragedy.

The Constitution provides only that the Congress shall designate who shall act as President in the event that both the President and Vice President are unable to serve, but it does not provide for replacement of a Vice President who has succeeded to the Presidency. All three of the congressional enactments under the original authorization have been premised on the absence of both a President and Vice President. In 1792 Congress designated the President pro tempore of the Senate, followed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and if both offices were vacant, a special election by the electoral college; in 1886 it substituted the Cabinet officers, beginning with the Secretary of State; and in 1947, at President Truman's urging, it placed the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate ahead of the Cabinet.

The present situation has aroused two elements of dissatisfaction with the existing machinery, in my view. First, no order of succession under the present constitutional provision will permit the replacement of the Vice President, so that any officer designated as next in the line of succession will not be free, as an elected Vice President would, to participate to the fullest extent in the work of the President. In the last two administrations the Vice President was kept fully advised and prepared to take over the reigns of Government, and the efficiency of the transfer of power in the present case is often attributed to this fact.

But under existing law, as many commentators have noted, there is a real difficulty in keeping the next officer in the line of succession, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, equally fully advised. He is the operating chief of the House, in duties and powers comparable to the majority leader of the Senate, and clearly there is an element of conflict between the duties of the Presidency and the duties of the chief officer of the House of Representatives. This is not a conflict in the sense of competition between the executive branch and the legislative branch, but in the sense of separation of powers—that wise division of our Government into three distinct branches, each of which, by acting in its own sphere, serves as a check against the others.

If the succession were simply changed so that the Cabinet were next in line, as they were between 1886 and 1947, the separation of powers problem would be eliminated but a further difficulty would arise—the Vice President who became President would have the sole power to select his successor. This was the very reason that this order of succession was changed.

The second difficulty with the present method of designating a successor is that any such order of succession imposes new duties on the officer selected who has served for years in a necessarily quite different job. This officer would have to resign his own post, after a lifetime of work, to serve, perhaps only temporarily, in the Presidency.

In my view the answer to this dilemma lies in providing for the immediate election, in situations like the present one, of a person to act as Vice President who resigns from his prior office and devotes full time and attention as a member of the executive branch to preparing for the Presidency if he should be called upon to assume it. Accordingly I am today introducing a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of a person to act as Vice President, when that office is vacant for any reason, by the two Houses of Congress in joint session, each Member of Congress having one vote. The Congress may, under this provision, elect a Vice President from among the members of the Cabinet or from the Congress itself. He would then assume all the duties and responsibilities of the Vice Presidency and would serve until the end of the term for which his predecessor was elected.

The virtue of this procedure, as opposed to appointment of a Vice President by the new President—which has also been suggested—is that some element of popular selection would be exercised, but without the delay and other problems inherent in a special election by the people. At the same time, the influence of the new President's choice would undoubtedly be given great weight by the Congress just as a presidential nominee's choice is given weight in party conventions.

Also, having Congress elect a new Vice President has a parallel in the existing constitutional provision to solve deadlocks in the electoral college after a regular popular election. Under that provision the House elects the President, voting by States. My proposal differs from this, since it gives a vote to each Member and adds the Senate. This would overcome the objection which is often voiced against the deadlock provision—that it gives disproportionate power to States with small populations. The proposed provision permits some balance between proportional representation in the House and equal representation in the Senate.

The proposal does not attempt to solve a further problem, which we hope will never arise but which must be faced—a virtually simultaneous vacancy in both the Presidency and the Vice Presidency. The terms of the amendment make it clear that in such a case the existing constitutional provision and the succession statute enacted pursuant to it remain operative, and a President would immediately be identified. The Vice President would then be elected under my proposed provision. This leaves unresolved some of the difficulties with the present system which have already been discussed. But the difficulties cannot be readily eliminated, for an elective approach to replacements would entail a measure of delay which, again our split-second world does not permit us. And a system of interim appointees, named in the statute of succession and who would yield to the elected President and Vice President after a special election also seems too cumbersome and uncertain because of the possibility of having three Chief Executives in rapid succession, the second one knowing that his term may only be temporary.

This last problem is one which deserves study by the Congress and by the Nation, but its difficulties should not interfere with a speedy solution of the present problem—the absence of a Vice President, a situation we have faced twice in less than 20 years. I feel this vital problem can be solved reasonably through this proposed constitutional amendment.

I send the proposed constitutional amendment to the desk for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### JOHN STEWART MURPHY—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 4, 1963, the bill H.R. 5083, for the relief of John Stewart Murphy, was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and was placed on the Senate Calendar. Subsequent to that action information was received which requires further study by the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 5083 be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 359)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments (No. 359) intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT — AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 360)

Mr. DODD submitted amendments (No. 360) intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1975) to amend the Federal Firearms Act, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

### JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS OR LOANS UNDER CERTAIN ACTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators BURDICK, ERVIN, and SIMPSON may be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2350) to provide for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RENAMING OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 136.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS OF JOHN MORGAN DAVIS AND A. LEON HIGGINBOTHAM, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, December 19, 1963, at 1:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

John Morgan Davis, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Thomas C. Egan, deceased.

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice J. Cullen Ganey, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 11, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.;

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held by the government of the District of Columbia; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 736, and that the following measures be considered in sequence; and I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate points in connection with these measures, I may be authorized to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the reports or recommendations and statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, both requests by the Senator from Montana are granted.

### TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY MOTOR VEHICLES

The bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 756), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter into agreements with motor vehicle passenger-carrying common carriers, without advertising for competitive bids and without bond, for transporting mail over established routes upon which the carrier is permitted, by law, to carry passengers.

#### STATEMENT

Title 41, United States Code, section 5 (public contracts) requires public advertisement and competitive bidding for transportation-of-mail contracts. However, the Post Office Department has found this requirement to be an impediment to providing the most efficient postal service because, regardless of what terms the Department advertised, only one bus company could respond to the bid. No two passenger-carrying common carriers have service and comparable schedules between any two places. Common carriers do not conform their schedules to departmental requirements as is usually done with formally advertised contract procedures.

Because of these peculiar characteristics of bus company transportation, the Department, several years ago, began negotiating a number of nonadvertised short-term contracts with these carriers. These contracts allowed bus companies to carry mail at a fixed rate—usually 75 cents per mailpouch—regardless of the distance involved.

In 1959, the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that negotiated contracts were in violation of the law unless Congress adopted legislation to extend an exception to such procedures. Contracts existing at the time of this decision (39 Comp. Gen. 485) were allowed to expire at the completion of their term.

H.R. 5179 would authorize the Post Office Department to begin again utilizing such contracts. It would eliminate the requirement of advertising mail-transportation contracts and allow the Postmaster General to determine which type of contract—advertised or negotiated—will best serve the interests of the postal service. It will bring a desirable degree of flexibility into scheduling mail transportation which now exists in the areas of railroad and airline mail transportation contracts. It should be emphasized that negotiated contracts would be permitted only in passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and not in trucks of the common carrier. Additionally, the routes to be covered are only those regularly established and permitted by law.

Common carriers are now subject to financial review by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee sees no necessity in requiring additional bond since such a requirement would merely increase the costs of mail transportation without securing additional protection for the Government.

### HEARINGS

Public hearings were held on H.R. 5179, by the Subcommittee on Postal Affairs. The views of the Post Office Department and representatives of other interested groups were expressed. No opposition was expressed.

### COST

The rate per mailpouch, under previously existing negotiated contracts, generally was less than the rate for advertised contracts. The committee believes resuming negotiated contracts and establishing more flexible procedures will reduce cost.

**Mr. MANSFIELD** subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, read a third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## INCREASE IN AREA IN WHICH POST OFFICE STATIONS MAY BE ESTABLISHED

The bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**Mr. MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 757), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PURPOSE

This measure has two purposes. It would grant new authority to the Postmaster General to:

1. Establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices within 20 miles of the limits of boundaries of a city in which the main post office is located, the present limitation being 10 miles.

2. Establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices at airports irrespective of the distance of the airport branch from the limits or boundaries of the city in which the main or parent post office is located.

The Post Office Department has stated that this authority is needed to provide the necessary postal service to suburban areas of large cities on an orderly and economical basis, and to provide adequate service at airports located a considerable distance from the cities with which they are identified.

### STATEMENT

The rapid growth of the suburbs of large cities in recent years has made unrealistic the 10-mile limitation of existing law on the establishment of branch post offices. The Post Office Department has stated that in view of the availability of modern transportation networks, it is more efficient to extend postal operation in a growing metropolitan area by the establishment of branches rather than a number of independent offices.

Requests received by the Department for the establishment of independent post offices usually are motivated by a desire on the part of patrons in an area for community identity. This community identity can be provided by the establishment of a named branch of the metropolitan post office if the area is located within 10 miles of the metropolitan city limits. Such a branch not only provides the desired community identity and the needed local service; it also contributes to the efficient operation of an economical and unified postal district under one independent post office.

Because of the present 10-mile limitation, however, the Department cannot respond affirmatively to justified requests for community identity received from patrons living in suburban areas beyond this distance. These requests must either be denied or an independent post office must be established at considerable expense.

In addition to the expense incurred, the establishment of independent suburban post offices is sometimes not desirable for the following reasons:

Frequently the area from which requests for independent offices emanate is provided city delivery service even though it is beyond the 10-mile limit. If an independent office and an independent postal district were established, the area could not qualify for the city delivery service. The Department reports that, in such a case, the establishment of an independent office would result in a reduction in service. The law requires that an independent post office shall have a minimum of $10,000 in gross postal receipts for the preceding fiscal year before city delivery service is authorized. Furthermore, experience has shown that it is operationally and economically unsound to establish city delivery service at offices where there are fewer than 2,500 patrons.

Few of the suburbs under consideration would meet these requirements on an independent basis.

Accordingly, the 10-mile limitation is now an impediment to the orderly extension of postal service.

The authority to establish post office branches at airports without regard to their distance from the cities which they serve is requested because many of today's commercial airports, often requiring long runways to accommodate jet aircraft, must frequently be located at considerable distance from the cities with which they are identified. It is impractical and unrealistic to make a postal facility at a large airport a branch of the post office of a small nearby village simply because the post office of the village is the closest independent post office.

The Department cites Dulles International Airport as an example—an airport universally associated with Washington, D.C. The Department cannot legally establish a branch at Dulles because the branch would be located beyond the present 10-mile limitation.

Precedent for the removal of the 10-mile limit exists in current law authorizing the establishment of postal stations, substations, or branches at camps, ports, or stations of the Armed Forces and at defense and other strategic locations without any limitation of distance.

The committee concurs with the Post Office Department in these two recommendations, recognizing that the Postmaster General should have the requested authority.

### HOUSE AMENDMENT

The House report on H.R. 5778 stipulates that "* * * the authorization to establish such stations, substations, or branches should be coupled with a clear statement of congressional intent that it shall not be used as a basis for discontinuing any established post office. Such a statement of intent will safeguard against any possible future application of this authority in a manner inconsistent with legislative intent."

Further, the House has amended H.R. 5778 so that it specifically amends section 705(c) of title 39, United States Code, by the addition of the following sentence: "This authority may not be used by the Postmaster General as a basis for discontinuing an established post office."

The committee agrees entirely with this stipulation and with this amendment and notes the assurance of the Department that the purpose of H.R. 5778 is not to increase the Postmaster General's authority to discontinue established post offices, since he now possesses sufficient authority for this under existing statutes.

It is the committee's understanding that should an independent post office be discontinued, the discontinuance would be made upon the basis of the Postmaster General's existing authority and it would not be discontinued because a branch was replacing it under the authority granted in H.R. 5778.

### COST

Enactment of H.R. 5778 will not entail any additional cost to the Government.

**Mr. MANSFIELD** subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT TO THE PEACE CORPS ACT

The bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**Mr. MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 759), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### I. BACKGROUND AND MAIN PURPOSE

On July 9, 1963, President Kennedy transmitted to the Senate draft legislation to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat.

612), as amended. The draft legislation was introduced as S. 1916 by Senator FULBRIGHT by request on July 18, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. H.R. 9009, a similar bill, passed the House of Representatives on November 13 by a voice vote and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the following day.

The main purpose of H.R. 9009 is to authorize the appropriation of $102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964.

### II. COMMITTEE ACTION

On December 3, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the pending legislation. Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, accompanied by William Josephson, General Counsel of the Peace Corps, appeared in support of the administration bill. The hearing is printed as an appendix to this report.

The committee is unaware of any objections to the proposed amendments to the Peace Corps Act.

On December 10, the committee met in executive session and, without objection, ordered H.R. 9009 reported favorably to the Senate.

### III. PROVISIONS OF H.R. 9009

#### *A. Authorization*

Section 1 of the bill, by amending section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, would authorize an appropriation of $102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964. This sum would enable the Peace Corps to have 11,300 volunteers either in training or overseas by August 31, 1964.

Congress authorized an appropriation of $63,750,000 to finance the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1963. The amount actually appropriated was $59 million to provide for 9,000 volunteers for training or oversea duty by August 31, 1963. By that date, however, only 6,634 volunteers were in training or overseas, and the Peace Corps consequently returned to the Treasury $3,870,000 of the appropriated funds. Several factors contributed to the failure to attain the projected number of volunteers. In the first place, the Peace Corps raised the standards by which it selects volunteers. In the second place, it chose to program people with certain skills—mathematics and science teachers, and doctors and nurses—because they are most urgently needed overseas. Applicants possessing such skills are not plentiful.

In his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations on December 3, the Director of the Peace Corps expressed confidence that during fiscal year 1964 the Peace Corps would be able to have either in training or in projects overseas the total number of 11,300 covered in its $102 million appropriation request. It might be noted that as of November 30, 1963, there were 7,185 trainees and volunteers. In each succeeding fiscal year during which the Peace Corps has been in existence, there has been a rise in the number of Peace Corps applications received. Nearly 7,000 applications reached the Peace Corps headquarters in the past 2 months.

There follows a table indicating the assignment of volunteers by region on August 31, 1963, and as planned through August 31, 1964.

*Assignment of volunteers*

| Region | Aug. 31, 1963 | | Aug. 31, 1964 (estimated) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Countries | Volunteers | Countries [1] | Volunteers [2] |
| Africa | 17 | 2,208 | 19 | 3,370 |
| Far East | 6 | 1,177 | [3] 4 | 1,730 |
| Latin America | 17 | 2,466 | 18 | 4,820 |
| Near East and south Asia | 8 | 783 | 8 | 1,380 |
| Total | 48 | 6,634 | 49 | 11,300 |

[1] The rate of increase of countries in which the Peace Corps program has been or will be initiated in 1962 and 1963 is not applied to 1964. It is assumed that during 1963, programs will have been developed for the majority of countries in which the Peace Corps at present has a potential for service.

[2] Includes 3,595 replacements in continuing programs of volunteers who will have completed service or whose service will have been terminated early during the period Aug. 31, 1963, to Aug. 31, 1964.

[3] Establishment of the Federation of Malaysia makes the 3 countries of Malaya, Sabah (formerly North Borneo), and Sarawak, 1 country.

It will be noted that the additional volunteers requested for fiscal year 1964 would primarily be sent to Latin America and Africa. Both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk recommended this increase.

Of the $102 million requested, it is estimated that 19.9 percent, or $20,300,000, will be spent for administration and that the remainder will be spent to support volunteers.

The annual cost per Peace Corps volunteer is $9,000, the same as it has been since the inception of the Peace Corps. The percentage represented by administrative expenses has changed slightly. In fiscal year 1962, the costs directly related to volunteers and projects were $6,300 per volunteer; administrative costs were $2,700. In fiscal 1964 it is anticipated that $7,000 will be earmarked for volunteer and project costs, while $2,000 will be earmarked for administrative expenses. The training costs for volunteers have risen because the Peace Corps, on the basis of its experience to date, believes it desirable that a volunteer achieve more proficiency in the language he will need in his work abroad prior to his being sent overseas.

In the hearing appended to this report will be found tables showing (1) Peace Corps administrative expenses by object classification, (2) ratio of Peace Corps employees to Peace Corps volunteers, and (3) ratio of administrative expenses to volunteers and project costs.

Evidence exists to show that the interest of Americans in serving in the Peace Corps continues high. As noted above, the number of Peace Corps applications has annually shown a steady rise. Moreover, of the volunteers who have successfully completed one tour of duty, roughly 10 percent expressed an interest either in spending another 2 years continuing to work on their initial assignment or in being assigned to other projects.

In addition, the work the volunteers have performed in providing skilled manpower to countries and areas less developed than our own has led, in all cases, to more requests for volunteers. Countries in which no projects have been in operation have also sought help from the Peace Corps.

It cannot be known with precision at this time whether or not the Peace Corps will be able to meet its goal of having 11,300 volunteers in training or overseas by August 31, 1964. Nonetheless, the committee believes there is a good chance that the Peace Corps will be able to fulfill the quota set and that it should not be penalized because it cannot make a flat guarantee. In matching volunteers and projects, the committee would rather the Peace Corps adopt a cautious approach than indulge in hasty and ill-conceived programing in order to obtain the maximum number of volunteers it requests. While the Peace Corps fell short of its goal last year, in the committee's view, its action was prudent and wise.

The committee's opinion is that the past achievements and present prospects of the Peace Corps are ample justification for recommending that there be authorized an appropriation of $102 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1964.

#### *B. Transfers of supplies and equipment and of property received by gift, devise, or otherwise (sec. 2(a) and sec. 5(b))*

Section 2(a) of the bill would amend section 5 of the Peace Corps Act to make it possible for certain supplies or equipment provided volunteers to be transferred to the government or to other entities of a country or area where volunteers have been serving.

In order for such transfers to be made, it will be necessary for a Peace Corps representative to make a determination that the supplies and equipment are no longer useful to the volunteer to whom provided or to his Peace Corps replacement, if any. Moreover, there may be transferred only "work" or "project" supplies or equipment, such as teaching aids, textbooks, tools furnished community development volunteers, and recreational equipment. Medicines, household furnishings, and vehicles are illustrative of nontransferable items.

In some cases, the actual value of supplies and equipment remaining on hand at the conclusion of a Peace Corps project would be exceeded by the cost of transporting them to the sites of other projects or back to the United States. Too, such supplies and equipment usually would be of considerable value to the beneficiaries.

Section 5 of the bill would amend section 10(a)(3) of the Peace Corps Act to permit donated property to be transferred to the government or other entities of the country or area with which the volunteers are serving when such transfers would generally further the purposes of the act.

At present, if the Peace Corps accepts from a donor property which is sent overseas for project use, the property cannot be disposed of except by following the procedures applicable to all Government property. In certain instances, donated items no longer needed for a particular project would not be readily salable or usable in projects elsewhere, or worth return shipping or storage costs.

In addition, the authority granted by section 5(a) would permit selective acceptance, shipment, and transfer of donated property to the entities abroad in which volunteers are working. An example of property which might be handled in that manner would be reference books for a library in a school where volunteers teach.

#### *C. Counseling programs for returned volunteers (sec. 2(f))*

Section 2(f) of the bill would add a new subsection (k) to section 5 of the Peace Corps Act. Pursuant to the new subsection, the Peace Corps would be authorized to undertake programs under which volunteers could be counseled with respect to opportunities for further education and employment.

The programs will be designed to assure that the skills and experience which former volunteers have derived from their training and their service abroad will be best utilized in the national interest. Peace Corps activities under section 2(f) of H.R. 9009 will be carried out in cooperation with other Government agencies, private employers, educational institutions, and other entities of the United States.

The Peace Corps policy will be to enable a former volunteer to avail himself of its counseling services up to 1 year after his termination from duty with the Peace Corps. For a former volunteer who, in the intervening time, is called to active military duty, an appropriate time extension will be made.

When the legislation to establish a Peace Corps was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1961, the committee rejected an executive branch provision which would have established a career development board. The committee felt that the need for such a board did not exist at that time, and also that able volunteers who did a good job overseas were capable of planning their own careers. The committee now believes that counseling assistance for returned volunteers can be justified.

In fiscal year 1964, it is anticipated that approximately 3,000 volunteers will successfully complete a tour of duty abroad and will return to the United States. Many of these volunteers have been serving in remote spots around the world and have had little opportunity to become informed on further educational possibilities available or jobs which may be open to them upon their return to the United States. Many have significantly altered their career goals.

In the 2 years these volunteers have served overseas, representatives of the Peace Corps will have had occasion to observe and measure their on-the-job performance, as well as their personal talents and skills. If these volunteers are able to receive timely and expert guidance and counsel to help them channel their lives into careers for which they appear well qualified and interested, their opportunities for future service to the Nation may well be enhanced.

It might be noted that the Carnegie Corp. of New York awarded a special 1-year grant (July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1964) to the American Council on Education to enable the latter to establish in Washington, D.C., a Peace Corps Volunteer Career Information Service for the benefit of returning Peace Corps volunteers.

With the cooperation of the Peace Corps, personnel of the service have undertaken systematically to apprise volunteers of educational and other opportunities available to them, and to offer counsel to volunteers seeking it. Committee hopes that the Peace Corps will gain useful information and knowledge from the pilot project made possible by this private grant. As this project is phased out, the Peace Corps can undertake the same services under the authority provided by section 2(f).

The committee expects these programs envisaged to be modest in scope and the counseling services offered not to be made compulsory for volunteers.

### *D. Restriction on use of official seal or emblem and name "Peace Corps" and penalties for unauthorized use*

Section 7 of the bill provides that the use of the official Peace Corps seal or emblem and the use of the name "Peace Corps" shall be restricted exclusively to designate programs authorized under the Peace Corps Act. Unauthorized use will subject a violator to a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both. A violation may be enjoined at the suit of the Attorney General, U.S. attorneys, or other persons duly authorized to represent the United States.

Section 7, which would amend section 19 of the Peace Corps Act, is similar to other prohibitions on the use of names and insignia contained in chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code, and is specifically based on 18 U.S.C. 707 which prohibits the unauthorized use of the 4-H Club name or insignia.

Various individuals or groups in the United States have been using the name "Peace Corps" in connection with, or to identify, their activities. Among the difficulties that are apt to arise if this use is not prohibited is that of confusion both in the United States and abroad as to whether a particular endeavor can be characterized as official or unofficial.

### *E. Encouragement of establishment by other countries and areas of voluntary service programs (sec. 8)*

Section 8 of the bill would add a new title III to the Peace Corps Act. The new section 301(a) of the act would declare that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of the Peace Corps Act to encourage countries and areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to help meet the needs of less developed countries or areas for trained manpower, and to encourage less developed countries or areas to establish programs under which their citizens and nationals would volunteer to serve in order to meet their needs for trained manpower.

The new section 301(b) of the act would restrict this authority in the following ways: First, not more than $300,000 may be used in fiscal year 1964 to carry out the purposes of the new title III. Second, the activities authorized to be carried out pursuant to the new title III are limited to the furnishing of knowledge and skills relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower. Third, none of the funds available to carry out the purposes of the act which are used in furtherance of the purposes of the new title III may be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof; nor may such funds be used to pay the costs of developing or operating volunteer programs or to pay any other costs of such organization, government, or agency. Moreover, it is provided in section 8 of the bill that activities carried out pursuant to the new title shall not compromise the national character of the Peace Corps.

While none of the $300,000 available for the purposes of encouragement of voluntary service programs may be contributed to any international organization, or to any foreign government or agency thereof, the Peace Corps would not be prohibited, under separate authority in section 14 of the Peace Corps Act, from detailing, assigning or otherwise making available any officer or employee (1) to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of any international organization, or (2) to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or agency thereof.

In the committee's opinion, if other countries and areas are sufficiently interested in establishing volunteer projects of their own, they should be willing to assume the primary financial burden of getting those projects underway.

In connection with its future examination of the Peace Corps programs for fiscal year 1965, the committee intends to look carefully at the utilization of the $300,000 authorized pursuant to section 8 of this bill, as well as at the percentage cost sharing of bilateral and international projects undertaken pursuant to section 8.

### *F. Other provisions of the bill*

#### (a) Payment of readjustment allowance to volunteers (sec. 2 (b) and (c); sec. 3)

Section 2(b) of the bill would change in several respects section 5(c) of the Peace Corps Act which authorizes the payment to each volunteer at the end of his service of not to exceed $75 for each month, or portion thereof, of satisfactory service. In subsection (c) the phrase "readjustment allowance" is to be substituted for the phrase "termination payments" to express more clearly the purpose of these payments. The other change would make it clear that the Peace Corps may withhold all or part of the readjustment allowance of a volunteer assigned overseas until he has actually returned to the United States, rather than making payments overseas where his service usually terminates.

Section 2(c) and section 3 of the bill are conforming amendments which would reflect in section 5(f)(2) and section b(1) of the Peace Corps Act the changes made by section 2(b) of H.R. 9009.

#### (b) Assignment of volunteers to duties on staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad

Section 2(d) of the bill would amend section 5(g) of the Peace Corps Act to make possible the assignment of not more than 100 volunteers to carry out secretarial and clerical duties on the staffs of Peace Corps representatives abroad.

While a number of persons with secretarial and clerical experience and skills have applied to join the Peace Corps, projects in which their abilities might be useful have not developed to any appreciable extent. However, the skills of such persons could be utilized by their assignment as volunteers to work on oversea staffs of the Peace Corps, with the result that Peace Corps administrative costs abroad will be reduced.

#### (c) Miscellaneous provisions

Section 2(e) of the bill would amend section 5(h) of the Peace Corps Act in two respects:

First, Peace Corps employees would be classified as Federal employees for the purposes of the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.). The effect of this amendment would be to enable the volunteers to receive appropriate assistance of an administrative nature with respect to the exercise of whatever absentee voting rights they may already possess under State law.

Section 2(e) of the bill would also serve to classify volunteers as Federal employees for the purposes of the act of June 4, 1954, chapter 264, section 4 (5 U.S.C. 73b—5). This act, authorizes, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the use of appropriations chargeable for transportation of baggage of Government employees for such payment of general average contributions as may be required in connection with authorized transportation of baggage. General average contributions are the contributions which each party to a sea venture may be required to make in order (1) to make good the loss sustained by any one of their number on account of sacrifices made of part of the ship or cargo to save the residue or the lives of those on board from impending peril, or (2) to share extraordinary expenses necessarily incurred for the common benefit and safety of all.

Section 4 of the bill contains an amendment to section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act to remove a possible ambiguity which might lead to an unintended interpretation which would preclude the Peace Corps from compensating at supergrade rates persons detailed to agency supergrade positions, such as Foreign Service or Public Health Service officers. The change proposed would in no way increase the total number of supergrades authorized for the Peace Corps.

Section 6(b) of the bill would amend section 13(a) of the act, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, by striking out the words "Peace Corps" which appear therein and substituting the word "President." This change merely reflects the fact that the act in itself does not create a Peace Corps agency, but confers authorities and functions upon the President.

## IV. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Fiscal year 1964 will denote the third full year that the Peace Corps has been in operation. Except for a few isolated incidents the volunteers have performed well the tasks to which they have been assigned and their presence and their accomplishments seem to have been genuinely welcomed and appreciated by the peoples of the countries and areas served.

As the committee noted both last year and the year before "the success of the Peace Corps will depend largely on the type of employees it has and the type of volunteers who will be sent abroad." The consistent overall high caliber of both employees and volunteers is markedly impressive.

The committee is satisfied with the Peace Corps' record of achievement to date and strongly recommends Senate approval of H.R. 9009.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which this bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 217) to authorize a study of a national system of scenic highways was announced as next in order.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Over.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

## PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF EULOGIES OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, DELIVERED IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

The resolution (S. Res. 230) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the eulogies of the late President, John F. Kennedy, delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on November 24, 1963, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That there be printed as a Senate document the eulogies to the late President John F. Kennedy delivered in the rotunda of the United States Capitol on November 24, 1963, by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and Speaker of the House John W. McCormack.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five hundred and forty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which one hundred and three thousand shall be for the use of the Senate and four hundred and forty-one thousand for the use of the House of Representatives.

## SAMUEL T. MOORE

The resolution (S. Res. 233) to pay a gratuity to Samuel T. Moore was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Samuel T. Moore, father of Harmon A. Moore, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## KATIE L. DISNEY

The resolution (S. Res. 234) to pay a gratuity to Katie L. Disney was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Katie L. Disney, widow of Francis L. Disney, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to seven months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances

## PRINTING OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FOR USE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works, certain information on water pollution control was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on water pollution control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.

## HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE DEBATE TOPICS

The bill (S. 2311) to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to prepare compilations of pertinent excerpts, bibliographical references, and other appropriate materials relating to (1) the subject selected annually by the National University Extension Association as the national high school debate topic and (2) the subject selected annually by the American Speech Association as the national college debate topic. In preparing such compilations the Librarian shall include materials which in his judgment are representative of, and give equal emphasis to, the opposing points of view on the respective topics.

SEC. 2. The compilations on the high school debate topics shall be printed as Senate documents and the compilations on the college debate topics shall be printed as House documents, the cost of which shall be charged to the congressional allotment for printing and binding. Additional copies of such documents may be printed in such quantities and distributed in such manner as the Joint Committee on Printing directs.

## PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY—SECOND INSTALLMENT"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 230) authorizing the printing of 5,000 copies of the study, "Tax Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy—Second Installment," for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business was considered and agreed to.

## PRINTING OF "TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS: THEIR IMPACT ON OUR ECONOMY"

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 231) authorizing the printing of the study "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Our Economy" was considered and agreed to.

## PRINTING OF CERTAIN SUPREME COURT OPINIONS INVOLVING OFFERING OF PRAYERS AND READING FROM BIBLE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 237) providing for the printing of certain opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in public schools was considered and agreed to.

## PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMVETS

The bill (H.R. 8751) to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS shall be printed as a House document was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Morning business is in order.

## AMERICAN INDIAN CRAFTS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, under the present administration of our Federal Indian policy there is a concerted effort being made to encourage the American Indian initiative in helping himself and the development of useful talents and industries. The most obvious success has been in the field of Indian arts and crafts. We have known for a long time about the crafts on certain reservations but not until recently did we realize the extent and quality of this work.

This month there are three exhibits in the Washington area which bring to sharper focus the fine arts and crafts that are being introduced by the American Indian. Now underway is the first one-man showing of the east coast of the paintings of Oscar Howe, the noted Sioux Indian artist. The main lobby of the Department of State is the site of an extensive exhibition of contemporary American Indian crafts. This exhibit includes objects from 30 States, including sculpture, jewelry, weaving, basketry, pottery, and a wealth of other items.

Later this month an exhibition of the traditional and new design concepts in objects handicrafted by Eskimos and Indians of Alaska will be opened at the Baltimore Museum of Art in Baltimore.

In discussing Indian art and crafts I would be derelict if I did not mention the extremely fine Museum of the Plains Indian at Browning, Mont. Also the December 1963 edition of the Holiday magazine contains a feature on "Our Indian Crafts" which I recommend to all.

The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board are to be highly complimented for their work in stimulating this creative work among our Indians and Eskimos.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the article which appeared in the December 1963 edition of Holiday magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Holiday, Dec. 1963]

### OUR INDIAN CRAFTS

(By Robert Phillips)

One of the most absorbing and admired pieces of sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City is a 30-foot-high totem pole carved by two Indians of the Pacific Northwest. The first time I saw it I wondered what it was doing in that setting. Was it modern? Was it art? That was years ago and I have since learned that assuredly it is both. But then I have also found that Indian crafts with their rich combination of decorative and symbolic art have universal appeal and stir the imagination as deeply as the creative work of any people.

The ancient Indian sketched men and animals on flat rock with colored clay or with a sharp stone. His wife wove a basket of reed yucca or grass so tightly it would hold water. Their whole existence revolved around two powerful, intertwined forces, nature and religion. Often ritual was woven into art, and always art into ritual, through ceremonial masks, costumes, dolls, sand paintings, and such.

The old religious ways are largely gone now, but the inspirational source remains. As René d'Harnoncourt, a man who knows his art and Indians, points out, "Now spiritual and functional values are replaced by purely esthetic values. But Indian work retains its fundamental feeling and sense of style. It remains a regional expression—the wood carver of the Northwest conveys the essence of the gloomy fogbound coast, the pueblo potter creates effects of the Southwest only."

D'Harnoncourt was the first general manager of the Department of the Interior's Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Until that Board was established early in the 1930's, the Federal Government had made every effort to replace Indian ways with white ways. The old art, language, and customs were not only discouraged, but suppressed. Creation of the Board marked a turning point—a decision to promote the economic welfare of the tribes through encouragement of their crafts. D'Harnoncourt approached the Indians with respect, and gave them the benefit of his vast background in the folk art of his native Austria and of Mexico. Through the years, the Board raised artisans' sights and standards. Under its present Chairman, Dr. Frederick Dockstader, director of the Museum of the American Indian in New York, it encourages the adaptation of traditional work into salable merchandise which harmonizes with modern dress and decor.

These craft items merit the attention of any discriminating shopper or decorator. Certainly the wild assortment of imitations fabricated everywhere from Brooklyn to Hong Kong emphasizes the value of the genuine article, which only the Indian can make. Let me take you around the country and point out some of my favorite artisans.

We begin far above the Arctic Circle, with the Eskimo basket weavers. At Point Barrow they make a basket of baleen, the long, slender fronds extracted from a whale's jaw, sometimes mistakenly called whalebone. The basket weavers, mostly men, first coil and soak the brownish-black blades, then split them into strips less than a half-inch wide. They weave the baskets on a base of walrus-tusk ivory, with incredible tightness and symmetry, perfectly round and about five inches high. Then they top them with an ivory carving—usually a walrus head—for the lid. Until recent years only a few baleen baskets could be found outside museums, and they sold for large sums. But these lovely pieces, which look like small ornamental sewing baskets, are now more generally available at prices of $40 to $50.

Many other handsome crafts, both useful and decorative, are produced by the Alaskan Indians and Eskimos. Ceremonial masks and driftwood carvings, inlaid with abalone shell, show a touch of surrealism and would feel in place on a modern wall. The ivory of the walrus tusk is carved into small, delicate figures of birds, penguins and the old walrus himself. Parkas and boots of caribou fur and moccasins of sealskin are the warmest of outer garments—and much less bulky than you would expect.

Among individual artisans to remember, there is Mrs. Ethel Washington, an Eskimo of Kotzebue, and a master skin sewer. In younger days she helped her husband fish and hunt the beluga, or white whale, and supplied the family with footwear and clothing. The women of Kotzebue make a doll family—man, woman and child dressed in parkas and mukluks—so faithful in detail they could serve as Eskimo models in any museum.

California is the hearth of basketry, where women of small, impoverished tribes continue the oldest of New World arts. The aboriginal Californians wove beautiful baskets, using bird plumage with techniques equaled only by the Peruvians and Polynesians. The greatest weaver of recent history was Dat-so-la-lee, of the Washoes, who transmitted the legend and lore of her tribe through 256 magnificent baskets before her death in 1925. Her finest piece, "Myriads of Stars Shine O'er the Graves of Our Ancestors," has no less than 86,590 stitches and is now valued at $10,000. Though her work may never be matched, you can still purchase baskets of museum quality from women of the Washoe, Pomo and Hoopa reservations.

On the Hoopa Valley Reservation, for example, in the high, forested mountains northeast of Eureka, the basket makers weave white grass, black maidenhair fern, willow root, woodworth shrub and hazel. One of their designs is a progressive zigzag in brown and pale green, named "rattlesnake."

Among the northern California weavers, Mrs. Lizzie Smith combines the sense of the past with the needs of the present; she makes large cooking baskets for preparing pinole (a meal made from plant seeds) as her grandmother did. Mrs. Smith also makes finely woven wine bottle covers traditional in pattern but adaptable to any modern setting. The price is $10. You can also order her more expensive baskets which combine porcupine quills, dyed yellow with lichen, and other materials in browns and beiges.

The tribes of the northern and southern plains create beadwork art, buckskin garments, feathered war bonnets and long fringed shirts that have been collectors' items for years. They draw inspiration from a heritage of master painters who inscribed their shields with life forms and recorded history on buffalo hides. In fact their forebears used nearly every part of the buffalo in some way. From the hides women made clothing, tepees, and rawhide vessels. They plaited the hair into ropes and the sinew into thread, they carved the horns into spoons and made the skull a ceremonial altar.

Women of the plains also developed the art of embroidering with brightly colored porcupine quills. Such quillwork is purely Indian but unfortunately it is almost a thing of the past. Before the introduction of glass beadwork, young girls were taught to apply the quills to buckskin in many designs. Here and there this dying craft is still practiced, or at least demonstrated, and it may yet come back. But protecting the authentic beadwork is problem enough, since the Plains are presently being flooded with cheap Hong Kong imitations. If you want the real thing you must shop carefully; it is worth the effort.

The Bannock and Shoshone of Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, for example, produce exquisite and precise floral designs on beaded purses and moccasins. In the southern plains of Oklahoma, on the other hand, the Kiowa, Arapaho, Comanche and other tribes do bolder beadwork on suede, in geometric and medallion forms reminiscent of warriors' belts and bridles. Buckskin jackets with fringed yoke and beaded decoration sell for $75 to $125, suede for $55. Beaded necklaces are $3 to $8, sturdy deerskin gloves, $4.50, and rawhide baskets $25.

In the upper reaches of North Dakota, the Turtle Mountain Chippewa are another tribe famous for beadwork. This area also produces a type of woodwork not found elsewhere: highly polished "diamond willow." The naturally grooved diamond shapes, caused by a fungus growth in the tree, become visible once the bark is removed. Whittlers make the most of the curving grains in the wood—and sometimes diamonds within diamonds—while fashioning lamps, chairs, bedsteads, and canes.

In Oklahoma, where 60 tribes number almost 58,000, the town of Anadarko has become one of the major Indian centers of the country. Here are located the Indian Hall of Fame and the Southern Plains Exhibit and Craft Center, and here is held, in mid-August (the American Indian Exposition featuring crafts demonstrations, ceremonials, and the National Indian War Dance Contest.

To show the genuine nature of the craft revival, I like to cite the example of the late Acee Blue Eagle, a distinguished Oklahoma Indian artist, who studied and lectured at Oxford, and became an articulate spokesman for his race. Although his primary interest was painting the lives of his people, their dances, their dress, and the land around them, he did exhaustive research in the ancient arts of ceramics, leatherwork, and jewelry. He traced the history of the Indians highly stylized little figures molded or carved as fetishes and charms, and of wooden figures carved on ceremonial staffs, spoons, or feast bowls. In museums he studied and sketched the way his ancestors treated the head, arms, legs, and feet in their art and tried to deduce a form of sculpture as characteristic of the Indian as their painting, beadwork, silver, and weaving.

At Pipestone, Minn., for three conturies the Sioux have quarried and carved ceremonial pipes. The "classic ground" George Catlin once called the sacred quarries. Catlin, artist, explorer, and devoted friend of the Indians, almost lost his life at the hands of the Sioux when he entered that ground in 1836. But he received his rewards: a pipe quarried for him by a chief, and the name "catlinite" later given to the smooth red stone.

The pipe filled a high role in tribal life. Treaties were arranged, lands acquired, and wars terminated over a pipe. But a pipe from these quarries was held in special esteem, for the red stone was believed formed from the flesh of the Indians' ancestors. The quarry is protected as Pipestone National Monument, and its use is reserved to Sioux members of the Indian Shrine Association. They preserve a vanishing skill in carving varieties of the highly ornamented plains pipe. The best known pipe, the Sioux calumet, has a wooden stem made of ash, 2 to 3 feet long, decorated with feathers, beadwork, or paint. On some pipes the stone bowl is carved in the form of a buffalo, bear, tomahawk, or eagle claw. Pipes sell for prices up to $35; there also are smaller effigies of turtles, bears, and buffaloes suitable for paperweights and ashtrays.

North America's highest expressions of aboriginal art survive in the Southwest. Among the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, the Hopi on their high mesas in Arizona, the Navajo, Apache, and Papago, the way of life is tied to ancient heritage, culture, and religion. Many individuals cling to old rituals, the occult, the secret society; consequently the purest art forms are reserved for their own eyes and use.

But undoubtedly the Southwest, in a 200-mile arc around Gallup, N. Mex., offers the purchaser the greatest volume and variety of fine Indian crafts. The Hopi alone, in their three principal villages overlooking the Painted Desert, offer more types of significant items than any other Indian group in the country. The best known are the kachina dolls, effigies of the spirit rainmakers, carved of cottonwood root, painted with vegetable and earth colors and embellished with feathers, fur, and cloth. Thousands of Japanese-made clay and plastic kachinas are sold to people willing to be duped, yet the real thing can be bought for 85 cents or a dollar.

Each Hopi village has its specialty. The first mesa is the source of almost all decorated Hopi pottery, made by hand, without benefit of a potter's wheel, and fired in the open without a kiln. The most characteristic Hopi pottery is colored red, with intricate black designs—often conventionalizations of feathers of birds—following the contours of the jar or bowl. The second mesa produces beautiful baskets, exceedingly strong and durable, made of galleta grass and split yucca-leaf strips. Four colors, usually vegetable dyes of yellow, green, black, and rust red, are combined with the cream background of the yucca. The third mesa makes wicker baskets, not so durable (nor so expensive), from branches of the wild currant bush and rabbit brush.

The Hopi once were known as crude silverworkers and copyists of other Indians, but the Museum of Northern Arizona at Flagstaff has given them guidance and encouragement. Now Hopi silver has come into its own as a distinctive, desirable type to compare with that of the Zuñi and Navajo. Hopi work is characterized by an overlay: a pattern of symbolic designs (often adapted from pottery) is cut out of a thin sheet of silver which is then soldered to the main silver bracelet or brooch. The two-layer effect is highlighted by the use of oxidation to darken the base and polishing to brighten the overlay. To be sure you are buying the genuine Hopi article, rather than a machine-made piece, look on the back for the emblem of the Hopi Silversmiths Guild, a sun shield.

The Zuñi, whose pueblo reservation lies south of Gallup, are the undisputed masters of turquoise, the semiprecious stone which their forefathers carved into fetishes of spirits and anmials. The use of turquoise for jewelry is far older than the use of silver. It was revered because it matched in color the deep-blue habitat of the gods; a piece of turquoise would protect its owner from danger and calamity; and turquoise deposits brought prestige to a community.

The Zuñi jewelry of today has evolved over a long period. About 1830 the tribe began to fashion pieces from brass and copper. Later they learned from the Navajo how to work silver and make dies, and began to set turquoise in silver. The "squash blossom" necklace is their classic, with delicately cut stones clustered in blossoms and the cresent "Naja" silver pendant hanging beneath them. (Both blossom and Naja derive from ancient sources in the Mediterranean, and came to the Indians by way of Mexico; all the Indian meanings written into them by zealous traders are without foundation.) Quite different from the squash blossom, but equally overwhelming, is the Zuñi inlay, vivid compositions of oxblood coral, green and blue turpoise, and gray abalone shell, representing the sun, rainbow, and thunderbird. Then there is channel work—narrow silver strips are soldered to form geometrical channels or cells, into which stones are fitted. The Zuñi's most recently developed style, called nugget, combines polished rough-cut turpoise with nuggetlike silver pieces for a highly modern effect.

A large Zuñi belt, bracelet, or necklace not only requires some courage to wear, but can be expensive. Smaller pins, rings, and earrings cost from $2.50 to $11. For the finest turquoise pieces, choose deep or clear colors and well-matched stones. "Spiderweb" stones, containing a delicate netting of black streaks of other minerals, are popular among the Indians. Deep blue is considered the choice color, but green is attractive, too. Stones to be avoided are whitish, flat-colored, or "doctored" turquoise—the last bathed in oil for temporary luster. There is also a tremendous assortment of cleverly made plastic imitations. Some of the finest Zuñi craftsmen are employed at reputable shops in Gallup, where you can see the products made.

Navajo jewelry is different from the Zuñi and Hopi—bolder and more forceful, with the accent on silver rather than turquoise. The Navajo learned their skill from Mexican silversmiths but have modified designs to express their own artistic feelings—and a Navajo squash blossom, Naja pendant or ornamental bow guard is unmistakable. From sheet silver they make discs called conchas (the Spanish word for shell) for belts, bracelets, and bolo ties. But the Navajo also pursue another method, sandcasting, in which the silversmith carves his design, freehand, on a mold of sandstone, then pours in molten silver to make heavy pieces for earrings, bracelets, belts, and buttons.

Among the whites who helped keep the real Indian talent alive, probably none wrote a more lasting record than Lorenzo Hubbell, called "Naakai Saani" (Old Mexican) in Navajo, and "King of Northern Arizona" in Yankee lingo. He lived in the company of good books and fine paintings in a sprawling adobe trading post, which he built in 1880 at Ganado, Ariz. To encourage Navajo silverwork, he imported Mexican silver, which is soft and easily worked; and it is said he once brought a Mexican platero, or silversmith, to live at his store and teach any Indian who wanted to learn. Among the first to work under Hubbell was the grandfather of Ambrose Roanhorse; now Ambrose is known by his people as "Beshlakai Natani" (the leading silversmith).

Other Indians may work well with silver, but when it comes to rug weaving the Navajo artist stands alone. The weaver, always a woman, shears her own sheep, scours and cards her wool, spins with a hand spindle, dyes with vegetable roots and leaves, and weaves at the side of her hogan on a simple vertical loom. Primitive? Possibly so, but the Navajo rug defies duplication. A remarkable part of its story is that vegetable-dye making was almost forgotten after the introduction of German aniline dye and commercial yarn (for brighter colors and quicker sales). Yet in the past 20 years a generation of young women, who had to be taught anew, have surpassed their grandmothers in dye making, as well as in originality of design.

The genuine Navajo rug is practically indestructible and will last at least 50 years. It should not be acquired as a curio, but as a house furnishing. Scarcely anywhere can one purchase more hours of human labor and artistry. Some textile manufacturers have chosen Indian designs for products merchandised and carelessly bought as "Indian blankets." In the real thing, the warp is wool (many rugs are woven on cotton warp to save time), and the weft is twisted and battened down tightly. The best guarantee is a "certificate of genuineness" issued by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, attesting that the article is made altogether of local wool, locally handspun, woven entirely on a native Navajo loom.

The Navajo weaver has no pattern to copy but works before the loom with a preconceived vision fixed in her mind's eye. Varieties of rugs are identifiable by types of weave, design and color and are named for the section of the reservation where they are made or the trading post nearby. The Two Gray Hills, made throughout the central part of the reservation, uses only natural wools—white, mixed with darker wools to form gray and brown—with fine close weave, intricate design, and a border of symmetrical right-angle patterns. It is expensive: you can find an attractive Two Gray Hills measuring 34 by 62 inches for about $175, but they run to as much as $1,600. Crystal, made in the area around Crystal Springs, is generally woven with large weft and conservative colors in a tweed effect; it is most often used as a wall decoration and is medium priced. The Wide Ruins is light and finely woven, with soft natural and vegetable colors, in the ancient striped style. Prices begin at about $130. The Tecnospos, from the northeast corner of the reservation near Shiprock, features many threads to the inch, with busy looking zigzag lines in various colors; actually, this pattern came into popularity with the new commercial yarns in early railroad days. The rug is thin but finely made and high priced. The larger, heavier Yeibeichai rug depicting symbolic figures of the healing ceremonial usually is not so fine in weft size, but is well woven and thoroughly battened down. It normally costs from $75 to $300.

Of all the world's pottery makers, only the American Indian has never turned to the potter's wheel. The work of Pueblo women, master potters for 1,500 years, shows little white influence. They still create their pots by rolling native clay into coils, painting them in earth colors freehand with a yucca leaf, and firing them over a bed of coals (with the vessels often covered with dry dung).

The pottery of each pueblo has its own style and uses. The best sources of utilitarian ware are Acoma (distinguished by its thinness), Zia, Zuñi and Hopi. Among the most beautiful designs are the graceful, fanciful animal figures on the curving rainbow band of Zia ware. Best for decorative use are the heavy walled wares of Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque.

The ranking artist of the pottery world is still aged Maria of San Ildefonso. In 1908, when Dr. E. L. Hewett was excavating the cliff ruins in Frijoles Canyon, N. Mex. (now part of Bandelier National Monument), he observed the young wife of one of his workmen making utility pots of great beauty. He asked her to duplicate vessels newly unearthed from the ancient cave rooms, and so encouraged this woman, Maria Martinez, to take a leading role in renewing the art of pueblo pottery. Maria undoubtedly is one of the great Indian personalities of our time.

Among her many honors are the Palme Academique of the French Republic and the Craftsmanship Medal of the American Institute of Architects. Through accident or experiment in firing, she and her late husband, Julian, created their black pottery, with a dull design against a polished body. The deep black is applied not by painting but by smoking—by enveloping the red-hot jars in caked manure. Other women have taken up the art; Legoria Tafoya, of Santa Clara, to name one, produces highly respected vessels that sell for $5 to $40.

The Indian School in Santa Fe includes a department of painting founded by the energetic Dorothy Dunn. It was she who encouraged Indian painters to study their graphic heritage—the high-spirited paintings on the great buffalo hides, the designs on shields and costumes, the motifs of quillwork and basketry. "Talk with the old people of your tribe," she urged, "and enlist their help in interpreting, preserving and developing Indian art. Then, from your own enriched knowledge, create and recreate."

Out of such study, pursued long and faithfully, emerged the so-called two-dimensional Indian style. It looks contemporary, though actually its strong lines and areas of flat opaque color have been characteristic of Indian art for centuries. Its subjects are equally ancient—sacred symbols such as the rain, rainbow and clouds, or expressions of the rhythm of the ceremonial dance, the grace of the horse, the speed of the antelope.

Mrs. Dunn's students have included Oscar Howe, Quincy Tahoma, Andrew Tsiihnahjinnie, Allan Houser, Richard West, Harrison Begay—men whose work adorns the walls of the finest museums.

Before leaving the Southwest, let us mention the intertribal ceremonial, held at Gallup for 4 days in early August. Thousands of Indians, 5,000 Navajo alone, representing tribes from Alaska to Florida, come to watch and participate in rodeos, dances and exhibitions. Artisans work at their crafts in full view, competing for prizes before an exacting board of judges.

The Seminole, living in southern Florida's grass prairies, adapted a white man's craft to create a dress of striking effect. It began when the Seminole women took a liking to patchwork quilting. They tore cloth into strips, strips into pieces, then sewed hundreds of pieces together on hand-operated sewing machines. They have been doing it ever since and the traditional Seminole patchwork yields a rich variety of blouses, sports shirts, swim trunks, aprons and stoles. Price is determined by the number of design strips in the garments; skirts costs $15 to $35, aprons $3.50 to $5.

Twenty-five years ago, Tommie Parker, a Seminole woman living near Lake Okeechobee, began making and selling dolls. Others did the same, business grew and the Seminole Crafts Guild was organized.

Recently, at Dania, between the reservation in the Everglades and booming Fort Lauderdale, the tribe constructed a replica of an Indian village for tourists who had been getting most of their ideas of Seminoles from chickees (thatched huts) along the Tamiami Trail, and commercial "monkey jungles." Craftsmen demonstrate patchwork sewing, carve model canoes from cypress and make necklaces, earrings and baskets. In mid-July, ceremonials are staged; these give some idea of the real feasting, fasting and purification rituals, held deep in the glades, removed from the public eye.

I have saved the Cherokee of North Carolina for last because these great people synthesize the Indians' determination to survive and advance, as Indians, and to perpetuate their own crafts. Tremendous odds have been against them. Once their domain covered virtually the entire southern Appalachians. Their lands were stolen, their treaties violated. In the 1830's most of the tribe were forcibly moved to the West by Federal troops over the infamous "trail of tears,"—a horrifying chapter of American history. Those remaining are descendants of the few who hid in the mountains and scratched the barest existence by farming the steep slopes. They endured official and public apathy and unending, frustrating changes in Government policy. Yet in the 1930's they achieved a revival of basket art as fine as anything done earlier, and today almost 20 percent of the eastern band derive some share of their income from a healthy, growing crafts industry.

Basketry owes much of its vigor to Lottie Stamper, a slender, soft-spoken but extremely determined Indian, a native of the town of Cherokee. Years ago the secret of the complicated double-weave was dying out, known to only one old woman who taught Mrs. Stamper to a certain point but refused to go further. Lottie struggled alone until she mastered the craft, then undertook to teach it to others. In 1939 she began teaching at the Cherokee Indian School. She showed her students how to collect their own materials—river cane, split oak, and honeysuckle vine, gathered early in the year before the snakes awake in the woods—and how to use roots and leaves for dyes. Consequently, many Cherokees now make fine baskets using the double-weave as it was practiced 200 years ago. And their teacher has become one of the most highly regarded craftworkers in the southern Appalachians.

One of my favorite craftsmen anywhere is James Going Back Chiltoskey, master whittler and wood sculptor, whose work is characterized by precision, realism, and smoothness. His favorite subjects are animals of the woodlands, carved in every wood from sugar pine of California to rockhard lignum vitae of the tropics, but he has also filled more church commissions for statutes of Saint Francis than he can remember. At one time when Chiltoskey taught woodwork at the Indian school in Cherokee, a plump little girl named Amanda Crowe came to his class armed with pocketknife and half-whittled wooden rabbit; she had started carving almost before she could talk. She is now the teacher in woodcarving and sculpture. In her own right Miss Crowe has won national recognition for her work in almost every medium: wood, metal, ceramics, and terra cotta, including large, modern pieces selling for several hundred dollars.

Two hundred Cherokee craftsmen are members of the Qualla Arts and Crafts Mutual, whose annual sales have grown from $7,000 in 1946 to $41,000 last year. Recently this cooperative organization erected the most modern building in Cherokee as its headquarters. To indicate prices: baskets range from $2 to $23; linen guest towels are $1.75; small carved animals, $1.60, large ones $6.75 up; and hand-carved cherry dolls $6 up.

Among other tribes as well, ancient crafts are being preserved or revived. The Choctaw of Mississippi have renewed their basketry. So have the Makah, of Neah Bay, Wash. In upper New York State the last remnants of the great League of the Iroquois continue to make their false faces of wood and braided corn husks (though only a few have been found for sale, more are becoming available now).

This cultural story has far from reached its climax. In the fall of 1962 the Bureau of Indian Affairs opened a new Institute of Indian Art at Santa Fe to encourage students of all tribes. The Indian community is growing (the Navajo Tribe, for instance, at a greater rate than the national population). Wherever the Indian still lives on his own soil, he expresses spirit and history through his craft. As Dr. Frederick Dockstader, chairman of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, told me, "Crafts have brought a dignity, a pride of self, to the Indian, and enabled the rest of us to discover his true genius."

FINDING THE AUTHENTIC

There is no harm in the purchase of pseudo-Indian merchandise, as long as the buyer realizes he is getting a machine-made facsimile. The trouble is that counterfeit items are sometimes sold at high prices, and it takes extreme care to avoid being led astray. The merchandising that I find least forgivable is the sale of Indian-type curios (made in Hong Kong) in some of the national parks, where concessioners are permitted to exercise their preference for high mark-ups and profits.

The best general rule to assure purchase of authentic Indian crafts is to shop only at tribal guilds or at dealers with a reputation for handling quality articles.

Buying from individual Indians who trade on street corners can be hazardous. Some sell cheap curios, such as pottery painted with poster colors after firing, or substandard items rejected by the guilds. Others sell 10-cent-store jewelry at five times what they paid. The truth is that few people can outbargain the Indian.

In shops, the most frequent misrepresentations are accomplished by association: The genuine and the machine-made are displayed side by side or intermingled, with the implication they are all genuine. The buyer should be alert to tricky labels ("Indian design," "Indian style," "Indian made") which are legal within the framework of a Federal law prohibiting fraudulent labeling of imitations. "Indian made" is often used for products made by machines operated by Indians, but by no means craft items. The buyer has the right to ask for a bill of sale with certification of authenticity, which no honest dealer will refuse. If you have questions about a purchase, or believe you have been duped, advise the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Indian paintings are becoming more widely available in the galleries of New York and other cities at prices ranging from $35 to several hundred dollars. Annual shows are held at the Philbrook Art Center, Tulsa, Okla.; the New Mexico Museum of Fine Arts, Santa Fe; and at Scottsdale, Ariz. The Denver Art Museum and De Young Memorial Museum, San Francisco, have also played a large part in the encouragement and presentation of Indian paintings and drawings.

Craft items, authentic and carefully chosen, are sold at a few museums in major cities, including the Museum of the American Indian, New York, the Brooklyn Museum, the Museum of Art, Baltimore, the De Young Memorial Museum and the Museum of Fine Arts, San Francisco. The newest important display and sales outlet is the American Indian Arts Center, 843 Lexington Avenue (near 64th Street), New York, operated under the auspices of the Association on American Indian Affairs.

The following craft organizations are further reliable sources, well worth visiting in the course of one's travels. A few, which are indicated, provide mail-order lists. Even they may be slow in replying, though patience will provide its reward.

Alaska Native Arts & Crafts, Post Office Box 883, Juneau, Alaska (mail order).

Hopi Arts & Crafts Guild, Oraibi, Ariz.

Papago Tribal Store Enterprise, Box 296, Sells, Ariz.

Navajo Arts & Crafts Guild, Window Rock, Ariz. (mail order).

Hoopa Subagency, Hoopa, Calif.

Seminole Arts & Crafts Center, 6075 Stirling Road, Hollywood, Fla. (mail order).

Tama Indian Crafts, Route 2, Tama, Iowa.

Pipestone Indian Arts & Crafts, Pipestone, Minn.

Choctaw Craft Workers Association, Choctaw Area Field Office, Philadelphia, Miss.

Northern Plains Indians Craft Association, 804 North 29th Street, Billings, Mont. (mail order). Also the Musuem of the Plains Indian, at Browning, Mont., includes an arts and crafts shop, operated by the Northern Plains Association.

Qualla Arts & Crafts Mutual, Post Office Box 76, Cherokee, N.C. (mail order).

Oklahoma Indian Arts & Crafts Cooperative, Post Office Box 447, Anadarko, Okla. (a part of the Southern Plains Indian Museum).

Sequoyah Indian Weavers Association, Tahlequah, Okla.

Tipi Shop, Sioux Exhibit & Craft Center, Box 1504, Rapid City, S. Dak. (mail order).

Shoshone Indian Craft Shop, Wind River Indian Agency, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

---

## PHYSICAL EDUCATOR RESEARCH AIDS U.S. FOREST SERVICE

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, very recently a most interesting and unique cooperative research project came to my attention. The project involved the graduate students of the physical education department at Montana State University and the Engineering Development Center operated in Missoula, Mont., by the U.S. Forest Service.

Briefly the graduate students work at the Development Center where new types of equipment for the Forest Service are used and they in turn attempt to evaluate the effects this equipment has on the men using it. It is my understanding that this is the only project of its kind. The project was recently presented to the national meeting of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues here in the Senate may be more fully informed on this unique project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the November 25, 1963, issue of the Missoulian and the presentation prepared by Wayne E. Sinning at Montana State University.

There being no objection, the editorial and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missoulian, Nov. 25, 1963]

### PHYSICAL EDUCATOR RESEARCH EASES FORESTERS' TASK

Learning to teach, coach, be an administrator and do research—this is the life of a physical education graduate student at Montana State University.

The above picture shows graduate students in physical education at Montana State University doing research. How much energy does it take for that firefighter to carry his pack up a hill? Is the pack too heavy—too light—how does smoke, dirt, apprehension affect the amount of energy he will use? These are some of the problems these physical education graduate students are trying to solve.

The university's expanding graduate program in physical education has made it possible to obtain as graduate assistants a select group of students from various parts of the country. They are working toward master's degrees under the direct supervision of Wayne Sinning, head of the physical education graduate program. Their research activities are concentrated on this cooperative venture which is a part of the total program in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics.

Missoula is the only place in the country where this particular type of research is being carried on in respect to Forest Service equipment. The effectiveness of the graduate program is enhanced by the unique cooperative enterprise agreement Montana State University has with the Missoula Equipment Development Center of the U.S. Forest Service.

The development center produces new types of equipment for Forest Service use. The graduate students attempt to evaluate the effects this equipment has on men using it. As compared to the old tools, are the new ones more economical in the use of human energy? Can a man do more work with them in the same amount of time? Another problem is to establish basic requirements and methods for measuring human effort and fatigue factors in the use of the new machines. Standards are being established to evaluate (1) the use of various safety items (respirators, goggles, guards, etc.), (2) working under adverse conditions (smoke, dust, heat, etc.), (3) operating various machines, (4) using various tools, and (5) using various methods of operating machines or doing work. Perhaps the greatest advantage to both the equipment development center and the department of health, physical education and athletics is that each can have a more extensive program for the evaluating of human performance than they could if they were working independently.

The equipment development center feels that the university will conduct research of this type on a higher level than that which could be attained were the center to do it themselves. Also, having an outside group such as the university personnel working on these projects provides a system of checks and balances that makes the evaluation program more objective and valid. It also felt that many indirect benefits will arise due to the accumulation of knowledge about human effort while performing forestry tasks.

This agreement gives direction to the research program of the department of health, physical education and athletics. Unless there is a unifying undercurrent of some sort running through the program, the research is too apt to become aimless and is nothing more than a matter of fulfilling thesis requirements.

It should be noted that this is not the only type of research that is pursued in the department, for studies more directly related to sports skills and physical fitness are also undertaken. Students who work under the terms of this research agreement may use the data for master's theses.

Many problem areas in development are being attacked in the project. The first of these is building firelines. There has been no real evaluation of different mechanical methods, or mechanical methods compared to older hand methods. The first studies in relation to this problem were completed this past year and additional ones are now underway.

Gear carrying and the development of testing equipment are also high-priority projects.

In addition to research and classwork, the graduate assistant must also help coach a varsity intercollegiate sport, teach physical education classes, attend all staff meetings, and participate in all department activities as a full-fledged staff member, thus obtaining an intimate knowledge of all phases of the department and how it functions. He also learns the intricacies of the profession as he works closely with the individual staff members. These duties plus a regular class load produce a topflight teacher-coach who will represent Montana State University and Montana with distinction.

### A COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROJECT—A UNIQUE METHOD OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

(By Wayne E. Sinning)

#### INTRODUCTION

The difficulty of attaining financial support for research in health, physical education, and recreation is recognized. This report describes a method of support through a cooperative research agreement rather than through direct grants of money to a department or an individual. It is felt the general approach of this plan has possibilities for the support of research in health, physical education, and recreation pursued by departments in other colleges and universities.

The agreement discussed here has been made between the Montana State University Department of Health, Physical Education, and Athletics, and the Missoula Equipment Development Center of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.[1] The Equipment Development Center was established in 1952 as part of the northern region of the Forest Service. Its original responsibility was for aerial development for the entire Forest Service, but it has since expanded into the development of all types of forestry equipment. Much of this equipment is used by smokejumpers who parachute into remote areas to fight fires.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AGREEMENT

It is felt that this agreement has certain characteristics that are essential if any such agreement is to be workable. These characteristics are discussed separately.

Written contract: A memorandum of understanding was developed to the satisfaction of both parties and signed by the administration of both Montana State University and the northern region of the U.S. Forest Service.

Budget provision: The use of funds must be defined. Each party to this agreement operates on an independent budget. The main emphasis is that provision has been made for the cooperative development of projects rather than mutual expenditure of funds. If either party should contribute money to the other, supplementary agreements would be necessary. Under this arrangement, the research program could continue even though one party might find it difficult to secure funds for a certain budget period.

Provision for independent work: Materials developed together can be used in independent studies. Both the Equipment Development Center and the Montana State University Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics plan to do research independently of the other. When mutually developed materials are used for independent study, provisions must be planned within the framework of the total program.

Stipulations on the use of results: It is required that each party provide the other with copies of the results of research completed either cooperatively or independently. Also, any inventions arising from cooperative research on the part of either party must be fully disclosed through publication or patented and made available for free public use. Procedures have also been established for the publication of research results.

Organized cooperative planning: Programs are to be reviewed and cooperatively planned annually. Supervisory responsibilities and immediate objectives are established at this time.

---

[1] The original concept of this agreement must be credited to the chairman of Men's Physical Education at Montana State University, Mr. C. H. Hertler, and the Chief of the Missoula Equipment Development Center, Mr. H. K. Harris.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

Certain objectives have been established for the program. These objectives are presented here to show the scope of the program and the type of research that is being done. These objectives are:

1. To search for and evaluate published reports, conduct necessary research, and to determine basic and applicable methods for measuring and analyzing the physiological cost of doing prescribed forestry jobs.

2. To purchase, design, develop, or construct equipment as necessary (1) to establish basic requirements and methods for measuring human effort and fatigue factors, (2) to measure human effort and fatigue factors under field conditions, and (3) to transmit measurements to a recorder for control and analysis.

3. To develop standards for comparison of physiological cost of (1) various safety items (respirators, goggles, guards, etc.), (2) working under adverse conditions (smoke, dust, apprehension, etc.), (3) operating various machines, (4) using various tools, and (5) using various methods of operating machines or doing work.

4. To conduct laboratory and field tests and measurements of physiological cost of doing work, as determined by program directors and within guides or limitations established by the university and the Forest Service.

5. To conduct either related cooperative work which may be financed or approved by either or both cooperators.[2]

### ADVANTAGES OF THE AGREEMENT

Perhaps the greatest advantage to both the equipment development center and the department of health, physical education, and athletics is that each can have a more extensive program for the evaluation of human performance than they could if they were working independently.

The equipment development center feels that the university will conduct research of this type on a higher level than that which could be attained were the center to do it themselves. Also, having an outside group such as the university personnel working on these projects provides a system of checks and balances that makes the evaluation program more objective and valid. It is also felt that many indirect benefits will arise due to the accumulation of knowledge about human effort while performing defined forestry tasks.[3]

This agreement gives direction to the research program of the Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics. Unless there is a unifying undercurrent of some sort running through the program, the research is too apt to become aimless and is nothing more than a matter of fulfilling thesis requirements. It should be noted that this is not the only type of research that is pursued in the Department, but studies in this project will be available to qualified graduate students. This agreement also helps the Department build a better laboratory faster due to the pooling of equipment.

### CURRENT STATUS

Three studies are either in progress or near completion in this year's program. One student has completed a study of strength decrement while backpacking a typical Forest Service load on the treadmill at different grades with speed held constant. Another student is examining the use of a predictive formula for determining energy expenditure during treadmill walking at rather severe grades. A third student will compare energy expenditure while building fireline with two types of mechanical trencher.

Both the university and the Equipment Development Center have contributed a considerable amount of equipment to the project this year. The Equipment Development Center has supplied a treadmill that their personnel designed and constructed, a tensiometer testing table, a calibrator for tensiometers, and is now having a cardiotachometer made. There are excellent opportunities for developing new equipment since the Equipment Development Center can utilize its shop facilities and engineering knowledge.

The university has also added much equipment. A room had been set aside for a laboratory and equipment purchased for the analysis of respiratory gases. This includes a 600-liter chain compensated gasometer, Douglas bags, a dry gas meter for field work, micro-Scholander apparatus, and miscellaneous materials essential to gas analysis.

### FUTURE EMPHASIS

Two main problem areas in equipment development are being attacked early in the project. The first of these is building fireline. There has been no real evaluation of different mechanical methods, or mechanical methods compared to older hand methods. The first research in relation to this problem is now in progress and plans have been made to study this more next year.

Gear carrying is also an important problem. Once equipment has been dropped into backwoods areas, it must be brought out and returned to base areas. There has been a variety of equipment developed but nothing has really proven superior to backpacking by men. The study of pack carrying on the treadmill, which was mentioned earlier, is the first contribution here.

Development of testing equipment is also a high-priority project. Much of this development will merely be adapting existing procedures or tests, but each item will have to be tested and validated for the situations in which their use is anticipated.

### IMPLICATIONS

This cooperative approach to research could have applications for other colleges and universities in other areas of research interest. For example, a similar arrangement could be made between a department and a public or private secondary school to study teaching methods; some phase of administrative problems related to health, physical education, or recreation, or for child development studies. Local industries might have problems similar to those of the Equipment Development Center and would possibly welcome some arrangement similar to the one described here. Another approach would be some form of written agreement between the physical education department and other departments in the same college or university where there is interest in similar research applications.

---

## MONTANAN IS SPECIALIST IN MIGRANT EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with each new administration there is always a great many new faces in the agencies and departments of the executive branch. Many of these are people who come from their home States to make a short or long term contribution in a field in which they have some expertise.

Many friends and acquaintances from Montana have come to the Nation's Capital and are making considerable contributions. One of the most talented is the former superintendent of schools for Butte, Mont., George E. Haney. George Haney, a longtime friend, has just published a new book "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education" in his capacity as a specialist for the Office of Education. George is an acknowledged expert in the field of migrant education and the problems confronting the children of this country's migrant labor force.

George Haney did a great job as superintendent of schools in Butte and is doing even greater things within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to add my congratulations and good wishes to the many others for his accomplishments in this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a feature story which appeared in the December 8, 1963, issue of the Montana Standard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., Dec. 8, 1963]

### EX-BUTTE MAN IS AUTHOR

George E. Haney, former superintendent of schools for Butte, now in Washington, D.C., where he is specialist in education for migrant children, has achieved distinction as an author in that field.

Haney, with the Office of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been praised in educational circles and has had articles published in several educational journals, including School Life, official journal of the Office of Education.

### FIRST WORK OF ITS KIND

His book, "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education," is the first of its kind to be written in the U.S. Office of Education. It is already receiving wide circulation in school districts, libraries, teacher training institutions and in educational associations of the Nation.

His pamphlet, "The Education of Migrant Children," has been in such demand that there already have been reruns for additional needed copies.

The publication "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education," was written by Haney after visits to several States where he reviewed educational facilities and programs for migrant children.

Highlights of the work include a study of seven States with educational programs for migrant children which defines certain specific problem areas and areas of needed research.

Among principal points outlined in the publication are:

Migratory children attend school irregularly, become academically retarded, and pose future educational problems for society.

There is evidence suggesting a definite trend in planning and organizing educational programs for these children on a State level.

One means of improving educational programs for migrant children lies in the growth of makeup summer school programs. In California, the State provides three-fourths of the costs and the school district one-fourth for operation of summer schools for migrant children. In six States, the State agency provided 100-percent reimbursement of the current operation expenses for such classes.

---

[2] From the contract covering the agreement, pp. 1–2.

[3] From a conversation with Mr. H. K. Harris, chief, Missoula Equipment Development Center, Missoula, Mont.

NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN

In "Questions and Answers on the Education of Migrant Children," Haney reports that it is estimated there are 320,000 to 500,000 migrant children, including those who do not move with their parents.

The majority of domestic migratory farmworkers in the United States includes Spanish-speaking Americans, Negroes, native whites, Puerto Ricans, and some Indians. The majority are of Mexican origin.

The migrant workers follow the Florida harvest starting in the winter. In the spring they move up the coast to New England. They follow the sugarbeet and fruit movement through Texas, and into the North Central, Mountain and Pacific Northwest States. Grain harvesting extends through Montana, North Dakota and even into Canada, with California and other Pacific Coast States, attracting workers in the fruit, vegetable and nut harvesting fields.

Haney also has prepared material for legislation on education for migrant children and the Domestic Service Corps. He served as a member of the Committee on Migratory Labor, and on other committees in that field.

Haney was city superintendent of schools here from July of 1952 to June of 1961. He and his wife, Alice, reside in Alexandria, Va. A son, Michael, a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is now an engineer with a large aircraft company in the East. A daughter, Marlyss, is married to an Air Force officer, Lt. Donald Erickson.

## LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT BENEFITS WEST VIRGINIA AND THE NATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, November 26, the Senate of the United States approved S. 2265, the amendment to Library Services and Construction Act. It was my responsibility to express support for this measure on the previous Friday during the debate, just prior to the tragic announcement of the death of President Kennedy. As I remarked on that occasion, the library bill is one of the most important measures to be considered by this body during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. It was, therefore, a matter of the keenest satisfaction to note at the time of the vote on this measure that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate shared enthusiasm for this legislation.

During the past two centuries, the American public library has frequently been called the university of the people. It is a unique educational facility in that it offers the opportunity for learning to all who wish to enter its doors. There are no qualifications to be met or examinations to be passed by those who choose to use it. Serving the interests of people of all ages and from every type of life, it provides materials and services which can meet the user on his own terms and at his own level of need.

In 1956 the Congress recognized the importance of public libraries by passing the Library Services Act—Public Law 597, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended. These grants for rural public library development have had a degree of success well beyond the amount of Federal funds involved. Since 1961 all eligible States and territories have been participating in this matching-grant, State-plan program. The accomplishments of the Library Services Act have been recognized and appreciated by librarians and congressional sponsors of the bill, and also by State and local officials. I know of its value to the millions of citizens in rural areas who have received and who have used substantially improved library services. Our experience with this program, limited though it has been to areas of less than 10,000 population, offers conclusive evidence that Federal, State, and local governments can join forces in an effective partnership to achieve mutually desirable goals.

The accomplishments in West Virginia have been noteworthy. In our State, 103,464 rural residents who had no library service whatever prior to the Library Services Act program now have access to public libraries of their own. In addition to these, 429,286 people in 29 counties have had their existing public library services expanded and improved. West Virginia has purchased 12 new bookmobiles under our State plan and these units are now operating in demonstration projects and in the various regional libraries. In one such regional library, serving Harrison and Upshur Counties, both the number of volumes available and the number of books loaned doubled between 1956 and 1961. The collection grew from 49,087 to 100,216 and the circulation of these books rose from 103,466 to 200,432.

These gains are very real and most satisfying, but even after 7 years of determined effort much remains to be done. In the country as a whole, more than 18 million Americans have no public library. Almost 110 million more have woefully weak libraries. Many of these can offer only small and obsolete collections, overcrowded or dilapidated quarters, and they are often open for use only a few hours per week.

In West Virginia, 716,026 citizens are without local public libraries. Of the thousands who have only inadequate service, nearly 500,000 are in urban areas which cannot participate in the present program. The proposed amendment to the Library Services Act will offer an effective tool for assisting the State to come to grips with this distressing situation. Of the $25 million authorized annually for the improvement of services, West Virginia would be eligible for an annual allotment of $301,862 to be matched by the State each year with $181,736.

As we evaluate the accomplishments of the Library Services Act and at the pressing needs yet to be met, one fact is clear. It is the very success of the present program which has helped show us the way to greater achievement. The present limitation of benefits to areas of under 10,000 population has been a serious obstacle to the organization and maintenance of high quality library units. All of the States have recognized the economy and the efficiency to be obtained by building rural library systems around more highly developed libraries, which are in urban centers. Because these libraries are prohibited from benefiting, directly or indirectly, under the present law, they have had little incentive to participate in any of the demonstration programs. As a result, further rural library development in many places has been handicapped.

The Library Services and Construction Act which we have just approved removes this artificial population restriction. The inclusion of urban areas will allow State plans to build substantial programs of library extension and improvement on the library resources of the larger cities. In this way, the improved library facilities and resources can be shared by all users regardless of their places of residence. Therefore, it can be said that in order to accomplish the original purpose of the rural library program, the urban libraries must become fully participating partners in the State plans for library development.

Another imperative need for this legislation is to help the urban libraries themselves. The rapid increase in our population, particularly the growth in metropolitan areas and the swarming suburbs, is creating a tremendous concentration of demand on the library facilities in these areas. More than 60 million people in these metropolitan sections have inadequate public library service because of submarginal budgets. The proposed amendment to the Library Services Act will encourage a system of libraries in which the small, the medium-sized, and the large public and regional libraries will be strengthened to better serve the educational needs of the Nation.

In order to stimulate and encourage the growth of a public library system of real excellence, more is needed than assistance for operating expenses. The ability of any library to respond adequately to the needs of its constituency is directly related to the adequacy of its physical plant. The present Library Services Act specifically prohibits the use of funds for the purchase or construction of buildings, or for the purchase of land. This restriction has unquestionably retarded both the extension of service into rural areas and the involvement of urban libraries in the program. Too often there has not been room to house an enlarged book collection or the necessary staff specialists.

The Library Services and Construction Act will authorize an appropriation of $20 million for the construction of public library buildings. In West Virginia the allotment for construction would be $241,894. The required matching expenditures would be $145,389. I am confident that this modest inducement will effectively stimulate West Virginia communities to renewed activity in the construction of public library buildings.

My commitment to the American free public library as an educational agency is constant and unequivocal. My confidence in the Library Services and Construction Act as a sound and substantial contribution to better libraries is equally strong. I was gratified, therefore, to cast my vote, along with 88 of my colleagues in the Senate, in favor of passage of this eminently desirable library legislation.

## REFLECTIONS ON THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, our respected colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, has delivered a most impressive address to the 50th anniversary dinner of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Speaking on Sunday, December 1, Senator NELSON said:

> America is in the midst of a crisis. In an hour of unprecedented challenge at home and overseas it has lost through senseless murder the gifted man who led the Nation so well and who we now discover had won the confidence of the civilized world to a rare degree.

Senator NELSON said further:

> It is a crisis borne out of hatred and violence in the mind of a man. * * * It is important that the people of America know the origin of this crisis for only then will they know how to face it.

Mr. President, because of the excellence of this address, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### REMARKS OF SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON AT PFISTER HOTEL DINNER MEETING MARKING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH

I have refrained from making any public comment on President Kennedy's tragic death, in the long week of agony which has followed, because I knew nothing I could say which was adequate for such an awful occasion.

Throughout these empty days, as I stood before the casket in the rotunda and beside the grave in Arlington Cemetery, I had the same chance all of you have had to reflect on how it happened, and on where we go from here.

Now I am called upon to speak and to a unique organization—one which has spent 50 years fighting hatred—and finally it seems that there is something which clearly must be said.

America is in the midst of a crisis. In an hour of unprecedented challenge at home and overseas, it has lost through senseless murder the gifted man who led the Nation so well and who, we now discover, had won the confidence of the civilized world to a rare degree.

This is a crisis created not from the rival aspirations of powerful nations, or the inexorable swings of the economic cycle, or by some great disaster of nature.

It is a crisis born out of hatred and violence in the mind of a man—a hatred which may have had no logical basis and yet which grew until it could be contained no longer, and then it burst out and killed our President.

It is important that the people of America know the origin of this crisis, for only then will they know how to face it.

If there was any doubt as to the origin of the crisis in the moments following the assassination, it should have been erased in the hours and days which followed. For a moment we didn't know what to fear. There was a killer on the loose. Who was he? Where would he strike next? Was he an enemy agent? Was he part of an armed band?

It almost seemed as though we tried to detect some plot or plan to bring some semblance of sense, some discernible motive to this senseless deed.

But we soon learned there was no sense, no plot, no motive that rational men would recognize. Only a strange and frightening and powerful kind of hate, which turned an insignificant and unsuccessful young man into a powerful enemy of America.

President Kennedy was assassinated by one man's hate, and all the world must pay the price.

All the Secret Service men and all the policemen in Dallas couldn't save him.

Then we swiftly learned that no one is safe once hatred is unleashed in the land—not even a man in a police station surrounded by 60 policemen and lighted by the glare of nationwide television. Hatred—unreasoning, senseless—broke through what was thought to be perfect security, and killed again.

Nor did it end there. Hatred breeds hatred, and the senseless hate killings in Dallas sowed a whirlwind of threatening telephone calls, aimed at attorneys and policemen and frightened mothers and little children.

Still numb from the shock of our great loss, many of us seem to be looking around, wondering where the violence will break out next.

This is the crisis we face.

What can we do about it?

I have heard the suggestion that the finest memorial we could erect to John F. Kennedy would be swift enactment of the civil rights legislation to which he had courageously committed his whole future political life.

I couldn't agree more. For this would be a lasting, a living, and a growing memorial. It would advance the cause for which President Kennedy was willing to give his life—the cause of representative democracy founded on equality before the law—and it would strike at the very terror which took him from us.

It seems out of place now to discuss the technicalities of civil rights legislation, and perhaps that is a good thing. What matters now is not whether we use the interstate commerce clause, or the 14th amendment, or whether the Republicans or Democrats get credit or blame. What matters is that our exalted system of government, faced with a great crisis born of hate and violence, respond to that crisis by repudiating hate and proclaiming justice and equal treatment for all our citizens as the unquestioned law of the land.

No other act could so swiftly redeem our American reputation before the court of world opinion.

But even if we are successful in passing a civil rights bill, I think much still remains to be done before the crisis resulting from the President's death can pass from us.

By passing a civil rights bill, we can remove hate from the official acts of State and Federal Government.

The next step is to remove it from our hearts. Only then can we be safe from this menace.

The fact is, we have been on a collision course with hatred and violence in this country for a long time. Hatred has been steadily becoming a standard form of political activity.

The list of the targets of hate seems to grow longer each day:

Chief Justice Earl Warren, a warm-hearted and wonderful man whose service to democracy has been matched by few men, now hated by many even in the State which repeatedly elected him to high office by overwhelming majorities;

Adlai Stevenson, a man with the soul of a poet and a gift for exemplifying democracy which has made him beloved around the world;

Eleanor Roosevelt, the First Lady of the world, who came to symbolize humanitarian compassion, and who is still hated, even in death.

The United Nations, the first real step toward the brotherhood of man which we all profess to believe in, and especially that branch of it, UNICEF, which collects pennies to buy milk for hungry children regardless of their commitment in the cold war.

The National Council of Churches, and the newly appointed Secretary of the Navy, because he once served as a Christian layman on a Council of Churches committee which sought a way to avoid a nuclear war.

The U.S. State Department.

The New York Times—and much of the time, all the major communications media of the Nation. And here at home, newspapers, such as the Milwaukee Journal, whenever they have spoken out forthrightly against demagogs and tried to stem the tides of hate.

I could cite hundreds of individuals and institutions who belong on this list—who are the regular targets of hate letters which come to my office and spread all across the Nation.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has been fighting hate movements such as this for 50 years. I don't need to tell you of the danger those groups present because you know from hard and brutal experience where hatred can lead.

You know that the first swastika scrawled on a synagogue wall, the first rabble-rousing speech by a politician feasting on hate, can lead to the murder of 6 million people in gas chambers and ovens.

And you have learned first hand that one form of hatred breeds another, and so you have not been content to fight just for your own heritage and your own freedom, but for the freedom and dignity of all men. I saw the banners of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish organizations in the great march on Washington back in August, and it struck me at the time that those banners have been marching in this cause much longer than the rest of us.

Even in the darkest crisis, we must find hope, and my hope today is that the assassination of President Kennedy will bring home to the American people the consequences of hatred—just as the assassination of the Jews of Europe brought this message home to the world almost two decades ago.

Our democracy cannot survive unless hatred perishes. That is the real message of the tragedy of Dallas.

We cannot seek comfort in the belief that the hate groups are a minority and that we can triumph over them through the political process, because we saw in Dallas what even a minority of one can do to a free society.

Furthermore, we cannot deal with the hate groups in the conventional political way because that simply spreads and aggravates the disease. Hate groups, by their very definition, will not accept defeat at the polls, or in open debate, or in the jury box. If they are outvoted, they will become all the more implacable, all the more convinced that they are the victims of some dark and sinister plot which lurks behind the scenes and explains why they have not been able to win. Then we turn to hating them because they are saying such hateful things about people and institutions which we cherish so.

And when that happens—and it happened some time ago in this country—we are headed down the road to violence.

That is why I say that all of us must forswear hatred and violence if America is to survive this crisis.

I think this would be easy to do if we understand what hatred is and how foolish it is in a healthy mind and a free society.

Hatred is a defense mechanism. It is a refuge into which a mind retreats when it is frightened and doesn't know what to do. It is a kind of alibi or a hideout.

But it is a very poor defense and a very insecure hideout.

In a democratic society such as ours, we have no right and no need to use hatred as a political weapon. We have an open society. We have a great free press—which demonstrated in the days after Dallas its tremendous ability and devotion to informing the public. It is utterly ridiculous for us to think in terms of plots and conspiracies involving the Supreme Court and the State Department—or the Knights of Columbus—because these grandiose secrets simply cannot dwell in a free and open society.

Furthermore, we have the greatest opportunity of any people in history to redress our grievances, to speak our piece, to amend and repudiate any policy of which we have reason to disapprove. We don't need to write on walls; we can write to our Congressmen or our President or our local newspaper, and have a far greater impact.

We don't have to resort to firearms, because we have the election ballot.

And this is a point which many Americans who glorify the ultimate resort to firearms should remember. There are guns all over the world. They have been passed out to the masses time and time again, and used by men with high hopes to shoot their way to freedom. But nowhere have guns alone bought freedom. Only where the guns have been laid down and an orderly society of law and order established in their place, has there ever been freedom. Everywhere else we have simply had unfinished revolutions, where the guns would simply pass from one side to the other, and the killing would go on and on with no logical end.

The difference between the American Revolution and the revolution in Cuba, for instance, is that Americans used their revolution to end tyranny and substitute law and order, while in Cuba it was used merely to substitute one tyranny for another.

So history proves conclusively that hatred must end if an orderly society is to survive. We must banish it from our national life—and we must banish it from our own minds.

We must recognize that hatred is a disease, a definable form of mental illness, and one which we all must guard against.

The New York Times interviewed psychiatrists who speculated on the mental illness that undoubtedly had gripped the President's assassin. In that story they pointed out that a paranoid is one who attributes his failures to the enmity of others. He says, in effect, "I hate you because you hate me." The psychiatrists said the paranoid twists actual situations, while the schizophrenic makes them up out of whole cloth. And then one psychiatrist added the comment that those labels are inexact because these symptoms appear in all gradations, and there is a little of them in all of us.

That is our enemy—that bit of hate in all of us which can grow and create a national crisis.

The human mind can be excused for acting strangely because it seems that the times are making more terrible demands on us with each passing year.

But we had an example this week of how a real person can react to the most terrible tragedy—without seeking refuge in the hideout of hate.

If ever a person was justified in such a reaction it was Jacqueline Kennedy. Here was a young woman who, we have long known, did not really like the awful demands which politics makes on a man and his family. I think many of us have felt that Mrs. Kennedy wished the Nation would allow her and her children to have a little more of her husband. And I think all of us must know how she reacted in recent months to the vicious and bitter personal attacks on her husband in many parts of the Nation.

With that background, think what that assassin's bullet did to her. Who would have been surprised if she had cried out in hatred at that empty window from which the fatal shot came? Who would have criticized her if she had been bitter at the Dallas police, and the Secret Service, and the very office of President, and the Nation itself.

But she quickly saw—as each of us must see—that this was not the thing to do. She realized that the way to triumph above hatred is to vow that you will not let it win in you or anywhere else. When senseless hatred stole her husband, she moved to protect what was left—her own dignity and that of her children, and the shaken confidence of an entire Nation.

I need not dwell on what this has meant to the American people. Every commentator has seen it and extolled it already.

In an hour of the darkest crisis, the wife of the President did the most important thing she could do. She helped the Nation decide whether to wipe out its grief in a binge of hate, or to wipe out hate itself.

We all have seen her towering example. Now it is up to us.

## PROTECTION FROM EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week the Tariff Commission heard representatives of the livestock industry who were asking that beef, beef products, lamb and mutton be eliminated from the preliminary negotiation list. It had been proposed that the tariff on these commodities be eliminated or reduced by as much as 50 percent in the upcoming GATT negotiations.

Several of the statements that were presented to the Tariff Commission have been made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These statements clearly demonstrate that there is a need for protection from the excessive imports rather than a further reduction of tariffs. I am hopeful that the Tariff Commission will strike these commodities from the negotiation list and that corrective action will be taken by our Government.

Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho presented a statement to the Commission which deserves the attention of the Senate. He speaks with great wisdom and understanding. LEN JORDAN has been a farmer, a rancher, and an economic adviser as well as serving as Governor of his State. Thus, he knows and appreciates the problems experienced by our livestock industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement which reflects the spirit of the livestock industry of Idaho and the Nation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN OF IDAHO AT HEARINGS BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND THE TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 10, 1963

I am U.S. Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho, and I am making this statement to you in the interest of the livestock producers, feeders, and processors of my State and in addition for the livestock industry and the consumers of this country.

Agriculture is the economic lifeblood of Idaho and most of the other Western States. Livestock is the keystone of our agriculture economy. More than one-fourth of our total returns from agriculture in 1962 were from the sale of livestock and of course the largest part of our agricultural sales of feed grains and hay were for livestock feed.

American consumers expect quality in their meat purchases and they have been able to get it. Our citizens consume one-third of the world's total supply of beef and veal. They rate far above world averages in sheep and mutton consumption and in the use of pork products. They have always been assured of an adequate supply of high-quality meats from American farms. In addition, the production, feeding, and processing of American meat products give job insurance to millions of our workers. The livestock industry in our western country gives direct and indirect benefits to grain growers, feed plants, merchants, implement car and truck dealers, the transportation companies, and many, many others. This in turn creates buying power to keep industrial workers employed.

In Idaho in a 1960 survey made by our own University of Idaho, it was determined that the capital investment in the beef cattle industry was $441 million, which included land, buildings, machinery, feed, supplies, and cattle. The income in 1960 was approximately $56,400,000 and the expenditures about $36,200,000, but the expenditures did not include labor charges for the operator or his family nor for interest charges. It is estimated the average investment per animal was about $325, not including the value of the animal.

Our sheep industry in Idaho is carried on by some 2,000 owners and operators on farms, ranches, and ranges, with about 1 million head of sheep of which approximately 820,000 are breeding ewes. There has been a marked reduction in numbers in recent years because of the profit squeeze. Costs have risen and prices received have declined. The average expenditure for each breeding ewe in Idaho is approximately $25 per head per year. The average return per ewe per year is $20 for a 110-pound lamb and $6.20 from the sale and Government support price on a 10-pound wool clip. This leaves a profit of $1.20 per head but does not include death losses and replacement costs. When these are added, an actual loss is shown. An investment of $40 for each ewe is indicated in lands, improvements, and machinery. This does not include the value of the ewe herself. These capital investments for cattle and sheep operations furnish much of our property tax base, which maintain our schools, road systems, and county government. It is an essential and integral part of our whole economy. With Idaho still 65 percent federally owned, we must maintain and enlarge, if possible, our tax base.

The breeding, raising, grazing and feeding of livestock coordinate the use of our private, State and Federal lands. We need your assistance and support to maintain this balance of use and earnings.

The average prices of all classes of cattle are down about 10 percent below 1 year ago. There can be no question but that increased imports of beef, veal, and meat products are largely responsible for this. Our own production has increased slightly to keep pace with local needs from about 2 percent per year over the past 5 years with the exception of 1962 when the increase was 4 percent. Meat imports, on the other hand, have increased 60 percent from 1958 to 1962, and imports of meat and meat products during January to August, 1963, were up 22 percent above the same period in 1962. We are told that 80 percent of these are from boneless beef, but that competes with utility cows and aged ewes, and they in turn compete with higher grades of beef and mutton, so the whole price structure is affected.

The consumers in the United States need protection as well as the producers. When high quality meat can be produced here at reasonable prices and the profits from such livestock operations furnish local employment, there seems no reason to increase import quotas or to lower import tariffs. We must keep the industry healthy, prosperous, and growing. It is my earnest request that you carefully weigh all the factors involved and that the members of this Commission, as well as members of the Trade Information Committee, recommend proper action to protect our livestock industry against imports of livestock and meat products which threaten to topple the whole structure.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF A CABINET LEVEL SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on November 5, 1963, Dr. Michael F. Walsh, director of development for Vernon Court Junior College in Newport, R.I., and former commissioner of education in my State, delivered an address before the annual Teachers' Congress at St. John's University in New York in which he advocated the establishment of a separate Cabinet-level post for Secretary of Education.

This is an address with which I wholeheartedly concur, and which I believe commends itself to all persons interested in the educational system in the United States. We find ourselves constantly talking about the problems in education, and in fact, for the first time in some years, we are actually devising and passing constructive legislation to meet the growing needs of this Nation. But we merely indulge ourselves when we, at the same time, fail to make provision at the highest Federal level for the direction and coordination of far-reaching Federal programs in this field.

The education of the youth of America ranks equally with any program undertaken by government. It demands the full efforts and resources of a separate Department of Education which under the guidance of a Secretary of Education, can plan and coordinate with the States and local communities and thus help develop our system of education to its very highest potential.

In this regard, I commend the efforts of my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman John E. Fogarty, who has introduced two bills, H.R. 9160 and H.R. 9161, which would create separate Departments of Education and Health.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record, Dr. Walsh's speech before the Teachers' Congress be reprinted in full.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Speech of Dr. Michael F. Walsh, Delivered at St. Johns' University, Brooklyn, November 5, at Annual Teachers' Convocation

In responding to the challenge, "Crucial Issues in Crucial Times," it is imperative that one at first consider the position of the United States in its international, as well as its national setting. One must approach this problem on the local, State, and national stage with the background of America's welfare at heart. And on this stage of crucial times, American education must play a crucial role. For as our Nation stands at the crossroads of many national and international complexities, one might well ask American educators and leaders "Quo Vadis—Whither Goest Thou."

Upon the answer to this question may well rest the future happiness and success of millions of American youth, who are at present sitting in our classrooms. For the youth of today demands leadership—a dynamic leadership that is farsighted. A leadership that can visualize the drama on the stage of tomorrow upon which American youth must play its part in American citizenship. To the degree that such a part will be played will be dependent in no small measure upon the intelligent leadership that American educators exert now and upon the loyal and dedicated service of teachers to the great cause and philosophy upon which this Government of a free people is based.

Perhaps at no time in the history of our country, outside that of actual fighting warfare, has the future of this Nation been so seriously threatened and challenged as it is in this day and age. I say outside of actual warfare because, in fact, we are at war. This war is not on the battlefield of bloodshed. It is a socioeconomic warfare that will be long and lasting and that will test to the limit the intelligence, the fortitude, and the patience of the American people.

American educators must come face to face with these issues and in so doing make adjustments in the curriculum of our schools so that the youth who are in their formative stages might be properly prepared to face these issues when they enter the world of affairs.

The America of today is not that of yesterday. No longer are we isolated from Europe. What took 7 to 8 days to travel from shore to shore, now takes but a few hours. What took seemingly unending hours and hundreds of ships to transport troops to the shores of Europe during World Wars I and II now can be accomplished through airlift in a matter of hours.

Dramatic changes have been made in our social relations with other nations of the world, and for that reason dramatic changes must be made in our educational system to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Think of the many small nations of the world since the two World Wars that have either secured their independence or are striving for it. They are seeking recognition and economic security. And we must not forget when we think about these nations that they are doing now what the Colonies did in 1775—they are breaking away from tyranny and suppression. We, too, rebelled against tyranny and suppression and from our rebellion came a free people, which people founded a government that was dedicated to the principle of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We hear murmurs in every walk of life about aid to foreign nations, but what would have happened to the colonies had the French nation turned a deaf ear to the pleas that we made during the time of the Revolution? This world of ours is in a state of evolution, and we must be prepared to meet the changes that such evolution will bring about.

Let us look at the horizon and take cognizance of the problems that hover about us and the challenge that they present to our educators. We see such disturbing forces as communism, integration, the Common Market, automation, 35-hour week, adult education, explosive population, dropouts, just to name a few.

These are some of the crucial issues that must be faced in this crucial age. These issues must be faced realistically and the students who are now in school must be made aware of their existence and taught ways and means of living with them. These will be their problems. What are the steps that must be taken in order that our youth will be properly prepared?

In the first place, I believe that our educational system should be more sharply pointed toward American needs and American welfare. By that I mean that the attention of our educational leaders and teachers in every city, town, and hamlet must begin to direct their attention toward the problems of the National Government. Our educational sights must be lifted. In the perpetuation of a free people, ignorance becomes a mortal enemy, and the strongest defense against this enemy is a strong educational system. As a first step, I believe that the Federal Government must establish a position of Secretary of Education, separating it from Health and Welfare, paralleling that of the Secretary of Defense. Such Secretary should have as a support an advisory council of approximately 20 outstanding citizens from all walks of life, who have a deep and sincere interest in the national welfare and who also have a knowledge of the crucial place that education must play in the defense of our Nation.

Such a move, I believe would tend to draw the attention of all those in the field of education toward a centralized point in our Government. Educational leaders can no longer limit their sights to the boundaries of the community in which they live; they must adopt an educational philosophy which spells out in no uncertain terms the needs of the Federal Government, and instruction in the classrooms must be pointed to such needs. Our teachers must become alerted to the problems that America is facing, for it is only when they have the proper information on hand that they will be able to introduce such knowledge into their subject matter and their classroom discussion.

America needs a Secretary of Education, for education is now a vital factor in the preservation of our freedom and our economy. The United States can no more depend upon isolated, unattached systems of education to perpetuate freedom any more than the Defense Department could depend solely upon the State militia or National Guard to defend our country in the face of an invasion of an enemy.

The demands that have been made on the Secretary of Defense, the Department of the Interior, and the Secretary of State in the past decade have been staggering. And many of their problems hinge upon American education. So great are the demands upon education, as on the various other agencies of National Government, that no longer can education be limited by State boundaries.

We must perish the thought that in the face of today's national and international problems that education is the function of the State alone. We must free ourselves from such antiquated ideas and face the facts of modern life realistically. Our educational system, if we are to face the critical issues in a critical age, must be nationalized. There must be established in Washington a strong, vigorous, and progressive Department of Education, which will be held responsible for strengthening American education on all levels, kindergarten through the university. There must be a rebirth of loyalty and dedication to those American principles that are the foundation rock of a free society. And a free society can only be maintained and made more secure by the complete education of all its citizens. A strong and vigorous educational system stemming from the National Government could well be the instrument whereby peace is retained and the principles of American philosophy spread throughout the world.

I do not mean to suggest that the Federal Government control the educational systems in the respective States. I do mean, however, that there should be a binding together of all our efforts toward the commonweal—the development of a triumverate composed of the Federal Government, the State, and the local community.

This leads to the next crucial step, and that is the problem of financing. Local communities and States have reached a breaking point in their attempts to provide adequate and challenging education, well-trained and dedicated teachers, and modern and efficient schoolbuildings for their children. I believe that the education of American citizens, young and old, is a responsibility of the Federal Government, and I believe that the Federal Government, should develop a formula, so that it could share the cost of education in every State. Such a formula should be based on the willingness of the communities and the State to share the cost. For example, the more money a community would pay for education, the more it would receive from the State; the more the State would pay, the more it would receive from the Federal Government.

All piecemeal contributions from the Federal Government for specific purposes, as is now the case, should be brought to an end, and a single appropriation should be channeled through the State departments of education to the local communities, dependent upon the educational needs of said States. The Secretary of Education, together with his advisory council, should make periodic reports to the States expressly pointing out the educational needs of the Nation, and each State should tailor these reports to fit the educational program of the community. Such a procedure would help tremendously in bringing all the facets of education together and would make for a united front that would give educational leaders and teachers a psychological lift. It would also focus their attention on the national goals and create an atmosphere at home that would place education in its proper place in relationship to the needs of the country.

With this thought in mind our attention must be turned toward the secondary school. The secondary school provides the last opportunity for school systems to establish in the minds and hearts of their youth the sound principles of loyalty and responsibility that will make for intelligent and constructive citizenship. For the large majority of our youth the years at high school mean the end of formal education. For this reason I believe that the secondary schools should be subjected to a reevaluation for the purpose of determining the part that it must play in the defense of the Nation.

I believe that if the high schools are to do their part effectively the school day must be lengthened, if for no other reason than to impress upon the minds of our citizens that the formative years of high school students are vitally important and that a vigorous and intelligent program on this level makes a contribution to our national defense.

Knowledge is power. It is imperative then that we take advantage of these years to strengthen the minds of the youth in understanding what problems the Nation faces. Every effort should be made to keep our young people in school until they have completed their high school education. In order for school administrators to successfully do this they must accept the challenge of evaluation. The curriculum must be broadened to make it possible for every boy and girl to develop his or her talents.

In order to provide such an opportunity it stands to reason that an intelligent guidance and testing system must be established in the school system. Each child should have a permanent record card on which is reported his mental, physical, and social attitudes. It must be on the lower level that we attack the problem of dropouts, for the first act of truancy is the first indication of a potential dropout. How do dropouts affect the Nation?

Large numbers of dropouts flood the unemployment rolls and challenge the Government to establish some other agency besides the schools to take over this responsibility, such as it had to do during depression days in the establishment of the NYA and the CCC. I believe that the schools should accept the challenge and exert all their efforts to set up programs that will help to keep the youth in school. For example, meetings should be arranged with the business and industrial leaders in the community to determine where potential dropouts might be placed and where a combination educational-work relationship might be developed.

No boy or girl should be permitted to leave school before a conference is held with the parents and the guidance counselor. There should be in each high school a work clearance department in which the needs of business and industry might be reported and to which potential dropouts might be referred. The counselors should make every effort to keep our youth in school. It is possible too, to visualize the school authorities setting up classrooms in the shops of business and industry. Here is another place where the Federal Government and industry could play a vital role in assisting to defray the expense of such a program.

At no other time in our history has there been such critical need for the careful husbandry of our intellectual resources. The need for unskilled workers grows smaller, while the demands for skilled and professional people increase. Even now our Nation finds itself short of the talent needed to maintain and control our civilization. Add to this shortage the fact that less than half the youth of the highest 10 percent in intelligence graduate from college and that each year there are about 50,000 students with ability to finish college who do not even graduate from high school. This situation is worsening at a time when our very survival may hinge upon the better management of the educational enterprise.

Our greatest natural resource is our youth and each September thousands upon thousands are placed in the hands of school administrators and teachers for processing. The ultimate goal of this processing is good and intelligent citizenship. This great army of youth enters school not alone to study, but also to be studied. Each one is the possessor of some talent. This talent might not be found in the intellectual powers of the individual, but it might well be found in his physical, spiritual, or social powers. The great job of the schools is to study the individual and to determine in which category the latent power rests, and to make provision for its natural growth. As big industry takes raw material and processes it to its greatest potential, allowing for no waste, or as little waste as possible, so the schools must take our youth and process them to their highest degree of refinement so that they can play an active part in the great machinery of social living in a free society.

Constantly, therefore, we must be ever alert to the discovery of talented youth which, properly nurtured and guided, will develop a stockpile of intellectual resource from which the leaders of tomorrow might come. This element in our social life must be challenged to the limit in order that intellectual desires might be satisfied. The challenge for a longer schoolday is not enough. There is also the challenge of readjustment of the curriculum to present-day needs and fitting subject matter into the course of studies, so that our youth will know firsthand what is happening in the world outside. A high school diploma must represent the cult of intelligence and not the cult of mediocrity. Thomas Jefferson, the great American leader, based his program of education on the selection of the best—the aristos. Today, we must still cling to Jefferson's idea and make every provision for the talented to reach the ultimate of their natural abilities and at the same time to provide an educational system that will test the abilities of the average and provide for them a course of study that will assist them in cutting their niche in a free society—or education for good citizenship.

For this reason, there must be introduced into the curriculum—so that all who attend our secondary schools might know—those subjects that are playing a vital part in the world of affairs today. If the Federal Government can support programs in science, language, and mathematics, it can certainly afford to spend millions in giving financial support to the development of a strong and challenging socioeconomic program of studies. Science, math, and languages are not shaping world thought today, either on the national or international level, and although a knowledge of these subjects is important and desirable, it cannot be overlooked that the socioeconomic factors of the national and international scene are as equally important, if not more so. We have only to think for a moment of the impact the Common Market will play on the economy of the Nation, together with the 35-hour week, automation, early retirements, leisure time, and the ever-present threat of communism.

About 75 percent of our students now in high school will soon emerge into the highways and byways of our respective cities and towns as citizens. Will they be able to cope with the problems of citizenship? Will they have the skills to help shape the course of democratic events? We ask ourselves the question, "Are we who are responsible for the education of youth doing our very best to provide for them the type of training and understanding that will equip them to meet the challenges of American society on all levels—city, State, and Nation?"

Toward this end I believe that our secondary school curriculum should be broadened and deepened so that those subjects which are playing so important a role in the affairs of the world be presented realistically and enthusiastically.

In this realistic presentation, I would encourage the daily use of the newspaper and, where possible, the use of TV and the radio. I believe that our youth should be presented firsthand the factors, international and national, that are shaping the world in which they live, as well as the problems that will confront them as adults. It should be graphically pointed out that the news reports, the editorials, the columnists that appear in the daily life of a community form the everyday library for the everyday man. Citizens of a free society must continue to grow in knowledge and to keep abreast of the tide of current events. The turn of events in the world has been so rapid that what was true yesterday is no longer true. Look how the map of the world has changed since 1960; look at the explosive developments in the world of science and economics.

This brings us then to another critical issue—the challenge of adult education.

This area on the educational ladder of a community might well turn out to be equally crucial.

Much emphasis is being placed on the dropout and ways and means are being studied whereby this army of youth might be kept in school. What about the youth of yesterday who were, because of some circumstances, forced to leave school, or having finished high school did not possess the means to go beyond for further study. They are being challenged by more free and leisure time; they are being challenged by the entrance of automation; they are middle-aged heads of families, threatened with the loss of a job because the skill that they learned is now antiquated. It is toward this group of citizens that our attention must be directed. It is only through adult educational programs in the cities and towns, geared to the needs of these citizens that these men and women can make a readjustment of their lives. The adult educational program on the local level should be a part of free education. It is nothing more than high school life extended into the later lives of our citizens to help them to know that American education does not end at the age of 16 or with high school graduation. If the Federal Government can afford scholarships and loans to those who wish to enter college it can certainly afford to assist those citizens who are faced with many problems and who wish to keep abreast of the times. This is the area of American life that needs help, for it is the adult population of a nation and not the youth that shape its destiny. That we must educate our youth to the fullest there can be no doubt, but we cannot wait for present-day youth to grow up to make an impact upon the Nation. The time is now and the more we do to assist the adult population to a knowledge of changing times, of providing counselor and guidance services for those who need direction, the more we will strengthen the Nation.

Last of all, our schools must come face to face with the problem of communism. There is no need to hide our heads with the hope that it will pass us by unnoticed. It is here and here to stay. It will always be a factor in our political, economic, and social life. The youth of today who will have to live with it during their lives should know all there is to know about communism. They should be taught the goals of this ism and be alerted to its techniques. Our youth, if they are to be properly prepared to meet the challenge, should be taught all that can be taught about it. It is only by knowing it that one can discern the propaganda that is used to promote its cause. Ignorance of communism will lead our future citizens into many traps and embarrassing situations. Knowledge of communism will prepare our future citizens to meet the issues as they arrive and prevent innocent men and women from being deceived by its philosophy.

We are educating for the maintenance of a free society, not only for America, but for the other peoples of the world. We each can do our part by being a more loyal, more intelligent, a more vigorous citizen in our own community. For, as we strengthen ourselves, we strengthen our society. In the words of Oliver Goldsmith there is much wisdom and truth, as well as a direct challenge to all of us:

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay,
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,
A breath can make them as a breath has made,
But a bold peasantry, a nation's pride,
When once destroyed can never be supplied."

## WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the word "automation" may have little meaning to someone presently secure in his job. But to one whose job is eliminated by automation, the meaning is stark and clear: out of work and often out of hope.

We read articles about the automation problem, but I am afraid that until there is broad understanding about what automation is doing now and is expected to do in the future, we will not as a nation take the variety of steps necessary to insure that automation will be a great benefit to us all instead of a great burden.

I realize that a Presidential Commission on Automation has been proposed. I am happy to support this idea. But I do not think that this approach is enough. I am afraid that it misses the vital point of encouraging and promoting widespread understanding about the problem, understanding at the grassroots level in particular.

Automation, after all, deals with individuals—individuals who are in school, who are choosing jobs, or who are in the work force. Regardless of what governments and businesses may do to alleviate automation's impact, essentially the problem boils down to individual decisions by the persons affected.

These individuals can make reasonable decisions only to the extent that they are informed.

Widespread information about automation is the greatest single good which would come from the White House Conference on Automation which I propose in S. 185, introduced last January. Delegates would meet in Washington to pool their best ideas only after the question had been thoroughly explored on local and State levels. I have confidence that the final Conference itself would produce valuable guides for action, but I am even more concerned about the fact that the local attention given the problem would result in a widespread understanding of automation—an understanding which does not now exist.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to refer to a letter of support for the White House Conference on Automation which I have received from the executive board of the Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania. The letter explains that the Pennsylvania Federation had presented the White House Conference plan to the Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions at its quarterly conference in New York City, and that the alliance had gone on record as supporting it.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF TELEPHONE WORKERS OF PENNSYLVANIA, EXECUTIVE BOARD,
*Philadelphia, Pa., December 9, 1963.*

Hon. J. CALEB BOGGS,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. BOGGS: On December 5, 1963, the Federation of Telephone Workers of Pennsylvania presented your proposal, S. 185, providing for a White House Conference on Automation to the Alliance of Independent Telephone Unions at quarterly conference in New York City.

The alliance represents about 100,000 telephone workers in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, the five New England States, and Canada.

That organization went on record as supporting your proposal and is preparing an appropriate resolution to that effect for general distribution to other unions, the public, and Congress

Your efforts to get the automation problem "off the ground" are most appreciated and represent progressive thinking of a type which we need more of these days.

Respectfully yours,
I. C. GLENDENNING,
*Vice President and Chief Negotiator.*

## DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT OSWALD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Victor Riesel is a nationally respected columnist not given to sensationalism or gossip. His widely syndicated observations appear in the many newspapers served by the Hall Syndicate. In his column for December 3, Mr. Riesel raises some questions which he states the Soviets have refused to answer about Lee Harvey Oswald's sojourn in Communist Russia. Oswald's Communist connections are becoming increasingly recognized and emphasized. The questions raised by the Riesel column should provide some significant answers if they were to become obtainable.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Riesel column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### SOME QUESTIONS THE SOVIETS REFUSE TO ANSWER ON LEE HARVEY OSWALD'S STAY INSIDE RUSSIA

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It would have been impolite and impolitic in the past few days to ask Soviet authorities some pertinent questions about Lee Harvey Oswald. The White House has been desperately and understandably eager to avoid an international incident by appearing to give even the slightest insinuation of an international plot to assassinate John Kennedy.

But now the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R., has changed the rules. It has authorized its newspaper, Pravda, to insinuate that Oswald was a Central Intelligence agent under President Eisenhower and under the late President Kennedy. Therefore, it is time to ask the Soviets some questions which are being discussed in international intelligence circles.

The Russians have said officially they denied Oswald Soviet citizenship because he was a Trotskyite.

This means he was declared an enemy of the state—a few days ago. But why was he permitted, back in 1959, to travel freely inside the Soviet Union. This is a coveted privilege. Official permission is needed by foreigners for bus and train travel. Yet he went some 420 miles from Moscow to Minsk.

Why did the Soviet employment services direct him to a job? This must have happened. He spoke no Russian then, he read no Russian. He had insufficient funds for such travel. He must have been directed to Minsk. He must have been assigned a job. Employment is under rigid state control. In the Soviet Union an applicant does not exactly get the Sunday papers and run through a list of want ads.

Who vouched for his identity card? Who got him his "rabochaia knizhka"—work permit? Such documents are absolutely necessary—especially for foreign workers. Without such papers he could not have been hired. He could not have drawn his wages and social benefits. He could not have participated in cultural affairs.

And who approved Oswald's membership in a Russian union? Joining is mandatory, so that central discipline can be exerted. That's why the Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions can claim 26 million members.

If the Soviet authorities believed Oswald to be a Trotskyite and an American spy, why did they permit him to associate freely with his fellow factory workers? Such activity might have eluded the secret police for a few weeks but not for over 2 years.

Why did the KGB (state security secret police) permit him to marry an attractive Russian girl? A few words to her and that romance would have ended quicker than you can say "Siberia."

Why was he permitted to quit his job and then travel freely from Minsk to Moscow? True, workers are not yet absolutely frozen to their jobs inside Russia. But few just pick themselves up and leave. Fewer, especially spies and enemies of the state, could blithely get travel accommodations for such a long haul. And this time, one must envision such a trip being taken by an ex-U.S. Marine and his Russian wife and child.

How did the attractive and sturdy Mrs. Oswald get permission to abandon her job in a land starved for workers. The Oswalds had no money when they got to Moscow. Where did they get the bus or train fare for the journey from the interior?

Finally, how did the alleged assassin get his wife and child out of the Soviet Union? Mighty few have accomplished this. I checked this out with an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. He could not recall more than four or five such instances. In some of these cases it took years to get an exit permit. Yet Oswald simply put in his request and got immediate approval.

What compounds the mystery even more is that Oswald had no skills. Once back in the United States, he lost every job he held. He was simply incompetent. What could he have done inside the Soviet Union for 2½ years which would be worth their paying for? Why don't they make his work record public?

True, President Johson has been told that Oswald was a misfit, a loner, a desperate seeker of prominence and publicity. True, the State Department has him down in its records as a "fuzzy Marxist."

True, the most authentic reports have it that there was no international plot. But why were the Soviets so kind and why did they offer so many privileges to a Trotskyite?

## HANUKAH CELEBRATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with warm personal pleasure that I extend my good wishes to our Jewish citizens on the occasion of the Hanukah celebration. The "Festival of Lights" began at sunset last Tuesday and is to continue for 8 days.

This ancient holiday dates back to the days when the Jews, led by Judah Maccabee and his brothers, successfully revolted against Antiochus Epiphanes, the Syrian tyrant who, in an attempt to gain complete loyalty to Greek culture, forbade Jews to practice their religion. The Maccabee army recaptured the temple at Jerusalem and rededicated it to God. Within the temple, they found a cruse with only enough oil to light the candelabrum of the temple for a night—but instead, and miraculously, the candelabrum remained lit for 8 successive days. Significantly, today, during this celebration of the "Festival of Lights," a candle is lit every night for 8 days.

Hanukah, meaning "rededication," is a solemn commemoration of the struggle for religious freedom. By openly defying their Syrian tyrant for a cause they so deeply felt and commonly believed in, the Jews are among history's first martyrs of religious freedom.

Mr. President, America's birthright in a free society sometimes makes it hard for us to comprehend the hardships of religious intolerance—intolerance which is unfortunately practiced in some areas of the globe today. Nearly every day, we hear reports of social ostracism and economic discrimination in the Soviet Union. The Jewish minority in Russia has and is suffering severely—synagogues have been closed, depriving persons of a place to worship, economic opportunism—deemed crimes particularly when Jews are involved—is in some cases punished by capital punishment. The Soviet's active campaign against and maltreatment of the Jewish religion deserves the condemnation of free peoples throughout the world. I have spoken out on this matter many, many times—both in public and on the Senate floor—and I am presently cosponsoring a resolution condemning this despicable prejudice on the part of the Soviets.

Mr. President, Hanukah is a time of dedication—a time for free citizens throughout the world to be grateful for the freedom they enjoy—and also a time to hope and pray that those less fortunate than they in other parts of the globe may someday soon be released from the persecution of intolerant political leaders.

Mr. President, I extend my heartfelt best wishes to our Jewish citizens during this deep spiritual celebration.

## COMMITTEE OF 100 ON THE FEDERAL CITY SUPPORTS JAMES MADISON LIBRARY ON SQUARE 732

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter I have received from Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, the chairman of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association. Admiral Phillips, on behalf of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, expresses his support for S. 1920, the bill which proposes construction of the third Library of Congress building on the site, known as square 732, just south of the present Library and across Independence Avenue from the Main Library Building.

For reasons of economy and efficiency, as well as of fairness to the residents of Capitol Hill, the Congress should move quickly to authorize construction of the third Library building on this site already owned by the Government. It would be thoroughly appropriate to honor President James Madison by designating the third Library building as the President James Madison Memorial Library. I hope very much that the Congress will act quickly so that the Library of Congress does not continue to be penalized by our indecision.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter of December 3 from the chairman of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City of the American Planning and Civic Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 3, 1963.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The Committee of 100 on the Federal City wishes to express its strong support of this bill and to commend your wisdom in introducing it.

This bill would authorize construction of an annex to the Library of Congress on a Government-owned site just south of the present Library, which already has been cleared and which previously has been proposed as the location of a monolithic James Madison Memorial. Meanwhile it is understood that the Architect of the Capitol is proposing to build the Library Annex on a site (to be condemned and bought with taxpayer's money) just to the east of the Library.

The Committee of 100 wishes to bring out these points:

1. Selection of the east site for a Library Annex would be a further act of extravagant destruction on Capitol Hill and would mean tearing down four blocks of restored houses, and St. Mark's Church.

2. The proposed Madison Memorial, while having some basement book space allotted to the Library of Congress, would not be a proper or efficient annex.

3. The plans for the memorial are considered to have little taste, imagination, or purpose. Furthermore, the site to the south of the Library is entirely unsuitable for a memorial, since it provides no focal point and would be lined up in a phalanx of massive office buildings. Furthermore, it would cost an estimated $39 million, or about the cost of the Cultural Center which our Nation's Capital so badly needs.

4. Apparently the construction developments on Capitol Hill are under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol with little, if any, reference to the Commissioners, the Planning Commission, or the Fine Arts Commission.

This is a matter of urgent concern.

There is a continuing and piecemeal proliferation of monstrous Federal buildings, with no apparent overall plan and with great destruction to the homes of taxpayers who have been doing a splendid job to restore this fine old section.

It is urgently hoped that something will be done to check the tendency to extravagant outlay for monolithic memorials and to bring some order and plan into Federal construction on Capitol Hill.

Yours sincerely,

NEILL PHILLIPS,
*Chairman, Committee of 100 on the Federal City.*

## JEWISH COMMUNITY TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on Monday night, November 25, the day of the funeral services for our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, I attended a Jewish community memorial service for President Kennedy, conducted under the auspices of the Greater Washington Rabbinate and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington. Among the 4,000 persons in the overflow crowd was the President of Israel, Shneor Zalman Shazar. Rabbis Norman Gerstenfeld, Martin S. Halpern, Eugene J. Lipman, Stanley Rabinowitz, and Lewis A. Weintraub led the assembly in reading the order of the service; tributes were presented by Mr. Justice Arthur J. Goldberg, of the U.S. Supreme Court, and by the Honorable Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to the President. Cantor Raphael Edgar chanted the memorial prayer.

The contents of this memorial were so meaningful and so moving, that I ask unanimous consent to have the order of the service and the texts of the tributes printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## A Jewish Community Tribute for Our Martyred President, John F. Kennedy

(Under the auspices of the Greater Washington Rabbinate and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, November 25, 1963, 8:30 p.m., at the temple of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Massachusetts Avenue and Macomb Street NW., Washington, D.C.)

### RESPONSIVELY

Lord, what is man, that Thou hast regard for him?
Or the son of man, that Thou takest account of him?
Man is like a breath,
His days are as a fleeting shadow.
In the morning he flourishes and grows up like grass,
In the evening he is cut down and withers.
So teach us to number our days,
That we may get us a heart of wisdom.
Mark the man of integrity, and behold the upright,
For there is a future for the man of peace.

### PSALM 23—A PSALM OF DAVID

The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul;
He guideth me in straight paths for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death,
I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me;
Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies;
Thou hast anointed my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life;
And I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

### AMERICA—FOUNDED ON BIBLICAL PRECEPTS

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Have we not all one Father?
Hath not one God created us?
Why do we deal treacherously, a man against his brother?

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish a constitution for the United States of America.

Justice, justice shalt thou pursue,
That thou mayest live in the land which God giveth thee.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Proclaim liberty throughout the land,
Unto all the inhabitants thereof.

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.

It hath been told thee, O man, what is good,
And what the Lord doth require of thee:
Only to do justly and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God.

For happily the Government of the United States which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

Righteousness maketh a nation great,
But sin is a reproach to any people.

We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Behold, how good and pleasant it is
For brethren to dwell together in unity.

With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Let justice well up as the waters,
And righteousness as a mighty stream.

In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms: freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world; freedom from want which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world; freedom from fear, which means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—everywhere in the world.

And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares,
And their spears into pruning-hooks,
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.

But they shall sit every man under his vine
And under his fig tree;
And none shall make them afraid.

### WORLD PEACE

It shall come to pass at the end of days,
That the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established
As the top of the mountains;
It shall be exalted above the hills;
All the nations shall flow unto it.

And many peoples shall go and say,
"Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord."

God will teach us His ways,
And we will walk in His paths;
God shall judge between the nations;
He shall decide for many peoples.

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
And their spears into pruning forks.
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation;
Neither shall they learn war any more.

The Lord will break the bow and the sword
And the battle out of the land;
He will make the people to lie down in safety.

Violence shall no more be heard in your land,
Neither desolation nor destruction within your borders.

All your children shall be taught of the Lord,
And great shall be the peace of your children.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain,
For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord,
As the waters cover the sea.

The work of the righteous shall be peace,
And the result of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever.

Then shall they sit every man under his vine
And under his fig tree,
And none shall make them afraid,
For the Lord Himself hath spoken it.

### FOR A REDEDICATION OF AMERICA TO HER TRADITIONAL IDEALS

Let America be America again.
Let it be the dream it used to be.

Let it be the pioneer on the plain
Seeking a home where he himself is free.

Let America be the dream the dreamers dreamed—
Let it be that great strong land of love,
Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme
That any man be crushed by one above.

O, let my land be a land where Liberty
Is crowned with no false patriotic wreath,
But opportunity is real, and life is free,
Equality is in the air we breathe.

O, let America be America again—
The land that never has been yet—
And yet must be—the land where every man is free,
The land that's mine—the poor man's, Indian's, Negro's—we
Who made America,
Whose sweat and blood, whose faith and pain,
Whose hand at the foundry, whose plow in the rain,
Must bring back our mighty dream again.

And yet this oath I swear—
America will be!
Out of the rack and ruin of our gangster death,
The rape and rot of graft, and stealth, and lies,
We, the people, must redeem America.

We, the people, must redeem
The land, the mines, the plants, the rivers,
The mountains and the endless plain—
All, all the stretch of these great green states—
And make America America again!

—Langston Hughes.

---

### VII. Tribute by Hon. Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to the President

I do not intend to eulogize him; others far more articulate than I have done it during the past 2 days and will do it in the future.

Nor do I intend to ask the question which must trouble all of us at times like this: "Why?" The rabbis in their wisdom should answer that for us.

Nor do I intend to answer the question of his place in history. Historians have already begun to make these judgments, and I leave to their mercies this task.

But there is a custom common among learned Jews that I should like to pursue. After one whose life has touched them has passed away they gather together and exchange recollections of that person. John F. Kennedy touched the lives of all of us, and I should like to share with you some of my memories.

I saw truckloads of flowers delivered to the White House yesterday, and I saw beautiful floral pieces decorating the hillside at Arlington Cemetery when he was laid to rest. But I thought of his joy as he looked out the French doors of his office and delighted in the beauty of the flower garden, the pride that he took in its reconstruction, and his pleasure in the beauties of nature. I saw John-John walk down the aisle of St. Matthew's Cathedral. But I remembered a morning only 2 or 3 weeks ago when John-John appeared at a business breakfast in the White House and sat in the chair that was reserved for the Secretary of State. The President, who had just decided upon the transfer of thousands of men thousands of miles, was unable to move John-John out of that chair.

I saw the silent crowds along the route we drove in a motorcade to the cemetery. But I thought of a hundred other motorcades, and of the impossibility of restraining John F. Kennedy from leaving his seat and walking along so that he could meet the people along the way. I thought of how, when arriving at an airport, he insisted upon walking to the barriers to shake hands, in spite of the pleas of Secret Service men. He felt that those who took the trouble to come to the airport were entitled to more than a fleeting glimpse of their President.

I saw the Negro pallbearers carrying the casket. But I remembered that day a little less than 3 years ago when he asked why there were no Negroes in the Coast Guard unit in the inaugural parade. This was quickly corrected.

I saw the preoccupations all around me, both in the funeral procession and in the airplane flying over the Pacific, where I learned the news. But I thought of the many preoccupations engendered by times of crisis. In the midst of one of the most severe, he was told of a letter from the widow of a postal employee who had died of cancer, leaving several small children. He learned that the husband had been so active in helping others he had been unable to accumulate any resources. President Kennedy dictated a response which assured her that a cold Government had a warm heart.

I saw the forlorn dogs on the White House lawn. And I thought of the kind manner in which he would call to them and bring them inside so that he could feed them a delicacy and send them on their way.

I thought of his flashes of wit and how these lightened the burden of everyone around him.

These were all random thoughts. They came to mind in connection with almost every incident during the past 2 days. They represented a man so full of compassion and understanding, so creative in mind, so courageous in spirit, that no one his life has touched, be it ever so lightly, will ever be the same. We are all the better for his having been with us.

Now it is up to us to pick up the torch which he lighted and follow along the way which he charted.

### VIII. TRIBUTE BY MR. JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. SUPREME COURT

In the Book of Ecclesiastes, chapter 9: 12, it is said, "For man also knoweth not his time, as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare, so are the sons of men snared in an evil time, when it falleth suddenly upon them." Friday was an evil time. Sunday was an evil time. Today our country has engaged in a day of national mourning; it has also endured a day of national shame.

It is a cardinal principle of our democracy derived from Biblical teachings that it is an inalienable right of man, as a child of God, to have human dignity. The assassination of our great President on Friday was a supreme violation of human dignity; the killing of the man charged with the assassination Sunday was a violation of human dignity too, for on Friday life was taken, the great commandment "Thou shalt not kill" was violated; and on Sunday a life was taken too without due process of law. Human dignity on both occasions was violated.

Today's day of mourning was different from that day of mourning when we buried our great President Franklin Roosevelt, because while our grief today was equally great, it was compounded by humiliation—humiliation lacking when Franklin Roosevelt was buried. If, in a new country in a remote corner of the world, the head of state was assassinated and if the man charged with the killing was himself assassinated a few days later while in the custody of the police, we would say to ourselves, in all self-righteousness, that the country was not fit to govern; that it was uncivilized. What are we to say to ourselves as a nation?

John F. Kennedy, 2 weeks before his inauguration, stood in the assembly of his native State of Massachusetts, and gave a speech in which he quoted Pericles' statement of the Athenians, "We do not imitate, but are a model to others." John F. Kennedy proudly said of our country, "We are a model to others, we do not imitate." An assassination is not an act of a people, another killing is not an act of a people, but in a very significant sense, we are all responsible for these terrible happenings—all of mankind is responsible. The dominant characteristic of our modern times is the cheapness of human life. The dominant characteristic of the present age is the lack of respect for the human being—our forgetfulness of the human dignity with which God endowed every human being. More people have been killed, more exterminations have taken place, more massive barbarism has occurred in the world since the beginning of World War II than has ever been recorded in the history of civilization.

There is another saying from Ecclesiastes, "Sorrow is better than laughter, for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better." Let us use the occasion of the sad, sad passing of our great President to make the heart better, to make the heart more responsive to what is needed in the world. And what is needed in the world more than any other thing is love and not hatred, because in a real sense, hatred is what caused the terrible events of the last few days.

Our late President, John F. Kennedy, was a man of love; he was not a man of hatred. He devoted himself in the international affairs to the elimination of hatred between nations, to the cause of world peace and world justice. He devoted himself, in domestic affairs, to the elimination of hatred between the people of this country, to the cause of equality and brotherhood. The President is a victim of the unfinished tasks of his own administration. Would that he had lived out his full days and his full time, so that he could have witnessed a more peaceful world and, in the words of our Constitution, a more perfect union. But he was snared in an evil time, and he knew not his time as indeed we know not our time.

We owe it to the memory of our martyred President to rid our Nation of the evil forces of hate and bigotry and violence. In the book of President Kennedy's speeches, which he called "To Turn the Tide" he wrote, "Neither wind nor tide is always with us. Our course on a dark and stormy sea cannot always be clear, but we have set sail, and the horizon, however cloudy, is also full of hope." Today, our course is on a dark and stormy sea, and the horizon is cloudy. We must make it full of hope, full of hope for a better world, full of hope, for freedom, for justice, for order, for peace. These are the ends of organized society, these are the ends for which President Kennedy gave his life, these are the ends to which we must all rededicate ourselves anew.

### IX. MEMORIAL PRAYER—"EL MOLEI RAHAMIM"

[Translation]

O merciful God who dwellest on high and art full of compassion, grant perfect rest beneath the shelter of Thy divine presence among the holy and pure who shine as the brightness of the firmament, to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, who gave his life for his country and for humanity. May his soul be bound up in the bonds of eternal life. Grant that his memory ever inspire us to noble and consecrated living. Amen.

### AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL

O beautiful for spacious skies,
  For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties
  Above the fruited plain!
America! America!
  God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
  From sea to shining sea!

O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
  Whose stern, impassioned stress,
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
  Across the wilderness!
America! America!
  God mend thine every flaw,
Confirm thy soul in self-control,
  Thy liberty in law!

O beautiful for patriot dream
  That sees beyond the years,
Thine alabaster cities gleam,
  Undimmed by human tears!
America! America!
  God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
  From sea to shining sea!

## JOHN F. KENNEDY STUDENT MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

**Mr. RIBICOFF.** Mr. President, each of us is seeking in his own way to honor our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. One of the most appropriate memorials that has been brought to my attention has been initiated by the students of Yale University in Connecticut.

This is a student-sponsored scholarship, to be called the John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship. Funds for the memorial, solicited from the students themselves, will be awarded to those Yale undergraduates who are interested in politics or public service as a career.

I can think of nothing that would have pleased this eminent Harvard man more. Deeply interested in education, and convinced of the value and excitement of public service, President Kennedy constantly sought to interest fine students in politics as an honorable and rewarding career. His own devotion to such a career is legend—now Yale's students have enhanced it with their own.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the article from the Yale Daily News announcing the

John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### Yale Students Plan Scholarship in Honor of President Kennedy—Request Individual Contributions; Fund Drive Starts Wednesday

Yale students will be asked to contribute to a student-sponsored scholarship in honor of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The scholarship, the John F. Kennedy Student Memorial Scholarship Fund, will be awarded to those Yale undergraduates who are interested in politics or public service as a career.

Donations will be collected in door-to-door solicitations Wednesday night and the drive will continue for a week. Students can charge donations to their bursar's bill.

### AWARDED ANNUALLY

According to Michael K. Lewis, 1965, chairman of the collection committee, no official goal for the drive has been set but it is hoped that enough money will be collected to enable the scholarship to be awarded annually to students taking an active interest in politics.

Students participating in the Washington summer internship program, foreign students who are interested in political careers in their own countries, or students showing concrete evidence of political interest will, says University President Kingman Brewster, Jr., be especially considered for the scholarship. The scholarship will be kept flexible, however, to allow for a change in endowment policy.

### BREWSTER LENDS SUPPORT

Mr. Brewster has given his support to the scholarship aims. He issued the following statement last night: "Although the university did not initiate or sponsor this effort, we welcome the student initiative to create a fund in honor of President Kennedy. The suggested purposes for which it might be used seem most appropriate to the memory of the late President."

The fact that door-to-door soliciting privileges were officially granted demonstrates the support that the scholarship drive is receiving from university officials. This is the first time since the Hungarian revolution of 1956 that this privilege has been granted for any other drive other than the Yale Charities Drive.

Charles A. Walker, chairman of the Council of Masters, the body that granted the privilege, said yesterday, "The members of the Council of Masters feel this drive gives the students a way to express themselves in view of the tragic death of the President."

### LIVING MEMORIAL

The right to charge donations on the bursar's bill was granted in order to aid students who wish to contribute to the scholarship fund, but do not have ready amounts of cash to give.

Bursar George F. Williams said, "Normally we would not allow paid employees to work on these projects, however, this one is of enough scope to warrant this support."

Yale alumni, according to President Brewster, will not be directly solicited, but are encouraged to donate money for the drive.

Lewis said, "The fund will establish a living memorial for a man whose life embodied the ideals valued here at Yale."

He added, "President Kennedy gave his life while in the act of public service and a scholarship to encourage students to enter public service would be a fitting way for Yale students to honor the late President.

"Yale University is officially planning no memorials for the President," he continued, "and this will be the only chance for Yale students as Yale students, to honor the dead President."

Dwight Hall is aiding the scholarship fund by granting the use of its facilities for the duration of the drive.

## TRIBUTE TO EDWARD A. SUISMAN AND FRANCIS J. BRACELAND

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, two close personal friends have recently received significant honors. Ed Suisman and Frank Braceland of the Greater Hartford community are decent human beings, modest and self-effacing. Their good deeds have brought so much good to so many.

Dr. Francis J. Braceland, one of the world's leading psychiatrists, has been named a knight commander of the Knights of St. Gregory by Pope Paul VI.

Edward A. Suisman has been given the Yale-in-Hartford Nathan Hale Award.

Day in and day out both men continuously give of themselves for their fellow men and the community. Connecticut is proud of both of them. I am honored and fortunate to have each one of them as a friend. I join in congratulating them on their new honors and wish for each one a long and happy life in continued service to mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Hartford Courant, dated December 10, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### For Their Fellow Men

During an age when it becomes increasingly easy for the misanthrope to take his melancholy view of human nature, it is comforting to look about and find men of great worth right here in the community. Not that the qualities which distinguish Dr. Francis J. Braceland or Edward A. Suisman have gone unnoticed up to now. If they were so minded, each man by now could have a series of scrapbooks dwarfing Dr. Eliot's famous Five Foot Bookshelf. But last week both achieved additional honors preeminently deserved because they represented continuing work for the benefit of their fellow men.

Dr. Braceland is perhaps best known in this community as psychiatrist in chief of the Institute of Living. Actually he has an international reputation as physician, educator, writer and lecturer. He has made significant contributions to the public welfare of this State, and served the Nation with distinction. When last year he received the University of Notre Dame's Laetare Medal, this observation was made: "In these times of prolonged anxiety and tensions, he symbolizes the concern of psychiatry and the church for those who are troubled in mind and spirit." Already in 1951, Dr. Braceland had been made a Knight of St. Gregory by the late Pope Pius XII. Now this week, Pope Paul VI has named him a knight commander of the order.

In a different field, Mr. Suisman has also worked unceasingly for the mind and spirit of mankind. He has engaged in a large number and wide variety of philanthropies, and served on the boards of institutions for the public weal. Though not a medical man—some of these institutions, like those served by Dr. Braceland, are medical institutions—St. Francis and Hartford hospitals are among them—possibly he plays no favorites among these community activities. But one cannot help especially remarking that as establisher of the Suisman Foundation, he has been instrumental in giving more than 125 college and preparatory scholarships in the last 25 years. This certainly must have been remembered by Yale-in-Hartford which has now given Mr. Suisman its Nathan Hale Award for distinguishing himself and Yale through work, interest and activities.

Honors cannot help following men like Dr. Braceland and Mr. Suisman. But both already must feel in their hearts a kind of reward that public acclaim will never quite catch up with.

## ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, it was my privilege to attend the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award Dinner here in Washington. The dinner honored Edward G. Robinson, the distinguished American actor and humanitarian, who received the first Eleanor Roosevelt Humanities Award for his contribution to humane causes, in philanthropy and in the arts. Elliott Roosevelt, son of the late President, made the presentation. Our distinguished colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, delivered a moving tribute to our beloved fallen President, John Kennedy.

In accepting the award, Mr. Robinson delivered a moving tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt:

> We are not here to memorialize Eleanor Roosevelt, but rather to celebrate her, to rejoice that she lived. In that life she ignited a flame that will keep burning in the hearts of mankind around the globe.

Mr. President, those of us who heard Mr. Robinson's address were so inspired by its beautiful eloquence, that I would like to share it with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### Address by Edward G. Robinson

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel deeply honored. It is a source of great personal satisfaction to me to be in such distinguished company tonight, and I truly appreciate the very kind messages that were read here this evening.

In acknowledging this award and your very generous introduction, may I say that to be linked in this fashion with the name and lifework of one of the greatest and most beloved personalities of our time is far more than I deserve. I accept this award not as a token of recognition, but rather as a symbol of our common interest in the ideals for which she stood.

We are not here to memorialize Eleanor Roosevelt, but rather to celebrate her, to rejoice that she lived. In that life she ignited a flame that will keep burning in the hearts of mankind around the globe.

Her selfless dedication not only placed her on a pedestal of greatness, but helped elevate the entire Nation in the eyes of the world.

Where the dollar was pursued as the ultimate goal of happiness, she dealt in the currency of humanity. Where the American people were pictured as worshipers at the shrine of materialism, she extolled the values of human dignity and freedom.

She had the vision and the courage to crusade for ideas even when they provoked controversy. She possessed the spirit of a true leader, for she was not deterred by criticism or opposition.

All her life she was blessed because she gave so much to so many. To a nation grappling with the challenge of totalitarianism from without, whether Nazi or Communist, she gave a fresh sense of America's passionate dedication to freedom. She stoutly defended the rights of the individual against the special groups that sought to suppress them. She practiced the philosophy of Thomas Paine who said that "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigues of supporting it." And she regarded this as a sacred duty.

She gave a tired world a fresh sense of the meaning of freedom. She gave mankind a fresh sense of the importance of peace. She gave the underprivileged peoples of the world, black, brown or yellow, a renewed faith in the ideals of equality and liberty, long before they achieved their independence. To the youth of our country, whom she saw as the guardians of the future, she gave a new sense of the challenge of leadership in a free world. To every group of every creed and of every color she was the voice of justice and mercy.

Eleanor Roosevelt knew no boundaries or dividing lines. In the greatness of her vision it was all one world, one human race.

I can see her now, standing before a huge map of the world, and saying—and these are her own words:

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person: the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere."

As I look back on my own life, I realize that Eleanor Roosevelt's constant warning against indifference, her plea for an alert citizenry to protect the bastions of liberty had a special appeal to me because I was not born to it. Freedom was not part of my heritage when I was a child in Bucharest. It did not belong to me as of right. It did not belong to my fellow Jews in Rumania. In those early years of my childhood, I could know the meaning of freedom only because it was denied to me. This was the general position of the Jewish people in almost every part of Europe. Many years have passed since I, together with my family, came to the United States.

But I have never ceased to remember my debt to this land of opportunity, and I shall never forget the deep inner feeling of gratitude to Eleanor Roosevelt for helping me to relive that first exhilarating introduction to freedom.

Throughout the past quarter century Mrs. Roosevelt was my guide in the sphere of public service. Whenever I would receive an invitation to support a cause, I would never hesitate to say yes if her name was associated with it.

I have always felt that her example of self-sacrificing effort was like a clarion call to those who enjoyed the limelight, those whose profession enabled them to reach a world audience, a call to utilize that position for the well-being of the country and of humanity. Mrs. Roosevelt made me realize that an actor who has achieved a degree of prominence, can make a significant contribution in behalf of the public good. I am happy to say that many members of my profession have understood this and have become involved in civic and humanitarian causes.

Eleanor Roosevelt believed that politics was not the exclusive property of the politicians. She believed that it was not the proverbially smoke-filled room, but every village, town and hamlet, every home was the place for the formulation and discussion of the policies of government and for the expression of the will of the people.

This, too, I learned from her, that the ivory tower cannot withstand the pressure of the social, economic, and political forces of our day.

You and I know that few of us who feel keenly the problems of our country can insulate ourselves from the world of reality. I for one cannot imagine an actor seeking out the shelter of the stage to escape the slings and arrows of life in the 20th century. It is the very nature of our times that demands that every citizen share in the democratic process to the best of his ability.

She made clear her creed when she said: "One must never turn one's back on life. There is so much to do, so many engrossing challenges, so many heartbreaking and pressing needs." The challenges she met with forthright enlightenment—the heartbreaking and pressing needs became less heartbreaking and less pressing when this great lady contributed to their solutions. Every cause which ennobled men was her cause.

One of the pressing needs in her always crowded life was Israel, and she gave of her time and her physical presence and her influence to help Israel become the nation which all of us here, and many more in America, view with such personal pride.

Israel struck deep roots in her heart and mind. The spectacle of a people bravely going about the business of rebuilding its ancient homeland after it had suffered the loss of one-third of its total population stirred her admiration. In that small land she could see many striking parallels to our own country—a courageous spirit of pioneering—a fierce and strong sense of human liberty—a fearless determination to succeed against all obstacles. Israel offered her a bright confirmation of her faith in the power of democracy. She found in Israel the promise of success for other undeveloped lands, for other small nations. She saw in Israel a firm and strongly reliable ally of the free world in the unstable region of the Middle East.

In many respects she acted as the eyes and ears of the American people. Her travels brought the faraway places of the world into the living room of almost every home. What she saw in Europe of the plight of the survivors and refugees of Hitlerism, what she saw in Israel of the herculean accomplishments of these same men and women in restoring the land of the Bible to life, she translated into the universal language of the family of man. To her the rebirth of the Jewish people in its ancient homeland was a challenge and a problem for all mankind. Its success was not only a triumph of the Jewish spirit but a victory for the concept of human justice.

Freedom and dignity are not divisible, whether in Israel or in our own great democracy. Phrases like "separate but equal" are nonsense and here in this capital city of the world, nobody knows it better than our lawmakers. Freedom is the birthright of every American. Yet, as Mrs. Roosevelt so often said, it is like some delicate plant that must be watered and tended with care and with love. Freedom will prevail and grow and the walls of prejudice will be torn down, if we recognize our duty to keep it alive.

The Passover Haggadah commands each generation of Jews to regard the Exodus from Egypt as as if it happened in its own time. Not so long ago the world witnessed the martyrdom of the Jewish people and its miraculous return to the land of Israel. If we put ourselves in the shoes of these soldiers and marytrs on the battlefronts of freedom, we shall more fully appreciate our responsibility as free men.

Science has scaled the peaks of knowledge to fashion terrible instruments of destruction. We must build up sufficient moral and spiritual strength to avert total human disaster. Eleanor Roosevelt clearly saw the dangers confronting a world balanced precariously on the edge of annihilation. What force shall freemen draw upon to restore the equilibrium of our civilization? What price are we prepared to pay?

In America we know the value of freedom. Our danger is that we sometimes take freedom for granted. Every once in a while when a crisis arises, we brush the dust off it, shine it up, and bask in its strong radiance.

But as we all know, freedom is not a commodity you can pay for all at once. You can only get it on a permanent installment plan—the terms of which are constant sacrifice and vigilance. If these terms are not fully met and on time, the whole deal can be canceled.

Citizenship cannot be expressed passively—democracy is not a spectator sport. It is a serious way of life that requires our daily involvement, our daily watchfulness, our daily faith and devotion.

In recent days we suffered the grievous loss of a young and brilliant President who made the supreme sacrifice for freedom and for peace. Yet this is not a time for despair. In this new crisis, the American system has provided a pattern of continuity of leadership that gives us hope and comfort for the future. The grim hour commands us to close ranks behind President Johnson, who has made such an auspicious beginning in preserving those ideals and those policies that will keep our Nation strong and free.

The teachings and philosophy of the great lady whose spirit is with us tonight can be a valuable source of strength to all of us in these trying times. The urgency of the moment summons us to examine the magnitude of the job ahead of us. When we search for the key to human understanding, when perplexing issues block our path, when momentary lapses in business and public life damage our moral fiber, when the values of democracy are threatened, when basic human rights are in jeopardy, we know that we can draw on the lifework of Mrs. Roosevelt to show us the way. For her spirit is like an eternal light, like a pillar of fire by night. It leads and comforts us and strengthens our will to fight for what is right and what is just.

To emulate her, to try to duplicate her missions, to try to copy her activities, would be a futile attempt for most of us. But we can try. We must try.

Today we all have to be greater and bigger than is normally possible, for this may be our last chance to preserve our Nation and civilization itself.

This is what this Eleanor Roosevelt award means to me. You have honored me tonight more than I have ever been honored before in my life. And so—thank you from the depths of my heart.

## HOPE FOR COTTON

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly hopeful of remedial cotton legislation. And, I am extremely pleased that there appears to be growing public sentiment for a meaningful and economical cotton program such as that proposed by myself and the Senator from Minnesota.

The cotton bill recently passed by the House of Representatives would give the American textile manufacturers some relief from the inequitable two-priced cotton system, but it would at the same time complicate the present overall problem by adding still another subsidy to the national cotton program.

In addition to greatly increasing the cost to the taxpayer of the present cotton program, the House bill falls short of solving the total problem now facing the textile industries and the cotton farmer, and it does nothing to take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling and giving away cotton.

This was ably pointed out in an editorial in the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer on December 8, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

Two excellent editorials also appeared this week in the Atlanta Journal and the Washington Post, both of which point to the Talmadge-Humphrey bill as the only real solution to the cotton problem. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### The Talmadge Bill

The specter of Government subsidy may cast a long and menacing shadow in the Senate when that body gets to the House-passed cotton bill, calling for a $200-million program of Federal handouts to salvage the textile industry.

Washington reports indicate there's no assurance this bill will get the blessings of the Senate, and once more hope is revived for a measure by Senator Talmadge which would provide for direct price support payments to farmers and eliminate all other Government participation in the cotton business.

This, as we have insisted all along, is a much better approach to the cotton and textile dilemma than piling on the back of the Government another giant subsidy program.

How, we keep wondering, can the textile giants, oriented as they are to the system of private enterprise, betray that cause by willingly going along with a Federal handout plan?

While it may serve their interests now, aren't they tying their hands about expressing future opposition to huge Government spending programs?

It's hard to believe the textile manufacturers are yet ready to resort to this desperate route.

They deserve a better break in the purchase of American cotton although they might argue, with some justification, that the Government has put them in their present position. To be sure there's no logical basis for forcing them to pay more for their domestic raw material than their foreign competitors. That could put them out of business.

But the whole point is that Senator Talmadge has a plan that would eliminate two-price cotton, while at the same time saving them from the humiliation of accepting Federal subsidies. Why can't the textile people and the public demand its resurrection?

---

### Hope for Cotton

The saving grace of the cotton bill passed by the House is that it paves the way for action in the Senate, thus raising the hope that a far better piece of legislation may emerge from a conference committee.

The principal purpose of the heavily amended Cooley bill approved by the House was the elimination of the two-price system under which foreign mills purchase American cotton at the world price while American textile manufacturers are compelled to pay higher supported prices in the domestic market. But while the House was willing to eliminate a patent inequity by agreeing to subsidize the cotton mills with payments in kind from the accumulated cotton stocks, it gave the textile manufacturers far less than either they or Mr. Cooley wanted.

In the original version of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture was instructed to make payments in kind in the amount necessary to make cotton available to domestic mills at the same price that American cotton is offered for export. This would amount to a subsidy of 8½ cents per pound, a sum greater than that necessary to place American mills on an equal footing with their foreign competitors whose advantage must be calculated as net of transport charges. But the House accepted the amendment offered by Representative Paul C. Jones, of Missouri, which provides only that the payments be sufficiently large to remove the inequity.

At the same time the House indicated its dissatisfaction with the high price-support level by adopting the McIntire amendment which would reduce it from the present 32.47 cents a pound to 29 cents a pound over a 3-year period.

Neither the Jones nor the McIntire amendment make the Cooley bill an acceptable piece of legislation and it is fortunate that it stands virtually no chance of Senate passage as it is. But the fact that the amendments were adopted indicates that some form of Senator Herman E. Talmadge's benefit-payment plan might find favor in the House. Under the Talmadge proposal the price-support program would be replaced by income subsidies to farmers, thus taking the Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton and eliminating the need for subsidies to exporters and manufacturers.

The transition from the amended Cooley bill to the Talmadge benefit-payments plan involves a host of issues, but none will impose an insuperable barrier if the House members of the conference committee are disposed to take a broad and enlightened view. Therein lies the hope for the most rational solution of the cotton problem that now seems available.

---

[From the Sunday Ledger-Enquirer, Dec. 8, 1963]

### Talmadge Bill Best Solution

A legislative solution for two-price cotton passed a significant test this past week when the House of Representatives gave it a 216 to 182 vote of approval.

But the bill's chances of surviving a similar test in the Senate are practically nonexistent.

First off, Senator Allen Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee does not like the bill. "I can't support a cotton bill which would greatly increase costs of the farm program after refusing to do this on wheat and dairy programs," he said last week.

Implementation of the House-passed bill would increase the farm program's cost an average of $200 million a year for the next 3 years.

The money would be used as an indirect subsidy to domestic textile mills, allowing them to obtain American-grown cotton at the same price foreign textilers pay. At present, American mills pay 8½ cents a pound more for American cotton than foreign competitors do.

President Johnson exerted the full influence of his administration to win passage of the bill in the House. Republicans and some big-city Democrats opposed it. In the Senate, it faces the additional opposition of a number of southern Democrats such as Senator Ellender.

Senator Aiken, a Republican, of Vermont, sounded a note that will probably be dominant in his party. "This is not an agriculture measure," he said. "It's a bill for the relief of textile mills. It's not the first time farmers have been soaked for something that did not benefit them."

Most discouraging was the statement from Senator Hubert Humphrey, assistant majority leader. "I cannot support the bill," Humphrey said. "It is unnecessarily costly and will be utterly impossible to police fully."

However, Senator Humphrey does support a plan drawn by Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge. Talmadge has already expressed opposition to the House-passed bill, another sign that it stands little chance in the Senate.

As a Georgian, Senator Talmadge is naturally concerned about domestic textile interests but he regards the House bill as the "wrong answer." His own plan for alleviating the two-price system would change the whole concept of cotton support prices, with all cotton being sold at the world price.

The House bill boasts merit only in the fact that it would give relief to domestic textilers in their uneven competition with low-priced imports. Otherwise, the bill complicates the already complex burden of subsidies, offsetting one subsidy by adding another, and in the process, raising the cost for the taxpayer.

Since the Senate appears unlikely to accept such a solution, the best course for textile-State Congressmen might be to get behind Senator Talmadge's bill, which the House would probably also pass.

---

## PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS AGGRAVATE RATHER THAN AID RACIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at a time when there is a great hue and cry for so-called civil rights legislation, and when demonstrators take to the streets in total disregard for law and order, it is refreshing indeed to hear a voice calling for the application of practical commonsense in the racial controversy which now has hold of the country.

Such a voice is that of a retired U.S. Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, a Negro who was until last June a professor at Fort Valley, Ga., State College. Major Robinson's views have a great deal of merit, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter he wrote to the Macon, Ga., Telegraph and an editorial written in the Albany, Ga., Herald be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Macon Telegraph, Nov. 15, 1963]

### Negroes' Cause Is Hurt by Professional Agitators

Editor, the Telegraph: During the past 4 weeks I made a survey of areas in which demonstrations were sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress of Racial Equality. The results of the survey indicate without doubt that race relations in Albany, Ga., Danville, Va., and Birmingham, Ala., were seriously hurt by the activities of the groups named above. The real pity is that all persons of importance, except those connected with the demonstrations, expressed the view that much more progress would have been made toward granting Negroes more rights had not the radical elements from elsewhere gone into the communities in which they were not a part.

Responsible citizens of both racial groups had been working for months on grievances advanced by Negroes in various sections of the country. In time it is possible that the Negroes would have been given many of the things they desired had not the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., inflamed the situation with ultimatums.

It appears to be the consensus among Negroes in all sections that civil rights is an issue for politicians and for those who exploit the ignorance of the Negroes for their own economic advantages, influence, prestige, and power. It is felt among the masses of the Negroes themselves that the civil right leaders would not associate themselves with other Negroes except those of the elite.

Ninety percent of the Negroes feel that mass agitation is the wrong method to go about improving the Negroes lot. Demonstrations are usually in the form of intimidation which will not be accepted by constitutional authorities, regardless of the positions they may hold.

Aside from special areas in which demonstrations were held, I visited every community in Georgia with a population of 4,000 inhabitants or more. Nowhere did I find Negroes interested in participation in demonstration except those who received compensations for their activities. What the Negroes desire and want most of all is a job, and otherwise be left to himself to live and enjoy happiness one among the other of his own group. The Southern Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress of Racial Equality would deprive the Negroes of this inalienable right.

If the incentive of individualism is permitted to be destroyed, free enterprise will disappear.

Certain self-appointed leaders today pretend that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or lie-down and sit-ins demonstrations which interfere forcibly with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business. Our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through the television, through the radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the public is ignored by the racial elements who sponsor demonstrations. Have not all these facilities been made available to minority groups as well as all other groups?

Maj. H. A. Robinson.

---

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1963]

### The Voice of Negro Integrity

It is indeed unfortunate that an American Negro of widespread respect and integrity cannot voice a moderate viewpoint without being assailed by the radicals within his own race as an "Uncle Tom" and worse. But that, apparently, is the price he must pay for asserting values long cherished in the American tradition. The radicals will not have it otherwise because they cannot afford for their self-appointed authority to be questioned in the slightest degree lest it vanish altogether.

Nevertheless, a great many individual Negroes, viewing the racial crisis askance, continue to make a great deal of sense. One such is a retired Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, who was attached to the faculty of Fort Valley State College until last June. A self-made man who lived on a Florida farm until he was 19, entered school at the age of 20 and received a bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Massachusetts, later studying at six other institutions of higher learning. Major Robinson served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist.

Interviewed by the Washington Post, he said he strongly opposes the Martin Luther King-type racial demonstrations. He applauded his students at Fort Valley for not participating in them. A far better course, he feels, is embraced by the difficult but rewarding improvement of self by the individual, by service to the Nation, by sharing in full citizenship through obeying laws, by more respect for constitutional authority and by criticizing other racial groups far less.

In the opinion of the major, those Negroes who create civil disturbances miss the whole point of the basic needs of their race in American society. Obviously, the cry of "freedom now" as devised by the Reverend Dr. King is catchy and compelling, but the undeniable fact is that every American, Negro or not, has freedom. What he does not have is unfettered license. That he will never possess in a democratic society. No truly responsible man desires this questionable quality, for to possess it he must rob his neighbor of some portion of the latter's liberty. This Major Robinson understands full well.

His entire thesis is that the Negro should make of himself whatever he wills. Implicit in his belief is that the Negro can do so under the American system, just as the Irish have done so, the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, the Chinese and other racial minorities. As he says, human nature is such that "certain ones will go ahead, even if the schoolhouse was a log cabin, while others may be assigned to the best schools and the best environment and still either drop out or fail to measure up to accepted standards."

In this respect, and others, Major Robinson reminds us strongly of the late great, Dr. J. W. Holley, founder and president of what is now Albany State College and easily the finest mind the local Negro community has produced. Dr. Holley, too, was labeled "old-fashioned" and "Uncle Tom" by the racial militants. But he was infinitely wiser. He knew instinctively, as well as by experience, that the color of a man's skin is not as important as the color of his character as measured by his contribution to the general good of the community. That was why Dr. Holley was adjudged by the white and Negro community alike to be a splendid man and a model citizen. He gave so much more than he ever received to his city, his school and his race. His memory is revered, not as a Negro, but as an outstanding human being.

---

## DR. JOHN BARCLAY OF CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH, AUSTIN, TEX., SAYS GOOD INFLUENCE OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WILL LIVE ON FOREVER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. John Barclay, minister of the Central Christian Church of Austin, Tex., a devout and scholarly man, delivered an invocation at the inauguration of President John F. Kennedy in January 1961.

After the cruel assassination of President Kennedy occurred November 22, this distinguished clergyman delivered a moving sermon of November 24, 1963. I agree with Dr. Barclay's estimate that "We would not see President Kennedy's like again in this century." It is a thoughtful message, voiced in sorrow, but filled with love and understanding. I ask unanimous consent that the inauguration invocation and the sermon of November 24, entitled, "A Vital, Living Memory," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Invocation at President Kennedy's Inauguration, January 1961

(By Rev. Dr. John Barclay, pastor of the Central Christian Church, Austin, Tex.)

Eternal God, our Father, we pause again to acknowledge that in Thy presence we are living and moving and in Thee alone we have our being.

We are thankful for the great and good men raised up by Thee to lead us in the past. Bless these leaders of recent decades, still with us, who have led us through these tumultuous times, to live out their years with the consciousness of the admiration and appreciation of a grateful people.

We thank Thee for our country, for the manner in which Thou didst lead our fathers to establish this Nation in which all men have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Help us to so unite duties and rights that there may develop in all our people a new maturity that will continually produce life more abundant, liberty more responsible, and spiritual satisfactions more abiding.

Our Father, we pray for the Congress and the courts and all public servants, that there may come from their deep dedication and high patriotism a new inspiration for all Americans.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the two men whom we have elected to lead us, who today assume the almost unbearable responsibilities of their exalted offices. We thank Thee for their high intelligence and their characters made great by hard work and devoted services to their country in war and in peace.

Bless them with vigorous health, great strength, and courageous boldness to lead our Nation out into a new era and into a new frontier. Help them to lead us to return to the virtues of our fathers: industry, honesty, and frugality.

Under their leadership may we recapture the faith of our fathers and their spiritual optimism that problems are soluble, that what ought to be can be, that neighborly potential is inherent in mankind.

#### FAMILY SUPPORT SOUGHT

Our Father, we pray Thou will bless Lyndon B. Johnson and add Thy strength to his strength as he continues to lead men of divergent views to reconcile their differences in the interest of the common good of our Nation and of all mankind. Add Thy wisdom, grace, and power to his great abilities, and may his willingness to serve bring strength and help to the President.

May the beauty, understanding, and spiritual support of his family continue to bless his life all his years.

We pray, Our Father, for John F. Kennedy as he assumes the heavy burden of great leadership in these ominous times. Bless his family that in all the turmoil of his public life they may be for him an oasis of quiet peace and rest.

When he faces great and solemn hours of decision, decisions upon which may hang the fate of all mankind, when he must ascend the lonely pinnacle, help him then to know that he is not alone; that Thou art with him to guide him in making decisions of wisdom and righteousness for his Nation and the whole world.

May the magnitude of his leadership inspire tens of millions of Americans into a dedicated involvement in their country's progress. And may peace crown his years.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

---

### A Vital, Living Memory

(By John Barclay)

Friends, we come this morning to worship God and to remember in sorrow and grief our slain President. I am sure we all deplore the increase in violence in these postwar years. Much of it is motivated by economic greed as in bank robberies, and in various types of stickup jobs. Political hatred as a motivation for violence has been greatly increased in this generation. This type of hatred has now climaxed in the assassination of President Kennedy. This happens because the Nation is being brainwashed by certain newspapers and by radio and TV commentators and as these editorials and other approaches are poured into people's minds day after day, there builds up a sense of hatred that may turn into violence. This situation marks out clearly the task of the pulpit and the church generally for years to come. It is simply this, we must reach, and preach, and practice this great principle that the law of love must become our way of life. We must continually preach against the sin of hate.

The New Testament is very clear on this. It says, "he that hateth his brother is a murderer." This we must remember. We can become mad, I mean literally unbalanced, through hatred. If we hate Lyndon Johnson; if we hate Ralph Yarborough; if we hate John Tower, if we hate John Connally, we are doubly sinners. It is a sin to hate any person, for every person in the world is the child of God. It is a sin to hate anybody, because it may lead to murder. It is a particular sin to hate people whom we have elected to lead us in public office, for this is a sin against democracy, and both are sins against God. If we have not learned yet how to be good citizens in a democracy where we speak with our votes, and change governments with our votes, then we are still children, in government. This has led to the assassination of other Presidents—three others, and two other attempts. This country went for nearly 75 years without an attempt to assassinate a President; then at the close of the Civil War, it began. Since Alfred the Great was crowned King of England in 871—and he was the first person ever to speak of England as one country, as a single land—and from then until now, nearly 1100 years, there has been no assassination of a British sovereign.

Friends, we must learn the deeper meaning of democracy that politics is the way of life in America. It is the art of the possible. The people elect their Governors, their Presidents, their Congressmen, their Senators, their city councilmen. We elect those that lead us. The very fact that we elect them puts us under a peculiar obligation to respect their leadership and most of all to respect and admire the offices which they fill. We must respect the office of authority in government and the way of dissent must be by nonviolence and voting.

There seems to me there is a double tragedy in the death of John F. Kennedy. First, his youth, his ability, his almost perfect preparation for the Presidency, the great fulfillment of his task now goes unfinished. This is the first tragedy.

The second tragedy is his depth of greatness in a new worldwide setting of opportunity; this was lost to our world. I sat and listened to him on that blustery, cold day as he gave his inaugural address, and there he pictured his vision of our country in a new frame of reference, in the world setting of tomorrow. I sat there and thought of two great men who were sitting on the platform. These men I had admired; men that I had often saluted in my heart because they were courageous men. I am speaking, of course, of General Eisenhower and ex-President Truman. These men had to make terrible decisions and they made them. They were great leaders and great Americans. But Mr. Kennedy was the first man to be President who was born in this century and as he finished this address, it seemed to me that his mind and his plans and his vision, were in the history of the future. Here was the stream of time into which his leadership and genius would be poured. This man in his 3 short years in the Presidency gave an image of America to the world that I believe will be an image in fulfillment for the rest of this century.

First, he wanted to talk about peace, like his predecessors, from the standpoint of strength. This we have. But it was a peace of reason that he wanted, and he was reasonable, in seeking it. His representatives at the peace conference have published now the "American Blueprint for the Peace Race," which is one of the most intelligent and forward-looking and hopeful documents that has ever come from the State Department. I hope you will read it word for word. It is a 35-page booklet. This is the dream of the future for mankind—to get out from under this nuclear cloud of fear and dread. That was first: that in our generation we begin to secure the peace for mankind. And his second great ideal was prosperity; to get the economy going; to lift up every year more hundreds of thousands of people who will live on a comfort level of life where they enjoy the good things that are created in our land. And the third was like unto it; namely, national sharing. He said to the Congress just the other day that "I cannot do my duty as President of this land if you are going to cut foreign aid, and cut and cut and cut." This was part of his program. This is a part of his ideal of life that he knew first in his family—simply, that if you have wealth, you must match it with responsibility. This is not just for persons; this is for nations. No rich nation in a poor world can ever be secure and safe, and this was a great, new ideal begun in the days of Mr. Truman and continued in the days of his successor and continued also by Mr. Kennedy. But this was his ideal to see not only our land lifted up, but also the whole world to a new level of prosperity, and mutual helpfulness.

And then he had a fourth very great ideal upon which he staked his very life, his political life; namely, that every citizen's rights should be respected by the people and protected by the government. Friends, this image of his country was personified in his own life. The flowers in the baptistry this morning are red roses because we want to symbolize his courage and his love and his sacrifice. His was a pure life, with a certain mature innocence. He knew that if somebody wanted to kill him, he could. There is no way to completely protect a President. But he never could make up his mind that anybody wanted to kill him. So he traveled more freely probably at times than he should have. His was a simple but strong and sincere faith in God; his religion was expressed by his churchmanship. The record shows that in nearly 3 years in the Presidency he never missed a Sunday going to church. Wherever he was in the world, he arranged to be close enough to a church to attend it, when Sunday came.

However difficult was his life, and however heavy the burdens of responsibility of his office, he felt that there was a duty that he had to his God, to his family, and to himself that he needed to worship; that he needed to go to church and experience again, as all Catholics do at the mass, the crucifixion of our Lord. In this he gave an example to all of us, to all of his citizens. He was just not satisfied to give his money to his church; he gave it his personal attention and his time. You have probably heard on the television what people have thought all over the country. I have this quotation from an Austin high school boy—which moved me deeply. He said, "Somehow I felt so safe while he was alive." He probably had never thought this before he died. He just went along taking things for granted and then when this tragedy struck—quickly—here in our own Texas, it stunned him, and then as he thought back, he felt that this man could lead us in ways of peace and mutual helpfulness.

And questions are being asked—not just by high school students and children, or college students, but by all of us. They are asking the question: Is there really anything to the doctrine of divine providence? Does God care? Does He care whether this man was protected; whether this other man with evil thoughts should kill him like that [snaps fingers]—and probably a second after the bullet hit, he was never aware of anything. Does God care about these things? And, of course, we answer: God does care. God cares about us all, whether it is the President of the United States or a nameless and an unknown peasant, that falls; God cares. Jesus went into this with such infinite detail, that He said: "The very hairs of your head are numbered. Not a sparrow falls without the Father's concern." This is the very basis of our religion. Then why does it happen? This is the price of freedom. When God divided His sovereignty with mankind and gave us freedom, then we help make the decisions about life and what happens in life.

What is left of John F. Kennedy? Tomorrow in a great formal ceremony before members of almost all the nations of the world they will inter his body among the immortal dead of this Nation there in Arlington. I know many of you have gone over there into the cemetery and paused on the front porch of Robert E. Lee's home. There many of the great and immortal dead of our country lie buried. And there they will inter his mortal remains, and that is what goes. But what stays—what remains? What is left? And this is the important thing. This is the thing that every preacher tries to say to people who are sorrowing at a funeral—this is difficult at times, because the spiritual atmosphere is not thrown around funerals as much as we would like, but what we are saying is that his vital, living memory continues to live. The glory of his life, his high purposes, his courage, his sacrifice, his high sense of duty, his great vision live on in all the people that loved him and followed him.

Thirty years ago I heard a story of a man who had come back from China. He had gone way out in the western province of China, Sikiang, and he said he saw there on the semidesert a little hut and way in the distance there was something shining on the top of the roof. When he got there he saw "Standard Oil" on the piece of tin that was on the roof, that was what was shining. But this herdsman asked him in; they had language difficulty but one thing he understood—there on the wall of this hut way out in western China was a picture of Abraham Lincoln, who had been slain 70 years before by an assassin.

This man and his family who were destined to live in poverty and squalor all their lives had some touch of dignity put into their souls by the fact that they could admire and get some inspiration from this man that came up from poverty, came up from the people, and yet became one of the great and dynamic men of history. The deathless quality of love and honorable character, and service to others live on. Indeed these are released by death. This we have always known about Jesus. As long as He was Jesus of Nazareth, He could be in only one place at a time; He could talk only to one group; He could heal only one person at a time; He had the limitations of the flesh, the limitations of time and space; but as soon as He rose from the dead, and became an immortal soul, He was freed from these limitations and Jesus could dwell in a hundred million minds at the same moment and He could bring healing and health and inspiration to millions around the world at the same time. And this is what is released in death—the limitations of the flesh. And we take this as the perfect case in the world. But there is no reason why we should limit this truth and not take this same ideal and apply it, take this same truth and apply it to the good and the great of all generations. Because out of this outpouring of life into the stream of humanity there goes this spiritual food, this mental lift, this guidance of the spirit for people not only who knew him, of people who were present, not only his contemporaries but if he is great enough, if he lifts his soul high enough in life, he lives on forever in other lives made better by his presence.

This morning as we close this memorial to our fallen President, I want to carry on a tradition that has been in this church since its beginning, 116½ years ago, we have never closed a worship hour in this church without opening the doors of the church to any who would come in and join us, either by letter or statement or the simple confession of Christ's saviourhood. Come and walk with us in this high tradition of our Saviour.

## DETROIT MAYOR JEROME P. CAVANAGH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 2 years ago, a political newcomer staged a spectacular upset in winning the post of mayor of Detroit. Harper's magazine this month carries an interesting report of how this man—Jerome P. Cavanagh—has taken hold of the reins of government and capably dealt with some of the most difficult and explosive problems which ever faced a mayor.

I ask unanimous consent that much of this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks. I make this request with the thought that my colleagues and the country will enjoy the story of accomplishments of this man, young in years but mature in leadership skills. It is good to be reminded that such men and women are engaged in public business in this Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DETROIT'S SURPRISING MAYOR

(By Tom Nicholson)

On a steamy Sunday afternoon last summer, some 125,000 citizens, most of them Negroes, paraded calmly on a freedom march through the downtown section of Detroit. The only untoward incident—quickly quelled—was caused by a lone American Nazi among the spectators. Around the same time, across the country, police were hauling civil-rights demonstrators to jails and in Chicago Mayor Richard Daley was shouted down when addressing an NAACP convention.

The relative tranquillity of the Detroit scene was startling; the city has a long history of turbulent race relations dating back to the bloody riots that took place there 20 years ago. Significantly, a prominent figure in the orderly June freedom march was a husky, blue-eyed, 35-year-old Irishman, Jerome Patrick Cavanagh. Unknown to most Detroiters 2 years ago, he was elected mayor in 1961 in the most spectacular upset in recent Michigan political history.

His victory was to a large degree the result of an explosive racial situation which a recent economic upturn has somewhat ameliorated. But to a considerable degree the easing of racial tension must be credited to the bold and realistic steps Cavanagh has taken in the field of civil rights. He has rammed through equally direct—and often unpopular—measures to replenish a bankrupt municipal treasury and, though he is an outspoken liberal on virtually all issues, he has also cracked down vigorously on the obstructionist tactics of craft-union leaders.

"You've got to have a definite philosophy and work at it," he told me recently, "even if it means that once in a while you get clobbered."

So far this has not happened, even though Cavanagh has handled an extraordinary number of political hot potatoes. Instead, during his brief term of office he has become the object of nearly constant worship by the city's newspapers as well as by civic, business, and labor leaders—most of whom supported his opponent, then-incumbent Louis C. Miriani, in the 1961 race.

Not long ago Cavanagh was guest of honor at a luncheon sponsored by Civic Searchlight, Inc., a respected local "good government" group. "It's a pleasant experience to be the focus of the Civic Searchlight today," he amiably told the assembled burghers. "It wasn't always this way. In November 1961, I was searching eagerly for the light but it was shining on someone else."

"We all know a lot more about our mayor now," said Searchlight's president by way of apology.

Detroit's municipal elections are nonpartisan. To win, Cavanagh had to outdistance eight other contenders all running in the August primary without party label. He then went on to trounce Mayor Miriani, an old pro who was supported by every branch of the Detroit establishment. At the height of the campaign, Henry Ford II, whose home is in Grosse Pointe, took the unusual step of announcing that if he lived in the city he would vote for the distinguished incumbent. Though Cavanagh had been active in the Young Democrats, even the stanchly Democratic AFL–CIO Council endorsed Miriani—unions, like other practical citizens, prefer to back a winner.

Certainly few people—except possibly his wife Mary and the seven little Cavanaghs—thought Jerry had any chance back in the summer of 1961 when he decided to enter the primary. A lawyer with a moderately lucrative practice, he is blessed with the Irish love of politics, an engaging presence on the platform or TV, and a sensitive ear for public opinion. This was, however, his first try for elective office. The campaign was run, says one of his aides, on "nickels and novenas." The former were supplied by personal friends, by the Detroit Fire Fighters Association, and by some Negro trade unionists. The prayers—plus plenty of sweat and shoe leather—were offered by the friends of his college days at the University of Detroit, a Jesuit school where he earned both his AB and his law degree.

Cavanagh finds the current adulation slightly embarrassing. "When the papers are too nice to you people begin to wonder," he told me recently.

Unanimity on any subject is a rare phenomenon in a city noted for its harsh social and economic cleavages and periodically racked by bitter collective-bargaining contests. Often called an overgrown small town, Detroit has shallow cultural roots. Its traditions and aristocracy date only from the birth of the automobile, and the wealthier citizens have never reached a comfortable accommodation with the United Auto Workers. Since the late 1940's, however, the union has become a major political force. Detroit's population has grown from 285,000 in 1900 to nearly 1,700,000. Nearly one-third are factory hands, who have little contact with white-collar workers or the other groups identified with management.

Physically, too, this is a divided city. Its 140 flat square miles start on the shores of the bustling Detroit River, clogged with ice in winter and churned during the summer months by hundreds of iron-ore freighters making the rounds between Duluth on Lake Superior and ports on the southern shore of Lake Erie. Sprawling north and west from the river bank, like spokes of a giant half wheel, are five wide avenues—Jefferson, Gratiot, Woodward, Michigan, and Grand River. Most of the city's half-million Negroes make their homes in two huge public housing projects or in a teeming tumbledown area called, ironically, "Paradise Valley." The Negroes, along with other working-class families, including a large sprinkling of Mexicans and white southerners, live within Grand Boulevard, a half-circle surrounding the city some 3 miles from downtown. The luckier Negroes are pushing out beyond the boulevard but have as yet made no inroads into Palmer Woods, Rosedale, and other sections where middle-class whites, in pleasant, tree-shaded houses, warily watch the dark-skinned out-migration. The really rich don't stay in Detroit but move to such elegant suburbs as Grosse Pointe, Birmingham, and Bloomfield Hills.

Tied to a single industry, Detroit is particularly vulnerable to fluctuations in national prosperity. "When the economy sneezes, Michigan catches pneumonia," goes a local saw; in fact, recent recessions have thrown 18 percent of the city's labor force out of work. Even apart from major economic swings, Detroit is a moody town. Spirits sag each summer as the auto production curve slopes off. Hopes rise in the fall when the new models are introduced and their very newness seems to promise big sales. If they fail to materialize, Detroit people don't buy homes and refrigerators, they stop going to ball games or concerts. They're saving against the ever-present threat of a layoff at Ford, GM, and Chrysler.

#### BRIDGING THE RIVER OF HATE

Two years ago, a kind of chronic chin-in-the-chest despair had settled over the city. It was compounded of nagging concern about continued unemployment, labor-management bickering, the inability or unwillingness of the legislature in Lansing to take action about the State's acute fiscal problems, and the platitudes of a mayor who seemed to understand everything about city government except how to make it work.

In late 1960, several white women were brutally murdered in one of the city's Negro ghettos. Mayor Miriani reacted by ordering a crackdown on crime, which was carried out by his police commissioner, Herbert W. Hart, a dapper millionaire food-distributor. Negroes were indiscriminately picked up on the streets, frisked, searched, and subjected to humiliating questioning. Overzealous policemen booked those deemed to be acting suspiciously on flimsy charges and held them overnight at precinct stations.

The Miriani-Hart dragnet captured a number of purse-snatchers, vandals, muggers, and petty thieves; a lethal-looking array of switchblade knives, zip guns, chains, and pipes was collected. But none of the murders was solved. Thousands of innocent Negroes were outraged and the entire Negro community seethed. This was the stage on which Jerry Cavanagh, unknown, untried, and uninhibited, made his political debut.

Campaigning from door to door, in supermarket parking lots, at small meetings in homes, he promised to end police harassment, to attack unemployment and the other social ills that were at the root of the crime problem, to deal justly with all citizens irrespective of color.

His message was heard in Paradise Valley and in the other areas where unemployed Negroes and whites patched the windows of their ramshackle frame homes with cardboard. In one such area on the west side the vote went 86 percent for Cavanagh. Across town, near the shells of the abandoned Hudson and Packard plants where Miriani in 1957 had polled 88 percent of the vote, Cavanagh won 77 percent. He did even better in a bleak 2-mile stretch on the city's northern outkirts, known as the "slave market." Here hundreds of Negro men regularly waited on the highway, shivering in the blustery fall morning, hoping that someone in a passing car or truck would stop and offer a day's odd job.

Immediately after his election, Cavanagh set about making good his campaign promises in a fashion that was both practical and dramatic. As his controller and the city's chief financial officer, he named a highly respected Negro, Alfred M. Pelham, a former member of the Wayne State University political science faculty who had previously been county budget director. Theodore Morgan, a Negro UAW official, was appointed secretary of the Department of Public Works Commission. To head the Mayor's Commission on Children and Youth he chose another Negro, Mrs. Esther LaMarr, a former probation officer of the juvenile court. Anticipating by a good 20 months the steps other cities have since taken under pressure of civil-rights demonstrations, he ordered a survey of employment in all city departments and instructed them, wherever feasible, to raise the ratio of Negroes to 30 percent—to reflect approximately the racial balance of the city's population. His first executive order was for fair employment practices in city hiring. Shortly afterward, he ruled that no city contracts go to firms practicing discrimination.

To deal with the critical issue of "police brutality" he named as Police Commissioner George Edwards, a 49-year-old Michigan Supreme Court justice who was once an organizer for the UAW. A sensitive man, well known for his liberal political and social views, Edwards was much esteemed by the Negro community. Under his direction random arrests for investigation were ended, and policemen were required to observe constitutional guarantees against illegal search and seizure. Edwards set out to "build a bridge over the river of hate" in Detroit. For this purpose he took to the streets, and three or four evenings a week he attended meetings in Negro neighborhoods, urging his listeners to forget their traditional distrust of all cops and to help them catch the muggers, racketeers, and narcotics peddlers who threaten both Negroes and whites.

These efforts bore fruit, even though Paradise Valley is still not a place for carefree strolling late at night. There has been some grumbling among policemen who accuse Edwards of being soft on Negro wrongdoers. But the salient fact is that excruciating tensions have been eased and a serious racial crisis has been averted. (Edwards was recently named by President Kennedy as a judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati.)

### THE MESS IN COBO HALL

Meanwhile, Cavanagh has moved briskly ahead in dealing with some of the other municipal messes he inherited.

One of these dates back to 1960 when the city completed a new $54 million complex on the Detroit River known as Cobo Hall and Convention Arena. Intended as a magnet for badly needed convention business, it became instead a private preserve to be milked by building-trades union stewards and business agents. Exhibitors, for example, were forced to hire a $4.50-an-hour electrician to screw in a light bulb or insert a plug. The simplest display had to be assembled by a three-man carpenter crew, some working at over-time rates. Even the UAW, which held a special convention here in 1961, was the victim of a jurisdictional dispute between Teamsters and Carpenters, both claiming the right to set up delegates' chairs. Several conventions canceled their plans; others vowed never to return unless the labor problem was straightened out. Cavanagh's predecessor, Miriani, made a few half-hearted attempts to iron out the difficulties. He was, however, in no position to take a firm stand since many of the recalcitrant union leaders were his cronies and regular Saturday afternoon companions at the Clique Lounge Bar, a midtown saloon favored by contractors, union leaders, and friendly politicians.

Cavanagh came into office with no debts or commitments to organized labor and a determination to clean up the Cobo Hall mess. As his chief troubleshooter on this front he appointed John D. McGillis, a tough, able administrator with considerable experience in city government. Under his direction a civic center commission drew up new work rules requiring that all job assignments be handled through a single labor contractor, with a city representative present during negotiations. Union officials were to have no direct dealings with any individual exhibitor. Since Cobo Hall is a public facility, Cavanagh announced that city employees would run it if the building trades unions would not accept the new rules.

When one union leader begged off from a conference with the mayor, on the grounds that he was not in the city, Cavanagh had him tailed.

"This guy," Cavanagh said to the president of the Detroit Building Trades Council, a close friend of the former mayor "out and out lied to us. He said he was out of town and we know damn well he wasn't. If you guys don't want to cooperate with us we'll get some people in the hall who will."

Jolted by such tough talk, the building trades leaders, in due course, bowed to the new rules.

### GRAND OPERA AND BAGELS

The mayor has been no milder in deed—though somewhat more urbane in manner—in his treatment of Detroit's genteel suburbanites who have not been happy about the steps taken to restore the city's fiscal integrity. In January 1962 the municipal treasury was bare; a budget deficit of $19 million was destined to climb to $34 million by June. Determined to find $40 million in new money, Cavanagh argued, first, for a State income tax. He hammered on this theme at meetings, press conferences, and on TV, and traveled to Lansing to plead his cause. Though responsible leaders of both parties agreed with him, the rural-dominated legislature said "no."

Defeated on this front, Cavanagh persuaded his city council to enact an unprecedented 1-percent city income tax—to be levied not merely on Detroiters but on suburbanites who work in the city. The outcry from the split levels was predictable. Suburban mayors banded together in a vigilance tax committee which collected a war chest from commuters to fight the new tax in the courts. A "tea party" to protest taxation without representation was organized. But in due course the courts upheld the tax; the budget, which expired June 30 of this year, was in balance, and the general fund deficit has been cut in half. Thanks to improved economic conditions, the yield has exceeded expectations and Cavanagh may be in the happy position of cutting taxes when his term ends in 1965.

"This is a hard, punishing job," Cavanagh said to me recently at the end of a day that had included 6 or 7 hours of conferences with his staff on juvenile delinquency, city planning, street resurfacing, and assorted municipal problems, sandwiched between an unending procession of citizen visitors, ranging from a delegation of schoolchildren to a police sergeant who wanted the mayor to meet his wife. However, he shows no signs of wear, except for thinning hair and an expanding waistline (the price of too much official dining). His workday normally starts at 8:30 a.m., when a police department driver arrives in a city-owned black Imperial Le Baron limousine at the six-bedroom Cavanagh home at 18055 Parkside. Before leaving he helps get four of the seven children ready for school.

"Mary doesn't like all the publicity and pressure surrounding the office," he told me. "But happily, the kids don't feel it. To them, my being mayor just means a chance to meet Al Kaline (a Detroit Tiger star) or Gordie Howe (of the Detroit Red Wing hockey club). At night, our kids still watch Popeye on television instead of the news."

His office is on the 11th floor of the marble and glass city-county building on Detroit's waterfront. When he arrives, Cavanagh generally heads for the basement cafeteria, picks up a cup of coffee and a bagel, and then tries to down them as he chats with the many people who like to say good morning to the mayor.

He greets most of them by name and asks appropriately about ailing aunts, uncles, or children. There is a disarming genuineness to these classic political gestures, as executed by Cavanagh—that quality which Madison Avenue calls "sincerity" but which reflects, in fact, a real concern for his fellow members of the human race. He has, in addition, what might be called style. He is quite at home, for example, at the opening of the Metropolitan Opera's 2-week Detroit season where he does the honors with Mrs. Edsel Ford, grand dame of the auto colony. And he is an equally warm and witty companion at a newspaper reporters' party upstairs in Jacoby's saloon. With his head cocked to one side, he has the knack of making the individual he is talking to feel important and respected.

No politician, of course, is without detractors. Billy Rogell, a cantankerous former Tiger shortstop (Detroit is peculiarly blessed with athletes turned politician) is Cavanagh's most vocal critic on the eight-member common council. He customarily refers to His Honor as "our boy mayor."

Cavanagh's most palpable fault is ducking tough decisions on key personnel. For instance, the Detroit Street Railways, badly in need of capable executive leadership, had to wait 20 months for the mayor to name a permanent general manager. The Detroit House of Correction, which handles all of Detroit's minor criminal offenders, was poorly run for many months—primarily because Cavanagh appointees on the institution's governing commission were too busy fighting among themselves to attend to their job.

Though he has been dilatory in some respects, Cavanagh's administration has been marked by notable acts of political courage, including the income tax and the cleanup at Cobo Hall. More recently, he boldly vetoed a tax cut of 22 cents per $1,000 of assessed valuation, passed by the common council. "I thought long and hard about it," he told me, "but I finally decided that if I didn't veto it, we'd be back on the same old road we were on when I took office."

Thanks to near-record car production, unemployment in Detroit has dropped from 118,000 to below 70,000 since Cavanagh took office.

"The economic improvement has been of incalculable aid," he concedes. "But this could have happened to anybody in office. The important thing is that we have taken advantage of it."

Cavanagh has seen to it that Detroit received the full benefit of available Federal funds. Currently, the city has on the planing boards or in progress a $5,500,000 accelerated water and sewer program, partly financed by Federal money; a $200,000 city-Federal juvenile-delinquency study; a $500,000 pilot program, financed by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, to provide a shelter for homeless men, and a $500,000 city-U.S. Labor Department program to train school dropouts for jobs in government and industry.

With programs started under the Miriani administration and carried forward under Cavanagh, downtown Detroit is being revamped. Hundreds of acres on Skid Row, which started at the doorstep of the Sheraton-Cadillac, the city's best hotel, and ran west along Michigan Avenue for 10 blocks, have been razed. This area will eventually be an International Village, a cluster of shops, restaurants, and cultural attractions.

Eighteen urban-renewal projects are also in the works, ranging from port development to luxury apartments. In addition, 4,000 acres have been blocked out for neighborhood conservation programs—the government supplies the money for street repairs, parks, and general civic improvements, while the homeowner, with guidance from government experts, rehabilitates his home. Three new privately built skyscrapers downtown are the recently-completed 32-story Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. building, the 26-story Detroit Bank & Trust Co., and the 25-story Pontchartrain Hotel, now under construction.

### PLATEAU OF OPTIMISM

As a fresh, attractive, and—so far—successful young politician, Cavanagh is inevitably compared with George Romney, whose election ended 14 years of Democratic control of the Michigan governorship last year. A direct contest between the two is probable—perhaps for Governor in 1964. Or, if Senator McNamara decides not to run again in 1966, as is rumored, the two might vie for the Senate. A Cavanagh-Romney race would be a lively encounter. Publicly the two men have cooperated amiably, in such matters as trying to persuade the American Olympic Committee to make Detroit rather than Los Angeles the site of the 1968 games. But privately Cavanagh has a deep antipathy for Romney whose self-righteousness, particularly, irks him.

"Romney is so much the creature of an overawed press that it's difficult to divine what lies beneath all those newspaper clippings," Cavanagh said to me not long ago when we were talking about his political future.

In a Romney-Cavanagh race, the "wise men" of the community—the editorial writers, businessmen, and civic leaders—would probably put their money on the former. He has, certainly, the advantages of wealth, prestige, and a massive press buildup. There are several X factors, however. One is Cavanagh's hypersensitive political antennae which enabled him—alone among the city's leaders—to sense the intensity and power of the Negro revolt in 1961. The physical improvements in the city are also among his tangible assets. Hardest to measure, but perhaps most important, is the change in the city's emotional climate during his administration.

I've lived in Detroit since 1951—through the ebullience of high production during the Korean war, the 1955 boom, and the bad years which started in 1957 and lasted through most of 1961. Now, for the first time, we seem not so much to be climbing out of a valley of trouble as to have reached a plateau of confidence and even optimism. A friend of mine who has decided to buy a home here after many postponements put it this way: "This city, with its unemployment and despair, seemed old before its time," he said. "Now, somehow, it seems young again."

## TARIFF RATES FOR IMPORTATION OF BEEF AND LAMB

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have been following with interest the hearings before the U.S. Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee which began on December 2 on tariff schedules which are under consideration for modification or continuance. I feel very strongly that further reductions in tariff rates for either lamb or beef would only compound an already unfair and difficult situation.

A particularly effective statement of the position of the National Wool Growers Association was made by its executive secretary, Edwin E. Marsh. I ask unanimous consent that his presentation which contains both excellent factual material and tables be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This statement is presented on behalf of the National Wool Growers Association which in 1965 will be commemorating its 100th anniversary as the recognized spokesman of the sheep farming and ranching industry of the United States. Our principal membership consists of the following 19 affiliated producer organizations: Arizona Wool Growers Association, California Wool Growers Association, Colorado Wool Growers Association, Idaho Wool Growers Association, Indiana Sheep Breeders Association, Maryland Sheep Breeders Association, Mississippi Sheep Producers Association, Montana Wool Growers Association, Nevada Wool Growers Association, New Mexico Wool Growers, Inc., Oregon Wool Growers Association, Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association, Utah Wool Growers, Inc., Washington Wool Growers Association, Western South Dakota Sheep Growers Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Wisconsin Cooperative Wool Growers Association, Midwest Wool Marketing Cooperative, Inc., and North Central Wool Marketing Corp. In the area covered by these oragnizations approximately 75 percent of the Nation's sheep, lambs, and wool are produced. We are the national organization which speaks for the approximately 300,000 sheep producers of the United States.

Imports of lamb and mutton continue to threaten the existence of our domestic sheep industry. Further tariff reductions would only cause additional economic distress to an industry already struggling for survival. Here are the facts:

1. Poundage of dressed lamb imports has increased 89 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962.

2. Poundage of dressed lamb imports is up 1,000 percent for the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1957.

3. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 13 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962.

4. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 7,264 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1957.

5. Total lamb and mutton imports in 1962, converted to a live animal basis, equal 3,144,800 head of sheep—compared to our federally inspected domestic sheep and lamb slaughter in 1962 of 14,691,800 head.

6. Lamb and mutton imports on a carcass equivalent basis amounted to approximately 22 percent of domestic production during the first 9 months of 1963.

7. During the past 2 years foreign lamb carcasses have been landed at our east coast ports, with freight, tariff and all other charges paid at from 5.22 to 19.70 cents per pound below average domestic wholesale prices at New York.

8. The rapid increase in imports would not indicate by any stretch of the imagination that present low tariff levels are trade barriers.

9. Packers and retailers have stated to us that the price variation between foreign and domestic lamb exerts a continual downward pressure on the market.

Costs of production in the domestic sheep industry are constantly rising. On the other hand U.S. live lamb prices as of October 15, 1963, averaged only 70 percent of parity; live sheep prices only 68 percent of parity. Certainly one of the important factors responsible for this is the constantly increasing lamb and mutton imports at tariff rates 50 percent below those in existence prior to 1948. Further duty reductions would only compound an already unfair and difficult situation.

Foreign lamb imports continue to rise and are running considerably ahead of last year. During the first 9 months of 1963, 14,927,000 pounds of dressed lamb have been imported compared to 7,904,000 pounds during the same period of 1962—an 89-percent increase.

In March 1960 we appeared before the Tariff Commission in the escape-clause investigation on lamb and mutton imports. At that time we used import data for the year 1959. Imports of lamb today are almost double the 1959 volume. It is interesting to note that we predicted before the Tariff Commission at that time that this increase would take place under the present low tariff rate. Under present conditions we predict another doubling in 3 years—probably sooner.

One of our major problems with foreign imports of lamb is the price differential compared to the domestic product. The price U.S. wholesalers have to pay for foreign lamb is frequently considerably below the price domestic producers must receive to meet their costs of production. In recent years many domestic producers have not been meeting their production costs and have progressively gone further in debt. As we have already pointed out, USDA reports for 1962 and 1963 show a difference between the cost of foreign lamb landed at east coast ports and domestic lamb prices at New York of from 5.22 cents to 19.70 cents per pound. Without the slightest doubt this price differential does create an adverse influence on our domestic lamb market which would only be further aggravated if present low duties on lamb were reduced.

In order to bring before you the latest data available, we made a check of the New York City area to obtain a current comparison between prices of foreign and domestic lamb. These are prices which we were able to obtain for the recent week ending November 25, 1963:

Domestic U.S. Choice carcasses in New York City that week were averaging 38 cents per pound with comparable New Zealand carcasses listed at 29½ cents per pound in New York and Australian lamb carcasses listed at 28½ cents per pound.

Even though the foreign carcasses are listed at 8½ to 9½ cents per pound below the domestic price, we would like to emphasize that the U.S. price is averaged from actual sales while in the case of the foreign lamb these are quotations and we are advised that brokers do not always adhere to these prices, but if they have to sell the imported lamb below the list price in order to move it, they will do so. Again we call your attention to the fact that this 8½-to-9½-per-pound differential is after payment of tariff and other charges.

The New York City area together with the New England States and the west coast consumes approximately 70 percent of the lamb sold in the United States. Our situation is different from that of beef and pork in that we must depend on these three areas for over two-thirds of our consumption. One carload of lambs too many for the demand in the New York City area frequently breaks that market. And when the dressed market in New York City breaks it can very easily and usually does break the live-lamb market all over the United States. New York City is the sensitive price-basing point. It is also the port through which a substantial volume of our imports arrive.

In the year 1940 choice 40- to 50-pound domestic lamb carcasses sold in the United States at an average price of 16.49 cents per pound. The 7-cents-per-pound tariff then applying on imported dressed lamb represented 42.4 percent of the domestic price.

In 1961, the latest complete yearly figure issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for this particular series, the average domestic price was 38.99 cents per pound. The 3.5-cents tariff represented only 8.9 percent of the domestic price.

Dressed mutton imports for the first 9 months of 1963 total 53,443,000 pounds compared to 47,341,000 pounds for the same period of 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period of 1957, mutton imports are up 7,364 percent.

If mutton imports, coming into the United States in boneless form, were converted to a carcass weight basis, which is the only fair comparison with domestic production, the imported product for the first 9 months of this year would amount to approximately 190 percent of the domestic mutton production for the same period.

When the Tariff Commission held hearings in March 1960 with regard to our urgent request that some control be placed on lamb and mutton imports, a statement was made by a representative of the importing countries that the sale by domestic sheepmen of older ewes is not an important factor in our sheep production. While the sale of older ewes which are no longer suitable for use on the range is not the most important part of domestic sheep operations, it is nevertheless a factor in returns to the sheep producer. It is highly essential that a domestic sheep producer secure every possible source of income from his operation in order to stay in business today. The sale of older ewes provides one necessary source of income. Certainly imports of boneless mutton, constantly increasing, reduce the outlet for domestic mutton. A further reduction in the already extremely low tariff of 2.5 per pound on dressed mutton would further aggravate the already unfair competition which domestic producers face from foreign countries in the imports of mutton.

In an agreement with Canada effective June 6, 1951, the duty on live sheep and lambs was reduced to its present rate of 75 cents per head, only one-fourth of the former $3 per head duty. This 75 cents per head would not begin to meet the differences in domestic and foreign production costs. That was very evident in the 1959–60 importation of live lambs from Australia. While imports of live sheep and lambs are not heavy at this time, they could again increase as they did during the 1959–60 period and it is therefore essential that the 75 cents per head duty now in effect be retained to render at least partial assistance in offsetting higher production costs in this country.

In 1954 the Tariff Commission recommended a 10 cents per pound increase in the tariff on imported raw wool. That recommendation was not carried out but in its place the National Wool Act was passed, through which tariff duties on raw wool were held at existing levels and 70 percent of these duties were applied to make incentive payments to domestic producers whenever the average domestic price fell below a level to be established by the Secretary of Agriculture. The purpose of this incentive level, as stated by the Congress, is to encourage production annually of three hundred million pounds of shorn wool as necessary for our defense needs and for the welfare of the Nation. It seems entirely indefensible to have the Wool Act on the one hand to encourage production and then to have tariff duties on lamb and mutton that are encouraging liquidation in our industry. It is even more indefensible to consider further cuts in these duties.

There are several bills before Congress which are patterned after the recommendations of the minority of the Tariff Commission in the 1960 lamb and mutton import investigation. These bills call for tariff quotas. At our annual convention next month we will discuss further activiation of these bills and will also consider requesting even more effective controls—such as straight quotas—because the problem has become even more serious since 1960.

The large increase in imports of dressed lamb and mutton since 1957 and the other problems we face from imports, are vividly portrayed in the six tables which follow this brief. They contain data furnished to us by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and I would appreciate their being made a part of the record.

In summary, we submit the following:

1. Present low tariffs on live lambs and on dressed lamb and mutton do not meet differences in costs of production here and abroad. Additional reductions in duties at this time would further aggravate the present serious economic situation of the domestic sheep industry, already growing worse each day as imports of dressed lamb and mutton continue to increase.

2. Dressed lamb imports have increased from 1,796,000 pounds in 1957 to 13,127,000 pounds in 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 they total 14,927,000 pounds. Dressed mutton imports have increased from 1,747,000 pounds in 1957 to 63,942,000 pounds in 1962. For the first 9 months of 1963 they total 53,443,000 pounds. Present extremely low tariffs are in no sense a trade barrier but have highly encouraged a constantly increasing flow of lamb and mutton imports to this country.

3. While importing countries may feel they should take advantage of this hearing to request further cuts in duties, we have not up to this time heard or seen any statements from importing countries or importers to the effect that present duties are unfair, oppressive, or in any sense a trade barrier.

Avoiding further injury to an already economically depressed sheep industry is much more important than the uncertain possibility of gaining some temporary trade advantage through further uncalled for duty reductions. In view of the foregoing considerations we urgently request that the items named in this statement be removed from the negotiation list issued on October 22, 1963.

TABLE 1.—*U.S. imports of lamb (1,000 pounds)*

| Country | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 9 months of 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Australia | 959 | 326 | 3,009 | 6,207 | 4,342 | 2,275 | 5,153 |
| New Zealand | 370 | 4,703 | 3,397 | 4,756 | 6,426 | 10,282 | 9,586 |
| Canada | 447 | 929 | 576 | 26 | 63 | 465 | 149 |
| Iceland | 20 | 843 | 2,473 | 1,445 | 109 | 35 | 10 |
| Others | ---------- | 1 | ---------- | 80 | ---------- | 70 | 29 |
| Total | 1,796 | 6,802 | 9,455 | 12,514 | 10,940 | 13,127 | 14,927 |

Source: Livestock and Meat Production Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. imports of mutton (1,000 pounds)*

| Country | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 9 months of 1963 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Australia | 441 | 12,250 | 37,615 | 32,297 | 40,306 | 62,612 | 50,864 |
| New Zealand | 1,287 | 2,310 | 9,432 | 4,360 | 4,384 | 793 | 2,196 |
| Canada | 16 | 302 | 188 | ---------- | 69 | 44 | 3 |
| Argentina | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 94 | ---------- |
| Iceland | ---------- | 303 | 93 | 576 | 95 | 163 | 291 |
| Others | 3 | 9 | 21 | 73 | 49 | 234 | 89 |
| Total | 1,747 | 15,174 | 47,349 | 37,306 | 44,903 | 63,940 | 53,443 |

Source: Livestock and Meat Production Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA.

TABLE 3. *Lamb and mutton: Australian production and exports to the United States and other countries, average 1936–40, 1951–55, and annual 1955–63 (carcass weight basis)*

| Year | Production | | | Total exports [1] | | | Exports to United States | | | Percent of exports to United States | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Lamb | Mutton | Total | Lamb | Mutton | Total | Lamb | Mutton | Total | Lamb | Mutton | Total |
| | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Million pounds* | *Percent* | *Percent* | *Percent* |
| 1936-40 [2] | 246 | 462 | 708 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| 1951-55 | 284 | 477 | 761 | 59.1 | 66.1 | 125.2 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- |
| 1955 | 330 | 539 | 869 | 93.4 | 62.5 | 155.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1956 | 326 | 524 | 850 | 82.7 | 66.5 | 149.2 | .9 | .5 | 1.4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1957 | 320 | 502 | 822 | 54.2 | 45.0 | 99.2 | 1.0 | .3 | 1.3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1958 | 340 | 582 | 922 | 65.4 | 95.9 | 161.3 | .2 | 16.8 | 17.0 | (3) | 18 | 11 |
| 1959 | 408 | 695 | 1,103 | 91.2 | 145.4 | 236.6 | 2.4 | 54.6 | 57.0 | 3 | 38 | 24 |
| 1960 | 455 | 830 | 1,185 | 60.3 | 166.2 | 226.5 | 6.1 | 50.5 | 56.6 | 10 | 30 | 25 |
| 1961 | 463 | 823 | 1,286 | 64.7 | 165.1 | 229.8 | 5.3 | 55.2 | 60.5 | 8 | 37 | 26 |
| 1962 | 490 | 824 | 1,314 | 38.5 | 230.7 | 269.2 | 2.1 | 77.4 | 79.5 | 5 | 34 | 30 |
| 1963 | 512 | 819 | 1,313 | 57.1 | 275.0 | 332.1 | 8.5 | 103.9 | 112.4 | 15 | 38 | 34 |

[1] Includes canned.
[2] Year ending Mar. 31, 1936–40; other years ending June 30.
[3] Less than 1 percent.

Source: Australian Meat Board and Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics; and Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of the cost of frozen New Zealand lamb and domestic chilled carcasses*

[In cents per pound]

| | New Zealand price [1] | Costs | | | | Total costs [2] | Domestic fresh lamb prices New York [3] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Freezing charges | Freight | Duty | Miscellaneous costs | | |
| *1962-63* | | | | | | | |
| *1962* | | | | | | | |
| Oct. 27 | 19.26 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.75 | 45.04 |
| Dec. 1 | 19.26 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.75 | 42.46 |
| Dec. 15 | 19.26 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.75 | 42.46 |
| *1963* | | | | | | | |
| Feb. 2 | 19.84 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.33 | 40.34 |
| Mar. 2 | 19.84 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.33 | 39.55 |
| Apr. 6 | 18.67 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.16 | 42.90 |
| May 4 | 20.13 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.62 | 47.31 |
| May 25 | 21.59 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.08 | 50.85 |
| July 6 | 21.59 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.08 | 46.98 |
| July 22 | 21.59 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.08 | 46.98 |
| *1963-64* | | | | | | | |
| *1963* | | | | | | | |
| Oct. 1 | 22.17 | 3.49 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.66 | 42.40 |

[1] Schedule price, South Island (except Southland) 29 to 36 pounds.
[2] East coast ports.
[3] Choice carcass 45 to 55 pounds, monthly average price.

Source: Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 5.—*Comparative costs fresh dressed lamb, New York, and frozen Australian lamb, New York, monthly 1960–63*

[In cents per pound]

| | Imported frozen Australian lamb | | | | | Domestic fresh lamb, New York [2] | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Price [1] | Freight | Duty | Miscellaneous costs | Net cost, east coast | | |
| *1962* | | | | | | | |
| January | 17.27 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 28.27 | 41.02 | 12.75 |
| February | 19.13 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 0.13 | 38.96 | 8.83 |
| March | 16.80 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 27.80 | 38.26 | 10.46 |
| April | 18.20 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 29.20 | 39.55 | 10.35 |
| May | 20.07 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 31.07 | 41.82 | 10.75 |
| June | 27.06 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 38.06 | 51.32 | 13.26 |
| July | [1] 25.20 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.20 | 49.20 | 13.00 |
| August | 23.33 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.33 | 49.02 | 14.69 |
| September | 17.55 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 28.55 | 48.25 | 19.70 |
| October | 15.17 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 26.17 | 45.04 | 18.87 |
| November | 14.84 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 25.84 | 43.24 | 17.43 |
| December | 16.24 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 27.24 | 42.46 | 15.22 |
| *1963* | | | | | | | |
| January | 19.32 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 20.32 | 42.10 | 11.78 |
| February | 22.96 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.96 | 40.34 | 6.38 |
| March | 21.84 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 32.84 | 39.55 | 6.71 |
| April | 21.84 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 32.84 | 42.90 | 10.06 |
| May | 22.96 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.96 | 47.31 | 13.35 |
| June | 26.88 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 37.88 | 50.85 | 12.97 |
| July | 26.69 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 37.69 | 46.98 | 9.29 |
| August | 22.59 | 6 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.59 | 44.85 | 11.26 |
| September | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 43.91 | ---------- |
| October | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 42.40 | ---------- |

[1] 1st and 2d export quality at Newmarket, Melbourne, 29 to 36 pound lamb.
[2] Choice carcass 45 to 55 pounds, 1960–62; Prime and Choice, 1957–59.

Source: Australian Meat Board, New York prices: USDA Livestock Market News; Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

TABLE 6.—*Comparative costs, fresh dressed domestic lamb, New York, and frozen Australian lamb, New York, annual 1951–63*

[In dollars per 100 pounds]

| Year | Cost of imported Australian lamb (frozen) | | | | | Domestic fresh lamb, New York [3] | Differences | Cost of imported as percent of domestic |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Price [1] | Freight [2] | Tariff duty | Miscellaneous costs | Total cost, New York | | | |
| 1951 | $20.89 | $5.66 | $3.50 | $1.50 | $31.55 | $60.85 | $29.30 | 51.8 |
| 1952 | 18.78 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 29.44 | 57.00 | 27.56 | 51.6 |
| 1953 | 23.94 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.60 | 46.23 | 11.63 | 74.8 |
| 1954 | 21.60 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 32.26 | 45.58 | 13.32 | 70.8 |
| 1955 | 23.01 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 33.67 | 43.40 | 9.73 | 77.6 |
| 1956 | 25.35 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 36.01 | 44.09 | 8.08 | 81.7 |
| 1957 | 23.71 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.37 | 47.08 | 12.71 | 73.0 |
| 1958 | 19.25 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 29.91 | 48.42 | 18.51 | 61.8 |
| 1959 | 17.97 | 5.66 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 28.63 | 47.41 | 18.78 | 60.4 |
| 1960 | 20.99 | 5.74 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 31.73 | [4] 43.64 | 11.91 | 72.7 |
| 1961 | 18.20 | 6.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 29.20 | 39.88 | 10.68 | 73.2 |
| 1962 | 19.24 | 6.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 30.24 | 44.01 | 13.77 | 68.7 |
| 1963 [5] | 23.13 | 6.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 | 34.13 | 44.36 | 10.23 | 76.9 |

[1] 1st and 2d export quality at Newmarket, Melbourne, 29 to 36 pound lamb.
[2] Net freight cost fo U.S. east coast.
[3] Prime and choice carcass.
[4] Choice carcass, 45 to 55 pounds.
[5] Preliminary: January–August.

Source: Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA, November 1963.

*Description and TSUS item number of commodities to which brief pertains*

| | Item | Rates of duty |
|---|---|---|
| Live animals: Sheep | 100.81 | 75 cents per head. |
| Meats, fresh, chilled, or frozen: | | |
| Goats and sheep | 106.20 | 2.5 cents per pound. |
| Lambs | 106.30 | 3.5 cents per pounds. |

## SIR ROBERT PLATT

**Mrs. NEUBERGER.** Mr. President, Sir Robert Platt is one of England's most distinguished physicians. A president of the Royal College of Physicians of London for 5 years, he has long led his nation's physicians along the paths of social responsibility. To Americans, he is best known—and justly known—for his role as president of the Royal College's Committee on Smoking and Atmospheric Pollution and as a prime mover of the now famous March 1962, Royal College report on smoking and health.

I was therefore greatly honored when invited to introduce Sir Robert at the 20th anniversary celebration of the Cancer Prevention Clinic in Chicago—honored, and delighted as well, because I knew that I was to hear the subject of smoking and health treated with rare wit and perception. But I did not suspect that Sir Robert would have for us, in addition, word of a fundamental breakthrough in smoking research. Nor did I suspect that he would aid us, though unintentionally, in diagnosing the aberrations of our own American Medical Association.

Thus, last week in Chicago, Sir Robert revealed hitherto unpublished evidence, collected by Sir Austin Bradford Hill and Dr. Richard Doll, of the smoking habits and health histories of 25,000 English doctors. Ten years ago approximately 60 percent of the doctors in the Doll-Hill survey were cigarette smokers. Today, only 20 percent continue to smoke cigarettes. This is in sharp contrast to the 75 percent of male cigarette smokers in the general public.

Sir Robert reported:

> Comparing the deaths in the two 5-year periods 1952–56 and 1957–61, Doll and Hill have found that the lung-cancer death rate had fallen by 7 percent in the doctors and risen by 23 percent in the general population.
>
> This demonstration, tragic in its significance for it conclusively proves that lung cancer is a preventable disease, should put an end to all further argument.

Sir Robert chastised medical scientists for treating the relationship between smoking and health as an intellectual controversy of little public significance:

> They have gone out of their way to look for every possible fallacy in their arguments, and given serious consideration to every counterargument, however absurd, thus leaving the ignorant with the impression that there is a lot to be said on both sides. So that they snatch at the straw so welcome to their addiction: it isn't proved. The time has come when we should have the courage of our convictions and speak of the evidence as being already accepted by all who have taken the trouble to read and understand.

Unhappily, almost as Sir Robert was speaking, the AMA in Portland was losing track of the time. Instead of resolving "to speak of the evidence as already accepted" the AMA instead called for a "long-range research program." The AMA action, if it can be called action, followed sharply on the heels of a stunning report from Dr. E. Cuyler Hammond, of the American Cancer Society, which had immeasurably strengthened and confirmed the results of previous studies defining smoking as the cause of premature death from a variety of diseases.

Although the AMA delegates in June had adopted a resolution identifying tobacco as a "toxic material," Dr. Charles L. Hudson, chairman of the three-man AMA committee which had sponsored the "long-range research program," now disavows the earlier resolution.

> We haven't stated that we know there is a relationship. (Between smoking and health.) We are trying to find out if there is a problem.

By these words and acts the AMA spread its mantle of respectability over the cigarette manufacturing industry, which has ritualistically—for the last 15 years—called for more research—and no action.

To answer the manufacturers and others who may fall for the lure of ever more research, Sir Robert cited the words of Lord Hailsham, then Minister of Health, delivered during the House of Lords debate on smoking:

> I do not want to say anything against research. By all means let us research on all these questions, but do not let us delude ourselves that research will buy us out of action now. Or out of the belief and conclusion that has now been established.

I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled, "Cancer of the Lung—The Facts are Known—What Next?" by Sir Robert Platt may be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### CANCER OF THE LUNG—THE FACTS ARE KNOWN—WHAT NEXT?

(By Sir Robert Platt)

Perhaps I should start by explaining how I come to be here. I am not engaged in cancer research and I am not one of those responsible for the important discovery that cigarette smoking is the main cause of cancer of the lung. I am a physician who all too often sees patients suffering from and dying from this very dreadful disease, which has become so much more common during my lifetime, and who realizes that almost the whole of it could be prevented, not in our generation, but in a future generation. And as president of the Royal College of Physicians of London for 5 years I found myself in an almost unique position to influence public opinion on this subject. To Dr. Charles Fletcher should go the credit for suggesting to me that the Royal College of Physicians should issue a report on smoking and health and for doing a great deal of the work of compiling it. It seemed to us that the evidence was quite clear but that governments were doing nothing, and the public who were not inclined to listen to scientists and research workers might understand a clear message from physicians.

We, that is the Royal College of Physicians, set up a committee to examine the evidence, and produced a report which, as you know, has been widely read all over the world. There is no doubt that our report has had an important effect on our own Government and its attitude toward this very urgent question of the public health, and it has brought the facts to the notice of thinking people all over the world. No longer is it possible to shrug off the facts and say "I do not believe them." As a Sunday newspaper in Britain said immediately after the report was published: "The evidence is now so overwhelming that only a tobacco manufacturer could deny it." It is far stronger evidence than the kind on which we are usually accustomed to make scientific, industrial and medical decisions, and if evidence half as strong had incriminated a canned food as a cause of cancer it would have been off the market in a week. As soon as it became known that there was a connection between the birth of a deformed baby and the taking of the drug thalidomide, all future sales of the drug were stopped by the manufacturers.

Why then has the knowledge that cigarettes cause lung cancer had comparatively little effect on the smoking habits of the general public? I say the general public advisedly because there is no doubt that in intellectual and medical circles in Britain people are smoking far fewer cigarettes than before. The difference in medical meetings in Britain is very noticeable. A striking consequence of this to which I shall later refer is that lung cancer amongst British doctors is now actually declining, while its incidence continues to rise in the general population.

The reasons for the comparatively small effect on the general public I intend to examine shortly, but first let me remind you very briefly of what the evidence is.

Preliminary inquiries showed that patients with lung cancer were, in general, heavy cigarette smokers. Scientific experiments were then done in America and in Britain on hundreds of thousands of human beings—the only animal that smokes cigarettes and therefore the only available animal for a satisfactory experiment. The main studies have been by Wynder and by Hammond and Horn and by Dorn in the United States, and by Doll and Hill in Britain. So that there should be no bias the studies were what we call prospective. The smoking habits of several hundred thousand normal people were recorded and the people were then observed over a number of years, and in all those who died the cause of death was noted. Heavy smokers died more often from all causes put together. This was one of the most striking facts. At 35 a heavy cigarette smoker has increased almost fourfold his chance of dying within the next 10 years. Mostly they die from coronary thrombosis, lung cancer, and bronchitis. The lung cancer statistics are the most striking because is is a very rare disease in nonsmokers and its incidence rises perfectly with the number of cigarettes smoked so that heavy cigarette smokers have about 30 times or more the chance of dying from lung cancer than nonsmokers have. Nevertheless, the increased death rate from coronary thrombosis in cigarette smokers is very important, and these two causes together go a long way to account for the large number of widows in the United States, for heavy cigarette smoking is still much commoner in men than in women. There is far more evidence than this from all kinds of sources and none of the objections put up will hold water. Nevertheless we might consider some of them, especially as they are so dear to the hearts of the cigarette manufacturers. The first is that because lung cancer is commoner in cities than in the country it is all due to atmospheric pollution. This turns out to be a two-edged argument, and it is worth drawing them out on this. What is atmospheric pollution? A smokey atmosphere? Is there any better way of exposing your lungs to a polluted atmosphere than inhaling 20 or 30 cigarettes a day? No doubt this explains why, even in the most polluted atmosphere of our cities, the incidence of lung cancer is enormously greater in the cigarette smokers. The argument can be put another way: If you arrived from a country where cigarettes were never smoked and found millions of people inhaling two or three hundred lungfuls per day of smoke which was known to contain cancer-producing chemicals the first thing you would say is, "but surely thousands of them must die of lung cancer?" The answer would be "yes, they do."

Then there is the argument that animal experiments have failed to reproduce the situation, but here you can point out, as I have already done, that the experiment has been done on the only suitable animal available—the only animal which smokes cigarettes—namely on man, and it has now been done on hundreds of thousands of specimens many of them now dead of cancer.

Then there is the rather more subtle arguement that there is some hereditary factor that both makes you smoke cigarettes and also causes lung cancer. Apart from the inherent unlikeliness of this, and that there is no evidence to support it, it fails to account for the enormous increase of lung cancer in the last 40 years and for the fact that if you give up smoking your chances of dying from it get rapidly less. That the increase of lung cancer is real and not merely due to improved diagnostic measures is proved in a variety of ways. The most striking fact is that it has doubled in Britain in the last 10 years during which time no notable improvement in diagnostic methods has been made.

But the final test which makes all other considerations of secondary importance is this: Can you prevent lung cancer by not smoking cigarettes? This is now proved by two vitally important facts: (1) That in the carefully collected series which I have mentioned those who had given up smoking showed a gradually decreasing liability to lung cancer until after about 10 years they were nearly back to the level of nonsmokers; (2) Doll and Hill in Britain did their experiment with 25,000 British doctors. Now British doctors have materially changed their smoking habits in the last 10 years so that only about 20 percent of them now smoke cigarettes where in the general male public about 75 percent do. Comparing the deaths in the two 5-year periods 1952–56 and 1957–61 Doll and Hill have found that the lung cancer death rate had fallen by 7 percent in the doctors and risen by 23 percent in the general population. This demonstration, tragic in its significance for it conclusively proves that lung cancer is a preventable disease, should put an end to all further argument.

And now let us turn to the question of why the general public are so reluctant to accept the facts. The reasons in my view are twofold. First there is the enormous vested interest, financial potential and advertising power of the cigarette manufacturers, whose expenditure on advertising has steeply increased as the evidence that cigarettes cause lung cancer has strengthened. In Britain their expenditure on advertising is now about $40 million (£14 million) per year. Nevertheless I would put the cigarette manufacturers second in importance as a cause of continued smoking. The plain fact is that smoking is an addiction and a very powerful one, and from now onwards I am bound to run the risk of offending the cigarette smokers in the audience, so I ask not only their indulgence, but their cooperation as test subjects in an experiment in public persuasion. Do not fear, I am not going to paint a horrific picture of dying cancer patients though I could easily do so. I am going to commit the even worse indiscretion of examining cigarette smoking as a social habit. Cigarette smoking is an addiction; not every smoker gets the addiction, but probably at least three-quarters of them do. You can, in fact, divide cigarette smokers into two groups. The first group are the dilletante smokers who toy with not more than a half a dozen cigarettes in the course of the day and don't usually inhale the smoke; they are not addicted and they tell you quite truthfully that they could easily give it up but that they enjoy the occasional cigarette and they don't see why they shouldn't. Herein is the very big difference between smoking and drinking. The great majority of drinkers are able to remain in the category of drinking in moderation, most of them not until the day's work is done. But the majority of smokers belong to the second group, the addicts who are compelled to inhale 20 or more cigarettes a day. A large number of them would like to give up but they know they can't. Knowing myself how strong the addiction is, and the absolute compulsion to seize and light a cigarette when you have been without one for about an hour one cannot expect the majority of people to be able to make the necessary effort of will. Like all addicts, they will seize on every possible excuse for not giving up their addiction, and will try to turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to any kind of argument or propaganda which appeals to their reason, because addicts are not reasonable where their addiction is concerned.

(At this stage I can already sense the cigarette smokers putting up their defenses—but there is worse to come.) Are we then to admit defeat and say that lung cancer must go on increasing, just as road accidents will be with us as long as there are motor cars? I don't think so. History shows that the human race got on very well without tobacco for thousands of years, and that the habit of filling your hostess' beautifully appointed and fragrant drawing room with a pall of smoke, and leaving behind a rather revolting series of ashtrays, has only recently been socially acceptable. Without the petrol engine, man would be unable to do many of the things he can do today but there is not the slightest evidence that the industrial and scientific progress of the 19th century was in any way impaired by the fact that cigarette smoking had not become a universal habit. The fact is that if you don't develop the addiction you don't miss it. Alternatively, if you have given it up long enough, which I can assure you can be a long time, to get rid of the craving, you find your efficiency improved, and since many smokers cannot be expected to give up cigarettes the really important thing is to prevent, as far as possible, the next generation from developing the habit. This is extremely difficult, and unfortunately leads us to a vicious circle for it has been clearly shown that the tendency for children to smoke is greatly increased if their parents smoke too—so perhaps it is the adults who must give up first.

Appeals based solely on health and reason are unlikely to succeed. The main channels must be through social acceptancy. Without being too obvious, we must subtly build up the superior status of the nonsmoker, for instance, whose superb self-confidence puts him immediately at an advantage on all social and business occasions while the cigarette addict nervously fumbles for his cigarette case. We must insinuate that the smoker is not a very welcome visitor to the drawing rooms of the best houses, and ask if he really likes making a substantial weekly contribution to the profits of the tobacco manufacturers. We must let the news circulate amongst teenagers that it is in their lower social and intelligence groups that cigarette smoking is commonest—indeed recent figures from Britain show it to be twice as common in 15-year-old sons of the so-called working classes than in middle class boys of the same age.

And finally one must of course appeal to sex. All the techniques are well-known to the American advertising corporations and I suggest that instead of governments giving their main attention to propaganda on lung cancer, they should study the techniques of the hidden persuaders, and employ at any cost the services of those who have studied the psychology and techniques of influencing the public. It might be a relief to some of them to be using their skills for the benefit of the community. If you could get glamorous young ladies objecting to the stale tobacco smell of their boy friends you would change the habits of a nation more quickly than all the cancer statistics in the world. Nevertheless cancer and the other health risks should remain our chief motivation for trying to bring this social change about.

Up to now two major mistakes have been made. Most of the talking has been at the intellectual level, and the scientists concerned in it have been writing as if they were writing in a scientific journal with no popular appeal. They have gone out of their way to look for every possible fallacy in their arguments, and given serious consideration to every counterargument put up, however absurd, thus leaving the ignorant public with the impression that there is a lot to be said on both sides so that they snatch at the straw, so welcome to their addiction: "It isn't proved." The time has come when we should have the courage of our convictions and speak of the evidence as being already accepted by all who have taken the trouble to read and understand.

The other major mistake is that propaganda both with adults and young people, has mostly relied on fear. Yet it has been shown by planned experiments that an appeal through fear is much more liable to arouse denial and rejection in the human mind than an appeal which gives some positive advantage to the action to be taken. This has been well shown in regard to cancer and other questions of health, and is the main reason why I think we should play down the admonitions on health, though still keeping the facts well before the public, and concentrate more on changing social attitudes toward smoking. I was interested to note that Senator NEUBERGER in her recent book "Smoke Screen" after examining the evidence comes to similar conclusions. The health reasons should be made known in a matter of fact way but final success can only come through changing social habits.

I do not think that antismoking clinics are going to make a very big dent in the statistics of cigarette smoking, but I do think that experiments with them should be continued and encouraged because those who want to give up smoking should be able to get the best advice, and support and because further research into the techniques of nicotine withdrawal is very necessary. I have been collecting up-to-date information on the clinics which have been established in Britain to put at the disposal of the Cancer Prevention Center of Chicago. Unfortunately, those who seek the help of antismoking clinics are liable to withdraw when they find that there is no magic pill and no easy way which does not require an effort on their part. It is therefore important that clinics should not seem to promise too much and should remain experimental at this stage. Most clinics report a success rate of 20 to 30 percent who stop smoking altogether but of course this is a selected group who genuinely want to stop.

In attempting to combat the cigarette habit is there any point at which compulsion should be used? Prohibition of alcohol did not work in the United States and I don't think prohibition of cigarettes would be more successful. There are however three fields in which I would be very tempted to use legal sanctions. The first is in the advertising of cigarettes and especially in sales promotion amongst young people which in the face of the present evidence might well be made an indictable offense. On a par with this is the avowed intention of some of the manufacturers to spread the habit in African countries where cigarette smoking is at present at a low level. The second point at which I would like to see some control is in the public appearance of leading personalities, be they pop singers, athletes, politicians or intellectuals. It would seem to me at least reasonable to ask if not to insist that in view of the enormous and rising death rate from cigarette smoking and the importance of not spreading the habit amongst young people they should not appear on television or on the stage smoking cigarettes. Third, there should be more widespread prohibition of smoking in public places, especially enclosed ones such as theaters, conference halls, and airplanes, where some rather dingy quarters might be provided for the smokers to retire to at intervals, leaving the remaining space sweet and clean for those who prefer it so. If authorities would take these actions, the general undesirability of smoking would be emphasized.

I have throughout been speaking of cigarette smoking as this is by far the greatest hazard to health. Indeed this is one of the strongest answers to the tobacco manufacturers who profess not to believe the statistics. If they are not due to cigarettes but to some other factor why do the figures for cigar and pipe smoking differ so very materially from those for cigarette smoking? To switch to cigars and pipes would undoubtedly cause a reversal of the lung cancer trend, but it is my personal hope that smokers of these even more pervasive varieties of tobacco would keep to their own enclosures as far as possible.

Finally I quote from Lord Hailsham in the debate in the House of Lords which followed our report. He was referring particularly to the tobacco manufacturers' delaying plea that more research was necessary before any action was taken. Hailsham said: "I do not want to say anything against research, by all means let us research on all these questions, but do not let us delude ourselves that research will buy us out of action now, or out of the belief in the conclusion which has now been established. * * * The impression that tobacco manufacturers now make on public opinion * * * will largely depend on the extent to which they prove themselves able to recognize as facts propositions which are accepted by impartial scientists everywhere. I believe it is to their interest to recognize the truth before and not after they are compelled to do so. The first class man is a man who recognizes and accepts compelling evidence, and not one that fights against it."

## CAUSE OF NEGROES INJURED BY PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS

**Mr. RUSSELL.** Mr. President, a distinguished Negro citizen of my State, has undertaken a significant and detailed study of the effect on good race relations of demonstrations, disorder, threats, and intimidation employed by various groups and agitators.

The conclusions reached by Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, U.S. Army—retired—were made after careful investigation into communities where these demonstrations had occurred and following conversations and meetings with average citizens, both Negro and white, in the areas affected.

Major Robinson is peculiarly qualified to undertake this research. He recently retired from the faculty at Fort Valley State College at Fort Valley, Ga. His record in the Army is one of honor. He served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist. Highly educated, he received the bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Mass., and later studied at six other institutions of higher learning.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief synopsis of Major Robinson's findings, published in the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph together with an editorial from the Albany (Ga.) Herald be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the synopsis and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, Nov. 15, 1963]

### NEGROES' CAUSE IS HURT BY PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS

Editor, the Telegraph: During the past 4 weeks I made a survey of areas in which demonstrations were sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress of Racial Equality. The results of the survey indicate without doubt that race relations in Albany, Ga., Danville, Va., and Birmingham, Ala., were seriously hurt by the activities of the groups named above. The real pity is that all persons of importance, except those connected with the demonstrations, expressed the view that much more progress would have been made toward granting Negroes more rights had not the radical elements from elsewhere gone into the communities in which they were not a part.

Responsible citizens of both racial groups had been working for months on grievances advanced by Negroes in various sections of the country. In time it is possible that the Negroes would have been given many of the things they desired had not the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., inflamed the situation with ultimatums.

It appears to be the consensus among Negroes in all sections that civil rights is an issue for politicians and for those who exploit the ignorance of the Negroes for their own economic advantages, influence, prestige, and power. It is felt among the masses of the Negroes themselves that the civil right leaders would not associate themselves with other Negroes except those of the "elite."

Ninety percent of the Negroes feel that mass agitation is the wrong method to go about improving the Negroes' lot. Demonstrations are usually in the form of intimidation which will not be accepted by constitutional authorities, regardless of the positions they may hold.

Aside from special areas in which demonstrations were held, I visited every community in Georgia with a population of 4,000 inhabitants or more. Nowhere did I find Negroes interested in participation in demonstrations except those who received compensations for their activities. What the Negroes desire and want most of all is a job, and otherwise be left to himself to live and enjoy happiness one among the other of his own group. The Southern Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress of Racial Equality would deprive the Negroes of this inalienable right.

If the incentive of individualism is permitted to be destroyed, free enterprise will disappear.

Certain self-appointed leaders today pretend that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or lie-down and sit-in demonstrations which interfere forcibly with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business. Our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through the television, through the radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the pulpit is ignored by the racial elements who sponsor demonstrations. Have not all these facilities been made available to minority groups as well as all other groups?

FORT VALLEY.

MAJ. H. A. ROBINSON.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Sept. 12, 1963]

### THE VOICE OF NEGRO INTEGRITY

It is indeed unfortunate that an American Negro of widespread respect and integrity cannot voice a moderate viewpoint without being assailed by the radicals within his own race as an "Uncle Tom" and worse. But that, apparently, is the price he must pay for asserting values long cherished in the American tradition. The radicals will not have it otherwise because they cannot afford for their self-appointed authority to be questioned in the slightest degree lest it vanish altogether.

Nevertheless, a great many individual Negroes, viewing the racial crisis askance, continue to make a great deal of sense. One such is a retired Army major, Hughes Alonzo Robinson, who was attached to the faculty of Fort Valley State College until last June. A self-made man who lived on a Florida farm until he was 19, entered school at the age of 20 and received a bachelor of science degree from Springfield College, Massachusetts, later studying at six other institutions of higher learning, Major Robinson served both as an Army chaplain and a Veterans' Administration psychologist.

Interviewed by the Washington Post, he said he strongly opposes the Martin Luther King-type racial demonstrations. He applauded his students at Fort Valley for not participating in them. A far better course, he feels, is embraced by the difficult but rewarding improvement of self by the individual, by service to the nation, by sharing in full citizenship through obeying laws, by more respect for constitutional authority and by criticizing other racial groups far less.

In the opinion of the major, those Negroes who create civil disturbances miss the whole point of the basic needs of their race in American society. Obviously, the cry of "freedom now!" as devised by the Reverend Dr. King is catchy and compelling, but the undeniable fact is that every American, Negro or not, has "freedom." What he does not have is unfettered license. That he will never possess in a democratic society. No truly responsible man desires this questionable quality, for to possess it he must rob his neighbor of some portion of the latter's liberty. This Major Robinson understands full well.

His entire thesis is that the Negro should make of himself whatever he wills. Implicit in his belief is that the Negro can do so under the American system, just as the Irish have done so, the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, the Chinese and other racial minorities. As he says, human nature is such that "certain ones will go ahead, even if the schoolhouse was a log cabin, while others may be assigned to the best schools and the best environment and still either drop out or fail to measure up to accepted standards."

In this respect, and others, Major Robinson reminds us strongly of the late, great Dr. J. W. Holley, founder and president of what is now Albany State College and easily the finest mind the local Negro community has produced. Dr. Holley, too, was labeled "old-fashioned" and "Uncle Tom" by the racial militants. But he was infinitely wiser. He knew instinctively, as well as by experience, that the color of a man's skin is not as important as the color of his character as measured by his contribution to the general good of the community. That was why Dr. Holley was adjudged by the white and Negro community alike to be a splendid man and a model citizen. He gave so much more than he ever received to his city, his school and his race. His memory is revered, not as a Negro, but as an outstanding human being.

## A LUNCHEON WITH A COURAGEOUS MAN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, approximately a year ago it was my distinct privilege to have been able to arrange a luncheon with the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and Martin Andersen, Editor and Publisher of the Orlando Sentinel.

Martin Andersen is a prominent civic leader in middle Florida, as well as a courageous, forthright and highly respected editor and publisher. Though we have differed on occasions, he is my friend of many years standing.

Upon the death of our late and great President, Martin Andersen wrote a remarkable editorial entitled "A Luncheon With a Courageous Man" in which he captured with the precision of words the true essence of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as he really was.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial placed in the body of the RECORD, because of its unique insight into the characteristics of our late President that have won the hearts of the American people and the countless millions throughout the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A LUNCHEON WITH A COURAGEOUS MAN

(By Martin Andersen)

No matter whether you agreed with him on all his policies or not, you had to admire John F. Kennedy.

He had a certain tough courage which is difficult to define, because it was a sort of courage which carried him forward in behalf of his beliefs in the face of great criticism from a large segment of the public and a large segment of the country.

He was a controversial figure, as he had to be, because he was bold enough to step up and stand out for his new and revolutionary concept of government and rights for all the people—with no thought to creed or color.

And yet, when the cowardly assassin's bullet cut him down from ambush yesterday, the Nation was shocked in its grief. Strong men and strong women wept after exposing themselves to hour after hour of the TV exposure of the tragic story. Others, too stunned to cry, thought of this young man's widow, his children, his mother, father, brothers, sisters and thought mostly of his great and sincere ordeal for his country.

President Kennedy was not a strong man physically. He was at death's door during World War II, after a Jap destroyer had cut his PT boat in half and left him for dead in an ocean of sharks. Ever since that time his back gave him trouble. There were times when he could hardly walk, so great was the pain in his repaired and wounded spine. But he did walk and he did travel and he did work and he did speak and argue and fight for his program and he courageously kept his suffering mostly his own secret.

We sat to the immediate right of the President one day at a luncheon in the White House some 2 years ago, with a group of six or seven other Florida publishers.

We occupied that seat of honor because our name came up first alphabetically. Greater publishers with larger newspapers, more circulation and more money were scattered around the table farther away. But President Kennedy followed the protocol of the alphabet and there we were not only in the White House for the first time in our life but we were having lunch with a President for the first time in our life and we were also closer to him than anybody else—except the man on his left.

The group of us arrived ahead of the President and were in a sitting room when he arrived. Senator SMATHERS introduced all of us to the President and as he gave us a firm, warm handclasp he called our names as they were announced by Senator SMATHERS. A waiter brought around cocktails. Martinis and scotch and bourbon and sherry. Most of us had a cocktail of strong liquor but the President took a small glass of sherry wine.

He never finished his drink, even though several minutes of conversation passed and some of the crowd took a second cocktail.

This was a busy man. There was trouble in Vietnam. There was trouble in Berlin. There was trouble in Africa and the Cuban thing and the Bay of Pigs fiasco had just passed. The President had plenty on his mind. But he appeared calm and collected and talked first to one and then to another of us, just about like a district governor of a Rotary Club would do. There was, of course, a certain austerity about the scene. There is no denying that we all held him and the high office he represented in awe. And we all addressed him, with care, as "Mr. President."

When I speak of the President's certain tough courage, I refer to his stand on Cuba.

We began asking him questions about his next move on that island, shortly after we were seated at the round table.

I am not going to quote the President because Senator SMATHERS announced before the luncheon that this was just an informal social gathering and not a press conference in any sense of the word.

But the President gave us to understand that he did not give air protection or an air offensive to the invading Cuban fighters at the Bay of Pigs for the simple reason that he did not dare risk a counter military move in Berlin or elsewhere or in "ten other spots" which Russia was able to initiate and which possibly would wind up in the last world war to be fought by modern man.

The popular thing before him of course was a marine landing on the island of Cuba and the elimination of Castro.

He admitted that this could be done—at that time—in 10 days of fighting.

He seemed to think that Castro, if given plenty of rope, would hang himself. And we would have been saved all the lives of several thousands Marines in Cuba plus the lives of perhaps several hundred thousand of Americans in "local wars" or incidents in a dozen different spots all over the universe.

At the time I disagreed with his plan, but later on, as I began to mull his program over in my mind. I realized the chance he would have been taking to invade Cuba. Not a personal risk, but a risk of many thousands of others. And we understood, as we thought over the situation months later, that the President was willing and able to let the Castro crisis ride for awhile and perhaps erase this problem in some other manner.

Right or wrong, such a move demanded a strange sort of courage. The country, and Florida in particular, was crying for action and hollering about the Reds being just 90 miles away. But the President was able to ride with the punches as he understood there is more to the problem of running our country and keeping the peace than teaching this bearded upstart a lesson. He had more information than I had and more information than any of us around that table had. He also had a program and his program was aimed at peace and survival and the prevention of unnecessary killing of American boys in a dozen little wars all around the world.

We looked down at the President's shoes as we sat there and listened to him banter questions put to him by the publishers.

The shoes looked old to us. They were brown and had not been shined, it appeared, for several days. They must have been comfortable shoes and we surmised that he must have argued with his butler or valet about wearing them day after day as any ordinary American will wear his favorite shoes and, being the busiest man in the country, he just didn't have the time nor the inclination to get them shined.

I think he had on a brown suit. Neat enough but it did not appear any more expensive than our own. He wore a shirt with a slight pinstripe and a blue necktie.

He appeared to be not in too good health. And shortly after our visit, he did go to bed with a cold or some other slight illness.

He was a bundle of nerves and as he talked, he played with a piece of toast with his right hand, breaking it in small bits there on the table. He drank milk and after his lunch he pulled out a small cigar, little longer and a little fatter than a cigarette. He did not offer anybody a cigar, but a little later, the waiter passed cigars and cigarettes.

After the luncheon he guided us into the elevator and we got off on a higher floor and there was his beautiful wife.

"Why didn't you come down and have lunch with us?" he asked her.

"I would have, if I had known about it," she replied.

Then the two of them paraded us through the various rooms of the White House, Jackie explained each room and each piece of furniture and each picture.

There was no hurry.

The President and his wife appeared to have all the time in the world. Just like your next-door neighbor. We wound up on a portico looking out over what I would call the spacious backyard of the White House. Workmen were putting up collapsible seats for some affair scheduled for the next day.

There seemed to be no end to the job of being President—either for John Fitzgerald Kennedy or his wife.

He belonged to the people.

One may disagree with some of his policies, but he had the size and the touch of greatness. He cared naught for money and on most occasions carried none with him. Lyndon Johnson used to chide him during the campaign that he, Lyndon, always had to pay for the drugstore lunch they would eat on the fly.

He belonged to the people and the people loved him as an individual, because he was a warm, charming human being with a beautiful wife and two wonderful children. And because he was fundamentally a great American who believed in rights for all of the people.

## TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, Mr. William E. Bradley, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County, Oreg., has brought to my attention a resolution adopted unanimously by the committee on December 5.

Because of the very fine sentiments expressed in the resolution concerning our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and the resolution's endorsement of the forward-looking legislative program President Kennedy sought on behalf of the people of the United States, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bradley's letter of December 6, containing the central committee's resolution, be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
*Portland, Oreg., December 6, 1963.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR WAYNE: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County at its meeting last night. I thought that you might be interested in it.

Whereas the late great President Kennedy had dedicated his life to the establishment of conditions of peace and dignity for human existence everywhere, and

Whereas President Kennedy, preoccupied with international relations, had only partially accomplished his aims to secure these objectives on the home front, and

Whereas President Johnson has emphasized his purpose to carry forward the same tradition of our late President: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee,* That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact into law as a memorial to our late great President, those programs—such as civil rights, aid to education, tax reduction, medical care for the aged—for which he fought so valiantly; and be it further

*Resolved,* That like-minded Americans everywhere be urged to write their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to erect this memorial to a great American.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. BRADLEY,
*Chairman.*

## SENATOR HARTKE PRAISES REMARKS OF INDIANA NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST

**Mr. HARTKE.** Mr. President, the assassination of President Kennedy deeply moved the people of this country and expressions of sympathy continue to be voiced throughout the land. Many of my fellow Hoosiers have sent their condolences through my office.

Few of the tributes which have reached my desk are as poignant and meaningful as that embodied in a newspaper column written by Mrs. Mary D'Andrea, society editor of the Logansport (Ind.) Pharos-Tribune. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

### NEWS AND VIEWS

(By Mary D'Andrea)

Words are inadequate in a time of great sorrow.

The loss of this Nation's President was one of inexpressible grief and frustration for the millions who considered him not a Republican or a Democrat, not a Catholic or a Protestant, but a leader of all men.

"Logan-land" residents expressed themselves in silent and solemn tribute, in special services in all churches, in a memorial service at Berry Bowl, in the display of the American flag at half mast or with black crepe, and in written words, lines of poetry.

Some of the poetic tributes to the late President, John F. Kennedy, are recorded here. Three of the local authors prefer to remain anonymous.

### BLACK FRIDAY

From Washington to Dallas and back
This day for our Nation was very black
It was Nov. 22nd, the year 1963,
It will never be forgotten, but go down in history.

It started with a big parade
With our President in a motorcade
In the State of Texas, on a Dallas street
Never thinking his fate he'd meet,
When all of a sudden, above the cheers
A shot rang out that brought us tears.

And now he's gone, and left us sad
This youngest leader we ever had
But our Nation lives on and is stronger today,
Because we had him—J.F.K.

—SARA RIVERS.

### TO KILL THIS NATION

How do you kill this Nation?
Murder its leader?
Oppress its people?
Purge its name?
Destroy its flag?

How do you kill this Nation?
Benedict Arnold tried betrayal.
John Booth tried murder.
Adolf Hitler tried war.
Nikita Khrushchev tried intimidation.

How do you kill this Nation
If it is loved?
If it is free?
If it is Christian?
If it is America?

How do you kill this Nation?
Only when you destroy peace.
Only when you destroy the last American.
Only when you destroy the world.
Only when you destroy God.

### A SHOT WAS FIRED

A shot was fired
An irrational act of man
Upon mankind
And though it was but one
It pierced the hearts of millions
Slaying a part of each.

A shot was fired
Producing not the death desired
But giving life anew
Through grief
To build men's lives
With courage and with love.

A shot was fired
In death to martyr
But in life
To give
A hundredfold
That which it was meant to destroy.

### IF DADDY HAD BEEN THERE

The day was gloomy in spite of the sun,
People crowded around everywhere
But John-John missed only one
His Daddy was not there.

"Why do all these people come?"
Was John-John's puzzled look.
It wasn't a day for fun; besides.
He'd rather look at a picture book.

Daddy always read to him
Before he went to bed
But last night all seemed grim
So he left the words unsaid.

John-John couldn't understand.
When Mommy wouldn't play his favorite game
Because Daddy wasn't home yet, and
Things just weren't quite the same.

"Daddy gone away?" he asked.
Recalling 'copter trips of the past
He always liked to watch for him
And be there when the "chopper" got in.

John-John knew something was wrong
When he didn't see Daddy in that throng
Even as Mommy held his hand tight
John-John knew something wasn't right.

The church was filled with people
But only sad tolling came from the steeple
And after Mass, the horses pranced in pairs,
Everything would have been just fine, if Daddy had been there.

The tiny tears came slow, then fast,
And Mommy soothed him as in the past
Why he was crying he did not know
And when Daddy comes he would tell him so.

The tears went away like Mommy said they would,
He stood very tall and as straight as he could,
He remembered the times on Daddy's knee
And he knew today was far from carefree.

The little hand went up to a youthful brow
And unshed tears were forgotten now.
His salute was solemn and given with care,
He knew Daddy would be proud, had he only been there.

From Twelve Mile we received a portion of a letter from a former resident of that town, Mrs. Myrna Kay Hoch, who wrote to her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Castle G. Farley, relating her reactions and impressions in passing the bier of the late President Kennedy. Her letter in part:

"I guess you are all interested in hearing about the trip to Washington. I'll try to explain the best I can. We got in line about 9 p.m. Sunday (November 24) walking 3 miles to find the end of it. People were standing from six to nine deep, all huddling together to keep warm. Among those waiting were babies a few months old and old timers supporting themselves with canes; even two or three were in wheelchairs.

"The majority of those waiting were middle class (in a manner of speaking); a few were wearing diamonds and mink and some were very obviously poor.

"One man had his family of 13 children there. The little boys were dressed in suits, topcoats and snap-brim hats; the girls in frilly Sunday dresses and hats. They all waited throughout the night, the tiniest sleeping in their parents' arms.

"There were people speaking languages I've never heard spoken before. The waiting itself was an education. People talked and laughed during the early part of the night while we were still out of sight of the Capitol, but as we got closer and closer they became quiet and orderly almost to the point of being unbelievable.

"A few times a group of 20 persons or so would try to break into the line and then these people who were so quiet and orderly became almost maniacs, pushing, shoving and cursing. It frightened me—I just knew someone would be hurt but fortunately no one was.

"When we finally got on the steps of the Capitol and were filing in, both men and women were crying and no one was ashamed. I've never before had the feeling that I had as I walked by the casket. A hundred things flashed through my mind, among them how I jokingly referred to him as if he were a personal friend, about Jackie, Caroline and even Macarone.

"The flowers were beautiful although most of them were in the corridors off of the rotunda. I could write six more pages and still the description of feelings wouldn't be complete. It was one experience I'm sure I shall never forget."

Mrs. Hoch is the wife of Capt. Virgil I. Hoch, stationed at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware, where the couple resides with their three sons. Captain Hoch's parents are Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Hoch, rural route 6, Logansport.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H.R. 7063, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

## FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. An editorial entitled "Breakthrough" published in this morning's Washington Post states that Congress has taken a giant stride forward in education. Then it proceeds to speak in a laudatory manner—and justifiably so—about the great piece of work that Congress did the other day in passing the higher education bill.

I thank the Washington Post for its editorial. I believe the American people need to know what a great stride forward has been taken on the subject of Federal aid to education by the passage of the higher education bill.

The Washington Post also points out in the editorial the importance of Congress passing the vocational education bill before adjournment. I believe the conference report is pending in the House today. If the report is approved by the House, the majority leader has assured me that it will be taken up in the Senate forthwith.

I sincerely hope and pray that the House will pass the vocational education bill, because it deals with what I consider to be the No. 1 domestic economic issue facing the country.

It deals with the problem of tens of thousands of young people from the ages of 15 to 21 who will be economically drowned in an increasingly deep pool of unemployability unless they are trained for employment. In the vocational education bill, we believed there have been hammered out in conference fair and equitable compromises in regard to the differences that existed between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

I thank the Washington Post for the support it has given to both the higher education bill and the vocational education bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1963]

### BREAKTHROUGH

Congress has taken a giant stride in education. Final action by the Senate Tuesday on the bill authorizing a 3-year program to help finance construction of college facilities, together with House-Senate conference agreement on vocational education and impacted area aid, constitutes a significant and effective Federal aid program. President Johnson had grounds for crediting the 88th Congress with "doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed 100 years ago."

The difficulties in the way of this package of aid-to-education bills were formidable. The House and Senate for a while seemed inextricably deadlocked. That the difficulties were resolved at last and resolved without any serious bloodletting, is a testimonial to the vitality of Capitol Hill's legislative machinery. It is also, one surmises, a testimonial to Lyndon Johnson's legendary persuasiveness in situations of this sort. He appears to have entered the conference room as deus ex machina.

The college aid measure with its promise of $1,195 million for the construction of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories in colleges and universities all over the country, should give a major boost to higher learning. It will open doors and enlarge opportunities for many aspiring young men and women. The vocational education measure with its amendments extending the National Defense Education Act should also be immensely stimulating and helpful.

What remains, of course, is the most stubborn and most important educational problem—to provide Federal aid for the Nation's ailing public elementary and secondary school system. The superstructure has been strengthened; the foundation must now be correspondingly enlarged. One may hope, not unreasonably, that a Congress that succeeded in working out the racial and religious issues which lay in the way of aid to higher education may succeed even in solving these issues as they impede aid to the public schools at a lower level.

There are deep differences of opinion respecting the constitutionality and the wis-

> dom of Federal aid to institutions which are church-related. The Catholic position has prevailed in higher education. Perhaps Catholics will now, in turn, despite the depth and conscientiousness of their conviction, recede from their demands regarding elementary and secondary schools. Perhaps they will abide by the wise and generous words of Cardinal Cushing 2 years ago: "While I am not convinced that the Constitution forbids all subsidies to private education, I feel that as long as the majority of the American people are against such use of taxes, Catholics should try to prove their right to such assistance but neither force such legislation through at the expense of national disunity or use their political influence in Congress to block other legislation of benefit to education because they do not get their own way."

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. MORSE.** I yield.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** I am happy that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon saw fit to mention the editorial in the Washington Post on the Morse-Green bill.

I read that editorial with interest and approval. I support wholeheartedly every comment the distinguished Senator from Oregon just made. I express the hope, also, that it will be possible—some time today perhaps—to receive the vocational education bill, which is extremely important, and bring it up for consideration in this body.

In reading the editorial, I was struck with one omission, among others. I note that the name of the Senator who was in charge of the bill, who fought for it with great vigor, enthusiasm, and skill in conference, was not mentioned in the editorial.

I refer, of course, to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, who made a great contribution, along with other members of the Committee on the Democratic side and all members on the Republican side—most especially the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the distinguished Senator, from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. On the Democratic side, the unfailing support given by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] in support of this measure was outstanding.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] for his deep understanding in this and other important legislation reported out of his committee. It is indeed a great record and one which the Senate can be very proud of.

Although the editorial is excellent, it could have gone a little further and given credit where credit was due.

I wish publicly to give credit to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and his colleagues on the conference and in the committee who have performed outstandingly. So far as that committee is concerned, the hallmark of this session, in addition to the passing of the nuclear test ban treaty, may well be what will be done in the field of education—not only in the field of higher education and vocational education, but also, perhaps most importantly, in the field of mental health and mental retardation as well.

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, the majority leader has been extremely gracious, which is typical of him.

However, it is not important that my name be mentioned in an editorial. I do not expect my name ever to be mentioned favorably in most newspapers, but I have a sense of humor about that.

I could not have been thanked more symbolically or more significantly for anything I may have accomplished in connection with the higher education bill.

I was also thanked the other afternoon at the airport. After the bill was passed, I had to go to Boston immediately to make a speech. I rushed to the airport, hoping to catch a plane. While I was in line, I was taken out of the line to the office of one of the airline supervisors to receive a telephone call from the President of the United States. With typical graciousness, the President expressed what I thought were undeserved and flattering thanks to me and to my colleague, Representative Edith Green, who sponsored the bill in the House.

The President graciously said that as far as he was concerned, the bill would always be referred to as the Morse-Green bill.

What more could one ask than such an expression of confidence from the President of the United States? I shall never forget it.

Nevertheless, I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Montana.

**Mr. JAVITS.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. MORSE.** I yield to the Senator from New York.

**Mr. JAVITS.** While I fully appreciate the gracious things said about me by the majority leader, as a conferee I should like to testify as a witness to the skill, forbearance, and deep devotion shown by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, my longtime friend and colleague in the conference. I am sure we would not have had a result without it.

I believe the President was correct. I should like to join in designating the bill as the Morse-Green bill. That is probably, for the Senator, much more historically important, much as I respect the Washington Post, than the fact that they did or did not refer to the bill's principal architect by name.

As we are recounting this little history, I add that the degree to which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, subordinated his deep convictions on this subject in order to arrive at a result—convictions which were superior to all others with him—is something quite admirable in showing the balance, equity, and openmindedness of one man. I know that he felt quite deeply on this subject, yet when he saw that in order to obtain a result he had to subordinate his feelings, which are long standing with him, he did so.

I hope the vocational education bill will come up today. I believe the two bills are parts of a scheme of legislation, and that they will go some distance toward dealing with the concrete underpinnings of which the Washington Post spoke.

I wish a bill dealing with primary and secondary education could be enacted. I voted for it. The Senator from Oregon is its outstanding leader. Obviously that cannot be done in this session of Congress.

We can bring the National Defense Education Act up to date. We can do something about the impacted areas legislation, for which many districts hunger. We can do something, in the field of labor, about automation. That is what the vocational education bill is all about. We can do something about school dropouts and the terrible rate of unemployment for youth, which is twice the rate for other segments of the population and, for many Negro youths, three times the rate for other elements of the population. I hope very much that there will be no haggling over that subject in this body and in the other body. I shall do my utmost, with whatever influence I have, to see that a bill is passed. A bill is far more important than any of the individual details, even the dollars involved, which I believe are quite modest.

Our fight is not over. I know of no man with whom I would rather be joined in that effort than the senior Senator from Oregon. All the tributes which have been paid to him today are well deserved. It is most important that the bill bear his name. I hope the bill will be called the Morse-Green bill.

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from New York has said. As the Senator knows, I have taken the position in both conferences, on higher education and vocational education, that we are all together on the need. I have previously stated, as I repeat now, my appreciation to every one of my colleagues in the two conferences, both Republicans and Democrats. We could not have had either bill had it not been for the complete cooperation of everyone in that conference, which was always extended to me as chairman of the conference.

As the Senator knows, we conducted a democratic conference. I took the position that the majority vote would prevail always with me, and that I would abide by the majority point of view. As a result, the conferees were almost unanimous.

I have already expressed my high regard and appreciation for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the chairman of the full committee. We would have gotten nowhere with either bill, in my judgment, if it had not been for his forbearance, his understanding, and his cooperation.

There is a great deal of public interest in all three pieces of education legislation. The higher education bill has been passed, the vocational education bill is within hands' grip, and I hope that the wisdom of the House will cause it to approve it. There will be no time between now and December 20 for any further modification. In my judgment, there could not be any, for it has been cut down to the bare bones, so to speak.

In the next session of Congress, as the Senator from New York said, we must proceed with all haste, but with careful deliberation at the same time, to see to it that something is done for the elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall make only a few brief remarks regarding the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1964.

The subcommittee held approximately 24 days of hearings on the bill. There is a record of some 2,500 pages of testimony.

As indicated in the report upon each Member's desk, the total amount of the bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee is $1,821,283,000. This amount is $322,143,841 under the total appropriations for 1963, and is also $338,608,900 below the total budget estimates submitted for fiscal year 1964. The reported bill is also $29,986,900 below the total recommended by the House.

The bill also includes an additional $3,249,650,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, which is derived from the highway trust fund.

In my judgment, we have a good bill and I have reason to believe it will provide sufficient funds to enable the various departments and activities to carry out satisfactorily their operations and essential programs this fiscal year.

For the Department of State, the committee recommends a net increase of $19,982,000 over the amount allowed by the House. Included in this sum is the allowance of $18,500,000 for the foreign buildings operations program, which the House had deleted because there was no substantive legislation for the program at that time.

For the regular educational and cultural exchange program, the committee recommended $43 million. This sum, together with the dollars available from prior-year appropriations and other available foreign credits, will provide a total program level of about $57 million—only slighty above the 1963 operating level. About one-half of the total expenditure recommended for 1964 will be made in hard dollars and approximately one-half in foreign currencies. This is about the same ratio followed in the program the past 2 fiscal years.

The committee also approved the revised additional request of $979,000 for expenses for the East-West Cultural and Technical Center in Hawaii. It was determined the additional sum was necessary to cover essential operating costs, scholarships and grants, and construction planning for additional buildings.

The committee also provided the full budget estimates, $2,053,000, for the international fisheries commissions in order that the various commissions could carry out their planned programs this fiscal year.

For the United Nations mission in New York, $45,000 was added to the allowance under the House bill. This sum will provide for three or four additional positions which are considered essential to help cope with the increased workload at the mission.

A reduction of $1,500,000 was made from the House allowance of $8 million in the construction appropriation of the International Water and Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, inasmuch as the Department advised that the lesser sum, $6,500,000, would be sufficient to meet the obligations anticipated this fiscal year.

The committee concurred with the House allowance of $153 million for the salaries and expenses appropriation of the Department. This sum was deemed sufficient not only to cover the ongoing rate costs of the many activities paid from this appropriation, but also to provide sufficient funds for so-called mandatory increases—grade promotions, oversea wage and price increases, and also the opening of new posts, elevation of posts, increased travel allowances, and other high-priority items of the Department.

For the Department of Justice, the committee recommended an increase of $618,000 over the total House allowances of $343,799,000 in the various appropriations for the Department. This increase is distributed in two items: namely, $84,000 for general legal activities, which would provide for 10 more positions and related expenses in the tax division and civil division, where it was found there had been a marked increase in the workload; and $534,000 for the Bureau of Prisons, where it was determined this additional amount was essential this fiscal year. Of this latter sum, $84,000 would cover the costs of about 30 additional positions and related expenses needed in the various Federal institutions, and the balance—$450,000—is required to provide $250,000 for staff housing at the New Marion, Ill., Federal penitentiary and $200,000 is required to cover the estimated costs for the preliminary design work proposed in connection with the replacement of the old National Training School.

For the Commerce Department, the committee recommends the total appropriation of $798,300,100, instead of $833,818,000 provided in the House allowance for the 48 appropriation items. As the report indicates, the committee recommended increases in five items totaling $6,102,100, and six decreases from the House bill totaling $41,620,000, leaving a net reduction of $35,517,900. Testimony at the hearings revealed that decreases under the House allowances could be made at this time in four appropriation items; namely, $17 million in the ship operating differential subsidy program; $2 million in the appropriation for control of outdoor advertising; $4 million in the inter-American highway appropriation; and $18 million in the Weather Bureau appropriation for the meteorological satellite operations program. In this latter case it was found there was a carryover balance of $28 million, plus $10,500,000 anticipated recovery from NASA which the committee considered ample to fund program needs this fiscal year. The recommended increases over the House bill will provide $525,000 additional for the Patent Office promotion program; $1,527,100 for additional costs in the salaries and expenses appropriation of the Weather Bureau, of which $1,144,700 is needed to defray the ocean weather service costs which were previously funded by the Navy Department—it has asked, therefore, that this amount be transferred to this appropriation bill, and that accounts for a major part of the increase—and $382,400 is required to improve the weather reporting services in various areas of the country; $1,800,000 is for costs of weather data acquisition and processing work formerly done by the Federal Aviation Agency; $1,500,000 is for additional costs in the research and technical services program of the National Bureau of Standards. For expenses relating to the transportation research program, the committee recommends a total appropriation of $1,625,000, or $750,000 more than allowed in the House bill.

For the judiciary branch, the committee concurred with the House recommendation which provided a total appropriation of $65,927,900. Officials of the judiciary indicated their satisfaction with this allowance.

For the 10 related agencies included in title V of the bill, the committee has approved the sum of $287,605,000. This is $93,347,000 below the total budget estimates requested for fiscal 1964, and is $15,069,000 below the total sum recommended in the House bill. This $15,069,000 decrease is the difference between $28,550,000, the total reductions or savings recommended in four appropriation items that had been allowed by the House, and $13,481,000, the total increases that the committee considered justified in four other appropriations.

Specifically, the recommended decreases were: $25 million in the revolving fund; $3 million in the trade adjustment loan fund; $200,000 in the salaries and expenses appropriation, of the Small Business Administration; and $350,000 in the appropriation for the informational media guarantee fund of the U.S. Information Agency. Testimony at the hearing indicated the reductions could be made at this time without hindrance to the programs of the Small Business Administration. With respect to the informational media guarantee fund, it was the committee's opinion that $650,000 should be appropriated to the fund this fiscal year instead of $1 million allowed in the House bill and further that the Agency should take steps to phase out the program. The $650,000 allowance is for payment of the interest to the Treasury.

The agencies increases totaling $13,481,000 would provide $100,000 for settlement of general war damage and Philippine claims: $50,000 for three additional employees and other costs essential to the operations of the special representative for trade negotiations; $5,831,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which sum, added to the House allowance of $1,669,000, would provide $7,500,000 for this Agency, or three-fourths of the amount authorized; and $7,500,000 for the operating expenses of the U.S. Information Agency. This latter increase, together with the House allowance of $131 million, will provide a total salaries and expenses appropriation of $138,500,000. The committee concluded that the additional allowance over the House recommendation would help defray the increased costs being incurred by the Agency at this time in connection with the various programs, particularly in the media services field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"ACQUISITION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

"For necessary expenses of carrying into effect the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292–300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801–1158); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $18,500,000, of which not less than $13,500,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,300,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 5, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,900,000".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "chauffeurs", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,545,000".

On page 7, line 15, after the word "negotiations", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$365,000".

On page 9, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000".

On page 12, line 6, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$1,910,000" and insert "$2,053,000".

On page 12, line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$2,000"; on page 13, line 2, after the word "amended", to strike out "$42,250,000" and insert "$43,000,000", and in line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "$14,515,000" and insert "$15,000,000".

On page 13, line 14, after the word "Hawaii", to strike out "$4,460,000" and insert "$5,439,000".

On page 16, line 2, after "(31 U.S.C. 529)", to strike out "$18,573,000" and insert "$18,657,000".

On page 21, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "$53,000,000" and insert "$53,084,000".

On page 22, line 8, after the word "account", to strike out "$9,425,000" and insert "$9,875,000".

On page 25, line 22, to strike out "$14,000,000" and insert "$13,650,000".

On page 27, line 22, after the word "abroad", to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$9,230,000", and in line 23, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,410,000".

On page 30, line 15, after the word "Patents", to strike out "$29,000,000" and insert "$29,525,000".

On page 30, line 24, after "(15 U.S.C. 278d)", to strike out "$28,075,000" and insert "$29,575,000, of which not to exceed $550,000 shall be available for payments to the 'Working Capital Fund', National Bureau of Standards, for additional capital".

On page 32, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "$63,000,000" and insert "$64,527,100".

On page 33, line 7, after the word "equipment" to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$11,300,000".

On page 34, after line 4, to strike out:

"METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE OPERATIONS

"For expenses necessary to establish and operate a system for the continuous observation of worldwide meteorological conditions from space satellites and for the reporting and processing of the data obtained for use in weather forecasting, $18,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payment to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for procurement, in accordance with the authority available to that Administration, of such equipment or facilities as may be necessary to establish and operate the aforesaid system."

On page 36, line 2, after the word "Commission," to strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$208,000,000".

On page 36, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$825,000".

On page 42, after line 17, to strike out:

"CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

"For incentive payments to the States for control of outdoor advertising, as authorized by law (23 U.S.C. 131), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 43, line 1, after the word "expended", to strike out "$19,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000".

On page 43, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,250,000".

On page 53, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$37,000" and insert "$79,000"; in line 17, after the word "aliens", to strike out "$1,455,000" and insert "$1,555,000", and in the same line, after the word "addition", to strike out "$575,000" and insert "$607,000".

On page 53, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$7,000,000"; on page 54, line 2, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$30,000", and in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$27,800,000" and insert "$27,300,000".

On page 54, line 22, after "(Public Law 87–550)", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

On page 55, line 4, after the word "limitations", to strike out "$115,000,000" and insert "$90,000,000".

On page 55, line 12, to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$500,000".

On page 57, line 1, after "(75 Stat. 631)", to strike out "$1,669,000" and insert "$7,500,000".

On page 58, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,500", and on page 59, line 10, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$131,000,000" and insert "$138,500,000".

On page 62, line 16, after "(22 U.S.C. 1442)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$650,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as ranking minority member on the subcommittee, I address my remarks to H.R. 7063, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

First, Mr. President, I want to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], for the excellent manner in which he carried out his assignment and duties in reporting this bill. His sincerity and dedication in conducting the hearings on this bill were of the highest order. The chairman and I joined together after the hearings were completed, going over each and every item in the bill in an effort to arrive at equitable recommendations to the subcommittee in its consideration of the bill before you. I believe that the chairman will agree that we always tried to keep a balance of perspective between the departments' requests and the interests of the taxpayer, who, at a later date, will be called upon to pay the bill.

I would not want to imply to the Senate today that I am against some of the program increases in this bill. What I do want to convey is that it is always popular and nice to allow all increases, but the fact of the matter is that even with the desire to do all of these things, one has to keep well in mind "the people" who will be called upon to pay the bills—and to determine whether or not all of the programs, though probably desirable, are wholly justified.

I would further point out for the record that many of the dollar reductions recommended in this bill are due to the fact that new positions which have been authorized, have now lapsed 50 percent. However, the additional positions recommended in this bill will have to be annualized in the next fiscal year. There are some program increases in this bill that are due to new authorizations which were not enacted until after the House had acted on this appropriation bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee has very thoroughly gone over the amounts of money in the bill so I will not take the time of the Senate to explain further. Mr. President, I would suggest to my colleagues in the Senate that they have a good bill before them, and hope that the Senate will support the committee recommendations.

In closing, I commend the members of the staff, specifically Mr. Harold Merrick, John Witeck, and most especially "Bill" Kennedy who has given me such invaluable assistance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Maine with respect to the staff. The service they render to us on the Appropriations Committee is absolutely invaluable. Senators could not possibly do this work without their services. That is true with respect to committees generally in the Congress, but I believe it is especially true with respect to the Appropriations Committee—and I serve on a number of subcommittees of that committee. It is absolutely essential that there be a trained and competent staff to guide and counsel Senators as they undertake to go through the myriad appropriation items, in trying to eliminate what can be eliminated without doing injury or violence, in order to carry out the essential functions of Government.

I wish also to express my appreciation for the excellent cooperation given to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill by Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle.

We have tried to write what we believe is a good bill, taking into account the fiscal situation which confronts the country, and taking into account the need for services that we feel should be performed, making increases in some cases where we think they are required, and reductions in other cases where we believe they can be made.

I hope that the Senate will sustain the committee in its recommendations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement supplementing the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

It is my pleasure to serve with Senator McCLELLAN on the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and to salute him for so ably directing this bill through a long and arduous course of hearings and discussions. This is a lengthy and complicated bill and I think the Senator from Arkansas has done an excellent job on it.

I also compliment the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for her excellent leadership and characteristically thorough study given each request and line item of appropriation.

I support the statement of the Senator from Arkansas and I urge the adoption of this bill in its present form. Because of my membership on the Judiciary Committee, I have a natural affinity for certain provisions of this bill—particularly those relating to the judiciary and the Justice Department. Therefore, I would like to stress the importance of two particular provisions of the bill.

The first item is the restoration of $200,000 for completion of the preliminary design work on the new National Training School to be located at Morgantown, W. Va. As a member of the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee, I have had many opportunities to visit and work with Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons. He has done an outstanding job in directing the Federal prison system. However, there is only so much that he can do with existing facilities. Frequently, his already difficult problems are intensified by them.

The present National Training School located here in the District of Columbia is a very old and totally inadequate institution. It can no longer be operated efficiently or effectively no matter how hard the Bureau may try.

For a number of years, Congress has recognized the deplorable conditions existing at the Training School. However, until recently it has not faced up to the only solution that exists if the Bureau of Prisons is to give the youngsters—most of them teenagers—committed to its custody—the help and care they need. This involves abandoning the present institution and building a properly designed facility in a more desirable location. By stepping up the construction of the new National Training School, as these appropriated funds allow, we will be taking an important step in redeeming our obligation to those whom our Federal courts have entrusted to our care.

The other matter of importance is set forth on page 19 of the Senate report which accompanies this bill. Under the heading "Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses" the committee directs that up to $156,000 of this appropriation be used to purchase sets of West Publishing Co.'s Modern Federal Practice Digest.

The West Digest System is the handiest tool that a judge has. However, the old digest has been discontinued for 3 years. For the past 2 years, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts has been trying to get funds to purchase the new system but with no success.

On one occasion, the request for these funds passed both bodies, and then failed because of a technicality. Earlier this year, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts requested funds for this item in the 1963 supplemental appropriations bill. Again, the request was rejected for reasons which did not touch the merit of the request.

At that time, it was too late to have the item placed in the 1964 budget so they have not requested additional funds to purchase these books. However, they need authority to use $156,000 of the funds provided for "Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses" to purchase these books, and we can no longer delay getting them into the courts' hands.

At the conclusion of fiscal year 1963, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts turned back approximately $200,000 to the Treasury. Therefore, it seems entirely appropriate that they have the authority to use $156,000 of this year's funds for a very worthy purpose.

If this is not granted, many of the judges of our Federal court system will have to go through another year without the aid of this very important set of books. This situation would be as shocking as it is now ridiculous.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish again to compliment the chairman on striking a fair and prudent balance between the requests and needs of those Departments coming within the coverage of this bill. In my judgment, the action of the committee evidences a faithful discharge of its responsibilities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is any money provided in the bill to meet the increased cost which might result from the passage of a bill which would increase the salaries of Supreme Court, appellate court, and district court judges?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; there is no money in the bill to pay the increased cost of salaries for Members of Congress, judges, Cabinet members, or anyone else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is any money provided in the bill to finance increased salaries in any of those offices?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Only where the increase has already been authorized by law and where it is now mandatory. No anticipated increases are included.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if this is a convenient time so far as the Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I should like to call up my amendment No. 349. However, several Senators have evidenced an interest in the amendment, and I therefore first suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE REA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on July 24, I introduced S. 1926, which would require the Rural Electrification Administration to increase interest rates on loans to their electric cooperatives from the present unrealistic figure of 2 percent to a rate comparable to the amount the Treasury has to pay for its borrowings. The bill also would more clearly define the areas and services for which loans to cooperatives could be made. Subsequently, I have spoken on the floor of the Senate pointing out some of the questionable practices in which the REA has engaged and also that some of the loans made were contrary to the intent of the Congress when the law was enacted in 1936. I pointed out that the original intent of the REA was to help to bring to our Nation's farmers the comforts and economic benefits of electric power. Today, with 98 percent of the Nation's farms receiving the benefits of electric power, REA's mission has been substantially fulfilled. Nevertheless, the REA continues to grow and grow by forcing itself through arbitrary decisions into new fields and services.

Mr. President, I now wish to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues an official document from the Comptroller General, entitled "Report to the Congress of the United States—Possibilities for Reducing Federal Expenditures Under the Electric Loan Program and Other Matters Pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture." This report is dated November 1963. The report substantiates my contention that the REA has in numerous cases been negligent, used poor judgment, and did not exercise prudence in loaning the taxpayers' money.

In his letter of transmittal, the Comptroller General pointed out that on the basis of his examination he believed that in certain circumstances Federal expenditures under the electric loan program could be reduced without adversely affecting the accomplishment of the program objectives. The Comptroller General cited one case where a loan was approved in May 1962 for $6.7 million to a cooperative for the construction of generation facilities while it appeared that the borrower's financial needs could have been readily satisfied without the $6.7 million loan at that time and without detriment to the rural electrification program objectives.

On a basis of the difference between the interest cost incurred by the Treasury around the time of loan approval from money obtained from outside sources for long-term marketable obligations, and the 2 percent interest paid to the Rural Electrification Administration by its borrowers, the Comptroller General estimated that in this one case the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on this 35-year loan will be about $3.6 million.

The Comptroller General in his letter of transmittal recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture institute appropriate action to provide that the agency impose a requirement upon borrowers to prepare and submit long-range financial plans and forecasts in support of loan applications. The recommendation includes a provision for careful analysis by the agency of such plans and forecasts before approving loans or granting loans for the maximum authorized 35-year repayment period, giving particular attention to the availability of funds expected to be generated by borrowers' income-producing operations and to the financial policies governing the planned disposition of borrowers' expected operating margins.

Mr. President, I will now refer specifically to some of the findings and recommendations that appear in the Comptroller General's 92-page report to the Congress.

### REA DOES NOT REQUIRE BORROWERS TO ADEQUATELY DEMONSTRATE A FINANCIAL NEED FOR LOAN FUNDS

On pages 13 through 17, the report reads:

> In arriving at its decision to approve or disapprove requests for loans, REA considers the amount of general funds (cash and investments) which borrowers have on hand at the time of the loan application. However, REA does not consider the funds expected to be generated by the borrowers' income-producing operations except to determine whether the borrowers will be able to repay the proposed loans within the required periods. Therefore, it is possible for borrowers to obtain REA loans even though it appears that their financial needs could be satisfied from funds expected to be generated by their income-producing operations in ensuing years.
>
> At hearings before the House Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1962, members of the subcommittee expressed concern over the fact that some REA borrowers were receiving REA loans while they had general funds in excess of their requirements which were invested so as to earn a return in excess of the 2 percent interest paid on REA loans.
>
> In the report by the House Committee on Appropriations on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1962, the committee stated that REA should consider a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.
>
> In February 1962 REA established a policy setting forth certain guidelines with respect to borrowers' general funds for its use in reviewing loan applications. This policy provides, among other things, that where a borrower has general funds exceeding 20 percent of the total amount of its plant, the loan application must be supported by a detailed analysis clearly justifying the amount of general funds. The 20-percent level is based on REA's estimate of the borrowers' needs for current operating costs and working capital (6 percent), plant replacements (6 percent), contingencies (3 percent), and allowance for local differences (5 percent).
>
> It is to be noted that REA's guidelines on borrowers' general funds relate only to the amount of such funds which borrowers have on hand at the time of the loan application. They do not concern themselves with the funds expected to be generated by the borrowers' income-producing operations in periods subsequent to the time of loan application.
>
> If borrowers were required by REA to demonstrate a financial need for loan funds after giving consideration to the funds expected to be generated from future income-producing operations, it is possible that fewer or smaller REA loans would be made, thereby reducing future REA borrowings from the Treasury. Since the Treasury is the source of REA loan funds, reduced borrowings by REA from the Treasury would result in reduced public debt interest costs incurred by the Treasury.

### EXAMPLE OF QUESTIONABLE NEED FOR REA LOAN

> We noted, for example, that on May 15, 1962, REA made a 35-year loan for $6,660,000 to a cooperative for the construction of generation facilities. On the basis of the borrower's forecast of the financial results of operations for succeeding years, it appears that the program objectives of rural electrification could have been accomplished in the borrower's service area without an REA loan at that time.
>
> The loan by REA was made to help finance a 50,000-kilowatt generating plant to be constructed pursuant to a contract the cooperative has with the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). The nuclear reactor boiler part of the plant will be constructed and owned by the AEC, and the conventional portion of the powerplant will be owned by the cooperative. The plant is scheduled to begin commercial operations in 1966. If the nuclear reactor produces steam at a net operating cost of 3.25 mills per kilowatt-hour, the cooperative will be required to buy the reactor from AEC sometime between the 5th and 10th year after the plant becomes operational, which is estimated by REA to be in 1966. If the reactor does not produce steam at the designated net cost, the cooperative plans to build a conventional boiler with additional funds to be provided by REA or with its own funds if REA will not make a loan for that purpose.
>
> The cooperative furnishes power on a wholesale basis to 27 member distribution-type cooperatives located in four different States, over transmission lines owned and operated by the cooperative. The member cooperatives serve more than 100,000 consumers.
>
> At December 31, 1961, general funds of the cooperative amounted to about $14.9 million, or 19.6 percent of the total amount of its plant. A financial forecast prepared by the cooperative for the 10-year period 1961–70 shows that the cash margins (net cash from operations less debt service payments to REA) expected to be generated for the 10-year period total about $55 million. The purposes of the forecast, as stated therein, were (1) to show the cooperative's financial requirements, (2) to furnish cost-of-power estimates for the use of its member distribution cooperatives, (3) to evaluate the financial position of the cooperative, and (4) to furnish information to the board of directors and management for development of procedures, policies, and overall future planning.
>
> According to the forecast, the cooperative plans to invest about $43.6 million of its cash margins in long-term and temporary investments earning 3 to 3.5 percent. The forecast shows that during the same period (1961–70) the cooperative plans to spend about $45.5 million for plant additions; this aspect of the forecast is based on obtaining REA loan funds to finance about $45 million of the increase in plant.
>
> The financial forecast also shows that the cash margins expected to be generated for the years 1962–66, the period during which the generating plant financed by REA is to be constructed, total about $23.5 million. According to the forecast, the cooperative plans to invest about $18.3 million of its cash margins generated during these years in long-term and temporary investments earning 3 to 3.5 percent.
>
> We noted that the financial forecast prepared by the borrower made no provision for the refund of patronage capital during the years 1961–70. In this connection, the borrower informed us in December 1962 that it had never paid any patronage refunds and did not expect to pay any patronage refunds in the near future. In June 1963 the borrower advised us that it may decide to make refunds of patronage capital in the future.
>
> On the basis of the borrower's annual cash margins expected to be generated over the years during which the generating plant financed by REA is to be constructed, and the estimated annual amounts required for construction of the generating plant during these years, it would seem that the borrower's financial needs could have been satisfied without the $6,660,000 REA loan approved in 1962 and without detriment to the rural electrification program objectives. Further, the information in the financial forecast indicated that the use of borrower's own funds for construction of the generating plant would still have permitted the borrower to make patronage refunds if so desired. The interest cost to the Federal Government, around the time of the loan approval, for money obtained from outside sources for long-term marketable obligations was slightly more than 4 percent. On the basis of the difference between the interest rate paid by the Treasury and the 2 percent interest paid to REA by its borrowers, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on the $6,660,000 loan over the 35-year period will be about $3.6 million.

### EXAMPLE OF REDUCTION IN BORROWER'S GENERAL FUNDS TO BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR NEW REA LOAN OF QUESTIONABLE NEED

Mr. President, beginning on page 18 of his report, the Comptroller General cites an example of reduction in borrower's general funds to become eligible for new REA loans of questionable need. The report reads:

> We noted, for example, where one REA borrower had general funds (cash and investments) at March 31, 1962, of $844,500 which

was 23.5 percent of its total plant of $3.6 million.

In order to become eligible for another REA loan, the borrower adjusted its general funds to about 19.9 percent of total plant by, among other things, making an advance payment of $221,000 on outstanding REA loans on July 6, 1962. On August 15, 1962, REA approved a new 35-year loan of $399,000 to the borrower to finance new distribution lines and improvements to the borrower's electrical system and to reimburse the borrower's general funds for construction costs previously paid by the borrower.

A financial forecast contained in the REA files for the years 1961 through 1970 prepared by the borrower shows that the facilities to be financed by the REA loan of $399,000 could have been financed by the net cash margins (cash from operations and interest on investments, less REA debt service payments) generated by the borrower's own operations. The forecast shows that, during the 2 years in which the borrower planned to receive loan funds from REA for construction of the facilities—1962 and 1963—cash margins expected to be generated by the borrower's own operations would be about $306,000. These cash margins plus the borrower's $221,000 advance payment of July 6, 1962, that need not have been made had the borrower planned to use its own funds for construction purposes, exceeded by about $128,000 the amount of construction funds which, according to the financial forecast, the borrower planned to receive from REA in 1962 and 1963. It would appear, therefore, that the borrower could have financed with its own funds the cost of the planned additions to its plant in 1962 and 1963, thus making unnecessary the approval of the REA loan for $399,000.

The borrower's forecast also shows that, in addition to the facilities to be constructed with the $399,000 loan, the borrower planned additional plant construction of about $500,000 through 1970. If the borrower were to finance all plant additions planned for the years 1961–70 out of funds expected to be generated by its own operations without any REA loans, the forecast shows that the borrower's general funds by the end of 1970 would be about $1,500,000 or 35.7 percent of the total amount of its plant at that time. Under a plan set forth in the forecast whereby the borrower would use REA loan funds for all plant additions planned in the years 1961–70, the borrower's general funds by the end of 1970 (after allowing for the advance payment to REA of $221,000 on July 6, 1962) are expected to be about $2,139,000 or 51.0 percent of the total amount of its plant.

Concerning the financial forecast, the borrower, by letter dated June 10, 1963, informed us that the purpose of the forecast was to attempt to determine the financial condition of the cooperative for the years 1961–70 with the thought of refunding capital credits to the members of the cooperative on a scheduled basis. The borrower further informed us that in February 1963 the board of directors decided to begin refunding capital credits to the members of the cooperative. The borrower stated that in 1963 the cooperative would refund about $150,000 to its members and that, by the end of 1967, the cooperative expects to have refunded at least a total of about $500,000 to its members. The decision to refund capital credits to members of the cooperative, the borrower stated, followed the establishment of a policy by the cooperative's board of directors in June 1962 whereby the amount of general funds of the cooperative would be maintained at 20 percent or less of the total amount of its electric plant. We noted that during the years 1941–62 total retirements of capital by the cooperative amounted to only $38,200.

On the basis of the borrower's financial forecast and the information on contemplated patronage refunds furnished to us by the borrower, it would appear that the borrower could have financed the cost of facilities covered by the $399,000 REA loan with its own funds and still have made planned patronage refunds of $500,000 and maintained the level of its general funds at about 20 percent of the total amount of its electric plant. We estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government on the $399,000 loan over the 35-year term, net of the savings attributable to the advance payment of $221,000, will be about $147,000.

### REPAYMENT PERIOD OF ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION AND GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS IS ESTABLISHED WITHOUT CONSIDERING BORROWERS' ABILITY TO REPAY

Mr. President, according to the Comptroller General's report, it appears that it is the policy of the REA to make electric distribution and generation and transmission loans—section 4 loans—for a maximum 35-year repayment period without determining before the loan is made whether or not the cooperatives might be able to repay the loan in a shorter time. The report states that if the repayment period of each section 4 loan were established after consideration of the borrowers' ability to repay, it is probable that in some cases loans could be repaid in less than 35 years without endangering the borrowers' financial positions or their capacity to provide electricity at rates that would promote and encourage its use by rural customers.

Such accelerated repayment periods would permit REA, in turn, to accelerate the repayments of its borrowings from the Treasury, therefore enabling reduction in public debt interest cost incurred by the Treasury. The Comptroller General cites an example, on pages 22, 23, and 24 of his report, which reveals an excessive length of time on the loan which resulted in an excess interest cost to the Government of about $162,000.

On page 35 of his report, the Comptroller General points out that:

> Insofar as rural electric systems borrowing from REA are concerned, if their continuing needs for expansion of facilities to meet anticipated heavy increases in future energy requirements are to be met by continually increasing amounts of Federal funds borrowed by the Treasury at an interest rate greater than the 2-percent maximum paid by REA borrowers, costs to the Government will increase substantially. We believe that, by effective implementation of our proposed revisions of REA policies and procedures for evaluating loan applications, REA would be in position to effect economies in Federal expenditures by requiring those borrowing rural electric systems capable of providing for their own needs to shoulder a part of the financial burden that would otherwise be borne by the American taxpayers.

### RECOMMENDATION TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, on this particular phase of the Comptroller General's report, his recommendation is as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture institute appropriate action to provide that REA, in addition to extending its current policy on general funds to make it applicable to future advances of funds under new loans, avail itself of the possibilities as exemplified in the cases described in this report, for reducing Federal expenditures under the electric loan program by imposing a requirement upon borrowers to prepare and submit long-range financial plans in support of REA loan applications. Provisions should also be made for careful analysis of such financial plans and forecasts before approving loans or granting loans for the maximum authorized 35-year repayment period, giving particular attention to the availability of funds expected to be generated by borrowers' income-producing operations and to the financial policies governing the planned disposition of borrowers' expected operating margins. The merits of such financial policies should be carefully weighed by REA with due regard to the rightful interests of the borrowing cooperatives and the consumer public, and also to the possibilities of effecting economies in the expenditure of Federal funds.

### THE LACK OF FULL EXPLORATION BY REA OF OFFERS BY EXISTING POWER SUPPLIERS

Mr. President, it appears that there have been cases where REA has made loans to cooperatives for generation and transmission facilities without thoroughly determining the availability of existing power suppliers who would be able and willing to fill the cooperatives' requirements. Beginning on page 40 the Comptroller General cites a specific case, which resulted in a $5.4 million interest loss to the Federal Government and which, had full cooperation between the REA and the cooperative been exercised, excessive cost could have been avoided.

The Comptroller General reports this case as follows:

> In our review we noted a particular case where REA did not thoroughly examine into the merits of an offer by an existing power supplier to provide the power requirements of six electric distribution borrowers before making a loan for $14,683,000 for the construction of generation and transmission facilities to serve these six borrowers. On the basis of our examination, it appears to us that, if REA had taken a more active role in helping the borrowers and the power supplier try to reach agreement on power contract rates and terms, it possibly would have been unnecessary for REA to make the loan. The salient facts pertaining to this loan are as follows:
>
> BACKGROUND DATA ON LOAN TO FEDERATION OF DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION FACILITIES
>
> On May 12, 1961, REA made a 35-year loan for $14,683,000 to a federation of 10 distribution cooperatives for the construction of generation and transmission facilities. At the time the loan was made, a private power company which sold power to 6 of these 10 cooperatives was negotiating with them for a new power supply contract. The other four cooperatives, although members of the borrowing federation, were purchasing their power from the Lower Colorado River Authority and not from the power company. Representatives of the cooperatives informed us that the cooperatives and the power company had been making intermittent efforts since 1958 to negotiate new power supply contracts and that the efforts were unsuccessful primarily because the power company refused to eliminate from its power contracts a dual-rate-provision—a higher rate for large nonfarm consumers served by the cooperatives than the rates charged by the company for other consumers served by the cooperatives.
>
> The loan recommendation approved by the REA Administrator showed that a plan for self-generation of power by the federation of cooperatives would provide a cheaper source of power over a period of 11 years—1962–72—than would a plan for purchasing

power from the power company. REA estimated that the cost savings to the six customer cooperatives under the self-generation plan over the 11-year period would be $291,000.

The cost savings advantage of $291,000 under the self-generation plan, compared with the purchase plan, was based on the assumption that, if the cooperatives did not generate their own power, the power company would continue to charge the cooperatives dual rates. According to REA, the higher rate for large nonfarm consumers would cost the cooperatives $1,268,000 for the 11 years. Without the imposition of the dual rates on power purchased by the cooperatives from the power company, the self-generated power would cost the cooperatives $977,000 more than the cost of power purchased from the power company over an 11-year period.

REA, through the loan to the federation of cooperatives, is also providing assistance to another generation and transmission borrower located nearby, which has substantial surplus generating capacity. The cooperatives' plan for self-generation of power is based, in part, on an agreement between the cooperatives and the other generation and transmission borrower whereby the cooperatives will, in effect, purchase most of the latter's excess generating capacity. According to REA, the second generation and transmission borrower will save about $1.6 million during the 11-year period 1962–72 as a result of the agreement with the cooperatives.

The offer by the existing power supplier in this case to provide the power requirements of the borrowing cooperatives included the supplier's willingness to (1) eliminate the dual-rate provision from its power supply contracts with the cooperatives and (2) purchase any of the surplus generating capacity of the second generation and transmission borrower.

### EFFORTS MADE BY POWER COMPANY IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING REA LOAN APPROVAL TO NEGOTIATE POWER SUPPLY CONTRACTS WITH THE REA COOPERATIVES

By letter to REA dated March 24, 1961, the president of the private power company stated that the company had adequate generating and transmission capacity to supply the existing and future power requirements of the six cooperatives which were then purchasing their power from the company, and he requested an opportunity to present to REA detailed information regarding the company's ability to serve the cooperatives with adequate electric power for all their needs at low rates. The president of the company asked that a conference be held either at the offices of the company or REA. REA replied by letter dated March 31, 1961, and suggested that, since the responsibility for securing an adequate supply of wholesale power at a reasonable price for its members belongs to a cooperative's board of directors, the company should discuss its offer directly with the individual boards of directors of the cooperatives.

On April 17, 1961, an official of the power company wrote to the REA cooperatives that were planning to generate their own power and requested to be informed of the details of the plans of the proposed power system so that the power company would be in a position to demonstrate its ability to sell ample power to the cooperatives at a cost lower than that to be incurred by the cooperatives in the generation of their own power. Copies of the company's letters to the cooperatives were furnished to REA. According to a power company representative, the responses received from the cooperatives did not furnish the requested information.

Subsequently, on May 3, 1961, a representative of the power company met with a representative of REA. The power company representative advised REA of the company's interest in improving relations with the cooperatives. He expressed the willingness of the company to execute a new long-term or short-term contract with the cooperatives and to remove from existing contracts certain features which the cooperatives had found to be objectionable. These features were a dual-rate provision and a restrictive provision prohibiting the cooperatives from using power company energy to serve consumers in towns having a population in excess of 1,500. The power company representative stated that the company was also willing, if necessary, to purchase any surplus capacity of the REA borrower—a party to the agreement with the six cooperatives planning to construct their own generation and transmission facilities.

The representative furnishing REA with a copy of an economic study prepared by the company containing its estimates of costs of operations under the proposed self-generation plan of the cooperatives and under a purchase plan from the company. The company's study states that during the 10-year period 1963–72 the cooperatives' plan for self-generated power would cost them about $10 million more than purchased power would cost. The REA official advised the power company representative to explain, as soon as possible, directly to the cooperatives any new proposal that the company wished to make.

We were advised by a representative of the power company that on May 8, 1961, an official of the company telephoned the president of the federation of cooperatives and requested a meeting on May 10, 1961, to discuss power supply contract terms and provisions and other related matters. The power company representative was told that the suggested date was not convenient and that he should call again on May 15, 1961, to arrange another meeting date. In the meantime, on May 12, 1961, REA approved the loan to the generation and transmission borrower for $14,683,000 to construct its own generation and transmission facilities. Construction of the facilities covered by the REA loan is presently under way, including the construction of about 800 miles of transmission line needed to serve the loan centers formerly served by the power company. The power company representative who met with the REA official on May 3, 1961, informed us that during their discussion he was not given any indication that approval of the loan by REA was imminent.

On May 19, 1961, a representative of the power company wrote to REA and referred to reports in the press relating to the loan to the cooperatives which, he stated, indicated that justification for the REA loan was based on the dual-rate and restrictive-use provisions in the company's power supply contracts with the cooperatives. The power company representative reminded REA of the company's offer on May 3, 1961, before the loan was made, to eliminate the two provisions from its power contracts with the cooperatives. In this connection, the manager of one of the member cooperatives informed us that, although REA advised him of the power company's economic study when it was received by REA, it did not advise him of the company's willingness to drop the dual-rate provision from its power supply contracts with the cooperatives.

Officials of other member cooperatives also stated that at no time did the power company inform their cooperatives specifically of the company's willingness to eliminate the dual-rate provision.

In a reply dated June 7, 1961, to the power company representative's letter of May 19, 1961, the Acting Administrator, REA, stated that

"While in our office we advised you that REA would not be the media by which a company proposal is transmitted to the cooperatives. Nor did we agree to withhold action on any loan request. You were advised that it was the company's responsibility to put its new policy into a proposal and submit it to the cooperatives. REA does not have any information that would indicate that this was done between your visit on May 3 and the signing of the loan on May 12, 1961."

The president of the federation of cooperatives acknowledged to us that an official of the power company had requested a meeting to be held on May 10, 1961, for the purpose of discussing power contract rates and terms. However, the president stated that the date was not convenient and that the company official had been asked to call back on May 15, 1961. The president further advised us that he was unaware that REA planned to approve the loan on May 12, 1961. Officials of the power company and the generation and transmission cooperative did eventually meet on May 29, 1961, and again on July 24, 1961, but we were advised by the power company representative that the meetings were nonproductive of any changes in existing arrangements.

In our examination we noted where an REA distribution cooperative, located in the same State as but not affiliated with the federation of cooperatives receiving the loan, took advantage of an offer by the power company here involved, which was similar to and made at approximately the same time as the offer made by the company to the six cooperatives. The contract between this borrower and the power company eliminated the dual-rate provision and stipulated an energy rate which is about 22 percent less than the rate that the six cooperatives will pay for self-generated power. The contract also assured an ample supply of power and energy and provided for the possibility of lower rates as the load factor improves.

In the example cited herein, REA officials stated that the offer by the power company representative on May 3, 1961, came after the generation and transmission borrower involved had spent thousands of dollars for engineering studies in connection with the proposed generation and transmission facilities.

They said that when extremely complex loans are involved, and offer by a power supplier to provide the power requirements of an REA borrower, made as many as 18 months prior to final action by REA on the borrower's loan application, might be considered as having not been made timely because of the time required by borrowers to make appropriate studies and application for an REA loan.

### CONCLUSION

We believe that in the particular case cited herein REA should have shown more concern over the possible merits of the offer made by the power company which, on the basis of financial data in the REA loan recommendation, would have resulted in the cooperatives' receiving electric energy at a cost lower than the cost of generating their own power. Also, a more active role by REA in helping its borrowers and their power suppliers try to reach agreement on power supply contract rates and terms, than was the case in the loan heretofore described, could obviate the need for generation and transmission loans in some cases.

On the basis of the difference between the interest cost to the Federal Government near the end of fiscal year 1963 (slightly higher than 4 percent) for money obtained from outside sources for REA by its borrowers, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government for each $1 million of 35-year loan funds is about $505,000. In the case of the $14,683,000 loan previously cited, we estimate that the excess interest cost to the Federal Government over the 35-year life of the loan, computed on the above basis and using the interest rate paid by the Treasury around the time of loan approval (slightly more than 3.5 percent), will be about $5.4 million.

Mr. President, the Comptroller General makes other important observations and comments in his report, which I urge Senators to study thoroughly.

In conclusion, these examples cited in the Comptroller General's report clearly reveal how governmental bureaus use every means at hand to perpetuate themselves and continue to feed upon the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. When the Congress returns next January, I shall insist upon early action upon my bill, S. 1926, and shall ask that it be modified in order that recommendations of the Comptroller General may become law.

---

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 349 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 2, it is proposed to strike "$18,657,000" and insert "$18,824,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the amendment is cosponsored by my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEATING. I asked unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this amendment would restore the sum of $167,000 to the item of salaries and expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice and is intended, specifically, to provide for the positions requested by the Department of Justice for the Civil Rights Division.

The situation is that 40 lawyers and 41 clerical personnel are now employed in the Civil Rights Division. The Department has requested for the 1964 fiscal year 56 lawyers and 63 clerical personnel. The division has been allowed 48 lawyers and 52 clerical personnel.

I stress, with all the vigor at my command, that this budget was prepared before the civil rights crises in the summer of 1963. I am certain that if the Attorney General and others concerned with the problem were to be asked unofficially the number of personnel the Civil Rights Division needs to do its work, the estimate would be considerably greater than the number that the Department said would be needed when the budget was originally prepared. In other words, there is a minimum need for 19 additional positions, of which 8 would be lawyers and 11 clerical personnel. The budget estimate, let me stress, now reflects only the minimum need for additional personnel.

There is much talk among the opponents of civil rights legislation—and this is one of the arguments which are used against any new legislation of this kind—to the effect that no new laws are needed; that all that needs to be done is to enforce the laws now on the statute books. But to deny to the Civil Rights Division the number of lawyers the Division says it needs, and that it said were needed before all the recent crises arose, would be to cripple it unduly and interfere seriously with the enforcement of existing laws.

Lawyers are not paid overtime. We who have practiced law know that it is not a clockwatching operation. Most successful lawyers in private life work overtime. But the clerical personnel are compensated for overtime; and an illustration of the vast increase in work, which I am sure would be even greater now, would be to compare the overtime hours paid to clerical personnel in 1962 with the amount paid in 1963. In 1962, in the Civil Rights Division, there were about 2,500 hours of clerical overtime; in 1963, more than 5,000, or more than double the amount paid for in the previous year.

The amount of incoming mail is another illustration. It increased from 32,000 pieces in 1962 to 54,000 pieces in 1963; and 23,000 of the 54,000 were complaints of violations of the law, which, of course, required careful attention.

The lawyers who are engaged in this work are dedicated persons. They necessarily must be. They work in a division of the law in which it is difficult to acquire marketable skills for private practice. We all know that many young lawyers spend time in the Antitrust Division in order to become experts or peculiarly equipped to handle antitrust cases. The same is true of the Tax Division.

But when lawyers in the Civil Rights Division step out to enter private life, they are in an entirely different position. Their experience and expertise are not of a nature which would readily command as large salaries or incomes as those enjoyed by lawyers who have worked in the Antitrust Division or the Tax Division. Unquestionably, by inclination and by the nature of their work, the lawyers in the Civil Rights Division work as hard as any other group of lawyers in the Government, perhaps harder, and they are under constant pressure and, often, harassment.

Without going into great detail, I have been told of cases in which lawyers from the Civil Rights Division were looking into alleged violations of civil rights laws and denial of voting rights in various parts of the country and were stopped by the police and questioned at length about what they were doing in the community. Their work is hard, and many times it is unpleasant; but they continue at their jobs, and do them well.

If we intend to enforce the civil rights laws on the statute books, we must give the Attorney General the necessary "muscle" with which to bring about their enforcement. Proper enforcement of the law is seriously threatened by the prospect of personnel shortage. Although there are those who would see an advantage in not having the laws strongly enforced, I feel sure that that is not the view of a majority of the Senate, and that a majority of the Senate would say the Attorney General should have what he needs in order to do a proper job in this area. Certainly we cannot have it both ways; we cannot refuse to pass additional laws, and at the same time not provide for proper enforcement of the existing laws.

Mr. President, this amendment involves $167,000—a sizable sum, although small in comparison to the total amount of appropriations provided by this bill, namely, $1,800 million. The bill provides an appropriation of $156,000 earmarked for purchasing the West Publishing Co. Law Digest for the district court and circuit court judges. In my opinion, enforcement of the law is at least as important, to say the least, as is the provision of such assistance to judges, to enable them to ascertain what the law is.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope very much that this amendment to give to the Department of Justice the amount it has requested for enforcement of the law will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Work yield briefly to me, if it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for this purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I have asked the Senator from New York to yield to me at this time, because I must attend an important meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

As a member of the subcommittee on the bill providing appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, I attended a number of the committee hearings, although I could not attend all of them. I did attend the one at which the chairman and the other members marked up the bill.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee and its ranking minority member, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], have done top quality work on the bill, and I wish to support the committee in its actions and recommendations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He attended the hearings and labored with us, as did the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who, I believe, attended every session of the hearings, and was most faithful and diligent.

Such cooperation made it possible for us to go thoroughly into the various items involved in the bill and to bring the Senate a bill which can be defended in connection with any particular issue which may be raised.

I am most grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for his cooperation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his kind remarks.

I also thank the Senator from New York for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I started to say a moment ago, I am a cosponsor of this amendment; and what I shall say about it will, I believe, be completely consistent with what has just now been stated by the Senator from Massachusetts. This amendment involves a comparatively small amount—$167,000—whereas the total amount of appropriation provided by the bill is $1,800 million. I think that in all fairness it can be said that it is clear that, comparatively, this amendment is a small one. I have seen amounts 3 or 4 or 10 times as large voted by the Senate as a courtesy to a particular Senator who felt very strongly about the particular item involved.

This amendment involves a very special matter, because, according to the evidence produced before the committee, this amount of money undoubtedly will be used for particular purposes, and this is what gives this amendment its great importance.

According to the law, even if some well-meaning persons were to wish to contribute to the Civil Rights Division, for the purpose of providing funds to enable it to employ lawyers, that would be contrary to law. So, Mr. President, if this service is to be rendered in the name of the United States, we must appropriate this amount of money. Although the amount may be small, what is involved in the amendment is of very great importance and, hence, deserves the argument that is being made in its behalf. I think it is most important that we keep that principle clearly in mind: Although the amount called for by the amendment is small, the work to be done by means of the amendment is of critical importance.

I believe that this amendment, which has been proposed by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself along with our colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY], can best be explained as follows: If there is any consensus in the Senate, it is that Negroes are entitled to their voting rights. I wish to repeat that statement, because it is important: If there is any consensus in the Senate—one which sweeps right across the board, and is supported by Senators from all sections of the country and Senators of all views, including those with various views in regard to States rights and Federal rights—it is clear that the Senate is very favorably inclined toward securing to Negroes their voting rights.

The principal work being done by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice is to assure to Negroes their voting rights under the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts. That is the purpose of providing this amount of money. If we fail to make this provision, if we do not implement the granting to them of this important right of citizenship, on which there is so broad a consensus in the Senate, how can we say to the Negroes of the country, "It is your solemn duty to preserve order and tranquility by not going into the streets to fight for your rights"?

Two things which came up in the course of the testimony on this subject are, in my opinion, very important in this connection. In the testimony of Burke Marshall, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, he made clear why the U.S. attorneys cannot be used in the way indicated in the questioning that it was desired that they be used in order to keep the staff of the Civil Rights Division itself very small.

The U.S. attorneys, Mr. Marshall pointed out, are in no position to handle these vastly complex voting cases, which, like antitrust cases, necessarily involve a very great amount of preparation. Mr. Marshall cited one case in which 36,000 pages of voting records had to be examined and the brief that was written amounted to almost 300 pages in order to present the case properly to the court.

A U.S. attorney is not physically in a position to do that kind of work, if he is not going to bog down in the many other cases which it is his duty also to prosecute. Invariably, the Department of Justice in Washington handles cases of that character, as well as land cases, bribery cases, and income tax cases, and antitrust cases of great complexity. Everyone who has engaged in the active practice of law knows that to be a fact. So U.S. attorneys cannot do the job in this field.

As to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Mr. Marshall said—and properly—on page 1100 of the record of the hearings:

> It was not the wish of Congress that the Commission be used as an investigative arm of the Department of Justice and it has never been used that way, Senator.

He made that statement in answer to a question.

He said further, as shown on page 1101:

> I will say, Senator, that since I have been in the Department of Justice, which is since March of 1961, the Commission has never been used by us to gather evidence to enforce the voting laws which the Congress enacted in 1957 and 1960.

I assume that it is the wish of Congress that the Commission should not be used as an agency of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. Therefore, again, the Commission cannot be a source from which—even if it had the resources—the Department of Justice could draw the support which it needs.

To indicate how tough these cases are, I should like to cite what I consider to be the historic words of a Senator. On page 1100, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], responded to a statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] about discrimination in voting. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] had stated:

> They are not treated that way in Arkansas, I want you to know, sir, and I don't care what your records show. In Arkansas every Negro that walks up to the polls after paying his poll tax can vote.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said—and I make no criticism of, or comment on, that statement whatever; I am referring only to the justification for the service which is sought to be supplied by the amendment:

> I would say the same thing in Louisiana except in six or seven cases where the Negroes outnumber the whites considerably. Those are the only instances where there might be some trouble.

Let us ponder that statement for a moment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not quite understand what the Senator from New York said about Arkansas. Is the Senator challenging my statement that every Negro in Arkansas votes on the same terms as white citizens?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York was not discussing the Senator's——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I heard the Senator say something about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I will come to that, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I was not discussing anything the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] had said except that when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] spoke, he spoke against the background of a brief statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. In order to understand the statement of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], it was necessary to read the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

I make no comment whatever upon either situation. The Senator has taken his position, and there he stands. I was pointing out that what was said was practically an admission that in Louisiana there were cases. That is an admission from a Senator who, I am sure, wishes to stand up completely for his State. It seems to me that if we need any justification for the fact that this work must urgently be done, there it is.

Facing the kind of situation in which, even in the most guarded and considered way, it must be admitted that there are cases that have to be dealt with, it seems to me that is conclusive evidence that we are dealing with a situation urgently requiring the attention of the Senate.

I close as I began. Whatever may be thought of my arguments or the arguments of others, including those of my colleague, the various aspects of the law which are in effect, or should be in effect, stress the securing of various rights of citizens of the United States. One thing was clear during passage of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts. There was no real argument; it was only a question of method. The securing to every individual, without regard to his color, of his voting rights, was agreed to by everyone.

We in the Senate have good faith in that principle. We either mean what we say, or we do not. Therefore, what the amendment seeks to do is to implement the consensus of Congress as enacted into law and to express the determination of what I deeply feel is the overwhelming majority of our people everywhere—North and South alike—to secure a basic right. In order to secure it, we must have a certain type of official in the Federal Government. When we deny that official adequate personnel to do the job, it is tantamount to making it so difficult to implement the right upon which we all agree, as to deprive it of the validity we intended it to have.

When we consider the amount of money involved in the bill, I say to Senators who have a passion for economy and who wish to sustain the committee, that this is one case in which, for so small a sum—even if we feel strongly about the amounts—we should stretch the point, because so much is at stake in having the country satisfied that we are doing everything we can to sustain the very minimum of rights which should be sustained for Negro citizens under the Constitution.

Mr. President, as this question has been raised—and it should be raised—what more reason could there be for resolving it in the way it should be resolved, with credit and dignity to our deep conviction that we shall, in good faith, implement that which we have by a broad consensus and in good faith legislated?

I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted. I am grateful to my colleague for including me as a cosponsor. I believe he has rendered a fine service by raising the point and making the strong and effective argument that is his wont.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful for the Senator's cosponsorship of the amendment. No one needs to be told in this Chamber of the Senator's fight for effective enforcement of the civil rights laws—and all the laws. I am particularly grateful for his eloquent support of the amendment, and for the arguments which he has advanced, every one of which is eminently sound.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to what the committee has done, not only in the department to which reference is made, but also in the others involved, for which money is provided in the bill. The use of the word "need" is almost becoming a stock phrase in discussion of expenditures.

If the Appropriations Committee granted funds every time a department or some agency said we need more money or we need more personnel, the budget and the cost of Government would soon be completely out of control.

For example, I should like to point out in the bill that in the State Department the House allowed 197 new positions.

The State Department appealed from that, and requested an increase. The Senate committee allowed 197 positions more than the House allowed for the State Department.

For the related agencies, the House allowed money for 426 new positions. The Senate committee allowed an additional 244 positions.

For the Justice Department, the House allowed 623 new positions. The Senate committee has recommended 40 more. They say they need even more.

There is no end to it. I remind my colleagues that, after all, the appropriation is a lump sum appropriation. If the Department has a need to use the money, it could allocate the money to any of the particular functions to which it wished to allocate it.

I also point out that the amendment was not offered in the subcommittee. It was not offered in the full committee. It is an amendment which is presented in the Senate.

We have done a pretty good job in this connection. I notice one instance was cited, that perhaps in one State there might be a need for some enforcement of existing law. I point out that there are U.S. attorneys and U.S. district attorneys in the law enforcement field and in the civil rights field.

Forty attorneys are to be allowed, in Washington, for that Division. The House allowance has provided 8 more. That will make 48. There will be 48 attorneys.

Let us see what is the record concerning the complaints received. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] questioned the witness, Mr. Marshall. He asked him:

> Would you be able to tell the committee how many complaints you did receive from the Commission during the fiscal year 1963?
>
> Mr. MARSHALL. From the Commission?
>
> Senator ELLENDER. Yes.

The reference is to the Civil Rights Commission, which is conducting investigations. Money has been appropriated for it. It is on the job. That is its business. Mr. Marshall replied:

> Senator, I do not have that figure. I would have to supply it.
>
> Senator ELLENDER. Will you supply it for the record and also indicate the nature of those complaints?
>
> Mr. MARSHALL. Yes. I will do that.

The information requested was supplied. It is:

> During fiscal year 1963 the Civil Rights Commission referred some 50 letters relating to a variety of civil rights complaints to this Division.

Fifty letters. There will be 48 attorneys, Mr. President. I believe that is enough.

If we wish to provide money on the basis of whatever is requested, we ought to allow the State Department another 441 personnel. We ought to allow more personnel for the Commerce Department, and more for the related agencies, if we are to act on the basis of stated need.

There is the prospect that a new civil rights bill will be passed some time next year. There are those who hope it will be passed. If it should be passed, there will come to the Congress a request for a great number of attorneys more, and more clerical help, to enforce the law.

I believe that the number of attorneys and the number of personnel in this section are adequate. If not, 10 new lawyers were authorized in the Civil Division and the Tax Division. They could use another one or two. They do things like that from time to time. They are not bound to any one division. They use their personnel wherever they need them.

I am persuaded that what the committee has recommended is pretty generous. It is equitable. It is on a basis of what actually is needed and what can be used.

We should support the President in the present drive, if we can call it that, for economy, and in the concern he has indicated, particularly in respect to the Defense Department and other departments, about holding down expenditures and beginning to retrench in some of these fields.

We could not be charged with not providing adequately for this activity or not giving due consideration to this particular item. I feel that the committee has been reasonably generous. I believe the committee should be sustained.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, is it not correct that the $18,657,000 is a lump-sum appropriation which could be used in any part of this area?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, indeed. That is what I have tried to say. If another two or three attorneys are needed, the money is provided for that purpose.

There is one thing which is certain. If we appropriate all the money requested it will be spent. If we hold down the amount, so that it will be necessary to make certain adjustments from time to time, we shall get more for our money. I believe we shall get better results.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mrs. SMITH. I should be happy to yield, but I believe the chairman of the committee has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. The report of the committee is quite explicit on that point, and justifies an increase of $84,000 over the House allowance in this way:

> The additional amount will provide funding for about 10 additional positions in the

Tax and Civil Rights Divisions to assist with the increased workloads.

Certainly if any of these particular funds were used for the Civil Rights Division the Appropriations Committee would be the first to complain about the Department using the funds contrary to the report of the committee.

I recognize that the report does not legally bind the Department, and it could legally use a portion of the $84,000 or of other sums for this division.

The Department made its presentation. The committee made its decision, up to this point, as to the number of personnel for the Civil Rights Division. The committee would allow 10 additional positions for 2 other divisions. If I were administering the Department of Justice, I would hesitate to use any of these funds for the purpose of the Civil Rights Division, in the face of this statement in the committee report.

**Mrs. SMITH.** Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that the 10 additional positions recommended by the committee were earmarked, and could not be transferred. That would not prohibit or prevent the transfer of any other amount from the very large appropriation, the remainder of $18,573,000.

This question was quite thoroughly discussed in the hearings as the Senator will notice.

My civil rights record is a good one, and I would not wish to deprive the people in this division of the attorneys they need. We were of the opinion that there was sufficient flexibility in that area so that the Civil Rights Division could borrow, whenever there was a need to do so.

**Mr. KEATING.** Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I know of the fine record of the distinguished Senator from Maine in the field of civil rights; and I am sure it would be furthest from her thought to cripple this division in any way.

However, the amount requested was considerably higher for the total appropriation. It is true that for all salaries and expenses for legal activities in the Department of Justice—excluding the Antitrust Division, which is covered by a separate item—the $18 million-plus is a sizable sum, but we are discussing what has been requested for this division.

I appeal to the Senator from Maine, who may not have been present at the time of my previous presentation, in this way: Even the sums which have been asked for and which have not been allowed were estimates made up at a time before the recent crisis in the summer of this year, which called for many additional legal personnel, which situation, we hope, will not be repeated; but there is no assurance that it will not be. Many of the lawyers worked night and day—around the clock in some instances—during that time of great crisis.

The Senator from Arkansas referred to the commendable efforts of the President to keep expenses down; but I call attention to the fact that the President also has taken a very vigorous position favorable to civil rights.

I quote this sentence from an editorial in the New York Times on this very subject, dealing with the amendment which the Senate now has before it, in which it is stated:

> Here is an opportunity for President Johnson to go beyond his admirable support of new civil rights legislation and help make existing law work. A strong word from the President should produce the votes to restore all 19 requested positions to the Civil Rights Diivsion—or even to go beyond that figure, as events since the budget was drawn up a year ago clearly demand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from which I have read, and also an editorial from last night's Star which is very favorable to this amendment.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STARVING CIVIL RIGHTS

The extent of Southern congressional power to hobble the Government's efforts to achieve Negro rights is illustrated by what has happened to the appropriation for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

The Division has only 40 lawyers to do all the laborious work of suing for the right to vote in counties across the South, of investigating police brutality, of planning legislation. In the current budget, President Kennedy sought a modest increase of 19 individuals. The House allowed funds for only eight. The Senate Appropriations Committee, while giving the Justice Department somewhat more than the House figure, specified that none of this additional sum was to go to the Civil Rights Division.

The Senate is to debate the Justice Department appropriation bill tomorrow. Here is an opportunity for President Johnson to go beyond his admirable support of new civil rights legislation and help make existing law work. A strong word from the President should produce the votes to restore all 19 requested positions to the Civil Rights Division—or even to go beyond that figure, as events since the budget was drawn up a year ago clearly demand.

---

### CIVIL RIGHTS LAWYERS

In the area of civil rights enforcement, the Department of Justice proceeds on the basis of laws which Congress has adopted. Now, however, the Department finds itself in the anomalous position of not having enough lawyers to carry out the civil rights job delegated to it by Congress.

This matter should be gone into when the Justice Department appropriation bill comes up in the Senate this week. It is expected that an effort will be made to show that the Appropriations Committee, though proposing more money, has subjected it to restrictions which will prevent the Department from hiring the lawyers it needs. If this can in fact be shown, the necessary funds should be made available without restriction or the Senate should indicate that it really does not expect the Department to go forward with the assignments that Congress has given it.

**Mrs. SMITH.** Mr. President, I do not like to take issue with my able colleague and good friend from New York on this matter or any other matter, but I remind Members of the Senate that 6 months of the fiscal year are practically over and that the new budget will come in early in January. At that time I am sure we shall know better the points which the new President, President Johnson, will emphasize, and I am sure this will be one of those which I shall be very glad to support.

**Mr. KEATING.** If the Senator will yield, I have no doubt that civil rights legislation will be enacted and that it will require additional staffing in the Civil Rights Division. However, we are discussing the situation as of today. The work of the Department, this minute and tomorrow, is crippled, in enforcing voting rights, by the lack of personnel.

While I agree with the distinguished Senator that very shortly there will be an opportunity to review the question hopefully, in connection with next year's appropriation bill—not a year from now but preferably 6 months from now—yet we cannot take a chance, judging from what has happened this year. We cannot very well plan to make provision for next year.

I realize that a large part of this year has gone by—half of the fiscal year, roughly—and that these positions are not to be filled retroactively, and it might be that there could be some modification of the figure of $167,000 which would be acceptable. But I could not withdraw the amendment with the hope that it will be taken care of next year, because there will be problems next year, and we must now face those which we have at present.

**Mr. JAVITS.** Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Maine, whom I admire and respect. I am sure that she understands our sincerity.

What is important is that the departments, as the Senator knows, pay the strictest attention to the views of the Appropriations Subcommittee before which they appear. What happens when there is a kind of consolidation of view in a matter of this character is that, the request having been considered and not granted, the Department becomes very loath to shift its employees around. In addition, it strengthens the other elements of the bureaucracy—and I say that kindly—in the Department, particularly when, as here, the positions are authorized in the words of the committee report and they are identified as being earmarked for the tax and civil divisions.

As to the question of coupling these items together, especially since the amounts of money involved are so irrelevant to the issues involved, we should really pay attention to the maxim that justice deferred is justice denied. As these positions are needed to do justice in an area as to which there is such a broad consensus, namely, the voting rights area, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee may be prevailed upon to accept a proposal for a reasonable sum, enough to carry the program for the next 6 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York in its present status would provide for an additional $167,000.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Half of the fiscal year has gone. A modification has been proposed to the Senator's amendment, about which I have spoken to him, that would for a half year require about $70,000 to employ 10 lawyers. I have discussed this question with the Justice Department. There is a feeling in the Department, as expressed by Department officials, that an additional 10 lawyers would be needed. I feel, however, that since it is now almost mid-December, and since it would require a rather considerable period of time to obtain security clearance for the personnel, a smaller amount would be provided in the amendment, which would fulfill the needs of the Department.

There is no need for asking more than is required and more than can be constructively used.

Therefore, I elicit the attention of the chairman. I feel a proposal to add $50,000 to the amount lined on line 2, page 16, to make the amount "$18,707,000," instead of "$18,657,000" would mean that an additional $50,000 would be made available to the Justice Department in this particular category, and thereby permit the Justice Department to employ approximately between six and seven additional attorneys for the remainder of the year. Actually, the number might be more, because it would greatly depend upon the time required for security clearance. I do not believe it would be done in much less than 6 weeks.

Therefore I should like to elicit the views of the chairman on this matter. I know what the committee report states. I serve on the committee. I must say, in all candor, that I voted for the committee recommendation. Incidentally, I have received no complaints from the Justice Department. I read about the possibility of an inadequate professional staff for the Civil Rights Division, and I inquired about it. I was told that there definitely was a need for additional professional staff members. Therefore, I prepared the amendment. However, I have no desire to substitute my amendment for the amendment offered by the Senators from New York, who took the lead in this matter. It is not a question of whose amendment is voted on; it is a matter of adjusting the figure to the point where we can obtain what we feel is needed, and nothing more. Would the chairman care to venture his views on this subject?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator indicates that there has been no complaint from the Justice Department with respect to the committee's action. No representation was made that the amount be increased. Of course, I would personally favor the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota over that of the amendment as originally sponsored.

However, I come back to this point: According to the best judgment of the department there is need for a few additional attorneys. If we go back to my original point, every agency has some need. However, I do not think it is a pressing need. It is not a need that must be accommodated immediately. I believe the Department can do pretty well with what is in the bill. This question was not raised either in the subcommittee or in the full committee.

I am hopeful that what we have done can be sustained. As has been indicated, there will be very early consideration of this subject next year. We shall find that there will be an insistence on getting down to business on appropriation bills early in the next year. There will be plenty of time to consider this matter.

I hope the committee will be sustained. If it cannot be sustained, naturally I would prefer the lesser amount. It seems to me that this is an admission that the Department does not need what the original amendment calls for. It is not insisting on it. In conversation it has been said, "We could use 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 more attorneys." I know I could use a couple more attorneys in my office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So could I.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We must recognize the fiscal problems, too, and try to adjust ourselves to them as much as we can. With 40 allowed, and 8 more to be proposed, that would make 48 lawyers. Why should they have that money, when they received only 50 letters or complaints from the Civil Rights Commission? That clearly indicates that with all the district attorneys and assistant district attorneys all over the country, for the next 3 or 4 months they certainly should be able to get along with what the bill provides.

Mr. KEATING. Did I understand the Senator to say that only 50 complaints had been received?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I previously indicated that 50 letters had been received from the Civil Rights Commission. That is all that had been received in fiscal 1963. That is their testimony.

Mr. KEATING. Is the Senator talking about the Civil Rights Commission or the Civil Rights Division?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Civil Rights Commission. That is the commission which is doing the investigating, and doing all the work on this problem. The Civil Rights Commission referred about 50 letters to the Division. Those letters related to a variety of civil rights complaints. That is their testimony.

Mr. KEATING. That may be so. The Division, however, had received 23,000 complaints. It may be that only 50 of those were referred to it by the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If 23,000 complaints were received, as the Senator says, from sources other than the Civil Rights Commission, it seems to me that the Commission is not very vigilant.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that the Commission referred to the Division specific matters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They were letters of complaint.

Mr. KEATING. Undoubtedly the Civil Rights Commission transmitted to the Civil Rights Division only those letters or complaints which were most meritorious, the remainder having been culled out for one reason or another. However, Justice Department testimony before the Committee was to the effect that they had received 23,000 complaints on new matters and cases, and that they had received 12,000 reports and memoranda from the FBI and other sources. I assume that in those 12,000 cases are included the 50 or so to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know the number; but does the Senater know how many district attorneys and assistant district attorneys there are all over the country? They handle matters that are referred to them.

Mr. KEATING. My colleague from New York has clearly stated the principal reason why the U.S. attorneys alone cannot handle these complicated cases. For example, in Montgomery County, Alabama, 36,000 pages of voting records had to be analyzed, and the brief ran to 300 pages. Mr. Marshall, the head of the Division, testified that if the U.S. attorney in this district had to prepare this case alone, he could not have done anything else for an estimated period of 2 years.

There are many other such cases. We know that every roadblock is thrown into the path of successful prosecution in such cases. They are like complicated antitrust or tax cases. They cannot all be handled by U.S. attorneys. If the U.S. attorneys tried to do so, their other work would become completely bogged down. They would not be able to handle the regular civil and criminal litigation which makes up the usual caseload in every district.

Addressing myself to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, it is true that the figure of $167,000 is for the full year, just as the other figure in the bill was for the full year.

We are faced with an unprecedented situation. We are passing an appropriation bill when the fiscal year is half over. If additional lawyers were employed—and most of the pressing need is for lawyers and not for clerical personnel—they would have to go through the normal FBI clearance procedure, which a Government lawyer must go through, and this would require about 6 weeks, as the Senator from Minnesota has indicated.

Therefore, it might be adequate to make an allowance for the remaining 5 months of the fiscal year. That might be adequate to employ the 10 lawyers that are needed, for the balance of the fiscal year. In that case I would compute the amount to be closer to $70,000 than the $50,000 the Senator from Minnesota has indicated.

I believe that some amount in that neighborhood would, as I envision it, do the job which the Department of Justice says is necessary for the balance of the fiscal year.

I wonder if the Senator could not see his way clear to agree to a figure of $70,000 as opposed to $50,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the amount I had originally intended to suggest for the 6-month period. In light of the security checks, I was of the opinion that $50,000 would be adequate. That is merely a rule-of-thumb suggestion. I do not guarantee accounting accuracy on this subject. The question to be decided is whether we want to add a few additional lawyers to handle the workload which the Senator from New York has so adequately documented. My own view is that if $50,000 were allowed, it would be of significant help to the Department, because the $50,000 would not be earmarked. That would permit some shifting of personnel among certain of the divisions and units in the Department of Justice, as has been suggested by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. She reminded us that there is a flexibility in the employment of lawyers and professional staff personnel, except in the instance of the Tax Division, where the report, I believe, requires—

Mr. KEATING. The Tax Division and the Civil Division.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the Tax Division and the Civil Division there is a requirement that any additional personnel be assigned to those Divisions.

The Senator may wish to modify his amendment. I have no desire to press any amendment of my own, because he has taken the lead, and I do not believe in "cutting in." Why does not the Senator modify it to provide some amount between $50,000 and $75,000? Then the Senate can vote.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, to show what a reasonable fellow I am, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment to provide $60,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The arrangement, then, will provide a modification of the amendment, so that the amount will be $18,717,000.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On page 16, line 2, "$18,657,000" would be stricken, and in lieu thereof "$18,717,000" would be inserted.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. President, since the yeas and nays have already been ordered, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from New York may modify his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, if we took a little longer, perhaps we might reduce the amount still further. I was not a party to this arrangement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that modification.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to make it clear that the Senator from Arkansas has been very cooperative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota would be willing to extend the debate, we might discuss the question a little further, perhaps reduce the amount still further, and convince Senators that the amount should be reduced. I am very happy with the progress that is being made.

I shall not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Arkansas is willing to become a third party to this arrangement, I think I could persuade the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to reduce the amount to $50,000.

I have never known a finer chairman than the Senator from Arkansas. He is one of my favorite chairmen. The Senator from Arkansas has been chairman of a committee on which I have served for many years. I know of no one whom I admire more, or for whose work I have greater respect. I would be glad to become party to such an arrangement. After this sincere testimonial, we should be able to simplify the whole procedure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota; but I fully subscribe to the view of the President of the United States and shall remain frugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Both my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I deeply appreciate the effort of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to resolve this question in a favorable way. I sincerely hope that this evidence of practicality on our part—and I fully appreciate why the Senator from Arkansas in this case might not be able to accept the amendment—will find favor with the Senate, and that the Senator from Minnesota, although he is a member of the committee, will feel that it is proper to support it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty and, if present and voting, would vote "yea." The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Aiken
Anderson
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Hill
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster
Clark
Cotton
Dominick
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McNamara
Monroney
Sparkman
Walters

So Mr. KEATING's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7073) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question.

There has been a good deal of objection from the supporters of the informational media guarantees program which is a program for the guarantee of payment in dollars instead of local currency, which might be tied up, for various publications sent abroad in the interest of our Nation. These people have appealed to us very strongly on the basis of the provision in the committee report, in which the committee directs that the program be eliminated.

Without trying to change the mind of the committee at this particular time, I should like to ask the chairman a question.

This is really, for all practical purposes, a foreign policy question, as to whether the foreign policy of the Nation is or is not helped by the informational media guarantee program—which has been, I know, under considerable fire. The plea has been made that the question ought to be considered and studied by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish to ask the chairman whether he could consent to making some request of the Committee on Foreign Relations for its opinion, in view of the fact that the provision in the committee report is so strong on that subject. I have it before me. On page 23 of the report it is stated:

> The committee has previously expressed its disapproval of this program and directs that it be phased out.

The language is "and directs that it be phased out."

That is pretty drastic language. Of course, the committee cannot compel the program to be phased out. There may be some objection to it.

I ask the chairman whether he would agree that the Foreign Relations Committee should be asked to review the program and give its judgment to the Appropriations Committee on the subject.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is nothing to prevent the committee from doing that at any time, either informally or formally, so far as I know, if the Committee on Foreign Relations wishes to act and wishes to submit a recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. The position of the Appropriations Committee is known. I do not know why we should make a special request to the Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a new program. It amounts to a subsidy. There is a feeling that it should be phased out.

Mr. JAVITS. The committee does not content itself by saying that it should be phased out. That is what brought me to my feet. The committee says: "Directs that it be phased out."

There is a very real question as to whether any committee of the Congress has any right to direct a Government department to phase out a program, in the absence of legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It can do so indirectly, if it does not appropriate the money.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This is the indication that the committee feels the program should be phased out, because the committee does not feel it should continue to make appropriations. It might be done in a more gentle way; I do not know. Apparently this is the view of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the reason why I came back to the proposition that the Foreign Relations Committee should conduct a review of the program and should express itself upon this subject. In view of the report's very drastic statement directing that the program be phased out, we ought to know, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, before a Government department accepts that direction in the absence of any other statement by anybody else, whether or not in the foreign policy interests of the United States the program should be phased out.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I pointed out, I know of no restriction on the Foreign Relations Committee about making its recommendations.

Mr. JAVITS. So it would be fair to say that what the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee are doing is serving notice that they will not appropriate money in the future for this program. That is really what it amounts to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is serving notice that the committee feels it ought to be phased out.

Mr. JAVITS. At this particular time that is the viewpoint of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be recalled that last year the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Congress, reduced the amount for this program to $1 million. It was felt by us then that efforts should be made to phase out the program. Irrespective of our feeling, I understand that this year the Bureau of the Budget made a request for $3 million. Is that the correct amount?

Mr. KEATING. The sum of $3,960,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, $3,960,000. The committee felt that the only money which should be appropriated, in view of the action taken last year, was an amount to provide enough to pay back the interest on the fund.

Actually, we are appropriating money out of the Treasury to pay back the Treasury. That is what it amounts to. I do not have before me now the breakdown as to how the money is being spent. But as I recall, all of the publishers which will be denied this subsidy, to which my good friend from Arkansas referred, are located in New York except for one in California.

Mr. KEATING. That is nothing against them, is it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have nothing against them, but I believe this is a program we should dispense with. We have had the program since 1947. It was started on more or less a temporary basis. Like many other programs, it has been continuing, instead of being phased out. Some are inclined to increase it.

Under the foreign aid program a large sum is being spent to provide schoolbooks for people we are serving abroad, by way of foreign aid. There is not much objection to that.

Under another program millions of dollars of counterpart funds, derived from the sale of surpluses abroad, are being used to assist libraries for schoolchildren.

I believe those programs are well directed. There is no opposition to them. However, when it comes to subsidizing large corporations, not only in the book line, but also in the motion picture business—since we are guaranteeing profits for the sale of motion pictures and other media, I do not believe it is either good or necessary. I am very hopeful that the program will be phased out as soon as possible.

**I call attention to the fact that this program is operating for the benefit of our large publishing concerns not only in the so-called underdeveloped countries, but also is acting to guarantee to them profitable business in such strong and prosperous nations as France, West Germany, and Israel.**

**I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the informational media guarantee program, as of June 30, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.**

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*U.S. Information Agency—Informational media guarantee program, June 30, 1962*

[Summary for each country, inception of program through June 30, 1962, listing total contracts of guarantee issued, dollar payments for foreign currency purchased, dollar proceeds of foreign currency sold, losses or gains on sales, dollar cost, and market value of excess foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department, and of foreign currency on hand June 30, 1962]

| Country (1) | Number of contractors [1] (2) | Number of contracts [2] (3) | Guarantee amount issued (4) | Dollar payments for currency purchased (5) | Sale of foreign currency: Dollar proceeds (6) | Sale of foreign currency: Loss (gain) on sales (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 13 | 22 | $77, 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Austria | 31 | 108 | 591, 010 | $369, 553 | $330, 056 | $39, 497 |
| Burma | 28 | 64 | 355, 650 | 149, 758 | 87, 139 | (866) |
| Chile | 69 | 99 | 1, 476, 110 | 921, 915 | 481, 149 | 440, 766 |
| France | 23 | 60 | 851, 625 | 428, 483 | 428, 003 | 480 |
| Germany | 70 | 224 | 11, 518, 052 | 7, 068, 729 | 7, 057, 036 | 11, 693 |
| Indonesia | 58 | 200 | 6, 827, 735 | 4, 958, 761 | 0 | 0 |
| Israel | 132 | 566 | 15, 406, 154 | 12, 183, 027 | 1, 895, 375 | 930, 158 |
| Italy | 8 | 10 | 83, 295 | 9, 307 | 9, 302 | 5 |
| Korea | 26 | 27 | 190, 000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 60 | 174 | 2, 866, 559 | 1, 838, 719 | 1, 833, 889 | 4, 830 |
| Norway | 12 | 44 | 586, 443 | 314, 757 | 311, 813 | 2, 944 |
| Pakistan | 86 | 283 | 3, 105, 273 | 1, 896, 077 | 0 | 50 |
| Philippines | 122 | 449 | 17, 913, 904 | 15, 409, 151 | 14, 598, 956 | 810, 144 |
| Poland | 65 | 183 | 5, 068, 864 | 3, 558, 260 | 1, 288, 040 | 1, 130, 260 |
| Spain | 58 | 180 | 2, 643, 675 | 1, 799, 911 | 1, 468, 070 | 331, 841 |
| Taiwan | 59 | 212 | 1, 880, 948 | 1, 283, 747 | 1, 237, 194 | 46, 553 |
| Turkey | 88 | 331 | 7, 305, 343 | 5, 539, 569 | 3, 016, 554 | 2, 523, 015 |
| Vietnam | 56 | 170 | 4, 251, 903 | 3, 398, 795 | 1, 643, 741 | 1, 753, 041 |
| Yugoslavia | 90 | 327 | 9, 001, 125 | 6, 648, 329 | 3, 177, 378 | 2, 805, 191 |
| Total | ---------- | 3, 733 | 92, 000, 668 | 67, 776, 848 | 38, 863, 695 | 10, 829, 602 |

| Country (8) | Foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department: Dollar cost (9) | Foreign currency transferred to Treasury Department: Market value (10) | Foreign currency inventory on hand June 30, 1962: Dollar cost (11) | Foreign currency inventory on hand June 30, 1962: Market value (12) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Austria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burma | $60. 323 | $60, 946 | $3, 162 | $3, 162 |
| Chile | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| France | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 3, 724, 304 | 1, 243, 604 | 1, 234, 457 | 609, 582 |
| Israel | 9, 357, 403 | 4, 122, 937 | 91 | 63 |
| Italy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Korea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Norway | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pakistan | $1, 592, 497 | $1, 605, 393 | $303, 530 | $306, 844 |
| Philippines | 0 | 0 | 51 | 29 |
| Poland | 883, 366 | 647, 342 | 256, 594 | 256, 595 |
| Spain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Taiwan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turkey | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vietnam | 0 | 0 | 2, 013 | 968 |
| Yugoslavia | 300, 713 | 120, 279 | 365, 047 | 151, 626 |
| Total | 15, 918, 606 | [3] 7, 800, 500 | 2, 164, 945 | 1, 328, 869 |

[1] Most contractors participate in more than 1 country. The number of different contractors at June 30, 1962, was 331. Several of the contractors act as jobbers and publishers' representatives for several hundred exporters of informational materials who do not have contracts directly with the Agency.

[2] Of the 3,733 contracts, there were 635 active as of June 30, 1962.

[3] Foreign currencies sold by Treasury after they were received as excess currencies are valued at actual sale rate for this computation, remaining units foreign currency valued at June 30, 1962, rates.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York. I believe that for the Appropriations Committee to direct—using the word "direct"—that a program be phased out is going somewhat beyond the proper scope of its activities.

Senators who are interested in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, which the Senate has been discussing, would feel that if the Appropriations Committee should direct that the activities of that Division be phased out, the committee would be going a little bit wide of the mark.

I agree with my colleague, that this subject does come primarily under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Its advice in the matter would be highly desirable.

I hope an effort will be made to obtain such advice. I do not know whether the request should be initiated by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] or the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], since the Senators are chairmen of the respective committees; but I hope an effort will be made by the Foreign Relations Committee to make its views known to the Appropriations Committee, so as to determine whether or not the opinion of members of the Appropriations Committee will be changed.

The fact is that the United States is spending thousands of dollars to send Peace Corps volunteers overseas to teach people to read and to understand English, yet at the same time there is a great scarcity of interesting current reading materials.

The Soviet Union subsidizes vast quantities of reading matter to be sent all over the world. It is propaganda, designed to woo men's minds. It is a threat to U.S. policies.

What we send in return, even under this program is meager compared to the Soviet effort. To reduce still further, or to eliminate the sending of published materials from the United States would be a very serious step, very much against the national interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it ought to be made clear that while there are publishing houses in places other than New York, it is fair to say, also, that most of the book publishing companies are in New York City.

Mr. KEATING. There is an important one in St. Paul.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the West Publishing Co.

Mr. KEATING. And they got about $150,000 out of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very good.

Mr. KEATING. It is a fine company, and everybody highly respects it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel that the point that has been made about the authorization of this program by the Foreign Relations Committee ought to be given serious consideration. If we are to change an authorization program, it ought to be done by the authorizing committee the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committee certainly has the power to decide the degree of the program, but the authorization has been made by the appropriate committee.

I hope the reduction in the informational media guarantee of some $350,000 will not seriously affect the distribution of educational and truly worthwhile material. This program has served a very useful purpose overseas. It seems to me we would be wise to take a constructive look at it, rather than say, at the appropriation level, "We are going to eliminate it or phase it out." My interpretation of "phase out" is that it does not necessarily mean the end of it next year. Programs are phased out over a period of time. But the chairman and the ranking minority member and other members of the legislative committee will want to take a look at it, because it is a program that has always been considered and reported favorably.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we ought to let it rest this way; namely, that it be directed that the program be phased out. We know the qualifying jurisdictional question involved, but I think it is important to spell it out. No one committee is given the authority to phase out the program. The Senate and the House have something to say about it. I am sure the chairman, who has always been fair, would want to make that clear.

Apart from that feeling, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that one of the important areas in which we are greatly deficient is the informational area.

There are three ways to win the cold war—militarily, economically, or informationally.

We certainly do not want to have a military test of strength. We want to be well prepared, but we do not want to be put to a test.

We are trying to win in the economic field and we have an enormous aid program involving billions of dollars.

But when we get to information there is something in us which restrains us from acting and doing what we ought to do in the interest of success for the United States. We are spending less money on information now than the Russians used to spend when they jammed American broadcasts. In the hierarchy of broadcasting, with all the genius of America, we come after Communist China in expenditures in that field. There is something wrong in this situation.

When we talk about the informational media guarantee fund, it is easy enough to say that Time and Life are big organizations, and to ask why we should do anything that makes it possible for them to gain. But they will be able to say, "We thank you, gentlemen. You are very kind and distinguished. But we are still a free enterprise, and instead of sending the magazines to Saudi Arabia, or to Yemen, or wherever you think they should go, we will instead sell them in the United States, France, or Britain, where we can get cold cash." They can very well say that. So it is no answer to say that they are big organizations.

Mr. President, who is getting the foreign aid business? Poor organizations? Who is getting the billions of dollars in contracts for hardware? General Motors, General Electric, and other great companies. Who provides telephone service? American Telegraph & Telephone Co., the biggest organization on earth. Is that any reason to cut them out? No; we want them to prosper and to keep busy and do a great job for the country.

I have previously urged that perhaps it would be a better decision to have the legislative committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, take a look at the whole posture of the information program of the United States. With all respect and deference to my colleagues of the Appropriations Committee, it is not right for them to determine what shall be the information program of this country. This is a great foreign relations question. Neither the Navy, Army, Air Force, nor foreign aid, can do more than this program. We are told, for example, that the main problem in the Alliance for Progress is that Latin Americans think we are buying their support, instead of winning their political and ideological support. Yet the very instrument we have to get that done is inadequate to the task we have before us.

So it is with the greatest respect that I urge—and I hope that it will be considered—that the Foreign Relations Committee set a rather high priority upon looking into the whole problem. Naturally, the Appropriations Committee can do only that which the law allows, and it does not deal with authorizations.

If the law needs change—and I believe it does—in order to give amplitude to our program, if the Foreign Relations Committee believes, for example, that the sums provided for the informational media program deserve a better break than they have been getting, I think it is up to that committee to say so.

Even if it is not within the premise of general legislation, there is the authority of legislative oversight to permit that committee to deal with the question of the informational media guarantee fund. To take a specific example, under the authority of legislative oversight, pressure can be brought to have the Foreign Relations Committee give high priority to the problem. I would hazard a guess, with all due respect, that there are few questions which are considered important enough to bring to the floor as a review of the informational media program, especially with the points that have been raised with respect to the program, and the making of some recommendations, either legislative or in terms of policy, to which I am sure the Appropriations Committee and the chairman will give the greatest respect and consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. I think there is here involved a policy question that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It seems to me the way we are viewed abroad is of great importance to the United States, and I know of no country about which more misinformation circulates.

No one can go abroad and not be impressed with the distorted view of America one finds all over the world. I think our motion pictures do little to correct this misimpression, and our Government-sponsored broadcasts abroad are naturally suspect, and are not given the credence we should like them to have.

Therefore, it seems to me that the best and most accurate sources for giving a true picture of America abroad are our periodicals and other magazines, which need to be circulated in areas where popular impressions of the United States count for much, and where they are grievously distorted.

So I believe the proper way to deal with the question is through the committee which is responsible for overseeing the conduct of American foreign policy. I subscribe to the recommendation the Senator from New York has made.

It seems to me that approaching this problem through a statement in the report of the Appropriations Committee is an improper and a backdoor method, to which I cannot subscribe. I hope the proper committee will undertake to review this question and give to it the weight that in my judgment it deserves.

### THE EAST-WEST CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to express my special gratitude and appreciation to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, as well as the members of that subcommittee, for their assistance and understanding in restoring the cuts previously administered to the appropriations of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West.

I also would like to express my sincere thanks to the majority leader and to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and its members for the most expeditious consideration of the restoration request of the East-West Center.

Speaking as a Senator from the State of Hawaii, I have personally watched the Center grow since its inception in 1960. Although some critics may disagree with me, I assure you that our tax dollars have been well spent. Dollar for dollar, the East-West Center, in my opinion, has better served the cause of relations between the people of these United States and the peoples of the Pacific basin and Asian nations than many other institutions and projects.

Through the East-West Center, we have made it possible for the future leaders of the Pacific and Asian areas to get to know each other, to understand their mutual problems, and to try to seek common solutions. The Center has also made it possible for selected future leaders from the United States to become acquainted with their counterparts from the Pacific and Asian countries, an experience which should prove valuable in the future course of this Nation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii made a very good presentation, and the committee was glad to approve the fund for East-West Cultural Center.

Again I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is another area in which we are undertaking to bring proper information abroad, in this case to the students who come to the Center to receive their education. I am perfectly willing to do that. I like to see money spent where I believe it will do some good. However, there has been a great deal of loose operation elsewhere in the State Department. I am not sure that all the information we are paying for sending abroad puts this country in the proper light. Many articles published in various periodicals do a great deal of harm.

I like to see money spent to put the American image over correctly, and not to tear it down. I agree that the Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this field, and should look into the program. I am perfectly willing to have it do so. I hope it will do so.

**Mr. FONG.** Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and particularly the members of the State Department Subcommittee, who evidenced their great interest, faith, and confidence in the East-West Center in Hawaii by restoring almost all of the entire amounts cut by the House of Representatives.

Particular credit is due to the able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and to the distinguished ranking minority member, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. They sat through the hearings on the East-West Center, and they asked searching questions about the various programs conducted by it. As a result, I believe a very convincing record has been compiled to take to conference with the House.

I want at this time to accord to these two leaders on the subcommittee the appreciation properly due them for their strong support of the East-West Center.

Other Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee have likewise been staunch and steadfast friends of this fledgling institution which holds so much promise for improving East-West relations.

The distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana, expressed his firm and enthusiastic support of the East-West Center at the second hearing, which was very helpful to our cause.

Other Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee have expressed to me similar favorable sentiments.

I and all the many friends of the East-West Center are deeply grateful that so many Senators believe that the East-West Center should continue its march toward the full potential envisioned by Congress when the Center was established by Congress in 1960, just 3 short years ago.

I am confident the Senate will endorse the full amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the East-West Center.

### INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTEE PROGRAM

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables issued by the U.S. Information Agency dealing with the informational media guarantee program.

I hope these tables will enable the Foreign Relations Committee to give early attention to this matter and to go into a consideration of all the facts.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

*Informational media guarantee program—list of motion picture contractors and total payments for currency purchased*

| Name of contractor | Address | Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fiscal year 1962 | Inception of program to June 30, 1962 |
| Alco Pictures Corp | Beverly Hills, Calif | | $5,950.00 |
| Allied Artists International Corp | New York, N.Y | | 152,037.73 |
| Alperson, Edward L., Productions, Inc | Hollywood, Calif | | 1,550.00 |
| American Trading Association | New York, N.Y | | 1,500.00 |
| Cavalcade Pictures, Inc | Hollywood, Calif | | 2,535.00 |
| Columbia Pictures Corp | New York, N.Y | | 329,032.74 |
| Columbia Pictures International Corp | do | $116,628.59 | 713,075.10 |
| Crystal Pictures | do | | 7,000.00 |
| Walt Disney Productions | do | 36,879.20 | 526,237.55 |
| Du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co | Wilmington, Del | | 522,547.48 |
| Eagle Lion Films, Inc | New York, N.Y | | 52,485.00 |
| Goldwyn, Samuel, Productions, Inc | do | | 120,920.00 |
| Guaranteed Pictures Co., Inc | do | | 1,200.00 |
| Keystone Pictures, Inc | do | | 13,013.36 |
| Lexington Trading Co., Inc | Los Angeles, Calif | | 9,443.00 |
| Little Fugitive, Inc | New York, N.Y | | 3,022.10 |
| Loew's, Inc | do | | 2,755.55 |
| Loew's International, Inc | do | | 1,323,431.45 |
| Loew's, Inc., and Loew's International Corp | do | | 635,226.99 |
| MJP Enterprises, Inc | do | 4,000.00 | 34,340.00 |
| Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc | do | 219,534.45 | 725,301.12 |
| Motion Picture Export Association of America, Inc | do | | 1,915,860.59 |
| Moulin Productions, Inc | New York, N.Y | | $23,964.76 |
| Paramount International Films, Inc | do | $90,284.93 | 843,921.06 |
| Paramount Pictures Corp | do | | 823,455.00 |
| Republic Pictures International Corp | North Hollywood, Calif | | 211,050.02 |
| RKO Radio Pictures, Inc | New York, N.Y | | 902,513.22 |
| RKO Teleradio Pictures, Inc | do | | 76,420.71 |
| Selznick Co., Inc | Culver City, Calif | 14,974.08 | 45,458.57 |
| Selznick Releasing Organization, Inc | New York, N.Y | | 118,073.04 |
| Small, Edward, Productions, Inc | Hollywood, Calif | | 25,370.00 |
| Sparta Film, Inc | New York, N.Y | | 5,020.00 |
| Sunset Securities Co | Los Angeles, Calif | | 6,100.00 |
| Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp | New York, N.Y | 42,951.98 | 1,015,121.68 |
| Twentieth Century-Fox International Corp | do | | 457,281.50 |
| United Artists Corp | do | 235,257.72 | 858,851.12 |
| Universal International Films, Inc | do | 54,021.20 | 618,492.15 |
| Universal Pictures Corp | do | | 422,347.12 |
| Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc | do | | 390,354.83 |
| Warner Bros. Pictures International Corp | do | 93,885.79 | 922,380.69 |
| Westrex Corp | do | | 176,243.90 |
| Total | | 908,417.94 | 14,740,884.13 |

*Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased (A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962*

| Name of contractor | Address | Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (A) Fiscal year 1962 | (B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962 |
| Academic Press, Inc | New York, N.Y | $16,323.05 | $272,419.40 |
| Acme Code Co., Inc | do | 43,084.07 | 491,634.32 |
| Adco International Co | do | 4,461.50 | 122,219.56 |
| Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc | Reading, Mass | 38,195.30 | 134,385.36 |
| Aero Publishers, Inc | Los Angeles, Calif | 0 | 1,203.35 |
| Affiliated Publishers, Inc | New York, N.Y | 14,234.24 | 1,361,961.83 |
| Alco Pictures Corp | Beverly Hills, Calif | 0 | 5,950.00 |
| Allied Artists International Corp | New York, N.Y | 0 | 152,037.73 |
| Allyn & Bacon, Inc | do | 0 | 44,062.69 |
| Alperson, Edward L., Productions, Inc | Hollywood, Calif | 0 | 1,550.00 |
| American Biblical Encyclopedia Society, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 256,124.41 |
| American Book Co | do | 151,934.60 | 965,350.31 |
| American Book Sellers Agency, Inc | do | 0 | $221.99 |
| American Chemical Society | Washington, D.C | 0 | 70,796.35 |
| American Foreign Credit Underwriters Corp | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,500.00 |
| American & Foreign Trade Corp | do | 0 | 9,993.91 |
| American Institute of Accountants | do | 0 | 784.65 |
| American Jewish Committee | do | 0 | 3,546.78 |
| American Library Association | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 2,607.93 |
| American Map Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 22,473.38 |
| American Mitchell Fashion Publishers, Inc | do | $3,149.67 | 27,404.24 |
| American News Company, Inc | do | 7,080.52 | 332,037.74 |
| American Technical Society | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 445.55 |

*Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased (A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962*—Continued

| Name of contractor | Address | Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (A) Fiscal year 1962 | (B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962 |
| American Trading Association | New York, N.Y | 0 | $1,500.00 |
| Americana Corp | Beverly Hills, Calif | $13,270.67 | 31,474.09 |
| Amsco Music Publishing Co | New York, N.Y | 0 | 106,591.83 |
| Annual Reviews, Inc | Stanford, Calif | 0 | 8,753.53 |
| Architectural Book Publishing Co., Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 171.39 |
| Archway Book Store | Philadelphia, Pa | 0 | 7,472.36 |
| Arco Publishing Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 15,325.58 |
| Army Times Publishing Co | Washington, D.C | 176.43 | 6,212.54 |
| Ashely-Radcliff Corp | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,245.23 |
| Ad. Auriema, Inc | do | 0 | 2,025.71 |
| Avon Book Sales Corp | do | 0 | 84,828.92 |
| Baker & Taylor Co | Hillside, N.J | 0 | 20,099.07 |
| Baker Voorhis & Company, Inc | Mount Kisco, N.Y | 0 | 3,174.09 |
| Ballantine Books, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 14,160.37 |
| Bantam Books, Inc | do | 0 | 324,561.79 |
| Barnes & Noble, Inc | do | 10,046.06 | 81,946.46 |
| Barsa Co | Los Angeles, Calif | 42,508.07 | 419,690.33 |
| Barsa Publications, Inc | do | 0 | 19,393.00 |
| Bender Co., Inc., Matthew | Albany, N.Y | 0 | 6,397.17 |
| Benzinger Bros., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 62,710.15 |
| Berliner J. J., & Staff | do | 177.40 | 10,605.78 |
| Bernett, F. A. and Ilse B | Larchmont, N.Y | 0 | 1,680.61 |
| Bloch Publishing Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 1,558.58 |
| Boarts International, Inc | do | 21,487.47 | 122,586.21 |
| Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc | Indianapolis, Ind | 0 | 236.83 |
| Book Exports, Ltd | New York, N.Y | 311,656.92 | 1,954,812.05 |
| Book Production Industries, Inc | Chicago, Ill | 28,650.00 | 244,184.92 |
| Book Promotions | New York, N.Y | 3,396.84 | 1,022,932.27 |
| Boston Music Co | Boston, Mass | 144.67 | 23,946.10 |
| Boxer, Oswald | New York, N.Y | 25,628.11 | 155,860.26 |
| Bruce Publishing Co | Milwaukee, Wis | 0 | 36,152.71 |
| Buena Vista International, Inc | Burbank, Calif | 134,272.43 | 134,272.43 |
| Capital International, Inc | Derby, Conn | 165.96 | 10,307.60 |
| Castle & Overton, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 71,827.45 |
| Catholic Book Publishing Co | do | 6,087.14 | 48,303.29 |
| Catholic Digest | St. Paul, Minn | 0 | 1,386.53 |
| Cavalcade Pictures, Inc | Hollywood, Calif | 0 | 2,535.00 |
| Cellar Book Shop | Detroit, Mich | 0 | 5,187.28 |
| Central National Corp | New York, N.Y | 0 | 240,312.94 |
| Century Music Publishing Co | do | 0 | 12,733.80 |
| Chelsea Publishing Co | do | 0 | 8,733.08 |
| Collier, P. F., & Sons Corp | do | 0 | 25,940.74 |
| Columbia Pictures Corp | do | 0 | 329,032.74 |
| Columbia Pictures International Corp. | do | 116,628.59 | 713,075.10 |
| Columbia University Press | do | 0 | 6,433.32 |
| Commerce Clearing House, Inc | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 1,740.09 |
| Compton, F. E., & Co | do | 0 | 5,556.89 |
| Consolidated Music Sales, Inc | New York, N.Y | 4,000.00 | 7,357.79 |
| Coronet Films | do | 0 | 5,784.08 |
| Coronet Instructional Films | do | 0 | 9,682.89 |
| Coronet Subscription Agency | do | 0 | 1,787.49 |
| Cosmos Ltd., Inc | Hanover, Pa | 0 | 140.60 |
| Cosmos Ltd., Inc., & Cosmos Ltd. Europe, Inc. | do | 26,633.24 | 91,136.39 |
| Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 228.97 |
| Crowell-Collier Publishing Co | do | 0 | 302,373.04 |
| Crystal Pictures, Inc | do | 0 | 7,000.00 |
| Curtis Circulation Co | Philadelphia, Pa | 108,847.76 | 471,379.48 |
| Curtis Publishing Co | do | 0 | 891,559.10 |
| Dalana Trading Corp | Hanover, Pa | 0 | 10,025.37 |
| Daro Exports, Ltd | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,745.62 |
| Davis Book Wholesale, Inc | do | 0 | 66,766.05 |
| Day Publishing Co., Inc | do | 5,158.50 | 151,696.40 |
| Decca Records, Inc | do | 0 | 9,951.28 |
| Dell Distributing, Inc., and Dell Publishing Co., Inc. | do | 23,197.37 | 92,071.20 |
| Dell Publishing Co., Inc | do | 0 | 185,015,47 |
| Denover-Geppert Co | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 84,167.10 |
| Dental Items of Interest Publishing Co., Inc. | Brooklyn, N.Y | 0 | 451.48 |
| Disney, Walt, Productions | New York, N.Y | 36,879.20 | 526,237.55 |
| Dodge & Seymour, Ltd | do | 4,273.70 | 27,029.77 |
| Doubleday & Co., Inc | do | 2,707.44 | 408,692.34 |
| Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc | do | 0 | 345.78 |
| Dun & Bradstreet Publishing Corp. | do | 0 | 1,902.50<br>K |
| Du Pont, E. I., de Nemours Co | Wilmington, Del | 0 | 522,547.48 |
| Eagle Lion Films, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 52,485.00 |
| East European Fund, Inc | do | 0 | 23,937.33 |
| Eastman Kodak Co., Inc | Rochester, N.Y | 960.22 | 9,374.57 |
| Editors & Engineers, Ltd | Santa Barbara, Calif | 0 | 1,000.00 |
| Eerdmans, William B., Publishing Co. | Grand Rapids, Mich. | 0 | 13,651.98 |
| Elkan-Vogel Co., Inc | Philadelphia, Pa | 0 | 165.02 |
| Encyclopaedia Americana, division of Grolier Society, Inc. | Beverly Hills, Calif | 0 | 24,871.54 |
| Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc | Chicago, Ill | 33,768.79 | 231,683.45 |
| Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 46,442.05 | 114,390.31 |
| Fawcett Publications, Inc | do | 33,474.76 | 285,908.76 |
| Faxon, F. W., Co., Inc | Boston, Mass | 0 | 68,768.81 |
| Feffer & Simons, Inc | New York, N.Y | 433,833.45 | 3,558,417.49 |
| Feldheim, Philip, Inc | do | 0 | 84,788.68 |
| Fidelity Trading Co., Inc | San Francisco, Calif | 0 | 949.86 |
| Fischer, Carl, Inc | New York, N.Y | 775.33 | 16,098.77 |
| Forward Association, Inc | do | 106.80 | 37,645.61 |
| Franklin Square Agency, Inc | Englewood, N.J | $8,511.80 | $8,511.80 |
| Freedman, Harold, Brandt & Brandt Dramatic Department, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,000.00 |
| Gazzo, Michael V | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,000.00 |
| Gilberton Co., Inc | do | 0 | 5,026.84 |
| Gilmary Society, Inc | do | 0 | 9,930.00 |
| Ginn & Co | Boston, Mass | 108,101.81 | 1,150,500.35 |
| Goldman, Sam | New York, N.Y | 0 | 99,912.12 |
| Goldman, S. Otzar Hasefarim, Inc. | do | 0 | 2,598.53 |
| Goldwyn, Samuel, Productions, Inc. | do | 0 | 120,920.00 |
| Grolier Society, Inc | Beverly Hills, Calif | 0 | 271,429.64 |
| Grune & Stratton, Inc | New York, N.Y | 844.68 | 72,131.42 |
| Guaranteed Pictures Co., Inc | do | 0 | 1,200.00 |
| Haagens, Gerard E | Bronxville, N.Y | 0 | 44,035.54 |
| Hall, W. S., & Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 123,018.49 | 1,301,028.50 |
| Hansberry, Lorraine | do | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc | do | 0 | 89,206.15 |
| Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc | do | 1,043.64 | 1,043.64 |
| Harper & Bros | do | 36,587.02 | 703,682.84 |
| Harvard University Press | Cambridge, Mass | 0 | 20,818.62 |
| Hearst Corp | New York, N.Y | 17,736.92 | 163,291.32 |
| Heath, D.C., & Co | Boston, Mass | 16,490.22 | 167,254.41 |
| Hebrew Publishing Co | New York, N.Y | 0 | 7,373.74 |
| Heinman, W.S | do | 0 | 2,053.11 |
| Herder, B., Book Co | St. Louis, Mo | 922.70 | 26,665.15 |
| Hillman Periodicals, Inc | New York, N.Y | 237.97 | 37,303.06 |
| Hoeber, Paul B., Inc | do | 0 | 15,648.39 |
| Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc | do | 4,721.99 | 4,721.99 |
| Hope International Co., Inc | do | 0 | 12,922.59 |
| IPMA Publishing Co | Minneapolis, Minn | 0 | 3,031.95 |
| Informational Media Publishing Co. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 19,941.41 |
| Inge, William | do | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Intercultural Publications, Inc | do | 0 | 2,590.20 |
| International Art Publishing Co., Inc. | Detroit, Mich | 0 | 2,499.98 |
| International Book Supplies | New York, N.Y | 0 | 34,558.35 |
| International College of Surgeons | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 187.89 |
| International Correspondence Schools World Limited, Inc. | Scranton, Pa | 0 | 5,069.86 |
| International Music Co | New York, N.Y | 0 | 17,605.59 |
| International Schools Company of Latin America. | Scranton, Pa | 0 | 6,567.95 |
| International University Press, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 398.90 |
| Interscience Publishers, Inc | do | 0 | 546,242.51 |
| Jewish Labor Committee | do | 0 | 10,991.63 |
| Jewish Theological Seminary of America. | do | 0 | 5,150.00 |
| Johnson, Walter J. Inc | do | 3,842.90 | 105,807.67 |
| Journal-News Corp | do | 0 | 3,760.00 |
| Kalmus E. F., Orchestra Scores, Inc. | do | 0 | 12,510.02 |
| Katz, Menyhert | do | 0 | 63,323.71 |
| Kenedy, P. J. & Sons | do | 2,001.80 | 14,693.19 |
| Keystone Pictures, Inc | do | 0 | 13,013.36 |
| Kleiman, Saul | Kansas City, Mo | 0 | 454.41 |
| Knopf, Alfred A., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 6,809.36 |
| Kramer, Sidney, Books, Inc | Washington, D.C | 0 | 12,203.57 |
| La Hacienda Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 1,102.48 |
| Laidlaw Bros., Inc | River Forest, Ill | 3,000.00 | 73,466.97 |
| Lake, Harry B | San Francisco, Calif. | 0 | 10,738.74 |
| Lana Lobell, Inc | Hanover, Pa | 0 | 364,797.59 |
| Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd. Asia, Inc. | do | 1,981.85 | 80,185.35 |
| Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd., Inc. | do | 0 | 1,715.53 |
| Lana Lobell, Inc. and Cosmos Ltd. Canada, Inc. | do | 0 | 6,731.95 |
| Lange Medical Publications | Los Altos, Calif | 945.00 | 8,744.91 |
| Latcorp, Ltd | New York, N.Y | 8,547.69 | 70,760.57 |
| Lawson & Co., Inc | do | 40,664.14 | 112,223.01 |
| Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co. | Rochester, N.Y | 111,854.04 | 1,567,783.82 |
| Lea & Febiger | Philadelphia, Pa | 20,484.55 | 220,888.73 |
| Lexington Trading Co., Inc | Los Angeles, Calif | 0 | 9,443.00 |
| Lippincott, J.B., Co | Philadelphia, Pa | 20,683.68 | 239,746.27 |
| Little Fugitive, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 3,022.10 |
| Loew's International Corp | do | 0 | 1,323,431.45 |
| Loew's Inc | do | 0 | 2,755.55 |
| Loew's Inc., and Loew's International Corp | do | 0 | 635,226.99 |
| Long's College Book Co | Columbus, Ohip | 2,037.04 | 24,462.88 |
| Loyola University Press | Chicago, Ill | 10,747.70 | 110,608.83 |
| McCormic-Mathers Publishing Co | Wichita, Kans | 3,100.00 | 26,923.66 |
| McGraw-Hill Book Co, Inc | New York, N.Y | 364,295.73 | 3,221,056.97 |
| McGraw-Hill Publishing Co, Inc | do | 26,956.92 | 962,375.74 |
| MJP Enterprises, Inc | do | 4,000.00 | 34,340.00 |
| Macfadden Publications International Corp | do | 0 | 2,024.76 |
| Macmillan Co, The | do | 130,293.51 | 1,527,588.08 |
| Maco Magazine Corp | do | 0 | 4,800.00 |
| Madden, Richard J. Play Co, Inc | do | 2,000.00 | 6,000.00 |

*Information Center Service, Informational media guarantee program—list of contractors and total payments for currency purchased (A) fiscal year 1962 and (B) cumulative total from inception of program to June 30, 1962*—Continued

| Name of contractor | Address | Dollar payments for foreign currency purchased | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (A) Fiscal year 1962 | (B) Inception of program to June 30, 1962 |
| Mapleton House | Brooklyn N.Y | $685.71 | $6,678.81 |
| Marks, Edward B., Music Corp. | New York N.Y | 498.13 | 13,511.33 |
| Matson, Harold, Co | do | 0 | 4,522.76 |
| Mentzer, Bush & Co | Chicago, Ill | 13,922.32 | 33,720.96 |
| Mercury Publications, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 964.03 |
| Merkos L'invonei Chinuch, Inc | Brooklyn, N.Y | 0 | 260,000.00 |
| Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc | New York, N.Y | 219,534.45 | 725,301.12 |
| Miller, Arthur | do | 0 | 7,500.00 |
| Monde Publishers, Inc | do | 0 | 157,150.00 |
| Monsky, Jacob | do | 0 | 4,926.32 |
| Moody Bible Institute | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 14,198.07 |
| Moore-Cottrell Subscription Agencies, Inc. | North Cohocton, N.Y. | 13,948.07 | 911,936.51 |
| Morehouse Association, Inc | Bronxville, N.Y | 0 | 1,000.00 |
| Mosby, C. V., Co | St. Louis, Mo | 44,420.04 | 266,453.25 |
| Motion Picture Export Association of America, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 1,915,860.59 |
| Moulin Productions, Inc | do | 0 | 23,964.76 |
| Muller, Maclean & Co, Inc | do | 7,226.04 | 75,001.27 |
| Museum Books, Inc | do | 0 | 54,866.72 |
| Museum Publications, Inc | do | 2,874.26 | 1,158,621.50 |
| Music Sales Corp | do | 6,687.36 | 6,687.36 |
| Nassau Distributing Co | do | 0 | 52,459.33 |
| National Bellas Hess Caribbean Corp. | North Kansas City, Mo. | 0 | 2,426.24 |
| National Bellas Hess World Wide Corp. | do | 0 | 7,191.97 |
| National Broadcasting Co | New York, NY | 1,560.00 | 1,560.00 |
| National Telefilm Associates, Inc. | Beverly Hills, Calif. | 0 | 3,055.00 |
| New American Library of World Literature, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 7,918.96 | 538,948.70 |
| Newman Press | Westminster, Md | 0 | 1,503.81 |
| Newsweek, Inc | New York, N.Y | 26,545.51 | 182,700.63 |
| New World Club, Inc | do | 153.68 | 15,907.81 |
| New York Graphic Society | Greenwich, Conn | 0 | 867.11 |
| New York Herald Tribune, Inc | New York, N.Y | 16,038.32 | 332,690.85 |
| New York Times Co | do | 13,353.58 | 81,037.18 |
| Nystrom, A. J., & Co | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 33,798.52 |
| Ottenheimer, I. & M | Baltimore, Md | 0 | 287.78 |
| Overseas News Agency, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 3,590.00 |
| Pacific Book & Supply Corp., New York. | New York 3, N.Y | 223,809.19 | 1,097,741.07 |
| Pacific Book & Supply Corp., Virginia. | do | 0 | 410,440.66 |
| Paramount International Films, Inc. | do | 90,284.93 | 843,921.06 |
| Paramount Pictures Corp | do | 0 | 523,455.00 |
| Pietro Deiro Accordion Headquarters. | do | 0 | 2,617.70 |
| Pines Publications, Inc | do | 0 | 97,569.47 |
| Pocket Books, Inc | do | 212,258.42 | 926,785.44 |
| Popular Library, Inc | do | 11,439.74 | 12,375.51 |
| Popular Mechanics Co | do | 0 | 74,987.14 |
| Popular Mechanics Press | do | 0 | 5,000.00 |
| Praeger, Inc., Frederick A | do | 0 | 146,116.21 |
| Prentice-Hall, Inc | Englewood Cliffs, N.J. | 0 | 362,355.39 |
| Prentice-Hall International, Inc | do | 222,701.76 | 597,560.71 |
| Princeton University Press | Princeton, N.J | 74,154.47 | 747,435.23 |
| Prior, W. F., Co., Inc | Hagerstown, Md | 834.96 | 36,358.50 |
| Publications Development Corp. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 2,903.83 |
| Purchasing Service, Inc | do | 0 | 25,174.69 |
| Querido, Inc | do | 40,044.72 | 40,044.72 |
| Quigley Publishing Co., Inc | do | 0 | 2,499.93 |
| RKO Radio Pictures, Inc | do | 0 | 902,513.22 |
| RKO Teleradio Pictures, Inc | do | 0 | 76,420.71 |
| Rafidane, Corp | do | 4,789.78 | 4,789.78 |
| Rand McNally & Co | Chicago, Ill | 1,633.63 | 164,600.56 |
| Readers' Digest Association, Inc. | Pleasantville, N.Y | 27,088.34 | 2,312,111.84 |
| Record Hunter | New York, N.Y | 0 | 297.64 |
| Reinhold Publishing Corp | do | 0 | 6,145.84 |
| Replogle Globes, Inc | Chicago, Ill | 0 | 14,702.13 |
| Republic Pictures International Corp. | North Hollywood, Calif. | 0 | 211,050.02 |
| Research Institute of Religious Jewry. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 3,409.55 |
| Roberts, Alex S., Associates, Inc. | do | 5,823.54 | 11,063.80 |
| Roberts, Flora, Inc | do | 1,000.00 | 1,000.00 |
| Russak, Ben | do | 1,913.36 | 2,903.36 |
| Sadlier, William H., Inc | do | 5,613.68 | 28,396.77 |
| Salisbury, Leah, Inc | do | 0 | 1,500.00 |
| Sanborn, Benjamin H. & Co | Chicago, Ill | 0 | $3,893.02 |
| Sann's Publishing Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 149,049.20 |
| Saunders, W. B., Co | Philadelphia, Pa | $60,701.67 | 423,057.94 |
| Schirmer, G., Inc | New York, N.Y | 10,640.49 | 202,257.39 |
| Schultz, Albert, Inc | do | 31,777.72 | 303,663.03 |
| Screen Gems, Inc | do | 1,950.00 | 9,355.00 |
| Select Magazines, Inc | do | 8,188.80 | 37,547.91 |
| Selznick Co., Inc | Culver City, Calif | 14,974.08 | 45,458.57 |
| Selznick Releasing Organization, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 0 | 118,073.04 |
| Seymour Mittlemark Organization, Inc. | do | 0 | 4,011.62 |
| Shulsinger Bros. Linotype & Publishing Co. | do | 0 | 40,709.15 |
| Silver Burdett Co | Morristown, N.J | 3,736.04 | 357,243.70 |
| Simon & Schuster, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 966.00 |
| Singer, L. W., Co | Syracuse, N.Y | 17,260.27 | 96,593.10 |
| Sklarsky, Morris S | New York, N.Y | 0 | 30,938.66 |
| Small, Edward, Productions, Inc. | Hollywood, Calif | 0 | 25,370.00 |
| Snyder, Henry M., & Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 3,409,805.86 |
| South-Western Publishing Co., Inc. | Cincinnati, Ohio | 38,581.42 | 371,297.24 |
| Sparta Flim, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 5,020.00 |
| Stechert-Hafner, Inc | do | 0 | 3,159.12 |
| Sunset Security Co | Los Angeles, Calif | 0 | 6,100.00 |
| Tams-Witmark Music Library, Inc. | New York, N.Y | 4,000.00 | 17,400.00 |
| Thomas Law Book Co | St. Louis, Mo | 0 | 12,036.14 |
| Time, Inc | New York, N.Y | 100,916.15 | 2,296,155.26 |
| Tomkins, J. E., & Son, Inc | do | 9,259.03 | 41,538.77 |
| Turner Subscription Agency, Inc. | do | 145,625.89 | 687,602.69 |
| Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. | do | 42,951.98 | 1,015,121.68 |
| Twentieth Century-Fox International Corp. | do | 0 | 457,281.50 |
| Ungar, Frederick, Publishing Co. | do | 436.00 | 15,053.11 |
| United Artists Associated, Inc | do | 4,858.75 | 4,858.75 |
| United Artists Corp | do | 235,257.72 | 858,851.12 |
| United World Films, Inc | do | 0 | 7,137.61 |
| Universal International Films, Inc. | do | 54,021.20 | 618,492.15 |
| Universal Pictures Co., Inc | do | 0 | 422,347.12 |
| Universal Publishers Representatives, Inc. | do | 8,014.65 | 21,949.74 |
| Van Nostrand, D., Co., Inc | Princeton, N.J | 1,831.91 | 33,941.87 |
| Van Riemsdyck Book Service, Inc. | Kew Gardens, N.Y. | 27,129.69 | 466,752.33 |
| Viking Press | New York, N.Y | 0 | 1,364.65 |
| Vox Productions, Inc | do | 0 | 10,000.00 |
| Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc | do | 0 | 390,354.83 |
| Warner Bros. Pictures International Corp. | do | 93,885.79 | 922,380.69 |
| Weber Costello Co | Chicago Heights, Ill. | 491.05 | 5,251.47 |
| Webster Publishing Co | St Louis, Mo | 0 | 392.38 |
| Weekly Publications, Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 82,054.78 |
| Westminster Recording Co., Inc. | do | 0 | 4,950.00 |
| Weston Woods Studios, Inc | Westport, Conn | 0 | 1,028.33 |
| Westrex Corp | New York, N.Y | 0 | 176,243.90 |
| Wiley, John, & Sons, Inc | do | 226,839.59 | 1,594,159.28 |
| Williams, Annie Laurie, Inc | do | 3,000.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Williams, Tennessee | do | 1,500.00 | 3,000.00 |
| Williams & Wilkins Co | Baltimore, Md | 20,790.44 | 124,021.32 |
| Winston, John C., Co., Inc | Philadelphia, Pa | 4,312.23 | 58,022.27 |
| Wolf Sales | New York, N.Y | 0 | 5,000.00 |
| World Book Co | Tarrytown, N.Y | 0 | 6,275.76 |
| World Tennis, Inc | New York, N.Y | 500.00 | 1,000.00 |
| World Wide Distributors, Inc | do | 0 | 21,237.13 |
| Yale University Press | New Haven, Conn | 0 | 7,256.84 |
| Year Book Medical Publishers, Inc. | Chicago, Ill | 4,601.10 | 14,943.80 |
| Year Book Publishers, Inc | do | 0 | 146,117.97 |
| Yorke Publishing Co., Inc | New York, N.Y | 0 | 946.67 |
| Total | | 5,310,262.72 | 67,776,848.51 |
| Less value of foreign currency returned to contractors. | | 324.91 | |
| Total payments (net) | | 5,309,937.81 | |

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the reduction in the Informational Media Guarantee Fund of some $350,000 will not adversely affect the distribution of educational and truly worthwhile materials. American interests can best be served abroad by wide dissemination of the products of American minds.

Education has been the strength of our country; let us hope that unwise frugality will not deprive our friends and allies of access to the valuable information which is pouring out of our colleges and universities.

Due to the exertions of our educators, our country bathes in the glow of an intellectual renaissance. I hope that we shall not, in our zeal to curtail mass media considered to be not in our national interest, miss the opportunity to light a few candles in countries less fortunate than ourselves.

**Mr. DODD.** Mr. President, it is with regret that I note a deep cut in the funds for the informational media guarantee program.

The original budget request was for $3,960,000 and the appropriations bill we are considering today contains a Senate committee recommendation of only $650,000.

This is an even lower figure than that of the House, which made a large slash down to $1 million.

But even more a cause of concern to me and to the other supporters of the informational media guarantee program is the Senate Appropriations Committee statement in its report that "the committee has previously expressed its disapproval of this program and directs that it be phased out."

This is one of the least costly programs conducted abroad by the United States. Actually, all we do is provide a guarantee to American exporters of books, magazines, newspapers and motion pictures that the payments they receive in local currency can be converted into American dollars at the official rate.

Because it is important that American books, magazines and other informational material be available to people in other countries, especially in the newer ones where currencies are not freely convertible, we should as a matter of national policy remove some of the financial risk that the exporters of this material run when they sell their product overseas.

It is in our national interest to sell through private channels textbooks and good magazines and the demand for them is substantial in many of the newly developing countries.

But as long as I have been in the Senate, we have encountered great difficulty in obtaining even enough funds to keep this program going at a modest level.

We have managed to keep it going, however, and I am convinced that the distribution of books, magazines, and newspapers made possible by this guarantee has been beneficial to the United States.

Let us just look briefly at what the Communists are doing in this area. The Russian and the Chinese Communists make available to countries throughout the world a tremendous amount of books, magazines, and other periodicals, either at a very nominal cost or at no cost.

We seek no such ambitious program. All we are trying to do under the informational media guarantee program is encourage exporters to sell American educational products overseas.

This is not the whole answer to meeting the Communist cultural offensive, but it is a worthwhile part of our efforts to bring to the attention of other people an aspect of American life that is one of the strongpoints of our society.

Mr. President, I do not think we should permit the IMG program to be terminated by a terse statement in a committee report that "it be phased out."

We deserve more explanation than this. Personally, I do not believe that IMG should be ended, but if it is to be phased out we should have a good reason and an adequate justification for taking such a serious step.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show my opposition to one particular appropriation contained in H.R. 7063. I am referring to the appropriation for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

When the House of Representatives considered this appropriation bill, they included an appropriation of $1,669,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. At the time the House considered the appropriation bill, this amount was the total remaining amount authorized to be appropriated. Since that time, Congress passed S. 777 which authorized an additional appropriation of $20 million for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. H.R. 7063, as it is before the Senate, has raised the appropriation, therefore, to $7,500,000.

Mr. President, I opposed the establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961, and I also opposed S. 777 which authorized additional appropriations to that Agency when it was considered by the Senate on June 13, 1963.

Most of the funds of this Agency are apparently spent on studies of various aspects of disarmament. Out of the $15 million which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency requested for fiscal 1964, the Agency proposed to spend $11 million on research studies.

I have examined a number of the studies already completed for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For instance, the Institute of Defense Analysis in Washington, D.C., produced a study under contract from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency entitled "A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations." This study was completed on March 10, 1962. The description of the paper is as follows:

> This paper is an attempt to sketch out the possible contours of a world effectively controlled by the United Nations, followed by a discussion of the difficulties attending an enterprise of this nature. The question of feasibility seems so overwhelming in today's world, and the common answer on the part of politically sophisticated people so invariably negative, that it may be wondered why the exercise is undertaken at all. It has three justifications. On policy grounds, it would be well to spell out with greater precision that to which this country has committed itself. On heuristic grounds, it may be worthwhile to apply analytical methods to a problem commonly approached on the basis of hunch alone. Finally there is always the possibility that sophisticated people will turn out to have been wrong.

The latest major series of studies to be completed which I have read were written by Mr. Vincent Rock on the subject of "Common Action for the Control of Conflict." I would certainly recommend the reading of all parts of this study to all those interested in finding areas in which to practice economy with governmental funds. It is charitable to characterize these contracts as impracticable and theoretical nonsense. If most of them are considered seriously by policymakers then they have much more dire consequences and it is even a greater reason to withhold appropriations for such purposes.

The appropriation of $7½ million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is grossly excessive.

Disarmament is an ancient and elusive goal that has been sought by civilized societies since groups of people first equipped themselves for combat. The prophet Isaiah recognized the wisdom of disarmament but relegated the time of fulfillment when "they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks" to the "last days."

Throughout history efforts to achieve disarmament have been more notable for their loftiness of purpose than for their effectiveness. Such steps toward disarmament as have come about through international agreements have been unilateral in application, usually against a prostrate and defeated nation at the end of a war. Even these forced disarmaments have been temporary in nature, and enforced more by economic conditions within the defeated country than by the dictates of victor nations.

In post-World War II years, disarmament has been promoted as never before as an ultimate solution of the world's political problems and disagreements. Some seem to think that actual disarmament is just beyond our grasp, with agreement among nations prevented merely by differences over concepts and techniques of inspections to assure compliance. This same school of thought anticipates solution of the inspection barrier through the continued development and perfection of such scientific achievements as the observation satellite and seismographic instruments of increased sensitivity.

As pleasing as are the temptations to join in the utopian dreams of a world unarmed lying just over the horizon, both the lessons of history and the cruel practicalities of the current political status of international relations reveal with stimulating clarity the opiate unrealism of such dreams.

Just as the development of defensive weapons never quite catches up with the development of offensive weapons, the development of observation and detection devices will never match the devices of subterfuge used to conceal the development, tests and buildup of new and advanced weapons. The design of observation and detection devices is necessarily dictated by the nature of the object or activity to be detected or observed, just as the defensive weapon's design is dependent on that of the offensive weapon.

The failure to achieve enforceable agreements for disarmament stems, however, not from the inadequacies of scientific devices with which to assure that such agreements are being adhered to, but rather from a failure in basic approach to the problem. The approach to disarmament which has been exclusively adopted in international negotiations, both in the past and in the current crisis, has been premised upon the mistaken assumption that the emphasis on armaments by the various nations of the world is a cause, rather than an effect, of the political differences which exist among those nations.

Prospects for disarmament are no better and no worse than—but indeed are identical to—the prospects for peaceful resolution of the controversies among nations. So long as any nation or group of nations harbor ambitions of aggrandizement at the expense of other nations, hope is futile for the development of the international good will which is a prerequisite for cessation of the arms race.

Unfortunately, national and bloc aggrandizement still exist as the foundation of the political system which holds sway in countries behind the Iron Curtain. Peaceful expressions of intent by the leaders of these countries are belied by their actions as well as by the words of their counterparts in other nations of their bloc.

Although the scientific instruments devised by freemen may be inadequate to detect the breach of disarmament agreements which might be reached, the minds of freemen can always detect the inconsistencies of peaceful words with the subjugation and enslavement of millions of people and the patently aggressive aims underlying the incitement of others to rebellion and revolution. No disarmament and no resolution of the conflicting aspirations of the several nations which constitute the cause of the arms race, is probable or possible so long as deception and aggression are the goals of one or more governments; for freemen will not willingly jeopardize, even for the preservation of life itself, their even more precious possession—individual liberty.

Preoccupation of our policy with arms control and disarmament is sapping the will and ability of our Nation to maintain its security. Disarmament is an idealistic road to tragedy, whether through pursuit of a formal plan for general and complete disarmament, or through unintentional unilateral disarmament as a result of policies based on an assumption that the ballistic missile is an ultimate weapon.

It is far better, therefore, that the funds of the United States be appropriated for positive programs to insure the security of the United States and the free world from the menace of aggression by Communist nations and other totalitarian nations than on the impractical and theoretical consideration of utopian concepts such as disarmament in a hostile world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 7063) was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Fulbright, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Mundt conferees on the part of the Senate.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the conference report on the foreign aid bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that the conference report on the foreign aid bill represents a fair and reasonable compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. Some of these differences were very great. It required five long and arduous meetings of the conference committee to resolve them.

So far as the amounts authorized are concerned, the final figure represents almost an exact 50–50 split. The House had authorized $3.5 billion and the Senate $3.7 billion. The conferees have agreed on $3.6 billion.

In many respects, the differences in substantive provisions were more important, and more difficult to resolve, than the question of the amounts to be authorized.

The bill is extraordinarily long and involved, and I do not want to take the time of the Senate to go over the conference report in detail item by item. I will, of course, be glad to answer any questions Senators may have about specific points.

Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is at present engaged in a hearing on the cultural center bill, I shall be glad to answer such questions as Senators may have concerning specific points. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a list of the major provisions of the Senate bill retained in the conference report.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Major Provisions of Senate Bill Retained in Conference Report

Research into population growth.

Aid to Latin American cooperatives.

Restrictions on military assistance to Latin America.

Restrictions on military assistance to Africa.

Sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.

Expropriation of U.S. property or nullification of contracts with U.S. citizens and valuation of claims by Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

No assistance to economically developed nations.

Use of private enterprise in providing technical assistance.

Most-favored-nation treatment for Poland and Yugoslavia.

Inclusion of fish in Public Law 480.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

## REQUIREMENT OF NOTICE FOR CLOSING OF DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. Javits] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require that, before the Secretary of Defense closes an installation or major facility or activity in an area of substantial unemployment, which would involve the loss of more than 100 civilian jobs, he be required to notify the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration. The ARA shall then be required to furnish within 60 days a report on the impact of such a closing, both immediate and over the long run, and on the estimated cost to the Federal Government to recreate the same number of jobs through other programs.

Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation should be clear. It is the express object and policy of the Federal Government to make particular efforts in areas of high unemployment to recreate jobs and business. This is based on the long-term recognition that depressed areas and areas of high unemployment are contrary to the national interest and result in long-term losses for the Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, incredible as it may seem, the Defense Department is actually prepared to close down two installations in New York State and a number of others elsewhere that are in Federal aid under the Area Redevelopment program or the public works program.

When this question was raised yesterday at a meeting with Defense Department officials, when it was pointed out that the loss of one facility in a seriously distressed area of New York State would mean the elimination of 7,500 jobs, that is, one-tenth of the total national cutback proposed, the reply of these high Defense Department officials was, "I know it is a depressed area, but that is not my responsibility."

Well, Mr. President, it may not be the responsibility of the Department of Defense, but it certainly is the responsibility of the President, of the Congress, and of the U.S. taxpayers. The Congress has just been asked to appropriate nearly $1 billion for accelerated public works projects. It costs on an average $4,230 to recreate a single job under this program. To recreate all of the jobs that the Defense Department wants to take away from central New York from areas that qualify for this type of assistance, would amount to $38 million. I cannot believe that any savings that the Defense Department might claim as the result of closing these installations would compare in cost with the expense of recreating these jobs. The taxpayers are not saving money in the long run if the Defense Department budget is cut by a few million dollars, but the area redevelopment program then has to be increased by several hundred million dollars.

Mr. President, this bill would insure that the Congress have adequate information on all aspects of proposed Defense Department cutbacks, so that the

Congress and the President can make an intelligent judgment as to the overall impact on the economy and on the budget of what the Defense Department so shortsightedly described as economies.

Yesterday afternoon, the New York congressional delegation had a bombshell dropped in their laps when they were told by a high-ranking official of the Department of Defense that the Department intended to close two major installations in New York State, one in Rome and one in Schenectady, both of which are areas of substantial unemployment, as well as five other smaller defense activities. This would result in a total loss of 11,000 jobs from a nationwide total of 75,000. Thus, New York is being asked to bear about one-seventh of the load.

Under the bill which my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I now introduce, the Area Redevelopment Administration, after it had been advised by the Secretary of Defense of the intention to close an installation in an area of substantial unemployment, would be required, within 60 days, to furnish a report of the impact of such a closing, both immediately and over the long run, and of the estimated cost to the Federal Government to recreate the same number of jobs through other programs.

The proposal of the Department of Defense was placed before us as an economy move. It is incredible that anyone could believe it is an economy move. The Area Redevelopment Administration has estimated that it costs $4,230 to recreate a job in an area which comes within its jurisdiction.

Taking Schenectady alone, which has the smaller of the 2 larger installations to be closed, the proposal of the Department of Defense would involve a loss of 1,700 jobs. When I speak of the loss of jobs, that expression must be understood. That is why I say this proposal is false economy. The job would still be provided in some other area. What it would mean would be that the 1,700 people in the area of Schenectady or the 7,500 people in the area of Rome would be thrown out of jobs there but some would be told that they could move to Georgia or Texas, or some other State, if they wanted jobs. It is likely that a few persons would move; but most of them have ties in the present locations and would not be willing or able to move. The unemployment situation would be greatly aggravated in the areas involved.

The purpose of the bill which my colleague and I are introducing should be clear.

It is the expressed object and policy of the Federal Government to make particular efforts to recreate jobs in areas of high unemployment. Congress appropriates large sums of money for that purpose. The program is based on the recognition that depressed areas and areas of high employment are contrary to the national interest and result in long-term losses for the Nation.

Incredible as it may seem, the Department of Defense is actually proposing to close two major installations in New York State. It plans to close installations in other States, too; but as to New York, this procedure has become standard operating procedure. In this instance, New York would take the brunt of the cut. The Department of Defense is preparing to close installations in areas which currently qualify for direct Federal aid under the area redevelopment program or the public works program.

In the Schenectady area, as to which I have the figures, in order to save $1,500,000, it would cost $7,191,000 to recreate the same number of jobs. If that is economy, I think it will be necessary to rewrite the definition in the dictionary. If there is a desire to create another Appalachia in the Nation, this is one of the best ways I know of to go about doing so.

When this question was raised yesterday at the meeting with the officials of the Department of Defense, it was pointed out that the loss of one facility in a seriously distressed area of New York State—the Rome area—would mean the elimination of 7,500 jobs in that area. Again, I stress that the jobs will be continued, but somewhere else. That is why I say there is no economy in the proposed move. It would mean the elimination of those 7,500 jobs.

But the reply of the Defense Department officials was, in effect, "We know it is a depressed area, but that is not our responsibility." Only a rather hard-boiled official could make that kind of reply. It may be technically accurate to say that it is not the responsibility of the Department of Defense, but it certainly is the responsibility of Congress, of the President, and of the taxpayers. Congress has just been asked to appropriate almost $1 billion for accelerated public works projects.

As I have said, the average cost of recreating one job under this program, according to the figures of the agency itself, is $4,230. To recreate the jobs that the Department of Defense wants to take away from central New York would amount, as I calculate it, to around $38 million, which is many times greater than the amount of any savings it is claimed would result from the closing of these installations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. First, I feel privileged to join with my colleague in introducing the bill and to join with him in the description of what was dropped in the laps of the New York congressional delegation yesterday as a bombshell. With the Senator's permission, I should like to clarify one point.

The Department of Defense has a duty to undertake economy. To pinpoint what we are arguing, it is not that the Department of Defense does not have a duty to close installations which no longer have any usefulness for defense; what we are arguing is that it cannot close them in the light of all the other consequences which will flow from such action. That is exactly what is happening.

Mr. KEATING. Not when they propose to move the installations to other places and conduct the same activities.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. We are not saying that it is necessary to keep every installation open. We are saying that the right hand must know what the left hand is doing.

We were told yesterday that this was not the Department's responsibility. It is a direct confrontation. The Department said it did not have to be concerned about anything that happened as a result; that, whatever might be the departmental purposes, if it were felt desirable to move the Material Command from the Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome to another place in the United States, the Department would do it; and if other departments or places or appropriations had to bear the burden, or if the community went to pot, that was just too bad; it was the responsibility of somebody else. The Department is not a member of the wedding in that regard; it is autonomous unto itself.

I thoroughly agree with my colleague that there must be congressional determination on this score. The action of a department cannot be the rule. Our Government never intended that it should be. The program is extremely wasteful in terms of absolute dollars, as the Senator has so eloquently pointed out, in that what would be saved would not remotely resemble what is claimed would be saved, because it would be necessary to pay far more for other programs, which are that much more expensive, than if the facility, which is obviously needed at the point where it is were to be continued.

I am grateful to the Senator for allowing me to make this intercession, because we are always charged with being like Senators from other States which lose defense installations: That we want to keep them all alive. That is not what we are arguing. We are arguing for the right to have the Department of Defense apprised of what every other department of Government is doing.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague. He is entirely correct.

Of course, those of us who complain about this action will be charged with parochialism. But the parochialism is manifested by a Government department or administrator who considers only one of the factors involved in the cost—not by those who are attempting to consider the overall picture.

Of course, the Senators from New York are interested in their own State—as all Senators are. However, this issue goes far beyond that. This is a case—on the figures of the Defense Department, with which I do not agree; and I have tried to point out why the Department is not correct when it says a saving will result—of making a saving of $5, on the one hand, and then asking Congress to provide another part of the Government with $25 in order to care for the situation which has developed as a result of making the $5 saving. That is exactly what the Department is doing when it seeks to have $1 billion appropriated for an accelerated public works program. In the total view, there will be no actual saving. So the taxpayers are being deceived if they are led to believe that a saving will result from the cut of $1 billion in the Defense Department budget, whereas, by reason of making of that cut, several billion dollars will have to be added under the area redevolpment program.

This bill would not, of course, and should not, prevent the elimination of closing of installations; no one wants to have the Federal Government carry on unnecessary activities. But the bill would insure that Congress would have adequate information on all aspects of proposed Defense Department cutbacks, so that Congress and the President could make an intelligent judgment as to the overall impact on the economy and on the budget of what the Defense Department has so shortsightedly described as economies.

Yesterday, the Defense Department told us that as of today it was going to make this recommendation to the President. Certainly it is a courtesy to be told in advance, although it would have been a greater courtesy to have been told more than 24 hours in advance. It is my hope that the President, after considering this matter from the overall point of view, and realizing that Congress is appropriating large sums of money for the area redevelopment program, will not support the recommendations of the Department of Defense.

Perhaps this bill cannot deal with this particular situation; but certainly the bill will deal with a repetition of it, and the bill might help in even this situation, because, of course, many of these closing would be phased out over a period of time.

This is the minimum that Congress should do in connection with the devastating situation in the face of the recommendations made by the Defense Department.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

**Mr. KEATING.** I yield.

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** At about 4:30 last Tuesday, word came to my office that the Secretary of Defense and his assistants wished to meet with me, and said they would have to see me on Wednesday morning at 10 a.m. My staff arranged the meeting, which was held; and at that time I was notified that the Erie Depot, at Port Clinton, Ohio, was to be phased out in 3 years, and 1,740 employees were either to be transferred or to be released during the 3-year phaseout period.

I concur in the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that it would be improper for us to try to have existing facilities that are not needed maintained; but I also agree with him that a Senator or a Representative is thrown into a rather cold situation when he is told of the decision to eliminate a Federal operation without any other preliminary notice.

**Mr. KEATING.** It certainly is. The Senator from Ohio and I can take it; but we are thinking of the people in these communities, who are given this news just before Chistmas. Even though then we are told, "What this will cost under the area redevelopment program is no responsibility of ours."

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** I said to the Secretary of the Army, "What do you expect me to say and do? I have no knowledge as to whether you have applied this treatment in equal measure to all parts of the country. How can I learn whether you are treating other States better or worse than you are treating Ohio?"

I was told about the installation being closed in New York. Part of the Ohio installation is to go to Pennsylvania. So I asked him, "How can I express an opinion that is rooted in fact, when I do not know how you have treated Texas, California, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and other States?"

If I had that information and if I were able to say that Ohio was treated on the same basis as other States, I would have nothing more to say. But yesterday the newspapers reported that the evaluating committee which recommended the closing of the New York installation and the Ohio depot, had recommended phasing out naval installations at Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco, but that recommendation has been set aside. If that one has been set aside, why is the one to eliminate the New York and Ohio installations still in effect?

I wish to express my view—without having studied the bill of the Senator from New York—that it seems to me it will enable us to know whether the Central Government is using an identical measuring stick in determining the rights of the 50 States within the Union.

The Washington Post on December 12, 1963, said:

> Meanwhile Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California reported that a naval survey board had recommended immediate closing of naval shipyards in Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco.
>
> Later, however, informed sources said the decision was not final, and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, reported last night that the Pentagon had informed him the Boston shipyard would remain open.
>
> "NO COMMENT" AT PENTAGON
>
> To all of the reports a Pentagon spokesman replied with a "no comment."

The Wall Street Journal on December 12, 1963, wrote:

> The Navy has told Congressmen that a survey board has recommended immediate closing of shipyards at Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco in an economy move, the Associated Press said. Top Defense officials have long suggested that the military services have more facilities than they need, but the Government has been reluctant to close them because of certain protests from Congressmen and others in the areas involved.

**Mr. KEATING.** I thank the Senator from Ohio for his comments, which are very pertinent.

An effort was made by me to ascertain what was happening in the other States, to determine whether equal treatment was being accorded; but we were told then, "We do not like to talk about the other States."

**Mr. LAUSCHE.** Two newspapers published articles in which it was stated that a recommendation was made to phase out the naval installations. But the recommendation to phase out those naval installations subsequently was changed. As a Senator from the State of Ohio, if I am to pacify the minds of the people who are employed at the Port Clinton installation, I should be able to say to them, "You have been treated no differently than other people in the country, and therefore you have no complaint."

**Mr. KEATING.** I entirely agree with the Senator. We shall await further information with great interest. I hope that there will be sufficient interest in the problem. Clearly and obviously, the proposal was rather hurriedly drawn. I believe it is sound and carefully worded, but I hope there will be enough interest so that there can be early committee action on the proposal to prevent a repetition of such a shortsighted move, or at least a move which considers only one phase of the situation.

In all fairness, the proposal is only a recommendation at this point. It is my hope—and our delegation has already communicated with the President to express its views and to request an opportunity to be heard before any definitive action is taken—that the President will recognize the overall picture in a way which the Defense Department claims it is not required to do and which certainly it has not done by its own admission, in this instance.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2380) to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING obtained the floor.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield briefly to me without losing his right to the floor?

**Mr. GRUENING.** I am glad to yield.

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**Mr. GRUENING.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ANOTHER REASON WHY THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IS IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

**Mr. GRUENING.** Mr. President, the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 is in many respects disappointing; in others it is gratifying.

This conference report follows a pattern for similar conference reports in prior years on foreign aid bills. That pattern, Mr. President, illustrates another reason why the foreign assistance program is in deep trouble—one might even say it is in grave peril for its continued existence.

This year on the floor of the Senate occurred a long overdue attempt by the friends of the foreign aid program to instill into its administration a new sense of direction and control, the lack of which heretofore had opened the program to overly harsh criticism and played directly into the hands of those who would do away with the program completely and who so unrealistically believe that if the United States would but ignore the woes of the world they would somehow vanish into thin air and we could continue, safe behind this dream wall, to go about our petty daily chores.

The attempt to change the AID program was, as it turned out, and as it has always turned out in the past, an attempt to save the AID program from itself.

I deplored the method used in the Senate early last month to rewrite the foreign aid bill on the floor of the Senate, acting as though we were meeting as a Committee of the Whole. I joined with others in an attempt to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations so that that committee could implement its caustic criticisms of the foreign aid program by appropriate amendments.

That attempt failed, and those who wanted to give direction to the foreign aid program and who wanted some little say on how U.S. taxpayers' dollars were to be spent had no recourse but to propose amendments to the bill.

This we proceeded to do with all possible dispatch.

The fact that so many amendments were adopted on the Senate floor was definite proof of widespread dissatisfaction with the manner in which the foreign aid program was being administered, irrespective of the amount of money authorized to be appropriated.

This problem of the amount of money to be authorized to be appropriated has been the source of much misunderstanding. Without in any way minimizing its importance, I would venture to say that discussions of the dollar figures have thrown a smokescreen around more important factors. Basically the question is more fundamental than whether we authorize the appropriation of $4.5 billion or $3.5 billion or $2.5 billion although as I shall demonstrate the last figure would be more than ample. We are and should be as much concerned with the authorization of the appropriation of even $1 for a purpose in which we do not believe and which we feel will not assist in the proper conduct of the foreign policy of the United States as in the authorization of the appropriation of $1 billion for that same purpose.

And yet year in and year out we get enmeshed in a gigantic numbers game—so far enmeshed, as a matter of fact, that this year we found that while our eyes were diverted to the dollar amounts the program itself had been extended to 107 countries around the globe and that U.S. taxpayers' dollars were being shipped on a grand scale to nations which were using these dollars to build political and economic systems at cross-purposes with our own or to acquire armaments with which to harass their peaceful neighbors, which were also receiving U.S. AID dollars or to construct costly and unsound projects, or to bail out governments which decline to put an end to their own financial follies, waste, extravagance, inflation and corruption.

I shall, later in my remarks, discuss the amount reported by the conferees to be authorized for the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964 and shall demonstrate with specific examples that the totals authorized by the bill are far too great and that they will do the AID program more harm than good.

At this point, however, I wish to confine my remarks to certain aspects of the program itself and point out how the dropping or weakening by the conferees of some of the provisions in the bill as it went to conference from the Senate, constitute yet another reason why the foreign aid program is in deep trouble with the people of the United States. If my colleagues doubt this, let them sound out grassroots opinion when they go home for the Christmas recess.

First let us consider the amendment sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and cosponsored by his colleague [Mr. ENGLE] by my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], and by myself.

The Kuchel amendment would have prevented aid to countries in Latin America which have been levying tribute on U.S. fishermen fishing on the high seas.

As was pointed out during the debate on this amendment, it is most disconcerting for U.S. fishermen engaged in their peaceful pursuits 200 miles off the coast of some Latin American nation to be illegally seized and forced to pay tribute to that nation, being hauled off to jail in a vessel given to that very same nation under our military assistance program.

The fishermen of the United States cannot understand why the United States continues, year after year after year, to send millions of U.S. dollars to the very same nations that engage in such piracy.

The actions of these Latin American countries recall the actions of the Barbary pirates off the North African coast a century and a half ago. Unfortunately, the vigorous action of the United States in those days, when we numbered only 18 States and were a far weaker Nation than now, contrasts with the supineness and inaction of our executive departments in the mid-20th century, and as the only alternative, properly inspired Senate action to redress the wrongs visited on American citizens, and to try to serve notice, not only on the offending nations, but on our own State Department that the Senate was sick and tired of watching these examples of piracy and blackmail continue.

We sent no gold for the economic development of the Barbary pirates. Neither did we give them naval vessels and arms so they could continue to prey upon our shipping. Instead we sent the U.S. Marines to the shores of Tripoli to enforce the freedom of the seas and respect for the Stars and Stripes.

This harassment of American fishermen by certain Latin American countries has been going on for some time now. Protests to our Department of State brought the usual reply that negotiations were going on and that the way in which to solve the problem was through continued negotiations.

Unfortunately the evidence was clear that while we sought to negotiate the abuses continued and increasingly revealed Uncle Sam's present preference to use the doormat as his symbol rather than our time-honored emblem.

The Senate decided that nations which harassed American fishermen were not worthy of our economic or military aid.

It was not a decision made on the spur of the moment by a handful of Senators. It was not an amendment slipped into the foreign aid bill at the end of a long day with the Chamber almost empty. It was discussed fully on the day previously by the senior Senator from California. It was adopted by the Senate in midafternoon after further discussion on the day following. Moreover it was decided by a recorded vote. Fifty-seven Senators—more than an absolute majority—voted in favor of the amendment. Only 29 voted against it.

And yet, what happened to the amendment in conference.

It was quietly dropped. The "fishing amendment," one might say, was "spurlos versenkt"—sunk without trace along with the rights of our American fishermen.

But how could it be, Mr. President? There was no similar amendment in the House version of the bill—the House had not even considered such an amendment, so there was no sentiment pro or con recorded in the House on such an amendment. The sentiment expressed in the Senate can be noted in the 57 votes in favor of the amendment.

It might be pertinent at this point to ask: Whom do the conferees on the part of the Senate really represent? I ask that question, Mr. President, with all due respect for the ability, the honesty, and the integrity, of each and every Member appointed to represent this body on the conference committee. I ask it, Mr. President, because in the answer to it will be found one of the reasons why the foreign aid program is in real danger. The pattern is all too familiar. It has been going on for years and years, leaving behind deep frustrations.

Each year the Senate adopts an amendment or two setting forth the purpose and direction of the foreign aid program. Even though the amendment was adopted, as the fishing amendment was, by a clear majority of the Senate—that valuable amendment sponsored by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and cosponsored by his junior colleague [Mr. ENGLE] and supported by the two Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]—nevertheless, the will of that majority was thwarted in conference, and the amendment was dropped.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. GRUENING.** I yield with pleasure to my distinguished colleague the Senator from California.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I thank the able Senator from Alaska for his comments. I agree with him with respect to the regrettable situation whereby the will of the Senate—in which he and I and two-thirds of those Senators present and voting participated—was blithely sheared away in conference.

I have some comments on that subject that I shall want to make later this afternoon; but the Senator from Alaska is correct. I remember that during the debate the distinguished Senator pointed out how, time and time again over the past decade, our fellow Americans were denied the right to use the seas, under the theory of freedom of the seas, because of a ridiculous contention, by three South American countries that their sovereignty extended 200 miles seaward from their shores.

The Senator from Alaska performed a service for the country during that debate. He performs a service now in pointing out the incredible fact that the will of the Senate was shunted aside in the conference report. I regret it keenly.

I speak as an American citizen who believes in the theory of mutual security, the helping of "free friendly nations," which is the language of that section. But the Senator has pointed out in his statement instance after instance in which aid was given to certain not very friendly nations. In one instance, in which the able Senator participated successfully, the Senate indicated that it does not want military aid funneled into a country which thereafter uses that aid as an offset for its own funds which can then be channeled into potentially aggressive acts.

**Mr. GRUENING.** I thank the Senator from California. We must emphasize that we prefer the method of negotiation, the peaceful method of give and take; but, as was clearly brought out by the Under Secretary of the Interior, negotiations with certain countries had proceeded at length, with no effect. They continue their abuses. They continue to seize our fishermen on the high seas with—strange irony—naval vessels which we had furnished to them as part of our foreign aid. If anything could be more amazing and ironical than that fact, I do not know what it could be. The Secretary was not a party to that aid, but he said negotiations were getting nowhere. I do not know what he hinted at when he said it, but he said more drastic action should be carried out. If the State Department had carried it out—and it should have taken action long since—it would have said to those countries, "We cannot continue to help you when you are violating international law, when you continue to permit acts of piracy," and that they would receive no aid if they continued to impose arbitrary and ruthless injustices.

So the Senate was impelled to act. Now the conferees have removed that provision in conference. I shall be interested to see what the results will be, because if the State Department does not take action within the next few months, I propose to speak on it at such length that it will become a public scandal, and public opinion will compel the State Department to act.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** The Senator is eminently correct in his statement. He knows, without my saying so, that I shall be with him in the pursuit of that objective. In the comments which I shall make, which will be synthesized with the very able statement that the Senator from Alaska is now making, I point out, by way of reiteration, that it is an American tragedy that the American Government does not protect American citizens when they seek to use the freedom of the seas, in order to earn their very livelihood, 200 miles seaward from the coastlines of some nations which have made a mockery of the theory of the freedom of the seas.

The Senator will recall instance after instance in which, many, many miles from the shoreline of a certain country, American citizens were arrested, and their boats were confiscated, on the theory that they were within the sovereign area of the country abutting the sea at that point.

The Senator is correct in the statement he has made.

**Mr. GRUENING.** I appreciate what the Senator has said. When the amendment was originally introduced, I took occasion to contrast the failure of our Nation to act at this time with our action taken a century and a half ago, when we were a small nation of 18 States. Yet, when the Barbary pirates attacked our shipping, we did not send them foreign aid in the way of ships or arms. We sent our Marines to stop them.

Have fashions completely changed so that now when we are powerful and wealthy, we are impotent to act? I do not concede that because we are strong and powerful we should be repeatedly kicked and abused.

I hope the situation will be resolved in the next few months.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I agree with the Senator.

**Mr. GRUENING.** The cry is raised: Do not tie the hands of the Administrator or the President. They must have flexibility.

I agree that there must be a certain amount of flexibility. But when 57 Senators vote to refuse aid to any nation ruthlessly harassing U.S. fishermen, penalizing them, imprisoning them, robbing them, one would think that, whether the amendment is or is not written into the law, the Administrator of the AID program would take the broad hint and stop aid to such countries.

But, Mr. President—and here is the reason for the mounting resentment—even in the face of such a record aid will continue to go to countries harassing American fishermen. These restrictions which we have been voting into the foreign assistance act in the Senate have been dropped in conference and ignored by the AID administrators.

Another example of how the will of the Senate has been thwarted in conference is furnished by the provision relating to interest rates on development loans.

As reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, interest rates on development loans would be raised from as low as three-fourths of 1 percent per annum, with a grace period of 10 years and a repayment period of 40 years to a minimum of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum for the first 5 years, and then a minimum of 2 percent per annum for the remaining years of the term of the loan.

The House version raised it to a flat 2 percent per annum.

During the debate on the bill I offered an amendment raising the rate to that which is paid by the United States for the funds which it borrows. That vote was narrowly defeated by a vote of 41 to 47, indicating a general dissatisfaction on the part of many Senators to the percent interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum.

With 41 Senators voting to increase the rate to over 4 percent, there seems to be no justification for the action by the conferees in adopting an interest rate more lenient than either the Senate or House versions. But that is exactly what the conferees did. The conference bill proposes a grace period of 10 years—there was no grace period in the House bill and only a 5-year grace period in the bill passed by the Senate—with a minimum interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent per annum during the 10-year grace period. The Senate-passed bill provided for the three-fourths of 1 percent per annum interest rate for only a 5-year grace period. In addition, gone from the conference bill was the Senate provision of a maximum term on loans of 35 years. In addition, the conference bill exempts loans from the International Development Association or loans authorized or committeed prior to the passage of this bill.

Here we see a clear-cut example of the third legislative body—the conference committee in action. It matters not what either the House or the Senate passed. A small minority overrules the majorities of both Senate and House. This is scarcely a demonstration of the democratic process.

The conference is king. The bill is rewritten in conference from scratch with neither the House version or the Senate version of the provision used as guidelines.

With such an example of the disregard of the wishes of both Houses before them, can the AID administrators wonder any longer at the dimming view in both Houses of the program?

Yes, Mr. President, maybe they got away with it this year. But in a few short months they will be before the Congress again and it may be that then we will be able to devise a method of circumventing these attempts to thwart the obvious will of both Houses of the Congress.

The 10-year grace period provided by the conference version of the interest rate provision will permit the program to continue as it has been in the past with absolutely no change in pace.

Loans will continue, as they have in the past, to be granted at three-fourths of 1 percent per annum interest with our Nation steadily going deeper into astronomic debt and our taxpayers paying about 4 percent for the money we reloan at less than one-fourth of that rate. And is there any concern on the part of the AID administrators as to whether those loans will ever be repaid? None of those responsible for this prodigal financing today will be around at that distant date.

In addition a new "gimmick" has been written into the provision. The restrictions—such as they are—do not apply to loans already "committed." Nowhere is the word "committed" defined, explained or limited. I wonder, Mr. President, when we examine the activities in the AID program next year how many loans we will find that were secretly "committed" at some cocktail party or luncheon.

It is my intention to follow through on this point in the months ahead and ask the Administrator of the AID program for a full justification of all development loans granted on "easy terms" for which there has been no obligation on the books of the AID at the time of passage of this bill.

A third provision I would mention at this time which was "junked" by the conference committee is the so-called junta provision barring aid to nations where a military coup has taken over from the duly-elected civilian governments.

Section 254 of the Senate bill provided as follows:

> Sec. 254. Restrictions on Assistance. None of the funds made available under authority of this Act may be used to furnish assistance to any country covered by this title in which the government has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections unless the President determines that withholding such assistance would be contrary to the national interest.

This is far and away a very mild provision designed to strengthen the hand of the President in a very vital area. You will note, Mr. President, that complete discretion is vested in the President of the United States to waive this provision whenever he determines—in his sole and unreviewable discretion—that "withholding such assistance would be contrary to the national interest".

Yet even this mild provision was dropped by the conferees.

One very unfortunate change was the dilution almost to the point of nullification in the wise Senate provision to assist nations in meeting their population explosion problems. Unless something of this nature is done—and soon—the whole program in many countries—particularly in India and Latin America—will go down the drain. I could cite ample substantiation of this prospect. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee deserves high credit and praise for writing such a provision into the bill for the first time. This action corresponds to a great surge of favorable public opinion. But the conferees watered it down to a meaningless wordage about doing some research.

I do not wish to give the impression that all the Senate amendments were dropped.

One amendment, which I sponsored, would deny military assistance to Latin America. This was retained. For that I am grateful and hope that it will be implemented and that the ample exemptions permitted to the President in that amendment will be sparingly used.

The other amendment, which I also sponsored, would bar aid to nations which are waging aggression against or preparing to wage aggression against countries also receiving our economic or military assistance. This amendment was also retained. For that I am thankful. I hope that the President will promptly make the necessary findings that Egypt and Indonesia are aggressors and just as promptly stop our aid program in those countries until their aggressive actions have abated.

I cannot help be disturbed that, despite the action of the Senate and the clear-cut exposure of Sukarno's aggressive policies, military aid continues to be given to Indonesia in next year's program.

However, this aggressor amendment points out the corner into which are being painted those of us who would seek to amend the foreign assistance bill in order to improve its administration.

Apparently, the one certain way of amending a foreign assistance bill is to adopt House-passed language thereby "locking in" the amendment and not making the amendment amenable to conference consideration. We are, in short, being asked to abdicate our obligations in the Senate in favor of the other body and to adopt precisely the same language adopted by that body even though that language could be improved.

If permitted to persist, this is very unfortunate.

It will ultimately spell the end of the influence of the U.S. Senate in an important area of United States foreign policy.

It should be clear that in these two bodies, in the field of foreign relations, the Senate plays, or should play, under the Constitution, a far more important role.

This situation will hand to the other body a complete veto over whatever conditions can be written into the foreign assistance bill.

I truly hope that those exercising the leadership role in this matter reconsider their positions and become reconciled to the fact that conferees should truly represent the will of the Senate and not the collective will of those appointed to serve on the conference committee.

Now, Mr. President, a few words about the money authorized to be appropriated for the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1964.

It is far too much.

And, because it is too much, it will lead to profligate practices and procedures. This is so obvious as to need no argument.

I recently completed for the Senate Committee on Government Operations a study of our foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries. In my report on that trip I showed the proliferation of technical assistance programs because of the abundance of funds. It can safely be said that we are in 107 countries with an AID program precisely because we have had too much money. If the AID program had to count its pennies, it would have fewer projects and would be in fewer countries.

But, Mr. President, precisely because it had less money and therefore had to be more selective, the AID program would have been in those countries and those programs where it could be more and most effective.

What is the money situation?

The administration request was for $4.5 billion.

The House-passed bill authorized the appropriation of $3.9 billion.

The Senate passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of $3.6 billion.

The figure of $3.5 billion was agreed to by the conferees—a sum $100 million more than the House figure.

Can this amount be cut further? I think it can and should be.

It is ironical, Mr. President, that at almost the precise moment that the Senate conferees were in conference on this measure we here in the Senate were engaged in a serious debate as to whether to appropriate $45 million for the accelerated public works program. The motion to delete the item was defeated. This double-standard thinking should stop. Items for foreign assistance should be scrutinized as closely as items which are destined to boost our economy here at home. For unless that economy here is strong and vigorous, we cannot long sustain the burdens abroad.

But there is much more to be said on this issue, while we are being importuned to vote these billions of dollars for aid to 107 foreign countries the funds for our domestic employment program—under the accelerated Public Works Act—has run dry. Not only have the $900 million authorized run out, but hundreds of useful projects in areas of mounting unemployment in every State of the Union are fully processed, approved and ready to go. But there is no money. At this very time, Mr. President, a special ad hoc committee appointed by the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNAMARA], and chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is holding hearings on the extent of that great domestic need. Hearings are being held all this week to hear Governors, mayors, State, county, and city officials who present a harrowing story of increasing unemployment with their useful projects ready to go—and no money.

I am a member of that ad hoc committee. It is shocking to think that such a situation could develop. I know, of course, that the ad hoc committee cannot, in the face of this tragic new factual evidence, fail to report favorably the bill of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] which would authorize $2,400,000, or to allow the accelerated works program to resume. That sum will be used up by existing projects.

My own bill (S. 1121) provides for the same amount that will be appropriated for foreign aid, which may be a slightly larger program. But to me, it is not only shocking, but incomprehensible, that the dire needs of the American people go unattended, while aid to 107 foreign countries proceeds merrily on. At best, we cannot get both authorization and appropriations to take care of American needs for months. This double standard—help for 107 foreign nations, none for America's communities and America's unemployed—is revolting. Moreover, these projects are sound, useful, desirable, needed undertakings.

As I listened to the testimony of State officials, I was impressed with the conscientiousness with which these community needed projects were prepared, presented, and processed. They include such research projects as installations for water supply, sewers, health centers, municipal buildings, and street improvements—projects which not only would employ people locally, but also back in the factories where the materials are manufactured. They would aid the transportation industry, including railroads and trucks, which convey the materials to the States where they will be used.

Yet we are just now holding hearings in an ad hoc committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, in order to get this essential program moving again. I could only wish that we might shortcut this delay and transfer what will be cut from the foreign assistance program to the domestic assistance program. But let it be crystal clear that I shall not cease my efforts to try to gain attention to the needs of American citizens at least equal to that which has been consistently given for years to the citizens of foreign lands. Our citizens should have not merely equality, but priority. At present, they have neither priority nor equality. They have posteriority. I repeat that I deem it shocking.

In the next 48 hours, there will be the final vote on a multibillion-dollar foreign aid bill. Action on the smaller domestic aid bill is for the indefinite future—the sweet bye and bye. That policy must cease.

During the course of the debate on the foreign assistance authorization bill, I urged repeatedly that the program be reviewed on a country-by-country basis.

Time is now of the essence, but I shall attempt to do precisely that very briefly.

All figures given will be those for fiscal 1963.

First, I would eliminate the military aid program for all Latin America—a saving of $74.8 million. This prohibition is now in the act and should necessarily lead to this savings.

Second, I would eliminate all military aid to the African nations. It must be remembered that, except for the violence in the Congo, the remaining nations in Africa have come into existence peacefully. Nevertheless, there is grave danger that the United States through its military assistance program is initiating an arms buildup which inevitably will mushroom into an arms race and world violence. Indeed, that is now happening. We are assisting Somalia, one of the newer republics, which is being invaded, harassed, and attacked by troops from neighboring Ethiopia. Food has been supplied as well as American planes, tanks, and machineguns. This is the fruit of our military aid program in Africa. It has already begun; it should be stopped immediately.

What a mockery this makes of our professions on behalf of a world at peace.

The elimination of this item will save $27.4 million.

Then I would eliminate the $476.4 million item for military assistance to economically prosperous Europe.

I would eliminate military aid to prosperous Japan—$172.9 million.

Next let us turn to the Middle East:

Our program in Greece is supposedly stopped so that should save us $128.8 million.

So is our program to Israel at a savings of $78.9 million.

Our program for Lebanon, they tell me, is also stopped, so we should save $300,000.

Our programs in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt should also be stopped until those countries start thinking more in terms of their own economic development than their political aggrandizement, and stop engaging in aggressive warfare.

Stopping these three programs will save $318.6 million.

We should stop our aid program to oil-rich Libya—$12.5 million.

Turning again to Latin America on the economic front, we have recommended that the aid program in the Dominican Republic and Honduras be stopped because of the military junta overthrow of the duly constituted civilian government. This would save an additional $66.1 million.

In addition, until Brazil takes the needed economic measures which would prevent our funds from being dissipated, we should withhold the $155.4 million in economic aid.

We can save $140.9 million in Indonesia and $29.2 in Cambodia which is resisting strongly our efforts to thrust this money on that nation.

How fantastic now appears the $300 million we have sunk into Cambodia. Not only is the money wasted, but, worse than that, our military air unit training, now that the Cambodians have elected to get into bed with Red China, helps that country in its war against freedom. We had better revise all our military aid programs with respect to which similar situations exist. It would be interesting to find out how we happened to be deceived, misled, and mispersuaded by those who happened to be in charge of this program during these years, and who could not foresee the waste which would occur, despite the generous amounts of money we poured into the program.

In line with the Clay Committee report, we should cut by at least 50 percent the aid given to the newly emerging nations of Africa, giving the former colonial powers the opportunity to assist their former colonies. This would save $250 million.

Then there is Taiwan, that little island into which we have poured the incredible sum of $4,500 million. It seems to me about time that that island were on its own. Of course, we want to prevent it from falling into the orbit of Red China. For that purpose we have built a tremendous military force there. We are paying the salaries of countless generals in the Taiwanese Army; but the real protection of Taiwan, if war should break out, would devolve upon our 7th Fleet. When we consider the amount of aid we have given Taiwan, it is almost fabulous. We have supplied Taiwan with machinery, powerplants, chemical plants, and fisheries. Everything the imagination could possibly conceive has been done for Taiwan. It is about time we stopped, and let that little island grow on the resources and the billions of dollars we have given it.

Another place where we could save money is in British Guiana. I tried to have an amendment adopted to prevent giving aid to colonies of old-world nations before they were set free. I see no reason why we should continue, as we have done in the past, to give aid to British Guiana, British Honduras, French Guiana, Dutch Guiana, and Surinam while they are still colonies. Is not such aid inconsistent with our stand that we will not aid nations that we have made prosperous, and that it is not proper to help their colonies while they are still colonies?

Thus even on this cursory review of our program the amount of $2 billion can be cut from the amount authorized to be appropriated.

I am fully aware of the argument that we must authorize more to be appropriated than we believe justified in order to bargain with the other body.

I reject that argument completely.

I cannot in all good conscience vote to appropriate one more dime for this or any other program than I believe can be honestly and wisely spent.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Star of November 9, 1963, entitled "Beginning of the End," a column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "Our Brothers' Keeper," and a table showing funds expended on the AID program for fiscal year 1963.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I voted in favor of H.R. 7885 a few weeks ago. I shall not vote in favor of the conference report; and I shall continue my efforts to cut this program down to a reasonable size and to eliminate some of its past and persistent follies which apparently those in charge of the program—and, I regret to say, some of our conferees—do not wish to see remedied.

When they go home to their constituents for their Christmas holidays, I think they will find an increasing view as voiced by the Evening Star editorial, which is that the foreign aid program should be scrapped.

I do not share this view. I want to see foreign aid continued where it is needed, where it is useful, where it is appreciated, where it will strengthen the cause of peace and achieve the objectives alleged for it, but so frequently honored in the breach in the execution of the program.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 9, 1963]

### BEGINNING OF THE END

The foreign aid authorization, though improved in one respect, has emerged from conference in a form which indicates that this vast international subsidy at the expense of the American taxpayer is on its way out. We hope so.

The improvement consists of the restoration of the President's authority to extend most-favored-nation trade treatment to Yugoslavia and Poland. The theory is that the President should not be forbidden by law to exercise this discretion in trying to encourage countries that seem to be endeavoring to break away from Communist domination. This, of course, has nothing to do with foreign aid. But it makes sense, and it is too bad that the conferees would not grant the President similar discretionary authority in the case of other Communist countries. The Kremlin's empire may or may not be in process of disintegrating. But why erect arbitrary bars which can only serve to discourage that process?

As for the rest, the conferees split the House and Senate money versions pretty much down the middle. The final authorized figure was $3,599,050,000. When the appropriations committees are through, the total will probably be down to $3 billion, or perhaps even a little less. This will represent a big cut from the $4.5 billion originally requested by the administration, and it will evoke anguished screams from the professional foreign-aiders.

We do not think, however, that any anguished screams will be heard from the taxpayers of America.

They have been lugging this foreign aid load for some 17 years and have doled out something like $100 billion in its support. They are fed up with it. This Congress should serve unmistakable notice that in the business of foreign aid we have come to the beginning of the end.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 9, 1963]

### OUR BROTHERS' KEEPER—CONGRESS REFLECTS U.S. DISILLUSIONMENT WITH WHAT HAPPENS TO VAST FOREIGN AID

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

What is the sensible thing to do about foreign aid?

And let's define "sensible."

Foreign aid should feed the calf without killing the cow. It should help unmess messed-up political systems and social philosophies.

It should turn mendicant countries with chronic deficit economies into going concerns that can stand on their own feet.

It should expand the area of freedom, making realistic allowances for the fact that ignorant and volatile people have to make a choice between a high degree of centralized authority and utter chaos.

Our first attempt at foreign aid, the Marshall plan, was a thumping success. Western Europe and Japan lived on industry, and the war had wrecked their means for living. American aid plus native energy and know-how created a miracle of reconstruction that filled a vacuum into which communism had confidently expected to flow.

But no sooner had we shored up war-ravaged economies than most of the rest of the world, including that part of it which far from having been injured by the war had profited from it, began shaking tambourines in our faces and crying, "Do you love us less?"

And we couldn't think of any other answer except to unlock Fort Knox.

It wasn't long before someone in Washington invented a marvelous phrase, "the take-off point." You were to give foreign aid to a poor and underdeveloped country until its industries were started, its dams and irrigation projects built, its starved fields revitalized with fertilizer, and then the marvelous takeoff would arrive.

This was the point where the country's economy would become self-regenerating and self-expanding. Foreign aid would then no longer be necessary and what had once been a miserable land, easy prey to communism, would become a vigorous, happy, free nation.

And this could happen, indeed. Provided such a country did have large untapped natural and agricultural resources, that its people were energetic and eager to learn, that public servants were generally honest and progressive, and that its wealthy citizens were willing to reinvest their money in new job-making and wealth-spreading ventures.

The only trouble is that where people had all these qualities they were generally already pretty prosperous. What we soon found ourselves doing was running a gigantic WPA for fouled-up nations remarkable for laziness, graft, and huge private fortunes that hid themselves in foreign banks.

In some nations we have simply shored up inefficient socialist regimes that have smothered enterprise in red tape and scraped the bottom of the confiscation barrel. In other words, as in India, we have poured money down a widening ratehole as the increase in population chronically outruns the rise in the gross national product.

In Yugoslavia we gave the frankly Communist Mr. Tito a billion or so on the theory that this would encourage an independent course for satellites. Mr. T. and Mr. K. are now closer than 10 college students in a phone booth.

If we expected gratitude we misjudged human nature. Many peoples to whom international philanthropy is unbelievable looked for the bug under the chip. They were helped by hints from the Communists about "hidden Yankee imperialism." The human being rebels at thinking of himself as a recipient of charity. He prefers to imagine that he is giving value in return, willingly or not.

President Sukarno of Indonesia recently said that the world's new nations, including his own, do not have "rising expectations," but "rising demands." He expects these demands to be met by the wealthy nations of the world.

Well, Sukarno runs a graft-ridden travesty of democracy, notable for its inefficient administration and its own brand of neo-imperialism. How do we advance human justice by periodically bailing out Sukarno?

Among some tribes of the Ivory Coast in Africa it is customary for a man to retire at 25. After that he squats around the village with his fighting cocks. How much earlier must a 65-year-old Iowa farmer get up so that he can contribute to the retirement fund of these 25-year-olds?

A huge bureaucracy has grown up in Washington and in the foreign service as a result of foreign aid. A man naturally sells what his job depends on and Americans have been given a heavy dose of the propaganda line that only our outlays can save the world for democracy.

But the recent reaction of Congress only reflects an advance disillusion among Americans in general. Americans, representing 7 percent of the human population, cannot continue to underwrite the deficits of people who cuddle their dry sacred cows.

Only a radical minority would end foreign aid altogether. There is much good that can be done with a carefully supervised and screened program for people who are determined to exercise the energy and self-discipline necessary to make their economies viable. But we're through tossing the gold over the transom. And history will not blame us.

*U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)*

[In millions of dollars]

| Region and country | Grand total | Total military | Economic assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total economic | AID programs | | | | Other economic assistance | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Development grants program social progress | Development loans | Supporting assistance and other | Total | Social Progress Trust Fund | Food for peace (Public Law 48 ) | | | | | Export-Import Bank long-term loans | Other economic programs |
| | | | | | | | | | | Total | Title I | | Title II | Title III | Title IV | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Total sales agreements | Planned for country use | | | | | |
| Total, all countries | 7,026.7 | 1,849.9 | 5,176.8 | 2,395.8 | 343.6 | 1,287.8 | 764.2 | 2,781.0 | 124.8 | 1,771.3 | (1,268.2) | 1,074.2 | 314.6 | 314.1 | 68.4 | 571.7 | 313.2 |
| Near East and south Asia | 2,288.0 | 380.3 | 1,907.7 | 983.9 | 54.0 | 779.6 | 150.3 | 923.8 | -------- | 854.4 | (766.6) | 682.0 | 111.5 | 60.9 | ------ | 64.5 | [1]4.9 |
| Afghanistan | 19.2 | 1.2 | 18.0 | 17.7 | 15.1 | 2.6 | -------- | .3 | -------- | .1 | -------- | -------- | ------ | .1 | ------ | -------- | .2 |
| Ceylon | 8.4 | -------- | 8.4 | .4 | .4 | -------- | -------- | 8.0 | -------- | 7.8 | (4.7) | 3.5 | ------ | 4.3 | ------ | -------- | .2 |
| Cyprus | 4.1 | -------- | 4.1 | 2.9 | .6 | 2.3 | -------- | 1.2 | -------- | 1.1 | [2](1.1) | .9 | ------ | .2 | ------ | -------- | .1 |
| Greece | 128.8 | 79.6 | 49.2 | 31.6 | -------- | 31.6 | -------- | 17.6 | -------- | 14.6 | (11.2) | 6.5 | ------ | 8.1 | ------ | 3.0 | -------- |
| India | 821.0 | 30.0 | 791.0 | 402.3 | 6.3 | 396.0 | -------- | 388.7 | -------- | 347.5 | [2](373.3) | 333.9 | ------ | 13.6 | ------ | 40.3 | .9 |
| Iran | 115.9 | 58.1 | 57.8 | 23.4 | 3.8 | 17.4 | 2.2 | 34.4 | -------- | 34.2 | (7.7) | 5.8 | 25.0 | 3.4 | ------ | -------- | .2 |
| Iraq | 1.0 | .1 | .9 | .8 | .8 | -------- | -------- | .1 | -------- | .1 | -------- | -------- | ------ | .1 | ------ | -------- | -------- |

See footnotes at end of table.

***U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)—*** Continued

[In millions of dollars]

| Region and country | Grand total | Total military | Economic assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total economic | AID programs | | | | Other economic assistance | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Development grants program social progress | Development loans | Supporting assistance and other | Total | Social Progress Trust Fund | Food for peace (Public Law 48 ) | | | | | | Export-Import Bank long-term loans | Other economic programs |
| | | | | | | | | | | Total | Title I | | Title II | Title III | Title IV | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Total sales agreements | Planned for country use | | | | | |
| **Near East, etc.—Con.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Israel | 78.9 | 0.6 | 78.3 | 45.0 | | 45.0 | | 33.3 | | 22.1 | [2] (23.2) | 19.8 | 1.5 | 0.8 | | 11.2 | |
| Jordan | 63.6 | 4.3 | 59.3 | 43.0 | 7.0 | | 36.0 | 16.3 | | 16.3 | | | 14.4 | 1.9 | | | |
| Lebanon | .3 | .2 | .1 | .1 | .1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nepal | 4.6 | | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | | | .7 | | .2 | | | .2 | | | | 0.5 |
| Pakistan | 372.5 | (3) | 372.5 | 185.0 | 7.9 | 176.8 | .3 | 187.5 | | 185.4 | [2] (155.4) | 146.1 | 35.5 | 3.8 | | | 2.1 |
| Saudi Arabia | | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Syrian Arab Republic | .4 | (4) | .4 | .2 | .2 | | (4) | .2 | | .2 | | | | .2 | | | |
| Turkey | 317.2 | 135.7 | 181.5 | 131.1 | 4.7 | 71.4 | 55.0 | 50.4 | | 49.8 | (55.9) | 45.0 | | 4.8 | | | .6 |
| United Arab Republic (Egypt) | 198.7 | | 198.7 | 48.6 | 2.3 | 36.3 | 10.0 | 150.1 | | 140.1 | [2] (134.1) | 120.5 | | 19.6 | | 10.0 | |
| Yemen | 4.0 | (4) | 4.0 | 3.4 | | | 3.4 | .6 | | .6 | | | .6 | | | | |
| Cento | .8 | | .8 | .8 | .5 | | .3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Regional | 148.5 | 70.5 | 78.0 | 43.5 | .4 | | 43.1 | 34.5 | | 34.5 | | | 34.4 | .1 | | | |
| Latin America | 1,102.7 | 74.8 | 1,027.9 | 548.9 | 109.0 | 342.8 | 97.1 | 479.0 | 124.8 | 185.4 | (63.6) | 51.5 | 18.8 | 75.6 | 39.6 | 91.2 | [5] 77.6 |
| Argentina | 156.5 | 2.7 | 153.8 | 99.7 | 3.3 | 76.4 | 20.0 | 54.1 | 30.0 | | | | | | | [6] 24.1 | |
| Bolivia | 69.9 | 1.6 | 68.3 | 35.7 | 7.5 | 18.3 | 9.9 | 32.6 | 10.5 | 21.4 | (16.9) | 14.3 | .4 | 3.7 | 3.0 | | .7 |
| Brazil | 172.3 | 16.9 | 155.4 | 86.9 | 24.0 | 37.4 | 25.5 | 68.5 | 5.8 | 61.6 | (43.4) | 34.7 | 11.3 | 15.6 | | | 1.1 |
| British Guiana | 1.4 | | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| British Honduras | .6 | | .6 | .1 | .1 | | | .5 | | .3 | | | | .3 | | | .2 |
| Chile | 99.2 | 10.2 | 89.0 | 41.3 | 6.3 | 35.0 | (4) | 47.7 | 4.9 | 26.5 | | | | 5.5 | 21.0 | 15.5 | .8 |
| Colombia | 134.9 | 8.4 | 126.5 | 93.5 | 6.1 | 87.2 | .2 | 33.0 | 8.5 | 18.3 | | | | 11.5 | 6.8 | 3.4 | 2.8 |
| Costa Rica | 15.5 | .7 | 14.8 | 13.0 | 2.4 | 10.6 | | 1.8 | | 1.6 | | | 1.5 | .1 | | | .2 |
| Dominican Republic | 51.7 | 2.1 | 49.6 | 29.4 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 23.9 | 20.2 | 6.5 | 12.5 | | | 1.2 | 6.3 | 5.0 | | 1.2 |
| Ecuador | 39.2 | 2.8 | 36.4 | 18.2 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 18.2 | 9.9 | 6.1 | | | | 2.3 | 3.8 | 1.3 | .9 |
| El Salvador | 23.1 | .6 | 22.5 | 19.6 | 3.0 | 16.6 | | 2.9 | | 2.6 | | | | 2.6 | | | .3 |
| Guatemala | 15.4 | 2.0 | 13.4 | 3.4 | 2.7 | .7 | | 10.0 | 7.8 | 1.0 | | | | 1.0 | | | 1.2 |
| Haiti | 6.2 | .4 | 5.8 | 4.9 | | | 4.9 | .9 | | .9 | | | | .9 | | | |
| Honduras | 14.4 | 1.1 | 13.3 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 5.6 | .3 | | | | .3 | | | .1 |
| Jamaica | 13.0 | | 13.0 | 5.8 | .8 | 5.0 | | 7.2 | | 2.0 | | | | 2.0 | | 5.0 | .2 |
| Mexico | 50.9 | 1.2 | 49.7 | .4 | .4 | | | 49.3 | 8.0 | 15.5 | | | 1.1 | 14.4 | | 25.8 | |
| Nicaragua | 9.0 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 1.0 | | 4.0 | .2 | 1.4 | | | | 1.4 | | | 2.4 |
| Panama | 10.0 | .8 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 2.2 | 6.0 | | 1.0 | | .7 | | | | .7 | | | .3 |
| Paraguay | 10.2 | .9 | 9.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | | 6.3 | 2.9 | 3.4 | (3.3) | 2.5 | | .9 | | | |
| Peru | 31.0 | 6.7 | 24.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | | | 21.3 | 1.5 | 6.9 | | | 3.1 | 3.8 | | 10.7 | 2.2 |
| Surinam | .4 | | .4 | .3 | .3 | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 4.1 | | 4.1 | 3.9 | .8 | | 3.1 | .2 | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | .2 |
| Uruguay | 24.6 | 2.5 | 22.1 | 7.9 | 1.9 | 6.0 | | 14.2 | 8.0 | .6 | | | | .6 | | 5.0 | .6 |
| Venezuela | 56.8 | 10.4 | 46.4 | 33.1 | 3.0 | 30.0 | .1 | 13.3 | 11.0 | 1.2 | | | | 1.2 | | .4 | .7 |
| Other West Indies | .4 | | .4 | | | | | .4 | | .4 | | | (4) | .4 | | | |
| ROCAP | 11.1 | | 11.1 | 8.2 | 5.7 | 2.5 | | 2.9 | 2.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Regional | 80.4 | 1.2 | 79.2 | 17.2 | 17.0 | | .1 | 62.1 | .7 | | | | | | | | 61.4 |
| Far East | 1,723.3 | 785.0 | 938.3 | 428.7 | 53.3 | 67.1 | 308.2 | 509.6 | | 297.7 | (229.9) | 203.0 | 43.5 | 42.8 | 8.4 | 131.8 | [7] 80.1 |
| Burma | 15.2 | | 15.2 | 6.7 | 1.0 | | 5.7 | 8.5 | | 8.5 | (10.7) | 8.1 | | .4 | | | |
| Cambodia | 29.2 | 10.4 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 7.8 | | 11.0 | (4) | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | |
| China, Republic of | 212.6 | 132.3 | 80.3 | 38.6 | 2.1 | 36.5 | | 41.7 | | 41.7 | [2] (27.0) | 21.9 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 8.4 | | |
| Hong Kong | 5.6 | | 5.6 | | | | | 5.6 | | 5.6 | | | 2.9 | 2.7 | | | |
| Indonesia | 140.9 | 17.6 | 123.3 | 36.7 | 14.8 | | 21.9 | 86.6 | | 86.4 | [3] (91.2) | 82.1 | .8 | 3.5 | | | .2 |
| Japan | 172.9 | 49.1 | 123.8 | | | | | 123.8 | | .9 | | | | .9 | | 122.9 | |
| Korea | 403.7 | 199.4 | 204.3 | 126.2 | 5.6 | 30.6 | 90.0 | 78.1 | | 78.1 | (74.0) | 66.6 | 1.4 | 10.1 | | | |
| Laos | 36.8 | (3) | 36.8 | 36.3 | | | 36.3 | .5 | | .5 | | | | .5 | | | |
| Malaya | 2.2 | | 2.2 | | | | | 2.2 | | 1.4 | | | | 1.4 | | | .8 |
| Philippines | 117.7 | 23.9 | 93.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 | | | 90.9 | | 9.8 | | | | 9.8 | | 3.9 | 77.2 |
| Thailand | 94.2 | 71.6 | 22.6 | 16.2 | 6.4 | | 9.9 | 6.4 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | 5.0 | 1.3 |
| Vietnam | 208.1 | (3) | 208.1 | 143.7 | 10.5 | | 133.2 | 64.4 | | 64.4 | (27.0) | 24.3 | 34.8 | 5.3 | | | |
| Regional | 284.0 | [3] 280.8 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 2.2 | | .2 | .7 | | | | | | | | | .7 |
| Africa | 553.9 | 27.4 | 526.5 | 261.6 | 79.8 | 98.3 | 83.4 | 264.9 | | 231.7 | (62.5) | 53.4 | 136.8 | 37.3 | 4.2 | 19.2 | [8] 14.0 |
| Algeria | 79.6 | | 79.6 | 1.8 | 1.1 | | .7 | 77.8 | | 77.8 | | | 63.8 | 14.0 | | | |
| Burundi | 1.5 | | 1.5 | (4) | (4) | | | 1.5 | | 1.5 | | | .6 | .9 | | | |
| Cameroon | 1.5 | (4) | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | .5 | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | .5 |
| Central African Representative | .7 | | .7 | .7 | .7 | | | (4) | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | |
| Chad | 1.1 | | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Congo (Brazzaville) | .7 | | .7 | .5 | .5 | | | .2 | | | | | | | | .2 | |
| Congo (Léopoldville) | 79.8 | .2 | 79.6 | 42.4 | 3.0 | | 39.4 | 37.2 | | 37.2 | (30.6) | 27.5 | 6.3 | 3.4 | | | |
| Dahomey | 1.0 | (4) | 1.0 | .7 | .7 | | | .3 | | .3 | | | | .3 | | | |
| Ethiopia | 24.2 | 9.0 | 15.2 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | | 5.2 | | 3.0 | (.9) | .7 | | .9 | 1.4 | | 2.2 |
| Gabon | 1.2 | | 1.2 | .7 | .7 | | | .5 | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | .5 |
| Ghana | 3.0 | .1 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | | | 1.2 | | .6 | | | | .6 | | | .6 |
| Guinea | 16.0 | | 16.0 | 12.1 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 3.9 | | 3.6 | [3] (4.7) | 3.6 | | | | | .3 |
| Ivory Coast | 7.9 | .1 | 7.8 | 2.5 | .8 | 1.7 | | 5.3 | | (4) | | | | (4) | | 4.7 | |
| Kenya | 5.7 | | 5.7 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 2.2 | | .8 | | .8 | | | .6 | .2 | | | |
| Liberia | 50.8 | 2.1 | 48.7 | 39.9 | 8.6 | 31.3 | | 8.8 | | 3.0 | | | | .2 | 2.8 | 4.5 | 1.6 |
| Libya | 12.5 | 1.1 | 11.4 | 10.4 | 1.4 | | 9.0 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | 1.4 |
| Malagasy Republic | 1.0 | | 1.0 | .5 | .5 | | | .5 | | .5 | | | | .5 | | | |
| Mali, Republic of | 4.6 | .7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 | .7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mauritania | .2 | | .2 | .1 | .1 | | (4) | .1 | | .1 | | | .1 | (4) | | | |
| Morocco | 75.0 | (3) | 75.0 | 21.6 | 1.1 | | 20.5 | 53.4 | | 52.6 | (7.7) | 5.8 | 35.3 | 11.5 | | | .2 |
| Niger | 1.4 | (4) | 1.4 | 1.2 | .7 | .5 | | .2 | | | | | | | | | .5 |
| Nigeria | 36.6 | .2 | 36.4 | 24.1 | 12.0 | 12.1 | | 12.3 | | .3 | | | | .3 | | 9.5 | 2.5 |
| Rhodesia and Nyasaland | 2.2 | | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | | | .4 | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | .4 |
| Rwanda | (4) | | (4) | | | | | (4) | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | |

See footnotes at end of table.

*U.S. aid to Foreign Assistance Act countries, by region and country—Obligations and loan authorizations, fiscal year 1963 (preliminary)*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

| Region and country | Grand total | Total military | Economic assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total economic | AID programs | | | | Other economic assistance | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Development grants program social progress | Development loans | Supporting assistance and other | Total | Social Progress Trust Fund | Food for peace (Public Law 48 ) | | | | | | Export-Import Bank long-term loans | Other economic programs |
| | | | | | | | | | | Total | Title I | | Title II | Title III | Title IV | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Total sales agreements | Planned for country use | | | | | |
| Africa—Continued | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Senegal | 5.2 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | | | 1.5 | | 0.6 | | | | 0.6 | | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Sierra Leone | 3.9 | | 3.9 | 2.5 | 2.5 | | | 1.4 | | .5 | | | | .5 | | | .9 |
| Somali Republic | 9.2 | | 9.2 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 3.6 | | 1.4 | | 1.2 | | | 1.2 | (4) | | | .2 |
| Sudan | 11.0 | | 11.0 | 6.5 | 2.7 | 3.8 | | 4.5 | | 4.5 | (6.0) | 4.5 | | | | | |
| Tanganyika | 12.5 | | 12.5 | 8.9 | 2.0 | 6.9 | | 3.6 | | 3.3 | | | 3.0 | .3 | | | .3 |
| Togo | 1.3 | | 1.3 | .8 | .8 | | | .5 | | .2 | | | | .2 | | | .3 |
| Tunisia | 71.9 | (3) | 71.9 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 23.3 | 6.8 | 39.6 | | 39.0 | (12.6) | 11.3 | 25.7 | 2.0 | | | .6 |
| Uganda | 7.0 | | 7.0 | 6.9 | 2.5 | 4.4 | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Upper Volta | 1.0 | (4) | 1.0 | .5 | .5 | | | .5 | | .5 | | | | .5 | | | |
| Zanzibar | (4) | | (4) | | | | | (4) | | (4) | | | | (4) | | | |
| Other Biritish territories | .1 | | .1 | | | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Regional | 22.0 | 12.3 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.4 | | .3 | (4) | | | | | | | | | (4) |
| Europe | 899.1 | 476.4 | 422.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 | | | 419.8 | | 154.8 | (145.6) | 84.3 | 4.0 | 50.3 | 16.2 | 265.0 | |
| Austria | 31.4 | | 31.4 | | | | | 31.4 | | | | | | | | 31.4 | |
| Belgium-Luxembourg | 28.1 | 28.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Denmark | 24.0 | 24.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| France | 30.6 | 30.5 | .1 | | | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Germany (Federal Republic) | .5 | .3 | .2 | | | | | .2 | | .2 | | | | .2 | | | |
| Iceland | 1.4 | | 1.4 | | | | | 1.4 | | 1.4 | (1.9) | 1.4 | | | | | |
| Italy (including Trieste) | 300.7 | 72.4 | 228.3 | | | | | 228.3 | | 14.4 | | | 4.0 | 10.4 | | 213.9 | |
| Netherlands | 16.4 | 16.3 | .1 | | | | | .1 | | .1 | | | | .1 | | | |
| Norway | 38.7 | 38.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poland | 10.8 | | 10.8 | 2.8 | [10] 2.8 | | | 8.0 | | 8.0 | (51.6) | | | 8.0 | | | |
| Portugal | 18.9 | 11.2 | 7.7 | | | | | 7.7 | | 7.7 | | | | 7.7 | | | |
| Spain | 61.0 | 31.8 | 29.2 | | | | | 29.2 | | 9.5 | | | | 9.5 | | 19.7 | |
| United Kingdom | 11.2 | 11.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yugoslavia | 113.5 | | 113.5 | .1 | .1 | | | 113.4 | | 113.4 | (92.1) | 82.9 | | 14.3 | 16.2 | | |
| Regional | 211.9 | 211.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonregional | 459.9 | 106.1 | 353.8 | 169.8 | 44.6 | | 125.2 | 184.0 | | 47.4 | | | | 47.4 | | | [11] 136 6 |

---

[1] Represents Peace Corps.

[2] Includes proration of multiyear agreements.

[3] Military data classified and included in regional totals.

[4] Less than $50,000.

[5] Represents $60,000,000 subscription to Inter-American Development Bank; $15,200,000 for Peace Corps; and $2,400,000 for Rama Road.

[6] Excludes refinancings of $72,000,000.

[7] Represents $73,000,000 war damage claims in the Philippines and $7,100,000 for the Peace Corps.

[8] Includes aid to Australia and New Zealand.

[9] Represents $13,000,000 for the Peace Corps and $1,000,000 in Libya for special purpose funds.

[10] For Krakow Research Hospital.

[11] Includes $61,700,000 subscription to the International Development Association and $72,100,000 for U.N. bonds.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4276) to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions adminstered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 19 to the bill and concurred therein.

## MILLIONAIRE OIL AND GAS OPERATORS WHO PAID LITTLE OR NO TAXES IN 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is now in the process of considering one of the two most important measures before Congress this year—namely, the tax bill.

Despite public discussion about the bill in general, the specific details, both of the bill and of the existing tax structure, are not thoroughly understood by the American people, or, I venture to say, even by the Members of Congress.

The report made last February by the Secretary of the Treasury to the House Ways and Means Committee indicated that in the field of depletion allowances, a total of approximately $3,300 million was written off, and served as an exemption from taxes; that of this amount, a total of $2,200 million was directly connected with gas and oil; and that companies not directly engaged in the gas and oil business possibly received additional amounts. This is one of the largest loopholes or "truck holes" in our entire system of taxation, and it is one of the most powerfully ensconced special privileges in our system of taxation.

### OIL AND GAS DEDUCTIONS

We must recognize that the oil industry now is given various tax deductions. First, it very properly is given a deduction for operating expenses. This is entirely correct.

In addition, the cost of dry holes is written off against the income from the successful drillings.

In addition, from 75 percent to 90 percent of the exploration, drilling, and developmental costs, both tangible and intangible, is written off in the first year. This item comes to approximately $2 billion.

In addition, those who are engaged in the oil and gas business receive a credit of 27½ percent of gross income, up to 50 percent of net income, which is completely free from taxation.

As I have said, the depletion allowance amounts, in all, to at least $2,200 million for the gas and oil industry, and to approximately $1,100 million for other industries.

These figures are so huge that apparently they do not make much impression upon the American people. For some 12 years some of us have been hammering home these facts on the floor of the Senate and in the public hearings before the Finance Committee. The special privileges thus received are so huge that they seem to slide off the mental back of the public as water is supposed to slide off a duck's back.

### INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLES

The American people seem to be impressed by personal case histories. We introduced some of them in the course of the 1951 debate. We obtained from the Treasury Department a report on 10 individuals whose income was tabulated over a period of 5 years and whose taxes were stated. I remember that in one case a man had, over a 5-year period, a net income of $13 million, but in that period of 5 years he paid only $80,000, or two-thirds of 1 percent of his income in taxes. There were other cases, although not quite that striking. Nevertheless, they were very real. However, today these are treated as "old hat" and as not being applicable to the present.

So when this tax bill was under consideration, I asked the Treasury Department to assemble for me some case histories of persons with very large incomes from gas and oil, who paid very small amounts of taxes. This afternoon, I shall introduce, for the RECORD, six of these cases.

I shall begin with the case of a man whom we shall call exhibit O. According to the Treasury Department, in 1960 this man had a total income, before exploration, developmental, and nonallocated expenses, of $28,716,469, or a total income of almost $29 million before the deduction of these items. There was a deduction of $1,546,000 for oil and gas exploration and developmental expenditures; and there was a deduction of $729,693, for overhead expenses—or a total deduction for exploration, developmental and nonallocated overhead expenditures or costs of approximately $2,276,000—leaving a total reported economic income of $26,440,776. I repeat, Mr. President, that this man had a total reported economic income of $26,440,776.

### PAID NO TAXES ON $26.4 MILLION INCOME

What do Senators suppose were the taxes he paid? Not a single cent, Mr. President. When the deductions were made for drilling and developmental costs, for capital gains, for the depletion allowance, and for certain other items, and also for the carryover of net losses in past years, absolutely no taxable income was left, and no Federal income tax was paid.

Mr. President, I submit that a study of this illustration, example D, should convince people, and even should convince the Senate, that these existing "truck holes" in the tax system should be remedied.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Lest someone be misled or thrown off the track by the deduction of carry-forward losses of previous years, will the Senator from Illinois give that figure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; it is $3,934,000.

Mr. GORE. So even after that amount is subtracted, there would still be left an income of $22 million a year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. It is economic income.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator has said, it is an amount on which no taxes were paid?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. As I understand it, the Senator is not alleging any violation of law on the part of this taxpayer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. He is, instead, showing that under the inequitable provisions of tax law, it was possible for a man with that perfectly enormous annual income to have no tax liability assessed against him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is completely correct. I daresay that the computation was completely legal, and completely in conformity with tax law. Of course, every advantage that could be taken of the Government was apparently taken, but the net result was the fact that the man to whom I refer, who had an income of $26 million, paid no taxes at all, although a wage earner with a salary of $100 a week, or $5,200 a year, with a wife and two children, would pay approximately $400.

Mr. GORE. Even though that wage earner would work as a butler, in the home of the man who had the large income, an oiler on his rig, or whatnot, he would pay his taxes out of every single paycheck he received?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Let us consider the case of another man, whom we call exhibit B, who had a total income, before oil and gas exploration and development expenditures, of $4,020,000 in the year 1960. There was deducted from that amount oil and gas exploration and development expenditures of $1,748,000, leaving a total reported economic income of $2,271,000. Although I speak of oil and gas exploration and development expenditure, some of it, of course, is intangible. For those items that are tangible, it is the fastest writeoff in any industry in the country, with 75 to 90 percent being written off in the first year.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Many people do not understand the meaning of tangible and intangible costs as related to the tax law. It might be well if this was spelled out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some of the intangible drilling and development costs are labor, electricity, pipes, mud, and so forth, used in drilling the hole which in the case of a factory or in most other industry we consider costs which must be depreciated over a long period of years. In this industry they are written off in 1 year.

The tangible costs relate to the physical structure which remains over a period of time.

After all deductions were made, what do Senators suppose was the amount of taxes which the gentleman or lady to whom I have referred paid? Again, not 1 cent. Not 1 cent.

Let us consider exhibit O. Here is a man with a total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses of $4,542,000 in the year 1960. After all deductions were made, he paid $166,768 in taxes, or 7.9 percent of his economic income, which was $2,110,000. A man earning only $100 a week would pay about 8 percent. A man earning $10,000 a year, of course, would pay much more.

### NO TAXES PAID

Let us consider exhibit E, which is the case of a man with a total income before exploration development and nonallocated overhead expenses of $1,522,000, and total reported economic income of $1,179,000. What do Senators suppose were the taxes that he paid?

Not one single cent, Mr. President. Not 1 cent.

The deductions for drilling and developmental costs, the depletion allowance, the capital gains, the dry holes—all of those items, plus contributions, swept away all taxes completely.

Let me state the final two illustrations. Exhibit C is a case involving income, before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses, totaling $2,201,000. Deducting the total exploration and development costs, the total reported income was $1,707,000. That man paid net Federal taxes of $142,808, or 8.4 percent upon his income. A man earning $7,000 a year would pay a larger proportion than that.

Finally, the income of the individual in exhibit F is only $1,307,962. I do not suppose he was up among the "singers" in the oil and gas group. After all deductions were made, he paid $61,240 in taxes. His net tax, as a percentage of total reported economic income, was 5.9 percent.

There are other cases, which I am assembling.

### SHOCKING SITUATION

Mr. President, I submit that what those six cases show is shocking. It seems to me the situation cannot really be defended. I am not proposing to eliminate the deduction for dry holes or unsuccessful drillings. I am not proposing to alter, as of this time at least, the allowances for drilling and developmental costs, tangible and intangible. I do have a modest proposal that the 27½-percent depletion allowance not be changed for enterprises which have a gross income of less than $1 million a year; but the allowance would be reduced to 21 percent for enterprises whose gross income was between $1 million and $5 million, and diminished to 15 percent for enterprises over $5 million—or, rather, for the increments of income in excess of $1 million and $5 million respectively.

This proposal has been before Congress many times. It has always been voted down. I believe once there were 38 votes for it.

The proposal strikes at one of the greatest sources of privilege in our entire tax structure. It is opposed by the most powerful economic groups in the country, not the oil interests alone, but also those who own shares and stock in the oil properties and oil companies. They are extremely powerful. They are extremely well entrenched.

I suppose this special tax provision will survive even the figures which I am producing before the Senate this afternoon, which I have obtained from the U.S. Treasury, although I wish to make it clear that the Treasury does not endorse my proposal.

There are other facts as well. Some months ago the magazine Fortune published an article with detailed statistics estimating how much the depletion allowance meant to some 20 of the great oil companies of the country. At a later time I shall introduce that material into the RECORD.

### TAXES OF OIL AND GAS COMPANIES

In years past I have discussed 28 other companies—generally smaller companies—and have examined their records historically and shown how they have been able to escape their fair share of taxation. There is one company whose name I have not made public but which, if stated, would be well known to every Member of this body which, over a period of 5 years, had net earnings of $65 million but which did not pay a single cent in taxes and received a refund of approximately $420,000. This was perhaps the most sensational case, but it cannot be said to be completely untypical.

We are maintaining the record on these 28 companies, and I hope at a later date to include additional material in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have been speaking in a somewhat impromptu fashion this afternoon, but I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks, plus the table which we have taken from the statistics given to us, may be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

### THE ABUSE HAS SPREAD

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States may disregard this evil on the ground that the entrenched forces of special privilege are too strong to be attacked and that it is politically too hazardous to try to reduce the amounts which they are now evading and avoiding in taxes. But this is the greatest, though not the only, abuse in our existing tax system, and its existence has spread.

I believe the analogy is that, like the fruits of the upas tree, it has poisoned many branches of our whole sytem of taxation. It has been extended to virtually everything that comes from underground; not merely sulfur but also oyster shells, clam shells, and sand and gravel. It has given to the average taxpayer the feeling that the game is rigged against him and that he is bearing the burden, while men with millions of dollars—and in one case, as we have seen, a man with $26 million income a year—pay no taxes at all.

There are two ways of plugging loopholes and truckholes. One is to try to close them. That is the method which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I have been trying to follow.

The other method is to generalize special privilege so that everybody receives it. In other words, instead of raising the valleys, lower the mountains so that there is a flat level of special privilege.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. None of this special privilege, however generalized, seems to reach very generously in the direction of the mass of our people whose income is derived from wages and salaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. This is for the millionaires, primarily, but also for those with incomes of more than $50,000 a year. They are the ones who receive the benefit.

Another test as to the sincerity of any system of tax reform is whether we make a beginning in closing the truckholes. The amendment which I have offered in the past and which I intend to offer in the future is most generous to the owners of royalty rights and to the wildcatters and small drillers, because there would be no change in the depletion allowance for those whose gross incomes were less than $1 million a year. The decrease would fall entirely upon the earnings in excess of $1 million, and earnings in excess of $5 million.

There are reforms which can be introduced in the taxation of foreign oil companies, about which I shall not speak at the moment, but about which I intend to speak in the future.

Mr. President, unless some kind of reform is effected now, this Congress, in my judgment, will stand condemned before the bar of history, if not before the bar of current public opinion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished Senator agree that the action most urgently needed, justified, and required in the public interest in the field of taxation is tax reform to remove the glaring inequities?

### TAX REFORM AND TAX CUTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the measure which appeals to me most. I know there is a case for tax reduction as a stimulant to economic activity, provided it is not canceled by corresponding reductions in needed public expenditures or corresponding reductions in the amount of credit available for private industry. If there were a tax cut and Mr. Martin and the Federal Reserve Board were then to diminish by an equal amount the bank credit otherwise available for business, we would cancel with one hand what we would create with the other and there would be no net stimulant.

Mr. GORE. Would not the same result be achieved if programs of public improvement now underway were curtailed by an amount equal to the reduction in revenues?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree. Of course, I am not in favor of the maintenance of inefficient expenditures or wasteful expenditures.

Mr. GORE. I understand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there were efficient and necessary expenditures which would otherwise be undertaken, and if they were curtailed or eliminated because of a tax cut, we would be helping to defeat with one hand what we were trying to achieve with the other.

Mr. GORE. I was speaking of the improvement of community facilities—schools, hospitals, streets, waterlines, sewers, and playgrounds.

I do not wish to draw the Senator into a discussion of the tax bill pending before the Finance Committee. I shall confine my questions—and this will be my last—to the tax favoritism extended to the oil and gas industry.

The Senator has pointed out some glaring examples of favoritism. Instead of removing these inequities, I ask the Senator if the tax bill pending before the Senate Finance Committee does not contain further benefits for the gas and oil industry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In one feature, benefits are reduced by approximately $40 million a year, but there is also a reduction in the capital gains tax and certain other features which, while perhaps they do not directly relate to the gas and oil industry, will help recipients of large incomes, along with others.

The administration more or less ducked the issue of taking on this great abuse. It sought to reduce the oil and gas benefits by very complicated methods which probably, taken together, would have netted probably $200 million of additional revenue. The House Ways and Means Committee eliminated all but one of those features, and the net gain is about $40 million a year. This may disappear before it comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator bear in mind the special provision, which some people regarded as obscure when it was discovered, by which the added benefits of investment credit allowances are extended; and that the consideration of these benefits by the Federal Power Commission in determining a ratemaking base is prohibited by the terms of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The Senator is completely correct on that point. I hope it can be discussed later.

Two things have happened. First, the Long amendment of 1962 is to be eliminated. This will increase the amount of the investment credit. Second, the bill in its present form prevents the investment credits given to gas pipelines and utilities from being passed on to the public in the form of lower rates. These two features taken together will unduly increase the net income going to the gas and oil industry by a very appreciable amount. The Senator is completely correct.

**Mr. GORE.** I thank the Senator. I shall not further divert him from his able remarks.

**Mr. DOUGLAS.** I am about finished.

**Mr. GORE.** I rose only to point out that the tax avoidance examples which he gave are increased, and that instead of the bill pending before the committee on which he and I serve being designed to remove these glaring injustices, in several instances the favoritism is increased rather than diminished.

**Mr. DOUGLAS.** That is correct. I lay this matter before the conscience of the Senate and, I hope, before the conscience of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details of these six examples of high-income oil operators who paid no or little taxes in the year 1960 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual A) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | $45, 000 |
| Dividends | $1, 028, 163 |
| Interest (taxable) | $5, 904 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) | $717, 166 |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions) [1] | $2, 336, 729 |
| Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and royalties | $399, 495 |
| Farm income | $9, 990 |
| Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $4, 542, 447 |
| Less: | |
| Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures [2] | $2, 072, 069 |
| Overhead expenses not allocated [3] | $360, 318 |
| Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $2, 432, 387 |
| Total reported economic income | $2, 110, 060 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | $45, 000 |
| Dividends less exclusion | $1, 028,063 |
| Interest (taxable) | $5, 904 |
| Capital gains (50 percent) | $358, 583 |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $2, 336, 729 |
| Less special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion [4] | $881, 297 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $464, 704 |
| Taxable income from oil and gas production | $990, 728 |
| Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and royalties | $399, 495 |
| Farm income | $9, 990 |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $2, 837, 763 |
| Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead [3] | $2, 432, 387 |
| Adjusted gross income | $405, 376 |
| Less deductions from adjusted gross income: | |
| Contributions | ---------- |
| Interest | ---------- |
| Taxes | $2, 157 |
| Medical | $85, 483 |
| Other | $452 |
| Total deductions | $88, 092 |
| Net taxable income | $317, 284 |
| Federal income tax: | |
| Computed tax before dividends credit | $179, 291 |
| Less dividends received credit | $12, 523 |
| Net Federal taxes | $166,768 |
| Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent) | 7. 9 |

[1] Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

[2] Including $1,221,925 in dryhole expenses, $520,508 in canceled and surrendered leases.

[3] Interest expenses of $382,766 is included in total overhead expenses of $617,797. Some $257,479 of total overhead was allocated to oil and gas production. The remaining $360,318 was not allocated by income category.

[4] Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

---

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual D) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | $18, 150 |
| Dividends | $64, 398 |
| Interest (taxable) | $852, 639 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) [1] | $26, 203, 307 |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions) [2] | $1, 534, 082 |
| Oil and gas royalties, drilling contracts, partnerships and miscellaneous [3] | $320, 724 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($276, 368) |
| Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $28, 716, 932 |
| Less: | |
| Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures | $1, 546, 463 |
| Overhead expenses not allocated | $729, 693 |
| Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $2, 276, 156 |
| Total reported economic income | $26, 440, 776 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | $18, 150 |
| Dividends less exclusion | $64, 298 |
| Interest (taxable) | $852, 639 |
| Capital gains (50 percent) [4] | $5, 436, 224 |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $1, 534, 082 |
| Less: | |
| Special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion [5] | $686, 642 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $1,609, 530 |
| Taxable income (loss) from oil and gas production | ($762, 090) |
| Oil and gas royalties, drilling contracts, partnerships, and miscellaneous | $320, 724 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($276, 368) |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $5, 653, 577 |
| Less total exploration and development and nonallocated expenses | $2, 276, 156 |
| Adjusted gross income before carryover of net loss | $3, 377, 421 |
| Less net operating carryover from 1957 and 1959 [6] | ($3, 934, 047) |
| Adjusted gross income after carryover of net loss | ($556, 626) |
| Less total itemized deductions | $289, 704 |
| Taxable income (loss) before personal exemptions | ($846, 330) |
| Federal income tax | 0 |
| Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent) | 0 |

[1] For tax purposes an installment of $10,872,449 was reported in 1960 from a total capital gain realized of $26,203,307 (under section 453(b)(2)(A)). The gain resulted from the sale of a reserved oil and gas production payment. A second installment of $5,743,200 from this capital gain was reported in the 1961 tax return.

[2] Excess of percentage depletion over cost depletion, and intangible drilling expenses.

[3] Includes net income from royalties, drilling contracts, drilling tools, and other sources, in part offset by net losses from partnerships in oil development and manufacturing operations.

[4] Includes $238,430 in interest, $80,675 in general overhead and $63,965 for employees' group insurance.

[5] Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

[6] $232,050 loss carried over from 1957 and $3,701,997 from 1958, primarily from oil operations.

---

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual B) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | ---------- |
| Dividends | $1, 441 |
| Interest (taxable) | $120 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) | $1, 642 |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions) [1] | $4, 061, 682 |
| Oil and gas distribution, royalties, and other income | ($44, 536) |
| Total income before oil and gas exploration and development expenditures | $4, 020, 349 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual B) with low effective tax rate, 1960*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income—Continued | |
| Less oil and gas exploration and development expenditures [2] | $1, 748, 626 |
| Total reported economic income | $2, 271, 723 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | ---------- |
| Dividends less exclusion | $1, 341 |
| Interest (taxable) | $120 |
| Capital gains (50 percent) [3] | ---------- |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $4, 061, 682 |
| Less special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion [4] | $1, 529, 667 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $1, 464, 230 |
| Taxable income from oil and gas production | $1, 067, 785 |
| Oil and gas distribution, royalties and other income (loss) | ($44, 536) |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and develop. expend | $1, 024, 710 |
| Less oil and gas exploration and development expenditures | $1, 748, 626 |
| Adjusted gross income | ($723, 916) |
| Less deductions from adjusted gross income: | |
| Contributions | $---------- |
| Interest | $---------- |
| Taxes | $1, 366 |
| Medical | $---------- |
| Other | $---------- |
| Total deductions | $1, 336 |
| Net taxable income | ($725, 252) |
| Federal income tax | 0 |
| Taxes as percent of total reported economic income | 0 |

[1] Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

[2] Includes $875,622 in dryhole expenses and $765,620 in canceled and surrendered leases.

[3] In 1960 capital gains offset by capital losses carried forward from previous years.

[4] Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual C) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | $100 |
| Dividends | $9, 927 |
| Interest (taxable) | $32, 192 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) | $571, 950 |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions) [1] | $2, 197, 052 |
| Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and other income (loss) [2] | $27, 731 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($637, 674) |
| Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $2, 201, 278 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual C) with low effective tax rate, 1960*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income—Continued | |
| Less: | |
| Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures | $286, 527 |
| Overhead expenses nonallocated | $206, 912 |
| Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $493, 439 |
| Total reported economic income | $1, 707, 839 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | $100 |
| Dividends less exclusion | $9, 877 |
| Interest (taxable) | $32, 192 |
| Capital gains (50 percent) | $285, 975 |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $2, 197, 052 |
| Less special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion [3] | $861, 400 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $106, 010 |
| Taxable income from oil and gas production | $1, 229, 962 |
| Oil and gas manufacturing, distribution and other income (loss) | $27, 731 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($637, 674) |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $947, 843 |
| Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $493, 439 |
| Adjusted gross income | $454, 404 |
| Less deductions from adjusted gross income: | |
| Contributions | $38, 940 |
| Interest | $49, 435 |
| Taxes | $63, 365 |
| Medical | ---------- |
| Other | $62, 648 |
| Total deductions | $214, 388 |
| Net taxable income | $240, 016 |
| Federal income tax: | |
| Computed tax before dividends credit | $143, 203 |
| Less dividends received credit | $395 |
| Net Federal taxes | $142, 808 |
| Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent) | 8. 4 |

[1] Excess percentage depletion (footnote 3) and intangible drilling expenses.

[2] Includes losses on various business ventures, offset by net income from others.

[3] Excess of percentage over adjusted basis depletion.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual E) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | $250 |
| Dividends | $73, 176 |
| Interest (taxable) | $320, 731 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) [1] | $610, 257 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual E) with low effective tax rate, 1960*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income—Continued | |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions) [2] | $440, 918 |
| Oil and gas royalties and miscellaneous income | $83, 499 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($6, 353) |
| Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $1, 522, 478 |
| Less: | |
| Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures [3] | $222, 671 |
| Overhead expenses not allocated [4] | $120, 559 |
| Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $343, 230 |
| Total reported economic income | $1, 179, 248 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | $250 |
| Dividends less exclusion | $73, 076 |
| Interest (taxable) | $320, 731 |
| Capital gains (50 percent) | $66, 164 |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $440, 918 |
| Less special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion [5] | $217, 513 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $59, 339 |
| Taxable income from oil and gas production | $164, 066 |
| Oil and gas royalties and miscellaneous income | $83, 499 |
| Farm income (loss) | ($6, 353) |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $701, 433 |
| Less total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $343, 230 |
| Adjusted gross income before net operating loss carryover | $358, 203 |
| Less net operating loss carryover from 1958 | ($27, 558) |
| Adjusted gross income after carryover of net loss | $330, 645 |
| Less deductions from adjusted gross income: | |
| Contributions [6] | $511, 419 |
| Interest | $------- |
| Taxes | $2, 950 |
| Medical | $1, 133 |
| Other | $135 |
| Total deductions | $515, 637 |
| Net taxable income (before exemptions) | ($184, 992) |
| Federal income tax | 0 |
| Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent) | 0 |

[1] Includes $125,469 from sale of oil and gas leases and $477,929 excess of market value over book value of gift (unimproved land in a major city) to a foundation.

See footnotes at end of table.

[2] Excess percentage depletion (footnote 5) and intangible drilling expenses.

[3] Includes $145,867 for drilling expenditures on nonproducing leases and $41,202 for leases expired and surrendered.

[4] Includes $82,700 for general and administrative expenses.

[5] Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

[6] Includes contribution to foundation referred to in footnote 1.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual F) with low effective tax rate, 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total reported economic income: | |
| Salary | ---------- |
| Dividends | $191,933 |
| Interest (taxable) | $1,157 |
| Capital gains (100 percent) | $120,089 |
| Oil and gas production (before special deductions)[1] | $767,488 |
| Oil and gas royalties, partnership, trust, and miscellaneous[2] | $227,295 |
| Total income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead expenses | $1,307,962 |
| Less: | |
| Oil and gas exploration and development expenditures[3] | [3] $175,665 |
| Overhead expenses not allocated | $102,757 |
| Total exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $278,422 |
| Total reported economic income | $1,029,540 |
| Components of taxable income for Federal tax purposes: | |
| Salary | ---------- |
| Dividends less exclusion | $191,833 |
| Interest (taxable) | $1,157 |
| Capital gains (50 percent)[4] | $60,940 |
| Oil and gas production: | |
| Net before special deductions | $767,488 |
| Less special deductions: | |
| Excess percentage depletion[5] | $297,703 |
| Intangible drilling expenses | $536,955 |
| Taxable income (loss) from oil and gas production | ($67,170) |
| Oil and gas royalties, partnership, trust and miscellaneous | $227,295 |
| Overhead | $278,422 |
| Total adjusted gross income before exploration and development and nonallocated overhead | $414,055 |
| Less total exploration and development and nonallocated adjusted gross income | $135,633 |
| Less deductions from adjusted gross income: | |
| Contributions | $1,151 |
| Interest | $1,471 |
| Taxes | $1,066 |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Example of actual high income oil operator (individual F) with low effective tax rate, 1960*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Medical | 0 |
| Other | 0 |
| Total deductions | $3,688 |
| Net taxable income (before exemption) | $131,945 |
| Federal income tax: | |
| Computed tax before dividends received and foreign tax credit | $66,628 |
| Less dividends received and foreign tax credits | $5,388 |
| Net Federal taxes | $61,240 |
| Net tax as percent of total reported economic income (percent) | 5.9 |

[1] Excess percentage depletion (footnote 4) and intangible drilling expenses.

[2] Includes $166,804 from a family partnership and $56,619 from rents and royalties.

[3] Includes $152,368 for leases canceled and expired.

[4] Includes a small amount of short-term capital gains at 100 percent.

[5] Excess of percentage depletion over adjusted basis depletion.

## EXHIBIT 1

## EXAMPLES OF MILLIONAIRE OIL AND GAS OPERATORS WHO PAID LITTLE OR NO TAXES IN 1960

During the hearings on the tax bill before the Senate Finance Committee, I asked Secretary Dillon to provide me with illustrations of actual cases in which oil operators with large incomes paid little or no taxes.

He has now furnished me with six such cases for 1960. In these cases we find individual oil operators with economic incomes ranging from $1.3 to $28.7 million a year. It will amaze my colleagues to know that the oil operator with $28.7 million of economic income for 1960 paid not one single cent in Federal income taxes for that year.

Another taxpayer with $4 million in economic income—that is, salary, dividends, interest, capital gains, income from oil and gas production, income from oil and gas manufacturing, distribution, and royalties, and other income such as farm income—paid no income taxes at all.

Another oil operator with $1.5 million in economic income paid no taxes at all in 1960.

Of the remaining three, one man with $4.5 million in economic income paid only $166,768 in Federal taxes, or about 3 percent of his total economic income, and only 7.9 percent of his economic income less his oil and gas deductions.

Another, who had $2.2 million in total economic income and $1.7 million in net income, paid only $142,808 in Federal taxes, or only 8.4 percent of his reported economic income, and about 6 percent of his total economic income.

Further, the sixth taxpayer had total economic income of $1,307,962 and a net economic income of $1,029,540. He paid only $61,240 in Federal taxes for 1960, or 5.9 percent of his net economic income and a little less than 5 percent of his total economic income.

The proportion of their income paid in Federal taxes for those with total incomes of $1.3 million to $28.7 million were far lower even for the three who paid any taxes at all than is paid by an average man and wife with two children and with $5,000 of income per year.

### OUTRAGEOUS SITUATION

This is an unjust and outrageous situation. This is why many of us have been pressing for tax reform for, if the tax laws are not reformed and examples such as this continue, the ordinary person will lose faith in his Government and in the fairness of our tax system.

The low tax rates for three of these millionaires and the three examples where no taxes were paid at all, are the result of the numerous loopholes and truck holes in our tax laws and particularly those which favor oil and gas.

### HOW IT WAS DONE

In example A there were deductions of $2.4 million for oil and gas exploration and development and nonallocated overhead costs.

In another example the oil deductions for exploration and development expenditures, as well as depletion, plus the ability to carry forward capital losses, resulted in the payment of no taxes at all on economic income of over $4 million.

In other examples we find that the write-offs and deductions give adjusted gross income figures, which is what the ordinary taxpayer pays his taxes on, of from no taxable income to as little as 20 percent of total income which is taxable.

In the case of the man with $28 million in economic income, of which $26 million was capital gains on the sale of a reserve oil and gas production payment, only a part of these gains were required to be reported for taxable purposes in the year in which the gain was made. Exploration and development costs further reduced his taxable income as did percentage depletion and intangible drilling expenses, as well as loss carryovers from previous years.

The 27½-percent depletion allowance, the fact that under the intangible drilling and development cost provision from 70 to 90 percent of costs can be written off in the first year, the capital gains provisions for oil and gas, and the loss carryover provisions as well as the other loopholes in the tax laws, are the means by which these six millionaire oil operators paid little or no taxes in 1960.

### WE CAN ACT NOW

The Senate Finance Committee, the Senate, and the Congress as a whole will soon have an opportunity to do something about this incredible situation. The minute reforms in the House-passed tax bill scarcely reach these individual millionaires who, in some cases, pay no taxes at all and who in other cases pay taxes at lower rates than the ordinary family workingman in the United States. One of the reasons many of us have been dismayed about the attitude of the Treasury is that Mr. Dillon stated that they do not intend to push for any reform not in the House-passed bill.

Because of these and other examples, some of us have been pushing for tax reform as well as tax reduction. The Treasury, and the administration, and the Senate, and the Congress, and the country cannot close their eyes to this gross injustice in our tax laws. In view of these examples, the Treasury cannot properly give up on needed reform, as it has now done.

In the days which follow, I expect to put in the RECORD information concerning both large and small oil and gas corporations as opposed to the examples of the individual oil operators which I am speaking about today.

TABLE I.—*Examples of high income oil operators with low effective tax rates (1960)*

| Taxpayer | (1) Total economic income | (2) Reported economic income | (3) Adjusted gross income | (4) Net taxable income | (5) Federal income tax | (6) Federal income tax as percentage of total reported economic income (col. 2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | $4,542,447 | $2,110,060 | $405,376 | $317,284 | $166,768 | 7.9 |
| B | 4,020,349 | 2,271,723 | (723,916) | (725,252) | 0 | 0 |
| C | 2,201,278 | 1,707,839 | 454,404 | 240,016 | 142,808 | 8.4 |
| D | 28,716,932 | 26,440,776 | [1] (556,626) | [2] (846,330) | 0 | 0 |
| E | 1,522,478 | 1,179,248 | [1] 330,645 | [2] (184,992) | 0 | 0 |
| F | 1,307,962 | 1,029,540 | 135,633 | [2] 131,945 | 61,240 | 5.9 |

[1] After carryover of net loss.

[2] Before personal exemptions.

## PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all of the Senate conferees.

All legislation is the result of compromise. In general, I believe that the Senate conferees did very well in upholding the position of the Senate. The conference report provides $4,406,272,700, which is $94,690,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $130,156,300 above the House; $155,684,300 below the budget; and $1,128,429,910 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary table explaining the action of the conferees on the various items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary table*

| Item | Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended) | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | |
| CEMETERIAL EXPENSES | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | $10,846,000 | $10,800,000 | $10,800,000 | $10,800,000 |
| CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL | | | | |
| General investigations | 20,060,000 | 18,000,000 | 20,600,000 | 19,115,000 |
| Construction, general | 819,486,000 | 798,282,700 | 849,856,000 | 827,146,500 |
| Operation and maintenance, general | 157,368,000 | 150,000,000 | 157,368,000 | 154,000,000 |
| General expenses | 15,252,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries | 74,860,000 | 74,500,000 | 80,406,000 | 77,862,000 |
| U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers | | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Total, rivers and harbors and flood control | 1,087,026,000 | 1,055,782,700 | 1,123,240,000 | 1,093,133,500 |
| THE PANAMA CANAL | | | | |
| Canal Zone Government: | | | | |
| Operating expenses | 26,465,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,725,000 | 25,725,000 |
| Capital outlay | 7,250,000 | 6,500,000 | 7,250,000 | 6,500,000 |
| Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses | (9,550,000) | (9,000,000) | (9,285,000) | (9,285,000) |
| Total, the Panama Canal | 33,715,000 | 31,500,000 | 32,975,000 | 32,225,000 |
| Total, title I | 1,131,587,000 | 1,098,082,700 | 1,167,015,000 | 1,136,158,500 |
| TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | |
| BUREAU OF RECLAMATION | | | | |
| General investigations | 11,361,000 | 9,894,000 | 10,442,000 | 10,294,000 |
| Construction and rehabilitation | 195,760,000 | 180,190,000 | 187,425,000 | 185,431,000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 38,588,000 | 38,000,000 | 38,000,000 | 38,000,000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts | (4,363,000) | (4,363,000) | (4,363,000) | (4,363,000) |
| Loan program | 13,300,000 | 12,217,000 | 12,367,000 | 12,367,000 |
| Emergency fund | | | | |
| Upper Colorado River Basin Fund | 101,287,000 | 97,845,700 | 97,989,200 | 97,989,200 |
| General administrative expenses | 10,051,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation | 370,347,000 | 348,146,700 | 356,223,200 | 354,081,200 |
| BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Construction | 56,058,000 | 36,000,000 | 36,204,000 | 36,204,000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 13,929,000 | 13,200,000 | 13,500,000 | 13,500,000 |
| Total, Bonneville Power Administration | 69,987,000 | 49,200,000 | 49,704,000 | 49,704,000 |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | |
| Construction | 3,520,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,568,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts) | (4,500,000) | (4,500,000) | (4,500,000) | (4,500,000) |
| Total, Southwestern Power Administration | 5,088,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 |
| Total, definite appropriations | 446,422,000 | 402,846,700 | 411,427,200 | 409,285,200 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 8,863,000 | 8,863,000 | 8,863,000 | 8,863,000 |
| Total, title II | 455,285,000 | 411,709,700 | 420,290,200 | 418,148,200 |

TABLE 1.—*Summary table*—Continued

| Item | Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended) | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | | |
| ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION | | | | |
| Operating expenses | $2,423,500,000 | $2,308,169,000 | $2,369,524,000 | $2,342,669,000 |
| Indefinite appropriation of receipts | (32,000,000) | (32,000,000) | (32,000,000) | (32,000,000) |
| Plant and capital equipment | 426,145,000 | 380,000,000 | 418,695,000 | 400,000,000 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Commission | 2,849,645,000 | 2,688,169,000 | 2,788,219,000 | 2,742,669,000 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: | | | | |
| Limitation on administrative expenses | (429,000) | (429,000) | (429,000) | (429,000) |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 48,284,000 | 46,000,000 | 48,284,000 | 47,142,000 |
| Delaware River Basin Commission: | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 39,000 | 38,000 | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission | 117,000 | 117,000 | 117,000 | 117,000 |
| Total, Delaware River Basin Commission | 156,000 | 155,000 | 155,000 | 155,000 |
| U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins | | | | |
| Total, definite appropriations | 2,898,085,000 | 2,734,324,000 | 2,836,658,000 | 2,789,966,000 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 32,000,000 | 32,000,000 | 32,000,000 | 32,000,000 |
| Total, title III | 2,930,085,000 | 2,766,324,000 | 2,868,658,000 | 2,821,966,000 |
| TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT | | | | |
| Public works acceleration | 45,000,000 | | 45,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| Total, title IV | 45,000,000 | | 45,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| Grand totals: | | | | |
| Total, definite appropriations | 4,521,094,000 | 4,235,253,400 | 4,460,100,200 | 4,365,409,700 |
| Total, indefinite appropriations | 40,863,000 | 40,863,000 | 40,863,000 | 40,863,000 |
| Grand total, all titles | 4,561,957,000 | 4,276,116,400 | 4,500,963,200 | 4,406,272,700 |

### TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

**Mr. ELLENDER.** For general investigations of the Corps of Engineers the bill provides $19,115,000, which is $1,485,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $1,115,000 above the amount allowed by the House; and $1,015,000 above the appropriation for 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*General investigations*

| Item | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Surveys: | | | | |
| (a) Navigation studies | $1,535,000 | $1,828,000 | $2,500,000 | $2,164,000 |
| (b) Flood control studies | 4,440,000 | 4,777,000 | 5,875,000 | 5,351,000 |
| (c) Beach erosion cooperative studies | 350,000 | 375,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| (d) Comprehensive basin studies: | | | | |
| Big Black River, Miss | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Big Muddy River, Ill | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| Brazos River Basin, Tex | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Colorado River, Tex | 215,000 | 215,000 | 215,000 | 215,000 |
| Connecticut River Basin, Conn , Mass., Vt., and N. H | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Fox River, Wis | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Grand River Basin, Mich | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Missouri River Basin | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Neches River, Tex | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 110,000 |
| Ohio River Basin review | 775,000 | 775,000 | 775,000 | 775,000 |
| Pascagoula River Basin, Miss | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Pearl River Basin Miss | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Puget Sound area, Washington | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Sabine River, Tex | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 115,000 |
| St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| St. Johns River Basin, Maine | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 |
| Upper Mississippi River Basin | 325,000 | 325,000 | 325,000 | 325,000 |
| Wabash River, Ind. and Ill | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| White River Basin, Ark. and Mo | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Willamette River Basin, Oreg | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 |
| (e) Special Studies: | | | | |
| Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana | 50,000 | 50,000 | 200,000 | 125,000 |
| Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.) | 300,000 | 30,0000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Great Lakes water levels | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y | 200,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Hurricane studies | 387,000 | 387,000 | 387,000 | 387,000 |
| Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y | 200,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Rampart Canyon, Alaska | 197,000 | 197,000 | 197,000 | 197,000 |
| San Francisco Bay area survey, California | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| Texas coast | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| Hudson River siltation study | | | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| General reduction applied against basin surveys | | −1,000,000 | −1,500,000 | −1,500,000 |
| Subtotal surveys | 13,234,000 | 12,989,000 | 14,489,000 | 13,554,000 |

TABLE 2.—*General investigations*—Continued

| Item | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Collection and study of basic data: | | | | |
| Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey) | $280,000 | $280,000 | $280,000 | $280,000 |
| Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau) | 480,000 | 480,000 | 480,000 | 480,000 |
| Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| International water studies | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| Flood plain studies | 715,000 | 715,000 | 715,000 | 715,000 |
| Subtotal, collection and study of basic data | 1,770,000 | 1,770,000 | 1,770,000 | 1,770,000 |
| 3. Research and development: | | | | |
| Beach erosion development studies | 820,000 | 820,000 | 820,000 | 820,000 |
| Hydrologic studies | 185,000 | 185,000 | 185,000 | 185,000 |
| Engineering studies | 1,365,000 | 1,365,000 | 1,365,000 | 1,365,000 |
| Plan formulation and evaluation studies | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Mississippi Basin model: | | | | |
| (1) Construction | 461,000 | 461,000 | 461,000 | 461,000 |
| (2) Mississippi River comprehensive study | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction | 1,915,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Subtotal, research and development | 5,056,000 | 4,341,000 | 4,341,000 | 4,341,000 |
| General reduction due to slippage | | −1,100,000 | | −550,000 |
| Total, general investigations | 20,060,000 | 18,000,000 | 20,600,000 | 19,115,000 |

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Mr. ELLENDER. For construction, general, the conference bill provides $827,146,500 which is $22,709,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $28,863,800 above the House; and $34,276,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As I stated earlier this week, when the bill was before the Senate, the House added some new unbudgeted items, which upon review by the Senate committee proved to be desirable projects, and the committee recommended approval of their inclusion in the bill. The Senate concurred in that recommendation.

The House added 17 new planning starts, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The Senate added 28 new planning starts, and the House approved 20 of these additional planning items approved by the Senate.

The House added 19 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $89,560,000. These projects were accepted by the Senate. The Senate added 23 additional construction starts. The House accepted 15 of the new starts added by the Senate having a future commitment of $20,953,000. The budget provided for 34 new starts having a future commitment of $365,483,000. Thus the conference bill provides for 68 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $475,996,000, or about 6 months work at the current rate of appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Alabama: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Holt lock and dam | $7,700,000 | | $7,700,000 | | $7,700,000 | | $7,700,000 | |
| (MP) | Jones Bluff lock and dam | | $250,000 | | $250,000 | | $250,000 | | $250,000 |
| (MP) | Millers Ferry lock and dam | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (N) | Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Paint Rock River | 231,000 | | 231,000 | | 231,000 | | 231,000 | |
| (N) | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. | | | | | | 225,000 | | |
| (MP) | Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia) | 500,000 | | | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Alaska: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin | | | | | 921,000 | | 921,000 | |
| (MP) | Snettishan power project | | 225,000 | | 225,000 | | 300,000 | | 225,000 |
| | Arizona: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Alamo Reservoir | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Tucson diversion channel | 1,750,000 | | 1,750,000 | | 1,750,000 | | 1,750,000 | |
| | Arkansas: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification | 18,000,000 | | 18,000,000 | | 18,000,000 | | 18,000,000 | |
| | (b) Navigation locks and dams | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Beaver Reservoir | 10,300,000 | | 10,300,000 | | 10,300,000 | | 10,300,000 | |
| (MP) | Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8 Arkansas and Missouri | 567,000 | | 567,000 | | 567,000 | | 567,000 | |
| (MP) | Dardanelle lock and dam | 20,000,000 | | 20,000,000 | | 20,000,000 | | 20,000,000 | |
| (FC) | De Queen Reservoir | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (MP) | Degray Reservoir | 2,350,000 | | 2,350,000 | | 2,350,000 | | 2,350,000 | |
| (FC) | Dierks Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Garland City | | | | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | Gillam Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Greers Ferry Reservoir | 2,917,000 | | 2,917,000 | | 2,917,000 | | 2,917,000 | |
| (FC) | Maniece Bayou, upstream extension | | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (FC) | McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas | | | | | | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| (FC) | Millwood Reservoir | 15,600,000 | | 15,600,000 | | 15,600,000 | | 15,600,000 | |
| (MP) | Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| (N) | Quachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,300,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Ozark lock and dam | | 285,000 | | 285,000 | | 285,000 | | 285,000 |
| (FC) | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts | | | | | | 75,000 | | 37,500 |

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | California: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Alameda Creek | | $250,000 | | $250,000 | | $250,000 | | $250,000 |
| (FC) | Bear Creek | $600,000 | | $600,000 | | $600,000 | | $600,000 | |
| (FC) | Buchanan Reservoir | | | | 125,000 | | 125,000 | | 125,000 |
| (FC) | Camanche Reservoir | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | |
| (FC) | Corte Madera Creek | | | | | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| (R) | Crescent City Harbor (breakwater) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Dana Point Harbor | | | | 95,000 | | 95,000 | | 95,000 |
| (FC) | Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement | | 150,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Hidden Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Los Angeles County drainage area | 15,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries | 610,000 | | 610,000 | | 610,000 | | 610,000 | |
| (N) | Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor | 1,350,000 | | 1,350,000 | | 1,350,000 | | 1,350,000 | |
| | Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Merced River Reservoirs | | 25,000 | | 25,000 | | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| (FC) | Mormon Slough | | | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | New Hogan Reservoir | 2,250,000 | | 2,250,000 | | 2,250,000 | | 2,250,000 | |
| (MP) | New Melones Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Noyo River and Harbor | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | 100,000 | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Oroville Reservoir | 8,000,000 | | 4,555,000 | | 4,555,000 | | 4,555,000 | |
| (N) | Redondo Beach King Harbor | 950,000 | | 950,000 | | 950,000 | | 950,000 | |
| (N) | Redwood City Harbor | | | 660,000 | | 660,000 | | 660,000 | |
| (FC) | Redwood Creek | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam) | 335,000 | | 335,000 | | 335,000 | | 335,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River bank protection | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries | 1,500,000 | | 70,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Sacramento River deep water ship channel | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (FC) | Sacramento River flood control project | 900,000 | | 840,000 | | 900,000 | | 840,000 | |
| (N) | Santa Barbara Harbor | | | | | | 50,000 | | |
| (BE) | Santa Cruz County (reimbursement) | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| (N) | Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant) | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| (FC) | Tahchevak Creek | | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (BE) | Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement) | 122,000 | | 122,000 | | 122,000 | | 122,000 | |
| (FC) | Walnut Creek | 100,000 | | 500,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | West Fork Reservoir | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| | Colorado: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Trinidad Reservoir | | 86,000 | | 86,000 | 300,000 | 86,000 | | 86,000 |
| | Connecticut: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Ansonia-Derby | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Black Rock Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Colebrook River Reservoir | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (R) | Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments) | | 60,000 | | 60,000 | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (N) | Connecticut River below Hartford, North Cove at Old Saybrook | | | | | 578,000 | | | |
| (FC) | East Branch Reservoir | 685,000 | | 685,000 | | 685,000 | | 685,000 | |
| (FC) | Hancock Brook Reservoir | 1,600,000 | | 1,600,000 | | 1,600,000 | | 1,600,000 | |
| (FC) | Hop Brook Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | New London Barrier | | | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Northfield Brook Reservoir | 900,000 | | 900,000 | | 900,000 | | 900,000 | |
| (BE) | Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement) | 32,000 | | 32,000 | | 32,000 | | 32,000 | |
| (FC) | Stamford | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Sucker Brook Reservoir | | 90,000 | | 90,000 | | 90,000 | | 90,000 |
| (FC) | West Thompson Reservoir | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | |
| | Delaware: | | | | | | | | |
| | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) | | | | | | | | |
| (R) | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Indian River Inlet (bulkheads) | 831,000 | | 831,000 | | 831,000 | | 831,000 | |
| (N) | Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | | 12,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |
| | Florida: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Apalachicola River channel improvement | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (N) | Bakers Haulover Inlet | 204,000 | | 204,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Canaveral Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Central and southern Florida | 14,000,000 | | 14,000,000 | | 15,500,000 | | 14,750,000 | |
| (N) | Cross Florida barge canal | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Intercoastal Waterway: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River | 950,000 | | 950,000 | | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| | (b) Jacksonville to Miami | 2,085,000 | | 2,085,000 | | 2,085,000 | | 2,085,000 | |
| (N) | Miami Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (BE) | Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement) | 9,000 | | 9,000 | | 9,000 | | 9,000 | |
| (N) | Palm Beach Harbor | | | | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Pensacola Harbor | | | | | 299,000 | | | |
| (N) | Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act) | 575,000 | | 575,000 | | 575,000 | | 575,000 | |
| | Georgia: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Carters Dam | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| (N) | Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C | | | 270,000 | | 270,000 | | 270,000 | |
| | Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 |
| | Hawaii: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Hilo Harbor | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 |
| (R) | Kahului Harbor (breakwater) | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Kaunakakai Harbor | | | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Wailoa Stream | 766,000 | | 766,000 | | 766,000 | | 766,000 | |
| | Idaho: | | | | | | | | |
| FC) | Boise Valley | 409,000 | | 409,000 | | 409,000 | | 409,000 | |
| MP) | Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | |
| FC) | Ririe Reservoir | | 375,000 | | 375,000 | | 375,000 | | 375,000 |

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Illinois: | | | | | | | | |
| (BA) | Calumet River, bridges | $1,400,000 | ----- | $1,400,000 | ----- | $1,400,000 | ----- | $1,400,000 | ----- |
| (N) | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | (b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor | 2,500,000 | ----- | 2,500,000 | ----- | 2,500,000 | ----- | 2,500,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Carlyle Reservoir | 5,700,000 | ----- | 5,700,000 | ----- | 5,900,000 | ----- | 5,700,000 | ----- |
| (R) | Chicago Harbor (breakwater) | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- |
| (N) | Chicago Harbor—1962 act | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | $27,000 | ----- | $27,000 |
| (FC) | Clear Lake Special Drainage District | ----- | $51,000 | ----- | $51,000 | ----- | 51,000 | ----- | 51,000 |
| (FC) | East St. Louis and vicinity | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Freeport | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 |
| (N) | Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana | 6,100,000 | ----- | 6,100,000 | ----- | 6,100,000 | ----- | 6,100,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Indian Grave Drainage District | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 |
| | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Kaskaskia River | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 |
| (FC) | Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred) | ----- | 10,000 | ----- | 10,000 | ----- | 10,000 | ----- | 10,000 |
| (FC) | McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District | ----- | 80,000 | ----- | 80,000 | ----- | 80,000 | ----- | 80,000 |
| (N) | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Regulating works | 2,300,000 | ----- | 2,300,000 | ----- | 2,300,000 | ----- | 2,300,000 | |
| | (b) Chain of Rocks | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Mount Carmel | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Oakley Reservoir | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Rend Lake Reservoir | ----- | 501,000 | ----- | 501,000 | 10,000 | 501,000 | ----- | 501,000 |
| (FC) | Richland Creek | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 150,000 | ----- | 150,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Shelbyville Reservoir | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown) | 695,000 | ----- | 695,000 | ----- | 695,000 | ----- | 695,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Sny Island Levee Drainage District | ----- | 166,000 | ----- | 166,000 | ----- | 166,000 | ----- | 166,000 |
| (FC) | Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | The Sny Basin | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Tri-Pond levee | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 300,000 | ----- | 300,000 | ----- |
| | Indiana: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Brookville Reservoir | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 |
| | Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Ketnucky | 9,871,000 | ----- | 9,871,000 | ----- | 9,871,000 | ----- | 9,871,000 | |
| (FC) | Evansville | 800,000 | ----- | 800,000 | ----- | 800,000 | ----- | 800,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Huntington Reservoir | 2,000,000 | ----- | 2,000,000 | ----- | 2,000,000 | ----- | 2,000,000 | ----- |
| | Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Island levee, Indiana and Illinois | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 50,000 | ----- | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Levee unit 5, Wabash River | 825,000 | ----- | 825,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 825,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Mason J. Niblack levee | 650,000 | ----- | 650,000 | ----- | 750,000 | ----- | 650,000 | ----- |
| | McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Mississinewa Reservoir | 5,100,000 | ----- | 51,00,000 | ----- | 5,100,000 | ----- | 5,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Monroe Reservoir | 2,600,000 | ----- | 2,600,000 | ----- | 2,600,000 | ----- | 2,600,000 | ----- |
| (N) | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 |
| (FC) | Salamonie Reservoir | 3,520,000 | ----- | 3,520,000 | ----- | 4,000,000 | ----- | 3,520,000 | ----- |
| (N) | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | 750,000 | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 |
| | Iowa: | | | | | | | | |
| | Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge | ----- | ----- | 150,000 | ----- | 150,000 | ----- | 150,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Dubuque | ----- | ----- | ----- | 35,000 | ----- | 35,000 | ----- | 35,000 |
| (FC) | Floyd River and tributaries | 3,800,000 | ----- | 3,722,000 | ----- | 3,722,000 | ----- | 3,722,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Indian Creek Dam | ----- | 45,000 | ----- | 45,000 | ----- | 45,000 | ----- | 45,000 |
| (FC) | Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16 | 1,500,000 | ----- | 1,500,000 | ----- | 1,500,000 | ----- | 1,500,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Little Sioux River | 1,148,000 | ----- | 1,148,000 | ----- | 1,148,000 | ----- | 1,148,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- |
| (N) | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- |
| | (b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City | 2,700,000 | ----- | 2,700,000 | ----- | 2,700,000 | ----- | 2,700,000 | ----- |
| | (c) Kansas City to the mouth | 2,700,000 | ----- | 2,700,000 | ----- | 3,000,000 | ----- | 3,000,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13 | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- | 200,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Rathbun Reservoir | ----- | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Red Rock Reservoir | 11,200,000 | ----- | 11,200,000 | ----- | 11,200,000 | ----- | 11,200,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Saylorville Reservoir | ----- | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- | 400,000 | ----- |
| | Kansas: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Atchison | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 | ----- | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Big Hill Reservoir | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 35,000 | ----- | 35,000 |
| (FC) | Clinton Reservoir | ----- | 60,000 | ----- | 60,000 | ----- | 60,000 | ----- | 60,000 |
| (FC) | Council Grove Reservoir | 1,800,000 | ----- | 1,800,000 | ----- | 1,800,000 | ----- | 1,800,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Dodge City | ----- | 185,000 | ----- | 185,000 | ----- | 185,000 | ----- | 185,000 |
| (FC) | Elk City Reservoir | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- | 5,600,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- | 6,000,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Kansas City, Kans. and Mo | 580,000 | ----- | 580,000 | ----- | 580,000 | ----- | 580,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification) | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 50,000 | ----- | ----- |
| (FC) | Marion Reservoir | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- | 1,000,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Melvern Reservoir | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 | ----- | 250,000 |
| (FC) | Merriam | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 50,000 | ----- | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Milford Reservoir | 14,925,000 | ----- | 14,925,000 | ----- | 14,925,000 | ----- | 14,925,000 | ----- |
| | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Osawatomie | ----- | 39,000 | ----- | 39,000 | ----- | 39,000 | ----- | 39,000 |
| (FC) | Perry Reservoir | 3,000,000 | ----- | 3,000,000 | ----- | 3,000,000 | ----- | 3,000,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Pomona Reservoir | 1,887,000 | ----- | 1,887,000 | ----- | 1,887,000 | ----- | 1,887,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Topeka | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- | 3,500,000 | ----- |
| (FC) | Wilson Reservoir | 6,600,000 | ----- | 6,600,000 | ----- | 6,600,000 | ----- | 6,600,000 | ----- |

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Kentucky: | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. | $27,000,000 | | $27,000,000 | | $27,000,000 | | $27,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Barren River Reservoir | 7,067,000 | | 7,067,000 | | 7,067,000 | | 7,067,000 | |
| | Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio | 9,200,000 | | 9,200,000 | | 10,000,000 | | 9,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Carr Fork Reservoir | | $320,000 | | $150,000 | | $250,000 | | $250,000 |
| (FC) | Cave Run Reservoir | | 220,000 | | 220,000 | | 220,000 | | 220,000 |
| (MP) | Celina Dam (deferred) | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Corbin | 270,000 | | 270,000 | | 270,000 | | 270,000 | |
| (FC) | Cumberland | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (FC) | Eagle Creek Reservoir | | | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Fishtrap Reservoir | 9,500,000 | | 9,500,000 | | 9,500,000 | | 9,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Grayson Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Green River Reservoir | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (N) | McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky | 4,220,000 | | 4,220,000 | | 4,220,000 | | 4,220,000 | |
| | Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Red River Reservoir | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Louisiana: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Calcasieu River and Pass | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | |
| (N) | Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier | | 103,000 | | 103,000 | 47,000 | 103,000 | 47,000 | 103,000 |
| (FC) | Campti Clarence levee | | 23,000 | | 23,000 | 100,000 | 23,000 | 100,000 | 23,000 |
| (N) | Freshwater Bayou | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (N) | Mississippi River, gulf outlet | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | |
| (FC) | New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act) | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| | Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Twelve Mile Bayou | | | | | [1] (258,000) | | [1] (258,000) | |
| | Maine: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Narragaugus River | | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (N) | Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel | 2,000,000 | | [2] 1,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| | Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Searsport Harbor (1962 act) | 718,000 | | 718,000 | | 718,000 | | 718,000 | |
| | Maryland: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Baltimore Harbor and Channel | 4,500,000 | | 4,500,000 | | 4,500,000 | | 4,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Massachusetts: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Boston Harbor, Chelsea River | | | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (R) | Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Chicopee Falls | 1,385,000 | | 1,385,000 | | 1,385,000 | | 1,385,000 | |
| (FC) | Conant Brook Reservoir | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (N) | Gloucester Harbor | | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Littleville Reservoir | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (FC) | New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier | 3,634,000 | | 3,634,000 | | 3,634,000 | | 3,634,000 | |
| (N) | Plymouth Harbor (1962 act) | | | | 35,000 | | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| (BE) | Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement) | 7,000 | | 7,000 | | 7,000 | | 7,000 | |
| (FC) | Three Rivers | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Wareham-Marion | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Westfield | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | Michigan: | | | | | | | | |
| (R) | Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (N) | Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel | 1,485,000 | | 1,485,000 | | 1,485,000 | | 1,485,000 | |
| (N) | Gladstone Harbor | | | | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (N) | Great Lakes connecting channels | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (R) | Ludington Harbor (north revetment) | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | |
| (R) | Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (R) | Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Muskegon Harbor | | 18,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| (R) | Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments) | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (N) | Ontonagon Harbor | | | | | | 75,000 | | |
| (FC) | Rouge River | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (N) | St. Marys River: New Poe lock | 242,000 | | 242,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Saginaw River (flood control) | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| | Minnesota: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Inner harbor, 27- and 23-foot channels | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| | (b) Outer harbor, 32- to 27-foot channels | 1,162,000 | | 1,162,000 | | 1,162,000 | | 1,162,000 | |
| (FC) | Marshall, Redwood River | 696,000 | | 696,000 | | 696,000 | | 696,000 | |
| (R) | Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls) | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (FC) | St. Paul and South St. Paul | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Winona | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| | Mississippi: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Jackson and East Jackson | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | |
| (FC) | Natchez | | | | | 115,000 | | 115,000 | |
| (FC) | Okatibbee Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Pascagoula Harbor | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| | Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.) | | | | | | | | |

**See footnotes at end of table.**

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Missouri: | | | | | | | | |
| | Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Canton | $300,000 | | $300,000 | | $300,000 | | $300,000 | |
| (FC) | Chariton River, Iowa and Mo | | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (FC) | Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (FC) | Gregory Drainage District | | $50,000 | | $50,000 | | $50,000 | | $50,000 |
| (FC) | Hannibal | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (MP) | Joanna Reservoir | | 300,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 |
| | Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir | | 650,000 | | 650,000 | 350,000 | 650,000 | | 650,000 |
| MP) | Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| | Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3 | 330,000 | | 330,000 | | 330,000 | | 330,000 | |
| (FC) | South River Drainage District | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | St. Louis | 8,000,000 | | 8,000,000 | | 8,000,000 | | 8,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Stockton Reservoir | 2,600,000 | | 2,600,000 | | 2,600,000 | | 2,600,000 | |
| (MP) | Montana: Libby Reservoir | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 |
| | Nebraska: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Clarkson | | | | | [1] (205,000) | | [1] (205,000) | |
| (FC) | Gering Valley | 650,000 | | 650,000 | | 650,000 | | 600,000 | |
| FC) | Little Papillion Creek | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| | Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Missouri River Channel stablization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Norfolk | | 45,000 | | 45,000 | | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| (FC) | Salt Creek and tributaries | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | | 4,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Nevada: Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev | | | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | New Hampshire: Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H | | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| | New Jersey: | | | | | | | | |
| (R) | Cold Spring Inlet (jetties) | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (N) | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| (R) | Manasquan River (bulkheads) | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | | 350,000 | |
| (N) | Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel | | | | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (R) | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays | 690,000 | | 690,000 | | 690,000 | | 690,000 | |
| (MP) | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| | New Mexico: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act) | | 130,000 | | 130,000 | | 130,000 | | 130,000 |
| (FC) | Cochiti Reservoir | | 308,000 | | 308,000 | | 308,000 | | 308,000 |
| (FC) | Galisteo Reservoir | | 220,000 | | 220,000 | | 220,000 | | 220,000 |
| (FC) | Las Cruces | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Socorro | 1,235,000 | | 1,235,000 | | 1,235,000 | | 1,235,000 | |
| | New York: | | | | | | | | |
| | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Buffalo Harbor: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Outer harbor (1962 modification) | | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| | (b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels | 707,000 | | 707,000 | | 707,000 | | 707,000 | |
| (N) | Buttermilk Channel | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (BE) | Fire Island Inlet, Long Island | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 600,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | |
| (N) | Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act) | 917,000 | | 917,000 | | 917,000 | | 917,000 | |
| (N) | Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway | 380,000 | | 380,000 | | 380,000 | | 380,000 | |
| (FC) | Herkimer | 286,000 | | 286,000 | | 286,000 | | 286,000 | |
| (N) | Hudson River, New York City to Albany | 5,100,000 | | 5,100,000 | | 5,100,000 | | 5,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet | | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Lackawanna | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (FC) | Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (R) | Little Sodus Bay (piers) | | 20,000 | | 20,000 | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| | New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Oswego Harbor (1962 act) | | | | 60,000 | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (N) | Rochester Harbor | 1,025,000 | | 1,025,000 | | 1,025,000 | | 1,025,000 | |
| (FC) | Rosendale | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Salamanca | | | | 20,000 | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| (FC) | South Amsterdam | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| | North Carolina: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (BE) | Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach | | | | | 54,000 | | 54,000 | |
| (FC) | New Hope Reservoir (not authorized) | | | | | | 180,000 | | 180,000 |
| (FC) | Swift Creek | | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (N) | Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act) | | | | | | 135,000 | | 135,000 |
| | North Dakota: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Bowman Haley Reservoir | | | | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (MP) | Garrison Reservoir | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | | 700,000 | |
| (FC) | Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (Not authorized.) | | | | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.) | | | | | | | | |

See footnotes at end of table.

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Ohio: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Ashtabula Harbor 27-30-foot channels, deepen turning area | $383,000 | | $383,000 | | $383,000 | | $383,000 | |
| (N) | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | | 12,000,000 | | 12,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Big Darby Creek Reservoir | | $266,000 | | $266,000 | | $266,000 | | $266,000 |
| (FC) | Buck Creek Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Caesar Creek Reservoir | | | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| | Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Cleveland Harbor: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act) | 900,000 | | 900,000 | | 900,000 | | 900,000 | |
| | (b) Deepen East Basin to 27-28 feet (1952 act) | | | | | | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| (R) | Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters) | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | |
| (N) | Conneaut Harbor | | | 225,000 | | 225,000 | | 225,000 | |
| (FC) | Deer Creek Reservoir | | 216,000 | | 216,000 | | 216,000 | | 216,000 |
| (FC) | East Fork Reservoir | | | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Fremont | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 |
| (N) | Lorain Harbor | 4,100,000 | | 4,100,000 | | 4,100,000 | | 4,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Manchester (deferred) | | | | 8,000 | | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| (FC) | North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| (FC) | Paint Creek Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (N) | Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | | 9,000,000 | |
| (N) | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Salt Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Sandusky Harbor | 1,531,000 | | 1,531,000 | | 1,531,000 | | 1,531,000 | |
| (R) | Sandusky Harbor (east jetty) | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | |
| | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Toledo Harbor | 6,268,000 | | 6,268,000 | | 6,268,000 | | 6,268,000 | |
| (FC) | West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | |
| (N) | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia | | | | | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Youngstown, Crab Creek | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | Oklahoma: | | | | | | | | |
| | Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Birch Reservoir | | 125,000 | | 125,000 | | 125,000 | | 125,000 |
| (MP) | Broken Bow Reservoir | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | |
| (FC) | Copan Reservoir | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (MP) | Eufaula Reservoir | 18,500,000 | | 18,500,000 | | 18,500,000 | | 18,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Hugo Reservoir | | | | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Kaw Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (MP) | Keystone Reservoir | 15,500,000 | | 15,500,000 | | 15,500,000 | | 15,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Optima Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| (FC) | Pine Creek Reservoir | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| (FC) | Skiatook Reservoir | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (N) | Webbers Falls lock and dam | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 |
| | Oregon: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Blue River Reservoir | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (N) | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington | | 170,000 | | 170,000 | | 170,000 | | 170,000 |
| (R) | Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (MP) | Cougar Reservoir | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | | 3,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Fall Creek Reservoir | 3,740,000 | | 3,740,000 | | 3,740,000 | | 3,740,000 | |
| (FC) | Gate Creek Reservoir | | | | | | 100,000 | | |
| (MP) | Green Peter Reservoir | 11,650,000 | | 11,650,000 | | 11,650,000 | | 11,650,000 | |
| (MP) | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington | 57,000,000 | | 57,000,000 | | 57,000,000 | | 57,000,000 | |
| (MP) | Lost Creek Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Tillamook Bay and Harbor | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Willamette River Basin bank protection | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (FC) | Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage: Shelton Ditch | | | | | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| (N) | Yaquina Bay and Harbor | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| | Pennsylvania: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. | 21,227,000 | | 21,227,000 | | 21,227,000 | | 21,227,000 | |
| (FC) | Beltzville Reservoir | | 240,000 | | 240,000 | | 240,000 | | 240,000 |
| (FC) | Bethlehem | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | | 370,000 | |
| (FC) | Blanchard Reservoir | | 428,000 | | 428,000 | | 428,000 | | 428,000 |
| (FC) | Butler | 750,000 | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | |
| (FC) | Curwensville Reservoir | 6,800,000 | | 6,800,000 | | 6,800,000 | | 6,800,000 | |
| (N) | Dam 4, Monongahela River | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| | Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Elkland | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | Latrobe | | 117,000 | | 117,000 | | 117,000 | | 117,000 |
| (N) | Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River | 5,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Muddy Creek Reservoir | | | | | | 25,000 | | |
| (FC) | Raystown Reservoir | | | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (FC) | Scranton | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (FC) | Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. | 10,800,000 | | 10,800,000 | | 10,800,000 | | 10,800,000 | |
| | Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Turtle Creek | 3,200,000 | | 3,200,000 | | 3,200,000 | | 3,200,000 | |
| (FC) | Union City Reservoir | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| | Puerto Rico: | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | San Juan Harbor | 4,633,000 | | 4,633,000 | | 4,633,000 | | 4,633,000 | |
| | Rhode Island: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Fox Point Barrier | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Lower Woonsocket | 1,450,000 | | 1,450,000 | | 1,450,000 | | 1,450,000 | |
| (FC) | Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (R) | Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters) | 470,000 | | 470,000 | | 470,000 | | 470,000 | |
| (FC) | Point Judith—Hurricane barrier | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| | South Carolina: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | South Dakota: | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Big Bend Reservoir | $23,800,000 | | $23,800,000 | | $23,800,000 | | $23,800,000 | |
| (MP) | Fort Randall Reservoir | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 | |
| | Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak | 5,700,000 | | 5,700,000 | | 5,700,000 | | 5,700,000 | |
| | Tennessee: | | | | | | | | |
| | Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Cordell Hull Dam | 2,400,000 | | 4,800,000 | | 4,800,000 | | 4,800,000 | |
| (MP) | J. Percy Priest Reservoir | 3,700,000 | | 4,800,000 | | 4,800,000 | | 4,800,000 | |
| (BA) | Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| | Texas: | | | | | | | | |
| | Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Bardwell Reservoir | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | | 3,700,000 | |
| (FC) | Big Fossil Creek | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Brazos Island Harbor (jetties) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (N) | Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act) | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | | 800,000 | |
| (FC) | Buffalo Bayou and tributaries | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | | 3,900,000 | |
| (FC) | Canyon Reservoir | 3,682,000 | | 3,682,000 | | 3,682,000 | | 3,682,000 | |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension | | $132,000 | | $132,000 | | $132,000 | | $132,000 |
| (FC) | Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (FC) | Freeport and vicinity | | 60,000 | | 60,000 | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| (R) | Galveston Harbor (jetties) | 2,560,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | | 2,500,000 | |
| (N) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios | | | | 30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (N) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| (R) | Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes | 562,000 | | 562,000 | | 562,000 | | 562,000 | |
| (N) | Houston ship channel (40-foot project) | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | | 3,800,000 | |
| (FC) | Lake Kemp Reservoir | | | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (FC) | Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| (N) | Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | |
| (FC) | North Fork Reservoir | | | | | | 50,000 | | |
| (FC) | Pat Mayse Reservoir | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| (N) | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| (R) | Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties) | 750,000 | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | |
| (FC) | Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection) | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| (FC) | Proctor Reservoir | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| | Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Sabine-Neches Waterway: | | | | | | | | |
| | (a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| | (b) Rectification and widening (1954 act) | 2,138,000 | | 2,138,000 | | 2,138,000 | | 2,138,000 | |
| (MP) | Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam | 12,450,000 | | 12,450,000 | | 12,450,000 | | 12,450,000 | |
| (FC) | San Antonio Channel | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Somerville Reservoir | 8,100,000 | | 8,100,000 | | 8,100,000 | | 8,100,000 | |
| (FC) | Stillhouse Hollow Dam | 3,400,000 | | 3,400,000 | | 3,400,000 | | 3,400,000 | |
| (FC) | Texas City | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | | 3,000,000 | |
| (R) | Texas City Channel (dikes) | 835,000 | | 835,000 | | 835,000 | | 835,000 | |
| (FC) | Vince and Little Vince Bayous | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (FC) | Waco Reservoir | 8,500,000 | | 8,500,000 | | 8,500,000 | | 8,500,000 | |
| (N) | Wallisville Reservoir | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 |
| | Vermont: | | | | | | | | |
| (R) | Burlington Harbor (breakwater) | 555,000 | | 555,000 | | 555,000 | | 555,000 | |
| (FC) | Victory Reservoir (deferred) | | 65,000 | | 65,000 | | 65,000 | | 65,000 |
| | Virginia: | | | | | | | | |
| (R) | Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.) | 620,000 | | 620,000 | | 620,000 | | 620,000 | |
| (FC) | John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| (FC) | Norfolk | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | | 250,000 | |
| (FC) | North Fork of Pound Reservoir | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | | 2,100,000 | |
| | Washington: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Colfax | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| | Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2 | | 39,000 | | 39,000 | | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| | John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Little Goose lock and dam | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | | 11,000,000 | |
| | Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.) | | | | | | | | |
| (MP) | Lower Granite lock and dam | | 884,000 | | 884,000 | | 884,000 | | 884,000 |
| (MP) | Lower Monumental lock and dam | 23,000,000 | | 23,000,000 | | 23,000,000 | | 23,000,000 | |
| (N) | Port Townsend | 598,000 | | 598,000 | | 598,000 | | 598,000 | |
| (FC) | Pullman | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 | | 80,000 |
| (FC) | Sammamish River | 729,000 | | 729,000 | | 729,000 | | 729,000 | |
| (N) | Swinomish Slough | | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | |
| (N) | Tacoma Harbor | | | | | 150,000 | | 150,000 | |
| (FC) | Washougal area | | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | | 100,000 | |
| | West Virginia: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Barboursville | | | | | [1] (150,000) | | [1] (150,000) | |
| (FC) | Beech Fork Reservoir | | | | | | 150,000 | | |
| | Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | | | | | |
| | Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Buckhannon | | 73,000 | | 73,000 | | 73,000 | | 73,000 |
| (FC) | East Lynn Reservoir | | 280,000 | | 280,000 | 220,000 | 280,000 | | 280,000 |
| | Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Justice Reservoir | | 300,000 | | 150,000 | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| | Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | | | | | |
| (N) | Opekiska lock and dam | 5,058,000 | | 5,058,000 | | 5,058,000 | | 5,058,000 | |
| | Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Summersville Reservoir | 10,900,000 | | 10,900,000 | | 10,900,000 | | 10,900,000 | |
| | Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.) | | | | | | | | |

**See footnotes at end of table.**

*Construction, general, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

| | Construction, general, State and project | Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| | Wisconsin: | | | | | | | | |
| | Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.) | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Eau Galle River, Spring Valley | $200,000 | | $200,000 | | $200,000 | | $200,000 | |
| (N) | Green Bay Harbor (1962 act) | | | | | | 150,000 | | $50,000 |
| (N) | Kenosha Harbor | | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | | 200,000 | |
| (R) | Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment) | | $30,000 | | $30,000 | | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| (FC) | Kickapoo River | | | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| (R) | Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| (N) | Milwaukee Harbor | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| (R) | Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater) | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | | 600,000 | |
| (R) | Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier) | 188,000 | | 188,000 | | 188,000 | | 188,000 | |
| (R) | Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| | Wyoming: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Jackson Hole | 479,000 | | 479,000 | | 479,000 | | 479,000 | |
| | Miscellaneous: | | | | | | | | |
| (FC) | Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | | 4,500,000 | |
| (FC) | Snagging and clearing | | | | | 750,000 | | 750,000 | |
| (N) | Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000 | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 | |
| (BE) | Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000 | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| | Projects deferred for restudy | | (150,000) | | (158,000) | (158,000) | | (158,000) | |
| | Recreation facilities, completed projects | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| | Small authorized projects | 2,128,000 | | 2,128,000 | | 2,750,000 | | 2,750,000 | |
| | Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (R) | Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000) | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | | 2,300,000 | |
| | Employees compensation | 72,000 | | 72,000 | | 72,000 | | 72,000 | |
| | Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages | −65,000,000 | | −84,672,000 | | −65,000,000 | | −75,000,000 | |
| | General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities | | | −6,033,300 | | | | −3,000,000 | |
| | Grand total, construction, general | 800,471,000 | 19,015,000 | 778,407,700 | 19,875,000 | 827,528,000 | 22,328,000 | | |
| | | (819,486,000) | | (798,282,700) | | (849,856,000) | | | |

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects. [2] 40-foot channel.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

**Mr. ELLENDER.** For Mississippi River and tributaries the conference report provides $77,862,000, which is $2,544,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $3,362,000 above the House; $3,002,000 above the budget; and $4,358,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Unfortunately, there is an error in the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the printed conference report, House Report No. 1027. On page 19 of that report it appears that the conferees agreed on $50,000 to start construction of the Cache River project in Arkansas. This is an error. The tabulation at the bottom of page 24233 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 11, 1963, correctly reflects the action of the conferees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation explaining the action of the conferees on the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

*Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1964*

| Projects | Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 | | House allowance | | Senate allowance | | Conference allowance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning | Construction | Planning |
| 1. General investigations: | | | | | | | | |
| (a) Examinations and surveys | $25,000 | | $25,000 | | $25,000 | | $25,000 | |
| (b) Collection and study of basic data | 85,000 | | 85,000 | | 85,000 | | 85,000 | |
| Subtotal, general investigations | 110,000 | | 110,000 | | 110,000 | | 110,000 | |
| 2. Construction and planning: | | | | | | | | |
| Mississippi River levees | 2,580,000 | | 2,580,000 | | 2,800,000 | | 2,700,000 | |
| Channel improvement | 26,500,000 | | 26,500,000 | | 28,000,000 | | 27,250,000 | |
| Memphis Harbor | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | | 1,200,000 | |
| Old River control | 1,225,000 | | 1,225,000 | | 1,225,000 | | 1,225,000 | |
| St. Francis Basin | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | | 4,000,000 | |
| Lower White River | 850,000 | | 850,000 | | 850,000 | | 850,000 | |
| Cache River | 50,000 | | | | 50,000 | | | |
| West Tennessee tributaries | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| Wolf River and tributaries | 395,000 | | 395,000 | | 395,000 | | 395,000 | |
| Lower Arkansas | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | | 400,000 | |
| Tensas Basin: | | | | | | | | |
| Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | | 1,500,000 | |
| Yazoo Basin: | | | | | | | | |
| Sardis Reservoir | 58,000 | | 58,000 | | 58,000 | | 58,000 | |
| Enid Reservoir | 56,000 | | 56,000 | | 56,000 | | 56,000 | |
| Arkabutla Reservoir | 49,000 | | 49,000 | | 49,000 | | 49,000 | |
| Grenada Reservoir | 37,000 | | 37,000 | | 37,000 | | 37,000 | |
| Greenwood | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | | 1,300,000 | |
| Main stem | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | | 2,200,000 | |
| Tributaries | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | | 1,000,000 | |
| Big Sunflower River, etc | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | | 1,100,000 | |
| Yazoo backwater | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | |
| Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | |
| Atchafalaya Basin | 7,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | | 8,000,000 | | 7,500,000 | |
| Lake Pontchartrain | | | | | 182,000 | | 182,000 | |
| Subtotal, construction and planning | 54,250,000 | | 54,200,000 | | 57,152,000 | | 55,752,000 | |
| Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages | −1,500,000 | | −1,810,000 | | −1,500,000 | | −1,500,000 | |
| Total, construction and planning | 52,750,000 | | 52,390,000 | | 55,652,000 | | 54,362,000 | |
| 3. Maintenance | 22,000,000 | | 22,000,000 | | 24,644,000 | | 23,500,000 | |
| Grand total | 74,860,000 | | 74,500,000 | | 80,406,000 | | 77,862,000 | |

**Mr. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, with respect to title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction, and Rehabilitation, the conference bill provides $185,431,000 for this item, which is $1,994,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $5,241,000 above the amount allowed by the House; $10,329,000 below the budget; and $21,913,000 above the appropriation for 1963. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a tabulation showing the action of the conferees on this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

*Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation*

| Project | Budget estimate | House allowance | Senate allowance | Conference allowance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advance planning | $692,000 | $692,000 | $692,000 | $692,000 |
| Gila project, Arizona | 2,855,000 | 2,855,000 | 2,855,000 | 2,855,000 |
| Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California | 4,350,000 | 4,550,000 | 4,550,000 | 4,550,000 |
| Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada | 973,000 | 973,000 | 973,000 | 973,000 |
| Central Valley project, California | 50,445,000 | 48,295,000 | 48,295,000 | 48,295,000 |
| Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 |
| Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 |
| Rio Grande project, recreational facilities, New Mexico | 460,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Arbuckle project, Oklahoma | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 | 1,800,000 |
| Norman project, Oklahoma | 7,400,000 | 7,400,000 | 7,400,000 | 7,400,000 |
| Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| The Dalles project, Western division, Oregon | 3,150,000 | 3,150,000 | 3,150,000 | 3,150,000 |
| Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon | 642,000 | 642,000 | 642,000 | 642,000 |
| Canadian River project, Texas | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000 |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |
| Weber Basin project, Utah | 11,309,000 | 11,309,000 | 11,309,000 | 11,309,000 |
| Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington | 1,325,000 | 1,325,000 | 1,325,000 | 1,325,000 |
| Columbia Basin project, Washington | 3,900,000 | 3,900,000 | 4,950,000 | 4,650,000 |
| Spokane Valley project, Washington | 600,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 |
| Drainage and minor construction | 2,432,000 | 2,432,000 | 2,432,000 | 2,432,000 |
| Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects | 3,943,000 | 3,943,000 | 3,943,000 | 3,943,000 |
| Denver office computer | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 |
| Reclamation office building | ---------- | ---------- | 800,000 | 350,000 |
| Subtotal | 129,176,000 | 127,066,000 | 128,916,000 | 128,166,000 |
| Missouri River Basin project: | | | | |
| Ainsworth unit, Nebraska | 8,100,000 | 8,100,000 | 8,100,000 | 8,100,000 |
| Almena unit, Kansas | 5,580,000 | 3,983,000 | 4,403,000 | 3,983,000 |
| East Bench unit, Montana | 4,400,000 | 4,400,000 | 4,400,000 | 4,400,000 |
| Farwell unit, Nebraska | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska | 1,787,000 | 1,787,000 | 1,787,000 | 1,787,000 |
| Glen Elder unit, Kansas | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota | 365,000 | 365,000 | 365,000 | 365,000 |
| Transmission division | 23,956,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,275,000 | 23,275,000 |
| Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming | 19,000,000 | 19,000,000 | 19,000,000 | 19,000,000 |
| Drainage and minor construction | 2,258,000 | 2,258,000 | 2,258,000 | 2,258,000 |
| Investigations | 1,824,000 | 1,557,000 | 1,717,000 | 1,717,000 |
| Advance planning | 1,343,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project | 78,613,000 | 75,650,000 | 76,505,000 | 76,085,000 |
| Other Department of the Interior agencies | 3,322,300 | 3,180,000 | 3,180,000 | 3,180,000 |
| Total, Missouri River Basin project | 81,935,300 | 78,830,000 | 79,685,000 | 79,265,000 |
| Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation | 211,111,300 | 205,896,000 | 208,601,000 | 207,431,000 |
| Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays | −15,351,300 | −25,706,000 | −21,176,000 | 22,000,000 |
| Total, construction and rehabilitation | 195,760,000 | 180,190,000 | 187,425,000 | 185,431,000 |

**Mr. CARLSON.** Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is discussing the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. I have before me the report of the conference committee, at page 22. I notice that under the heading "Kansas," for the Almena unit, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1964, for construction, was $5,580,000, and that the conference committee allowed $3,983,000.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if the reduction was made because the original amount included funds to be made available for the beginning of work on the irrigation project, and if the funds for the construction of the dam itself remain as proposed originally.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** The Senator is correct.

**Mr. CARLSON.** While I had hoped that the bill would contain funds for the irrigation section, we are pleased that it contains funds for the construction of the dam. I assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that next year and in future years I shall return to ask for funds for the irrigation section as well.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I am hopeful that Congress will agree with the suggestion of my friend from Kansas.

**Mr. CARLSON.** I thank the Senator.

**Mr. ELLENDER.** As to title III, very little change was made by the conferees. As Senators know, that title deals with TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and so forth. Very little change was made in that title.

I have already submitted to the Senate the table indicating exactly what was done as to each agency in that title.

During the consideration of the public works appropriation bill, H.R. 9140, by the Senate, I discussed the meaning of the Senate committee language on the SPA continuing fund item. This language reads as follows:

> The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration; or to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration. The Administration should give preference in the sale of power and energy to public bodies and cooperatives, as provided by law; but it should not participate directly or indirectly in the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

I stated during the discussion of the bill that in my opinion the Senate committee language is a restatement of existing law. The hearings on the bill disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee, therefore, felt it necessary to restate the law and the congressional policy.

It was believed that the language might cause an adverse affect on contracting which must be done by an ordinary distribution cooperative with SPA or might be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. It was suggested that the language be further discussed in conference.

There was no intention on the part of the committee to adversely affect the operations of REA and SPA, as those operations have been authorized by the Congress. However, to make certain that the language did not affect the contracts entered into with SPA by distribution cooperatives and to make certain that it did not affect the right of preference users to public power, the committee on the conference has restated this language. However, neither the language of the Senate report nor of the conference report authorizes or gives consent of the Congress to arrangements which make the feasibility of an REA loan dependent on contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration. This is the kind of activity which the Senate committee believes is contrary to the law.

With respect to title IV, funds appropriated to the President. The conference report provides $30 million instead of the $45 million approved by the Senate.

The conferees of both Houses agreed that except for $2 million for administration the funds appropriated should be limited to community facility type projects.

Personally, I would have preferred to have the House accept the Senate version. The House conferees felt that the Senate should have accepted the House bill. They contended that the House had sent the Senate a very good bill, as indeed it had. The Senate conferees waged a valiant fight to uphold the position of the Senate, and I believe they made an excellent showing in this respect.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish once again to salute the Senator from Louisiana for the hours and days and weeks and months that he has assiduously devoted to the problems of public works in this session of this Congress, as he has also so ably and expertly done in prior Congresses. He has performed a service not only for the people of a particular State, but also for all the people in the country. I thank him for a job that he has once again expertly done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from California in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and his coconferees. He has performed magnificently. It was my desire to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, to pay our respects to the Senator from Louisiana. It would have been a unanimous vote, or close to it. However, my friend the majority leader has quite rightly said that he had given indication to Senators that there would be no yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. Therefore, I will not ask for one.

However, I wish the Record to show that in my opinion if there had been a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report, it would have been practically a unanimous vote, and in no small measure it would have been an expression of our appreciation for the good work the Senator from Louisiana has done on the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other members of the committee, and also to the conferees from the other body, who have worked on the conference in behalf of the control of the water runoff of this Nation.

We in Kansas are particularly indebted for the interest Senators have shown in the problems of our own State, and for their knowledge of the benefits of the program.

I am convinced that the future growth, not only of Kansas, but of the entire Middle West, will be determined by the amount of water that can be conserved and used for beneficial purposes. We have made a great start in this field, and I am indebted to the Senator for the work he and his committee have done in this field.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana deserves every tribute that has been paid to him for the manner in which he has handled the pending bill. This is one of the bigger appropriation bills, and certainly one of the most important bills, although it is not as popular in some circles as some of the other appropriation bills. The Senator from Louisiana has handled the bill in a unique way, and he should be commended for the very satisfactory and effective way in which he has handled it.

I want also to pay tribute to Ken Bousquet, who is probably one of the most able staff members that we have on any of our committees. Too, I want to commend Paul Eaton who handled title II of the bill. He always does a swell job.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am certain I speak for all of my colleagues who have saluted the Senator from Louisiana in also congratulating one of the ablest and most efficient members of an excellent and efficient staff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Words are not needed to express our wholehearted and unanimous appreciation for the outstanding work which the Senator from Louisiana has done, not only this year, but also down through the years. Every Member, regardless of party has had a fair opportunity to present his claim. All I can say is, "Amen."

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate these salutes very much. I am always vitally interested in preserving the water resources and the land resources of our country. I believe that what we are doing now will benefit generations yet unborn. I hope that I shall be in a position where I can continue to do this work. I assure my colleagues that I shall make every effort to do in the future what I have done in the past, that is, not to make provision for the conservation of resources in a particular area of our country, but for this to be done irrespective of State boundaries. I say this because it is my belief that a program of this kind must be looked at in that way if we are to succeed in doing a good overall job for the full protection of our water and land resources.

I wish again to pay my respects to the competent clerks and advisers on the committee staff, particularly to Ken Bousquet, who has been with this committee for some time, and also to Mr. Paul Eaton, who has been particularly responsible for the work on reclamation and other programs in title II of the bill. Both of these gentlemen have done yeoman work in assisting in the hearings and in the preparation of all the data that I was able to make available to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer specifically to page 24 of the conference report. This item is of particular importance to the Senators and people of Oregon, the Senators and people of Washington, and the Senators and people of California.

In the Northwest, there is the Bonneville Power Administration, capable of producing a great quantity of hydroelectric power. Unfortunately, there has been a waste of the water because of the inability of the Bonneville Power Administration, to sell power. The people of California need power. It has been recommended by Senators from the Western States, by the governments of the Western States, and by the executive branch of the Government that an appropriation be made under which the Secretary of the Interior could negotiate and determine a contract to build a power line from the north to my State and beyond, which would be in the public interest.

Written into the Senate report is language that reflects the public interest and would continue the authorization to the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of sound and solid competition, to make the best deal for the people of the United States. That language prevailed. It is a specific reason why the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and his colleagues deserve an accolade.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall do everything I can to help get surplus Bonneville power delivered to the people of California, for the people of California. I shall oppose any attempt to have it delivered to Pacific Power and Light or any of the other private utilities in California, because I think it ought to be delivered over a Federal transmission line. That power is generated from streams that belong to all the people of the country and should be delivered for the benefit of all the people of the country over a Federal transmission line. The language in the bill permits that kind of transmission. I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana for retaining that kind of language.

I know of no issue that could be a hotter one in my State than the issue of the transmission of power, for Oregon is losing much industry to Washington, for example, which has public power transmission lines, in contrast with the domination of the economy of my State by private utilities. I do not want to aid and abet that situation any longer.

So I shall support the efforts of my good friend to put a public power transmission line into California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will translate those comments, in which the Senator from Oregon has joined with the Senator from

California, into a joint committee on the retention of that language.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] for his helpfulness in adding two worthwhile Connecticut projects to the bill this year.

I am very much pleased that he and his fellow Senate conferees were able to keep in the bill the $50,000 for planning on the New London Barrier. This is a start, and a very important one, on a project to which the Federal Government will eventually contribute $2,431,000.

Many people in the New London area join me in expressing our gratitude and our thanks to the senior Senator from Louisiana and to the other members of the committee for their help.

The second matter to which I wish to briefly refer is not such a happy one, especially to the people in Old Saybrook and to many boat owners in the States bordering the Long Island Sound.

The Senate conferees had to recede to the House and take out of the bill the $578,000 initially approved by the Senate for the North Cove navigation project.

I realize the Senate cannot have its way on all of these public works projects, but I think it is especially regrettable that North Cove is one of the ones that was taken out of the bill. I say this because it was first authorized 18 years ago, in 1945, and because the $578,000 would have permitted both the initiation and the completion of the proposed North Cove anchorage area and channel deepening.

The Corps of Engineers has stated that, "The cove may be reasonably expected to become one of the most used harbors of refuge for small boats in the northeastern part of the Long Island Sound."

It is a good project and the people of Old Saybrook are living up to the requirements for participation in the project by the Federal Government.

Because of the soundness of the project and the support given to it in my State, I wonder if the distinguished Senator could give me any idea as to the chances of including in an appropriations bill the funds for North Cove in the near future.

I do not wish to put the Senator on the spot, but I thought it might be possible to include the $578,000 in the fiscal 1964 supplemental appropriations bill we will take up early next year. Or perhaps he could give an assurance that he will include it in the next regular public works appropriations bill, the one for fiscal 1965.

I would appreciate any help or hope he is able to offer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the two new projects that were proposed for Connecticut, we were able to save the one for planning the New London Barrier.

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am very grateful for that.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was impossible to persuade the House to agree to the second one, of which the Senator has just spoken. But I assure the Senator from Connecticut that we will make another try in the public works bill next year.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful for the Senator's response.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe we may succeed in doing so at that time.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

### CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech on foreign aid,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make be placed in the RECORD prior to the action of the Senate on the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill, 1964, as adopted today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under title IV—"Funds Appropriated to the President—Public Works Acceleration," the conference made the following statement:

> The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the $2 million for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

That language refers to the public works acceleration program with respect to which the conference agreed to $30 million instead of the $45 million proposed by the Senate.

That particular limitation would impose an incredible hardship upon a large number of people in the northern regions of the United States. I deeply regret that the limitation has been placed in the conference report. I hope that somehow or other it can be totally ignored, because it so happens that today the temperature is about 10° below zero in northern Minnesota. It so happens that thousands of people in that area are without jobs. It so happens that the only job that they can get in the winter is work in the forests. We desperately need that work in the forests. It may be warm in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, or Florida, but in Minnesota, particularly in the northeastern section where our forest lands are, it is very cold.

To place the kind of limitation I have read in the conference report is cruel. In northern Minnesota in the wintertime we do not need community facilities. We cannot build them. Construction comes to a complete halt. It so happens that at Bemidji, Minn., it will be 35° to 45° below zero. At International Falls the temperature will go to from 20° to 50° below zero week after week.

The good people in that area are hard-pressed for jobs. They are the victims of seasonal unemployment in good times. For the past 5 years they have been the victims of chronic unemployment. All that those people have had in terms of help is a little assistance under the accelerated public works program for the forestry projects conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. Now the Congress has imposed a limitation which in effect states to hundreds of my people, "Starve," or "Get on relief," or "Get some food stamps and be happy."

Mr. President, I resent that. I am shocked to think that a conference committee would put such a crippling amendment upon the use of public funds for the sake of public works to help people who are desperately in need.

On an appropriation bill a conference committee has a certain amount of authority, but it does not have omnipotent authority. I hope that the President of the United States, in administering the funds, will ignore that language.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree with the Senator more. I share his resentment. The problem is not one limited to Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, it is not.

Mr. MORSE. It is a problem that affects all of us.

I have several questions I should like to ask the Senator. The language in the conference report does not have the effect of binding legislation, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe so. It is a recommendation, but it is not even in the form of a proviso. The language of the conference report is as follows:

> The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated * * * shall be limited to community facilities type of projects.

But there is a limitation to what an Appropriations Committee can do. I hope that that limitation will impose some restraint upon that kind of harsh language.

I know that the President of the United States is carefully examining the budget for 1964. I assure him that in any way that we can save on resources and promote better administration he has my support. But I did not come to the Senate to give my assent and consent to provisions of law relating to the welfare of the citizens of our country that for all practical purposes condemn those people to relief and deprivation. That is exactly what the conference report would do.

I do not like it. I believe it is outrageous that the money can be limited when we know full well what the needs are. I have been before the Committee on Appropriations. We have had representatives of the accelerated public works program, including the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget, in meetings with Senators from the Northern States. Our people are jobless. They need work. It is cold. Community facilities cannot be built in northeastern Minnesota in the middle of the winter. The accelerated public works program is designed to be of some help to people.

Mr. MORSE. It is my interpretation—and I believe the Senator from Minnesota shares it—that the language really is a statement of recommendation on the part of the Appropriations Committee to the Forest Service, but it does not have the binding effect of law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope that will be the case. It would seem to me that, as the Senator from Oregon has explained it, it is the case. If it is not the case, I wish to redefine the term "community facilities," because in northeast Minnesota in the wintertime "community facilities" includes cutting trees.

**Mr. MORSE.** Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the Senator from Oregon on the observation that if it should develop that the Forest Service would in fact be prohibited from the development of the facilities and the providing of employment in northern Minnesota——

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Wisconsin, Michigan, and Oregon——

**Mr. MORSE.** And elsewhere, where the same need exists, the President of the United States and the agencies of our Government should take an emergency look—I should like to describe it in that way—at all the programs that call for the allocation of funds by the various departments, and recommend to the departments concerned that wherever they can hold out a helping hand to those who are unemployed, as described by the Senator from Minnesota, they should proceed forthwith to do so.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** I thank the Senator. He is absolutely correct. Our greatest asset happens to be our forests. We can build something in those forests. We can build the kind of trails that are needed. We can clean out the forests and work in those forests. We can do constructive work that will produce dividends and money to the Federal Treasury.

Now we have received a sort of warm climate amendment. It happens that the United States does not all belong in the Torrid Zone. Some of it is in the Frigid Zone. I happen to represent a part of the United States which is cold in the wintertime. Perhaps my conferee friends would like to give us a little vacation down South so that we can have a little easier living for the winter months.

I wish to make the RECORD clear that I do not abide by that decision. I ask the President of the United States to put first the care of the people and second the budget. I am not at all sure I agree with all the things that are being done about the budget. I will get around to that subject a little later.

In the meantime, I rise to protest, in the name of humanity, decency, and compassion, a provision in the civil functions report that has no relevance to fairplay and no relevance to the consideration of the people who live in the areas of this country where it gets mighty chilly and mighty snowbound in the wintertime.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. ELLENDER.** I yield.

**Mr. BARTLETT.** I would not want to have the conference report adopted and action on it concluded without first expressing my deep appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues for their objective, and favorable consideration of several Alaska projects, notably the Sitka small boat harbor. I am most grateful for that action. Likewise, my gratitude extends to the House conferees, who accepted the proposal for the Sitka Harbor after it had been added by the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the report was unanimously agreed to.

## AGREEMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY PASSENGER COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill was passed earlier today, at a time when I was unable to be present. I asked that the votes by which it was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, in order that I might offer a short amendment to correct an inadvertent injustice which is contained in the law.

Under the postal law, in fixing postal rates, it is provided that a special rate may apply to not to exceed one publication published by an official highway agency of a State which meets all the regulations of section 4354 and which contains no advertising. The only State magazine that is published by a highway agency is the magazine Arizona Highways.

Vermont has an official magazine published by its development agency. Under the law enacted a year or so ago, the State of Vermont is required to pay 1 cent a pound more postage than would the State of Arizona. So I ask that the bill be amended at the proper place by inserting after the word "highway" the words "or development". The bill as thus amended would read:

> Not to exceed one publication published by the official highway agency or development agency of a State which meets all of the requirements of section 4354 and which contains no advertising.

The reason for the amendment is that the Arizona magazine is published by the highway agency, while in Vermont the magazine is published by the development agency.

Both magazines are about the same quality. I think Vermont's is a little better, but I met with some resistance when I tried to prove it. Neither magazine carries any advertising; both comply with the law in other ways.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that it will not be possible to act on the bill until the House returns it to the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the time the bill is returned to the Senate, the colloquy which has been in progress since it was called up, inadvertently, be made a part of the RECORD, and that at that time the amendment be considered. For the information of the Senate, it is my understanding that this proposal meets with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the other members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is present. He can speak for himself.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks made by the majority leader in regard to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I visited with the Senator from Vermont regarding this amendment some time ago and assured him that I would offer the amendment in committee, when the bill was before the committee. I sincerely regret that I failed to do so. I hope the Senate will take action now. I heartily approve of the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the explanation made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas, I am sure it is understood by all that the bill will be brought up later in the afternoon, at which time the amendment will be offered and accepted, and the bill then passed by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, it is my understanding that Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179, and Calendar No. 737, H.R. 5778, have been returned from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the colloquy which occurred previously, I ask unanimous consent, in regard to H.R. 5179, that the Senate resume consideration of the bill and that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] may be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which would add the language:

> Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

the word "highway" the words "or development".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 20, it is proposed to insert:

> SEC. 4. Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "highway" the words "or development".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 5179) was read the third time and passed.

## INCREASE IN AREA IN WHICH POST OFFICE STATIONS MAY BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 737, H.R. 5778, which has been returned from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5778) to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 5778) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his assistance in obtaining proper consideration of these bills, so that I might offer an amendment to correct what I am sure was an inadvertent injustice in the present law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was a pleasure.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, there be 2 hours of debate on the pending conference report on the foreign aid bill, with 1 hour to be under the control of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the other hour to be under the control of the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or any other Senator he may designate; and that the vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report be taken at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, of course I shall not object, for I shall be glad to have the conference report voted on. But there is an important amendment on which I wish to have a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from New York, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

*Ordered*, That, effective on Friday, December 13, beginning at 12 o'clock noon, during the further consideration of the conference report on H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], or someone designated by him, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]: *Provided*, That the vote on adoption of the report be taken not later than 2 p.m.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not wish to interfere with the presentation by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am not worried about that, for it is early in the afternoon, and the night which will follow it will be long.

So I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, it is with considerable bitterness that I observe that the conference report demonstrates that the will of the Senate, as determined by a 2-to-1 vote, has been completely frustrated by the members of the conference committee.

During the Senate debate on the mutual security bill, I offered—on behalf of myself, my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the two Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]—an amendment to prevent a recipient of assistance under the Alliance for Progress from continuing to flout international law and from continuing a foolish and fatuous attempt to arrogate unto itself complete jurisdiction over the open seas for a distance 200 miles seaward from its coastline.

For the past decade, three countries—Peru, Chile, and Ecuador—have made such a contention.

It is true that the question of jurisdiction over the area of the oceans immediately adjacent to a maritime nation is an involved problem. It is true that, in connection with the area facing the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, the United States of America makes the historic contention for a jurisdiction 3 miles seaward. It is also true that Senators from the Southern States which face the Gulf of Mexico continue to state on this floor that the jurisdiction of their States—by reason of a peculiar international history—extends 3 leagues seaward, rather than 3 miles. It is also true that some nations—as I endeavored to indicate in my comments on this floor, during the debate on this subject—contend, for reasons which to them seem relevant, for a jurisdiction to the extent of 6 miles; and some prefer to make their contention for 12 miles. But there are only four nations which have the temerity to endeavor to abuse the entire history of international law by attempting by their own ipse dixit, to maintain that, "We own the ocean 200 miles distant from our coast"; and for 10 years, free American citizens, as they have attempted to utilize the open seas for fishing purposes, when they arrived in the area 200 miles seaward or less—but clearly outside a 3-mile limit or even a 12-mile limit have been interfered with by officials of the governments concerned. In some cases they have been arrested and put in jail and required to pay fines. In other cases they have been shot at and forced into port where they have been unreasonably detained for days, with, I regret to say, hardly an attitude of vigor for their protection by the Government of the United States.

Paradoxically, it is a fact that almost a decade ago, the United States enacted a law which provided that when the freedom of the seas was so violated by a nation and when American ships were detained and their owners fined, the Government of the United States would reimburse those who had paid the fine from the Treasury.

But I do not believe that such a law is the proper antidote in that situation, and that once the owners have been reimbursed the United States can forget the incident.

Therefore, some of us in the Senate offered an amendment reading as follows:

> (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which (1) has extended, or hereafter extends, its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this

> subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement to which the United States is a party.

That language is really self-explanatory. But to turn for a moment to the last sentence of the amendment, it simply means that a country which in good faith and with reason attempts to extend its jurisdiction for more than 3 miles, or 3 leagues, which is the limit currently recognized by the United States, should participate in an international understanding concerning such a desire on its part; and if the Government of the United States is a party to such negotiations and agreement, the interdiction against aid will not apply.

I remember the debate. It was rather exhausting, and some novel parliamentary practices were engaged in, that afternoon, in this Chamber. But that did not prevent the Senate from establishing its position by a vote of 2 to 1. Fifty-seven Senators agreed with this agreement. Only 29 were opposed. Later, after the novel parliamentary practices, a vote was taken on the question of laying on the table the motion to reconsider. The motion carried by a vote of 50 to 33 and once again the Senate showed its support for the amendment offered by myself and my colleague from California. Thus, the Members of the U.S. Senate twice unequivocally demonstrated that they did not want any of their fellow Americans mistreated by any other country, when those Americans were simply endeavoring to use the open seas in a fashion long permitted by international law.

However, the conference committee disposed in rather short order of the amendment the Senate had overwhelmingly adopted; and I reiterate my resentment and my bitterness because the conference committee simply and blithely flouted the plainly stated desire of the U.S. Senate when it twice passed judgment on this matter.

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I yield.

**Mr. AIKEN.** As one of the conferees who dealt with this bill, I wish to say that when we came to the amendment offered by the Senator from California, and adopted by the Senate by a very substantial margin, we found the House conferees adamant in this respect. Also, the State Department registered very vigorous opposition to acceptance of the amendment—on the ground that there are underway negotiations in which it is sought to settle the very difficult matter of how far into the ocean the jurisdiction of any country may extend.

I suggested that the House write into its report that by not accepting the amendment the United States was in no sense withdrawing from its position that the countries to which reference has been made were exceeding their proper rights in claiming territory extending as much as 200 miles out into the ocean. I do not find that the House wrote such language into the report, but I wish to say for the RECORD that by failing to accept the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from California and accepted by the Senate, the United States is in no way receding from its position that those countries are exceeding their jurisdictional authority in laying territorial claim to a considerable part of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I know of his activities in the conference committee in endeavoring to obtain an agreement to the principle involved in our amendment—if the amendment in its entire verbiage could not have been approved—and I thank him for it.

I hope and pray that the Government of the United States will take the precise position which the Senator from Vermont has laid down. If it does not, and if we ever travel south in the Pacific along the western coast of South America, we had better not go inside the 200-mile limit, because we will be violating the sovereignty of the three countries to which I have alluded, unless we comply with the rule of jurisdiction which they have laid down in complete disregard of international practice.

Two hundred miles. What would happen if the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, said, "We are going to take 200 miles out of the ocean"? What would we do with the important isthmus in this hemisphere, or in any other hemisphere, if the abutting nations said, "We are going to claim jurisdiction over an area 15 or 20 miles out"? Such action would close the approaches to the canal and be intolerable to all who wish freedom of transit on the high seas.

Certainly the U.S. Navy does not order its ships to veer 200 miles westward when they are plying the waters of the Pacific Ocean off of the West coast of South America and suddenly they reach the vast territorial waters claimed by Chile, Ecuador, and Peru. Then why should American fishermen?

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I yield.

**Mr. MORSE.** I wish to join in the comments of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] with respect to the position of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I share his views. To build the record in this case, I wish to ask the Senator from California whether it is not American taxpayers' money we are discussing.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** The Senator is eminently correct.

**Mr. MORSE.** If any Latin American country does not wish that money as aid, it does not have to take it, does it?

**Mr. KUCHEL.** The Senator is precisely correct.

**Mr. MORSE.** Do we not, as Members of Congress, have the right under the Constitution to prescribe the conditions under which the executive branch of the Government can spend the taxpayers' money?

**Mr. KUCHEL.** That is the theory upon which the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution of the United States.

**Mr. MORSE.** That is why I say that in my judgment, Secretary Rusk should go back to high school and retake the course in high school civics, since he held a recent press conference and sought to give the false impression to the American people that Congress is interfering with foreign policy when it seeks to lay down the terms and conditions under which taxpayers' money can be spent on a foreign aid bill. I do not know whether the Secretary of State has registered for that refresher course, but he sorely needs it.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I must say to the Senator from Oregon that in my judgment—and I am sure the Senator shares my opinion—the Secretary of State is a very able man.

**Mr. MORSE.** He is uninformed in this field.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** We disagree with respect to the position he takes on this question.

**Mr. MORSE.** It is not a question of disagreement. It is a question of complete basic knowledge. The press interview revealed that he lacks basic knowledge in respect to the Constitution as to the rights of Congress.

If the Senator thinks I am going to let him off the hook, he is mistaken. I do not intend to let him off the hook in view of the ignorance he displayed at that press conference.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** Is the Senator from Oregon referring to the Secretary or to me when he refers to "letting him off the hook"?

**Mr. MORSE.** The Senator from California is too smart ever to get caught on a hook. I wish to proceed in my examination a bit further——

**Mr. AIKEN.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I am glad to yield.

**Mr. AIKEN.** I assume that when the Senator from Oregon refers to not letting the Secretary of State get off the hook, he means in this case a fishhook.

**Mr. MORSE.** The Secretary of State has no regard for a fishhook. This is the fishhook amendment that the Senator from California offered. The Secretary of State does not even recognize a fishhook, apparently.

Senators remember that when the chairman of our committee opposed the amendment of the Senator from California, he said something to the effect that it was one of the worst amendments he had ever observed in his years in the Senate.

**Mr. KUCHEL.** I was resentful then and I am resentful now. The Senate, too, is resentful. The 2 to 1 yea-and-nay vote demonstrated that.

**Mr. MORSE.** That is the point I am leading up to. In spite of the position taken by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who was also chairman of the conference, the Senate did not follow him. The Senate in effect said to the chairman of the Senate conferees that if countries do not wish to take our money under the terms and conditions which we lay down, they do not have to take it. Unless they are willing to accept our aid under the terms and conditions that they do not impose a 200-mile limit, it is our intention to see to it that they do not get American taxpayers' money.

I ask the Senator from California when—oh, when—will the Congress, in the field of foreign aid, start to impose some terms and conditions that will protect the taxpayers of the United States and stop the shocking giveaway of the taxpayers' money, because officials of foreign governments, who flout us and insult us take the position that they are not going to comply with reasonable conditions?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Oregon makes an excellent comment. I should like to recall with him that last year when, as the Senator will recall, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] offered an amendment to provide that in instances in which a recipient nation of American assistance expropriated the property of American citizens, without making any compensation for such property, American aid would be cut off. We had to fight to put that provision into the law. We put it in. It stayed there. Under that particular part of the present law, when Ceylon, for example, expropriated American property by taking it away, aid was terminated, as it should have been.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is not the Senator aware that the State Department vigorously opposed the Hickenlooper amendment and wished no part of it?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. If those in the State Department could have had their way, it would not be part of the law today.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Apparently the State Department labors under a misconception of the constitutional power of Congress, that we are interfering with foreign policy if we impose restrictions on the expenditure of foreign aid that protects the American taxpayer.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is exactly correct. I tried to make the point during debate that what we would attempt to do with our freedom of the seas amendment was related to what we did with respect to the expropriation of property. In effect, what the three nations in South America have attempted to do is to arrogate to themselves something that does not belong to them under international law and then exclude Americans and the nationals of any other country from that area.

Mr. President, I wish to allude to another bit of history surrounding the measure and the highly regrettable treatment which was accorded to this particular provision by the conferees.

I do not know Mr. Edwin P. Neilan, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, although I have noted over the past several months comments which have been attributed to him in the Capital, in my own State of California, and elsewhere. Addresses which have been made by him and have been printed thereafter appear under such attractive titles as "They're Throwing It Away Just To Be Big Spenders" and "The Pork Barrel Polka."

I judge that Mr. Neilan is a very moral and righteous man who is honorably concerned, and rightly so, about the spending of the taxpayers' dollars and the future of our Republic.

I observe parenthetically that a few moments ago the Senate, without opposition, approved the conference report on the public works appropriation bill and did so because it was making an investment in America.

Now I wish to quote a few sentences uttered by Mr. Neilan before the West Side Association Chamber of Commerce in New York City on November 21 last:

> This citation might better have been inscribed to all of the members and staff of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States who have worked alongside me in our campaign to restore a sense of decency to the conduct of our public affairs. With your permission, I should like to accept this honor for all of them. It will encourage us to continue this fight, to disregard the cynical abuse that is heaped on us daily, not alone by the politicians whom we have criticized but by many shortsighted or selfish businessmen who have their hands on the public purse and don't want to let go.
>
> We will not have truly earned this honor unless and until our efforts produce results, until we see signs of a moral awakening in Washington. I think things will improve, not because our politicians' consciences are hurting; but because they're hearing the first rumblings of an aroused public opinion that could drive them out of office if they don't mend their ways.
>
> The mailroom in our national chamber headquarters in Washington is still working overtime handling letters from citizens in all walks of life who are fed up with political corruption and want to do something about it. * * * It's up to us to keep this public indignation alive and to channel it into effective political action.
>
> Let's face it: the whole corrupt system works only through the connivance of everyday citizens and some of our so-called community leaders, too.
>
> It is our job, yours as well as mine, to see that the public is told the truth. Maybe we can light a fire that all the special wind in Washington can't blow out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand this is a comment by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KUCHEL. The distinguished president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I wish to address myself, with my friend's permission, to my own comment.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator a question first.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I listened to the reading of the remarks. Do I correctly understand that the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce suggests that the politicians who do not agree with the chamber should be defeated?

Mr. KUCHEL. I would infer, I say to my able friend, that that is the simple implication of the comments he makes. In addition, he wants to lay it down his way. I shall come to the matter before us and the position he took about it in a moment.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Senator from California. The Senator will stay as long as he wishes to stay in Congress, if his staying is dependent upon any votes the U.S. Chamber of Commerce may influence. I am a Senator in no small measure because they have always opposed me. Many times on the platforms of my State I have thanked them for U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposition. Nothing shows I am more correct than the fact that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is against me.

I congratulate the Senator from California. I only wish that more Democrats had his kind of support.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend.

Mr. President, the distinguished head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was talking about what he called the pork barrel process, which he claims exists in the U.S. Congress and which acts to the detriment of the public interest.

I suggest, however, that Mr. Neilan's comments might very well be applied to his own conduct and to that of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with reference to the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, which is now pending in the Senate.

As Senators know, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has a rather large staff, which is interested in a multitude of activities. It comes as no surprise to many Senators that the policies of that organization frequently do not reflect the views of the membership of the chamber in our own States and local communities. Nevertheless, in a strange, inscrutable way, policies and statements, like those of the Oracle of Apollo at Delphi, are evolved, and the word is spread by various means, covert and otherwise, to legislators and to members of the executive branch.

For example, on November 20, 1963, a five-page telegram was dispatched from the gray-stone headquarters of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which faces the White House across Lafayette Square, to all of the House and Senate conferees on the foreign aid bill. This telegram outlined the provisions which the chamber of commerce, in its wisdom, had deigned to support. It expressed great concern for a revolving Development Loan Fund, and approval of $200 million for the Social Progress Trust Fund. It went on record in support of the Senate provision for long-range private enterprise development as a part of foreign aid planning. It advocated program evaluation committees with public members. It viewed with enthusiasm an advisory committee on private enterprise—to name but a few of the items which the chamber determined to support. Having made that determination, it alerted Senators and House Members who were conferees on the pending bill.

The chamber's telegram was signed by Theron J. Rice, legislative general manager for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the full text of the telegram be printed at this point in my remarks

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*November 20, 1963.*

Consistent with 1963 chamber House and Senate testimony and in best interest of sound economic development, private enterprise participation, and administrative logic, U.S. Chamber respectfully urges conference committee to adopt foreign assistance authorization not to exceed $3.6 billion, with following provisions:

Urge adoption of House provisions for continued revolving Development Loan Fund (sec. 202(a));

For $200 million Social Progress Trust Fund (sec. 401(b));

For required aid agency definition of "purposes," "objectives," and "priorities" of each foreign assistance program (sec. 102(b));

And for limitation upon use of economic development funds for short-term emergency assistance (sec. 102(d)).

Urge adoption of Senate provisions for long-range private enterprise development as part of aid planning (sec. 102(f)).

For program evaluation committees with public members (secs. 261–264); for advisory committee on private enterprise (sec. 601(c)).

The following Senate amendments appear inconsistent with basic foreign assistance program objectives previously endorsed by national chamber:

Section 620(e)(2) suspending aid to any nation "which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen or any corporation" appears to depart from clear definition of "expropriation" and "nationalization" inherent in section 620 of 1962 act, and goes beyond current House provisions designed to give added protection to U.S. investors against discriminatory or confiscatory acts of government. Section 620(m) suspending aid to any nation involved in territorial water fishing dispute with United States appears to hamper Alliance for Progress and self-help reforms in key cooperating countries.

Moreover section 620(e)(2) and 620(m) appear to go beyond economic development and security purposes of the act to involve unrelated questions of sovereign legal disputes.

Section 620(n)(2) suspending aid to any nation determined to be "preparing for aggressive military efforts" against any other aid-recipient nation appears impracticable of administration with respect to key countries in Middle East and southeast Asia.

THERON J. RICE,
*Legislative General Manager, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the telegram noted that other "Senate amendments appear inconsistent with basic foreign assistance program objectives previously endorsed by national chamber." A number of worthwhile sections which were added by the Senate then came in for severe criticism by the chamber.

The chamber objected, presumably on behalf of its many members throughout the country, to suspending aid to any nation which has taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any U.S. citizen or any corporation.

The chamber noted that this amendment departed from a "clear definition of expropriation and nationalization inherent in section 620 of the 1962 act, and goes beyond current House provisions designed to give added protection to U.S. investors against discriminatory or confiscatory acts of government."

The chamber objected to still another section. It objected to Senate action authorizing a suspension of aid to any nation that was using American assistance to prepare for aggressive military action against another country that was also an aid recipient.

Then, thoroughly unbelievably, I am sure, to most of the membership of the chamber, it opposed an amendment which I and my colleague and other Senators offered. That amendment would prevent assistance to any country which attempted to arrogate to itself sovereign jurisdiction over the open sea 200 miles seaward from its coastline unless the U.S. Government were a party to the agreement by which the nation extended its jurisdiction.

The Senate agreed to that amendment on a rollcall by a vote of 57 to 29. It later confirmed that decision, by tabling a motion to reconsider, by a vote of 50 to 33. One could hardly describe either of those votes as hairline votes. Yet the conferees, in secret session behind closed doors, threw out the will of the Senate, and came back silent on a problem that has raged for the past 12 years—a problem, incidentally, which at least one department of the executive branch, the Department of the Interior, which has some jurisdiction over American fisheries, stated that the time has come for some action. Said the Department of the Interior in a letter to me on October 24, 1963: "These efforts to work out solutions through diplomatic channels, although in some cases useful, in general have not proved overly fruitful." The Department of the Interior thought it was "increasingly clear that the United States must take perhaps more drastic action to protect its fishermen than it has taken before."

I asked the representatives of the chamber of commerce if the telegram sent to the House and Senate conferees was approved by the president, Mr. Neilan, and by the executive council of the chamber. I was informed that it had been so approved. Mr. Neilan has been going across the country urging the public "to restore a sense of decency to the conduct of our public affairs." Decency in the conduct of our public affairs? How does the U.S. Government indicate a decent regard for American citizens? By permitting them to be shot at, arrested, jailed, fined, detained, and preventing them from using the open seas 200 miles off the coastline of any nation? Hardly.

I must say, Mr. President, I find it strange to appeal for honor in our public affairs on one hand and then vigorously oppose an amendment based on the historic principle of international law for which our country went to war in 1812 and 1917, known as freedom of the seas. Apparently the freedom advocated by the chamber of commerce at this point includes freedom to deny needed public works projects in America as well as freedom to deny the right of American citizens to earn their livelihood on the high and open seas. What a strange and twisted concept of freedom. I only wish that some would spend less time theorizing on international relations and more time schooling themselves in the realities which face people in everyday life. I only wish, also, that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America had available to its membership that great series of democratic devices which we have in the California State constitution known as the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. I am confident that if this issue were taken to the membership of the chamber, just as I am confident that if the conferees of the House and Senate who deleted this provision took this issue to the American people, the amendment which I had the honor to offer in the U.S. Senate would be overwhelmingly endorsed.

I suggest that the position which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and its distinguished president took with respect to this amendment was an ugly assault upon the American public interest, and I am rather amazed that it could send such a statement of its own policy to Members of the U.S. Congress.

I am not one of those who seek to shackle the executive branch of our Government. But who speaks here, or elsewhere, in support of our fellow citizens who ply the seas for a living if Senators and Members of the House of Representatives do not speak for them? Thank Heaven, the Senate has spoken now, and the Senate has spoken overwhelmingly.

It is quite beyond my understanding that the conferees could have summarily sheared away what the U.S. Senate clearly wanted, as a result of a debate of several hours.

My able friend from Oregon is a valued member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I submitted my amendment months before the bill came to the floor of the Senate for consideration. I ask my friend if my amendment was ever considered by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. My recollection is that the proposed amendment was discussed and defeated.

Mr. KUCHEL. A decision that was rather elegantly overriden in the Senate itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Foreign Relations Committee should have been completed overruled, so far as a majority in the Senate was concerned. I am glad we were overruled on that amendment and a few others, but not enough.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I stand here trying to represent my State, along with my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], whose illness prevents him from being present today.

I am glad to say, on that score, that I received a letter from my colleague [Mr.

Engle] only yesterday, in which he told me that he was improving, and that he looked forward to coming back before too long.

In a sense, I believe that Senators who joined in the amendment and voted for it represent something else—we represent the kind of dignity we want accorded to American citizens in exercising their rights. I would be recreant to my sense of duty if I did not rise on this occasion to denounce with all the vigor at my command what the conferees did to my amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his usual courtesy in permitting me to speak briefly on this matter.

Mr. MORSE. I am always delighted to yield to the Senator from California. It is a greater pleasure today than usual, because he spoke for me, as well as for himself.

## COLUMNIST JOSEPH ALSOP AND REPRESENTATIVE KASTENMEIER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the Record an article published in the Wisconsin Capital Times, written by an able newspaperman, Miles McMillin, who pays his disrespects to the most superficial, superegotistical, supercilious pain in the neck in the press gallery, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

In the course of this article Mr. McMillin writes:

> Alsop is never more painful than when he is accusing others of excessive vanity and "posturing."

Mr. McMillin also writes:

> Alsop's problem is that he does not know the difference between being rough and being tough. Their kind think you are tough if you worship toughness, when, in fact, this simply makes you rough. When they run into a real tough guy, like Kastenmeier, they don't recognize the product. He doesn't talk about how great it is to be tough. He is gentle and soft spoken, but all the king's horses and all the king's men in the White House and Congress can't move him away from the principles to which we all give lipservice but hate to observe. He wouldn't like it if you said he was tough.

He concludes his column pointedly by saying:

> The worshipers of toughness are usually the worshipers of "realism." The only difference between them is that those who like to think of themselves as the "realists" have a great measure of conceit.

The word "conceit" is so applicable to Mr. Alsop.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, which I have edited in order to meet the rules of the Senate, be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Alsop Lectures Kastenmeier on Realism

(By Miles McMillin)

Among the Washington realists attacking Representative Bob Kastenmeier for his civil rights stand is Joe Alsop, whose column formerly appeared in this paper. Alsop blew his stack because Kastenmeier took the position that the civil rights bill ought to conform to the promises made in the campaign; that it ought, at least, extend the right to vote in State and local elections. This, says Alsop, is a typical instance of the "empty, competitive posturing" of the liberals, proving that they are "vain, empty and impractical."

Alsop is never more painful than when he is accusing others of excessive vanity and posturing. During the 1960 presidential primary in this State, he came to interview former Governor Nelson. After about 5 minutes, Nelson was obliged to inquire of him whether he had come to ask about Wisconsin or to tell its Governor what was going on here. He has a massive addiction for lecturing politicians on the practicalities of politics, but he could not himself get elected keeper of the hangover pills in the National Press Club. It is especially farcical to note him zeroing in on Kastenmeier who has three times been elected in a district which elected its last Democrat 30 years ago—a district which President Kennedy couldn't carry against Humphrey or Nixon and which Alsop couldn't carry against Dracula.

Progress has always been achieved over the prostrate forms of such self-proclaimed realists as Alsop. They were around in the slavery days proclaiming that the abolitionists were vain, empty and impractical. They were incensed at the empty, competitive posturing of those who wanted to abolish slavery. They admired the shrewd, tough men who defended slavery, as Alsop today admires the shrewd, tough men who are the enemies of civil rights legislation.

Alsop's problem is that he does not know the difference between being rough and being tough. Their kind think you are tough if you worship toughness, when, in fact, this simply makes you rough. When they run into a real tough guy, like Kastenmeier, they don't recognize the product. He doesn't talk about how great it is to be tough. He is gentle and soft spoken, but all the king's horses and all the king's men in the White House and Congress can't move him away from the principles to which we all give lipservice but hate to observe. He wouldn't like it if you said he was tough.

Not long ago Alsop was hacking at Adlai Stevenson because he lacked the toughness Alsop thinks everyone should have. Stevenson had shown reluctance to risk the end of the world over Cuba. Stevenson's unrealistic attitudes are the despair of the unelected, self-appointed masters of realism. Dick Nixon, another tough realist, said in 1956 that Stevenson's views on a nuclear test ban were "catastrophic nonsense." To date—7 years later—the most notable achievement of the tough realists in the Kennedy administration is the test ban treaty. Maybe even Alsop someday will come to recognize that whatever substance is left in the civil rights bill is the result of the stand taken by the impractical liberals, Kastenmeier and John Lindsay of New York.

The most pathetic people, if not the most dangerous, are the worshippers of toughness. They reached their most squalid depths in the cult that surrounded the late Ernest Hemingway. Alsop was one of the idolators who virtually ruined him by glorifying his boozing, brawling, and bloodlusting. It seemed that they, aware of their own inability to booze and brawl on his scale, sought to prove something about their own manhood by worshipping what was worst in him. The worshippers of toughness are usually the worshipers of realism. The only difference between them is that those who like to think of themselves as the realists have a greater measure of conceit.

## PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, introduced on behalf of myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. I ask unanimous consent that it lie over for 10 days, in the hope that we may have additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. Bayh (for himself and Mr. Long, of Missouri), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is an attempt to deal at one time with the closely related questions of Presidential succession and Presidential inability.

Inasmuch as the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, wrote an excellent article, published in this morning's Washington Post, dealing with the need for investigating a charge in the present law in this respect, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lippmann be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BAYH. Every reason and logic and sound organization calls upon us to deal simultaneously with the questions of death, resignation, removal, or inability.

Now is clearly the time to act—while the question of Presidential succession is uppermost in our minds, and we have just completed a smooth and calm transition. If we do not act in this time of sober and reasoned reflection, when shall we act? When will we be as close to the issue as we are today? Hopefully, never. But because history is unpredictable, we must provide for the unsought moments of national crises.

The joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If enacted through the congressional and State ratification processes, it would accomplish the following:

Section 1 contains the heart of the joint resolution. It provides that the Vice President become President for the unexpired portion of the term of a President who dies, resigns, or is removed from office. It eliminates the historical confusion as to whether the Vice President becomes President or Acting President.

This was the situation when Vice President Tyler assumed the position of the Presidency a long time ago, following the death of President Harrison. At that time many constitutional scholars felt that the Vice President became the Acting President. Vice President Tyler, after a while, decided he was tired of being Acting President and took over full authority as President. There has been no specific change made in the Constitution itself, but it has been generally accepted that this is the case.

Further, it provides that the new President shall nominate a new Vice President within 30 days, and that the new Vice President shall take office upon confirmation of a majority of both Houses of Congress. It is this refilling of the office of Vice President which is the key provision in the proposal.

Section 2 provides for refilling of the office of Vice President, not upon the death of the President, but of the Vice President himself.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the mechanism for the assumption of office as "Acting President" by the Vice President in case of Presidential inability. Section 3 deals with the situation where the President is able and willing to declare his own inability in writing. Section 4 provides for the situation where the President is either unwilling or unable to make such declaration.

Section 5 provides for the mechanism whereby a President can resume his office after recovery from a disability. In case of dispute as to whether the President has recovered, the Vice President can retain his office as "Acting President" only with the written approval of the majority of the Cabinet and concurring vote of two-thirds of the Members present in both Houses of Congress.

Section 6 disposes of the case, which will be rare if the present amendment is adopted, where there is neither a President nor a Vice President due to death, resignation, removal, inability, or failure to qualify. The line of succession is modeled on that which was in effect between 1886 and 1947, designating a list of Cabinet members as successors in the previous order.

Mr. President, there have been a number of instances of succession to the Presidency on the part of the Vice President. Each case has demonstrated the weakness of a system whereby there is no replacement of the Vice President.

The accelerated pace of international affairs, plus the overwhelming problems of modern military security, make it almost imperative that we change our system to provide for not only a President but a Vice President at all times.

The modern concept of the Vice Presidency is that of a man "standing in the wings"—even if reluctantly—ready at all times to take the burden. He must know the job of the President. He must keep current on all national and international developments. He must, in fact, be something of an "assistant President", such as Vice President Johnson was in the fields of space and civil rights and in carrying the flag of the United States to foreign countries on good will missions and on matters of great diplomatic concern.

Provisions for filling the job are contained in sections 1 and 2 of the proposal. In addition to the other advantages, this system would provide for continuity in the office of President of the same party during any 4-year term.

The proposal also eliminates the historical ambiguity between President and Acting President: Upon the death, resignation or removal of the President, the Vice President becomes President; in case of Presidential inability, the Vice President becomes Acting President.

The provisions on inability, contained in sections 3, 4, and 5, are the same as those worked out in previous proposals by Senators Dirksen, Hennings, and Kefauver in the past. Extensive hearings have been held on these proposals in the past and it is believed that most of the problems with respect to inability have been provided for.

The section on succession in the case of vacancies in both the offices of President and Vice President reverts to the state of the law prior to 1947. It provides for succession by members of the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State.

There is one remaining question. Why is this extensive proposal in the form of a constitutional amendment, rather than simple legislation? There are a number of answers.

Many constitutional authorities have questioned the authority of Congress to deal with the subject of inability in a statute. More important, both the questions of succession—which clearly can be dealt with in a statute—and inability are precisely the types of questions which should be incorporated in the Constitution, our basic charter of government. Not only are they exactly the type of provision which one normally finds in a constitution, but also, once so enacted—and this is important—they are not subject to the political whims of a particular day. These are probems which go to the very heart of our democratic form of government and they should be worked out in a period of relative calm, such as exists today.

The need for clarification and supplementation of our constitutional provisions dealing with the succession problem has seldom been clearer than it is today.

But it is important that any proposal dealing with a basic constitutional issue adhere closely to the design of our constitutional system.

By leaving the nomination of the new Vice President up to the President himself, and the approval of that nomination up to the representatives of the people in Congress, my amendment provides for a means of selection very similar to the one which now prevails in our nomination and election process.

There can be no question that when our two great parties meet in convention, the presidential nomination having been made, the presidential nominee of each party has a great voice in determining who his running mate for Vice President shall be. In addition, it is imperative that the President should have as his Vice President one with whom he can work and who can assist him in carrying the burdens of the Presidency.

Thus, this proposal follows the principles of the Constitution. It would provide, through the representatives of the people, those who represent their constituents in Congress, a method of going to the people to get the choice, as is done every 4 years in the election.

In regard to the succession laws, it is the purpose of my amendment to restore succession to the executive branch and thus preserve the separation of powers so basic to our system.

Equally important, my amendment would insure political continuity by allowing the President to participate in the selection of his own potential successor.

In addition to the implications which the present Presidential succession law has on the executive branch of our Government, we must not overlook the impact which this law has on the legislative branch.

At a time of national crisis, such as that which always follows the death of a President in office, the legislative branch as well as the executive branch is faced with many critical problems. At such a time it is imperative that all branches of our Government be united and functioning at peak efficiency.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives under normal circumstances is carrying an extremely heavy burden. His efficient operation is necessary for the proper functioning of the House of Representatives. It is unwise during a time of national crisis to further overburden a man who is already one of the busiest individuals in the United States of America.

How can we expect a man who already is responsible for directing the energies of 434 of his colleagues in the House to assume the additional burdens of attending national security counsel meetings, of conferring with Cabinet officers and of assuming the other jobs which, as Acting Vice President, he will be required to do?

Representative McCormack, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, is a dedicated and well-qualified individual. The proposal I am making to the Senate today has nothing whatsoever to do with his qualifications to fill the office of Vice President or President. But no human being can accept and carry the responsibilities of both the Speaker of the House and Vice President of the United States. In my estimation, neither at this hour nor in the future, can our country afford to be without a Vice President.

I believe that the Congress should act on this proposal without delay. However, this proposal should be given the most searching consideration before proposing a solution to the States for ratification.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I shall see that a study in the Senate shall begin in earnest and as quickly as possible.

### Exhibit 1

### The Presidential Succession

(By Walter Lippmann)

Speaker McCormack, who now stands next in line to the President, is naturally enough diffident about discussing the problem of the Presidential succession. But the country cannot take his view that the matter is too horrible to think about, much more to talk about. The problem is of the highest importance and there should be no more squeamishness about discussing it than there is when a man or woman makes a will.

The law which has put the Speaker so unexpectedly where he now finds himself was proposed only in 1945 during the emotional upset following President Roosevelt's death, and passed in 1947. What it did was to insert into the line of succession—President, Vice President, Secretary of State and so forth—two Members of Congress—the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. The theory of the bill was that the man who becomes President should owe his place in the line of succession to an election, not to an appointment. In fact the 1947 law did not adhere to this principle. For after naming the two Members of Congress it went back to the old line beginning with the Secretary of State.

Defenders of the 1947 law appeal to the principle of election on the mystical ground that because Mr. McCormack has been elected repeatedly from the Ninth District of Massachusetts he has become thereby anointed and qualified for President. Applied to the concrete facts, the "principle" is nonsense, and it has no relation whatever to any real choice of the President by the will of the people.

There are several very grave objections to the present law. One is that because the congressional system operates by seniority and whatnot it has provided a successor who is unprepared and unqualified to succeed. Nobody has ever given 5 minutes' thought to the qualifications of the man who may be the next President of the United States. Under the old law, where the next in line would be the Secretary of State, the fact that he might become President would become a great consideration in his appointment and his confirmation by the Senate. The reality of this was proved in 1945 when President Truman's accession left Secretary Stettinius as the next in line. Though Edward Stettinius was a nice man, he was manifestly unqualified to be President, and a great agitation arose at once which brought about his replacement as Secretary of State by a man of vast experience in government, James Byrnes of South Carolina.

There is another radical defect in the present law. In our system of government it has happened many times that one or both of the Houses of Congress is controlled by the opposition party. It happened, for example, both to President Truman and to President Eisenhower. Under the badly considered 1947 law, the whole administration of the Government can be transferred from one party to the other by the act of one sniper.

There should never be such a premium on the assassination of a President offered to criminal lunatics or conspirators to brood upon. The very thing that has sustained the country since November 22 has been the continuity of the Presidency, the undisputed accession of a completely qualified man. Had there been any intelligible purpose in the assassination, it would have been defeated.

The sovereign principle of continuity is sacrificed in the law of 1947, and we ought lose no time in wiping it off the statute books. We should return to the old law which would put Secretary Rusk next in line, and then we should let Congress and public opinion make it known to President Johnson, as they did to President Truman in 1945, whether they are content.

There is a way, undoubtedly an organic part of the intent of the Constitution, in which real deference can be paid to the principle of election. We know from James Madison that the authors of the Constitution meant to leave to Congress "a supply of the vacancy (in the Office of President) by an intermediate election of the President." Congress was to decide whether to call an intermediate election.

It would be quite feasible, and perhaps desirable, to provide that when the line of succession reaches the Secretary of State or the other Cabinet officers, the man who takes over the office shall be only the Acting President until a new election can be held at midterm or at the end of the 4-year term. I think myself that this ancient formula should also apply to the Vice President when he succeeds. It would not affect President Johnson who must face the voters in less than 12 months.

If we arouse ourselves enough to deal firmly with the problem of the succession, we should proceed at once to repair the other great hole in our system, which is what to do when a President is incapacitated, as were Garfield and Wilson, and for a time Eisenhower. Nobody will, I think, propose that the Speaker of the House should, or that constitutionally he could, serve also as the Acting President.

## CONFUSION OF GRIEF WITH GUILT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I felt it necessary to speak from the floor of the Senate in an attempt to warn those who were confusing grief with guilt. Those who compound this confusion still speak out both at home and abroad. Last Friday some of our colleagues in the House made a strong statement clearing the confusion and pointing out the real source of our greatness as Americans. May I humbly express some further thoughts that occur to me.

America stands accused today by many critics, of sins of bigotry, hatred, and fanaticism in connection with the vile act that struck down President Kennedy. These accusations must find a strong answer. Sorrow cannot excuse, nor tears blind us to the real need of our Nation when its integrity and the fiber of its people are under unjust assault.

America stands also in peril of seeing its tragic moment cynically or unthinkingly twisted into a time when honest dissent could be stilled by unworthy and unfeeling statements, when undefined doubts could silence the need to question, when misplaced guilt could halt the quest for responsible answers to the future's challenge.

As representatives, not of a party, but of the people who are this Nation, we should speak now and always as our conscience dictates. We cannot permit ourselves even the luxury of a respectful silence in the light of the clamor of abuse.

We must speak out.

We should reject, and I sincerely believe that most of the people of this Nation do reject, the charge that it was a weakness, flaw, or bitterness of the American spirit that set the stage for the murder of our President. The murderer was not a product of our way, not of any part of our way, but of an alien way that is committed to our destruction.

Bitterness there is in American life, and hatreds too. But the people did not do this deed, encourage it, or make it possible. Violence there is in American life, but America has not nourished it. Instead it has moved steadily against it, abjuring it, not teaching it; rejecting it, not reaching for it. Violence as a way of accomplishing ends is characteristic not of America but of the alien philosophy upon which the assassin fed and upon which the philosophy itself trades throughout the world even today.

And there is where the guilt must be placed, not for the sake of this Nation alone, but for the sake of all nations who live in the shadow of the same violence.

Beyond the guilt, there is the self-destructive, corrosive recrimination which would equate political opposition with political fanaticism, or which would demand, in expiation of an imagined sin, abandonment of dissent and honest argument. This, too, must be intolerable to a people who love liberty, just as it would have been intolerable to one whose office calls for leadership of such people, but carefully is guarded against coercion of the people. No honor is done the memory of a President by turning away from the very processes which make the Presidency meaningful.

And no service is done to the responsibilities of a free people by ill-defined admonitions, no matter the depth of the emotions that may impel the admonitions.

Americans do not need to be lectured on their love of country. It is this very love they are taught, or should be taught, from childhood. To say that hatred and fanaticism are the result of such lessons is to misread the people and misjudge their history.

Therefore, let us say these things:

The soul of America is sound. It was shaken, but not stained, by the killing of our President.

The people of America are sound. They are not haters, bigots, and fanatics; and those among them who are, stand scorned and at the ebb of their time, not at the flood.

The future of America is sound. It is the very strength of our political institutions which we have seen most dramatically demonstrated in these trying times.

The cause of America is sound. No reflection on that cause or reflection against it results from the ordeal imposed upon it by a way of thinking totally alien to it.

The way of America is sound. Let it not be barred or blocked by those who forget that the great business of the Nation must be threshed out in healthy discussion, in spirited debate, and in the great dialog of open dissent and open society. Those who would cry heresy at such debate today, as some seem to cry, would memorialize tyranny, not liberty.

We will not suffer the name of bigot for those who speak from conscience. We will not suffer the name of fanatic for those who decently believe in and decently strive for their causes. We will not suffer the charge that hatred is being taught in a land that always has been, and still must be, a symbol of the sort of humane order for which men have striven and died across the face of the earth and the face of time.

The business of this Congress must be carried forward by the judgment of its membership. The laws it is to consider are for the common good, and cannot be tokens of remembrance, no matter how earnest. They must be faithful to the lessons of yesterday, but must be fashioned for today and tomorrow. Laws cannot be memorials to the past alone; they must be servants of the future.

This is our Nation and these are our people. We are proud of both. The time to tell the world we are proud is right now. Thus we will move to the end of hatred, by the triumph of truth and justice. Thus we will know the nature of those who oppose that triumph.

Let Americans say this now to all mankind, as indeed we are saying it, each to the other, here in our Nation's Capitol—the citadel of freedom.

---

## ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS DAY IN MINNESOTA

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the excellent address of the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, delivered before the 555 Club in Minneapolis on the occasion of Alliance for Progress Day in Minnesota.

I congratulate the farsighted Governor of Minnesota on proclaiming Monday, December 9, as Alliance for Progress Day, and for the excellent program of activities which focused the attention of Minnesotans on this joint endeavor between the United States and its neighbors in this hemisphere.

I want to commend the Time-Life Broadcasting Co. for their efforts in organizing the Alliance celebration and for bringing to Minnesota the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance, and also the Chilean Ambassador, Mr. Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos.

Through an hour-long TV program on station WTCN devoted to the Alliance for Progress, Minnesotans had an opportunity to hear Mr. Moscoso and the senior Senator from Minnesota discuss with a panel of reporters the principal problems confronting the United States in Latin America today.

Minnesotans were also treated to an exhibit of Chilean painting, brought to Minnesota by the Minneapolis people-to-people program as part of the "Image of Chile" program appearing in the United States this year. I congratulate the distinguished Ambassador of Chile on this contribution to our appreciation of Chilean culture. It is exactly what our late President Kennedy desired to promote: greater understanding between North American and Latin American peoples. As the President stated in his address proclaiming the Alliance for Progress:

> We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need * * * access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.

Through programs like the Alliance for Progress Day in Minnesota, our people can learn what is going on in this hemisphere and thus better understand the mutual problems which both Latin Americans and North Americans share in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the address by Teodoro Moscoso before the 555 Club in Minneapolis; my speech, also delivered before the 555 Club; and two newspaper articles dealing with Alliance for Progress Day.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE TEODORO MOSCOSO

### I

Governor Rolvaag, Senator Humphrey, Congressman Fraser, Congressman McGregor, Mayor Naftalin, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, this has been a good day for the Alliance for Progress. Your Governor has dedicated this day to the Alliance, and many citizens of this great metropolis, led by your mayor, have manifested their support for the program, which our late great President initiated, and to which our new Chief Executive has dedicated himself.

You have shown today that you want this program to succeed; you are aware that it takes resources from this country to make it succeed; and you are ready to contribute your share to the common task of which our Latin American friends bear the main burden.

I am deeply grateful for your hospitality, and your understanding; I am gratified at the presence of your Governor, your mayor, your Representatives in the House, and of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. You rightly consider HUBERT HUMPHREY one of the great Senators this or any other State has sent to Washington. Latin America thinks of HUBERT HUMPHREY as the most courageous and effective fighter on Capitol Hill for freedom and progress in this hemisphere. Of the many things which he has accomplished in his career, little compares to the unremitting, virtually singlehanded effort he is making to secure the resources for the Alliance for Progress from this country without which the program cannot succeed. He has won a crucial round of that fight, and he is keeping it up down to the wire. The people of Latin America will never forget it; the people of the United States will come to understand it and appreciate it once the whole Nation realizes the importance of Latin America for our country's own security.

It is fitting, too, that we are observing this Alliance day as the Image of Chile presentation opens in your city. In producing this program, Chile's Ambassador Gutierrez acted on the 10th point of our late President's address of March 13, 1961, in which he proclaimed the Alliance for Progress. In that speech, the President said: "We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need * * * access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers * * * In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere."

John Kennedy always had the broad view of things. He conceived of the Alliance not merely as a job for economic planners and social programers. He thought of it as a hemispherewide effort touching on the whole range of our many activities and interests. To him, the purpose of the Alliance was not merely to relieve hunger and cure disease, to provide jobs and curb illiteracy; it was also to enhance the dignity of every person in the hemisphere, and to give greater meaning to our lives through better understanding of each other's cultural accomplishments.

In his last foreign policy speech, 3 weeks ago today, in which he discussed the Alliance for Progress, this is the way he expressed his vision: "For a hemisphere where every man, from the American Negro to the Indian of the Altiplano, can be liberated from the bonds of social injustice, free to pursue his own talents as far as they will take him, allowed to participate in the fruits of progress."

Latin America took our late President's death hard. With stunning uniformity, cities and villages throughout the lands south of us were engulfed by a great stillness, as word of the incredible deed spread. From Mexico to Argentina, from Venezuela to Chile, people shed tears just as our people did. And then the flags came out half mast, on public buildings and skyscrapers, in city slums and adobe huts, and in newly built homes which are monuments to his leadership. Then came the words, the torrent of eulogies expressing deeply felt sorrow for the loss of a great human being, a father, and a leader—and concern for the future which he had done so much to brighten.

The former President of Colombia, Alberto Lleras Camargo, a man who knew John F. Kennedy and who knows Latin America, put it this way: "Never has a President of the United States devoted so much and such affectionate interest to Latin American affairs, particularly to the affairs of the less fortunate * * * he was the principal author of the Alliance, its defender and supporter. His enemies sought to hurt him through the Alliance, knowing him to be more vulnerable there than in any other part of his program. For Latin America, Kennedy's passing is a blackening, a tunnel, a gust of cloud and smoke. Until it dissipates, until someone takes up the fallen banner, there will be uncertainty and danger in that part of the world."

Fortunately, Latin America did not have to wait long for someone to "take up the fallen banner." In his first foreign policy action, in the presence of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, and in the very room in which less than 3 years before John Kennedy had proposed the program, our new President spoke to the delegates from Latin America who had come to Washington for the funeral. Lyndon Johnson said: "Today, among you in this same room, I have come to reaffirm that Alliance (for Progress) and to pledge all the energies of my Government to our common goals * * *. Inspired by his memory * * * we will carry on the job. Let the Alliance for Progress be his living memorial."

So we know and Latin America knows that the watchword is: The Alliance moves forward. Now we must make good on this pledge. That is the greatest tribute we can pay John F. Kennedy. He was short on ceremony, and long on work. And he inspired thousands of others to act likewise. I doubt that so many people in Government worked so hard for so many hours in recent history as the people who worked for John Kennedy. Nobody asked them to do this. It was his drive, his example, and his leadership that made them do it. We can best honor his memory by keeping up the same pace under the new President.

### II

Lyndon Johnson has forcefully reasserted our country's responsibilities under the program. His assumption of this responsibility coincides with a crucial moment in the development of the Alliance—the beginning of a new phase in its operations.

In mid-November, the Finance Ministers of the Alliance countries completed their second annual review of the program, and took some significant decisions which are likely to change the future shape and course of the program.

The most important decision taken at this meeting in São Paulo, Brazil, was to create a mechanism designed to make the Alliance in practice what it was conceived to be in its charter: a cooperative program.

Up to now, too many people in Latin America have viewed the Alliance for Progress as a conventional American aid program with a fancy new name. Consequently, they looked to Washington for funds, for policy decisions and for scapegoats. Disregarding the fact that it takes at least two to make an Alliance, many politicians, journalists and people at large defined the term to mean just one country—the United States.

This was due to a variety of factors—among them that the initiative to launch the program came from President Kennedy and that no single inter-American organization was available to give unified direction to the program. Thus, the United States was forced to make most of the judgments and decisions that should have been made jointly by the twenty member countries from the outset.

Inadequate involvement on the part of the Latin American nations—governments as well as people—in the work of the Alliance accounts for many of the problems we have encountered during the past two years. It slowed down political decisionmaking on such issues as changes in land tenure, tax reform and collection, the setting of priorities for the most effective use of national resources and many other actions that only the governments and people of the countries themselves can take. This slowdown in turn caused disappointments with the results of the program, disappointments sharpened by a highly exaggerated degree of expectation.

Now Latin America has decided to create an organ in which seven representatives, representing six regions of Latin America and the United States, and headed by a strong chairman, will take over many of the responsibilities that up to now have rested upon the United States alone. Instead of the United States judging development plans, evaluating performance in self-help and reform, and thus seemingly applying conditions for its aid, it will be this new Inter-American Committee for the Alliance that will do this job. Latin Americans will be evaluating each other's plans and performance, estimate the resources each country needs and can usefully absorb and suggest the most effective distribution of funds that become available from outside sources.

The members and the Chairman are to be selected by January 15, 1964, and hopefully the new Committee can start operations shortly afterward.

In creating this group, the Alliance nations have taken a leaf out of the book of success written by the Marshall plan. That program also got off to a slow start. Its pace increased after the creation of the Organization of European Economic Cooperation, which made it possible for the European nations to play a full and policymaking part in the revival of their economies and the renewal of their societies.

But an organization is meaningful and effective only to the extent that its members act to make it a success. The question is whether all of us—our Latin American friends and ourselves—have the will and the maturity to use the new tool with which we have equipped ourselves. The U.S. Government is determined to play a full and active role in the new body—neither to take a back seat, nor to dominate or control it; neither to escape responsibility nor to encroach on that of its partners; neither to weaken its own effort nor to inhibit the initiative of others. We approach our task in this new and promising stage of the Alliance for Progress with a strengthened will to convert the program into the truly cooperative endeavor that it is designed to be, and we are confident that our partners will do likewise.

The decision to create this new Committee tended to overshadow some other major actions in São Paulo. Thus, the conference adopted a resolution designed to give free labor a bigger voice in development planning. It called for setting up Trade Union Advisory Committees for the Alliance in each member country, on which all major free trade unions will be represented. The job of these committees is to cooperate with national planning institutions, and to make sure that development programs are worked out and carried out with the fullest possible participation of the working people and their representatives.

The conference also recognized the growing effectiveness of cooperatives, which our Agency—The Agency for International Development—has done much to foster, using the skills and experience of many people from this and nearby States. In the spreading network of cooperatives in a wide variety of fields—credit, farm, consumer and housing co-ops, to name just a few—lies one of the best hopes for the economic and social development of Latin America.

The conference also decided to have a special study focus on ways and means to increase Latin America's exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured products, thus lessening the region's dependence on a few commodities which are subject to sharply fluctuating prices on world markets.

The São Paulo meeting took an important step to promote Latin America's interests at the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Between now and March, when the U.N. Conference opens, the Latin American countries will meet to coordinate their positions for that Conference and thus better represent their common interests in world trade.

These are some of the major actions taken in São Paulo. The results could not have been achieved without a strong sense of realism and determination on the part of most delegations.

Much has been written from and since São Paulo about criticism of the Alliance on the part of some speakers and delegations. Little, and I am afraid too little, has been written about the substantial accomplishments which I reported to you tonight.

In a similar vein, we have read for many weeks about the violent attempts of Castroite terrorists to prevent the Venezuelan elections, but less about the sustained, difficult and successful struggle of the democratic Government of Venezuela and its armed forces to foil the terrorist onslaught. Here is a triumph of democracy achieved by a people that braved threats and bullets to vote. It is also a triumph for the principles underlying our Alliance for Progress.

Turning to economic issues, there is generally blow-by-blow reporting of disputes between American companies and Latin American governments, but are you aware of the agreement we signed with Chile less than a week ago under which virtually all new American investment in Chile can be guaranteed against a wide range of political and commercial risks?

It is unfortunate that conflict makes news, while progress is taken for granted as the normal and appointed way of the world. These criteria reflect a confident and optimistic view of history, and perhaps this is all to the good. But now and then one wishes that people found some thrill and excitement in progress.

### III

I do not wish to hide the serious obstacles the Alliance for Progress faces in its quest to revitalize the economies and societies of 19 Latin American nations—each different from the other, each facing a different set of problems.

In some Latin American countries, strong political leadership has created favorable conditions for action, but inadequacies in project preparation and shortages of skilled personnel hobble progress. In other cases, the resources for performance are available in greater measure, but political indecision or opposition inhibits action.

On the extreme right in several countries, we encounter criticism couched in reasonable terms but motivated by deep-seated resistance to reform. On the other side of the spectrum, the Communists and their allies are laboring day and night to wreck the chances of the peaceful revolution sought by the Alliance so as to increase their opportunities for a takeover by violent revolution.

Here in this country, much remains to be done to gear our diplomacy to the changing requirements of economic and social development, and our economic relationships and investment patterns must be adjusted to the new political realities in the region. What was good and valid in a placid past is not necessarily right and effective in the turbulent present, dominated by a rising sense of self-assertion and nationalism.

But despite the problems, the Alliance has moved ahead. And it could not have achieved what it has accomplished in two years were it not for a great deal of dedicated effort on the part of many people throughout the hemisphere. Millions of Latin Americans have been affected by the Alliance in one way or another—be it that they own a home of their own, that they till their own land, that they have clean water to drink, a hospital or school to go to, or that they have a job in which they earn a decent living.

A beginning has been made. Now the need is to speed up the process we have set in motion. This means more rapid accomplishment of the difficult tasks to which our sister republics have committed themselves—the basic reforms they have pledged to carry out and the domestic resources they must generate for their development. Under the Alliance compact, it also means that we must continue to come through with timely and effective support.

It is in this connection that your senior Senator has rendered such outstanding service to the Alliance for Progress. We have suffered a sharp cut in our authorization for the fiscal year 1964, and we still have the appropriations stage ahead of us. Had it not been for Senator HUMPHREY, the cuts might have been so drastic as to endanger the very future of the program.

The administration's request for the Alliance—before any cuts were made—amounts to less than 1 percent of our total budget—less than 1 percent to assist 200 million people whose security is vital to our own. Most of the money will be spent right here in this country, for equipment and commodities to be used in the development of our sister republics. Eighty-five percent of the administration request is in the form of long-term repayable loans, and only 15 percent in outright grants.

We can ill afford not to make these funds available. For years, we neglected Latin America. In those years, we helped rebuild Europe, and then put out fires in other farflung parts of the world. That we concentrated last on Latin America, the region closest to us, is not Latin America's doing. It is our own. The fact that problems in that region have been allowed to fester and build up to their present proportions is not the result of ill will but a fact of history. Now we have committed ourselves to face up to these problems, and to go back on that commitment is unthinkable.

It is unthinkable because the economic and social development of Latin America is both a human duty and an essential requirement for our own security.

People in Latin America live on average incomes of less than $300 a year, and in some countries of less than $100. Ten percent of the landholders own 90 percent of the farmland, even though this overall average hides significant differences in land tenure patterns from country to country. Ninety million Latin Americans cannot read or write. Tens of millions die before they reach adulthood.

Now, after centuries of patience, the peoples of Latin America are making themselves heard—loudly and unmistakably. They demand to be recognized; they demand jobs; and they are determined to enjoy the fruits of their work. They demand to be integrated into their countries' national fabric—politically, economically, and socially.

This demand will not cease. It will become louder from year to year. And it will be met. It will be met either by totalitarian demagogs, whom the people may decide to follow in desperation, only to end up in despair. Or it will be met through the Alliance for Progress.

The purpose of this program is not merely to build. Totalitarians, too, can build. From the slaveworkers of ancient Egypt who built the pyramids, to Hitler's autobahn and the sputnik, there runs a thread of indignity and inhumanity which all peoples ignore at their peril.

The purpose of the Alliance is to build in freedom. Thus, what the Alliance seeks to accomplish cannot be described in mere statistics. The homes, factories, roads, and schools going up all over the southern part of our hemisphere are mere building blocks. They become meaningful only as all our people—minorities here and majorities in many of our Latin American sister republics—are truly integrated into each country's national life as free and first-class citizens with equal opportunity.

I believe this Alliance is the most inspiring endeavor ever undertaken by any group of nations: to develop a vast degion of 19 independent countries, plagued by varying degrees of underdevelopment, into a modern community of nations, and to integrate this community into a hemisphere sharing the fruits of prosperity and shaped in the image of freedom.

This is the legacy of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

---

### REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Nothing would please the late President John F. Kennedy more than to know that interest in the Alliance for Progress program was spreading across his beloved country, and expressed through a special day designated as "Alliance for Progress Day."

I congratulate those responsible for this "Alliance for Progress Day" and I am honored to participate in it.

As the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress has indicated, there will be no change in U.S. policy in Latin America under the new administration. President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear that U.S. support for the Alliance for Progress will continue. President Johnson's first foreign policy speech after he became President was to the assembled Latin American delegates at the funeral of President Kennedy. Speaking to them in the East Room of the White House where President Kennedy had originally announced his plans for the Alliance, President Johnson pledged to carry on the job that his predecessor began.

At a meeting in my office one-half hour after the White House meeting, the Brazilian Foreign Minister told me of the profound impression President Johnson had made on the Latin American leaders. They returned to their countries reassured that President Kennedy's policy would be implemented.

The next year will be an important one in our relations with Latin America, and President Johnson will face some formidable problems before the year is over. In Argentina and Peru, new reform-minded Governments are attempting to effect radical social and economic changes in their societies, and in the process are calling into question existing relationships with foreign investors, particularly U.S. oil companies. In Brazil, rampant inflation, a stagnant agricultural situation, and an increasing polarization of political life between the right and the left make the future of this developing giant highly uncertain during the next 2 years. In Chile, a Communist-Socialist coalition is one of the three leading competitors in the presidential election of September 1964. These are but a few of the situations that may erupt into crises during the next 12 months.

But we should not focus all our attention on the bad news that may come or the crises that may erupt. Too often the only news that gets to headlines is the bad news. The good news is buried on the bottom of page 14. We have heard far too much bad news about Latin America, far too much about the failures of the Alliance for Progress, and too little about its accomplishments.

Last week we had some good news about the Alliance. The presidential elections in Venezuela on December 1 resulted in a resounding victory for those two political parties whose programs are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress. The two parties of the Betancourt coalition government, Accion Democratica and the Social Christian Policy, were the victors—proving that a government like Betancourt's, a government that pursues a policy of economic and social reform, can win and hold the allegiance of the people.

The election revealed that in a wealthy, rapidly developing country like Venezuela, the two strongest political parties are precisely those two parties whose programs and objectives are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress. The two victorious parties in this election represent the two principal reform-minded, non-Communist groups in Latin America, the Democratic left group in the Caribbean, and the Christian Democratic group in South America. President-elect Leoni is a member of that movement, the Democratic left, which has provided the principal leadership in the last decade for progressive constitutional forces in Latin America. It is this movement that has come forth with astute leaders like Betancourt, Jose Figueres and Daniel Oduber in Costa Rica, and Luis Muñoz Marín and Tedoro Moscoso in Puerto Rico. The Social Christian (COPEI), headed by Dr. Rafael Caldera, is typical of the Christian Democratic Parties, which, although a minor force in Latin America up until recently, are now rapidly growing in strength and are destined to play a major role in the political life of such countries as Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, and Peru. With the continued cooperation between Accion Democratica and COPEI that has characterized the Betancourt government in the past 2 years, Venezuela will be governed by a progressive, friendly government which will enjoy the firm backing of the U.S. Government.

From the events of the past week, it is clear that the new Venezuelan Government will need the support of its friends in this hemisphere to repel external attacks originating in Cuba. The evidence is clear and indisputable that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. The evidence has been presented to the OAS Council, which voted 16-0 to investigate the charges of interference by Cuba in the internal affairs of Venezuela.

The case of Venezuela demonstrates dramatically the nature of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere. In my "Report on the Alliance for Progress" issued in March of this year, I spelled out my view of the nature of this threat. I would like to quote one passage from that report:

"In considering the Communist problem in relation to the Alliance for Progress, we must therefore always bear in mind the distinction between the two salient strands of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere: (1) the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; (2) the attempt of a Communist regime (i.e., Cuba) and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage, and propaganda.

"One cannot meet the appeal of the first with solutions appropriate only for the second. The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions—but rather by the programs which fall under the Alliance—effective mobilization of resources and accomplishments of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of foreign aid loans, food for peace, the Peace Corps, and technical assistance. The security problem cannot be met alone by the above economic programs, but by the political and internal security measures described earlier. The subversion and terrorism problem requires specific political and internal security measures. Violence and subversion in Latin America cannot be defeated by relying wholly on the elimination of hunger, poverty, and disease."

Today a government that has implemented the economic and social programs prescribed by the Alliance for Progress is under attack, is threatened with subversion from abroad. What is our policy? Our policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba to Venezuela. We have stated before that we will not permit the Castro regime to subvert the democratic governments of its neighbors through armed aggression, whether covert or open. We have repeatedly stated this as our policy. Today we have a clear, carefully documented case of arms shipments into Venezuela. The Venezuelan Government has presented convincing photographic evidence of the smuggled arms shipments.

What is our response to this situation? I believe we should mean what we say. We should take all steps necessary to prevent further arms shipments from Cuba into Venezuela. And I mean all measures. Mere words alone will be of little avail.

The new administration headed by President Johnson should serve notice on the Soviet Union that we do not intend to see friendly governments like that in Venezuela subverted by terrorists armed from Cuba. If action is needed to convince the Cubans that we mean business, then action should be the order of the day. Either we defend our friends in Latin America against armed subversion, or we may as well forget about a peaceful, democratic revolution in Latin American countries through the Alliance for Progress.

The Venezuelan Government has asked for support and assistance. We should provide it—now.

By protecting progressive governments from external Communist threats from abroad, and by giving them our strong support for the Alliance programs in the economic and social fields, we can contribute heavily to the development of stable progressive societies in Latin America. We can insure that the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

Our own contribution to the success of the Alliance will be more effective if we translate into the machinery of the Alliance the uniqueness of the Alliance program. The Alliance is not just another part of the U.S. aid program. The Alliance for Progress program should not be merely one of four regional programs in the same agency. It is different, and on the U.S. end alone entails a wide variety of capital development loans, economic loans, social development loans and grants, and technical assistance.

The Alliance program in the U.S. Government should be more independent, should be more autonomous than it now is. Perhaps it should be a separate agency, like the Peace Corps. If this would pose too great a problem of coordination with the State Department, there should be some other steps taken to make the Alliance program more autonomous, independent, and visible.

In my report on the Alliance for Progress issued in April of this year, I suggested that we need to do more in terms of contacts with legislative bodies, both at the State and National level. I would like to repeat this suggestion.

I propose the establishment of an inter-American parliamentary body, somewhat along the lines of our NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, in which Members of Congress from the Latin American countries and the United States meet regularly and get to know each other's domestic problems. The Alliance needs more political content, and if some of our Senators and Congressmen had a better idea of the problems confronting their Latin American colleagues as they try to face up to difficult decisions in domestic reform, it would help all around. Similarly, such a body would give the Latin American Congressmen an idea of the problems we face in our Congress in voting on foreign aid appropriations.

---

### Alliance for Progress Chief, Others Cite Successes in U.S. Foreign Aid

(By Beverly Kees)

The Alliance for Progress has had successes and failures although people seem to focus on its shortcomings, Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance, said at a Minnesota League of Women Voters State foreign aid conference Monday in the Thunderbird Motel, Bloomington.

Latin American countries have agreed to certain reforms under a self-help policy with "only marginal help from the United States," he said. The United States provides about 10 percent of the funds going to those reforms "principally in the form of loans, not grants."

The U.S. faith in the program was rewarded in recent Venezuelan elections, he said. "The fact that there was an election was a success. This is the first time a democratically elected government has turned over the power to a new democratically elected government in Venezuela.

"Ninety-five percent of registered voters went to the polls despite Communist activity," he said.

Lloyd W. Woodruff, director of research and planning for the Minnesota Department of Taxation and former public administration specialist for Michigan State University program in South Vietnam, told the 150 league members that the university program was set up to help the government of Ngo Dinh Diem survive and to work on a reform program, dealing with public finance, civil service, and in-service training.

When the program began in 1955, Woodruff said, Diem was considered one of the great democratic leaders of southeast Asia.

The program was considered successful by the university team, Woodruff said, in that it increased administration efficiency, helped give the Vietnamese a more critical attitude in research and planning, raised educational standards and "planted the idea in public officials of responsibility and responsiveness."

Norman Craig, University of Minnesota assistant professor of public health and former regional adviser, health education for World Health Organization, said one great problem facing health educators in Latin America "was to know the cultural basis for beliefs of the peasants and to use those beliefs to help them improve their health."

In the afternoon, John Rielly, foreign policy assistant to Senator Hubert Humphrey, and Barbara Stuhler, U.S. League of Women Voters foreign policy chairman and assistant director of the World Affairs Center, answered questions from league members.

Rielly's comments were:

There is more social and economic rather than military emphasis today in foreign aid, which is concerned with such programs as health, education, housing, water pollution control, and irrigation. This emphasis gets the aid to lower levels of people with less chance of graft by local officials.

There is no need for heavy weapon assistance to Latin American countries, he said. "But there is a need for limited military assistance to meet the problems of internal subversion." Those countries need trained police, guerrilla forces, helicopters, and radios, rather than tanks, planes, and missiles.

Miss Stuhler said:

"We must judge the validity of a foreign aid program on its economic and political reality. We have learned in the United States that if there are many poor and few rich, the poor will drag down the rich. If the United States is to stay rich, perhaps the best thing we can do is to make sure there is a wider base of purchasing power" by raising the world's economy.

The political reality is "that if the United States is indifferent to the needs of those less fortunate, it is only logical that they will be indifferent to the values we want to share."

---

### Culture Stressed by Chile Envoy's Wife

(Editor's note.—Katherine Evans, the former Katherine Winton of Deephaven, interviewed Mme. Gutierrez-Olivos before she left Washington, D.C., for a quick trip to Minneapolis Sunday and Monday, accompanying her husband, the Chilean Ambassador. They came to open the Chilean art exhibit Sunday at First National Bank of Minneapolis.)

(By Katherine Evans)

Washington, D.C.—You'd never guess it from her schedule—a constant round of lunches, receptions, and dinners—but Margot Gutierrez-Olivos, pretty, vivacious wife of the new Chilean Ambassador, has the novel idea that a diplomat can make more friends for his country with culture than with parties. And with good reason.

"The cultural approach is really better because culture is a common language which everyone understands," she says. She ought to know. She and her husband, Chile's dashing Ambassador, Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, have spent their first months in Washington successfully speaking the language of culture to Americans.

They've already produced a 6-week program on the Chilean arts called "Image of Chile." Since September they've invited 15,000 Americans to 20 performances by outstanding Chilean artists here and in New York—recitals, concerts, lectures, and roundtable discussions.

Felicia Monteleagre has read Chilean poetry. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose versatility constantly amazes us, has discussed Chilean fiction and official Washington has flocked to hear Chilean musicians like pianist Claudio Arrau. It all winds up with a show of paintings by Chilean artists, now on exhibit at Howard University, which is now touring the country.

"Image of Chile" is a new wrinkle in the old art of diplomacy, and it's all the bright idea of Ambassador Gutierrez himself. He experimented with the idea when he was Chile's Ambassador to Argentina. A former professor of international law, he is not a career diplomat, which may account for his refreshing approach.

When we went to see his wife at the imposing gray stone Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue, "Image of Chile" was coming to an end, but it was still very much on her mind.

We talked in the drawing room, which is filled with French furniture and with Signora Gutierrez' own tapestries and paintings, including a fine painting by Boudin and an old Italian bas-relief, which she brought to Washington with her. She also brought her Italian chef and practically the whole household staff from their last post in Buenos Aires.

Life in the United States has not always been well-appointed for Senora Gutierrez. When she first came here—back in 1949—she and her husband lived in a tiny, three room apartment on Cutter Mill Road in Great Neck, Long Island. At that time he was a hardworking foreign student on a scholarship at New York University and she was a hardworking young housewife who did all her own cooking and took care of their baby son.

"A very interesting year but for me a very hard experience. Of course I did everything in the house there was to do—from diapers to cleaning and cooking and frankly, I wasn't accustomed to any of it, because in Chile I did no housework at all. My husband so often brought his American friends home to dinner and, well, I had to learn in a hurry to cook a complicated Chilean meal."

---

## CRITICAL YEAR FOR GRAIN FARMERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 9, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Grain Terminal Association, made his 26th annual report as general manager of this far-flung organization. I read it with a great deal of interest and felt it might be appropriately made a part of the Congressional Record.

The minority has been very free in its criticism of administration farm policies but, frankly, if I were to comment in the same temper and to the same degree on farm policies as Mr. Thatcher, who has had generations of experience in that field, it might be regarded as captiously partisan.

I allude to only one sentence in Mr. Thatcher's report, for he says:

> For grain farmers the next 12 months will be the most critical in at least the last 30 years. Your future on the farm and the future of your cooperatives hangs in the balance.

This is indeed strong and heady comment but it comes from one who has been an expert in that field for a long time and whose political sympathies generally have been toward, rather than away from, the administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the General Manager to the Members of GTA, December 9, 1963

#### TWO PRECIOUS VOTES

Our Nation has been profoundly shaken by the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy. The shockwave of events that follows the dastardly assassination reaches into the affairs of all men, even into those of your cooperative.

In the same moment that we express our sorrow, we pledge our support to President Lyndon B. Johnson, who now has assumed all the cares and responsibilities inherent within the affairs of the greatest Nation in the world.

No one in Government could have more earnestly wished for parity of income and opportunity for American farmers than did President Kennedy. This I know. I am certain that our new President has that same desire.

But, as Mr. Kennedy himself often said, the President does not run the United States. He can only make his recommendations to the Congress, which then must express itself within what it assumes to be the will of the people.

Because the basic ingredients of democracy are attitudes and opinions and convictions, no one knows at this moment what direction the new administration in Washington will take in the carrying out of the Nation's affairs.

This uncertainty, coupled with the events of the past several years, makes it unalterably true that your cooperative now stands, more than ever, a vigilant and determined trustee of the farmers' economic interests.

Your GTA was founded to help improve your position as a family farmer in the business of providing vital food for your Nation and the world. It has no other purpose. We have never aimed at making a lot of profit. On the contrary, by our cooperative competition we have aimed to hold down the profits made in grain handling. We have succeeded. Today, grain is handled on the lowest margins in history.

There is no need for me to recite here the details of the assets and liabilities of GTA, or its operating income and expenses, which are contained in other sections of this report. I want to discuss with you, within the limitations of the space allotted here, the fact that your co-ops and your GTA are the tools that give you power and influence in the marketplace and in the affairs of your State and Nation.

For grain farmers the next 12 months will be the most critical in at least the last 30 years. Your future on the farm and the future of your cooperatives hang in the balance.

If, within the coming year, we do not get a change in the trend, 12 months from now you will be well on your way toward losing title to your farms or will be off the farm altogether.

This is a peril that threatens every farmer and every businessman on every Main Street in every town and village throughout our land.

These dangers include falling farm prices, rising costs, falling net income, and an uncertain future for every aspect of farming. Your grain marketing cooperatives are threatened as never before by a governmental marketing agency that overshadows us and takes away from farmers' cooperatives the business for which they were set up to handle. This agency has all the elements of a Frankenstein which, in time, could destroy all of our grain cooperatives.

As far back as 1961 I wrote Secretary of Agriculture Freeman about this as follows: "If the Government wants to take over the marketing, and there is every indication that's on the way, then we should negotiate between our farmers as owners and the Government as to the best way of handling this, either by leasing the properties to the Government for a period of years or selling them outright."

Since January of 1961, the Federal Government has taken over a large part of the grain business. In that time it has sold the stupendous total of nearly 3.5 billion bushels. That's between one-third and one-half of all the grain moving in commercial channels. This has been accomplished through a vast organization that has offices in almost every county, unlimited finances, giant central computers, and arbitrary control over all the rules.

Millions of dollars of income that should have sustained the private enterprise marketing system, which is essential year in and year out to your marketing service, are building this vast government machine.

This must end. Either farmers must get out of the business of grain marketing, or the Government must get out.

The Federal Government could not do such a thing to any other group in the country. Banks, or labor, or transportation wouldn't take such mistreatment. The voice of protest would be so loud and the resultant political fear so great that Congress and the administration would make prompt corrections.

We need a definite official policy on the Nation's grain reserves. It must spell out the kinds and amounts and locations of the Nation's reserve supplies of grains and oilseeds. This policy must be for a stated period of years so that farmers, their cooperatives, processors, and the entire grain trade may know where they are. The costs of such a program should be placed upon the Nation's general welfare, national defense, commerce, and other appropriate budgets. Reserves must be frozen, so that the Government cannot continue, as it does today, to put surplus commodities on the market, which unjustly depresses farm prices.

Much makeshift storage capacity, temporary and second rate, still exists throughout the country, a holdover from times of war emergency. The Government has a responsibility to get such storage out of use and leave the system of distribution to private enterprise.

We must continue to open up and expand the avenues of trade for U.S. grain farmers by encouraging foreign sales and the use of our grain and oilseed surpluses, just as other commercial grain nations are doing around the world. This means sales to the Communist bloc and to anyone else who wants to buy, and it means more food for peace, including the surplus vegetable oils.

Many steps can be taken, if taken in time, to keep wheat income from collapsing in 1964. These include going back to the policy followed from 1938 to 1951, when no reduction was made from crop loans for storage and farmers were given the full support called for by law. Since then, 10 cents per bushel, on the average, comes out of every grain loan, thus lowering the floor price by that amount. Commodity Credit Corporation selling prices for all grains and oilseeds should be lifted from 105 to 115 percent of the loan, plus carrying charges. This would greatly lessen the amount of grains and oilseeds annually taken over by CCC. Carrying charges must include costs for storage and handling, and interest at regular commercial rates.

The present system of CCC sales at only 105 percent constitutes a ceiling which kills any chance of farmers redeeming grains or oilseeds in surplus and marketing them through the private enterprise system. Such a policy was not the intent of Congress, and it destroys the whole purpose of our farm laws. The present CCC system keeps the bulk of the inventory of grain in the possession of the Federal Government, at unwarranted expense. Much of the inventory could and should be borne by the commercial marketing system.

Grain farmers; dairy, poultry and livestock producers; cotton and tobacco growers; all are in common danger today. Their programs designed to protect price and income are collapsing. They stand desperately in need of a practical and realistic program on which to unite.

Secretary Freeman, of course, knows this, and he desires to see parity of income for farmers.

As history tells us, the goal we seek must be a self-run, self-financed program, commodity by commodity. It should provide an American price in the American market and an export program to carry our abundant production to all corners of the world.

Farmers' bargaining power must not change with each passing change in administrations or with each new Secretary of Agriculture or bureau chief. We must be given this bargaining power through the same method that it has been attained by others, by State and Federal law and by our own organizations under that law. Then we can run our own business, just as others do, subject to the needs of public welfare. That means putting a fair price on our products, and doing so without burdening the taxpayers. Then, and only then, can we assume full responsibility for our business of furnishing the basic food and fiber needed by our Nation.

A step in this direction would be the passage of the Humphrey direct-payment plan, which uses appropriations out of the Federal Treasury, or the McGovern voluntary certificate plan, which depends on the marketplace for its funds.

As always at GTA, our minds are on the things we can and must do to get better prices and more income for the farmers who produce the grain, oilseeds, and other commodities that we market. GTA is an instrument designed to reach those ends.

Your GTA has its vast system of communications to keep farmers in the central Northwest constantly informed on agricultural news and markets. We maintain a corps of men in the country as superintendents and field representatives. We have a line of more than 200 elevators in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, and we have almost 500 local cooperatives that market their grain through GTA. We have subterminals in the country, and we have large terminals at Minneapolis, St. Paul, Superior, Sioux City, Great Falls, and St. Louis.

In addition to these institutions we have a number of processing plants. Durum wheat is processed in our mill at Rush City, Minn., which makes us one of the important stabilizing influences in the premiums connected with Durum. We have the large flaxseed processing plant in Minneapolis, the Minnesota Linseed Oil Co., where we process many millions of bushels of flaxseed every year. We are probably the most stabilizing influence in the flaxseed market. This also is true of the Honeymead Products Co. at Mankato, Minn., where we process about 20 million bushels of soybeans each year.

We operate 125 lumberyards as Great Plains Supply Co., with a large number of service people in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North and South Dakota.

All these institutions function under the direction of a single board of directors and one general manager.

This was all started out of nothing. We can literally say that out of the farmers' patronage of his own institutions we built this huge business machine. We like to refer to this machine as a tool we need to get the farmers' job done.

The year 1964 is the year in which our Nation, through its political conventions, its candidates and its elections will decide what you'll get. In less than a year the Nation will elect a President and a new Congress. Your future farm prices will be made in Washington by them.

Under the present farm laws as they have been administered for the last 10 years more than half of our farmers will be out of business within a very few years. And that's the guarantee of a national depression, not just a rural one. So it becomes an all-important question of what policies the new Congress and the President are to follow.

The farmer has two precious votes. He votes as to where he will take his business—to a cooperative or not—and he votes for the men he wants at the Capitol and in the White House.

This is the year of decision for you. Your future is in your hands.

## ANTITRUST LAWS AND PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as the ranking Republican on the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I joined the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], in cosponsoring a bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes. This bill is almost an exact duplicate of S. 4070 of the 85th Congress, 2d session, which was cosponsored by a majority of Senators at that time. Hearings were held between July 9 and July 31, 1958. A corresponding bill, H.R. 10378, passed the House of Representatives on June 24, 1958, but the time ran out in the 85th Congress before either the House-passed bill or S. 4070 could have been reported to the Senate for action. This bill had and still has bipartisan support and it would be consistent with other congressional action to give certain exemptions to the antitrust laws when good cause is shown. The Supreme Court of the United States in 1922, in the *Federal Club* case—259 U.S. 200—held that baseball was not subject to the antitrust laws on the ground that the business of presenting baseball exhibitions, being "personal effort not related to production, is not the subject of commerce."

Following that decision, baseball grew and developed under the protection of this judicial exemption. Again in 1953, in the case of *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees* (346 U.S. 356), the Supreme Court upheld the rationale of the Federal Club case in an opinion and declined to reverse the Federal Club case.

However, in 1957, the Supreme Court in *Radovich* v. *National Football League* (352 U.S. 445), held that professional football was not exempt from the antitrust laws and distinguished this case from the professional baseball case. The objective of this bill would be to give to the professional sports, football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, the same exemptions that were enumerated in the two baseball cases referred to above.

Professional baseball is included in this bill so that all four of the enumerated sports would be treated equally by legislative action. We believe it is fair to say, from the evidence of the previous hearings before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the House Judiciary Subcommittee, that practically all of the witnesses representing management and the players themselves, as well as the public, agreed that this bill is needed.

It should be noted that Congress recently exempted professional team sports from the antitrust laws pertaining to entering into collective agreements in televising professional team sports.

## DRUGS IN SOUTH AMERICA—RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, adopted a resolution, submitted by me, dealing with the rather controversial proposed investigation of "Drugs in South America."

This matter has been one of continuing controversy, and was initiated in the first instance by the late Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, who caused the issuance of all-inclusive subpenas on the basis of allegations by a single drug distributor.

The subcommittee has wrestled with the jurisdictional problems involved, and also has conferred with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, because of the delicate international factors which might be involved.

The resolution which I submitted, and which was adopted by unanimous vote of all members of the subcommittee, and subsequently was ratified by unanimous vote of the full Judiciary Committee, reads as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee,* That the proposed investigation in the matter of "Drugs in South America" be submitted to the Department of State and the Department of Justice for further action and that the data and information collected by the subcommittee be turned over to the Department of Justice; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That further action be deferred at this time on the matter of "Drugs in South America" and the outstanding subpenas issued by the late chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Kefauver, be extended for 90 days; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That at a later date the subcommittee reexamine said matter to determine whether an investigation broader in scope concerning the application of antitrust laws to matters in foreign field be undertaken.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], provided it is agreed that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

## "THE CONGRESSMAN—HIS WORK AS HE SEES IT"

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his customary courtesy in yielding.

At this time I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a remarkable book, recently published. It is entitled "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It."

The book deals largely with Congress—Members of Congress, the House of Representatives; it also deals with the Federal Government. The title of the book really should be "The Congressman—His Work and His Worries," because it deals more with the work of Congressmen and also with the surroundings and environment of the Members of Congress who participated in the discussions which led to the writing of the book.

The book was written under the sponsorship of the Brookings Institution, as a result of a grant by the McKinsey Foundation for Management Research, Inc. The book was developed as a result of eight dinner meetings at which Congressmen of the Republican Party and Congressmen of the Democratic Party discussed specific problems, which are listed as chapter headings of the book, as follows:

1. The Member and His Colleagues.
2. The Congressman and His Constituents.
3. The Congressman as Legislator.
4. Pressure Groups and Legislation.
5. Committee Assignments.
6. The Committee System.
7. The Leadership.
8. The Problem of Being Returned.
9. Congressional Wives and Congressional Life.
10. Is It Worthwhile?

As a result of the discussions which were held, tape recordings were made of the various comments by the participating Congressmen on the issues under discussion.

The book has been edited by Charles L. Clapp, now a member of the staff of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and in connection with the book, Mr. Clapp has made appropriate comments.

I was privileged to be one of the Democratic members of the group which participated in the eight roundtable discussions. That was a most rewarding experience. It was illuminating; and I learned—and am sure that my associates also did—a great deal more about the functioning of the House of Representatives and some of the mysteries in connection with the operations of that strange body.

The experience was also rewarding because the Brookings Institution group became a special one which became part of a very special fraternity which reached across party lines.

With apologies to Mr. Gunther, the book perhaps should be entitled "Inside Congress," beacuse it really was made by Members of Congress.

Mr. President, this book is very critical of some of the institutions of the House of Representatives. At the same time, it is critical of some of the critics of the House of Representatives. It presents problems of government which at this time are of great interest to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who participated in the roundtable discussions leading to publication of the book "The Congressman—His Works As He Sees It."

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives participating in roundtable discussions on "The Congressman and His Work."

The Honorable Perkins Bass, of New Hampshire.

The Honorable John F. Baldwin, of California.

The Honorable Richard Bolling, of Missouri.

The Honorable John Brademas, of Indiana.

The Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church, of Illinois.

The Honorable Frank M. Coffin, of Maine.

The Honorable Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri.

The Honorable Ed Edmondson, of Oklahoma.

The Honorable Carl Elliott, of Alabama.

The Honorable Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan.

The Honorable Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey.

The Honorable Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan.

The Honorable Byron L. Johnson, of Colorado.

The Honorable Charles Raper Jonas, of North Carolina.

The Honorable Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland.

The Honorable John V. Lindsay, of New York.

The Honorable George S. McGovern, of South Dakota.

The Honorable Lee Metcalf, of Montana.

The Honorable John E. Moss, of California.

The Honorable Richard H. Poff, of Virginia.

The Honorable Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota.

The Honorable James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania.

The Honorable Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.

The Honorable John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.

The Honorable Paul C. Rogers, of Florida.

The Honorable Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York.

The Honorable Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.

The Honorable Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi.

The Honorable Keith Thomson, of Wyoming.

The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona.

The Honorable Al Ullman, of Oregon.

The Honorable Jessica Weis, of New York.

The Honorable Bob Wilson, of California.

The Honorable James C. Wright, Jr., of Texas.

The Honorable Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks, I wish to mention one other facet of the book, which I especially commend to the attention of my colleagues. I refer to the chapter of the book which presents the views of the wives of the participating Members of Congress on their work and their problems and attitudes and in regard to what happens to them as a result of their husbands' coming to Congress. I believe that everyone who reads the book will obtain a new insight in regard to how the difficult job they have affects the family life of Members of Congress.

I also commend to the group of Senators who are not alumni of the House of Representatives—about half of the Members of this body—a reading of some of the comments by Members of the other body in regard to their attitude toward this body. That will also be a rewarding experience.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to have printed in the Record a paragraph from the introduction of the book which refers to its editor, Charles L. Clapp. He has done a remarkable job in analyzing a great many tape recordings, in making excerpts from appropriate remarks on various subjects, in tying together the various parts, in adding his own comments, and in bringing the book up to date with observations on personal experiences and events of the day. I think this book ranks alongside the book by Mr. Neil McNeil, as regards an understanding of Congress, especially the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Charles L. Clapp, then of the governmental studies staff, served as executive secretary, and had the principal part in organizing the conference and preparing the agenda. George A. Graham, director of governmental studies at the Brookings Institution, served as conference chairman. Mr. Clapp subsequently prepared this book from the recorded discussions, from additional interviews, and from other relevant materials. A political scientist with teaching and governmental experience, he had worked in both the House and the Senate, in the offices of Members of Congress, and for congressional committees before joining the Brookings staff. He has now returned to Capitol Hill where he is legislative assistant to Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts. The Brookings Institution is indebted to him for the skill with which he has brought the material together and prepared the manuscript.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President——

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Oregon, I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern].

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I was the other Member of the Senate, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives, who participated in the discussions which led to the publication of this book.

The Senator from Montana mentioned the recently published book, by Neil McNeil, on the operations of the House of Representatives. That book stands in contrast to this one, in that in the book edited by Mr. Clapp the Congressmen themselves speak and offer their views on the problems and also the rewards of service in the House of Representatives.

The two books make a very fine set of volumes on the work and scope of Congress, both as an institution and on the problems and opportunities of Representatives. I believe Mr. Clapp, the author of the book to which the Senator from Montana has referred, is especially endowed to write such a volume, not only because it comes in the wake of long conferences with Members of the House of Representatives, but also because he himself is a trained political scientist—not merely a theoretical political scientist—but one who has worked both in the House of Representatives in committees and on congressional staffs, but also has had experience on the Senate side.

I commend the book to Senators. I believe it is well worth reading by all Members of Congress and by anyone who is interested in government.

I thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I believe it should be called to the attention of Senators and to all Representatives who are not familiar with the work of the Brookings Institution that their publications on government are available to every Member of Congress—one copy each—upon request.

Again, as the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned, I, as one who served in the House of Representatives, suggest that it is a fine book to provide even a greater understanding of that body. Those of us who have not served in the House will obtain a better understanding of the mysteries of the other body.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. I was anxious to comment on the book which has been discussed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf].

I commend to my colleagues this new and excellent work from the Brookings Institution, written by a former staff member there, Charles L. Clapp, who is now legislative assistant to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. I believe the book deserves attention both in the Congress and in the Nation because it explores, through interviews with Congressmen, an all too little understood aspect of our governmental system—the human workings of the legislative institution, how a Congressman operates in his various official functions and how he feels about his work.

Reform of outdated congressional procedures has long been a goal of mine, a goal which I share with an ever-increasing number of Members as public disenchantment with congressional inability to act on certain types of vital legislation grows and as the burden upon the executive and judicial branches grows. Meaningful reforms will not, in my judgment, really be possible until the public gains greater insight into how the Congress works than the existing textbooks impart. This book is a valuable step in the direction of greater public information about the basic elements of congressional life—preparation of legislation, voting, constituent mail, the committee system, congressional leadership, reelection. I hope that it is widely read.

The book deserves the attention of Congress and the Nation because it explains, through interviews with Representatives, the human workings of the legislative institution, and the Representative as an operating human being. I know how important that is from my own service in the other body, and also in the Senate.

It bears upon the need for bringing up to date the outdated congressional procedures to which I heavily attribute our apparently getting so involved that we are not able to do all we should be doing here. But we have a big stake in what the public thinks of Congress. We have suffered in public esteem. That is bad for a system of freedom and for our Republic. So, for all these reasons, I hope very much that the book will be widely read by all Senators and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as one who served 16 years in the House of Representatives before coming to the Senate, I was particularly impressed by the scope and depth of a book just published by the Brookings Institution, "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It," by Charles L. Clapp.

The complexities of a Congressman's duties and responsibilities are far too frequently misunderstood by the public. Indeed, I know from my own experience in the House that Congressmen themselves sometimes have difficulty in diagnosing their numerous areas of responsibility, and even more difficulty in covering their field.

Although the legislative process can be frustrating and cumbersome, and many of us both in and out of the Congress have long advocated change and reform, we must never lose sight of the fact that it is one of the three great pinnacles of our free society. It is both our lawmaking body, and an irreplaceable part of our unique system of checks and balances.

Mr. Clapp has performed an invaluable service both to the public and to the Congress itself. Anything which furthers understanding of the Congress and of its mounting problems is of great importance to us all. Mr. Clapp's book does this admirably.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, "The Congressman—His Work as He Sees It," by Charles L. Clapp, is an excellent treatise on the work of the Congressman and the environment within which he functions. It provides a clear discussion on the pros and cons of being a Congressman. There are the satisfactions that come with being a part of the Government of our country, the opportunities to meet interesting and able colleagues and their wives, the chances of seeing world leaders and hearing vital domestic and international difficulties discussed firsthand. On the other hand, there are the problems of getting elected, the difficulties of educating one's children while shuttling back and forth between one's congressional district and Washington, the personal financial questions, the little time available to give to the study of legislative bills because of the time devoted to serving and entertaining constituents. All these points and many more are clearly brought out with apt quotations from the actual Members of the House of Representatives.

Charles L. Clapp is a careful and thorough researcher. I know because he has served as my legislative assistant for the last 2 years. The Brookings Institution gave him the job of writing a treatise about Congress from the Congressman's point of view. He has succeeded very well. The result of his research, stimulatingly set forth, gives everyone interested a chance to understand what a Congressman really thinks and does from the lips of the Member himself. Clapp conducted well-attended roundtable meetings in which 36 Members of the House participated. He met individually with many Members of Congress. He did further research on many of the subjects discussed in these sessions. This book is the result of the roundtable discussions and meetings, and the author's research. As a Member of Congress, I find many of my own thoughts clearly portrayed through the chapters of this book. In a manner of speaking, it is a study in psychology.

The Brookings Institution has made a contribution to the knowledge of the legislative branch of our Government and the way it carries on its work by describing it in the words of those actually doing the work. Mr. Clapp can be congratulated on the clear and accurate way in which he has reflected the many sides of the Congressman—his hopes, his successes, his difficulties, and his frustrations, and above all, in depicting the importance of the job the Congressman does for our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in bringing to the attention of the Senate and, indeed, all thoughtful students of government throughout this land a most worthwhile book which has just been published by the Brookings Institution. "The Congressman," by Mr. Charles L. Clapp, is a distinguished contribution to a rather limited number of outstanding works on the Congress.

Mr. Clapp based his extremely well-written and perceptive study on a series of roundtable conferences with a select group of Democratic and Republican Members of the House of Representatives. Several of the participants are now Members of the U.S. Senate. He followed these discussions up with careful and detailed interviews with still more Representatives as well as committee and office staff members. However, Mr. Clapp brings to this most impressive study—which ranges across the board from the daily overwhelming detail and busy work which confronts Members in both Houses to the broader philosophical problems of the appropriate role of an elected Representative to his constituency in our Republic—not merely deft handling of many opinions but also a deep understanding which he has gained by working with a congressional committee, in a Congressman's office, and now in his responsibilities as legislative assistant to Senator SALTONSTALL.

This book will provide invaluable information for all who want to understand the environment and the problems of Congress, which I think many of us feel is only infrequently understood and often much abused sometimes by people who should know better. Before one seeks to reform Congress he should seek to understand it. Mr. Clapp has provided this understanding. His comments and the comments of Members which he faithfully relates will, I am sure, offer insight to even the most hardened legislator who has spent many years here. Most appropriately, Mr. Clapp in seeking to explain the motivation of Members of Congress whose days are filled with much work and sometimes with little appreciation but who on the whole would not trade their opportunity to serve the American people with any other person, concludes with the words of Daniel Webster, which appear above the Speaker's rostrum in the House of Representatives:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Clapp has met this standard in the field of political science with his work, "The Congressman." It is, also, a worthy standard to guide all of us in the days ahead.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we hope in the very near future—today, if possible, if not tomorrow—that the conference report on the vocational education bill will be before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon has been a leader on that bill, and, as on all education measures this year, he has done a marvelous job.

The other day the President said that the present session of Congress would be remembered, at least in large part, because of the great contribution which it has made to our Nation's educational problems. There is no question about that in the mind of any Senator who knows anything about what is going on in the Senate. The Senator from Oregon is a leader in this regard, and has done a masterly job in this connection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I share his hope that the conference report on the vocational education bill will be before the Senate tomorrow. I sincerely hope that the rumors to the effect that there is even a possibility that the conference report might be rejected in the House will not prove to be true, because I see no hope of the subject ever being considered again in conference if that course of action is followed.

The bill is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. I understand that those who are objecting to it claim to be objecting chiefly on the ground that they believe it would authorize too much money. I happen to believe that we cannot authorize too much money to meet the great needs of the 15- to 21-year-olds in this country who must be vocationally trained if they are ever to be employable.

It is a bill that has connected with it all of the impacted area money and the National Defense Education Act money. All I can do is express the sincere hope that if there are those in the House who believe the bill authorizes too much money, they will remember that it is not an appropriation bill and that they can reserve their objections to a fight on the appropriations.

**I most respectfully point out to the House that I see no opportunity whatsoever of any further consideration of the bill prior to adjournment. I know nothing more that Senate conferees can offer. In the average we have cut by two-thirds those parts of the program to which certain House conferees objected.**

**We have come more than half way. I shall ever be proud of the fact that the Republicans on the Senate conference, save one absentee, stood shoulder to shoulder with me in my endeavor to get a conference report on vocational education.**

**At the present moment, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], whose yeoman service, in my judgment, spelled the difference between a conference report and no conference report, stands near. All we can do is bide our time, wait and hope. I hope that a majority of the Members of the other body will see the merits of the comments I have made, which are shared by many other members of the conference, and will approve the conference report.**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee, but I am interested in education. I am a member of several economic committees. There is no more important contribution to our economy that Congress can make than the vocational education bill.

We know the No. 1 economic problem is unemployment. The heart of that unemployment problem is lack of skill. The bill is designed explicitly to solve that tough problem.

The Milwaukee Journal reports that the high schools of Wisconsin have the lowest dropout rate in the Nation—only 8 in 100. This means that 92 out of 100 high school students finish high school.

I am proud that the State I represent is No. 1 in the country.

There are many reasons, but the primary reason is that, unlike most States, Wisconsin has a law which requires students to remain in school until they are 18 years of age. Some students attend a vocational school under the law.

I have a resolution before the subcommittee, of which the Senator from Oregon is chairman, which would call for a national showing of sentiment on the part of the Senate favoring this kind of law for adoption in all States.

As I indicated a moment ago, I strongly feel that the toughest problem we have is unemployment, and that the most constructive way to deal with the unemployment problem is to provide for a substantial amount of vocational education so that the unemployed, who are largely concentrated among the unskilled people, can develop the skills they need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "State Lowest in Dropouts—Only 8 of 100," may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATE LOWEST IN DROPOUTS—ONLY 8 OF 100

Wisconsin leads the Nation in the percentage of high school students who graduate according to the results of an educational survey, announced Monday.

Of 100 Wisconsin students who were in the eighth grade in 1958, 92 completed high school in 1962. The national average is about 71.

This report was made in Washington by the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools.

In median years of schooling, however, Wisconsin was lower. The State ranked 35th, with a median of 10.4 years of school. This figure takes in all of the population, showing that 50 percent of the people have completed more than 10.4 years, and 50 percent have completed less. Nationally the figure is 10.6.

Unlike most States, Wisconsin has a law that requires students to remain in school, at least part time, until they are 18. Some students attend a vocational school part time under this law.

Wisconsin was 14th in financial support, measured by amount spent per year per pupil. Wisconsin spent $467 per pupil in 1962-63.

The report said:

"A geographical financial pattern becomes readily apparent in the fact sheet. Twelve of the thirteen States with the lowest holding power are in the southern regions, and all of these are below the national average of $432 in estimated current expenditures per pupil."

## REDUCTION OF COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS BY DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense deserves great credit for the drastic reduction of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by the Defense Department as great news for the taxpayer and excellent medicine for the free enterprise system.

Secretary McNamara's cost-slashing campaign has achieved in the first quarter of fiscal 1964 an astonishing reduction in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to only 12½ percent of total procurements.

This represents the eventual 3-year goal aimed at by Secretary McNamara when he first announced this program in mid-1962, putting the Defense Department a happy 2 years ahead of schedule.

This is a sensational reduction from about 40 percent of defense procurements which were cost-plus-fixed-fee when Secretary McNamara took over the administration of the Defense Department 3 years ago.

This is really an amazing accomplishment, because there has been great resistance on the part of industry, and, of course, it involves great benefits for the taxpayers.

Cost-plus is the worst kind of a contract. It gives the taxpayer no protection whatsover from cost padding, unnecessary, inefficient personnel, fat contracts with subcontractors, and a general "why-worry-about-costs-Uncle-Sam-pays-it-anyhow" attitude that skyrocket defense costs and the taxpayer's burden without increasing our military strength.

At the same time cost-plus is sometimes necesary, especially with rapidly changing research and technology, when neither the Government nor industry can arrive at a fair estimate of likely eventual cost.

Of course, it is also the easiest as well as the softest policy. It requires no tough Government negotiation, no rigorous competition, no painful presure for ingenuity to keep costs down.

Defense procurement, amounting as it does to a huge proportion of American manufacturing production, has an immense impact on the efficiency and productivity of American industry.

The drastic reduction of cost-plus in favor of more competitive procurement is certain to improve the efficiency of American industry significantly.

This achievement is also sure to save American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

## U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY MAY ERR BECAUSE OF FAULTY STATISTICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the October issue of Fortune magazine there appeared an article by Prof. Oskar Morgenstern entitled "Qui Numerare Incipit Errare Incipit." Freely translated from the Latin I had as a freshman in college, this means that he who begins to rely on statistics for action begins to make mistakes.

The article raises a large number of questions about the quality and usefulness of our Federal statistics. As chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I am very concerned about this matter.

It is an axiom that no military operation can be better than its intelligence. It is equally true that no economic policy can be better than the reliability of the statistics on which it is based.

Since the Morgenstern article appeared, Congressman TOM CURTIS, a member of the Statistics Subcommittee, has had a considerable amount of correspondence in support of the Morgenstern article. This correspondence appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 27 on pages 22849–22852.

Mr. President, I think that there is much of merit in the Morgenstern article. I believe, in fact, that it would be very useful for the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee to reexamine our general economic statistics to be sure that we fully understand their weaknesses as well as their strengths, and their margins of error as well as their precision.

Since I became chairman of the subcommittee a couple of years ago, our subcommittee has held a series of hearings on statistics. By and large the hearings have been reassuring. We have invited to appear the strongest critics. It is apparent there is still plenty of room for improvement. There is no question that our statistics are the best statistics of any government in the world. They should be. They are still not nearly good enough.

I have recently received a copy of a letter from Mr. A. Arthur Charous, chairman of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference, to the editors of Fortune magazine, commenting on the Morgenstern article. I think the points made by Mr. Charous in this letter are excellent. In particular, he indicates that there is no reason to doubt the honesty or the conscientiousness of those Federal Government civil servants who construct and produce the Federal statistics. Quite the contrary, they have done an excellent job in the past.

Mr. Charous also points out in this letter that many publications have been produced by Federal Government agencies indicating the qualifications and characteristics of the statistics which are available.

I still believe that it would be useful for the Statistics Subcommittee to draw this material together and make it generally available so that all users of Federal statistics, including those of us here in the Congress, can be aware of the limitations which should be associated with the statistics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Charous be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 10, 1963.

Editor, Fortune,
*Rockefeller Center,*
*New York, N.Y.*

Dear Sir: It is unfortunate that Professor Morgenstern's article ("Qui Numerare Incipit Errare Incipit," Fortune, October 1963) did not begin with those paragraphs with which it concludes. His last page states the essential argument in a nutshell: the economic statistics with which we operate are not completely satisfactory. We should make them better. We should cast out data which are deliberately falsified by the reporter.

These are truisms which all can accept. But one does not have to accept Professor Morgenstern's assertion that many of our statistics are based upon information which is false to begin with. There are, no doubt, individual instances of basic information having been deliberately falsified by householders or by businessmen, but this unjustified general indictment of Americans as individuals or as businessmen has no place in any article dealing with Government statistics unless there is at least some modicum of solid evidence to back it up. Unless there is wholesale moral decay in this country, we can have confidence that the information supplied for statistical purposes is not deliberately falsified. This confidence is buttressed by the knowledge that the Government's statisticians carefully review data reported by respondents. Many inaccuracies are noted in this review process, and many reports are amended by respondents before the data are included in the Government's published statistics.

Nor is it necessary to accept Professor Morgenstern's judgment that economic statistics are presented to the public as if these were free from fault. Such is simply not the case. Many current Federal statistical programs, especially those emanating from the Bureau of the Census, explicitly detail the limitations, shortcomings, and standard error of sampling. Very considerable sums of money are spent to evaluate the effectiveness, shortcomings, inaccuracies, and other deficiencies of our vast Censuses of Business, Manufactures, Mining, Population, Housing, and Agriculture.

No one can fault the Office of Business Economics for failing to describe either the methods of the compilation of the National Economic Accounts or their limitations and deficiencies. These are spelled out in detail in "National Income," 1954 edition, and "U.S. Income and Output," 1958.

And the Office of Business Economics has been trying for years to educate us away from relying too heavily upon the gross aggregates of GNP and national income. Especially in this last year, it has made substantial strides forward.

It is true that no estimate of error is attached to the figures presented in the national economic accounts. The task is probably impossible because of the wide variety of sources used in compiling these summary figures. It is worth noting, however, that the figures for national income and gross national product are developed independently, largely from different sources of original data. Yet, when they are compared in true bookkeeping fashion as the right and left sides of a ledger, the statistical discrepancy has been remarkably small—well under 2 percent in every year since World War II. While this is not a test of statistical accuracy as demanded by Professor Morgenstern, it is a test of reasonableness.

The vast amount of detailed economic information available from other sources also provides a test of reasonableness for the reported figures for national income and gross national product. It is highly unlikely that national income and GNP can be as wildly inaccurate as Professor Morgenstern suggests. Current information on retail sales, on tax receipts, on unemployment, on industrial production, on bank deposits and loans, on manufacturers' sales, on commodity exports and imports, etc. which reflect what is going on in all aspects of economic life are simply too numerous to allow egregious errors in the national economic accounts.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains continuing efforts to improve the adequacy and accuracy of its price information. The concepts it uses, its methods, and the limitations of the data are very clearly spelled out in a number of places, including a very extensive series of Congressional hearings. Likewise, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made very considerable efforts to improve our understanding of the nature and extent of unemployment. In doing so, it has tried to educated users away from overweaning reliance upon the aggregate figure expressed as a percentage of the labor force unemployed.

Annually, the Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes a brief summary of its major statistical series, together with their limitations. For more detailed study, one may consult the detailed descriptions and critiques contained in "Techniques of Preparing Major BLS Statistical Series."

The Department of Agriculture has a nine-volume handbook—"Major Statistical Series of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, How They Are Constructed and Used"—which describes in painful detail how each of these major series is developed, what the shortcomings and limitations are, and what needs to be done to improve them.

Finally, the "Historical and Descriptions Supplement to Economic Indicators," a cooperative effort of the "Joint Economic Committee" of the Congress, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, clearly states the limitations of and needed improvements to those major series included regularly in "Economic Indicators."

No one questions the need to improve our present statistics, but everyone questions the cost of doing so. It has been pointed out that the demands for statistical improvement are almost infinite. There are only limited funds available, or likely to be available, for making statistical improvements. The talents available to bring these improvements about are limited. And the patience of respondents who fill out questionnaires is limited. For these reasons, it is extremely important that we diligently seek a consensus as to which improvements are most needed. Then, with adequate public support, it should be possible for the statisticians to get on with the job of providing better data in those areas where the need for improvement is most critical.

Sincerely yours,
A. Arthur Charous,
*Chairman.*

## THE "FED" WOULD MAKE TAX CUT WORTHLESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, testified before the Senate Finance Committee on the monetary policy which he thought should be associated with the proposed tax cut. Copies of his statement are not available but one résumé of his statement appears in the Wall Street Journal for Wednesday, December 11. I ask unanimous consent that this résumé article be printed in the Record at the end of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe Mr. Martin provides one of the most effective arguments that can be given against adoption of the proposed tax cut. He indicated clearly before the Finance Committee, as he has on repeated occasions in the past, that any budget deficit resulting from a tax cut should be financed—of course, he has the principal say as to how it will be financed—primarily from borrowing funds from individuals and institutions. He obviously does not believe that the national debt should be increased by additional sales of Government securities, either to commercial banks or to the Federal Reserve banks; in other words, monetizing the debt.

In effect, therefore, Mr. Martin is saying that the money supply should not increase in order to finance the greater level of economic activity which is anticipated as a result of the tax cut.

One brief example shows what that could do. If all the tax cut were financed by borrowing, the situation would be the same as if a typical John Q. Public got a $400 tax cut and then used the money to buy Government bonds. The effect on the economy would be nil.

When I have called Mr. Martin in the past he has indicated, "Yes; but with extra money in his pocket he is more likely to spend other income." There is no indication that he would do so. I know of no study which suggests that he would do so.

It is extremely important, if we are to have a tax cut, that the monetry and fiscal policies march step by step.

I do not believe there should be a tax cut now. If the money supply is not increased, even though economic activity increases, the effect will certainly be higher interest rates; and what is even more important, no additional credit available to finance an expanding economy.

The effect of higher interest rates and no additional credit, of course, will be to curb any stimulating effects that may stem from the tax cut. Therefore, the Government will be doing with the left monetary hand exactly the opposite of what it is attempting to do with its right fiscal hand. Under these conditions, Mr. President, it seems a much wiser policy simply to increase the monetary supply without a tax cut. The lower interest rates that would follow could stimulate the economy without incurring the deeper budgetary deficit which would otherwise take place as a result of the tax cut.

If a bill is enacted to cut taxes by $11 billion and we then sell that much in bonds to individuals and institutions, there will be no economic stimulation. There will be a deeper deficit and a deeper burden on the taxpayers of the future, without the benefit the tax cut would otherwise provide.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for so graciously yielding to me.

EXHIBIT 1

### FEDERAL RESERVE HEAD TELLS PANEL TAX CUT COULD STIMULATE HIGHER INTEREST RATES

WASHINGTON.—The Government's top money manager told Congress a tax cut won't necessarily spark a new round of inflation but warned it may lead to higher interest rates.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the credit-regulating Federal Reserve Board, testified before the Senate Finance Committee on problems involved in handling the increased Federal budget deficit that would result from the administration's $11.1 billion tax-cutting bill. Mr. Martin was the committee's last public witness on the House-passed measure; the 17-man committee will begin closed-door consideration of proposed Senate amendments to the bill today.

Mr. Martin repeated his oft-declared admonition that the Government should cover a Federal budget deficit mainly by borrowing funds from individuals and institutions that hold supplies of savings. He warned that inflation would result if the Treasury relies on the commercial banking system to buy its I.O.U.'s, especially if the Federal Reserve tries to expand the supply of funds with which banks can buy the securities.

#### FINANCING DEFICITS WITHOUT INFLATION

He said the Government so far has been able to finance recent budget deficits "without producing inflation," mainly because a big supply of savings was available for lending to the Treasury. But if the Federal Reserve "inordinately" increases the Nation's money supply just to cover a Treasury deficit, "it's just a matter of time before prices begin to rise again," Mr. Martin warned.

Mr. Martin said the Federal Reserve Board doesn't intend to allow a big increase in the money supply in the wake of a tax cut. Thus if tax reductions stimulate the economy and spur new business demands for credit, he said, "it may lead to higher interest rates." He predicted the board probably will be criticized for not staving off higher interest rates by expanding the supply of credit, quipping: "We're always put in the position of a chaperone who takes away the punch just when the party's getting good."

Mr. Martin gave carefully hedged approval to the idea of cutting taxes now, saying it's a "risk worth taking" if strong pressures are applied to control Government expenditures. Beyond that, Mr. Martin refused to say what he thinks about specific features of the House-passed bill.

#### COMMENT ON CURRENT "WHODUNIT"

Under committee questioning, the Federal Reserve chief's testimony sometimes strayed far from the subject of taxes. In answer to a question from Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, Mr. Martin said he thinks there should be some form of Federal control over credit margins in trading on commodity markets. The Federal Reserve Board currently restricts the amount of credit that can be extended to buyers of stock, but no Government agency has similar power over commodity market trading.

Mr. Martin said he's felt for some time that Government margin requirements should be established for commodities trading, remarking that the current "whodunit" involving missing salad oil at a Bayonne, N.J., tank farm is the latest illustration of that need. He said he wasn't prepared to tell Senator WILLIAMS what kind of margin controls are needed or what Federal agency should administer them. But he promised to give the Senator a written report on the matter.

Answering another question, Mr. Martin said he might favor at some future time a reduction in the amount of gold required to stand behind U.S. currency. Present law requires 25 percent gold backing for Federal Reserve currency and other liabilities. "I don't think there's anything sacred" about this percentage, Mr. Martin declared, noting it was reduced in 1946 from a previous level of 40 percent.

Mr. Martin said that once the U.S. eliminates the persistent deficit in its balance of international payments "the time may come again when we want to make an adjustment" in the 25-percent gold requirement, but he repeated his earlier opposition to taking any such step now. The balance of payments represents the difference between what is loaned, spent or given away abroad and what is received.

Finance Committee Chairman HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, said his group will begin considering today some of the 30-odd amendments introduced for attachment to the House bill by various Senators. He said he hoped some of the pending amendments could be disposed of one way or another before Congress takes its Christmas recess, but he declined to predict flatly how much progress could be made.

In a separate discussion with reporters, Republican Senate Leader DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he thinks the committee can make "very little" progress before the Christmas recess. Chairman BYRD has pledged that his panel will resume consideration of the tax bill when Congress returns in early January.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether he proposes any other business for the Senate today, and whether there is likely to be any rollcall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In reply to the distinguished minority leader, there is an order that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow. It is my understanding that an agreement has been arrived at as to an hour to vote on the foreign aid conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be no votes tonight?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No votes tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can the Senator inform the Senate what will be considered after the vote is taken on the foreign aid conference report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We hope that by that time the House will have acted on the vocational education conference report, which will be handled in the Senate by the Senator from Oregon. We will consider that after the House acts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that is before the House today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, with the understanding that the colloquy will be printed elsewhere?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If there is no impertinence involved, I should like to inquire how long the Senator will engage the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. A couple of hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A couple of hours.

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have agreed with the leadership to make my speech in opposition to the foreign aid conference report this evening, in order that the Senate might enter into its unanimous understanding, that debate shall be limited tomorrow to 1 hour to each side, with the vote at 2 p.m.

The record against the conference report on foreign aid really was made during the 3-week period of debate on the foreign aid bill of the recent past. Nevertheless, Senators who feel strongly about our opposition to the conference report should make this record, for the reason that the remarks today and during the 2-hour period tomorrow are not the last that will be heard of the foreign aid problem which confronts this country. When the Senate reconvenes in January Senators will have been in close touch with their constituencies over the holidays.

I am satisfied that Senator after Senator and Representative after Representative will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people want no part of this conference report, and they want no part of the foreign aid policies that prevail in this country at the present time. The senior Senator from Oregon has said many times in the historic debate this year on foreign aid that they will support a foreign aid program; but they want that program reformed. They want to put an end to the shocking waste and inefficiency, and downright corruption—and I use that word advisedly—that has come to characterize so much of foreign aid in so many places in the world.

Therefore, I feel that I owe a trust to the people of my State to make this address tonight in the Senate for the RECORD.

I wish to associate myself with the brilliant and eloquent speech that was made earlier today by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in opposition to the conference report. He expressed many of the views that the senior Senator from Oregon will express tonight.

I am pleased and delighted to know that my good friend **Ernest Gruening**, of Alaska, will vote against the conference report. He helped immeasurably in the debate in which we sought to amend the foreign aid bill.

As I told him, I was disappointed that on the final vote on the bill he saw fit to vote for it; I respect his reason for so doing, but disagree with it.

He seemed to feel that voting for it might be helpful in obtaining a better conference report. But I have been in the Senate long enough to know that that never happens—that a better conference report is obtained if a Senator continues to oppose a bill that he believes is wrong in its major parts. The foreign aid bill, in its major parts, has been wrong from the very beginning; and it is wrong now; and it should not be approved by the adoption of the conference report.

So I say, in the opening of my address, that the conference report on the foreign aid bill should be rejected.

I am very much disappointed in the procedures that were followed by the Foreign Relations Committee in the handling of the foreign aid bill. I am disappointed that the Foreign Relations Committee sent to the floor of the Senate a conference report on foreign aid that most of us on the Foreign Relations Committee never saw until we picked it up on our desks on the floor of the Senate prior to the beginning of the debate—a Foreign Relations Committee report, Mr. President, not even seen by the members of the committee.

What kind of procedure is that? It is not pleasant to criticize the policies of a committee of which I am a member. When I find myself in such thorough disagreement with so many of the policies of the committee of which I am a member, it seems to me necessary to bring those criticisms of the policies into the light of public gaze, because I have given up any hope of trying to change the procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee behind closed doors. The procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee are going to have to be changed, in my judgment, by the mandate of the Senate. I have already announced to the Foreign Relations Committee, behind the closed doors of the committee, my unhappiness with a good many of its policies and procedures. I intend now, in the months ahead, to express my dissatisfaction with the procedures of the Foreign Relations Committee on the floor of the Senate, if it is true that we have reached the point where we cannot obtain changes within the committee itself.

I am very unhappy about the selection of the conferees for the conference on the foreign aid bill. It was very interesting where the line was drawn this year in the selection of the conferees, a selection based on the inexcusable principle of seniority that prevails in the Senate, behind which are so often hidden many disservices to the American people in conducting the affairs of the Senate.

The line was carefully drawn, in selecting the conferees for the conference on the foreign aid bill at a point where not a single Senator opposed to the bill was selected. That is an interesting commentary, because when we find that kind of stacked procedure, we cannot expect the conference to have had presented to it very effectively the point of view of the opposition. There was no effective presentation of the views of the opposition.

We listened to the Senator from California [Mr. **Kuchel**] this afternoon make a speech expressing his great disappointment because the amendment forbidding aid to countries that seize vessels in international waters was dropped in conference, although it passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote. I do not think anyone need be surprised about it. The chairman of the conference in Senate said, in effect, during the debate on the Senate floor, that he considered it to be—and I paraphrase him; I do not quote him—one of the most unsound amendments or proposals that had been made in his time in the Senate. But the overwhelming majority of Senators disagreed with him.

It is interesting that the Senate conferees dropped, in conference, policy reform after policy reform on foreign aid that was adopted in the Senate. I speak only for myself. Other Senators can interpret the action of the conference, but I tell the Senate how I interpret it. It is exactly the result we should expect when the number of conferees is so limited, so far as the Democratic side of the conference was concerned. The result is not surprising when the three Democrats who were selected, on the basis of the outworn and unsound principle of seniority, were ardent proponents of the bill, who made clear time and time again throughout the debate on the bill their general opposition to most of the reforms we sought to bring about.

Mr. President, there will be another day on which legislation dealing with foreign aid will be before the Senate. If anyone believes that I will in the slightest relent in my opposition to foreign aid as now administered, he could not be more wrong.

The American people are being fleeced, rooked, cheated, and defrauded by much of the foreign aid program.

So long as I serve in the Senate, I intend to make reform of foreign aid one of my major legislative objectives.

The reasons for my objection and opposition to the pending conference report on foreign aid, as now before the Senate, are basically two: The amounts to be authorized are too high, and some significant policy provisions added by the Senate were omitted or so drastically changed as to make them meaningless.

So important do I consider a statutory restriction on aid to military juntas that have deposed constituted governments in Latin America, that I would vote against almost any foreign aid bill that lacks such a provision; this one lacks it. Even the weak and feeble Senate language is sunk without so much as a mention in the conference report.

I believe it particularly apropos at this hour—and I predict that events in the very near future will show how apropos what I am saying now is—to a discussion of this subject matter that I now write into the history of the Congressional Record the source of the Morse amendment on juntas which I finally agreed to offer.

I fought for a junta amendment which would provide that the President of the United States could not make foreign aid available to any country whose democratically elected, constitutional form of government was overthrown by a military junta, unless the President reported to Congress that in his judgment it was in our national interest to do so, and Congress passed a concurrent resolution approving of the President's recommendation. That is the democratic process. That is representative government put to work. That is carrying out our check-and-balance system under our form of government.

The administration found that there were many in Congress who shared my point of view, many in America who shared my point of view, and many of the leaders of our friendly neighbors to the south in Latin America who shared my point of view.

I put in the Congressional Record letters and cablegrams and expressions from some of our best democratic friends who are leaders of democratic regimes in Latin America.

I am advised by the majority leader that at one of the Tuesday morning breakfasts of the leadership at the White House the position of the senior Senator from Oregon and some of his other objections to foreign aid were discussed.

As a result of that discussion, the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, called me to the White House. I conferred with him for approximately 45 minutes regarding some of my major objections to the foreign aid bill, but particularly with regard to my junta amendment.

If the majority leader were present, I would call him as my witness, because he knows what the President subsequently told him about this matter. In that conference the President expressed concern as to whether or not my amendment would interfere with his Presidential right to recognize a government.

I said, "Mr. President, I taught the separation-of-powers doctrine for years, and I would not walk out on it now merely because I am in the Senate. I would be the first in the Senate to take up the forensic cudgels to defend your right under our Constitution to recognize any government that you wish to recognize. My amendment has nothing to do with your right to recognize a government. But, Mr. President, your right to recognize a government does not give you the right to spend a single taxpayer dollar to aid any government merely because you have recognized it. I do not think you should aid any government that was created by a military junta overthrowing a democratically elected, constitutional government."

The President was not aware that that was the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. He was pleased. Then we discussed my amendment. He asked me if I would modify my amendment by putting it in the negative form rather than in the affirmative.

He asked me if I would modify my amendment by providing that if the President filed a report with Congress asking for aid to be given to a so-called junta government which, in the opinion of the President, it was in the national interest to aid, he would be allowed to grant such aid provided Congress, within 30 days, did not pass a resolution forbidding it.

I made it clear to the President that I would prefer the affirmative form. I said, "You would be in a much stronger position if you were to accept an amendment providing that you would give no aid unless Congress affirmatively joined you in the approval of such aid. Furthermore, the affirmative form would make it possible, in my judgment, for you to obtain aid in a matter of hours, whereas your suggestion would require the passage of at least 30 days. If you took it in the negative form, I do not believe 30 days would be long enough."

He said he would talk with the Secretary of State about it. He expressed the view that he saw the merit in my proposal; that he was concerned about it; but that he had felt it would be preferable to make the approach that he was recommending, which was that he could grant aid after 30 days if Congress, in the 30-day period, did not pass a resolution forbidding the granting of the aid.

I shall always be glad, because it will be one of my most cherished memories, that my last conference with President Kennedy was that conference. It was a delightful one. It was a most friendly and pleasant one. All the President sought was my point of view on the issues that are in conflict on foreign aid at the present time.

The day of the conference was a beautiful day. The President walked with me from his Office, down the sidewalk to the pavement within the White House grounds, and part way down toward the southwest gate, where I was to take a car. In that walk, having finished our discussion of foreign aid, we discussed the two major education bills—the bill on higher education and the bill on vocational education. The President was most kind in his reference to the work that we had done on those two bills. He made clear to me, as I pointed out on the floor last Friday, I believe, his complete and enthusiastic endorsement of the vocational education bill, which carries out his recommendations, and particularly his supplemental report on education, which he filed on June 18 of this year.

He also asked me about the status of the higher education bill, and I explained to him the position I had taken, as I subsequently explained, that, as chairman of the Senate conferees, I preferred to bring up the higher education bill after the conference report on the vocational education bill had been agreed to. The President completely agreed with my legislative procedure in that regard.

After a few days—and I presume that during that period of time the President spoke with the Secretary of State—the administration sent to the Senate its junta amendment. The carrier of the message was the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, Mr. Dutton. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is in the Chamber as I give this account, for the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon met with Mr. Dutton in the Senate restaurant and there discussed the administration's proposal, which was the President's proposal. The administration's proposal contained the identical language that President Kennedy presented in his White House Office in the last conference I had with him.

In the conference with Mr. Dutton, in the Senate restaurant, I said that I would prefer 60 days, rather than 30 days. At that time the Senator from Minnesota agreed with me that such a recommendation should be made to the Secretary of State. The Senator from Minnesota could not commit the administration; he could only recommend. At that time he felt that that recommendation should go back to the Secretary of State, and it did go back.

Then the day for the final vote on a junta amendment was reached. I reached the conclusion that we could not get the 60-day provision for after all, in the legislative process it is necessary to count noses. I felt we could get the President's language, and I announced on the floor of the Senate that I would take the language that was sent to the Senate from the State Department. I tried to respect the officials of the executive department. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I did not seek to take advantage of my conversation with the President. So I did not make the argument I am making now. But this is a very important piece of legislative history.

However, it was pretty well known in the Senate at the time it voted on the junta amendment that it was an amendment that the administration was willing to accept. I do not mean, as I made clear then, that the administration would have preferred my amendment to no amendment. But faced with the serious possibility that they would have to accept an amendment, this was their proposal for compromise, and this was the President's own language, as he stated it to me in my last conference with him.

When the vote was taken on the final Morse junta amendment, the amendment was defeated. The Senate had a right to work its will in that respect. In my judgment, the Senate made a serious mistake, particularly in view of the oncoming problems in Latin America. Time will prove the significance of my statement.

Now we have a conference report which does not contain a single word that will be helpful in connection with the junta problem that faces us in Latin America. The conference report says not one word about the problem. That is one reason why I oppose the conference report, for, in my judgment, the problem of coups in Latin America probably has to be placed at the top of the list in any evaluation of U.S. relations with Latin America.

Either this great Nation must make it crystal clear to Latin America that it will not aid, directly or indirectly, military juntas in overthrowing democratically elected governments in Latin America, or the United States will have to assume a larger responsibility for the loss to communism of one Latin American government after another in the immediate future.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is not this a principle that was deeply enshrined in the agreement at Punta del Este? Were not the principles of evolution in economic progress under democratic forms the principles repeatedly set forth by President Kennedy?

Mr. MORSE. I believe so. That was always my understanding. I believe that if we encourage military juntas, by recognition of governments set up by military juntas, we shall be doing Khrushchev's job for him.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, if the United States recognizes military-junta governments set up in the Dominican Republic or in Honduras, the United States will be doing Khrushchev's job and Castro's job for them, will play directly into the hands of the Communist elements in Latin America, will discourage our democratic friends in Latin America, and will provide, in regard to Latin America, another example of American hypocrisy. Unhappily, throughout Latin America our record is pockmarked with hypocrisy.

Mr. President, I believe it is regrettable that we are confronted with a conference report which says nothing about this urgent problem of juntas in Latin America. For that reason, I am opposed to the conference report, and I am satisfied that our democratic friends in Latin America have been dealt a serious blow by the conference report.

I would that we had adopted at least the language proposed by President Kennedy, although again I make clear that I am not saying that he would have preferred that language to no language at all. But I think time will prove that at least language as strong as that which President Kennedy was willing to accept would have been one of the great weapons we could have used against junta takeovers.

Equally important is the determination that when nations are economically capable of financing their own development and their defenses, the American taxpayers shall be relieved of the burden of financing them. The Senate amendment defining such nations was eliminated.

The necessity for a complete country-by-country review of foreign aid next year was emphasized in two Senate provisions, neither of which now remains in the bill. The first was my own amendment repealing the authorization for the Development Loan Fund for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. That provision was entirely eliminated. The second Senate amendment was that offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], requiring the President to set up committees to review economic aid in each country. These committees were to be of three to five members, with a majority representing the public, and reporting to the President and the Congress whether the recipient country has a practical development program, is providing the maximum amount of self-help, has adopted reforms necessary to the success of the program, and whether the projects being financed by the United States contribute materially to the needs of that country's development and to the purpose of the United States in strengthening democratic processes.

This Senate amendment was similar in purpose to my own amendment which would have canceled all foreign aid at the close of the fiscal year 1964 and started over with criteria very much like those outlined in the Cooper amendment.

The conference gutted this amendment, by making the appointment of these committees permissive, rather than mandatory, and by allowing the President to determine the makeup of the committees, if he appoints any at all.

I submit that this issue, while it does not go to the heart of the current program, does go to the heart of the future of foreign aid. The language of the conference report is a clear indication that those who wrote it and signed it have no intention of requiring a reevaluated and revamped program from the administration. Virtual elimination of these two Senate amendments is the proof of the pudding that the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, calling for a revamped program for 1965, is nothing more than window dressing.

### MAKEUP OF CONFERENCE

To begin at the beginning, however, I would call attention to the makeup of the conference itself. Last year, the Senate was represented by seven conferees. They were Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Capehart—who replaced Senator Wiley—Hickenlooper, and Aiken. This year the Senate was represented by only five conferees. They were the same gentlemen, except for the absence of Senators Capehart and MANSFIELD.

In other words, there was not represented among the majority side of the Senate conferees the clear and unequivocal demand by Senate Democrats—which I think was clearly demonstrated in the floor action on this bill—that foreign aid be revised and reduced. Not a single serious critic of foreign aid represented the Senate in the conference. At the rate we are going, however, the Senate representation is going to have to be even smaller next year if it is going to continue studiously avoiding Democratic Senators on the conference committee who will demand meaningful changes in the program.

### MONEY FIGURES OF BILL

The introduction to the statement by the House conferees points out that the final money figure in the conference report is $100 million more than the House approved and $100,290,000 less than the Senate approved. The only substantial increase in the Senate figures was for the Social Progress Trust Fund, which put the amount at $180 million, compared to $155 million allowed by the Senate and $200 million allowed by the House. There was also a $2 million increase in AID administrative expenses over what the Senate provided.

I shall always be at a loss to understand that. If there is any group whose wasteful administration is so flagrant that it is known around the world, it is the group responsible for the military expenditures of AID. If there is any place where we had a better opportunity to save the American taxpayers great sums of money, I do not know where it could be found. However, instead, the conferees recommend a $2 million increase.

But with the possible exception of the funds for Latin America, I believe the House figures were more realistic throughout than were the Senate figures on the items in disagreement.

The authorizations for development loans, for supporting assistance, for military assistance, and for the contingency fund are still far in excess of what should be spent in foreign aid. I do not even exempt the Latin American program from that statement. There are increasing signs that the largest recipients of U.S. aid in Latin America are drifting away from the objectives of the Alliance and are failing to fulfill their own obligations under it. In Argentina, we have seen every U.S. dollar of private investment there held hostage for more foreign aid dollars. Senators will recall that the Senate had no more than adopted the Hickenlooper amendment suspending aid, when contracts with private investors were canceled without fair compensation, and the Government of Argentina pointed out that there was far more American wealth in Argentina that it could seize than was represented in the oil contracts, if the United States made good on the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. President, my position in regard to threat is this: Let us call Argentina's hand. So far as I am concerned, until Argentina submits a plan, under the Alliance for Progress program, as called for by the Act of Punta del Este, I favor not giving Argentina one dollar of aid under the Alliance for Progress, or any other U.S. source.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In line with the Senator's discussion of the conference report concerning the junta amendment, lest the record be in doubt, the Senator's discussion is accurate. The Senator from Oregon was rightfully put out with me for not having supported that amendment.

I say to the Senator that my reason for my vote was that the administration preferred not to have his amendment. They thought it was preferable to what they thought they might get. The Senator related the situation accurately.

It is a regrettable mistake that the bill is without the junta amendment. I want the Senator to know that. I also want the Senator to know that I believe it is regrettable that the Cooper amendments, which were in the bill, were dropped.

I tried my best to maintain those amendments. I was not very successful.

I did not want the Senator's statement today, in the light of the fact that I was present in the Chamber, to go uncorroborated in reference to the amendment. I owe the Senator that fairness, and I wanted the RECORD to so reveal.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I continue my discussion of the conference report.

The Act of Bogotá and the Act of Punta del Este both made it perfectly clear that private investment was to be the source of by far the largest part of development capital. Now we find that to one of the largest participants and beneficiaries from the Alliance, our private capital is only a hostage being held to coerce the United States into giving Argentina more of our taxpayer dollars.

I know that more recent word is that Argentina is having some second thoughts. Some accord on the oil contracts is reportedly possible. But irrespective of its outcome, the incident proves to me that some Latin American countries are not yet ready for the Alliance for Progress.

Argentina has yet to submit a plan called for by the Act of Punta del Este as a basis for eligibility to receive foreign aid under the Alliance for Progress program. But she is after the money, and she has been receiving it without a plan. She has been getting millions of dollars out of the President's contingency fund, as has Brazil, yet neither country has submitted a plan.

So long as we follow such an inefficient administrative course of action in handling foreign aid, what can we expect from Latin America but a flouting of the wishes of the United States?

As I have stated previously in this speech, in effect we sanction military overthrows by waiting a few weeks and then recognizing them, and then aiding them. We weaken every friendly democratic nation in all of Latin America by so doing. I am at a loss to understand such an American policy.

I ask Senators to go to the Pan American Union and talk with the representatives of Latin American countries. I am able to do so, because I have the confidence of many of them. They do not take us seriously when we use nice sounding words about seeking to strengthen the arms of democratic leaders in Latin America. They know our sorry record of the past—and it is a disgraceful one, to the everlasting discredit of this Nation. We have come to the assistance of military juntas within a few weeks after they have overthrown democratically elected governments. We go on supporting them as though nothing had happened.

Argentina is not alone in flouting the wishes of the United States. Brazil also does. The response to American offers of aid on the part of the Goulart government has been still more inflation and a still sharper turn to the left. I believe that before anything like $600 million is spent in Latin America, the whole program must be reviewed right from its roots, country by country.

I called this to the attention of Mr. Moscoso in a letter I sent to him this morning in regard to the Alliance for Progress program and the great difficulties which I believe will confront us in the months and years immediately ahead unless the administration of the Alliance for Progress program itself is drastically changed.

I see no likelihood that $600 million, plus the $180 million of the Social Progress Trust Fund, could be effectively and efficiently spent in Latin America in fiscal 1964.

### INVESTMENT GUARANTEES

Adoption of the House language on investment guarantees was an improvement in the bill over the Senate version. But it is only a small beginning in the direction of reducing and processing the objectives of foreign aid. In this case, the amendment states that aid is prohibited to any less developed country which fails to enter into an agreement with the United States to institute an investment guarantee program providing protection to private investors against inconvertibility and expropriation or confiscation. The Senate language was only a "sense of Congress" statement to the same effect. I note that the effective date was changed, however, from December of 1964 to December of 1965. I think that is too generous. I see no reason why Congress should not make it clear that nations seeking capital from the United States cannot receive public money from our taxpayers while at the same time they reject, discourage, or even seize the investments of our private citizens. By moving the effective date to the end of 1965, we have suspended its applicability to the program for fiscal 1964. It is now only a promise, a statement of intention. I regret that the conferees did not write it into this year's program.

### PURPOSES, OBJECTIVES, AND PRIORITIES

The omission of the House amendment requiring a detailed statement of the purposes, objectives, and priorities of economic assistance programs in the request for authorization is another setback. Why should not such an outline be included in the request for authorization? The statement of the conferees suggests that this information is contained in the executive branch presentations to the committees. But we all know that these presentations often do more to cover up than to reveal the purposes, objectives, and priorities of aid. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] described in detail the changes in the use of various grant funds between the time of presentation to Congress and the final expenditure. The Senator from Louisiana showed very clearly that the contingency fund is the chief source of money for countries and purposes that are not contained in the executive branch presentations to Congress.

To put these purposes into the authorization would not preclude a degree of discretion in use of the contingency fund for emergencies affecting the vital interests of the United States. But it would, I believe, reduce the extent to which aid programs in many countries are revised upward after Congress has been shown a different outline of what is planned for them.

### SHORT-TERM EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

The House provision which is now section 101(c)(3) is an improvement insofar as it goes. But it urges only that development loan money not be diverted to such short-range purposes as budget support, balance-of-payment problems, and military purposes. It says nothing about uses of supporting assistance or contingency funds for these same purposes.

I am interested to note that the language approved spells out these undesirable uses of development loan funds, which I think should be extended to all kinds of U.S. aid in certain parts of the world. It says "such as budgetary purposes, balance-of-payments purposes, or military purposes." I offered an amendment in the Senate prohibiting expenditure of any kind of aid money for the first two of these purposes in Latin America. I intend to continue pressing the prohibition at every opportunity. Now that this language is part of the foreign aid statute, there is a precedent, and a very small beginning, to curb this unproductive use of American money.

### AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM

The statement of the conferees notes that the Senate's "sense of Congress" language on South Vietnam is retained. It states that aid to that country should be extended or withheld "at the discretion of the President" to further the objectives of victory in the war against communism and the return of Americans involved in the struggle. That is not much of an amendment. It certainly is no help to the President or to his administration. It is congressional buckpassing at its most obvious. Least of all, it will not absolve Members of Congress from the responsibility for getting and keeping the United States involved politically and militarily in one of the most useless foreign policy ventures of the postwar era.

Our forces in South Vietnam should be withdrawn right now, before we are dragged down to the position of France in 1954. That is where we are going to end up in Vietnam. I do not think it is a question of which faction we put in power in South Vietnam. It is a question of whether the United States can run any country in Asia by remote control. And that control is not so remote that it will not cost the American taxpayers upward of $300 million in aid to that nation alone in the current fiscal year. That is in addition to the cost of keeping 15,000 American troops on the scene.

The infatuation of Far East policymakers with "the domino theory" in southeast Asia is not only expensive but it is ineffective. I shall develop that theme at some other time; but this provision is merely an evasion of one of the most important issues of the whole program.

### INTEREST RATES

In my opinion, the House provision regarding interest rates on development loans should have been retained. Instead, it was modified to permit a grace period of up to 10 years, during which the rate may be as low as three-quarters of 1 percent, whereas the House language provided for no grace period. In view of the fact that the House said nothing about a grace period and the Senate allowed a grace period up to 5 years, one might logically expect the grace period to be not more than 5 years. But it magically rose in this conference to 10 years, and the 35-year limit of the loans called for by the Senate also disappeared.

The tightening of the interest rates on loans must be a foremost objective next year in considering a foreign aid authorization.

If anybody wants proof or justification for the statement of the senior Senator from Oregon that the American taxpayers are being fleeced, defrauded, and deceived by this bill, let him examine the conference report on interest rates. It will continue the rate at three-quarters of 1 percent for up to 10 years. It will continue the 10-year grace period, with no requirement for payment on the capital. It will continue the shocking present arrangement whereby Russia, Great Britain, France, West Germany can lend, on a short-term loan basis, at 5 and 6 percent interest and get paid off at the expense of the American taxpayers, who, under this program, put up loans at three-quarters of 1 percent for 10 years and thereafter not more than 2 percent. If that is not rooking and cheating and defrauding the American taxpayer, I do not know the definition of the terms.

I said during the debate, and I say tonight, that the American taxpayers must hold to political accountability those responsible for that kind of bill. Until the American taxpayers walk into that citadel of freedom, the voting booth, and hold politicians accountable for this kind of injustice, we shall not have the lesson learned here in the Congress that a program such as this cannot be foisted on the American taxpayers by the politicians and the politicians not be held to an accountability.

### EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

I move next to an item I mentioned at the outset—the Cooper amendment requiring a country-by-country reevaluation of economic assistance. As adopted by the Senate, the bill required the President to appoint committees dominated by public representatives to review economic aid in each country. The committees were to consider the performance of the recipient in working out a general development program and in carrying out self-help and reform; whether specific projects are contributing to development; and any other matters which the committees believed would aid Congress in considering the program authorization for fiscal 1965.

This highly meritorious provision was watered down to virtually nothing. We now find the President merely authorized to appoint a committee "to review and evaluate the economic development program under this act, and to report to the President and to the Congress its findings."

It has been pointed out in the press that the Clay Committee has already done that, so it is very unlikely that the President will make any use of this provision.

I especially regret the omission of the intent and meaning of the Cooper amendment because the conferees have dropped without so much as a mention in their report the Morse amendment repealing the aid authorizations for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. The action of the Senate in approving that amendment was a fortification of the Foreign Relations Committee call for a revamped program next year. Adoption of the Morse amendment wiped the slate clean, and required the administration to come in with a new program. Adoption of the Cooper amendment was a requirement for a public review of foreign aid country by country.

Mr. President, I will not proceed in the Senate until the Chair gets the Sergeant at Arms to produce order both in the Press Gallery and on the floor of the Senate. It is about time that order is maintained in the Senate. I request that the Sergeant at Arms be produced immediately, and that he notify the Press Gallery that another sound out of the Press Gallery will result in the clearing of the Press Gallery, and that another sound out of an assistant of the Senate on the floor will result in his ejection from the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The Sergeant at Arms will be notified accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know what more the Senate could have done in the bill to emphasize our determination to have foreign aid reexamined.

But the conferees have dumped all these provisions out the window. They have left the Senate with nothing but the language of the Foreign Relations Committee report, asking the administration for the umpteenth time to revamp foreign aid. The action of the conferees is notice to me that they intend to let the administration off scot free. They do not propose to require a revamping of foreign aid—they only want to ask for it.

I say to the President of the United States that you have ample authority to do for the Congress and the country what Congress has refused to do for itself. That is to set up publicly dominated committees to review not only economic aid, but aid of every kind, to each country in the world now receiving it, and to make recommendations to you and to Congress on how the program should be changed. To the Cooper amendment should be added the military aid programs as a subject for review, too, because we know that the extent and purpose of our military aid has a very great bearing on the extent and purpose of our economic aid.

Judging from the Senate amendments that have disappeared from this bill, and judging from the testimony currently being given to the Appropriations Committees by Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Bell, I can only say that there is no intention, no plan, and no expectation of any kind within the administration or among the managers of this bill that foreign aid will really be reconsidered for fiscal 1965.

The Senate has been treated to another version of the old shell game, in which Congress always picks up the wrong shell no matter how sure we think we are where the pea is and no matter how many of the shells we pick up. The Senate did its best to nail down its demand for a new program. The conferees have taken the nails out; and the administration is busily declaring that it needs every cent of the $3.6 billion in this bill for the current year. I have heard not a word of any review or revamping. I have heard only how badly it needs the money. I am satisfied that the Rusk-McNamara-Bell statements before the Appropriations Committees are also the preview of next year's program, and that we are going to be presented with nothing but the same old justifications for the same old expenditures in the same old countries for the same old purposes.

### RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE

While I welcome retention of the Senate's purpose in limiting military aid to Latin America, again I regret that it does not go far enough. Moreover, although there is no word in the conference report nor in the statement of the House managers about it, the feeble Senate language regarding Latin American juntas has been dropped entirely. The $55 million ceiling on Latin American military aid is retained, as is the $25 million ceiling on such aid to Africa. The limitation on Latin American military aid to past commitments, and the security of the United States or the security of a country against overthrow of a duly constituted government remains.

But the warning flag to nations to the south that the United States means what it says about supporting constitutional government has been pulled down. The Foreign Relations Committee language was weak enough; it was so weak that I sought to strengthen it on the Senate floor. The only worse thing than the committee language on this point is no language at all, and now in the conference report we have no language at all.

I have already referred to the political climate and events in Latin America that I think call for a basic review of American financing of the Alliance for Progress. The sudden overthrow of elected governments in four countries of the Alliance is another major reason why such a review is urgently needed. As I have said, I am not at all sure that the major countries of Argentina and Brazil are ready for the Alliance for Progress. But there are military and oligarchic factions in virtually every Latin American country that are not ready, either.

To the extent that the Alliance has failed to achieve its purpose, the United States has to share a large part of the burden for the failure, because we have not applied the conditions and standards that are essential to its success. We have not been tough enough in insisting on the standards which alone can bring success in the program.

We have made only one beginning in establishing firm and absolute standards, and that is in the area of protecting American private enterprise. I am a firm supporter of the Hickenlooper amendments. I see no purpose to be served in supplying taxpayer money to nations which have expropriated private money.

But it is to the everlasting shame and discredit of the United States that we have not shown the same concern for constitutionalism in Latin America. As I said during the Senate debate on this matter, the U.S. Government should have at least as much concern for constitutionalism in Latin America as it has for Esso and Texaco in Latin America.

I do not question for a moment that a major purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to increase stability in the Western Hemisphere, and to decrease the possibility of Communist takeovers. But there is no greater threat to stability and no more fertile ground for Communist takeovers than the countries ruled by military juntas. Until we have a firm and clearly established policy, known to all factions and elements within each country, that no American assistance of any kind shall be extended to a junta that comes to power by destroying a constitutional power, we are not going to achieve the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

### ASSISTANCE TO INDONESIA

I note with some satisfaction that the Senate language restricting aid to Indonesia was retained. It prohibits aid to that country unless the President finds that it is "essential to the national interest of the United States." I think both Houses would have achieved their purpose only by banning aid to this country entirely.

Senators know that the presentation figures show Indonesia down for aid in fiscal 1964 amounting to more than $50 million. Almost half of that is supposed to be grant aid of one kind or another. The reluctance of the administration to cut off aid to Indonesia in spite of the most flagrant affronts to the policies and principles of the United States has been well established. When the bill was under debate in the Senate, aid to Indonesia was still being continued at that time. We also learned from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], that Indonesia is one of the countries that has received aid considerably above and beyond what was scheduled for her in the presentation to Congress for fiscal 1963.

I very seriously doubt that the provision voted by the Senate and retained by the conferees will really terminate aid to Indonesia. The terms "national interest" and "vital interests" and "national security" have been stretched so far by previous aid administrators that they are now almost devoid of real meaning. Putting the word "essential" in front of any of these terms will bring forth a little more explanation from downtown, but I doubt that the outcome will be any different.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] brought to me the other day a classified document. That classified document made perfectly clear the intention of the State Department and the AID officials to continue aid to Indonesia, both economic and military. Although the figures are classified, I say to the American people that they involve tens of millions of dollars. If this administration continues that program for Indonesia, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, it has bought a fight; and it has bought a fight not only with the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators who share this view, but also with the American people.

That causes me to say again that I wonder how long Congress will continue to be taken advantage of by the State Department and the Pentagon by being denied the right to extend to the American people the facts about their foreign policy by the use of the word "classified." Whenever the State Department and the Pentagon want to hide from the people facts that they are entitled to know, they put the word "classified" on them, and place those of us in Congress who are serving the people in a position where we cannot violate that label, because if we were to do so we would subject ourselves—and rightly so—to the discipline of Congress.

But this is a basic policy question. I say to the American people: "It is about time you rose up and made it perfectly clear to any administration, Democratic or Republican—for this policy has existed through both Democratic and Republican administrations—that you want the word "classified" limited to situations in which the great national interest is really and truly involved, and not misused, as it is being misused, time and time again, by the Pentagon and the State Department. This is such an example."

Why should not the American people be told now of every dollar that the State Department and the Pentagon propose to spend by way of military and economic aid in Indonesia? I should like to have any Member of the Senate or any member of the administration give me an answer to that question. Why should not the American people be told that plans are underway to spend many millions of their dollars in Indonesia, a country headed by a corruptionist, an aggressor, a man who is a threat to peace in Asia and may very well be a threat to the peace of the world. Yet it is now being proposed that we spend many more millions of dollars on him in the coming year. This must be stopped; and the American people are going to demand that it be stopped.

I shall point out before I finish what a series of conferences downtown have produced by way of a new strategy to get around the Congress. The recent historic debate on foreign aid, really the first comprehensive one the Senate has had for years, and the first one that has resulted in having some amendments adopted to the foreign aid program, really dehorned the sacred bull of the State Department and the Pentagon. It has the bureaucrats upset. But they have not met with any desire to conform to the will of Congress. They are scheming to flout Congress. They are scheming to get around Congress. They are scheming to put Congress in a position where they will be able to nullify the check of the Constitution that is granted to Congress, the provision of Constitution that provides that no funds may be spent except as appropriated by law. That is what they are up to.

There are some Senators who dare to oppose them. We shall oppose them. We shall go exactly as far as we can under the restrictions that are placed upon us in respect to classified material to warn the American people of what the Pentagon and the State Department are up to.

That is why, staying within my rights, I am warning the American people tonight that there is no intention on the part of either Secretary McNamara or Secretary Rusk or Administrator Bell to bring an effective end to economic or military aid to Sukarno. We must hold the administration to an accounting. It is not easy to oppose one's administration; but I shall oppose this administration, as I have opposed all administrations in the past during my 19 years in the Senate, whenever I believe the administration is following a course of action that is not in the public interest. Aid to Sukarno is not in the public interest. I dare the administration to announce the exact sums that it proposes to make available to Sukarno. Then let the American people pass judgment on the program.

### LIMITATION ON GRANT ASSISTANCE

The statement of the House conferees on section 301(e)(3) makes it clear that the Morse amendment defining "economically developed nation" has been removed from the bill. There is no reason I can fathom for its removal. The statement says that such a determination is one of "reasonable judgment." It does not say that the judgment of the Senate is in any way faulty. It was the judgment of the Senate that we should apply the finding of the General Assembly of the United Nations in determining what nations are economically developed, and not give them any more money. What is wrong with that? The conference report does not say.

It does allude to U.S. base rights in Portugal and Spain. But the General Assembly resolution does not mention Portugal or Spain as being economically developed.

I think it is perfectly evident that this is not a matter of what is reasonable judgment, but a question of who is to exercise it. The administration does not want Congress to exercise a "reasonable judgment" in foreign aid matters. It wants that privilege reserved entirely to itself. This is one of the chief obstacles Congress will have to overcome if the United States is ever to have a truly revamped foreign aid program.

Do not be surprised by the action taken by the conference committee. It is only necessary to consider the personnel of the conference. When no voices representing the opposition are a part of the conference, we ought to expect this kind of result. As I said earlier in my speech, one of the major mistakes was in the selection of the conferees, to begin with.

### EXEMPTIONS OF CERTAIN ACTS FROM THE PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE

The conferees agreed to language in section 302(h) that excludes from the various prohibitions in the act, the Peace Corps, the student and cultural exchange program, Export-Import Bank operations, and title II of the Food for Peace Act. This title relates to famine or disaster relief, including such relief through voluntary agencies.

This means that all the provisions seeking to ban aid to Communist countries, to Indonesia, to nations that seize U.S. property without compensation, and to aggressor nations will not affect a very large part of American aid. I think the Export-Import Bank operations should most certainly be included in any ban on aid, and I regret that the conferees added it to the loophole.

Of course, the conference report is not clear on how this section jibes with the so-called aggressor amendment. As approved by both Houses, this amendment states that no assistance shall be provided under this or any other act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and so forth.

I recognize that title II of the 1954 act would probably not be covered, since it deals with relief rather than with sales. But to continue the Peace Corps, cultural exchange, Export-Import Bank operations, and famine relief to nations that are in clear violation of the principles and objectives of the American Government, seems to me to vitiate much of the meaning of a ban on aid to them under the Foreign Assistance Act.

### USE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Under this heading the House conferees discussed section 302(a). They noted that they had accepted the Senate language to encourage use of private enterprise, rather than Federal agencies, where the former is able to provide the goods and services on a contract basis.

I very much regret that in approving the Senate amendment, the conferees did not improve upon it to make use of some Federal services which enhance these private services. It has repeatedly been brought to my attention that the planning and supervision of construction constitute one of the major weaknesses of U.S. aid programs abroad. The aid agency itself has never organized the kind of engineering supervision of this kind of work that is already available in other Federal agencies.

The Corps of Engineers of the Army, for example, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy not only have long experience in this field themselves, but have enabled such complex new agencies as NASA to get their programs going much more effectively and efficiently than they could have done alone.

I believe that in calling for utilization of professional and other services from private enterprise, the law should also utilize in the planning, administration, and supervision of contracts the services of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

### CONCLUSION

Finally, I would also point out to the Senate that the conference report has dropped entirely the Senate amendment relating to fishing rights. It will be remembered that we terminated aid to nations that unilaterally extend their fishing limits beyond those recognized by the United States. I think this was an entirely salutary provision. It did no more than establish an American determination to settle international rights and claims by negotiation. Far from being an arbitrary provision, as has been charged, the Kuchel amendment was an upholding of negotiation as the means of settling disputes. Why in the world should not the Congress say that we will not extend aid to nations that unilaterally and arbitrarily violate an international understanding on territorial or fishing limits?

Mr. President, you will look in vain for any explanation of why this amendment was eliminated. So will you look in vain for any explanation of why the Morse amendments repealing the aid authorizations for the next fiscal years and defining economically developed countries were eliminated.

Most important, however, is the elimination or watering down of the provisions that were to guarantee Congress a new program next year. In my opinion, this is the real issue in this year's foreign aid bill. It is an issue of whether Congress means what it says when we call for a revamping of foreign aid. We can always cut the funds if we do not like the program; but how do those of us who believe foreign aid can have useful and fruitful application go about getting the kind of standards and requirements that produce such a program? That is our problem; but we have had the ground cut out from under us by the conference report.

Our only recourse is a country-by-country review of foreign aid by ourselves. When the aid authorization comes before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next year, it will be up to us to examine every program, in every country, in all its ramifications. I serve notice on the State Department and the Pentagon that that will be the approach I will make. I also serve notice on the Foreign Relations Committee that never again, so long as I am a member of that committee, with a bill as important as this one, will I go along in a cooperative attitude and arrangement of 10 minutes at a time for cross-examination, the objective being to permit the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense or Mr. Bell, the Director of AID, to conclude their presentations at one session of the committee hearings.

Of course, I shall abide by the will of my colleagues in regard to the rotation system; but next time when we take up foreign aid, country by country, I shall insist, as a Senator from a sovereign State, representing its people, that we keep Mr. Rusk, Mr. Bell, and Mr. McNamara before the committee for as many days as will be required in order to have adequate cross-examination, on a country-by-country basis, in regard to the AID program set forth in the administration's proposal.

We on the Foreign Relations Committee must go into the question of the purposes and objectives of both economic and military aid and their relationship to each other; the degree of self-help; the existence or lack of existence of a country program; and all the other factors that determine whether aid is worthwhile. Interested Senators will have to undertake, themselves, the kind of country-by-country review contemplated by the Cooper amendment. I shall be doing my best to do that in the months ahead; and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I shall exercise my rights, as a member of that committee and as a Member of the Senate, to do what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] sought to have done by way of the appointment of the kind of commission or committee which he contemplated to have appointed to investigate the foreign aid program and to consider it on a country-by-country basis.

Mr. President, an article, published this morning in the New York Times, has a close and direct bearing on the pending conference report. The article has the headline:

> Johnson Calls in Passman on Aid.

The article was written by Felix Belair, Jr. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### JOHNSON CALLS IN PASSMAN ON AID—WHITE HOUSE MEETING DRAWS LINES FOR A SHOWDOWN

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 11.—President Johnson intervened today to prevent a further slash in this year's foreign aid funds.

He sought to maintain the $3.6 billion compromise authorization recently approved by Senate and House negotiators.

He summoned Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid, to a White House conference with David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development and Lawrence F. O'Brien, congressional liaison chief for the President.

From the meeting emerged a clear definition of the battlelines in what has already become the toughest behind-the-scenes fight over foreign aid in many years. President Johnson gave the component parts of the $3.6 billion he wants for this year's commitments. Mr. PASSMAN outlined his own set of figures. They were far apart both on figures and categories.

No agreement or compromise was sought or offered by either side. But it was implicit in the President's position that he was prepared to force a showdown on the House floor if Mr. PASSMAN carried out his announced intention to bring in an appropriation bill of less than $3 billion for what the administration calls its substantive aid program.

Another major consequence of the meeting was to make it impossible for the Louisiana Democrat to outsmart the administration by making a deal on a certain appropriation figure to avoid a floor fight and then including in his agreement figure many extraneous items that the administration does not regard as part of the aid program.

Mr. PASSMAN has employed this technique with success several times in recent years. After reaching an understanding with the Speaker and the White House he has then included in the foreign aid appropriations bill such items as the Peace Corps, the civil administration expenses for the Ryukyu Islands and new funds for various Federal and multilateral financing agencies.

At today's meeting, for instance, the wily foe of the aid program included in his figures an estimated total of $700 million of so-called carryover funds from prior appropriations He proposed to include these in the appropriation bill he intends to bring out next week.

He was informed at the conference that his $700 million figure was irrelevant since much of the amount was in the form of unobligated balances of various loan programs that were not subject to reappropriation and did not lapse at the close of the fiscal year.

President Johnson made it clear that the only carryover funds in which he was interested were $209 million of unexpended balances of military and economic aid appropriations that lapsed last June 30 and had to be reappropriated for that reason.

The President included in his $209 million an item of $127 million that was unexpended from his cold war contingency fund and that the administration said it was turning back to the Treasury Department. That was before Senate-House negotiators compromised differences and brought back agreement on a contingency fund of $160 million, compared with the administration's $300 million asking figure.

Now, President Johnson made clear, he wants the $127 million put back in the appropriation bill.

Representative PASSMAN was keeping his own counsel about his intentions. But some members of his subcommittee indicated that the President's intervention has put him in the most difficult position in many years in trying to win over a majority of the subcommittee to his formula.

This was reflected in his recent attempts to make a no-floor-fight deal with the Speaker. But Mr. MCCORMACK's unwillingness to be maneuvered into the position of middleman culminated in today's White House meeting.

Resentment of some members of the subcommittee at what they considered Mr. PASSMAN's attempt to railroad his formula through that group broke into the open earlier in the day. On the House floor, Mr. PASSMAN sought unanimous consent to file by midnight Friday a report from the full appropriations panel on his bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article indicates that President Johnson is insisting upon a foreign aid appropriation of at least $3 billion in new money for the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act, plus reappropriation of some unspent funds from last year. I particularly call attention to these words in Mr. Belair's article:

> President Johnson made it clear that the only carryover funds in which he was interested were $209 million of unexpended balances of military and economic aid appropriations that lapsed last June 30 and had to be reappropriated for that reason.
>
> The President included in his $209 million an item of $127 million that was unexpended from his cold war contingency fund and that the Administration said it was turning back to the Treasury. That was before Senate-House negotiators compromised differences and brought back agreement on a contingency fund of $160 million, compared with the Administration's $300 million asking figure.

**Now, President Johnson made it clear, he wants the $127 million put back in the appropriation bill.**

In my opinion, it is time for the American people to rise up and put a stop to the freehanded, freewheeling use of what is euphemistically called a contingency fund.

Why does this, or any other President, require an advance appropriation for allegedly unanticipated emergencies, amounting to almost $300 million? That is the sum the administration is clearly determined to have, if it can get it. On what basis is the figure $300 million fixed? How can the administration know that it must have $300 million?

What is it up to, that it is so sure it must have $300 million?

This demand, and it is becoming nothing less than a demand, for $300 million in money unrestricted and unlimited as to use, should be resisted not only by the Congress but by all the American people.

My suspicions are rising that contingency money is not for unforeseen contingencies at all. I think most administrations have a pretty good idea what they are going to do with contingency funds before they are ever appropriated. In short, the emergencies are not unforeseen or unanticipated. They are known in advance.

I refer Senators again to the figures placed in the RECORD during the debate on this authorization bill. As our magnificent friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proved beyond any question, not more than $35 million was spent out of the contingency fund last year for real unforeseen emergencies. That is out of appropriated funds of $250 million—$35 million spent for real emergencies.

The real emergencies were natural disasters, and upheavals in various countries in Latin America resulting from the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. At that time, we made available small amounts to several countries in South and Central America to forestall Castro-inspired disorders.

But out of the contingency fund we also extended $7 million to Ecuador to cover a budget deficit, and "to avoid serious political disturbances which would result from the Government's inability to meet its immediate expenses."

Did Senators ever hear of a budget deficit in the United States? I am at a complete loss to understand why it is thought proper to take $7 million out of the contingency fund, unknown at the time by Congress or the American people, to shore up a deficit in the budget of Ecuador. I said during the debate on the bill, and I repeat now in the debate on the conference report, that it is an improper use of contingency funds. The purpose for which contingency funds should be spent, on the basis of which it has always been implied they are being asked, is for an emergency to the United States that threatens the security of the Republic. We had better get back to our objective—and fast.

Three hundred million dollars for a contingency fund is $300 million of unchecked funds. Forget about the individual involved. Think only of the office. With $300 milion, if a President wished to misuse it, we would soon be at war. The constitutional power of Congress to declare war would become meaningless. In principle this is not a safe practice. Any practice that is not safe in principle is a practice that should be checked by the Congress and prohibited by law.

We should stop granting to a President of the United States unchecked contingency fund money, except in a small reasonable amount which he might need to take care of a national emergency or an emergency that might involve serious national interests overnight, so to speak.

Name one. Just name one, Mr. President, that $100 million would not be perfectly adequate to take care of. It takes a President only 20 minutes to get from the White House to a joint session of Congress. If Congress is not in session—and it looks like Congress will always be in session from now on almost all the time—we can return to Washington in 24 hours.

No, Mr. President, no President can possibly justify on the basis of the element of time $300 million for a contingency fund.

What we are really doing in effect as a Congress is waiving a constitutional responsibility. There is a tendency to downgrade Congress and to seek to undermine the powers of Congress and to build up the powers of the Executive. It is dangerous. It is dangerous because, I point out, it changes our form of government. It changes our form of government from a government of 3 coordinate, coequal branches of government to a form of government in which the Executive is supreme. It is not safe for the American people to live under a government which has become a government in which the Executive has become supreme.

Do not make the mistake of thinking, I say to the American people, that our system of representative government cannot be changed into a system of executive-controlled government. Whenever the ugly head of executive supremacy rears itself, the Congress should strike it down. It is rearing its ugly head in connection with the issue of contingency funds. In principle, $300 million requested for contingency funds is a movement in the direction of making the executive supreme. It must be stopped. If it is true that the administration is proposing that $127 million of unexpended funds in the contingency fund which would otherwise revert to the Treasury of the United States should be reappropriated to the executive and added to the $160 million set forth in the conference report for contingency funds, it should be stopped by the Congress.

Oh, I know the comments that will be made on the argument I have made. It will probably be said that this is a serious attack on the President. Nonsense. But it is a serious attack on a proposal to enhance the power of the Executive which is inconsistent with our system of government based upon three coordinate and coequal branches of government.

Those principles of government had better be preserved. I do not intend to be a party to voting to this President or to any other President any such request for additional Executive power as is suggested in the Belair story.

Mr. President, when I say that I have become suspicious that a practice has grown up and contingency funds are asked for because it is pretty well known in advance what their probable use will be, I am not merely yielding to suspicion.

I refer Senators again to what I have pointed out, that $7 million went to cover a budget deficit in Ecuador. I submit that the budget deficit in Ecuador was an emergency in Ecuador, but it was not an emergency in the United States. We merely found it convenient to dip into the contingency fund and bail out Ecuador.

Mr. President, are we to chase around the world shoring up every budget that has a deficit? We do not have that much money. In my judgment, we cannot justify it in a single specific instance.

In fiscal 1963, we also used $23.9 million out of the contingency fund to support the economy of the Dominican Republic. One million of it went to assist agriculture and industrial diversification, for some reason that completely eludes my wildest imagination, in respect to a U.S. national emergency. The use of $22,750,000 of this remains "confidential."

Do Senators believe it is safe, in a democracy, to give any President of the United States that many millions of dollars to spend in accordance with his own judgment or whims, unchecked by the taxpayers of the United States?

Oh, I know. It will be said that these are abstract principles of government I am talking about, and that therefore the objections are impractical and theoretical. I repeat, the only rights of freedom the American people have are in relationship to the abstract principles of government under which they live.

Never argue with me that we can justify expediency in the name of practicality. Never argue with me that we can compromise these basic principles and guarantees of our system of government and still preserve for the American people their rights to freedom, for their rights to freedom are dependent upon maintaining good faith and respect in the carrying out of these abstract principles of government.

I am greatly concerned about the ease with which administrations have been able to get through the Congress these violations of abstract principles of government. as they have been succeeding to do in connection with the contingency fund. We must hold the Presidency to an accountability.

The contingency fund use in the Dominican Republic was all grant money. So was $2 million in contingency funds given to Trinidad-Tobago.

Twenty-five and a half million of contingency fund dollars went to Brazil in the form of a loan.

Why in the world should we loan money to Brazil out of a contingency fund? How does that meet a definition of "U.S. emergency"? What is wrong with insisting that an administration come to the Congress and get legislative approval for a $25 million loan to Brazil? I do not know what is wrong with that, in view of the fact that it is exactly what the Constitution of the United States provides.

I happen to believe that any dollar spent out of a Presidential contingency fund for any so-called emergency which is not a U.S. emergency, which endangers the security of the United States, is an unconstitutional act on the part of the President of the United States. Oh, I know it will be said, "You cannot very well test it in the courts, Senator." But that does not make it any less unconstitutional.

Let us take a little longer look at the $25.5 million of the contingency funds that went to Brazil in the form of a loan.

It was extended last March, when the Brazilian Finance Minister negotiated a $84 million package from several American aid sources to balance its international payments.

Twenty million dollars more went to Argentina to correct its serious balance-of-payments and budget deficit. Hence a total of $45 million was used from the contingency fund for Brazil and Argentina alone in fiscal 1963, not for any unforeseen situations at all, but to bail them out of embarrassing situations that were foreseen by many in both countries.

There is another shocking phase of this. That was American taxpayers' money, and in some amounts it was used to pay American business creditors of the Brazilian and Argentine Governments. I am at a loss to understand how anyone could possibly believe that could be justified. I am at a loss to understand how any one could believe one could justify using American taxpayers' dollars from a Presidential contingency fund to bail out foreign governments and to help foreign governments pay American business interests to whom they owe money.

Then there are those in this country who get a little concerned about subsidies to American farmers. No economic group in the United States has received anywhere near the amount in subsidy from the American taxpayers that American business interests have. But here is an unjustifiable subsidy.

I have just related the facts to show how the contingency funds were spent in Latin America up to March of fiscal year 1963.

Of course, this is not anything like the only aid these countries received from us. It is only in addition to the aid they received from the other categories of foreign aid.

I think it is apparent that the contingency fund is the loophole of the Alliance for Progress. Unless it is closed, the Alliance cannot demand effective self-help from the biggest countries of the hemisphere—Brazil and Argentina. So long as these two largest nations of South America are able to flout the requirements of the Alliance and obtain money from the United States, anyway, through the contingency fund, the other nations of Latin America are not going to see much need for them to meet the requirements of the Alliance, either.

### CONTINGENCY FUND IN FAR EAST

How were contingency funds used in the Far East? Why, primarily for Indonesia. Out of the President's fund for uses he determines "to be important to the national interest" the United States furnished almost $20 million last year to Sukarno and Indonesia. As was pointed out in the Senate on November 6, $17 million was in the form of a loan to mitigate serious internal financial and balance-of-payments problems. A grant of $2.7 million was made to Indonesia to assist in equipping and training the mobile brigade, a special unit of the Indonesian National Police which has been trained to deal with civil disturbances.

Of course, the mobile brigade was not interested in "dealing" with the civil disturbance which wrecked the British Embassy not long ago and threatened the lives of its employees. As we all know, there are only certain civil disturbances that many nations desire to deal with, and they are glad to have American training. But what folly our policymakers commit when they think that by financing the training and equipping of such forces we assure that American interests will be promoted.

Sukarno—and put it down, Mr. President, because it is undeniably true—will promote Sukarno's interests, and that is all. The money we have wasted from the contingency fund for these purposes is only a small fraction of what has been wasted from other sources for the same purposes.

Finally, out of the contingency fund we extended $80,000 to Indonesia to aid flood victims in Java. I call that a genuine unforeseen emergency.

The other nation of the Far East which received money from the contingency fund in fiscal 1963 was Thailand. It was a grant of $9.5 million, the purposes of which still remain "confidential." Too bad, Mr. President. I do not know why the American taxpayers should not know for what the money was spent.

### CONTINGENCY FUND IN NEAR EAST

Three countries of the Near East received money from the contingency fund. Iran received $465,000 to take care of earthquake victims; Syria received $7,000 to acquire Salk vaccine after an outbreak of polio in rural areas; and the United Arab Republic received a $10 million loan.

What emergency was involved that brought about the use of $10 million from the contingency fund? Why, the UAR had a "stabilization" problem. She had already obtained a loan from us of $20 million from other aid sources, and the contingency fund was only used to boost it to $30 million.

I can understand, of course, that a nation that finances a war in Yemen, that contributes troops to Algeria for use against Morocco, and that spends vast sums every year to propagandize the Arab world against Israel would have some budgetary stabilization problems. It was very generous of the United States to help the UAR finance these activities. I am against our financing them from any source; but to call this a contingency that it is in the national interest of the United States to finance is simply absurd.

### CONTINGENCY FUNDS IN AFRICA

In Africa, contingency funds were all used for medical purposes or natural disaster relief. To Algeria went $753,000 to finance a Care-Medico team of doctors and nurses. To Mauritania went $54,000 to provide inland transportation for food furnished under title II of Public Law 480. To Tunisia went $113,000 to provide blankets for flood victims in the Gabes region. I find this an incredible figure, but that is the explanation for the expenditure. Morocco received $500,000 for urgent flood relief; and Libya received $27,000 to aid victims of an earthquake at Barce.

Finally, $150,000 has been spent as a result of a flood in India, an earthquake in Turkey, a cholera epidemic in Taiwan, a typhoon in Hong Kong, a typhoon in Thailand, and the collapse of a dike in Korea.

This analysis has covered the uses of the contingency fund during the first 9 months of fiscal 1963. It describes how $120,028,000 was used, of the $250 million appropriated. I think the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is probably generous in concluding that $35 million of this was spent for true contingencies that could not be financed out of the regular categories or programed for the forthcoming fiscal year.

### REVERSION OF CONTINGENCY FUNDS TO TREASURY

One of the highlights of the debate on the contingency authorization was, it will be remembered, the stress put upon the return of unspent contingency funds to the Treasury. The figure of $117 million was given. But now we are told that what was returned to the Treasury must be taken out again. To do so makes a mockery of the effort to fix authorization ceilings.

This is typical of the Treasury Department. It is also typical of the State Department, the Pentagon Building, and the administration of AID. I regret to say it, but I have learned it is true—they are masters of deception.

They come before us and try to pacify us into going along with the program on the basis that they will return $117 million to the Treasury. We take it for granted that the taxpayers will get the $117 million returned. I say to the Senate, do not be so naive. Do not be so trusting. That is their argument of expediency for the moment. Just wait a few weeks or months. They think we shall have forgotten it. They will have completely reversed their field. They will be back, as they are now, before the Appropriations Committee, seeking to keep the $117 million.

Mr. President, it is serious. We cannot even deal with them at arm's length. What we must do is exercise the checking power that our constitutional forefathers gave the Congress of the United States. We must make clear to them that they cannot spend a dime except as authorized by law, as provided for by the Constitution, and that they cannot continue to weaken, or attempt to weaken, or evade, or avoid the checking powers of the Congress of the United States by the type of expediency they are resorting to in their various presentations of requests for foreign aid, including contingency fund aid.

The $160 million we have provided in the conference report for the contingency fund is right now being undermined by the demand for that plus $127 million more in funds unspent from last year.

The American people must not be deluded about foreign aid appropriations. The deception that is too often practiced on them is to reappropriate unspent money which does not show up in the figure for new obligational authority. By that device it will be possible for some to make the claim that foreign aid funds were being kept to $3 billion or a little less. But the public will not be told that over $200 million more is also being appropriated under another provision of the bill which gives money not for new purposes but for old ones.

The price tag on foreign aid funds, according to the account in the New York Times, is not $3 billion; it is $3.2 billion. I intend to make this fact perfectly clear to the American people, so there will be no misrepresentation of how much of their money is going into foreign aid in fiscal 1964.

Today a leader of the House of Representatives, who is fully informed in regard to unspent balances, said to me, "You have not heard anything yet." To use his language, he said, "The deal is to reach a settlement on $3 billion. The purpose is to let it go out to the country that a great saving has been made and there has been a great cut made in the foreign aid program, and that only $3 billion was allowed."

But, he said, the gimmick is a sleeper provision which will permit the administration to spend another $400 million—not $200 million as referred to by the New York Times—of unexpended funds.

If it happens, who is responsible for it? The Congress.

The people have given us the power to check. The Constitution gives us the power to check. In fact, I am shocked and alarmed that there is any thought over on the House side of an appropriation of $1 dollar more than $2,700 million. If the appropriation figure ended up with $2,500 million, it would be ample.

I also intend to make clear to the American people that there is no need for a contingency fund of anything like the $287 million, which the President is apparently seeking. A fund of such size is unnecessary for true emergency purposes which cannot await specific Congressional action. It can, in fact, be a positive threat to the principle that the foreign policy of the United States belongs to the people of the United States and not to any one officeholder or group of officeholders.

Let it not be forgotten by either the Congress or the people that when a true emergency, threatening the interests of the United States, arose in Berlin in 1961, the Congress of the United States appropriated $3.2 billion almost immediately, almost overnight. That is how contingencies and emergencies which truly threaten the vital interests of the United States should be handled.

I have one final topic to discuss before I close. I said earlier in my speech that I would disclose, before this speech was over, the tactics and strategy—yes, the schemes—of the bureaucrats downtown to evade and avoid and run around the checking powers of Congress. I made mention of it last night in a speech on the floor of the Senate. We have pending before the Foreign Relations Committee a couple of bills, which came to us from the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury came before the committee and testified for them. That is a part of the scheme. What they are up to is to change the administration of American foreign aid involving billions of American taxpayer dollars into a system of multilateral administrative set-ups, whereby other countries, which put up very little money, will really come to have a controlling voice in the administration of the expenditure of American taxpayer money.

They will try to rush some of that legislation through before we quit on December 20. If I can only get some pledges of help, they will not do it.

The time is at hand for the American people to come to realize what these officials are up to. The administration of the expenditure of American taxpayer dollars in the foreign aid program must be kept by the Congress under its complete control. If any foreign country does not like it, it does not have to take the money. It is that simple. This is taxpayer money, and not the money of the Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, or the Secretary of State Rusk, or Bell of AID, or McNamara of the Pentagon, or the President of the United States himself.

Under this constitutional checking system of ours, Congress must say, "You can spend it for this purpose, and for this purpose alone. No one else will have a voice in determining the policy of expenditure."

That does not stop any country in Latin America—and I say this as one of the delegates at Bogotá and Punta del Este, which brought the Alliance for Progress program into possibility of implementation—that they cannot make their recommendations, that they cannot make their proposals, that they cannot submit their plans. However, Congress must be on guard. The American people must warn Congress to keep on guard. We must be on guard against turning the administration of the funds for foreign aid over to any multilateral commission or organization. To do that would put these Secretaries or the President in the position of being able to say, as they are now able to say to a too great degree in connection with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, "After all, these are not merely American funds. After all, the charter of these organizations—and the United States is a charter member, and Congress approved our becoming a charter member—authorizes this multilateral administration."

This is a great threat to the taxpayers. It explains why the senior Senator from Oregon in the debate on foreign aid sought to have adopted an amendment that would end all foreign aid at the end of fiscal year 1965 and establish a new foreign aid program with the necessary terms, conditions, and restrictions that would have to be complied with by the applicant countries, limited in number to not more than 50, instead of the 107 into which we are now pouring the taxpayers' largess, many of which are not entitled to a single dollar.

If Congress falls for this propaganda of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of AID, it will have lost a considerable portion of its checking power under the Constitution in regard to the regulating of the expenditure of taxpayers' money. It will be extremely hard to make the dangers clear. It will be most difficult to persuade Members of Congress, to say nothing of the American public, to think in terms of abstract principles of government. Nevertheless, that is what is involved. The whole system of representative government is involved.

But in the debate this year we served notice on the bureaucrats that we were aware of the dangers of bureaucratic control, and the bureaucrats do not intend to give up without a struggle to protect their selfish interests.

I understand that tomorrow a couple of these bills will again be before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We shall discuss them later. If the committee takes final action on them tomorrow—and I think a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be as willing to sacrifice the rights of the taxpayers in regard to these bills as the conference report shows they were willing to sacrifice the rights of the taxpayers in connection with foreign aid generally—we shall have to fight the battle again on the floor of the Senate. Then we shall have to fight it on the political platforms of America. We shall have to urge the American people to exercise their precious right and duty to hold to political accountability the present Members of Congress who are willing to support such a frightening and dangerous weakening of our whole system of representative government by voting to enhance the power of the executive branch of the Government and making it supreme, rather than coequal and coordinated with the other two branches of Government.

That is my case against the conference report. I sincerely hope that tomorrow the Senate will reject the conference report. If the Senate rejects it, then under the parliamentary situation we will be in a position to call for another conference. There is no hurry. The rush act on the foreign aid bill has been pulled on us for months. There are so many millions of dollars in the pipeline that it is not necessary to appropriate another dollar for many months. Time is not of the essence, contrary to the false representations of the spokesmen for the administration.

What is of the essence is that Congress keep the faith with the taxpayers in regard to its clear obligation to fulfill that provision of the Constitution which gives Congress a checking power on foreign policy, and to see to it that the conference report is rewritten so that the necessary checks will be put into it to protect the rights of the people.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in keeping with the agreement previously entered into, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, December 13, 1963, a 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1963:

### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

#### ALABAMA

Rebecca H. Baker, Crossville, Ala., in place of Amby Campbell, retired.

Evelyn Y. Lambert, Darlington, Ala., in place of J. E. Lambert, deceased.

Marion L. Glass, Jemison, Ala., in place of D. A. Littlejohn, retired.

David E. Dunn, Sr., Montgomery, Ala., in place of C. D. Moore, resigned.

Margaret P. Gray, Sipsey, Ala., in place of L. H. Barton, retired.

Lillian E. Tyson, Toxey, Ala., in place of N. C. Davidson, retired.

#### ARKANSAS

Pleasant I. Richardson, Ash Flat, Ark., in place of F. B. Richardson, deceased.

Lexie P. Woods, Crossett, Ark., in place of P. G. Gates, retired.

Hal E. Bodenhamer, Mountain Home, Ark., in place of J. L. Bodenhamer, retired.

Henry R. Robinson, Wilson, Ark., in place of A. T. Harnden, resigned.

#### CALIFORNIA

James T. Smith, Banning, Calif., in place of J. A. Adrian, Jr., deceased.

Herbert V. Irey, Bridgeport, Calif., in place of W. B. Evans, resigned.

Marguerite M. Fanning, Burbank, Calif., in place of A. S. Richetts, retired.

Roberta M. Shriner, Burnt Ranch, Calif., in place of V. R. McKnight, retired.

George N. Laird, Colusa, Calif., in place of L. A. Mannee, deceased.

Frank P. Siatt, Fremont, Calif., in place of M. W. Lewis, resigned.

Alvin C. Blackford, Fullerton, Calif., in place of J. R. Layton, deceased.

Herman W. Biggers, Sr., Graton, Calif., in place of H. P. Heintz, retired.

Marie W. Forrest, Highland, Calif., in place of D. M. Alexander, retired.

Anna M. Brosh, Piru, Calif., in place of M. E. Bailey, retired.

Joan E. Gold, South Pasadena, Calif., in place of M. R. Rix, retired.

John W. James, Upland, Calif., in place of R. A. Ray, retired.

#### COLORADO

Laurell E. Julius, Evergreen, Colo., in place of A. J. Elmgreen, retired.

Carrol E. Byerrum, Grand Valley, Colo., in place of Otis Murray, retired.

Jacob N. Schmidt, Montrose, Colo., in place of F. H. Buskirk, deceased.

Reyburn I. Morgan, Platteville, Colo., in place of G. E. O'Neill, retired.

#### DELAWARE

Melvin R. Hearn, Georgetown, Del., in place of H. T. Swain, retired.

#### FLORIDA

Raymond E. Chandler, Altamonte Springs, Fla., in place of E. N. Mitchell, retired.

Alfred J. Tracy, Palm Beach, Fla., in place of E. R. McKenna, retired.

Lucille H. Pearce, Saint James City, Fla., in place of Nellie Hord, deceased.

#### GEORGIA

Wilfred E. Parrish, Chickamauga, Ga., in place of M. L. Deck, retired.

Guy C. Wallis, Conyers, Ga., in place of H. D. Austin, retired.

Roselyn S. Tyson, Harrison, Ga., in place of J. G. Jackson, retired.

John M. Johnston, Jr., Huber, Ga., in place of M. R. Denson, retired.

#### HAWAII

Thomas T. Oyasato, Wahiawa, Hawaii, in place of M. C. White, retired.

#### IDAHO

Ella M. Dixon, Stites, Idaho, in place of H. E. Detwiler, retired.

#### ILLINOIS

Orlin H. Nuernberger, Barrington, Ill., in place of H. C. Berghorn, retired.

R. Kent Billingsley, Buncombe, Ill., in place of B. H. Davis, deceased.

Harold H. Westendorf, Dieterich, Ill., in place of G. C. Hardiek, transferred.

Joseph B. Reichard, Jr., Prophetstown, Ill., in place of M. D. Pritchard, deceased.

Edward S. Howe, Robinson, Ill., in place of H. L. Thompson, deceased.

Wallace B. Rice, Williamsfield, Ill., in place of A. G. Daub, retired.

#### INDIANA

James L. Slough, Bourbon, Ind., in place of L. M. Slough, deceased.

Kenneth W. Cochran, Flat Rock, Ind., in place of O. C. Mohr, resigned.

Eleanor N. Harness, Grovertown, Ind., in place of W. B. Pelkey, deceased.

Michael H. Faikel, Portage, Ind. Office established on June 17, 1961.

Mildred L. Burchett, Romney, Ind., in place of G. G. Barker, retired.

#### IOWA

Charles H. Hamilton, Barnes City, Iowa, in place of R. T. Allen, retired.

Byron L. Evans, Centerville, Iowa, in place of W. W. Koestner, deceased.

Lester C. Schulte, Elkader, Iowa, in place of Lyle Barthel, retired.

Lucille J. Erickson, Hartford, Iowa, in place of R. W. Schooler, retired.

John H. Tutje, Matlock, Iowa, in place of J. C. Koele, deceased.

Clarence W. Sorensen, Melvin, Iowa, in place of M. J. Wackerbarth, resigned.

Thomas L. McDermott, Oto, Iowa, in place of C. P. McKenna, deceased.

Carl A. Thompson, Promise City, Iowa, in place of J. W. Smith, retired.

#### KANSAS

Harold H. Derby, Dresden, Kans., in place of P. T. Welter, transferred.

M. Kenneth Morgan, Dwight, Kans., in place of L. A. Holshouser, retired.

Everett W. Hull, Fredonia, Kans., in place of W. W. Koch, retired.

Hubert P. Johnson, Harper, Kans., in place of W. W. Nye, transferred.

James R. Hogue, Pomona, Kans., in place of E. J. Neely, transferred.

Walter C. Preble, Jr., Rossville, Kans., in place of Everett Pelfrey, retired.

#### KENTUCKY

Jerry W. Davis, Radcliff, Ky. Office established on September 15, 1962.

James H. Sutton, Woodbine, Ky., in place of A. O. Perkins, retired.

#### LOUISIANA

Earline F. Lowrey, Lisbon, La., in place of W. B. Killgore, retired.

#### MAINE

Evelyn W. Stinson, Dryden, Maine, in place of A. M. McLaughlin, retired.

Philip A. Whitehouse, Winter Harbor, Maine, in place of A. B. Gerrish, resigned.

#### MARYLAND

Virginia M. Lochstamphfor, Burtonsville, Md., in place of V. E. Beasley, retired.

John B. Sewell, Henryton, Md., in place of O. E. Corsa, deceased.

Mary L. Greiner, Queen Anne, Md., in place of M. L. Clark, retired.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Richard C. Bockus, East Templeton, Mass., in place of B. T. Conners, deceased.

Theodore I. Piwowarczyk, Indian Orchard, Mass., in place of A. L. Bengle, retired.

Charles F. Germano, Millis, Mass., in place of F. J. Sheehan, retired.

#### MICHIGAN

Vere W. Arend, Baroda, Mich., in place of Samuel Somora, Sr., retired.

Donald C. Brill, Brutus, Mich., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.

Arnold S. Keskimaki, Chatham, Mich, in place of S. I. Seppi, deceased.

Bernard F. Beauchamp, Hubbell, Mich., in place of A. J. Pini, resigned.

#### MINNESOTA

James F. Kuelbs, Gaylord, Minn., in place of R. G. Mueller, retired.

Earl W. Rueckert, Grove City, Minn., in place of O. W. Anderberg, transferred.

Edward W. Appel, Millville, Minn., in place of T. E. McGowan, retired.

Alvin H. Groen, Murdock, Minn., in place of L. H. Egerstrom, transferred.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Robert D. Heslep, Boyle, Miss., in place of D. M. Collins, retired.

Lawrence C. Skipper, Jr., Gholson, Miss., in place of J. R. VanDevender, transferred.

Lula L. Chatham, Rose Hill, Miss., in place of R. E. Chatham, retired.

#### MISSOURI

John R. Evans, Monroe City, Mo., in place of R. L. Hawkins, retired.

Jack Crafton, Saint James, Mo., in place of M. C. Mikkelsen, retired.

#### MONTANA

Lawrence J. Driscoll, Charlo, Mont., in place of Lee Biggerstaff, retired.

Florn K. Martin, Poplar, Mont., in place of O. M. Mitchell, retired.

#### NEBRASKA

Nadine F. Summers, Creston, Nebr., in place of G. H. Summers, retired.

Orvale J. Widick, Farnam, Nebr., in place of W. E. Parker, retired.

Robert L. Jelden, Hildreth, Nebr., in place of Carl Kruse, transferred.

#### NEVADA

Susan I. Brizendine, Black Springs, Nev., in place of B. L. Linder, removed.

Charles L. Connor, Henderson, Nev., in place of H. S. Baldwin, retired.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Arthur J. King, Conway, N.H., in place of E. L. Richardson, retired.

#### NEW JERSEY

Jane M. Seelman, Dorothy, N.J., in place of C. R. Andersen, deceased.

Edward R. Haag, Levittown, N.J., office established, October 2, 1961.

F. Robert Siebert, Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., in place of C. A. Snyder, Sr., deceased.

Allan E. Hamilton, Waretown, N.J., in place of P. O. Bonnell, retired.

### NEW MEXICO

Frances G. Shaw, Capitan, N. Mex., in place of O. V. Cloud, deceased.

### NEW YORK

Joseph A. Smith, Jr., Barneveld, N.Y., in place of W. C. Wells, retired.

James D. Foits, Cochocton, N.Y., in place of P. A. Kinkaid, retired.

Carol A. Young, Hughsonville, N.Y., in place of J. F. Clark, resigned.

June J. Sinius, Huntington Station, N.Y., in place of L. P. Cass, deceased.

Vincent J. Boccalini, Valley Cottage, N.Y., in place of Frank Piliere, deceased.

### NORTH CAROLINA

H. Burch Idol, Colfax, N.C., in place of G. G. Gibbons, retired.

Opal W. Packard, Mooresboro, N.C., in place of E. A. Pipkin, Jr., deceased.

Archibald L. Taylor, Jr., Oxford, N.C., in place of V. W. Taylor, retired.

William A. Lovelace, Jr., Thomasville, N.C., in place of Paul Green, retired.

Robert S. Smith, Jr., Walnut Cove, N.C., in place of M. W. Davis, retired.

### NORTH DAKOTA

Arthur B. Haakenson, Tioga, N. Dak., in place of G. E. Mark, retired.

Eldora M. LaBar, White Earth, N. Dak., in place of H. C. LaBar, deceased.

### OHIO

Ralph G. Moore, Logan, Ohio, in place of C. C. Achauer, retired.

Merrel D. Geiger, Pandora, Ohio, in place of H. L. Basinger, retired.

Donald S. Fankhauser, Perry, Ohio, in place of H. B. Acker, deceased.

Henri L. Mondor, Piedmont, Ohio, in place of E. J. Calfee, retired.

Buel F. Collins, South Point, Ohio, in place of F. L. Brown, retired.

### OKLAHOMA

William L. Bond, Madill, Okla., in place of R. T. Strickland, retired.

Charles B. Harjo, Sasakwa, Okla, in place of J. D. Bullington, retired.

Betty J. Lozano, Wann, Okla., in place of F. B. Taylor, retired.

Charles M. Horner, Welch, Okla., in place of J. E. Ewers, transferred.

### OREGON

Robert B. Roe, Gaston, Oreg., in place of T. R. Roe, retired.

### PENNSYLVANIA

Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard, Pa., in place of G. W. Golden, retired.

Walter G. Woolbaugh, Hallstead, Pa., in place of F. E. Chamberlin, retired.

Robert M. Kellerman, Irvine, Pa., in place of H. K. Kellerman, resigned.

Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg, Pa., in place of G. L. Johnson, retired.

George Mermon, Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of V. J. Koomar, deceased.

Donald J. Bogert, North East, Pa., in place of L. A. Clavin, retired.

Lester L. Miller, Slatedale, Pa., in place of F. O. Shenton, retired.

William D. Hartman, Stouchsburg, Pa., in place of M. W. Loeb, retired.

Jane W. Hinkle, West Hickory, Pa., in place of H. B. Wheeler, retired.

John D. Kershner, Witmer, Pa., in place of W. W. Kershner, retired.

### PUERTO RICO

Carlos Oramas, Bayamon, P.R., in place of Vicente Feliu, retired.

Julio C. Rivera, Moca, P.R., in place of A. B. Rivera, retired.

Pedro J. Sandin, San Juan, P.R., in place of M. F. Varela, retired.

### RHODE ISLAND

Raymond N. Lombardi, Warren, R.I., in place of J. E. Conley, deceased.

### SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Ellison Deer, Ulmers, S.C., in place of L. V. McMillan, retired.

### SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo P. Harens, Marion, S. Dak., in place of F. M. Weiland, retired.

Clifford R. Mitchell, Watertown, S. Dak., in place of W. A. Farl, deceased.

Marion C. Nash, Yankton, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Beaver, deceased.

### TEXAS

Jimmie L. McFarland, Claude, Tex., in place of C. W. Appling, retired.

Ted Reeder, Crowell, Tex., in place of Alva Spencer, retired.

Henry F. Sheppard, Cuero, Tex., in place of S. G. Tarkington, Jr., retired.

James W. Dowe, Jr., Falfurrias, Tex., in place of T. R. Bennett, retired.

Dan J. Morse, Lewisville, Tex., in place of J. C. Cobb, retired.

W. Phillips Wolford, McKinney, Tex., in place of D. O. Davis, retired.

Ted F. Robinson, Marietta, Tex., in place of R. L. Harris, transferred.

Charlie Scaff, Matador, Tex., in place of E. F. Springer, retired.

Donald C. Reece, Prosper, Tex., in place of A. E. Robinson, deceased.

Eddith P. Mattox, Rio Vista, Tex., in place of I. C. McClellan, retired.

Virgie M. Holmes, Tolar, Tex., in place of N. O. Jackson, transferred.

Florence E. Warren, Wilmer, Tex., in place of H. M. Stadden, retired.

### VERMONT

Nall P. McGinn, East Fairfield, Vt., in place of L. B. Maginn, retired.

Carroll P. Eastman, East Hardwick, Vt., in place of S. M. Eastman, retired.

Barbara M. Champney, North Pownal, Vt., in place of A. G. Church, retired.

### VIRGINIA

Mary E. Farrar, Afton, Va., in place of G. G. Farrar, deceased.

William E. Brubeck, Middlebrook, Va., in place of C. E. Almarode, retired.

Martha E. Deane, Nottoway, Va., in place of W. G. Carter, retired.

### WASHINGTON

D. Ben Meservey, Aberdeen, Wash., in place of G. D. Magee, retired.

W. Duane Duke, Vantage, Wash., in place of W. C. Duke, deceased.

### WISCONSIN

James C. Anderson, Dallas, Wis., in place of H. C. Lee, transferred.

Philip A. Panetti, Juneau, Wis., in place of E. J. Peters, retired.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of December 11, 1963):

### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Allen E. Rolland
James L. Walker
William L. Avery
David W. Proudfoot
James A. McIntosh
James L. Mueller
Richard J. Kiessel
Joseph H. Discenza
David H. Withers
Leonard J. Pichini
William S. Haight
Frederick D. Smith
Charles W. Morgan
Robert A. Bastek
Alexander C. McKean, Jr.
Larry D. Brooks
Francis W. Mooney
Ronald M. Potter
Richard C. Blaschke
Stephen H. Hines
George A. Casimir
Robert K. Blaschke
Thomas P. Keane
Thomas H. Lloyd, Jr.
Thomas W. Boerger
John G. Denninger, Jr.
Theodore A. Somes
Arthur R. Gandt
John W. Brittain
Lawrence M. Schilling
David W. Robinette
David H. Whitten
Harvey L. Wahnquist, Jr.
Jon P. Ryan
Harry A. Allen
Joseph L. Valenti
Lance A. Eagan
Richard B. O'Keefe
Hugh L. Thomas, Jr.
William J. Wallace, Jr.
Eugene Hornstein
John A. Wuestneck
Michael J. Schiro
Harold L. Bonnet
Arthur W. Mergner, Jr.
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Daniel T. Koenig
Frederick A. Kelley
James H. Lightner
Raymond D. Bland
James F. Greene, Jr.
Arthur E. Henn
John T. Mason
Joseph H. Sanford
Joseph J. Smith
Laurence J. Dallaire, Jr.
Peter C. Hennings
Ronald C. Zinzer
Walter M. Coburn
Henry B. Traver
William H. Spence
John K. Andrews
Wade M. Moncrief, Jr.
David S. Gemmell
Richard V. Consigli
Carl H. Burkhart
Joseph P. Bibella
Neal Mahan
George E. Archer, Jr.
Glenn E. Haines
Timothy G. McKinna
Peter T. Muth
Richard E. Shrum
David T. Boyle
William A. Borchers
Edward K. Roe, Jr.
Michael O. Murtagh
Joseph L. Crowe, Jr.
Anthony J. Soltys
William H. Roth
William C. Heming
James A. Umberger
Kwang-Ping Hsu
Albert F. Baker
William S. Murray
George E. Mason
Norman H. Huff
Clifford E. Banner
Don M. Keehn
Thomas D. Smith
Daniel M. White
Thomas F. McGrath III
Thomas S. Whipple
Robert D. Markoff
Stewart B. Morgan
Raymond J. Houttekier
David K. Carey
Louis M. Casale
John M. McCann
Peter M. Bernstein
Robert E. McDonough, Jr.
Joseph R. Finelli
Wayne P. Stevens
Jack W. Whiting, Jr.
Phillip J. Bull
Harry N. Hutchins III
Thomas W. Watkins III
David W. Hastings
Herbert M. Hurst
Richmond D. Greenough, Jr.
Thomas J. Kenney
John C. Schmidtman
Robert F. Boysen, Jr.
James C. McElroy

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of December 11), 1963:

### POSTMASTERS

### ARIZONA

Oscar W. Schahn, Morenci.
Jane T. Williams, Patagonia.
Charles H. Archibald, San Luis.
Emert W. Hawkins, Thatcher.

### COLORADO

Ralph M. Apple, Crowley.
Louis Bruder, Jr., Oak Creek.

### CONNECTICUT

Dignor G. Piner, Mansfield Center.

### IDAHO

Harold K. Beaudreau, Nampa.
Frederic M. Sanger, Twin Falls.

### MARYLAND

William F. McNutt, Fallston.
William Telemeco, Maugansville.
George R. Parsons, Sr., Rock Hall.
Albert N. Golliday, Severn.
George L. Hart, Sudlersville.

### MISSISSIPPI

Charles H. Hughes, Cleveland.

### NEBRASKA

Raymond O. Johnson, Butte.

### NEW JERSEY

Michael Arillo, Jr., Allenwood.
William F. Martin, Elmer.
Vincent T. Fagan, Jackson.
Frank W. Howell III, Newton.
Francis A. Newman, Spring Lake.
John R. Latourette, White House Station.

NEW YORK

A. Joseph Boulet, Gouverneur.
Edward A. Lesson, Greenwich.
John M. Hickey, Round Lake
Edna E. Grossman, Woodmere.
Paul G. Kenna, Wyoming.

OREGON

Stephen N. Blackmore, Cave Junction.
James P. Sandoz, The Dalles.

PENNSYLVANIA

John W. Richard, Elysburg.
Kathleen W. Cairns, Morgan.
Roy S. King, Pitcairn.
Francis A. Keyack, Shamokin.
Rudolph M. Gallup, Ulster.
Agnes K. Timko, Windber.

TEXAS

James R. Smart, Farwell.
Wright H. Williams, Friona.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park.
Luther G. Pool, Garland.
Eugene J. Dworaczyk, Hobson.
Talmage E. Gilbreath, Iowa Park.
Cecil W. James, Palestine.
Hiram C. Dubose, Port Arthur.
Ernest C. Minyard, Sudan.
Memory G. Wright, Jr., Troup.

WISCONSIN

Eldon R. Rode, Cambria.
Loren G. Nelson, Cushing.
Adolph L. Somers, Custer.
Michael J. Finnane, Evansville.
Ronald L. Marcks, Pepin.

WYOMING

Ellen R. Smith, Medicine Bow.
Charles G. Taylor, Pavillion.
Margaret H. Hennek, Wamsutter.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Independence of Kenya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ADAM C. POWELL**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1963, the final transfer of power will take place between Britain and the Kenyan Government, making Kenya an independent nation. We wish to take this great occasion to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister, Jomo Kenyatta, and the people of Kenya on their approaching independence, and express to them all good wishes for a peaceful and progressive future as an independent nation-state.

Kenya's future indeed looks promising. This prosperous country on the east coast of Africa, roughly equivalent in size to the combined area of our States of Colorado and New Mexico, includes some of the best agricultural land in Africa. Kenya is a land of contrasts. The north and northeastern part of the country is arid—almost desertland—but the south contains the fertile well-watered highlands which produce the coffee, tea, sisal, and livestock that are the basis of the Kenyan economy. Agricultural production accounts for more than 80 percent, by value, of all exports.

Kenya is a multiracial society par excellence. Included in Kenya's population of about 6,500,000 people are approximately 6,215,000 Africans; 175,000 Indians, Pakistani, and Goans; 65,000 Europeans; 40,000 Arabs; and 5,000 others. Although a majority of the Africans still practice subsistence agriculture on small farms, under the impetus of government efforts to intensify African agriculture, African farmers have begun to make a substantial contribution to the production of cash crops, which were formerly produced almost entirely by Europeans. The Asian population is engaged chiefly in marketing, distribution, and transport. In recent years industrial activity has been increasing fairly rapidly; over 2,400 new public and private companies were registered between 1952 and 1962, among them subsidiaries of several large British firms.

Thus, Kenya is reaching the threshold of independence with a more diversified and complex economy than many of its African sister countries. It is not a single-crop economy; an important measure of agricultural diversification has already been achieved. Industrialization has already begun, and recent assurances by Kenyan leaders that an independent Kenya Government will not nationalize industries should encourage further private foreign investment. The marketing, distributing, and transportation industries are thriving concerns.

The inheritance of this progressive economy is a mixed blessing, however, for it is based on a multiracial society in which tensions can easily be aroused if a balance is not struck. The memory of Mau Mau is not yet dead, but the election manifesto of Prime Minister Kenyatta's party, the Kenya African National Union—KANU—should assuage the apprehension of any who fear that a repetition of Mau Mau might accompany independence. The manifesto stated:

> The KANU government will welcome those non-Africans who choose to join with us in the noble task of building a Kenya nation. Their training, skills, and knowledge will be of the greatest value to us. We are confident that those who show confidence in us will appreciate the need to pass on to the nation what they can teach the people. They will be fully accepted by us, not only through legal forms, but in our hearts.

We, too, are confident that the new government and the people of Kenya will achieve lasting harmony in the task of successfully building a progressive and united nation.

## The 1963 Achievement Awards to 870 Outstanding Students of English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CARL ALBERT**
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a letter received from Mr. James R. Squire, executive secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill., announcing the selection of 870 outstanding students of English throughout the Nation as winners of the 1963 Achievement Awards for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness. The letter is as follows:

> NOVEMBER 27, 1963.
>
> DEAR MEMBER OF THE 88TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: In the enclosed brochure you will find the names of 870 of the Nation's outstanding students in English who have been cited for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness by the National Council of Teachers of English. The winners and runners-up from your State are listed therein.
>
> These young people were chosen from approximately 6,800 students who were nominated by their schools for the 1963 Achievement Awards competition. Their entries were carefully judged by teams of prominent high school and college teachers across the Nation. We are confident that these finalists, who are recommended by the NCTE for college scholarships in 1964, represent the most able students of English in our Nation today. We also highly commend the respective English departments of these students for contributing to their achievements by providing a superior quality of instruction.
>
> Today statesmen are calling for excellence of performance in all activities crucial to our effectiveness and creativity as a society. We, therefore, present these young people to you in response to this expressed need.
>
> We trust that, should the opportunity present itself, you will assist these young people to develop their talents for the benefit of their country by congratulating them and recommending them to schools and scholarship donors.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JAMES R. SQUIRE,
> *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives of the NCTE Achievement Awards is the identification of highly qualified students to colleges and universities where they may apply for admission, as well as to scholarship donors. The NCTE is a nonprofit organization without funds to support college scholarships, but those students who receive the recognition of the distinguished chairmen and judges, representing the 50 States, who selected the award winners, do find their prospects of receiving a scholarship greatly enhanced.

It is gratifying indeed in this age when great emphasis is given to other areas of academic activity that the NCTE has balanced the scales of intellectual achievement by recognizing outstanding young students of English. There is great value to the Nation in preserving and developing a high degree of competence in the English language, our most important heritage from our mother country. I commend the National Council of Teachers of English upon the establishment of its achievement awards and urge that it continue its efforts to stimulate interest and achievement among students of English throughout the United States.

On my own behalf, and on behalf of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, I extend congratulations to the award winners from our State. I was particularly gratified by the selection of Joe Ben Champion, a student at Ardmore Senior High School in my district, as one of the finalists. I know that Joe Ben and all the students in Oklahoma and throughout the Nation who have won this distinguished award under highly competitive circumstances, have worked hard and have persevered in the cultivation of their talents and the acquisition of knowledge in their field of study.

I extend to all the winners, both finalists and runners-up, my congratulations and good wishes.

## The Higher Education Facilities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased with the action of the Senate on Tuesday, December 10, in adopting the conference report on H.R. 6143, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. I had been happy earlier to lend my support to the bill when it passed the House. I am also pleased that overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle led to the tremendous margin—better than 2 to 1—by which the measure cleared the House. The action of the Senate now clears the way for early action by the President.

The need for additional college academic facilities was recognized and stressed as far back as 1959. At that time it was recommended that a $2 billion program be inaugurated, extending over a period of 5 years, to keep college academic facilities in pace with the rapidly expanding college population.

There can be no mistaking the fact that the rapid growth in the Nation's college-age population has made necessary an expansion of college classroom facilities. This can be shown by the fact that, in the fall of 1962, the total college enrollment in the United States was 4,174,936. It is estimated that, in 1965, that enrollment will increase to 5,220,000—and that in 1970 it will have further increased to 6,959,000.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6143 provides for Federal assistance where that help is most urgently needed. Title I authorizes a 5-year program of matching grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning for the construction of academic facilities and authorizes appropriations of $230 million annually for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966—after which the Congress would review the program before authorizing appropriations for the final 2 years of the program.

At least 22 percent of a State's allotment for any year is reserved for construction of academic facilities for junior colleges and technical institutes. Junior colleges have absorbed much of the increase in college enrollments in recent years, and may be expected to continue to do so. It was pointed out during the hearings on this bill that expansion of these 2-year institutions would place post-high school opportunities within reach of thousands of our young people. Also, the shortage of technicians has often forced graduate engineers to do semi-professional work, resulting in inefficient use of professional manpower. The reservation of funds for technical institutions would lead to the training of additional numbers of technicians, releasing the engineers for their more highly skilled work.

Title II authorizes a 5-year program of matching construction grants for establishment or improvement of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. In order to meet the Nation's needs in the fields of engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences, it will require double the number of masters' and doctors' degrees awarded annually in these fields by 1970. This need will be met through H.R. 6143 in expanded and improved centers of graduate work all over the country—and will lead to decentralization of these centers.

As matters stand now, 75 percent of all doctoral degrees are granted by a small number of universities concentrated in 12 States. The bill, which authorizes appropriation of $25 million for fiscal year 1964 and $60 million each for fiscal years 1965 and 1966, again provides for congressional review of the program before appropriations are authorized for the last 2 years.

Patterned after the loan provisions of the college housing program, title III authorizes loans to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to higher education building agencies, for the construction of classrooms, laboratories and libraries. Authorized annually for the first 3 years is $120 million, after which the program would again be subject to congressional review before appropriations for the final 2 years would be authorized. The college housing program has been a tremendous success since its inception in 1950. Some 900 colleges and universities, accounting for approximately 85 percent of all enrollments in schools of higher education, have participated in the program. H.R. 6143 will enable these colleges and universities to apply the same methods toward the construction of facilities to teach the students housed under the college housing law.

The general provisions under title IV provide safeguards for the expenditure of Federal funds, specifically prohibiting expenditures for other than the purposes stated in the first three titles of the bill and also insuring that there will be no duplication of programs.

A particularly good feature of H.R. 6143 is that the smaller colleges will be given equal consideration on their projects—and will be helped in direct ratio to our great universities. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in my memory that the smaller colleges and the large universities—the private institutions and the publicly supported institutions—have united in their support for a bill designed to aid higher education.

Mr. Speaker, the need for H.R. 6143 has been repeatedly demonstrated over the years. I am sure, in view of the statement of Tuesday of this week by President Johnson praising the Senate for its action, that he will sign the measure promptly—thus extending to our colleges and universities the aid they have needed so urgently for so long.

## Address of Hon. Leonard Farbstein of New York, at Luncheon Meeting of American Israel Public Affairs Committee December 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include at this point an address made by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, at a luncheon meeting of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, on December 9.

I wholeheartedly agree with Congressman FARBSTEIN's amendment which provides that no assistance shall be provided under the foreign aid bill to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against our own country or any country which receives U.S. aid.

I commend his remarks to the Members of this body:

> I ask you to utter a silent prayer for our departed President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; for in his passing we lost a good friend, and Israel lost a good friend.
>
> Israel lost a good friend because John Kennedy was the first President of the United States to sell Israel important arms, necessary for her survival. Whenever requests were made of the previous administration for the right to purchase arms from this Government, Israel was generally informed that inasmuch as France was her traditional supplier, we did not think it wise to do so. Whether or not this was the only reason, I leave to your determination. I do not think so. This drastic change was made in the face of what must have been the displeasure and mortification of Israel's enemies.
>
> At the direction of President Kennedy, Hawk missiles were sold to Israel, for defensive purposes. These defensive weapons are the latest word in destroying invading Arab aircraft. Let me say that Israel has been seeking defensive weapons—she seeks solely to protect her borders and people.
>
> Shortly before his death, I wrote to the State Department complaining of the presence of Nazi scientists in Egypt, hired by Nasser for the purpose of building missiles,

submarines, and other weapons of terribly destructive power. I requested that we make representations to the German Government to recall its scientists, and to the United Arab Republic to desist from spending its needed moneys for these devilish purposes. I received a reply from that office, signed by the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, advising that the State Department could not interfere in the internal affairs of another country; and that if the German scientists were withdrawn or removed, Russian scientists would take their place. I thereupon wrote directly to the President of my dismay, to which I received a reply by letter from the White House; and 3 days later, the late President publicly announced at a press conference in Washington, "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors." "We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Near East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people."

So you can understand what I mean when I say we lost a good friend, and Israel lost a good friend, when John Fitzgerald Kennedy passed from the scene. While defending the interests of this country, he did not hesitate to break precedent in the cause of righteousness, of decency, and of fairness.

Now it can be truthfully said that "God reigns and the Government at Washington goes on." And we are the living and must take up the cudgels in behalf of right, decency, and fair treatment for the survivors of the concentration camps and the oppressed of our people who seek a haven of refuge in Israel. And if this haven of refuge is not to be destroyed, and a holocaust is not again to be visited upon our people in Israel, those of us who are able must exert every effort in their behalf. We, who have the good fortune to live in the greatest, most powerful Nation on earth, dare not spare ourselves if Israel is to survive.

I greet all of you who have labored together in the cause of Jewish survival. We must not forget that for centuries, our people have been driven across the face of the earth and, paraphrasing what the late Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver said, some of them are still in its torture chambers in certain areas of the world.

With a new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, what does the future hold for Israel?

Will the policies of the State Department, insofar as they apply to the Near East, remain the same? Will they change—and if they do, in what respect?

What is our policy in the Near East? I believe our policy in the Near East is based upon keeping peace in the area, keeping the Soviets out, and upon protecting our national interests in the area—which, in this instance, I believe, means oil reserves. These considerations, despite the morals and emotions, the rights and wrongs, in my opinion, will guide our Government in its policy in the Near East.

And the question arises, What will be the effect of my amendment to the foreign aid bill? The amendment says that no assistance shall be provided, under the foreign aid bill, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or any country receiving assistance until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. In other words, no aid is to be given in the event of war or preparation for war against Yemen, Israel, or any other country to which we are giving assistance. Time alone will tell if this amendment will be given force, and to what degree.

The question really is: Can our foreign policy, as I have stated it, be sustained with my amendment in the law? Can the guidelines of our foreign policy that I spoke of previously, be adhered to if my amendment is faithfully observed? Let's analyze it and see.

There is no doubt that Nasser is presently in violation of that law in more than one instance. First, his troops are in Yemen, where he is obviously committing aggression; and his airplanes have bombed Saudi Arabia, in whose security we have a vital interest. His soldiers have appeared in Algeria in the dispute between Morocco and Algeria.

These are matters of record insofar as aggression in concerned.

It is also a matter of record that he has hired Nazi scientists to build submarines, missiles, etc., and has publicly declared that he intends to drive Israel into the sea. This is also a matter of public record.

If my amendment is to be enforced, in keeping with the intent of Congress, aid should immediately be cut off from Nasser.

That is clear from the legislative history—from the debate in both Houses of the Congress. So the people of the United States, as represented by the Congress, have spoken.

Will this happen? Will the administration feel that it is advisable, in keeping with our present foreign policy, to follow the letter of this amendment and risk the results that might flow therefrom?

Frankly, I doubt it; though I will urge this course. You must remember that there must first be a finding by the President. The President must determine that the nation receiving our aid is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts. That, he may hesitate to do. And frankly, I do not think that we should be surprised, if he does not readily make that finding. Cutting off all aid to Egypt would create political as well as economic instability among most of the countries of the Near East, which, I expect, the administration fears.

Although I do not believe the administration will abide by the letter of my amendment; nevertheless, I do not believe that the voice of the Congress, as reflected by the amendment, will be disregarded. I do not think that the State Department which, if it dared, would like to do nothing, can afford to ignore the voice of the Congress, which holds the purse strings.

Some have argued, that the amendment makes it very difficult for the President. But I would like to suggest that this amendment could strengthen the hand of the Executive and the State Department in their dealings not only with Nasser but with all the other countries, not alone in the Near East but throughout the world—at least those who are the beneficiaries of our aid.

Because of my amendment, and judging by the comments which have appeared in the Egyptian press—there is no doubt that Nasser is aware of it—the Egyptian dictator must now be somewhat chastened, since he now can be effectively challenged insofar as his policy toward Israel is concerned.

I maintain that my amendment will put a weapon in the hands of this Government for I firmly believe that Egypt cannot afford to do without our aid, for we feed practically half of her people by the sale of foodstuffs for her local currency, which incidentally is of no use to us. And as a result of the receipt of these grains from us, Nasser is enabled to sell his cotton to the Soviet Union in exchange for implements of war.

Nasser, in my opinion, will prove amenable to persuasion. He must. He has no choice. He cannot expect that his people will be fed by the Russians. They haven't enough food for themselves in the first place, and are considerably extended in the area already.

This amendment provides the persuader, if this administration desire to use it; and I can see no reason why it should not be used. It can be used to good advantage to cut down Nasser's ability to engage in adventures away from home to the detriment not alone of Israel, but to all the countries of the Near East who, at one time or another, were subjected to his machinations.

We understand the President's dislike of loss of "executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs." Nevertheless, Congress appropriates the money and is responsible to the people. It does have some authority to direct how this money should be spent. No one questions that the conduct of foreign policy is the prerogative of the executive; yet the Congress cannot be considered impotent. It is a partner in every aspect of our complex international relations.

We must also face the fact, and I do not think that I am telling you anything new when I say, that there are some in our State Department who believe that Nasser represents the wave of the future, and these individuals seek so to direct our foreign policy. Beginning with the American Ambassador to Egypt who was the former President of the American University in Cairo and wrote the introduction to Nasser's book on revolution, up through the various echelons in the State Department, we must wrestle with the problem of policy directed by individuals so mentally oriented.

Nasser, of course, encourages this.

In connection with our policy of keeping the Soviets out, as I have mentioned earlier, we give aid to Nasser in order to offset the massive aid given him by the Soviet Union. And so you must understand the resistance on the part of those in the State Department, and perhaps others, to the discontinuance of aid.

Now whether or not my amendment is endorsed tomorrow, or next week, or next month, I would like to stress the significance of that amendment from the standpoint of Israel's security and survival.

My colleagues and I in the House did not support this amendment merely because we wanted to save a few million dollars in foreign aid. Indeed, most of the people who supported it were people who believe in foreign aid. We sponsored this amendment because we want the Department of State to understand that the people of our country do not understand a policy which fails to distinguish between the aggressor and the victim. Most Congressmen feel very strongly on this point.

Most of us are old enough to remember Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous Chicago speech in 1937 when he called for quarantining the aggressor. Many of us believe that if the civilized community had quarantined the aggressor at that time we might have averted war.

What we are now saying to the administration, firmly and emphatically, is that we do not want our country to be neutral where there is the threat of another war. We want the influence of our country to be exerted as vigorously as possible on the side of peace. That is what the amendment means. And when you look at the vote in Congress, it is very gratifying to see that it was unanimous in the House. And in the Senate, where there was a debate, 82 Senators of the 100 Members of the Senate are recorded as being in favor.

Thus we have served notice that what we want is to be certain that our Government stands firmly in opposition to renewed war and in support of Israel's security.

My amendment serves notice, not only on the Department of State, but on Egypt and every other Arab country that threatens Israel, that the American people are deeply and vitally concerned about the peace of the Near East.

We are the voice of American opinion. That is why I am glad to be here today talking to this audience. I know from the years

I have spent in Washington of the work you have done to alert the American people, to alert Congress to sound the alarm, and to summon our own Government to a recognition of the danger and its responsibility to avert another tragedy in the Near East.

Our work did not end when Congress voted my amendment. Our work goes on. We must make certain that this amendment is implemented. We must call for a reconsideration of policies which do not serve the peace. We want to insure that all of the resources of our country, diplomatic, as well as military, are mobilized in the service of an Arab-Israel peace.

This then, I feel, is the picture which presently confronts this administration. And what can we expect from the new President and his administration? Here, perforce, we must be guided by the past.

In 1957, when President Eisenhower threatened Israel with punitive sanctions unless she withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula, Mr. Johnson was then the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He told President Eisenhower that the Senate would not approve economic sanctions against Israel. He called for a just peace and deplored the attempted coercion of Israel.

As a Senator, President Johnson fought to obtain for Israel a fair share of economic aid, noting that Israel was forced to divert its own resources for defensive arms against the Russian arms that were flowing into Egypt.

He also strongly supported the Douglas-Keating amendment to the foreign aid bill directed against the Arab blockade; which amendment, incidentally, was introduced by me and was passed in the House. This amendment called for "freedom of the seas."

When Senator FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, sought to limit this amendment, Senator Johnson took the unusual and courageous step of leading this fight against one of his committee chairmen. As majority leader, he would normally have supported the committee chairman, but because he believed in the principle of "freedom of the seas," he moved to table the Fulbright motion and was successful by a 45-to-39 vote.

I am confident that President Johnson will, at the very least, continue the basic policies of the Kennedy administration. Better than that, I firmly believe that aid to Nasser will be cut down, gradually, and substantially, if he disregards the mandate of Congress and continues his troublemaking.

As for myself, I assure you that I shall continue to do all that a representative of the people can do to make certain that the voice of the Congress of the United States is not lost to would-be aggressors.

## Human Rights Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 10, we celebrated the 15th anniversary of the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and on Sunday, December 15, Americans will observe the 172d anniversary of the Bill of Rights. By Presidential proclamation, the week December 10–17 is known as Human Rights Week. To Americans everywhere, this should be a time for review and reflection. Now, more than ever, we must ask ourselves what we as individuals have done to secure the goal of human rights for all.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes as fundamental that individuals have rights both as members of national states and as members of a developing world society. People thus have rights precisely because they are people, not because they happen to be Americans, Russians, or any other nationality.

The United Nations undertook in the charter to promote human rights and freedoms. It is the task of the Universal Declaration to define these fundamental rights. The declaration is therefore both a moral and an educational force, expressing a "common standard of achievement" for all peoples. This it has admirably done in the course of the declaration's 30 articles devoted to 2 broad categories: First, personal, civil, and political rights, and second, economic, social, and cultural rights. The articles draw heavily upon the experience of democratic nations, and our own Bill of Rights finds many parallels in the declaration.

The United Nations has set itself a threefold task: the declaration, a convention giving binding legal status to the declaration, and implementing machinery to enforce the observance of the articles. All three instruments will comprise the International Bill of Human Rights.

The second and third stages have been combined in two treaties known as "Covenants on Human Rights." These documents have been in the drafting process since 1947. In 1954, the Human Rights Commission completed its draft version of the covenants, and since 1955 a General Assembly committee has been discussing their provisions. The standing committee of the Assembly concerned with the human rights bill has completed hearings on both the preambles and the substantive articles falling under the two covenants on civil and political rights and on social and cultural rights. This year, the committee has begun discussion on the articles of implementation.

There will probably be another 5 years' work involved before the covenants can be approved by the Assembly. It is a difficult process to reconcile and codify principles of human rights as they are applied in 111 independent states. Furthermore, the large number of new states admitted to the United Nations over the past few years means that many states now engaged in formulating the covenants had no part in drafting the original declaration. Thus, they might well be perplexed by the covenant's format and less than enthused about the overall objective. Nevertheless, real progress in this difficult area is being made, and soon the declaration may have legal effect in addition to being a moral and educational force.

As we commemorate Human Rights Week we should be aware of the dynamic spread throughout the world of the concepts embodied in our Bill of Rights. The development of an International Bill of Human Rights reveals the lasting legacy America can bequeath to the world. But when our own guaranteed freedoms are withheld from some, when men and women are denied the opportunity to fully exercise the rights and privileges of citizenship, and when we lack universal respect for human rights, then our legacy on behalf of an International Bill of Rights is incomplete and even suspect.

The rule of law must guarantee human rights for all the world's citizens. Law must be used here in the United States to guarantee the declared rights of our own citizens. Law must also ban the denial of equal opportunity to any American. Today we bear witness to the struggle for full enjoyment of the fundamental freedoms now withheld from some of our citizens. These goals must be fulfilled; during this Human Rights Week they should be ever in the forefront of our thoughts.

A great man has died—his life ended before he could witness the realization of these rights which he sought and advocated for all. We can now build a living monument to our departed President. Let us resolve to enact an International Bill of Rights for the peoples of the world and an American Bill of Civil Rights for the peoples of our country.

## Grassroots Support for Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 12, 1963*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the quality stabilization bill I have many times pointed out that this legislation has extensive support at the Nation's grassroots level. This support is not limited to those persons having a direct interest in the well-being of our independent retail economy, but it also includes a large and knowledgeable segment of the consumer public.

The propaganda smokescreen set up by opponents of quality stabilization to obscure the real issues involved in the bill continues unabated. But no amount of propaganda can obscure the harsh economic facts which make passage of this legislation necessary if our free competitive retail system is to survive. Either the Congress acts to save the Nation's competitive retail system, or that system is doomed to be bled white by unfair and cutthroat competitive practices.

This was the essence of testimony I gave in early October to the Senate Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization. At that time I described the quality stabilization bill as a tourniquet to stop the flow of retail lifeblood. This viewpoint, I am gratified to be able to say, has received wide acceptance and support, not only in my home State of Washington, but in all parts of the country.

As a matter of fact, mail response to my position on this vital economic issue during 1963 has reinforced my conviction that quality stabilization is not simply good economics, but good politics as well. The people best informed about the economic facts of life concerning our Nation's retail market are behind quality stabilization. They are supporting this legislation not because it offers a panacea to our retail ills, but because it is the best solution yet evolved to curb the source of these ills.

The Congress will do well to hear the voice of public opinion on this key issue rather than the chant of the high-powered propagandists of its special-interest opponents. Toward this end, I believe that a reading of certain excerpts from letters received in my office on quality stabilization can serve a useful purpose.

Let me begin with a letter received from an official of one of the largest and most important retail trade groups in the U.S. shoe industry:

> For some time, the independent retailers have been seriously concerned about their future—

Writes Mr. Edward J. MacDonald, executive vice president of the National Shoe Retailers Association.

> The lack of capital and the increasing competition of new forms of distribution have been threatening their security.

Mr. MacDonald continues:

> The board of directors of the National Shoe Retailers Association, speaking for the entire membership, unanimously approved the provisions of the quality stabilization bill—eliminating bait advertising, unscrupulous price cutting and merchandising practices—as a powerful means to help guarantee the future security of brand name retailers and, therefore, the future security of the national economy.

So writes an executive of a retail commodity trade association. From a different perspective, another executive official, this one the mayor of a Maryland town, writes on behalf of the interests of the small businessmen of his community and State:

> The Quality Stabilization Act is essential to help the consumer—

Writes Mayor John H. Burbage, of Berlin, Md.—

> He often is a sucker, being baited into a store by unprincipled loss-leader operators who then gouge him on less known products * * *. The quality stabilization bill will help the quality manufacturer build better and better products, not cheaper and cheaper imitations.

Additional support for quality stabilization comes from Mr. W. F. Moore, of the Christian Booksellers Association, Inc., of Chicago, Ill. Mr. Moore writes:

> The Christian Booksellers Association is not seeking legislation that will protect the inefficient merchant, but rather we seek legislation that will provide the necessary protection against the encroachment of unfair competition by unscrupulous merchants * * *. It is our considered opinion that the early enactment of the quality stabilization bill is needed.

Especially gratifying has been the mail response to my own recent testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization.

From a West Virginia automotive supply executive comes a letter graphically telling of a current economic plight of the small independent businessman. Says Mr. Frank G. McKenzie of Bluefield, W. Va.:

> I have been the head of a private enterprise business with several outlets in the automotive after-market for parts, supplies, and equipment since 1930, and have served in many capacities in association work * * * and I have never seen such a squeeze coming up in our field, as well as others, as has occurred in the last few years.

A similar warning is spelled out in a letter from Mr. Moe Weiss, executive secretary of Consolidated Brooklyn Retail Pharmacists, Inc., of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

> Unless a fair competitive climate is created soon, to protect small and independent retailers, we will see many thousands of failures—

Writes Mr. Weiss, who urges favorable congressional action on quality stabilization legislation.

But the disease which quality stabilization is aimed at curing is national, not regional, in scope. To the voices of Mr. McKenzie of West Virginia and Mr. Weiss of California, add that of Mr. F. A. Palmer, Jr. of Clute, Tex. Only a few short days ago, Mr. Palmer wrote as follows:

> DEAR SIR: I just finished reading your remarks of October 7, 1963, on the quality stabilization bill. I wish to congratulate you on your stand and your astute insight into the basic problem of American small business * * *. My wife and I own a small store in Clute, Tex., and we are supporting four families, representing 21 people, out of this small business. If something is not done in the very near future to protect small business, we will be forced to give up. Multiply this by thousands and see what it does to unemployment.

From Mr. Rudolph Schiller, president of W. Schiller & Co., of St. Louis, Mo., comes still more verification of the plight of the small businessman throughout the country:

> Here in the small towns of Missouri there are more small merchants going out of business all of the time and one can see more and more for rent signs.

States Mr. Schiller—

> For years we have been hearing about the small businessman, but nothing is done about him.

Mr. Schiller's letter continues:

> The small businessman does not want a loan. What he wants is to make a fair and legitimate profit out of at least some of the things he sells, and especially those items which are quality products.

Referring specifically to one of the key elements of the quality stabilization bill, Mr. Schiller concludes:

> To my mind, a man who makes a quality product and has it trademarked should have protection all the way down to the consumer.

In the Southeast, the retail situation is described, by Mr. K. K. Kennedy, president of the Florida State Retailers Association, as "tragic." Writes Mr. Kennedy:

> Your timely and forceful testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee on behalf of the quality stabilization bill, is a true and heartbreaking portrayal of the tragic situation facing the independent retailers of our State.

And from my home State of Washington, here are but a few excerpts from the many letters I received in response to my quality stabilization testimony before the Senate subcommittee:

From Mr. Robert D. Gibb of Associated Stationers, Seattle:

> As a former competitor of yours, and knowing you believe in fair competition, I again thank you for your effort toward this bill.

From Mr. John Walters, Walters Prescription Pharmacy, Inc., Seattle:

> Your talk before the committee was logical and presented in such an A-B-C manner that it should be obvious to any fairminded Senator or Congressman that such a bill is necessary if the independent merchant is to survive.

From Mr. Clyde F. Allen of Clyde's Pharmacy, Bremerton, Wash.:

> Keep up the good work that you are doing to convince all of your colleagues that this is necessary legislation.

And finally, from Mr. F. N. McCowan, executive director of the Washington State Food Dealers Association, Seattle:

> It is very gratifying to know of your interest and work for small business and our free competitive enterprise system.

I know that in recent months there have been hundreds of thousands of words written and spoken concerning quality stabilization. But, in my opinion, few tracts or words spoken on the subject speak more eloquently of the need for enactment of this legislation than some of the pertinent excerpts I have just read. These are the expressions of grassroots American businessmen close to the Nation's retail economy.

These men, Mr. Speaker, who depend on the well-being of the retail economy for their livelihoods, cannot permit themselves to be fooled by the distorted slogans and arguments put forth by quality stabilization's opponents, and, considering that the fate of this legislation might mean life or death for America's independent small businessmen, neither can the Congress.